



Status Differences between a Male and a Female in Family Social Structure of Manggarai Society (Cultural Linguistic Analysis)

Fransiskus Bustan¹, Florens Maxi Un Bria², Emanuel I. D. Je'e Mally³, Filemon Fridolino Ngebos⁴

¹ Lecturer of Nusa Cendana University Kupang, Indonesia

² Lecturer of College of Pastoral Sciences, Archdiocese of Kupang, Indonesia

³ Lecturer of College of Pastoral Sciences, Archdiocese of Kupang, Indonesia

⁴ Lecturer of Law Faculty, Wydia Mandira Catholic University Kupang, Indonesia

Article DOI: [10.55677/SSHRB/2025-3050-0203](https://doi.org/10.55677/SSHRB/2025-3050-0203)

DOI URL: <https://doi.org/10.55677/SSHRB/2025-3050-0203>

KEYWORDS: status differences, male, female, family social structure, Manggarai society

ABSTRACT: This study aims to examine status differences between a male and female in family social structure in Manggarai society, as reflected in the idiomatic expressions used in the speech event of baby birth in a nuclear family. The study is viewed from the perspective of cultural linguistics as one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics exploring the relationship of language, culture, and conceptualization. The study is descriptive-qualitative as it describes status differences between a male and female in family social structure in Manggarai society, as reflected in idiomatic expressions used in the speech event of baby birth in a nuclear family. The result of study shows that status differences between a male and a female in family social structure in Manggarai society have been ascribed since their births, as reflected in the term **ata one** 'inside person' as the attribute for a male as the owner of the **wa'u** as a patrilineal-genealogic clan and the term the **ata pe'ang** as the attribute for a female as not the owner of the **wa'u**. The terms imply gender differences as the sexual differences as something given are socially constructed as the basis of status differences between a male and a female in family social structure in Manggarai society. The differences should be redefined because both a male and a female have the same dignity and worth as human beings. The sexual differences as something given are not a reason to treat a female unfairly and unequally in the social structure of family in Manggarai society because it is contrary to human rights.

Corresponding Author:

Fransiskus Bustan

Published:

February 16, 2025

License:

This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

INTRODUCTION

Culture serves a pivotal role in the life of a society because culture makes the life of a society as members of a social group meaningful and the meaningfulness of culture they share can be seen in its function that represents their beliefs and practices (Geertz, 1973; Cassirer, 1987; Suriasumantri, 2001; Bustan et al., 2023; Bustan, 2024). Culture in this light serves as a self-identity of a society as members of a social group as it comprises the concepts of who they are, of what sort of people they are, and how they relate to others (Hogs & Abrams, 1988; Alshammari, 2018). In addition to being a unitary phenomenon of a society as members of a social group, culture also serves as a source of differences between societies, as propounded by Ochs (1988) that culture as an identity marker of a society as members of a social group serves not only as a sense of identity for them as members of a social group but also as a symbol of identity distinguishing them from those of other social groups.

The differences between cultures they share can be seen languages they employ because language used by a society as members of a social group is the reflection of culture they share. The relationship of both language and culture belonging to a society as members of a social group is manifested in conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map that contains a bulk of linguistic knowledge and cultural knowledge as the sources of reference for them in viewing the word. The world involves both the factual world and the symbolic world which refers to the world in which the object as referent of language used is imaginative in nature as it exists in the cognitions or minds of the speakers of that language.

Bearing the matters stated above in minds, this study explores the relationship of both Manggarai language and Manggarai culture belonging to Manggarai society as members of Manggarai ethnic group residing in the region of Manggarai which occupies the western part of the island of Flores in the province of East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia (Erb, 1999; Lawang, 1999; Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006; Bustan, 2009; Bustan & Liunokas, 2019; Bustan & Kabelen, 2023; Gunas et al., 2023; Bustan et al., 2023; Bria et al., 2023; Bustan et al., 2024; Bustan, 2024). Along with the idea of Koentjaraningrat (1987), Manggarai society is identified as members of an ethnic group known as Manggarai ethnic because they are bound by the awareness of sharing the same culture known as Manggarai culture which is also often strengthened by their awareness of speaking the same language known as Manggarai language. Therefore, in terms of Manggarai culture, Manggarai society can be identified as members of Manggarai cultural community, while in terms of Manggarai language, they can be identified as members of Manggarai speech community.

As the relationship of both Manggarai language and Manggarai culture is complex and pervasive that the study focuses on status differences between a male and a female in the social structure of family in Manggarai society. As family can be defined differently, the term family used in this study refers to a nuclear family known as *kilo koe* 'small family' in Manggarai language and an extended family known as *wa'u* in Manggarai language which refers to a patrilineal-genealogic clan (Verheijen, 1991; (Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006; Bustan, 2009; Bustan et al., 2023; Bria et al., 2023; Bustan et al., 2024). The status differences are explored on the basis of conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai society, as reflected in the features of linguistic phenomena they employ in idiomatic expressions of speech event taking place in cultural domain when there is a newly born baby in a nuclear family. As the speech event takes place in a cultural domain, the speech event can be defined as a cultural discourse which is concerned with the function or significance of Manggarai language as the reflection of Manggarai culture.

We are interested in conducting the study for the basic reason that the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the idiomatic expressions of Manggarai language as the sources of references are unique and specific in some respect to Manggarai culture as the hosting culture in which Manggarai language is embedded. The meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the idiomatic expressions of Manggarai language designate the conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai society regarding status differences between a male and a female in family social structure. Another reason is that, indeed, there have been many previous studies investigating the relationship of Manggarai language and Manggarai culture, but none has yet examined in more depth the differences of status between a male and a female in the social structure of family in Manggarai society. Nevertheless, there are several previous studies which indirectly support conceptions and ideas relevant to the study on the differences of status between a male and a female in the social structure of family in Manggarai society as the focus of this study.

The study of Bustan (2005) explored the cultural discourse of *tudak* in the *penti* ritual in Manggarai ethnic group in West Flores Barat which also provided an overview on the social structure of family in Manggarai society. The study of Bustan & Semiun (2019) examining the cultural discourse of baby birth in Manggarai speech community provided information regarding the context of situation when there was a birth baby event in a nuclear family. Regardless several points of similarities with the results of previous studies, this study is mainly viewed from the perspective of cultural linguistics as one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics which examines the relationship of language, culture, and conceptualization belonging to a society as members of a social group in viewing the world on the basis of premise that language they employ is the window into their cognitions or minds (Palmer, 1996; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Yu, 2007; Malcolm, 2007). The use of cultural linguistics as the main theoretical framework is one of the novelty dimensions of this study compared with the results of previous studies aforementioned.

FRAMEWORK

As previously stated, both language and culture belonging to a society as members of a social group are closely related in designating the ways they view the world. The relationship is manifested in conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map as the frame of reference for them in viewing the world. The relationship of language, culture, and conceptualization is the main concern of study in cultural linguistics as an emerging paradigm or model in cognitive linguistics which draws on the combined resource of both anthropological linguistics and cognitive linguistics in providing an account of the communicative behavior of a society as members of a social group (Palmer, 1996; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Malcolm, 2007). In the perspective of cultural linguistics, language is explored through the lens of culture in an attempt to uncover conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of its speakers in viewing the world (Goodenough, 1964). The aim is based on premise that, as mentioned earlier, language in view of its use as a chief means of communication between and among members of a society as members of a social group serves as the window into their cognitions or minds (Yu, 2007; Casson, 1981; Stross, 1981; Whorf, 2001; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007). The aim supports the conception of Langacker (1999) as a pioneer of cognitive linguistics declaring that there is a close relationship between language and cognitions or minds of a society as members of a social group (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Alshammari, 2018).

Cultural linguistics puts emphasis on the cultural elements of cognition (Casson, 1981; Wallace, 1981; Keesing, 1981; Stross, 1981) and, as such, cultural linguistics can also be defined as an approach to identifying language differences and the differences between languages are due to cultural differences (Occhi, 2007; Cassirer, 1987; Sapir, 1949; Miller, 1968; Richards et al., 1992). This comes closest to the conception of Humboldt that the diversity of languages is not concerned with the diversity of signs and sounds, but the diversity of worldviews. The conception is also reflected in the theory of linguistic relativity 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. Therefore, the 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 (Sapir, 1949; Miller, 1968; Cassirer, 1987; Richards et al., 1992; Palmer, 1996; Foley, 1997; Bilal & Erdogan, 2005; Cakir, 2006; Alshammari, 2018).

As language can be defined differently, in the perspective of cultural linguistics, language is defined as a cultural activity and, at the same time, as an instrument for organizing other cultural domains (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2007). This supports the idea of Brown (1994) that culture is deeply ingrained part of the very fiber of our being, but language as the means for communication among members of a society is the most visible and available expression of culture they share (Cassirer, 1987; Wierzbicka, 1991; Suriasumantri, 2001; Bilal & Erdogan, 2005; Cakir, 2006). Similar to language, culture may mean different things for different people and, as a result, there are many different definitions of culture (Ochs, 1988; Kaplan & Manners, 1999). In the perspective of cultural linguistics, culture is defined as the source of conceptualization of experience encountered by a society in the context of living together as members of social group (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011; Palmer, 1996; Wallace, 1981). In line with this, according to Foley (1997), culture is a cognitive map belonging to a society as members of a social group used as the source of reference for them in viewing the world (Goodenough, 1964). Culture in this light is a display illustrating how a society as members of a social group organize their ways of thinking about items, behaviors, and beliefs or events taking place in cultural domain (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011; Palmer, 1996).

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. 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. As cultural conceptualizations and language are two intrinsic aspects of cultural cognition, cultural conceptualizations have conceptual existence and linguistic encoding. Language in this light can be defined as a central aspect of cultural cognition that serves as a collective memory bank for cultural conceptualizations, past and present. It is said so because language is shaped by cultural conceptualizations that have prevailed at different stages in the story of its speakers and the different stages can leave their traces in current linguistic practices. Language is one of the primary mechanisms that functions not only to store the cultural conceptualizations, but also to communicate the cultural conceptualizations in question. Therefore, it is true to say then that language is a social-collective memory bank that serves as a fluid vehicle for the retransmission of the socioculturally embodied cultural conceptualizations (Palmer, 1996; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011).

Nevertheless, it is worth highlighting that cultural conceptualization may not be correlated objectively with external world because cultural conceptualization is the result of interaction between members of a culture carried out through a continuous process of negotiation and renegotiation taking place through time, space, and across generations. This implies that the function of language is twofold because, in addition to being a means for communicating cultural conceptualization, language also serves as a means for embodying cultural conceptualization. This is because language in its use as a system of symbols is the vehicle for expressing the cultural identity of a society as members of a speech community (Alshammari, 2018). The cultural conceptualizations distributed across the minds of a speech community representing their cognition at the cultural level are called linguistic imagery which is concerned with how they speak about the world that they themselves imagine. The linguistic imagery can be examined from the physical forms of language and the contents stored in the forms of language should be interpreted along with the sociocultural context of its speakers as the nonverbal environment in which that language is used (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011).

Language in its use as a symbolic system with the power to shape and create such cultural realities as norms, values, perceptions, and identities is expressed through discourse as its vehicle (Berger & Luckman, 1967; Grice, 1987; Kramsch, 2001). The significance of discourse as the vehicle for expressing cultural realities can be clearly seen when the members of a speech community interact for particular purposes. To achieve the intended goals of interactions, they produce particular discourses as assemblies of meanings relating to 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 seen as ideologies or worldviews (Kovecses,

2009; Fairclough, 2003; Berger & Luckman, 1967). Therefore, according to Geertz (1973) and Schneider (1976), a discourse can be defined as a source of making meanings in a culture and the meanings are defined as cultural meanings or symbolic meanings in culture.

More specifically, meaning as fundamental to language and culture is realized in a cultural discourse as an umbrella term for any form of discourse which takes place in a cultural domain (Gumperz, 1992). While in terms of the meanings stored in the forms of language used, a cultural discourse contains a set of items, behaviors, and beliefs defined as belonging to the same category of things. As a cultural domain is a basic unit of meaning that shapes how a people as members of a speech community conceptually organize their world, a cultural discourse is seen as the vehicle for the representation of cultural conceptualization (Schensul et al., 1999; Gumperz, 1992). In addition, as the use of language as an essential instrument and component of culture is reflected in linguistic structure (Langacker, 1999), a cultural discourse is also defined as a repository of meanings stored in the forms of linguistic signs commonly shared by members of a culture (Kovecses, 2009).

Therefore, the features of linguistic phenomena used in a text of cultural discourse should be viewed from their forms and meanings as the two poles of linguistic signs. The forms refer to the physical features of linguistic phenomena used, as reflected in the surface structure, while the meanings refer to the contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena in question which reflect the conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of its speakers regarding experience they faced in the contexts of living together for years or a long period of time and even transgenerations (Palmer & Sharifan, 2007; Sharifian, 2007; Foley, 1997; Piliang, 2004). This is also one of the reasons why the differences of status between a male and a female in the social structure of family in Manggarai society as the focus of this study are portrayed through the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the cultural discourse of Manggarai language as the main source of reference.

METHOD

This is a descriptive-qualitative study as its main aim is to describe the differences of status between a male and a female in the social structure of family Manggarai society and the description is presented and provided in words on the basis of conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map as the sources of reference (Muhadjir, 1995; Nusa Putra, 2011).

The procedures of research were field and library research. The field research aimed to collect the primary data dealing with the differences of status between a male and a female in the social structure of family in Manggarai society on the basis of conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map. The field research was carried out in Ruteng, the capital city of Manggarai regency, as the main location. The approach to obtaining the required data was dialogic ethnography approach (Hymes, 1974; Gumperz, 1992; Spradley, 1997; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Geertz, 1971; Foley, 1997).

The methods of data collection were observation and interview. Based on the data of observation, the in-depth interviews were carried out with the members of Manggarai society, especially those residing in Ruteng as the main location of the field research. For the purpose of this study, however, they were represented by five persons as the key informants that were selected on basis of the ideal criteria proposed by Faisal (1990), Spradley (1997), and Sudikan (2001). The interviews aimed to distill the conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map regarding the differences of status between a male and a female in the social structure of family in Manggarai society. The techniques of data collection were recording, elicitation, and note-taking.

The library research was conducted to collect the secondary data relevant to the focus of study dealing with the differences of status between a male and a female in the social structure of family in Manggarai society. The method used to collect the secondary data was documentary study carried out by retrieving documents and the kinds of documents used as the sources of data were general documents (books) and special documents (scientific articles, results of research, paper).

The collected data were then analyzed qualitatively by using inductive method in the sense that the analysis was started from the data to the concept/theory. The concept/theory is local-ideographic in nature as it provides a written description regarding the differences of status between a male and female in the social structure of family in Manggarai society. The concept/theory applies to Manggarai culture because the description was made on the basis of conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map, as reflected in the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena they employed in the idiomatic expressions of Manggarai language in the cultural discourse of baby birth in a nuclear family (Spradley, 1987; Sudikan, 2001; Duranti, 2001; Bustan, 2006; Bustan & Semiun, 2019).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The result of study shows 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 the conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map regarding the differences of status between a male and a female in the social structure of family. More specifically, the differences are reflected in the features of linguistic phenomena in the idiomatic expressions of Manggarai language used in the cultural discourse of baby birth occurring in a nuclear family. The differences are conveyed through the attachment of special terms, involving both *ata one* 'inside person' as the attribute or label for a male and *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' the attribute or label for a female. The meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the two terms designate gender differences in Manggarai language. This is because the sexual differences between a male and a female as something given are socially constructed as the differences of status between a male and a female in the family social structure of Manggarai society regardless that both a male and a female as human beings have the same dignity and worth.

Discussion

The differences of status between a male and a female in the social structure of family in Manggarai society are reflected in the term *ata one* 'inside person' which is used as the attribute or label for a male and the term *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' which is used as the attribute or label for a female which have been ascribed since their births. As seen in the physical forms of linguistic phenomena used, the term *ata one* is a compound word made up of two words or lexical items as its component parts, that is the word (noun) *ata* means 'person' and the word (adverb) *one* means 'inside'. The combination of the two words creates a new meaning in regard to the attribute or label for a male in the social structure of family in Manggarai society. The term *ata pe'ang* is a compound word made up of two words or lexical items as its component parts, that is the word (noun) *ata* means 'person' and the word (adverb) *pe'ang* means 'outside'. The combination of the two words creates a new meaning in regard to the attribute or label for a female in the social structure of family in Manggarai society. Thus the differences between the two terms are marked by the word (adverb) *one* 'inside' and the word (adverb) *pe'ang* 'outside' indicating that the meanings of the two terms have antonymous relationships.

As conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society, the term *ata one* 'inside person' as the attribute or label for a male and the term *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' as the attribute or label for a female have manifold meanings. The term *ata one* 'inside person' as the attribute or label for a male implies meaning that a male is the owner of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan because, after marriage, he must stay in his parents' house and live in his natal village for life. Being the *ata one* as the owner of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan, a male holds privilege of having inheritance from his parents as he will take care of his parents when they get old. In addition, being a member of the *wa'u* as an extended family originated from the same descents, it is also obligated for a male as the *ata one* 'inside person' to guard the *mbaru gendang* 'drum house' as the origin house of the *wa'u* residing in one village and to control over the *lingko randang* as the communal agricultural land belonging to the *wa'u*. Being born as the *ata one* 'inside person', the status of a male as the owner of the *wa'u* is characterized not only by physical properties like natal village (*beo*), origin house (*mbaru gendang*), and communal agricultural land (*lingko randang*), but also by various kinds of rules, norms, and conventions relating to the wider world. The status a male as the owner the *wa'u* designates that he holds primary power and predominates in roles of political leadership, moral authority, and social control of all cultural properties belonging to the *wa'u*. At the same time, the term *ata one* 'inside person' as the attribute or label for a male as the owner of the *wa'u* also indicates male dominance, male identification, and male centredness in the social structure of family in Manggarai society.

Different from the term *ata one* 'inside person' as the attribute or label for a male, the term *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' as the attribute or label for a female as outside person implies meaning that a female is not the owner of the *wa'u*. As conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society, the basic reason of ascribing a female as the *ata pe'ang* is that, after marriage, she will move away from her natal village and, as the same time, she will live in her husband's natal village and then become member of her husband's clan for life. Being born as the *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' as the attribute or label of a female as not the owner of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan, a female is destined to reproduce for other clan, the clan of her husband, and she has no rights of having inheritance from her parents in the nuclear family. Thus, the term *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' as the attribute or label for a female as not the owner of the *wa'u* shows female subordination, marginalization, and discrimination in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai society. At the same time, it is worth noting that, being the *ata pe'ang* 'outside person', a female is also regarded inferior as her role is submissive and subservient in the social structure of the *wa'u* in Manggarai society. The status of a female in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai society before she is married is temporal and peripheral. Before marriage she served selflessly in her parents' family as the results of her hard work would not be taken with her after she married (Bustan & Semiun, 2019).

In addition to reflecting the differences of status held by a male and a female in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggarai society, the term *ata one* 'inside person' as the attribute or label for a male and the term *ata pe'ang* as the attribute or label for a female as outside person reveal the phenomena of gender differences in linguistic practices in Manggarai society. This is because the sexual differences as something given are socially constructed by Manggarai society as the basis of identifying the differences of ascribed status between both a male and a female in the social structure of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan. The conceptualization regarding such differences is one of the controversial issues in today's Manggarai society because it is regarded as a form of gender inequality between a male and a female for the basic reason that both a male and a female as human beings have the same dignity and worth.

Although there is no consensus among the members of Manggarai society regarding the meanings and motivations behind the significances of the two terms, the conceptualization of Manggarai society regarding the differences of ascribed status between a male and a female in the social structure of the *wa'u* should be redefined. This is because status differences between a male and a female imply harassment of the dignity and worth of females as people who give birth to humans for the sake of their survival in the world. Added to this, another reason is that culture as an aspect of human beings' life is a dynamic entity in the sense that culture is not immune to changes and the changes of culture almost always occur together with the changes of its society in viewing and making sense of the word. This implies that the Manggarai society's paradigm of thinking regarding the differences of status of a male and a female can be redefined according to the developing world constellation regarding human rights without the distinction of gender as a basis for consideration.

CONCLUSION

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 regarding the differences of status between a male and a female in the social structure of family. The natures of such differences are reflected in the term *ata one* 'inside person' as attribute or label for a male as the owner of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan and the term *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' as the attribute or label for a female as not the owner of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan. A male as the *ata one* shares physical properties like natal village (*beo*), origin house (*mbaru gendang*), communal agricultural land (*lingko randang*), as well as various kinds of rules, norms, and coventions relating to the wider world. The differences imply male dominance, male identification, and male centredness in the social structure of family in Manggarai society. A female as the *ata pe'ang* 'outside person' is not the owner of the *wa'u* because, after marriage, she will move away from her natal village, live in her husband's natal village, and become member of her husband's clan for life. As a female is destined to reproduce for the clan of her husband, she has no rights of having inheritance from her parents. The conceptualization shows the subordination, marginalization, and discrimination of a female in the family social structure of Manggarai society.

The two terms reveal gender differences in Manggarai language as the sexual differences between a male and a female as something given are socially constructed as the differences of status between a male and a female in the family social structure of Manggarai society. As both a male and a female as human beings have the same dignity and worth, it is suggested for Manggarai society that the differences of their status should be redefined. This is also because culture belonging to a society is not a static entity but a dynamic entity so as culture is not immune to change as well. To what extent the change of Manggarai culture affects the change in conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai society regarding status differences between a male and a female in family social structure depends greatly on the good will of Manggarai society because as the time goes, the world changes as well and the world of Manggarai society is no exception.

Conflict of Interest

Authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Afrizal. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif: Sebuah Upaya Mendukung Penggunaan Penelitian Kualitatif dalam Berbagai Disiplin Ilmu*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
2. 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.
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. Boas, F. (1962). *Anthropology and Modern Life*. New York: The Norton Library. W. W. Norton & company.
5. Bria, F. M. U., Monteiro, A. E., Taolin, H., Bustan, F., Otta, G. M. N. "The characteristics of endogamy marriage in Manggaraian cultural community". *International Journal of Arts and Social Science*. Volume 6 Issue 12, December 2023.

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 kebudayaan". *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. (2009). "Peran *tu'a golo* sebagai pemimpin tertinggi dalam struktur sosial kelompok etnik Manggarai ditinjau dari perspektif linguistik kebudayaan". *Linguistika*. Vol. 16, No. 30, Maret 2009, 1-17.
10. Bustan, F. (2024). *Pelangi Budaya Pertanian Lahan Kering Masyarakat Manggarai di Flores*. Yogyakarta: Jejak Pustaka.
11. Bustan, F., Semiun, A., Bire, J. (2017). *The Characteristics of Anthropomorphic Metaphor in the Manggarai language*. Balti: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
12. Bustan, F., Semiun, A. (2019). *The Cultural Discourse of Baby Birth in Manggarai Speech Community*. Germany: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
13. 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.
14. Bustan, F., Kabelen A. H., Bria, F. M. U., Monteiro, A. E., Taolin, H. (2023). "The cultural conceptualization of the Manggaraian speech community regarding the omnipotence of God as supernatural power". *SPARKLE: Journal of Language, Education, and Culture*, Volume 3, Issue 1, December 2023, Pp. 1-10.
15. Bustan, F., Liunokas Y. (2019). "The forms and meanings of verbal expressions on the existence of God as a supernatural power in Manggarai language (a cultural linguistic analysis)". *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*. www.ijicc.net. Volume 5, Issue 3, 2019. Special Edition: Science, Applied Science, Teaching and Education
16. Bustan, F., Bria, F. M. U., Sumitri, N. W. (2024). "The nature and solution of family conflict in a patrilineal genealogic clan of Manggaraian society". *Global Journal of Arts Humanity and Social Sciences*. Volume 4, Issue 1, Jan 2024.
17. Cassirer, E. (1987). *Manusia dan Kebudayaan: Sebuah Esai tentang Manusia*. Diterjemahkan oleh Alois A. Nugroho. Jakarta: Gramedia.
18. Casson, R. W. (1981). *Language, Culture and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. New York: Macmillan.
19. Duranti, A. (2001). *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
20. Erb, M. (1999). *The Manggaraians: A Guide to Traditional Lifestyles*. Singapore: Times Editions.
21. Fairclough, N. (2003). *Language and Power: Relasi Bahasa, Kekuasaan, dan Ideologi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Indah Rohmani-Komunitas Ambarawa. Malang: Boyan Publishing.
22. Faisal, S. (1990). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Dasar-dasar dan Aplikasi*. Malang: Yayasan Asih Asah Asuh (YA3).
23. Foley, W. A. (1997). *Anthropological Linguistics: an Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
24. Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Culture: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books
25. Goodenough, W. H. (1964). "Cultural anthropology and linguistics. In *Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology*. New York: Harper & Row.
26. Gumperz, J. (1992). "Contextualization of language". In *The Contextualization of Language*. Edited by Aldo di Luzio and Peter Aus. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benyamins.
27. Gunas, T., Bustan, F., Menggo, S., Jem, H. Y. 'Politeness in *Tiba Meka* ritual in Manggarai language and culture, Eastern Indonesia'. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Sociality Studies*. Vol. 3 (2023), 61-71.
28. Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage.
29. Hogg, M., Abrams, D. (1988). *Social Identifications: A Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations and Group Processes*. London: Routledge.
30. Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
31. Kaplan, D., Manners, A. A. (1999). *Teori Budaya*. Diterjemahkan oleh L. Simatupang. Yogyakarta: Pusat Pelajar.
32. Keesing, R. M. (1981). "Theories of culture". In *Language, Culture and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmillan.
33. Koentjaraningrat. (2004). *Kebudayaan, Mentalitas dan Pembangunan*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
34. Lawang, M. Z. R. (1999). *Konflik Tanah di Manggarai: Pendekatan Sosiologik*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia.
35. Muhadjir, N. (1995). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Telaah Positivistik, Rasionalistik, Fenomenologik, Realisme Metaphisik*. Yogyakarta: Rake Sarasin.
36. Nusa Putra. (2011). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Proses dan Aplikasi*. Jakarta: Indeks.
37. Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in Samoan Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
38. 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.

39. Sabean, D. W., Teuscher, S. (2013). "Introduction". In *Blood & Kinship: Matter for Metaphor from Ancient Rome to the Present*. Edited by Christopher H. Johnson, Bernhard Jussen, David Warren Sabean, Simon Teuscher. New York: Berghahn Books.
40. 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.
41. Spradley, J. P. (1997). *Metode Etnografi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Misbah Zulfa Elizabeth. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana Yogya.
42. Sudikan, S. Y. (2001). *Metode Penelitian Kebudayaan*. Surabaya: Unesa Unipress bekerjasama dengan Citra Wacana.
43. Suriasumantri, J. S. (2001). *Filsafat Ilmu: Sebuah Pengantar Populer*. Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan.
44. Tylor, E. B. (2010). *Primitive Culture: Researches Into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom*. Volume 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
45. Wallace, A. F. C. (1981). "Culture and cognition". In *Language, Culture, and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmilan.
46. Verheijen, A. J. (1991). *Manggarai dan Wujud Tertinggi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Alex Beding dan Marsel Beding. Jakarta: LIPI-RUL.
47. 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.