Global Journal of Arts Humanity and Social Sciences ISSN: 2583-2034

GSAR PUBLISHERS
GLOBAL SCIENTIFIC AND ACADEMIC RESEARCH

Glob. J.Arts.Humanit.Soc.Sci
ISSN: 2583-2034
Vol-3 Iss-12, page 1450-1456

THE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF MANGGARAI SOCIETY REGARDING STATUS DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE

BY

[1]Ni Wayan Sumitri, [2]Fransiskus Bustan

[1]The Lecturer of Faculty of Teacher Training and Educational Sciences, PGRI Mahadewa University Indonesia, Bali
[2]The Lecturer of Faculty of Teacher Training and Educational Sciences, Nusa Cendana University Kupang, Indonesia

Article History
Received: 31/10/2023
Accepted: 24/11/2023
Published: 13/12/2023

Corresponding author:

Ni Wayan Sumitri

Abstract

This study describes the conceptualization of Manggarai society regarding status differences between male and female in view of cultural linguistics as one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics exploring the relationship of language, culture, and conceptualization. Along with its aim, the study is descriptive as it describes status differences between male and female in Manggarai language based on the conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai society. The results of study show that the conceptualization of Manggarai society regarding status differences between male and female is reflected in the term ata one 'inside person' as the label for a male and the term ata pe'ang 'outside person' as the label for a female. The terms designate the conceptualization of Manggarai society regarding the differences of status between male and female in the social structure of wa'u as a patrilineal-genealogic clan on the basis of their sexual differences. The term ata one means that a male is the owner of clan as he lives in his natal village after marriage and, as such, he has privilege of having inheritances from his parents. While the term ata pe'ang means that a female is not the owner of clan as she will become member of her husband's clan after marriage and, as such, she has no right of having inheritances from her parents. The two terms reveal not only male dominance, identification, and centredness, but also gender differences in linguistic practices in Manggarai language designating the subordination of female.

Key words: *conceptualization, Manggarai society, status differences, male, female*

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is a large multiethnic nation as its population is made up of thousands of ethnic groups widely spreading in the archipelago of Indonesia. As every ethnic group has its own local culture and language, in addition to being a multiethnic nation, Indonesia is also known as a multicultural and multilingual nation. The miniature of Indonesia as a multiethnic, multicultural, and multilingual nation can be seen in the province of East Nusa Tenggara because its population consists of eighteen ethnic groups widely spreading in five big islands and hundreds of small islands. One of the ethnic groups is Manggarai ethnic group residing in the region of Manggarai which occupies approximately one-third of the length of the island of Flores as one of the big islands in the province of East Nusa Tenggara. Referring to the conception of Koentjaraningrat (2004) and Ochs (1988), Manggarai society are defined an ethnic group known as Manggarai ethnic group because they are bound by the awareness of sharing the same local culture known as Manggarai culture and, at the same time, they are also bound by the awareness of speaking the same language known as Manggarai language. The conception reveals that both Manggarai language and Manggarai culture belonging to Manggarai society as members of Manggarai ethnic group are closely related. The manifestation of such a relationship is mirrored in the conceptualization of Manggarai society in viewing and making sense of their world. The conceptualization is reflected more specifically in the features of Manggarai language they employ in micro-interactional levels like in certain speech events and speech acts (Erb, 1999; Verheijen, 1991; Bustan, 2005; Semiun, 2013; Bustan et al, 2017; Bustan et al, 2020; Taneo et al, 2021). Many

linguistic evidences show that the features of Manggarai language they employ in micro-interactional levels are specific in some respect to Manggarai culture as the parent culture in which it is embedded. The specific features of linguistic phenomena used in the speech events and speech acts can be seen in the two poles of linguistic sign, that is pairing of form (signified or expression) and meaning (signified or content) (Hasan, 1988; Foley, 1997; Bustan, 2005).

This study describes the relationship of Manggarai language, Manggarai culture, and conceptualization of Manggarai society in viewing and making sense of their world. As the relationship is so complex that the study focuses on the conceptualization of Manggarai society regarding status differences between male and female in the social structure of a clan in Manggarai culture with special reference to the forms and meanings of verbal expressions uttered in a speech event when there is a newly-born baby in a nuclear family in Manggarai society (Pampe, 2004; Bustan & Semiun, 2019). We are interested in conducting the study for the basic reason that, in addition to having specific features, the meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expressions designate the conceptualization of Manggarai society regarding status differences between male and female in the social structure of clan in Manggarai culture identified on the basis of their sexual differences. The sexual differences between male and female as something given are socially constructed by Manggarai society in such a way that reflect gender differences in linguistic practices in Manggarai language designating the subordination of female in social structure of a clan in Manggarai culture (Pampe, 2004; Bustan & Semiun, 2019). Another reason that shows its novelty dimension is that the study is viewed from the perspective of cultural linguistics as a emerging paradigm or model in cognitive linguistics which explores in more depth the relationship of language, culture, and conceptualization, paying special attention the forms and meaning of linguistic phenomena used by Manggarai society in a cultural discourse spoken when there is a newly-born baby in a nuclear family (Bustan & Semiun, 2019).

FRAMEWORK

Different societies speak different languages because every language has its own system, as reflected in a set of rules used as the guidelines for the speakers of that language when they communicate or interact with each other in their contexts of living together as members of a speech community. In the view of technical linguistic terms, the differences between the systems of languages can be seen in three formal levels or strata that include semantic, lexico-gramatical, and phonological level (Hasan, 1988). As every language represents the world of thoughts in its own ways, however, the differences between languages are due to cultural differences. As Humboldt propounded, the diversity of languages is not a diversity of signs and sounds, but a diversity of views of the world (Cassirer, 1987; Miller, 1968). The conception comes closest to the theory of linguistic relativity proposed by Sapir and Whorf that the varying cultural concepts and categories inherent in different languages affect the cognitive classification of the experienced world in such a way that the speakers of different languages think and behave differently. Along with such differences, it is noteworthy that the principles that should be taken into account when we explore a new or foreign language are as follows: (a) we perceive the world in terms of categories and distinctions found in our native language and (b) what is found in one language may not be found in another language due to cultural differences (Miller, 1968).

The principles are based on the premise that language used by a people as members of a social group is the mirror of culture they share (Ochs, 1988; Kramsch, 2001; Bilal & Bada, 2005; Cakir, 2006). As Brown (1994) declared, culture shared by a society as members of a social group is deeply ingrained part of the very fiber of their being, but language as the means for communication between and among them is the most visible and available expression of their culture (Palmer, 1996; Foley, 1997; Kramsch, 2001; Fairclough, 2003; Cakir, 2008; Kaplan, 1988; Cassirer, 1987). The use of language as the most visible and available expression of culture shared by a people as members of a speech community can be seen in the features of linguistic phenomena they employ in cultural domains which reflect the ways they view and make sense of their world (Goodenough, 1964). In line with this, according to Wardaugh (1991), the culture of a people finds its reflection in the language they employ because when they value certain things and do them in a certain way, they come to use their language in ways reflecting what they value and what they do (Kramsch, 2001; Sudikan, 2001; Kaplan, 1988).

The use of language as the most visible and available expression of culture shared by a society as members of a speech community is the main concern of study in cultural linguistics which is defined, as mentioned earlier, as one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics exploring the relationship of language, culture, and conceptualization (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Palmer, 1996; Langacker, 1999; Stross, 1981). In the perspective of cultural linguistics, language is defined as a cultural activity and, at the same time, and an instrument for organizing other cultural domains. The definition is based on the premise that language used by a society as members of a ssocial group is shaped not only by special and general innate potentials as human beings but also by their physical and sociocultural experiences in their contexts of living together for years or a long period of time (Wierzbicka, 1991). Likewise language, as culture can be defined differently, in the perspective of cultural linguistics, culture is referred to as the source of conceptualization of experience faced by a society as members of a social group in viewing and making sense of their world (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Palmer, 1996; Wallace, 1981). The relationship of both language and culture belonging to a society is reflected in their conceptualization which is concerned with the way they conceptualize experiences in their minds or cognitions in viewing and making sense of their world (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007). In this light, language along with its function as the mirror of culture shared by a society is defined as the window into their minds or cognitions (Yu, 2007; Occi, 2007; Stross, 1981). Added to this, as culture is the worldview of a society as members of a social group, language they employ is also defined as

the window of their world (Ochs, 1988; Bustan, 2005; Ola, 1998; Kramsch, 2001; Cassirer, 1987).

On the other side, according to Kramsch (2009), language as a symbolic system with the power to shape and create such symbolic realities as norms, values, perceptions, and identities is expressed through discourse as its vehicle (Berger and Luckman, 1967; Grice, 1987; Dillitone, 2002). Discourse as the vehicle of symbolic realities is produced when they interact with each other, as pointed out by Kovecses (2009) that when people interact with each other for particular purposes and to achieve their goals of interactions, they produce particular discourses as assemblies of meanings dealing with particular subject matters. When the discourses present a conceptual framework within which significant subject matters are discussed in their culture and latent norms of conduct, discourses are regarded as ideologies or worldviews shared by a society as members of a social group. Therefore, according to Geertz (1971) and Schneider (1976), a discourse is defined as the source of making meaning in a culture (Ochs, 1988; Bustan, 2005).

The function of a discourse as the source of making meaning in a culture is realised in a cultural discourse as an umbrella term for any form of discourse wich takes place within a cultural domain that contains a set of items, behaviors, and beliefs defined as belonging to the same category of things (Gumperz, 1992). Along with the idea of Langacker (1999), that language is an essential instrument and component of culture whose reflection can be seen in the forms of linguistic phenomena used, Kovecses (2009) propounded that a cultural discourse serves as a repository of meanings shared by members of a culture (Wierzbicka, 1991). As cultural domain is the basic unit of meaning that shapes how a people as members of a cultural community conceptually organize their world, a cultural discourse can be defined as the vehicle for the representation of their cultural conceptualization. The cultural conceptualization is reflected in the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the cultural discourse. The forms refer to the physical features of linguistic phenomena used, while the meanings refer to the contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used (Foley, 1997; Hasan, 1988; Bustan & Semiun, 2019).

METHODOLOGY

This is a descriptive study as it describes the conceptualization of Manggarai society regarding the differences of status between male and female on the basis of data collected through the field research (Muhadjir, 1995; Bungin, 2007; Nusa Putra, 2011; Afrizal, 2014; Sugyono, 2018; Yusuf, 2019; Moleong, 2021; Sugyono, 2022). The field research was carried out in the region of Manggarai, especially in Ruteng town as its main location. The approach used to obtain data was ethnographic approach (Hymes, 1974; Spradley, 1997; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Geertz, 1971; Foley, 1997; Duranti, 2001). The methods of data collection were interview and focused-group discussion. The interviews were carried out with Manggarai society as members of Manggarai speech community represented by five key informants selected on basis of ideal criteria proposed by Faisal (1990), Spradley (1997), Sudikan (2001), Bungin (2007), and Moleong (2022). The interviews done were aimed at distilling their conceptualization regarding the differences of status between male and female, as reflected in the forms and meanings of the linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expressions of Manggarai language. For the sake of data triangulation, the focused-group discussion was carried out with the key informants. Besides recording data, we also took some notes during the interview and focused-group discussion. In addition to the field research, documentary study was done in order to collect the secondary data relevant to the main concern of the study. The documents used as the sources of data were general documents (books) and special documents (scientific articles, results of research, paper). The collected data were analyzed qualitatively by inductive method as the analysis was started from the data to the concept in the form of local-ideographic theory regarding the conceptualization of Manggarai society regarding status differences between male and female (Bungin, 2007; Moleong, 2021).

Results

The results of study show that both Manggarai language and Manggarai culture belonging to Manggarai society are closely related. The relationship is manifested in the conceptualization of Manggarai society regarding status differences between male and female in the social structure of *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture. The conceptualization is reflected in two main terms, that is *ata one* 'inside person' as the attribute or label for male and *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' as the attribute or label for female (Lawang, 1999; Pampe, 2004; Bustan, 2006; Bustan & Semiun, 2019). Both the term *ata one* 'inside person' as the attribute or label for male and the term *ata pe'ang* as the attribute or label for female are regarded as the fixed forms of verbal expressions in Manggarai language designating the conceptualization of Manggarai society regarding status differences between male and female in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture. The differences of status can be seen in their rights and obligations in that a male as the *ata one* 'inside person' holds higher status than a female as the *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' does. The conceptualization reflects gender differences in linguistic practices in Manggarai language because the sexual differences as something given are socially constructed as the basis of identifying status differences between male and female in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture. In addition, the conceptualization shows the subordination of a female because, being born as the *ata pe'ang* 'outside person', a female does not have inheritance rights from her parents in the nuclear family (Verheijen, 1991; Lawang, 1999; Pampe, 2004; Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006; Bustan & Semiun, 2019). Referring to the conception of Dillitone (2002) and Fairclough (2003), the conceptualization of Manggarai society regarding such differences shows asymmetric power relationship between a male and a female in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture.

Discussion

Along with the results of study provided above, this section discusses in more depth the differences of status between male and

female in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture. The matters of discussion pay special attention to the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the term *ata one* 'inside person' as the attribute or label for male and the term *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' as the attribute or label for female.

Ata One

As can be seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used, the term *ata one* 'inside person' as the attribute or label for male is a compound word made up two words as its component parts. The two words as its component parts are the word (noun) *ata* 'person' and the word (adverb of place) *one* 'inside'. The combination of those two words creates a new meaning which is referred to as the attribute or label for male as inside person in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture. As conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society as members of Manggarai speech community, the term *ata one* 'inside person' as the attribute or label for male designates that male is the owner of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan. The basic reason is that, after marriage, he must stay in his parents' house and live in his natal village for life. Being born as the *ata one* 'inside person', male as the owner of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan holds privilege of having inheritances in the nuclear family because, in addition to taking care of his parents when they get old, he must maintain the existence of the *wa'u* for life (Bustan & Semiun, 2019). Along with the privilege of having inheritance rights from his parents in the nuclear family, he is also obligated to guard the *mbaru gendang* 'drum house' as the origin house of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan. The origin house of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan living in one village (*beo*) is known as *mbaru gendang* 'drum house' in Manggarai language because there stores *gendang* 'drum' which is conceptualized by Manggarai society as the image of common ancestors of the *wa'u* in question. Therefore, it is not surprising that the *gendang* is treated as a sacred cultural property inherited from their ancestors in Manggarai culture (Bustan, 2005; Bustan & Semiun, 2019).

In addition to guarding the *mbaru gendang* as their origin house, male as the *ata one* 'inside person' together with other members of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan residing in one village is also obligated to control over agricultural land which is known as *lingko* 'round field' in Manggarai language. The obligation is reflected in the verbal expression of Manggarai language, *Gendangn one, lingkon pe'ang* 'Drum inside, round field outside'. The verbal expression is a compound sentence made up of two independent clauses or complete sentences as it component parts. The two independent clauses as it component parts are as follows: (1) *Gendangn one* 'Drum inside' and (2) *Lingkon pe'ang* 'Round field outside'. The word (noun) *gendangn* is the conversion of the term *mbaru gendang* as the origin house of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan and the word (adverb of place) *one* 'inside' refers to village (*beo*) as their natal village. The word (noun) *lingko* refers to the agricultural land of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan and the word (adverb of place) *pe'ang* refers to location of the *lingko* which lies quite far from the *beo* as their natal village. The verbal expression emphasizes the ownership of the *mbaru gendang* and the *lingko* as the cultural properties of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan inherited from their ancestors (Bustan, 2005; Bustan & Semiun, 2019). In addition to sharing the physical properties like natal village (*beo*), origin house (*mbaru gendang*), and agricultural land (*lingko*), the term *ata one* 'inside person' means tha male also shares various rules, norms, and coventions related to the wider world. Being born as the *ata one* 'inside person', male holds primary power and predominates in the roles of political leadership, moral authority, and the social control of properties inherited from ancestors. The conceptualization implies that term *ata one* 'inside person' as the attribute or label for male reveals male dominance, male identification, and male-centredness in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture (Bustan, 2005; Bustan & Semiun, 2019).

Ata Pe'ang

As can be seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used, the term *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' as the attribute or label for female is a compound word made up two words as its component parts. The two words as its component parts are the word (noun) *ata* 'person' and the word (adverb of place) *pe'ang* 'outside'. The combination of the two words forms and creates a new meaning which is referred to as the attribute or label for a female as outside person in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture. As conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society, the term *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' as the attribute or label of female implies meaning that she is not the owner the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture. This is because, after marriage, she must move away from her natal village, live in her husband's natal village, and then she becomes the member of her husband's clan for life.

The conceptualization is also reflected in the verbal expression of Manggarai language, *Weta wa'i deu, nara lami tana* 'Sister gets married far away, brother guards land'. The verbal expression reveals that, being born as the *ata pe'ang* 'outside person', female is destinied to reproduce for other clan or the clan of her husband and, as such, she does not have inheritance rights from her parents in the nuclear family. The status of female as the *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture before she gets married is peripheral (Lawang, 1999; Bustan & Semiun, 2019). At the same time, it is worth noting that, even though female does not have inheritance rights from her parents in the nuclear family, after marriage, she is obliged to help her siblings when they get married. The obligation is reflected in the verbal expression of Manggarai language, *Laki nara papi, weta pampang darap* 'When brothers get married, sisters challenges the heat'. Based on the context of its use, the verbal expression means that a female as a sister that has got married becomes the main source of power to pay the dowry of her sibling when getting married. The kinds of help given are in the form of money (*seng*) and animal like buffalo (*kaba*) or *horse* (jarang).

CONCLUSION

There is a close relationship between Manggarai language, Manggarai culture, and conceptualization of Manggarai society in viewing and making sense of their world. The manifestation of such a relationship can be seen in the conceptualization of Manggarai society regarding status differences between male and female in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture. The conceptualization is reflected in the term *ata one* 'inside person' as the attribute or label for male meaning that he is the owner of clan, while the term *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' as the attribute or label for female meaning that she is not the owner of clan. Along with the privilege of having inheritances from his parents, male as the *ata one* 'inside person' holds higher status than female as the *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' does in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture. The meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the two terms reveal the subordination of female in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture. The forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the two terms designate gender differences in linguistic practices in Manggarai language. The sexual differences between male and female as something given are socially constructed by Manggarai society as members as the basic reason of identifying the differences of status between male and female in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture. It is suggested that the conceptualization of Manggarai society regarding status differences between male and female in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture should be redefined because culture as an aspect of human life is essentially a dynamic entity. The dynamics of a culture occurs along with the dynamics of its society in viewing and making sense of their world in accordance with the diversity of phenomenological realities they encounter due to the rapid growth of education in one side and of cross-cultural communication with those coming from different cultural background on the other. The last but not the least, it is noteworthy that the redefinition depends greatly on the good will of Manggarai society because the sexual differences between male and female as something given are socially constructed as gender differences. Therefore, it is not surprising that the conceptualization of status differences between male and female in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai culture is one of the controversial issues in today's Manggarai society.

REFERENCES

1. Afrizal. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif: Sebuah Upaya Mendukung Penggunaan Penelitian Kualitatif dalam Berbagai Disiplin Ilmu*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
2. Berger, P. L., Luckman, T. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality*. Hammondsworth, United Kingdom: Penguin
3. Bernstein, B. (1972). *A Sociolinguistic Approach to Socialization with Some Reference to Educability: The Ethnography of Communication*. Edited by John Joseph Gumperz and Dell H. Hymes. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
4. Bilal, G., Bada, E. (2005). "Culture in language learning and teaching". *The Reading Matrix*. Vol. 5, No. 1, April 2005.
5. Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. The USA: Prentice Hall Regents.
6. Bungin, B. (2007). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Komunikasi, Ekonomi, Kebijakan Publik dan Ilmu Sosial Lainnya*. Jakarta: Prenada Media.
7. Bustan, F. (2005). "Wacana budaya *tudak* dalam ritual *penti* pada kelompok etnik Manggarai di Flores Barat: sebuah kajian linguistik budaya''. *Disertasi*. Denpasar: Program Doktor (S3) Linguistik Universitas Udayana.
8. Bustan, F. (2006). *Etnografi Budaya Manggarai Selayang Pandang*. Kupang: Publikasi Khusus LSM Agricola Kupang.
9. Bustan, F., Semiun, A., Bire, J. (2017). *The Features of Anthropomorhic Metaphors in the Manggarai Language*. Balti: LAP LAMBERT ACADEMIC PUBLISHING.
10. Bustan, F., Semiun, A. (2019). *The Cultural Discourse of Baby Birth in Manggarai Speech Community*. Balti: LAP LAMBERT ACADEMIC PUBLISHING.
11. Bustan, F., Mahur, A., Kabelen, A. H. (2020). "Karakteristik dan dinamika sistem pertanian lahan kering dalam kebudayaan Manggarai". *Jurnal Lazuardi* 3 (1), 344 – 367.
12. Cakir. I. (2006). "Developing cultural awareness in foreign language teaching". Turkish *Online Journal of Distance Education – TODJE*. July 2006, Volume: 7 Number: 3
13. Cassirer, E. (1987). *Manusia dan Kebudayaan*: *Sebuah Esai tentang Manusia*. Diterjemahkan oleh Alois A. Nugroho. Jakarta: Gramedia.
14. Casson, R. W. (1981). *Language, Culture, and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. New York: Macmillan.
15. Dillitone, F. W. (2002). *The Power of Symbols*. Diterjemahkan oleh A. Wydiamartaya. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
16. Duranti, A. (2001). *Linguistic Anthropology*: *A Reader*. Massachussets: Blackwell Publishers.
17. Erb, M. (1999). *The Manggaraians: A Guide to Traditional Lifestyles*. Singapore: Times Editions.
18. Fairclough, N. (2003). *Language and Power*: *Relasi Bahasa, Kekuasaan, dan Ideologi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Indah Rohmani-Komunitas Ambarawa. Malang: Boyan Publishing.
19. Faisal, S. (1990). *Penelitian Kualitatif*: *Dasar-dasar dan Aplikasi*. Malang: Yayasan Asih Asah Asuh (YA3).
20. Foley, W. A. (1997). *Anthropological Linguistics*: *an Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
21. Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Culture: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books
22. Goodenough, W. H. (1964). "Cultural anthropology and linguistics". In *Language in Culture and Society*: *A*

Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology. New York: Harper & Row.
23. Gumperz, J. (1992). "Contextualization of language". In *The Contextualization of Language*. Edited by Aldo di Luzio and Peter Aus. Amsterdam/Philadephia: Benyamins.
24. Grice, G. W. (1987). *The Linguistic Construction of Reality*. London: Croom Helm.
25. Hasan, R. (1988). *Linguistics, Language, and Verbal Art*. Victoria: Deakin University.
26. Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philedelphia: University of Pensylvania Press.
27. Keesing, R. M. (1981). "Theories of culture". In *Language, Culture, and Cognition*: *Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmilan.
28. Koentjaraningrat. (2004). *Kebudayaan, Mentalitas dan Pembangunan*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
29. Kovecses, Z. (2009). "Metaphorical meaning making: discourse, language, and culture". *Quardens de Filologia. Estudis Linguistics*. Vol. XIV (2009) 135-151.
30. Kramsch, K. (2001). *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
31. Langacker, R. (1999). "Assessing the cognitive linguistic enterprise". In *Cognitive Linguistics: Foundation, Scope, and Methodology*. Edited by Janssen and G. Redeker. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
32. Lawang, M. E. (1999). *Konflik Tanah di Manggarai: Pendekatan Sosiologik*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia Press.
33. Malcolm, G. I. (2007). "Cultural linguistics and bidialectal education". In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzard Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
34. Miller, R. L. (1968). *The Linguistic Relativity Principle and Humboldtian Ethnolinguistics*: *A History and Appraisal*. Paris: The Hague
35. Moleong, L. J. (2021). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Edisi Revisi. Bandung: Rosda.
36. Muhadjir, N. (1995). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*: *Telaah Positivistik, Rasionalistik, Phenomenologik, Realisme Metaphisik*. Yogyakarta: Rake Sarasin.
37. Nusa Putra. (2011). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Proses dan Aplikasi*. Jakarta: Indeks.
38. Occi, D. J. (2007). "Using cultural linguistics to teach English language inferential schemas used in archeology to Japanenese university students." In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzard Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
39. Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in Samoan Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
40. Ola, S. S. (1998). "Bahasa, gambaran budaya penuturnya". *Linguistika*. Tahun V. Edisi Kesembilan. September 1998. Denpasar: Program Magister (S2) Linguistik Universitas Udayana.
41. Palmer, G. B. (1996). *Towards a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
42. Palmer, G. B., Sharifian, F. (2007). "Applied cultural linguistics: an emerging paradigm." In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzard Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
43. Pampe, P. (2004). "Wanita sebagai *ata pe'ang* dalam masyarakat etnik Manggarai: sebuah kajian awal dari sudut sosiolinguistik". *Linguistika*. Volume II, No.20. Maret 2004. Denpasar: Program Magister (S2) Linguistik Universitas Udayana.
44. Sapir, E. (1949). *Selected Writings in Language, Culture, and Personality*. D. Mandelbaum (ed.). Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
45. Schneider, D. (1976). "Notes toward a theory of culture". In *Meaning in Anthropology*. Edited by Keith H. Basso and Henry A. Selby. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
46. Semiun, A. (2013). "The functions of politeness marker "*IO*" in Manggarai language: *Kempo* speech". In *Leceo Higher Education Research*. Volume 9, No. 1, December 2013.
47. Sharifian, F. (2007). "L1 cultural conceptualization in L2 learning: the case of Persian-speaking learners of English". In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzad Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
48. Sharifian, F. (2011). *Cultural Conceptualisations and Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
49. Spradley, J. P. (1997). *Metode Etnografi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Misbah Zulfa Elizabeth. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana Yogya.
50. Stross, B. (1981). "Language, culture, and cognition". In *Language, Culture, and Cognition*: *Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmilan.
51. Sudikan, S. Y. (2001). *Metode Penelitian Kebudayaan*. Surabaya: Unesa Unipress bekerjasama dengan Citra Wacana.
52. Sugyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Kombinasi* (*Mixed Methods*). Cetakan ke-10. Bandung: Alfabeta.
53. Sugyono. (2022). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Cetakan Kelima. Bandung: Alfabeta.
54. Taneo, M., Bustan, F., Basri, K. (2022). "Makna pesta sekolah dalam masyarakat Manggarai di Flores". *Haumeni Journal of Education* 2 (1), 27-35, 2022.
55. Wallace, A. F. C. (1981). "Culture and cognition". In *Language, Culture, and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmilan.
56. Wardaugh, R. (2011). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New Jersey, United States: Wiley-Blackwell.

57. Whorf, B. L. (2001). "The relationship of habiatual thought and behavior to language". In *Linguistic Anthropology*: *A Reader*. Edited by Alessandro Duranti. Massachussets: Blackwell Publishers.
58. Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural Pragmatics*: *The Semantics of Human Interaction.* New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
59. Verheijen, A. J. (1991). *Manggarai dan Wujud Tertinggi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Alex Beding dan Marsel Beding. Jakarta: LIPI-RUL.
60. Yu, N. (2007). "The Chinese conceptualization of the heart and its cultural context: implications for second language learning". In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzad Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
61. Yusuf, A. M. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Penelitian Gabungan*. Jakarta: Kencana.