

LOCAL WISDOM OF HARD WORK IN MANGGARAI LANGUAGE (A Cultural Linguistic Analysis)

Alexander Home Kabelen (a,1*)

Fransiskus Bustan (b,2)

Jhon Bhae (c,3)

Nur Laili Nahdliyah (d,4)

^{1,2,3}English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Nusa Cendana, Indonesia

⁴Linguistic Study Program, Universitas Nusa Cendana, Indonesia

¹alexkabelen63@gmail.com

²frankybustando@gmail.com

³jhonbhae581@gmail.com

⁴Laili.nadhea@gmail.com

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
Local wisdom, Hard work, Manggarai language, Cultural linguistics	This study aims at describing local wisdom of hard work in Manggarai language with special reference to the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the cultural discourse of agriculture. The study is viewed from the perspective of cultural linguistics one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics which studies the relationship of language, culture and conceptualization. The study is descriptive-qualitative. The results of study show that the local wisdoms of hard work in Manggarai language are reflected in the following fragment: Duat gula, wee mane, dempul wuku, tela toni 'Go to work in the morning, come home in the afternoon, broken nails, split back'. The features of linguistic phenomena used in the fragment are unique and specific to Manggarai culture as the parent culture in which Manggarai language is embedded. The unique and specific features of the linguistic phenomena can be seen in their forms and meanings. The meanings stored in the forms of the linguistic phenomena reveal the conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai society as dry land farmers regarding the local wisdom of hard work on the basis of tradition inherited from their ancestors. The local wisdom of hard work in Manggarai language is one of the moral values inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai society as dry land farmers that should be maintained because it is related to the value of mutual cooperation.

How to cite: Kabelen, A. H., Bustan, F., Bhae, J., & Nahdliyah, N. L. (2024). Local Wisdom of Hard Work in Manggarai Language (A Cultural Linguistic Analysis). *SPARKLE Journal of Language, Education and Culture*, 4 (1) 38-46

INTRODUCTION

Different societies speak different languages because every language has its own system, as reflected in a set of rules used as the guidelines for its speakers when communicating with each other in the contexts of living together. The differences between the systems of languages can be seen in such formal levels of linguistics as phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. However, if we explore in more depth, the differences between languages are actually due to cultural differences, as Humboldt addressed, the diversity of languages is not just concerned with the diversity of signs and sounds, but the diversity of cultures (Miller, 1968). The reason of such differences is that every culture has its own ways in viewing and making sense of the world (Cassirer, 1987; Foley, 1997; Sumarsono, 2010; Alshammari, 2018). The world that involves both the factual world and the symbolic world which refers to world in which the objects as referents of language used are imaginative as the objects are in the cognitions or minds of the speakers of that language (Grice, 1987; Cassirer, 1987; Foley, 1997).

The conceptions come 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 their experiences in the world in such a way that speakers of different languages think and behave differently. As they perceive the world in terms of categories and distinctions found in their native language and, what is found in one language may not be found in another language due to cultural differences (Miller, 1968; Keesing, 1981; Foley, 1997). This implies that language used by a society as members of a social group is closely related to culture they share that functions as the source of conceptualization of their experiences in viewing and making sense of the world. As culture as the worldview of a society as members of a social group finds its reflection in language they employ, language is defined as the window of their world (Sapir, 1921; Whorf, 1941; Goodenough, 1964; Miller, 1968; Cassirer, 1987; Ochs, 1988; Kramsch, 2001; Bilal & Bada, 2005; Cakir, 2006; Alshammari, 2018). On the other side, as language is the reflection of cognitions or minds of its speakers, it is true to say then that language they employ is defined as the window into their cognitions or minds as well (Keesing, 1981; Palmer, 1996; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Yu, 2007).

This study explores the relationship of both Manggarai language and Manggarai culture with special reference to the conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai society as dry land farmers regarding hard work, as reflected in the forms and meanings of traditional expressions inherited from their ancestors. The study is conducted for the basic reason that the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expressions are unique and specific to Manggarai culture as the parent culture in which Manggarai language is embedded. The meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena in the traditional expressions designate the conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai society as dry land farmers regarding hard work as one of the local wisdoms inherited from their ancestors. As the conceptualization can be viewed from different theoretical perspectives, the study is viewed from cultural linguistics as one of the new one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics which studies the relationship of language, culture and conceptualization (Palmer, 1996; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007). The use of cultural linguistics as its theoretical framework is the novelty dimension of this study compared with the results of previous studies exploring the relationship of Manggarai language and Manggarai culture.

FRAMEWORK

As mentioned earlier, cultural linguistics is one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics which studies the relationship of language, culture and conceptualization (Palmer, 1996; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007). Cultural linguistics is defined as a new theoretical perspective in cognitive linguistics because, in addition to hybridizing the resources of cognitive linguistics, anthropological linguistics and sociolinguistics with the emphasis on the cultural elements of cognition, cultural linguistics is an approach to identifying language differences due to cultural differences (Occhi, 2007). In the perspective of cultural linguistics, language used by a society as members of social group is explored through the lens of culture they share in an attempt to uncover the conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map concerning with the ways they view and make sense of the world. The world involves the factual world as well as the symbolic world which refers to the world in which the objects used

as the referents of language used are imaginative in nature as the objects are in their minds and cognitions.

Three basic concepts of cultural linguistics, as it is implied in its definition, are language, culture, and conceptualization. In the perspective cultural linguistics, language is defined as a cultural activity and, at the same time, as an instrument for organizing other cultural domains. The definition is based on the fact 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 their physical and sociocultural experiences in the contexts of living together (Palmer, 1996; Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007). The features of language in this regard are seen not only as linguistic phenomena, but also as social and cultural phenomena (Bustan, 2005; Foley, 1997). Similar to language, as the definition of culture varies from school to school (Ochs, 1988; Sudikan, 2001), in the perspective of cultural linguistics, culture is defined as the source of conceptualization of experiences faced by a society as members of a social group in the contexts of living together for a long period of time (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011; Palmer, 1996; Wallace, 1981; Casson, 1981; Stross, 1981). Culture in this light is seen as a cognitive map shared together by a society as members of a social group that functions as the frame of reference for them in viewing and making sense of the world. It is said so because culture serves as a display illustrating how they organize their ways of thinking about items, behaviors, and beliefs in cultural domains (Bernstein, 1972; Foley, 1997; Goodenough, 1964; Whorf, 2001; Wallace, 1981; Schneider, 1976). The relationship of language and culture is manifested in conceptualization which refers to fundamental cognitive processes which naturally lead to the development of schemas, categories, metaphors, and scripts (Palmer, 1996; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011).

The relationship of language, culture, and conceptualization is seen in the features of linguistic phenomena used cultural discourses which refer to any kind of discourse taking place in cultural domains. In perspective of cultural discourse, culture shared by a society as members of a social group is defined as a display which illustrates how they organize their ways of thinking about items, behaviors and beliefs in cultural domains. The features of linguistic phenomena used in the cultural discourse are unique and specific to culture as the parent culture in which that language is embedded. The unique and specific features of linguistic phenomena they employ in the cultural discourse are reflected in their forms and meanings as the two poles of linguistic signs. This is one of the reasons why the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena in the cultural discourses of agriculture are used as the frames of reference in exploring the local wisdoms of hard work in Manggarai language as the main concern of study.

METHODOLOGY

This is a descriptive-qualitative study as it aims to describe the local wisdoms of hard work, as reflected in the verbal expressions of Manggarai language used in the cultural discourses of agriculture as the reflection of Manggarai culture (Sugyono, 2018; Yusuf, 2019; Moleong, 2021; Sugyono, 2022). The study was based on two sources of data, involving both primary data and secondary data. The procedures of research were field and library research. The field research was intended to obtain the primary data. The location of research was in Pagal, Cibal district in the regency of Manggarai. The sources of primary data were the members of

Manggarai society residing in Pagal represented by four key informants selected on the basis of the ideal criteria put forward by Faisal (1990), Spradley (1997), Duranti (2001) and Sudikan (2001). The main method of data collection was interview. The techniques of data collection were recording, elicitation and note-taking. The library research aimed to obtain the secondary data relevant to the main concern of study. The method of data collection was documentary study. The documents used as the sources of reference were general references such as books and specific references such as research results and scientific articles. The collected data were analyzed qualitatively by using inductive method as the analysis moved from data to abstraction and concept/theory which is local-ideographic as it describes the local wisdoms of hard work in Manggarai language as the reflection of Manggarai culture as the identity marker of Manggarai society as members of Manggarai ethnic group, especially along with their existence as dry land farmers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The results of study show that there is a close relationship between both Manggarai language and Manggarai culture belonging to Manggarai society as members of Manggarai ethnic group. The relationship is manifested in conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai society as dry land farmers regarding the local wisdoms of hard work. More specifically, the local wisdoms of hard work in Manggarai language are reflected in the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in cultural discourses spoken in the contexts of agricultural ritual inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai society. Based on the results of data selection, the local wisdoms of hard work are reflected in the following fragment: *Duat gula, we'e mane, dempul wuku, tela toni* 'Go to work in the morning, come home in the afternoon, broken nails, split back'. The features of linguistic phenomena used in the fragment are unique and specific in some respect to Manggarai culture as the parent or hosting culture in which Manggarai language is embedded. In terms of the two poles of linguistic signs used in the fragment, the unique and specific features of linguistic phenomena can be seen in the pairing of forms and meanings. The meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used reveal the conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai society along with their existence as dry land farmers regarding the local wisdoms of hard work on the basis of traditions inherited from their ancestors.

Discussion

Referring to the physical features of its linguistic phenomena, *Duat gula, we'e mane, dempul wuku, tela toni* 'Go to work in the morning, come home in the afternoon, broken nails, split back', the fragment appears in the form of a declarative sentence as it provides information regarding the local wisdoms of hard in Manggarai language indicated by going to work in the morning and coming home in the afternoon as well as working until broken nails and split back. Meanwhile, in terms of its component parts, the sentence appears in the form of a compound sentence made up two independent clauses or complete sentences as its component parts. The two independent clauses serving as its component parts are as follows: (1) *Duat gula, we'e mane* 'Go to work in the morning, come home in the afternoon' and (2) *Dempul wuku, tela toni* 'Broken nails, split back'. The linguistic phenomena used in the two independent clauses are closely related to each other in their forms and meanings. This is because the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the independent

clause (1) support and emphasize the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the independent clause (2).

The relationship of the two independent clauses forms an asyndeton construction as it is not linked by using the coordinating conjunction *agu* 'and' as a lexical cohesive device. Regardless its function as a lexical cohesive device, it is conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society that the coordinating conjunction is intentionally omitted in order to keep and maintain the harmony of tempo and rhythm when the fragment is spoken to as the number of words in the two independent clauses as its component parts is the same as four in the sense that the number of words in the independent clause (1) is four and the number of words in the independent clause (2) is four as well. This is one of the prominent features of linguistic phenomena used in the cultural discourses of agriculture indicating the poetic function of Manggarai language so that the contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the cultural discourses of agriculture in question are dense in meanings. The meanings are concerned with the conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai society as dry land farmers.

Independent Clause (1): *Duat gula, we'e mane*

As seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used, the independent clause (1), *Duat gula, we'e mane* 'Go to work in the morning, come home in the afternoon', is a declarative sentence as it provides information regarding the habits of Manggarai society as dry land farmers to always go to work in their farming land early in the morning and come home from work in the afternoon. Meanwhile, in terms of its component parts, the independent clause appears in the form of a compound sentence made up two independent clauses or complete sentences. The two independent clauses serving as its component parts are as follows: (a) *Duat gula* 'Go to work in the morning' and (b) *We'e mane* 'Come home in the afternoon'. The linguistic phenomena used in the two independent clauses are closely related to each other. This is because, as mentioned earlier, the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the independent clause (a) support and emphasize the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the independent clause (b).

The relationship of two independent clauses forms an asyndeton construction as it is not linked by using the coordinating conjunction *agu* 'and' as lexical cohesive device. As conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society, the coordinating conjunction is intentionally omitted in order to keep and maintain the harmony of tempo and rhythm when the two independent clauses are spoken to as the number of words for each independent clause is two. The number of words in the independent clause (a) is two and the number of words in the independent clause (b) is two. Other than the number of words, the aesthetic forms are also indicated by the assonance of vocal phonemes, /u-a/, in the pairing of words *duat* 'work' and *gula* 'morning' in the independent clause (a). In addition, the aesthetic forms of linguistic phenomena are also indicated by using antonymous words, that is the word (verb) *duat* in the independent clause (a) and the word (verb) *we'e* 'go home' in the independent clause as well as the word (adverb) *gula* 'morning' as the adverb of time or temporal marker in the independent clause (a) and the word (adverb) *mane* 'afternoon' as the adverb of time or temporal marker in the independent clause (b).

The meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expression (01) reveal that they work non-stop in the farming land all day long from early in morning to afternoon. They have their lunch in the farming land as they bring it when they go to work in the morning so that it is no need for them to cook their lunch in the farming land or the come back home just to have their lunch. As such, they can focus on working in their farming land all day from early in the morning until afternoon. As conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society as dry land farmers, working hard from early in morning until afternoon is a prerequisite for them achieve a descent life of prosperity. The descent of life prosperity can't be achieved as expected without working hard all day in the farming land from early in morning until afternoon and, as such, time is conceptualized by Manggarai society as dry land farmers is the same as work or, in short, time is work.

Being dry land farmers, according to Bustan (2005) and Bustan (2006), the descent life of prosperity is indicated by the availability of abundant corn and rice as their staple foods, as reflected in verbal expression of Manggarai language, as in the following: *Latung peno mbaru, woja peno ca'o* 'Corn is full in the house, rice is full in the storage'. If the availability of corn and rice as their staple foods in one year of the season is abundant, they can have meals three times a day, as reflected in the verbal expression of Manggarai, as in the following: *Cumang hang gula, remong hang lesu, haeng hang mane* 'having breakfast, having lunch, having dinner'. The conditions can't be achieved as expected they don't work hard in the farming land all day long started from early in the morning until afternoon when the sun begins to set on the western horizon as the length of work time in a day. Therefore, the local wisdom of hard work in Manggarai language is one of the moral values inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai society that should be maintained for good.

Furthermore, according to Bustan et al (2023), the value of hard work inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai society as dry land farmers should be maintained for good because it is also related to the value of mutual cooperation. As conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society as dry land farmers, the value of mutual cooperation is reflected in the verbal expression of Manggarai language, *Duat gula cama rangka lama, we'e mane cama rangka ruek* 'Go to work in the morning crowded like male monkeys, come home in the afternoon crowded like water birds'. The verbal expression implies the meaning that they are always together when going to work in the morning and when coming home in the afternoon.

Independent Clause (2): *Dempul wuku, tela toni*

As seen in the physical features of its linguistic phenomena used, *Dempul wuku, tela toni* 'Broken nails, split back', the independent clause (2) appears in the form of a compound sentence made up two independent clauses or complete sentences as its component parts. The two independent clauses serving as its component parts are as follows: (a) *Dempul wuku* 'Broken nails' and (b) *Tela toni* 'Split back'. The linguistic phenomena used in the two independent clauses are closely related to each other. This is because the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the independent clause (a) support and emphasize the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the independent clause (b).

On the other side, it is worth noting that the relationship of two independent clauses forms an asyndeton construction because it is not linked by using the coordinating conjunction *agu*

'and' as lexical a cohesive device. As conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society, the coordinating conjunction is intentionally omitted in order to keep and maintain the harmony of tempo and rhythm when the traditional expression is spoken to as the number of words in each independent clause is the same as two. The number of words in the independent clause (a) is two and the number of words in the independent clause (b) is two as well. As mentioned earlier, this is one of the prominent features of linguistic phenomena used in the cultural discourses of agriculture indicating the poetic function of Manggarai language so that the contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the cultural discourses of agriculture in question are dense in meanings.

The meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used reveal that, as dry land farmers, they work hard in their farming land all day long from early in the morning to afternoon until their fingernails are broken and their backs are split by the heat of sun. As conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society as dry land farmers, working hard until their fingernails are broken and their backs are split is the prerequisite for them achieve a descent life of prosperity. The descent of life prosperity can't be achieved as expected without sweating and eating from their own sweat will taste more delicious that eating the results of other people's sweat. As such, stealing is regarded as one of the sins in Manggarai culture because stealing other people's sweat causes other people to suffer. Therefore, the local wisdom of hard work implied in the verbal expression of Manggarai language is one of the moral values inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai society that should be maintain for good.

CONCLUSION

The relationship of both Manggarai language and Manggarai culture belonging to Manggarai society is manifested in conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map regarding the local wisdoms of hard work. The local wisdoms of hard work are implied in the linguistic phenomena used in cultural discourses of agriculture, as reflected in the following fragment: *Duat gula, we'e mane, dempul wuku, tela toni* 'Go to work in the morning, come home in the afternoon, broken nails, split back'. The features of linguistic phenomena used in the fragment are unique and specific to Manggarai culture as the parent or hosting culture in which Manggarai language is embedded. The unique and specific features of linguistic phenomena used can be seen in the forms and meanings as the two poles of linguistic signs. The meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena reveal the conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai society as dry land farmers regarding the local wisdoms of hard work on the basis of traditions inherited from their ancestors. The local wisdom of hard work in Manggarai language is one of the moral values inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai society that should be maintained for good because it is also interconnected with the value of mutual cooperation.

REFERENCES

- Afrizal. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif: Sebuah Upaya Mendukung Penggunaan Penelitian Kualitatif dalam Berbagai Disiplin Ilmu*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Alshammari, S. H. (2018). "The relationship between language, identity and cultural differences". *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol. 8, No. 4, 2018, 98-101.

- Berger, P. L., Luckman, T. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality*. Hammondsouth, United Kingdom: Penguin
- 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.
- Bilal, G., Bada, E. (2005). "Culture in language learning and teaching". *The Reading Matrix*. Vol. 5, No. 1, April 2005.
- Bustan, F. (2005). "Wacana budaya *tudak* dalam ritual *penti* pada kelompok etnik Manggarai di Flores Barat: sebuah kajian linguistik kebudayaan". *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., Bire, J. (2017). *The Features of Anthropomorphic Metaphor in the Manggarai Language*. Balti: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Bustan, F., Semiun, A. (2019). *The Cultural Discourse of Baby Birth in Manggarai Speech Community*. Germany: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Bustan, F., Mahur, A., Kabelen, A. H. (2020). "Karakteristik dan dinamika sistem pertanian lahan kering dalam kebudayaan Manggarai". *Jurnal Lazuardi* 3 (1), 344-367, 2020.
- Bustan, F., Kabelen, A. H. (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.
- Bustan, F., Kabelen, A. H., Taneo, M. (2023). *International Journal of Arts and Social Science*. Volume 6 Issue 9, September 2023.
- Bustan, F., Huan, E., Otta, G. M. N. (2023). "The traditional calendar of dry land farming in Manggarai culture". *International Journal of Arts and Social Science*. Volume 6 Issue 11, November 2023.
- 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*. Massachussets: Blackwell Publishers.
- 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.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philedelphia: University of Pemsylvania Press.
- Keesing, R. M. (1981). "Theories of culture." In *Language, Culture and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmilan.
- Kovecses, Z. (2009). "Metaphorical meaning making: discourse, language and culture". *Quardens de Filologia*. Estudis Linguistics. Vol. XIV (2009) 135-151.
- 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
- Moleong, L. J. (2021). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Edisi Revisi. Bandung: Rosda.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in a Samoan Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, G. B. (1996). *Towards a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
- 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.
- 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.
- Sharifian, F. (2007). "L1 cultural conceptualization 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.
- Sharifian, F. (2011). *Cultural Conceptualizations and Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 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.
- Sugyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Kombinasi (Mixed Methods)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugyono. (2022). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Wallace, A. F. C. (1981). "Culture and cognition." In *Language, Culture, and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmillan.
- 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.
- Yu, N. (2007). "The Chinese conceptualization 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.
- Yusuf, A. M. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Penelitian Gabungan*. Jakarta: Kencana.