The International Journal of Social Sciences World
TIJOSSW is Available Online at:
https://www.growingscholar.org/journal/index.php/TIJOSSW
Vol. 5 No. 2, July-December 2023, pages: 297~315
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10402183
ISSN **2690-5167**
Growingscholar Publisher

Comparative Historical Dialects of Sasak Language: Toward Codified Standardized-Based Local Language Instruction

Sudirman Wilian[1], Khairul Paridi[2], I Nyoman Sudika[3]

Article history:
Received: Sept. 25, 2023; Accepted: November 21. 2023; Displayed Online: December 15, 2023; Published: December 30, 2023

Keywords

Sasak dialect;
local language;
codification;
standardization;
language instruction;

Abstract

Language variations have always opened the debate over which variety or dialect to be chosen as codified standardized norms within a vernacular or indigenous speech community. Sasak is one of those ethnic group languages that is now striving to search for its standardization. This article investigates the possibility of picking up one of the five varieties of Sasak that is most likely to be adopted as the norm code of its standardized-based-written means of the local language instruction for both elementary and junior high school students in Mataram and possibly across the island of Lombok, Indonesia. In addition to the contrastive analysis techniques used in describing the syntactic-linguistic discrepancies, this research also employed survey question air, documents, and interviews to elicit primary data on norm of code selection. Findings reveals that the majority of the respondents (92%) agreed toward the codification and standardization of Sasak and recommended that either the 'meno-mene /i' 'this-that' (Pejanggik) dialect or the 'ngeno – ngeno' (Selaparang) dialect be used as standardized norm written code for local content materials development and language instruction. However, from the focused group discussion, based on the contrastive and diachronic historical linguistic analysis of some morpho-syntactical structure of the three well-known dialects it was suggested that the 'ngeno-ngene' or the Selaparang dialect is the most probable, logical and acceptable dialect to be used. One of the reasons is that diacronically this dialect is supposedly the origin of the other four due to the fact that much of the morphosyntactical features of those four other dialects were transformed from Selaparang variety.

1. Introduction

[1] *Universitas Mataram, Indonesia; Corresponding author Email: sudirman_wilian@unram.ac.id*
[2] *Universitas Mataram, Indonesia; Email: khairul_paridi@unram.ac.id*
[3] *Universitas Mataram, Indonesia; Email: dika_n62@yahoo.com*

As a consequence of a domination of a more powerful language over the others within a multilingual country or community, concern on the loss of the native's people languages becomes a major issue in sociolinguistic studies. Hence, the agenda of using the student's first language at school either as means of classroom instruction as well as a way of the concerned language preservation has long become prevalent in educational research and language standardization in large parts of the globe following the era of decolonization. Wardhaugh (2000) maintains that one of the major concerns of language standardization is its practical in the teaching of the language at school aside from its being as model, unifier of the people, and ethnic identity. Meanwhile it has also been provoked that the use of students' mother tongue in educational domain is claimed the best way of teaching pupils (Unesco, 1958; Rubin, 1973; Kafata, 2016; Akello & M. C. Greetje Timmerman, 2017). Teaching children through their own ancestral language is viewed as emancipatory and empowering to promote education and other forms of civic communication (Costa, James, Haley De Korney, and Pia Lane in Lane, et. all (eds), 2014).

Currently, however, the use of native language even in its own right of home and neighborhood domains of language use worldwide is shockingly discouraging. Of the 718 languages throughout Indonesia mapped up to 2019, only 12.95% (93 languages) have obtained their language vitality status detected using the evaluative factors of language vitality maintained by UNESCO (Harimansyah, 2017; RMT Lauder, 2019 as cited in Lauder, et.al., 2021). Based on the number of languages known to have become extinct in the recent past, Endangered Language Catalogue (EL Cat) reported that language death progresses at the rate of about one language in three months (UH Mānoa linguists, 2012). One of the main causes that could be detected is because of the absence of intergenerational language transfer from parents to children (Fishman, 1972; Crystal, 2014). Looking at this critical situation, continuous effort should be made not only by linguists but also by concerned communities to assist to prevent language loss. Hence, as native users of Sasak we feel obliged to find some portion of ways to help raise the prestige of the indigenous language from the perspective of language standardization and education even though this language has been reported as one of the twenty-one languages whose vitality is assessed safe in Indonesia (Harimansyah, 2019 as cited in Lauder et.al., 2021).

During the past twenty-five years, Sasak in fact has been brought into the school curriculum of the elementary and secondary education under the local government policy. In order for the language to be understood and spoken by students, especially in the capital city of Mataram, the Provincial Department of Education and Culture legally mandated the teaching of Sasak as local content subject for elementary and secondary schools, the aim of which is to introduce students the importance of local language use in their daily interaction in order to cultivate and enhance the youth's cultural and social identity awareness. Sasak language was then one of the subject matters students have to learn beginning from grade 2 of elementary schools to grade 9 Junior High. School teachers were required to write text books in Sasak, some being published in a compilation of its syntax, literature, culture, tradition materials, employing either the '*ngeno-ngene*', the '*meno-mene*' or even the '*meriak-meriku*' variants (see Azhar, 1996; Badar, 2007; Ratmaja, 2011).

Subsequently, however, considerable complains came up from students and parents on the variability of the language used in the text books. Some of the teachers in fact realized this. There were no standardized, codified linguistic norms ever introduced as guidance. This is clearly shown particularly in some of the different morph syntactical types of passages printed in the mainstream text books used by the schools that implement the program. The use of certain linguistic forms or lexical arrangements adopted in the reading materials, in some degrees, have contributed to the difficulties in learning and comprehending the language as a result of the language variations. This paper is aimed to disclose these linguistic variation disparities in Sasak and find out which of the three

varieties that would be most likely to be codified and standardized as the norm code that will be used primarily in the local content text books for both elementary and secondary education level in Lombok.

2. Literature Review

A brief overview of Sasak language

Sasak is by far one of the most top thirteen recognized indigenous languages in Indonesia in terms of number of speakers along with Javanese, Sundanese, Madurese, Minangkabau, Balinese, Batak, Aceh, Bugis, Makassar, Melayu, Rejang, and Lampung (Kompas, June 17, 2015). It is now spoken as mother tongue by some 4 million people in and outside the five administrative regencies of Lombok, the mainland of the native speakers. As it is for most other languages, Sasak is a multidialectal language that embeds several speech varieties. Earlier researchers in Sasak have identified five common variations of the language namely: *ngeno-ngene, meno-mene/i, ngeto-ngete, meriaq-meriku, and kuto-kute* (Thoir, 1978; Syahdan, 1996). They are named based on the synonymous 'like that-like this' term (supposedly from Javanese '*ngono-ngene'*) as used in each dialect region. By definition, the term dialect refers to "the speech characteristic of a region (regional dialect) or of a group of people defined by social or occupational characteristics rather than by region alone (social dialect)" (Mesthrie, 2000: 45). According to Wardhaugh, at al (2015:38) a dialect is a subordinate variety of a language. For most occurrences common people from different dialect groups who meet with each other could interact using their own respective variants without trouble (mutually intelligible language), except the '*kuto-kute'* or Bayan dialect of the northerner Lombok, due to mostly lexical and morpho-syntactical distinction. Commonly, however, Sasak speakers living in Mataram would employ either *'meno-mene/i'* or *'ngeno-ngene'* variety, the two commonly shared forms or code mutually intelligible among native speakers regardless of which region one is coming from.

As a matter of fact, Sasak has been studied quite extensively by a substantial number of researchers, university students and scholars, including that from the Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics of The University of Melbourne yielding two consecutive volumes of report 'Working Papers in Sasak' edited by Austin (1998, vol.1 and 2000, vol.2). The two volume reports chiefly covered some lengthy description on Sasak phonological, morpho-semantical, syntactical analysis, and a brief dialectal overview of the language, including that topic of the "preliminary analysis of the history of Sasak language levels". It is unfortunate that the main consultants and informants of the *Lombok and Sumbawa Research Project* were mostly from the native speakers of the '*meno-mene/i'* Pejanggik dialect, which has a great deal of discrepancies in the prosodic features and notably in the morpho-semantical and syntactical analysis from that of the '*ngeno-ngene'* (Selaparang) variety, the most parts of which will be elaborated and analyzed here.

Of all the researches that have intensively been studied on Sasak, up to the present, only few inquiries have engaged with dialectal comparative analysis. One of them is Jacq's (1998) questioning of the number of the 'traditional' subgrouping of Sasak dialects proposed by the previous researchers. However, since the data analysis was only limited to the phonological aspect of Sasak as used in Praya, Pujut, Selong, and Suralaga, leaving the evidences of Sasak morphological and syntactical comparative analysis, Jacq failed to reexamine the dialect mapping properly. He himself confessed that "the data available for studying Sasak variants, on phonological, morphological, or syntactical level, are not suitable for making any valid conclusions about dialect variance."

Other studies are that of Sirulhaq's (2012) two consecutive research reports on "Studies on Standardization of Sasak Language" (2009), and "Sasak dialect syntactic comparison: toward the formulation of local content language teaching materials in schools" (2010). Surprisingly, the first report only scrutinized the possible standardized Sasak teaching materials from the phonological and refined lexical view, claiming that 'Pujut Dialect', based on Mahsun's (2006) findings, would become the most possible and acceptable variety that could be adopted and standardized. Unfortunately, no further previous study was illustrated as to what degree the variety, in terms of lexical and grammatical variation (John Wells, 1982: Vol. 1), was to be accepted by the society. Using diachronic dialectology principles and lexicostatistic method, according to Mahsun, Sasak only has four dialects: Selaparang (e~e) dialect, Pujut (a~e) dialect, Bayan (a~a) dialect, and Aiq Bukaq (a~o) dialect, as realized in the example of ultima and penaltima pronunciation of the lexim '*mete'* /eye/ in Selaparang, '*mate'* in Pujut, '*mata'* in Bayan, and '*mato'* in Aiq Bukaq dialect. Unfortunately, depending only on the phonological and lexical analysis of the dialect based on Swadesh's formulation of 'lexicostatistics' method in Sasak still seems to be inadequate, for it is only an area of accentual variation not a dialectal one.

The groupings with shibboleth '*like that-like this*' phrase (Austin, 1998) by former researchers (such as Thoir, 1978) were not in fact given by chance, but judged also by phonological, morphological and syntactical evidences represented in each of the variety. Even though it was claimed (such as by Austin, 1998:3) that the syntactical analysis of the language was quite fragile due to lack of description on complex construction, especially in the pronominal clitic distribution of the language. Since then, however, the common belief of the Sasak people being grouped by the linguistic variations labelled *ngeno-ngene, meno-mene/i, meriak-meriku,* etc. and the historical as well as political dimension is acceptable as evidenced by the morphological and syntactical forms. Therefore, it becomes a commonly shared view acceptable among fellow scholars in Sasak linguistics (see Syahdan, 1996; Austin, 2005; Wilian, 2006, 2010; Asikin-Garmager, 2016; Hidayat, 2019; Hanafi, 2020; Archangeli, 2020). We can actually claim, and it is common for Sasak people, that someone's dialect can easily be recognized by the use of its prosodic, lexical, and morpho-syntactical features, not only from its segmental unit of the sounds as is shown in the ultima and final lexical pronunciation.

Language planning, codification, and standardization

Sociolinguists in language planning and policy have agreed that "a standard language has to be codified and normalized in order to fulfill the unifying function for its constituent speech community. This involves the selection of reference norms and the codification of grammar and dictionary forms" (Wolck in Gleich and Wolf, 1991:44). Kloss (1967, 1969) as quoted in Mesthrie at.al (2000) distinguished two basic types of language planning based on the distinction between language as an independent linguistic system and as a social institution, namely corpus planning and status planning. The former is concerned with the internal structure of language, and the later deals with "all the efforts undertaken to change the use and function of a language (or language variety) within a given society". As a social institution, status planning is commonly based on and adapted to government decisions for national or regional policy in language area.

Corpus planning or linguistic code is based on language policy intended for that own language as an object. Mesthrie (ibid) advocates that "typical activities of corpus planning include devising a writing system for a spoken language, initiating spelling reforms, coining new terms and publishing grammar books. A central aspect of corpus planning (and language planning *per se*) is **language standardization**, which can be understood as the creation and establishment of a uniform linguistic norm". Corpus planning also aims to give response to the change and evaluation of a language so that, as a means of communication, it could fit with the societies need as language users. Corpus change is

related to the whole components of language, which means that it covers changes in phonological, semantical, pronunciation, writing systems and others. Evaluation change of language is concerned with change of language function, from which a language can be evaluated in terms of its goodness, truth, and accuracy. While language goodness and accuracy can be seen from its usage in accordance with its function and situation in a broad sense, language truthfulness can be observed from its loyalty to the principles prevailing in that language. Therefore, evaluation planning must be made through two ways: code or corpus strip and language function strip. Both corpus planning and function planning need stages of implementation.

Codification is the process of selecting, developing, and lying down (prescribing) a model for standard language usage, which can be employed for public communication in a speech community (Richards & Schmidt, 2020:554) (Finegan, 2007:14). Mostly the reasons for language codification and standardization in many countries are national identity, decolonization, and independence of one state from the other (Gelagay, 2018), but in some ways it is also a potent way of doing or inventing language, or producing languages as bounded, discrete entities and as social institutions and subsequently increasing the social status of those who use them (Costa, James, Haley De Korne, Pia Lane, 2014). In the context of indigenous language it is more likely that language standardization is an effort of cultural wealth preservation and language modernization. However, rarely has been heard of one variety of an indigenous language within an independent multilingual country, such as Indonesia, was codified and standardized to facilitate its society for a more formal means of oral and written communication as could be used in school domain for the maintenance and the prestige of the language. Mesthrie (2000) acknowledged that "when a language is standardized, it is intentionally planned and intended to be protected and preserved as cultural and ideological human wealth." In the current situation of national as well as global linguistic 'colonization' over ethnic or indigenous languages, in which Indonesian and English languages are encroaching every individual home family code, the effort toward standardizing a vernacular language seems urgently worth doing. Young generation need to be introduced and trained to use their ancestor heritage culture and tradition through the use of language as a core value.

A standard language, according to Garvin (1964:522), has to fulfill three functions: the unifying function, the prestige function, and the frame-of reference function. All these functions seem to fit the aims of the search of Sasak standardization. As a unifying function it connects several dialect regions into a single standard language community which can be identified as a separate entity from other neighboring languages or varieties. The prestige function gives the standard language a superiority over nonstandard local varieties, and its possession lends a degree of social prestige to its speakers when compared to those that do not possess it. As a frame-of-reference the standard language is the tool to judge degrees of appropriateness (correctness) in social context.

Based on this concept, this study is intended to find out the answer toward the following three fundamental questions:

a. What are the opinions of the respondents toward the codification and standardization of Sasak as local content materials at elementary and secondary schools in Mataram?
b. What are some of the most distinctive features of the three main dialects employed by Sasak speakers in Mataram?
c. Which of the three existing dialects is the most probable, appropriate and acceptable type of code that could be used and transcribed, codified, and standardized as a common shared variety among members of school community implementing Sasak as local content teaching materials?

3. Research Method

To provide relevant data collection the researchers employed a mixed method approach where both qualitative and quantitative data gathering techniques were used, the instruments of which included a questionnaire survey, document analysis, reflective-introspective methods with recording and elicitation technique, as well as semi structured interview using focused group discussion technique.

Based on the norm of selection in language standardization process (Haugen, 1966), respondents and informants of this research comprised primary and secondary school teachers, who were actively teaching Sasak as local content. There were also university lecturers, school supervisors, students' parents, and common people speaking different regional dialects. This would represent a proportional number of speakers across dialect users, maximizing variation in the sample mechanism of purposeful sampling method as Creswell (2006:112) noted. In all there were 62 Sasak native respondents of diverse geographical origin having been living in Mataram for some fifteen to thirty-two years and speaking diverse Sasak dialects.

The questionnaire survey was intended to investigate the respondent attitude toward the standardization of Sasak, whether or not they agree with the standardization; to find out the respondents' dialect preferences in Mataram when communicating with other Sasak speakers from diverse regional dialect background; and to discover which of the Sasak varieties that would be most likely to be codified and standardized as a guide for designing and developing local content language instruction. Language data for corpus analysis were taken by elicitation of diverse recorded dialectal speech and interviews with different group of informants chosen from each dialect and sub dialect origin. Documents of Sasak text books as used in elementary and secondary schools in Mataram were also surveyed.

To analyse the discrepancies among dialects, the technique of diachronic dialectological comparison across the existing dialects were employed, so that changes in how the phonological, morphological, and syntactical elements among dialects occurred could be traced, and finally one original dialect could be predicted and identified (Mahsun, 2005). Following the questionnaire survey and the document analysis, focused group discussion was also carried out attended by lecturers and school teachers representing all the five distingtive dialects. The discussion was aimed at sharing ideas around the basic lexical items, syntactical and morph syntactical behavior of each of the verities. Finally the discussion was also meant for seeking agreement on which of the dialect is most likely to be employed as common shared standardized code in education setting in Mataram.

4. Findings and Discussion

On norm of selection

Survey on whether or not Sasak is important to be standardized and which dialect to be codified and standardized, 90% out of 62 respondents agreed with the proposed idea, 8% did not agree, and only 2% did not have idea about it. As to which dialect the respondents commonly used in Mataram when encountering and talking to a Sasak acquaintance who does not come from the same dialect region, 50% of them communicate using PjgD, 47% use Sl.D, and only 3% speak in Pjt.D (Table 1). This may imply that respondents have a positive attitude toward the codification and standardization of Sasak.

Table 01: Dialect used in Mataram among repondents of Sasak speakers from different groups of Dialect.

	Dialects	%	Total
1.	Pjg.D = Pejanggik (*Meno-Mene/i*)	50	31
2.	Sl.D = Selaparang (*Ngeno-Ngene*)	47	29
3.	Pjt.D = Pujut (*Meriak-Meriku*)	3	2
4.	Mixed	0	0
%		100	62

In everyday communication among Sasak speakers of Mataram community who come from different geographical area of origin in Lombok the two varieties are the most recognized means of interaction. Demographically, the number of Pjg.D speakers either in Mataram or across the island exeeds that of Sl.D and Pjt.D. Therefore, the use of Pjg.D is dominant among new acquaintances and in public speaking sphere on the radio, television, religious event, cultural and traditional wedding feast of Sasak. This may imply that the variety that is common and acceptable to be used as the norm means of instruction in the school setting in Mataram is that of the Pjg.D or *meno-mene/i* dialect. Sometimes, however, it happens that for those 'ears' which are not accustomed to the pronominal clitics and other morpho-syntactical phenomena existing in Pjg.D, which distinguishes it from Selaparang variety, could be inconvenient with it. Not for reasons of the fact that some lexical distinction often occurs between the twos but more on the morpho-syntactical barriers. The use of pronominal suffixes of a noun in Pjg.D, for example, may sound queer and thus unacceptable for the Selaparang 'ears', which may mean downgrading the interlocutor.

Therefore, toward the question of which dialect the respondents are to use when encountering Sasak acquaintance in Mataram regardless of his/her geographical origin, 53% respondents used Pjg.D, 26% spoke depending on the interlocutor's dialect, and 21% used their own home town (village) variety. Occasionally, however, speakers may switch from Pjg.D, commonly used in Mataram, to their home town variety if each party has been able to identify with each other. Very often too they remain employing their own distinct dialect if either party has no knowledge of the use of each other's variety.

Distinctive morph syntactical features over the three Sasak varieties

One of the linguistic elements that seem to be a serious problem in determining the standardization of dialect codes to be used in Sasak language grammar is the variation of morph-syntactic distribution of clitics in the three profound dialects of the Selaparang, Pejanggik, and Pujut. Clitics are lexical items that participate in particular sort of morphological process but are lexically listed as elements of the syntax (Sadock in Kroon, 2000). Although the difference in the syntactic pattern of clitics in Sasak does not significantly interfere with communication between speakers of the three varieties, pedagogically and linguistically speaking, it will weaken students' interest and enthusiastic of learning Sasak in general unless one of them were prescriptively to be determined.

The clitical forms of pronouns that exist in the last two dialects are correspondences of pronouns in the first as a result of language change. This is shown in the manner the lexical and pronominal clitics transformed into the current southern eastern and central (Pejanggik '*meno-mene/i'*), as well as the southern central Lombok (Pujut *'meriak-meriku'*) variety, which can be shown in various clause structure such as the followings: (a) = Selaparang, (b) = Pejanggik, and (c) = Pujut, subsequently abreviated Sl.D, Pjg.D, and Pjt.D. Basically the syntactic distribution of pronoun clitics in the three varieties can be traced through the transformation of the free pronoun forms as follows:

Table 02: Transformation of Pronominal Clitic Forms in Selaparang, Pejanggik and Pujut

Person	PRONOUN		CLITICS		
	Sing.	Plural	Sl.D	Pjg.D	Pjt.D
1	*aku*	*kami*	*-ku, -*	*-k*	*-k*
2	*kamu* *anta/e* *(side)*	*kamu pada* *anta/e pada* *side pada*	*-bi* *-mek* *-ida pada*	*-m* *-m* *-*	*-m* *-m* *-*
3	*ia/ie*	*ia pada*	*-na*	*nie*	*-n*
1+2 (inklusif interlokutor)		*ita*	*-ta*	*-t*	*-t*
1+3 (ekslusif interlokutor)		*kami*	*kami*	*-*	*-*

Distinction over Morph syntactic Basic Sentence Pattern

Data on the principal distinctive features of pronominal clitic and lexical-syntactic distribution is summarized in each of the following structural category: **modality** and **aspect**, **construction of negation, passive construction, cleft sentence**, and **relative clause structure**, in which **a = Sl.D, b = Pjg.D, and c = Pjt.D.**

Modality and Aspects

(1) *a. Tao **aku** piyak layangan*
Can 1sg make kite.
'**I** can make a kite.'
*b. Taong'**kaku** pinak layangan.*
*c. Taong**'k** pinak layangan* (***aku***).

Basically a statement in Sasak may begin either with modal/verbal before the subject or the reverse (SV+ (O)) as in most other languages. All the three examples in (1) are structurally the same with the same meaning. The initial position of modals and aspectual auxiliaries in a sentence preceding the argument (subject) is one of the unique features of Sasak as a verb initial language. The modal '*tao'* /can/ in (1) precedes the subject pronoun *'aku'* /I/, followed by the verb *'piyak'* /make/ and *'layangan'* /kite/. However, the pronoun *'aku'* in (1) a is enclitisized and attached to the modal */tao/* and nasalized with the linker *'ng' 'taong'kaku'* /can I/ in (1)b, and transforms into *'taong'k'* in (1)c, with the pronoun *'aku'* that could be restated at the end of the sentence. This rule applies in all modal and aspectual auxiliaries in all three dialects (see also Austin in Austin (Ed), 2000:2-24); Musgrave in Austin (Ed), 1998: 91-104); Kroon in Austin (ed.), 1998: 105-118); Ashriany, ET. al., 2019).

(2) a. *Kanggo **da/sida** milu (**ida/sida**)*.
May **2sg** come along **2sg** (intens.)
'**You** may come along.'
b. Kanggo**m** milu (**side)**.
c. Kanggo**m** milu (**side)**.

Note that while clitic *'da'* or pronoun *'side'* (elevated honorific terms of address for 'you') can be used in Sl.D following the aux, in the other two varieties the clitic *'-m'* is used instead, with *'side'* is restated at the end. This pronominal clitics '*-m'* is actually derived from *'-mek'* /you/ in Sl.D and used only for younger male interlocutor, e.g. '*Kanggo **mek** milu **ante**.'* /You can come along/.

Within a statement with SV(O) order containing modal, similar pronominal clitics transformation from Sl.D to Pg.D and Pj.D remains the same.

(3) a. *Aku **Meta** colok.*
1sg **looking for** (prog.) match.
'I am looking for a match.'
b. *Aku pe**te/boyak** colok.*
c. *Aku **pite/bojak** colok.*

However, in a statement that carries a progressive or present meaning there is no difference in the clause structure among the threes, except for the variation of lexical initial/mid sound as in (4) with no clitic after the verb. When a person asks, for example, '*Apa petan**da**?*' or *'Sida meta/peta apa?'*/What are **you** looking for?/ in Sl.D, or '*Ape boyak**m**/bojak**m**/'* in Pg.D and Pj.D, one can respond for example:

(4) a. *Aku **Meta** colok.*
1sg **looking for** (prog.) match.
'I am looking for a match.'
b. *Aku Pete**/boyak** colok.*
c. *Aku **pite/bojak** colok.*

Lexically, the lexeme *'meta' /*looking for/ changes its form from Sl.D to Pg.D and Pj.D. This shows how one dialect may vary morph-syntactically from one region to another as indicated by the verb *meta, pite, boyak/bojak* in (4) *iye, nie, lapar, lapah* in (5) below, and the pronominal clitic *'na'* and '*n'* in (6) occuring in the three dialects. However, this variation again, does not substantially interfere with communication among Sasak speakers of diverse dialect background. "Speakers of Sasak are aware of lexical, phonological, and syntactic structural differences in the language from one region to another" (Jacq in Austin 1998:73). Commonly, one can understand and predict where a speaker is from as soon as he/she knows the style, the prosody, and the lexical features of the variation an interlocutor is using.

In a clause with no verb, in which the predicate is expressed by an adjective or noun, there is no different in sentence structure among the three varieties as in (5) and (6)a, b, and c below, except for the pronoun form *'ia/ie'* and *'nie'* along with the final consonant change of the word *'lapar'* becoming *'lapah'*. The final sound change of 'r' in Sl.D word to 'h' in Pjg.D and Pjt.D is also one of the common lexical distinction among the three dialects ('*belajar' – 'belajah/berajah'* /study/, *'luar'-'luah'* /outside/, *'liar'-'liah'* /wild/, '*ular'-'ulah'* /snake/, etc.

(5) a. ***Ia** lapar.*
3sg thirsty.
'He/she is thirsty.'
b. ***Nie** lapah.*
c. ***Nie** lapah.*

(6) a. *Amaq**na**/Ama**na guru** SD.*
Father **poss.3sg** teacher elementary school.
'**His** father is an elementary school teacher.'
b. *Amaq**'n** guru SD.*
c. *Amaq**'n** guru SD*

It is easily identified that the pronominal clitic '*-na'* in Sl.D changes into '*-n'* in both Pjg.D and Pjt.D. As in modal auxiliary, '*na'* and thus *'-n'* is possessive marker attachés to noun. So other pronominal possessive clitics also apply.

(7) a. *Ine baleng**ku**.*
This house **poss.1sg**
This is **my** house.
b. Ne baleng'**ke**.
c. Ne baleng'**k**.

The lexim *'bale'* for /house/ takes a final nasal consonant *'ng'* before being attached with the clitic '*ku'* as with other verbal and auxiliary vowel final in both Pjg.D and Pjt.D, but not in Sl.D, for example:
'*Tao'* /can/ – *'tao aku'* – *'taong'k'* /I can/;
'Mele' /want/ – *'mele aku'* – *'meleng'k'* /I want/;
'*Kanggo' /may/ - 'kanggo ia' – 'kanggo-n' /he/she may*. This rule applies to all three varieties.

Sentences containing aspectual notions in Sasak can either begin with the subject before the verb or be preceded with the verb/modal being enclitisized. Ashriany, et.al (2019) found 28 aspectual lexicons in Sasak, which are grouped into 11 types of aspect. Each has its own syntactical behavior. For a future and perfect aspectual meaning, subject in all three dialects can take the position in initial sentence. However, aspect is expressed with different lexemes for future meaning for each dialect as in (8) and (9), while for progressive aspect there is slightly phonological change from /*j*/ in Sl.D to /*y*/ and with the additional final glottal sound /*q*/ in Pjg.D and Pjt.D as in (10), but for perfect meaning the same lexeme is used, as shown (11) below.

(8) a. ***Ia gin na** lalo keto nengka.*
3sg. **will 3sg** go there now.
'She/he will go there right now.'
b. ***Nie jaq na** lalo jok to nani. or*
Nie yaq'n lalo jok to nani.
c***. Nie yan** lalo jok to nani.*

(9) a. (*Aku) **ginku** ketok **gitak ia** jemak klemak.*
1sg **be going 1sg** go there **to see him/her** tomorrow mornig.
'**I** am going (there) **to see him/her** tomorrow morning.'
b. *(Aku) yak**'k** lito seriok'n lemak aru. Or*
*(Yak lito seriok**'n** lemak aru.)*
d. *Yak lito seriok**'n** lemak aru.*
(10) a. *Mariam **kenjekana** belajar bareng batur**na**.*
Mariam **now3sg** studying with **his/her** friend.
'Mariam is studying with his/her friend.'
b. *Mariam **kenyekaq'n** berajah bareng batur'n.*

c. *Mariam **kenyekaq'n** berajah bareng batur'n.*

(11) a. ***Wah aku** lalo nggitak **aik** bangket no.*
Already **1sg** went see **water** rice field Det.
'I have been checking the rice field water.'
b. *Wah klalo serioq aiq bangket no.*
c. *Waklalo sereoq aiq bangket no.*

Construction of Negation

In all three varieties negative sentence is indicated by the use of the word *'ndek'* /not/ in initial sentence position before the aux or verb or noun followed by the pronominal clitic, determined by the subject. While '*ndek'* is used for a statement (12), the negation word *'ndak'* is used for command in Sl.D (13)a, and *'dendek'* in Pjg.D and Pjt.D (13)b,c. But for some sub-varieties of Sl.D, they also use '*dendek'* (for example of Masbagik, Selong/Pancor districts in Eastern Lombok and others in Western and Central Lombok).

(12) a. *Ndek**ku** tao piyak layangan.*
Not.**1sg** can make kite.
'**I** cannot make a kite.'
b. *Ndek'**k** tao pinak layangan.*
c. *Ndek'**k** tao pinak layangan.*

(13) a. *Ndak beng ie kepeng.*
Don't give **2sg** money.
'Don't give him/her money.'
b. *Dendek beng **nie** kepeng.*
c. *Dendek beng**'n** kepeng.*

However, just like in (3) where subject can take initial sentence position, the negation word in Sasak precedes the subject.

(14) a. *Ia ndek**na** tao piyak layangan.*
2sg Neg. **2sg clitic** can make kite.
'He/she cannot make a kite.
b. *Nie ndek'**n** tao pinak layangan. Or*
(*Ndek'n tao pinak layangan nie.)*
c. *Nie ndek'**n** tao pinak layangan.*

Other forms of negation words include *'ndek na arak'* /nothing/ or *'ndek arak'* or '*ndenarak'*, all mean nothing or nobody/no one. Pujut, however, use a shorter form *'edak'.*

(15) a. *Ndek**na** arak dengan lek bale.*
Not **2sg cliti**c there is person loc. home
'There isn't anybody at home'
'Nobody at home.
b. Ndenarak *dengan to bale. or*
(***Ndek** arak dengan to bale.)*

c. ***Edak*** *dengan to bale.*

Construction of Passive

One of the significant differences between Sl.D, Pjg.D and Pjt.D lies in the way passive sentences are commonly constructed. In a ditransitive verb, passive sentence in (16a) can begin with the verb enclitic zed with its pronominal subject marker '*na'* followed by the passive subject pronoun '*aku'*, but in Pjg.D and Pjt.D it starts with the prefix ***te****+verb+ pronominal clitic* followed by the object + '*isiq'* /by/ *phrase* as in (16).

(16) a. *Beliang-**na aku** kereng isiq Amaq.*
Buy (past) **2sg 1sg** 'sarong' by father.
Dad bought a 'sarong' for me. Or
Dad bought me a 'sarong'.
b. ***Te****beliang'**k** kereng isiq Amaq.* (Sakra*).* Or
Sin *beliang'**kə** kereng isiq Amaq.* (Puyung) or
Kereng sin beliang'k siq Amaq.
c. *T**e**pebeliq**'k** kereng isiq Amaq.*

(17) a. *Kepeng beng**na** aku isiq Amangku.*
Money gave **2sg 1sg** by father+N+1poss.
'Money was given to me by my father.'
Father gave me some money.
b. *Kepeng.tebeng**'k** isiq Amaq'k.* (Sakra) *or*
*Kepeng **sin** beng'k siq Amaq'k.* (Praya)
c. *Kepeng tebeng'k siq Amaq'k.*

In sentences with ditransitive verb such as (18), the object *'kepeng'* /money/ can be put as subject in the passive sentence followed by the verb and the pronominal clitic. However, with DO as the subject, all three dialects can begin with the Agent+Verb and its pronominal subject clitic as in (17), determined by the agent. In one variant of Pjg.D, however, the verb can be preceded by passive transitive marker, namely '*mum*', '*mun*', '*muk'*, and '*sin'* (also ditermined by the agent) followed by the subject and object, encoding the active notion and the agent notion of its grammatical categories (further see also Kroon in Austin, 1998:109-115).

Apart from functioning as passive markers, the form /*sin*/, /*sim*/ and /*mum*/ in Pjg.D can also function as a 'past tense' markers. Often, the use of a speech form using such a 'passive marker' in everyday conversation (based on the speaker's accent) can imply the speaker's original native identity.

Likewise, if a Sasak speaker is heard to employ an 'eastern' accent indicated by the suffix /*na*/ or /*ne*/ and with a clear pronoun, accompanied with its typical prosodic features, one can definitely think that the speaker must be coming from 'the Eastern' of Lombok with their Selaparang dialect, sometimes along with its sub-dialect groups usually defined by district/sub-(district/village name. That is why it is often heard that someone who is being talked to will ask "*Side dengan Timuq?*" 'Are you from East Lombok?' implying "Are you from the Selaparang dialect".

Note that within Pjg.D itself, there are also variations in the use of passive between South-Eastern Lombok and Central-Lombok *'meno-mene'* sub variety, indicated by the presence of pronominal markers *'sin'* /he,she/, '*sim'* /you/, *'muk'* /I/,*'sit'* /we/, before the verb. Following Foley and Van Valin

(1985), Musgrave in Austin (1998) refers to this as strategy to increase salience of some portion of a message.

a. ***Sin*** *beliang'**k** kereng isiq Amaq*.
'(**3sg**) bought **1sg** *sarong* by Father.'
Father bought a *sarong* for me.
Sim *suruq **tə** lalo gitaq sampi no.*
'(2sg) told 2pl go see cow det.'.
You told us to go to see the cow.
b. ***Muk*** *gitaq **side** to*.
'(**1sg**) saw **you** there'
I saw you there.
c. ***Sit*** *tatong kanak no jok Mentaram kadu montor.*
(**1pl**) took that boy prep Mataram by car.
We took that boy to Mataram by car.

Compare with Sl.D:

*a. Beliang**na aku** kereng isiq Amaq.*
'Buy (past) **2sg 1.sg** 'sarong' det by Father.'
Father bought *sarong* for me.
*b. 'Suruq **da ita** lalo nggitaq sampi ino.'*
'Asked **2sg 2pl** go N+see cow det.'
You asked us to go to see the cow.
*c. 'gitak**ku side** tono.'*
'See (past) **1sg 2sg** there'
I saw **you** there.
*d. Atong**ta** kanak ino jok Mentaram kadu montor.*
'Took**1pl** that boy prep Mataram by car.'
We took that boy to Mataram by car.

Cleft Sentence

A very common grammatical feature in Sasak is the construction of cleft sentence, in which the subject and object of a sentence can take (but not necessarily) the clause marker *'si/siq'* for Sl.D or *'saq'* for both Pjg.D and Pjt.D. The presence of the clause marker depends on the referential context a speaker is pointing such as shown in (19) and (20). Even though it does not require the presence of clause marker *'si/siq'* in Sl.D (19)-a, the meaning is exactly the same with the other two varieties. They all caries the information that "It was a horse cart that we took, not other vehicle." In the meantime, the inclusion of relative pronoun marker *'siq'* instead of *'saq'* in (20)-a is optional, but in (20)-b and c it is obligatory. In terms of lexicon, Sl.D employs *'kadu'* for /took/ which is nasalized before being attached with the pronoun *'kami',* while Pjg.D and Pjt.D use *'kawih'.*

(18) a. *Cidomo kadung **kami** lalo.*
'Horse cart took **1.pl** go.'
It was horse cart that we took to go.

'We took horse cart to go.'
'We went by horse cart.'
b. *Cidomo (saq) kawih **te** lalo.*
c. *Cidomo (saq) kawih**'t** lalo.*

(19) a. *Kanak mama ino si(q) nendang bembek**ku**.*
'Boy def. REL kicked goat **1sg.** Or
Kanaq mama ino nendang bembekku.
It was that boy who kicked my goat.
That boy kicked my goat.
b. *Kanak mame no saq tendang bembek**'k.***
c. *Kanak mame no saq tendang bembek**'k.***

Another difference also between the three dialects lies in the clefted object of Pg.D and Pj.D which requires the insertion of *'mun'* after *'saq'*, but not in Sl.D as demonstrated in (23).

(20) a. *Kanak ino si ketik**na** isiq jaran**ku**.*
Child def REL kick **2sg** by horse **1sg.poss**
That is the child who was kicked by my horse.
'It was that child who was kicked by my horse.'
b. *Kanak no saq **te**ketik isiq jaran'ke.* (Sakre)
*Kanak no saq **mun** ketik isiq jaran'k.* (Puyung)
c. *Kanaq no saq ketik**'n** isiq jaran'k.*

Relative Clause Structure

In fact, relative clause in Sasak has been studied quite extensively by linguists interested in syntactical linguistic typology beginning from Eades in Austin (ed, 1998), Lutfa (2003), Shibatani (2008), Hanafi (2020), and others. They all focused on how Sasak in general construct relative clauses, which function as nominal modifier in a range of position in a sentence, and they intended to prove Comrie & Keenan's (1979) NP Accessibility Hierarchy of grammatical relation theory. Even though their analysis concentrated on the two most familiar Sasak dialects, namely the *Ngeno-Ngene* (Sl.D) as represented by Pancor/Selong and *meno-meni* varieties (Pjg.D) by Praya/Puyung, basically there is no significant distinction between them, except for different relative clause marker,'siq' /which/ for Sl.D, and '*saq'* for Pjg.D and Pjt.D, along with the distinct Puyung/Praya subject clitic marker *'sin', 'sim', 'muk', 'sit*' as described above following (20).

Syntactically, regardless of the strategies occurring in both direct and indirect relativization, all NP in all dialects are accessible for relativization. Based on Eades (in Austin, 1998), Shibatani (2008), Hanafi, et.al (2020), it can be deduced that Sasak, not particularly on Sl.D (*Ngeno-Ngene*) but also for the others, can make use of the gap strategy for direct relativization, and passivization strategy for all indirect relativization. The examples in (24) - (26) below demonstrate how some of the RC behavior works in Sasak. Most importantly here is, certainly, how each of the variety realizes the accessibility of relativization in various sentence position and to what extent each differ with each other.

(21) a. *Pak Amat si(q) beng **aku** kepeng ino lekan*
Mr. Ahmad REL gave **1.sg** money DET from
Selong. (SU Relativization)

Selong (adv. of place)
Mr. Ahmad who gave me the money is from Selong.
b. *Pak Amat saq beng**'ke** kepeng no leman Selong.* (Praya/Sakre)
*Pak Amat saq beng**'k** kepeng no olek Selong.* (Puyung)
c. *Pak Amat saq beng'k kepeng no oleq Selong.*

While the clause marker *siq/saq* should present after the NP in subject relativization in all dialects, the clause marker *siq* is optional in Sl.D indirect object relativization, and so is the preposition *isiq* /by/ as in (25) and (26) below.

(22) *a. Kepeng (siq) beng**na** aku (isiq) pak Amat ino*
Money REL gave**2sg 1sg** (by) Mr. Ahmad *wah buek.* (DO Relativization)
'The money which pak Amat gave me has already been used up.'
b. *Kepeng saq tebeng'ke isiq pak Amat no wah bis.* (Praya/Sakre) *or*
Kepeng saq mun beng'ke isiq pak Amat no wah bis. (Puyung)
c. *Kepeng saq tebeng'k isiq pak Amat no wah bis.*

(23) a. *Kayuk (si) kadu**na** pak Amat mantok kaoq ino polak.*
Wood (REL) use**2sg** Mr. Amat hit buffalow *det broken.* (OBL Relativization)
b. *Kayuk saq kawih'**n** pak Amat pantok kaoq no polak.* (Praya/Sakre) or
*Kayuk saq **mun** kawih isiq pak Amat pantok kaoq no polak.* (Puyung)
c. *Kayuk saq kawih**'n** isiq pak Amat pantok kaoq no polak.*

4. Discussion

After a thorough morpho-syntactical analysis of the threes, by looking at the behavior and the distribution pattern of the clitics and morphological analysis of some lexical items it is quite clear that the changes of pronominal clitic variation in the Pejanggik and Pujut existing dialects are derivative or sub-dialect of Selaparang. Initially, based on past historical records (see Regional History of West Nusa Tenggara: Ministry of Education and Culture, Center for Historical and Cultural Research - Regional Culture Research and Recording Project, 1977/1978) the 'original' Selaparang Sasak located in Eastern Lombok spread into Southern East Lombok then to Central Lombok, creating the Pejanggik dialect, and later on to Southern Central Lombok, yielding the Pujut variety. Using Wardhaugh & Fuller's term (2015, 7th edition: 39) this could well be referred to as **dialect continuum**, in which there is a gradual change on the part of the subject pronominal clitic from Sl.D pattern as used in the eastern and western part of Lombok to that of the south eastern and central Lombok, where Pjg.D is the norm, and to the southern central in which Pjt.D is typical.

All actual subject pronouns in Sl.D, for example, follow the modal and aspectual auxiliaries: '*Tao **aku** piyak layangan.*' /**I** can make a kite/ becomes '*Taong**'kkaku** pinak layangan'* then transformed into *'taong**'k** pinak layangan',* even though in other circumstances subject pronoun can take initial position before a modal or verb. Austin (2000) pointed out that all varieties of Sasak enclitic pronouns are attached to modal and aspectual auxiliaries which precede the main verb. In thematic relations theory, the enclitic pronoun in Sasak "essentially cross-references the thematically highest argument, ie. the agent-like argument of two-place or three-place verb, or single argument of one-place verb." This transformation also applies in the relative clause structure. Distinctively enough, within the Pjg.D itself, change also took place in the passive construction as used in the Pjg.D of Sakra/Praya which uses prefix *'**te**'* before the verb on one hand and the passive marker *'sin'* /he, she/, *'sim'* /you/,

'sit' /we/, and *'muk'* /I/ preceding the verb as used in Puyung and Praya on the other. Similarly, the use of posessive pronoun after a noun such as *'buku**na**'* /his/her book/ in Sl.D becomes *'buku**n**'* in Pjg.D and Pjt.D with long vowel /ŭ/ on the second syllable before being incliticized, *'bukung**ku**'* /my book/ becomes *'bukung**k**',* having been nasalized before the clitics, et cetera. These pronominal clitics are equal to those of Javanese as in '*bukune'* or Balinese /*bukune*/ 'his/her book', /*balene*/→ /*omahe*/ (Javanese), /*umahe*/ (Balinese) 'his/her house'.

Lexically, sound changes occur in some verbals, nominals, adjectivals categories as well as in other parts of speech across varieties as in the followings:

	Sl.D	**Pjg.D**	**Pjt.D**	**Gloss**
Verb:	*iduk*	*iruk*	*iruk*	'kiss','smell'
	badak	*barak*	*barak*	"tell"
Noun:	*bibir*	*biwih*	*biwih*	'lip'
Adj. :	*telir*	*telih*	*telih*	'cold'
	benar	*benah*	*benah/menah*	'day light'
Conj :	*adekna*	*adeknaden*		'so that'
Prep. :	*tono*	*to*	*to*	'there'
	tene	*te*	*te*	'here'
	lekan	*lemanleman*		'from'
Dem. :	*ngene*	*mene/i*	*meni*	'like this'
	ine	*ne/i*	*ni*	'this'

As in other languages, variation like these is very common, and systematic within a language, and it is also very similar across languages (Bybee, 2015). However, to avoid the probable increase number of lexical disparities, within this regard, standardization of one form of varieties could be constructed. And therefore, for its maintenance, it should be consistently employed in print and electronic media, taught in schools, learned by non-native speakers, spoken by the educated and elite as defined by Trudgill (1995, 5-6) for standard variety of English. Henceforth, for the dialect to be accepted it needs legal formal documents set by the government.

5. Conclusion

Based on the survey of norm of acceptance, selection this study reveals that the majority of respondents (90%) warmly welcome the codification and standardization of Sasak. Most of them expected that a single shared form of Sasak code that could be found and used in text books, electronic broadcasting, print media and formal speech could be established. For a teacher who will teach the language, the provision of one standardized Sasak norm in written text (book) would help ease them to cope with the language instruction in the classroom, and the variability that the students might have used at home domain. Therefore, several important conclusions can be drawn which must be noted as differences and the basis for codification and standardization of Sasak.

First, the variability of pronominal clitic behaviour in almost all types of sentence patterns among the three dialects could be assumed to have been born from one root of form as the 'mother' or the origin of the others. The systematic 'sound changes' found both in Pjg.D and Pjt.D are clearly born out of the other dialect. By definition "sound change is a change in the pronunciation of a segment within a word (or occasionally more than one segment) conditioned by the phonetic environment, that is, the surrounding sounds" (Bybee, 2015:15). This certainly fits with what are found in the lexical sound changes across Sasak varieties as exemplified above. In other circumstance Bybee (ibid) also pointed out that "When we use language we are constantly doing pattern-matching, and in so doing we

reinforce certain patterns." This again is clearly indicated in the use of the morphosyntactic patterning from the Sl.D to both Pjg.D and finally to Pjt.D.

Second, in term of relative clause structure, there is no substantial constraints over comprehending people's talk from Pjg.D for people with Sl.D background or the other way around, but not with people with Pjt.D for people with Sl.D due to some lengthy morphosyntactical and lexical pecularities. It is very common for people in Eastern and Western Lombok listening to Sasak Talk Program or Radio Drama on the state regional radio of Mataram (RRI) that employs Pjg.D mostly, and Sl.D at times. Therefore, while pragmatically people can use any of the form in everyday informal speech, as well as being careful not to judge nonstandard Sasak as incorrect, work to the choice of Sl.D as the standardized norm could soon be proposed to the government as the bases for the sentence-structure and lexical rules and a standard norm of wider-inter-group formal communication code.

Third, the different in Praya/Puyung sub dialect of Pjg.D over the use of the passive clause marker *'sin'* /he, she/, *'sim'* /you/, *'sit'* /we/, and *'muk'* /I/ preceding a verb is very specific which is not common and unintelligble even to the whole users of south easthern Sasak '*meno-mene/*i' such as Sakra and other parts of Eastern Lombok. Hence, this is not supposed to be used in a more formal and wider communication should a Pjg.D speaker be delivering a speech in formal context. Rather, it is more appropriate and common to be conveyed using a shared passive form regularly used in any speech events. And finally, almost all participants in the focused group discussion accepted that the probable original dialect of Sasak was that of the Sl.D or the *Ngeno-Ngene* dialect after having been demonstrated and shown with the data of the dialect continuum especially in the pronominal clitic and sound change data. It follows that they could endorse that the codified and standardized norm of Sasak written form to be would be that of the Selaparang Dialect but with more on the accent of that commonly used in western and souhern Lombok practiced by Sasak people around Mataram, eventhough this would not conform with what Hymes(1974:123) asserted, as cited in Wardhaugh (2006:26), that "….a different of accent may be as important as one boundary as a difference of grammar at another."

References

Archangeli, Diana., Tanashur, Panji., Yip, Janthan. (2018). Sasak, Meno-Mene Dialect*. Journal of the International Phonetic Association.*
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025100318000063 (Accessed on February, 2019)

Asikin-Garmager, Eli, Nur Ahmadi. (2916). Dialect Variation as a Window into Language Change – A Syntactic Example from Sasak (Lombok). *International Seminar on Language Maintenance and Shift (LAMAS) 6 August 9-10,* 2016, Diponegoro University, Semarang - Indonesia.

Austin, Peter. (2000). Verbs, Voice and Valence in Sasak. In Austin, Peter K. (ed.), *Working Papers in Sasak vol.2 2000: 5-24.*

Austin, P. K. (2004). Clitics in Sasak, Eastern Indonesia. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/2993630/Clitics_in_Sasak_eastern_Indonesia on (June 5, 2021).

Azhar, Lalu. (1995). *Reramputan Bahasa Sasak.* Percetakan Aksara Sasak

Badar, Fe. Muhammad Muzhab. ((2007). *Himpunan Materi Mulok Kebudayaan Daerah Sasak.* Dinas Pendidikan Kota Mataram

Bybee, Joan. (2015). *Language Change*. Cambridge University Press.

Creswell, John. (2006). *Collecting Data in Mixed Methods.* UK: SAGE Publications Inc.

Eades, Yusuf. (1998). Relativization. In Austin, Peter K (ed.), Herman Suheri (consulting ed.) *SASAK: Working Papaers in Sasak, Vol. 1: 119-129.* Lombok and Sumbawa Research Project: Departemen of Linguistics & Applied Linguistics. The University of Melbourne

Ferguson, Gibson. (2006). *Language Planning and Education.* Edinburgh University Press

Fishman, J.A. (1972). Language Maintenance and Language Shift. In J.A. Fishman *Langauge in the Sociocultural Change.* Stanford: Stanford University Press

Fishman, J.A. (1991). *Rivershing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Gelagay, Almaz Wasse. (2018). *The Challenges of Language Standardization: The Case of Gamo*. Addis Ababa University

Hanafi, Nurachman and Udin, Eny Juhaini, Edy Syahrial, (2020). Relativization Strategies of Sasak Ngeno Ngene Dialect in Lombok. *Ethical Lingua Vol. 7, No. 1, 2020*. https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.162

Haugen, E.. (1966). Linguistics and Language Planning. In W. Bright (ed.). *Sociolingustics: Proceedings of the VCLA Sociolinguistics Conference.* The Huggue: Norton, hlm. 159: 190.

Jacq, Pascale. (1998). How many dialects are there?. In Austin, Peter K (ed.) *SASAK: Working Papaers in Sasak, Vol. 1: 67-90.* Lombok and Sumbawa Research Project: Departemen of Linguistics & Applied Linguistics. The University of Melbourne

Jordan, Mary Ellen. (1998). Morpho-Semantic Processes in Sasak. In Austin, Peter K. (ed.), Herman Suheri (consulting ed.) *SASAK: Working Papaers in Sasak, Vol. 1: 147-159.* Lombok and Sumbawa Research Project: Departemen of Linguistics & Applied Linguistics. The University of Melbourne

Jernudd, Bjorn H. & das Gupta, Jyotirindra. Towards (1975). A Theory of Language Planning. In Joan Rubin & Bjorn H.Jernudd (Ed.), *Can Language Be Planned* (195-215). The University Press of Hawaii

Kafata, Francis. (2016). An Investigation into the Impact of Teaching in Local Languages on Pupils and Teachers (Advantages, Challenges, Opportunities, Etc) in Selected Primary Schools in Kitwe District of The Copperbelt Province of Zambia. International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research Volume 5, Issue 08, August 2016.

Lane, Pia., James Costa., and Haley De Korne (Ed.) (2018). Standardizing Minority Languages. New York: Routledge

Lauder, Allan F., Lauder, Multamia RMT., and Kiftiawati Kiftiawati. (2021). Preserving and Empowering Local Languages amidst the Covid-19 Pandemic. In *Wacana Vol.22 No.2 (2021):439-466*

Lucy Dora Akello & M. C. Greetje Timmerman (2017): Local language a medium of instruction: challenges and way forward, Educational Action Research, DOI: 10.1080/09650792.2017.1319287 downloaded from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316632886_Local_language_a_medium_of_instruction_challenges_and_way_forward on January 4, 2022

Mahsun, (2009). *Perbandingan Struktur Dialek dalam Bahasa Sasak: Ke Arah Perumusan Materi Pembelajaran Muatan Lokal Bahasa Sasak di Sekolah*. Laporan Penelitian, Lembaga Penelitian Universitas Mataram.

Mahsun. (2005). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa: Tahapan, Strategi, Metode dan Tekniknya*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

Mesthrie, Rajen., Swann, Joan., Deumert, Andrea., & L, Leap, William. (200). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Edinburg University Press.

Ratmaja, Lalu. (2011). *Bahan Ajar: Mulok Gumi Sasak.* CV. Gumi Sasak.

Regional History of West Nusa Tenggara: Ministry of Education and Culture, Center for Historical and Cultural Research - *Regional Culture Research and Recording Project*, 1977/1978.

Rubin, J. (1971). Evaluation and Langauge Planning. In J. Rubin & B.H. Jernudd. *Can Language be Planned?* University Press of Hawaii.

Sirulhaq, A. (2012). Standardisasi Bahasa Sasak Dan Problem Pembelajarannya (*Standardization of*

Sasak Language and Its Learning Problem). *Mabasan*, *6*(1), 26–30. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26499/mab.v6i1.219

Shibatani, Masayoshi. (2008). Relativization in Sasak. *Language and Linguistics 9.4:865-916, 2008* http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~eivs/papers/Shibatani-Sasak%20RCs.pdf (Accessed on March 4, 2021)

Syahdan. (1996). *Sasak-Indonesian Codeswitching* Unpublished Ph.D Thesis. The University of Arizona.

Thoir, Nazir. (1979). *Morfology dan Sintaksis Bahasa Sasak* (Sasak Syntax and Morphology). Universitas Udayana.

UH Mānoa linguists. (2012) *Catalog of Endangered Languages (ELCAT)*. (Accessed from http://ling.hawaii.edu/research-current/projects/elcat/ on June 5, 2021)

Wardhaugh, Ronald and Fuller, Janet M. (2015). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (7th edition). Blackwell Publishing.

Wells, J.,C. (1982). Accents in English 1 an Introduction. Cambridge University Press.

Wilian, S. (2010). Pemertahanan Bahasa dan Kesetabilan Kedwibahasaan pada Penutur Bahasa Sasak di Lombok. *Journal Linguistic Indonesia Vol. 28 No. 1 pp. 21-39 2010*.

Wilian, S. (2006). Tingkat Tutur dalam Bahasa Sasak dan Bahasa Jawa. Wacana Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya Vol. 8 No. 1. DOI: 10.17510/wjhi.v8i1.245

Yulida, Ratna, dkk. (2020) Aspektualitas Bahasa Sasak. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional FKIP Universitas Mataram Vol. 1 No. 1 2020*.
https://jurnalfkip.unram.ac.id/index.php/PSN/article/view/1694