

THE CULTURAL CONCEPTUALIZATION OF MANGGARAI ETHNIC GROUP REGARDING ECONOMIC WELFARE IN THE FIELD OF ANIMAL HUSBANDRY

Fransiskus Bustan ^(a,1*)
Alexander Home Kabelen ^(b)

^{a,b,c}: Nusa Cendana University

¹frankybustando@gmail.com*

²alexkabelen63@gmail.com

KEYWORDS

*Cultural,
Conceptualization,
Manggarai ethnic
group,
Economic welfare,
Animal husbandry*

ABSTRACT

This study describes the cultural conceptualization of Manggarai ethnic group regarding economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry, with special reference to the forms and meanings of the linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language. This is a descriptive study. The results of the study show that the forms and meanings of the linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language designate that, in the cultural conceptualization of Manggarai community, the indicators of economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry are marked by the availability of pigs and chickens raised.

How to cite: Bustan, F., & Kabelen, A. (2023) The Cultural Conceptualization of Manggarai Ethnic Group Regarding Economic Welfare in The Field Of Animal Husbandry. *SPARKLE Journal of Language, Education, and Culture*, 2 (1) 1-8.

INTRODUCTION

Culture serves as an important role in the life of a society as members of an ethnic group. The reason is clear and understandable that culture functions as an identify marker identifying a society as members of an ethnic group and, at the same time, to differ them from those of other ethnic groups (Koentjaraningrat, 2004). The conception implies that, besides serving as a sense of identity, culture also functions as a symbol of identity or a distinctive feature for a society as members of an ethnic group (Ochs, 1988). Many linguistic evidences show that the function of culture as an identify marker of a society as members of an ethnic group finds its reflection in language they employ because both language and culture belonging to a society as members of an ethnic group are closely related. The manifestation of such a relationship is reflected in cultural conceptualizations ascribed and imprinted in their cognitive map. The cultural conceptualizations can be seen when they value certain things and do them in a certain way, they come to use their language in ways that reflect what they value and what they do as well (Goodenough, 1964; Wierzbicka, 1991; Kramsch, 2001; Cakir, 2006; Wardaugh, 2011).

Along with the matters stated above in our minds, in this study, we investigate the relationship of both Manggarai language and Manggarai culture belonging to Manggarai society as members of Manggarai ethnic group, those living or residing in the land of

Manggarai that lies in the western part of the island of Flores as one of the big islands in the province of East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia (Verheijen, 1991; Bagul, 1997; Erb, 1999; Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006; Bustan, et al., 2017). However, as the relationship of both Manggarai language and Manggarai culture is so complex in nature that the focus of the study is concerned with the cultural conceptualisation of Manggarai ethnic group on economic welfare paying special attention to the field of animal husbandry, as reflected in the forms and meanings of the linguistic phenomena they employ (Hasan, 1989; Foley, 1997) in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language.

We are interested in conducting the study for the reason that the features of the linguistic phenomena that Manggarai ethnic group employ in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language designating their cultural conceptualisation regarding economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry are unique and specific in some respect to Manggarai culture. The unique and specific features of the linguistic phenomena they employ in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language are reflected in two poles of linguistic signs involving forms and meanings (Hasan, 1989; Foley, 1997). Another reason is that, due to the dynamic of Manggarai ethnic group, the traditional expressions of Manggarai language designating their cultural conceptualisation ascribed or imprinted in their cognitive map regarding economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry are no longer used nowadays.

In general, this study investigates the relationship of both Manggarai language and Manggarai culture belonging to Manggarai ethnic group living or residing in the region of Manggarai that lies in the western parts of the island of Flores as one of the big islands in the province of East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia, as reflected in the cultural conceptualizations ascribed or imprinted in their cognitive map in viewing the world. As the cultural conceptualizations ascribed in their cognitive map in viewing the world are of various kinds, the study focuses on the cultural conceptualizations of Manggarai ethnic group regarding economic welfare in the field animal husbandry with special reference to the forms and meanings of the linguistic phenomena they employ in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language. Referring to the scope of its problem, the specific objectives of the study are as follows: (1) to describe and explain the forms of the linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language designating the cultural conceptualisation of Manggarai ethnic group regarding economic welfare in the field animal husbandry and (2) to describe and explain the meanings of the linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language designating the cultural conceptualisation of Manggarai ethnic group regarding economic welfare in the field animal husbandry

This study is viewed from the perspective of cultural linguistics as one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics which explores the relationship between language, culture, and conceptualisation (Palmer and Sharifian, 2007; Palmer, 1996; Bustan, 2005). Cultural linguistics is defined as one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics because it draws on the combined resource of anthropological linguistics and cognitive linguistics (Palmer, 1996) in providing an account of the communicative behavior (Malcolm, 2007). As language used by a society as members of a social group serves as a window into the minds or cognitions (Yu, 2007; Casson, 1981; Stross, 1981; Whorf, 2001; Langacker, 1999), in the perspective of cultural linguistics, language is explored through the prism of culture aimed at uncovering the conceptualisation of its speakers in viewing the world (Goodenough, 1964). The aim is set up on the basis of conception that language used by a society as members of a social group is the mirror of culture they share or adhere and, at the same time, as culture is the worldview of a society as members of a social group, the language they employ is also defined as the window of their world as well (Kramersch, 2001; Bustan, 2005).

Cultural linguistics is defined as an emerging paradigm in cognitive linguistics because, in addition to emphasizing the cultural elements of cognition as its main concerns or interests (Casson, 1981; Wallace, 1981; Keesing, 1981; Stross, 1981), it also serves as an approach to identifying language differences and such differences are due to cultural differences (Occhi, 2007; Cassirer, 1987). The approach parallels to the conception of Humboldt that the diversity of languages is not the diversity of signs and sounds, but the diversity of cultures (Miller, 1968; Cassirer, 1987; Foley, 1997). The conception comes closest to the cultural relativism of Boas (1962) and, more specifically to the theory of linguistic relativity proposed in the hypothesis of 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 speakers of different languages think and behave differently. In line the conception of linguistic relativity, Richards et al (1992) pinpointed that two basic concepts that should be taken into account when we explore the differences between languages 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.

As its definition implies, the basic concepts of cultural linguistics as a new theoretical perspective in cognitive linguistics are language, culture, and conceptualisation. As language can be defined differently, in the perspective of cultural linguistics, language is defined as a cultural activity as well as an instrument for organizing other cultural domains. The reason is that language used by a society as members of a social group is shaped not only by their special and general innate potentials as human beings, but also by physical and sociocultural experiences in their contexts of living together for years (Palmer and Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2007). Similar to language, as culture can be defined differently (Kaplan and Manners, 1999), in the perspective of cultural linguistics, culture shared by a society as members of a social group is defined as the source of conceptualisation of their experiences in the world (Wallace, 1981; Palmer, 1996; Wallace, 1981; Bustan, 2005; Palmer and Sharifian, 2007). Culture in this light, according to Foley (1997), is a cognitive map shared by a society as members of a social group (Goodenough, 1964) that serves as a display illustrating how they organize their ways of thinking about items, behaviors, and beliefs or events in cultural domains (Palmer, 1996; Palmer and Sharifian, 2007).

As cultural concepts are embedded in language, the relationship of both language and culture belonging to a society as members of a social group is manifested the conceptualizations ascribed in the cognitive map which are referred to as fundamental cognitive processes which naturally lead to the development of schemas, categories, metaphors, and scripts. The ways a society as members of a social group conceptualize their experiences in cultural domains are called cultural conceptualizations that contain such cultural aspects as beliefs, norms, customs, traditions, and values. Added to this, as cultural conceptualisation and language are two intrinsic aspects of cultural cognition, it is a truism that the cultural conceptualizations have conceptual existence and linguistic encoding. As language serves as a central aspect of cultural cognition, language in this regard is defined as collective memory bank for cultural conceptualizations, past and present. The conception is based on the fact that language is shaped by cultural conceptualizations that have prevailed at different stages in the story of its speakers and these different stages can leave traces in current linguistic practices. On the other side, language is also viewed as one of the primary mechanisms to store and communicate cultural conceptualizations because it functions as a fluid vehicle for the retransmission of the socioculturally embodied cultural conceptualisations (Palmer, 1996; Palmer and Sharifian, 2007).

It is worth noting that cultural conceptualization may not be correlated objectively with external world because cultural conceptualisation is the result of interaction between members of a culture through continuous process of negotiation and renegotiation through time and space as well as across generations. The reason is understandable that language functions not only as a means for communicating cultural conceptualisation but also as a means for embodying cultural conceptualisation as it serves as the vehicle for expressing the cultural identity of a society as members of a social group. The cultural conceptualisations which are distributed across the minds of a society as members of a social group representing their cognition at the cultural level are called linguistic imagery. Nevertheless, a linguistic imagery is not related to how they speak about objective reality, but it deals with how they speak about the world that they themselves imagine. The linguistic imagery can be examined from the physical form of language used along with the situational context of speech event and the sociocultural context of society as the speakers of the language in question (Palmer and Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2007).

METHOD

This is a descriptive study as it mainly describes the cultural conceptualisation of Manggarai ethnic group on economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry on the basis of data collected during the field research conducted in the region of Manggarai, especially in Ruteng as the main location of the field research (Muhadjir, 1995; Nusa Putra, 2011; Afrizal, 2014). The data were mainly obtained by using ethnographic approach, especially dialogic-ethnographic approach (Bernstein, 1972; Spradley, 1997; Geertz, 1973; Hymes, 1974; Palmer, 1996; Foley, 1997; Palmer and Sharifian, 2007; Duranti, 2001). The main sources of primary data were the members of Manggarai ethnic group as the native speakers of Manggarai language, especially those living or residing in Ruteng town as the main location of the field research. For the purpose of this study, however, they were represented by five key informants selected on the basis of ideal criteria proposed by Faisal (1990), Spradley (1997), Sudikan (2001), and Bungin (2007).

The methods of collecting data were of two kinds including interviews and focused-group discussion. The interviews were done with the five key informants as the sources of data. For the sake of data triangulation, the focused-group discussion was conducted with the five key informants. Besides recording data, some notes were also taken during interviews and focused-group discussion. The method of documentary study was carried out to collect secondary data relevant to the problem of the study. The documents used as the sources of reference were of general documents (books) and special documents (scientific articles, results of research and paper). All the collected data were then analyzed qualitatively by using inductive method as the analysis was started from data to concepts related to the cultural conceptualisation of Manggarai ethnic group regarding economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry as reflected in the forms and meanings of the linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language. The process of data analysis was continuously done from the beginning of the field research until the final report finished. The results of data analysis were continuously discussed and negotiated with the five key informants in order to keep the objectivity of data resulted from the study dealing with the cultural conceptualisation of Manggarai ethnic group regarding economic welfare in the field animal husbandry.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results of study show that both Manggarai language and Manggarai culture belonging to Manggarai ethnic group are closely related. The manifestation of such a relationship can be seen in the cultural conceptualisation ascribed or imprinted in the cognitive map of Manggarai ethnic group regarding economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry. The cultural

conceptualization is reflected in the forms and meanings of the linguistic phenomena they employ in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language. Based on the forms and meanings of the linguistic phenomena they employ in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language, it is found out that the cultural conceptualisation ascribed or imprinted in the cognitive map of Manggarai ethnic group regarding economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry is marked by two related phenomena, that is (1) the availability of pigs raised outside and (2) the availability of chickens raised.

The cultural conceptualisation of Manggarai ethnic group regarding the availability of pigs raised as the indicator of economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry is reflected in the forms and meanings of the linguistic phenomena they employ in the traditional expression of Manggarai language, *Tela galang pe'ang, dila api one* 'The manger is open outside, the fire flames inside'. As can be seen in the physical features of the linguistic phenomena used, the traditional expression appears in the form of a compound sentence made up of two independent clauses or complete sentences as its component parts. The two independent clauses as its component parts are as follows: (a) *Tela galang pe'ang* 'The manger is open outside' and (b) *Dila api one* 'The fire flames inside'. The combination of the two independent clauses constructs an asyndeton structure as the relationship of the two independent clauses is not linked by using the coordinating conjunction, *agu* 'and' or *ko* 'or'.

The independent clause (a), *Tela galang pe'ang*, is made of three words as its component parts involving the word (verb) *tela* 'open', the word (noun) *galang* 'manger', and the word (adverb of place) *pe'ang* 'outside' which refers to the outside of the house (*mbaru*). Along with the contents stored in the forms of the linguistic phenomena used, it is ascribed and imprinted in the cultural conceptualisation of Manggarai ethnic group that, if the manger is always opened outside the house, it reveals that they have pigs raised. More specifically, the availability of pigs raised is indicated by using the word (noun) *galang* 'manger' which refers to the container of food for pigs in Manggarai language. The independent clause (b), *Dila api one* 'The fire flames inside', is made up of three words as its component parts involving the word (verb) *dila* 'flame', the word (noun) *api* 'fire', and the word (adverb of place) *one* 'inside' which refers to the inside of the house (*mbaru*). Along with the contents stored in the forms of the linguistic phenomena used, it is also ascribed and imprinted in the cultural conceptualisation of Manggarai ethnic group that, if the fire flames inside the house, it means that they have foodstuff being cooked inside the house, including the foodstuff for pigs known as *peka* or *pakang* in Manggarai language.

The cultural conceptualisation of Manggarai ethnic group regarding the availability of chickens raised as an indicator of economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry is reflected in the forms and meanings of the linguistic phenomena they employ in the traditional expression of Manggarai as in the following: *Res baling lele, ras baling racap* 'Chickens cackle around armpit, chickens crackle around side'. As can be seen in the physical forms of the linguistic phenomena used, the traditional expression is a compound sentence made up of two independent clauses or complete sentences as its component parts. The two independent clauses as its component parts are as follows: (a) *Res baling lele* 'Chickens cackle around armpits' and (b) *Ras baling racap* 'Chickens crackle around sides'. The combination of the two independent clauses constructs an asyndeton structure as the relationship of the two independent clauses is not linked by using the coordinating conjunction, *agu* 'and' or *ko* 'or'.

The independent clause (a), *Res baling lele* 'Chickens cackle around armpits', is made of three words involving the word (verb) *res* 'cackle', the word (adverb of place) *baling* 'around' as locative marker, and the word *lele* 'armpit'. The independent clause (b), *Ras baling racap* 'Chickens cackle around sides', is also made up of three words involving the word (verb) *ras*

'cackle', the word (adverb of place) *baling* 'around' as locative marker, and the word *racap* 'sides'. It is worth noting that both the word (verb) *res* and the word (verb) *ras* appear as the reduplication forms depicting the noises of chickens when being fed in the morning. In the cultural conceptualisation of Manggarai ethnic group, the availability of chickens raised as one of the indicators designating their socio-economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry is symbolized by the noises of chickens when being fed in the morning.

CONCLUSION

There is a close relationship between Manggarai language and Manggarai culture belonging to Manggarai society. The relationship is reflected in the forms and meanings of the traditional expressions of Manggarai language designating the cultural conceptualisation of Manggarai community on socio-economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry. As ascribed and imprinted in the cultural conceptualisation of Manggarai community, the indicators of socio-economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry are designated by the he availability of pigs and chickens raised. Theoretically, the study contributes the conception that every language represents the world of thoughts with its own ways, as proposed by Boas, Humboldt, Sapir and Whorf through the conception of linguistic relativity, the conceptions on the relationship between language, culture, and conceptualisation proposed in the theory of cultural linguistics of Palmer and Palmer and Scharifian, the theory of anthropological linguistics of Foley, the theory of language and culture of Kramsch, the theory of sociolinguistics of Wardaugh, Gumperz, and Bernstein, the theory of culture of Schneider and Geertz, the theory of cultural discourse of Bernstein. Practically, this study might be beneficial to inspire other researchers who are interested in studying in more depth the forms and meanings of the linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expressions of other local languages designating in the cultural conceptualisations ascribed or imprinted in their cognitive map regarding the economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry.

REFERENCES

- Afrizal. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif: Sebuah Upaya Mendukung Penggunaan Penelitian Kualitatif dalam Berbagai Disiplin Ilmu*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Bagul, A. B. (1997). *Kebudayaan Manggarai sebagai salah satu Khasanah Kebudayaan Nasional*. Surabaya: Ubhara Press.
- 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.
- Boas, F. (1962). *Anthropology and Modern Life*. New York: The Norton Library. W. W. Norton & company.
- Bungin, B. (2007). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Komunikasi, Ekonomi, Kebijakan Publik dan Ilmu Sosial Lainnya*. Jakarta: Prenada Media.
- 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.
- Bustan, F. (2006). *Etnografi Budaya Manggarai Selayang Pandang*. Kupang: Publikasi Khusus LSM Agricola Kupang.
- Bustan, F., Semiun, A., and Bire, J. (2017). *The Features of Anthropomorphic Metaphor in the Manggarai language*. Balti: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Cakir, I. (2006). "Developing cultural awareness in foreign language teaching". *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education – TODJE*. July, 2006, Volume: 7 Number: 3.
- Cassirer, E. (1987). *Manusia dan Kebudayaan: Sebuah Esai tentang Manusia*. Diterjemahkan oleh Alois A. Nugroho. Jakarta: Gramedia.

- Casson, R. W. (1981). *Language, Culture, and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. New York: Macmillan.
- Duranti, A. (2001). *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Erb, M. (1999). *The Manggaraians: A Guide to Traditional Lifestyles*. Singapore: Times Editions.
- Faisal, S. (1990). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Dasar-dasar dan Aplikasi*. Malang: Yayasan Asih Asah Asuh (YA3).
- Foley, W. A. (1997). *Anthropological Linguistics: an Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Culture: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books
- Goodenough, W. H. (1964). "Cultural anthropology and linguistics. In *Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Grice, G. W. (1987). *The Linguistic Construction of Reality*. London: Croom Helm.
- Gumperz, J. (1992). "Contextualization of language". In *The Contextualization of Language*. Edited by Aldo di Luzio and Peter Aus. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Hasan, R. (1989). *Linguistics, Language, and Verbal Art*. Victoria: Deakin University.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kaplan, D., dan Manners, A. A. (1999). *Teori Budaya*. Diterjemahkan oleh L. Simatupang. Yogyakarta: Pusat Pelajar.
- Keesing, R. M. (1981). "Theories of culture." In *Language, Culture and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmillan.
- Koentjaraningrat. (2004). *Kebudayaan, Mentalitas dan Pembangunan*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Kramsch, K. (2001). *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Malcolm, G. I. (2007). "Cultural linguistics and bidialectal education". In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzard Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Miller, R. L. (1968). *The Linguistic Relativity Principle and Humboldtian Ethnolinguistics: A History and Appraisal*. Paris: The Hague
- Muhadjir, N. (1995). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Telaah Positivistik, Rasionalistik, Fenomenologik, Realisme Metaphisik*. Yogyakarta: Rake Sarasin.
- Nusa Putra. (2011). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Proses dan Aplikasi*. Jakarta: Indeks.
- Occi, D. J. (2007). "Using cultural linguistics to teach English language inferential schemas used in archeology to Japanese university students." In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzard Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in Samoan Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, G. B. (1996). *Toward a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
- Palmer, G. B., and Scharifian, F. (2007). "Applied cultural linguistics: an emerging paradigm." In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzard Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Richards, J. C., Platt., and Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics*. Essex: Longman.
- Sharifian, F. (2007). "L1 cultural conceptualisation in L2 learning: the case of Persian-speaking learners of English". In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzard Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Spradley, J. P. (1997). *Metode Etnografi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Misbah Zulfa Elizabeth. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana Yogya.

- Stross, B. (1981). "Language, culture, and cognition." In *Language, Culture and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmillan.
- Sudikan, S. Y. (2001). *Metode Penelitian Kebudayaan*. Surabaya: Unesa Unipress bekerjasama dengan Citra Wacana.
- Wallace, A. F. C. (1981). "Culture and cognition." Dalam *Language, Culture, and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmillan.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2011). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New Jersey, United States: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Whorf, B. L. (2001). "The relationship of habitual thought and behavior to language". In *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. Edited by Alessandro Duranti. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Verheijen, A. J. (1991). *Manggarai dan Wujud Tertinggi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Alex Beding dan Marsel Beding. Jakarta: LIPI-RUL.
- Yu, N. (2007). "The Chinese conceptualisation of the heart and its cultural context: implications for second language learning". In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzard Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.