

LEXICOGRAPHY OF KALINGA DIALECTS

*Harwin Curtney L. Baggay, Thalia P. Melad
and Liza M. Empedrad, Ph.D
School of Education, Arts, and Sciences*

ABSTRACT

The study was a comparative study of dialects used by Upper Kalinga and Lower Kalinga with a view on finding out the differences and similarities used by them. The study was based on the selected 81 words which were translated in their dialects. The respondents of the study were the Kalinga tribes who reside in the Upper Kalinga which are Tulgaw and Dananaw Tribes and Lower Kalinga which are Limos and Cal-Owan tribes. These tribes belong to the same geographical location. More particularly, this paper describes in details the lexical, phonological and morphological differences of the tribes. The data gathering was conducted using two methods: written communication and oral communication. The findings show that Kalinga has differences and similarities in their lexemes. The Kalinga tribes have their own distinct lexemes. They differ in the pronunciation of various letters. It was found out that the differences of the four tribes have variation pattern. It was revealed in the study that the Kalinga province has its own lexemes and it varies in different location. This only shows that the tribes that are near to each other have a greater percentage of similarity and the tribes that are far from each other show high percentage of differences. This implies that the province has its own unique language disposition. Moreover, the implementation of the MTB-MLE can use the native tongue of the people aside from using the Ilocano dialect by knowing each student's tribe to know what dialect to use as a medium of instruction.

Keywords: *Lexicography, Morphology, Phonology, Kalinga Dialects, Natural Language Processing*

INTRODUCTION

No human language is fixed, uniform, or unvarying; all languages show internal variation. The actual usage varies from group to group and from speaker to speaker in terms of pronunciation, choice of words, meanings or semantics, and syntactic constructions (Ayeomoni, 2012). So, this study looks into both variations and similarities in the lexicography of the Kalinga dialects with respect to dialects spoken in lower and upper Kalinga.

Language variation is an observed phenomenon found in every language in this world (Abu Shareah, Abdulhakim, AL-Takhayim, 2015). Every language has its varieties or dialects; when a certain variety of a language is used according to the users, then it is called dialect. Dialects are normally determined by speaker's geographical background.

Differences in vocabulary are one aspect of dialect diversity which people notice readily and comment on quite frequently. One factor that affects dialect diversity is the influence of geographical barriers. A river, a mountain range, or an expanse of barren land, can serve to keep two populations apart, creating or maintaining differences in usage between dialects on either side (Rickford, 2002).

The Kalinga is one of the major ethnolinguistic groups inhabiting Northern Luzon. Though Kalinga is an ethnic group that lived in the same province, the Kalingas are divided into tribes. They are classified according to "bodong" holding groups or "ili," namely the *Tinglayans, Lubuagans, Tanudans, Pasils, Balbalans, Pinukupuks, and Tabuks*. The people of Tinglayan, Lubuagan, and Tanudan live in upper Kalinga while the people of *Pasil, Pinukupuk, Balbalan, Rizal and Tabuk* live in lower Kalinga. These tribes have also sub-tribes, each having its own dialect, tradition, and customs. These differences in culture and dialects often cause trial misunderstanding that leads to inter-tribal armed warfare.

It is in their multilingual diversity that the Kalinga tribal community is often referred to as the "Babel of the Philippines". In spite of the number of dialects spoken by each of the sub-tribes, the

Kalingas can understand one another even if they speak or communicate with other Kalingas in their own distinct dialect (AUS, 1988).

Research Objective

This study aimed to look for the differences and similarities in the lexicography of Kalinga, specifically on the morphology and phonology of the Kalinga dialects with respect to dialects spoken in Upper and Lower Kalinga.

METHODS

This study utilized ethnolinguistic type of research. The informants of the study were the Kalinga tribes who reside in the Upper Kalinga which are Tulgaw and Dananaw Tribes and Lower Kalinga which are Limos and Cal-Owan tribes. These tribes belong to the same geographical location. The natives were aged 30 years old and above. The researchers conducted an interview to the Kalinga people using a list of the possible common things and daily activities (in the English language) for the natives of the four tribes to identify their terminologies. The terminologies gathered were sorted according to their descriptions.

RESULTS

Table 1. Similarities and Differences of terminologies in terms of ACTION WORDS

Action Words (English Term)	Pinukpuk 1 (Limos)	Pinukpuk 2 (Cal-Owan)	Description (Lower)	Tinglayan 1 (Dananaw)	Tinglayan 2 (Tulgaw)	Description (Upper)
Bathing	Man-omos	man-omos	Similar	Manamos	Man avos	Dissimilar
Chewing	Mankotkot	mankotkot	Similar	Man-ot-ot	Man-ot-ot	Similar
Cleaning	Mandalus	mandawus	Dissimilar	Mancharus	Mancharcharus	Dissimilar
Cooking	Manut-utu	manut-utu	Dissimilar	Manut-utu	Man-ututu	Dissimilar
Drinking	Uminum	uminum	Similar	Uminum	Uvirum	Dissimilar
Eating	Mangan	mangan	Similar	Mahan	Mangmagan	Dissimilar
Feeding	Mampakan	mampakan	Similar	Mampaan	Mampa-an	Dissimilar
Gurgling	Manmulimug	manmulimug	similar	Manmurumug	Manmulivog	Dissimilar
Hearing	Mandongol	mandongo	Dissimilar	Manchonhor	Manchungor	Dissimilar
Jumping	Lumagtuk	lumagtuk	similar	Tumawod	Luvagtu	Dissimilar
Perspiring	Mankalingot	mankalingot	similar	Mallihot	Mankalingot	Dissimilar
Planting	Mammula	mammuwa	Dissimilar	Mammura	Mammura	Similar
Running	Manoddak	manoddak	similar	Manodchak	Mantudtuchak	Dissimilar
Siting	Manumtumok	manumtumok	similar	Tumutuchu	Mantugtukao	Dissimilar
Sleeping	Masuyop	masuyop	similar	Masmasuyop	Masmasuyop	Similar
Speaking	Mambagbaga	mambagbaga	similar	Kumigkigha	Kuvigkinga	Dissimilar
Swimming	Manassaling	manassaling	Similar	Umit-ijat	Luvanglangoy	Dissimilar
Standing	Sumikad	sumikad	similar	Sumi-ad	Huvi-ad	Dissimilar
Talking	mambagbaga	mambagbaga	similar	Kumiha	Mangkwagkwaka	Dissimilar
Waking up	lumitna	lumitna	similar	Fumahon	Luiina	Dissimilar
Walking	kumyang	kumyang	similar	Manadcharan	Maradcharan	Dissimilar
Washing	mambulu	mambuu	Dissimilar	Mamfuru	Manchuru	Dissimilar
Holding	umuggom	umuggom	similar	Oogkam	Manugnan	Dissimilar
Flying	tumaud	tumaud	similar	Tumajap	Tuvajap	Dissimilar
Spitting	manlugpa	manlugpa	similar	Mantubfa	tugva	Dissimilar

Table 1 shows the similarities and differences of the two tribes of Pinukpuk and two tribes of Tinglayan on terminologies on words that depict action. It shows that the two tribes of Pinukpuk (Limus & Cal-Owan) have 72% similar terms while only 28% different terms. For Tinglayan (Dananaw & Tulgaw), it has the average of 86.36% similar terms and 13.64% different terms.

Furthermore, the result shows that the two tribes of Pinukpuk mostly use the same terminologies in terms of the action words while the two tribes of tinglayan mostly use different terminologies.

Table 2. Similarities and Differences of terminologies in terms of NUMBERS

Numbers (English Term)	Pinukpuk 1 (Limus)	Pinukpuk 2 (Cal-Owan)	Description (Lower)	Tinglayan 1 (Dananaw)	Tinglayan2 (Tulgaw)	Description (Upper)
One	Osa	Osa	Similar	Osa	Osa	Similar
Two	Duwa	Duwa	Similar	Chugwa	Tsuga	Dissimilar
Three	Tulu	Tuu	Dissimilar	Turu	Turu	Similar
Four	Opat	Opat	Similar	Opat	Opat	Similar
Five	Lima	Lima	Similar	Lima	Liva	Dissimilar
Six	Onom	Onom	Similar	Onom	Urum	Dissimilar
Seven	Pitu	Pitu	Similar	Pitu	Pitu	Similar
Eight	Walu	Wawu	Dissimilar	Gwaru	Gwaru	Similar
Ten	simpulu	simpuu	dissimilar	simpuru	Himpuru	dissimilar

The table shows the similarities and differences of the two tribes of Pinukpuk and the two tribes of Tinglayan on terminologies as regards numbers. It shows that the two tribes of Pinukpuk (Limus & Cal-Owan) have 66.67% similar terms and 33.33% different terms while those of Tinglayan (Dananaw & Tulgaw) have 55.56% similar terms and 44.44% different terms. In addition, the result shows that the two tribes of Pinukpuk and Tinglayan mostly use the same terminologies on numbers

Table 3. Similarities and Differences of terminologies in terms of LIVING THINGS

Living Things (English Term)	Pinukpuk 1 (Limus)	Pinukpuk 2 (Cal-Owan)	Description (Lower)	Tinglayan 1 (Dananaw)	Tinglayan 2 (Tulgaw)	Description (Upper)
Cat	Kusa	Kusa	Similar	Hijaw	Una	Dissimilar
Dog	Asu	Asu	Similar	Asu	Ahu	Dissimilar
Bird	Mammanuk	Sussuwit	Dissimilar	Issigwit	Kuwil-lit	Dissimilar
Carabao	Luwang	Luwang	similar	Rugwang	Luwang	Dissimilar
cow	Baka	Baka	Similar	Faa	Chua-ah	Dissimilar
horse	Kabayu	Kabayu	Similar	Afaju	Akwaju	Dissimilar
Frog	Gowek	Gowek	Similar	Tuak	Tu-ah	Dissimilar
Fish	Lamos	Lamos	Similar	Ramos/ukachiw	Lavos	Dissimilar
Pig	bolok	Bok	Dissimilar	Forok	Huruk	Dissimilar
chicken	Manuk	Manuk	Similar	Manuk	Maru-ok	Dissimilar
Snake	Ulog	Uwog	Dissimilar	Urog	Urog	Similar
Tree	Kayu	Kayu	Similar	Aju	Aju	Similar
Plant	Mula	Muwa	Dissimilar	Mura	Mura	Similar
Human	Tagu	Tagu	Similar	Taku	Taku	similar
Banana	Balat	Bat	Dissimilar	Farat	Kwarat	Dissimilar
Bamboo	Bulu	Buu	Dissimilar	Furu	Kwuru	Dissimilar
Corn	Bakaw	Bakaw	Similar	Kaaw	Kwaaw	Dissimilar
Snail	Balleleku	Balleleku	similar	Agkung	Kwis-suur	Dissimilar
Turtle	dogga	dogga	similar	chagka	chagka	Similar

The table shows the similarities and differences of the two tribes of Pinukpuk and two tribes of Tinglayan on terminologies about living things. It shows that the two tribes of Pinukpuk (Limus & Cal-Owan) have 68.42% similar terms and 31.58% different terms while of Tinglayan (Dananaw & Tulgaw) have 26.32% similar terms and 73.68% different terms. In addition, the result shows that the two tribes of Pinukpuk mostly use the same terminologies in terms of living things while the two tribes of Tinglayan mostly use different terminologies.

Table 4. Similarities and Differences of terminologies in terms of BODY PARTS

Body parts (English terms)	Pinukpuk 1 (Limus)	Pinukpuk 2 (Cal-Owan)	Description (Lower)	Tinglayan 1 (Dananaw)	Tinglayan 2 (Tulgaw)	Description (Upper)
Feet	Iki	Iki	Similar	li	Ei	Dissimilar
Nose	Ongol	Ongo	Dissimilar	Ohor	Ongor	Dissimilar
Eyes	Ata	Ata	Similar	Ata	Ata	Similar
Hands	Ima	Ima	Similar	Ima	Iva	Dissimilar
Fingers	Pagayyamot	Paggayamot	Similar	Kammat	Paggayyamot	Dissimilar
Armpit	Oyok	Oyok	Similar	Jojok	Ojok	Dissimilar
Hair	Buuk	Buuk	Similar	Fuuk	Huuk	Dissimilar
Head	Ulu	Uu	Dissimilar	Uru	Uru	Similar
Ears	Inga	Inga	Similar	Iha	Inga	Dissimilar
Forehead	Kiday	Kiday	Similar	Ichay	Ichay	Dissimilar
brain	utok	utok	similar	utok	uto	Dissimilar

The table shows the similarities and differences of the two tribes of Pinukpuk and two tribes of Tinglayan on terminologies about body parts. It shows that the two tribes of Pinukpuk (Limus & Cal-Owan) have 81.82% similar terms and 18.18% different terms while of Tinglayan (Dananaw & Tulgaw) have 27.27% similar and 72.73% different terms. In addition, the result shows that the two tribes of Pinukpuk mostly use the same terminologies in terms of the body parts while the two tribes of Tinglayan mostly use different terminologies.

Table 5. Similarities and Differences of terminologies in terms of NON-LIVING THINGS

Non-Living things (English terms)	Pinukpuk 1 (Limus)	Pinukpuk 2 (Cal-Owan)	Description (Lower)	Tinglayan 1 (Dananao)	Tinglayan 2 (Tulgao)	Description (Upper)
Water	Danum	Danum	Similar	Chanum	Charum	Dissimilar
River	Wang-wang	Wang-wang	Similar	Gwang-gwang	Chwang-chwang	Dissimilar
Mountains	Bateled-ginubat	Bateled-ginubat	Similar	Filig	Kirungat	Dissimilar
House	Boloy	Boy	Dissimilar	Foroy	Furoy	Dissimilar
Rain	Udan	Udan	Similar	Uchan	Uchan	Similar
Rice (cooked)	Isna	Isna	Similar	Isna	Ahug	Dissimilar
Rice (uncooked)	Binayu	Binayu	Similar	Finaju	Kwiraju	Dissimilar
Stone	Batu	batu	Similar	Fatu	Kwato	Dissimilar
Plate	Palatu	Palatu	Similar	Paratu	Paratu	Similar
Sand	Lagan	Lagan	Similar	Rakan	Rakan	Similar
Mud	Piyok	Piyok	Similar	Pijok	Pijuk	Dissimilar
Stars	Bittuwon	Bittuwon	Similar	Fituwon	Kwittuwong	Dissimilar
Sun	Init	Init	Similar	Init	Irit	Dissimilar
Monn	Bulan	Bu-an	Dissimilar	Furan	Churan	Dissimilar
Viand	tipoy	tipoy	Similar	tipoy	tipoy	Similar

The table shows the similarities and differences of the two tribes of Pinukpuk and two tribes of Tinglayan on terminologies about the non-living things. It shows that the two tribes of Pinukpuk (Limus & Cal-Owan) have 86.67% similar terms and 13.33% different terms while in Tinglayan (Dananao & Tulgaw) have 26.27% similar terms and 73.33% different terms. In addition, the result shows that the two tribes of Pinukpuk mostly use the same terminologies in terms of the non-living things while the two tribes of Tinglayan mostly use different terminologies.

Phonological Patterns

Table 6. Phonological Patterns of Pinukpuk Ethnic Groups

Limos (Pinukpuk 1)	Cal-Owan (Pinukpuk 2)	English
Mambulu	mambu	To wash
Walu	wawu	eight
Ongol	ongo	nose
Ulog	uwog	snake

The table shows the intervocalic drop and the labial glide to (w) of the Cal-Owan tribe in the letter (l) of the Limos tribe.

Table 7. Phonological Patterns of Tinglayan Ethnic Groups

Dananaw (Tinglayan 1)	Tulgaw (Tinglayan 2)	English
Chanum	charum	Water
Init	irit	Sun
Manadcharan	Marad'charan	Walking
Onum	orum	Six
Furan	tʃuran	Rain
mamfuru	mamtʃuru	Washing
Faa	tʃaa	Cow
Fittuwon	kwittuwong	Star
finadʒu	kwinadʒu	Rice
Furu	kwuru	Ten
Uminum	uvirum	Drink
kumigkigha	kuvigkigha	Talking
Sumiad	huviad	Stand
Lima	liva	Five
Sumiad	huviad	Stand
Simpuru	himpuru	Ten
Asu	ahu	Dog

The table 7 shows the differences of the two Tinglayan tribes. The shift of (n) to (r), (r) to (t), (f) to (kw), (m) to (v), and (s) to (h). The (tʃ) is pronounced as (ch) and the (dʒ) is pronounced as (j). The symbols were derived from the International Phonetic Alphabet.

Table 8. Phonological Patterns of Pinukpuk and Tinglayan Tribes

Pinukpuk	Tinglayan	English
tulu	tuɾu	three
simpulu	simpuru	ten
lamos	ɾamos	fish
mula	muɾa	plant
ongol	ongoɾ	nose
ulu	uɾu	head
ulog	uɾog	snake
bittuwon	fittuwon	star
boloy	foɾoy	house
batu	fatu	stone
buuk	fuuk	hair
bolok	foɾok	pig
bulu	fuɾu	bambo
mambulu	mamfuɾu	washing
manoddak	manodtʃak	Running
Udan	Utʃan	Rain
Danum	tʃanum	Water
Kiday	ltʃay	Forehead
Duwa	tʃugwa	Two

Table 8 shows the lexical variations of letter (l) into (ɾ), (b) into (f), and (d) into (tʃ). The (tʃ) is pronounced as (ch).

Morphological Similarities

Table 9. Morphological Similarities of the Kalinga Dialects

Limos	Cal-Owan	Dananaw	Tulgaw	English
mam- pakán	mam- pakan	mam- paan	mam- paan	Eat
man- dalus	man- dawus	man- charus	man- charus	Clean

The table shows the four tribes use of prefix man- and mam-.

Table 10. Verbal Morphology of Kalinga Dialects

Present	Ongoing	Past	English
mancharus	mancharcharus	nancharus	Clean
manlugpa	manluglugpa	nanlugpa	Spit
mampakan	mampakpakan	nampakan	Eat

The table shows the verbal morphology of the tribes. They use the prefix man-, mam- or mang- to indicate a present action, they repeat the initial syllable of the root word to indicate an ongoing action, and the prefix nan- or nam- to indicate a past action.

DISCUSSION

The study aimed to determine the similarities in the lexicography of the two tribes in Pinukpuk and the two tribes in Tinglayan. These two locations were chosen based on their geographical position and on the Dozier's (1966) report that the Kalinga divide themselves into the Southern Kalinga who reside in Lubuagan, Pasil, and Tinglayan; Eastern Kalinga who live in Tanudan; and Northern Kalinga who live in Balbalan, Pinukpuk, and Tabuk. This study utilized a qualitative type of research through interview to gather data from the tribes in both locations.

The findings in this study somehow agree to dialectical mapping done by Llamzon (1978), where he differentiated Kalinga according to six dialectical location; namely; Guinaang, Lubuagan, Pinukpuk, Tabuk, Tinglayan, and Tanudan. The two tribes in Pinukpuk basically share the same lexemes except in the variation in phonological system, specifically the consonant (l). The letter (l) of Limos (Pinukpuk 1) is produced by relaxing the tongue and placing the tip either behind the lower front teeth, or behind the lower lip which Geiser (1958) explains in his paper while Cal-Owan on the other hand, has the (l) of Limos be changed into (w) or being omitted. The intervocalic drop and the labial glide to (w) by the letter (l) of Limos is similar to Conant (1916) findings. It occurs only in syllable-initial position, word-medially, between non-front vowels, Wiens (1976).

In the case of the two Tinglayan tribes however, it shows more differences in their lexemes compared to the two Pinukpuk Tribes. Most of their differences are brought about by phonological variation. The letter (n) of the Dananaw tribe becomes letter (r) for the Tulgaw tribe, the letter (r) becomes (t), the letter (f) becomes (kw), the letter (m) becomes (v), and the letter (s) becomes (h).

The results also show the variation of the letter (l) in the four tribes which support Grayden (1979), Llamzon (1978), Geiser (1958) , Reid (1963) and Wiens (1976) study in various places in the Cordillera region where Kalinga belongs. The letter (l) is being omitted or changed into (w) by Cal-Owan Conant (1916), and changed into (r), which is produced by placing the tip of the tongue in the upper gum, by both Dananaw and Tulgaw. Moreover, It also indicates that the dialects of the Upper and Lower Kalinga are closely related in the areas of lexical selection. As shown in table 8, the letter (d) of

the two Pinukpuk tribes becomes (tj) for the two Tinglayan tribes and the letter (b) of the two Pinukpuk tribes becomes (f) for the two Tinglayan tribes.

As regards to morphology, all the four tribes use the prefix man-, mam-, and um-. However, the prefix um- for the Tulgaw tribe differs from the other tribes by changing it into uv- like **um**-inum to **uv**-irum and all other else are similar. These findings confer with Ferreirinho (1993) dialectical sketch.

The tribes also use the infix –um- in their lexemes like l-**um**-itna, l-**um**-agtuk, t-**um**-ututchu, t-**um**-jap, and t-**um**-aud. However, the Tulgaw tribe uses the infix –uv- instead of –um- like l-**uv**-agtu, t-**uv**-ajap and k-**uv**-igkinga.

The tribes also use repetitions of letters in their verbal morphology. They use the prefix man-, mam- or mang- to indicate a present action, they repeat the initial syllable of the root word to indicate an ongoing action, and the prefix nan- or nam- to indicate a past action. These support the claim of Ferreirinho (1993). Tribes also change the initial letters of some lexemes when an affix is added like **toddak** (run) into **manoddak** (will run).

The findings show that Kalinga has differences and similarities in their lexemes. It was also found out that Kalinga tribes have their own distinct lexemes. The finding supports the claim of AUS (1988) which states that Kalinga is a multilingual diversified community and it is the “Babel of the Philippines.” Based also on the findings, Kalinga dialects mostly differ in their lexemes in terms of phonology. The four tribes shows differences in the pronunciation of various letter. It was found out that the differences of the four tribes have variation pattern. It was also found out that Kalinga province has its own lexemes and it varies in different location. The study shows also that, though Kalinga is the “Babel of the Philippines,” it has similarities in lexemes.

CONCLUSION

This study described and analyzed the differences and similarities and differences of the four tribes in Kalinga. Though the Kalinga province is bounded by environmental barriers because of the province’s geophysical attributes, the tribes that can be found there share similar terms as described in the terminologies of the two tribes in Pinukpuk. However, it also shows that the tribes also have their own differences especially the two tribes in Tinglayan but these differences in the dialects can be determined by patterns. It shows that the differences and similarities of the tribes was influenced by their proximity in position. This only shows that the tribes that are near to each other have a greater percentage of similarity and the tribes that are far from each other show high percentage of differences. This implies that the province has its own unique language disposition.

The study also shows the phonological variations among the tribes that are not present in IPA. Thus, shedding light for future study to include more tribes, to identify more phonologies that are not present in the IPA. Furthermore, despite the differences in the lexemes of the tribes they can still be able to understand each other, for they share the same morphology and their phonological variations has a pattern.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The implementation of the MTB-MLE can use the native tongue of the people of Kalinga aside from using the Ilocano dialect by knowing each student’s tribe to know what dialect to use as a medium of instruction.

The different lexical patterns found in the study can serve as a basis for dialectical mapping of the province to identify the tribes that belong to a dialectical category.

REFERENCES

- Billiet, F., & Lambrecht, F. (1970). *Studies on Kalinga Ullalim and Ifugaw Orthography* (Vol. 1). Philippines, Catholic School Press.
- Dozier, E. P. (1967). *The Kalinga of Northern Luzon, Philippines*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Labov, W. (1990). The intersection of sex and social class in the course of linguistic change. *Language variation and change*, 2(02), 205-254.
- Scott, W. H. (1960). Social and religious culture of the Kalingas of Madukayan. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 16(2), 174-190.
- Asuncion, Z. S. (2012). Lectal Classification and Phonological Features of Ilocano and Ifugao Speakers of English. *Graduate School Journal*. 5
- Ayeomoni, O. M. (2012). A Lexico-syntactic Comparative Analysis of Ondo and Ikale Dialects of the Yoruba Language. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(9), 1802.
- Ayeomoni, M. O. (2012). The languages in Nigerian socio-political domains: Features and Functions. *English Language Teaching*, 5(10), 12.
- Bollas, A .A. (2013). *Comparative analysis on the phonology of Tagalog, Cebuano and Itawis* Retrieved: March 3, 2016 from https://www.academia.edu/4427395/Comparative_Analysis_on_the_Phonology_of_Tagalog_Cebuano_and_Itawis
- Cai, H. (2013). A Comparative Study of Gong'an dialect: An Introduction. *Kaleidoscope*, 5(1), 17-32.
- Díaz-Campos, M., & Navarro-Galisteo, I. (2009). Perceptual categorization of dialect variation in Spanish. In *Selected Proceedings of the 11th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 179-195).
- Dumanig, F. P., & Jubilado, R. C. (2015). A Descriptive Analysis of Surigaonon Language. *Polyglossia: the Asia-Pacific's voice in language and language teaching*, 27, 1-10.
- Il-Hazmy, A. M. (1975). *A critical and comparative study of the spoken dialect of the harb tribe in Saudi Arabia* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Leeds).
- Honda, I. (2002). Seke phonology: a comparative study of three Seke dialects. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman area*, 25(1), 191-210.
- Kortmann, B. (2003). Comparative English dialect grammar: a typological approach. *Fifty Years of English Studies in Spain (1952: 2002). A Commemorative Volume, Santiago de Compostela: University of Santiago*, 63-81.
- Lusk, H. M. (2008). A study of dialectical theory and its relation to interpersonal relationships.
- Mishra, D., & Bali, K. (2011). A comparative phonological study of the dialects of Hindi. *Proceedings of ICPHS XVII, Hong Kong*, 17-21.
- Sagon, R. R., & Uchanski, R. M. (2010). the Development of ilocano Word Lists for speech Audiometry. *Philippine Journal of Otolaryngology Head and Neck Surgery*, 21(1 & 2), 11-19.

Wieling, M., Montemagni, S., Nerbonne, J., & Baayen, R. H. (2014). Lexical differences between Tuscan dialects and standard Italian: Accounting for geographic and sociodemographic variation using generalized additive mixed modeling. *Language*, 90(3), 669-692.