



**International
Journal of Society, Culture & Language
IJSCL**

Journal homepage: www.ijsc.net
ISSN 2323-2210 (online)

Cultuling Analysis: A New Methodology for Discovering Cultural Memes

Reza Pishghadam^{1a}, Shima Ebrahimi^{2a}, Ali Derakhshan^{3b}

ARTICLE HISTORY:

Received April 2020
Received in revised form June 2020
Accepted June 2020
Available online July 2020

KEYWORDS:

Culture
Cultuling
Cultuling analysis
Emotioncy model
Euculturing

Abstract

The close relationship between language and culture has been highlighted by scholars in sociology, sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication, psychology, and linguistics. They postulate that language is a tool to instantiate cultural concepts and delineate how individuals perceive the world. Regarding such an outstanding impetus and triggered by the conceptualization of cultulings (culture in language), language structures and expressions can manifest the overt and covert cultural patterns. Not only can the cultuling analysis of a society disclose the cultural patterns entrenched in the language, but also it can unearth the effective and defective cultural memes. To this end, our cultural model, underpinned by environmental factors, cultural, emo-sensory, and linguistic differences, can provide a robust model to analyze cultulings of a given society. Therefore, to analyze and explain the cultulings, the cultural, emotioncy, and SPEAKING models are suggested to be collectively utilized to reflect the participants' culture. The amalgamation of these models and the underlying environmental factors can delineate people's specific behaviors and cultulings which can culminate in euculturing.

© 2020 IJSCL. All rights reserved.

¹ Professor, Email: pishghadam@um.ac.ir (Corresponding Author)
Tel: +98-51-38802000

² Assistant Professor, Email: shimaebrahimi@um.ac.ir

³ Associate Professor, Email: a.derakhshan@gu.ac.ir

^a Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran

^b Golestan University, Iran

1. Introduction

The progress and transcendence of each nation might be inextricably bound to its rich and healthy culture, which per se plays an indispensable role in the identity formation of that society. Therefore, in order to develop a society, it seems essential to first develop its culture. In other words, if a culture of a society is well-developed and appropriate, it guarantees its progress, and if the culture is undeveloped and inappropriate, it hinders its progress. Needless to say that exploring the healthy culture and diffusing it paves the way for its development (Pishghadam & Ebrahimi, in press).

Considered as social heredity, culture has received a great momentum in diverse fields of study such as anthropology, sociology, philosophy, and psycholinguistics, each of which has conceptualized culture with respect to its specific domain. For instance, anthropologists and sociologists define 'culture' as a symbolic-meaningful or a social system, encompassing symbols, ideas, beliefs, attitudes, norms, artifacts, manners, literature, art, architecture, customs, etc. (Gill, 2013; Henslin, Possamai, Possamai-Inesedy, Marjoribanks, & Elder, 2015). In such a definition, culture pertains to those customary beliefs and values that ethnic, religious, and social groups transmit fairly unchanged from generation to generation (Guiso, Sapienza, & Zingales, 2006). It is therefore perceived that culture is a means of communication and that interaction among the members of a group, and the analysis of a culture reflects its people's lifestyles, attitudes, beliefs, and ways of thinking (Wardhaugh, 2010). Moreover, Axelrod (1997) defines culture as the set of individual attributes that are subject to social influence. This definition is in line with that of Taga's (1999), positing that culture constructs, reconstructs, reflects, and conveys ideas and beliefs. It also gives the individuals knowledge and information about customs, traditions, norms, and values which are concomitantly transferred through language as an inseparable entity of each culture (Derakhshan, 2018).

Therefore, many distinguished researchers (Agar, 1994; Diaz, 2013; Fantini, 1997; Friedrich, 1989; Risager, 2006, 2011) have focused on the language-culture relationship, the most outstanding of which is Sapir and

Whorf's (1956) linguistic relativism and linguistic determinism. Their well-grounded theorization has justified that the role of language in culture should not be overlooked and that culture affects people's thoughts and mentality through language. Thus, people's mindsets and behaviors hinge on their language and they construct and reconstruct their world based on their language.

As explicated, in addition to the language-culture relationship, the issue of people's thinking and cognition regarding their surrounding world is remarkably significant, which is addressed by pioneering scholars such as Vygotsky (1978, 1986) and Halliday (2003). These scholars have considered culture as a social behavior that produces language and plays a decisive role in shaping people's thoughts in society.

From another crucial perspective, Pishghadam (2013) has considered the role of language to be even more decisive and held that "language first led to the technology development and at the same time created culture, this culture again produces a special discourse in a society explaining how to practice wisdom" (p. 51). As a result, "an accurate analysis of a language can reflect the culture that governs the society where it is spoken" (Pishghadam, 2013, p. 52) and can be well elucidated by investigating the linguistic components containing a society's cultural information, the culture governing that society, and their thinking. Thus, like his 'Brainling' (Pishghadam, 2020), which is built upon the structure of the brain (constituting cogling (thinking in brain), emoling (emotion in brain), and sensoling (sense in brain)), Pishghadam (2013) coalesced the two words 'language' and 'culture' and introduced the concept of 'cultuling', that is, 'culture in language' in sociological studies of language.

Regarding the fact that cultulings play a crucial role in revealing the cultural and linguistic characteristics of individuals in a society, through their thorough analysis, in other words, cultuling analysis (CLA, hereafter), one can extract cultural roots, raise public awareness toward them, and make suggestions for altering them if needed. In addition to providing valuable contributions to language planners, CLA also lays the groundwork for the assessment of attitudes, feelings, and language behavior of different classes of people

(Pishghadam & Ebrahimi, in press), culminating in the euculturing (bettering culture) of any society. Bearing this in mind, we seek to provide a comprehensive analytical model for CLA. Accordingly, we conjecture that in order to analyze a culturing, one must describe and explain the culture well. To this end, in this study, we elaborate on memes as a unit of cultural transmission, culturing, CLA, different cultural models (CMs), the emotioncy model, factors underlying CLA, and our comprehensive model. It is believed that a clear picture of a nation's culture and the linguistic expressions they use (culturing) can be provided by considering these factors simultaneously.

2. Meme as a Unit of Cultural Transmission

Many scholars have been searching for a base for culture, and they have tried to explore its evolutionary principles. In the late 20th century, inspired by Darwin's postulations and genetics science which argues that genetic information is transmitted from one generation to the next, Richard Dawkins (1976) propounded the term 'meme' and established the science of 'memetics'. 'Meme', rhyming with the word 'gene', means the cultural gene. According to this theory, memes are considered as units of information in the brain, just like genetic information that resides in the DNA (Dawkins, 1982). "Imitation is key to Dawkins' notion of the meme because imitation is the means by which memes propagate themselves amongst members of a culture" (as cited in Chandler, 2013, p. 8). Therefore, it is understood that memes like genes undergo transmission, mutation, as well as replication, and can be spread and proliferated. Blackmore (1999) concurred with Dawkins, highlighting that whatever is learned through imitation is therefore called a meme.

Regarding genes and memes, Dawkins compares the process of genes spreading themselves in the gene pool, "leaping" from body to body, to the process of memes spreading through the "meme pool" by leaping from brain to brain via imitation (as cited in Chandler, 2013, p. 8). Its phenotypic effects, in contrast, are its consequences in the outside world. The phenotypic effects of a meme may be in the form of words, music, visual images, styles of clothing, facial or hand gestures, architecture, etc. which are the outward and visible (audible, etc.) manifestations of memes

within the brain. They may be perceived by the sense organs of other individuals, and they may so imprint themselves on the brains of the receiving individuals that a copy of the original meme is graven in the receiving brain. "The new copy of the meme is then in a position to broadcast its phenotypic effects, with the result that further copies of itself may be made in yet other brains". (Dawkins, 1982, p. 109). Consequently, memes are living beings (Distin, 2005) which are informative in nature and are a combination of biological and mental factors intertwined with social and cultural factors. Patterns, concepts, and ideas are stored in the memes. Clothing styles, music, common idioms, etc. are examples of cultural memes (Dawkins, 1989).

Dawkins (1976, 1989) expounded that we can identify people's ideas and beliefs in a society through memes which are considered as subunits of culture transmitted by copying and imitation because they are ideas, symbols, and cultural acts which are transmitted in various forms such as language (oral and written), behavior, customs, architecture, music, art, etc. Therefore, memes have the ability to construct cultures and can be considered as a base for cultural evolution (Aunger, 2002). They are not only characterized as self-replicating but also known as contagious (Taecharungroj & Nueangjamnong, 2014). Traditions, beliefs, customs, values, etc. are stored in the individual's memory which are transmitted or copied from one individual to another, but the adaptability of memes to the environment is different. Therefore, in different environments, we have different cultures (Blackmore, 2010). If a cultural characteristic engages and influences many individuals in a society, it becomes a localized and stable feature of that society, and that characteristic is reproduced through imitation and transmission. Brodie (2009), embarking on the term 'viruses of the mind' as a simile to introduce memes, explicated that memes are particles of culture that spread like a virus quickly and can infect all members of a society and can parasitize the host.

In line with Dawkins, Lynch (1996) compared memes to germs that are contagious and mentioned that they are 'thought contagion'. He cogently argued that similar to Darwin's evolutionary theory, some ideas and beliefs

have survived throughout history and have been passed on from one generation to the next, while others have been lost. Some thoughts are strong and some are weak, and those that survive are the ones most people tend to like. Needless to say that people can transmit cultural memes, and they play significant roles in transmission, reproduction, and balancing and eradicating some memes, and changing some other memes to the cultural norms. In general, we can argue that since the common norms, beliefs, customs, and behaviors in a culture are shaped by its cultural memes, it can be said that culture is a gene that can be passed on from one generation to another and has a great influence on the lives of individuals. In other words, memes can be regarded as the behavioral codes, playing an important role in their transmission through communication, which can determine and explain people's culture (Dawkins, 1989). If the genes are good, we will see good behaviors, so people will have social and mental health and we will have 'euculturing', and if the genes are bad, we will witness inappropriate and abnormal behaviors, and people will malfunction socially and mentally. In other words, "a healthy culture creates rational behavior that can cause its people to grow. An unhealthy culture, on the other hand, by producing mental illness makes pathogenic behavior, which slows down the process of human development" (Pishghadam, 2013, p. 48). It should be born in mind that memes can be balanced, mixed, influenced, and changed by others' beliefs. Inasmuch as the fact that language and language norms develop and change in the society, moods, patterns, and norms of a society can develop and change (Dawkins, 1976). Therefore, eradicating and balancing unpleasant cultural behaviors, as well as exploring these cultural memes remain a desideratum.

3. Cultuling

As envisaged, language and culture are indubitably inseparable whereby culture influences people's ideas and beliefs through language, and language, in turn, determines people's thoughts. Distin (2005), expounding the "memes-as-words hypothesis", characterizes language as a "representational system" (p. 142), drawing on cultural memes to disseminate their content to the individuals of the society. From this vantage point, the meaning of a

lexicon can undergo a change, and individuals play a determining role in facilitating or debilitating the language expressions and words from one generation to the next. Consequently, it is explicated that we can instantiate the culture of a society by exploring its language.

Consolidating the interconnectedness of language and culture, Pishghadam (2013) persuasively accentuated that by scrutinizing the language of a society, one can discover its people's cultural patterns, hidden ideologies, beliefs, customs, rituals, etc. which all make the cornerstone of what he conceptualized as "culturology of language" (p. 52). He foregrounded that structures and expressions of a language can manifest people's attitudes, beliefs, customs, and ideas which, in turn, help us explore the culture of a society. Enlightened by the premises put forward by Halliday (1975, 1994), Vygotsky (1978, 1986), Sapir-Whorf (1956), and Agar (1994), Pishghadam (2013) intermingled language and culture, and expounded the concept of 'cultuling', or 'culture in language'. Cultuling entails the structures and expressions of language that instantiate the cultural background of a nation and includes a reciprocal relationship between language and culture. Simply put, "language can represent the culture of a society" (Pishghadam, 2013, p. 47). Finding these cultulings requires careful scrutiny of language within the context of history and society. In other words, investigating the language of a society can reveal its hidden culture. It is, therefore, axiomatic to realize that cultulings are hidden in the language expressions which are frequently negotiated and exchanged in our daily interactions and transactions. Not only can the identification and scrutiny of these cultulings unearth the hidden cultural manifestations and beliefs, but also they can reveal the dominant thoughts and cultural patterns of the society.

Multifarious cultulings can culminate in what is called 'meta-cultulings', the analysis of which gives a thoroughgoing picture of a country's cultural system. "Meta-cultulings depict the general outline of a culture and also manage their sub-cultulings" (Pishghadam, 2013, p. 58). In other words, the cultulings of a speech community are subsumed under a larger category called a meta-cultuling, and each meta-cultuling encompasses more subtle but

interrelated cultulings. Hence, each meta-cultuling can be envisioned as a set of deeper-

linked cultulings (Pishghadam, 2013). Figure 1 illustrates these relationships.




Figure 1

Cultuling and Meta-Cultuling (Adapted from "Introducing Cultuling as a Dynamic Tool in Culturology of Language", by R. Pishghadam, 2013, *Language and Translation Studies*, 45, p. 58. Copyright 2013 by the Journal of Language and Translation Studies)

Pishghadam and Ebrahimi (in press) articulate that identifying the cultulings and meta-cultulings of a society can help us determine cultural memes and differentiate healthy genes from malfunctioning and unhealthy genes, which in turn shed light on our understanding to modify and eradicate the inappropriate cultural behaviors of society and substitute them with appropriate habits, culminating in *eu-culturing*. As succinctly put forward by Pishghadam (2013) "cultulings are transformative tools, which can be used to bring about cultural change and reflection" (p. 58). Premiered in a seminal work on cultuling by Pishghadam (2013), many studies have been conducted on different cultulings, including 'swearing' (Pishghadam & Attaran, 2014), 'cursing' (Pishghadam, Vahidnia, & Firoozian Pour Esfahani, 2015) 'praying' (Pishghadam & Vahidnia, 2016), 'Haji' (Pishghadam & Noruz Kermanshahi, 2016), 'fatalism' (Pishghadam &

Attaran, 2016), 'I don't know' (Pishghadam & Firoozian Pour Esfahani, 2017), 'coquetry' or 'naz' in Persian (Pishghadam, Firoozian Pour Esfahani, & Tabatabaee Farani, 2018), chrophobia and death-seeking (Pishghadam, Firoozian Pour Esfahani, & Firoozian Pour Esfahani, in press). All these studies have corroborated that the scrutiny of these cultulings can disclose thoughts and prevailing cultural patterns.

4. Cultuling Analysis (CLA)

Cultuling Analysis was first put forth by Pishghadam and Ebrahimi (in press), who eloquently spell out that many lexicons and language expressions are constructed as a result of social activities and interactions which embody humans' characters and cultures, transmitted from one generation to the next. One analytical approach to have a

comprehensive understanding of the cultural patterns embedded behind language expressions of a society is CLA. In CLA, the unit of analysis includes words, phrases, or sentences embedded in different contexts that contain cultural information conveyed through an interactive relationship between the cultuling and the context of its occurrence. In other words, the social conditions, contexts, types of communication, and relationships among individuals which influence the formation of cultulings are all important (Pishghadam, Ebrahimi, Naji Meidani, & Derakhshan, in press). In CLA, like discourse analysis and unlike traditional types of analyses, linguistic structures and expressions are not merely construed in terms of their lexical and syntactic roles in the text, but rather beyond the text, that is, cultural, situational, social, political contexts, etc. can play significant roles. Therefore, CLA delves deeply into how linguistic meanings are entrenched in relation to culture, attitude, and thinking. Given that, the attitudes and thoughts of the people in a speech community can be analyzed through their language to discover and interpret their prevalent cultulings. Through their analysis and interpretation, CLA analysts make an endeavor to identify social, cultural, political, contextual, and communicative characterizations and meanings of these overt and covert cultulings. Thus, the overt collective features, frequently characterizing people's behaviors and discourse, can be considered as a cultuling which can be represented through specific words and expressions. One of the centerpieces, making the foundation for the analysis of cultulings, lies in the language context, occurrence, and frequency of cultulings to better visualize and construct their social process. CLA illuminates how cultuling structures can influence people's discourse which per se can lead to the maintenance, eradication, and mutation over time (Pishghadam, Ebrahimi, & Derakhshan, in press).

CLA is done on two layers. At the surface layer of CLA, the overt and conspicuous features of high-frequency words and expressions are analyzed. Conversely, the deep level reflects the cultural patterns and values of people in a society. Above these layers are embedded social and cultural structures of the individuals in a society, so CLA can be utilized as a robust

analytical tool to divulge the cultural contents, constructs, and patterns, identify defective genes, and promulgate healthy cultural standards. CLA seeks to identify the memes that are transmitted through language in the form of conversations, stories, poetry, and proverbs so as to eradicate defective genes and raises people's awareness of them (Pishghadam & Ebrahimi, in press; Pishghadam, Ebrahimi, Naji Meidani, et al., in press). If needed, CLA makes suggestions for the modification of these genes which can pave the way for language planning to delve into people's behavior through the acquisition, structure, and functions of language (Cooper, 1989; Pishghadam & Ebrahimi, in press). Language planning or language engineering has become one of the most influential fields of interdisciplinary research in recent years which has drawn great attention from socio-cultural planners and policymakers in different contexts. In this interdisciplinary area, researchers seek viable strategies to make progress and ameliorate social and cultural problems of their own society in which language functions, language attitudes, as well as overt and covert behaviors of language, so individuals can be analyzed, evaluated, and interpreted to have a better society. To do so, factors such as objectives, motifs, attitudes, social contexts, etc. are consequential to alleviate some of the contingent problems of a society. In a nutshell, it can be recapitulated that CLA can expedite the identification of the origins of the defective cultural memes and achieve a healthier culture which per se leads to a logical behavior and promotes the collective growth of a society (Pishghadam, 2013). Consequently, one of the ways to obtain cultural transcendence and euculturing is to analyze cultulings in different societies, and it is stipulated that CLA is one of the consolidated analytical tools to change and promote the culture in a given society.

5. Cultural Models (CMs)

As it is unequivocal, the culture of a society is not confined to humans and one individual's mind, but rather it is determined by visible and invisible cultural patterns which are instantiated through social interactions at the societal level (Markus & Hamedani, 2007). These constructed patterns are related to the values, behaviors, norms, ideologies, and attitudes of individuals in a society, manifesting their cultural

characteristics (D'Andrade & Strauss, 1992). In such conditions, membership in the community requires constituting organized collections of cultures, ideas, attitudes, norms, and social axioms which are enculturated during our childhood through enculturative routines and become internalized as cultural models. Therefore, cultural models are discernable instances of organization of collectively shared knowledge inextricably bound to our social life (Zerubavel, 1999), and indigenous individuals are interpreted based on these cultural models which are cognitive maps of the mental landscape inhabited by the group members (Maltseva, 2017). Put it succinctly, CM can be defined as the “presupposed, taken-for-granted knowledge shared within a society” (Quinn, & Holland, 1987, p. 4). CMs abound across cultures which are descriptive and explanatory in nature and can explain the cultural differences in diverse societies. In the following, we have elaborated on some of the most outstanding CMs to shed light on our understanding by providing the comprehensive explanation of CMs, based on which we can get familiarized with the behavioral and cultural characteristics of different societies as well as dominant cultural orientations in Eastern and Western societies.

Hofstede is one of the distinguished scholars who has conceptualized a comprehensive category of cultural models and values, pinpointing the influential role of cultural diversities in different societies. Hofstede (1991) defined culture as “The collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from others.” (p. 5) He further draws an analogy that culture is like a character for human beings. The group or category can be a national society, but Hofstede recounts vividly that his definition applies also to other collectives, such as regions, ethnicities, occupations, organizations, or even age groups and genders. The six dimensions of national culture, making the quintessential elements of the model are the result of extensive research by Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov (2010), are as follows:

Power Distance: This dimension pertains to the fact that inequality of power and wealth is expected and accepted in a given society by subordinates. It relates to power, status, and authority that you command from individuals in

a given context and to the extent to which individuals can tolerate this inequality. In such societies, it is often observed that the less powerful members are ruled over by more powerful members who make the important decisions in a society. The societies with high power distance conform to an autocratic style of management and accept a hierarchical order, while the democratic style of management is observed within societies with less power distance where individuals can contribute in the process of decision making, express their objections against the authorities, and strive to equalize the distribution of power (Minkov & Hofstede, 2013). The fundamental concern of this dimension is how a society deals with inequalities among people.

Uncertainty Avoidance: This dimension represents the degree to which the members of a society feel uncomfortable with uncertainty, threats, as well as ambiguity, and whether they are threatened in such conditions. The societies with a high level of uncertainty avoidance feel uncomfortable about the future uncertainties, show unpredictable reactions toward these ambiguities, and are intolerant of unorthodox behavior and ideas. On the other hand, societies with a low level of uncertainty avoidance maintain a more relaxed attitude and show resilience toward uncertainties and future ambiguities. The key issue here is how a society deals with the fact that the future can never be known (Ilagan, 2009; Minkov & Hofstede, 2013).

Individualism/Collectivism: This demarcation refers to a loosely-knit social framework in the society in which each individual is expected to take care of himself or herself. In such a society, ‘me’ or ‘I’ is prioritized to ‘we’, ‘us’. That is, individuals’ decisions are of paramount importance, and if individuals succeed, they relate their triumph to their own perseverance. Given that, individuals have more emancipation in what to do and how to do. By way of contrast, collectivist societies prioritize their collective decisions to those of individuals’ because of a tightly-knit framework, and the concept of ‘self’ is perceived with respect to other members of the group. As a result, ‘we’ plays an essential role and relations count more than practices. In such societies, people usually give credence to others’ ideas and thoughts, and most often

change their preferences in favor of others (Hofstede & Bond, 1984).

Masculinity/Femininity: This dichotomy refers to the individuals' preferences for cultural values with respect to their masculine or feminine attitudes. The masculine society represents a preference for achievement, heroism, assertiveness, and material rewards for success. Such societies give credence to the men, and the important political and social positions are assigned to men. On the other hand, femininity illustrates values of modesty, courtesy, cooperation, and caring for the weak and quality of life, trying to be more consensus-oriented and expressive (Hofstede, 2001).

Long Term Orientation/Short Term Orientation: Long term relates to rewarding responsibility with an intention in mind, and such societies are more concerned about the future. In contrast, societies with short-term orientations value their own present endeavors while dealing with the challenges of the future (Hofstede, 2001).

Indulgence/Restraint: This distinction refers to the amount of indulgence and restraint of societies. Indulgent societies characterize a relatively free gratification of basic and natural human drives related to enjoying life and having fun, while restraint societies have a tendency to work, control, and suppress gratification of needs, and regulate it by strict social norms. Minkov (2009) asserted that indulgent societies are more optimistic and sanguine, while restraint societies are pessimistic and have no penchant making friends.

As was observed, Hofstede (1991, 2001), laying the foundation for the CM, has tried to manifest different cultural features in diverse societies. In addition to this comprehensive CM, other researchers have introduced other CMs. Hall (1976), for instance, made a demarcation between high context cultures and low context cultures, in which high context cultures are inclined to pay attention to collectivist activities, do not express their intention explicitly, and their messages are usually ambiguous because the interrelation between individuals depends on individuals and the context. They value interpersonal relations and reciprocal understanding. In low context cultures, however, people's communication and relations are crystal clear and explicit. Hall categorized people in Asia, Africa, Latin

America, and the Middle East as high context cultures, but the German, Swedish, Scandinavian, and North Americans are categorized as low context cultures (Nam, 2015). Furthermore, regarding the significant role of time in cultures, Hall (1983) classified cultures as polychronic and monochronic. He elucidated that countries with a low context culture pay a lot of attention to time and are monochronic in which planning and individuals' activities are based on time and calendar, and different activities are not done simultaneously. In such cultures, people's delays in their appointments are important and they have plans for their future. In contrast, people with high context cultures are polychronic who can perform different activities concomitantly, pay more attention to the present activities, and do not pay much attention to their own planning, and they pine that time management is under their own control, so they do not believe in a waste of time and show up late for their appointments. They do not get exasperated if they are distracted or disturbed, and they can easily accommodate and change their plans. Moreover, these people prioritize past events, traditions, and customs, so it can be said that they are not futuristic (Pishghadam, Ebrahimi, & Tabatabaeian, 2019).

Another distinction for CMs has been made between 'coconut' and 'peach' cultures with regard to how individuals treat and interact with each other (Levin, as cited in Meyer, 2014, pp. 103-104). In coconut cultures such as Russia and Germany, individuals protect their friendship, do not allow others to be intimate with them, and are initially closed off from those they do not have friendships with; therefore, these people manifest different social conducts in public and private contexts and rarely do they make acquaintances with strangers since they preserve their own privacy, and it requires time to behave friendly with unfamiliar individuals. But, over time, as coconuts get to know you, they become gradually warmer and friendlier, and once the friendship is built up, they have the penchant to continue a long intimate friendship. On the contrary, in peach cultures such as the USA and Brazil, people tend to be friendly 'soft' just like the surface of the peach. They have no problem with strangers, smile frequently, interact with others cheerfully, and share information with them. These individuals are resilient, behave

amicably, and are sociable, but after a little friendly interaction with a peach, you may suddenly get to the hard shell of the pit where the peach protects his or her real self and the relationship suddenly stops (Meyer, 2014).

According to Fukuyama's (1995) classification of CMs, societies are divided into low- and high-trust cultures. He stipulated that in high-trust societies, such as Japan and Germany individuals trust each other, and such a high level of trust directly boils down into their high investment, prosperous, and sustainable economic growth. It is argued that high-trust societies take advantage of their lower transaction costs in building large private business organizations. Conversely, in low-trust and familistic cultures, the exemplars of which include China, Italy, France, and Korea, the degree of trust is low, cultural values are often neglected, individuals do not trust each other confidently, and the primary focus of loyalty in these societies is directed to the family, rather than to organizations outside it.

By comparing different cultural models and social patterns in different countries, we can discern their similarities and differences, some of the most outstanding of which have already been discussed above. Pedantic scrutiny of various dimensions of CMs in different nations deepens our understanding and perspicuously depicts the distinctive features of collective conducts in family, school, work, politics, and public (Hofstede, 1991). In other words, the association between values and behaviors, and the impact of cultures on the social values are picturesquely illustrated in the CMs and their dimensions. Therefore, in order to analyze and interpret the cultural and social problems of societies, we can refer to their cultural values and their dimensions (Pishghadam & Ebrahimi, in press). To deeply examine the similarities, differences, and their impacts on the cultuling analysis of a society, it is of utmost prominence to explain the linguistic and cultural features; hence, in the following section we elaborate on Hymes' (1967) SPEAKING Model as an influential model which has shed light on the analysis and description of cultulings.

5.1. Dell Hymes' (1967) SPEAKING Model

The investigation of cultural differences with respect to the contextual language use has gained considerable momentum in sociological

and sociolinguistic studies. The ethnography of communication (EOC), originally called the ethnography of speaking, is predicated on the premise that language and social interaction are inseparable, seeking to explore the cultural peculiarities of communication within a wider context of social and cultural practices and beliefs of a particular culture or speech community. Hymes (1971), dwelling on the inseparability of language and culture, persuasively argued that communication, language, and social interaction are inextricably bound to cultural patterns, encompassing analytical and philosophical assumptions of values, ideologies, thoughts, and wisdom. Consolidated by the assumptions of EOC, Hymes (1971) conceptualized that a speaker's *communicative competence* encompasses four types of knowledge which can take account of their ability to assess whether and to what extent an utterance is a) grammatically possible, b) cognitively feasible, c) socially and culturally appropriate, and d) actually performed.

Communicative competence, exploring language not just as a formal system of grammar but as something culturally grounded in the contexts of social life, pertains to the fact that individuals should realize how socially and culturally the discourse is appropriate within a specific context. Such a realization determines the novelty and contingent occurrence of the discursual interaction, leading to more social and cultural interactions. Communicative competence also deals with how individuals need to identify the setting, participants, end, instruments, key, and speech sequence within a particular context. These eight influential and systematic components were encapsulated by Hymes utilizing the mnemonic device SPEAKING. "Such a model enables the researchers to explore different discourses and analyze the effective factors in the interaction among individuals" (Pishghadam et al., 2015, p. 51). Below you can see a succinct description for these components.

(S) *Setting or Scene*: Hymes (2003) considered setting as 'time' and 'place' of a speech event. This component explores two aspects of context: the physical setting in which it takes place, and the scene. Analyzing the setting and scenic qualities of the practice helps ground the analyses in a specific context. Saville-Troike

(2003) believed that setting refers not only to the physical context, but also to time, days, seasons, and whatever is related to the communication act. Hymes considered setting as the psychological setting, and cultural definition of the setting as a certain type of scene, which may be applied here, as when and whether the speech event is appropriate for the context. "A frequent type of rule is one in which a form of speech act is dependent on an appropriate scene; of equal importance is the use of speech acts or the choice of code to define scenes as appropriate." (Hymes, 1967, p. 21). In general, setting includes time, physical context, and act sequence, and the scene pertains to the appropriacy of content and place which can be further subdivided into public/formal and private/informal (Pishghadam & Firoozian Pour Esfahani, 2017).

(P) *Participants*: The identity of the participants in speech events can be evaluated based on their age, gender, social status, and interpersonal relations (Farah, 1998). Based on these features, the relationship of the participants of a speech event can have four categories, including equal and formal (two university professors), equal and intimate (two friends), unequal and formal (head of the department and the faculty member), as well as unequal and intimate (Pishghadam, Firoozian Pour Esfahani, et al., in press).

(E) *End*: In addition to the participants' goals and purposes in a conversation, each speech event has some cultural ends which can be manifest or latent. These ends are dynamic and can change in different contexts (Fasold, 1990).

(A) *Act sequence*: The act sequence gives us information about the sequence and order of interaction which includes both content and form (Sarfo, 2011), and drawing on the act sequence maxim, the participants of a speech event pave the way for the communication act during which act seems to play an important role in the sequence (Pishghadam & Firoozian Pour Esfahani, et al., in press).

(K) *Key*: This component is introduced to distinguish the tone, manner, or spirit in which an act is done. Key can be depressing, serious, meticulous, kind, friendly, mockery, perfunctory, satirical, amicable, threatening, animositous, violent, etc. Hymes (1967) pinpointed that the communicative significance of key is

underscored by the view that, where the two are in conflict, the manner of an act overrides the content to specify its true significance. The signaling of key may sometimes be a part of the message-form itself, but maybe nonverbal such as a wink, gesture, attire, as well as musical accompaniment, or linguistic features such as aspiration which can make the intention of the communicative act explicit (Wardhaugh, 2010). Pishghadam and Noruz Kermanshahi (2016) highlighted that key is dynamic and can change as other components of the speech event change.

(I) *Instrumentalities*: Instrumentalities of speech events refer to the channel and code. Those of channel include medium of transmission which can be oral, written, telegraphic, semaphore or other medium of transmission. By choice of code is understood a choice at the level of distinct languages.

(N) *Norms of interaction and interpretation*: Norms of interaction pertain to the normative character that attaches to all rules for choice among components, but specific behaviors and proprieties that may accompany acts of speech, implicating the social structure.

(G) *Genres*: Genres are the categories or types of speech act and speech event, encompassing conversation, curse, blessing, prayer, lecture, imprecation, sales pitch, and the rest. (Hymes, 1967).

All in all, these factors permit formal treatment of many of the functions served in acts of speech. The conventional means of many such functions can indeed be analyzed as relations among components. With respect to these components, we can identify participants' goals, needs, as well as levels of satisfaction, and how language is used in the context (Hymes, 1972). As was observed in Hymes' CM, the emphasis has been placed only on the socio-cultural information in the speech interaction, and the psychological dimensions of interaction are overlooked. Pishghadam and Ebrahimi (in press) righteously conceptualize *emoling* (emotion + language), elucidating that the mere socio-cultural knowledge and information in interactions is not sufficient to have a thoroughgoing analysis and interpretation of cultulings due to the fact that cultulings and language expressions can vary depending on so many factors that individuals experience

including sense, amount of frequency, and kind of emotion. Consequently, the roles of emotions, senses, and frequency of sensing the language expressions cannot be neglected. In fact, emotions and senses can unquestionably and directly impact the individuals' cognition, understanding, thoughts, and interaction (Pishghadam, Ebrahimi, et al., in press).

Pishghadam, Ebrahimi, et al. (in press), reconceptualizing Hymes' SPEAKING model by adding *Emotions*, posit E-SPEAKING model. They cogently contend that lexicons, language expressions, and all components of Hymes' model are indubitably influenced by emotions which per se affect the participants' intentions, end, key, and orientations. In other words, the emotions hidden behind words and expressions can affect all components of Hymes' model including setting, participants, end, act sequence, key, instrumentalities, norms of interaction, and gender, so the participants' emotions can change their attitudes and positions in the communication act, and these emotions can determine and control the way participants interact. Thus, we believe that the amalgamation of the Hymes' SPEAKING model, its revised model, that is, E-SPEAKING, and the Emotioncy Model can lucidly and comprehensively pave the way to analyze and interpret the cultulings. In the next section, we will elaborate on the emotioncy model.

5.2. Pishghadam's (2015) Emotioncy Model

Inspired by Greenspan and Shunker's (2004) Developmental, Individual-differences,

Relationship-based (DIR) model, consisting of three components of the development of emotions in children, individual differences in children's way of experiencing the world, and relationships of children with their mother or caregiver, Pishghadam (2015) conceptualized the emotioncy model which puts premium on emotional, social, and discursive interactions. Pishghadam and Mirzaee (2008) pointed out that differences in sensory emotions not only could lead to different achievements but also make individuals more enthusiastic to take part in interactions, culminating in a higher level of learning which lasts longer. Pishghadam, Adamson, and Shayesteh (2013) also emphasized that learners' emotional and sensory experiences facilitate language learning. They accentuated that, individuals maintain varying degrees of emotions which are primarily instilled by senses, technically called emotioncy (which is a kind of sensbination (sense + combination)), towards various items of a language depending on whether they have heard, seen, smelled, touched, experienced, or done research on that item. Indeed, emotioncy claims that "individuals can construct their idiosyncratic understanding of the world through their senses" (Pishghadam, Jajarmi, & Shayesteh, 2016, p. 14). In order to have a thorough understanding of the role of emotioncy, Pishghadam (2015) proposed a hierarchical model for different levels of emotioncy ranging from null, auditory, visual, kinesthetic, inner, to arch emotioncies". Table 1 illustrates the different levels of emotioncy.

Table 1
Emotioncy Types

Experience	Kind
When an individual has not heard about, seen, or experienced an object or a concept.	Null emotioncy
When an individual has merely heard about a word/concept.	Auditory emotioncy
When an individual has both heard about and seen the item.	Visual emotioncy
When an individual has heard about, seen, and touched the real object.	Kinesthetic emotioncy
When an individual has directly experienced the word/concept.	Inner emotioncy
When an individual has deeply done research to get additional information.	Arch emotioncy

Note. This table is adapted from Pishghadam, Jajarmi, et al. (2016, p. 14)

As can be seen, this hierarchical categorization encompasses six levels labeled with different kinds and varying frequencies of emotioncy, starting from Null emotioncy and culminating in the most comprehensive level, which is, Arch. In the Null stage, an individual has not heard about, seen, or experienced an object or a concept. In the Auditory emotioncy stage, an individual has only heard about a word or concept. When it comes to the Visual emotioncy level, individuals have the experience of hearing and seeing the item. The fourth stage deals with Kinesthetic emotioncy where individuals have heard about, seen, and

touched the real object. The next stage, Inner emotioncy, happens when individuals have directly experienced the word or concept. Ultimately, Arch emotioncy, during which individuals are fully involved in the process of learning, takes place when they have deeply done research to get additional information.

Moreover, Pishghadam (2016), regarding three components of sense, emotion (quality), and frequency (quantity), classifies these six levels of emotioncy into five qualitative and 5 quantitative levels depicted in Figure 2.




Figure 2

A Metric for Measuring Emotioncy (Adapted from “Emotioncy, Extraversion, and Anxiety in Willingness to Communicate in English”, by R. Pishghadam (2016, May). Paper presented at the 5th International Conference on Language, Education and Innovation. London, England.)

We can measure the emotioncy toward something as follows. The quantitative measurement of exposure has five levels ranging from a little to a lot. Based on the individuals’ experience in doing something, the frequency of 1 (the lowest frequency) to 5 (the highest frequency) will be assigned. In the five qualitative phases of emotioncy, all six levels of emotioncy can be measured based on the very negative emotion (1), negative emotion (2), neutral emotion (3), positive emotion (4), and very positive emotion (5).

As can be seen in Figure 3, the levels of emotioncy include *Avolvement*, *Exvolvement*, and *Involvement*. It is vividly observed that Null

emotioncy (0) refers to *Avolvement*, Auditory (1), Visual (2), and Kinesthetic emotioncies deal with *Exvolvement*, and Inner (4) and Arch emotioncies (5) pertain to *Involvement* (Pishghadam, 2015). The extended model of emotioncy was conceptualized by Pishghadam et al. (2019) who added *Mastery* to the emotioncy model and included *Metavolvement* to explicate that an individual who reaches this climax has thoroughly mastered the materials and is able to produce and teach those materials to others. Needless to say that *metavolvement* entails the maximum level of emotioncy that an individual has experienced with all of his or her senses and emotions.




Figure 3

Emotioncy Levels (Adapted from "A novel approach to psychology of language education" by Pishghadam, Ebrahimi, & Tabatabaeian (2019, p. 219))

It is also hypothesized that the more emotioncy involvement through our senses and emotions, the more intelligible the word or concept is for individuals, and individuals will have a deeper understanding, which per se leads to the maximum utility of the word and ease of retrieval (Pishghadam et al., 2018). Moreover, Pishghadam (2016) articulated that there is a direct relationship between Willingness to Communicate (WTC) and levels of emotioncy. In other words, it can be noted that the higher the level of emotioncy, the more willing individuals are to communicate because individuals show more willingness in the involvement than evolution phases of emotioncy which leads to more learning as well.

As explicated, senses, emotions, and the frequency of encountering of something

indicate individuals' experiences, thoughts, and mindsets. That is, the higher the level of emotioncy, the more exact the language expressions and cultulings, confirming that individuals have a higher level of understanding of the concepts. Consequently, the thoroughgoing analysis of emotioncy and language e expressions can determine and specify why a cultuling gains momentum or fades away.

6. The Suggested Model for Cultuling Analysis (CA)

With respect to the outstanding contributions of different factors in the analysis of cultulings, we encapsulate the determining factors as illustrated in Figure 4. It is axiomatic that in order to discover cultulings in a language we need to take all these factors into account.




Figure 4

The Factors Underlying the Cultuling Analysis

As clearly delineated, the environmental demands such as the geographical location of a country, amount of wealth, national resources, economy, etc. can play a decisive role in the acculturation process and cultuling analysis of a society, and we should admit that these cultural behaviors can be affected by the individuals' cultural environment (Pishghadam & Ebrahimi, in press). In other words, the environment in which the individuals of a society live is a determining origin of cultuling differences and a focal element in the cultuling construction and interpretation which per se determines the amount of emotioncy, cultural, and linguistic differences regarding words and expressions.

Succinctly speaking, climatic and weather conditions of a society contribute to a change in the individuals' moods and habits, which, in turn, affect their cultural patterns and behaviors. For instance, living in a desert and tropical climates necessitates some requirements to survive, so people should behave accordingly and the amount of sensory and emotional involvement and the frequency of encountering objects and phenomena in such places are different from those of a person living in a cold region, which could lead to the different habitual construction. With respect to the amount of exposure to something, they either do it frequently or avoid doing it, so the vocabulary repertoire of these individuals are different, and they may have positive or negative feelings toward these lexicons. For

example, those people, living in a desert, may just have the auditory or visual (pictures, films, etc.) experience of the word 'snow', and because they do not have the inner feeling and experience of 'snowing' in their city, their emotions and emotioncy differ from those societies in which people consider 'snowing' a natural phenomenon. As a result, depending on the sensory and emotional involvement, different cultulings emerge.

In another example, if an infection is spread in an area where certain mosquitoes are reproduced, it can cause fear in people in that area and become unconsciously collective, so they eat certain foods to protect themselves against the disease. If that mosquito bites people, they will behave differently, which is defined as cultural differences, and in the confirmation of Sapir-Whorf's theory, cultural differences will cause linguistic and communicative differences.

Based on the aforementioned conceptualizations, taking into account the proposed models and the set of underlying factors, we can analyze and interpret cultulings with a systematic and holistic view, so we suggest the following model as the comprehensive model of CLA. Evidently, the consideration of factors such as senses and emotions as psychosocial factors completes the sociological and cultural patterns which concomitantly leads to cultuling analysis in a systematic and holistic way. Thus, referring to the importance of cultural models, the

SPEAKING model, as well as the emotioncy model in the CLA and their meticulous scrutiny and interpretation in the linguistic community,

the following comprehensive model, as depicted in Figure 5, is suggested as a robust framework.




Figure 5

The Conceptual Model of the Cultuling Analysis

Based on this model, we stipulate that in order to analyze cultulings, we need to realize the underlying culture of a language community, and then to describe that language, we need to embark on the emotioncy model (exposure level, sensory involvement toward the generated phrases, and emotion types) and the SPEAKING model. Cultural patterns also explain language, all of which are inherently rooted in the environment and environmental factors that may lead to the formation of these particular habits, behaviors, and cultulings of a region. Therefore, considering all these factors will provide an accurate picture of the people of that society to punctiliously scrutinize and construe its cultulings.

6. Concluding Remarks

Granted that culture plays a crucial role in human development, identifying the healthy or unhealthy culture is of utmost importance in guiding individuals' behaviors. To determine appropriate or inappropriate behaviors, one first needs to discover the cultural memes, embedded in linguistic expressions. These linguistic elements can show the cultulings in a society, emanating from the memes. Thus, researchers need to employ some tools to

dissect language to reveal the cultulings. These tools are required to analyze language from social, emotional, and sensory perspectives. To this end, a new comprehensive model has been proposed to analyze cultulings.

The conceptual model of the CLA proposed in this study rests on the assumption that these cultulings should be both identified and justified in the context of a culture. To this end, the conceptual model analyzes language in communicative, emo-sensory, and cultural ways. Thus, it is suggested to use the SPEAKING and emotioncy models to identify cultulings and to use cultural models to explicate and justify the findings. Taken together, it is our hope that this new model of analysis can help researchers discover cultulings and provide the necessary information for policy makers and planners to improve the quality of life in a society.

References

- Agar, M. (1994). *Language shock. Understanding the culture of conversation*. New York, NY: William Morrow.

- Aunger, R. (2002). *The electric meme: A new theory about how we think*. New York: NY: Free Press.
- Axelrod, R. (1997). The dissemination of culture. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 41(2), 203-226.
- Blackmore, S. (1999). *The meme machine*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Blackmore, S. (2010). Memetics does provide a useful way of understanding cultural evolution. In F. J. Ayala & R. Arp (Eds.), *Contemporary debates in philosophy of biology* (pp. 255-272). New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Brodie, R. (2009). *Virus of the mind: The revolutionary new science of the meme and how it can help you*. London, England: Hay House, Inc.
- Chandler, P. C. (2013). *Meme world syndrome: A critical discourse analysis of the first world problems and third world success internet memes* (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). Florida, Orlando: University of Central Florida.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- D'Andrade, R., & Strauss, C. (1992). *Human motives and cultural models*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Dawkins, R. (1976). *The selfish gene*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Dawkins, R. (1982). *The extended phenotype*. Oxford, England: Freeman.
- Dawkins, R. (1989). *The selfish gene (new edition)*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Derakhshan, A. (2018). The critical analysis of cultural values in American English File textbook series. *Critical Studies in Texts and Programs in Human Sciences*, 18(8), 53-76.
- Diaz, A. R. (2013). *Developing critical lanaguaculture pedagogies in higher education*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Distin, K. (2005). *The selfish meme: A critical reassessment*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Fantini, A. (1997). Language: Its cultural and intercultural dimensions. In A. Fantini (Ed.), *New ways in teaching culture* (pp. 3-15). Alexandria, Egypt: TESOL.
- Farah, I. (1998). The ethnography of communication. In N. H. Hornberger & P. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Research methods in language and education* (pp.125-127). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Fasold, R. (1990). *The sociolinguistics of language: Introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Friedrich, P. (1989). Language, ideology, and political economy. *American Anthropologist*, 91(2), 295-312.
- Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust. The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Gill, T. G. (2013). Culture, complexity, and informing: How shared beliefs can enhance our search for fitness. *International Journal of an Emerging Transdiscipline*, 16, 71-98.
- Greenspan, S., & Shanker, S. (2004). *The first idea: How symbols, language and intelligence evolved from our primate ancestors to modern humans*. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press.
- Guiso, L., Sapienza, P., & Zingales, L. (2006). Does culture affect economic outcomes? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20(2), 23-48.
- Hall, E. (1976). *Beyond culture*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Hall, E. (1983). *The dance of life: The other dimensions of time*. New York, NY: Anchor Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1975). *Learning how to mean: Explorations in the development of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to systemic functional grammar* (2nd ed.). London, England: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2003). *On language and linguistics*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Henslin, J. M., Possamai, A. M., Possamai-Inesedy, A. L., Marjoribanks, T., & Elder, K. (2015). *Sociology: A down to earth approach*. Melbourne, Australia: Pearson Higher Education.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Cultures consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1984). Hofstede's culture dimensions. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 15, 417-433.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Hymes, D. (1967). Models of interaction of language and social setting. *Journal of Social Issues*, 33(2), 8-28.
- Hymes, D. H. (1971). Competence and performance in linguistic theory. In R. Huxley & E. Ingram (Eds.), *Language acquisition: Models and methods* (pp. 3-28). London, England: Academic Press.
- Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 35-71). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Hymes, D. (2003). The interaction of language and social life. In C. B. Paulston & R. G. Tucker (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: The essential readings* (pp. 30-47). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Ilagan, S. V. (2009). *Exploring the impact of culture on the formation of consumer trust in internet shopping*. Wyoming, Laramie, USA: University of Wyoming Press.
- Lynch, A. (1996). *Thought contagion: How belief spreads through society*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Maltseva, K. (2017). Cultural models and belief systems: Detection and quantitative assessment of the threshold of shared collective knowledge. *NaUKMA Research Papers*, 196, 38-45.
- Markus, H. R., & Hamedani, M. G. (2007). Sociocultural psychology: The dynamic interdependence among self-systems and social systems. In S. Kitayama & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (pp. 3-39). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Meyer, E. (2014). *The culture map: Breaking through the invisible boundaries of global business*. New York, NY: Public Affairs.
- Minkov, M. (2009). Predictors of differences in subjective well-being across 97 nations. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 43(2), 152-179.
- Minkov, M., & Hofstede, G. (2013). *Cross-cultural analysis: The science and art of comparing the world's modern societies and their cultures*. London, England: Sage Publications.
- Nam, K. A. (2015). High-context and low-context communication. In J. M. Bennett (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of intercultural competence* (pp. 377-381). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pishghadam, R. (2013). Introducing cultuling as a dynamic tool in culturology of language. *Language and Translation Studies*, 45, 47-62.
- Pishghadam, R. (2015, October). *Emotioncy in language education: From exvolvement to involvement*. Paper presented at the 2nd Conference of Interdisciplinary Approaches to Language Teaching, Literature, and Translation Studies. Mashhad, Iran.
- Pishghadam, R. (2016, May). *Emotioncy, extraversion, and anxiety in willingness to communicate in English*. Paper presented at the 5th International Conference on Language, Education and Innovation. London, England.
- Pishghadam, R. (2020). *101 educational concepts* [101 mafhoom-e amoozeshi]. North Carolina, USA: Lulu Press.
- Pishghadam, R., Adamson, B., & Shayesteh, S. (2013). Emotion-based language instruction (EBLI) as a new perspective in bilingual education. *Multilingual Education*, 3(1), 1-16.
- Pishghadam, R., & Attaran, A. (2014). A sociological comparison of speech act of swearing: A case study of Persian and English languages. *Language and Translation Studies*, 46(4), 25-50.
- Pishghadam, R., & Attaran, A. (2016). Discourse analysis of "Qesmat" in Iranian culture and language. *Culture-Communication Studies*, 17(35), 129-149.
- Pishghadam, R., & Ebrahimi, S. (in press). *Introducing cultuling: A study into Iranians' cultural memes*. Iran, Mashhad: Ferdowsi University of Mashhad Publications.
- Pishghadam, R., Ebrahimi, S., & Derakhshan, A. (in press). Introducing "Emoling" as the missing link in ethnography of communication: A complement to Hymes' SPEAKING Model. *Language Related Research*.

- Pishghadam, R., Ebrahimi, S., Naji Meidani, E., & Derakhshan, A. (in press). An introduction to 'cultuling analysis' (CLA) in light of variational pragmatics: A step toward euculturing. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics (RALs)*.
- Pishghadam, R., Ebrahimi, S., & Tabatabaeian, M. S. (2019). *A novel approach to psychology of language education*. Iran, Mashhad: Ferdowsi University of Mashhad Publications.
- Pishghadam, R., & Firoozian Pour Esfahani, A. (2017). A sociolinguistic analysis of the discourse functions of "I don't know" in Persian language: Hymes' SPEAKING model. *Culture-Communication Studies*, 37(18), 7-35.
- Pishghadam, R., Firoozian Pour Esfahani, A., & Firoozian Pour Esfahani, A. (in press). Introducing cherophobia cultuling: A close look into the discursive functions of death-oriented terms in Persian. *Culture-Communication Studies*.
- Pishghadam, R., Firoozian Pour Esfahani, A., & Tabatabaee Farani, S. (2018). Examining the concept of nāz and its related vocabulary items in Persian language in light of emotioncy. *Culture-Communication Studies*, 18(39), 67-96.
- Pishghadam, R., Firoozian Pour Esfahani, A., & Vahidnia, F. (2015). A sociological look into speech act of cursing: A comparison of Persian and English languages. *Language and Translation Studies*, 47(2), 45-72.
- Pishghadam, R., Jajarmi, H., & Shayesteh, S. (2016). Conceptualizing sensory relativism in light of emotioncy: A movement beyond linguistic relativism?. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 4(2), 11-21.
- Pishghadam, R., & Mirzaee, A. (2008). English language teaching in postmodern era. *Journal of Teaching English Language and Literature Society of Iran*, 2(7), 89-109.
- Pishghadam, R., & Noruz Kermanshahi, P. (2016). Relationship between language, religion, and culture: Research and analysis of the functions of the Hajji and related terms in Persian language. *Journal of Language Research*, 8(20), 27-51.
- Pishghadam, R., & Vahidnia, F. (2016). Uses of praying in Persian and English movies in the light of Hymes' model. *Language Related Research*, 6(7), 53-72.
- Quinn, N., & Holland, D. (1987). Culture and cognition. In D. Holland & N. Quinn (Eds.), *Cultural models in language and thought* (pp. 3-42). London, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Risager, K. (2006). *Language and culture. Global flows and local complexity*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Risager, K. (2011). The cultural dimensions of language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 44(4), 485-499.
- Sarfo, E. (2011). Variations in ways of refusing requests in English among members of a college community in Ghana. *African Nebula*, 3, 1-13.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2003). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction*. London, England: Blackwell.
- Taga, H.A. (1999). *Sociology: An introduction*. Lahore, Pakistan: Ismail Brothers Publishers.
- Taecharungroj, V., & Pitchganut, N. (2014, August). *The effect of humor on virality: The study of Internet memes on social media*. Paper presented at the 7th International Forum on Public Relations and Advertising Media Impacts on Culture and Social Communication. Bangkok.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Presidents and Fellows of Harvard College.
- Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford, England: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, thought and reality: Selected writings*. London, England: Chapman & Hall.
- Zerubavel, E. (1999). *Social mindscapes: An invitation to cognitive sociology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.