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Abstract
Every language has its varieties or dialects, including the Acehnese language, which includes the Daya dialect. This paper examines how the variants of the Acehnese Daya dialect are used in social interactions. The study employed a qualitative method, with primary data obtained from speakers of the Acehnese Daya dialect in each variant. Secondary data sources included literature on the Acehnese language and its variants, contributing to the interpretation of the primary data. Data collection involved observation and interviews, with data analysis conducted using the interactive model analysis, which includes four stages: data reduction, data categorization, data presentation, and conclusion. The study reveals that the Acehnese Daya dialect, as a variety of Acehnese, can be distinguished as the Meulon and the Meuke languages. The Meulon dialect does not have variants, while the Meuke dialect has two variants characterized by phonetic differences: ‘bune’, ‘mane’, ‘jine’, ‘lake’, and ‘bunai’, ‘manai’, ‘jinai’, and ‘lakai’, which mean ‘earlier’, ‘taking a bath’, ‘now’, and ‘husband’, respectively. Each variant also exhibits some phonetic, lexical, and semantic similarities. Unique lexical resources in the Acehnese Daya dialect are another distinguishing feature compared to general Acehnese. Code-switching and code-mixing between variants are also found in the speech of Acehnese Daya dialect speakers. The distinctiveness of the Acehnese Daya dialect, particularly its variants, 

* Corresponding author, email: teukualamsyah@usk.ac.id


Received February 28, 2023; Revised October 20, 2023; Accepted April 20, 2024; Published Online May 31, 2024

https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v11i2.31018
emphasizes the importance of preserving linguistic diversity within communities.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Language is a heterogeneous and dynamic system (Belahcen & Ouahmiche, 2017). In language usage, a common phenomenon is the presence of language variations (Shareah et al., 2015). This is a universal characteristic of human language, which is non-random and structured in its use by individuals, communities, and the language itself (Matsumoto, 2019). Language variation can be found in different geographical areas, indicating that not all communities in a geographic area speak the same way in every situation (Yule, 2020).

As the focus of sociolinguistic studies, language variation refers to regional, social, or contextual differences in how a particular language is used. Variations between languages, dialects, and speakers are known as interspeaker variations. Zhan (2011) revealed that people speak differently depending on their geographic origins in a particular language area (regional variation), their social status (social variation), and the situations in which they use the language (stylistic variation). Every language has varieties or dialects, with a particular language variety used by speakers known as a dialect, typically determined by the geographical background of the speakers (Shareah et al., 2015; Siregar, 2017).

A dialect is a regional or social variation of a language characterized by its phonological, syntactic, and lexical features (O’Grady et al., 1997). In its most basic understanding, a dialect is a sub-categorization of language linguistically differentiated through grammar and lexicon. It is related to phonology regarding pronunciation (Bowen, 2011). Solano-Flores (2006) defined a dialect as variations of the same language concerning pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, discourse conventions, and other linguistic features (Wardhaugh, 2006). Moreover, a dialect is a variety of languages that differ from others along three dimensions: vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation or accent (Edwards, 2009).

There is a difference between language and dialect; as Wardhaugh (2006) exemplified, Texas English and Swiss German are dialects of English and German, respectively. According to him, a dialect is part of the language. Some languages have several dialects. In English, many dialects differ according to geographical area, such as Scottish, Yorkshire, and Lancashire dialects (O’Grady et al., 1997). All dialects are regional and social because all speakers have a social background and regional location. In their speech, they often identify themselves not only as natives or residents of a particular place but also as members of a particular social class, age group, ethnic background, or other social characteristics (Chambers & Trudgill, 2004). However, it is also important to note that a dialect is never purely social, ethnic, or regional. The reality shows that regional, social, and ethnic factors combine and intersect in various ways in dialect identification (Shareah et al., 2015).

Zhan (2011) and Shareah et al. (2015) explained that languages worldwide are famous for dialect diffusion. English, for example, has many variations, including
British English, Australian English, Nigerian English, South African English, etc. British English is different from American English, and both are also different from Australian English. If the speakers of a particular language speak different varieties of the language, they are said to speak different dialects of the same language. The same case can also be found in Indonesia as a multilingual country (Ulum & Setiawan, 2014).

Bahasa Indonesia or Indonesian, as the national language of Indonesia, is diverse or varied, with specific local dialects such as Acehnese, Jakarta, Madura, and others (Daulay, 2012; Mail & Mail, 2022; Taembo, 2016). However, every Indonesian speaker from these different dialects can understand each other (Budiarsa, 2015). Such dialects are also known as regional or demographic dialects (Mayabar, 2015; Nordquist, 2019a). Indonesia, inhabited by various ethnic groups, has many regional languages that have lived, developed, and been used for communication and social interaction. Based on a Ministry of Education and Culture study from 1991 to 2019, Indonesia has 718 regional languages spread throughout the country (Sadya, 2022). The Acehnese language is one of the 718 regional languages used by its speakers as a mother tongue (Alamsyah et al., 2022) and is one of the ten regional languages which has the most speakers (Setyaningrum, 2022).

The Acehnese language has four geographic dialects: North Aceh, Pidie Aceh, West Aceh, and Great Aceh (Asyik, 1978; Ramli et al., 2018). In West Aceh, variations of the dialect or subdialect refer to the Daya dialect (Alamsyah, 2003; Berri, 2010; Mukhlis, 1995; Ramli, et al., 2018). Its speaking community is known as the Daya community. The Daya dialect, which becomes the focus of this study, is used by the speakers who live in the Jaya and Indra Jaya District, Lamno, Aceh Jaya County. Within the Daya dialect, there are variants or subdialects. It is essential to point out that the Daya dialect differs significantly from the commonly known Acehnese language (Alamsyah, 2003; Hanoum et al., 1986).

This study refers to the theory of language variation proposed by Wardhaugh (2006) and Yule (2020). It can also be classified as a dialectological study referring to Shareah et al. (2015), Tegegne (2016), Barzan and Heidary (2019), and Nordquist (2019a, 2019b). Taembo (2016) also referred to it as a study of social dialectology. Studies by Shareah et al. (2015), Tegegne (2016), Barzan and Heidary (2019), and Nordquist (2019a, 2019b), on dialects based on the area of use, known as regional or geographical dialects are the references for this study as a whole. Specifically, the Daya dialect also refers to the division of Acehnese dialects in the study conducted by Ramli et al. (2018). Hence, this study explores a particular aspect of language variation, focusing on the Daya dialect within the Acehnese language spoken in West Aceh, Indonesia. Despite being part of the Acehnese linguistic landscape, the Daya dialect stands out for its distinct phonological, syntactic, and lexical features. This study investigates the social and regional dimensions of language diversity by examining the details of the Daya dialect through the complex relationship between geography, social identity, and linguistic variation within the Acehnese linguistic context. The following research questions are posed:

1. What are the distinguishing features of the Daya dialect in social interactions?
2. Are there similarities in the linguistic features of the Acehnese Daya dialect variants in social interaction?
3. How are code-switching and code-mixing among Acehnese Daya dialect speakers in social interaction?
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Language in Social Interaction

Language and society are two interrelated entities (Wardhaugh, 2006). Community life is reflected in language, both in spoken, written, and monumental forms of different genres, uniquely and distinctively. Society uses language to interact, collect, and inform about all events that occur in human material and spiritual life (Ogli, 2020). Every society has its language, and every community or group has its specific language. The language used by community groups and understood by their members is called a speech community (Saadiyah, et al., 2019). The speech community comprises all the people who speak a language and share the same or different meanings in phonology or grammar. They usually reside in the same area and speak the same variant or standard language (Zhan, 2013).

A speech community is defined by shared norms rather than agreement on language elements (Jacquemet, 2019; Patrick, 2004). Language communities develop specific norms for use through interaction, leading to linguistic similarities, including code-switching and contextual signals, understood only within the community (Woolard, 2004). In social interactions, individuals may change language variants based on the situation (Penny, 2000). These shared norms help distinguish different speech communities (Zhan, 2013), as unfamiliar accents may seem amusing due to different speech norms. Speakers present themselves through their speech in various interactions (Baha, 2014). Language code mixing can occur due to different settings and participants (Jendra, 2010), often seen in bilingual or multilingual communities as a communication strategy (Hutauruk, 2016), leading to code-mixing and code-switching (Moetia et al., 2018).

Code mixing relates to the aspects of language structure or linguistic competence, while code-switching emphasizes linguistic performance (Sianipar & Manik, 2018). In this context, Wardhaugh (2006) stated that code-switching could be situational when speakers change the language code according to the situation. Code-switching is the use of languages alternately in discourse and is commonly found in bilingual speakers (Shiraz et al., 2016). Code-mixing involves mixing two or more languages or language varieties, including words, clauses, idioms, and greetings combined or used in conditions requiring such things (Gullberg & Parafita Couto, 2016). Ho and Woon (2007) defined code mixing as a change from one language to another in the form of spoken or written text. Febryanti et al. (2019) referred to it as code-mixing within one language related to language contact.

2.2 Theory of Language Variation

Tegegne (2016) stated that in a broad sense, variety refers to different languages; in a narrow sense, it refers to differences within a language. Referring to Guiraud (1970) opinion, Wahya (2010) stated that differences in language variations, in the form of dialects, could be grouped into phonetic, lexical, semantic, and morphological differences. However, according to Trudgill (2001), all language varieties are equal and not superior or inferior to other varieties of the same language regarding their linguistic features and functions.
Wardhaugh (2006) argued that language varies in many ways. According to him, one way to characterize certain variations is that speakers of a particular language sometimes speak a different dialect of that language. In addition, Yule (2020) stated that language variations can exist in regional and social contexts. Regional variation is related to the use of language in different geographical areas. In contrast, social variation is related to the use of language in various situations as an indication of membership in different social groups or speech communities.

Nordquist (2019b) revealed that language variety, or dialect, is an umbrella term for any distinctive form of language or linguistic expression. Mougeon et al., (2010) stated that there are two types of language variation: linguistic and sociolinguistic. Within linguistic variation, substitutions between elements are categorically limited by the linguistic context in which they occur. Meanwhile, speakers can choose between elements in the same linguistic context in sociolinguistic variation; thus, substitution is probabilistic. Furthermore, the probability that one form is chosen over another is also influenced probabilistically by various extra-linguistic factors (Nordquist, 2019b). Moreover, variations in language use among groups of speakers are critical criteria or changes that may occur in pronunciation (accent), word choice (lexicon), or even preferences for specific grammatical patterns (Barzan & Heydari, 2019).

Two individuals of the same generation and locality, speaking precisely the same variety of languages and moving in the same social circle, never really blend in their speech habits. Chaturvedi (2015) revealed that a speech community has more than one language code capable of expressing different social meanings. All these linguistic codes are controlled and directed by social references and situations that are continuously mixed, exchanged, and interrelated in the language used by the speech community (see Alamsyah et al., 2011). All of these linguistic usage codes, in totality, are known as the language community matrix codes (Chaturvedi, 2015).

### 2.3 Acehnese Language Daya Dialect

As mentioned earlier, the Daya dialect in this study is the Acehnese language spoken by the community in the Jaya and Indra Jaya districts. Indra Jaya is a new district resulting from the expansion of the Aceh Jaya district, based on Aceh Jaya District Qanun Number 3 of 2012 concerning the establishment of the Indra Jaya district. The general public knows the two districts as the Lamno area. Referring to historical records, at the end of the 15th century AD, a kingdom named ‘Negeri Daya’ was established in the area. King Sultan Salatin Alaidin Riayat Syah led this kingdom with the title Pote Meureuhom Daya (Pemerintah Aceh Jaya, 2020). However, Djayadinggrat noted that Sultan Meureuhom Daya’s original name was Uzir, Sultan Inayatsyah, the son of Abdullah al-Malikul Mubin (Teungkuputh, 2020). According to these records, ‘Negeri Daya’ was believed to have been established in the late 15th century.

The term Daya dialect refers to the Acehnese language variant spoken by the community in the Jaya and Indra Jaya districts and to the historical facts about the kingdom’s name that once existed in the area. The Daya dialect refers to the division of Acehnese dialects (Asyik, 1978; Durie, 1985). It is included in the West Aceh dialect group (Ramli et al., 2018). In some literature related to Acehnese language studies, the term Daya dialect is a distinguishing feature from other Acehnese dialects. Hanoum et al. (1986) explained that the dialect of the Acehnese language, West Aceh,
in the Jaya district, Lamno, has very distinctive characteristics. However, the study does not explicitly mention the Daya dialect. The studies on the communication system of the Daya community mention that the Acehnese language used in the Daya community is the Daya dialect of Acehnese (Alamsyah, 2003; Mukhlis, 1995). Berri (2010) mentioned that the Daya dialect is spoken in the Jaya district, Aceh Jaya regency. A study by Ramli et al., (2018) stated that the result of the recent mapping on Acehnese dialects shows that Daya dialects must be added to the four Acehnese dialects which have been pioneered by Asyik (1978). Thus, for this study, the term for the Acehnese language variants used in speech communities of the Jaya and Indra Jaya districts, Aceh Jaya regency, is the Bahasa Aceh Dialek Daya (BADD, or Acehnese language of the Daya Dialect).

Based on the initial data from the literature review and field study, BADD in terms of personal greetings can be distinguished as BADD meulôn and BADD meukè (ignoring the number of speakers and the area of speech). Meulôn is derived from lôn, meaning ‘I/me’ (categorized as a refined and more polite variety of BADD used in various situations) by adding the prefix meu-. Meulôn is interpreted as the greeting lôn ‘I/me.’ Moreover, meukè, derived from kê ‘I/me’, is categorized as rude or impolite BADD and less appropriate for use in specific communication situations but is kind, polite, and appropriate for use in other situations (Alamsyah, 2003). Speakers who use the self-address lôn ‘I/me’ use vocabularies such as bunoe ‘earlier’, manoe ‘bathe’, anoe ‘sand’, baRoe ‘yesterday’, uRoe ‘day’, bloe ‘buy’, kloe ‘deaf’, asoe ‘content’, paseo ‘fill’, jaRoe ‘finger or hand’, daRa ‘girl’, referred to as BADD Variant 1. Meanwhile, the speakers who use the self-address kê ‘I/me’, the vocabularies are spoken as bune ‘earlier’, mane ‘bathe’, ane ‘sand’, baRe ‘yesterday’, uRe ‘day’, ble ‘buy’, kle ‘deaf’, ase ‘content’, pase ‘filling’, jare ‘finger or hand’, daRe ‘girl’, recognized as BADD Variant 2.

In BADD, speakers who use the self-address kê ‘I/me’ also employ another variant found in the form of bunai ‘earlier’, mania ‘bathe’, anai ‘land’, baRai ‘yesterday’, uRai ‘day’, blai ‘buy’, kloe ‘deaf’, asai ‘fill’, pasai ‘fill’, jarai ‘finger or hand’, dare ‘girl’, and they are recognized as Variant 3. Similar pronunciation and meaning in Variant 1 and Variant 2 are found in vocabulary examples of BADD speech. Some other examples of BADD variants can be found in the data from Hanoum et al. (1986), Mukhlis (1995), and Berri (2010). This cursory overview indicates that BADD is a distinctive and unique Acehnese language variant within the general population of Acehnese speakers.

3. METHOD

3.1 Research Approach

This study employed a qualitative approach to elucidate, comprehend, and interpret the nuances of the phenomena under investigation through the analysis of non-numeric data such as texts, images, or sounds (Busetto et al., 2020; Creswell, 2012; Kabir, 2016; Maxwell, 2012; Sugiyono, 2017). The qualitative approach, furthermore, enables a profound and intricate understanding of social phenomena. Additionally, the data generated is narrative-descriptive, reflecting natural conditions, with a focus on optimizing the external validity of findings. It employs a non-
experimental design and offers flexibility (Cropley, 2019; Sugiyono, 2017). Therefore, the utilization of the qualitative approach aligns with the aim of this research to investigate the usage variants of the Acehnese Daya dialect in social interactions.

3.2 Data and Data Source

The data for this study comprise BADD Variant 1, Variant 2, and Variant 3 speaking communities aged between 15 and 65 years in Jaya and Indra Jaya Sub-district, Aceh Jaya District. They are categorized into adolescent (12-25 years old), adult (26-45 years old), and elderly (56-65 years old) age groups (Al Amin & Juniati, 2017). The data sources for the study were determined based on where social interactions occurred in BADD when the study was conducted. The participants, chosen as data sources, were purposively selected based on specific considerations (Palys, 2008; Sugiyono, 2017). For each BADD speaker variant, 16 people were selected, comprising four individuals from each age category: children, adolescents, adults, and elderly. The total number of participants involved in this study was 64 people, covering all age categories and consisting of 28 male participants and 36 female participants.

The participants designated as data sources were limited to social interactions involving a maximum of 3-4 participants so that the data collection process could be focused and continue smoothly according to data needs (see Alamsyah et al., 2022). Meanwhile, for the completeness of the code-switching and code-mixing data, interactions involving children aged 3-12 years were also the focus of observation.

3.3 Data Collection

Non-participant observation techniques and in-depth interviews were applied in the data collection process, as Kabir (2016) and Roller (2017) acknowledged that observation and interviews are the main techniques for collecting qualitative research data. Researchers act as human instruments interacting with data sources (Sugiyono, 2017). The researcher recorded the data in manual notes and electronic records to document it. Interview questions in the data collection process were constructed referring to the formulation of the research questions. For each data that was collected based on the formulation of the research questions, five main interview questions were built. Thus, the main interview questions that were built totalled fifteen questions. However, during field data collection, the main interview questions that had been designed previously changed or were further developed according to the reality that occurred during the data collection process. Data collection was then conducted through the following steps: 1) listening to and recording participant conversations, 2) conducting interviews using prepared questions, 3) transcribing the data, and 4) classifying the data based on discourse in Daya dialect Variants 1, 2, and 3.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data analysis had already begun before the field research was conducted, namely, the secondary data analysis served as the basis for determining the research focus. The data analysis procedure refers to the Miles and Huberman Model, which includes four steps: (1) data collection, (2) data reduction, (3) data display, and (4)
conclusions: drawing/verifying (Sugiyono, 2017). The data analysis technique was conducted through the following steps: (1) selecting and determining Variants 1, 2, and 3 of the Acehnese Daya dialect; identified variants of the Acehnese Daya dialect were included in the data corpus, (2) identifying features of the Acehnese Daya dialect based on Meulon and Meuke languages, (3) determining variants of the Acehnese Daya dialect, and (4) summarizing the variants of the Daya dialect in Acehnese.

4. RESULTS

4.1 The Distinguishing Features of the Daya Dialect in Social Interactions

The peculiarities of speech variants of the Daya dialect of the Acehnese language in social interaction. The Aceh dialect of Daya (BADD) is used by speaking communities who live in Jaya District (consisting of 34 villages and five townships) and Indra Jaya District (consisting of 14 villages and two townships), which are administratively included in Aceh Jaya Regency. Based on the area of the speakers and their speech in social interaction, the study results indicated that BADD could be broadly distinguished into two groups of speakers: the meulôn group of speakers (using the greeting word lôn), known as BADD Variant 1 speakers, and the group of speakers meukè (using the greeting word kè), identified as BADD Variant 2 speakers. In BADD Variant 2, there are also different speech varieties, primarily related to phonology, pronunciation, and phoneme changes (Solano-Flores, 2006; Wardhaugh, 2006), known as BADD Variant 3 in this study. The BADD Variant 1 was found in both sub-districts among the speaker groups of BADD Variants 2 and 3, albeit with relatively fewer speakers. Variant 2 BADD speakers were also found in the two BADD-speaking sub-districts. However, BADD Variant 3 was only found in some villages within the Jaya District area. In other words, BADD Variant 1 and Variant 2 were found in the Indra Jaya District area. The description of the variants based on the amount of data obtained is stated in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. BADD variants in social interaction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BADD V1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jaroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bloe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pathoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keunoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kamoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keundoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geutanyoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adoe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. V is the abbreviation of “variant”
The realization of the three BADD variants in Table 1 can be observed in the following speech data.

(1) \textit{E’ lheuh kumanoe bunoe kusyok honda kujak aju u peukan.} (BADD V1)
   ‘After having a shower, I took the motorbike and went to the market’.

(2) \textit{E’ lheuh kumanè bune kusyek honda kujak aju u peukan.} (BADD V2)
   ‘After having a shower, I took the motorbike and went to the market’.

(3) \textit{E’ lheuh kumanai bunai kusyek honda kujak aju u peukan.} (BADD V3)
   ‘After having a shower, I took the motorbike and went to the market’.

The original speech data obtained from observations in social interactions is labelled as data (3). This data consists of a sequence of utterances from a speaker in speech interaction discourse involving more than two speakers. In contrast, data (1) and (2) represent confirmation results of speech (3) from BADD Variant 1 and 2 speakers, respectively. Speech data (1) and (2) were obtained through in-depth interview techniques. Similar methods were used for several other presented data sets.

Referring to the speech in data (1), (2), and (3), differences in phonemes (when written) and pronunciation (when spoken) between BADD Variants 1, 2, and 3 are apparent. However, the utterances in the three variants have the same meaning, and interviews with speakers from the three groups indicated no difference in their understanding of these utterances. Another important observation from Variants 1, 2 and 3 is the consistent use of the pronoun \textit{ku: kumanoe, kumanè, kumanai} (meaning ‘bath’). The use of \textit{ku} in BADD speech was not considered rude; rather, it was regarded as a standard of politeness, ethics, and acceptable speech, especially within their speech community (Alamsyah, 2003). Additionally, Trudgill (2001) asserted that all language varieties are equal, with no variety being superior or inferior to others of the same language in terms of their linguistic features and functions.

Based on observations of BADD usage in social interaction, the word \textit{lôn} (meaning ‘I’) by BADD Variant 1 speakers was not found in forms such as \textit{lôn jak} ‘I go’, \textit{lôn cok} ‘I take’, \textit{lôn bloe} ‘I buy’, and \textit{lôn leungoe} ‘I hear’. Instead, it was observed in forms like \textit{kujak} ‘I go’, \textit{kucok} ‘I take’, \textit{kubloe} ‘I buy’, and \textit{kuleunge} ‘I hear’. Interviewees explained that the use of \textit{lôn} in these contexts was limited to specific social groups or interactions among BADD Variant 1 speakers. For instance, they might use it when communicating or greeting individuals from non-BADD speaking communities (Mukhlis, 1995). To compare the speech forms of \textit{meulôn} and \textit{meukè} speakers in BADD, the following data can be observed.

(4) \textit{DaRi baroekon lôn hana kuteupeu kapai teureubang bosyo bhan chit.} (BADD V1)
   ‘I have not known before that airplane can have punctured tires’.

(5) \textit{DaRi bareken kè hane kuteupui kapai teureubang bosyo bhan chet.} (BADD V2)
   ‘I didn’t know planes have punctured tires before’.

(6) \textit{DaRi baraiken kè haneu kuteupui kapai teureubang bosyo bhan chet.} (BADD V3)
   ‘I didn’t know planes have punctured tires before’.

Referring to the speeches in (4), (5), and (6), it can be understood that the speech forms \textit{lôn hana lôn teupeu} ‘I did not know’, \textit{lôn hana lôn leungoe} ‘I did not hear’, and \textit{lôn hana lôn kalan} ‘I did not see’ are rarely used in the speech of BADD Variant 1.
speakers. Data (4), (5), and (6) indicate that the difference between BADD Variants 1, 2, and 3 lies in the words baroekon ‘before’, lôn ‘I’, and hana kuteupu ‘did not know’. BADD Variants 2 and 3 differ in the words barèken ‘before’ and hane kuteupui ‘did not know’. In BADD Variant 3, it is pronounced baraiken ‘before’ and haneu ‘did not know’. Meanwhile, ke ‘I’ and teupui ‘know’ are the distinguishing features of speech in BADD Variants 2 and 3 from Variant 1.

4.2 The Similarities of Linguistic Features in Variants of the Acehnese Daya Dialect during Social Interactions

As earlier discussed, BADD Variants 2 and 3 differ in pronunciation and phonemes. However, they also share some similarities. For instance, the question words pui ‘what’ and hane ‘nothing’ have the same pronunciation in BADD Variants 2 and 3, as observed from the following sequence taken from the speech data.

(7) Pui nyeng ka peugah hane deuh kuleunge. (BADD V2)
‘What did you say? I cannot hear you’.

(8) Pui nyeng ka peugah hane deuh kuleunge. (BADD V3)
‘What did you say? I cannot hear you’.

Compare to:

(9) Peu nyeng ka peugah hana deuh kuleunge. (BADD V1)
‘What did you say? I can’t hear you’.

Data (7) shows that hane ‘nothing’ in BADD Variant 3 is not pronounced as hanai. Likewise, the word kana ‘already exists’, as pronounced in the speech of BADD Variant 1, is pronounced as kene ‘already exists’ in BADD Variant 3, instead of kenai. Kene ‘already exists’ is also pronounced in BADD Variant 2. Thus, the words hana ‘does not exist’ and kana ‘already exist’ in BADD Variant 1 are pronounced with the same pronunciation by speakers of BADD Variants 2 and 3, hane ‘does not exist’ and kene ‘already exists’. Similarly, other words ending in the phoneme /a/ in BADD Variant 1, such as ata ‘belong’, gata ‘you’, batha ‘language’, mita ‘search’, are pronounced as ate ‘belongs’, geute ‘you’, bathe ‘language’, mite ‘search’ by speakers of BADD Variants 2 and 3. This study finds that a number of words ending with the phoneme /a/ in BADD 1 are pronounced with the phoneme /e/ by speakers of BADD Variants 2 and 3. This means that words ending with the phoneme /a/ in BADD Variant 1 are pronounced with the phoneme /æ/ by speakers of BADD Variants 2 and 3. This means that words ending with the phoneme /a/, such as tha ‘one’, dua ‘two’, atha ‘afternoon prayer’, pha ‘thigh’, aba ‘khabar’, siRa ‘salt’, guRa ‘odd or funny’, jRa ‘deterrent’, tanca ‘spoon’, insya ‘evening prayer’ in BADD Variant 1 become the, due, athe, phe, aba, thiRe, guRe, jRe, tance, insye in BADD Variants 2 and 3. These changes occur consistently to form a linguistic pattern or system in a language variant.

Meanwhile, the question word pui ‘what’ in data (7) and (8), which can also contribute to the variations of hane pui ‘it’s okay’, hane pui-pui ‘it’s okay’, barang gapu ‘anything’, hane sapui ‘nothing’, are another uniqueness found in BADD Variants 1 and 2. This uniqueness was also revealed by Hanoum et al. (1986) in their research on the varieties and dialects of Acehnese. The use of pui ‘apa’, which is commonly known in Acehnese as peu ‘what’, is a characteristic of the Aceh Lamno Jaya dialect of West Aceh (Hanoum et al., 2006; Mukhlis, 1995). When Hanoum et al.
(1986) carried out the study, the Lamno area was administratively part of the West Aceh District (Alamsyah, 2003).

A number of common linguistic features related to vocabulary, pronunciation, and meaning in the three BADD variants are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The similarities of linguistic features in the Acehnese Daya dialect variants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BADD V1</th>
<th>BADD V2</th>
<th>BADD V3</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhoi</strong></td>
<td>bhoi</td>
<td>bhoi</td>
<td>bhoi</td>
<td>cake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>peuneuwoi</strong></td>
<td>peuneuwoi</td>
<td>peuneuwoi</td>
<td>peuneuwoi</td>
<td>gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>uRoh</strong></td>
<td>uRoh</td>
<td>uRoh</td>
<td>uRoh</td>
<td>invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>meuuRoh</strong></td>
<td>meuuRoh</td>
<td>meuuRoh</td>
<td>meuuRoh</td>
<td>invite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kRebiek</strong></td>
<td>kRebiek</td>
<td>kRebiek</td>
<td>kRebiek</td>
<td>how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ubé</strong></td>
<td>ubé</td>
<td>ubé</td>
<td>ubé</td>
<td>as big as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>paté</strong></td>
<td>paté</td>
<td>paté</td>
<td>paté</td>
<td>wrap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>abé</strong></td>
<td>abé</td>
<td>abé</td>
<td>abé</td>
<td>dust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>mè</strong></td>
<td>mè</td>
<td>mè</td>
<td>mè</td>
<td>bring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>lham</strong></td>
<td>lham</td>
<td>lham</td>
<td>lham</td>
<td>drowning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>syob</strong></td>
<td>syob</td>
<td>syob</td>
<td>syob</td>
<td>stab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>phui</strong></td>
<td>phui</td>
<td>phui</td>
<td>phui</td>
<td>light</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table 2 shows common linguistic features used by speakers in the three BADD variants. However, in real speech or interaction, speakers of BADD Variant 1 can still be distinguished from speakers of BADD Variants 2 and 3 because each choice of word in communication is inseparable from the speech context. The most easily marked feature of BADD Variants 1, 2, and 3 speakers is the speech content in the following words.

(10) *Bak keudè teh kablaib bhoi a’?* (BADD Variant 3)
‘Which shop did you buy the cake at?’

(11) *Bak keudè teh kabloe bhoi a’? hane inan kukalon.* (BADD Variant 1)
‘From which shop did you buy the cake? I didn’t see it there’,

(12) *Bak keudè teh kable bhoi a’?* (BADD Variant 2)
‘From which shop did you buy the cake?’

Meanwhile, the word *kRebiek* ‘how’ is also used in other variations, namely *kReban* or *pakReban* ‘like what’ or ‘how’, and can be found in all three variants of the BADD dialect. The word *syob* ‘stab’ is found in all three variants with the same pronunciation, but the word *syob* ‘sew’ (BADD Variant 1) in BADD Variants 2 and 3 is pronounced *syeb* ‘sew’. In addition, in the BADD of the three variants, there are a number of words that are rarely heard in Acehnese speech but commonly used by Acehnese speakers outside the BADD-speaking area, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Data on a number of vocabularies that can be considered unique in the Acehnese Daya dialect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BADD V1</th>
<th>BADD V2</th>
<th>BADD V3</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>tungko</strong></td>
<td>tungko</td>
<td>tungko</td>
<td>tungko</td>
<td>throw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kiyam</strong></td>
<td>kiyam</td>
<td>kiyam</td>
<td>kiyam</td>
<td>noisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ceureuboi</strong></td>
<td>ceureuboi</td>
<td>ceureuboi</td>
<td>ceureuboi</td>
<td>curly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>thanthoi</strong></td>
<td>thanthoi</td>
<td>thanthoi</td>
<td>thanthoi</td>
<td>curly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>padoi</strong></td>
<td>padoi</td>
<td>padoi</td>
<td>padoi</td>
<td>make</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the word *tungko* ‘throw’, there is also the word *Rom* or *geulawa* ‘throw’. The speakers of BADD Variants 1 and 2 pronounce the word as *Rom*, while speakers of BADD Variant 3 pronounce it as *Rem*. *Geulawa* ‘throw’ is pronounced by BADD Variant 1 speakers, while BADD Variants 2 and 3 speakers say it as *geulawe* ‘throw’. The word *ceureuboi* is used and understood in all three variants of BADD with the meaning of very dense curly hair (frizzy). The word *thanthoi* ‘curly’ in BADD is used to refer to curly-feathered chickens as manok *thanthoi*. *Thanthoi*, interpreted as curly, is not used to refer to people with curly hair. It specifically applies only to curly-feathered chickens, not humans. The word *padoi* ‘make’ or *kiyam* ‘noisy’ can be classified as classic words and they compete with the words *peugot* or *peuget* ‘make’. *Riyôh* or *kaRu* ‘noisy’ is also found in the three BADD variants, competing with the word *kiyam*. The following is an example of its use in speech.

(13) *Peu/pui teungoh kapadoi?*!
    ‘What are you doing?!’

(14) *Bèk kiyam that watè na ureung beut!*
    ‘Don’t be noisy when someone is reciting the Quran!’

(15) *Pakon/paken kapadoi lôn/kè aju-aju!*
    ‘Why do you annoy me/trick me constantly!’

Speeches in (13) tend to be used in an atmosphere of intimacy and brotherhood; hence, the trick made by someone or the perpetrator will also be understood by the target as a joke. The use of the word *padoi* in such a context is appropriate and represents a number of unspoken meanings. In today’s Indonesian context, perhaps it is equivalent to ‘prank’, but in a positive sense.

4.3 Code-Switching and Code-Mixing among Acehnese Daya Dialect Speakers in Social Interaction

In communication, code-switching and code-mixing often occur due to the demands of the speech situation (Chaturvedi, 2015). This study finds that today, code-switching and code-mixing in the speech of speakers of BADD Variants 1, 2, and 3 are more common due to adjusting the speech variety with family members following the child’s first language choice in the family. The study also reveals that a number of families in this research area choose Indonesian as the child’s first language, consistent with a study by Alamsyah et al. (2011), which concludes that Acehnese speakers choose Indonesian as the first language for children in the family.

In a limited scope, namely the family, code-switching and code-mixing that occur involve switching from BADD to Indonesian or vice versa, depending on the situation and the participants involved in the interaction. The researchers observed that children in almost all villages in the Jaya and Indra Jaya Districts use Indonesian as the first language in the family, but they also understand BADD. Thus, code-switching and code-mixing involving Indonesian and BADD codes are strongly supported by accurate data.

The observation also identified that code-switching and code-mixing of BADD speakers occurred in speech situations involving Acehnese speakers outside the BADD speaker community, particularly with BADD Variants 2 and 3 speakers. In such situations, BADD Variants 1 and 2 speakers tend to choose the BADD Variant 1
language. In other situations, code-switching and internal code-mixing (code-switching and code-mixing within the BADD of the three variants) were also recorded in this study. The frequent tendency of code-switching and code-mixing was from BADD Variant 2 and BADD Variant 3 to BADD Variant 1. This commonly occurred in contexts of high formality, such as public lectures or religious lectures, Friday sermons, village meetings, youth meetings, family welfare movement meetings, engagements, and other formal activities in social life, which were dominated by BADD Variant 1.

In cases of marriages between BADD Variants 1 and 2 or 3 speakers, the BADD Variant 1 variety was commonly chosen in a meeting, visit, or extended family gathering of both parties. Similarly, when interacting with children in the context of a family of BADD Variants 2 and 3 speakers who choose Indonesian as the child’s first language, the code-switching and code-mixing of BADD also tended to be in BADD 1. However, in social interactions involving non-formal contexts, code-switching and code-mixing from one BADD variant to another were rare, even in the context of husband-wife communication with different BADD variants.

5. DISCUSSION

The results of the study show that apart from showing differences with other dialects of the Acehnese language, The Daya dialect also shows the existence of variants within these dialects. From the results of the study, it was found that there are three variants of the Daya dialect of Acehnese. The quite obvious differences between the three variants are related to phonology, pronunciation, and phoneme changes. This is in line with the statement of Shareah et al. (2015), namely that in the reality of language use, language variations are found. Language variation itself is characterized by regular heterogeneity and regular differences (Matsumoto, 2019). Tegegne (2016) calls language variation to differences within one language. However, from the results of this study, it was found that there were dialect variations that were marked as variants. As a comparison, we can give an example of the words meaning bathing, earlier, and now, which are pronounced by the Variant 1 speaker group as manoe, bunoe, and jinoe/ inoe; the Variant 2 speaker group pronounces it as mane, bune, jine/ine; and the Variant 3 speaker group pronounces it as manai, bunai, and jinai/inai. In addition, speech based on these variants can identify the speaker as a local native, the region/village the speaker comes from, and the speaker’s social class. This is in line with what was stated by Chambers and Trudgill (2004) that all speakers have social backgrounds as well as regional locations and variations in speech which can be a means of self-identification as residents of certain places, members of certain social classes, certain ethnicities, and other social characteristics.

The Aceh dialect speaker groups, Variant 2 and Variant 3, are two groups of speakers who inhabit different areas and this is better known as a form of regional variation, namely language variation due to geographical factors or the speaker’s place of residence (Mayabar, 2015; Nordquist, 2019a; Shareah et al., 2015; Siregar, 2017; Yule, 2020). However, a limited number of Variant 2 speakers can also be found in the area where Variant 3 speakers are domiciled. Likewise, conversely, a limited number of Variant 3 speakers are also found in areas demarcated by Variant 2 speakers. This condition can occur due to various reasons, such as changing residence
due to marriage, work, or other reasons. Meanwhile, the Variant 1 speaker group spread to the Variant 2 and Variant 3 speaker groups. This also means that in almost all villages in the area where Aceh speakers speak the Daya dialect, you can find speakers of Variant 1. Thus, in particular, it can be stated that the existence of Variant 1 speakers is not caused by geographical factors so Variant 1 speech cannot be categorized as a regional variation. Referring to the opinion Zhan (2011), the Aceh language variation, the Daya dialect Variant 1, can be called a social variation (see also Chambers & Trudgill, 2004; Yule, 2020). It shows the characteristics of a particular social class in society.

From the results of this study, another important point that was found was that every Acehnese speaker of the Daya dialect from different speech variants could understand each other’s speech so that there were no communication barriers when two or more speakers spoke their respective variants. This reality is in line with the results of Budiarsa’s (2015) study of Indonesian speakers with various dialects. Budiarsa (2015) found that the diversity of Indonesian dialects did not cause communication barriers for its speakers. Referring to Trudgill (2001), all language varieties are the same and no variety is superior or inferior to other varieties of the same language as far as their linguistic features and functions are concerned. This means that the three Acehnese language variants in the Daya dialect are varieties of the same dialect so that in terms of linguistic features and functions, no variant is superior or inferior to the other variants.

The Daya dialect of Acehnese is used by its speakers as a means of communication and a means of establishing social interaction, as stated by Ogli (2020) language is used by people to interact with each other, collect and convey information about all events in social and spiritual life. They are a speech community (Saadiyah, et al., 2019) who speak one language and share the same or different meanings in phonology or grammar (Zhan, 2013). As a language community, Acehnese speakers of the Daya dialect participate in social interactions through a set of shared norms that can refer to linguistic similarities between the various codes used including code-switching, code-mixing, and various contextualization cues. Kerswill (1994) states that code-switching and various speech contexts can only be fully understood by the language community concerned. Considering that Acehnese speakers of the Daya dialect of the three variants can understand each other, the results of the study found that there were incidents of code-switching and code-mixing in social interactions in certain speech situations. Code-switching and code-mixing events in the speech of Acehnese speakers of the Daya dialect can be differentiated into (1) code-switching and code-mixing when speaking with outsiders outside the community of Acehnese speakers of the Daya dialect, (2) code-switching and code-mixing when speaking in situations certain speech partners, and (3) code-switching and code-mixing when interacting with children who use Indonesian as the first language in the family (Alamsyah et al., 2011).

In speech incidents involving Acehnese speakers outside the community of Acehnese speakers of the Daya dialect, code-switching, and code-mixing events tend not to occur among speakers of Acehnese dialect Variant 1. Code-switching and code-mixing tend to occur among Variant 2 speakers and Variant 3 speakers. In this context, speakers of the Acehnese dialect Daya Variant 2 and Variant 3 use the Acehnese dialect variant Daya dialect Variant 1. Likewise, in formal speech situations, the language variation used is Variant 1. Speakers of Variant 2 and Variant 3 tend to code-
switch to the Acehnese Daya dialect Variant 1 and in such situations, code mixing often occurs. Penny (2000) states that in social interaction, each individual in a speech community can choose or change variants according to the speech situation. This phenomenon can occur in speakers who master more than one language or language code and they are known as speakers of bilingualism and multilingualism (Moetia et al., 2018).

6. CONCLUSION

The Bahasa Aceh Dialek Daya (BADD, or Acehnese language of the Daya Dialect, with its variants, is one of the Acehnese dialects in use today within the community as a means of communication in social interactions. As an identity of the speaking community, especially BADD Variants 2 and 3, it is distinctive and unique, particularly in terms of the pronunciation of certain phonemes. Hence, it is evident that there are several linguistic features that differ from those of Acehnese in general. For example, the word *pui*, which means ‘what’, is not found in Acehnese or other Acehnese dialects, based on the study of some literature on Acehnese dialects and observations of Acehnese usage in general. It is challenging for speakers of BADD Variants 2 and 3 to pronounce *pui* as *peu*, as pronounced by BADD Variant 1 speakers or common Acehnese speakers. Related data indicate that the frequency of using the question word *pui* in everyday language is high, having become an internalized value among speakers. Simultaneously, it is also one of the distinguishing characteristics of speakers of BADD Variants 2 and 3 from those of BADD Variant 1 and general Acehnese speakers.

Language and its speakers are identity entities, reflecting the origin and culture of individuals. When this awareness is cultivated among speakers of various language variants, efforts to maintain language or dialect are believed to persist. Most members of society never expect to be detached from their cultural roots. This research focuses on the use of the Acehnese Daya dialect language in social interaction. However, it has a limited scope in observing variations in BADD usage throughout Aceh Jaya as a whole. Future research can encompass various sub-districts in Aceh Jaya, comparing the use of BADD among these areas.

The implications of this research for the theory of language variation and sociolinguistics, in general, underline the significance of localized linguistic diversity. By highlighting the distinctiveness and cultural significance of the Acehnese Daya dialect, particularly its variants, it emphasizes the importance of preserving linguistic diversity within communities. Recognizing and valuing linguistic heritage not only fosters cultural identity but also promotes inclusivity and respect for different language variants. Therefore, efforts to document, promote, and conserve the Acehnese Daya dialect should be encouraged to ensure its continued vitality and relevance in contemporary society.
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