

# AN ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE, DIALECT, AND VARIETIES

Anggun Hervi Rahmania<sup>1</sup>  
Dion Tira Erlangga<sup>2</sup>  
English Literature  
English Education

[diontiraerlangga@gmail.com](mailto:diontiraerlangga@gmail.com)

## Abstract

Most speakers can give a name to whatever it is they speak. On occasion, some of these names may appear to be strange to those who take a scientific interest in languages, but we should remember that human naming practices often have a large ‘unscientific’ component to them. Census-takers in India find themselves confronted with a wide array of language names when they ask people what language or languages they speak. Names are not only ascribed by region, which is what we might expect, but sometimes also by caste, religion, village, and so on. Moreover, they can change from census to census as the political and social climate of the country changes. While people do usually know what language they speak, they may not always lay claim to be fully qualified speakers of that language. They may experience difficulty in deciding whether what they speak should be called a language proper or merely a dialect of some language.

**Key words:** Analysis, dialect, language, varieties

---

## INTRODUCTION

(Sari & Pranoto, 2021) define dialect as a variety of a language that differs from others along three dimensions: vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation (accent) because they are forms of the same language. (Suprayogi et al., 2021), (Amelia et al., 2022) has pointed out that language and dialect are ambiguous terms. Ordinary people use these terms quite freely in speech (Samanik, 2021); for them a dialect is almost certainly no more than a local non-prestigious (therefore powerless) variety of a real language (Kuswanto et al., 2020), (Candra & Qodriani, 2019), (Fakhrurozi & Adrian, 2020). In contrast, scholars often experience considerable difficulty in deciding whether one term should be used rather than the other in certain situations (Mandasari et al., 2022), (Nurmala Sari et al., 2021), (Puspita, 2019). As (Afrianto et al., 2021) say, the terms ‘represent a simple dichotomy in a situation that is almost infinitely complex.’ They points out that the confusion goes back to the Ancient Greeks (Oktaviani et al., 2021), (Kuswoyo & Audina, 2020). The Greek language that we associate with Ancient Greece was actually a group of distinct local varieties (Ionic, Doric, and Attic) (Amelia & Dintasi, 2019), (Suprayogi & Eko, 2020), descended by divergence from a common spoken source with each variety having its own literary traditions and uses (Mandasari, n.d.), (Puspita & Pranoto, 2021),

e.g., Ionic for history, Doric for choral and lyric works, and Attic for tragedy (Samanik, 2019), (Yulianti & Sulistyawati, 2021). Later, Athenian Greek, the koiné – or ‘common’ language – became the norm for the spoken language as the various spoken varieties converged on the dialect of the major cultural and administrative center (Kardiansyah, 2019), (Fakhrurozi & Adrian, 2021).

(Septiyana & Aminatun, 2021b), (Endang Woro Kasih, 2018) point out that the Greek situation has provided the model for all later usages of the two terms with the resulting ambiguity. Language can be used to refer either to a single linguistic norm or to a group of related norms (Sartika & Pranoto, 2021), (Setri & Setiawan, 2020), and dialect to refer to one of the norms (Qodriani & Kardiansyah, 2018), (Afrianto & Gulö, 2019). The situation is further confused by the distinction the French make between un dialecte and un patois (Mandasari & Aminatun, 2020), (Hutauruk & Puspita, 2020), (Fadilah & Kuswoyo, 2021).

The former is a regional variety of a language that has an associated literary tradition (Samanik & Lianasari, 2018), whereas the latter is a regional variety that lacks such a literary tradition (Oktavia & Suprayogi, 2021), (Yulianti & Sulistyawati, 2020). Therefore patois tends to be used pejoratively; it is regarded as something less than a dialect because of its lack of an associated literature (Fithratullah, 2021), (Wardaningsih & Kasih, 2022), (Nababan & Nurmaily, 2021). Even a language like Breton, a Celtic language still spoken in parts of Brittany, is called a patois because of its lack of a strong literary tradition and the fact that it is not some country’s language (Fakhrurozi & Puspita, 2021). However, dialect in French, like dialect in German, cannot be used in connection with the standard language (Pranoto & Afrilita, 2019), (Septiyana & Aminatun, 2021a), i.e., no speaker of French considers Standard French to be a dialect of French (Gulö & Rahmawelly, 2019). In contrast, it is not uncommon to find references to Standard English being a dialect – admittedly a very important one – of English.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Haugen points out that, while speakers of English have never seriously adopted patois as a term to be used in the description of language, they have tried to employ both language and dialect in a number of conflicting senses. Dialect is used both for local varieties of English, e.g., Yorkshire dialect, and for various types of informal, lower-class, or rural speech. ‘In

general usage it therefore remains quite undefined whether such dialects are part of the “language” or not. In fact, the dialect is often thought of as standing outside the language.

As a social norm, then, a dialect is a language that is excluded from polite society. It is often equivalent to nonstandard or even substandard, when such terms are applied to language, and can connote various degrees of inferiority, with that connotation of inferiority carried over to those who speak a dialect. One such attempt, seven criteria that may be useful in discussing different kinds of languages. These criteria (standardization, vitality, historicity, autonomy, reduction, mixture, and de facto norms) may be used to distinguish certain languages from others. They also make it possible to speak of some languages as being more ‘developed’ in certain ways than others, thus addressing a key issue in the language–dialect distinction, since speakers usually feel that languages are generally ‘better’ than dialects in some sense.

1. Standardization refers to the process by which a language has been codified in some way.
2. Vitality refers to the existence of a living community of speakers.
3. Historicity refers to the fact that a particular group of people finds a sense of identity through using a particular language: it belongs to them.
4. Autonomy is an interesting concept because it is really one of feeling. A language must be felt by its speakers to be different from other languages.
5. Reduction refers to the fact that a particular variety may be regarded as a sub-variety rather than as an independent entity.
6. Mixture refers to feelings speakers have about the ‘purity’ of the variety they speak.
7. De facto norms refers to the feeling that many speakers have that there are both ‘good’ speakers and ‘poor’ speakers and that the good speakers represent the norms of proper usage.

## **METHOD**

The researchers utilized library research techniques and subjective depiction. This study utilized a subjective methodology zeroing in on story understanding. Subjective means

examination dependent principally upon a constructivist viewpoint with respect to a singular's encounter that has been by and large or socially built. The information hotspot for this study was a strategies for teaching in second language acquisition. Information assortment strategies were performed by exploring or perusing sources in books, the web, as well as in past exploration reports, and others. Most understudies can find their assets in the library, information on the main libraries, experience with the chapter by chapter guide and other reference works, about complex is surely a fundamental apparatus for pretty much every understudy of writing. The information examination procedure utilized in this study is clear investigation. To help this information, the specialists looked for important information from different sources. Information investigation is the methodical course of considering and orchestrating information from meetings, perceptions, and records by coordinating the information and concluding what is significant and which should be contemplated. also, make determinations that are straightforward.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Regional Dialect**

Dialect geography is term used to describe attempts made map the distribution of various linguistic features so as to show their geographical provenance. For example, in seeking to determine features of the dialects of English and to show their distribution, dialect geographers try to find to question such as the following. Is this an –r pronouncing area of English, as in word like *car* and *cart* or is it not? What past tense form of drink do speakers prefer? What names do people give particular objects in the environment, e.g., elevator or lift, petrol or gas carousel or roundabout? Do people say ‘ *i haven’t any* ’ ; ‘ *i don’t have any* ’ *i ain’t got none* ‘? And so on. Sometimes maps are drawn to show actual boundaries around such features, boundaries call isoglosses, sonas to distinguish an area in which certain feature is found from area in which it is absent. When several sch isoglosses coincide, the result is sometimes called a dialect boundary.

All people in the same place can talk to each other and for the most part understand each other. Yet not two speak exactly alike. Some differences are due to the age, sex, state of health, size, personality, emotional state, and personal idiosyncrasies (Fromkin, Rodman, Collins, and Blair; 1990: 245). That each person speaks somewhat differently form all others is shown by our ability to recognize acquaintances by hearing them talk. The unique

characteristic of the language of an individual speaker are referred to as the speaker's idiolect.

Beyond these individual differences, the language of a group of people may show regular variations from that used by other groups of speaker of that language. When the English of speaker in different geographical regions and from different social groups shows systemic differences, the groups are said to speak different dialects of the same language. The dialect of a single language may thus be defined as mutually intelligible forms of a language that differ in systemic ways from each other.

There are two kinds of dialect; they can be regional dialect and social dialect. Regional dialect is geographically based. It means that a dialect that differs because of geographical area. The differences can be in terms of pronunciation, choice of words, and syntax.

Finally, the term dialect, particularly when it is used in reference to regional variation, should not be confused with the term accents, standard English, for example is spoken in a variety of accent. Often with clear regional social association: there are accents associated with North America, Singapore, India, Liverpool (Scouse), Tyneside (Geordie), Boston, New York and so on.

### **Social Dialect**

A sociolect or social dialect is a variety of language (a register) associated with a social group such as a socioeconomic class, an ethnic group (precisely termed ethnolect), an age group, etc. Sociolects involve both passive acquisition of particular communicative practices through association with a local community, as well as active learning and choice among speech or writing forms to demonstrate identification with particular groups.

Sociolect, defined by Peter Trudgill, a leading sociolinguist and philosopher, is "a variety which is thought of as being related to its speakers' social background rather than geographical background". This idea of sociolect began with the commencement of Dialectology, the study of different dialects in relation to social society, which has been established in countries such as England for many years, but only recently has the field garnered more attention. However, as opposed to dialect, the basic concept of a sociolect is that a person speaks in accordance with their social group whether it is with regard to one's

ethnicity, age, gender, etc. As William Labov once said, “the sociolinguistic view...is that we are programmed to learn to speak in ways that fit the general pattern of our communities”. Therefore, what we are surrounded with in unison with our environment determines how we speak; hence, our actions and associations.

DIALECT	AMERICAN	BRITISH	DATA SOURCE
Pronunciation <i>(accent)</i> : (1) (2) (3)	/stu:pid/ /rɑ:n/ /dɜ:t/	/'stju:pid/ /rɒn/ /dɜ:t/	Harry's potter movie
Grammar/Syntax (1) (2) (3)	I have got dirt on your nose . I will place the sorting hat Did you know?	I have gotten dirt on your nose. I shall place the sorting hat Have you know?	Harry potter movie
Vocabulary (1) (2) (3)	flavor trousers hoover	flavour pants vacuum	Harry potter movie and learn british English free

## CONCLUSION

Variety is a language that has same sounds, words, grammatical features. A general term for any distinctive form of a language or linguistic expression is Language varieties. Linguists commonly use language variety, as a cover term for any of the overlapping subcategories of a language, including dialect, idiolect, register, and social dialect. Dialect

refers to a variety of a language that can signal the speaker's regional or social background, dialects are subdivisions of language, the term of dialect refers to grammar and vocabulary (or lexis). Dialect is divided into two, social dialect and regional dialect. Regional dialect refers to a place, and social dialect refers to social groups and classes. Style relates to the typical ways in which one or more people do a particular thing, and Registers can simply be described as variations of the language according to its use, while the dialect as a language variation based on users registers on this concept is not limited to the choice of words (such as the notion registers in the traditional theory) but also includes the choice of the use of text structure, and texture.

## REFERENCES

- Afrianto, A., & Gulö, I. (2019). Revisiting English competence at hotel. *Teknosastik*, 17(1), 35–39.
- Afrianto, Sujatna, E. T. S., Darmayanti, N., & Ariyani, F. (2021). Configuration of Lampung Mental Clause: a Functional Grammar Investigation. *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language and Arts (ICLA 2020)*, 539(Icla 2020), 222–226. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210325.039>
- Amelia, D., Afrianto, A., Samanik, S., Suprayogi, S., Pranoto, B. E., & Gulo, I. (2022). Improving Public Speaking Ability through Speech. *Journal of Social Sciences and Technology for Community Service (JSSTCS)*, 3(2), 322. <https://doi.org/10.33365/jsstcs.v3i2.2231>
- Amelia, D., & Dintasi, F. D. (2019). Ephebophilia suffered by the main character. *Teknosastik*, 15(2), 81–86.
- Candra, L. K., & Qodriani, L. U. (2019). An Analysis of Code Switching in Leila S. Chudori's For Nadira. *Teknosastik*, 16(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.33365/ts.v16i1.128>
- Endang Woro Kasih, E. (2018). Formulating Western Fiction in Garrett Touch of Texas. *Arab World English Journal For Translation and Literary Studies*, 2(2), 142–155. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol2no2.10>
- Fadilah, R., & Kuswoyo, H. (2021). Transitivity Analysis of News Reports on Covid-19 of Jakarta Post Press. *The 1st International Conference on Language Linguistic Literature and Education (ICLLLE)*.
- Fakhrurozi, J., & Adrian, Q. J. (2020). Ekranisasi Cerpen ke Film Pendek: Alternatif Pembelajaran Kolaboratif di Perguruan Tinggi. *Seminar Nasional Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 1(1), 91–97.
- Fakhrurozi, J., & Adrian, Q. J. (2021). Kajian Dan Praktik Ekranisasi Cerpen Perempuan di Rumah Panggung ke Film Pendek Angkon. *Deiksis: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 8(1), 31–40.
- Fakhrurozi, J., & Puspita, D. (2021). KONSEP PIIL PESENGGIRI DALAM SASTRA LISAN WAWANCAN LAMPUNG SAIBATIN. *JURNAL PESONA*, 7(1), 1–13.
- Fithratullah, M. (2021). Representation of Korean Values Sustainability in American Remake Movies. *Teknosastik*, 19(1), 60. <https://doi.org/10.33365/ts.v19i1.874>
- Gulö, I., & Rahmawelly, T. V. (2019). An Analysis of Omission in Students' English Writings. *Teknosastik*, 16(2), 55–59.
- Hutauruk, M., & Puspita, D. (2020). A METAPRAGMATIC ANALYSIS: A STUDY OF

- PRAGMATIC FAILURE FOUND IN INDONESIAN EFL STUDENTS. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 1(2), 62–69.
- Kardiansyah, M. Y. (2019). Wattpad as a Story Sharing Website; Is it a field of literary production? *ELLiC Proceedings*, 3, 419–426.
- Kuswanto, H., Pratama, W. B. H., & Ahmad, I. S. (2020). Survey data on students' online shopping behaviour: A focus on selected university students in Indonesia. *Data in Brief*, 29, 105073.
- Kuswoyo, H., & Audina, A. Y. (2020). Consecutive Interpreting Strategies on A Court Setting: A Study of English into Indonesia Interpretation. *TEKNOSASTIK*, 18(2), 90–102.
- Mandasari, B. (n.d.). AN ANALYSIS OF ERRORS IN STUDENTS' WRITTEN ENGLISH SENTENCES: A CASE STUDY ON INDONESIAN EFL LEARNERS. 16 November 2019, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia I.
- Mandasari, B., & Aminatun, D. (2020). VLOG: A TOOL TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY AT UNIVERSITY LEVEL. *PROCEEDINGS UNIVERSITAS PAMULANG*, 1(1).
- Mandasari, B., Aminatun, D., Pustika, R., Setiawansyah, S., Megawaty, D. A., Ahmad, I., & Alita, D. (2022). Pendampingan Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris Bagi Siswa-Siswi Sma/Ma/Smk Di Desa Purworejo Lampung Tengah. *Community Development Journal : Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, 3(1), 332–338. <https://doi.org/10.31004/cdj.v3i1.4026>
- Nababan, R. M., & Nurmaily, E. (2021). *THE HYPERMASCULINITY AS SEEN IN THE MAIN CHARACTER IN RAMBO : LAST BLOOD MOVIE*. 2(1), 25–32.
- Nurmala Sari, S., Aminatun, D., Sari, S. N., Aminatun, D., Nurmala Sari, S., & Aminatun, D. (2021). Students' Perception on the Use of English Movies to Improve Vocabulary Mastery. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 2(1), 16–22. <http://jim.teknokrat.ac.id/index.php/english-language-teaching/index>
- Oktavia, W. R., & Suprayogi, S. (2021). GRAMMATICAL COHESION IN BORIS JOHNSON'S SPEECH ENTITLED CORONAVIRUS SPREAD IN UK. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 2(1), 8–16.
- Oktaviani, L., Fernando, Y., Romadhoni, R., & Noviana, N. (2021). Developing a web-based application for school counselling and guidance during COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Community Service and Empowerment*, 2(3), 110–117. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jcse.v2i3.17630>
- Pranoto, B. E., & Afrilita, L. K. (2019). The organization of words in mental lexicon: evidence from word association test. *Teknosastik*, 16(1), 26–33.
- Puspita, D. (2019). Error analysis on learners' interlanguage and intralanguage: a case study of two adolescent students. *Teknosastik*, 17(2), 12–18.
- Puspita, D., & Pranoto, B. E. (2021). The attitude of Japanese newspapers in narrating disaster events: Appraisal in critical discourse study. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 8(2), 796–817.
- Qodriani, L. U., & Kardiansyah, M. Y. (2018). Exploring Culture in Indonesia English Textbook for Secondary Education. *JPI (Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia)*, 7(1), 51–58.
- Samanik. (2019). Fable for Character Building. *Journal Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia*.
- Samanik, S. (2021). Imagery Analysis In Matsuoka's Cloud Of Sparrows. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 2(1), 17–24.
- Samanik, S., & Lianasari, F. (2018). Antimatter Technology: The Bridge between Science and Religion toward Universe Creation Theory Illustrated in Dan Brown's Angels and Demons. *Teknosastik*, 14(2), 18. <https://doi.org/10.33365/ts.v14i2.58>

- Sari, K., & Pranoto, B. E. (2021). *Representation of Government Concerning the Draft of Criminal Code in The Jakarta Post : A Critical Discourse Analysis*. 11(2), 98–113.
- Sartika, L. A., & Pranoto, B. E. (2021). *Analysis of Humor in the Big Bang Theory By Using Relevance Theory : a Pragmatic Study*. 2(1), 1–7.
- Septiyana, L., & Aminatun, D. (2021a). the Correlation Between Efl Learners' Cohesion and Their Reading Comprehension. *Journal of Research on Language Education*, 2(2), 68–74.
- Septiyana, L., & Aminatun, D. (2021b). THE CORRELATION BETWEEN EFL LEARNERS' COHESION AND THEIR READING COMPREHENSION. *Journal of Research on Language Education*, 2(2), 68–74.
- Setri, T. I., & Setiawan, D. B. (2020). Matriarchal Society in The Secret Life of Bees by Sue Monk Kidd. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 1(1), 28–33. <https://doi.org/10.33365/lj.v1i1.223>
- Suprayogi, S., & Eko, P. B. (2020). The Implementation of Virtual Exhibition Project in English for Tourism Class for University Students. *Academic Journal Perspective: Education, Language, and Literature*, 8(2), 87–97.
- Suprayogi, S., Samanik, S., Novanti, E. A., & Ardesis, Y.-. (2021). EFL Learner's Literary Competence Mapping through Reader-Response Writing Assessed using CCEA GCSE Mark Scheme. *Celt: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature*, 21(1), 1. <http://journal.unika.ac.id/index.php/celt/article/view/2871>
- Wardaniningsih, A. D., & Kasih, E. N. E. W. (2022). Delineation of Women Identity in the Disney Animated Film Ecanto (2019). *Lire Journal (Journal of Linguistics and Literature)*, 6(2), 209–229. <https://doi.org/10.33019/lire.v6i2.160>
- Yulianti, T., & Sulistiyawati, A. (2020). The Blended Learning for Student's Character Building. *International Conference on Progressive Education (ICOPE 2019)*, 56–60.
- Yulianti, T., & Sulistyawati, A. (2021). *Online Focus Group Discussion (OFGD) Model Design in Learning*.