

Indonesian EFL Journal: Journal of ELT, Linguistics, and Literature

||Volume||3||Issue||2||Pages|| 82 – 101 ||2017||

Available online at:<http://ejournal.kopertais4.or.id/mataraman/index.php/efi> |P-ISSN: 2460-0938; E-ISSN: 2460-2604|**HOW DO PEOPLE SAY ABOUT LANGUAGE,
CULTURE, AND IDEOLOGY?****Mardliya Pratiwi Zamruddin***tiwinsight@gmail.com*

Mulawarman University, Samarinda, Indonesia

*Jalan Kuaro, Gn. Kelua, Samarinda Ulu, Samarinda, Kalimantan Timur 75119***Article History:**

Received:

August 17, 2017

Revised:

October 26, 2017

Accepted:

December 21, 2017

Corresponding Author:*pratiwi.bahar@gmail.com*

Abstract: This article talks about definitions on language, culture, and ideology from several point of views and experts and also how the three are linked and connected and created relationship that the question of ‘Which comes first?’ or ‘Which one is more important?’ can only be answered by putting language, culture, and ideology together. This article also provides understanding on intercultural within the heterogeneous society as well as whether or not culture can be improved.

Keywords – Language, culture, ideology, intercultural, heterogeneous society

INTRODUCTION

It is generally approved that language and culture are closely related. Language is viewed as a verbal expression of culture. It is used to maintain and convey culture and cultural ties. Language provides many of the categories used for expressing thoughts, so it is therefore natural to assume that the language used influences thinking process. Cultures hide in languages. In our big world every minute is a lesson looks at intercultural communication and examines how it can affect interactions between people from countries and backgrounds.

Living in multicultural societies within a global life, we all face the question “How do people understand another when they do not share a common cultural experience?” every day. We now realize that issues of intercultural understanding are connected in other

complex question: What kind of communication is needed by a pluralistic society to be both culturally diverse and unified in common goals?

DISCUSSION

HOW DO PEOPLE SAY ABOUT LANGUAGE?

LANGUAGE

Language displays properties, which enable human to express themselves through verbal communication, like words, phrases, sentences, and nonverbal communication, like body language, sign language. The most remarkable property of language is the way it enables us to talk about anything we want.

The effects of language are remarkable, and include much of what distinguishes human from animals. However, it is only within the last several centuries or so that language has been studied in a scientific way, by careful and comprehensive observation, Linguistics, the study of language, is only in its beginnings. Language is more than just a means of communication. It plays a great part in our life, influences our culture and even our thought processes. During the first four decades of the 20th century, American linguists and anthropologists viewed language as being more important than it actually is in shaping our perception of reality.

This was mostly due to Edward Sapir and his student Benjamin Whorf who said that language predetermines what we see in the world around us. In other words, language acts like a polarizing lens on a camera in filtering reality--we see the real world only in the categories of our language.

Leonard Bloomfield in his book *The Study of Language* stated that the Greek generalizations about language were not improved upon until the eighteenth century, when scholars ceased to view language as a direct gift of God, and put forth various theories as to its origin (1933: 5-6).

Danish linguist Otto Jespersen (1860-1943) grouped some theories that are commonly held about the origin of language into five types (Crystal, 2007: 350-351):

- *The 'bow-wow' theory*
Speech arose through people imitating the sounds of the environment, especially animal calls.
- *The 'pooh-pooh' theory*
Speech arose through people making instinctive sounds, caused by pain, anger, or other emotions.

- *The 'ding-dong' theory*
Speech arose because people reacted to the stimuli in the world around them, and spontaneously produced sounds which in some way reflected or were in harmony with the environment.
- *The 'yo-he-ho' theory*
Speech arose because as people worked together, their physical efforts produced communal, rhythmical grunts, which in due course developed into chants, and thus language.
- *The 'la-la' theory*
Speech arose from the romantic side of life – sounds associated with love, play, poetic feeling, perhaps even song.

Those five theories on how language is developed still had not taking into account the aspects of emotional and rational of speech expression and thus made those theories lacked of support and were being questioned.

Language reflects culture, and is influenced and shaped by it. In the broadest sense, it is also the symbolic representation of a people, since it comprises their historical and cultural backgrounds, as well as their approach to life and their ways of living and thinking. Sapir (1949) in the first place, language is primarily a system of phonetic symbols for the expression of communicable thought and feeling. In other words, the symbols of language are differentiated products of the vocal behaviour, which is associated with the larynx of the higher mammals. Chase (1969) declares that the purpose of language use is to communicate with others, to think, and to shape one's standpoint and outlook on life. Indeed, language figures human thoughts.

Saussure (1959) believes that language is a system of signs. For him, a sign consists of a signifier (the sound- image or the written shape) and a signified (a concept), in the manner that, they both are inseparably linked with each other. In other words, the sound-image cannot be separated from the concept, that is to say, these two never part with each other. Crystal (1981) introduced language as “the systematic, conventional use of sounds, signs or written symbols in a human society for communication and self-expression.

Brown (1994) describes the two as follows: ‘A language is a part of a culture and a culture is a part of a language; the two are intricately interwoven so that one cannot separate the two without losing the significance of either language or culture.’ In a word, culture and language are inseparable. Language is a system of arbitrary signs, which is accepted by a group, and society of users. It is taken delivery of a specific purpose in

relation to the communal world of clients. (Pollock, 1997). Language is a system of signs that is seen as having itself a cultural value” (Kramsch, Claire. 1998).

Defining language is an impossible task. The best way to formulate a working definition `is to consider the origin of the word itself, which comes from the Latin *lingua*, meaning tongue.”(Danesi, 2004). A composite of a number of possible definitions of language let the following combination definition

1. Language is systematic.
2. Language is a set of arbitrary symbols.
3. Those symbols are primarily vocal, but may also be visual.
4. The symbols have conventionalized meanings to which they refer.
5. Language is used for communication.
6. Language operates in a speech community or culture.
7. Language is essentially human, although possibly not limited to humans.
8. Language is acquired by all people in much the same way; language and language learning both have universal characteristics.

We can say that language is acquired symbols which have conventionalized meanings used for communication in much the same way. As human, we have brain that has some functions like the control of hearing and acquiring language.

CULTURE

Culture is often described as a structure that is constructed in the society. Hoed (2014) in his book *Semiotik & Dinamika Sosial Budaya* stated that culture is the way a nation perceives the world, the way of thinking, value system, basic assumptions, and the lifestyle of the nation. Culture also involving material aspects such as text, architectures, crafts, manufactures things, and even culinary.

In previous ages, some scholars define culture in several ways although it led to particular words that have almost the same meaning. “Culture or civilization, taken in its wide ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society”. (E. B. Tylor, 1871). Civilization and culture the same and they believe the two terms have been used synonymously. For them, they both indicate different levels of the same subject. Civilization indicates the great development of a civilized society; culture

indicates the same subject too. Each society has its own special culture either simple or complex". (Kroeber and Kluckhohn, 1952).

Culture is a system of behaviors and modes that depend on unconsciousness. (Edward Sapir, 1956). Culture is the pattern of life within a community, the regularly recurring activities and material and social arrangements characteristic of a particular group". (Ward. H. Goodenough 1957). Culture is the framework of beliefs, expressive symbols, and values in terms of which individuals define their feelings and make their judgments" (Geertz, 1957). Culture is as a capital and means for developing all cultures and knowledge in order to terminate all human sharing problems, for helping economical stabilization and political security". (T. S. Eliot, 1961). Culture is the entirety of socially transmitted and common behaviour patterns, prototypes, samples, arts, beliefs, institutions, and all other products of human work and thought". (Levis Strauss, 1963). Culture the milieu of super organic and highlights the separation of culture from physical and natural factors. He believes that the super organic factor is only for man, whereas; the other two factors are the same for man and animal". (Spencer, 1986)

Culture has multifarious meanings. Culture means farming. It is used everywhere as rural culture, urban culture, American culture and so on. Today, in every field, in humanities, every research requires a general view of culture. It is used in archaeology, linguistics, history, psychology, sociology etc. It is even said that man is an animal with culture (Roohul-Amini, 1989). Culture refers to what has been grown and groomed, the word *culture* from latin *colere*: to cultivate). Culture forces nature to reveal its essential potentialities. (Kramsch, 1998). Culture as a way of life based on a signifying order developed originally in a tribal context that is passed along through the signifying order from one generation to the next". (Danesi. M and Paul Perron, 1999). Culture is everything that people has, thinks, and does as members of a society" (Ferraro, 2003).

Interest in culture is as old as human history where the first scientific definition of culture was in the nineteenth century. At that time, the British anthropologist Edward B. Taylor defined it in 1871, as a complex whole including knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capability or habit acquired by human beings as members of society (Danesi & Perron, 1999: 3).

Furthermore, Kroeber and Kluckholn, both anthropologists, found 150 qualitatively distinct definitions about culture. They found that there are two broad consensuses dealt with defining culture:

1. That culture is a way of life based on some system of shared meanings; and
2. That it is passed on from generation to generation through this very system. (Danesi & Perron, 1999: 22).

Much of the difficulty of understanding the concept of culture stems from the different usages of the term as it was increasingly employed in the nineteenth century. Broadly speaking, it was used in three ways (all of which can be found today as well). First, as exemplified in Matthew Arnolds' *Culture and Anarchy* (1867), culture referred to special intellectual or artistic endeavors or products, what today we might call "high culture" as opposed to "popular culture" (or "folkways" in an earlier usage). By this definition, only a portion – typically a small one – of any social group "has" culture. (The rest are potential sources of anarchy!) This sense of culture is more closely related to aesthetics than to social science.

Partly in reaction to this usage, the second, as pioneered by Edward B. Tylor in *Primitive Culture* (1870), referred to a quality possessed by all people in all social groups, who nevertheless could be arrayed on a development (evolutionary) continuum (in Lewis Henry Morgan's scheme) from "savagery" through "barbarism" to "civilization". It is worth quoting Tylor's definition in its entirety; first because it became the foundational one for anthropology; and second because it partly explains why Kroeber and Kluckhohn found definitional fecundity by the early 1950s. Tylor's definition of culture is "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society". In contrast to Arnold's view, all folks "have" culture, which they acquire by virtue of membership in some social group – society. In addition, a whole grab bag of things, from knowledge to habits to capabilities, makes up culture.

The third usage of culture developed in anthropology in the twentieth-century work of Franz Boas and his students, though with roots in the eighteenth-century writings of Johann von Herder. As Tylor reacted to Arnold to establish a scientific (rather than aesthetic) basis for culture, so Boas reacted against Tylor and other social evolutionists. Whereas the evolutionists stressed the universal character of a single culture, with different societies arrayed from savage to civilized, Boas emphasized the uniqueness of the many and varied cultures of different peoples or societies. Moreover, he dismissed the value judgments he found inherent in both the Arnoldian and Tylorean views of culture; for Boas, one should never differentiate high from low culture, and one ought not differentially valorize cultures as savage or civilized.

Culture can be defined as human creation (Freire, 1970). It is the human part of the environment (Wang, Brislin, Wang, Williams, & Chao, 2000). In other words, culture is the non-biological aspects of life. It is the process of generating and sharing meaning within a social system. This social system is comprised of values, norms and ways of behaving and so culture comprises the ways we interact, behave, and communicate with one another. Culture is something that is learned from parents, schools the media and the broader community.

Singer (1998) defined culture as: a pattern of learned, group-related perceptions – including both verbal and nonverbal language, attitudes, values, belief systems, disbelief systems and behaviours that is accepted and expected by an identity group (Singer, 1998:5)

Yet cultures are not fixed. They changed and interconnected, but it may be slow or irregular. Cultures are dynamic as they are created and recreated through shared interactions (Gudykunst, 1983). However, these changes may be slow or irregular.

Furthermore, Bronislaw Malinowski said that everything contained in society is determined by the culture that is owned by the community itself. The term for that opinion is called Cultural-determinism. In addition, Andreas Eppink's idea contains the entire understanding of the culture, values, norms, knowledge and overall social structures. Also, Clifford Geertz defines culture is a symbolic meaning system. It is semiotic system in which symbols function to communicate meaning from one mind to another. Cultural symbols encode a connection between a signifying form and a signaled meaning.

For one thing, some Indonesian archaeologist namely Ki Hajar Dewantara said that Culture means the fruit of the human mind. It is the result of the struggle of man against two strong influences, the nature of the times and is a testament to the triumph of human life to overcome the obstacles and hardships in life and livelihood in order to achieve salvation and happiness at the birth is orderly and peaceful.; besides, Koentjaraningrat defined Culture is a whole system of ideas, actions, and the work of human beings in order to become a society that human beings belong to learn; also, Selo Soemardjan dan Soelaiman Soemardi define culture is a means of work, interest, and creative community; then archaeologist R. Soekmono expressed Culture is all the result of human effort, either an object or just a piece of mind and the life.

Moreover, M. Jacobs and B.J. Stern said that culture covers all forms of technology including social, ideological, religious, and arts and objects, all of which are social heritage. Another idea explored by Francis Merrill who emphasize two points about culture: Behavioral patterns are generated by social interaction; All behavior and all products

produced by someone as a member of a community that is found through symbolic interaction.

Moreover, Bounded, et.al said culture is something that is formed by the development and transmission of human beliefs through certain symbols, such as language symbols as a series of symbols that are used to divert the cultural beliefs among the members of a society. The messages about the culture, which is expected to be found in the media, government, religious institutions, educational systems and such.

Next, Mitchell said Culture is the most overall looping action or human activity and human-generated products that have been popular in the community socially and not just in the genetically switch. Then, Robert H.Lowie said that Culture is everything in getting individuals from the community, including beliefs, customs, norms artistic, eating habits, skills obtained not from his own creativity but rather a legacy of the past which can be through formal or informal education.

In addition, Ralph Linton culture is the entirety of the knowledge and attitudes and patterns of behaviour that is a habit, owned and inherited by members of a particular community. 'The sum total of knowledge, attitudes and habitual behavior patterns shared and transmitted by the members of a particular society' (Ralph Linton (1940).

More ideas on culture found the pattern of life within a community, the regularly recurring activities and material and social arrangements characteristic of a particular group' (Ward Goodenough (1957). Geertz 1973, an American Anthropologist said Culture is the framework of beliefs, expressive symbols, and values in terms of which individuals define their feelings and make their judgements". is 'an historically transmitted pattern of meaning embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic form by means which men communicate' (1973: 89).

Nababan formulates Culture as the whole communication system that binds and allows operation of a set of people called the public. Thus culture can be defined as a "system of rules of communication and interaction that allows a society occurs, preserved, and preserved". Culture gives meaning to all business and human movements. (Nababan, 1984: 49)

Sapir wrote more complex of the word "culture" seems to be used in three main senses or groups of senses. First, the ethnologist and culture-historian to embody any socially inherited element in the life of man, material and spiritual, technically use culture. Culture so defined is coterminous with man himself, for even the lowliest savages live in a social world characterized by a complex network of traditionally conserved habits, usages, and attitudes.

Kramersch (2009) in her book *Language and Culture* stated that language is the principal means whereby we conduct our social lives. Furthermore, she mentioned three notions of language that are:

- Language expresses cultural reality
- Language embodies cultural reality
- Language symbolizes cultural reality

From the three notions of language proposed by Kramersch above, it is clearly seen that language cannot be separated from culture. Language when it is used in context of communication will involve culture in favor to help understanding the message being conveyed.

In analyzing the culture of a particular group or organization, it is desirable to distinguish three fundamental levels at which culture manifests itself: (a) observable artifacts, (b) values, and (c) basic underlying assumptions. When one enters an organization, one observes and feels its artifacts. This category includes everything from the physical layout, the dress code, the manner in which people address each other, the smell and feel of the place, its emotional intensity, and other phenomena, to the more permanent archival manifestations such as company records, products, statements of philosophy, and annual reports. (Schein 1990: 111)

In addition, a culture involves a social group (such as a nation, ethnic group, profession, generation, etc.) defined in terms of similar cultural representations held by a significant proportion of the group's members. In other words, people are said to belong in the same culture to the extent that the set of their shared cultural representations is large. (Žegarac 2007: 39–40)

Culture is learned from the people you interact with as you are socialized. Watching how adults react and talk to new babies is an excellent way to see the actual symbolic transmission of culture among people. Two babies born at exactly the same time in two parts of the globe may be taught to respond to physical and social stimuli in very different ways. For example, some babies are taught to smile at strangers, whereas others are taught to smile only in very specific circumstances. In the United States, most children are asked from a very early age to make decisions about what they want to do and what they prefer; in many other cultures, a parent would never ask a child what she or he wants to do but would simply tell the child what to do. (Lustig and Koester 1999: 31–2)

At least two or more people share culture, and of course, real, live societies are always larger than that. There is, in other words, no such thing as the culture of a hermit. If a solitary individual thinks and behaves in a certain way, that thought or action is idiosyncratic, not cultural. For an idea, a thing, or a behaviour to be considered cultural, it must be shared by some type of social group or society (Ferraro 1998: 16).

IDEOLOGY

It was Antoine Louis Claude, Comte Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836), who invented the term *Idéologie* (Dijk, 1998) in that naturalizing move of the French Enlightenment rendition of Locke that sought to understand human 'nature' (Silverstein, 1998). Ideologies are system of ideas, ideas are also social, political and cultural, and that therefore it is needed to account for them.

Ideologies may be defined as the basis of the social representations shared by members of a group. This means that ideologies allow people, as group members, to organize multitude of social beliefs about what is the case, good or bad, right or wrong, for them, and to act accordingly (Dijk, 1998). Ideology is science of idea. (Destutt de Tracy in Brian William Head, 1985)

Ideology as a particular organization of signifying practices which goes to constitutes human beings as a social subjects, and which produces the lived relations by which such subjects are connected to the dominant relations of production in society. (Eagleton, 1991)

Ideology defined as the basis of the social representations shared by members of a group. Ideologies are self-serving and a function of the material and symbolic interests of the group. (Van Dick, Teun A. 1998)

Ideology is (a) process of production of meanings, signs and values in social life; (b) a body of ideas characteristic of a particular social group or class; (c) ideas which help to legitimate a dominant political power; (d) false ideas which help to legitimate a dominant political power; (e) systematically distorted communication; (f) that which offers a Position for a subject; (g) forms of thought motivated by Social interests; (h) identity thinking; (i) socially necessary illusion; u) the conjuncture of discourse and power; (k) the medium in which conscious social actors make sense of their world; (I) action-oriented sets of beliefs; (m) the confusion of linguistic and phenomenal reality; (n) semiotic closure; (O) the indispensable medium in which individuals live out their relations to a social structure; (P) the process whereby social life is converted to a natural reality". (A. Naess in Eagleton, 1991)

Ideology is an organization of opinions, attitudes, and values—a way of thinking about man and society. We may speak of an individual's total ideology or of his ideology with respect to different areas of social life: politics, economics, religion, minority groups, and so forth. (Adorno et al. 1950). Ideology is maps of problematic social reality and matrices for the creation of collective conscience. (Geertz, 1973)

Furthermore, Van Dijk provided timeline discussion under the notion of ideology throughout stages ever since the term was introduced. The remnant of the classical debates are crystallized in the everyday commonsense uses of the notion of 'ideology' taken as a system of wrong, false, distorted or otherwise misguided beliefs, typically associated with social or political opponents.

In the second part of the twentieth century more inclusive and less pejorative notions of ideologies developed. Ideologies are defined as political or social systems of ideas, values or prescriptions of groups or other collectivities and have the function of organizing or legitimating the actions of the group. Ideology needs to be analyzed systematically in the study of language, not invoked opportunistically or dismissed summarily. In a critical essay on social scientific notions of ideology generally, Geertz long ago called for systematic attention to the social and, semiotic processes, through which ideologies come to signify (Woolard, 1991).

Boas cited in Woolard (1991) proposed that language is a cultural system whose primary structure is little influenced by secondary rationalizations and so is an exemplary target of analysis. Bloomfield (1933) is among the sharpest statements of the disregard for linguistic ideologies that sometimes followed from this position among structural linguists.

Language Ideology

A review of the literature on 'language ideology' reveals that the concept can be traced back to more than three decades ago when it was introduced by Silverstein (1979) and Kress and Hodge (1979, 1993). They viewed ideology as a construct that is not only of a sociocultural and political nature (as mentioned in the dictionary definitions above), but also is closely connected with language and its use by individuals and/or groups. Silverstein (1979) defined language ideologies as sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use [5] (p. 193). In the preface to their book titled *Language as Ideology* (written between 1973 and 1976 and first published in 1979), Kress and Hodge described the rationale for creating

their work as the necessity they had felt to link history and linguistics, that is, to relate forms of thought to the existence of the procedures of those thoughts [6] (p. vii). Indeed, they attempted to fill the gap between language and ideology. Regarding 'ideology' as being organized from a particular point of view, they discussed two aspects of the ideological nature of the language. First, they viewed language as an instrument of control as well as of communication, where hearers can be both manipulated and informed, preferably manipulated while they suppose they are being informed. Second, in a socio-political sense, they believed that language as ideology deals with systematic distortion in the service of class [particular sociopolitical groups] interest [6]. Kress and Hodge (1993) also suggested that language and power could be interrelated in the sense that what is said by the powerful is often assumed to be right.

Accordingly, the concept of 'language ideology' is concerned with control and power. Introduction of such a concept by Silverstein (1979) and Kress and Hodge (1979, 1993) later led to the emergence of critical discourse analysis (CDA) pioneered by Fairclough (1989, 2001). In his book titled *Language and Power*, he sought to elucidate how language functions in maintaining and changing power relations in contemporary society, ways of analysing language that can reveal these processes, and how people can become more conscious of them and more able to resist and change them. In other words, CDA deals with analysing language to find the ideology behind its use. Whatever is uttered by language users can carry certain ideas, and when the utterances are analysed, such ideas are revealed. As Bloor and Bloor (2007) have emphasized, the beliefs or attitudes that stem from ideology can be so deeply ingrained in our thought patterns and language that we take them for granted as self-evident. Therefore, the position one has in the society and how s/he may think of, influence, and control others are mainly related to the personal opinions s/he holds.

Review of the literature about 'language ideology' also shows that different terms have been used in this area. According to Woolard (1998), some works have concentrated on 'linguistic ideology' and its relation to linguistic structures; some other works have dealt with 'language ideology', focusing on the contact between languages or language varieties; still some other works have addressed 'ideologies of language', produced by the historiography of public discourses on language. Despite the variety of terms in the literature, in this essay, 'language ideology' is used as an umbrella term to cover the other two, i.e. 'linguistic ideology' and 'ideologies of language'.

Language ideologies as analytic tool

Many contemporary educational researchers study the role that language plays in learning and identity development. However, only some have focused on the contemporary work in linguistic anthropology (Wortham, 2001). I argue that a focus on language ideologies—one concept developed in linguistic anthropology of education over the past two decades—can be a useful analytic tool in conducting educational research.

Wortham (2001) defines the research in the field of linguistic anthropology of education with the following characteristics: 1) it studies people using language instead of concerning itself with structural grammar or phonology; 2) it tries to understand its participants' point of view; 3) it tries to address macro-sociological questions by doing detailed analyses of language use in particular contexts; 4) it studies how language use can represent aspects of culture and identity in particular contexts; and 5) it systematically analyzes patterns of semiotic cues across particular segments of language use (pp. 254-255). My study draws on many of these aspects described above.

Language ideologies is defined as “the beliefs and attitudes shared by individuals regarding the use of particular language in both oral and written form in the context of power struggles among different groups” (Martínez-Roldán & Malavé, 2004). Woolard (1998) defines language ideologies as “representations, whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in social world”. Thus, language ideologies theory allows us to make a link between forms of social life and forms of talk (Woolard, 1998).

Focusing on both macro-level beliefs about language and micro-level analysis of utterances, language ideologies studies describe “a general process of positioning and the enactment of social identity” (Wortham, 2001, p. 256). Language ideologies works as a “mediating link between social structure and forms of talk” (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994, p. 55). For example, Silverstein (1985) explains the loss of deferential second person plural *thee/thou* during 17th century in relation with Quakers's identity to index their moral objections to social hierarchy at that time. Quakers's purposeful use of *thee/thou* in any context, as a resistance toward social hierarchy, developed language ideologies: using *thee/thou* sounded like Quaker in favour of their political ideas. Thus, others only used *ye/you* in order to avoid sounding like Quaker. This example illustrates that language ideologies not only explain but also affect linguistic structure. Language ideologies can be a powerful analytic tool because it makes a link between linguistic form and forms of social life, as presented in the aforementioned example.

The concept of language ideologies can provide both theoretical insights and empirical contribution to the educational processes. For example, a study can illustrate how

language ideologies mediate the development of learners' social identities and classroom behaviour (Wortham, 2001). Furthermore, language ideologies link the micro-classroom context for learning with more distant socio-cultural-historical contexts that mediate the local pedagogical practices; thus, it plays as a "pivotal relational concept" (Moll, 2004). Language ideologies theoretical framework empirically proves how people in the context of everyday language use—such as educational context—reproduce or sustain hegemonic relations (Gal & Irvine, 1995; Gal, 1998; Razfar, 2005). Thus, language ideologies involve the issues of identity, morality, epistemology, and social and political dimensions of life (Gal, 1998; Woolard, 1998). Our language ideologies are not only about language, but they are always about definitions of human beings in the world (Woolard, 1998).

How Can Culture Be Improved?

The question about possibility to improve culture has always emerged especially because the constant change of the world. It leads to the next question about whether or not there is superior and/or inferior culture that needs more concern. Kramsch argued that cultures are not only heterogeneous and constantly changing, but they are the sites of struggle for power and recognition (2008:10).

Improvement on the side of culture needs to be carefully understood and done. The concern of cultural authenticity (Kramsch, 2009) arise with culture improvement because improvement most of the time come together with changes which for the good and the bad may disturbed the essential authenticity of culture.

However, the need for survival for human being also urges them to change or shift their culture accordingly so that they can still live the world they are living in. The interesting part here is that the needs for survival, that is crucial for human, should now be shifted. The need for human to survive that may have effect on culture survival should be changing from just be survived to at least survive so that culture still have its way to come along side by side.

The concept of political recognition introduced by Kramsch (2009) has also brought up a difficult and complex issue for the sake of culture, like tolerance, empathy, and recognition of other cultures. The need for those three things may also lead to cultural change or shift that sometimes or even most of the times misunderstood with the term cultural improvement.

In one session of lecturing on the subject of Language and Culture, Arafah (2016) explained that improvement goes beyond the idea of survival like moral, emotional,

philosophical. Culture is like an iceberg, what we see on the surface is just merely a small fraction of the whole gigantic thing underneath it. He also stated that improvement is different from evolution and it must not be misunderstood or misused term to explain in the needs for survival.

Intercultural

Intercultural can be roughly understood as communication process between two or more different culture with emphasize on the communication process. Kramersch (2009) defined intercultural as:

1. It refers to the meeting between people from different cultures and languages across the political boundaries of nation-states.
2. It refers to communication between people from different ethnic, social, gendered cultures within the boundaries of the same nation.

Intercultural is different levels of awareness and control between people with different cultural backgrounds, where different cultural backgrounds include both national cultural differences and differences which are connected with participation in the different activities that exist within a national unit". (Allwood, 1985). Intercultural is groups and individuals interact with cultural 'others' with a view to bridging differences, defusing conflicts and setting the foundations of peaceful coexistence. (UNESCO, 2013)

Intercultural refers to communication between people from different ethnic, social, gendered cultures within the boundaries of the same national language". (Kramersch, 1998). For instance in intercultural is education. Baldwin.et.al mentions that another major source of international travel is international education. Very likely, many readers of this book are reading it in a country outside of their own. The Institute of International Education, based in the United States, reported a 5% increase in international students studying in the U.S. from the 2009/10 year to the 2010/11 year, with students from China, India, and South Korea constituting nearly 50% of the students. There were nearly 300,000 each of undergraduate and graduate students studying abroad in the United States. (Baldwin. et.al, 2014).

Through intercultural relationships, we can learn a terrific figure about other people and their cultures, and about ourselves and our own cultural background. Intercultural can also involve divider like stereotyping and discrimination.

As we learn more about other cultures, we also learn more about our own cultures and about ourselves. Learning new cultures gives us new ways to think, feel, and act. We may become “intercultural man,” who can move freely between cultures, or at least understand different cultural perspectives more easily. We can say that intercultural is something that take place between people of different cultures including different religious groups or people of different nation and culture.

As cultures differ from one to another, the communication process, practices and behaviors of people involved will be varied as a result of different point of view in looking at the world. One more important thing being understood in the intercultural communication process is that from one culture to another must have one underlying same notion of knowledge, in this case language.

One clear example of intercultural communication can be easily seen in a country with variety of discourse and speech community such as Indonesia where there are more than 17,000 local languages live in it that makes Bahasa Indonesia is used in an intercultural communication when people from Java, who speaks Javanese, meet people from Sulawesi, who speak Buginese.

Another example is in Australia where immigrants from other countries come to live there. The intercultural communication that happens in Australia will certainly involve the use of English so that people from various cultural, and language, background can communicate. Like people from India, Saudi Arabia, China, South Korea, German, Indonesia who will certainly use English when they meet in one room and practices intercultural communication.

The important thing to remember about culture is that while it may be fundamental, it is not innate. Yet it is often not discussed, analysed or critiqued but is seen as being ‘common sense’. Culture is made up of the shared values and assumptions of a particular group of people. Because these values and assumptions are shared, it is easy to take them for granted and believe that they are ‘normal’. In this way it is possible for people to believe that the ways in which they behave and the things they value are right and true for everyone.

As Paige, (1993) has pointed out, cultures have an internal logic and coherence and hence their own validity. However, in order to facilitate communication between cultures it is necessary to understand human reality as socially constructed (Berger & Luckman 1967 cited in Paige 1993). If we can understand that then we can begin to understand that different groups may have different values, different way of communicating, different customs, conventions and assumptions. While these may conflict with our own

understandings and assumptions it does not necessarily mean that they are inferior, 'wrong' or 'rude'.

Wang et al., (2000:1-3) identify the essential features of culture. They are:

- a. Culture is the human made part of the environment.
- b. Culture reflects widely shared assumptions about life.
- c. Culture is so fundamental that most people do not and cannot discuss or analyse it.
- d. Culture becomes evident when someone encounters someone from another country who deviates from their own cultural norms.
- e. Culture is transmitted from generation to generation
- f. Even in new situations, people can make a judgement about what is expected in their own culture.
- g. Cultural values endure and change takes place over a number of generations.
- h. Violations of cultural norms have an emotional impact
- i. It is relatively easy (although not necessarily helpful) to make generalisations about cultural differences.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTION

There are some conclusions that can be summarized. First, most of the students still make some grammatical errors in writing proposal. The kinds of grammatical errors that students make in writing proposal are Omitted Subject, Omitted Verbs, Number Agreement, Subject-Verb Agreement, Word Order, Reference, Article, Word Form, Passive Voice, Infinitive Verb, Faulty Parallelism, Conjunction, Gerund, Verb Form, and Relative Pronouns. In addition, the factors that make the students do some kinds of grammatical errors are overgeneralization, ignorance of rule restrictions, incomplete application of rules, and false concept hypothesized.

As suggestion, it is important for students to improve their ability in applying many kinds of grammatical rules in writing by learning more about English grammar, particularly about the most frequent error that they make. Besides, the occurrence of errors on what students make in writing proposal can be solved by giving them more attention and practice in order to develop their knowledge about English grammar.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T.W. et. al. (1950). *The authoritarian Personality*. USA: American Jewish Committee Publication.
- Allwood, J. (1987). Intercultural Communication. Paper in *Antropological Linguistics*, 2(12): 23-39.
- Arafah, B. (2016). *Lecturing on Doctoral Degree on Subject: Language and Culture*. Makassar: Faculty of Cultural Science.
- Baldwin, J.R., Robin R., Means C., Alberto G., & Suchitra S.P. (2014). *Intercultural Communication for Everyday Life*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *The Study of Language*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Buttjes, D.&Byram, M. (1991). *Mediating Languages and Cultures: Towards an Intercultural Theory of Foreign Language Education Multilingual Matters (Series)*. Sydney: Multilingual Matters.
- Chomsky, N. (2005). *New Horizons in the Study of Language and Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Corbett, J. (2003). *An Intercultural Approach to English Language Teaching*. Sydney: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Danesi, M.,&Perron, P. (1999). *Analyzing Cultures: An Introduction & Handbook*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Dijk, T. A. V. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Eliot, T.S. (1961). *Notes toward the Definition of Culture*. London: A Harvest Book Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Eagleton, Terry. (1991). *Ideology (An Introduction)*. London: Verso.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. 2nd ed. London: Longman.
- Ferraro, Gary, Susan A. (2003). *Cultural Anthropology (An Applied Perspective)*. USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Culture*. USA: Basic Books.
- Goodenough & Ward H. (1968). *Description and comparison in Cultural Antropology*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1983). *Intercultural communication theory: Current perspectives*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Hjelmslev, L. (1969). *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language*. Wisc: University of Wisconsin Press.

- Hoed, B.H. (2014). *Semiotik & Dinamika Sosial Budaya*. Jakarta: Komunitas Bambu.
- Jackson&Jane. (2012). *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication*. Routledge :Taylor & Francis Group.
- Jandt, F. E. (2001). *Intercultural communication: An introduction (third ed.)*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Klopf, D. W., & Park, M. (1982). *Cross cultural communication: An introduction to the fundamentals*. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.
- Kramersch, C. (2009). *Language and Culture*. Oxford University Press.
- Kress, G., and Hodge, R. (1993). *Language as ideology. 2nd ed.* London: Routledge.
- Mandelbaum, David.G.(1949). *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir : Culture, Language, and Personality*. Calofornia: University Of California Press.
- Martin., Judith N., &Thomas K.N. (2010). *Intercultural Communication in Context*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Montgomery, Martin. (1995). *Introduction to Language and Society Studies in Culture and Communication (2nd Ed)*. Publisher: Taylor & Francis Routledge.
- Noth, W. (1990). *Handbook of Semiotics*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Paige, R. M. (1993). *On the Nature of Intercultural Experiences and Intercultural Education*. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.
- Price, F. (2000). *The naked Australian: The valuable Australian*. Melbourne: Workshop.
- Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. (1991). *Communication between cultures*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Riley.,&Philip. (2007). *Language, Culture and Identity. An Ethnolinguistic Perspective*. Great Britain by Athenaem Press Ltd., Gateshead, Tyne & Wear.
- Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. (Eds.). (1997). *Intercultural communication: A reader (eighth ed.)*. Belmont, Ca: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Sapir, E. (1976). *Culture, Language, and Personality*. (Selected Essay) ed. David G. Mandelbaum. USA: University of California Press.
- Saussure, F. de. (1959). *Course in General Linguistics*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Schieffelin, Bambi B. et.al (ed.). (1998). *Language Ideologies (Practice and Theory)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sharifian, Farzad (ed.). (2015). *Handbook of language and culture*. Taylor and Francis Books.

- Silverstein, M. (1979). *Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology*. In P. R. Clyne, W. F. Hanks, and C. L. Hofbauer, Eds. *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.
- Silverstein, M. (1998). *The Uses and Utility of Ideology. Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. Eds. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Simpson, Paul. (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. Publisher: Routledge :Taylor & Francis Group.
- Strauss, C.L. (1963). *Structural Anthropology*. Trans. Claire Jacobson. New York: Basic Books Inc. Publishers.
- Taylor, E. B. (1871). *Primitive Culture*. London: Bradbury, Evans and Co.
- Van Dick, Teun A. (1998). *Ideology (a multidisciplinary approach)*. Great Britain: Sage Publication.
- Wang, M. M., Brislin, R., Wang, W., Williams, D., & Chao, J. H. (2000). *Turning bricks into jade: Critical incidents for mutual understanding among Chinese and Americans*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. John B. Carroll (ed.), ed. Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Woolard, K. A. (1991). *Language Ideology: Issues and Approaches* (pp. 235-249). International Pragmatics Association. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.476.2519&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.