

ENGLISH WITH INDONESIA TASTE DOMINANT CULTURE SHIFT TO LOCAL CULTURE

Moh. Yamin

*A lecturer of English Department at Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,
Lambung Mangkurat University Banjarmasin*

ABSTRACT

English is not only the language that should be learned and mastered as the tool of communication, but it also should be understood as the language that has its own world. Although English is not the mother tongue of Indonesia, but it has been the cultural part of Indonesia when the Indonesian people use it as the medium of interaction. That is why, English as the life part of Indonesia should have the spirit of Indonesia. The cultural values that come from England, America or other countries using English as the mother tongue should be deleted. Making English for Indonesian people is a must. It means that what the people learn from English is not the culture, but the language itself. Separating the English from its own culture and bring it into Indonesian culture is a new way without forgetting the knowledge of English culture for enriching the language culture knowledge. Many Indonesian people use English as the medium of communication as if they are English people, such as their performance, gesture, behavior, and so forth. This case creates the stigma that English has destructed the local culture, whereas learning and using English is not for that, but for medium of interaction.

Key Words: English Culture, Indonesia Culture, and Language

Having communication is the necessity for anyone who wants to speak with the others. Communication gives any messages that will create the life dynamic among the others. Language as the tool of communication has the significant role in speaking. All linguists say that language is the media in making life live. One Audiolingual Method (ALM) proponent William Muolton (see Rivers 1981: 41-3) said five slogans of the day for way of having a language. Those are (1) language is speech, not writing; (2) a language is a set of habits; (3) teach the language and not about the language; (4) a language is what its native speakers say, not what someone thinks they ought to say, and (5) languages are different. From the five ones, number one and number two are the necessity in having a language. Having a language and speaking using language will bear the different life. Many people can unite because of language. The people wherever and whenever can be in one community because of the sameness of language that is used. English as one of language names that is admitted and used by the people all over the world now becomes the central point in transforming the world recently. It is because such English has been the tool in all kinds of progress in the world, such as education, technology, and so forth; however, in English itself there is culture as the back ground. English does not stand itself, but there is culture that bases the language. In the other word, language without culture dries in the desert and culture without language cannot show the identity to the world where the language comes from. That is why; talking

about English does not escape from the culture. When English is used as the tool of communication, there is the culture of English as its base and it should be used as the media. English as the language has its own culture.

The problem is when English comes into another country, so this is the case itself whether English should free itself from its own culture or not. Admittedly or not, every language has its own culture because the birth of language is for the culture or inversely. English that comes into another country and is learnt as a foreign language or second language should be viewed in different context. It means that the existence of English in another country should be understood in which English should be down to earth. In this context, every culture in every language should not be used in every country in which the language is used, such English. It is because the culture in such language is not certain to be acceptable yet. Culture is the reflection of human beings' lives in one certain place and the life reflection is not the same from one place to another place. Should the culture of English that is used and internalized in western people be applied by the eastern people who have different culture and belief in meaning the culture? We all agree to say that every person should speak in the same language so that they can interact, especially when they are in global era. English now has been the dominant language all over the world, but should all people all over the world use the English culture in their lives?

What is in English culture does not guarantee that it is good to practice in all over the world with the different culture because the way of communication of English whether verbally or inversibly is not the same in every country. This is the fact. The culture in English communication cannot be applied in one place or country that has different culture. English with its culture comes from The Western and it has different way of behavior in speaking pattern. The Western is known as the openness that has different norms than The Eastern. That is why; this article will discuss the position of English when it is in Eastern culture. Indonesia as a country with its Eastern culture will be the key word how English should be uttered and communicated in social interaction based on the Eastern culture. It means that English should be communicated with Indonesia culture. English spoken must be viewed from Indonesia perspective. Indonesia perspective means that how the people wherever they are from, whether from Indonesia or outside Indonesia, including Western people should speak and interact based Indonesia perspective.

The question is how to learn and understand the culture before we or the learners use the language as the communication? Admittedly or not, one way in which culture has often been understood is as a body of knowledge that people have about a particular society. This body of knowledge can be seen in various ways: as knowledge about cultural artefacts or works of art; as knowledge about places and institutions; as knowledge about events and symbols; or as knowledge about ways of living. It is also possible to consider this aspect of culture in terms of information and to teach the culture as if it were a set of the learnable rules which can be mastered by students. When being translated into language teaching and learning, this knowledge-based view of culture often takes the form of teaching information about another country, its people, its institutions, and so on. Culture is not, however, simply a body of knowledge but rather a framework in which people live their lives and communicate shared meanings with each other. Therefore, it is very important to propose some statements relating to the culture as the soul of language. Here are as follows:

- 1) Culture can be seen as practices or as information;
- 2) Culture plays a central role in the way meanings are interpreted;
- 3) Cultures are characterised by variability and diversity;
- 4) The intercultural is not the same as culture but is a process which goes beyond the idea of 'knowing a culture';
- 5) Culture is fundamentally related to language.

Therefore, knowledge of cultures is important for facilitating communication with people. Therefore learners of languages need to learn about and understand cultures. Understanding culture as practices with which people engage becomes centrally important. This means that in the language classroom it is not just a question of learners developing knowledge about another culture but of learners coming to understand themselves in relation to some other culture. This is why there is a contemporary emphasis on 'intercultural'. Learning to be intercultural involves much more than just knowing about another culture: it involves learning to understand how one's own culture shapes perceptions of oneself, of the world, and of our relationship with others. Learners need to become familiar with how they can personally engage with linguistic and cultural diversity. There is another way to think about culture in language teaching: the distinction between a cultural perspective and an intercultural perspective (Liddicoat, 2005). This 'cultural' pole implies the development of knowledge about culture which remains external to the learner and is not intended to confront or transform the learner's existing identity, practices, values, attitudes, beliefs and worldview. The 'intercultural' pole implies the transformational engagement of the learner in the act of learning.

DISCUSSION

Folklorist Crats Williams defines language as "culture expressing itself in sound" (quoted in Ovando 1990:341). It means that It gives individuals and groups their identity. There is a powerful connection between language and sociocultural identity. The language you learnt your first words in, the language your mother and father talked to you, the language which was used in your nearest surroundings and the language you use with your closest family and friends will always be a part of your identity as a person. When the language one uses in daily communication is denigrated, for instance not deemed fit as a language of instruction at higher levels of schooling, the child may feel that a part of her/himself is also being denigrated (Brock-Utne, 2005). Edward B. Tylor known as the pioneer English Anthropologist in his book, *Primitive Culture*, published in 1871 said that culture is that "complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, law, morals, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society." Culture is the life reflection how the people live and interact each other. Culture is something inherent in people's life. When talking about culture, language as the part of culture in interacting needs to be positioned as the main point to explain how the interaction will be celebrated in life. Language is largely a vehicle whereby interactions make propositions about the world. From this perspective, which is explicit or implicit in traditional social psychological research on language, problems of meaning involve how well linguistic concepts refer to, correspond with, or represent reality, including internal thoughts and feelings (Mayrand and Perakyla, 2003, p. 235). Some people say that language is the mirror of culture, in the sense that people can see a culture through its language. Another metaphor used to symbolize language and

culture is the iceberg. The visible part is the language, with a small part of culture; the greater part, lying hidden beneath the surface, is the invisible aspect of culture (Jiang, 2000, p. 328).

The next thing that should be discussed is about how the English should be uttered in Indonesia whether the English should use its culture coming from The Western or not? Admittedly or not, English that is spoken by the people Indonesia or non Indonesian people should be based on the culture of Indonesia. What the culture of Indonesia is, so there are many kinds of culture living in Indonesia because this country is known as the multicultural country. We have Javanese culture, Banjarese culture, Balinese culture and so forth. Although there are many kinds of culture, actually there are some principles that can be simplified to be components in communication among and between each other:

1. Communication between and among each other must pay attention who the subject is to be taken in speaking. When the person who is taken to speak is older, so the politeness is the necessity. However, although the person is taken to speak younger or is the same age, so the politeness is the necessity to apply yet. In ethics, etiquette is the key word to discuss the politeness. It means that the level of politeness from one place or one community is different from another place or another community. Principally, Indonesia etiquette still is behalf on how the people talk politely in different age. Language and etiquette are the two things that should be held in communication. There should any different way of communication to whom we talk. That is why; communication condition etiquette as the base of interacting and speaking;
2. A Language is culture. A language can be called culture because in language there is culture as the life reflection. Language and culture makes a living organism; language is flesh, and culture is blood. Without culture, language would be dead; without language, culture would have no shape (Jiang, 2000: 328). It means that English as the language that will be communicated in Indonesia should have the culture of Indonesia. English culture should be deleted and changed into Indonesia culture as the base of communication. It is not necessary to use the English culture because it is “not good” to implement in Indonesia;
3. English culture considers all people in the same status. Every people should be taken to speak in the same status. Whether they are young or old, the way of speaking to them is the same. This case is not good to implement in Indonesia as the country and nation with the eastern culture. Eastern culture has the different pattern in communicating than Western culture.

It can be concluded that English that is uttered in Indonesia should have several traits and those are called Indonesian English. Here are several examples in Indonesian English usages:

1. *Bolehkan saya berbicara dengan Bapak Abdul Wahid?*

Can I speak to you?

Can I speak to Mr. Abdul Wahid?

Can I speak to Bapak Abdul Wahid?

I means a student.

Abdul Wahid means a lecturer.

Based on the Eastern culture, it is not polite to call someone considered the old or older by calling “you” or “the name” only. “You” or “the name” is the call that is crude and does not show the politeness to someone who is older and to be considered old. In such case, speaking with someone who has been old should pay attention the etiquette. That is why; implementing English communication in Indonesia with Eastern culture should be based on the Indonesian culture.

2. *Assalamu’alaikum War. Wab.*

Pertama-tama pantaslah kita panjatkan puji syukur dan seterusnya....

Selanjutnya, kami mengucapkan banyak terimakasih atas kehadiran para bapak/ibu

Selanjutnya kami akan membahas materi yang akan diperbincangkan....

Assalamu’alaikum War. Wab.

First of all, let’s thank to the God and so forth....

We thank very much for the attendance of ladies and gentlemen....

I will discuss the material that is the topic....

Generally, such expressions are used in seminar and the like. Such expressions are usually uttered by the people with the Eastern culture. Indonesian people with Eastern culture never go to straight discussion, but they try to make any kinds of introduction before the topic will be discussed. Introduction before discussion is the point to make the atmosphere conducive and interactive. Such thing is also functioned to bridge the interpersonal relationship between the speaker and the audience. In Eastern culture, it is not polite if going directly to discussion without introduction at first. Another point from such expressions is existence of “we”. “We” does not mean more than one person but only one person *an sich*. “We” in such expression is the manifestation of self politeness to the audience. “We” is the humbleness of the speaker who speaks in front of the audience. “We” replaces “I” for the humbleness and politeness.

3. *“Tadi Pak Yai menunggu Ustadz dan beliau sekarang sudah mengikuti rapat,” kata seorang santri.*

“Pak Yai was waiting for Ustadz and beliau has been meeting,” said a student of Islamic boarding house.

Such expressions show that an Islamic boarding house student does not want to name Pak Yai and Ustadz with dia atau he. For the Islamic boarding house student, Pak Yai and Ustadz are the persons that should be respected. Both of them have the plus value for the Islamic boarding house student so that he has to call them with good call. This condition will be different if it is implemented in the Western culture. In the other words, the Western culture does not know the social status because everyone whether they become priests or not are the same. The Western culture does not discriminate anybody. Therefore, the Eastern and Western culture have different perspectives in looking at the life reality. Whatever it is, the Eastern culture treats people in old age or the people who have the power in social in different way.

Based on the four examples above with their analysis, English that is uttered and applied in Indonesian life should be based on the Indonesia culture. English with high taste is the life

reflection of one indefinite place with local taste. English that is the daily life is the language that has been a part of community. English lives with his local taste, not foreign taste. English that is a part of community should take the culture of community to be taken as the culture foundation. English that has been living in one definite place and has been going away from the original place should have the new culture in which the English has been interacting with the new environment. English that has soul is the English that has been a part of the new community and environment. Therefore, language is the human beings' expression that shows the identity. Language is the soul language that expresses the life values of one definite community and environment. Language is the tool to be able to speak behalf on the culture. The language which is civilized is the language that represents the local interest.

Language is a system of conventional vocal signs by means of which human beings communicate. It means that a language is not just a collection of words, but also the rule or patterns that relate our words to one another (Algeo, 2010, p.2). It means that language actually delivers the substantial meaning to the others. That is why, language as the tool of communication needs to be positioned for the contextual dialogue. Because of that, language should be put as the way of thinking and behaving. Language as the way of thinking means that it is the tool for actualizing the ideas into words, phrases, and sentences. It guides and orders the order of thinking so that it can be systematical manner. Whatever it is, language will be able to shape the way of human beings' thinking so that it can be holistic and comprehensive in doing anything. It means that language as the way of thinking has the main purpose to make the way of thinking more and more smooth.

The question is how to understand language? This is a pre-occupation going back to the very beginning of our intellectual tradition. What is the relation of language to other signs? to signs in general? Are linguistic signs arbitrary or motivated? What is it that signs and words have when they have meaning? These are very old questions. Language is an old topic in Western philosophy, but its importance has grown. It is not a major issue among the ancients. It begins to take on greater importance in the seventeenth century, with Hobbes and Locke. And then in the twentieth century it has become close to obsessional. All major philosophers have their theories of language: Heidegger, Wittgenstein, Davidson, and all manner of "deconstructionists" have made language central to their philosophical reflection.

In what we can call the modern period, from the seventeenth century, there has been a continual debate, with philosophers reacting to and feeding off each other, about the nature of language. On this debate we identify two grand types of theory. The first is an "enframing" theory. The attempt is made to understand language within the framework of a picture of human life, behaviour, purposes, or mental functioning, which is itself described and defined without reference to language. Language is seen as arising in this framework, which can be variously conceived as we shall see, and fulfilling some function within it, but the framework itself precedes, or at least can be characterized independently of language.

The other type of theory is called "constitutive." As this word suggests, it is the antitype of the enframing sort. It gives us a picture of language as making possible new purposes, new levels of behaviour, new meanings, and hence as not explicable within a framework picture

of human life conceived without language. The classical case, and most influential first form of an enframing theory was

the set of ideas developed from Hobbes through Locke to Condillac (Taylor, 1999). Briefly, the Hobbes–Locke–Condillac (HLC) form of theory tried to understand language within the confines of the modern representational epistemology made dominant by Descartes. In the mind, there are “ideas.” These are bits of putative representation of reality, much of it “external.” Knowledge consists in having the representation actually square with the reality. This we can only hope to achieve if we put together our ideas according to a responsible procedure. Our beliefs about things are constructed, they result from a synthesis. The issue is whether the construction will be reliable and responsible or indulgent, slapdash, and delusory.

Language plays an important role in this construction. Words are given meaning by being attached to the things represented via the “ideas” which represent them. The introduction of words greatly facilitates the combination of ideas into a responsible picture. This facilitation is understood in different ways. For Hobbes and Locke, they allow us to grasp things in classes, and hence make possible synthesis wholesale where non-linguistic intuition would be confined to the painstaking association of particulars. Condillac thinks that the introduction of language gives us for the first time control over the whole process of association; it affords us “empire sur notre imagination” (Lock, 1959).

The constitutive theory finds its most energetic early expression in Herder (1772), precisely in a criticism of Condillac. In a famous passage of the treatise on the Ursprung der Sprache, Herder repeats Condillac’s fable – one might say “just so” story – of how language might have arisen between two children in a desert. He professes to find something missing in this account. It seems to him to presuppose what it’s meant to explain. What it’s meant to explain is language, the passage from a condition in which the children emit just animal cries to the stage where they use words with meaning. The association between sign and some mental content is already there with the animal cry (what Condillac calls the “natural sign”). What is new with the “instituted sign” is that the children can now use it to focus on and manipulate the associated idea, and hence direct the whole play of their imagination. The transition just amounts to their tumbling to the notion that the association can be used in this way.

This is the classic case of an enframing theory. Language is understood in terms of certain elements: ideas, signs, and their association, which precede its arising. Before and after, the imagination is at work and association takes place. What’s new is that now the mind is in control. This itself is, of course, something that didn’t exist before. But the theory establishes the maximal possible continuity between before and after. The elements are the same, combination continues, only the direction changes. We can surmise that it is precisely this continuity which gives the theory its seeming clarity and explanatory power: language is robbed of its mysterious character, is related to elements that seem unproblematic.

Herder starts from the intuition that language makes possible a different kind of consciousness, which he calls “reflective” (*besonnen*). That is why, he finds a continuity explanation like Condillac’s so frustrating and unsatisfying. The issue of what this new consciousness consists in and how it arises is not addressed, as far as Herder is concerned, by an account in terms of pre-existing elements. That’s why he accuses Condillac of begging the

question. “Der Abt Condillac [. . .] hat das ganze Ding Sprache schon vor der ersten Seite seines Buchs erfunden vorausgesetzt, [. . .]”

What did Herder mean by “reflection” (Besonnenheit)? This is harder to explain. We might try to formulate it this way: pre-linguistic beings can react to the things which surround them. But language enables us to grasp something as what it is. This explanation is hardly transparent, but it puts us on the track. To get a clearer idea we need to reflect on what is involved in using language. So language involves sensitivity to the issue of rightness. The rightness in the descriptive case turns on the characteristics of the described. We might call this “intrinsic” rightness. To see what this amounts to let’s look at a contrast case (Taylor, 2006).

That is why, understanding the nature of the relationship between language and culture is central to the process of learning another language. In actual language use, it is not the case that it is only the forms of language that convey meaning. It is language in its cultural context that creates meaning: creating and interpreting meaning is done within a cultural framework. In language learning classrooms, learners need to engage with the ways in which context affects what is communicated and how. Both the learner’s culture and the culture in which meaning is created or communicated have an influence on the ways in which possible meanings are understood. This context is not a single culture as both the target language and culture and the learner’s own language and culture are simultaneously present and can be simultaneously engaged. Learning to communicate in an additional language involves developing an awareness of the ways in which culture interrelates with language whenever it is used (Liddicoat, Papademetre, Scarino, & Kohler, 2003).

Language as the way of behaving means it tries to create the new situations and conditions so that the behavior human beings do become more and more acceptable in society. Admittedly or not, language reflects the human beings’ behavior. The high language means the high behavior. Language relates to behavior, mental, mind, character, and local values. Effendi said by quoting Lado that politeness in verbal communication is a universal concept, but it is lexicalized may differ from one language to another, as shown by contrastive forms of the second pronominal in English and Indonesian. Thus grammaticalization and lexicalization themselves are universal processes of putting meaning into form (2005 p. 21-22). The language acceptable in one definite community and environment is the language that understands the locality. Although the language that will enter the new community and environment is the foreign language, such language should be able to with the culture of the community and environment. The new language does not kill the culture of the new community and environment, but the culture inherent in the new language should be killed. It is the necessity and cannot be negated. Language is the mirror of life in which the language does the socialization. In a word, language as the language that represents the human beings’ life should be able swim with the human beings themselves. Language is the communication language so that the language used as the media of communication should be able to speak for the human beings. A Language is culture and human beings should be culturalized. Language reflects the culture (Yule, 1985, p.190), so everthing that is uttered by human being using language always involves the culture.

Culture is communication and communication is culture. Since most of what is known about communication has been learned from the study of language, Hall projects (1990) some

principles of language (language as it is spoken, not written, writing being a symbolization of symbolization) into other less elaborated and specialized communication system. He gives a common terminology for all forms of communication, including language. Every message can be broken down into three parts: sets, what you perceive first (for example, words); isolates the components that make up the sets (sounds); patterns, the way in which sets are strung together in order to give them meaning (grammar, syntax).

According to Byram (1994, p.95), there are some main points that should be considered when talking about language and culture:

1. Language is inseparable from the culture, by which we mean the way of thinking and acting in a social group; language embodies many of these social actions and expresses the underlying values and beliefs;
2. By culture, we refer to what a person needs to know in order to be part of a social group: ways of thinking and valuing, ways of behaving, shared knowledge of the world;
3. The acquisition of a foreign language involves acquiring some of the culture it embodies, through learning modes which include ‘study’ and ‘practice’ of language and culture.

Human beings who are culturalized are those who can use the language with their own culture root (Lazear, 1997). Culturalized English is the English that is adaptable with the condition in which the English is used as the media of communication.

CONCLUSION

English has its own culture. The problem is when English is used as the medium of communication in a country that does not take English as the mother tongue, so the English culture should be abolished and replaced with the culture of its own country. Language is the self expression and self actualization of human beings’ lives in one definite country. Language shows the identity of human being’s lives in one definite country. Relating to identity as the language, Bucholtz and Hall (2005) explains as follows:

1. Identity is best viewed as the emergent product rather than the pre-existing source of linguistic and other semiotic practices and therefore as fundamentally a social and cultural phenomenon;
2. Identities encompass (a) macro-level demographic categories; (b) local, ethnographically specific cultural positions; and (c) temporary and interactionally specific stances and participant roles;
3. Identity relations emerge in interaction through several related indexical processes, including: (a) overt mention of identity category and label; (b) implicatures and presuppositions regarding one’s own or others’ identity position; (c) displayed evaluative and epistemic orientations to ongoing talk, as well as interactional footings and participant roles; and (d) the use of linguistic structures and systems that are ideologically associated with personas and groups;
4. Identities are intersubjectively constructed through several, often overlapping, complementary relations, including similarity/difference, genuineness/artifice, and authority/delegitimacy;

5. Any given construction of identity may be in part deliberate and intentional, in part habitual and hence often less than fully conscious, in part an outcome of interactional negotiation and contestation, in part an outcome of others' perception and representation, and in part an effect of larger ideological processes and material structures that may become relevant to interaction. It is therefore constantly shifting both as interaction unfolds and across discourse contexts.

What about Indonesia? Should Indonesian people speaking in English implement the Indonesian culture in English speaking? Admittedly or not, Indonesian culture as the life way of Indonesian people should be inherent in their lives. Although they speak in English, their own culture should be internalized in their own daily life. It is necessary for them to speak using their own culture. Culture is the mirror of nation identity. Culture represents on how the people speak, think, and act based on their culture root. One of the function of culture is to provide a screen between people and the outside world. Culture designates what we pay attention to and what we ignore. What people choose, either consciously and unconsciously, to take in is what gives structure and meaning to the world. The Indonesia culture in whatever language is should be inserted so that there is the significant difference between Indonesia English, British English, American English, and so forth.

In the other word, the way of Indonesia English in speaking, thinking, and acting is different from British English, American English, and so forth. It is the necessity. The level of having etiquette in Indonesia English, British English, American English, and the like is also not the same. Language is civilization. The language that文明izes the human being and nation is the language that makes the culture as the chemistry of interacting. That is why; relating to Indonesia English, English should go away from its own culture and comes into Indonesia culture that is universal. Such English is called English with Indonesia taste. English with Indonesia taste is English that melts into Indonesia culture as the way of life.

REFERENCES

- Algeo, John. (2010). *The Origins and Development of the English Language*. Sixth Edition. USA: Michael Rosenberg.
- Birgit Brock-Utne. (2005). *The interrelationship between language and culture*. Beitostølen, Norway, 5th-7th December.
- Byram, Michael et all. (1994). *Teaching-and-Learning Language-and-culture*. Great Britain: WBC Ltd.
- Bucholtzi, Mary and Hall, Kira. (2005). *Identity and interaction: a Sociocultural Linguistic Approach*. London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Taylor, Charles. (2006). *An Issue About Language in Language, Culture, and Society*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- .(1995). *The Importance of Herder in Philosophical Arguments*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . (1999). *Human Agency and Language: Philosophical Papers 1*. Eighth Printing. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Delamater, John (editor). (2003). *Language and Social Interaction in Handbook of Social Psychology*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

- Effendi, Kadarisman. (2005). *Linguistic Relativity, Cultural Relativity*. TEFLIN Journal, vol. XVI.
- Hall, Edward T. (1990). *The Silent Language*. United States: Doubleday.
- Hoed, Benny H. (2011). Edisi. II. *Semiotika dan Dinamika Sosial Budaya*, Depok: Komunitas Bambu.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried. (1772). *Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache*. Reprinted in *Sprachphilosophische Schriften*, ed. E. Heintel. Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1960.
- Jiang, Wenyi. (2000). The Relationship between Culture and Language. *ELT Journal Volume 54/4 October*.
- John Lock. (1959). *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. 2 volumes. New York: Dover.
- Lazear, Edward P. (1997). Culture and Language. *Journal of Political Economy*.
- Liddicoat, A.J., Papademetre, L., Scarino, A. and Kohler, M. 2003. *Report on Intercultural Language Learning*. Canberra: DEST.
- Liddicoat, A.J. (2005). *Teaching Languages for Intercultural Communication*. In D. Cunningham and A. Hatoss (eds) *An International Perspective on Language Policies, Practices, and Proficiencies*. Belgrave: FIPLV
- Latif, Yudi. (2009). *Menyemai Karakter Bangsa: Budaya Kebangkitan Berbasis Kesastraan*. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas.
- Ovando, Carlos. (1990). Politics and Pedagogy: The Case of Bilingual Education. *Harvard Educational Review*. Vol. 60. No. 3.
- Rivers, Wilga M. (1981). *Teaching Foreign-Language Skills* (Second Edition). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Utne, Birgit Brock. (2005). *The Interrelationship between Language and Culture*. Institute for Educational Research. P.B.1092 Blindern. Norway: University of Oslo, 0317 Oslo.

