

**How to Cite:**

Vysotki, V. M., Patalashko, E. V., Stepanenko, V. E., Makarova, T. V., & Balabanova, I. A. (2021). Language as a communication resource and its place in the representation of world practices: philosophical and linguistic approach. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S3), 574-584. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5nS3.1621>

## **Language as a Communication Resource and its Place in the Representation of World Practices: Philosophical and Linguistic Approach**

**Vadim Mikhailovich Vysotki**

St Petersburg University, 7/9 Universitetskaya Emb., Petersburg , Russia

**Patalashko Ekaterina Viktorovna**

St Petersburg University, 7/9 Universitetskaya Emb., Petersburg , Russia

**Victoria Evgenievna Stepanenko**

St Petersburg University, 7/9 Universitetskaya Emb., Petersburg , Russia

**Makarova Tatiana Valerievna**

Kuban State University, Krasnodar, Russia

**Iuliia Andreevna Balabanova**

Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO), Prospect Vernadskogo Moscow, Russia

**Abstract**---The paper considers language as a communication resource and its place in the representation of world practices is evaluated from the standpoint of a philosophical and linguistic approach. The authors note that discussions of language are necessarily based on ontological, sometimes contradictory ideas about languages or language use. These reports are not limited to categories that attempt to describe and analyze them. Moving forward, there are still opportunities for more interaction with language ontologies. Thinking in the ontological register is not an interpretation or description, but rather, much more importantly, it is the identification and display of hypotheses hidden in the world of language. Researchers insist on assigning ontological significance to various practices and regulations. This requires moving away from ideological analysis and the assumption that they represent multiple points of view that illuminate various partial aspects of an independently existing and ultimately determined phenomenon, and towards an approach that aims to purify reality - worlds - as created through practices. It can be stated that specific ways of perceiving a language are more complex and, therefore, more comprehensive descriptions of

languages. It is inevitable that contradictory ideas about language can coexist. Different language concepts are not a matter of point of view, but rather a matter of creating languages.

**Keywords**---communication resource, language, philosophical and linguistic approach, world practices.

## Introduction

Language tends to be conceptualized and to be as a characteristic of experience, taking various existential forms. Consideration of these points requires expansion beyond linguistic ideologies towards explicit interaction with linguistic ontologies. Both language practices and the theoretically defined concepts of language corresponding to them are based on certain ontologies and reveal them. Moreover, the issues related to the development of language practices are themselves ontologically determined: the initial act of conceptualizing a language sets parameters for a research and theorizing program that accept this concept of language as an object of research (Alberti et al., 2011).

It is interesting to study three ontologies: language as an object, language as practice and language as assembly. Each of them corresponds to specific practices, ontologies and ontological assumptions. The study of language in this context is not only a movement towards a more comprehensive and conscious consideration of linguistic ontologies, but also the avoidance of methodological pitfalls that may arise when we assume that we are all talking about the same thing when we use the term "language". The key component here is going beyond the framework of linguistic ideologies. The well-established study of linguistic ideologies – ideas, concepts, or beliefs about language structures, trajectories, uses, and effects -has made an important contribution to understanding the social, historical, and political foundations of language (Jacquemet, 2005; Martínez, 2013).

The term "ideology" refers to the form of consciousness or lens imposed on reality in order to understand it and possibly prescribe behavior towards it. However, in the ontological register, the scope and potential of ideological criticism are limited by its ontological attachment to a single reality. That is, linguistic ideologies operate on the basis of the fact that there is an externally existing, identifiable and singular entity that we (all) call language, but which we can define, interact with or think differently. Turning to ontology provides a radically different point of view on the language learning. Instead of multiple views on one reality (multiple ideologies informing how reality is understood), a turn to ontology presupposes the existence of multiple realities or worlds. Thus, there is a noticeable shift from the "one world" approach to the potential of fractal, multifractal or pluriversal worlds (Appleby & Pennycook, 2017). If we apply the ontological register to our thinking about languages (and their implementation), then it becomes possible to represent language not in the singular - or, in the case of multilingualism, as a multiplication of the singular - but as a generalizing term under which a number of completely different phenomena were organized. Language practices play out

the type of world that underlies and is supported by individual linguistic ontologies.

### **Materials and Methods**

The article examines the arrays of information within the framework of the research topic, as well as the application of comparative research methods.

### **Results**

The term "ideology" has been used in many ways in different contexts; despite some differences, the unifying characteristic is that ideology refers to beliefs or understanding of these systems, entities or practices. In a broad sense, ideology emerged as a descriptive scientific study of ideas. Then it began to be framed as a form of prescriptive social regulation. The Marxist idea of ideology as a false consciousness is firmly connected with power, domination, dogmas and absolutism embedded in social structures and designed to maintain them - thus, ideology functions as a "camera obscura" that reverses reality. Ideology is used as a critical and analytical tool to investigate how power and domination are distributed in societies, reflexively informing about the situations and experiences of certain people, as well as how they understand their situations and experiences.

The study of linguistic ideologies has become a serious field. Language ideology as a "rubric for considering ideas about the structure and use of language in the context of social contexts" reflects ingrained ways of thinking about language and contributes to the regulation of language use ([Louhiala-Salminen & Kankaanranta, 2012](#); [Zu, 2021](#)). Leading scientists in this field claim that linguistic ideologies have a social, cultural and historical position and are associated with group and personal identity, aesthetics, morality and epistemology. In addition, these ideologies are supported by meta-discursive modes, such as grammars and dictionaries, which codify, stabilize and prescribe acceptable ways of using language. However, language ideologies are spread not only by official institutions and authorities; they are also supported and promoted by small groups of language users.

While ideology refers to belief systems and lenses through which one can look at oneself and the world, ontology comes from a branch of metaphysics that deals with "what is". In other words, ideology concerns what a human (person, group, community, organization) thinks about and reacts to in relation to what is, and ontology concerns reality and being; more precisely, existential obligations. There is an interaction between them in the sense that ideology is likely to be somehow adapted to its ontological foundations (although sometimes this is assumed without recognition or articulation. Moreover, different ideologies may exist in relation to the same or similar ontology ([Blaser, 2013](#)). It is also necessary to consider the turn to ontologies in various disciplines of research more deeply, tracing the possibilities opened up by the ontological turn in connection with the existence of multiple worlds.

In the broadest sense, the term "ontology" refers to the issues of being. The plural form, ontologies, is used in cases where the focus of analysis - be it a living being, artifact, place, practice - can be several things at the same time. Instead of the singular, ontology has become plural, and in practice questions are asked about how opposite versions of reality are reconciled. The ontological turn is based not on cultures, perspectives, worldviews or ideologies, but on the premise of simultaneous and multiple coexistence of worlds (Cummins, 2014; Bernolet et al., 2009). As a starting point, recent ontologically oriented research has sought to tap into the perceived pragmatism underlying many works in anthropological and cultural studies, as well as in the fields cross-pollinated by them. It is believed that this pragmatism contributed to the promotion of models based on the idea (or credibility) of a single world or reality - what the authors called the "world of one world".

In their critique of the Western epistemological tradition, some authors argue that Western universalism is trying to create a subject detached from temporal and spatial dimensions, devoid of body and content, and which can thereby pass itself off as neutral. Some researchers discuss this phenomenon through what he calls zero-degree arrogance; that is, the refusal of Western knowledge to accept its locus of utterance in order to represent itself as universal. Under this mask, subjectivity turns into a position of perceived objectivity, from which time-bound and geographically (ontological) beings make useless observations and declare facts (Blaser, 2014).

The result of applying one world model of the world is the following: ontological possibilities that do not correspond to this, for example, those that may include a multiple character, are reduced in the sense that they are accepted to be problematic or incomplete interpretations of the world, rather than reasonable responses to different worlds (Belhassen & Caton, 2009; Chuu, 2011). Thus, alternative ways of being can be positioned as imaginative, problematic or irrational, and not as rational reactions to multiple worlds or individual ontological spaces. In this regard, a central problem arises: "to assume that the world is one and that we are all inside it; or, instead, to deal with the consequences of the plural worlds being played out in various practices impregnated with power."

One of the proposed ways to overcome the limitations of the one world model is to more seriously engage in alternative ways of cognition, action and existence on their own terms. Consequently, to a large extent, ontologically concerned theorizing was connected with the study of what things are - with the expectation that things may turn out to be different from previously thought - rather than continuing within the framework of what things may represent for a certain group of people included in it in order to fit into a predetermined framework explaining the work of human communities or the world in a broader sense.

Ontologies are neither cultures nor cultural points of view: the concept of "cultural difference" is a function of the modernist ontological assumption that there is one reality or world outside and many points of view or cultural representations about it. Thus, when researchers view the difference as cultural, they are promoting a specific ontology that does not take into account the

ontological difference that may be at stake. The application of the one world model is conceptually limited and politically charged, and also creates special problems for anthropological ethnographic practice. In the ontology of a single world, data (that is, what occurs in the field) is interpreted in a relatively rigid framework, regardless of the compatibility of the structure with what occurs. In addition to the problematic approach to data analysis, the correlative result of this practice is that the moment of ethnographic understanding is used for larger-scale efforts to understand how the human world (social, cultural, etc.) is organized.

Ontological research, on the contrary, is aimed at a more complete understanding of the various worlds experienced by others, in an attempt to avoid imposing already existing frameworks and concepts. By doing so, the ontological register transforms ontology as a heuristic device, and not as an exclusively theoretical position. This approach is methodological rather than normative in nature - ontologies are not hierarchical as to what is better or worse - and it is aimed to allow classification schemes to be products rather than preconditions for analysis (Creese & Blackledge, 2011; Deephouse, 2000).

## **Discussion**

By delineating preoccupation with being, the ontological register becomes heuristic at the moment when it "takes seriously" other ways of being or being "otherwise". This is a significant contribution of the ontological turn in anthropology: an ethnographic meeting is being reworked as an occasion of integrating inherited concepts and existing frameworks, and not as an occasion of describing or explaining what is encountered, thereby strengthening the established anthropological lens. As some researchers explain, the anthropological task, therefore, is not to explain why ethnographic data are what they are, but to understand what they are - instead of explanation or interpretation, conceptualization is required. Instead of using our own analytical concepts to make sense of this ethnography (explanation, interpretation), we use ethnography to rethink our analytical concepts (Bolander & Sultana, 2019).

The ontological register as a heuristic or recursive methodology gives priority to ethnographic interaction, on the basis of which analytical tools are developed. This process necessarily denotes the analytical foundations used in the analysis of worlds, and aims to go beyond the idea that certain categories are simply not applicable to a given context. When confronted with practices and artifacts in this field, the ontological thinker questions the available methods and conceptual tools, instead of assuming that what he encountered can be explained within the existing framework. This is ontology: the result of systematic attempts by anthropologists to transform their conceptual repertoire in such a way as to be able to describe their ethnographic material in terms that are not absurd (Jing, 2017; Marschan-Piekkari et al., 1999).

Thus, ontology is as heuristic functions for studying and redefining (our) conceptual and analytical tools, deploying a high degree of self- and meta-reflexivity, while being open to the existence (or fact) of a multitude and potentially conflicting or competing with the world. Ontologically oriented

research "is not so much about seeing differently. First of all, it is an opportunity to see different things. If we accept the premise or the fact of numerous, simultaneously existing and sometimes contradictory, worlds, then this prompts the question, how did these different worlds make up? This leads to another dimension of ontology. Instead of existing externally and independently of each other realities, worlds arise ontologically through practices and acting out. Actions, performances, stories, etc. give rise to certain ontologies (Candea & Alcayna-Stevens, 2012). Considering political ontology, some authors argue that it is associated with practices, performances and productions, and not with specific groups. One can talk about a given world or ontology as long as one can trace its playing out. Moreover, the practice does not have to be completely consistent, although in some situations it is possible to find more or less consistency than in others. Other authors note that realities are constituted through rulings that are both accidental and relative. Ontologically, there is no single existing reality "outside", but there are "performances and rituals" held in certain places (and presumably at certain times).

Realities are recreated, played out and revealed through performance. An important consequence of this is that different performances - practices and stories - imply different worlds, and do not just float above the ultimate real world. Consequently, practices cannot be fully understood without realizing their ideological effects. In other words, practices do not constitute single ontologies sitting like bubbles in the external arena, but rather generate continuous, overlapping and heterogeneous legendary performatives: by this we mean constitutive processes through which actions or practices are told, and the stories themselves are played out. From this foundation of ontology as a worldview - through acting out and stories - language turns into becoming; that is, there is no independently existing language there, but the ways in which we bring language/linguistic existence, which depend on the practices, stories, performances and productions underlying (pre) ontological descriptions.

Languages or language formulation are recreated through countless heterogeneous practices and artifacts. These include, for example, material and sound signs, such as words, sounds, or certain signs on a page, as well as relationships between actors in broader "semiotic landscapes" that can encompass the actions and intentions of interlocutors, as well as the influence of ideologies, physical and spatial environment, and other contextual factors. In short, a set of both linguistic and non-linguistic elements can be mobilized into a world language in certain ways. Thus, to talk about world formation means to talk about practices that create worlds, which then allows us to trace how various ontologies of languages are carried out through the study of practices (Yani et al., 2018; Keohin & Graw, 2017).

Next, it is necessary to consider the language in an ontological framework. In thinking through the ideas of previous studies, as well as in accordance with ontology as a heuristic, we note that language is not limited to the research of a linguist or descriptive categories of an anthropologist. In addition, "language" cannot be reproduced, transmitted, or used "without a theory"-implicit or explicit-of what it is. Although this is not the first attempt to postulate ontology as a field worthy of further theorizing, existing research is little known outside of linguistic

anthropology. Despite the fact that the terminology varies - from ontology to philosophy and nature - the commandment is the same (Chaves et al., 2017).

For some time, dualistic assumptions have dominated orthodox linguistics practices by constructing languages as independent communicative resources through which symbols convey meaning from mind to mind; however, these assumptions are based on a special ontological position that is not shared by everyone. Even parole languages - as an abstract language system and concrete examples of the use of language - are based on the ontology of language as a psycho-oriented phenomenon, which, in turn, relies on the Cartesian separation of mind and body. This does not mean that such practices are not valid languages; rather, we claim that they are frequently used, as shown in our discussion of language as an object. However, we also argue that they do not represent satisfactorily all the worlds of language and that the inclusion of the ontologies of others in this structure may require some distortion of their understanding of what we (collectively) they began to call it "language" and its interconnection with various aspects of the world, including people (Borris & Zecho, 2018; Gede Budasi & Wayan Suryasa, 2021).

Speaking about the diverse nature of language and the complexity of its definition, researchers argue that language is a system of signs, a form of action, a social practice and a cultural resource, but it is also something more that we may not yet have the right vocabulary to describe. And, perhaps, not all communicative phenomena in general can be understood as examples of the general phenomenon of "language", as different varieties, genres, registers, modalities or other "forms" of discourse, which, nevertheless, are in some way commensurate. They can all be different. The dominant and rather natural way of ontologizing language in many contexts is the use of an autonomous object, that is, language as an object. Here, language is seen as an abstract system that can also be conceptualized in the plural through language.

Languages consist of a finite set of elements that supposedly provide users with endless possibilities for constructing meaning. In particular, each language provides an unlimited array of hierarchically structured expressions that are interpreted on two interfaces: sensorimotor for externalization and conceptual intentional for mental processes." Each language is based on computational procedures and mentalistic processes inherent in a person. This ontology of language, promoted by structuralist linguistics, crystallized in interaction with cognitive approaches to learning and behavior, which came to the fore in the mid-twentieth century (1950s and beyond) in response to the perceived inadequacy of previous behaviorism and the position of mental processes as reliable objects of scientific research (Chernela, 2018).

However, the trajectory of language as an object can be traced in both historical and modern productions, many of which far predate the cognitive revolution. The researchers place the creation of discrete language systems in the European context in the early Modern period. From the end of the fifteenth century onwards, languages that could "know everything, speak everything and translate everything" were "created" and formalized, relying on dictionaries, grammars, educational materials, literacy training, initiatives, public policy, etc. These

formalized systems make up finite sets of linguistic elements that can be used to create infinite messages.

It is noteworthy that these practices, representations and rulings themselves relate to the world - in other words, to ontologization - to language as an object. Historically, during the colonial expansion of Europe, language played a central role in the empire building: standardized - reproducible and predictable - language systems facilitated communication and control over vast territories and millions of people. With the subsequent mobilization of the national state as a means of political and social organization in geographical territories, the identification of national languages has become the main aspect of identity building.

Currently, countless practices lead to the existence of national languages - for example, through dominant discourses aimed at consolidating identity and ethnic "cohesion" under the banner of official languages; legitimizing and sanctioning certain languages and their use in comparison with others; through the regulation of language practice through social institutions (school, law, media); and through the creation and dissemination of national literatures. Subsequent theoretical arguments, directly addressing the ideological foundations of monolingualism, linked these practices with monoglossia. Here, the basic principles of language include a focused, well-defined and relatively stable grammar that is used and practiced between people and communities, and is emphasized by the idea that over time linguistic behaviors converge and become more homogeneous (Chomsky, 2015).

Language as an object allows us to conceive and implement a number of academic, economic, legal, social and political efforts. For example, the massification of higher education, the spread of neoliberal globalization and the expansion of global capitalism - all this is supported and depends, in different ways and to varying degrees, on the functioning of languages as stable (finite) sets of rules, storing and transmitting a predictable value in time and space. In the legal spheres, alchemical properties are attributed to language when material consequences are produced through statements. These practices promote the ontological validity of language systems that retain meaning and form with relative consistency and stability (Fischli et al., 1998). This does not mean that this practice will not change over time; however, the role of language as an object is significant. Moreover, it is inextricably linked with a number of other practices that create the world, and facilitates their implementation.

Despite its modern significance, a significant and constantly growing volume of critical research problematizes language as an object as an ideological project that does not take into account the complexity of language or linguistic behavior. Although such studies are well grounded in social criticism, the preservation of ideology as a heuristic has limitations. Ignoring the ontological basis of language as an object does not allow us to catch the performances that constantly (recreate) and naturalize - and not (re-) interpret - language as such.

Moreover, since ontologically oriented work meets the requirements of modernity, the recognition of language as an object as a form of attitude is important for a

number of reasons. Language as an object corresponds to the processes that led to the universality of Western modernity and the proclamation of a special "one world" that it mobilizes. This caused damage to many and contributed to a noticeable hierarchy of language practices, for example, under the banner of literacy. Under this pretext, identifiable and standardized languages are positioned as human communication tools that exist in different communities, are based on cultural practice and that can be studied from a scientific point of view through the use of disciplinary tools and lenses, i.e. the discipline of linguistics (Cowley, 2019). The world of structural linguistics is modernist. Secondly, ideological criticism is unable to explain or remain silent about the unified world of language treatment. Criticism of language as an object on an ideological or discursive basis is based on the recognition of the only "real reality" of language - in other words, even if language as an object may not cover this reality comprehensively, and it may subsequently remain in the shadows, we can nevertheless assume that it exists.

### **Conclusion**

Discussions about a language are necessarily based on ontological, at times contradictory ideas about languages or language usage. These reports are not limited to categories that attempt to describe and analyze them. Moving forward, there are still opportunities for more interaction with language ontologies. Thinking in the ontological register is not an interpretation or description, but rather, much more importantly, it is the identification and display of assumptions hidden in the world of language. Researchers insist on assigning ontological significance to various practices and regulations. This requires moving away from ideological analysis and the assumption that they represent multiple points of view that illuminate various partial aspects of an independently existing and ultimately determined phenomenon, and towards an approach that aims to purify reality - worlds - as created through practices. It can be stated that specific ways of perceiving a language are more complex and, therefore, more comprehensive descriptions of languages. It is inevitable that contradictory ideas about language can coexist. Different language concepts are not a matter of point of view, but rather a matter of creating languages.

### **References**

- Alberti, B., Fowles, S., Holbraad, M., Marshall, Y., & Witmore, C. (2011). "Worlds otherwise" archaeology, anthropology, and ontological difference. *Current anthropology*, 52(6), 896-912.
- Appleby, R., & Pennycook, A. (2017). Swimming with sharks, ecological feminism and posthuman language politics. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 14(2-3), 239-261.
- Belhassen, Y., & Caton, K. (2009). Advancing understandings: A linguistic approach to tourism epistemology. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(2), 335-352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2009.01.006>
- Bernolet, S., Hartsuiker, R. J., & Pickering, M. J. (2009). Persistence of emphasis in language production: A cross-linguistic approach. *Cognition*, 112(2), 300-317. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2009.05.013>

- Blaser, M. (2013). Ontological conflicts and the stories of peoples in spite of Europe: Toward a conversation on political ontology. *Current anthropology*, 54(5), 547-568.
- Blaser, M. (2014). Ontology and indigeneity: on the political ontology of heterogeneous assemblages. *Cultural geographies*, 21(1), 49-58.
- Bolander, B., & Sultana, S. (2019). Ordinary English amongst Muslim communities in South and Central Asia. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 16(2), 162-174.
- Borris, D. ., & Zecho, C. . (2018). The linguistic politeness having seen on the current study issue. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 2(1), 32-44. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v2n1.10>
- Candea, M., & Alcayna-Stevens, L. (2012). Internal others: ethnographies of naturalism. *The Cambridge Journal of Anthropology*, 30(2), 36-47.
- Chaves, M., Macintyre, T., Verschoor, G., & Wals, A. E. (2017). Towards transgressive learning through ontological politics: Answering the “call of the mountain” in a Colombian network of sustainability. *Sustainability*, 9(1), 21.
- Chernela, J. (2018). Language in an ontological register: Embodied speech in the Northwest Amazon of Colombia and Brazil. *Language & Communication*, 63, 23-32.
- Chomsky, N. (2015). *What kind of creatures are we?*. Columbia University Press.
- Chuu, S. J. (2011). Interactive group decision-making using a fuzzy linguistic approach for evaluating the flexibility in a supply chain. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 213(1), 279-289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2011.03.022>
- Cowley, S. J. (2019). The return of languaging. *Chinese Semiotic Studies*, 15(4), 483-512.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2011). Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. *Journal of pragmatics*, 43(5), 1196-1208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.006>
- Cummins, J. (2014). Beyond language: Academic communication and student success. *Linguistics and Education*, 26, 145-154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.01.006>
- Deephouse, D. L. (2000). Media reputation as a strategic resource: An integration of mass communication and resource-based theories. *Journal of management*, 26(6), 1091-1112. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(00\)00075-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(00)00075-1)
- Fischli, A. E., Godfraind, T., & Purchase, I. F. H. (1998). Natural and anthropogenic environmental oestrogens: the scientific basis for risk assessment. *Pure Appl. Chem*, 70(9), 1863-1865.
- Gede Budasi, I. & Wayan Suryasa, I. (2021). The cultural view of North Bali community towards Ngidih marriage reflected from its lexicons. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(3), 1484–1497
- Jacquemet, M. (2005). Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization. *Language & communication*, 25(3), 257-277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2005.05.001>
- Jing, F. (2017). Investigating intentionality of linguistic landscapes from the multilingual commercial signs. *International journal of linguistics, literature and culture*, 3(5), 46-52.

- Keohin, H. C. ., & Graw, N. J. . (2017). Linguistic and cognitive ability of children before five years old on their effort to communicate action. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 1(1), 50-59. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v1n1.5>
- Louhiala-Salminen, L., & Kankaanranta, A. (2012). Language as an issue in international internal communication: English or local language? If English, what English?. *Public Relations Review*, 38(2), 262-269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.12.021>
- Marschan-Piekkari, R., Welch, D., & Welch, L. (1999). In the shadow: The impact of language on structure, power and communication in the multinational. *International business review*, 8(4), 421-440. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0969-5931\(99\)00015-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0969-5931(99)00015-3)
- Martínez, R. A. (2013). Reading the world in Spanglish: Hybrid language practices and ideological contestation in a sixth-grade English language arts classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 24(3), 276-288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2013.03.007>
- Yani, L., Artawa, K., Satyawati, N. M. S., & Udayana, I. N. (2018). Transitivity construction of verbal clause in Ciacia language. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 4(3), 15-23.
- Zu, Z. (2021). The right contextual information determining the success of communication on translation. *Applied Translation*, 15(1), 39-43. Retrieved from <https://appliedtranslation.nyc/index.php/journal/article/view/1423>