How Does Language Play a Role in Intercultural Communication Today?*

(Chapter Review of Intercultural Communication in Contexts, 8th Edition by Judith N. Martin and Thomas K. Nakayama)

[1]Anugrah Puspita Ayu Muhammad, [2]Asbar Asbar,
[3]Samsudin Samsuddin, [4]Misnawati Misnawati
[1] Universitas Halu Oleo, Kendari, Indonesia
Anugrah.p.ayu@uho.ac.id

[2] Universitas Muhammadiyah Enrekang, Makassar, Indonesia
Asbar@gmail.com

[3] Universitas Teknologi Sumbawa, Bima, Indonesia
Samsudin@iisbudsarea.ac.id

[4] Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi Puangrimaggalatung
Misnawati_amir@yahoo.com

Article Info	Abstract
	This article is a review chapter of Judith N. Martin and Thomas K. Nakayama's book entitled "Intercultural Communication in Contexts, 8th Edition. The chapter reviewed in this article is Chapter 6 with the sub-title Language and Intercultural Communication. This chapter focuses on discussing issues - issues related to language in the process of verbal communication. In this article, the authors also present the cultural variations of language and some of the barriers that these variations pose in the relationship between 1) language and power, 2) language and identity, and 3) examine multilingualism, translation, and interpretation issues. So, in this paper, as a review chapter, we look at language and identity, language rules and politics, and globalization.

Introduction

Language is a central element in intercultural communication, either face-to-face or online. Other things that are often challenging are understanding slang and issues related to

power. In online communication, time and time zone can also be a challenge. Online communication or other technologies highlight another challenge: language is constantly changing. How can we begin to understand the critical role language plays in intercultural communication in today's world, with more human activity and technological connectivity in every sphere of life? First, it is surprising how many languages are spoken today, about 7,000 languages. Experts estimate that 800 languages are spoken in New York City alone. How is it possible for people to communicate and remember all the different languages? Is intercultural communication easier online or face-to-face? Do we use languages differently online? What are the difficulties in interpreting and translating? Should everyone learn two or more languages?

This article is a review chapter of Judith N. Martin and Thomas K. Nakayama's book entitled "Intercultural Communication in Contexts, 8th Edition. The chapter reviewed in this article is Chapter 6 with the sub-title Language and Intercultural Communication. This chapter focuses on discussing issues - issues related to language in the process of verbal communication. This chapter uses a dialectical perspective to explore how language works dynamically in an intercultural context. Although the language component tends to be static, language usage tends to be dynamic. With personal-contextual debate, we can consider how language use operates at the individual level and how it is influenced by context. Judith N. Martin and Thomas K. Nakayama also use the statistical-dynamic debate to distinguish between language and discourse, identify language components, and explore the relationship between language, meaning, and perception.

Discussion

Language and Perceptions

Social Science Perspective on Language

The social science perspective focuses on individual aspects of language use: language components, language perception and thinking, cultural groups that use language differently, and the barriers this variation presents. The study of linguistics is one of many ways to think about language, and it provides a reasonable basis for exploring intercultural language communication. Linguists generally divide language study into four parts: semantics, syntax, phonetics, and pragmatics.

People worldwide speak many different languages , and some scholars think that the particular language we speak affects the way we see the world. Pragmatics is probably the most useful for students through intercultural communication because it focuses on language use. Before we answer how to reduce language barriers in intercultural communication, we need to ask the following questions: Do speakers of Japanese, Chinese, Arabic, and other languages see the world differently or do they depend on specific languages? Or do we all know the world in the same way but have different ways of expressing our experiences?

How much of our perceptions are shaped by the particular language we use is at the heart of the "Political correctness" debate. We can tackle this question from two points of view: the nominalist and the relativist. According to the nominalist position, perception is not shaped by our language. Language is just an arbitrary "form of thought." So, we all have the same range of thoughts, which we express in different ways in different languages. This means that any idea can be expressed in any language, although some may require more or fewer words. Other languages do not signify that people have different thought processes or have different

perceptions. After all, a tree may be an arbre in French and an arbol in Spanish, but we all view trees the same way.

According to the relativist position, the particular language we use, especially the structure of that language, determines our mindset, perception of reality, and, ultimately, an essential component of culture. for example, syntactic and semantic variations reflect differences in perception.

In light of this and other research findings, most contemporary linguists advocate a middle ground, a suitable relativist position, suggesting that although not a "prison." This view allows more freedom than the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. According to Guy Deutscher, the language habits that have been instilled in our culture since we first learned to speak may indeed shape our orientation towards the world and the people and objects we encounter (The New York Times, 2010).

Language and Thought: Metaphor

One way of thinking about the relationship between language and thought is to look at metaphors. A metaphor is an expression where a word (or words) is used outside of its ordinary conventional meaning to express the same concept (Lakoff, 1992). For example, "You are my sunshine." Although one cannot be sunshine, comparing one to the sun reveals specific positive meanings. Scholars used to think that metaphors were about language or literary writing but could not understand everyday speech.

Understanding cultural metaphors help us understand something about culture itself. Consider the English metaphor of equating love with a journey. Metaphors can also be a way to understand other cultures. For example, some metaphors are universal, such as the metaphor of an angry person as a pressure vessel (Kövecses, 2005). Consider this English phrase: "His pent-up anger welled up inside him. Billy had just blown off steam. He exploded with rage. When I told him, he just exploded? "Other languages have similar expressions. The universality of the metaphor may lie in the universal human physiology because the physical changes of the body occur when we are angry (blood pressure rises, pulse rate increases, temperature rises).

Cultural Variations in Communication Style

Communication style combines language and nonverbal communication. It is a metamessage that contextualizes how listeners are expected to receive and interpret messages. The different ways cultural groups communicate types can be seen in high versus low context communication. A high-level communication style is when "most of the information is either in a physical context or internalized within the person, while very little is in the coded, explicit, sending the message" (Hall, 1976, p.79). This communication style emphasizes understanding the message without direct verbal communication. People in long-term relationships often communicate in this style. For example, one person can send a meaningful glance across the room at a party, and their partner will know from nonverbal cues that it's time to go home.

In contrast, most meaning and information in low communication contexts is in verbal code. This communication style, which emphasizes explicit verbal messages, is highly valued in many parts of the United States. However, many cultural groups around the world value high-context communication. It's better, they say, to be explicit and to the point and not leave things ambiguous.

Direct Versus Indirect Styles. This dimension refers to how speakers express their intentions through explicit verbal communication and emphasize low context communication. The natural communication style is one in which the message tells the speaker's true intentions, needs, wants, and desires. Indirect style is a type in which verbal statements are often designed to disguise the speaker's true intentions, needs, wants, and desires (Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey, & Chua, 1988). Most of the time, individuals and groups are more or less directly dependent on the context. Many English speakers in the United States favor direct speech as most appropriate in most contexts. This is revealed in statements such as *"Don't beat around the bush," "Get to the point," and "What exactly are you trying to say?"*

Elaborate Versus Understated Styles. This dimension of communication style refers to how speech is used. The complex type involves using rich and expressive language in everyday conversation. For example, Arabic has many metaphorical expressions used in everyday conversation. In this style, simple assertive statements mean little; listeners will believe otherwise.

In contrast, the understated style values succinctness, simple statements, and silence. Amish people often use this style of communication. A common repetition is, "If you don't have anything nice to say, say nothing." Free self-expression is discouraged. Silence is especially appropriate in ambiguous situations; if one is unsure of what is going on, it is better to remain silent.

The Effect of Interactive Media Use on Language and Communication Style

In general, email, text messaging, and Twitter emphasize written communication that is low-context, direct, and unpretentious. Precision, efficiency, and ensuring that meaning is conveyed are priorities in this medium. Does this prevalence of social media platforms worldwide promote and lead to more direct, low-context, or down-to-earth communication styles regardless of cultural background? Maybe not, for several reasons. First, interactive media provide increasing opportunities to provide contextual information along with our words; We add emoticons, emojis, and stickers to our texts and photos and videos to convey more emotional meaning to our messages.

Second, not everyone adopts or uses all available technologies. Business experts report that in many countries where high-context, indirect communication is preferred. However, digital communication is standard and readily available (and used in marketing). Businesses prefer face-to-face or telephone contact (especially for initial contact) or Skype and teleconferencing more than email and text messages to combine more contextual information. In many countries, voicemail and SMS are still not widespread in business. For example, in Kenya, many people have mobile phones, young people use social media, and financial transactions via mobile phones are every day. However, most Kenyans prefer written and face-to-face communication over virtual communication in a business context, especially when dealing with serious issues. Government transactions require written communications in hard copy, sent and signed (Virtual communications in Kenya, 2016). Apart from highlighting cultural differences in language, interactive media also hugely impact slang and humor, which will be discussed in the following section.

Slang and Humor in Language Use

Another cultural variation in language use that can present challenges is slang. A linguist Tom Dalzell (2005), slang is generally cunning and cleverer than standard language. This is a creative invention and has the critical function of building a sense of community identity among

its users, often at odds with normal language users. Slang can be considered a barrier to those outside the language group. Dalzell suggests that the cultural groups most likely to produce slang in society are the youth, the powerless, the sports participants, and the criminals.

Slang is essential to youth culture; it is almost necessary to create slang that every generation has and cannot understand by parents and other adults. The point of slang is to separate your language, but using social media means someone can make a video or Vine. Social media really "shorts life" slang. This is faster because of social media and technology and quicker out of date. Once a new slang word reaches a broader audience, it loses its value (social media accelerates language evolution, 2015).

Humor can be a language variation of another culture that presents challenges, even when two cultural groups speak the same language. For example, some say that humor for British people is nuanced and subtle and often relies on irony. In contrast, humor for Americans tends to be more precise and more straightforward than for Americans themselves. However, these differences do not seem to be barriers to creating comedic situations. Trying to use humor in a foreign language can be very challenging because the basis of humor is often tied to specific cultural (or historical) experiences.

Interpretive Perspective on Language

Variations in Contextual Rules

The dialectical perspective reminds us that the particular style of communication we use may differ from one context to another. We may be more direct with your family and less natural in a classroom setting. Similarly, you can use informal communication in your interactions with friends and, more formally, low-context conversations with your professors. When communicating with professors via email, you may write in more formal language than texting your friends. These same cultural variations can be applied to written communication.

Many research studies have examined the rules for using language socially placed in specific contexts. They seek to identify the context and then "find" the laws that apply in this context to a particular speech community. For example, several studies examined gender differences in the interpersonal communication "rules" of text messaging for men and women in India. In the first study, researchers found that, in contrast to men, women tend to send and receive text messages mostly when they are alone (Shuter & Chattopadhyay, 2010). In a second study, through in-depth interviews, Indian women reported receiving adverse reactions from their parents, extended family members, husbands, and male friends when sending or reading text messages in their presence.

Action-oriented

Another study compared the communication styles used by two different speech communities. For example, researchers have examined how communication styles vary from generation to generation. They suggest that millennials (those born between 1982 and 2001) tend to be polite, prefer electronic communication, are less skilled in face-to-face contact because they are more familiar with technical ways of communicating, such as visual images in language, and prefer communication. Gen X, slightly older, is comfortable with more direct and informal contact and prefers immediate communication and results. In comparison, the older generation, Baby Boomers, communicate directly and diplomatically, preferring face-to-face communication but can use digital communication. These different communication styles have led to several conflicts, and business experts have written extensively on managing a multigenerational workplace (Boogaard, 2015; Goudreau, 2013).

People communicate differently in different speech communities. While we may share one way within one language community, we may change our communication style in another. Thus, the context in which communication occurs is an essential part of the meaning. Understanding the dynamics of different speech communities helps us look at other communication styles.

Critical Perspective on Language

A critical perspective on language suggests that to use language effectively in intercultural encounters, we need to understand the role of power and power differences in these encounters. Remember that discourse refers to the language used. The language used—the words and meanings communicated—depend not only on the context but also on the social relationships that are part of the interaction. This means that all address is social.

Co-Cultural Communication

The theory of co-cultural communication, proposed by communication scholar Mark Orbe (1998), explains how language works between dominant and non-dominant groups—or co-cultural groups. The most potent groups (whites, men, heterosexuals) consciously or unconsciously formulate communication systems that support their perception of the world. This means that members of cultural groups (ethnic minorities, women, gays) must function in communication systems that often do not represent their experiences. The non-dominant groups thus find themselves in a dialectical struggle.

The point here is that there are costs and benefits to members of a shared culture when they choose which strategy to use. Since language is structured in a way that does not reflect their experience, they have to adopt several strategies for dealing with the linguistic framework. For example, if Mark wanted to mention his relationship with Kevin, would he use girlfriend, friend, roommate, husband, partner, or other words? If Mark and Kevin were married, she might choose to refer to Kevin as her husband in some contexts. In others (e.g., Thanksgiving dinner with disapproving family or at work), he may choose a different term, depending on how he views the costs and benefits of each situation.

Assimilation Strategy

The three assimilation strategies are non-assertive, assertive, and aggressive. Some co-cultural individuals tend to use non-assertive assimilation strategies. These strategies emphasize efforts to conform and be accepted by the dominant group. Such a strategy might emphasize commonality and avoid controversy.

The second assimilation strategy is assertive assimilation. Co-cultural individuals who take this strategy may underestimate co-cultural differences and try to adjust to the existing structure. In contrast to non-assertive assimilation strategies, these individuals will try to fit in but also let people know how they are feeling from time to time. However, this strategy can promote an us-versus-them mentality, and some people find it challenging to maintain this strategy for long.

Aggressive assimilation strategies emphasize conformity, and members of cultures who take this approach may go to great lengths to prove they are like members of the dominant group. Sometimes this means distancing yourself from other members of their shared culture, imitating (dressing and behaving like the dominant group), or mocking oneself. The benefit of this strategy is that co-cultural members are not seen as "typical" members of the co-cultural.

Accommodation Strategy

Non-assertive accommodation strategies emphasize blending into the dominant culture but wisely challenge dominant structures to recognize co-cultural practices. Using this strategy, co-cultural individuals may influence group decision-making while still demonstrating loyalty to the organization's larger goals.

Assertive accommodation strategies try to balance the attention of members of the dominant and cultural groups. This strategy involves self-communication, conducting intragroup networking, liaisons, and educating others.

An aggressive accommodation strategy involves moving to a dominant structure and then working from within to drive significant change—no matter how high the personal costs. While it may seem as though cultural workers using these strategies are aggressive or self-promoting, they also reflect a genuine desire to work with and not against dominant group workers.

Separation Strategy

Indecisive separation strategies are often used by those who perceive some separation as a part of everyday life in the United States. Generally, people live, work, study, socialize, and pray with people who are like them. This is usually easier for dominant groups than for co-cultural members. Some co-cultural individuals perceive segregation as a natural phenomenon and use subtle communication practices to maintain separation from the dominant group. Perhaps the most common strategy is to avoid interaction with dominant group members whenever possible.

An assertive separation strategy reflects a conscious choice to maintain space between members of the dominant group and the shared cultural group. Typical plans might include emphasizing strengths and embracing stereotypes. One of the benefits of this approach, such as the non-assertive separation strategy, is that it promotes shared cultural unity and self-determination. The cost, however, is that members of a shared cultural group must try to survive without having access to the resources controlled by the dominant group.

Aggressive separation strategies are used by those who consider cultural separation a critical priority. These strategies can include criticizing, attacking, and sabotaging others. The benefit of this approach for co-cultural members is that it allows them to deal with assumed discriminatory practices and structures daily. The cost may be that the dominant group retaliates against the open disclosure of this perceived way of doing things.

Discourse and Social Structure

Differences in social position are significant for understanding intercultural communication. For one thing, not all parts in the structure are equal. When a man whistles at an attractive woman passing by, it has a different power and meaning than when a woman whistles at a passing man. When we communicate, we tend to note (but unconsciously) group memberships and participant positions. For example, when a judge in court says what he thinks means free speech, it carries far more power than when a neighbor or classmate gives an opinion.

Groups also hold different positions of power in the social structure. Since intercultural contact occurs between members of other groups, the group's work affects communication. Group differences give meaning to intercultural communication because, as previously mentioned, the concept of difference is a crucial language and semiotic process.

The "Power" Effects of Labels

Labels, as markers, recognize certain aspects of our social identity. For example, we may label ourselves or others as "male" or "female," indicating sexual identity. The context in which a label is used can determine how strongly we feel about the brand.

Sometimes people feel trapped or misunderstood by labels. It is almost impossible to communicate without tags. People rarely have trouble being labeled with terms they agree with. Problems arise from using labels that they don't like or inaccurately describing them. Think about how you feel when someone describes you using terms you don't like.

Labels communicate many levels of meaning and define a certain type of relationship between speaker and listener. Sometimes people use labels to communicate closeness and affection to others. Labels like "friend," "lover," and "partner" communicate equality. Sometimes people purposely use labels to forge hostile relationships. Labels like "white trash" and "redneck" intentionally communicate inequality. Sometimes people use labels that unintentionally offend others.

Discourse is closely tied to social structures, so messages communicated through the use of labels are highly dependent on the speaker's social position. If the speaker and listener are close friends, certain labels may not cause distance in the relationship or be offensive. But if both the speaker and the listener are strangers, this same label can cause anger or block lines of communication. Because culture changes over time, as does language, we must stay aware of these changes as much as possible so that we don't accidentally offend others. Regardless of the speaker's intentions, negative labels can work in small but powerful ways: Every utterance acts like a grain of sand in sedimentary rock or like a snowball rolling down a hill—small on its own but spoken over and over again to reproduce systems of sexism, racism, homophobia, and the like.

Switch between Languages

Some people in the United States do not feel the need to learn a second language. They assume that most people they meet both at home and abroad can speak English. Some of them also feel that they have succeeded even without learning another language. Meanwhile, if the need for multilingualism arises in a professional context, they can hire an interpreter. This is supported by a survey that asked Canadian and US professionals wherein the survey conclusions made it clear that foreign languages are not important in doing business abroad. That language is not very important (Varner & Beamer, 2011). In another survey, US students said they should learn another language but did not consider it necessary due to the prevalence and existence of English as a world language (Demont-Heinrich, 2010).

But the fact is, for someone who only knows one language, others can understand their words, but they will never understand what other people are saying in another language. So, they will always depend on translators who will most likely also misunderstand what is said. Such people certainly miss the opportunity to learn about a culture where language and culture are very closely related. Learning a new language means gaining new insights into other cultures. Also, other reasons people learn foreign languages are to compete in global markets or meet more personal demands, such as changing social realities.

Multilingualism

Multilingualism is the act of using multiple languages by individuals or communities. A person who can speak multiple languages is called a polyglot. At the same time, Trilingual is a person's ability to speak three languages. Another term is Bilingual, which is a term for those who master two languages in communication. Monolingual or unilingual is when a person can only speak one language.

Almost all countries are bilingual or multilingual. Belgium, for example, has three national languages (Dutch, German, and French), and Switzerland has four (French, German, Italian, and Romance). Fifty percent of the world's population is bilingual (Mathews, 2019). Indonesia itself noted that 17.4 percent of Indonesians are trilingual (Javanese, English, and Indonesian) while 57.3 percent are bilingual (Indonesian, local languages) (IDN Times, 2016). The data released by the Language Development and Development Agency (BP2B) of the Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbud) of the Republic of Indonesia in 2017 showed that 652 regional languages had been identified and validated so that Indonesia is a country with a multilingual society (Kumparan, 2020).

Interlanguage

An interesting linguistic phenomenon known as interlanguage has implications for teaching and learning other languages. Interlanguage refers to the type of communication that occurs when speakers of one language speak another language, commonly referred to as Interferences/Negative Language Transfer. Interlanguage is the wrong language spoken by speakers who are not native speakers of that language. The mother tongue's semantics, syntax, pragmatics, and phonetics often overlap with the second language and create a third mode of communication. For example, we often hear Indonesians, whether intentionally or not, say, "No, what what" they mean it's okay, or Child Fruit.

Different people react differently to the dialectical tensions of a multilingual world. Some work hard to learn other languages and other ways of communicating, even if they make many mistakes. Others regress into the language and way of life they are familiar with. Dialectical tensions that arise in different languages and different systems of meaning are played out worldwide. But this dialectical tension never goes away; they always present new challenges for intercultural communicators.

Translation and Interpretation

Difference between Translation and Interpretation

Since no one can learn all the world's languages, we must rely on translation and interpretation—two different but essential ways to communicate across languages. The European Union (EU), for example, has a strict policy of recognizing all the languages of its constituent members. Therefore, the EU employs many translators and interpreters to help bridge the linguistic gap.

Translation generally means producing a written text that refers to something said or written in another language. The original translated language text is the source text; the translated text is the target text. Meanwhile, interpretation refers to the process of verbally expressing what is said or written in another language. Interpretation can be made with the interpreter simultaneously as the native speaker.

As we know from language theories, language is a whole system of meaning and consciousness that is not easily translated into other languages in its word-for-word equivalent. The equivalence and accuracy of several languages can be expressed flexibly, especially in words that have a wide range of meanings and do not apply to comments that have a limited range of meanings. Translators have traditionally tended to emphasize the issue of word equivalence and accuracy. The focus, mostly in linguistics, is on comparing the translated meaning with the original meaning. However, for those who are interested in the process of intercultural communication, the emphasis is not on equality and accuracy.

Role of Translator or Interpreter

The translation is more than just switching languages, but it also involves cultural negotiation. We often assume that translators and interpreters translate into whatever target language they hear or read accurately and accurately. However, translators or interpreters do not always translate everything one speaker says to another in the same way because the potential for misunderstanding due to cultural differences may be too great. It may be more correct to think of them as cultural intermediaries who must be very sensitive to the context of intercultural communication.

We often assume that anyone who speaks two or more languages can become a translator or interpreter. Research shows, however, that a person's level of fluency in another language does not necessarily make them a good translator or interpreter. Knowing English does not guarantee that we can become good writers in English because of some complex relationships that must be considered, such as intercultural situations or linguistic equivalence.

With the sophistication of technology and translation applications such as Google Translate, iTranslate 3 (voice to voice), Say hi (voice to text), and Textgrabber (read signs and menus and translate), the presence of translators and interpreters have not been abolished. The reasons are: (1) Instant translator is not always accurate; (2) Instant translation ignores context (e.g., jokes will be taken seriously or even offensively distorting meaning); and (3) Instant translator tool does not know all idioms and slang of most Languages.

Code Switch

Code-switching is a technical term in communication that refers to the phenomenon of changing languages, dialects, or even accents. This discussion of code-switching and language settings raises how bilinguals decide which language to use in a setting where multiple languages are spoken? Is it polite to switch between two languages when several people in the room only understand one language?

National Public Radio in America recently conducted an informal survey, asking about their experiences with code-switching. The survey revealed five main motivations for someone to do code-switching:

1. Lizard brains or commonly called talkative in Indonesian. Sometimes people switch to another language or accent without any thought or spontaneity.
2. To conform. People often switch codes to talk and act like the people around them.
3. To get something. People in the service industry report that a Southern accent is "a surefire way to get a tip." Also, an American woman who lives in Ireland says she gets better prices as a buyer if she speaks in a local Irish accent.
4. To say something in secret. One US woman reported that she and a friend would speak French to each other on their train ride in Chicago if they wanted to comment on other passengers.

Politics and Language Policy

In politics and language policy issues, the state usually rules the official language used in written and spoken forms, such as Indonesian in Indonesia, French in France, and Irish in Ireland. In addition, some countries have more than one official language, such as Canada, which uses French and English as official languages. Malaysia uses four official languages : Malay, Mandarin, Tamil, and English. Political factors influence the determination of the official language in the use of language. As happened in the high court state, Catherine, Russia, does not use Russian but uses French because it is closely related to social, political, and economic class.

The policy of establishing an official language was also influenced by colonialism, as happened in Cameroon, which used English and French as official languages. The formation of an official language in a country is not solely without reason, but there are several different motivations behind the determination of language policies that lead to the status of the language, namely,

1. Assimilation with national culture; Language policies lead people to assimilate into the national culture. If a country wants to increase assimilation, it must make a policy regarding the official language used in business, politics, etc.
2. Protecting minority language; This policy is intended to protect the languages of minority groups so that they continue to exist even though the state has a lingua franca that is used by the community in cross-cultural communication.
3. Language policy is governed by location. For example, in Belgium, Dutch is the official language in Flanders in the north of Belgium. Then French became the official language in Wallonia in the south,
4. Language policies were developed to maintain language balance. For example, in Cameroon, English and French are the official languages. However, there are 247 regional languages spoken. Cameroonians who speak French make French their official language. Meanwhile, British Cameroonians who use English make English their official language.

Language and Globalization

The presence of globalization brings both positive and negative impacts on the development of languages where people, products, and ideas can move or move quickly around the world. This is because of the language that is spoken and learned. In addition, globalization has also increased people's interest in some languages while also allowing other languages to become extinct.

The rapid development of globalization will directly affect regional languages . Linguists later strengthened this statement and said that half of the world's languages would be extinct in the next few centuries. Then, media and communication technology, which is a product of globalization, impact the use of language, as is the case with today's children. Children or teenagers feel prouder when they use English in their daily lives than their local language. They usually get these languages from communication media and online games. However, it does not rule out the possibility that the presence of globalization also revives extinct languages such as the Cornish language, which became extinct in 1777 and reappeared in 2000. That means that globalization does not only have a negative impact. Produce other changes in language use, such as producing new dialects such as Indian dialect, Taiwanese, and so on. In addition to dialects, the product of globalization on the internet also encourages students to consume and use mixed languages in communicating.

Conclusion

1. The social science approach focuses on the individual aspects of language. The interpretive approach focuses on the contextual factors of the language. The critical approach emphasizes the role of power in the use of language.
2. There is a positional difference in the relationship between language and our perception. The nominalist position holds that our language does not shape our perceptions. The relativist position holds that our language determines our perceptions. A qualified relativist position holds that language influences the way we perceive.
3. Communication styles can be high context or low context, more direct or indirect, or more complex or understated.
4. Interactive media influence language use and communication style in several ways.
5. Co-cultural groups can use one of three orientations to deal with the dominant group—assimilation, accommodation, or separation. There are non-assertive, assertive, and aggressive strategies within each approach. Each of these strategies comes with benefits and costs for the individual co-culture.
6. Language policies are instituted for different purposes. Sometimes language policies are intended to encourage assimilation into language and national identity. Sometimes language policies are intended to protect minority languages. Sometimes language policies regulate language use in different parts of the country.
7. Globalization and technology have influenced how language is spoken or not used. Globalization means that English is not.

References

Boogaard, K. (2015, August 27). Mixing Millenials and Baby Boomers in the workplace melting pot. *officeninjas.com.* Retrieved May 27, 2016, from http://officeninjas.com/2015/08/27/mixing-millennials-and-baby-boomers-in-the- workplace-melting-pot/.

Dazell, T. (2005). Sez who? The power of slang. *PBS .org*. Retrieved June 4, 2011, from www.pbs.org/speak /words/sezwho/slang/.

Deutscher, G. (2010). *Through the language glass: Why the world looks different in other languages*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Goudreau, J (2016). How to communicate in the new multigenerational office. forbes.com. Retrieved May 27, 2016, from http://www.forbes.com/sites/jennagoudreau/2013/02/14/how-to-communicate-in-the- new-multigenerational office/#f68656150d8d.

Gudykunst, W. B., Ting-Toomey, S., & Chua, E. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, G. (1992). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In Ortony, A. (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed.) (pp. 202–251). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Orbe, M. P. (1998). *Constructing co-cultural theory: An explication of culture, power, and communication.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sapir, E. (Ed.). (1921). *Language: An introduction to the study of speech.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Shuter, R., & Chattopadhyay, S. (2010). Emerging interpersonal norms of text messaging in India and the United States. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *39*(2), 121– 145.

Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, thought and reality.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Biographies

Anugrah Puspita Ayu Muhammad, Asbar Asbar, Samsudin Samsuddin, Misnawati Misnawati are doctoral students' program at Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia through a scholarship from the Education Service Center (Puslapdik) of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology (Kemendikbudristek) which is fully funded by the Education Fund Management Institute (LPDP) in Indonesia.