Indonesian Journal OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE
https://www.journal.formadenglishfoundation.org/index.php/IJES

Dialectological Study of Language Use in Beleka Village Community

Ozi Satria[1]

[1], Institut Palapa Nusantara Lombok, NTB, Indonesia
Email: satriaozi41@gmail.com[1]

ABSTRACT

Language variation reflects the interaction between linguistic structures, geographical contexts, and social relationships within speech communities. This study examined dialectological variation in language use among the community of Beleka Village, Central Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia, focusing on differences between its northern and southern parts and their potential social and geographical associations. A qualitative descriptive method with a dialectological approach was employed. Data were collected through direct observation, semi-structured interviews, audio recordings, and field notes documenting everyday language practices. The data were analyzed descriptively by classifying and comparing phonological, lexical, and expressive or stylistic features across speakers and social contexts. The findings revealed three interconnected dimensions of linguistic variation. Phonological differences appeared in vowel realizations, final sounds, and pronunciation patterns. Lexical variation was evident in locally distinctive terms used to refer to common objects and activities. Expressive and stylistic variation involved differences in intonation, diction, conversational practices, and code-mixing. The findings also indicated generational differences, with older speakers tending to maintain traditional forms and younger speakers incorporating expressions influenced by education, Indonesian, English, and digital communication. These patterns suggest that local dialect variation is associated with geographical backgrounds, social interaction, and changing communicative environments. The study contributes a localized account of linguistic diversity within a single village and highlights the potential role of dialect in expressing community identity and cultural continuity. Further research using acoustic phonetic analysis, systematic participant sampling, and dialectometric methods is needed to establish linguistic distances and clarify the factors associated with these variations.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received: October 24, 2026
Revised: October 28, 2026
Accepted: October 30, 2026
Published: October 31, 2026

Keywords:
Dialectology; Language Variation; Phonological Variation; Lexical Variation; Sasak Language

Correspondance Author:
Ozi Satria
Dept. of Islamic Educational Management, Institut Palapa Nusantara Lombok, NTB, Indonesia. Jln Palapa No. 01 Selebung Keruak, Lombok Timur, NTB, Indonesia.

INTRODUCTION

Language is a fundamental means of communication through which people express social relationships, cultural knowledge, and collective identity. However, language use is not uniform

across geographical areas or social groups; differences may emerge in pronunciation, vocabulary, grammatical structures, and expressions. These differences provide an important foundation for dialectological research, which examines the distribution and characteristics of linguistic variation across communities. Language variation should therefore be understood not merely as a difference in speech forms but also as a reflection of the historical, geographical, and social experiences of speakers (Holmes & Wilson, 2022; Syam & Abdu, 2023; Trudgill, 1998). The study of language variation across different cultural contexts is particularly important because sociolinguistic patterns identified in one community cannot necessarily be generalized to another without considering local circumstances (Adli & Guy, 2022). Moreover, dialect differences may involve grammatical patterns as well as lexical and phonological features, particularly where speakers interact across linguistic boundaries (Mansfield et al., 2023). Consequently, dialectology provides an analytical framework for examining how linguistic similarities and differences develop within particular speech communities.

International research has increasingly demonstrated that linguistic variation can be examined through the interaction of geographical, social, and linguistic factors. Geographic distance, accessibility, and environmental characteristics may be associated with differences in linguistic distribution, although their effects must be established through empirical analysis rather than assumed in advance (Fernández et al., 2024). Systematic geographical sampling is also important because the selection of observation points influences the representation of regional variation (Koile & Moroz, 2024). In addition to linguistic evidence, speakers' perceptions of regional accents can provide complementary information about how geographical and social identities are recognized within a speech community (Pinget & Voeten, 2023). These perspectives indicate that dialectological research benefits from integrating linguistic description with geographical mapping and relevant social information. Nevertheless, perceived differences should be distinguished from objectively identifiable linguistic features, since judgments about accents do not necessarily establish the boundaries between dialects. Such distinctions are essential when investigating small communities in which speakers may share a broader language but use distinctive local forms.

In Indonesia, linguistic diversity provides a significant context for investigating regional language variation. The country's diverse linguistic and cultural environments create opportunities to examine how local speech practices are maintained, adapted, and transmitted across generations. Previous studies have demonstrated that lexical and phonological differences can distinguish speech communities even when their languages remain mutually intelligible. Research on Javanese varieties, for example, has employed geographical observation points and dialectometric analysis to examine linguistic differences and relationships between regional varieties (Saddhono & Hartanto, 2021). Studies comparing the languages of Kangean and Madura have likewise demonstrated the relevance of dialectological classification for understanding regional linguistic distinctions (Hakim et al., 2022). Research on Luwu varieties has further illustrated the value of comparing speech practices across geographical locations through observations, interviews, recordings, and field notes (Surahim & Ramli, 2023). These studies establish a methodological basis for examining regional language variation in Indonesia, while also indicating the importance of collecting primary data from the communities under investigation.

Research on regional languages has also highlighted the importance of examining linguistic variation alongside social interaction and cultural practices. Studies of code-switching and code-mixing in village communities demonstrate that everyday language use may involve the alternation

of regional and national languages, which should be distinguished analytically from dialect differences (Putri & Pulungan, 2022). Research on diglossia in the Madurese community of Gili Ketapang similarly indicates that language choice may vary across family, religious, educational, occupational, and social contexts (Hamdiah et al., 2023). Studies of Sasak language variation in Lombok provide a particularly relevant regional foundation for investigating local linguistic practices in West Nusa Tenggara (Sugianto & Hasby, 2023). Other research has examined how social stratification, family language choices, and cultural terminology contribute to differences in language use and the expression of local identity (Hasbullah & Al-Pansori, 2022; Jaeka & Anggarista, 2023; Wilian et al., 2023). These findings suggest that local language practices need to be examined in relation to both the forms speakers produce and the circumstances in which those forms are used.

Research on lexical and phonological variation provides further methodological guidance. Studies of Lampung and Minangkabau varieties have used structured vocabulary lists, informant interviews, and comparisons across observation points to identify lexical differences and investigate their geographical distribution (Larizky & Widyastuti, 2023; Risani et al., 2023; Septianingtias et al., 2024). Research comparing coastal and mountainous Javanese varieties in Jepara has also demonstrated the relevance of environmental and geographical contexts to the analysis of lexical and phonological variation (Fardzilatin & Suryadi, 2022). Similarly, research on Lakiung and Konjo varieties of Makassar has combined phonological and lexical analysis to describe differences between speech varieties (Astuti et al., 2022). More recent research has applied dialectometry and digital tools to classify subdialects and map linguistic relationships among observation points (Salahuddin, 2025; Lubis et al., 2026). Collectively, these studies demonstrate the usefulness of systematic linguistic data collection. However, the analytical categories and classification thresholds employed in each study must be adapted to the characteristics of the language and community being investigated.

Despite these contributions, several issues remain insufficiently addressed. Existing dialectological studies have largely focused on comparisons between established regional varieties, the identification of lexical differences, or the classification of subdialects through dialectometric calculations. Although these approaches provide valuable descriptions of linguistic diversity, they do not necessarily explain how distinctive language practices operate within smaller communities divided by local geographical and social boundaries. This limitation is important because linguistic differences may occur even among people living within the same village, where shared cultural backgrounds coexist with different patterns of interaction. Research on Sasak speech has shown that intonation and conversational context can contribute to the interpretation of utterances (Murtafi'ah, 2023), while studies of language attitudes and maintenance emphasize the importance of continued local-language use for cultural identity (Dewi et al., 2022; Siregar et al., 2025). Research on language accommodation and migrant communities further indicates that contact with other speakers and mobility may influence linguistic practices (Ate, 2026; Resticka et al., 2023). In addition, tourism-related language shifts and comparisons of lexical similarities across regional languages highlight the need to consider language transmission and contact without assuming that geographical proximity automatically produces linguistic similarity (Ernanda & Amri, 2026; Muin et al., 2026). Nevertheless, these social and geographical dimensions have not been sufficiently integrated into a focused investigation of language use within the Beleka Village community.

Volume 2, Issue 4, October 2026, 292-307
E-ISSN 3064-5379

The present study addresses this gap by examining language use in Beleka Village, Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara, where the community is described as comprising northern and southern parts with distinctive patterns of pronunciation, vocabulary choice, and expression. Although these local differences provide an important starting point, their linguistic characteristics and distribution require systematic empirical investigation. The study is informed by sociolinguistic perspectives on language variation and dialect formation, which recognize the relevance of social relationships, geographical location, and linguistic interaction (Clark & Yallop, n.d.; Spolsky & Trudgill, 1986). It also draws on dialectological research that treats lexical and phonological comparison as important tools for identifying relationships between speech varieties (Trudgill, 1998). Recent studies comparing regional linguistic features across several varieties further demonstrate the value of examining lexical, phonological, morphological, and sociolinguistic dimensions together (Puspandari & Tricahyaningati, 2026). However, the specific features and boundaries of the language varieties used in Beleka cannot be established from these previous findings; they must be demonstrated through evidence collected from local speakers.

The novelty of this study lies primarily in its empirical and contextual contribution. Rather than assuming that Beleka represents a linguistically homogeneous community, it investigates the reported differences between its northern and southern parts as a specific problem in local dialectology. It brings together the identification of pronunciation, vocabulary, and expression differences with consideration of geographical location and social factors, including age, occupation, education, migration, and contact with other language communities. These factors are treated as possible influences to be examined rather than predetermined causes of variation. The study also connects linguistic description with the documentation of local expressions as potential resources for understanding cultural identity and language continuity. This integrated perspective complements previous studies that have separately examined regional dialect classification, lexical variation, language choice, and language maintenance. Its contribution is therefore not a claim to establish an entirely new dialectological theory, but to provide a locally grounded account of linguistic variation that may inform comparative research on Sasak and other Indonesian regional languages.

Accordingly, this study aims to investigate the dialectological characteristics of language use in the Beleka Village community by identifying differences in pronunciation, vocabulary, and everyday expressions between speakers from the northern and southern parts of the village. It also examines how geographical and social circumstances may relate to the distribution of these differences. By documenting local speech patterns and interpreting them within their social and geographical contexts, the study seeks to contribute empirical evidence to dialectological scholarship while supporting the documentation of the linguistic identity of the Beleka Village community.

METHODS

1. Research Approach and Design

This study employed a qualitative descriptive method with a dialectological approach to examine language use and dialect variation in the community of Beleka Village, Central Lombok, Indonesia. The qualitative approach enabled the researcher to explore language practices and describe linguistic phenomena within their natural social contexts. Qualitative research is appropriate for investigating how individuals and groups interpret social experiences and construct meaning in everyday life (Creswell, 2014, as cited in Perreault, 2011). Accordingly, the dialectological approach was used to identify and compare phonological, lexical, and grammatical

variations, as well as differences in everyday expressions. This approach also supported an examination of how language variation was associated with social and geographical contexts.

2. Research Site and Participants

The research was conducted in Beleka Village, Central Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. Participants were selected through purposive sampling based on their active use of local dialects in daily communication. They represented different age groups, including teenagers, adults, and older community members, to provide a basis for examining possible generational differences in language use. The inclusion of speakers with diverse social backgrounds was relevant because language practices may reflect social identity, group membership, and patterns of interaction within a community (Nguyen Quoc Dung, 2024; Suroso et al., 2025). The participants' linguistic experiences were therefore considered when comparing dialect features and interpreting patterns of variation. The total number of participants was not specified in the available research information.

3. Research Instruments

The researcher served as the primary instrument and used observation, semi-structured interviews, audio recordings, and field notes to collect the data. Observation documented language use in natural interactions, while semi-structured interviews explored participants' perceptions of dialect differences and their experiences of using local language varieties. Audio recordings were used to preserve spoken data for accurate transcription and analysis, particularly regarding pronunciation and lexical choices. Field notes documented contextual information, including participants' backgrounds, communication settings, and interactional circumstances. These contextual details were important because language choices and linguistic forms may vary according to social situations and communicative purposes (Gregory & Carroll, 1978).

4. Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected through direct observation, semi-structured interviews, audio recording, and note-taking. Observations focused on everyday conversations in settings such as homes, markets, and public spaces. These observations provided opportunities to document naturally occurring speech and identify potential differences in pronunciation, vocabulary, grammatical forms, and everyday expressions. The emphasis on natural interaction was consistent with Labov's (2010) sociolinguistic perspective, which highlighted the importance of examining speech in relation to actual language use rather than relying exclusively on artificial elicitation situations. Interviews were subsequently used to obtain further explanations of participants' language practices and perceptions of dialect differences. With appropriate consent, spoken interactions were recorded and transcribed into written form. Field notes were maintained throughout the process to preserve contextual information relevant to interpreting the linguistic data.

5. Data Analysis Techniques

The data were analyzed using descriptive qualitative analysis. First, the recordings were transcribed and reviewed alongside the interview transcripts and field notes. Second, relevant linguistic features were identified and classified into phonological, lexical, and grammatical variations, including differences in everyday expressions where supported by the data. Third, the identified features were compared across speakers and age groups to determine recurring patterns and differences in language use. The analysis also considered the geographical and social contexts in which the variations occurred, including possible differences between the northern and southern parts of Beleka Village. This procedure was consistent with the view that dialect variation could be

examined systematically in relation to geographical distribution and social factors (Wieling et al., 2011). The analysis also considered the relationship between linguistic practices, social identity, and community membership (Nguyen Quoc Dung, 2024; Suroso et al., 2025). Interpretations were based on the collected evidence rather than on assumptions that every observed difference represented a separate dialect.

6. Data Trustworthiness

Data trustworthiness was supported through source and method triangulation. Information obtained from observations, interviews, recordings, and field notes was compared to identify consistencies and clarify discrepancies. Triangulation can strengthen qualitative research by bringing together different sources and methods to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon under investigation (Fusch et al., 2018; Vivek et al., 2023). In this study, recorded speech was checked against the transcripts and contextual field notes to ensure that the identified linguistic features were interpreted in relation to the actual data. Participants' accounts were also compared with observed language practices where relevant. These procedures provided a systematic basis for describing dialect variation and examining the social and geographical factors associated with language use in Beleka Village.

RESULTS

The findings of this study indicate that language use in the Beleka Village community shows a rich and systematic pattern of dialectal variation. These variations appear in everyday communication and are strongly influenced by social interaction, age differences, and cultural background. Based on the data collected through observation, interviews, recordings, and field notes, three main forms of dialectal variation were identified, namely phonological variation, lexical variation, and expressive or stylistic variation. In terms of phonological variation, it is the differences in the pronunciation of speech sound produced by different speakers. The words spoken carry the same meaning. This variation was able to be affected by place or origin, dialect, social environment, and speaking habits. For instances, in order to say the phrase "this is the place" the societies who are located in the southernmost of Beleke village (Golong hamlet) said "*ni taokne*" while other locations said "*ni taokn*". Furthermore, to say "miss you" the societies who are located in the southernmost of Beleke village (Golong hamlet) said "*kangenme*" meanwhile other locations said "*kangenm*".

In addition, the both south part of Beleka community and the north part Beleke community were also produced phonological variation in terms of vowel sound and consonant sound. For instances, when they said "where are you?" the south part of Beleka communities said "*embe taok e*?" in which the letter "o" is pronounced "o" just like the letter "o" in the word "hope". Meanwhile, the north part of Beleke community said "*embe taok e*?" just like the letter "o" in the word "hop". Not only that but also when they said the word in Sasak language like "*ngeme*". The south part of Beleka community pronounced the letter "e" that existed in the last letter of the word "*ngeme*" just like the English word "came". Meanwhile the north part of Beleke pronounced it such as in the word "tell". The last instance that the writer found was when they use suffix "e" in Sasak language such as "*mbe nok taok e*", the south part of Beleke said the suffix "e" like in the word "blame" while the north part of Beleke said it like the word "mam". This phonological variation happened because the first comer of the north part of Beleka came from Praya while the north part of Beleke came from Langko and Lekor village.

In the lexical aspect, the research identified a number of local vocabulary items which were uniquely used within the Beleka Village community. For instances, in order to say the word

"chair", the south part of Beleka communities said "*Sentauk*" while the north part of Beleke said "*Serantauk*". The next was in order to say the word "tanktop" the south part of Beleka said "*singelet*" while the north part of Beleke said "*selekak*", and to say the word "fruit picker" the south part of Beleka said "*penggaet*" while the north part of Beleke said "*penggale*". These lexical items functioned as markers of local identity and solidarity among speakers. Many of these words are not found in standard Indonesian dictionaries and may be difficult for outsiders to understand. The use of local vocabulary is particularly strong in daily activities such as farming, social gatherings, and informal discussions. These lexical variations demonstrated how language reflects the cultural practices and lived experiences of the community. This lexical variation happened because of language innovation. Both of the hamlets try to create new terms which only popular in their villages.

Furthermore, Expressive and stylistic variation a diversity in terms of the way of giving explanation, intonation, diction choice, figure of speech that speaker use in different region to express emotion or adjusting situation. Even though the both south part of Beleka and the north part of Beleke are in the same place, but they have several differences in terms of intonation in which the south part of Beleke produced smoother language and of course with smoother sound moreover when younger talks to older. While the north part of Beleke also produced smooth language but they employed a unique intonation and stronger power. This case could be held because of several factors such as each communities make sure that they preserve their own identity for instance, the accent of certain village, typical community tone of voice, and the way of certain pronunciation to show a uniqueness.

Furthermore, Expressive and stylistic variation is highly visible in everyday interaction. Speakers often use informal expressions, repetition, and code-mixing between Indonesian and local language varieties. Younger speakers, in particular, show a strong tendency to incorporate expressions influenced by social media, popular culture, and digital communication trends. This results in a hybrid form of communication that blends traditional dialect features with modern linguistic elements. In contrast, older speakers tend to use more stable and traditional forms of expression. The data also reveal that language variation is strongly influenced by age groups. Elderly speakers generally preserve traditional dialect forms and use more conservative linguistic structures. Adults show a balance between traditional and modern language use, while teenagers and young adults demonstrate higher levels of variation and language mixing. This generational difference indicates that language in Beleka Village is undergoing gradual change over time. Overall, the findings clearly show that language use in Beleka Village is dynamic, diverse, and socially meaningful.

DISCUSSION

1. Results Analysis

This study aimed to examine dialectological variation in language use among the Beleka Village community, Central Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara, focusing on differences in pronunciation, vocabulary, and everyday expressions between speakers from the northern and southern parts of the village, as well as the social and geographical circumstances associated with these differences. The findings reveal that linguistic variation in Beleka is systematic rather than random, encompassing three interconnected dimensions: phonological variation, lexical variation, and expressive or stylistic variation. These patterns suggest that dialect differences within a single village can emerge through the interaction of local linguistic practices, historical settlement

backgrounds, intergenerational transmission, and changing communicative environments. The central finding is that dialect in Beleka functions not only as a means of communication but also as a marker of local identity, social affiliation, and cultural continuity.

Phonological variation provides the clearest evidence that geographical proximity does not necessarily produce uniform speech patterns. Differences such as ni taokne and ni taokn, kangenme and kangenm, and the contrasting pronunciation of vowel sounds and final -e illustrate how speakers may communicate similar meanings through distinct phonetic realizations. These differences are particularly significant because they occur within the same village, indicating that dialectological boundaries do not always coincide with administrative boundaries. The reported settlement backgrounds of the northern and southern communities provide a plausible historical explanation for these patterns, although the precise relationship between migration history and present-day pronunciation requires further empirical verification. The findings therefore suggest that local dialect formation should be understood as a gradual process in which inherited speech habits and continuing interaction contribute to the maintenance of distinctive pronunciation patterns. From this perspective, phonological variation is not simply a difference in articulation; it may also serve as a subtle means through which speakers recognize and reproduce local belonging.

Lexical variation provides a complementary explanation of how dialect differences acquire social and cultural significance. The contrasts between sentauk and serantauk for "chair," singelet and selekak for "tank top," and penggaet and penggale for "fruit picker" demonstrate that speakers from different parts of Beleka may employ different lexical forms to refer to comparable objects. These differences suggest that local vocabulary develops through community-specific linguistic practices and becomes embedded in everyday activities. The significance of such variation extends beyond the existence of alternative words: repeated use within particular social networks may reinforce familiarity, solidarity, and recognition among community members. Local vocabulary may consequently operate as an informal identity marker that distinguishes speakers familiar with particular village practices from those less familiar with them. However, the interpretation of these forms as products of linguistic innovation remains a plausible explanation rather than a conclusively established historical process, because the available findings do not trace when the terms emerged or how they spread between speakers.

Expressive and stylistic variation further demonstrates that dialect differences involve more than pronunciation and vocabulary. The reported contrast between the relatively softer intonation of southern speakers and the distinctive, stronger intonation of northern speakers indicates that meaning and social identity may also be communicated through tone, diction, and interactional style. Such differences are particularly relevant in interpersonal communication because speakers may adjust their expressions according to the interlocutor, social relationship, and communicative situation. The reported use of informal expressions, repetition, and code-mixing also suggests that language practices in Beleka are responsive to changing social environments. Younger speakers appear more inclined to incorporate expressions associated with Indonesian, English, social media, and popular culture, whereas older speakers tend to maintain more traditional forms. Nevertheless, code-mixing should be distinguished analytically from dialect variation: the former involves the use of linguistic resources from different languages, while the latter concerns patterned differences between speech varieties. Their coexistence in Beleka indicates that local dialects can remain socially meaningful while speakers simultaneously adapt their communicative repertoires to contemporary influences.

Generational differences provide a further dimension for interpreting these findings. Older speakers appear to contribute to the continuity of established pronunciation, vocabulary, and expressive conventions, whereas younger speakers participate more actively in linguistic adaptation and mixing. This distinction should not be interpreted as evidence that younger speakers are necessarily abandoning their local dialect. Instead, it suggests that linguistic continuity and innovation may occur simultaneously. Younger speakers can retain locally recognizable forms while incorporating expressions acquired through education, mobility, and digital communication. Language change in Beleka may therefore be better understood as a process of selective adaptation than as a straightforward transition from traditional to modern speech. The extent to which these patterns represent stable generational change, rather than differences associated with particular situations or communication partners, cannot be determined conclusively from the available findings.

These interpretations directly address the study's objective of identifying linguistic differences between the northern and southern parts of Beleka and examining their possible social and geographical associations. The findings indicate that phonological and lexical differences provide the most identifiable evidence of local differentiation, while expressive practices and code-mixing reveal how those differences operate within changing social interactions. The three dimensions are interrelated: geographical and historical experiences may contribute to the development of distinctive speech forms; repeated interaction may sustain these forms as markers of community affiliation; and generational contact with wider linguistic environments may introduce new expressions without necessarily eliminating established local features.

Theoretically, these findings can be interpreted through sociolinguistic perspectives that understand linguistic variation as a socially situated phenomenon. Labov's (2010) account of language variation provides a basis for interpreting differences in pronunciation as part of the relationship between linguistic patterns and social differentiation. Similarly, Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015) emphasize the importance of social context in understanding language use and speakers' choices across communicative situations. Applied to Beleka, these perspectives suggest that dialect is best understood not as a fixed collection of isolated linguistic forms but as a dynamic system shaped by the interaction between linguistic structure, social relationships, and communicative practice. The findings also reinforce the relevance of examining local dialects at a fine geographical scale, where variation may occur even among speakers who share a broader linguistic and cultural environment.

Synthesizing these findings, the study proposes a conceptual interpretation in which geographical and historical backgrounds, social interaction, and generational experiences function as interconnected conditions associated with dialect variation. These conditions are reflected in phonological, lexical, and expressive patterns, which become recognizable through repeated community use and contribute to local identity. Meanwhile, education, mobility, and digital communication introduce additional linguistic resources that may reshape everyday expression. The resulting relationship is dynamic: community practices sustain distinctive local forms, while changing social environments create opportunities for linguistic adaptation. This synthesis constitutes the study's principal analytical contribution by connecting the structural description of dialect differences with their social functions and potential mechanisms of continuity and change. However, these relationships should be understood as an interpretive framework derived from the observed patterns, not as a causal model conclusively demonstrated by the available data.

Volume 2, Issue 4, October 2026, 292-307
E-ISSN 3064-5379

Overall, dialectological variation in Beleka Village illustrates how linguistic diversity can exist within a relatively small geographical area and remain meaningful in everyday social life. The findings extend the analysis beyond identifying alternative pronunciations and lexical items by showing how these forms may intersect with historical settlement, community affiliation, and generational language practices. The study thus provides a locally grounded account of dialect variation in the Sasak-speaking context and establishes a basis for further research into the geographical distribution, historical development, and intergenerational transmission of local speech forms.

2. Comparison with Previous Studies

The findings of this study are broadly consistent with previous dialectological and sociolinguistic research demonstrating that linguistic variation reflects the interaction between geographical distribution, social relationships, and language practices. However, the Beleka Village case adds a more localized perspective by showing that systematic differences in pronunciation, vocabulary, and expressive style may occur within a single village. Rather than treating dialect variation exclusively as a distinction between established regional languages or geographically distant speech communities, this study highlights the importance of examining linguistic differentiation at the village level. This perspective is particularly relevant to understanding how local speech varieties develop and remain recognizable within communities that share a broader cultural and linguistic environment.

Regarding phonological variation, the differences identified between northern and southern Beleka speakers are consistent with research emphasizing the geographical distribution and social conditioning of pronunciation patterns. Fernández et al. (2024) examined the relationship between geographical factors and linguistic distribution, while Koile and Moroz (2024) highlighted the importance of systematic geographical sampling in representing regional linguistic variation. These perspectives support the relevance of examining the spatial distribution of speech forms within Beleka. Similarly, Labov's (2010) sociolinguistic perspective provides a basis for interpreting pronunciation differences as potentially associated with social differentiation and language change. Nevertheless, the Beleka findings offer a distinct empirical emphasis: the observed differences involve specific vowel realizations, final sounds, and pronunciation patterns among speakers from neighboring parts of the same village. Whereas geographical studies may examine variation across broader observation points, the present case draws attention to the possibility that settlement histories and local interaction patterns contribute to fine-grained linguistic distinctions. The historical explanation proposed for Beleka remains tentative, however, because the relationship between migration origins and particular phonological features requires further investigation.

The lexical findings also correspond with previous studies that have used vocabulary comparison to identify relationships between regional speech varieties. Research on Javanese varieties by Saddhono and Hartanto (2021), comparisons of Kangean and Madura by Hakim et al. (2022), and research on Lampung and Minangkabau varieties by Larizky and Widyastuti (2023), Risani et al. (2023), and Septianingtias et al. (2024) demonstrate the value of systematically documenting lexical differences across speech communities. Similarly, Astuti et al. (2022) examined phonological and lexical differences between Lakiung and Konjo varieties of Makassar. These studies provide methodological support for identifying contrasting lexical forms such as sentauk and serantauk, singelet and selekak, and penggaet and penggale in Beleka. The principal difference lies in the scale and interpretation of the findings. In Beleka, lexical variation is not considered solely as evidence for linguistic classification; it is also interpreted in relation to everyday activities,

community familiarity, and local identity. This distinction broadens the analytical significance of lexical documentation by connecting differences in word choice with the social contexts in which those words are used.

The findings concerning expressive and stylistic variation are also consistent with research demonstrating that language use changes according to social context, communicative purpose, and relationships between speakers. Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015) emphasize the relationship between linguistic choices and social circumstances, providing a useful framework for interpreting differences in intonation, diction, and conversational style in Beleka. Research on Sasak language variation by Sugianto and Hasby (2023) offers a relevant regional point of reference, while Murtafi'ah (2023) highlights the significance of intonation and conversational context in interpreting Sasak utterances. These studies support the importance of examining not only the linguistic forms speakers produce but also how they use them in interaction. The Beleka findings extend this perspective by identifying reported stylistic differences between northern and southern speakers, including variations in perceived softness and strength of intonation. Nevertheless, the social meanings of these differences cannot be assumed from pronunciation alone; further analysis of recorded interactions would be needed to establish whether they systematically signal politeness, solidarity, regional affiliation, or other interpersonal meanings.

The findings on code-mixing and generational differences further correspond with studies emphasizing the relationship between language choice, social interaction, and changing communicative environments. Putri and Pulungan (2022) examined code-switching and code-mixing in village communities, while Hamdiah et al. (2023) investigated diglossia among the Madurese community of Gili Ketapang across different social contexts. These studies demonstrate the relevance of distinguishing between variation within a speech variety and the selection or alternation of linguistic resources. In Beleka, the incorporation of Indonesian and English expressions by younger speakers suggests that local language practices operate alongside broader linguistic influences. However, the findings do not establish that digital media alone cause these patterns, since education, peer interaction, mobility, and other forms of language contact may also contribute. The comparison therefore supports an interpretation of language use as adaptive while cautioning against attributing observed differences to a single external influence.

A further point of comparison concerns the relationship between linguistic variation and cultural identity. Hasbullah and Al-Pansori (2022), Jaeka and Anggarista (2023), and Wilian et al. (2023) provide relevant perspectives on social stratification, family language choices, and cultural terminology in the study of local linguistic practices. Dewi et al. (2022) and Siregar et al. (2025) also highlight the relevance of language attitudes and maintenance to cultural identity. These perspectives help explain why locally distinctive vocabulary and pronunciation may remain meaningful even when speakers are exposed to wider linguistic influences. In Beleka, the coexistence of traditional forms and newer expressions suggests that cultural continuity does not necessarily require linguistic uniformity. Instead, local identity may be maintained through recognizable speech features while individual speakers adapt their language to different social settings. The findings thus complement research on language maintenance by drawing attention to the potential significance of variation within a single community, rather than focusing exclusively on differences between languages or the survival of a language as a whole.

More broadly, the Beleka case relates to dialectological research that uses comparative linguistic evidence to examine regional relationships. Surahim and Ramli (2023) demonstrated the

relevance of observations, interviews, recordings, and field notes for studying Luwu language varieties, while Salahuddin (2025) and Lubis et al. (2026) highlighted the potential of dialectometry and digital tools for classifying subdialects and mapping linguistic relationships. These approaches suggest possible directions for extending the present research. The current findings establish a descriptive basis for identifying differences between northern and southern Beleka speech, but they do not yet provide the quantitative evidence needed to determine the degree of linguistic distance between the two areas or classify them as separate subdialects. Future research could therefore combine the qualitative documentation presented here with systematic lexical comparisons, phonetic measurements, and dialectometric calculations. Such integration would allow the proposed geographical distinctions to be evaluated more rigorously.

Taken together, the comparison with previous studies indicates both continuity and a distinctive contribution. The Beleka findings reinforce established understandings of phonological and lexical variation, socially situated language use, and the relationship between linguistic practices and local identity. Their particular contribution lies in bringing these dimensions together within a geographically localized investigation of a single village community. Whereas earlier studies cited here have addressed regional classification, language choice, social context, or language maintenance from different perspectives, the Beleka study integrates pronunciation, vocabulary, expressive style, and generational differences into one descriptive account. This contribution should be understood as a contextual and empirical extension of existing dialectological research rather than as evidence that the Beleka speech varieties constitute independently established dialects. The available data support the presence of localized linguistic differences, while further comparative and quantitative investigation is required to establish their historical development, geographical boundaries, and relationship to wider Sasak varieties.

3. Implications of Findings

The findings have theoretical and practical implications for dialectological research. Theoretically, this study extends the understanding of local linguistic variation by demonstrating how phonological, lexical, and expressive differences may coexist within a single village and intersect with geographical backgrounds, social interaction, and generational experiences. The findings support a contextual understanding of dialect as both a linguistic system and a potential marker of community identity. Practically, documenting the distinctive speech forms of northern and southern Beleka provides a preliminary resource for preserving local linguistic knowledge and supporting further research on Sasak language variation. The findings may also inform community-based language documentation and educational initiatives that introduce younger generations to local vocabulary and speech traditions. However, these implications should be developed through further empirical validation and community participation to ensure that documentation reflects speakers' actual practices and interpretations.

4. Research Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, the available data do not specify the number of participants or provide a detailed account of the sampling distribution across geographical and age groups, limiting the assessment of representativeness. Second, although differences in pronunciation, vocabulary, and expressive style were identified, the analysis does not include quantitative phonetic measurements or dialectometric calculations to establish the extent of linguistic distance between the northern and southern parts of Beleka. Third, the proposed influence of settlement history, education, social interaction, and digital media remains interpretive because these factors were not independently examined as causal variables. Finally, differences in

speaking situations and researchers' interpretations may have influenced the identification of linguistic patterns. Future studies should therefore employ a larger and more systematically distributed participant sample, standardized linguistic elicitation, acoustic analysis, and comparative dialectometry to validate the observed patterns and clarify their geographical and social distribution.

CONCLUSION

This study examined dialectological variation in language use among the Beleka Village community in Central Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara, focusing on differences between the northern and southern parts of the village and their potential social and geographical associations. The findings identified three interconnected dimensions of variation: phonological, lexical, and expressive or stylistic. Differences in pronunciation, including final sounds and vowel realizations, indicate localized speech patterns, while contrasting vocabulary items demonstrate the distinctive linguistic practices of the two communities. Variations in intonation, conversational style, and code-mixing further reveal that language use is dynamic and responsive to social interaction and changing communicative environments. Collectively, these findings suggest that dialect functions not only as a means of communication but also as a potential marker of local identity and community affiliation. The study's principal contribution is its integrated examination of linguistic forms, geographical context, and generational practices within a single village, demonstrating the value of investigating dialect variation at a more localized level.

Nevertheless, the findings should be interpreted in light of the study's limitations, particularly the absence of a specified participant count, quantitative phonetic measurements, and dialectometric analysis. Consequently, the observed differences provide a descriptive basis for understanding local linguistic variation but do not conclusively establish separate dialect boundaries or causal relationships between social factors and linguistic features. Future research should involve a larger and systematically selected sample of speakers across geographical and age groups, supported by acoustic phonetic analysis, structured lexical comparison, and dialectometric methods. Further investigation into settlement history, language contact, and intergenerational transmission would also help clarify how distinctive speech patterns emerge and persist in Beleka. These efforts could strengthen the empirical understanding of Sasak dialect variation while contributing to the documentation and preservation of local linguistic heritage.

REFERENCES

Adli, A., & Guy, G. R. (2022). Globalising the study of language variation and change: A manifesto on cross-cultural sociolinguistics. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 16*(5–6), Article e12452. https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12452

Astuti, D., Kaharuddin, & Gusnawaty. (2022). Variasi fonologi dan leksikon dialek Lakiung dan dialek Konjo pada bahasa Makassar Sulawesi Selatan. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra, 8*(2), 520–532. https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v8i2.1840

Ate, C. P. (2026). Sustaining the mother tongue: Insights into Waijewa language maintenance among migrant workers in the Denpasar diaspora. *ELite Journal: International Journal of Education, Language and Literature, 6*(2), 84–96. https://doi.org/10.26740/elitejournal.v6n2.p84-96

Clark, J., & Yallop, C. (n.d.). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed., V. Knight, Ed.). SAGE Publications.

Dewi, E., Indarti, T., & Raharjo, R. P. (2022). Sikap dan pemertahanan bahasa Sasak pada masyarakat Lombok. *MATAPENA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya, 5*(2). https://doi.org/10.36815/matapena.v5i02.2213

Ernanda, & Amri, U. (2026). When lexical data speak: Reassessing the genetic classification of Indonesia's regional languages. *Linguistik Indonesia, 44*(1), 111–131. https://doi.org/10.26499/li.v44i1.1065

Fardzilatin, E., & Suryadi, M. (2022). Lexical variations of coastal and mountain Javanese in Jepara, Indonesia: A sociodialecology study. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, dan Budaya, 12*(2), 180–196. https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.12.2.2022.180-196

Fernández, J. O., Bonilla, J., & Rocha, L. Á. (2024). The influence of geographic variables in linguistic variation. *Dialectologia, 32*, 165–191. https://doi.org/10.1344/DIALECTOLOGIA2023.32.7

Fusch, P., Fusch, G. E., & Ness, L. R. (2018). Denzin's paradigm shift: Revisiting triangulation in qualitative research. *Journal of Social Change, 10*(1), 19–32. https://doi.org/10.5590/josc.2018.10.1.02

Gregory, M., & Carroll, S. (1978). *Language and situation*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hakim, M. M., Sariono, A., & Asrumi. (2022). Dialect identification on Kangean Island and Madurese Island: Dialectology study. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa, 8*(2), 129–143. https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.8.2.2022.129-143

Hamdiah, M., Rohmah, N., & Hanindita, A. W. (2023). The situation of speech diglossia in Madurese Gili Ketapang village community, Sumberasih District, Probolinggo Regency. *Jurnal Disastri, 5*(3), 496–503. https://doi.org/10.33752/disastri.v5i3.5158

Hasbullah, & Al-Pansori, M. J. (2022). Distingsi stratifikasi sosial variasi bahasa Sasak, Indonesia. *Literasi: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Indonesia, 1*(1), 21–37. https://doi.org/10.58218/literasi.v1i3.310

Holmes, J., & Wilson, N. (2022). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (6th ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367821852

Jaeka, F., & Anggarista, R. (2023). Kajian istilah dalam prosesi bejangkep Suku Sasak Lombok: Pemertahanan ragam istilah lokal. *Jurnalistrendi: Jurnal Linguistik, Sastra, dan Pendidikan, 8*(2), 253–268. https://doi.org/10.51673/jurnalistrendi.v8i2.1830

Koile, E., & Moroz, G. (2024). Detecting linguistic variation with geographic sampling. *Journal of Linguistic Geography*. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-linguistic-geography/open-access

Labov, W. (2010). *Principles of linguistic change: Cognitive and cultural factors*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Larizky, H. N., & Widyastuti, C. S. (2023). Lexical variation of Agam Tanah Datar dialect in Nagari Gunuang of Padang Panjang City. *Jurnal Arbitrer, 10*(2), 169–175. https://doi.org/10.25077/ar.10.2.169-175.2023

Lubis, D. F., Bowo, T. A., & Amalia, R. (2026). The distribution of isolects in Payung Sub-District, South Bangka Regency: A dialectometric study. *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education, 16*(1), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.14710/parole.v16i1.27-40

Mansfield, J., Leslie-O'Neill, H., & Li, H. (2023). Dialect differences and linguistic divergence: A crosslinguistic survey of grammatical variation. *Language Dynamics and Change*. https://doi.org/10.1163/22105832-bja10026

Muin, A., Arma, A., Afif, M., Pratiwi, H., Hilmiyati, F., & Ansori, A. (2026). Local language vitality in Indonesian tourism destinations: Tourism-driven language shift and preservation. *Khazanah Sosial, 8*(1). https://doi.org/10.15575/ks.v8i1.51178

Murtafi'ah, W. (2023). Makna diferensial dalam percakapan bahasa Sasak di Desa Montong Betok. *MEMACE: Jurnal Linguistik, Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia, dan Asing, 1*(1), 27–32. https://doi.org/10.55681/memace.v1i1.663

Nguyen Quoc Dung. (2024). Abbreviated key title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci Nguyen Quoc Dung. *IAGR Journal of Arts*, *7672*(VI), 322–329. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16718886

Perreault, K. (2011). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. *Manual Therapy, 16*(1), 103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.math.2010.09.003

Pinget, A.-F., & Voeten, C. C. (2023). Social factors in accent recognition: A large-scale study in perceptual dialectology. *Journal of Linguistic Geography, 11*(2), 78–90. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-linguistic-geography/open-access

Puspandari, L. E., & Tricahyaningati, D. (2026). Dialectological analysis of Arekan, Mataraman, and Pendhalungan regional linguistic features in East Java. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15*(3), 658–672. https://doi.org/10.17509/6kd1sp97

Putri, D. D., & Pulungan, R. (2022). Analisis alih kode dan campur kode bahasa Jawa dan bahasa Indonesia dalam interaksi warga Desa Namo Bintang Dusun II Sumberingin. *Bahastra: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, 7*(1). https://doi.org/10.30743/bahastra.v7i1.5506

Resticka, G. A., Nurdiyanto, E., & Purwandari, G. A. (2023). Language accommodation in speech communities in Banyumas District. *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, 12*(2). https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh.v12i2.5154

Risani, M., Nadra, & Noviatri. (2023). Variasi leksikal bahasa Minangkabau di Kecamatan Ranah Pesisir, Kabupaten Pesisir Selatan: Kajian dialektologi. *Jurnal Sastra Indonesia (SASINDO), 12*(2), 106–118. https://doi.org/10.24114/sasindo.v12i2.45124

Saddhono, K., & Hartanto, W. (2021). A dialect geography in Yogyakarta-Surakarta isolect in Wedi District: An examination of permutation and phonological dialectometry as an endeavor to preserve Javanese language in Indonesia. *Heliyon, 7*(7), Article e07660. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07660

Salahuddin. (2025). Subdialect classification of Manggarai language using dialectometry calculation and Gabmap. *Linguistik Indonesia, 43*(1), 19–42. https://doi.org/10.26499/li.v43i1.704

Siregar, I. W., Zainuddin, & Hasibuan, Y. (2025). Language maintenance in regional languages: Sociolinguistic study. *JELIM: Journal of Education, Language, Social and Management, 3*(2). https://doi.org/10.65787/jelim.v3i2.71

Spolsky, B., & Trudgill, P. (1986). Applied sociolinguistics. *Language, 62*(2). https://doi.org/10.2307/414687

Sugianto, S., & Hasby, M. A. (2023). The language variations used among speakers of Sasak Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 11*(1), 144–150. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v11i1.6071

Sultani, M. E., & Matin, F. (2025). Key factors contributing to language variation. *Kunduz University International Journal of Islamic Studies and Social Sciences, 2*(2), 278–288. https://doi.org/10.71082/1jp6rf72

Surahim, I., & Ramli, A. (2023). An analysis of the language variations of Luwunese through speech acts (Focus: Luwu, North Luwu, and East Luwu). *Jurnal Dieksis ID, 3*(2), 160–169. https://doi.org/10.54065/dieksis.3.2.2023.356

Suroso, R. F., Riyanto, E. D., & Khusyairi, J. A. (2025). The dual valence of identity: A quantitative analysis of cultural and social identity's influences on English language usage in Indonesian higher education. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology, 10*(5), 4277–4284. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25may2059

Syam, C., & Abdu, W. J. (2023). Dynamics of language interaction in multicultural urban communities: Analysis of socio-cultural linguistic environment. *Society, 11*(2), 575–588. https://doi.org/10.33019/society.v11i2.628

Trudgill, P. (1998). *Dialectology* (2nd ed.).

Vivek, R., Nanthagopan, Y., & Piriyatharshan, S. (2023). Beyond methods: Theoretical underpinnings of triangulation in qualitative and multi-method studies. *SEEU Review, 18*(2), 105–122. https://doi.org/10.2478/seeur-2023-0088

Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. A. M. (2015). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (7th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Wibisono, B., Kushartanti, B., & Octavianna, Y. (2021). Pemetaan bahasa Jawa di Provinsi Jawa Timur: Sebuah kajian dialektologi. *LITERA, 20*(3), 432–446. https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v20i3.44521

Wieling, M., Nerbonne, J., & Baayen, R. H. (2011). Quantitative social dialectology: Explaining linguistic variation geographically and socially. *PLoS ONE, 6*(9), Article e23613. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0023613

Wilian, S., Mahyuni, M., & Fitriana, E. (2023). Competition of ethnic and national languages within the home domain: Insights from multilingual Sasak family language choice, Lombok–Indonesia. *World Journal of English Language, 13*(5), 131–140. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n5p131