

## REFERENCES

- Alshami, Iman. (2019). Language and linguistics.
- Anggita, N. L. P. (2022) THE RECONSTRUCTION OF PROTO BIMA-TOLOWERI-MBOJO-DONGGO-SAMBORI AND KOLO ISOLECTS: BOTTOM-UP ANALYSIS. Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.
- Aprilia, N. K. S. (2022) THE RECONSTRUCTION OF PROTO BIMA - TOLOWERI - MBOJO ISOLECTS: BOTTOM-UP ANALYSIS. Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.
- Ariantini, K. P., Suarnajaya, I. W., & Budasi, I. G. (2017). *the Phonological Changes From Gelgel Dialect To Tampekan Dialect: a Descriptive Qualitative Study*. Vol 5(No 2).
- Baker, Lynda, M. (2006). Observation: A complex research method. *Library Trends*, 55(1), 171–189. Retrieved from <https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/3659/ResearchProcess.pdf?sequence=2>
- Bima, L. I. N., & Nusatenggara, W. (2019). *A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF PHONETICS AND PHONEME IN NNGAHI MBOJO*. 177–185.
- Budasi, I. G., Made, N., & Indriyani, S. (2020). *Genetical Status of Relatedness Between Sambori and Teta Dialects Spoken in Bima Regency , West Nusa Tenggara*. 2020(2), 48–57.
- Burch, T. K. (2003). Demography in a new key: A theory of population theory. *Demographic Research*, 9(December), 263–284. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2003.9.11>
- Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., Dicenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, 41(5), 545–547. <https://doi.org/10.1188/14.ONF.545-547>
- Creswell, J. . (2012). *Educational Research Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Crystal, D. (2004). The stories of English.
- Erwin Wayan, R., & Arifin. (2013). Penggunaan Bahasa Mbojo Di Lingkungan Masyarakat Bima Di Bima : Sebuah Kajian Variasi Bahasa. *E-Journal Program Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha*, 2.
- Hollingsworth, J. E., & Graff, W. L. (1934). Language and Languages: An Introduction to Linguistics. In *The Classical Weekly* (Vol. 27). <https://doi.org/10.2307/4339354>

- Item, I. (2009). Language and Variation. *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*, 149–150. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511551185.008>
- Lamb, S. M. (1965). Kinship Terminology and Linguistic Structure. *American Anthropologist*, 67(5), 37–64. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/668756>
- Maiti, & Bidinger. (1981). 濟無No Title No Title. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 53(9), 1689–1699.
- Marsden, S. (2013). *Phonological variation and the construction of regional identities in New Zealand English by.*
- Masitah, P. (2021) THE LEXICAL EVIDENCES UNIFYING SAMBORI AND BIMA LANGUAGES IN BIMA REGENCY, NTB. Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha
- McMahon, A. (2002). *An Introduction to English Phonology-Edinburgh University Press (2001) (1)*. 146.
- Natania, P. P. (2022) THE RECONSTRUCTION OF PROTO BIMA-TOLOWERI-MBOJO-DONGGO AND SAMBORI ISOLECT. Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.
- Parwati, P. N. (2022) The Uniting And Differentiating Linguistic Features Between Proto Bima-Toloweri And Mbojo Dialect Spoken In Bima Regency. Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.
- Pramesti, I Dewa Ayu Made Meilani (2022) THE UNITING AND DIFFERENTIATING LINGUISTIC FEATURES BETWEEN PROTO KOLO-SAMBORI-BIMA AND SANGGAR LANGUAGE. Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.
- Raftery, A. E., Tanner, M. a, Wells, M. T., Cre, H., Raton, B., New, L., & Washington, Y. (n.d.). Statistics in the 21st Century Edited by. In *New York*.
- Widiastuti, N. P. N. (2022) THE UNITING AND DIFFERENTIATING LINGUISTIC FEATURES BETWEEN PROTO BIMA AND SANGGAR LANGUAGE: A DESCRIPTIVE QUALITATIVE STUDY. Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.
- Yilmaz, K. (2013). Comparison of quantitative and qualitative research traditions: Epistemological, theoretical, and methodological differences. *European Journal of Education*, 48(2), 311–325. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12014>
- Zuze, H., & Weideman, M. (2013). Keyword stuffing and the big three search engines. *Online Information Review*, 37(2), 268–286. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-11-2011-0193>