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Abstract

The aim of this study was to investigate the impact of a significant number of women from other parts of Aceh in the small community of Leupueng which was hard hit by the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami on Leupueng dialect. These women married men from Leupueng, and it was hypothesised that such mixed dialect marriages might result in the formation of a new dialect used by the children of these unions. This situation would reflect several observations on language shift and would seem to be a possible outcome in light of what is known about the role of mothers in shaping children’s language use and the sociolinguistic context in general. Fieldwork was carried out in Leupueng focusing on the language use of young children, whose interactions were recorded and analysed in light of the characteristic dialect features of Leupueng speakers. Basic research on the nature of this dialect had been carried out in the 1990s, and the resulting recordings were available as a baseline for determining the current nature of the dialect. The study’s findings suggest that language usage in Leupueng is becoming more like the standard dialect of Acehnese, and this is reflected in children’s usage. Attitudes of adults in Leupueng toward the use of various dialects were also assessed, suggesting that most have a favourable view of the local dialect. Nonetheless, increasing use of a more widely comprehensible standard dialect was observed and is associated with the presence of a significant number of women who do not speak the Leupueng dialect. In addition, the current social context in Aceh exposed both children and adults to Indonesian more than in the past and heavy use of new technology is also a factor in changing patterns of language use. These findings suggest that the characteristic Leupueng dialect may be at risk in the future as younger speakers gradually shift to a more comprehensible and socially advantageous type of Acehnese. The study is significant in that it provides insight into the complex nature of language use in Indonesia and represents a snapshot of the way in which dialect shift, levelling and convergence may occur in a complex, multilingual context. To date, there has been little rigorous study of these issues in Indonesia, and this study contributes to our knowledge of this area of sociolinguistics.
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Chapter 1
Context of the Research

This chapter contains an introduction to the study that is described in this thesis. It is divided into sections that cover the background, rationale, aims, and significance of the study. In addition, its research questions and limitations are presented and the structure of this thesis is laid out.

1.1 Introduction

There are not many studies on dialect and linguistic change of the Acehnese language, although there are a number of references which are research-based that can be followed up for further studies of the language. Asyik (1972) studied the word construction and the morphology of Acehnese. Later, he also studied other aspects of the language which include its phonetics, phonology, morphology, and syntax (Asyik, 1987). Prior to this, similar analysis on the grammar of Acehnese was also done by Durie (1985). Durie’s grammar provides a reference for Acehnese phonetics, phonology, morphology, and syntax. Although mention of the diversity of dialects of Acehnese was made, there is little documentation of specific dialects that can be used as a reference. The only dialect study, which was conducted by Sulaiman et al. (1985), provides some description of a number of dialects of
Acehnese although not much of this is relevant to dialect change, which is the main purpose of the current study.

The Indian Ocean Tsunami in 2004 provided a moment, motivation, and urgency to study its impact on the linguistic communities affected. It presented an opportunity to examine to what extent a particular speech community was influenced linguistically as a result of the event. Relevant phenomena in this context might include language loss, dialect loss, synchronic variation emerging after the event, and aspects of change that might have affected language use in Aceh. More specifically, these issues can be approached in terms of linguistic factors and non-linguistic factors. The study of linguistic factors might include segmental issues such as phonetics, phonology, morphology, and syntax but could also focus on suprasegmental issues such as stress and intonation at word, phrasal, as well as clausal levels. Studies of non-linguistic factors could investigate the community’s linguistic attitudes, their social interaction and networks, and how these can affect the way they use the language.

This study provides both linguistic and non-linguistic analysis of the dynamic of language use that has occurred since the tsunami in Leupueng, a heavily affected community. It includes analysis of phonological variation in the speech of children born in the Leupueng dialect community as a result of inter-dialectal marriages, as well as the speech of children whose parents are not inter-dialectally married. The reciprocal influence of the children from
intermarried and non-intermarried families is analysed as part of network influence. Also, the influence of parents’ language, to which their children are exposed, and their attitude towards the local dialect are an important part of the analysis.

Linguistic change occurs because of the synchronic heterogeneity in a speech community (Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog, 1968; Kay, 1975). That all linguistic change comes from synchronic heterogeneity has also been demonstrated in the areas of lexical semantics, phonology (Wang, 1969; Labov, 1972), and syntax (Bickerton, 1973). This study considers how the synchronic heterogeneity (variation) that exists in Leupueng might explain change in its local dialect after a sudden change of population composition brought different variants into the existing patterns of the dialect as a direct effect of the 2004 Tsunami.

1.2 Statement of the problem

The Indian Ocean Tsunami on 26 December, 2004 left the coastal area of Aceh in ruins. The reports of The Agency of Rehabilitation and Reconstruction for Aceh and Nias (BRR) for 2004 and 2005 detail the devastation. Two hundred thousand lives were lost, physical infrastructure — 14 seaports, 120 bridges, 3,000 kilometres of roads, 1,050 government buildings, 2,000 school buildings, 114 health centres, 20,000 fishponds, and 60,000 hectares of agricultural land — were destroyed; people lost their
livelihoods, and the government was practically ineffective for a period of time. Damage to 190,000 houses meant that many people were regarded as ‘missing’, and 500,000 people were displaced from their homes. The tsunami also caused small and medium sized entrepreneurs to lose their businesses, and, in the education sector, the deaths of 2,500 teachers were noted, and about 167,000 students lost their schools (Faisal and Dercon, 2006; Faisal, 2007).

To date, however, there has been no survey of the impact on language that was caused by the tsunami and its aftermath. Therefore, a study to document if any extreme change is taking place in the linguistic profiles of speakers from particular speech communities located in the areas affected by the tsunami is timely. In Leupueng, one of these communities, many women died in the tsunami, while some men were spared and survived. The higher number of deaths among women in Leupueng is related to the Acehnese family tradition. Acehnese is a matrilocal society (Siegel, 1969). A community in the Acehnese tradition is built upon the women’s family relationships. A man who is married comes to live at his wife’s parent’s house until the couple can afford their own house or until the parents are able to provide them with one. The new house for the new family would normally not be far from the wife’s parents. Therefore, the husband is always seen as a guest at the house or in the area, especially linguistically. The wife has more authority in the household and stays at home to take care of domestic work while her husband
works outside the home. As Leupueng is located by the sea, some men work as fishermen but many are farmers and go to their land on the mountain not far from their village during the day. On the morning of the tsunami, most of the men had already left for work and the women as usual were at home. This was the reason why many of them were not able to escape and survive. There is another aspect of the story, which relates to the religious faith of the population, which led to more deaths in Leupueng. The strong earthquake and the coming of the tsunami suggested to many people that it was Judgment Day. Therefore, they made only a minimum effort to escape and save themselves. Instead, they chose to perform *dzikir*¹ and recite verses from the Quran in the last seconds of their lives.

The loss of life among the women of Leupueng, who in the traditional Acehnese matrilocal society are the primary transmitters of local dialects, has led to dramatic change in language use in the region, especially among children born since the tsunami. This change is associated with the migration of many women into this community through intermarriage to men native to Leupueng. Since virtually all the people who were in Leupueng were killed when the tsunami struck, this meant that, after the tsunami, the residents of

---

¹ *Dzikir* is a type of religious recital practiced by Muslims in an effort to remember their Creator.
Leupueng were reduced to a very small community consisting only of those who were not at home when the event took place. The survivors were dominated numerically by men because women were more likely to have been at home. This led the surviving Leupueng men to marry women from outside Leupueng.

In considering potential change in children’s language use in this context, the sociolinguistic model of language acquisition suggests that the primary communication context of interest is the child-mother or child-caregiver pair (Owens, 2012). This is the process that leads to language acquisition by children who start from infancy with their early reflexive behaviour through repeated interactions with their mothers. Labov (2001) supports this notion based on his observations and points out that children speak their mothers’ vernacular. This raises an interesting question about what might happen when a community’s women are lost but the men survive. In a context where in-marrying mothers come from non-local dialect backgrounds, it is likely that the local features of the fathers’ dialect will not be transmitted to the children in the family and will thus be lost. When this process occurs, it is most probable that the mothers’ dialect features will be passed on to the following generation.

For this reason, the number of mixed-dialect marriages is significant in the Leupueng community. It is expected that this might create conditions where dialect loss could occur in this community due to the influence of the
in-marrying mothers’ dialects upon the language acquired by children in the community. In other words, it seems likely that the language acquired by children born since the tsunami would tend to reflect the language use of their mothers, who do not speak the Leupueng dialect, rather than the features of local usage, which in the long term might contribute to change in the nature of the Leupueng dialect.

1.3 Aims of the study

This study investigates possible evidence of new dialect formation in Leupueng as a result of the unique social and demographic restructuring caused by population movement, displacement and intermarriages following the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami. The evidence sought is in linguistic variation that has emerged in the community since the tsunami. It documents variability in language use among children of the area and considers whether the presence of ‘in-marrying’ mothers from various dialect backgrounds in the community is contributing to the creation of more variation or variability, which is considered the basis for linguistic change.

By looking at this variation, this study aims to determine whether a new dialect has started to form in the Leupueng speech community and to determine the extent to which any evidence for new dialect formation as a result of the change of the composition of the community and the demographic restructuring of the area can be observed and documented. The study
examines the features in the speech of children of pre-school age born into intermarried\textsuperscript{2} families. Specifically, it seeks to identify whether and to what extent the local dialect features appear in the children’s speech and to provide a descriptive analysis of the possible evidence of new dialect formation. It further attempts to identify signs of the loss of Leupueng dialect features. In addition to the children from intermarried families, the study also considers children from non-intermarried families to determine the extent to which their speech has altered from the local dialect and to describe the variation found in their speech.

This research also aims to explain factors commonly associated with and thought to influence and shape children’s use of dialect features. These factors consist of the children’s social networks and parental attitudes. When parents come from different dialect backgrounds, their attitude toward their own dialect is critical in the transmission of dialect features to their children. The language of the people with whom children interact in their daily lives also contributes to the complexity of their use of language and, together with the parents’ contribution, might therefore shape their dialect use. For this reason,

\textsuperscript{2} The terms intermarried, interdialectal-marriage, and mixed dialect marriage frequently appear in this thesis. Unless otherwise defined, all of these terms refer to marriage between men from Leupueng and women from outside Leupueng.
this study also analyses the children’s social networks and contrasts them with their speech.

This study focuses on the phonological features that appear in the speech of these children in intermarried families in relation to the local Leupueng dialect and compares these features with those of children born to locally married parents. It introduces the current situation of sociolinguistic change and variation into Acehnese dialect studies by providing an account of the Leupueng dialect and its contemporary dynamic (variation) of use in children’s speech.

1.4 Significance of the study

Studies on Acehnese have focused on its grammar based on particular dialect areas. Two major works describing Acehnese grammar have focused on the dialect of North Aceh (Durie, 1985; Asyik, 1987). Studies on the varieties of Acehnese are very limited. These varieties of Acehnese have generally been described in the aforementioned works based on the administrative areas or regions of the modern administrative framework, rather than on patterns of traditional usage. For this reason, dialects or varieties of Acehnese have been classified into four general groups: North Aceh, Pidie, Aceh Besar, and West Aceh dialects. The latest work on the varieties of Acehnese is by Yunisrina Qismullah Yusuf, who analysed the
quality of vowels produced by speakers of Acehnese in Kampung Aceh, Kedah, Malaysia, and speakers of the North Aceh dialect (Yusuf, 2013).

Although the classification of dialects of Acehnese only includes four groups, it is acknowledged that there are more than just these four varieties, especially in Aceh Besar and Lamno which are now part of the administrative region of Aceh Jaya. There are numerous dialects that can be found in Aceh Besar and Lamno, which are believed to be the areas that have been inhabited the longest by Acehnese speakers, compared to other locations. Many clusters of communities in Aceh Besar and Lamno that were assumed to speak their own varieties of Acehnese were located on the west coast of Aceh which was severely affected by the 2004 tsunami. One of these communities is Leupueng, Aceh Besar.

Leupueng is located within the area of Greater Aceh on the west coast. Most areas in Greater Aceh, in addition to the Daya region which is located further south, are considered to be the oldest Acehnese speaking regions, based on the evidence that the greatest degree of dialect variation is found in these areas (Durie, 1985). Dialects in Greater Aceh typically differ from one village to another, which suggests that the greater the distances between villages, the more difficulty people would have in understanding each other. Thus, any change in the Leupueng dialect that might lead to new dialect formation should be investigated, as the Leupueng dialect can be considered to be one of the earliest varieties of the Acehnese language and is important
in understanding the historical development of the language. This is based on the assumption that speakers of the Leupueng dialect tend to preserve older forms of usage because of its geographic isolation which made it less susceptible to change over time. Now, with the presence of many other dialect speakers in the community, and especially women with their special role in the formation of children’s language, it is very important to study the impact of the social and demographic restructuring which resulted from the tsunami, including the loss of almost all the local women of the Leupueng dialect community.

The study is important in understanding the nature of language change but also in terms of documenting and preserving the linguistic heritage of Aceh. As one of the oldest dialects of the language that retains many archaic forms, the Leupueng dialect can help researchers to further study linguistic typology for comparison with other languages that belong to the same family, and this will shed more light on the history of its speakers about which we still know comparatively little. Other dialects have had more intense contact with Malay in the past and now with Indonesian. In Banda Aceh, the provincial capital, where the predominant dialect has been referred to as the Greater Aceh dialect (Hurgronje, 1906), dialects have been influenced by contact with speakers from North Aceh, Pidie, and West Aceh, in addition to Malay and Indonesian, as a result of increased mobility and increasing migration to the city.
Although this study is limited only to certain aspects of phonology, with the pattern of change described above, it is hoped that its study of current variation will serve as a reference for further investigation into linguistic change that is concerned with additional aspects of language use, not only in this dialect but also in other Acehnese dialects which have more speakers than the dialect spoken in Leupueng. It is also hoped that it will raise awareness of possible new dialect formation that may be occurring in Leupueng as well as encourage greater consciousness of the linguistic change that may occur in parts of the world affected by natural disasters. Finally, this study also serves to provide a record of what may be one of the oldest varieties of Acehnese in current use.

1.5 Research Questions

Research on the Acehnese language has included descriptions of its linguistic elements, such as phonetics, phonology, morphology, and syntax (Durie, 1985; Asyik, 1987). In an attempt to explain the origin of Acehnese, historical reconstruction has also been described in studies of a number of lexical items (Durie, 1990; Thurgood, 1999). The language family Acehnese is a member of the Chamic group, which is one of the Austronesian language sub-groups (Durie, 1985, 1990). A study of Acehnese dialectology by Hanoum et al. (1986) has mapped several lexical and phonological differences across the region.
Sociolinguistic research into change, variation and shift has, thus far, been under-represented in linguistic studies of Acehnese. Durie (1985) believes that linguistic change and variation across generations are apparent everywhere in Aceh. Durie’s observations of these changes include, for example, the merging of diphthongs /oe/ and /ee/ into /o/ and /e/, suggesting that phonological change may be significant in Leupueng as well as in other locations. Using available studies as a starting point, this research seeks possible evidence of dialect shift or new dialect formation in the dialect of Acehnese which is spoken by the current Leupueng community, particularly any change motivated by mixed-dialect marriages following the 2004 tsunami. Marriages of this type are common in the Leupueng community.

There are many sociolinguistic factors that can be analysed in an intermarried speech community. Certain questions are more urgent than others. Normally, the documentation of linguistic change – whether in ‘real time’ or ‘apparent time’ studies – requires a long period of time for completion. However, dramatic social change can occur spasmodically and may offer a unique opportunity for sociolinguistic research; in such cases, time is of the essence in capturing the specific changes occurring in a given context. The present study is confined to a defined time period in order to capture the unique linguistic experience of the children born after the tsunami. The following questions shape this study in the effort to determine whether possible dialect shift or new dialect formation is taking pace, based on the
language of the children who took part in this research. These questions are intended to allow evaluation of the extent to which exposure to the mothers’ dialect is reflected in the children’s use of language.

1. What are the distinctive characteristics of the Leupueng dialect as compared to the standard variety of Acehnese?

2. Do features of the Leupueng dialect appear in the language used by children born since the tsunami in Leupueng?

3. What are the attitudes of parents toward the local dialect and what are their perceptions of their children’s dialect use?

Question 1 relates to linguistic data collected through a process of fieldwork. Questions 2 and 3 concern an analysis of sociolinguistic factors in the community and how these factors are related to the dynamic of language use among the children studied.

**1.6 Structure of the Thesis**

This thesis is divided into 10 chapters. They are: Context of the Research; Background; The Acehnese Language; Dialect Contact and Dialect Change; Methodological Framework; Phonological Characteristics of the Leupueng Dialect; Features of the Leupueng Dialect in Children’s Language Use; Parents’ Language Attitudes’ Discussion; and Summary and Conclusion.
Chapter 2

Background

This chapter provides two types of background for the study. First, it gives an account of the Leupueng community’s psychosocial dimensions and social practices before and after the tsunami. Second, it reviews the history of the Acehnese language and its use in Aceh as well as in Leupueng more specifically. This includes the linguistic relationship of the language with Chamic and Malay languages. It then discusses the history of literacy in Aceh and the development of its writing system and orthography. This is followed by a discussion of Acehnese dialects, including some background on the features of the Leupueng dialect.

2.1 The Geographic and Demographic Setting of Leupueng

The geographic setting and population information presented in this section are intended to provide background on the context of this study and to describe the life of the people in the community, including their modes of interaction and their contact with people from outside Leupueng. This information is crucial to the understanding of the dynamics of language use in the community.

Leupueng is a *mukim*, a settlement consisting of a collection of villages. It is a subdistrict of the Aceh Besar Regency, located on the west coast of the
island of Sumatra, approximately 25 kilometres south of Banda Aceh, the capital of the Indonesian province of Aceh. Leupueng extends along the Banda Aceh-Meulaboh route between kilometres 16 - 30. It is isolated from other settled areas by three mountains. In the north, there is Glé Judah, ‘Judah Hill’, and, on its southern side it is separated from other settlements by two mountains Gunong Paro, ‘Mount Paro’, and Gunong Kulu, ‘Mount Kulu’. On the west side, Leupueng borders the Indian Ocean, and, on its east side, lies Lamtéh Mountain which is covered by thick rain-forest.

There are five neighbouring subdistricts surrounding Leupueng. On the other side of Glé Judah is Lhok Nga, which used to be part of the same subdistrict as Leupueng before they were divided because they were felt to be too far apart (about 12 kilometres) to have a single local administration. Behind Gunong Paro and Gunong Kulu is Lhoong subdistrict, which is a 45-minute drive along a winding mountain road. To the east, on the other side of Lamtéh Mountain, lie three other subdistricts, Kuta Cot Gli, Suka Makmur and Kuta Malaka.

There are six villages in Leupueng which cover an area of 76 square kilometres. These villages are Layeun, Pulot, Lamseunia, Meunasah Mesjid, Meunasah Bak U and Deah Mamplam. This area includes residential sites and agricultural land. Each village is about one to two kilometres from the next, except for Deah Mamplam, which is rather distant from the other five. The current population of Leupueng is 2611 (BPS, 2012). While numbers tend to
fluctuate, there has been a population decline over the period from 2009 to 2011, as shown in the BPS’ data (BPS, 2012). The data also show that since 2009 the population of Leupueng has decreased almost fifty percent, from 4,033. In Lamseunia, the number of residents has declined from 353 to 246 (BPS, 2012).

As revealed in some interviews during the field work, one of the reasons is that many people have moved to the city to work. They have left their houses in the village, most of which are empty and not taken care of. These houses were built by aid organisations, such as UN Habitat, the Asian Development Bank, and Muslim Aid during the rehabilitation and reconstruction period following the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami. In many other places affected by the tsunami, people have modified or renovated the houses built following the event to give them a more personalised form, but in Lamseunia, possibly due to financial constraints, very few people have renovated the original houses.

Most people in Lamseunia are from lower socioeconomic levels. In subdistrict records, families are classified by welfare categories ranging from 1 (pre-welfare), 2 (welfare level 1), 3 (welfare level 2), 4 (welfare level 3), to 5 (welfare level 3 plus). In Lamseunia, like other villages in Leupueng, the majority of the population is categorised as welfare level 1. In Indonesia, welfare standards are based on five basic needs: access to food, housing, clothing, education, and religious activities. Law of the Republic of Indonesia
No 10/1992 about the Determination of Pre-Welfare and Welfare Status is based on a household’s ability to obtain the basic needs described in the standard. When a family is not able to afford these necessities, they are categorised as pre-welfare. Families who are able to afford, and have access to, basic needs are considered Welfare Level 1, 2, 3, or 3 Plus. Beyond the essentials, the ability to fulfil their psychosocial needs, such as education, interaction with family members and the environment, the ability to save money, access to information, and ability to contribute to and participate actively in society are all considered in determining these levels (Law No 10/1992).

Women in Leupueng, and especially in Lamseunia, are mostly housewives who stay at home and take care of their children. They are also active in many social events in the community. For example, when there is a death in the community, they help the family of the deceased; when there is a wedding, they serve food to guests who visit. They also organise their own julo-julo (similar to a raffle) and meet for a small party after the draw. Julo-julo is often followed by a Quran recital and wirid\(^3\). Some women help their husbands in the fields, but this would be unusual for the wife of a fisherman. In Lamseunia, few women do agricultural work. Their husbands prefer them

\(^3\) Wirid is a number of phrases, mostly from the Quran, recited together for the remembrance of Allah.
to stay at home and take care of the children. Many people feel they cannot afford to risk their children by not giving them appropriate care after they lost everything in the tsunami.

Since the tsunami, the community has become more mobile. In the past road infrastructure was minimal, and only the very rich could afford to buy vehicles. Now, despite its geographical isolation, it is easier to travel to and from Leupueng. The roads have been improved, and people have better access to a means of transportation. Motorbikes are the most common mode of transportation, and there is usually at least one such vehicle in every family. Thus, contacts and interactions with other people from outside Leupueng have increased.

2.2 Sociopsychological Dimensions

To understand why a person acts, reacts, and has a certain perception of language it is important to understand the socio-psychological dynamics of the person’s community (Giles, 1979). The dynamics of language use in a community develop along with the dynamics of its social context.

As emerged in interviews with several Leupueng elders, the people of Leupueng used to have a feeling of superiority when interacting with visitors to that area. This manifested as a perceived lack of modesty in these interactions and conversations with other people. Immodesty among the people of Leupueng was generally attributed to their pride in the availability
of abundant natural resources in their area and their historical heroism which was often talked about in the community. This resulted in the residents of Leupueng being both socially isolated and exclusive (excluded). Leupueng used to be a prosperous rural area. The prosperity came from the availability of many different sources of livelihood from nature. There are mountains where people cultivated many different fruit trees. Near the villages, rice fields produced yearly crops. The people also had access to the open sea just a few minutes away where they tethered the palông (a type of large, double fishing boat) that they used for fishing. The Krueng Raba River provided a source of income from fresh water fishing. Most people in Leupueng were farmers, fishermen, truck drivers, or fish vendors. Farmers produced one crop of rice a year. They had wet rice fields in the low lands and, in mountainous areas, they used to grow other crops such as chilli and peanuts, although rice was also sometimes grown there as well. Leupueng was also known for fruit production. It was one of the most important regions for the production of durian, rambutan, langsat, and mangosteen. Leupueng durian was well known for its good and thick flesh. Fishermen used palông which were usually owned by a toké (business man). Most truck drivers from Leupueng worked for two nationally known businessmen from Leupueng, Agam Patra and Ali Sinar Desa, both of whom have headquarters in Aceh and Medan with many inter-provincial trucks and trailers. Fish vendors sold the catch from motorbikes in the surrounding villages. They sold fish as far away as Lhok Nga and Lhoong.
The Leupueng people used to be pampered by the richness of their surroundings which provided a livelihood and contributed, to a certain degree, to their perceived immodesty⁴. One of the anecdotes often told in Leupueng from a parent’s perspective was that it did not matter how stupid or uneducated a child from Leupueng might be, he would not suffer from hunger. Some people in Leupueng believed that, if their child was not able to obtain a good job or did not succeed as a trader in the city *peukan* (market) or if he were not able to make it in Darussalam, where many young people went to continue their education, he could always return to Leupueng. He could go to the mountains and earn money from their resources. Logging used to be very popular and promised a good income. If the young person lacked motivation to go logging, he could work in the rice fields within the village without having to make the climb up the mountain. If he complained about the mud in the rice fields, he could go to sea and fish. If he was still not interested in any of these occupations, all he needed was to fish in the nearby river, and that would keep him from hunger. In a way, this anecdote indicates that people had an awareness of the importance of education by sending their children to school and perhaps the university. But it also contains an element of rejection

---

⁴ In the researcher’s personal communication with some elders in the community, it was pointed out that people from Leupueng tended to be rather rude when they talked to other people.
of this notion by implying that education is overrated because a person could still survive and have income without education. If education represented a path to a high-paying job and an investment for the future, the people of Leupueng felt they were not in need of such a path.

Regarding their prosperity, another story often told in the community is about the 1997-1998 financial crisis that hit Southeast Asia. People from Leupueng did not experience any problems because their economy was strong, and they even joked that, when people from other areas found it hard to put food on the table, they were starting to buy new motorbikes. The commodity that supported them was indigo, an oil producing plant whose price skyrocketed at that time.

Another aspect of the feeling of superiority of the people of Leupueng relates to their historical heroism. People in Leupueng saw themselves as brave and tough like their predecessors. Stories told by the elders in the community describe how the people of Leupueng took an active part in the struggle against the Dutch colonial government until the Dutch left and Indonesia achieved its independence following World War II. After Indonesia gained independence, the Dutch returned to attempt to regain control of the country, and people from Leupueng again demonstrated their heroism by participating in the war against the Dutch incursions. They went to Langkat, now part of the Province of North Sumatra, to fight the Dutch and defend the independence of Indonesia.
Once independence was permanently achieved, Aceh was seen to be unfairly treated, and its people felt betrayed by the national government, which led to the rise of a freedom movement in Aceh. People from Leupueng took part in the fight against what they saw as unfair governance. There were two major and costly conflicts with the Indonesian government as the result of this perception. They were the DI/TII movement in 1959 and Aceh Merdeka (Free Aceh), which began in 1976 and ended in 2005. DI/TII stands for Darul Islam/Tentara Islam Indonesia (Nation of Islam/The Islamic Army of Indonesia). The Aceh Merdeka was later better known as GAM which stands for Gerakan Aceh Merdeka (Free Aceh Movement). While the DI/TII movement was a widespread conflict against the government in many parts of Indonesia and driven by religious ideology, Aceh Merdeka was a struggle of the Acehnese driven by unfairness in provincial development accompanied by the exploitation of the natural resources of the region (for historical account and the root of the freedom movement, see, for example, Miller, 2009).

As to many other Acehnese, to the people of Leupueng, the DI/TII movement and Free Aceh Movement have left an unforgettable memory about how severe the cost that they had to bear was. One of the most remembered stories regarding this movement was the tragedy of Pulot Cot Jeumpa. In the late 1950s, almost a hundred people were brutally killed by the Indonesian army. It was said that they were told to line up facing the sea and were shot from behind. They were then buried in a mass grave without any ritual
procession, which was a violation of both local cultural norms and human rights. These people were villagers who were innocent of any involvement in the movement. It was reported that this was an overreaction out of frustration by the Indonesian army from dealing with the movement.

During the Free Aceh Movement conflict, there were also stories frequently told in the Leupueng community. One of these is the story of Geuchik Khairon. He was a wealthy man who was involved in Free Aceh Movement, especially in the late 1990s. He fought for and protected the interests of local communities and people in Aceh in general. Geuchik Khairon was found dead in his boat, but no one claimed responsibility for his death. To the people of Leupueng, these stories inspire their continued bravery and self-confidence.

Pride and a high level of confidence is still observable in the way people from Leupueng speak. Some community elders report that their confidence in speaking results from their pride in being from Leupueng. However, this pride has sometimes affected their interaction with outsiders who see it as a sign of arrogance and immodesty. At sporting events, for example, people from Leupueng sometimes used to get into fights with other spectators when a team from another area was playing the Leupueng team. These incidents are viewed and related with amusement and pride by many Leupueng men and are associated with a high level of solidarity among the people of Leupueng. People might quarrel among themselves in their own village, but they would
always unite and demonstrate high in-group solidarity when there were conflicts with people from other communities. The occurrences of such conflicts were so frequent that people from Leupueng had to be cautious about identifying themselves as coming from Leupueng when they travelled to other areas.

The confidence of people from Leupueng that derived from their identity also affected their way of speaking, which was often seen by outsiders as too direct and impolite. This evaluation and judgment about the people of Leupueng could influence other people’s perception of the language that they used. To some people from outside Leupueng, the language and way of speaking of people from Leupueng were seen as rough and unpleasant. However, the people of Leupueng were not concerned about other people’s opinions of their language use. This lack of concern about others’ opinions can be attributed to the feeling of independence that they had as part of their confidence and can be considered a reason for their isolation.

This social isolation was characterised by a lack of interdependency between the Leupueng community and others in the geographical vicinity. From a socio-psychological perspective, when there is a lack of referent power, there will be less possibility for a community to be influenced by others. Referent power is associated with admiration and the respect of other people (Heffner, 2001). In this case, because of the pride of its members, the Leupueng community had not developed admiration for other communities or
for other varieties of the Acehnese language used outside their area, and thus it was very unlikely for the people of Leupueng to linguistically accommodate to other varieties of Acehnese. This may have contributed to the development of the distinctiveness of Leupueng dialect features. This strong attitude seems to have shifted after the tsunami, however. This issue is a major part of this research, specifically the extent to which attitude shift has influenced the dialect used by children.

Another aspect of social isolation in Leupueng can be seen in past marriage practices in the community. Marrying another person from Leupueng used to be very highly valued, while someone who married a person from another location was often the object of ridicule. In Acehnese tradition in general, however, marriage practice is less exclusive than in Leupueng and is based on the concept of matrilocal or which follows an uxorilocal pattern (Siegel, 1979). Uxorilocal social organisation consists of networks based on relationships on the mother’s side of the family. Women stay in their own village after marriage while men move to their wife’s village. So, in a given area, men will mostly be from different villages, sometimes from neighbouring localities, but there are also cases where the husbands are from distant villages, from a different regency. As women stay in their own village, maintenance of the local dialect is more likely to occur and less change would be expected in the transmission process. In Leupueng, this matrilocal marriage pattern was maintained historically and, in addition, husbands were
mostly drawn from the local community. Therefore, before the tsunami, the Leupueng dialect was well maintained, and its unique features were not greatly affected by outside influences.

Exclusivity, which led to social isolation, is also demonstrated through the way guests or outsiders are welcomed and treated in Leupueng. Guests coming to Leupueng can find it difficult to develop relationships with the locals, especially when they are not aware of the local people’s ways of doing things. Any guest who is seen as self-promoting will be ignored socially or disregarded. The term that is used to refer to guests who are not respectful to the locals is awak jamai, meaning ‘guest people’. When one is labelled awak jamai, it is very difficult to win the hearts of the people of Leupueng. By contrast, people in Leupueng are very welcoming to people who respect their traditions and admire the local people. This rather exclusive characteristic of the people of Leupueng has made it difficult for outsiders to settle in Leupueng or marry into Leupueng families. Leupueng only started to be more open to outsiders in the late 1970s. However, the only people who started to come to Leupueng at that time were those brought by the wealthy to work in their timber mills or other businesses. Later, there were a few more who moved to Leupueng for marriage.
2.3 Religious Activities and Language Use in the Leupueng Community

Acehnese society is very religious and is bound to Islamic tradition and teachings. Therefore, almost all community activities are related to religion. There is at least one mosque in each mukim. The mosque is the centre of the living environment where activities ranging from the weekly Friday prayers to the nikah (marriage) procession for new couples are held. There are yearly events such as Mulod, the Celebration of the Prophet Muhammad’s birthday, Commemoration of Isra mi’raj, the Prophet’s journey to meet God, and other religious activities. For each event, especially Mulod and Isra mi’raj, the community invites a famous teungku (religious leader) to make a speech. The teungku is usually from a different place and sometimes from different kabupaten (district in the Indonesian administrative structure). He may speak a different variety of Acehnese. Most of the famous teungku are from east coast areas and speak the standard variety of Acehnese or a variety close to the standard. In each Acehnese village, there is a village hall called meunasah which is also used for communal activities. In many ways, the meunasah is similar to the mosque in terms of the activities held there, except for Friday prayers which must take place at the mukim mosque.

Past research has shown that the spread of religion has linguistic consequences (Spolsky, 2003). The spread of religion tends to be followed by the spread of language. Islam started to grow in Aceh in the 13th century, then
spread through the whole Indonesian archipelago. Trade and commerce was
the common medium of the spread of Islam (Reid, 2006). There are many
words in Acehnese that have an Arabic origin. Some examples are sikin ‘knife’,
syarat ‘condition’, haphai ‘memorise’, muphom ‘understand’ and many more.
Many of the adopted and adapted words have correspondences in Malay. This
implies the possibility that these words were absorbed into Acehnese through
Malay. This possibility is supported by the framing of the Acehnese language
by these two languages. It has been suggested that Acehnese language
discourse is framed by Malay and Arabic at the outer layers (Durie, 1996).
This framing can clearly be observed in both indigenous Acehnese texts and
the structure of talks given by Acehnese religious preachers where language
choice is iconically used as a discourse marker. Talks are usually opened with
Arabic phrases and utterances. These include greetings and praise of God and
the prophet. The second part of talks usually consists of addresses to honorary
and invited guests and all audience members. This part is delivered in either
fully in Malay/Indonesian or in a mixture of Malay/Indonesian and Acehnese.
Then the content of such talks is delivered in Acehnese with occasional
codeswitching into Malay/Indonesian and the use of many Arabic terms. The
closing of these talks can consist of two parts. The first part where the speaker
indicates that the talk is over is usually expressed in Malay/Indonesian or a
mixture of Acehnese and Malay/Indonesian. The final part is a prayer for God’s
guidance and a final greeting which is expressed in Arabic.
There are linguistic impacts associated with the language of the speakers responsible for spreading religion and the book from which their teachings come. The teachings of Islam are based on the Quran, which is written in Arabic. The Acehnese were exposed to the language spoken by preachers and Islamic missionaries and thus adopted many Arabic words. This is comparable in some sense to the current situation of dialect contact taking place in Leupueng. On many religious occasions and celebrations in Leupueng, people invite famous speakers (preachers) from outside Leupueng. As invited speakers mostly come from other areas, exposure to the dialect features of the speaker’s place of origin is unavoidable. The influence of this phenomenon may be at the level of phonology where Leupueng speakers are exposed to sound variation in the dialect of the speaker. This phenomenon in itself would make an interesting topic of study to determine the extent to which it might influence dialect change in this context.

2.4 Life after the Tsunami in Leupueng

Changes in the psychosocial dimension of Leupueng may have occurred after the tsunami. For example, it would be interesting to know whether the pride the people of Leupueng used to have is still present among the survivors, whether they still talk about their heroes and the tragedy of Pulot Cot Jumpa, whether they are still proud of the riches that nature provided to them before the tsunami, whether modern education has become more of a concern, and
whether they have come to pay more attention to what other people think of their language. It might also be interesting to observe whether they have become more welcoming and more open to people visiting their villages. There are also a number of other questions that could be asked to better understand the nature of the current Leupueng community. One aspect of this is whether there has been a change of occupation and livelihood among community members since the tsunami. Regarding the practice of matrilocality, it is clearly the case that Leupueng men have had no choice but to marry women from outside their community.

The tsunami caused significant damage to the Acehnese communities located in coastal areas. It cost hundreds of thousands of lives and destroyed infrastructure, such as schools and other public facilities. In Leupueng, there were as many as 10,000 casualties, most of whom were women and children. People from six Leupueng villages have been relocated from their original locations. However, since people’s feeling of attachment to their land is still very high, these people did not move very far. For example, the Lamseunia community was moved about 2 kilometres from its original location. The changing composition of the population has disturbed linguistic homogeneity in this area. The community, which used to be linguistically homogenous, has become more heterogeneous and diverse as far as the language varieties in use are concerned. This heterogeneity may also have impacted on the acquisition of language by children born since the tsunami.
Children born after 2004 have had the potential to acquire some or many non-local forms which might potentially threaten the existence of the local dialect. The local dialect is now spoken only by members of the original population of Leupueng who survived the tsunami. The newcomers have not been particularly interested in learning to speak or to use the local dialect. The attitudes of newcomers in Leupueng are discussed in Chapter 8 and is an important aspect of this study.

The practice of marriage which used to be very locally centred has now changed because the wives of local men mostly come from different areas with different dialect backgrounds. The people of Leupueng are now becoming more aware of dialect differences. They interact with people who speak the Pidie dialect, the North Aceh dialect, the West Aceh dialect and other varieties on a daily basis. This is now a matter of necessity, which in the past was not required and potentially could be avoided.

Newcomers to Leupueng before the tsunami were different in at least two ways from newcomers since the tsunami. Before the tsunami, it was mostly men who migrated to and settled in Leupueng. Since the tsunami, it has been women who dominated migration to Leupueng through marriage. People who moved to Leupueng before the tsunami accommodated to the ways of the community, including in speech and language use. Those moving to Leupueng since the tsunami have been more resistant to change.
2.5 The Literacy of Acehnese

In the past, the literacy tradition of the Acehnese was indicated by their ability to read the Quran and religious books (kitab) written in Jawi, an adapted form of Arabic script used to write Malay (Hurgronje, 1906). Jawi can also be used to write other languages that are related to Malay, including Acehnese, and there are, in fact, some older books in Acehnese written in Jawi. Today, before they are old enough to begin formal schooling, children are still introduced to the Arabic alphabet and later learn to read Arabic words and sentences which supports an ability to read the Quran. This is done through informal education institutions called rumoh beuet or dayah which are found in almost every village in Aceh. However, the ability to read the Quran, for most children, was not an indication of their understanding of the content of the book, but it was limited to the ability to voice the Arabic in which the Quran is written.

When they finish reading the Quran, or when the teacher thinks that they have this ability, they can move on to read kitab jawoe, books written in a variety of Malay with Arabic characters. The content of these books ranges from character education to Islamic jurisprudence. Similar to the reading of the Quran, the reading of kitab jawoe was not an indication of content understanding for most children. For this reason, a teungku (teacher) would always provide a surah (explanation and translation) of the reading following
every sentence to ensure the students had some grasp of the meaning of the
text.

When they start school, Acehnese children are introduced to the Roman
alphabet to learn how to read and to write Indonesian. Written Acehnese is
not introduced to children, except in a few schools that have chosen to include
the local language as a local content subject or elective. Therefore, many
Acehnese are not used to reading and writing in Acehnese, and the language
has not been standardised like Indonesian and Malay.

2.6 Domain of Acehnese Language Use

Acehnese is used in informal communication among its speakers. In
formal settings, such as school, universities, and offices, Indonesian is used.
In cities, when one meets a new person, Indonesian is used in greetings; then
the speakers might switch to Acehnese when and if they find out that they
both speak the language. At school, although Indonesian is prescribed as the
language of instruction in education, many teachers use Acehnese in the
classroom, especially in rural areas.

Efforts have also been made to promote the use of Acehnese. Some
radio stations, such as Serambi FM and Megah FM, have special programs
where the announcer delivers the content in Acehnese. There is also a local
TV station called Aceh TV that participates in the promotion of the use of
Acehnese. Although not all of its programs are in Acehnese, there are at least
two that are delivered. One is called *Sya’e*, ‘Acehnese poems’, and the other is *Kupi Beungoh*, ‘Morning Coffee’. *Kupi Beungoh* is a casual morning show but serious guests, such as government officials and parliament members, are also invited to discuss current issues. One thing that can be observed is that, although all the guests are Acehnese speakers, they sometimes find it difficult to discuss certain issues in Acehnese and therefore, they often fully or partly switch to Indonesian. This may be because, for some guests, these topics are normally discussed in Indonesian and they experience some difficulty transferring them into Acehnese.

There are also many Acehnese songs and movies that have been written and produced in the last decade. Most of these movies are comedies. One of the most popular ones is called *Eumpang Breueh*, ‘Rice Sack’. This movie series seems to be loved by viewers of all age groups, perhaps because the comedic use of their native language is especially appealing. The series has not aired on television but is sold to the public on DVDs.

### 2.7 The Position of Acehnese within the Indonesian Speaking Sphere

Historically, Malay (a variety of which was standardised to become modern Indonesian) has been the common language in Aceh since the earliest times in the historical record. “To Acheh Malay was what Latin was to Europe in the Middle Ages,” is how Windstedt described the position of Malay in the Acehnese speaking community in Aceh (Durie, 1996).
The Acehnese language is used by the Acehnese who live in Aceh and the Acehnese who live in other cities in Indonesia and other countries. For most Acehnese speakers, Acehnese is their first language. It is the language that they acquire when they are first able to talk. In rural areas where everyone speaks Acehnese, the language is spoken at home as well as outside it. In urban areas, people tend to use Acehnese less frequently than in villages because of more encounters with Indonesian language speakers and because of the domains of Indonesian language use.

In rural areas, most people of all ages speak Acehnese all the time because there is less urgency to speak Indonesian as the national and official language of the country. Exposure to the Indonesian language is limited and, in most cases, is passive. This exposure comes only from school books, television and newspapers. Newspapers are mostly read at coffee shops by men. Therefore, men tend to have better fluency in Indonesian among the older age groups. Going to coffee shops used to be a strictly male pastime, but now, especially in urban areas, young women also do so. In general, people do not subscribe to newspapers. Television only recently became affordable for every household. A decade ago, in rural areas, only very rich people had a television at home, and newspapers were only available at coffee shops. Only one television channel, TVRI, was available until the later 1980s when the government first began to license private broadcasters (see Kitley, 2014). Men, especially adult men, in the villages who did not have television
at home would go and watch at the nearest house which had a set. Men would normally watch *Dunia Dalam Berita* (‘World News’) nightly at 9 pm. Women would wait to watch TV soap operas after the news. Movies were shown only after the late news program. Only young people and children would stay up to watch these movies. As is generally the case in the Malay world, people who had a TV welcomed other villagers to stay until late on Saturday night. Other nights, people would leave before the late news which normally aired at 11 pm. Programs on TVRI were mostly in Indonesian.

Radio also used to be part of life in Acehnese villages. People would listen to radio plays at certain times during the day. From 1990 to 1995, there were radio plays aired at different times in many different parts of Aceh. One of the most popular programs at the time was called *Nini Pelet* (‘The Witch’). The story came from Java, was produced in Jakarta, and was distributed to almost all regions of Indonesia. There were some other similar series at that time, but none was as popular as *Nini Pelet*. This play also became a source of exposure to Indonesian for Acehnese teenagers at the time.

In towns and cities, like Banda Aceh for example, people tend to have more contact with non-Acehnese speakers. These non-Acehnese speakers come from parts of Aceh where the language is not used or from outside the province. Over time, some of the people, who initially came to Aceh to work, decided to settle there, and their children were born in Aceh. Some do learn
to speak Acehnese, but many choose not to speak the local language. Instead, the Acehnese tend to accommodate by speaking Indonesian.

The non-Acehnese speaking population also includes Acehnese who were born in Banda Aceh or in other smaller towns but were introduced Indonesian as their first language by their parents. These parents are mostly fluent Acehnese speakers. However, they are normally concerned with their children’s future achievement in school and therefore introduce them to Indonesian when they start to talk. In urban areas, most students speak Indonesian at school even though they are native speakers of Acehnese. The researcher’s own experience includes firsthand knowledge of this language situation. As a child in Sigli, the capital of the Pidie District, everyone in the class spoke Indonesian. His desk mate could not speak Acehnese, being the son of a military officer from Padang, the capital of the province of West Sumatra. So, for many days, the researcher kept silent and only started to speak in the second term. Before starting at that school, he assumed he would be able to speak like everyone else because he understood the Indonesian used on TV and the radio, but it turned out speaking the language was more difficult than expected. Later, it turned out there were other students in a similar situation who were not very fluent Indonesian speakers.

Schools in towns provide their students with exposure to Indonesian and the opportunity not only to hear the language spoken but also to use Indonesian in real communication with other students and teachers. Schools
in rural areas are different. While the textbooks are all in Indonesian, the language of instruction used by teachers is mostly Acehnese. Therefore, compared to students in cities, children living rural areas tend to speak less Indonesian and more Acehnese. Although Acehnese is used almost all the time in rural communities, formal settings may still allow for some exposure to Indonesian formal language usage generally includes a great deal of code switching to Indonesian. Such domains include Friday sermons, wedding speeches, and Maulid celebration speeches. On such occasions, code switching into Indonesian occurs very frequently.

2.8 Leupueng Dialect as a Variety of Acehnese

Desa Mesjid of Leupueng was among 29 villages surveyed in the Acehnese speaking areas of Aceh as part of a project funded by the Department of Education and Culture in 1982 and 1983 (Hanoum et al., 1986). This study mapped varieties of Acehnese, but there were many features that were missed in the project descriptions. One example is the absence of a distinction between the alveolar tap /r/ in North Aceh and the voiced velar fricative /ɣ/ in Greater Aceh. Another is the failure to identify diphthong /ai/ as a variant of the diphthong /èë/ which have been found to be different in some areas, especially in Leupueng.

Leupueng as a dialect area is marked by its use of the /è/ sound where /a/ occurs in other major dialects. The very well-known phrase people use to
identify or refer to the Leupueng dialect is /ho meujèk/ ‘where are you going?’ In other dialects, this phrase would be /ho meujak/. Another characteristic of the Leupueng dialect is the use of the diphthong /ai/ for /èë/ as in the word /ulai/ for /ulèë/ in the standard dialect. These characteristic features are easily perceived by speakers of Acehnese and allow them to identify the origin of the speaker. They are also the features that contribute to the impressions they tend to have about speakers from Leupueng. This is discussed in detail in Chapter 9. In analysing the nature of usage in Leupueng, this study identified 11 distinctive phonological features of the dialect which are presented in Chapter 6. These features are described based on recorded data from 1993 that was updated as part of the fieldwork for the present study.

2.9 The Story of Gampong Pande/The Origin of Lamseunia, Leupueng

Almost everyone in the villages of Leupueng believes that the origin of Leupueng was Gampong Pande, a past settlement built on the mountain far away from the coastal area which is the location of Leupueng today. Based on old stories, Gampong Pande is about 2 day’s travel on foot from the current site of Leupueng. It is likely that the remains of this settlement could no longer be found if historians or archaeologists were to search for them. The story of Gampong Pande is based on what is told by local elders who claim to have heard it from their elders. They also claim that they have seen evidence left in the jungle themselves. The movement of the people of Leupueng from the
mountain to the coastal areas was a gradual process. There is no information about the origin of the people who established the initial settlement in Gampong Pande, but it is said there were only four original settlers.

A number of people who lived in the earlier settlement were prosperous. They relied on the bounty of nature for whatever they needed. They embraced nature and co-existed with it. This went on for a very long time until conflict with other inhabitants of the jungle occurred. People had to stay in lower altitude areas because the tigers and other jungle animals were no longer accepting of the presence of human beings in their surroundings. In many parts of the Malay world, tigers are viewed as supernaturally endowed creatures that rule the jungle. It was said that when sunset came, people were taken\(^5\) by tigers. Sometimes men would go to their fields and leave their children at the settlement with their mother. When they came home, they found that their wives and children were gone, having been taken by tigers. Sometimes only the children were missing because they played in the yard far from the house. Help from other people was rarely sought because houses were rather far from others in the settlement.

\(^{5}\) taken = /dicok/; the Acehnese use the word dicok ‘taken’ as a euphemism for ‘eaten’ by the tigers
Religion was still not part of community practice at this time. There were no mosques where people, as they do today, could go for Friday prayers. Perhaps there were teungku and community leaders, but there were no mosques. However, there is some evidence that religious practice already existed at this time because there is a grave of a teungku on the mountain. This teungku was called Teungku Ali Ijo.

This lower area was called Babah Dua (‘Second Mouth’). It was less distant from the coastal area compared to the original settlement at Gampong Pande. People lived safely in Babah Dua for a period of time. They still relied on trees and plants in the jungle for food. Again, the animals were unhappy with human presence in this area. The animals continued to disturb the human community and finally forced them to move to near the coast. This coastal area was where Leupueng is now situated. The early settlers there called the first village that they built Lamseunia, which means ‘in peace’.

There are at least two reasons why people chose this name. First, they could live safely and free from threat and disturbance by jungle animals. Second, in their new home called Lamseunia, they had abundant food resources. Their prosperity came from more numerous and more varied sources compared to what they previously had when they lived in Gampong Pande and Babah Dua. This is said to be the origin of the name Leupueng. The many different sources of food available caused so much excitement that people made frequent use of this word. In Acehnese, these different sources
of subsistence were referred to as ‘many things’. The Acehnese phrase for ‘many things’ is *le peue*. The phrase *le peue* then gradually evolved to become *le pung*, and finally became the current place name, the one-word unit, *Leupueng*.

Lamseunia, then, is the first of all the Leupueng villages. The other villages were established later in history following patterns of local migration and expansion of the community. Some grew up in locations where people built a place to study the Quran. This most likely took place after the presence of Islam was established in Acehnese society. These places were called *Dayah*, from the Arabic *zawiyah*, meaning ‘the corner of a mosque’. In Islam, it was the tradition that, after prayers, men would find a space in the mosque to sit, learn from each other, and discuss religious matters. In Acehnese, this word has undergone a meaning change. Now *dayah* means the building or institution where children are sent to study the Quran and Islam. These places grew in population and eventually became a new village called *Dayah*. There were more than one *dayah* in the past but now only one village uses the term *dayah* in its name, Deah Mamplam, ‘Mango Dayah’.

There are two aspects of this origin story that are worth further consideration. First, how reliable is the story of original settlement and the gradual retreat from the mountain to the lowlands and coastal area? Second, how reliable is the evolutionary process of the word Leupueng? Did it really come from *le peue*?
Upon consideration of the story and additional information provided by the elders of Leupueng, it seems possible that Gampong Pande is a metaphorical place used to represent the origin of the village as an entity, though its existence as a real place cannot be ruled out. However, it can be argued that Gampong Pande is only a mythical place used by the Acehnese to represent their place of origin. People in many different villages refer to their original settlement as Gampong Pande. This is true for Acehnese in general. Although no one is certain of what ‘Aceh’ refers to as a place name, many people are quite certain that the first, or at least the most prominent and civilised Acehnese, lived in Gampong Pande at some time in the past. In Acehnese context, Gampong Pande is viewed the place where the first visitors from overseas arrived. Gampong Pande is also said to be the place where the first Acehnese smiths lived and worked. Metalworking was the most advanced technology at the time so it was highly prestigious for anyone to live and to be part of Gampong Pande. It should be noted that the legend of Gampong Pande has many similarities to origin myths in other parts of the Malay world, where various ethnic groups all describe their ancestors coming down from the mountains to settle various regions in lowland and coastal areas. This has been associated with very ancient beliefs about the mountains as the home of the gods, a pre-existing idea that has an interesting parallel with Hindu and Tibetan traditions regarding the celestial Mount Meru. Additionally, the name of this original village, Gampong Pande, is significant. While *gampong* simply
means ‘village’, the term pande is cognate with similar terms in Malay and other languages of the region. Pandai, in Malay/Indonesian, can refer to a craftsman who works in metal, such as a blacksmith or goldsmith, but is also used in some languages to mean ‘clever.’ The association of the origin village of Gampong Pande with the most significant technological development of early human civilisation is significant and suggests, as in the myth of Prometheus and other early folklore of various cultures, that the ability to control fire and its associated technologies was seminal in the conceptualisation of distinct ethnic and cultural identity.

Nonetheless, there has been tantalising evidence for the existence of a real Gampong Pande. In 2013, many people were shocked and awed by the discovery of many gold coins and a gold-handled sword in the Krueng Doy river (Kompas, 2013). This treasure was accepted by many people as proving the truth of the existence of Gampong Pande. As for the details, members of the public have different versions of the story that share characteristics to a greater or lesser degree. The evidence for Gampong Pande as the origin of Leupueng, however, is less concrete. The local elders believe that evidence they found when looking for rattan in the jungle supports the story they know. As emerged in interviews, they say that there are durian trees that average two metres in diameter deep in the jungle. It is believed that these durian trees were planted by the early settlers on their way down to the lower ground when they had to leave Gampong Pande. They planted durian trees to mark
the route that they took from their original settlement to the place where they would eventually reside. These durian trees produced so many durians that even gibbons were not able to eat them all. The trees were so big that the gibbons could not climb to where the fruit was. There were 20 durian trees planted in the one area, and it is known that humans plant and spread durian even today because the fruit is highly prized. There were also other trees that are associated with human activity and human settlement. The elders also believed they found graves that they suspected were those of people who had been killed by wild animals such as tigers in the distant past.

When asked about the differences in the language used in different villages of Leupueng, however, most people mention Layeuen. The village of Layeuen was said to use a different dialect from other Leupueng villages because the people there came from Lampuuk. Some say they migrated to Layeuen to settle. Others say they married people from Layeuen. Other people say that it is possible to distinguish the dialect in Lamseunia from that of Meunasah Bak U, another village in Leupueng. It is said that people from Meuansah Bak U speak with a softer rhythm.

Lampuuk is interesting in that its name is not pronounced as the way people from other areas would expect. The local elders pronounce this name as Lampoh U. This raises the question of whether there could have been phonological changes that involved glottalisation of a middle back vowel in a single syllable environment. One way to consider this is by trying to determine
whether Lampuuk was initially a place where many coconut trees grow. *Lampoh* means ‘garden’ and is used to refer to coconut groves. There are a number of other places called Lampuuk as well. It might be possible to determine whether those places also had a lot of coconut trees which might suggest the place name Lampuuk refers to this environmental characteristic.

Leupueng people refer to others from different part of Aceh in such a way that, the greater the distance, the broader the geographical area that is used for reference. They refer to people from Aceh Besar based on more local terms, mostly by *kecamatan* (subdistricts in the Indonesian administrative system). For example, they might talk about *Awak Blang Bintang*, *Awak Sibreh*, and *Awak Seulimeum*, where *awak* means ‘people’ followed by the name of the location. People from other west coast areas are referred in broader terms, generally *Awak Lhong*, *Awak Lamno*, and *Awak Meulaboh*, where the geographic location refers to a larger area containing multiple villages and several districts. Meanwhile, the whole population from the east coast, which stretch from Mount Seulawaih to the Teumieng – Langkat border, is referred as *Awak Timu* in general, ‘people from the east’. The only reason that people in Leupueng might refer to people from east coast in terms of smaller geographical areas is that some of women married to Leupueng are from certain areas from east coast. Therefore, they would recognise *Awak Sigli*, *Awak Jeunieb*, *Awak Aceh Utara*, and *Ureueng Teumieng*. 
2.10 The Leupueng Identity

The nature of the Leupueng dialect, the views of the people of the area about themselves, and their origin story all support a unique identity that includes both language (dialect) and cultural perceptions. Historically, the people of Leupueng have tended to see themselves as part of the larger Acehnese community but also distinct within it because of their unique background that they viewed as exceptional. The tsunami and its effects on the social environment posed a serious challenge to this and required that the people of Leupueng adjust their views of themselves and others in order to accept outsiders as permanent members of their community. Because circumstances meant that many of these newcomers were women, the social change caused by the tsunami resulted in significant changes in the nature of families which led, in turn, to significant change in the linguistic environment. This is discussed in detail in the following chapters and must be seen in the context of the Leupueng identity that, in the past, supported residents’ views of themselves as both distinct from other Acehnese and exceptional, including in terms of their language use.

2.11 Summary

This chapter described the linguistic context in Leupueng and in Aceh in general as well as sources of exposure of Acehnese speakers to Indonesian
and other languages, especially Arabic. The traditional ways in which language was learned and mastered were discussed, as was background on the nature of the linguistic and cultural environment in Leupueng specifically. In addition, the origin story of the Leupueng area was presented to provide context and background on the way in which residents of the area have traditionally perceived themselves in relation to speakers of other Acehnese dialects.
Chapter 3
The Acehnese Language

This chapter reviews several key theories that are related to the study of language and dialect change and relate to the contact phenomenon. The concept of speech community as the linguistic unit that constitutes the scope of this study is discussed, followed by problematic issues regarding the boundary that distinguishes between dialects and languages, both in the global perspective and in the Indonesian perspective. It then discusses language contact and dialect contact and the impacts of these phenomena on the language and dialect in question. As the children studied in this project are still at the early language acquisition stage, a section is dedicated to language transmission theory, reviewing past studies on this topic, and considering the role of transmission in ongoing language change. Then, as language change has always been associated with external factors, a discussion of social network and attitude is presented. Finally, the chapter reviews selected work on exogamous communities so that adequate comparison can be made regarding the practice to the community researched in this study.

3.1 Linguistic History of Acehnese

On the classification of Acehnese, Blust (1981) proposes a Malayic Subgroups which includes Malaya, Minangkabau, Kerinci, Middle Malay, Iban,
Rejang, Embaloh, Salako, Sundanese, Acehnese and the Chamic languages. He, however, considers, Acehnese, Chamic, Sundanese, Rejang and Embaloh as the remotest relatives of Malay, while Malay, Minangkabau, Kerinci and Middle Malay as the closest.

Acehnese has usually been portrayed as a descendent of Malay and has been thought to have split from Proto-Malay in the distant past. It was also often suggested that Acehnese has inherent similarities to Malay rather than similarities due to contact between the two languages (Tolson, 1880; Blagden, 1929, in Durie, 1990). Tolson’s (1880) observation of some of the names of place in Aceh led to his attestation that Acehnese “is fundamentally Malay”. However, Tolson added that Acehnese is very difficult to understand for someone who is unacquainted with the language, even if the speaker is fluent in Malay. He stated that Acehnese is unusual because speakers roll their words and clip them when they speak. Tolson’s description of Acehnese as unusual was most probably due to the fact that Acehnese has the many centring diphthongs which were not the phonetic inventory of Malay, the language with which he was more familiar. It is not known, however, if Tolson was aware of the existence of Chamic languages which were later found to have a close relationship with Acehnese. Some words were borrowed from Nias and Gayo, and other languages that people in Aceh had constant contact with (Durie, 1990). Blagden (1929) denies a genetic relationship between Acehnese and the Chamic languages. He claimed that the similarities between the two were
due to influences from Austro-Asiatic languages on both Acehnese and Chamic (in Durie, 1985).

However, recent evidence has also suggested that Acehnese has a closer relationship with Chamic languages than Malay. The existence of many lexical cognates of Acehnese in Malay indicates that Acehnese has been in long contact with that language (Durie, 1996). Similarly, the relationship of Acehnese with the Chamic languages is also attested by its many cognates in these languages (Thurgood, 1999). Which language it is more closely related to is still a matter for further investigation. Durie (1996) proposes that the recognizable cognates of Acehnese in Malay are both current borrowings due to their close proximity to each other, and inherited forms from early stages of the languages. He also suggested that the split of Acehnese from Malay occurred earlier than its split with other Chamic languages but later Acehnese encountered Malay again and, at that time, adopted more lexical items, and probably other aspects too, from this language.

The earliest suggestion that Acehnese does not belong to the family of Malay languages was made by Rost (1885). He said that, of all Malay dialects in Sumatra, only Acehnese deserved a mention. He implied that Acehnese was different in nature from other dialects of Malay spoken in Sumatra and did not belong to the same family.

The relationship between Aceh and Cham was not only indicated by their lexical resemblance but also other aspects of language. In addition to lexicon,

A close relationship with the Chamic languages is also evidenced by mid-vowel contrast in Acehnese. Durie (1990) found that mid-vowel contrast in Acehnese is cognate with a contrast reconstructed for Proto-Chamic presented by Lee (1966) and Burnham (1976). Durie’s examination demonstrated that the Acehnese low-midvowels and Chamic mid-vowels correspond closely (1990, p.17). An example of this is in the word for the imperative ‘don’t’ which is *beʔ* in Chamic and *bɛʔ* in Acehnese which shows that Chamic bears the mid-vowel /e/ and Acehnese the low midvowel /ɛ/. Another example is in the word for ‘hill, steep’ which is *cəʔ* in Chamic and *cʌt* in Acehnese. This also shows that Acehnese low-midvowel /ʌ/ has Chamic mid-vowel /ə/ cognates (Durie, 1990, p.10).

The suggestion of a close genetic relationship between Acehnese and Chamic was first made by Nieman (1891, in Durie, 1990)\(^6\). This suggestion was also supported by Cowan’s work (1933, 1948, 1974, 1981, 1983, 1988, in Durie, 1990), Shorto’s work (1975 and 1977, in Durie, 1990), and Collins

\(^6\) Nieman’s work is in Dutch so could not be accessed directly by the author.
They all agree on the existence of an Aceh-Chamic subgroup within Austronesian.

In the latest work on this topic, Acehnese is still said to have a closer relationship with Chamic (Thurgood, 2007). Thurgood denies a (closer) genetic relationship between Malay and Acehnese. He says that a genetic relationship is not established based on geographical distribution but is seen in shared historical innovation. The abundance of shared lexical items in Malay and Acehnese are not inherited features but are instead loaned elements. Innovation refers to change of features of language from its proto forms. In his earlier work, Thurgood (1999) demonstrated a number of shared innovations in Acehnese and Chamic. One of these innovations is the reduction of disyllables into monosyllables. Across Chamic languages there is a tendency to drop syllables in more colloquial speech (Cowan, 1948 in Shorto, 1975; Thurgood, 1999). This reduction has two results; one is the formation of new presyllable consonant clusters as the vowel in unstressed syllables are dropped, and the other one is complete omission of the unstressed syllable. There are many examples of this reduction in Acehnese as shown in Table 1 below.
Table 1: Vowel Reduction in Acehnese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disyllabic Form</th>
<th>Reduced form in Acehnese (monosyllabic)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>krras</td>
<td>krwah</td>
<td>hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tahan</td>
<td>thun</td>
<td>Defend, hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gwahan</td>
<td>ghan</td>
<td>heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brli</td>
<td>bloə</td>
<td>buy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gelêk</td>
<td>glek</td>
<td>tickle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mijup</td>
<td>jup</td>
<td>under, below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rumoh</td>
<td>moh</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puteh</td>
<td>teh</td>
<td>white (personal name)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that the current state of Acehnese gives the impression that Acehnese is closer to Malay than Chamic can be associated with the split of Acehnese with the mainland Chamic languages long time ago about around the 10th century (Thurgood, 1999). Moreover, a more recent examination of Thurgood’s Proto-Chamic lexicon suggests that the split took place a lot earlier than the 10th century as proposed by Thurgod when Chamic had not had much lexical influence from Mon-Khmer (Sidwell, 2006). Since then, Acehnese has not had any contact with Mon-Khmer but has had more intense contact with Malay. On the other hand, the mainland Chamic languages have continued to be in contact with Mon-Khmer languages. Therefore, without careful examination, it would be easy to think that Acehnese is a dialect of Malay, as Tolson (1880) believed at the end of the 19th century.

In addition to the linguistic evidence, the close relationship between Acehnese and Chamic languages is also evidenced by cognate literature.
Cowan’s observations showed that there is a close link between Acehnese sanjak verse and verses in Cham’s song of *kadhar* (a musician-officiant). They employ similar metrical patterns and rhyme structure, which consist of eight feet within a line, and the final foot of the first line rhymes with the middle foot of the second line. The following is cited from Cowan (1933, in Daud, 1997).

Acehnese:

*Gah ban gajah sie ban tulô*

*Jitueng judô ji nap mata*

Cham

*Hadah parouw pauk bhong parauw*

*Papuh mok lauw pron lei camok*

As far as literature is concerned, there is also other evidence of the close relationship between the Chamic languages and Acehnese. It is the content of a form of story called *parauw* (question in chanting) in Cham which is very similar to *haba cakeuek* (story of kingfisher) in Acehnese which is also mentioned in Cowan (1933, in Daud, 1997). All of this evidence supports the proposal that Acehnese has a closer genetic relationship to Chamic languages than to Malay.
3.2 Sounds in Standard Acehnese

This section provides a general overview of the sound system in Acehnese. Several linguists (Asyik, 1972; Durie, 1985; Daud and Durie, 1999; Wildan, 2010) have described the grammar of Acehnese. In particular, comprehensive grammatical analyses can be found in Durie’s work and Asyik’s work, both of which are the result of doctoral research (Asyik, 1972; Durie, 1985).

Studies of Acehnese have shown that variations among all Acehnese dialects are limited to two aspects, vowel inventory in stressed syllables and limited number of consonant features of /ih/, /R/ or /r/, and /ts/ (Asyik, 1972; Durie, 1985; Hanoum et al., 1986; Yusuf 2014, and Zulfadli, 2014). This section describes Standard Acehnese (SA). Much of this is also applicable to the Leupueng dialect. Specific variations of the dialect will be described later in Chapter 5. Both descriptions are mainly on the basis of the North Aceh dialect. The North Aceh dialect is considered as Standard Acehnese while description of the Leupueng dialect is on the basis on comparisons of its features to the Standard Acehnese.

The following are the consonants, vowels, syllables and word structure of Acehnese.

3.2.1 Consonants

Daud and Durie (1999) list 20 consonant phonemes in the SA. These consonants consist of four voiced stops: bilabial, alveolar, palatal, and velar;
along with four voiceless counterparts, and a glottal stop. There are two fricatives: alveolar and palatal fricatives, four nasals: bilabial, alveolar, palatal, and velar nasals, two alveolar liquids, and three glides: bilabial, palatal, and glottal glides.

Table 2: Consonant Phonemes in Standard Acehnese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Stops</td>
<td>[b]</td>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>[j]</td>
<td>[g]</td>
<td>[ʔ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless Stops</td>
<td>[p]</td>
<td>[t]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
<td>[k]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>[ʃ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>[n]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids</td>
<td>[l]</td>
<td>[l]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glides/Approximant</td>
<td>[ɾ]</td>
<td>[j]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[h]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that [ɾ] is a tap rather than a trill in standard Acehnese.

3.2.2 Vowels

Trubetzkoy (in Durie, 1985) provides two perceptually based parameters for categorising vowels: degrees of opening or intensity and degrees of localisation. Degrees of localisation captures the front-central-back and rounded-unrounded distinctions. According to Durie (1985), Acehnese vowels are arranged at ten primary positions. They are oral monophthongs with four degrees of opening: open, mid-open, mid-close, and close, and have three
degrees of localisation: front unrounded, back unrounded, and back rounded. See Table 3 based on Durie (1985) and Daud and Durie (1999).

Table 3: Oral Vowels in Standard Acehnese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front Unrounded</th>
<th>Back Unrounded</th>
<th>Back Rounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>[u]</td>
<td>[u]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-mid</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>[r]</td>
<td>[o]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mid</td>
<td>[ɛ]</td>
<td>[ʌ]</td>
<td>[ɔ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
<td>[a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Acehnese has seven nasal monophthongs with three degrees of opening: closed, open-mid, and open. There are no closed-mid nasal vowels, as they are in oral monophthongs. In this description, nasal vowels are indicated orthographically by an apostrophe on the left side of the vowel. Table 4 shows the nasal monophthongs in standard Acehnese.

Table 4: Nasal Monophthongs in Standard Acehnese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front Unrounded</th>
<th>Back Unrounded</th>
<th>Back Rounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>[i] /'i'/</td>
<td>[u] /'eu'/</td>
<td>[u] /'u'/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mid</td>
<td>[ɛ] /'ɛ'/</td>
<td>[ʌ] /'ö'/</td>
<td>[ɔ] /'o'/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
<td>[a] /'a'/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the oral vowel table in Durie (1985), and Daud and Durie (1999, p. 4).

In Acehnese, there are 5 centring diphthongs: [iæ], [uə], [uə], [ɛə], [ɔə]; and 4 rising diphthongs: [ui], [ri], [oi], [ai]. Diphthongs are treated as single phonemes and they do not act as sequences of two single vowels because of their syntagmatic and paradigmatic substitutability with monophthongs (Asyik,
In this study, they are also treated the same. This treatment is especially important for the syllable structure analysis. To consider them as sequences would complicate the description of syllable structure (Section 5.2.3). There are also four degrees of opening, and three degrees of localisation. These diphthongs are shown in the following table. Table 5 shows these diphthongs.

**Table 5: Oral Diphthongs in Standard Acehnese**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front Unrounded</th>
<th>Back Unrounded</th>
<th>Back Rounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>[iə]</td>
<td>[uə]</td>
<td>[uə] [ui]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-mid</td>
<td>[ɛə]</td>
<td>[tɪ]</td>
<td>[oi]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mid</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ai]</td>
<td>[ɔə]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nasal diphthongs are found at three degrees of opening, high, open-mid, and open. They are spread through three degrees of localisation. Nasal diphthongs /'ue/, /'ui/, and /'oe/ only occur after nasal consonants. Table 6 shows nine nasal diphthongs found in Standard Acehnese.

**Table 6: Nasal Diphthongs in Standard Acehnese**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front Unrounded</th>
<th>Back Unrounded</th>
<th>Back Rounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>[iə] /'ie/</td>
<td>[uɪi] /'eui/</td>
<td>[uə] /'ue/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>[aɪ] /'ai/</td>
<td>[ai]</td>
<td>[oə]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The description of the phonemic inventory of Standard Acehnese will be somewhat descriptive of the inventory of Leupueng dialect. What makes the Leupueng dialect distinctive from SA will be discussed in Chapter 6.

3.2.3 Syllable and Word Structure

Although disyllabic words are common, words in Acehnese are mostly monosyllabic. There are two types of syllable in Acehnese (Durie, 1985, p. 21). The first type is syllable that bears stress. Stress in Acehnese always falls on the final syllable. Monosyllabic words are always stressed. These final syllables start with an initial consonant or consonant cluster, followed by a vowel phoneme, and closed by a consonant. Final or stressed syllable can also stand as an open syllable. So, the structure of this syllable type is **consonant + (optional consonant) + vowel + optional consonant** C(C)V(C). For examples,

- [manɔʔ] *manok* ‘hen’: CVC: closed
- [bruəʔ] *bru ek* ‘nutshell’: CCVC: closed
- [anœə] *anoe* ‘sand’: CV: open
- [karu] *karu* ‘noisy’: CV

Another type is syllable that is never stressed and has the structure of **consonant + vowel + optional consonant** CV(C). It is the first syllable of disyllabic words. For examples,

- [gutɛə] *gutée* ‘lice’: CV: open
[kurwəŋ] kureueng ‘less’: CV: open

[jiŋki] jiŋki ‘traditional rice mill’: closed

3.2.4 Consonant clusters

Clusters in Acehnese are possible with three second targets, [ɬ], [ɾ], [ɭ], and four other combinations, which are called ‘funny nasals’. Funny nasals are those that do not nasalise the vowels that follow. They only occur as the initial syllables (Daud and Durie, 1999, pp. 6 - 8). The clusters are possible with the following combinations:

a. \{p, t, c, k, b, d, j, g, r, l, ny\} + h


b. \{p, t, c, k, b, d, j, g\} + r

Only stop consonants, both voiced and voiceless, can combine with /r/, as in the following examples: [prēh] prēh ‘to wait’; [troh] trôh ‘to arrive’; [croh]

c. \{p, k, b, g\} + l

Only the bilabial and velar stop are combined with [l]. Examples are [plah] plah ‘to split’; [klo] klo ‘dumb’; [blɔe] bloe ‘to buy’; and [gli] gli ‘ticklish’.

d. mb, nd, nj, nng

These combinations tend to be merged in speech, so that for example [banda] ‘port’ is pronounced like [bana], but without the strong nasal effect on the following vowel which ordinary nasal has. Therefore, some call them funny nasals (Lawler 1975) or incomplete nasals (Asyik, 1972). From an auditory perspective, the difference between ordinary nasals and ‘funny nasals’ is that after ordinary nasals, the following vowel is a nasal vowel while after ‘funny nasals’ the following vowel is not nasal. Examples are: [mān] m‘ön ‘well’ : [mon] mbôn ‘dew’, [nāp] nap ‘groin’ : [nap] ndap ‘to tiptoe’, [tūnāŋ] tung’ang ‘stubborn’ : [nāŋ] nang ‘egret’. Funny nasals tend to be assimilated in speech and the first targets, which are nasals, are left or dropped, but the nasalisation is not as strong as the nasalisation of a vowel following an ordinary nasal. An example for this is [nj] as in [njē] njē ‘sugarcane crusher’.
3.2.5 Syllable Initial and Syllable Final Consonants

According to Durie (1985), although all consonants in Table 2 can begin a syllable in all Acehnese dialects, not all consonants can close a syllable. Syllable-final consonants in Acehnese are limited to those in Table 7. They consist of two voiceless oral stops, [p] and [t]; two glides, [j] and [h]; the glottal stop glide [ʔ]; and three nasal stops, [m], [n], and [ŋ]. However, glide [j] is treated as vowel i (following the *Acehnese Dictionary*) as part of the diphthong in this description. These are summarised in Table 7 based on Durie (1985) and Daud and Durie (1999).

**Table 7: Final Consonant Phones in Standard Acehnese**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voiceless Stops</th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>[p]</td>
<td>[t]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ŋ]</td>
<td>[h]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuant Glide</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>[j]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ʔ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.6 Vowels in Stressed Syllables and Unstressed Syllables

All vowels can occur in stressed syllables. The vowels with the highest frequency in stressed syllables are [i], [u], [ɯ], [a], [ɪ], [ʊ], [ɯ̃], and [ã] as in words [bati] *bati* ‘to bounce’, [su] *su* ‘voice’, [dawa] *dawa* ‘argument’, [pʰiəʔ] *pr’iek* ‘to tear’, [muũə] *mu’ue* ‘to plough’, [lũhũəʔ] *leuh’euek* ‘saliva’, [pɾãʔ] *pr’ak* ‘to bluff’. The most common vowel in unstressed syllables is [ɯ] as in [tũbîəʔ] *teubiet* ‘to get out’ which replaces the schwa of other languages in
borrowings. The most central vowel is [ɤ] and it is the least common in Acehnese, even in stressed syllables. Mid-vowels [ɔ], [ɔ], [ɛ], [ɔ̃], and [ɛ̃] also occur in unstressed syllables, but usually in borrowings or derived words.

3.2.7 Diphthongs and Unstressed Syllables

Acehnese diphthongs do not occur in unstressed syllables. Moreover, [ɛə] and [ɔə] never occur in closed syllables; they only occur in open-stressed syllables as in [lakɛə] lakèe ‘to ask for’ and [ɔə] lakoë ‘husband’.

3.2.8 Nasal Vowels and Unstressed Syllables

Acehnese contrastive nasal vowels only occur in stressed syllables. Contrastive nasals are nasals that do not have the influence of nasal consonants, for example, [pʰiəʔ] pr’iek ‘to tear’ and [præʔ] pr’ak ‘to bluff’. In unstressed syllable nasals occur only if there is an immediate preceding nasal stop.

3.3 Varieties of Acehnese

Aceh has four major dialect regions, namely Greater Aceh, Pidie, North Aceh, and West Aceh (Durie, 1985; Asyik, 1987; Daud, 1997). The four dialect regions are distinguished from each other mainly on the basis of phonological features, with some differences in lexical and suprasegmental features also present.
The Greater Aceh region has more local varieties compared to other regions. The region is distinguished from other dialects on the basis of four phonological features, the pronunciation of /a/ as [ə] or [ɛ], the pronunciation of /s/ as [θ], the pronunciation of /r/ as [ɣ], and the pronunciation of /i/ as [ɛ] (Asyik, 1987).

The pronunciation of the central low back vowel sound /a/ as schwa [ə] is found in the vicinity of Banda Aceh such as Ulee Lheue, Lhok Nga, and Samahani. /a/ is pronounced [ə] in an open final syllable. For example:

- /mata/ : /matə/ ‘eye’
- /tika/ : /tikə/ ‘mat’
- /guda/ : /gudə/ ‘horse’

Asyik (1987) mentions that in some areas between Banda Aceh and Lhok Nga the final /a/ is pronounced more or less as [ɛa]. For example:

- /hana/ : /hanɛa/ ‘there is no’
- /kaya/ : /kayɛa/ ‘rich’

The author has observed that the realization of /a/ as [ɛa] instead of [ɛ] is also found in Leupueng, which is a subdistrict past Lhok Nga (not between Lhok Nga and Banda Aceh).
In other areas of Greater Aceh such as Montasik, Krueng Raya, Indrapuri, Seulimum, and Lam Tamot, /a/ is pronounced /a/ which is similar to all other major dialects.

The pronunciation of /s/ is also one of the characteristics of the dialect of Greater Aceh. The alveolar fricative /s/ is pronounced as dental fricative /θ/ which is similar to English /th/ in the word /think/. For example:

/susu/: /θuθu/ ‘milk’
/sikut/: /θikat/ ‘brush’
/asap/: /aθap/ ‘smoke’

The Greater Aceh region also has a distinctive pronunciation of the alveolar tap /r/. The /r/ is pronounced as voiced velar fricative [ɣ]. For example:

/baroe/: /baɣoe/ ‘yesterday’
/karu/: /kaɣu/ ‘noisy’

In some areas of Greater Aceh, final /i/ is pronounced [e] when it follows the alveolar tap /r/. For example:

/turi/: /tuɣe/ ‘recognise’
The Greater Aceh region is also marked by a multitude of use of the question tag /ah/ and /èh/ at the end of sentences (Daud, 1997). This feature is sometimes viewed as a stereotype of dialects in Greater Aceh.

The Pidie region has a more homogenous dialect compared to Greater Aceh. There are three distinctive features associated with the dialect in the Pidie region. First, in Pidie, people use the far back of low back vowel /a/ more as compared to other major dialects (Asyik, 1987, p.5). Second, back vowels followed by the glottal glide /h/ in final syllables is replaced by a diphthong with /i/ as the second target. For example:

/patah/ : /pataih/ ‘broken’
/tikôh/ : /tikôih/ ‘mouse’
/roh/ : /roih/ ‘cut’ (a female person’s nickname)
/pruh/ : /pruih/ ‘blow’

The Pidie dialect is also distinguished by the pronunciation of the vowel /u/ in certain circumstances. In the first syllable of a two-or-three syllable word, the vowel /u/ is replaced by /eu/. For example:
These features are shared by a large portion of Pidie, except for people living in areas from Trieng Gadeng to the east whose use of the dialect is moderated by the North Aceh dialect.

In the North Aceh region, the dialect is phonologically homogenous and has no phonological markedness (Asyik, 1987). Some lexical items, however, are said to specifically belong to the North Aceh dialect such as /abang/ and /cutda/ for ‘elder brother’ and ‘elder sister’. These are used in areas to the east of Bireuen in the North Aceh region. /dalém/ and /cutpo/ are used in areas to the east of Bireuen respectively for ‘elder brother’ and ‘elder sister’. The North Aceh dialect is also identified by the use of first person pronoun /long/ for /lon/ meaning ‘I’. There are few differences observable in speakers from North Aceh (Durie, 1985).

The final dialect region is West Aceh. Many people in West Aceh are bilingual; they converse in both Acehnese and Aneuk Jamèë, a dialect of Minangkabau. Therefore, the Acehnese dialect in this region is influenced to a
certain degree by the Aneuk Jamèë language. One clear influence on the
dialect of Acehnese in the West Aceh region is said to be rising sentence
intonation (Daud, 1997).

In addition to the four major regions, there is another, smaller region
that is worth noting. This is the Daya region surrounding the small town of
Lamno, which is located between Banda Aceh and Meulaboh. Asyik (1987)
noted the markedness of the dialect in this region which is signalled by the
pronunciation of final /oə/ as /ai/. For example:

\[
\begin{align*}
/\text{baroe}/ & : /\text{barai}/ & \text{‘yesterdays’} \\
/\text{beusoe}/ & : /\text{beusai}/ & \text{‘iron’} \\
/\text{taloe}/ & : /\text{talai}/ & \text{‘rope’} \\
/\text{jaroe}/ & : /\text{jarai}/ & \text{‘hand’}
\end{align*}
\]

The Daya region is also rich in dialect diversity which has not been
studied\(^8\). As mentioned earlier, the Greater Aceh and Daya regions have the
most varieties compared to other regions. The Leupueng dialect is one of the
varieties of the Greater Aceh region, and one of its villages was mentioned in
an early variety study (Hanoum et al., 1986).

\(^8\) In communication with locals of Daya, the author learned that there are at least five
different dialects that can be distinguished by the way they pronounce the final /oə/:
/\text{aθοε}/ : /\text{aθο}/ : /\text{aθοi}/ : /\text{aθai}/ : /\text{aθè}/ for ‘flesh’. 
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3.4 Acehnese Orthography

The current orthography of Acehnese was described in a seminar report *Perumusan Seminar Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa Aceh* published by Universitas Syiah Kuala in 1980. This orthography was adopted by Mark Durie in his description of the Acehnese grammar (1985). Mark Durie added another detail to the orthography. That is the contrast of [a] and [ʌ]. This is also the deficiency of earlier orthographies, Hussein Djajadiningrat (1934), who followed Snouck Hurgronje (1896). This orthography follows the most recent writing system of Acehnese (Daud and Durie, 1999), with the exception to symbols in no. 15 [R] and 16 [ts] which are used only in this description. These two sounds are not found in the described Standard Acehnese.

1. [j] is written as y.
2. [j] is written as j.
3. [ʃ] is written as sy.
4. [ʔ] is written as k syllable-finally.
5. [ʔ] is omitted/not written syllble-initially.
6. [ʔ] is omitted/not written in between two consecutive vowels (not in diphthongs). The exception is the word *rapai* ‘drum’. /ai/ is a diphthongs /ay/ but it is pronounced *ra-pa-i* in this word.
7. [ɲ] is written as ny.
8. \([ŋ]\) is written as \(ng\).

9. Funny nasals are written as cluster of nasal + voiced stop: \([m^{\text{\textdagger}}]\) is written as \(mb\), \([n^{\text{\textdagger}}]\) is written as \(nd\), \([ŋ^{\text{\textdagger}}]\) is written as \(ngg\), and \([n^{\text{\textdagger}}]\) is written as \(nj\).

10. All other consonants are written exactly the same as for their phonemic representations.

11. Vowel nasalisation is indicated by (’) preceeding the vowel, but no indication is made for nasal vowels after and before nasal consonants.

12. \([i]\), \([e]\), and \([ɛ]\) are respectively written as \(i\), \(é\), and \(è\).

13. \([ɤ]\), \([ʊ]\), and \([ʌ]\) are respectively written as \(eu\), \(ë\), and \(ö\).

14. \([u]\), \([o]\), and \([ɔ]\) are respectively written as \(u\), \(ô\), and \(o\).

15. \([a]\) is written the same as for its phonemic representation \(a\).

16. The schwa \([ə]\) ending of centralised diphthongs is written as \(e\), and therefore for example, \([ɔə]\) is written as \(oe\).

17. The variation of \([r]\) in Leupueng is \([ɤ]\) and it is written as \(R\).

18. The variation of \([s]\) in Leupueng is \([ɬ]\) and it is written as \(ts\).

19. A dash (-) is used to separate pronominal clitic from base form.

20. A dash (-) is used to separate quantifier /si/ which means ‘one’ from base form.

This orthography does not consider suprasegmentals as the analysis of the dialect will only be limited to the word level. Throughout this presentation,
both IPA and the Acehnese orthographic representation are provided for the sake of an easy understanding of the examples presented. Lexical examples are presented as [mano?] *manok* ‘hen’.

Examples of utterances are presented as:

[ɲʊɡ̃ qaŋɔ siat]

/neu-jak keunoe si-at/

‘2-come to-here one-moment’

### 3.5 Summary

This chapter described the history of the Acehnese language and outlined the sounds present in current usage with a focus on the standard dialect of the language. This will serve as a reference for the characteristics of the Leupueng dialect which are described in Chapter 6 and will serve as an indication of the distinct nature of local usage.

---

⁹ The numeral 2 in [neujak] is the second person pro-clitic identifier.
Chapter 4

Dialect Contact and Dialect Change

This chapter reviews some of the major principles of language and dialect contact. It provides the theoretical framework for this study.

4.1 Dialect Contact

Several studies associated with dialect contact and new dialect formation, including the Origin of New Zealand English (ONZE) (Trudgill, 2004), the English Fens (Britain, 1997a), the Dutch Polders (Scholtmeijer, 1992, in Kerswill and Williams, 2000), Children in Spitsbergen (Maehlum, 1992), Hoyanger study (Sandve 1976, Omdal 1977, in Kerswill and Williams, 2000), Milton Keynes (Kerswill and Williams, 2000), and Australian English (Cox and Fletcher, 2017) are revisited to discuss factors influencing the outcomes of dialect contact.

Dialect contact, according to Trudgill (1986), takes place when people migrate from different parts of a single-language area to a new settlement. Croft (2000, p. 212) provides an example taken from Western Europe during the Industrial Revolution, when there was migration from different rural areas to the cities. This led to interaction between speakers of different language varieties. The continuous interaction between speakers of mutually intelligible
varieties, according to Kerswill (2002, p. 669), can lead to ‘koinézation’, which is a contact-induced process that may cause rapid, dramatic change. The process will result in language change as a consequence of linguistic accommodation.

In normal situation, change normally takes place after several generations. Then, a new variety based on the former dialects - a ‘koiné’ - forms (Schirmunski, 1930, 1962; Andersen 1982; Siegel 1987; Kerswill 1994; in Boas, 2009). A ‘koiné’ is a stabilised result of the mixing of linguistic subsystems, such as dialects, to serve as a lingua franca among the speakers of different varieties in contact situations (Siegel, 1985).

Interest in English dialect-contact research has increased only in the three decades; it is also marked by the increased interest of Anglo-American linguists who are starting to investigate the permanent effects of long-term linguistic accommodation in more detail (Trudgill 1986, 2004; Britain 1997; Kerswill and William 2000; Sudbury 2000; Schreier 2003; Gordon at a 2004; Hickey 2004 in Boas, 2009). There are a number of studies on what factors determine the results of such a contact situation.

4.2 Speech Community

A linguistic study is usually conducted in a speech community, in which individuals interact and influence each other based on their linguistic attributes. Yule (2006) stated that a speech community is used as a tool to define a unit
of analysis within which language variation and change is analysed. This section presents different definitions of the notion in order to define Leupueng as a speech community.

In relation to his study of a German dialect in Texas, Boas (2009) defined a speech community as a linguistic and cultural enclave that forms as a result of speakers of one language migrating into a new area where they are surrounded by speakers of other languages. In some cases, one variation is dominated by others or dominates others. This community shares certain linguistic repertoires and rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, which differs from that of the surrounding areas (Labov, 1972; Hymes, 1974; Dorian, 1981; Gumperz, 1982; Romaine, 1994; Milroy and Milroy, 1997).

There are several views regarding the definition of a speech community. Fishman’s definition, like Gumperz’s, covers the notion that a speech community is one community, all of whose members share at least a single speech variety and the norms for its appropriate use (1971, in Romaine, 1982, p. 27). Gumperz’s definition refers to a speech community as any human aggregate characterised by regular and frequent interaction by means of shared body of verbal signs and set off from similar aggregates by significant differences in language usage (1971, in Romaine, 1982, p. 26). Therefore, he refers to Gaelic-speaking Fisherfolk descendants who are bilinguals as having two speech communities, whereas their monolingual fellow-villagers as belonging to one (in Romaine, 1982). Labov’s concept of speech community
ignores the uniformity in usage, and focuses on the shared evaluation of patterns of usage (Labov, 1972, pp. 120-121). Labov’s concept would still define a single language community even where two different varieties are spoken, as long as there is a shared evaluation of pattern usage. Thus, he perceives New York City’s complex native population as a single speech community because it shares regular patterns of subjective reaction to phonological variations (in Romaine, 1982). Thus, a speech community, according to Labov, cannot be conceived as a group of speakers who all use the same forms; it should be defined as a group who share the same norms in regard to language, i.e. share a set of social attitudes toward language.

Meanwhile, both Hymes (1974) and Corder (1973) proposed two approaches that seem more adequate because they do not exclude from membership those who have low productive capacity but high receptive capacity and who conform to the sociolinguistic norms (in Romaine, 1982, p. 29). Hymes emphasised that the notion of social group, rather than the language, should be taken into consideration, and then the entire organization of linguistic features within it (1974, in Romaine, 1982). Corder (1973) emphasised self-perceived group as the basis for a speech community. He says that “a speech community is made up of people who regard themselves as speaking the same language; it need have no other speaking attributes” (in Romaine, 1982, p. 29).
Eastman (1983) agreed, referring to a speech community as “the unit of analysis of a language in its context; that is, the speech community is a set of individuals who share the knowledge of what is the appropriate conduct in one language and interpretation of speech. These individuals also share the understanding of at least one language so that they may communicate with each other” (in Jendra, 2010, p. 30). This definition is also supported by Yule (2006) when he points out that a speech community is a group of people who share a set of norms and expectations regarding the use of language.

In a speech community, where a number of variations exist, one will see that some variations dominate others. Mattheier (2003, in Boas, 2009) pointed to the existence and death of a Sprachinseln ‘speech island.’ Sprachinseln refers to the linguistic enclave formed by the migration of speakers of one language to a new area where they are surrounded by speakers of other languages. In some cases, according to Mattheier, economic and social networks are dominated by the settlers’ language and culture, which serve as the basis for group identification. In other cases, Sprachinseln speakers are often economically and culturally isolated. The speakers then come into contact with the culturally dominant group that surrounds them which leads to various levels of contact. The results include lexical borrowing and grammatical construction into the Sprachinseln, which is also followed by different degrees of bilingualism, depending on the length and intensity of the contact. Sprachinseln may be assimilated by the surrounding speech
community. Mattheier states that this process usually takes two to three generations and eventually results in the death of the *Sprahinseln* (in Boas, 2009).

The Leupueng community in the present study is regarded as a speech community for the following two reasons. First, it is an area or enclave (Boas, 2009), where all of its speakers who have regular or frequent interactions with each other in some ways or other (Gumperz, 1971). Second, it also used to have only one variety of speech, but now different varieties are spoken as many people migrated into Leupueng, especially through marriage, after the tsunami in 2004. However, this does not make it more or less of a speech community; as noted above, a speech community can consist of speakers of different varieties but still have a shared evaluation or judgment of pattern usage (Labov, 1972). In Leupueng, this shared evaluation of pattern usage is observed in the form of subjective judgements towards the forms used by speakers of different varieties and dialects within the community.

**4.3 Language and Dialect**

Dialects are normally divided according to two factors - regional and social factors (Holmes, 2001; Wardhaugh, 2006; Fromkin et al., 2009). Wardhaugh (2006) noted that regional dialect is one of the easiest ways to observe variety in language. If one travels through a wide geographical area in which a language is spoken, particularly if that language has been spoken
in that area for several centuries, it will be simple to notice differences in pronunciation, in the choices and forms of words, and in syntax (Wardhaugh, 2006, pp. 43-44). Even very distinctive local colourings can be observed in a language from one location to another. Such distinctive varieties are usually called *regional dialects*. Meanwhile, the term *social dialect* or “sociolect” is used to describe differences in speech associated with various social groups or classes. The task for the social dialectologist is to define social group or social class. The result of such classification is that we can find such terms as “public-school” dialect in Britain, “African-American Vernacular English” dialect in the USA, and so on. The principal social factors in terms social dialect classification are social class, religion, and ethnicity (also known as “ethnolect” – e.g., Indigenous Australian English, Greek Australian English, etc.) (Wardhaugh, 2006).

However, it is difficult to set a clear boundary and definition to distinguish a dialect from a language or vice versa. Many researchers have attempted to provide different definitions for both terms and some of them devise different parameters to set the boundary. This section discusses these definitions and proposed parameters and proposes a boundary that can be applied to the context of the present study.

Fromkin et al. state that when a group of speakers from a specific region or social class speak differently in a systematic way, they are said to speak a different dialect (1985, p. 245; 2009, p. 398). Dialects of a single language
are referred to as mutually intelligible variations of the language spoken by specific groups; these variations are systematically different from one another (Fromkin et al., 1985). Mutual intelligibility is emphasised for the distinction between language and dialect. Other sociolinguists have also highlighted that the notion of mutual intelligibility is the parameter for dialects of a single language where speakers from each variety can still understand each other without much effort, despite differences that might appear (Fromkin et al., 1985; Coulmas, 1997; Trudgill, 2004; Wardhough, 2006).

However, the way the word dialect is used does not always reflect the notion of mutual intelligibility in different contexts. Sometimes, the term languages is used to refer to two or more mutually intelligible varieties. At other times, varieties that are not intelligible to speakers from other varieties are called dialects. This inconsistency of how this term is used is, among other cases, obvious in the cases of the ‘languages’ of three Scandinavian countries, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden; and the ‘dialects’ of multitude of different Chinese speech communities in China. In the Scandinavian case, all three varieties spoken in each country are referred to as three different languages although speakers of each of the languages can communicate and converse with each other (Fromkin, et al., 1985; Coulmas, 1997; Wardhough, 2006). In China, as discussed by Mair (1991), different regional languages such as Mandarin and Cantonese as well as many other different local languages, each of which has millions of speakers, are perceived as dialects by their own native
speakers despite the lack of mutual intelligibility among them. The use of the terms dialect and language in these situations has been determined by socio-political constraints associated with national identity.

Another similar case is that of Serbia and Croatia (Wardhough, 2006). Both ex-Yugoslavian countries speak the same South Slav Language, but because of political issues following the breakup of Yugoslavia in 1990s, the language now are referred to by two different names, Serbian and Croatian. There are no differences between the two in terms of speech (spoken version); only writing systems and some vocabulary are different. Croatia uses the Roman alphabet, while Serbia uses the Cyrillic (Russian) alphabet (Fromkin, et al., 1985). Similarly, Indonesian and Malay are formally called two different languages although the speakers of both languages can understand one another.

Although there are differences in the use of the words “dialect” and “language”, different sociolinguists try to set a parameter to define the two terms. Fromkin stated that a rule of thumb to facilitate the definition of language and dialect is that when dialects become mutually unintelligible, they become different languages. Wardhaugh (2006) suggested a language would be some unitary linguistic system which subsumes a number of mutually intelligible varieties, with these varieties being referred to as dialects. Therefore, a language is bigger than its dialects. Coulmas (1997), on the other hand, looked at whether a variety has the writing system. He says the
difference between language and dialect is that a language has the written norms but its dialects do not have the written norms.

Another parameter set to describe varieties of languages is the dialect-accent distinction. People in England and Australia speak English, but there are differences that are systematic in the way patterns are identified. However, Fromkin et al. point out that English as spoken in England and Australia is not referred to as two different dialects, but rather as two different accents (2010). The classification of different accents is based on regional phonological and phonetic distinctions which are manifested in pronunciation, while dialects are classified based on differences in the use of words and grammar, in addition to pronunciation, while remaining mutually intelligible.

This distinction between languages, dialects and accents is also problematic when it comes to the field. The question is, what scale of differences in pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar between varieties are needed to classify them as two different accents, dialects or languages? This is especially important in defining spatial or regional dialects. Dialectologists developed dialectometry to make such distinctions (Séguy 1973; Guiter 1973, in Lauder, 2002). Dialectometry requires conducting observations at several testing points to identify a dialect continuum or isoglossic areas (areas indicating geographical boundaries based on linguistic features) between dialects or regional varieties. Séguy proposed the following formula to be used.
\[
\frac{(s \times 100)}{n} - d \%
\]

Where

\( s \) = the number of differences from other test points;
\( n \) = the number of maps being compared; and
\( d \) = the distance of lexical items in percentage (Séguy, 1973, in Lauder, 2002).

With this formula researchers, especially regional dialectologists, will be able to differentiate whether varieties are dialects, languages or accents based on the percentage difference between the test points.

Guiter (1973, in Lauder 2002) provided a scale to categorise differences. If the result is below 20% the difference is negligible or insignificant which means both areas compared belong to the same variety. Between 21% and 30% the two varieties are said to belong to different parlers or accents. Between 31% and 50%, they belong to different subdialects. Between 51% and 80% they are said to belong to different dialects, and above 80% they are two different languages.

This quantitative approach to define varieties looks helpful, but Fromkin (2010) took issue with quantifying the categories. Her argument was that there is an arbitrariness in saying that more than certain number of rule differences represent languages and less than that number represent dialects.
According to her, there is no sudden break between dialects and what is observable is only the dialect continuum, where dialects merge into each other.

In the context of Indonesia, Lauder (2002) also urged modification of the scale. Lauder argued that while there are close resemblances of, say, words in two neighbouring dialects, there are many dialects regionally close to each other where the cognates in both dialects cannot be determined whether they originate from the same etymon. Therefore, commenting of dialectological research conducted in Indonesia over several decades, Lauder said that over 60% of these studies applied dialectometry, but they were only counting inter-village triangle differences, not permutations. Most of the studies found 65% - 70% which means that they are only dialects according to Séguy-Guiter’s interpretation. This becomes problematic in Indonesian linguistic context. If this interpretation was adopted it would mean that Batak speakers can communicate with Sunda speakers, Madurese speakers can communicate with Acehnese speakers; just as speakers of Indonesian can communicate with speakers of Malay.

Therefore, Lauder proposed a modification of Séguy-Guiter’s interpretation. Based on the results conducted by different researchers on different languages contexts in Indonesia, he suggested the following modification to Séguy-Guiter’s scale: Below 30% difference is negligible; 31% - 40% means the varieties belong to different accents (parler); 41% - 50% means different sub-dialects; 51% - 60% means different dialects; and above
60% they belong to different languages (Guiter, 1973, in Lauder 2002, pp. 39-40).

Dialects are also described as internal variations of a language by Wardhaugh (2006, p. 25). However, according to him, it is difficult to provide a clear definition of a variety because the notion of homogenous speech in a community, as suggested by Hudson’s similar distribution of unique sets (1996, in Wardhough, 2006) and Fergusons’s sufficiently homogenous items (1972, in Wardhough, 2006), is also made complex by individual differences. There is a doubt about the existence of such a unique set in any given community (Wardhaugh, 2006). Foley also expresses this doubt because there is no society that is entirely homogenous (1997, p. 382).

Another view of the distinction between languages and dialects says that a dialect is a variety or one of the varieties of the language which has no writing system (Coulmas, 1997). Holmes (2001, p. 132) points to the stereotype that a dialect speaker is usually associated with an elderly person from a rural area who is unintelligible to those who live in the modern urban community. However, the accuracy of this stereotype is doubtful because a dialect, according to her, is simply a linguistic variety which is characterised by its specific vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. Holmes also points out that there should not be a tendency to differentiate dialect from the standard (2001). Fromkin et al. (2009, p. 407) said that this tendency would suggest that there are variations of a language that are better, right, and/or
correct as opposed to those which are worse, wrong, and/or incorrect. They indicate that this view derives from the perspective of prescriptive grammar, a view attributed to language purists (1985).

The view that certain dialects are better than others based on their perceived prestige of their speakers is a rather ridiculous circular argument. Otto Jespersen (1925, in Fromkin et al., 2009, p. 407) once commented on the view that a particular dialect is better than others. He said that it is a very traditional view to regard the best language as the one that is used by the best writer, and regard a writer as the best when he uses the best language.

In the context of the Acehnese language, Durie (1985) referred to North Aceh dialect as ‘something of a standard’ because it is regarded as more refined than any other dialect and it has larger number of speakers than other dialects. Although this notion runs counter, to a degree, to Jespersen’s view, and those of other descriptive grammarians, this proposition goes in line with Coulmas’ distinction since the North Aceh dialect has been described by two scholars, Mark Durie (1985) and Abdul Gani Asyik (1987). However, whether these descriptions have been developed into a writing system and, if they have, whether the writing system has been used by the people writing in Acehnese are the questions that remain to be further explored in order to make the distinction between the standard and dialects in the Acehnese context.
The question of which Acehnese dialect is the standard has no simple answer. Daud (1997) acknowledged this issue, arguing that there is no single universal standard dialect of Acehnese spoken in Aceh today. Each region has its own particular dialect which is noticeable by others. Finegan (2007) stated that a standard language or standard dialect is the one used by a group of people in public discourse, such as in education, commerce, and government. The Acehnese language, in all of its varieties, is not used as a language of instruction in school, nor in any other formal occasions and therefore, the notion of ‘standard variation’ or ‘standardised dialect’ is hardly applicable. The same is true for the many hundreds of languages in different provinces of Indonesia because Indonesian is the official language used in public domains. Therefore, many languages in Indonesia have not developed their own writing system. Although some have adopted the Roman alphabet, many speakers of these languages do not write in their language.

Some scholars have suggested that the standard variety is the one associated with prestige (Holmes, 2001). One way of identifying it is by looking at the pattern of accommodation in conversations involving people from different dialectal backgrounds. The theory is that the dialect people choose to accommodate to is the one with highest prestige. In order to be able to say which variety is the standard Acehnese, dialect accommodation study has to be conducted, especially in places like Banda Aceh, where there is a significant mixture of all people from different regions in Aceh.
From the discussion above it is clear that the distinction between language and dialect is not an issue with an easy solution. To make the distinction, it involves at least three considerations: intelligibility, linguistic system differences, and attitude and political boundaries, which reminds us of the popular quote from Max Weinreich (in Fromkin 2010), “Language is the dialect with a navy and an army”. None of these three factors are decisive in determining what is a dialect and what is a language. Therefore, it is not possible to strictly define dialects and languages. Fromkin, however, suggested a rule of thumb for the distinction, which can be used in broad application but is not intended to be strictly accurate and reliable for every situation. Her rule is emphasised on the intelligibility of the varieties: dialects of one language are mutually intelligible linguistic systems with systematic differences (2010).

4.4 Dialect Change

There are two approaches usually used to study linguistic change, the genetic approach and the contact approach. Genetic approach views the complexity of a language as the result of the splitting up of an original single language due to the separation of its speakers across space and across time (Duran 1995). After the separation, changes begin to occur randomly and spontaneously in the speech of the separate groups. Changes can also occur because of what is known as Sapir’s Drift, the unconscious change in natural
language. This change will eventually eliminate or at least reduce mutual intelligibility between the groups over years, centuries, or even millennia. These changes can occur in any of the subsystems of language: sound system, lexicon or grammar.

On the other hand, contact approach, which is used to investigate the variations in the speech community of interest in the present study, sees the influences of neighbouring languages or dialects as a cause of language variation (Duran, 1995). Frequent contact through various kinds and levels of bilingualism, and especially through intermarriage, would bilaterally influence the speech patterns. When one community acquires and uses the new speech pattern more frequently, uses its local dialect less frequently, or, even replaces its language and dialect, the term language shift is used. In language-shift cases, peculiarities of pronunciation or structure of grammar from the formerly spoken language will appear in the newly acquired language; this is because the archaic forms or ingrained linguistic habits of any language are difficult to shift (Duran, 1995). The retention of these forms will be the evidence of a linguistic substratum underlying the new language or dialect, and this helps explain the linguistic prehistory of a speech community.

Other scholars also state that contact can have various linguistic outcomes, ranging from only slight borrowing of the vocabulary to the creation of entirely new languages (Winford, 2003). Between those two extremes, there is an even wider range of possible outcomes with different degrees of
influence of one language to another. The results of linguistic contact are influenced by both linguistic factors and non-linguistic factors (Winford, 2003). The linguistic factors include the nature of the relationship between the languages in contact, especially the degree of typological similarity between the two languages. Linguistic factors also involve linguistic constraints in such situations. These constraints can be specific to particular areas of linguistic structure, such as lexicon, phonology and morphology; or they can be more general such as the universal nature of language. Social factors include the length and intensity of contact between the groups, their respective sizes, the power or prestige relationship and patterns of interaction between them, and the function which are served by the intergroup communication (Winford, 2003). Socio-political factors which operate at both individual level and group level, such as attitude towards the languages and motivation to use one or the other, are also significant. However, Milroy emphasised that it is the speakers (non-linguistic factors) that play the most important role in determining the outcome of the contact (Milroy, 1992).

Regarding the outcome of dialect contact, there have been a number of studies of its outcomes, which are discussed in the following section to provide an understanding of the approach to dynamics in the speech community of interest to the present study.
4.5 Contact as a Determinant for Dialect Change

4.5.1 New Zealand English

In relation to the study of *The Origin of New Zealand English* (Gordon et al., 2004), Trudgill acknowledges that, in general, linguistic change is definitely not deterministic; however, he maintains that, given sufficient linguistic information about the dialects which contribute to the mixture and given sufficient demographic information about the proportions of speakers of the different dialects, it is possible, within certain limitations, to make broad predictions about the outcomes of the mixture, at least in broad outline. Trudgill argues that the change is deterministic with respect to the unusual type of situation where colonial varieties develop in what he calls a *tabula rasa* environment. *Tabula rasa* means that there was no population speaking that language before, either in the location or nearby. It is unusual, according to him, because this *tabula rasa* type of dialect-contact situation allows for the absolutely pivotal role played by young children in the new-dialect formation process (Gordon et al., 2004).

Therefore, in the ONZE study, a model is proposed to provide a comprehensive account of new dialect formation which is said to have three stages (Gordon et al., 2004). He suggests that in a situation where there is a mixture of various dialects, different variants are levelled out and a new dialect comes into existence. This dialect will be different from all the input varieties
in some ways. His major claim is that new dialect formation is not a random process, but the outcome of a development that can be predicted as long as there is sufficient information about the contributing dialects as well as demographic information about the proportion of speakers with different dialects (Gordon et al., 2004).

In the first stage of New Zealand English’s formation, which lasted roughly until 1860, Trudgill (2004) described adult speakers of different regional and social varieties from the British Isles coming into contact on the six-month boat journey, and then again in New Zealand. He called this rudimentary dialect levelling (Trudgill, 1986). Levelling refers to the reduction of a number of variants of a particular phonological, morphological, and lexical unit. During this stage, initial contact and mixing took place and resulted in limited accommodation of speakers to one another in face-to-face interaction and led to interdialect development (2004, pp. 94-99). Comprehensibility was a very important factor at this stage and therefore, any localised features that hampered understanding and mutual intelligibility were very likely to be lost (2004, p. 89). However, determining the range of mutually intelligible dialects is problematic because intelligibility is not easy to define (Hudson 1996, Campbell 1998, Trudgill et al., 2000, Schreier 2003, in Boas, 2009). Another important process during the first stage, according to Trudgill, was formation of the interdialectal features that were not present in any of the dialects in contact. Trudgill suggested that these are the result of the interaction between
dialects that may take three forms: 1) intermediate forms that result from partial accommodation, 2) simpler and more regular forms, and 3) hyper-adaptive forms.

In the second stage of Trudgill’s model of new-dialect formation, which lasted until approximately 1900 in New Zealand, the process was characterised by extreme variability (2004, pp. 100-112). This situation was due to the fact that the immigrants’ children had access to many different linguistic models, the result of mixing that occurred in the previous generation. Because this was not a stable linguistic situation, children were confronted with many different linguistic options and had no single peer-group dialect to which they could accommodate. Agreeing with Berthele (2000, in Trudgill, 2004), in such diffuse dialect contact situations Trudgill proposed that the role of adults in language acquisition was more significant (2004, p. 101). The outcome of this “diffuseness”, according to Page and Tabourert-Keller, is that children typically selected several variants from different dialects to form them into new mixtures (1985, in Boas, 2009). It was suggested that this unusual type of language acquisition eventually led to intraindividual variability once these children reach adulthood; it is possible that they fluctuate in their own speech quite considerably and therefore, exhibit a different type of linguistic behaviour from people raised in the more homogeneous speech communities. This stage was also characterised by the presence of intervariability. Trudgill’s observation suggests that people from the same location exhibited speech
patterns that were quite different from each other. However, he claimed that the variability at this stage was smaller than that assumed to exist among the speakers in the first generation i.e. stage one (2004).

According to Trudgill, the processes occurring during the first two stages of new-dialect formation are commonly referred to as koinézation (Trudgill 1986; Siegel 1987; Mesthrie 1993; Britain 1997, in Boas, 2009). New-dialect formation happens after the third stage which is characterised by focusing. **Focusing** is a process in which individual varieties of speakers become more and more similar to one another as individuals gradually adjust their own speech patterns so that they resemble the speech of the larger group (Le Page and Tabourett-Keller, 1985, in Trudgill, 2004). It forms a crystallised variety with remarkably little regional variation. Trudgill characterises focusing as levelling that took place among New Zealand speakers born around 1890 i.e. the accommodation between speakers in face-to-face interaction (2004, pp. 113-114). The questions remaining are what factors determined whether certain forms were retained while other forms were lost at this stage; and which outcome reflects the modern New Zealand English (Boas, 2009, p. 87; see also Watson, Maclagan, & Harrington, 2000).

Trudgill compared the speech of ONZE project informants to that of modern New Zealand English speakers to answer these questions. A drastic decline in variation between the speakers was observed and that suggest that the survival of the majority variants has a major role in focusing. At this stage,
it is important to emphasise the important role of children as they are not exposed to as many variants as those children had in stage two, because now they were in a more stable social environment with a more restricted set of variants to choose from. The proposal is that because of this difference in environment, stage three children selected from among a smaller array of variants on a rational, although still subconscious basis. Their selection is always based on the most commonly used (Trudgill, 2004).

Trudgill’s model is different from others (Domingue, 1981; Chambers, 1995) because it claims that dialect mixture is not a random process, but deterministic (2004, p. 126). Boas agreed with this view, stating that Trudgill’s approach not only offers a coherent method of analysing a development of new dialects, but also it has easily comparable stages and has the potential to answer the most intriguing questions about the dynamics and mechanism underlying new dialect formation (Boas, 2009). These questions include: (1) What features of donor dialects are retained in dialect contact situation? (2) What is the influence of external factors on new dialect formation? and (3) What development can be attributed to internal factors? Because many components of Trudgill’s model have been successfully incorporated, they adopted into other accounts and studies of new-dialect formation (Sudbury, 2000; Kerswill and Williams, 2000; Gordon, Campbell, Hay, Maclagan, and Trudgill, 2004; Boas, 2009).
The present study considers some ongoing processes in the dialect-contact situation of Leupueng. The processes that are observed, as identified in the example of ONZE, include what is the nature of dialect accommodation, how many local features are lost and whether it is because they hamper understanding or are prestige-related, and whether there are emergent new forms which were not the contribution of the dialects involved.

Since the present study of Leupueng looks at the data from children in a dialect mixture community, the following sections present some studies which are relevant for two reasons. First, they demonstrate roles played by children in such a community. Second, the studies were conducted in dialect contact situations. These studies suggest the importance of the presence of children in the process of new-dialect formation in a new settlement. They also look at how koinezation takes place and point to the evidence of simplification (regularisation of the irregularities of the rules) and complexification (irregularisation of the regularities of the rules) in the process.

### 4.5.2 The English Fens

The Fens, a geographical area also known as the Fenland(s), is a muddy region in eastern England. These fens were mostly drained several centuries ago, and became a low-lying agricultural region.
A study of the variables (ai) and (ʌ), by Britain (1997a, 1997b), is principally of interest due to the huge difference in the time it took for the focus of each variable to take place. In the 17th century, two populations migrated to a newly drained area of eastern England. These people happened to come from either side of two isoglosses. One was the boundary between two reflexes of middle English /iː/, in such words as kite and slide — [ɔɪ] to the northwest and [əɪ] to the southeast. The other isogloss defined the border between areas with and without an opposition between /ʌ/ and /ʊ/, as in cut and put. Britain’s argument is that the former opposition was easily resolved by “reallocation” of the two variants to pre-voiced and pre-voiceless environments, respectively. However, the clash between dialects with and without the /ʌ/ - /ʊ/ opposition led to an unstable situation that is only now becoming focused. The time difference is said to be the result of the relative resilience and complexity of the features (Britain, 1997a). In this regard, Kerswill and Williams view that there are two relevant points to be made; the first is that in any case of koinezation, it must be noted that there are differences in the potential for different features to focus; and second, as Britain argues, the social structure of the 17th century militated against rapid focusing (Kerswill, 2000).

Britain says that children in an extensive dialect mixing are in the position of having to focus on a new norm from a diffuse target variety spoken in a speech community only beginning to develop new social groupings.
According to Britain (1997a), this process occurred in the sparsely populated Fens during the time before education was universal, when there was no school environment, which would have encouraged the development of wider peer group norms; as a result, the koine development was further slowed down. Although no direct evidence is available (Kerswill and Williams, 2000), Britain posits that “it is only in the third generation that the focusing is achieved” (1997b).

4.5.3 Texas

Thomas (1997) conducted a study of /ai/ in Southern US. His data on this diphthong indicates the loss of the stereotypically Southern US monophthongal /aɪ/ in urbanised areas of Texas. This is in line with the claim that mass migration can lead to the simplification of phonological complex rules. In traditional, rural varieties, monophthongal /aɪ/ is found only before voiced consonants and word-finally. This resembles Fenland /aɪ/ (Kerswill and Williams, 2000, p. 72). The loss of the allophonic split in cities, with their large and recent in-migrated populations, can be associated to simplification. In contrast to the fens, as reported by Kerswill and Williams (2000), the societies Thomas describes are presumably open and mobile, where the majority of children and young adults, who are mostly of in-migrant communities, afford a high possibility of forming new social relationships. In the case of the
children, the relationships would automatically result in school and
neighbourhood-based peer-groups. Statistics provided by Thomas (1997)
indicate substantial in-migration, in which over half of the parents of his child
subjects were from outside Texas. According to Kerswill and Williams (2000),
if Thomas’ simplification hypothesis is correct, then it should be assumed that
the focusing on the new, simplified norm took place rapidly among the first-
native born children, in spite of their attested ability to acquire complex
features.

4.5.4 Hoyanger, Odda, and Tyssedal

Sandve (1976) reported a mass migration of Norwegians to a
linguistically near-virgin territory occurred during the development of new
towns on the shores of fjords in western Norway in the period of 1915-25 (in
Kerswill and Williams, 2000, see also Omdal 1977). These areas became what
Kerswill and Williams call a “virtual laboratory” of koinezation study, because
these single-industry, ore-smelting towns were in relative isolation for
decades (Kerswill, 2000). It also becomes easier for the study of koinezation,
since there are accurate records of the figures and origins of the migrants, as
well as the rates of population growth in the early years. The towns of Odda
and Tyssedal are particularly interesting because the very different origins of
the incomers have led to the development of different koines within a five-
kilometre radius. Based on Sandve’s data (1976, in Kerswill and Williams, 2000), levelling and simplification were found as the outcome of dialect contact in these areas.

As reported by Sandoy (1987), migration to Hoyanger was rapid, although absolute numbers were small. The population started at just 120 in 1916, but then rose to 953 in 1920, when the factory was opened, and ultimately rose to 2,216 ten years later (in Kerswill and Williams, 2000; see also Nygard 1997). The growth of population was also contributed to by the evidently high birth rate. However, evidence strongly suggests that focusing took place only in the third generation – the grandchildren of the migrants. The first generation did not speak a unified dialect (Omdal 1977, in Kerswill and Williams, 2000) (Omdal 1977, in Kerswill and Williams, 2000), and their speech resembled the dialect of their parents. A unified dialect could only be observed in the following generation. There are two factors believed to have cause the slow rate of focusing: high linguistic differences between the contributing varieties, and strong social segregation, where managers and professionals lived separately from the workers (Byrkjeland 1991; Nygard, p.c. 1997, in Kerswill and Williams, 2000).

Convergence only took place later when social and geographical allegiances were more oriented towards the new community. Trudgill argues that linguistic accommodation would have occurred between adults, and the strategies adopted by them would have included some of the simplified
features found in the later koine (1986). Kerswill and Williams (2000) take issue with Trudgill’s contention (1994), in this regard, by claiming that children also contribute to the simplification because the proportion of the children in some communities is relatively high.

4.5.5 The Dutch Polders

Scholtmeijer’s (1992, 1997) studies of phonetic variables in emerging varieties of Dutch in three new settlements (polders) revealed a very different pattern from that of the Norwegian new towns. In all cases, it appeared that there was a distinct break between the settlers’ strongly regional dialectal speech and the speech of their children, who came to speak a highly standardised form of Dutch, with relatively few traces of the dialect/accent of the older generation. These traces, as noted by Scholtmeijer, are greatest in the oldest polder (1992, in Kerswill and Williams, 2000). His conclusion is that the parents’ speech is irrelevant for the development of the children’s speech, and there is no question of any new dialect in the polders which might be a mixture of the varieties of the “old land”. Despite the possibility of overstating the case for the absence of new varieties, he ascribed the trends he finds to the need for a language variety for external communication, and to the strong impact of schooling in the standard (in Kerswill and Williams, 2000). Referring to Hinskens (1992), Kerswill and Williams suspected that Scholtmeijer might
have left out the influence of continued contact with surrounding districts, through commuting and use of services, as well as the general tendency towards dialect levelling and standardization in the Netherlands.

**4.5.6 Children in Spitsbergen**

Maehlum (1992) studied a highly diffuse dialectal situation in the Norwegian arctic territory. This study is very informative because it shows what children do when there is no stable adult model, nor a stable childhood peer group. The children have “unclear dialect identity” which may be the result of their longer period of stay in the Norwegian mainland than in Spitsbergen. The children are identified both with the ‘home’ town or village and with Spitsbergen. These children seem to retain stronger influence from their parents’ speech than do children elsewhere (Maehlum, 1992), which is similar to Hoyanger’s children as observed by Omdal. Children also vary in the degree in which they have adopted their parents’ dialects, depending on their orientation towards their family or their peers. This study shows the importance of demographic stability for the establishment of new dialects, even among children. It also reveals the kind of linguistic strategies adopted by children in an extremely diffuse community.
4.5.7 Milton Keynes

Milton Keynes is situated in the north of the country of Buckinghamshire, 80 kilometers from London, Oxford, Coventry, and Cambridge, and it is often regarded as the first “new city” in Britain. It was officially incorporated in 1967, and many people from different parts of England migrated to this new town. Therefore, it is a good place to study dialect mixing and koinezation. Kerswill and Williams conducted (2000) a quantitative study of ten phonetic variables, and suggested that substantial but not complete focusing occurs in the child generation – the children of the migrating people. Despite the lack of continuity of the focusing, this study also revealed that simplification is not only led by adults but also by children, and in fact, they are demonstrably the main agents of focusing in Milton Keynes and elsewhere (Kerswill and Williams, 2000). The completeness or lack of continuity of focusing is dependent upon linguistic and social factors, such as the opportunity for the formation of the child peer groups in which the focusing takes place. The nature of the linguistic factors which can hamper the focusing process is a significant difference among the contributing varieties.

4.5.8 Lessons from the Studies

The studies above suggest that there are a range of factors that influence the outcomes of dialect contact. The outcomes are influenced by the
proportion of children to adults in immediate post-settlement years. If the number of adults during the migration is greater than children, simplification and reduction will take place more readily than otherwise, and focusing will not take place until the third generation. If there is a high number of children, there may be a lack of simplification, as well as the presence of focusing in the second generation. However, this is not always the case and can be overridden by a high degree of linguistic difference between contributing varieties, and the complexity of individual dialect features. This will slow down focusing. Demographic factors can also override the children proportion factor. For example, high population density and the presence of common schooling, which provides the possibility of forming new social networks, can promote rapid focusing (Kerswill and Williams, 2000, p. 75).

4.6 Transmission and Acquisition

The variation and heterogeneity in a speech community will influence the transmission and acquisition process. Different values, attitudes and patterns of interaction in a social network that contains people from different backgrounds also play a role in the process.

Labov (2007) defined the term linguistic transmission as the un-broken sequence of native-language acquisition by children. The continuity of dialects and languages across time depends on the ability of children to replicate
faithfully the form of the older generation’s language, in all structural detail, with consequent preservation.

Within a sociolinguistic model of language acquisition, Owens (2012) said that the primary communication context of interest is the child-mother or child-caregiver pair. This was emphasised by Labov’s (1964, in Chambers, 1995) description of the six stages of acculturation process, where he pointed out that the acquisition of the basic grammar in childhood occurs normally under parental influence. Specifically, Guy (2011) pointed out that if most of the adult caregivers for young children in a community are female, such as mothers, childcare workers, primary school teachers, etc., then the language features favoured by females are more likely to be transmitted to the next generation of language acquirers (see also Labov, 2001). Guy (2011) argued that the transmission of men’s language features, which generally refer to male-led changes, will face a transmission problem if men have low frequency of interaction with children.

Owens (2012) further explained that as mothers respond to their infants’ early reflexive behaviours, the infants learn to communicate their intentions. Children refine this communication skill through repeated interactions. In a few months of life, infants are able to distinguish contrasting phonemes, different intonational patterns, and speech from non-speech (Owens, 2012, p.121).
However, the development of a child’s language is not only dependent on language instruction used to address the child as mentioned above. Any early and regular exposure to language, according to Fromkin et al. (2009), is critical to a child’s language development. This includes adults’ talk to each other in the presence of children.

The ability of a child to acquire language forms and syntactic structures is largely limited during the critical period – the critical-age hypothesis (Fromkin et al., 2009). The critical-age hypothesis assumes that the ability to learn a native language develops within a fixed period, from birth to middle-childhood, which according to Labov (2007), lasts until the age of eight. During this critical period, the acquisition process takes place easily and swiftly. After this period, as also stated by Fromkin et al. (2009), the acquisition of grammar becomes difficult, and for most individuals, never fully achieved.

In contact situation, children are exposed to different forms of the language. Whether a child will acquire certain forms rather than another will depend on which form they are exposed to more frequently. This is related to Croft’s (2000) theory, which suggested that the act of conformity with social norms is significant (in Trudgill, 2004, p. 27). Therefore, to explain the origin of the features that appear in children’s speech, it is also important to look at social network theory in terms of children’s language acquisition.
4.7 Social Networks

Children do not always completely acquire their mothers’ vernaculars (Trudgill, 2004, p. 27). This is one of the reasons why social networks are significant to a study which looks at a possible dialect or language change. One usually talks and operates according to a powerful, and very general pattern; this is what Keller (1994, in Trudgill, 2004) calls ‘talk like others talk’, which was earlier known as *phatic function* (Jakobson 1971, in Trudgill, 2004, p. 27) and recently interpreted by Croft (2000, p. 73) as ‘the drive to act out of conformity with social norms’. It is this process that forms the basis for Giles’ *accommodation theory* of (1973, in Trudgill 2004).

Giles and Smith (1979) posited that accommodation theory assumes that speech style shift occurs to encourage further interaction and decrease the perceived discrepancies between the actors (interlocutors). The assumption is that in a contact situation, the speaker and listener share a common set of interpretative procedures which allow the speaker’s intention to be conveyed by the speaker and decoded by the listener.

Accommodation is an automatic consequence of interaction. Trudgill (1986a, in Trudgill, 2004, pp. 27-28) argued that the notion ‘talk like others talk’ is a universal human tendency towards ‘behavioural co-ordination’. Accommodation of others’ speech starts in the infant-parent interaction, and, unlike later stages of interaction, is not necessarily associated with social
prestige and identity. By acknowledging Labov’s end of a critical period (Labov, 1972, 2007), Trudgill pointed out that Keller’s maxim would be unproblematic for children under eight, especially in a situation where they are newcomers to any given speech community. They are able to adjust quickly to their peers (Trudgill, 2004).

However, referring to the ONZE project, Trudgill emphasised that, in a very complicated situation, where children are exposed to many different features, the adjustment is not a straightforward procedure. Thus, he is convinced it takes two generations for a new dialect formation, where one speaks like others, to take place. In a contact situation, the influence of other social factors, such as ‘prestige’ and ‘stigma’, are surpassed by that of the accommodation process, which is one of the results of social networking. The tendency in a community with a mixture of dialects, according to Trudgill (2004), is that the minority simply accommodate to the majority in a given social network.

The concept of social networks was first introduced by Radcliffe-Brown (1940), and by Barnes (1954, in Marshall, 2004). In social anthropology, the concept of social networks examines how people’s interactions can change the institution that they participate in (Boissevain, 1984, p. 164). This network has a definite structure, containing patterns of regularities. An important distinction was made by Boissevain between interactional and structural criteria for the network. Interactional criteria include the network’s
multiplexity, transactional content, directional flow and frequency and duration. Structural criteria include its size, density, centrality, and clusters.

Boissevain (1987) used the term ‘loosely-knit’ to describe a network with low scores in multiplexity, density and transactional content. It is believed that density and multiplexity of the network have important implications for social behaviour, including the linguistic behaviour of a person (Marshall, 2004).

However, Boissevain believes that social network analysis should only be used to answer specific research questions. It is only to be used to answer who is linked to whom, the nature of the linkage, and how this linkage affects behaviour; the use of the network should, therefore not be over-complicated and over-analysed. Boissevain’s criticism is supported by Marshall (2004), based on what is reflected in his Huntly linguistic data. His findings show that there is no correlation between network indices and dialect maintenance. This is because people are free to choose what to use. He says that attitude, solidarity, and orientation have more influence on the choice of linguistic features. Marshall, nevertheless, acknowledges that networks can be seen as a pre-condition to a change. People are free to choose, but their choice is constrained by what is available in the network.

Although the Huntly data do not show the correlation between social network and language maintenance, other studies have shown otherwise. Evans’ study (2004), for example, demonstrates that social network and sex
are statistically significant predictors of acquisition, or lack of acquisition of local norms. Evans studied the extent to which the speech of Appalachian migrants in Ypsilanti, Michigan has been influenced by the emerging local norm, which is an ongoing dialect changed labelled the Northern Cities Shift (NCS) (2004, p. 153). The speech from those migrants were recorded and analysed acoustically to determine whether the NCS feature of low-front vowel raising /æ/ was present in their speech. Their use or non-use of the feature was correlated with their sex, social status, age, and social network characteristics to determine which factors have influenced the subjects’ participation, or lack of it, in the NCS. The findings showed that sex and social network, not age and socio-economic status, have significant correlation with the acquisition, or lack of acquisition of the feature.

In sociolinguistic studies, the use of social networks was pioneered by Milroy (1980) in her Belfast study. The idea behind the use of social networks is to facilitate better understanding of language variation than by simple social stratification. Understanding more about social network structure and the interaction of individuals will particularly help the understanding of how vernacular forms are maintained. Therefore, she proposes that the social network concept can be used as an analytic tool, rather than simply a ‘metaphoric device’.

Every individual is surrounded by his or her networks. Although there are linguists who say that individuals may or may not have ‘social networks’,
Milroy and Milroy (1998) argued that every individual is embedded in a network. However, the strength of the tie in the network can vary from one individual to another. The strength and weakness of the tie are measured by looking at the structure and content of the network.

The quality of social networks, however, is not limited to their content and structure. In addition to the structure and the content of networks, Stokowski (1994) divided networks following two main criteria: interactional criteria and structural criteria. The interactional criteria include the frequency of communication, content of ties, multiplexity, reciprocity, and strength of ties. The structural criteria look at the size of the network, its density, distance and proximity, centrality, clustering and network roles (as cited in Marshall, 2004, pp. 20-21).


**Table 8: Social Network Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactional Criteria</th>
<th>Structural Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Frequency of communication (number and continuity of interactions over time)</td>
<td>• Size (number of people or relationship in the network)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Content of ties (purpose and function of relation, types of relational ties, i.e. exchange, obligation, power and sentiment)</td>
<td>• Density (connectedness of the network; actual links computed as proportion of total links)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multiplexity (redundancy of relationship: number of contents combined in a relationship)</td>
<td>• Distance or proximity (number of links between any two nodes in network)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Centrality (adjacency and influence of nodes and subgroups in network)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Reciprocity (degrees of symmetry in relation, i.e. if A chooses B, does B chose A?)
- Strength of ties (relative measure of time, effect, intensity, and mutuality)

- Clustering (partition of ties into network subgroups and cliques)
- Network roles:
  - Isolate (peripheral nodes in a network)
  - Bridge (group members who provide links to another network subgroup)
  - Liaison (nodes that links several groups without being a member of any group)
  - Star (Nodes with largest communication links)

Regarding the diffusion of linguistic change, Labov (Labov, 2001) tended to see the frequency of interaction as the most influential factor. This is mostly associated with who interacts most frequently with whom. To explain this matter of interaction density, Labov developed the principle of density:

The principle of density implicitly asserts that we do not have to search for a motivating force behind the diffusion of linguistic change. The effect is mechanical and inevitable; the implicit assumption is that social evaluation and attitudes play a minor role (2001, p. 20).

Therefore, Labov (2001) argued that it is a good start to consider the simpler and more mechanical view, that social structure affects linguistic output through change in frequency of interaction.
In line with Labov, Trudgill (2004) pointed out that, in addition to explaining linguistic diffusion, patterns of interaction can also be used to explain shift, or new dialect formation. New dialect formation depends on how individual speakers behave linguistically in face-to-face interaction.

Milroy and Milroy (1998) pointed out that the strength of social networks is relative across individuals. They argue that social networks, which might play a role in linguistic change and variation, can be measured in terms of the closeness of ties within a community. They reject the assumption that a social network is limited to the strong ties of a ‘peer-group’. The Milroys emphasised the relativity of the network structure, comparing the individuals and groups in terms of the relative strength and weakness of the social ties that bind them.

Reflecting the views of Boissevain, they refer to a community with strong ties as a ‘close-knit community’, and to one with weak ties as a ‘loose-knit community’. A close-knit community is defined as dense and multiplex, in which everyone would know everyone else (density), and the actors would know one another in a range of capacities (multiplexity). According to the Milroys (1998), a close-knit network functions as a conservative force, resisting pressure for change originating from an outside network. Meanwhile, where ties are relatively loose-knit, communities will be “susceptible to change originating from outside the network” (Milroy and Milroy, 1998). However, Milroy (1980) admitted that it is almost impossible to determine the number
of links; very few researchers are able to gather all the links of individuals in the network structure.

The present study seeks to describe the networks of the children, which may be similar to the networks of one or both of their parents, to see if networks have a significant correlation to their acquisition of dialect. The density of networks is considered to determine how a close-tied community, where most interactions take place within the in-group network, contributes to the maintenance of the language or dialect. However, this study does not focus on the density of the network because the role of the in-marrying mothers, the outsiders, already explains the density of the community network and introduced heterogeneity in the community. Thus, this study only focuses on the interactional criteria, particularly the number of links and frequency of interaction with the links. It considers whether interaction with other individuals has influence on the children’s acquisition and transmission of the dialect.

4.8 Mixed Dialect Marriages

There have been few studies that attempt to explain dialect change and shift involving mixed-dialect marriages. Duran (1995) examined the notions of speech communities and diffusion of linguistic traits with varieties of Irish Gaelic in the Aran Islands of Ireland. He points out that communities that are not large enough to be endogamous will have to “marry-out” to survive.
Consequently, such communities will be exposed to linguistic features of the in-married individuals, and, because of their smaller population base, will produce fewer innovations, and risk either losing the archaic forms or being stigmatised by them. The results of his findings suggest that the ‘in-marrying’ mothers and their relatives will import new variants in the community (Duran, 1995).

In a more recent study, Stanford (2010) identified that in mixed-dialect marriages between Hmong and Hmong-Mien dialect speakers, their linguistic behaviour is influenced by the community ideology. The community ideology is that a woman inter-marrying with a man of another dialect is expected to adapt to the man’s dialect features. However, Stanford’s findings suggest that Hmong women tend to challenge this traditional expectation of dialect accommodation and challenge the Hmong gender roles and behaviour in general (Ochs 1992, in Stanford, 2010). This challenge and perspective, according to Stanford, reflects their use of the notion of “American Freedom of Speech”.

Children born in intermarried families will be exposed to linguistic variation as a result of linguistic contact. Based on his own experience as a child brought up in a family with linguistic contact due to marriage, Stanford (2010) witnessed dialect accommodation, regional style-shift, lexical and phonological variation, and many other aspects of variation and change. It seems that many households with intermarried background around the world
share experience and family lore about dialects and marriage. Therefore, according to Stanford, the widespread human experiences needs to have variationist’s attention.

**4.9 Attitude and Language Use**

According to Giles (1979), to understand why individuals acquire, use, and react to language and its varieties in the way they do, it is important to understand the dynamics of attitudes, motivations, identities and intentions, which constitute social psychological phenomena. Giles and Sachdev (2004) developed the Communication Accommodation Theory, which was earlier referred to as Social Accommodation Theory, to describe a positive or negative attitude found between communicants in their communications.

Attitude is also held to have close relation with the definition of speech community. Labov (1972) considered that it is necessary to define a speech community from the perspective of certain attitude of speakers of a certain language.

This theory is used to explain the attitude shown by individual speakers towards the listener(s) in a conversation. Fasold (1984) highlighted that there are two important sociolinguistic concepts in the theory: convergence and divergence. Convergence refers to the positive attitude shown by a speaker towards the listener by adjusting the features of his/her language (the pronunciation, accent, vocabulary, structure) so that he/she is understood and
accepted. Divergence is a concept reflecting language attitude that takes an opposite direction from the convergence. It normally demonstrates the separation between the speaker and the listener. This is usually associated with the desire of the speaker to maintain the loyalty to their tongue (linguistic variety), ethnicity, and culture (Holmes 1992, in Jendra, 2010).

Language attitudes towards a language, a variety of it, and its users are a dynamic social and linguistic phenomenon. As it is dynamic, Giles explained (1979) that the attitude shown by users of a language variety in one time may change in another time for several reasons; a negative attitude becomes positive or the other way around. This is believed by sociolinguists to be as normal as the change of language itself (Jendra, 2010).

As social psychologists and sociolinguists become interested in the study of attitude, they have arrived at a variety of definitions (Löw 1997, in Marshall, 2004). However, Marshall (2004) pointed out that a controversy exists over whether attitudes are always reflected in behaviour, particularly in linguistic behaviour; such a measurement of attitude has implications for linguistic change and shift. Attitude is seen as a ‘readiness to respond’, i.e. an underlying, intervening variable between a stimulus and a response (Agheyisi and Fishman, 1970; Fasold, 1984). Williams (1974) defined attitude as an internal state aroused by some type of stimulation which may mediate the organism’s subsequent response. This view, according to Marshall (2004), sees that attitude can be perceived from indirect inference from actual
behaviour, or elicited via questions. However, Fasold (1984) argued that both options have limitations. The concept of actual behaviour, as a manifestation of attitude, can be criticised for its subjectivity, while the validity of self-reported data is rather questionable. For example, standard varieties in Britain are regarded as holding high status and competence, whereas regional and rural accents also have high scores on solidarity and attractiveness measures; and this is usually associated with the in-group solidarity they seem to reflect (Edwards 1982, in Marshall, 2004).

Attitude toward a language may be influenced by several factors. The prestige or power of the language, the historical background associated with the language and its users, the social change found in the society, and the experience in learning the language are said to be the most common factors influencing language attitude in most studies (e.g. Fasold, 1984). English is now seen as the language of power, and therefore, most people around the world now learn to speak the language. This is seen as a positive attitude toward English. However, in some parts of the world where colonialism is part of their history, some people may have a different attitude to English since it was regarded as the colonial language, and therefore, they pose resistance to a degree. In a society with a diglossic situation, the higher variety of a language is usually regarded as a better form than the lower one. In a traditional polyglossic society, however, there may be a negative attitude towards the use of language associated with a higher class, especially if it is
perceived as instrumental for controlling and downgrading other people. For example, some Balinese in Indonesia may reject the higher variety (*Alus*) of their tongue when talking to the people of traditionally ‘higher’, especially when the people addressed in that variety respond in lower variety. However, if such a traditional polyglossic or diglossic situation is fading, positive reactions may emerge. A negative attitude toward a language may also arise from the internal system of the language. In learning a new or a second language people often show positive attitude towards a language because of its relatively easy grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary (Jendra, 2010).

Although there is nothing intrinsically bad or good about the speech of a certain language or dialect, people hold different views about different dialects or languages. Holmes (2001) observed that different attitudes towards different speech patterns are influenced by socio-political factors. People’s attitudes are heavily determined by their views about its users and the contexts in which the dialect is used. For example, the issue of /r/ realization in English pronunciation generates different responses from different people. It was also observed that some communities regard the pronunciation of /r/ as an example of a good speech, while it is regarded as humorous in other communities. Ultimately, attitudes to language reflect attitudes to the users and the uses of language (Holmes, 2001).

Regarding attitude, Omdal (1994) developed the concept of resolution of cognitive dissonance, and also pointed out that attitude can have impacts
on local dialect maintenance. Positive attitudes towards a local community, its linguistic norms, or even dress, can lead to the maintenance of local norms. This is an indication of the harmony of attitudes and behaviours. Meanwhile, negative attitudes will lead to attempts to change the behaviour, including the linguistic behaviour in favour of a supra-local norm. This can result in two different possibilities. The first is a successful change in the behaviour, which also indicates a harmony between attitudes and behaviour. The other possible result is an unsuccessful change in behaviour, which might be associated with linguistic difficulties. This leads to a disharmony between attitudes and behaviour. Subsequently, this inability to change behaviour may change or reverse the attitude. This will reinstate the positive attitude to local norms and this will favour of local norm maintenance (Omdal 1994, in Marshall, 2004).

4.10 Summary

Previous studies on dialect contact showed that contact could lead to new dialect formation or koinezation. Studies have been conducted in many parts of the world with different speech communities, which showed how contributing dialects influenced each other in their process towards koinezation. The outcome of the contact demonstrated in the studies are mostly identical, namely, koinezation following migration or new-town formation. Children were investigated to know what features are more preferable for them in polyglossic and diglossic situations and how social
networks in such a community might play a role in language change and maintenance. Stages of the process of new-dialect formation indicate that change can occur as early as the second generation after the migration, although most change or koinezation tends to take place in the third generation after migration.

It has been shown that during the process that lead to koinezation, linguistic behaviour of speakers varies. The linguistic behaviour of the speakers determines the relative outcomes of dialect contact. This linguistic behaviour is often associated with the attitudes and networks of the speakers. Therefore, these two non-linguistic factors are the main investigation of this research to explain the speech forms of the children in the Leupueng community.
Chapter 5

Methodological Framework

This chapter describes the methodology employed in the data collection and analysis of this study. The profiles of the children and their parents are presented, along with children’s language elicitation, variable analysis of the children’s language data, parental data collection using attitude questionnaires (AQ) and semi-structured interviews (SSI) and their analyses.

5.1 Research site

This study was conducted in Desa Lamseunia, Leupueng, which is located on the west coast line of Aceh and about 30 KM from Banda Aceh. Lamseunia was chosen out of the seven villages in Leupueng because of two reasons. First, there is a high number of intermarriages in this village, which means there are many other dialect speakers that have moved to Leupueng because of marriage; the majority of these are women. Second, the only available record (tapes) of Leupueng dialect originates from this village. It is a recording of sociolinguistic interviews conducted by Mark Durie (MD) in 1993. This study used these recordings to identify features of the Leupueng dialect.

5.2 Identification and Analysis of LD Source

MD’s tapes were transcribed and eleven phonological features of LD were identified. The features were identified based on its correspondences with the standard Acehnese (SA) features. Each corresponding feature is
considered as a variable (V). The rules of the 11 variables are described. These features are discussed in Chapter 5.

5.3 Durie’s 1990 Field Session in Leupueng

The data that were used as the starting point to describe the features of the Leupueng dialect came from Mark Durie’s recording in 1993. The speaker in this recording is an older woman from Desa Lamseunia; the forms suggested by this speaker were used as a baseline to identify the current features of the dialect. During the interview, which was a wordlist interview, there were a few other Leupueng dialect speakers around the setting who seemed to be younger and, perhaps, relatives or neighbours of the main speaker. Occasionally, these speakers disagreed with the forms suggested by the main speaker.

The following description reflects the forms heard in the interview updated according to current norms. It has to be admitted, however, that the language use of the main speaker and of those present at the interview site were not as rigid as the prescribed forms. There is variability that can be observed in everyone’s language use. The main speaker suggested that *jak* ‘go’ is realised as [jèk] in Leupueng dialect. For example,

*lôn meujèk* (MD Tape 1)

I am going.
In the same tape later, however, the speaker herself also realised it as [jak], the form that is similar to the standard. This phenomenon is defined as intra-speaker variability since the speaker uses different variants for the variable (è) in different occasions.

\textit{ka-jak peugöh (MD Tape 1)}

You go tell.

As with the main speaker in the interview, other speakers who were present also demonstrated variability. This implies inter-speaker variability among Leupueng dialect speakers. Variability of language use was also observed in the data gathered in the present study. Variability of language use by Leupueng dialect speakers is discussed in Chapter 6.

\textbf{5.4 Research participants}

Data for this research were collected from children and parents who live in Desa Lamseuni, Leupueng. The fieldwork was conducted in 2012.

\textbf{5.4.1 The children}

There were 18 child participants included as the language sources/informants in this study. The age of the oldest children born after the tsunami in Leupueng age is 6 years. This age range of the language informants
for this study is 4 – 6 years old. Children as young as 4 years old have mastered complete phonological inventory (Owens, 2012). Also, this age group is the oldest children available as child language sources at the time of data collection.

The children were divided into four different groups based on the geographical locations of their mothers’ origins. They have 4 different backgrounds, considered on the basis of their mothers’ origin: the Leupueng (LP) children, the East Coast (EC) children, the Aceh Besar (AB) children, and the West Coast (WC) children. One of the eighteen children that were recorded has a Sundanese mother. He is included in LP group because the language that he is exposed to at home is Leupueng Dialect as his father is a speaker of Leupueng dialect and his mother does not speak Acehnese. Thus, he is presumably not exposed to any other dialects of Acehnese at home, except Leupueng dialect. The Sundanese are one of the major ethnic groups of Indonesia, most of whom inhabit the western part of Java island, and speak a distinct language, Sundanese.

The LP children

Leupueng (LP) children are the children who have the most exposure to the Leupueng dialect at home as they have mothers (or mothers and fathers) who are Leupueng dialect speakers. Eight children belong to this group. Table 9 shows the background of each LP child.
Table 9: The Profile of LP Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mother’s origin</th>
<th>Father’s origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
<td>Kuala Bhee, West Aceh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Meunasah Bak U,</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leupueng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(died)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sunda (Non Acehnese)</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Desa Mesjid, Leupueng</td>
<td>Pulot, Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Layeuen, Leupueng</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
<td>Lamno, Aceh Jaya (West Aceh)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most children have mothers and fathers who are LD speakers except for LP4, LP1, and LP8. LP4’s mother is the aforementioned Sunda-background woman, who speaks Indonesian to the family and is learning to speak Acehnese. LP1’s and LP8’s fathers are not from Leupueng but as their mothers are LD speakers, the language exposure at home is mostly in LD.

The EC children

The EC children are those whose mothers are from the east coast of Aceh and speak the North Aceh dialect. The fathers of children in this group are LD speakers who were born in Leupueng and men from outside Leupueng who are already familiar with Leupueng dialect. Five children are included in this group. Table 10 shows the profile of East Coast children.
Table 10: The Profile of East Coast Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mother’s origin</th>
<th>Father’s origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Seuneudon, North Aceh</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Panton Labu, North Aceh</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Panton Labu, North Aceh</td>
<td>Leupueng, Originally from Krueng Sabé, West Aceh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jeunieb, Bireuen (North Aceh)</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jeunieb, Bireuen (North Aceh)</td>
<td>Leupueng, originally from Kuala Simpang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The AB children
There are only two children in this group.

Table 11: The Profile of the AB Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mother’s origin</th>
<th>Father’s origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lambaro, Aceh Besar</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lampeuneureut, Aceh Besar</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The WC children
This group is represented by three children each of whom has a mother from different part of the west coast. One is from Lhong, the other two are from Lamno and Nagan.
Table 12: The Profile of the WC Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mother’s origin</th>
<th>Father’s origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lhong, Aceh Besar</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pante Ceureumen, Lamno</td>
<td>Lamseunia, Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Krueng Alem, Aceh Barat/Nagan</td>
<td>Lamseunia Leupueng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.2 The Parents

The speakers in this study belong to the same social background. The majority of adults work as farmers and fishmongers who earn less than $300 a month. They rely on the crops from their farm and from traditional cattle breeding. The fishmongers bring home similar amount, depending on the situation at sea. During rough seasons at sea, fish are expensive and people eat less fish. The villagers live under the same housing built by donors after the tsunami, and thus, social class is not apparent/visible in the community. As such, the analysis of the use of language in this study has not been based on the social background but on regional background of the parents.

The first group of parents were those who were born in Leupueng and spent most of their lives in Leupueng and identified themselves as being from Leupueng, designated as LP. The second group were those who moved to
Leupueng because they were married to one of the LP parents, and are designated as NLP.

5.5 Language Elicitation and Analysis

The researcher attempted to make recordings of children’s speech in the most natural settings possible that could be organised. This includes recording the children in one on one conversations with the researcher, recording the children during their own time, and recording the children in organised meetings. The children were recorded in one-on-one dynamic and peer-conversation dynamic. One-on-one recording involved the child and a researcher where conversation occurred between the researcher and the child. One-on-one recording started with questions about general, everyday topics, such as about the child’s friends. Then the conversation went on for about an hour discussing an Indonesian-language picture story book in Acehnese. The text in the book was ignored and the focus was only on the series of pictures in the story. The researcher and the child took turns to tell the picture story. During the child’s turn the researcher helped by asking questions about what happens next in the story. Peer-conversation involved the researcher and two or more children. The children were given fruit and snacks and some playbooks, and were encouraged to interact with each other. The children’s conversations during these activities were recorded.
After the recordings were transcribed, the rates of use of each variable described in Chapter 7 by the children were impressionistically analysed. The rate of realization in Leupueng dialect features and in non-Leupueng dialect features was calculated. The rate of use variables were also examined in relation to the background of the children.

5.6 Parent Attitude Questionnaires and Semi-structured Interviews

Parent data were collected using attitude questionnaires (AQ) and the semi-structured interviews (SSI). The purpose of AQ is to identify the parents’ attitude towards LD i.e. whether they have negative or positive views on LD based on their responses to the statements (items) in the questionnaires. The purpose of SSI is to complement and further explore their responses to the questionnaires items of the parents. The list of questionnaire items and list of interview questions are attached in the appendices.

The items in AQ and SSI are differently phrased to suit the context of LP parents and NLP parents. Thus, there are two sets of AQ and two sets of SSINT, each of which was designed for LP and NLP parents. The design of both interviews and questionnaires were guided by the tripartite model introduced by Kristiansen (1990) and later developed by Ladegaard (2000). This model includes three components of language attitude: knowledge, emotion, and behavior. Knowledge constitutes the speakers’ awareness of differences and
variation that exist in their speech variety; for example, their ability to identify which form, for example, belongs to which dialect or speech variety. Emotion refers to the attachment an individual speaker has to a certain variety and their perception of that variety; for example, whether s/he thinks that that variety is an easy to understand variety, or whether that variety is identified as of lower status. Language behaviour is the actual use of the language by the speakers, as a result of or despite of their attitude and views expressed in the first two components. This is identified in the language the participants used spontaneously during the interviews.

All the questions from both sets of the SSI were designed to inform the three components of attitude outlined in the tripartite model and relate the parental response to the acquisition of LD features by the children. In Ladegaard’s model (2001), the emotion and evaluation of a speech form was inquired using a matched-guise test, intended to identify speakers’ actual feelings about a specific dialect or way of speaking. Ladegaard investigated the attitude of speakers to other forms of speeches to which they barely have any acquaintance.

Instead of using a matched-guise test, this study employed a number of questions relating to Leupueng dialect to identify the evaluation of LD by the parents. There is no need for a matched-guise test for this context as the parents in this were already familiar with LD, which is the variety to be evaluated.
In SSINT, questions asked to address the three components were preceded by a number of profiling questions to confirm the background of each parent, especially the history concerning their language use. The purpose of profiling the parents is to understand the history of their language use, including their experience with other language varieties which could influence their language use and the language their children use.

The LP parents were interviewed by Suhaimi, the secretary of Desa Lamseunia, Leupueng. There are two reasons for the choice of a local interviewer to interview LP parents. First, LP parents might be more open to someone they already know. Second, it is important for this study that LP parents do not accommodate or switch to other varieties during the interview, which could have happened if the researcher himself had done the interview.

The NLP parents were interviewed by a non Leupueng female interviewer, who was not from Leupueng and was considered a speaker of SA (Standard Acehnese). She had previously conducted interviews with people in this community. Some of the parents already knew this interviewer from a previous study. Additionally, as the interview is not a local Leupueng person, these NLP parents could have more freedom and openness in expressing their opinions on LD.

The response of both Leupueng parents and non-Leupueng parents are presented in Chapter 8. Most questionnaire items are favourable to the Leupueng dialect, but there are some that are not. Thus, the scale points of
the negative items (items that are not favourable to LD) were reversed (1, 2, 3, and 4 instead of 4, 3, 2, and 1) when the central tendency measure was performed. For the purposes of this study, a calculated higher central tendency values translates into a more positive attitude to Leupueng dialect.

Using Central Tendency Measure (Levine and Stephan, 2010), the data from the questionnaire responses is calculated to show the attitude tendency of Leupueng parents to the Leupueng dialect as described below in Chapter 8. Average tendency measure looks at the average agreement to the ‘in favour’ statements and ‘not in favour’ statements. The higher the values of central tendency, the more positive the attitude toward the Leupueng dialect.

5.7 Summary

This chapter describes the methodology for this study. The process for ascertaining the specific features of the Leupueng dialect is explained. The chapter then outlines the dialect background of the children who are the main focus of the research as well as their parents and discusses the methods used to elicit data. The rationale for using these methods is also noted.
Chapter 6

Some Phonological Characteristics of Leupueng Dialect

This chapter presents the phonemic characteristics of Standard Acehnese (SA) in comparison to the characteristics of the Leupueng Dialect (LD). Based on the field observations of the author, this is intended to elucidate the characteristic aspects of the Leupueng dialect that represent its marked nature.

6.1 The Leupueng Dialect in Relation to Standard Acehnese

In this study, Standard Acehnese is described in terms of its phonemic inventory and phonemic distribution. Leupueng dialect (LD) is described in terms of its distinctive features in comparison to standard Acehnese (SA). The phonemic inventory and the syllable structure of Standard Acehnese is described with reference to Durie’s *A Grammar of Acehnese based on North Aceh Dialect* (Durie, 1985) and the Acehnese Dictionary (Daud and Durie, 1999). The SA sound system, which consists of consonants, vowels, consonant clusters, and diphthongs, is outlined here. The phonemic distribution of SA is also discussed. The inventory of LD is described using the field data recorded by Mark Durie and Bukhari Daud in 1993 as a starting point and updated by the author to conform to current use. The description compares and contrasts
LD characteristics from the SA sound system. The description only focuses on the phonemic inventory and its phonological distribution because these features provide the most tangible distinction between SA and LD. Other features that may be distinctive to LD which include but not limited to vocabulary, syntax and suprasegmental features are not discussed.

It is important to refer to SA in the identification of Leupueng dialect characteristics. The phonological characteristics of the dialect will be more easily identified in this way. Identification of the distinctive features of Leupueng dialect will facilitate the analysis of the dialect features used by the child speakers in Leupueng, which is the main purpose of this study. After the identification of Leupueng dialect characteristics, the phonological features of child speech can be described.

The features of Leupueng dialect (cf. research question #1) were identified from recordings made by Mark Durie in 1993. These recordings were accessed from PARADISEC, the linguistic digital repository of the University of Melbourne. Validation of the features described based on the recordings was performed at the field site. The validation was performed by testing the features that had been identified with the speakers of Leupueng dialect living in the area. The features of Leupueng dialect described in this study are mainly phonological. The Standard Acehnese reference uses the description of Acehnese by Durie (1985) who underwent rigorous acoustic analysis of the sounds of the language.
The identification of Leupueng dialect features is based on comparisons to their correspondences in Standard Acehnese. The sounds in Leupueng dialect are contrasted to the sounds in the Standard Acehnese as they occur in certain contexts using phonotactic analysis. Features that are constrained by their phonological contexts are included in Conditional Correspondences and features that are not constrained by their phonological contexts are included in Unconditional Correspondences.

Unconditional correspondences refer to those that are not conditioned by the phonological context. Both dialects share the environment in which these correspondences occur. Conditional correspondences are those that are determined by phonological environments. For example,

a. LD [ai] : SA [ɛə]
b. LD [ɔi] : SA [ɔə]

The rising diphthongs LD [ai] and LD [ɔi] correspond to the diphthongs [ɛə] and [ɔə] respectively in the SA. For example, in SA [ʔulɛə] 'head' is LD [ʔulai] (WL131)10, and SA [gigɔə] 'tooth' is LD [gigoi] (WL56). These correspondences are unconditional. Every occurrence of [ɛə] and [ɔə] in the standard dialect corresponds to LD [ai] and LD [ɔi] respectively without being

10 Wordlist no. 131(WL.131) from recording’s wordlist.
determined by the environment. These diphthongs occur in the same environment in both dialects, in this case, open stressed syllables.

Conditional correspondences refer to distinctive features of Leupueng Dialect in comparison to Standard Acehnese, but the correspondences are determined by their phonological environments. The correspondences vary depending upon whether they precede or follow different phonemes. SA [a], for example, corresponds to LD [ɛ] when occurring in open stressed syllables as in SA [mata]: LD [mate] ‘eye’ (WL62). But, when it occurs in unstressed syllables, LD speakers use the same [a] as used by SA speakers.

Although the phonological distribution of the Leupueng dialect is generally similar to SA, numerous features that make LD distinctive can be identified. The most distinctive feature of LD is the occurrence of rising diphthongs in place of centring diphthongs in the standard dialect. Additionally, other dialects, such as Pidie dialect, and even dialects in Aceh Besar, with the exception of some dialects in the Lamno, may not share this feature; however, studies to verify this are needed.

The following is the comparison of correspondences between the Standard Acehnese and the Leupueng dialect, and therefore, they are identified as Leupueng dialect features. As mentioned earlier, some of these correspondences are unconditional and others are conditional.
6.2 Unconditional correspondences

There are five unconditional correspondences of SA that can be found in LD. They are rising diphthongs, absence of diphthongs in closed syllables, uvularisation of the alveolar tap, the dentalised alveolar fricative, and the case of the aspirated alveolar tap.

6.2.1 Rising Diphthongs in LD

Out of five SA centring diphthongs, two – [ɛə], and [ɔə] – are rising in LD. These diphthongs only occur in open stressed syllables (Durie, 1985). For example, (WL86) SA [talɔə] taloe corresponds to LD [talɔi] taloi 'rope', and (WL165) SA [ʔasɛə] asèe corresponds to LD [ʔatɔi] atsai 'dog'. For SA [ɛə], the alteration does not only happen to the second target [ə], which is raised to [i], but also to the first target, which is lowered to [a].

SA diphthongs [iə], [uə], and [uə] appear in LD as vowels [i], [u] and [u], irrespective of their occurrence in open or closed syllables. The exception to this is the nasalised /ũə/, which is raised in Leupueng dialect. For example, (WL127) SA [ʔũə] 'eue corresponds to LD [ʔũi] éui 'to crawl'. The examples of diphthong-to-vowel correspondences are:

(WL22) SA [wuə?] weuek: LD [wuʔ?] weuk 'to divide, to apportion', in closed syllables,

Thus, Leupueng dialect only has rising diphthongs, which only occur in open stressed syllables. This correspondence is, in general, a current development of diphthong simplification, which marks a difference between older and younger generations’ speech, (Durie, 1985). However, this is not necessarily the case in Leupueng dialect since the older generation also use the simplified version of the diphthongs. Even if we were to assume that diphthong simplification already took place earlier in this dialect, the question remains as to why other diphthongs such as [oi] and [ai] are retained.

6.2.2 Absence of Diphthongs in Closed Syllables

The Leupueng dialect is characterised by the absence of diphthongs in closed syllables. Unlike the presence of a centring diphthong [uə] in stressed closed syllables in SA, LD drops a second element of the diphthongs (the schwa [ə]) in closed stressed syllables in this context as in the following examples. This correspondence is unconditional because the environment in which this occurs is shared by both dialects.

(WL102) SA [kruəŋ] krueng: LD [kəʊŋ] kRung 'river'
(WL115) SA [ʔuət] úet: LD [ʔuət] úet 'to swallow'
Again, this is a case of simplification of diphthongs where the second element of the diphthong is dropped, only in this case it occurs in closed syllables.

6.2.3 The Uvularisation of the Alveolar Tap \(/r/\)

Another unconditional correspondence that defines the phonological characteristics of LD is the uvular approximant \([ʁ]\) that occurs in any positions in words, corresponding to SA \([r]\).

(\(\text{WL88}\)) SA \([ɾ\text{ёт}]\) \(röt\): LD \([ʁ\text{ёт}]\) \(Rot\) 'path'
(\(\text{WL112}\)) SA \([pru\text{ёт}]\) \(pruet\): LD \([pr\text{ут}]\) \(pRut\) 'stomach'
(\(\text{WL247}\)) SA \([ructor\text{й}]\) \(rugoe\): LD \([ʁugoi]\) \(Rugoi\) 'loss'
(\(\text{WL128}\)) SA \([bri]\) \(bri\): LD \([b\text{бе}]\) \(bRe\) 'to give'

The uvularization of the alveolar tap is a feature that is common in Aceh Besar in general, of which Leupueng is a part (Asyik, 1987). Other dialects on the west coast, such as dialects in Lamno also share this feature (Hanoum, 1986).

6.2.4 The Dentalisation \(\{t\}\) of the Alveolar Fricative \(\{s\}\)

As in many dialects of Aceh Besar (Hurgronje, 1906; Asyik, 1987), the correspondence of SA's alveolar fricative \([s]\) is LD's alveo-dental stop \([t]\) as in the following examples:
(WL193) SA [munasah] meunasah: LD [munaʈʰ] meunatsèh 'village prayer hall'
(WL192) SA [sumwjup] seumeuyup: LD [ʈュumwjup] tseumeuyup 'to bury'
(WL156) SA [puwasa] puwasa: LD [puwatsə] puwatsè 'Ramadhan'

In some instances, [s] is assimilated with the previous consonant. In this case, it is assimilated to an alveolar and is realised as an alveolar stop [t] as in the following example.


This is assimilation; the alveo-laminal follows the nasal alveolar, so they both become alveolar consonant [t].

6.2.5 The Correspondence of SA Aspirated Alveolar Tap [ɾh] (Cluster) with LD [ʈʰ] Cluster

The aspirated alveolar tap in the standard dialect corresponds to LD [ʈʰ] cluster. Like other consonant clusters (see Section 5.2.4), this cluster is only found at the start of a final stressed syllable.

11 The original form of SA /rh/ is /sr/ (Pers. Com. with Mark Durie)
(27) SA [rhom] rhom : LD [tsɔm] tsRom 'to throw'
(28) SA [rhah] rhah : LD [tsah] tsRah 'to wash'

The word rhah ‘wash’ according to Durie (2012, pers. com.) is derived from seurah. The people in east coast (SA) shorten this word by dropping the unstressed syllable /seu_/ and the remaining stressed syllable initial /r/ is pronounced in a rather breathy voice, and therefore, it becomes rhah rather than rah. Many monosyllabic words in SA are also often pronounced in breathy voice /rh/ or aspirated (Durie, 1985). Another example is lhôh from the word sulôh “kerosene torch.” It is pronounced lhôh instead of lôh after being shortened. The latter example is also shared by LD.

6.3 Conditional Correspondences

There are three cases in which conditional correspondences occur in the identification of Leupueng dialect: the realization of [a], the case of SA vowel [ʌ] and LD [ɔ], and the lowering of closed front vowel SA [i]: LD [e].

6.3.1 The realization of [a]

SA vowel [a] is realised as three different vowel sounds in Leupueng dialect, in stressed syllables.


Substitution of SA [a] into LD [ʌ] also occurs in this environment /voiced velar/ / {h, ?, #}/ for example, SA /pɔugah/ peugah : LD /pʌugʌh/ peugöh ‘to tell’ and /glottal / {h, ?, #}/, for example, SA /ɡuha/ guha : LD /ɡuha/ guhö ‘cave’

6.3.2 The SA Vowel [ʌ] and LD [ɔ]

The correspondence of these two back vowels is included in the non-standard characteristics of LD. In some cases, the SA rounded vowel [ɔ] is LD unrounded [ʌ], but in other cases, the SA unrounded vowel [ʌ] is LD rounded [ɔ]. The following are the environments for both cases:

SA [ʌ] : LD [ɔ] / {n, h, ɛ, t, #}/


SA [ɔ] : LD [ʌ] / {p, b, m, ?}/ (bilabial and glottal stop)
Examples:
(WL78) LD [tʃdʌm] tsidöm 'ant', LD [ɬwʰʌp] leuhöp 'mud', LD [ɡʌm] göm 'to cover something', LD [catʌʔ] catök 'to hoe'. In this environment, in SA, [ɔ] is used instead of [ʌ].
(WL82) SA [buŋɔŋ] bungong : LD [buŋʌŋ] bungöng 'flower' is an exception to this rule.

6.3.3 The Lowering of Closed Front Vowel SA [i]: LD [e]

The SA [i] : LD [e] correspondence occurs only in the following environment: SA [i] : LD [e] /{k, ʁ} _. Examples are:

SA [aki] aki: LD [ake] ake 'foot';
SA [turi] turi: LD [tuɾe] tuRe 'to know someone';
SA [tukri] tukri: LD [tukɾe] tukRe 'to know how';
SA [bri] bri: LD [bɾe] bRe 'to give'.

This description of the characteristics of Leupueng dialect can be summarised in the table below. The correspondences in the table are used for the identification of the use of the dialect by the children, and therefore, the table provides a coding guide.
Table 13: Correspondences between Standard Acehnese and the Leupueng Dialect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Correspondences SA : LD</th>
<th>Characteristics of LD</th>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SA [èe] : LD [ai]</td>
<td>Rising diphthong</td>
<td>Unconditionally all stressed syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SA [e] : LD [oi]</td>
<td>Rising diphthong</td>
<td>Unconditionally all stressed syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SA [ie] : LD [i]</td>
<td>Absence of diphthongs in stressed syllables</td>
<td>Unconditionally all stressed syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA [eue] : LD [eu]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA [ue] : LD [u]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SA [r] : LD [ʁ]</td>
<td>Uvularisation of the alveolar tap</td>
<td>Unconditional, syllable initial (never closes syllable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SA [s] : LD [t̪]</td>
<td>Dentalisation of the alveolar fricative</td>
<td>Unconditional, syllable initial (never closes syllable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SA [rh] : LD [t̪ʁ]</td>
<td>Correspondence of aspirated alveolar tap with /t̪ʁ/ cluster</td>
<td>Unconditional, Initial stressed syllable, the only possible position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SA /a/ : LD /ö/</td>
<td>Lifting of open mid central vowel</td>
<td>- /{voiceless velar, bilabial _ h, k, #}/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- /voiced velar_ {h, k}/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- /glotta _ #/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SA [a] : LD [è]</td>
<td>Fronting of open mid central vowel</td>
<td>/alveolar, palatal _ h, k, #}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SA [ö] : LD [o]</td>
<td>Rounding of back unrounded vowel</td>
<td>/_ {n, h, ng, t, #}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SA [o] : LD [ö]</td>
<td>Unrounding of back rounded vowel</td>
<td>/_ p, b, k¹²/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SA [i] : LD [é]</td>
<td>Lowering of close front vowel</td>
<td>/{k, ʁ _ #}/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹² Glottal stop. Any /k/ that closes a syllable is a glottal stop.
As Table 13 indicates, there are specific, characteristic differences between Leupueng usage and that of speakers of the standard Acehnese dialect. It is these features that are recognisable to speakers of Acehnese and are marked in their perception of language use. These issues are discussed further in the subsequent chapters.

6.4 Summary

This chapter has provided the phonemic inventory of the Acehnese language based on descriptions from the work of Durie (1985) Asyik (1987), which are both based on the North Aceh dialect, and updated by the author in light of current usage. It described eleven distinctive features of the Leupueng dialect in comparison to the dialect of North Aceh. These are the features that are used to examine language use in children in Leupueng.
Chapter 7

Features of Leupueng Dialect in Children’s Language Use

This chapter presents results relevant to Research Question 2 of this study, “Do features of Leupueng dialect appear in the language use of the children?” The statistical occurrence of examined variables and the frequency of the variables realised in LD features is provided. Highly retained features and features with low frequency of retention are noted. The context and environment of use of each feature is also provided.

7.1 Overall Variable Occurrences

As many as 4441 occurrences of the eleven variables in twenty hours of language recording of the 18 children were identified with reference to the list of variables from Table 13 in Chapter 6. Analysis of the recordings of the children’s language found that there is variation in the realization of each of these variables. The following table shows the overall variable occurrences and percentage of their realization in LD features.
Table 14: Children’s Realization of the Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>LD realization</th>
<th>Total Occurrence of Variable</th>
<th>Percentage of LD realization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1 SA [èe] : LD [ai]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2 SA [oe] : LD [oi]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3 SA [ie, ue, eue ] :</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>87.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD [i, u, eu]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4 SA [r] : LD [R]</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>33.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5 SA [s] : LD [ts]</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>14.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6 SA [rh] : LD [tsR]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7 SA [a] : LD [ö]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>2.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8 SA [a] : LD [è]</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9 SA [ö] : LD[o]</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>23.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10 SA [o] : LD [ö]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11 SA [i] : LD [é]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each variable appears at distinctly different frequency. V7 and V8 were the most frequently occurring dialect variables with 983 and 800 occurrences respectively, while V6 was the least frequent, occurring only 15 times in the data. Middle frequency variables are V2, V4, V5, V3, and V9 and low frequency variables are V1, V6, V11, and V10. While variation of realizations occurred for other variables, V2 and V6 were only realised in the standard form. No realization in LD features of these two variables were found. The identification of the frequency of occurrence of each variable will enable prediction of which local dialect features may endure and which are declining.
7.1.1 High Frequency Variables

Variable 7, as described in Chapter 5, is the /a/ that occurs in /{voiceless velar, bilabial} _ {h, ?, #}/, /voiced velar _ {h, ?, #}/, and /glottal _ #/. The data show that most of the occurrences Variable V7 are found in /bilabial _ ?/. The examples of occurrence in this environment are /pak/ ‘teacher’ and /mak/ or /mamak/ ‘mother’. This variable is attested in the /voiced velar _ h/ environment as in the word /peugah/ ‘say’ and in /velar _ #/ as in /ka/ ‘already’. It was also attested in in the /glottal _ #/ environment as in the word /satu a/ ‘1 A’ (name of a classroom).

Variable 8 is also the vowel /a/, in the contexts of /{alveolar, palatal} _ {h, ?, #}/ and /voiced velar stop _ #/. Most of the occurrences of V8 are found in /voiced palatal _ ?/ in the common word /jak/ or /meujak/ ‘go’. This word and the sound /è/ in this word were the most identifiable Leupueng dialect feature in the corpus. Leupueng dialect is often identified by people in terms of the use of /jèk/ instead of /jak/. After the alveolar nasal /n/ this Variable is also common as in word SA /hana/ : LD /hanè/ ‘there be no’ (negation).

7.1.2 Middle Frequency Variables

Variables 2, 4, 5, 3 and 9 occurred with intermediate frequency. Variable 2 is the diphthong /oe/. Like other Acehnese diphthongs, this variable only
occurs in stressed syllables. Most of the occurrences of V2 were in common words as /nyoe/ 'this/here’, /sinoe/ ‘here’, and /uroe/ ‘day’.

Variable 4 is the pronunciation of /r/. /r/ occurs in Acehnese in all environments except in the syllable final. The local dialect form is /R/. There are many words which contain this sound. In the data /r/ is found in words such as /röh/ ‘again’13, /pré/ ‘day off/holiday/free’, /rumoh/ ‘house’, /rô/ ‘spilled’, /trôk/ ‘arrive/reached’, /droe/ ‘self’ and /ureueng/ ‘men/people’.

Variable 5 is the pronunciation of /s/. The phoneme also occurs in all environments except syllable final. It occurs in both stressed and unstressed syllables. The data show that the occurrence of the /s/ variable in children’s language was mostly found in common words as /sakét/ ‘ill’, /soe/ ‘who’, /sabé/ ‘all the time’, /Lamseunia/ ‘Lamseunia’, and /saboh/ ‘one’ (determiner for certain countable nouns).

Variable 3 is the treatment of the three central diphthongs /ie/, /ue/, and /eue/ which occur in stressed syllables. The diphthong was found mostly in high frequency words such as /peue/ ‘what’, /beuet/ ‘read/study’ (specifically used for religious study or learning to read the Quran), /keue/

13 /röh/ to mean ‘again’ is only applied in this context: Soe nan droeneuh röh? ‘What’s your name again?’. There are other meanings of this word in different contexts, mainly as a particle used to intensify meaning.
‘can, able’.

Feature 9 is the treatment of /ö/ in /_ {n, h, ng, t, #}/ environment. The occurrence of this variable in the data was mostly found in a handful of common words such as /ngön/ ‘friend/with’, /töh/ ‘which one/pass to me’, and /teungöh/ ‘in the middle’ (both for time and space).

7.1.3 Low Frequency Variables

V1, the /ai/: /èe/ correspondence, however, had a considerably higher occurrence than the other three. Variable 1 is also considered by speakers to be a marker of the Leupueng dialect. The standard Acehnese diphthong /èe/ occurs in stressed syllables, with unconditional correspondence. In the data, this variable mostly occurred in such words as /watèe/ ‘time’ or ‘when’, /lagèe/ ‘be like’, /lhèè/ ‘three’, /batèe/ ‘stone’, /lakèe/ ‘ask for/request’, and /ilèe/ ‘first’ as in ‘Do this one first!’.

Variable 6 is the pronunciation of /rh/, which in the standard variation is a breathy voice alveolar trill (Durie, 1985). This only occurs at the onset position of stressed syllables. Very few words containing this variable were found in the children’s language. Examples were /rhom/ ‘throw’ and /rhah/ ‘wash’. Variable 10 is the treatment of open-mid back vowel /o/ in the / #_ p,

Variable 11 is the treatment of /i/ following the voiceless velar obstruent /k/, alveolar trill /r/ and stop clusters with /r/ as the second element, /kr/ and /br/. The vocal variant is /é/. The variable was found in the following words /aki/ ‘foot’, /turi/ ‘recognise’, and /nuri/ ‘parrot (also a person’s name)’.

7.2 Patterns of Use

The following sections discuss the children’s realization of each variable and consider the environments in which they occur. As seen in Table 14, not all of the 11 variables are realised in the LD forms. The realization of LD forms ranges from 0% to 88%.

The realization of LD forms is found to be very low for the higher frequency variables. This means that there is a low level of visibility of Leupueng dialect in the children’s. For example, Variable 7 is only realised in the LD form in about 2.54% of cases and V8’s realization is in only 2.4% of all occurrences.

¹⁴ Glottal stop, any /k/ that closes a syllable is a glottal stop
7.2.1 Variation Across Groups

As discussed in Chapter 5, the children were divided into four groups based on the dialect spoken in their mothers’ place of origin. These four groups are the geographical regions of Leupueng (LP), Aceh Besar (AB), West Coast (WC), and East Coast (WC). The data presentation that follows looks at the variation of each variable across these groups. This grouping does not consider the origin of the father, but the father’s origin will be mentioned in the explication of some of the variation that might have a correlation with their origins.

In order to find out whether the NLP (children with non-Leupueng mothers) could be the driving force for the dropping of many Leupueng features in most of the occasions as opposed to the LP (children with Leupueng mothers), a brief comparison between these two groups is provided before looking at the variation across the four groups. The term “Leupueng mothers” refers to the mothers who were born in one of the six villages of Leupueng and “non Leupueng mothers” are those who have moved and live in Leupueng as a result of their marriage to men from Leupueng.

There was not any big difference in realization of the eleven variables in LD forms between the LP group and NLP groups. The average rate of LD realization in the NLP group was 16% which is slightly lower than that of LP (17%). As shown in Table 15, there was an extreme variation among children
with NLP background, which can be associated to the dialect background of their mothers. The lowest LD realization was found in the East Coast (EC) group, ranging from 0% - 13%, with the exception of one who realised the variables 21% in LD. Children from the West Coast group retained 17% and 18%, while children from Aceh Besar had the highest retention rate of 25%.

Table 15: Realization in LD among the NLP (Non-Leupueng Children)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NLP Groups</th>
<th>Average realization of variables in LD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC4</td>
<td>0 % (EC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>7 % (EC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1</td>
<td>10 % (EC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3</td>
<td>13 % (EC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC3</td>
<td>16 % (WC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC1</td>
<td>18 % (WC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5</td>
<td>21 % (EC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC2</td>
<td>25 % (WC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB1</td>
<td>25 % (AB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2</td>
<td>25 % (AB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children in the LP group also demonstrate varied retention of LD forms in their speech, ranging from 6% - 37%.
Table 16: LD Occurrence in the Language of LP Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LP Child Participants</th>
<th>Percentage of LD Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP2</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP5</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP8</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP4</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP6</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP7</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average rate of LD retention of both LP and NLP groups are equally low, 17% and 16%. This may suggest that, contrary to previous expectations, the mothers did not play important roles in the transmission of LD features to their children. It is possible that the other children they are friends with influence much of their language use. This reflects the language acquisition for school-aged children whose peers that they socially interact with to a greater extent than their parents exert more influence.

The NLP children would also be expected to retain LD features at a lower rate than the LP children. Instead, the rate was 16 percent, almost identical to the NLP children’s retention rate. Apparently, high retention of LD features in the NLP group was contributed by two children from Aceh Besar and three from West Coast.

The high retention rate among the Aceh Besar and the West Coast children might be associated to their high rate LD realization of V3 (WC2, AB2, AB1), V4 (WC1, WC3, AB2, AB1), V5 (AB2, AB1), V7 (WC1), V8 (WC2). V9,
V10, and V11 do not have much influence as their occurrences were very few. The reason why the children from AB and WC, not EC, make more contributions to the retention of LD features in NLP is an interesting question. It is likely that dialects in these areas share LD features. Asyik has noted the similarities across Aceh Besar and a West Coast region called Daya, especially in the use of /r/ (V4) and /è/ (V8) (Asyik, 1987). Further detailed investigation on this matter is needed.

In the LP group, two specific children account for most noticeable shifts in the overall rate of realization of LD features. LP7 contributed the most to the overall rate with 37% of LD realization, while LP1 brought down the average rate contributing only 6%. Table 16 shows the realization rate of LD features in each child’s language. Different rate of retention of LD features in the speech of these two children may have been influenced by their network.

LP7’s mother is a Leupueng born woman from Desa Layeun who has never lived outside Leupueng. Her father is a Leupueng born man who has always lived and worked in Leupueng. They have not had much exposure to non-LD speech before the tsunami. After school, LP7 plays with children who live close to her house: LP2 (LP group), WC2 (WC), and EC1 (EC). Among these friends, LP7 plays a dominant role. She seems to be more articulate than Ipah and is a little older than WC2 and EC1. Therefore, she might exert more influence on them rather than being influenced by them.
LP1’s mother is a Leupueng born woman. However, she is married to a man from Non-Leupueng background. Her husband is from Woyla, West Aceh. LP1’s mother has experienced living in environments where people do not speak LD and do not speak Acehnese. Before the tsunami she lived and worked in Malaysia for a few years. Although during the interview she showed very positive attitude and pride towards LD, her own dialect, she also talked about the experience accommodating to the speech of others. LP1’s friends are AB1, EC3, EC2, EC5, EC4 and WC1, who are NLP children. AB1, who is the oldest in this network, is from the AB group and his mother displayed a negative attitude towards LD.

Being surrounded by NLP children might have influenced LP1’s low retention of the LD forms. He might have been influenced by the higher frequency of interaction with children from the EC group such as EC4, EC3, EC2 and EC5.

**7.2.2 Variation across variables**

Although there is little overall difference between these two general groups, differences become apparent when realizations of variables across the four more specific groups are examined.
### Table 17: Average Variable Realization in Leupueng Dialect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children Groups</th>
<th>Average of variable realization in LD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, the group that had the highest rate of LD realization was not the LP group. The highest LD realization was in the Aceh Besar group, followed by the West Coast group. The East Coast group comes last, which is perhaps expected as dialects from the East Coast have more differences from Leupueng than AB and WC.

#### 7.2.3 Variables with Zero Realization in LD (V1, V2, V6)

Among the 11 variables observed, there are three variables that were not realised in LD form at all by the children. These are Variables 1 and 2, the central diphthongs in open stressed syllables /èe/ and /oe/, and Variable 6, the treatment of /rh/, each of which corresponds to LD features /ai/, /oi/ and /t̪R/ respectively. As shown in Table 6.2, that V1 and V2 are common and frequently used diphthongs in Acehnese in general. In this study, this diphthong was also found to be used frequently by the children; however, only one LD realization of this variable was found, which is in the speech of EC5. No V2 realization in LD was found. V6, the syllable initial consonant cluster
/rh/, was of scarce occurrence and the LD variant of this variable was not attested.

Although variation of V2 does not include realization of this Variable in LD form, not all children realised this variable as SA /oe/. In fact, many of them realised this diphthong in a merged version /o/. Its pronunciation mostly sounds like a long low central vowel /oː/, perhaps due to its position in the final syllable, which is stressed in Acehnese. Variable 1 /èe/ realised in LD was only found once, as mentioned above. Most children realised this central diphthong in either its merged form /è/ or in the SA /èe/ in each of its occurrences. The merged form of V1 was also realised in a slightly longer /èː/.

Variable 6 occurs in a small number of such words as /rhah/ ‘wash’, /rhët/ ‘drop (int verb)’ / /rhom/ ‘throw’. This variable was found only once in the speech of a child with an LD mother. It was realised in a reduced form of the cluster which is SA /r/ instead of LD /R/ or LD /t̪R/. Other occurrences of this variable were seen in three children from East Coast and Aceh Besar. Although there were no occurrences in their recorded speech, two other children were sometimes observed to use the LD form of this variable.

### 7.2.4 Variables with Low Occurrence and Low LD Realization

Variable 10 and Variable 11 had very low rates of occurrence in the data. Table 18 summarises their observed realization in LD.
Table 18: Occurrence of V10 and V11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>x10</th>
<th>c10</th>
<th>x11</th>
<th>c11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Their realization in LD was also very low at 12% and 11% respectively. The realization of V10 in LD was found in 3 out of 12 occurrences and of V11 in 5 out of 41 occurrences. The LD realization of V10 is only found in the EC and LP group. EC1, a child from the EC group, used this Variable four times with 2 realizations in LD. LP7, from LP, used it twice realizing it in LD once.

In LD, V10 is realised in /ö/ as opposed to SA /o/. Most children who encountered this variable realised it as SA /o/ except EC1 and LP7. There were 7 other children whose speech has instances of this variable, including four whose mothers are LD speakers, but they all realised this Variable as SA /o/.
As for Variable 11, its LD realization was only found in three children from the LP group, and one whose mother is a Sundanese speaker. This latter child’s LD realization of V11 occurred once in 12 encounters. It occurred in the words /tukri/ ‘know how’, realised as /tukRé/, and in the words /dari/ ‘from’ and /akri/ ‘proper name’, realised as /daRé/ and /akRé/ respectively.

It seems that this variable is only realised in LD by these three children when it occurs in stressed syllables. On one occasion, this variable was realised in an unstressed syllable as the SA /kriban/ ‘how’ instead of LD /kRéban/.

### 7.2.5 Variation in Stereotyped LD Features

Variable 8, SA /a/: LD /è/, is a stereotyped LD form recognised by speakers of other Acehnese dialects. The expression *ho meujèk* ‘where are you going?’ is used by speakers of other dialects as emblematic of how LD people speak.

The data in this study showed that realization of V8 in LD occurred mostly in children from the WC group (4.4%) and LP group (3.2%). Its occurrence is only 0.4% in the EC group and zero in the AB group.

#### Table 19: Occurrence of V8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>X8</th>
<th>C8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 19, in the LP group, this variable was realised in LD only 12 times out of 361 encounters. Children who realised this variable in LD were LP7 (3/43), LP2 (3/47), LP4 (3/70), LP5 (1/24), and LP6 (4/172). LP1 did not have LD realization for this variable. LP7 realised this Variable in LD in such words as /hanè/ ‘there’s no’, and /nè/ ‘there is’, all of which occurred in the same environment, following an alveolar nasal in an open syllable. LP2 realised the variable in LD form in the words /hanè/ and /Rayè/ ‘big’. Most LD realization of this variable occurred in the words /hanè/ and /nè/. It also occurred once each in the words /mèjè/ ‘table’ and /blèh/ ‘side’.

Although this feature is considered emblematic of LD, it was children from the WC group who had a higher percentage of LD realization than the LP children themselves. However, this was only realised by one child from this group. The other two children did not realise this variable in the LD variant. One child realised this variable in LD in such words as /salèh/ ‘wrong’ and /Rayè/ ‘big’. Another’s mother is from Lamno where /è/ is also a dialect variable in some localities; another is from Lhong, and there is no mention of the use of this feature in this area, and a third’s mother is from Krueng Alem, Nagan, and there is no mention of this feature from this area either.

LD realization of this Variable occurred only once in the East Coast group, in the word /nè/ ‘there’s’. Other children from this group all realised this Variable as SA /a/.
7.2.6 Variation in the Production of the Alveolar Trill

Overall, Variable 4, SA /r/: LD /R/, was also realised significantly more in LD, with about 34% LD realization in the data. As appears in Table 20, the realization of the uvular /R/ was higher among children in the AB, LP and WC groups. It was comparatively lower in the EC group. The average production of the uvular /R/ by LP, AB, and WC children was above 35%. In LP, the average production was 44.8%, AB 36.4%, and WC 39.7%. Meanwhile, the average production by children from the East Coast was only 8.1%.

The realization of this variable in LD differentiates children with mothers from Aceh Besar, Leupueng, and West Coast areas from those with mothers from the East Coast. This seems to be related to the fact that the /r/: /R/ distinction is a divider between East Coast Acehnese speakers compared to Aceh Besar and West Coast speakers (Asyik, 1987).

As /R/ is shared by Aceh Besar speakers (including LD) and speakers from the west coast, the use of this variable by children with this background does not correspond to the origin of mothers from LD and Aceh Besar and West Coast. For example, the top three highest rates of use of /R/ are LP7, WC3, and AB2. These three children represent different areas of Aceh Besar and the west coast. LP7, with 66 % of /R/ use, has an LD speaking mother; WC3, with 61 percent, has a mother who speaks the West Aceh dialect and AB2, with 54 percent use of /R/, has a mother who came from another
locality/area of Aceh Besar. Most children with Aceh Besar and West Coast mothers have a rate of realization of /r/ as /R/ greater than 25 percent, and all the children whose mothers come from the east coast have below 20 percent. The exceptions are LP5, WC2 and LP1. Although their mothers are speakers of either LD or Lamno on the West Coast, their rate of LD realization of this variable is very low. Table 20 compares rates of use of V4 by each child.

Table 20: Variation in the Use of Variable 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Non-LD realization</th>
<th>LD realization</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2.7 Variation in the Realization of Central Diphthongs

Variable 3, which has the highest realization in LD represents a merging of the central diphthongs /ie/, /ue/, and /eue/ which are merged into single vowels in their LD realization. This Variable was realised 100% of the time in LD by two children from the Aceh Besar group, who did not have central diphthongs across the data. Children from the LP group had a rate of 88.5% realization in LD for this variable. WC children also merged the diphthong at a rate of 82.7%. Meanwhile, children from EC had an average LD realization of 73% for this Variable.

Although the children in the LP group had a relatively high realization in LD for this Variable, there were two who were found to keep the diphthongs, a number of times.

In general, despite high realization of V3 in LD among the children in general, another two, EC4 and LP1, had less LD realization than non-LD. EC4 did not realise this variable at all in LD form and LP1 merged the central diphthongs only three times out of eight encounters with this variable. EC4 had an EC mother. LP1, whose mother is a strongly LD accented speaker, also had more realization in non-LD, in which he keeps the diphthongs, than LD form for this variable.

Other children whose mothers are LD speakers showed a high frequency of LD realization of V3, although they still used the non-LD form a number of
times. In one case, a child, realised V3 in LD 31 times and slipped once and used the non-LD form, which means that she used the central diphthong. Another had 48 realizations in LD of this variable and also had 8 non-LD realizations. Two other children had similar patterns: realising V3 44 times in LD and only using the diphthong once, and realising V3 14 times in LD and 5 times in non-LD.

The high frequency of V3 realization in LD is also contributed to by children with non-LD mothers. In one case, a child whose mother is from the east coast and whose father who identifies himself as a Leupueng person, had 33 V3 realizations in LD and only 7 in non-LD.

There were three other similar cases: a child whose mother is from Lamno realised V3 in LD 32 times and 5 times in non-LD; one whose mother is from Lhong had 21 realizations in LD and two in non-LD; and another, whose mother is not an Acehnese speaker, realised it in LD 62 times and only 3 times in non-LD. Additionally, one child used this variable in LD 66.6% of the time in the following words: /leupung/ ‘Leupueng’, /teubit/ ‘get out’, /saleum/ ‘greeting’, /ceu/ ‘scratch’, /ureung/ ‘people’, /jeut/ ‘ok’, /kaleuh/ ‘be done’, and /ujeun/ ‘rain’.

There were also five children who always realised V3 in LD forms, but four of the five children have non-LD speaking mothers. AB2 and AB1 both have Aceh Besar mothers, and EC2 and EC3 both have East Coast mothers. LP5 is the only child with a Leupueng mother who reduced these three central
diphthongs into single vowels. Table 21 shows comparison of use LD and non-LD variants of V3 by children.

**Table 21: Variation in the Use of Variable 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Non-LD realization</th>
<th>LD Realization</th>
<th>Mother background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>East Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>West Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>West Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>West Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Non Acehnese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>East Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>East Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>East Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Aceh Besar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Aceh Besar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Leupueng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>East Coast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7.2.8 Children with Low LD Use**

There were three children who are found to have the lowest acquisition of LD variants. They do not fall into one specific group and come from the LP and EC groups. The rate of LD variant use among these children was below 10%.
7.2.9 Children with High LD Use

There are five children with a high rate of use of LD variants. The rate of use of LD above 20% can be comparatively classified as high frequency. This high frequency of LD use is also not dominated by children from one particular group – between them, the five children represent all four groups.

7.2.10 Four Illustrative Cases

There is a correlation between the mother’s previous travel experiences and the children’s language use. In the group of children whose mothers were from East Coast, a child whose mother had never lived anywhere apart from their places of origin retained the lowest percentage of LD features. Similarly, for children whose mothers had had more travel experience, the tendency to accommodate others seemed to be higher.

First, LP7, whose mother is an LD speaker and whose father is also a Leupueng Dialect speakers, had a rate of retention of LD features as high as 37%. However, the case of LP1 was different: her mother is also an LD speaker but his retention is only 5 %. EC4’s mother is from the East Coast and whose father is from Leupueng. In contrast to LP7, she retained zero percent, which was expected considering her mother’s background from the east coast. But EC5, whose mother is from the East Coast, had a retention of 21%, which was equivalent to the average percentage of children where both
parents are local dialect speakers. It seems likely that the background of mothers and their experience with other dialects plays a bigger role in which dialect forms/features their children acquire than other factors.

Assuming that children speak their mothers’ language or the language of their main caregiver, then it seems that mothers who had lived outside their places of origin prior to their marriage tend to make more accommodations to other varieties of the language. Those who had not tended to be less accommodating, an idea suggested by the retention figures. LP7’s mother had never been away from Leupueng for more than a month. LP7 retained the highest percentage of Leupueng Dialect features in comparison to her friends. EC4’s mother had never been away from Jeunieb, her hometown on the east coast, before she married and moved to Leupueng. EC4 did not acquire any of the Leupueng Dialect features. On the other hand, LP1’s mother who is from Leupueng and speaks in a very pronounced Leupueng manner lived in Malaysia for a number of years, and he had a high frequency of dropping his mother’s dialect features. Then, EC5 whose mother had also lived outside of her village on the east coast was more open to Leupueng Dialect features (21% as mentioned before). In other words, children whose mothers are well-travelled tend to be more accommodating to dialect features which are not of their mothers’.

Language and dialect maintenance can also be influenced by other factors such as the attitude of the speakers. The following chapters will assess
the attitude of the parents to determine how the language use of the children can be associated with their parents’ attitude.

7.3 Some Discussion and Conclusions

This chapter has shown that the use of Leupueng dialect features is still evident in the language of most of the children. The frequency of the use of LD features is generally low.

Figure 1: Realization of the Variables in LD ($c_n$) and Non-LD Forms ($x_n$)

Retention of LD features among children with East Coast mothers was much lower than the other three groups. The following figure shows the
comparison between children in the EC group and children in the LP group.

Figure 2 shows that on average, children in the LP group retained more LD forms than children in the EC group. However, on the individual level, it is difficult to say which group retained more, as there is variation among each child in every group.

Figure 2: Comparison of LD Retention in EC Group and LP Group\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{15} While LP Group in general includes children with both parents are LD speakers and whose mothers are LD speakers, LP Group in Figure 2 only includes children whose parents (both father and mother) are from Leupueng.
7.4 Summary

This chapter describes the realization of various features of the Leupueng dialect by children whose mothers come from various dialect backgrounds. Overall, the findings indicate that considerable variation exists among these young speakers but that children whose mothers come from the east coast show the lowest use of Leupueng dialect features. While the frequency of Leupueng specific characteristics was low overall, it was nonetheless found that all the children used these features to some extent. This suggests the relative importance of various linguistic influences on children’s language use. This issue is discussed further in Chapter 9.
CHAPTER 8
Parents’ Language Attitude

Chapters 6 and 7 identified 11 phonological features of Leupueng dialect and their contextual occurrence and illustrated the scarcity of Leupueng dialect features in the language use of the children. This chapter presents an analysis of parental attitudes to the Leupueng dialect. Chapter 8 specifically seeks to explore the attitudes of parents toward the local dialect while the subsequent chapter examines the perceptions that they have about their children’s dialect use.

8.1 Language Attitude and Usage

Although the present study is concerned with the language use of children, parent factors cannot be excluded or ignored as they are the first contact and initial source of the language input for the children. Parents’ language choice is expected to have influence to a certain extent on the acquisition of the language by the children. This chapter deals with the attitude of parents who live in Leupueng towards the Leupueng dialect, and their language choice/use. By understanding the attitude and language use of the parents and observing the language use of the children, it will be possible to estimate to what extent parental factors and child language use are related. There are some studies which suggested that there is inconsistency between
one’s attitude and his or her linguistic behavior or language choice under certain situational duress (Maitz, 2011). However, the attitude of the parents from diverse backgrounds who presently live in Leupueng is worth studying, since the context may have its own situational idiosyncrasies, as well as phenomena that are universally shared.

The importance of studying attitude in language contact situations, and thereby dialect contact situations, is because a person’s attitude can impact on his or her language choice to a certain degree. At a micro level, in conversations between people who come from different groups and speak different language varieties, attitude can result in either a divergence or convergence situation (Giles and Johnson, 1987). Divergence is a situation where some members of a group accentuate their ethnolinguistic characteristics (language, dialect, etc.) when conversing with outgroup speakers, while convergence is a situation where some members of a group converge towards or accommodate outgroup speakers by attenuating their linguistic distinctiveness. The divergence situation, according to Giles and Johnson (1987), can be a special case for language maintenance as this is a face-to-face strategy which may be an example of language maintenance in a context when an outgroup language is the societal norm. In this context, ethnolinguistic differentiation can lead to considerable social disadvantages. This chapter explores the attitude of both Leupueng parents (Leupueng dialect
speakers) and non-Leupueng parents (other dialect speakers, including the standard dialect speakers) and how their attitudes affect their language choice in different situations.

The first part of this chapter (8.2) reports the results from the attitude questionnaire. It was used to obtain data for parental attitude and was designed to explore the three components of language attitude: knowledge, evaluation of the dialect, and language use (Ladegaard, 2000). Questionnaire responses are used for the purpose of illustrating the parents’ attitude towards the Leupueng dialect. The second part of the chapter provides a more detailed explanation of parental attitudes based on interviews. The interview was also designed with reference to the ‘tripartite model’ of language attitude developed by Ladegaard (2000). Interview responses provide the context to the respondents’ responses to the questionnaire. The interviews explored the motivation behind the language attitude and language use of the parents, the research participants, and the extent to which the continuum of their attitude has impact on (can be associated with) their children’s language use. In addition, the interviews addressed parental language use, past experience, knowledge of varieties of Acehnese, denial and awareness/confession of shifting and accommodating, their emotions and perceptions, as well as identity and affiliation. All these aspects are discussed in the following
frameworks/concepts: dialect contact, overt and covert prestige, (the mutual influence of) attitude and intelligibility, and code-switching.

8.2 Questionnaire Results/Attitude of the Parents

The result from attitude questionnaire shows that the attitude of Leupueng parents and the attitude of non-Leupueng parents are not very different. For the complete list of the questionnaire items or statements, see Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 on pages 293 and 294 respectively.

On the four-point Likert Scale questionnaire (which asks the participant to indicate whether they Agree, Partly Agree, Partly Disagree, or Disagree), the tendency value of Leupueng parents was measured at 3.27 and Non-Leupueng parents at 2.95 as shown in Figures 3 and 4. Both values are leaning towards positive as they are above the middle value of the scale at 2.5. Leupueng parents scored slightly higher than non-Leupueng parents which is not surprising. Figure 3 illustrates the average tendency measure of Leupueng parents. LPQ1 to LPQ10 are positive statements about the Leupueng dialect while LPQ11 to LPQ13 are negative statements about the Leupueng dialect.
The overall average of the central tendency value is 3.27, which is above the middle score of scale point (2.5 on 1 – 4 point-scale). There is a difference between the response to the positive statements (LPQ1-LPQ10) and the response to the negative statements (LPQ1-LPQ13). More agreement is shown in the response to the positive statements with the tendency average value of 3.37, while the average value in the response to negative statements is 2.94. The very high tendency values for positive statements means that the agreement rate and/or partial agreement rate are very high among Leupueng parents.
parents, with the exception for LPQ3. It scores 2.38, below the middle value of the scale (2.5). As for the negative statements, two statements also score high. The other statement (LPQ11) scores far below the middle scale score which means the agreement and/or partial agreement rate for this negative statement was notably high. Both LPQ3 (“I always use the Leupueng dialect even when speaking to people from outside Leupueng”) and LPQ11 (“When speaking to people from outside Leupueng, I always try to accommodate to their way of speaking”) contain similar content related to the idea of switching dialect and accommodating other dialect speakers, but the two items were worded differently in such a way that one is favourable to LD and the other is unfavourable to LD. The accommodation phenomenon will be discussed further below.

As previously mentioned, non-Leupueng parents also demonstrate a positive attitude to LD, which is indicated by the high average tendency values (2.95) of their responses to the questionnaire. The following figure is an illustration of the attitude tendency of non-Leupueng parents towards the Leupueng dialect.
As shown in Figure 4, the attitude tendency of non Leupueng parents is also positive with the overall average value of 2.95, slightly lower than that of LD speakers (3.27, as above). As in the case of LD speakers, the non-LD speakers also rated higher in their responses to the positive statements (NLPQ1-NLPQ7 with tendency value 3.01) than to negative statements (NLPQ8-NLPQ12 with tendency value 2.87). As illustrated in Figure 4, there were also two items that received low ratings from non-Leupueng speakers.
They are NLPQ6 (“I often remind my spouse to spend more time with my child so that my child will learn the Leupueng dialect”) and NLPQ8 (“Sometimes I can’t help but laugh (at the way LD speakers speak) when listening to Leupueng dialect being spoken by its speakers”).

Despite the commonly held view which suggests lack of preference for a minority dialect, including in Aceh (Zulfadli, 2014), there is no extremely negative attitude and evaluation of Leupueng dialect by non-LD speakers shown in Figure 4. This point is addressed further in Section 8.4, regarding overt and covert prestige. The remainder of this chapter discusses responses to the questionnaire and looks at the context and motivation behind the responses, making use of data obtained through interviews where participants had the opportunity to elaborate on their responses. The data from interviews has been organised into the following themes: awareness, emotion, evaluation and accommodation, and codeswitching as an important part of language use in the context of bidialectism.

Although different sets of questionnaires were given to each group, there are three items that received similar responses from both LD speakers and non-LD speakers. They are LPQ1 and NLPQ1, LPQ4 and NLPQ4, and LPQ8 and NLPQ7. The first is the awareness of differences and distinctiveness of Leupueng dialect. The agreement rate on this item is very high in both groups (LD speakers rated 3.95 and non-LD speakers 3.93), which indicates that both
LD speakers and non-LD speakers are aware of the distinctiveness of the Leupueng dialect. The second is the wish for the children to speak the Leupueng dialect when they grow up. Although the average response to this item by both groups was positive, LD speakers rated substantially higher (3.71) than non-LD speakers, who rated it just above the middle of the scale at 2.67. However, the non-LD speakers group also rated very high on NLPQ5 (“I do not mind if my child grows up speaking the Leupueng dialect”) which essentially carries similar meaning but less emphasis. The third is the wish for the people married to LD speakers to be able to speak the Leupueng dialect. On this item, LD speakers also rated substantially higher (3.62) than non-LD speakers (2.60). For the LD speakers group, they also rated their wish for other LD speakers to keep the dialect at 3.86, which was higher than their wish for non-LD speakers to speak Leupueng dialect.

Most items of the questionnaires were rated positive on the average (above the value of median) by both groups but there are items that received ratings below the median value. Item LPQ11, which is a statement not in favour of LD, received a low average agreement rate of 1.95 from LD speakers. This indicates that most Leupueng parents would attenuate their LD features in their encounter with non-LD speakers. Unlike LD speakers’ response, non-LD speakers rated 2.87 on a similar item, LPQ3, which asked them to rate the possibility to switch to LD when speaking to LD speakers – in other words, the
rating indicates that almost half of the respondents would not switch to LD. Two items were rated below the median by non-LD speakers, one is in favour of Leupueng dialect, NLPQ6 (“I often remind my spouse to spend more time with my child so that my child will learn the Leupueng dialect”) which was rated 2.40, and the other is a negative statement about LD, NLPQ8 (“Sometimes I can’t help but laugh (at the way LD speakers speak) when listening to Leupueng dialect being spoken by its speakers”) which was rated 1.93. Item NLPQ6 indicates a strong commitment to LD that is not suggested among non-LD speakers. Item NLPQ8 implies that LD is low-prestige and most non-LD speakers agreed with this statement, which is indicated by the low disagreement rate (1.93).

In the questionnaire set for Leupueng parents, the knowledge component is represented in statement LPQ1, emotion and perception components in statements LPQ2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, and 13, and language use component in statements LPQ3, 7 and 11. Thus, the overall tendency average of perception components is 3.45, which is very positive; and the overall tendency of language use is 2.51, which is relatively low considering they are LD speakers.

In the questionnaires given to Non Leupueng parents, NLPQ1 represents the knowledge components and NLPQ3 represents the language use component. The remaining items of the questionnaire set are related to the
emotion and perception of the respondents regarding the Leupueng dialect. The overall average of tendency of perception components in non-LD speakers group is 2.86 which is similar to the language use average which is rated 2.87.

The overall results of the questionnaire’s responses suggest that both LD speakers and non-LD speakers have a positive attitude toward the Leupueng dialect, with LD speakers having higher tendency rate than non-LD speakers. However, certain items also have negative ratings by both LD speakers and non-LD speakers, which shows an awareness of the social connotations of language among all speakers in Leupueng. These issues are discussed further in Chapter 9.

8.3 Context and Outcome of Dialect Contact in Leupueng

8.3.1 Local Variations

Although Leupueng is a small community consisting only of 6 villages, there are also language differences between these villages. The differences are believed to be the result of different history of some of the villages. The most frequently mentioned local variety is Layeuen, which was named as a village by people who had come from other areas, especially Lampuuk. Their settlement was later than other villages such as Lamseunia and Desa Mesjid. Lamseunia is believed to be the oldest and the origin of other villages in Leupueng, based on stories passed around in the community. One respondent
said “They [Layeuen people] are also different because they say *meujak woi u Leupueng siat* ‘I want to go home to Leupueng for a while’ instead of saying *meujak woi u Lamseunia* ‘I want to go home to Lamseunia’, which implies that Lamsuniya is the *mother village* of Leupueng.

Regarding dialect differences, most participants say that although Layeuen belongs to Leupueng, their dialect bears the characteristics of Lhok Nga, a neighbouring area. As one interviewee commented: “They [Layeuen people] are similar to Lhok Nga. [They say] *Ho ka meujak* ‘where are you going’.” The word *meujak* ‘go’ in Layeuen does not reflect the phonological characteristics of Leupueng dialect (Variable 8), as in Leupueng the pronunciation is *meujèk* instead of *meujak*. Examples of differences were also given by a woman from Layeuen who is now married to a man from Leupueng, when asked if she noticed the distinctiveness of LD. “Yes, I know. It is different. Sometimes even between villages in Leupueng, there are differences. Here [in Lamseunia] they say *lhai* for *lhèe* ‘three’. We in Layeuen say *lhèe*. We say *jeuèe* ‘winnower’, here they say *jeuai*. Here they say *batai* ‘stone’, we say *batèe*.” The last three examples are the phonological variables that belongs to Variable 1 (V1).

Layeuen is not the only village to show differences from other Leupueng villages; other villages also have distinctive characteristics. Since no study has been performed to investigate these differences, the knowledge of these
variations is only based on reports from some participants in this study. Based on observation of some participants, the LD version of Meunasah Bak U is said to have some differences from the one spoken in Lamseunia, for instance. “Kamoi leubèh halôh” “We [in Meunasah Bak U speak] softer” said the mother of LP2; she was born in Meunasah Bak U, one of the villages of Leupueng about 1 km from Lamseunia. She added “Awaknyoe leubèh meuteugön lom nibök kamoi” “[the speech of] these people [Lamseunia] is more suppressed than ours.” She used the word meuteugön, “suppressed”, to describe Lamseunia as opposed to leubèh halôh, “softer”, which is her description for LD in her village of origin. Her description of meuteugön becomes clearer when she compares Meunasah Bak U, Lamseunia, and Pulôt, another village in Leupueng. “Awak Pulôt leubèh meutegön lom.” [People in Pulôt are even more suppressed.]

8.3.2 Contact with Other Dialects

Before the tsunami, the interaction of Leupueng dialect speakers with speakers of other dialects was limited to those who frequently travelled and stayed outside Leupueng. In Aceh Besar in general, people may find and encounter different dialect speakers just by travelling two or three villages away (Durie, 1985). This is because of the dialect diversity in this region as the result of longer settlement of Acehnese speakers in this area, compared to other Acehnese speaking regions. This has led to the innovation of distinct
varieties in different communities. Other regions, such as Pidie, Pasè, and East Aceh, are mostly uniform linguistically as a result of more recent settlement in these areas (Durie, pers.comm. 2013). Based on information from interviews, there are two modes of interaction wherein contacts with other dialect speakers occurred: short trip and long stay (ranto).

An example of a short trip might be going to peukan (‘market’) to the city centre of Banda Aceh or the markets within the vicinity of Banda Aceh. In this short trip, they observe the different speech of other speakers who come from different places. Leupueng dialect speakers will also observe reactions from other dialect speakers upon hearing the speech from Leupueng.

Recounting on her experience going to the market, the mother of LP8 says:

“Sometimes, when we go to Peukan Aceh, where [there are] many people from Sigli [running businesses], they would ask ‘Sister, you are from Leupueng, aren’t you?’ they can spot us right away. ... When they listen to us speak to each other, they would guess us either from Lhok Nga or Leupueng.”

LP8’s mother was also able to detect a person’s dialect as she mentioned that there are many people from Sigli, an area on the east coast where the Pidie dialect, a variety very close to the standard, is spoken. Other dialect speakers are also able to recognise a Leupueng dialect speaker although sometimes they mistake a Lhok Nga dialect speaker for a Leupueng dialect
speaker. (Leupueng and Lhok Nga are two neighbouring localities separated by Glé Judah (Hill of Judah); this also recalls the interviewee’s comment mentioned above about speech in Lhok Nga versus Layeuen).

Another story involving a short trip was given by a Leupueng father who insisted that Leupueng people’s contact with other dialect speakers was scarce and limited to asking questions such as directions to strangers. Asked if he had ever encountered and interacted with people from other dialect backgrounds before the tsunami, he said,

“... lagè nyo meurumpok, maksud jih nteuk bak ta jak-jak lagè nyojih, bak ta-jak ta piyôh ta-teumanyong meseu jih, [meu]seu meujak [u] rumoh pulan meseu, kan, kan, teu-manyong, jak jak kan ‘salamlekom’ ‘wa’alaikom salam’, ‘pak lake tulông tanyong rumoh si pulan nyo pat?’ paléng lagè nyan mantöng, rumoh nyo, rumoh bang nyo pat, meseu lagè nyan rumoh nyo, rumoh bang nyo pat meseu lagè nyan... di pat mantöng lagè nyan.”

“... this is how you met them, I mean when we travel around, we would stop by at certain places, to ask for direction and location. For example, we want to go to Fulan’s house, we need to ask people for directions. You go [and greet them] ‘Assalamualikum’ [they would reply] ‘Walaikumsalam’. 'Sir, may we ask direction to get to Fulan’s house?’ That’s it. You would ask for directions to this house, that house, this brother’s house, that brother’s house, for example ... you would do that wherever you go.”

His example of a short trip is in addition to some other LD speakers who had a job visiting other villages to sell fish.
The other mode of contact before the tsunami was *ranto*. This is a practice where young men leave their home area for an extended period of time to seek their fortune (Durie, 1985, p.89). Going on *ranto* (*meuranto*) was one of the most widespread traditions within the Acehnese community. Although people from Pidie were known for this tradition, some people in Leupueng, even some women, also went on *ranto*. Destinations of the *ranto* are usually more urban places within the province like Banda Aceh, large cities in other parts of Indonesia such as Medan and Jakarta, and overseas destinations such as Kuala Lumpur and Penang, both in Malaysia. LP1’s mother is one of the Leupueng women who went on *ranto* to Malaysia before the tsunami for two years. In Malaysia, she was friends with a number of Acehnese speakers who spoke different dialects. Most of them were speakers of east coast dialects such as Pidie and North Aceh. As a result of this encounter, she is very familiar with the use of the standard dialect as she was always exposed to it and used it when she was in Malaysia. Frequent code-switching occurred when she had to speak to east coast dialect speakers, for intelligibility reasons. This is what LP1’s mother had to say when asked if she has always used the Leupueng dialect:

“... sama droe-droe ya ... nyo ngon gop hana muphom gop...nyo ngon gop, gop aju ta seutot ... awak Leupueng bahasa Leupueng lah biatsê ... Ngon awak luwa, lon kalon kiban gop marit, meunan lon marit ... na tom lon marit aju bahasa Leupueng, nyan ikheun le awaknyan, ‘hana lon teupeu ilon bahasa droeneuh’... watee di Malaysia, bahasa awaknyan lah ... han Roh teumaRit bahasa Leupueng... awaknyan hana iteupeu....”
“...with our own people, yes (I would use LD) ... with others, they wouldn’t understand... with others, I would follow them... with Leupueng people I would of course use the Leupueng dialect as usual... with outsiders, I would observe how they speak, then I would speak like them... I tried once to go on and use the Leupueng dialect, then they said, ‘I can’t understand the language that you use... when I was in Malaysia, I would of course use their dialect [the dialect of other Acehnese speakers in Malaysia] ...we would not use the Leupueng dialect... they would not understand...’”

Similar to LP1’s mother, LP2’s mother was also exposed to other Acehnese dialects when she was on ranto. While LP1’s mother was on ranto for work purpose, LP2’s mother stayed in Medan for a year to accompany her sister who was expecting a child. There are possibly even more Acehnese in Medan than in Malaysia, as it is the closest major Sumatran city to Aceh. LP2’s mother met many people, again, from Sigli, Lhok Sukon and Panton Labu who speak near-Standard and Standard Acehnese. Asked which dialect she would use to speak with those people, she had a similar answer to LP1’s mother and said: “... bahasa awak nyan. ... tapi biasa mantöng, hana yak kheun 'putra’” which means “... their language. But just the usual one. I didn’t go all the way to say putra16 (what).” Then, LP2’s mother continued, “I wouldn’t say peu neubö? “what have brought with you/what have you got?” as Leupueng people

16 The word putra (short for seu atra) “what” is one of the lexical items used by Leupueng people, and possibly other minority dialect speakers, to characterise (stereotypically) the east coast dialect (basa awak timu). The word actually derives from a portmanteau of two words, seu “what” and atra “thing/belonging”, but has been used to mean what. During the fieldwork in Leupueng, local people used this reference many times.
say but I would say *peu neuba?*, emphasizing on her dropping of the LD phonological feature /ö/ for the standard /a/. But she would not say the stereotype form *putra*. “*Awak Panton Labu kôn ’putra neuba’ jikheun.*” “Panton Labuers would say *putra neuba* (instead of *peu neuba*), wouldn’t they?”

LP2’s mother seems to show that she tried to find moderate ground for herself, not “too Leupueng” or “too North”.

After the tsunami, exposure to other dialects increased as people from other parts of Aceh moved to Leupueng as a result of intermarriages. Consequently, Leupueng people have gained more knowledge and awareness of the different varieties of Acehnese, and especially about the distinctiveness of their own dialect.

This awareness has also increased during the tsunami emergency period when they had more intense contact with other dialect speakers. As all of their homes were destroyed, they had to live in temporary shelters shared by many survivors from other areas, mostly from Aceh Besar. Two places where survivors from Leupueng were placed were Mata Ie and Lambarô. In these compounds, they met many people from coastal areas of Banda Aceh and Aceh Besar. While people from Aceh Besar were speakers of a range of dialects, people from Banda Aceh included speakers from different areas outside Aceh Besar – its status as the provincial capital means that people from various
parts of Aceh had migrated there. People in Leupueng were exposed to many
different dialects as a result of living in these shelters.

Another occasion which resulted in exposure to different dialect
speakers is at weddings. One of the main wedding traditions in Aceh is called
Intat Linto. This is when the groom is taken to the home of the bride’s family
in an official ceremony. In most cases, all the men and women in the groom’s
village are invited to join the intat linto entourage. In some cases, the bride’s
family would limit the number of guests expected from the groom’s side,
usually due to their budget for the wedding.

Face-to-face interaction with other dialect speakers paves the way for
diffusion of language features from one geographical area to another (Trudgill,
1986). As a form of contact which provides the opportunity for Leupueng
people to interact face-to-face with other dialect speakers, intat linto may
have been one of the main origin points for the penetration of other dialect
features into the repertoire of LD. Deeper penetration of other dialect features
into Leupueng dialect continued as other dialect speakers moved to Leupueng
for marriage and provided LD speakers with more varied options and a higher
frequency of exposure to other dialects.
8.3.3 Evidence of Awareness

The interactions described above have provided Leupueng people with an awareness of the distinctiveness of their dialect. A number of examples of these differences were given during the interviews. The most frequently given examples by Leupueng parents were words containing phonological features of V1, V2, V4 and V8 such as /hana/ ‘there is no’ (V8), /bajèe/ ‘shirt’ (V1), /woe/ ‘go home’ (V2), /baroe/ ‘yesterday’ (V2 and V4). There were also examples taken from other minority dialects, such as /h’anë/ ‘there is no’ from Lhok Nga dialect, /baRai/ ‘yesterday’ from Lam No dialect, /boh zRin/ ‘durian’ from Lhong dialect, given by parents who were more familiar with those dialects. Some of the examples given are lexical variations such as /cidèng/ ‘cool’ and /bl’èt/ ‘bucket’. Their ability to mention and point out some examples of differences is an evidence of awareness of language varieties.

Many Leupueng parents say that the differences can be easily spotted and there are a number of aspects to them. The following is what the father of LP7 said when asked if he is aware of the distinctiveness of LD.

“Yes, I do. I know. When we listen to them talking we can immediately identify that our language is different from others. The rythm is different. (Other) people are softer. We are rough and not soft.” [Excerpt 1]

Many Leupueng parents said something similar to the father of LP7. They are aware of differences, able to refer to some examples, and tend to
comment on the lack of softness of LD by assigning the following continuum of rather negative qualities to LD as *meuteugön* (suppressed/deep), *keuteukön* (suppressed/deep), *kreueh* ‘strong’, *kreueh bacut* “a little strong”, *janggal*, *hanè gèt* “not good”, *kuReung tsopan* “not very polite”, *gatsè* “very rough”, *bagöh-bagöh* “very fast”, *bakai* “not refined” and *hana meusaneup* “not very eloquent”. The following sections discuss how Leupueng speakers rate and value their own dialect and the consequence of their practice of code-switching and accommodation.

**8.4 Overt and Covert Prestige**

The second component of attitude to language in the Tripartite Model is how people feel and what they believe about their language or language variety (Kristiansen, 1991, in Ladegaard, 2000). Most of the questionnaire items used for this study explore the emotions of speakers in relation to their own speech, and the emotion of speakers of other dialects towards LD. Although the results of the survey show that the evaluation of LD is more positive by LD speakers themselves than non-LD speakers, there are variations in each group in the ways they respond to each of the items related to the evaluation of the dialect.

In the language or dialect contact situation, the evaluation of one’s own variety can be in two forms: *overt prestige* and *covert prestige* (Holmes, 2001). The concept of prestige is subjective and dependent upon those who evaluate
a certain variety. While overt prestige is a positive attitude demonstrated by speakers of a standard dialect to their own dialect, covert prestige is referred to as the positive feelings and evaluations of one who speaks a minority dialect or vernacular which is not publicly recognised. This is the case with the Leupueng dialect.

As noted above, Leupueng parents have very strong feelings about the Leupueng dialect. Responding to LPQ2 most of them agree that they are proud to use LD and some would use it even with speakers of other dialects. One person who partly disagrees misunderstood the word *bangga* ‘proud’ with *peubangga-bangga droe* which means ‘to be self-promoting or bragging’ and said “*keupeue tajèk peubangga-bangga droe?*” which means ‘why should we self-brag about it?’ Then, she continued by saying “*biasa mantong*”. The phrase *biasa mantong*, “nothing special”, is very commonly used by Acehnese to express their neutral position about a certain matter. The phrase can also be used to conceal an unpopular opinion.

Although Leupueng parents acknowledged the lack of modesty of the Leupueng dialect as they reported in interviews, most of them expressed a feeling of pride in their own speech. This feeling of pride comes mainly from the fact that LD is the language of their forefathers who had settled in Leupueng before them. It is the dialect that has become their mark of identity as Leupueng people. Their feeling of pride is closely linked to the feeling of
belonging to their community. The following is a typical response of LD speakers in interview when asked whether they are proud of their own dialect.

*Bangga lah! kiban han bangga ngon basa gampong droe? Basa nenek moyang.*

I certainly am proud! How can I not be proud of the language of my own village? It is the speech of our forefathers.

(T1.L193)

However, the expression of pride (LPQ2) was not always consistent with their evaluations (see LPQ13) and use of LD (see LPQ4, for instance). In interviews, many Leupueng parents suggested that LD is not “the best” variety/dialect and therefore; they would not use it to speak to other dialect speakers. Some LD speakers point out that the variety that they consider “the best” and “the most modest” and “more intelligible” is the dialect of *Awak Timu* (people of the east) and *Awak Aceh Utara* (people of North Aceh).

It is hard for most Leupueng speakers to answer if their dialect is better than others as it is not a black and white matter. On one hand, LD is the subject of pride as it is the dialect of their own home but on the other hand, they understand that their dialect is not as modest as some other dialects. All of them felt the need to elaborate on their response rather than simply agree or to disagree to the LPQ13 statement. In the elaboration, most LD speakers want to demonstrate that they love their dialect but are also willing to provide
reasons of why LD might not be “the best” dialect by applying some quality to it.

Some Leupueng participants gave negative evaluations of LD by characterizing it as kReuh (hard/stiff), kReuh bacut (a little rough), kReuh that (very hard), kuReung sapan (less polite), hanè meusaneup (not modest), hanè gêt (not good), gatsè (rough), leubèh gatsè (courser), panè meusaneut batsè Leupueng! (there is no way for LD to be considered modest), and meuteugön (depressed). These evaluations were usually offered in the context of comparison with some other Acehnese dialects. The following are several statements from Leupueng parents:

*Batsè tanyo tsopan... man lagè tapeugöh bunoe kReuh bacut.*

Our language is polite... but as we said earlier it is a little strong.

(T2.L25)

*Meuno, nyan hanjeut takheun setuju hana seutuju. Basa Leupueng chit kReuh. hanè mandum uReung iteupeu basa Leupueng. Tapi basa Aceh Utara, mandum ureung iteupeu basa Aceh Utara.*

Ok... well, [with] that [matter] we cannot say agree or disagree. The language in Leupueng is indeed strong. Not all people know Leupueng Dialect. But North Aceh dialect, everyone knows North Aceh Dialect.

(T2.L10)
Some speakers of LD point out the roughness of Leupueng dialect without any reservation. The father of LP2 stated directly that LD is not as good as other dialects by providing an example of comparison with the standard dialect. In addition, he also remarked on the notion of correctness by implying that the form used in LD is incorrect.

_Hanè gêt batsè gampông tanyo._

The language in our village is not good.

(T2.L28)

_Meunyo basa aceh nyang butoi ho tajak, kon ho mejêk._

The proper Acehnese is _ho tajak_ [SA: where are you going?], not _ho mejêk_ [LD: where are you going?].

The mother of LP8, however, softened her remarks immediately after saying that LD is very coarse by substituting the word ‘very’ with the word ‘a little’.

_Batse Leupueng gatsè that. gatsè bacut memang batsè tanyo._

Leupueng dialect is very coarse/rude. I have to say that our language is a little rough/rude.

(T2.L47)
Some LD speakers associate LD with its speakers. Leupueng people are often considered “rougher” than people from other dialect speakers. Therefore, this roughness is associated with the dialect, which according to some participants is rude. But this rudeness has somewhat softened after the tsunami as put forward by the father of LP4. Before the tsunami, Leupueng people were very rude and proud and projected the image of arrogance to some outsiders.

_UReung Leupueng kReuh._

Leupueng people were rude/rough/tough.

(Father of LP4)

In an Acehnese dictionary, _kreuh_ is a word to describe a solid substance (Daud and Durie, 1999) and, therefore, it does not hold any negative or positive value. However, when this word is used to describe people’s characteristics its meaning becomes negative. The phrase _kreueh ulee_ ‘hard head’ is used to describe someone who is stubborn. Thus, when the word _kreueh_ is used to describe a speech variety, to some extent it also implies the coarseness of the speech and the rudeness of its speakers. The word _gasa_ (SA version of LD _gatsè_) also carries the same meanings, coarse, rude, and rough (Daud and Durie, 1999).
The word *meusaneup* is defined as polite and chivalrous (Daud and Durie, 1999), which is also the meaning of the Indonesian word *sopan* (polite). When one describes a speech as *hanè meusaneup*, it means the speech sounds less polite or impolite or not elegant. Another word used to describe their own speech variety was *meuteugön* ‘depressed’. This word was used to euphemise the word *gatsè* (rude/coarse) and *kreueh* (strong/hard). Together, these descriptions imply a lack of politeness in the Leupueng dialect.

The word *gatsè* is also often used by Leupueng parents to describe LD. The word *gatsè* which is LD form for the SA’s *gasa*, according to Kamus Aceh Indonesia (Aboebakar et al., 1985, p.245), means *tidak sopan* ‘impolite’. The examples given in the entry for *gasa* imply that the word can describe the nature of *ija* ‘cloth’, *peuneugèt* ‘make’, *narit* ‘speech/words’, *peurangui* ‘behaviour’, *hukôm* ‘law’, *su* ‘sound’, and *adat* ‘custom’. Therefore, the meaning of *gasa* is not only confined to ‘impolite’ but also ‘coarse’, ‘rude’, ‘rough’, ‘inconsiderate’, and ‘loud’. The example given regarding speech is *narit jih gasa* that ‘his speech/words is/are very rude/impolite’.

It is not easy for parents to evaluate their dialect and to state whether it is good or not. There were mixed emotions when attempting to evaluate their own speech variety. There were Leupueng parents who denied the coarseness of Leupueng dialect. The following are some of the defensive
responses to a statement that LD is better than other dialects. Most of these are inconsistent with the widely-perceived roughness of Leupueng dialect.

Meunurot lon, basa droe lah yang gèt. Lon hanè peureumeun peu gop kheun. bah mantong ikheun basa tanyoe hanè gèt.

To me, it is my own language that is good. I don’t care what other people say. Just let them say that our language is not good.

(T2.L101)

Mandum uReung bela basa dro.

Everyone defends his own language.

(T2.L106)

Tanyo payah peugöh setuju. tapi gop peugöh hanè gèt.

We should say agree. But people say it is not good.

(T2.L123)

Nyan hana butoi. bagi awak Leupueng, basa Leupueng nyang leubèh gèt. bagi awak laen, basa dro jih nyang leubèh gèt. nyan untuk tajaga identitas.

That is not right. For Leupueng people, LD is better. For others, their own language is better. That is for us to keep our identity.

(T2.L82)
Meunyo tatanyong bak ureung, pasti ijaweub basa drojih nyang leubah gèt.

If you ask another person, he would answer that his own language is better.

(T2.L73)

Ureung pasti geupeugah ata dro nyang butoi. beuthat ata gop butoi that, pasti peugah ata dro nyang butoi.

People would always say that their own [language] is the correct one. Although other people’s [language] is very right, they would say their own is the right one.

(T2.L63)

Hanè tatu’oh peugöh. meunyo setuju, mungken ureung laen (peugoh basa tanyoe gasa).

I don’t know what to say. If I agree, maybe other people [think that our language is coarse/impolite].

(T2.L52)

Situju (basa tanyo leubah get). i gampong dro (basa droe). awak laen pasti ipeuruno basa dro.
We agree [that LD is better] for our own place [our own language]. Other people would also teach their own language.

(T2.L37)

Situju, tanyoe harus tapeugah basa Leupueng nyang leubeh get, bah iteupeu le gop basa Leupueng kiban.

Yes, we must say *basa Leupueng* is better, so people understand what Leupueng dialect sounds like.

(T2.L17)


If you are from Leupueng, you would not say that Leupueng dialect is not good. You have used it since you first used the language. If you think it’s not good, you would not use it. So, for a Leupueng person, Leupueng dialect is always good. So, there should not be a judgment that Leupueng dialect is not good, or odd.

(T2.L5)

Nyan teugantung bak maseng-maseng. Basa tanyo kon sopan chit kon?

That really depends on the people (individuals), ... our language is also quite polite, not that rough, right?
Evidently, Leupueng people have mixed feelings and complex attitudes about their dialect. Their responses express a range of opinions about their own dialect ranging from high pride to low. Also, at an individual level, Leupueng people want to feel proud of their own speech but at the same time acknowledge that other people may have different opinions on the politeness or “softness” of Leupueng dialect and therefore, it is difficult for most of them to give a straight answer to the question. This is consistent with the definition of covert prestige.

8.5 Accommodation to Other Dialects

According to Trudgill (1986), dialect accommodation can lead to a shift of the dialect into a new interdialect or formation of a new dialect. He argued that if a speaker accommodates a certain accent or variety frequently enough, the accommodation may one day become permanent, particularly if attitudinal factors are favourable. This section provides the context of accommodation for Leupueng people.

A person with LD background would use LD mainly with people known to share the same background. This is mostly motivated by group identity. An LD speaker who is heard to speak non-LD with other LD speakers might be mocked in the manner of: ‘ka kapeugōh batsè mejjak hai!’ ‘Hey you are talking mejjak language (Non Leupueng dialect)!’ which is a critical remark.
Although most LD-background parents use LD when they speak, most Leupueng parents acknowledged shifting to other dialects when they interact with speakers of other dialects. This phenomenon is called convergence (Giles and Johnson, 1987), as LD speakers attenuate their linguistic characteristics when conversing with outgroup speakers.

Intra-speaker variability occurs mostly in the context of accommodation. Most Leupueng parents would code-switch when speaking to non-LD speakers, mostly to facilitate understanding. Although code-switching frequently occurs among LD speakers, the characteristics and features of LD can still be identified as it is hard to completely switch to another dialect, especially for those who have not had much experience with other dialects.

Features frequently remaining are most of the less iconic or emblematic features of LD, including the LD /ö:/ SA /o/ or the LD /o/:SA /ö/, the monophthongised diphthongs (merged diphthongs) e.g. LD /i/:SA /ie/, and the alveodental fricative/stop LD /t/:SA /s/. The features that are explainably LD features recognised by the community as ‘dialect’ such as the SA /a/: LD /è/, SA /æ:/LD /ö/, and the SA /èe/:LD /ai/ disappear when they speak with speakers of other dialects, especially with speakers from east coast dialects. When these features are dropped, other speakers would not notice their distinctiveness. The uvular trill /R/, which is shared with most dialects of Aceh Besar and west coast, also often disappears in situations where it occurs on
its own in such words as *baroe* ‘yesterday’, or in occurrences as the second element of the cluster /tsR/ in such words as *tsRah* “wash”, *tsRom* “throw”, and *tsRôt* “fall”. When it disappears, it is usually replaced by the alveolar trill /r/ hence *tsrah*, *tsrom*, and *tsrôt*. These speakers keep the LD /ts/ and drop the LD /R/. This demonstrates the intra-variability in the speech of the parents with Leupueng dialect background and shows that their efforts to shift are not entirely successful, and some LD speech features still remain which can be recognised by speakers of other dialects.

For a Leupueng speaker, there are at least two reasons that motivate their shifting to other dialects. First, as noted previously, LD speakers are aware that LD speech is perceived as odd by others. Most LD parents said in the interviews that they have had the experience, or heard about other people’s experience, of being ridiculed or laughed at by other dialect speakers when they were heard using LD. There is awareness, although a subjective one, that there is a lack of appreciation of LD outside the Leupueng community. Secondly, there is a perception among LD speakers that LD is rather difficult for speakers of other dialects to understand. Therefore, in order to avoid misunderstanding, it is easier for an LD speaker to shift than to expect speakers of other dialects to understand LD speech.

Code-mixing between LD and non-LD variants is a common practice for Leupueng fathers, especially, when they speak to a person from a non-LD
background. Compared to speakers of other dialects who moved to Leupueng, it is easier for Leupueng dialect speakers to switch into a more standard dialect. Therefore, switching codes takes place more frequently among Leupueng fathers married to east coast mothers, who are speakers of the more prestigious North Aceh dialect.

Being speakers of a minority dialect is a dilemma for some Leupueng fathers. The dilemma derives from having to make a choice between feeling proud of being a Leupueng dialect speaker versus being regarded as harsh/rough, impolite, and rude, and between keeping and demonstrating language identity versus risking misunderstanding of their speech by other dialect speakers. Leupueng speakers are worried that their message might be misunderstood if conveyed in LD. Additionally, a dilemma that is faced by most Leupueng parents is that they have to make a choice between using their own dialect and being misunderstood by their children and the mother of their children.

As noted previously, the most prevalent form of dialect contact observed after the tsunami is intermarriage. Not only has such intermarriage impacted the husbands and wives involved, but it has also provided the entire Leupueng community the exposure to different varieties of Acehnese, mostly brought in by the wives who come from other parts of Aceh.
Many Leupueng dialect speakers have had little experience and exposure to other dialects of Acehnese. Their exposure to other dialects is mostly limited to post-tsunami-related events. Their infrequent trips to the city, which they call *peukan*, provides the opportunity for encounters with other dialect speakers such as interactions with shop attendants. Another interaction is related to the jobs of those Leupueng men who are truck drivers and fish vendors.

Truck drivers go to many different areas of Aceh and often as far as Medan, the capital of North Sumatra, where they meet other truck drivers and other men with courier/transport related jobs and who are mostly speakers of other dialects. Most of these drivers transport cement from the cement factory, PT Semen Andalas Indonesia (now La Farge Cement Ltd). The requirements of their job mean that these men need to be more fluent and adaptable with regard to other dialects. They also become more fluent in Indonesian.

Intelligibility is another reason for LD speakers not to use LD when interacting speakers of other dialects. The pride of using their own dialect features is counteracted by a lack of confidence stemming from the perceived unintelligibility of LD. They are afraid of causing misunderstandings and difficulties for others. The experience of many Leupueng dialect speakers who have had encounters with speakers of other dialects teaches them not to use LD unless they speak to other LD speakers. The father of EC2, for example,
said that LD is sometimes quite difficult for speakers of other dialect speakers to understand, referring to his experience going to his wife’s village:

_Nyo meuseu jih lon kuwoe keudeh bak gampong mak jih, watee kupeugah aba meujan payah pakek juRu bicara ilè_

For example, if I go to my wife’s village, I should be helped by ‘an interpreter’.

(Father of EC2)

The use of _juRu bicara_ ‘interpreter’ is an exaggeration to say that someone should help explain what he has to say. This fear was expressed by most of the Leupueng parents when responding to questions about whether they would always speak LD and whether they would use LD with speakers of other dialects. The desire to accommodate was emphasised by those speakers who have had extensive experience of interacting with speakers of other dialects or have outside networks. Those who have not travelled much were more likely to say that they would always use LD. The following are some responses from Leupueng parents who have often travelled.

_Lon meukawen u luwa, jadi kadang meujampu ngon basa luwa karna awak inong awak luwa Leupueng._

I am married to a person from outside Leupueng, so I have to mix it sometimes with outside language because my wife is from outside Leupueng.

(T1.L279)
Meunoe, kadang-kadang basa tanyoe beda... kadang tapeugah A dikira B. Karna basa awaknyan beda dan beda muphom, jadi le that salah paham. Meunyo hana taikot awaknyan beda muphom treuk. Ngon awak luwa meunyo lon hana lon marit basa Leupueng karna awaknya hantom ideungo basa Leupueng.

Well, sometimes, the language that we speak has differences... sometimes, when we say A they would understand it as B. Because their language is different, and their reception would also be different and therefore, there is a potential for misunderstanding. So if we don't try to follow their way, the understanding would be different... With people from other areas, I would not speak basa Leupueng because they have not heard how basa? Leupueng sounds.

(T1.L287)


It depends who you are talking to. When we go outside Leupueng, we will be alone/different/singled out if we use basa Leupueng. In that case we have to follow their language sometimes. But while speaking, basa Leupueng can slip in also sometimes... so it is not possible to use one hundred percent our language. They might not understand.

(T1.L303)
Ngon awak Bireuen, pasti basa Bireuen lon marit.

With people from Bireuen, I would definitely speak the Bireuen dialect. (T1.L377)


With friends [from outside Leupueng], it’s not possible to say ho meujèk [LD version of ‘Where are you going?’], right? But sometimes, I slipped and said it the same way, too [laughs]… If that person says ho meujak [SA version of where are you going?] I would say ho meujak, too. Except when my tongue slips. (T1.L415)

When asked about her motivation to accommodate to other dialects, LP8’s mother said,

Kon karna bek iteupeu tanyoe awak Leupueng, tapi takot hana muphom, keucuali na dua teuh awak Leupueng dan na awak laen deungo, jadi tapeugah basa Leupueng lheuhnnyan awak laen bah ikhém

It is not because I do not want people to know that I am from Leupueng or hide my identity, but I am concerned about their understanding… except when there are two of us and there are others, then we speak LD and they would just listen and laugh. (T1.L421)
Misunderstandings also occurred with their spouses, especially during the first one or two years of their marriage as T1 recalled,

*Kadang linto lon payah that muphom cara lon marit. Na tom sigo, lon kheun aneuk canggok. "Kamoi tungkuk meukheun” geukheun le genyan.*

Sometimes my own husband finds it hard to understand the way I speak. I remember one time, he did not understand when I said *aneuk canggok* [young frog]. “...we say *tungkok* [frog],” my husband said. Are you sure this is a correct translation?”

(T1.L436)

This misunderstanding sometimes is not only due to the pronunciation and lexical differences, but also because of the speed of speaking.

*Meunurot awaknyan tanyo bagah that tamarit, padahai tanyo biasa mantong.*

They think we speak very fast, but it is just our normal speaking speed.

(LP8’s mother)

(T1.L442)
To some, dropping dialect features does not happen directly at the beginning of the conversations, but rather after the realization that the listener is confused.

_Watee awaknyan hana muphom, lon ikot aju basa awaknyan. Watee phon basa dro._

When I find out that they do not understand, then I switch to his/her language. When we started, I would use my own dialect.

(T1.L480)

_Basa dro... hana meuubah lon. Keucuali watee awaknyan hana muphom, nyan ngon basa Indonesia aju._

Yes, my own way... I would never switch. Except when they cannot understand, then I would use Indonesian.

(T1.L361)

There is one parent (father of WC1) who said that he would still use LD when speaking to other dialect speakers although he realises that they might have difficulties understanding him. This is because of his own difficulty in accommodating others.

_Susah that tatiru awaknyan jadi pake basa dro aju, hana ikot awaknyan._
It is very difficult to imitate them so I remain speaking my own dialect, not following their speech.

(T1.L455)

He was the only person who expressed this difficulty. In other parts of his interview, he said that sometimes he code-mixes with Lhong dialect, the dialect of his wife. That might have been caused by the fact that he has not travelled much outside Leupueng and therefore, has less exposure to other dialects. It seems that his statement constitutes his plan for the future as he perceives the difficulty in switching to other dialects. This is in line with the Theory of Planned Behavior in which where the realization of behaviour is determined by the intent to behave by an individual (Ajzen, 1991). Intention is a person’s situation before an action, which can be taken as a predictor of the behaviour and action (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1991, P. 15).

All other speakers have the tendency to accommodate for intelligibility reasons. Almost all Leupueng parents voiced this concern. According to them, it is important to make people understand even if they have to compromise by switching to other dialects.

8.6 An Outsider’s Evaluation of Leupueng Dialect and Its Speakers

EC5’s mother, a woman from Jeunieb, a speaker of North Aceh dialect married to Leupueng, was one of the most articulate and outspoken in her
evaluation of LD. This section contains her descriptions of the dialect of Leupueng.

8.6.1 Awareness of LD Distinctiveness

Non Leupueng parents are also aware of the distinctiveness of the Leupueng dialect, and most of them made comparisons between their own dialects and LD. They were able to point to some examples of the differences they noticed after they moved to Leupueng. Most of these reflected the same variables as given by Leupueng parents, V1, V8, V4, and V2. To them, the most noticeable characteristics of LD are V8, /a/ : /è/ correspondence as in /ayèh/ ‘father’ and V1, /èe/: /ai/ correspondence as in /lhai/ ‘three’. Most of them were amused by these two differences when they first came to live in Leupueng. A number of non-phonological examples were also given, such as LD /cheu/: SA /rului/ ‘shady’, LD /Radôk/: AB /peugöm/ ‘cloudy’ and LD /maRit/: SA /peugah haba/ ‘speak’.

For the non-LD parents, although they were aware that Acehnese has many different dialects, they first learned about LD only when moved to Leupueng. Answering question 1 from the interview, the mother of EC5 said, “Now I know. But when I was about to move here I did not know at all.”

The mother of EC5 commented on her experience in Peukan Aceh (Aceh Market) where people who come from many different places and speak
different dialects meet. “If you notice when you go to the market (in Banda Aceh), the way they speak is not that bad, not as severe as the way Leupueng people speak.”

According to non-Leupueng speakers, in addition to differences in the sound and some vocabulary, the choice of some expressions is also different from their dialects. As expressed by the mother of EC5, “Our people, if they want to ask where someone has been, they say panè neu-wo ureung droen neuh? “Where have guys come from?” They say that. Here people say panè bhan? “where have [you] just [come from/been]?” Non Leupueng parents were surprised when they first learned the differences but as they have now lived there for a number of years, they have become familiar to the sound of LD; they still have a range of opinions and willingness to use the dialect.

8.6.2 Knowledge of Varieties

EC5’s mother demonstrated significant awareness of the differences between speech in North Aceh compared to Leupueng. She was consistently able to give examples of the differences.

“beda kamo hidéh meunyo kuweh kheun sikrèk kan, meunyo sinoe sikrak” ‘They are different. We over there refer to a cookie ‘sikrèk’, here the say ‘sikrak’”.

[Sikrak or sikrèk means ‘a piece of’.]
There were other times when she seemed less aware or confused by differences. At one point, EC5’s mother was asked “jadi seumeurah peu kheun kak?” (‘So what is seumeurah ‘doing laundry’ called here, sister?’). She answered, “seumeurah cit seumeurah ija cit kheun lagè nyan” (‘they also say seumeurah, like that’). In this case, EC5’s mother either misunderstood the question or was not aware that there are phonological differences in this word between Leupueng and other dialects. She might have understood the question as referring to a lexical difference, not phonological; and therefore, her response was that the word is the same both in Leupueng and Standard form. She was not concerned with the pronunciation. But when she was asked again if she was aware that tsRah is used in Leupueng, EC5’s mother agreed. “‘eu, meunyo hino tʁah” ‘yes, here they say tRah”.

The word seumeurah is the affixed form from SA rhah ‘wash’. Therefore, the difference did not occur to EC5’s mother as the correspondences show tangible difference in their base forms, i.e., SA rhah : LD tsRah. Regarding the base form of this word, Mark Durie (pc) suggests that the base form of this word is seurah. Therefore, in Banda dialect (BD), including Leupueng dialect, it is shortened through the epenthesis process and becomes LD srah. As the LD (BD) alveolar fricative /s/ is realised as an alveodental stop /ts/ [tʃ], the base form in LD becomes tʃah. Other words with this structure are rhom and rhot. There is a need to seek an explanation of
the SD plosive alveolar thrill /rh/ across a range of list with where this feature occurs in an initial syllable.

Another time when EC5’s mother seemed unaware of differences between the Leupueng dialect and her own variety is when she was asked how the local people say ‘ho meujak’? EC5’s mother seemed to be thinking if LD speakers had a different phrase to ask the same question. When asked, “nyë hino pu t(r)a geu-kheun ah” (‘here, how do they say it here’), she replied, “ho meujak cit geu-kheun” (‘they also say ‘ho meujak’ here’). EC5’s mother answered in terms of the choice of expression rather than the phonological elements in that expression.

There is a clear phonological distinction between the version of ‘ho meujak?’ as in the interviewee’s native dialect, and the LD speakers’ version of it. This utterance is pronounced ‘ho meujèk?’ by LD speakers. A person who is new to the community would generally be able to identify immediately that it is different from SA. Indeed, as mentioned before, the phrase ho meujèk is strongly associated with LD by speakers of other dialects. It appeared that EC5’s mother is so familiar with the expression after living for 6 years in Leupueng that she was not able to immediately reflect on the phonological distinctiveness of the expression.

The expression ‘ho meujak?’ in Acehnese is a frequently used expression in daily conversation. It means ‘where are you going?’. The function of this
expression in Acehnese is not only literal, but also is used as a polite greeting between people in state of motion or on a journey, or generally any situation where it can be perceived that someone is going to a certain place or in a certain direction. The response does not have to be an accurate description/answer of one’s destination. It is very often that the response is merely ‘hana, lon meu jak keunan siat’ (‘nowhere specific, I am going there for a moment’). The word ‘keunan’ ‘there’ is a general location which refers to a relatively close location as opposed to ‘keudeh’ (‘there (farther than keunan’)) which refers to a relatively more distant location.

EC5’s mother was consistently able to point to a number of words that show lexical or phonological differences between her dialect and LD. Words recalled by EC5’s mother throughout the interviews include: Cheu vs reuluy, sikRak vs sikrek, ayèh vs ayah, aneuk vs sinyak, boh panèh vs boh panah, and panè bhan vs panè woe.

Although EC5’s mother said that she encountered many dialectical differences in Leupueng, there were some that she had heard before as she had lived for some years in Banda Aceh. She used to live in Lampulo, an area in Banda Aceh famous for fish landing. This area is linguistically diverse as it is inhabited by people from different parts of the province.
8.6.3 Experiences of the Leupueng Dialect

Sometimes, the way the Leupueng speakers speak is difficult to understand for Non-LD speakers. The case of téhmarhèh is one example. EC5’s mother said that she did not know the woman’s name and she had no idea that it turned out to be Teh Mariah, ‘Aunt Mariah’. The form in LD has gone through a number of changes that resulting in reduced intelligibility for non-LD speakers like EC5’s mother.

The first shift is related to /SD a: LD è/, so that SD: marijah → (changed to) LD marijèh. Another shift involved /SD r: LD R/ rule, so that SD: marijah → LD maRijèh. As Acehnese is a language with monosyllabic and disyllabic lexicons (Durie, 1985), this already shortened name was shortened again into a two-syllable form. This time the vowel of the middle syllable /i/ and the onset consonant of the last syllable /j/ were lost. Apparently, the vowel /i/ does not occur in the middle of long words in Leupueng dialect. Therefore, the change sequence is as follows, marijah → marijèh → maRijèh → maRèh.

Mariah is a shortened form of Kamariah. It is very common in Acehnese to shorten a person’s name; three or more syllable names are normally shortened by using only the last two or three, or even one syllable of the names. Therefore, Kamariah could easily be shortened to Mariah. Syama’un might be called Ma’un; Ismail could be called ma’e; Iskandar shortened to kandat. However, the shortened form can also take only the first one or two
syllables of the names. Therefore, Kamariah might also be called Kama, Syama’un can be called Syam, and Iskandar can only be called ih, in this case the first syllable of the name with an adaptation of the syllable’s end into the Acehnese phonological system from /s/ to /h/. These changes indicate the level of difficulty and complexity a person who does not speak LD might have to go through to understand LD.

EC5’s mother also recalled a moment of confusion that occurred shortly after she moved to Leupueng.


‘I was [we were] going to Sarah [the River]. [Here] If you want to ask ‘you are coming home from where?’ it’s ‘panè ban’, right? [So I was asked like that.] I just laughed and I did not respond, because I did not understand, right? When that person was gone, I asked my husband. My husband speaks the dialect of this place. I said to him ‘What did that person just say?’ ‘When, which one?’ he asked. I said ‘the one that just
greeted us. She asked ‘*pane ban*’. [In SA *ban* generally means ‘tyre’.] My husband said, ‘oh, she asked where we have been’, then I said ‘I see... I was like a fool, why does she speak like that?’ but after that day, when I met people I would be the one to ask the question first.”

EC5’s mother said that there are significant differences between variants in her dialect and LD. According to her, *panè ban* in LD and *panè neuwoe* in her dialect are very different and will cause great misunderstandings to respective speakers. “*meseu tanyo hantom ta-deungo beutôy-beutôy bangai*” (‘If we had not heard it before we would look really stupid’). The two lexical variants, *panè ban* and *panè neuwoe* “where have you been?” which shows that LD and North Aceh dialect differences are not only limited to the phonology, but are also lexical.

### 8.6.4 LD as a Funny and Difficult Dialect/Lack of Intelligibility

The difficulty in understanding or speaking LD is acknowledged by parents with non-LD background. Based on their auditory judgment, LD speech sounds as if it comes mostly from ‘deep in the throat’. An example of this, as pointed out by the mother of EC5, is the expression *téh maRèh* which originally is from *Kamariyah*. To her, it is not clear whether it is a one-word or two-word phrase. To speakers of east coast dialects, there are a number of problems problem with *téh maRèh*. Firstly, there are two variables that are different from their dialects, namely LD /R/ and the LD /è/, which are the last
syllable’s initial consonant and its nucleus vowel. In the dialects of the east coast, these would be /r/ and /a/, respectively. What is referred to as ‘deep in the throat’ in LD is probably the articulation of the SA alveolar trill /r/, which is the LD uvular trill /R/, which is actually located further back in the glottis.

The second problem is that there is a dropping of two consecutive sounds following the /R/ sound. The two sounds that are dropped are the mid-open front vowel /é/ and the semi vowel /y/ that follows /R/. The phrase téh maRèh without the dropping of /é/ and /y/ would be téh maRényèh. Knowing this will help facilitate understanding of the phrase, but now that the form is complete, there is an additional corresponding feature that needs to be worked out by a non-LD speaker, that is V11, the /i/ : /é/ correspondence following the uvular trill /R/. After working out this problem, an east coast dialect speaker is normally able to understand that this is a two-word unit téh and maRényèh, which is in fact, a common Acehnese short form for téh kamariyah – ‘Aunt Kamariyah’, a name derived from Arabic, meaning ‘moon-like’. This is an example of the complexities of LD speech which non-LD speakers have to adapt to. The perceived complexity automatically increases as a number of other equally complex words or units follow in a sentence.

However, we cannot make an exact judgment of what EC5 meant when she said that LD speakers speak from ‘deep in the throat’, as it is probably a way of expressing ‘unintelligible.’ Sometimes, in general, people’s judgment
or evaluation about a language variety is not entirely based on the language or linguistic aspect itself, but more influenced by social and political factors. In reply to a 1950s’ postal questionnaire asking for Scandinavian people’s opinion of the relative aesthetic qualities of Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian, one Norwegian respondent wrote ‘Danish is not a language, but a throat disease’ (Holmes, 2001). Swedish ranked first and Danish was at the bottom. The results reflected not so much the relative aesthetic qualities of the three languages but the political relationship between these three countries. Sweden was at that time the undoubted political leader, while Denmark was in a less influential position. People’s attitude to Swedish and Danish was a reflection of Scandinavian politics rather than the intrinsic linguistic feature of the language. As for EC5’s mother referring to LD as ‘deep in throat’, it could be referring to an intrinsic linguistic quality of Leupueng dialect, or it could also be related to the fact that LD is a minority and low-prestige dialect.

Such complexity and the hindrance to understanding is part of the reason for most Leupueng dialect speakers to switch to other dialects when they interact with other speakers. As in the case of many minority dialect speakers, Leupueng parents’ language use depends on the audience or interlocutors, resulting in accommodation to speakers of more standard dialect. The use of complete LD is limited to interactions involving LD speakers only. When they have to communicate with non-LD users, they tend to shift
away from their own dialect, although sometimes they do not fully code-switch and some LD features are still present in their speech during that interaction. Incomplete code-switching is not only because of their inability to switch but can also be motivated by their dislike of certain features of the dialect they are code-switching to. For example, LP2’s mother said she would not use the North Aceh’s stereotyped putra “what” for peu “what”, as quoted in section 8.3.2 above.

During the interview, the mothers born outside Leupueng were asked about their reactions and perception of LD when they first heard it. Their first reaction was mostly that LD sounds unusual and different. They also had difficulties in understanding the way Leupueng people talk. These mothers were often not able to understand the dialect nor able to participate in conversations.

_Hai janggal, tahë teuh watèe tadeungo gop marit. Peue guepeugah, meunyö lon tujeut tanyong lontanyong. Bèk ikheun bangai that nah._ (Mother of EC2)

It is a little bizarre/unusual, I was stunned when listening to them speaking. I thought ‘what are they talking about?’ Sometimes, I asked when I had the courage to, so that I was not labelled stupid.

The same experience of not being able to understand LD was related by the mother of EC4.
When I first came here, I did not understand. I did not understand the language of this place. When they talked I just said ‘yes, yes’.

And when they asked ‘why are you always saying yes?’ I said ‘who cares? I don’t understand’, then they laughed. We all laughed about it.

A similar reaction was also expressed by EC1’s mother:

*Aneh. Taho lon, pakon meunan jeut geumarit ‘oh. (Mother of EC1)*

Bizarre. I was stunned/confused why are they speaking like that.

LD is also difficult for speakers of Aceh Besar dialects. Two mothers from Aceh Besar also commented on the differences between LD and their dialects. AB1’s mother singled out LD as the most unusual/bizarre/different compared to other Aceh Besar dialects.


It is very different, indeed. Although it is still part of Aceh Raye, when we compare to all other districts of Aceh Raye, here in Leupueng is the
most different/distinctive/bizarre. I have lived here for ten years but I cannot follow the language here.

AB2’s mother said that it is not difficult and there are similarities as well, despite the differences in the way words are pronounced.


It is different from the language I speak in my village. When I first came they used to tease me about my language my language is different from the language here. The language here is not difficult but the pronunciation is different. They say _Radôk ‘cloudy’_ here but we say _peugom._

Some non-Leupueng mothers said that differences are in LD’s sounds, and not so much in the vocabulary. WC1’s mother, from Lhong, West Coast, acknowledged the similarities between her language and Leupueng dialect except in the way LD sounds.

_Kheun-kheun (kata-kata) jih sama. Cuman beda jih ngon awak inoe i Leupueng man kadang beda jih... meuseue lagee haba peugah bunoe...meuse kamoe kheun kon ‘ayah’ meunyoe sinoe ‘ayèh’ tapi ayah chit._
The words are the same. But the difference is like we said earlier. We say *ayah* ‘father’, they say *ayèh*, but it means the same thing.

To mothers from the east coast, some lexical differences were also noticed in LD.

*Beda. Beda kamoe hidéh meuyo kuweh kheun ‘sikrèk’ menyo sinoe ‘sikrak’.*

Different. To describe [a piece of] cake we say *sikrèk* ‘a piece of’ in our village. Here they say *sikrak*.

*BRat that beda. Meuseu inoe ‘ho meujaak’. Meuseue idéh ‘ho keuneuk jak’.*

Huge differences. Here they say *ho meujaak*. In my village they say *ho keuneuk jak* ‘where are you going’.

Two mothers from the west coast, WC2’s mother and WC3’s mother, expressed their preferences in terms of the dialect that they use. While WC2’s mother implied her slight discomfort using LD, WC3’s mother, indirectly express her dislike of the sound of LD.

I do not go along with the language here. I don’t want to. It is just not comfortable. I feel comfortable with my own language. It is difficult for me to use the language of this place. For *honda* they would say *hondè*. They also say *ka matsèk* ‘it’s ready/cooked’ [for *ka masak*]. *Kuah leumòk* [for *kuah leumak*].

Although many of these outside mothers do not prefer to use LD, their language use demonstrated that there are changes in relation to the way they speak, especially the use of LD features which were observed in some of the mothers’ speech during the interview.

**8.6.5 Understanding and Use of the Leupueng Dialect**

EC5’s mother said that she was able to learn and understand LD more easily because she has had some experience with Aceh Besar dialects. As noted above, she used to live in Banda Aceh:

“*sabab na tinggai hino lôn di bandatrép watè masa umu limöng-limöng blah thôn na tinggai lôn di banda kana siplôh thôn. makajih long long meu-kawén hino hana susah bahasa sino walaupun sikrèk dua krèk lôn teupeu*”

‘because I used to live here in Banda for a long time when I was fifteen. I lived there for about ten years. Therefore, when I got married here it was not that difficult to understand the language here. I knew one or two expressions [pieces]’.
From that statement, EC5’s mother implies that Leupueng is still part of Banda for her. This is very common for people from outside Banda Aceh and Aceh Besar. They regard almost all areas of Aceh Besar as a part of Banda Aceh, even if the place in question is separated from the capital by an hour. Linguistically, the region is also diverse.

EC5’s mother used Leupueng dialect features a number of times throughout the interview, seemingly unconsciously. She even used the LD feature of the word (marit ‘speak’) that she pointed out as different from her own dialect, commenting on her own child’s lack of willingness to talk.

**8.6.6 Accommodation of (into) LD**

After living in Leupueng for a number of years, these Non Leupueng mothers noticed that their ways of speaking have altered to a certain degree. Some women insisted that their speech remained the same, but their use of certain features was found to have changed from their own dialect to LD features. Other women acknowledged that this change is inevitable as they have been in Leupueng for many years, although they are mostly not aware of the change. Some of these women reported that it is other people from their place of origin who commented that their use of language had changed.

*padahay lôn pebasaan hana; hana wencana meu-ubah; hana niet meu-ubah meuseu ah; maksud jih tanyo kiban, kiban ta-ba bit nan ju; bit nan ju ta mašit geu-tanyo*
I do not feel that I have changed; and I do not plan to change; I do not intend to; how should I say this; the way we speak is the way people from my place of origin speak; we keep speaking like that.

One woman from the east coast acknowledged the change in the way of her speaking and attributed the change to the length of time she has lived in Leupueng. EC5’s mother explained that her ability to codeswitch has much to do with her time lived in Leupueng.

I have stayed in Leupueng for about seven years, so maybe I have been influenced to a certain degree.

She, however, said that when she returned to Jeunieb, her place of origin, she switches to her own dialect. One of the reasons is the desire to be seen as appreciative to his own language and does not seem as a person who leaves his mother tongue behind.
But when I return to my own village, I follow mostly the features of my own language.

This means that even in her own village, EC5’s mother was aware of her use of some Leupueng features. EC5’s mother added that she was not 100% influenced by the dialect spoken in Leupueng.

EC5’s mother said that on arrival in her village, her way of speaking can be a little different from people there, but after staying for about a week, she gradually switches again to her ‘own’ dialect again.

meuèt lhè uro dua uroe ta-wo nyan meu-beda nyan lagè nyan kan, kan meunyo kana saboh minggu ta-döng hana that lé, geu-ikôt bahasa droe ah

Up to about three or two days, it can be a little different, it is like that. After staying for about a week, it is not that different anymore. It follows my own dialect again.

EC2’s mother is from Panton Labu and has lived in Leupueng since her marriage after the tsunami. Despite the difficulty in understanding LD she encountered when first moving to Leupueng, she now sometimes switches to LD even when speaking to someone in her own village. EC2’s husband reported that he himself speaks in a mixture of dialects, as does EC2.
"For me, my language is already mixed. Why is my language mixed? My child has also spoken her [EC2’s mother] language. But sometimes, I unintentionally/unconsciously use it [LD]. We were just married, it was even worse [she and others in her village would ask] ‘what did you just say, what did you just say?’. Now she herself sometimes, when she goes back to her village, unconsciously uses the language of this place [LD].”

EC3’s mother feels the same way, describing her own language as meujampu-jampu “mixed”. She was told that she had changed, despite the fact that she herself thought that her use of dialect/language was the same.

8.6.7 Perceptions of the Leupueng Dialect

According to EC5’s mother, the difficulty with LD is that it is too often produced from the ‘throat’. This might refer to the tendency towards uvular articulation among Leupueng speakers, which always occurs when pronouncing words involving SD /r/ alveolar trill. EC5’s mother could not recall the differences related to /ho meujak/ when asked how Leupueng speakers
say this expression (as noted above, people from other parts of Aceh generally consider this to be the most prominent feature of the Leupueng dialect).

As mentioned above, EC5’s mother has lived in Banda before and said that it is easier for her to understand LD. However, EC5’s mother noticed that LD is different from other Banda dialects.

**hay memang meunyo bahasa awak leupung ngen bahasa daerah banda aceh na perbedaan jih. meunyo awak banda aceh hana that lagè awak leupung. nye awak leupung terlalu dalam. nye meseu kan meunyo tanyo jak peukan. tanyo jak peukan aceh nyan hana that parah lagè bahasa awak leupung. Ino Parah.**

Indeed, the language of the people of Leupueng is different from the language from Aceh Besar. The language of Aceh Besar is as heavy as that of Leupueng. Leupueng language is too deep. If we go to peukan [market] it is not as severe as the language in Leupueng. Here it is severe.

EC5’s mother compares herself to a friend from the place of origin who is now also married to a man from Leupueng. She recalled her having more difficulties understanding the local Leupueng people speak.
So for example when there was .... For example, when we went somewhere ... for example, once Pak Geuchik’s sister in law, when she was newly residing here, was with the elders here. I knew it at that time [that she would have difficulty understanding]. So sometimes, when the elders were not paying attention, I asked her ‘what did they tell you?’ ‘God knows,’ she said. ‘Why did you nod and say yes?’ ‘there were things that I don’t understand I would just say yes, don’t ask me what. I don’t know. So that they would not know I was that bad [in my understanding of LD]’.

EC5’s mother stressed that she perceived a different attitude in her friend’s interactions with the locals.

I think I don’t want to be a person like that. I don’t know ... ‘what did you just said? (I would ask) I don't understand a word.’ I would ask in
my own language. And the people here understand it. The only thing that they don’t understand is just the same as the thing that we don’t understand about theirs. They would understand it very well, same like us, things that are too difficult.

EC5’s mother is known as a very talkative person compared to other newcomers to the community. However, EC5’s mother has developed a positive attitude to learning (to understand) Leupueng dialect. In the early days of her settlement in Leupueng, she would not directly ask local people about things that she could not understand, but ask her husband instead. But later, she became more direct about this.

8.7 Summary

This section has laid out the attitudinal data of the Leupueng parents who participated in the study. While Leupueng speakers rated LD very positively on the questionnaire, in interviews they provided some information and evaluations of LD which did not entirely reflect the questionnaire results. Accommodation and code-switching were prevalent among LD speakers when they converse with other dialect speakers. From the dialect contact perspective, the convergence phenomenon can work against dialect maintenance. This will be further discussed with more details in Chapter 9.
CHAPTER 9

DISCUSSION

This chapter contains a discussion of the findings of this study as outlined in Chapters 7 and 8. It provides analysis and interpretation of the major findings of the study and places them within the existing literature and the social, cultural and linguistic context of Indonesia.

9.1 Levelling of the Leupueng Dialect

The results of this study suggest that for the 11 variables studied, with the exception of one (the centring diphthongs), the speech of children born in Leupueng after the tsunami has largely diverged from the local dialect, converging towards the norms of the North Aceh dialect, which is a more standard variety. Realization of /ɛ/, the emblematic marker of the Leupueng dialect, appears to be among the least frequent sounds in the speech of the children, irrespective of their parents’ background. The raising of the diphthong /ɛə/ into /ai/, also one of the hallmarks of the Leupueng dialect, has almost completely disappeared in the speech of Leupueng children, demonstrating a strong tendency for convergence towards the standard centring /ɛə/ variant of the diphthong. Other variables also show divergence from the local dialect as their frequency of use by the children was found to
be extremely low (see Table 18 in Chapter 7). Realization of supra local variant /ʁ/, which is also identified as a Leupueng dialect feature in this study, shows a similar tendency to diverge to the standard variant /r/, despite its wider use in most dialects of Aceh Besar and the West Aceh dialect. Although its frequency rate was higher than other variables, the realization of /ʁ/ in the children speech was still less than 40%.

The exception to this is the lenition or monophthongization of three centring diphthongs /iə/, /uə/, and /euə/ into /i/, /u/, and /eu/ respectively. The realization of these three diphthongs by the children reached 87.6%. This is in line with Durie’s (1985) claim that the lenition of centring diphthongs represents the change/trend across varieties of younger Acehnese speakers as a whole where the second element of the diphthongs tend to be dropped. It must be noted, however, that the research this suggestion was based on was carried out more than 30 years ago and may have represented the trend at the time. At present, current circumstances seem to suggest that the changes Durie observed have not persisted. While it is true that lenition of the centring diphthongs occurs among speakers across varieties of Acehnese, the tendency to lenition of diphthongs is only observed among those who are frequently exposed to different varieties of Acehnese as well as to Indonesian, the national language of Indonesia. It is also a phenomenon observable among children who are in the early stages of language development. Once they acquire the speech facility to produce the centring diphthongs, the centring
diphthongs are completely realised the way adults do if the children live within a homogenous speech community where centring diphthongs are used. The high rate of retention of these monophthongised centring diphthongs by Leupueng children and by speakers of different varieties who have a certain level of exposure to different dialects suggests a tendency for speakers to use more simplified variants (monophthongs instead of diphthongs). Monophthongization in contact situations has been widely observed in many linguistic change studies involving different languages (Anderson 2002, Johnstone and Kiesling 2008).

The divergence of Leupueng dialect norms is a prominent phenomenon in language following the tsunami, which served as the impetus for significant change in the linguistic, social, and cultural environment in this region. Based on the direction of change, it can be argued that the Leupueng dialect is undergoing a levelling process in which most of the characteristic Leupueng dialect features have been reduced and replaced by more standard forms. Levelling implies the reduction and attrition of marked variants that belong to minority dialects (Trudgill, 1986a). The Leupueng dialect fits into this definition as a minority dialect for at least three reasons. First, the number of its speakers is relatively low compared to the North Aceh dialect which is considered the standard. Second, many people have difficulty understanding the Leupueng dialect because of its distinctive features and may find its sounds amusing. Third, there is a tendency for interaction between speakers
of the Leupueng dialect and speakers of the North Aceh dialect that go in one direction, where Leupueng speakers switch to the other dialect or at least drop the distinctive features of their own dialect in order to facilitate communication. In other words, Leupueng speakers are aware of the nature of their dialect as perceived by speakers of other Acehnese dialects and try to accommodate to the norms of those speakers. This is consistent with descriptions in the literature of the situation in various language contexts in different locations (see, for example, Trudgill, 1986; Kerswill, 2002; Holmes, 2013), and illustrates one of the pressures on minority dialects which may cause speakers to choose in favour of dropping distinctive features with the aim of supporting more effective communication.

Based on the observations of the Leupueng children in Chapter 7, the levelling process they exhibit in their speech seems to be the result of several emerging factors (Stanford, 2016). Specifically, the impact of multilingualism in the community, kinship issues, and social networks influences seem to be the most prominent of these factors. The idea that children in dialect contact situation do not speak or use the language of their mothers but the language of their peers (Labov, 1972) is widely accepted but may not apply in all language contexts. The findings of this study suggest that both parents, and especially mothers, as well as peers influence on the language use of children in Leupueng. Much of the children’s language resembles that of their peers, but elements used by their parents can be easily heard in their usage. This
was most noticeable in children whose mothers come from the East Coast where the North Aceh dialect or dialects that are relatively close to the North Aceh dialect are spoken.

As noted above, the North Aceh dialect is considered to be the standard dialect of Acehnese. For this reason, there are significant benefits to using it, outside the specific linguistic context of Leupueng. Adult speakers, both from Leupueng as well as from other locations, understand this implicitly; native speakers gain a subconscious understanding of the social meaning of varieties of language in use in their environment, and their sociolinguistic behavior has this implicit understanding as its base (see Durie, 1985; Delvaux and Soquet, 2007; Zulfadli, 2014). The awareness of the social implications of different ways of speaking likely begins to develop in infancy as a child is gradually exposed to the language usage around them. By the time children are old enough to interact outside the home and have been exposed to a variety of adult speakers, they, too, may begin to have the same subconscious reaction to language use that the adult speakers they know do and may, without making any kind of conscious decision, begin to use the type of language they perceive as more socially valuable. The significance of this in Indonesia, which has a very complex language context, cannot be overemphasised.

As a country with more than 700 languages associated with several hundred indigenous ethnic groups and a correspondingly large number of dialects, exposure to and contact with different languages and language
varieties other than their own characterises many people’s language experience (Fanany and Effendy, 1999). This has likely always been the case, but exposure to a wider variety of dialects and language use has greatly increased in recent decades, first because of national development projects implemented by the New Order (1965-1998) government of President Soeharto and, later, under the Regional Autonomy system that was established in 2001. During the New Order period, many rural areas in Indonesia were reached by electricity for the first time, which allowed members of the public to watch television. While the available channels were extremely limited until the early 1990s, television has had the effect of bringing Indonesian, as it was spoken in various parts of the country, into even very remote communities that primarily communicated in a local language. Originally, much of this language use consisted of relatively formal standard Indonesia, such as might be used in news broadcasts, but some entertainment programs and dubbed movies were also available. In 1992, licenses were given to several private companies that allowed for the establishment of private television channels. These new broadcasters focused mainly on entertainment television, and the nature of the industry in Indonesia expanded rapidly. This brought the average person, even in very remote areas, into contact with many more varieties of spoken language that demonstrated characteristics associated with specific regional usages, as well as the more standard type of formal Indonesian. At about the same time,
satellite dishes began to be available, which permitted the public to access foreign channels as well as Indonesian ones. These included broadcasts from Singapore, Malaysia, Australia, and other parts of Southeast Asia and elsewhere depending on the location and size of the dish. As was experienced in many other parts of the world, televisions rapidly became the most common form of entertainment. At the present time, almost 90% of Acehnese aged over 10 years old report having watched television in the past week (BPS, 2014). The children who took part in this study, like other Indonesian children their age, watch television on a regular basis. Indonesian TV programming aimed at this age group makes use of a standard style of Indonesian that is presented especially clearly to facilitate language mastery (see Kitley, 2000).

The impact of technology on language exposure greatly increased again following Regional Autonomy in 2001. This massive decentralization of services and administrative function was accompanied by the almost total opening of access to technology and sources of information following the end of the New Order. Indonesians reacted extremely quickly to the new environment and have now become among the highest users of social media in the world, with 88.1 million users from a total population of about 250 million and 326.3 million SIM subscriptions (Balea, 2016). This very high use of social media and the internet is facilitated by internet service that is among the cheapest in the world as well as the availability of inexpensive smart devices; these devices are the means by which most of the public accesses
online sites (Yuniar, 2014). At present, Indonesian is the fifth most commonly used language on Facebook (The Independent, 2010), which represents another important source of exposure for Indonesians (including Acehnese) to other dialects and ways of speaking.

While it is difficult to quantify the extent to which the rapid increase in exposure to speakers outside the immediate community whose language use reflects norms across Indonesia that are influenced by local language as well as the type of Indonesian in use, there can be no doubt that the average Acehnese speaker today has access to a much wider and more varied range of language than was the case in the past. This has likely sharpened people’s awareness of the existence of dialects and the salient characteristics of different ways of speaking relative to their own. In case of the Indonesian language, for example, the emergence of a prestigious, extremely informal dialect associated with the capital Jakarta and the entertainment industry is an example of this, and it has been observed in many locations that young people are tending to alter their own usage to conform to this non-standard type of Indonesian because of its social status (see, for example, Smith-Hefner, 2007). Interestingly, the tendency to adapt one’s speech to copy a prestige dialect has long been noted in Indonesia and was commonly observed during the New Order when some politicians and other public figures were seen to imitate the Javanese accent of the president.
9.2 Accommodation among Leupueng Speakers

The findings of this study are notable in that they demonstrate a high level of accommodation by the Acehnese speakers in Leupueng, regardless of whether they are originally from the area or have come there from another part of the province. In particular, Leupueng speakers seem to be very accepting of more standard varieties, and mothers who have had greater exposure to other varieties of languages appear to be most accommodating of other dialects. This often results in their willingness to try to use a dialect other than their own and also to accept language use in others, including their own children, that shows a range of characteristics associated with different varieties of usage. This linguistic behavior has been described in the literature as relating to speakers’ feelings about their own dialect or language (see, for example, Holmes, 2001; Mesthrie, 2001a, 2001b). This, in turn, has been suggested to be a potential trigger for code-switching which can entail altering one’s speech to be more like admired speakers or associate oneself with someone in a socially superior position (Holmes, 2013). The implication of this is that speakers may adjust their own language use to raise their own position to the perceived level of an interlocutor in an attempt to avoid negative social implications of (perceived) low status language use. The phenomenon where speakers approximate their speech to the speech of their addressee is well-known (Bell, 1984) and may represent a desire to gain the approval of those
they are talking to (Sachdev and Giles, 2004). Byrne (1969) has associated this tendency with the concept of similarity attraction which suggests that the more similar a speaker is to their interlocutors, the more social benefit and reward will emerge out of the interaction for the speaker. In fact, it has been suggested that similarity in language use is a more important factor than cultural similarity in relation to the individual’s feeling of belonging to the same group (Giles, Bourhis, and Taylor, 1977).

While the phenomenon of code-switching as described in the literature no doubt applies in Leupueng, and more broadly in Indonesia, the tendency toward accommodation as well as the acceptance of dialect usage has another aspect among Indonesian speakers, including those in Aceh. The very large number of dialects and varieties of language in Indonesia mean that the average speaker is highly aware of language variation. In addition, almost all Indonesians are speakers of some local language first and have studied Indonesian, the national language, in school. In effect, they are all non-native speakers of Indonesian and come into contact with people who speak another dialect of their own language or another local language entirely on a regular basis. Needless to say, language ability (including the ability to master Indonesian) varies greatly across society, and everyone has likely had the experience of being a non-native speaker in some context or in having difficulty expressing their thoughts in a way that could be understood by those around them. In practical terms, most Indonesians interact with people whose
language background is different from their own on a daily basis, and this is greatly intensified for those whose work involves travelling; who are employed in formal sectors such as national business or the government, where employees come from all over the country; and, interestingly, for those who are school teachers, as one of the main aims of formal education in Indonesia is to train young people, not just to speak Indonesian, but to master technical subjects in a language which is not their native language (for a detailed discussion of this, see Fanany and Effendi, 1999; Fanany, 2013). In other words, almost all Indonesians are aware of the difficulties that can impede communication and understand the difficulty of being a non-native speaker of some language or dialect as well as the feeling of being a linguistic outsider.

At the same time, the culture of Aceh, as the culture of the many areas in Indonesia in general, tends to be more group oriented than most western societies (Hofstede, 1983) and also supports smooth social relations. The importance of avoiding conflict in Indonesian society has been noted in the literature and has been found to extend to children and include language use (see French et al., 2005). This represents an externally focused basis for potential code-switching, accommodation in language use, and also acceptance of variation in the language of others that contrasts with the internally focused basis often described in the literature and noted above. In other words, the social desirability of maintaining cordial relationships with others combined with firsthand experience of outsider linguistic status may
make many Indonesians more accepting and also more accommodating in language use. This can have the effect of making others feel more comfortable and creating a friendlier social environment. The importance of sociability has been noted for various parts of Indonesia (see Heider, 2006).

While there is considerable indication that speakers of the Leupueng dialect are open and accustomed to accommodating their speech to the dialects of other speakers of Acehnese and that the purpose of this is to facilitate communication, in the long term, this may result in the loss of some of the distinctive characteristics of the Leupueng dialect. This process may be hastened by the greatly increased exposure to Indonesian and the nature and understanding of the language context in Indonesia from the perspective of speakers. The increasing presence of Indonesian in the language repertoire of Acehnese speakers not only has the potential to cause phonological change to minority dialects such as that of Leupueng, but also to the standard dialect. When people are frequently exposed to a different language that is perceived as having more prestige and especially when they are compelled to use it, which is the case for Indonesian among the many local languages in Indonesia, they tend to bring the inventory of that language into their own language. In terms of Acehnese-Indonesian code-switching, this includes lexical and phonological features. This phenomenon, especially using Indonesian lexical items, is apparent in the Friday prayer speeches/sermons and other instances of formal language use, even in rural areas where everyone speaks Acehnese.
The lexical items, most of which are function words like conjunctions and prepositions, are sometimes fully adopted but usually they are adapted into the phonology of Acehnese. For example, the sound /ɛ/ (e) in the first syllable of the Indonesian word *selama* ‘during’ is changed into /ɯ/ (eu) Acehnese and thus, *seulama*. The sound /ɯ/ has been noted as the Acehnese corresponding norm for the Indonesian’s /ɛ/ in the first syllable (Durie, 1985; Asyik, 1987). Similarly, phonological influence can be observed in the speech of most Acehnese who are also frequent users of Indonesian due to their job or education. This usually takes the form of a softening of the Acehnese centring diphthongs. As there are no centring diphthongs in Indonesian, the pronunciation of these centring diphthongs in Acehnese is reduced to monophthongs or prolonged monophthongised forms. For example, the centring diphthong /ɔə/ (oe) in the verb *manoe* ‘shower’ is softened by speakers, who have a high level of exposure to Indonesian, into /ɔ/ or /ɔː:/ and thus, /manoː/. The sounds /ʁ/ and /ts/ in the Leupueng dialect are not found in either Indonesian or standard Acehnese. In this case, increasing exposure to Indonesian seems to be contributing to the erosion of these two sounds in the Leupueng dialect which are being replaced by the Indonesian /r/ and /s/ which are also the corresponding forms in the standard dialect of Acehnese.

While there can be no doubt that language change is a process that has always occurred in human society, it is also the case that speakers of the
Leupueng dialect tend to be attached to their characteristic way of speaking and have an affection for the specific language use of their region. Again, this is not unexpected. Nonetheless, based on the speech of the Leupueng children who took part in this study, it is possible that this generation of speakers will feel somewhat differently about the need or desirability of preserving the more unusual features of the dialect and may opt instead for a more neutral or standard usage relative to the Acehnese of other speakers. They may still feel an emotional desire to maintain this characteristic usage but may be unable to do so because of the difficulty other speakers of Acehnese have in understanding it. In a broader context, there can be no doubt that this generation of children will also have greater exposure to Indonesian in all its varieties than their parents did, through the combination of access to technology; a higher level of schooling (currently 9 years of school is required and policy exists to support 12 years of compulsory education, although this has not been fully implemented across the country (Rahayu, 2017); and the demands of formal employment which increasingly require high levels of fluency in Indonesian (see Spolsky, 2004). The impacts of these factors have been noted in relation to other local languages in Indonesia (see, for example, Poedjosoedarmo, 2006), and Acehnese, because it is used in the same language environment, may well be affected in the same way.
9.3 Attrition of the Leupueng Dialect

As noted above, the phenomenon of convergence can represent a destructive force in the maintenance of a given dialect. In the case of the Leupueng dialect, this is closely related to the attitudes and perceptions of speakers. Based on the survey of attitudes toward the dialect that was part of this study, one of the major reasons for the observable divergence is that the norms of the local Leupueng dialect are viewed as a source of confusion and amusement. This occurs in addition to the difficulty experienced by North Aceh dialect speakers and speakers of one of the East Coast dialects in using the norms of the dialect, which is an additional source of pressure on the dialect. In fact, dialects of Achenese other than those from the East Coast are considered stigmatised. This includes the dialect of West Aceh (Zulfadli, 2014), and other dialects with the characteristic feature /ʁ/, such as dialects in Aceh Besar, which were referred by Hurgronje (1906) as Banda dialects. In the capital of Aceh, Banda Aceh, Achenese speakers tend to code-switch into the North Aceh dialect when they are involved in conversations with multi-dialect background speakers. This was true in the past (Durie, 1985) and remains the case today, despite Banda Aceh being the home of speakers of the Banda dialect. This suggests a highly-developed sense of regional identity and recognition of social characteristics that aligns with specific ways of speaking. It is likely that there are historical reasons for this that are lost to us at the
present time but that are still discernible in the views speakers of Achenese have about certain dialects and regionally-linked varieties of usage.

At the present time, Acehnese speakers have more opportunity than in the past to interact with speakers from other regions, through their work, travel, and in general because communication, facilitated by technology, is greatly improved relative to the past. For this reason, it is not surprising that more Acehnese are interacting more intensively with speakers from other dialects than in the past. One example of this is the phenomenon of intermarriage between men who use the Leupueng dialect and women from other areas. While this was triggered by an unusual event, the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, it is nonetheless indicative of an increasing level of interaction between dialect groups. Studies have shown (for example Dimmendaal, 1992) that intermarriage, as in the case of Leupueng, can reduce the domains of use of minority languages or dialects. In Leupueng, this is apparent as evidenced by constant and frequent switching to the standard dialect by Leupueng speakers at home with their spouse and outside the home with speakers of other dialects who have moved to Leupueng because of marriage. The destructive effect of divergence on the maintenance of the local dialect is also indicated by the subconscious use of more standard norms even when all participants in a conversation are local dialect speakers (see Aitchison, 2004, p.83). Consequently, the use of local dialect features is frequently replaced by the use of more standard norms and, over time, the domains of use of the
local dialect may also be lessened as speakers increasingly find it easier to use the standard dialect in a greater number of social contexts.

The Leupueng dialect, as is the case of Acehnese in general, is only used in informal domains, at home and with friends; it is not used in formal contexts such as government and education. This is the norm for local languages in Indonesia and is, in fact, part of the context for the establishment of the national language. As noted, the adoption of Indonesian (itself a standardised form of the Malay language that had been in use in the region that became the modern nation of Indonesia) as the national language has meant that the majority of Indonesians have historically had to develop the ability to use Indonesian at a high level, despite it being a second language (Musgrave, 2014). Local languages are protected and have a status that is noted in the national constitution, and has since been reiterated in laws relating to language and culture, such as Undang-undang No 24 tahun 2009 tentang Bendera, Bahasa dan Lambang Negara [National Law No 24 of 2009 on the Flag, Language and National Symbols]. However, the fact that Acehnese, as a local language, is only used in informal contexts that are mostly oral means that it is difficult for the language to develop.

There have been attempts to advocate the use of Acehnese in formal contexts, but these have not succeeded or have not lasted. These efforts have been considered ambitious and merely symbolic (Miller, 2009). In 2000, the local parliament of the province of Aceh proposed a draft resolution to be
reviewed at the national parliament, which included the use of the Acehnese language as the official language of the province. The draft was ‘accepted for discussion’ by the national parliament in Jakarta, but rejected by the Indonesian Home Affairs Minister who wanted to offer his own proposal (Miller, 2009). The Undang-Undang Pemerintahan Aceh 2006 (Law on the Governing of Aceh of 2006) which was passed after the peace agreement between GAM (the Aceh Freedom Movement) and the Indonesian Government does not mention the Acehinese language specifically. In Chapter XXXI Article 221, Point 4, it is stated in a general way that “local languages are to be taught at schools as local content”, which is comparable to the situation in other parts of Indonesia and does not have a significant impact for the development of the Acehnese language.

Indonesian is used for all technical subjects and is the language of innovation in Indonesia. Interestingly, since the establishment of regional autonomy in 1999, a number of regions across the country have passed local regulations [peraturan daerah] relating to language use. Many of these have instituted a policy of use of the local language in formal contexts one day a week (see, for example, Dewi, 2005; Manado Ekspres, 2015; Nurbogarullah, 2017; and many more), despite the fact that some observers consider this to be unconstitutional. The aim of such regulations is to support local identity and help maintain the local language. It is worth noting, however, that the same issues have been raised in relation to Indonesian which is seen by some
as losing ground to English in public forums (see, for example, Purnama, 2016).

The Leupueng dialect, which is non-standard in the context of Acehnese, has even fewer possibilities for innovation because it is some ways removed from standard Acehnese and has an even smaller role in community interaction from the perspective of the language as a whole. Increased contact with newcomers to the area after the tsunami had the effect of causing the Leupueng dialect to be used in fewer and fewer speech events as a result of accommodation to more standard varieties. This has resulted in a deterioration of its contexts for use. This accommodation-based process of levelling (see Kerswill, 2003) is an important potential reason for the reduced use of Leupueng dialect features. The mobility required for contact to take place, and thus for levelling of the dialect to occur, as described by Kerswill, has become a constant feature of life in Leupueng as the result of the intermarriages, as well as other changes in the sociocultural context in Aceh, after the tsunami.

The attrition of Leupueng dialect features may also be hastened by the fact that there are no efforts to maintain smaller dialects, nor a language policy that supports maintenance of local dialects in Aceh. The only observable movement in this direction is the choice to use Acehnese in very informal social media communication, which seems to be motivated by emotion and a desire to express personal identity. Even this is impeded by the confusion of
orthography, as many Acehnese are not familiar with the writing system that have been introduced (See for example, Daud and Durie, 1999). In Indonesia, as in other parts of the world, social media seems to be viewed by speakers as an extension of spoken language, not a new form of written language. The situation with prevailing language domains in Indonesia means that written communication almost always uses Indonesian, and this was certainly the case in the past when personal letter writing was common (Gallop, 2003). Social media has been an exception to this, and the norms of spoken language are commonly seen in communication using this medium (Saraceni, 2013). However, extensive code mixing occurs in Indonesian social media and includes, not just between Indonesian and local languages, but also with English (see Das and Gamback, 2015).

While Indonesia has extensive language planning for Indonesian carried out by a national level agency (Pusat Bahasa) and is part of an international forum on language standardization (Majlis Antarabangsa Bahasa Melayu, MABM) that includes all the nations that use a form of Malay (namely Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and Brunei Darussalam), there is no explicit policy to promote dialect use within either Indonesian or local languages. It is the case that local languages are sometimes taught in school as part of the local content component of the curriculum (Yeom et al., 2002), but no attempts are made to capture dialect differences, and what is taught represents some variety that is considered standard by speakers of the
language in question. Speakers of minority dialects tend to be more accepting of the phenomenon of change and see it as a natural process. In addition, they perceive social and economic gains associated with more standard language use and may diverge to more standard norms as part of the development of symbolic capital, which in turn assists with gaining internal power and economic benefit for the community (Bourdieu, 1977). Despite the existence of an ideal that all dialects and varieties should be viewed as having the same status, social interactions in Aceh often dictate otherwise, and speakers of minority dialects are often perceived as *meugampong* ‘hicks’. In the case of Leupueng dialect speakers, an example of this is described in Chapter 7, where a speaker from Leupueng who was shopping in Banda Aceh was immediately identified as being from Leupueng. This indicates that Leupueng dialect speakers are seen as ‘different’ or are marked, in a sociolinguistic sense. This is an indication of potential stigma associated with using Leupueng dialect features. For Leupueng dialect speakers, switching to a more standard dialect by using more standard features is an option to avoid any possible stigma and as a way to blend in more among speakers of other dialects. For some Leupueng dialect speakers, the preferred option is to switch to Indonesian rather than to use another dialect of Acehnese.

The tendency to code-switch into a more standard dialect mirrors the code-switching to Indonesian engaged in by many Acehnese speakers, and in general by many other speakers of local languages across the archipelago.
The use of Indonesian at home in the family is increasingly common in the case of many highly-educated people and those who live in urban areas. Some of the children in these families even acquire Indonesian first and Acehnese second. In situations like this, families generally make a conscious decision to use Indonesian because of its higher social and educational value and also because adults, who use Indonesian on a daily basis, often come to feel more comfortable using the language for social as well as linguistic reasons (Poedjoesoedarmo, 2006; Musgrave, 2014).

9.4 Children and Language Change

It has been suggested that the language of children plays a role in the process of dialect change. Although children’s phonology is still unstable, they will carry some forms of language use from childhood into adolescence and adulthood (Roberts, 2002). In this context, it might be suggested that children in Leupueng may acquire more features of the Leupueng dialect as they grow up. However, the extremely low use of LD features by the children in this study may indicate the opposite. Instead of using more distinct dialect features, these children may use fewer LD features because they will have even more contact with speakers of other dialects of Acehnese as they move through the educational system and eventually begin to work, which, in many cases, will mean leaving their village.
In addition, children in Leupueng have been exposed to Indonesian from birth because of the presence of television in many homes as well as through incidental use and code switching by older speakers. As they progress in school, they will be required to use Indonesian more and more and will gradually take on the cognitive framework associated with the language (see Fanany and Efendi, 1999). In addition, it is likely their perceptions and desires relative to language use will parallel those of young people elsewhere in Indonesia, which includes a strong perception of what constitutes the prestige dialect of Indonesian. This informal variety of language, that includes borrowings and influences from Javanese and the Betawi language spoken in Jakarta as well as from English, is widely used on television and the internet and is closely associated with celebrities of various kinds. It also features in popular culture products, such as comics and teen novels, intended for younger readers (see Smith-Hefner, 2007; Manns, 2010; Manns, 2014; among others, for discussion of these issues from a national perspective).

However, it is important to note that Aceh, because of its recent history and cultural associations, is somewhat different from Jakarta, Java, and other large cities where the cultural shift towards a more national identity associated with this informal, urban variety of Indonesian is felt more strongly. Aceh is very much part of the Malay cultural continuum and shares certain elements of culture, social norms and language use with other Malay regions, which includes peninsular Malaysia and Brunei Darussalam as well as certain parts
of Indonesia, such as areas on the islands Kalimantan, Sulawesi, and other parts of Sumatra. The main elements of Malay identity, which are somewhat different from the Javanised culture of mainstream Indonesia, include more superficial aspects of life such as dress and food culture but also, more significantly, language and religion (see Shamsul, 2001; Reid, 2001; Milner, 2009).

For individuals growing up in Aceh today, the elements of Malay identity that link them to the larger Malay world represent an opposing force that may draw them away from the national popular culture of Indonesia, especially when it contains elements that might contradict their religious and cultural upbringing. Aceh is one of the more conservative parts of Indonesia in terms of religion, and the westernised elements of Indonesian popular culture (especially as relate to dress and social behavior) conflict with the predominant social norms in the Acehnese community. For example, as part of its status of special autonomy, Aceh has been permitted to apply *syariah* (Islamic) law in certain contexts and is the only part of Indonesia where this is allowed (see Hooker, 2008, for discussion of this). This reflects the unique nature of Acehnese society and its social and cultural norms which are somewhat different from other parts of Indonesia.

For this reason, it is possible that the children who took part in this study will be more drawn toward their Acehnese heritage than toward the national mainstream, even as they interact more in the Indonesian speaking
environment over time. There are precedents for this as well in Indonesia, as the increasing importance of ethnic identity seems to be a characteristic of Regional Autonomy which has been in place for almost two decades. One example of this can be seen in West Sumatra, an area that shares some important cultural characteristics with Aceh, although its local culture is matrilineal and has a number of specific characteristics not shared by people in Aceh. Nonetheless, the people of West Sumatra are conservative, Muslim and part of the Malay world. Their local language is closely related to Malay, as is Acehnese, and it is believed that Islam reached the area from Aceh and retains some of the characteristic views of the Acehnese religious community (see, for example, Miksic, 2004). Strong cultural movements to return to traditional social structures that are supported by and encoded in the local language currently exist in West Sumatra (see Biezeveld, 2007; Henley and Davidson, 2008) that call for a return to the traditional views, attitudes, and perceptions of the region. It is possible that a similar movement will emerge in Aceh that will push speakers of Acehnese in the direction of the traditional culture and local language.

Nonetheless, even if future social and cultural trends in Aceh favour the use of Acehnese, Indonesian will remain the language of formal, official interaction because this is a basic tenet of the national context and will continue to be the language of formal education and professional interaction (see Spolsky, 2004). It is also the case that Aceh will be, to some extent at
least, affected by the continued influence and emphasis on English mastery in Indonesia, which has been associated with employment, especially in the context of the ASEAN Economic Community which took effect in 2015 (see Lauder, 2010). While it was beyond the scope of this study to consider the impact of English on local language use as well as on Indonesian, this remains an issue deemed to be of great importance and widely discussed in both scholarly writing and popular media in Indonesia (see Kirkpatrick, 2008; Lamb and Colemen, 2008; Onishi, 2010; among many others).

For the children who took part in this study, as they grow up and become more integrated in the wider society of their own community and Indonesia, these simultaneous social trends may lead them in various directions – toward more use of Indonesian and less use of Acehnese; toward an intensification of Acehnese identity with a concomitant use of Acehnese as the language of choice; or perhaps in a different direction that cannot currently be anticipated. Regardless of which of these tendencies comes to dominate, it is likely that specific use of the Leupueng dialect will become less important to them as adult members of the Acehnese speaking community in favour of a more standard type of dialect use that is more comprehensible to other speakers, that avoids the more unusual features of Leupueng usage that may be seen as socially disadvantageous, and that is associated with more beneficial social and economic characteristics in the community. Based on their language use at the time of this study, which was missing some of the expected features of
the Leupueng dialect, it is not reasonable to expect that these young speakers will re-adopt the more non-standard features of the local dialect, especially as they are exposed to other types of Acehnese in their own home and their parents and other adult members of their community do not place a high value on maintaining the dialect. In fact, it is likely that as they grow older, they will increasingly be influenced by the language use of their peers and the cultural cohort they are part of and will come to reflect the language use that is part of the experience of their generation.

9.5 Summary

This chapter discussed the findings of this study from the broad perspective of social and cultural trends in Aceh and Indonesia. Specifically, it addressed four issues of significance that emerged from the findings of this study, namely levelling of the Leupueng dialect, accommodation among Leupueng speakers, levelling of the Leupueng dialect; and the role of children in language change in the area. Chapter 9 will summarise the study as a whole, address the research questions for this study, and discuss directions for future research.
Chapter 10

Summary and Conclusion

This chapter presents a summary of the aims of this study, the way in which it was conducted and an overview of its findings. The research questions that form the base for the study are addresses and its implications and directions for future research are discussed.

10.1 Summary of the Study

This study was intended to achieve three goals. First, it was designed to identify the features of the Leupueng dialect of Acehnese and characterise its distinctive features in comparison with the standard dialect. Second, as the post-tsunami context was suspected to bring change to the Leupueng dialect due to dialect contact, this study was intended to find out whether the characteristic Leupueng dialect features are still used by children born in Leupueng after the tsunami. Third, as the acquisition of dialect features is suspected to be influenced by parents, this study considered parental attitudes to the Leupueng dialect in an attempt to identify a correlation between these attitudes and the acquisition of Leupueng dialect features by the children.

In order to identify the features of the Leupueng dialect, this study employed two methods. First, the study made use of three existing tapes
recorded in the 1990s as the basis for the identification of the distinctive features of the Leupueng dialect as it is used today. Comparison was then made with the corresponding features in the dialect of North Aceh, which is a more standard dialect, using the researcher’s own observations with reference to two existing works on the North Aceh dialect (Durie, 1985; Asyik, 1987). Second, the results of analysis of the tapes were verified with Leupueng dialect speakers in Lamseunia, Leupueng, Aceh in 2012, as part of the fieldwork associated with the present study. To analyse the acquisition of Leupueng dialect features by the children, the researcher recorded 18 child participants born after the tsunami selected from different backgrounds in relation to their parents’ origins. The children were recorded both in groups and individually. Then, to understand the attitude of the parents towards the Leupueng dialect, an attitude survey was performed using the tripartite components of attitude from Ladegaard (2000) who adapted it from Kristiansen (1991). The survey sets were differentiated for Leupueng parents and for parents whose origins were not from Leupueng.

Analyses of the interviews from the 1990s tapes show that there are 11 phonological features of Leupueng dialect which distinguish it from the North Aceh dialect. Two of these features are unconditional and the remaining nine features are conditional. The two unconditional correspondences show differences in the Leupueng dialect that do not experience any environment constraints, while the other nine sounds depended on specific environmental
constraints. These constraints of environment were analysed in Chapter 5.
One of the hallmarks of the Leupueng dialect is the fronting of SA open mid central vowel sound /a/ into LD /ɛ/ in the environment of \{alveolar stop, nasal and fricative, palatal stops _ h, k, #\}. Other features that are also characteristic of the Leupueng dialect include the substitution of the SA central diphthong /ɛə/ for LD /ai/ and the fronting of SA central diphthong /ɔə/ into LD /ɔi/ both of which occur in open stressed syllables.

Most of the sounds identified in Chapter 5 were found to be used at extremely low frequency by the children who took part in the study, including the sound /ɛ/ that is particularly characteristic of the Leupueng dialect. Although retention of Leupueng dialect features was low across the four groups of children studied in this research, the retention that was observed seems to be influenced by two factors: parents and peers. The parental factor was indicated by features that can be seen to derive from parents’ origins and mobility in the past and which are used by their children. The peer factor was indicated by the children’s accommodation to and use of more standard features that occur in other dialects of Acehnese.

The accommodation of more standard features was also a phenomenon observed among parents, and it was apparent in their responses questionnaire items and in interviews. Although parents with a Leupueng background had a more positive attitude to their own dialect, as indicated by their tendency measure of 3.27 on a 4-point scale, they had a higher tendency to code-switch
to more standard features than parents with non-Leupueng dialect backgrounds, whose attitude tendency measure regarding the Leupueng dialect was only 2.6. The tendency to codeswitch to more standard features has been associated with the concept of similarity attraction, which suggests that, the more similar a speaker is to their interlocutors, the more social benefit and rewards will emerge from the interaction for the speaker. Similarity in language use has been found to be a more important factor than cultural similarity in relation to the individual’s feeling of belonging to the same group (Giles, Bourhis, and Taylor, 1977). The tendency to codeswitch from a local to a more standard dialect is a common phenomenon among both younger speakers and adults in Leupueng, in Aceh and in Indonesia in general. These phenomena do not support maintenance of the Leupueng dialect and are an aspect of language change. Nonetheless, the attrition of Leupueng dialect features may occur at a much faster rate, considering the determinant factors that support dialect levelling and a shift in the dialect toward a more standard, North Aceh-like dialect.

10.2 Research Questions

This study had three research questions that were designed to allow for the exploration of children’s language use in Leupueng in the context of dialect contact following the 2004 tsunami. These questions were answered in the
chapters relating to the findings and discussion of this study and can be summarised as follows.

The first research question for this study related to the distinctive characteristics of the phonemic inventory of the Leupueng dialect as compared to the standard variety of Acehnese. As discussed in Chapter 6, there are 11 features of the Leupueng dialect that contrast with those of the more standard North Aceh dialect. Some of these features are also shared by other groups of speakers in the Aceh Besar region. However, taken together, these features are characteristic of the language use of Leupueng speakers and should be seen as identifying a specific dialect that is distinct from those used by other speakers of Acehnese. These features are summarised in Table 13.

The second research question in this study related to the features of the local dialect that appeared in the language use of children after the tsunami in Leupueng. Because of the nature of events, some of these children had mothers who originated in other parts of Aceh and spoke other dialects of Acehnese. Chapter 7 of this study discussed the children’s use of the 11 distinctive features of the Leupueng dialect and the frequency with which they occurred. As noted there, most of the children in this study showed usage of the Leupueng dialect, but the occurrences of characteristic Leupueng features was low. This occurrence was lowest among children whose mothers came from the east coast of Aceh and highest among those whose mothers came from Leupueng. Children whose mothers had lived away from their place of
origin, including in areas where Acehnese is not spoken, showed the lowest occurrence of Leupueng dialect features. This suggests that the mothers’ usage was very significant in influencing the language of the children and may relate directly to their exposure to other dialects as well as to parental attitudes toward language use.

The third research question for this study related to the attitudes of parents towards the local dialect and their perceptions of their children’s dialect use. Parental attitudes were assessed by interview and questionnaire and are described in Chapter 8. Overall, all the parents of children involved in this study had positive attitudes toward the Leupueng dialect, despite an awareness that it is non-standard (as compared to other Acehnese dialects) and a perception that it contains difficult or odd-sounding words and phrases. In this, there was little difference between the attitude of parents who originated in Leupueng and those from other places. No distinctly negative attitudes were found, and parents did not have strong preferences for what language variety their children used. This may reflect the high level of awareness of the existence and usage of numerous dialects and languages in Indonesia, and the understanding that Indonesians generally possess about the language context in which they live. This is discussed in depth in Chapter 9.
10.3 Implications of the Study and Directions for Future Research

There are many areas in Aceh that are similar to Leupueng, where a local dialect is spoken that has become at risk since the 2004 tsunami. Most of these areas are on the west coast of Aceh, which was hit the hardest by the tsunami due to their closer proximity to the earthquake’s epicenter. These areas include Lampuuk, Lhoknga, Gampong Pie, Ulee Lheue, Lhong, Lamno and Krueng Sabee, Calang. Studies of potential dialect shift in these areas will provide more insight into the issue of dialect maintenance and loss in Aceh in the post-tsunami context. Such studies will also add to the body of knowledge of Acehnese dialectology and contribute to an understanding of the broader linguistic context in Indonesia which is characterised by numerous dialects, language, and varieties of the national language.

This study also serves as a warning to the community being studied that their dialect, which is one part of a heritage of culturally specific forms that characterise the Leupueng community, could face potential extinction in the near future unless speakers are aware of the influence from contact with other dialects and this is followed by action designed to slow the pace of attrition. While it is unlikely that policy or legislation can affect the way in which speakers use language in their daily affairs, it is possible that efforts can be made to preserve and document the characteristic dialect of Leupueng and similar areas. While beyond the scope of this study, the issue of language and
dialect extinction has been widely discussed by linguists as well as by culture experts in relation to the loss of intangible heritage and the potential impacts to the cognitive state of speakers (see, for example, Trudgill, 1991; Grenoble and Whaley, 1998; Amano et al, 2014). The UNESCO Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger (Moseley, 2010) lists 143 languages at risk in Indonesia. Although Acehnese is not one of these, it may still face significant dialect loss as a result of social and cultural change that is largely unpredictable, as in the case of the 2004 tsunami.

Using the features that have been identified in this research, further study in Leupueng can sample the same children who took part in this research in the future to find out whether their language use remains consistent with the findings of this study as well as to identify the trend of change in the children’s language use as they grow up in the current community of Leupueng. This will shed light on the level of stability of child language at the age of 4-6 and how much they might shift by the time they are 11 to 13, for example. This will support a better understanding of whether or not the transition from childhood to early adolescence transition is associated with language transition.

In addition, any future research need not encompass all 11 features of the Leupueng dialect as identified in this research. Future studies of the dialect could use only the features that are hallmarks of the Leupueng dialect in the
interest of providing a much more in-depth and richer analysis of the selected features.

Finally, because this study focused only on the nature and status of the Leupueng dialect in the period immediately following the tsunami of 2004 and specifically considered the language use of younger children, it did not take into consideration the impact of exposure to and required use of Indonesian as part of the national context, including formal education. This is an additional direction for future research that will elucidate additional aspects of the linguistic context in Indonesia that will be relevant to Aceh and also to other parts of Indonesia that have their own local languages.
References


Asyik, AG 1987, *A Contextual Grammar of Acehnese Sentences*, 0419-4209 (Part A); 0419-4217 (Part B); 1042-7279 (Part C),


Boissevain, J 1984, 'Social Networks', in *Sociolinguistics 1*, de Gruyter, New York.


Fanany, R and Effendi, ZM 1999, "Minangkabau children to Indonesian adults: promoting public policy through Indonesian language teaching in West Sumatra, Indonesia", in *Crossroads: an interdisciplinary journal of Southeast Asian studies*, vol. 13, no. 1

Fanany, R and Fanany, I 2013, Post-disaster coping in Aceh: sociocultural factors and emotional response. In Banwell, Cathy, Ulijaszek, Stanley and


Jendra, MII 2010, *Sociolinguistics, the study of Societies' Languages*, 1st edn., Graha Ilmu, Yogyakarta Indonesia.


Kitley, P 2014, *Television, Nation, and Culture in Indonesia*. Ohio University Press, Athen, OH.
Kompas Media.


Thurgood, G 2007, The Historical Place of Acehnese: the Known and the Unknown, *First International Conference of Aceh and Indian Ocean Studies*.

Thurgood, G 1999, 'From ancient Cham to modern dialects: two thousand years of language contact and change', *Oceanic Linguistics*, vol. Special.


Yasmeen, S 2008, 'Understanding Muslim identities: From perceived relative exclusion to inclusion', Center for Muslim Studies and Societies, University of Western Australia.


http://blogs.wsj.com/briefly/2014/12/05/indonesias-mobile-internet-users-the-numbers/


Appendices

Appendix 1 **Central Tendency of non Leupueng parents’ attitude to Leupueng dialect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NLPQ</th>
<th>Questionnaire statements to Non-LD speakers (n=15)</th>
<th>Positive attitude tendency to LD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Items in favour of Leupueng dialect</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPQ1</td>
<td>I am aware that Leupueng dialect is different from dialects of Acehnese in other areas.</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPQ2</td>
<td>I like listening to Leupueng dialect.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPQ3</td>
<td>When I speak to a Leupueng dialect speakers I always try to accommodate to the dialect.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPQ4</td>
<td>I really wish that my children speak Leupueng dialect.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPQ5</td>
<td>I do not mind if my child grows up speaking Leupueng dialect.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPQ6</td>
<td>I often remind my spouse to spend more time with my child so that my child speaks Leupueng dialect.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPQ7</td>
<td>I wish that the people marrying Leupueng partners were able to speak Leupueng dialect.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL AVERAGE OF POSITIVE ITEMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.01</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Items not in favour of Leupueng dialect</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPQ8</td>
<td>*Sometimes I can’t help but laughing (at the way LD speakers speak) when listening to Leupueng dialect being spoken by its speakers.</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPQ9</td>
<td>*I always protest when my spouse speaks Leupueng dialect with my child. I do not want my child to speak Leupueng dialect.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPQ10</td>
<td>*I want my child to speak my own dialect.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPQ11</td>
<td>*I tell my child not to speak Leupueng dialect because I don’t want people to know that he is from Leupueng.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPQ12</td>
<td>*It is very difficult to understand Leupueng dialect.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL AVERAGE OF NEGATIVE ITEMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.87</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL AVERAGE OF ALL ITEMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.95</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: processed questionnaires response
Appendix 2 **Central Tendency of Leupueng parents’ attitude to Leupueng dialect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPQ</th>
<th>Questionnaire statements to LD speakers (n=21)</th>
<th>Positive attitude tendency to LD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items in favour of Leupueng dialect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPQ1</td>
<td>I am aware that Leupueng dialect is different from dialects of Acehnese in other areas.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPQ2</td>
<td>I am proud to speak Leupueng dialect.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPQ3</td>
<td>I always use Leupueng dialect even when speaking to people from outside Leupueng.</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPQ4</td>
<td>I really wish that my children speak Leupueng dialect.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPQ5</td>
<td>I am offended if people from outside Leupueng speak Leupueng dialect in mocking manner.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPQ6</td>
<td>I wish for Leupueng people to always speak Leupueng dialect.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPQ7</td>
<td>I always speak Leupueng dialect with my spouse. (n=20)*</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPQ8</td>
<td>I wish that the people marrying Leupueng partners were able to speak Leupueng dialect.</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPQ9</td>
<td>Leupueng dialect is better than other Acehnese dialects.</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPQ10</td>
<td>Leupueng dialect must be preserved.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL AVERAGE OF POSITIVE ITEMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.37</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items not in favour of Leupueng dialect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPQ11</td>
<td>*When speaking to people from outside Leupueng, I always try to accommodate their way of speaking.</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPQ12</td>
<td>*I feel shy to speak Leupueng dialect with people from outside Leupueng because I fear of being ridiculed.</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPQ13</td>
<td>*The children will be better off not speaking Leupueng dialect.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL AVERAGE OF NEGATIVE ITEMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.94</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OVERALL AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3  **Analysis of Wordlist from Mark Durie’s Tapes**

MD4 A Tape 1

1. /ʒʔ/ → /ʃʔ/ 'to go'
2. /mɯʒʔ/ → /mɯʃʔ/ 'to go'
3. /ɡwɭhn/ → /ɡhɔn/ 'heavy'
4. /phui/ → /phui/ 'heavy'
5. /pɰɡah/ → /pɰɡɭh/ 'to tell/ to talk'
6. /thon/ → /thon/ 'year'
7. /ɡalaʔ/ → /ɡaleʔ/ 'like'
8. /cɑɭn/ → /cɑɔn/ 'smart'
9. /mɯɭnɛn/ → /mɯɭnɛn/ 'long for'
10. /cɯa/ → /chɯ/ 'shade' (in standard Acehnese /rɰlui/, lexical item)
11. /kɥn/ → /kɥn/ 'say'
12. /bɯɭnɛn/ → /bulun/ 'moon, month'
13. /kɦɛn/ → /kɦɛn/ 'laugh'
14. /ʔiɲɛn/ → /ʔiɲi/ 'at present'
15. /ban/ → /bhan/ 'Tyre, football'
16. /dɦɛn/ → /dɦi/ 'forehead'
17. /talaʔ/ → /talɛʔ/ 'forehead'
18. /ɡɭnɛn/ → /ɡɭnɛn/ 'straightforward'
19. /ʔabɛn/ → /ʔabai/ 'dust'
20. /dɥɛt/ → /dɥot/ 'to get angry at'
21. /ʃiɛt/ → /ʃiɛt/ 'ok'
22. /ʍɯʔ/ → /ʍʔ/ 'to give away'
23. /krɰɭnɛn/ → /ɡɦun/ 'thick, for example, thick cookie dough' (this is lexical variation, not phonological process)
24. /ɾamah/ → /ɾamɛn/ 'squeeze'
25. /ɾɿt/ → /ɾɔt/ 'drop'
26. /basa/ → /bati/ 'language'
27. /rhom/ → /tɔm/ 'to throw'
28. /rhah/ → /tɔah/ 'to wash'
29. /swumurah/ → /tɔumɔah/ 'to do the washing'
30. /swumulɔ/ → /tɔumulɔ/ 'to thresh (manually)'
31. /hana/ → /ʔanɔ/ 'no (negative marker)'
32. /lhɔah/ → /lhɔh/ 'released, escaped'
33. /nuə/ → /num/ 'to throw your legs straight when you are sitting down'
34. /jamɛə/ → /jamai/ 'guest'
35. /lhɔh/ → /lhɔh/ 'deconstruct'
36. /jarə/ → /tŋudasa/ 'relatives' /ʔawɔ/ 
37. /jarat/ → /jat/ 'precondition/prerequisite'
38. /sah/ → /tɔh/ 'valid/recognised, legitimate'
39. /wiə/ → /wi/ 'left'
40. /ʔunun/ → /ʔunɔn/ 'right'
41. /ʔutwən/ → /ʔutɔn/ 'jungle'
42. /guhə/ → /guhɔ/ 'cave'
43. /batɛə/ → /batai/ 'stone'
44. /kapai/ → /kapai/ 'ship/
45. /kajɛə/ → /kajai/ 'wood(en)'
46. /tingkuə/ → /tingku/ 'to carry a baby'
47. /suʔɔn/ → /tɔʔɔn/ 'to carry things on the head'
48. /ba/ → /bΛ/ 'to carry, to bring'
49. /kwde/ → /kwde/ 'shop'
50. /tʁuʔ/ → /tɔuʔ/ 'more as in once more, later'
51. /tapa/ → /tapa/ 'yeast-fermented rice'
52. /ʔabah/ → /babΛh/ 'mouth'
53. /jaʔ wɔə/ → /jaʔ woʔ/ 'to go home'
54. /jarəei/ → /jaiʔi/ 'hand'
55. /gaki/ → /ʔake/ 'foot'
56. /gɔə/ → /gɔi/ 'tooth'
57. /tɔə/ → /tɔi/ 'close, near'
58. /sɔə/ → /tɔi/ 'who'
59. /mɔə/ → /mɔi/ 'to cry'
60. /ho/ → /hɔ/ 'where'
61. /pɔ/ → /pɔ/ 'Lord'
62. /mata/ → /matɛ/ 'eye, blade (of a knife, for example)'
63. /gʌ/ → /gɔ/ 'handle, part that you hold on a knife'
64. /tuco/ → /tuco/ 'grandchild'
65. /ticaʔ/ → /ticɛʔ/ 'lizard, house lizard'
66. /jʌ/ → /jɔ/ 'scared'
67. /jɛə/ → /jai/ 'shark'
68. /tubə/ → /tuboi/ 'deaf'
69. /klɔ/ → /klɔ/ 'deaf, stubborn'
70. /gasa/ → /gaʥ/ 'rude, rough'
71. /pɔ/ → /pɔ/ 'to fly, Lord'
72. /ɲʌ/ → /ɲɔ/ 'yes'
73. /bʌh/ → /bɔh/ 'to throw away'
74. /pɔh/ → /pɔh/ 'to hit'
75. /mʌn/ → /mɔn/ 'well'
76. /timʌn/ → timʌn/ 'cucumber'
77. /gɔm/ → /gʌm/ 'to cover something'
78. /sidʌm/ → /tjʌm/ 'ant'
79. /kʌn/ → /kɔn/ 'strong, not easy to break/tear'
80. /dʌn/ → /dɔn/ 'to stand up'
81. /bʌdʌh/ → /bʌdɔh/ 'to rise'
82. /buŋɔn/ → /buŋnɔn/ 'flower'
83. /gɔt/ → /ɡɛt/ 'good'
84. /dɯŋŋ/ → /dɯŋŋ/ 'to listen'
85. /pʌt/ → /pɔt/ 'to pick (fruit-picking)'
86. /talɔ/ → /talɔi/ 'rope'
87. /ʔuŋt/ → /ʔuŋt/ 'rotan-like rope'
88. /ɬɔt/ → /ɬɔt/ 'path'
89. /wɔt/ → /wot/ 'one way of cooking'
90. /cʌt/ → /cʌt/ 'hill, great grandchild'
91. /gusuʔ/ → /guʔuʔ/ 'to rub'
92. /ʔadɛ/ → /ʔadai/ 'to dry, to sun-dry'
93. /mɯba/ → /mɯba/ 'to bring'

nyo lon salah neupeusalah aju
94. /lɔ/ → /lo/ 'many'
95. /pahla/ → /pale/ 'reward'
96. /ʔiə/ → /ʔi/ 'water'
97. /miə/ → /mi:/ 'cat'
98. /miŋə/ → /miŋ/ 'cheek'
99. /buə/ → /bhu/ 'monkey' (retracted tongue root)
100. /bu/ → /bu/ 'rice'

MD4 B Tape 2
101. /gluʔə/ → /gluh/ 'mose-deer'
102. /kruəŋ/ → /kʷuŋ/ 'river'
103. /truəŋ/ → /tuŋ/ 'eggplant'
104. /adoə/ → /adoi/ 'younger siblings'
105. /rhup/ → /t̪ũp/ 'muddy'
106. /sũp/ → /t̪ũp/ 'lung'
107. /suət/ → /tuʔt/ 'drawer'
108. /tareʔ/ → /taʔeʔ/ 'to pull'
109. /meja/ → /meje/ 'table'
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10. /sampoh/ → /tsampoh/ 'wipe, sweep'
11. /swuam/ → /tjuam/ 'fever'
12. /prut/ → /p̥ut/ 'stomach'
13. /kuʔ/ → /kūʔ/ 'Egret-like bird' MD: /meunye hana kuek lam blang daruet keuleubang jeut keu raja/
14. /khuŋ/ → /khuŋ/ 'dry season'
15. /ʔuʔ/ → /ʔūʔ/ 'to swallow'
16. /takū/ → /taku/ 'neck'
17. /kwuə/ → /k̥w̥uə/ 'buffalo'
18. /bwət/ → /b̥w̥t/ 'to read or recite verses from Quran'
19. /blwət/ → /bl̥w̥t/ 'woven coconut leaves'
20. /bl̥w̥t/ → /bl̥w̥t/ 'to open the eyes'
21. /swət/ → /t̥wət/ 'to dry an inundated place using bucket'
22. /troʔ/ → /toʔ/ 'to arrive'
23. /brəh/ → /b̥ʁh/ 'rice'
24. /w̥e/ → /w̥e/ 'fish net'
25. /wwe/ → /w̥w̥/ 'buffalo house' In daily use though the word /ʔumpuɲ/ is more often used than /w̥w̥/ to refer to the house of any cattle by LD speakers.
26. /ʔu̟a/ → /ʔu̟a/ 'not able to do reproduction' used only for animals
27. /ʔu̟i/ → /ʔu̟i/ 'to crawl'
28. /bri/ → /b̥ɾi/ 'to give'
29. /tukri/ → /tuk̥ɾi/ 'to know how'
30. /gluŋku/ → /g̥luŋku/ 'rasping tool'
31. /ʔulə/ → /ʔula/ 'head'
32. /ʔu/ → /ʔu/ 'coconut'
33. /tika/ → /tikə/ 'mat'
34. /dr̥ənəh/ → /dən̥/ or /dən/ 'you'
35. /gata/ → /gâte/ 'you, normally for a younger person'
136. /mwnîntə/ → /muhnîntai/ 'son or daughter in law'
137. /kah/ → /k̡ʌv/ 'you, for a younger person but not formal as /gatɛ/
138. /gjən̩/ → /gjoŋn̩/ 'he or she for an older person'
139. /drɔə/ → /dɔi/ 'oneself'
140. /naŋ/ → /nɔŋ/ 'those who, contextual translation'
141. (lost, mistyped)
142. /ʔalwʌt/ → /ʔalʌt/
143. /sulə̃n̩/ → /nən̩/ 'Monday'
145. /sulasə/ → /lɔtʃ/ 'Tuesday'
146. /rabu/ → /ʔabu/ 'Wednesday'
147. /hameh/ → /ʔameh/ ‘Thursday’
148. /jumət̩/ → /jumaʔət̩/ ‘Friday’
149. /satu/ → /təptu/ 'Saturday'
150. /muharam/ → /ʔaɾəntən/ 'First Hijriah month'
151. /safa/ → /təphə/ 'Second Hijriah month'
152. /mʊlot/ → /moʔlot/ 'Third Hijriah month' There are three series of
   /moʔlət/ apparently; /phon/ 'the first', /duwʌ/ 'the second', and /lhaʔ/ 'the third'.
153. /buŋə kajɛə/ → /buŋə kajai/ ‘tree flower’ (sometimes in running speech,
   second element of dipthongs /ai/ is dropped.)
154. /ʔapam/ → /ʔapʌm/ 'Acehnese pancake’
155. /khanuri bu / → /kanuʃi bu/ 'rice feast’
156. /puwəsa/ → /pwətʃ/ 'Ramadhan'
157. /ʔurɔəɾaʃa/ → /bɔwəʃe/ 'Ied, End of fasting month celebration'
158. /puɾapet/ → /mʊɾapet/ ‘The eleventh month of Islamic lunar calendar’
159. /ʔaʃi/ → /ʔaʃi/ 'the twelfth month of Islamic lunar calendar'
160. /duwabləh/ → /duwablɛə/ 'twelve'
161. /sithon/ → /tɨθon/ ' a year'
162. /subəh/ → /tɨbəh/ '(early) morning prayer'
163. /luho/ → /luho/ 'midday prayer'
164. /ʔāsa/ → /ʔātɛ/ 'late afternoon prayer'
165. /ʔasɛʔ/ → /ʔatæi/ 'dog'
166. /ʔasɛʔ/ → /ʔatæi/ 'meat or flesh'
167. /swumajaŋ/ → /tsumajaŋ/ 'prayer'
168. /muŋgrep/ /muŋber/ 'evening prayer'
169. /ʔinca/ → /ʔinçɛ/ 'late evening prayer'
170. /jaraŋ/ → /jaʁoi/ 'hand'
171. /ginæŋ/ → /ʔinæŋ/ 'thumb'
172. /t̪ʊnɛʔ/ → /t̪ʊnɛʔ/ 'point'
173. /t̪ʊŋlah/ → /t̪ʊŋlah/ 'middle'
174. /maneh/ → /ʔimaneh/ 'ring finger'
175. /giteʔ/ → /giteʔ/ 'little finger'
176. /baɾɔ/ → /baɾoi/ 'yesterday'
177. /baɾɔsa/ → /baɾɔtʃɛ/ 'day before yesterday'
178. /hana tamɛ/ → /hanɛ tamɛ/ 'not (we) to bring' (This is to examine if two consecutive words can end with nasalised open mid-front unrounded vowel /ɛ/ in LD)
179. /gwiɾiʔ/ → /gwiɾiʔ/ 'armpit'
180. /gwiɾiʔ/ → /kaɾiʔ/ 'head of the village'
181. /gaswaɾ/ → /gaɾ waɾ/ 'a kind of beam of an Acehnese house construction'
182. /pwaɾ/ → /pwa/ 'what'
183. /pakan/ → /pakan/ 'why'
184. /ʔubena/ → /pænɛʔuɓe/ 'how big'
185. /duŋmaŋ/ → /pæŋduŋ nɛ lo/ 'how many or how much'
186. /ʔsna muʔoh/ → /pænɛʔ ʔɛt nɛ ʔuʔoh/ 'how far'
187. /swulanke/ → /tswulanke/ 'a person who has a role as a matchmaker'
188. /swumanɔ/ → /pumanaŋ/ 'to bathe someone else, mostly babies or children'
189. /ʃulamɛə/ → /ʔinamai/ 'dowry'
190. /bɬə/ → /b loi/ 'to buy'
191. /publɔə/ → /publɔi/ 'to sell'
192. /swumʒup/ → /tʃumʒup/ 'to bury'
193. /mənasah/ → /mənatʃə/ 'village prayer hall'
194. /mənataŋ/ → /mənataŋ/ 'animal'
195. /lɛ/ → /lɔ/ 'plenty'

MD4 A Tape 3
196. /ʔudep/ → /ʔudep/ 'alive'
197. /hakim/ → /ʔakim/ 'judge'
198. /lidah/ → /lidəh/ 'tongue'
199. /pɛŋ/ → /pəŋ/ 'money'
200. /mbon/ → /mon/ 'dew'
201. /ŋŋaŋ/ → /ŋŋaŋ/ 'egret-like bird'
202. /lampoh/ → /lampoh/ 'piece of land'
203. /tikoh/ → /tikoh/ 'mouse'
204. /mɯh/ → /mɯh/ 'gold'
205. /turi/ → /tɯe/ 'to know someone'
206. /sapai/ → /ʧapai/ → 'arm'
207. /ɡliŋuəŋ/ → /ɡwluŋuŋ/ 'ear'
208. /itaŋɛ/ → /ɡasi/ 'bicycle'
209. /croh/ → /cəûh/ 'to fry'
210. /catɔʔ/ → /catɔʔi/ 'to hoe'
211. /cangkoi/ → /cangkoi/ 'to hoe'
212. /lansonŋ/ → /lantonŋ/ 'straight away' Note: Alveo-dental fricative /tʃ/ is sometimes realised as voiceles alveolar stop /t/.
213. /ʃuʔeə/ → /ʃuʔai/ 'winnower'
214. /ʃuʔoh/ → /ʃuʔoh/ 'far'
215. /ɾwən/ → /ʃən/ 'stair, ladder'
216. /ta Ʇ kəti gastr/ → /ta Ʇ kəti/ 'belt'
217. /ta Ʇ apu ← /ga Ʇ ita/ 'train'
218. /kənsə → /putulot/ 'pencil' Note: this vocabulary variation.
219. /kupila/ → /kutile/ 'root'
220. /kəɾə Ʇu?/ → /ka Ʇ upu?/ 'chips' Note: this is not from the tape
221. /muda/ → /mude/ 'young'
222. /boh lupiŋ → /boh lupiŋ/ 'putik u'
223. /boh kətupuŋ → /boh kətupuŋ/ 'already punched by squirrel'
224. /keh/ → /balum/ 'pocket'
225. /ka Ʇʔ/ → /ʔak Ʇʔ/ 'older sister'
226. /cupu → /cutp^u/ 'older sister'
227. /cuda/ → /cutd^e/ 'older sister'
228. /jep/ → /jep/ 'to drink'
229. /jəp/ → /jip/ 'to chew the sugarcane'
230. /pɨp/ → /pɨp/ 'to suck, to smoke, to chew gum'
231. /ka/ → /k^e/ 'perfect sentence marker'
232. /ka tuha/ → /k^e tuh^a/ 'already old'
234. /buja/ → /buje/ 'crocodile'
235. /raga/ → /ʔaga/ 'basket'
236. /pha/ → /ph^e/ 'leg'
237. /ra Ʇ/ → /ʁa Ʇe/ 'king'
238. /putrə → /putrəi/ 'princess'
239. /gaca/ → /gac^e/ 'henna'
240. /dara/ → /dafa/ 'teenaged girl, can also be used for animals even though not teenaged'
241. /limpən/ → /limpən/ 'millipede'
242. /rupa/ → /ʁuŋ/ 'face'
243. /lagʔ/ → /lag^aʔ/ 'pretty'
244. /krwəh/ → /kai/ 'thick, for for coconut milk' (from 23)
245. /ləwəp/ → /ləwʌp/ 'mud' after 75, looking for /lʌn/ 'sediment'
246. /dəm/ → /dʌm/ 'to stay over', after 78 to see if it corresponds with 
     /tɪdʌm/ 'ant'
247. /rugə/ → /ŋugə/ 'useless' After 93.
248. /rancaʔ/ : /bəncəʔ/ 'very good' (after 8)
249. /rinthaʔ/ : /bɨnthəʔ/ 'to jerk' (not in recording)
250. /caŋguʔ/ : /caŋgoʔ/ 'frog' (not in the recording, from observation)
251. /aki/ → /ake/ 'foot'
### Questions relating to the background of the interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acehnese</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Padum umu dron?</td>
<td>1. What is your age?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dron lahe pat uro jeh?</td>
<td>2. Where were you born?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ureung inong/Linto dron Pat gampong? Kiban cara meuturi? Peue na tom tinggai toe ngen gampong genyan dron?</td>
<td>4. Where did your wife come from? How did you get to know each other? Did you live near his/her village?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Padum na trep dron ka neu meu keuluarga?</td>
<td>5. How long have you been married?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Oh lheuh tsunami peu dron na tinggai aju di Leupung? Ato peu na tinggai di gampong awak inong/linto ilee?</td>
<td>6. Have you always lived in Leupueng after the tsunami and after you got married? Or did you live in your wife’s/husband’s village for some time and then moved here?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acehnese</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dron peu na neuteupeue basa di Leupung sinoe bedangaen basa Aceh di Teumpat laen?</td>
<td>1. Do you know if dialect in Leupueng is different from dialects in other places?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Kiban cara neu teupeu?</td>
<td>a. How do you know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dron na bangga neu marit ngen basa Leupung?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dron wate neumarit basa Aceh, nye ngen basa leupung sabe neumarit?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Ngen Awak Lhoknga?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Ngen Awak Sibreh?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. (Pakon han neumarit basa Leupung meunyo ngen awak di luwa Leupung?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aneukmit dron ngen basa peu dimarit inoe?</td>
<td>a. Ngen dron basa peu dimarit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Ngen mak/ayah jih basa peu?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Watee dron marit basa Leupung kiban aneukmit drone? Na di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suot ngen basa Leupung?</td>
<td>c. How would your child respond when you speak LD to them? Do they respond in LD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Meunurot dron, na peurlee aneukmit droe beu dimarit ngen basa Leupung?</td>
<td>6. In your opinion, is it important/necessary that your child speak LD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Kira-kira dengan keuadaan lawetnyoe, na kemungkinan aneukmiet droen untuk jeut dimarit ngen basa Leupung?</td>
<td>a. With current condition, is there possibility that your child will be able to speak LD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Na tom neusaha kiban cara beu dimarit ngen basa Leupung aneuk dron?</td>
<td>b. Do you make any effort to make your child speak LD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Watee neumarit ngen ureung luwa Leupung, na tom neu marit ngen basa Leupung? Peu kira2 urengnyan na meuphom nyang dron peugah?</td>
<td>7. When you speak with people from outside Leupueng, do you use Leupueng dialect? Do you think they have no problem understanding what you are saying?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dron peu na to teupike, “nyoe meureumpok ngen beurangkasos mantong, asai awak Aceh, lon teutap lon marit ngen basa Leupung, mangat iteupeu le gop bahwa gampong lon di Leupung”?</td>
<td>8. Have ever had this thought, “I will keep speaking LD to anyone, it doesn’t matter who, as long as they understand Acehnese. I want them to know that I am from Leupueng”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Na tom dipeukhem le awak laen dron watee neumaritngen basa Leupung? Kiban reaksi dron?</td>
<td>Have you ever been laughed at when speaking LD to people outside Leupueng? What was your reaction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dron ngen ureung inong/linto peu basa neupeugah haba?</td>
<td>With your wife/husband, what dialect do you speak?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Menurot dron, basa Leupung nyoe ek gadoh singeh bak saboh saat? Pakon?</td>
<td>In your opinion, will Leupueng dialect disappear one day? Why do/don’t you think so?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Meunye meunurot dron akan gadoh, kiban cara nyang paleng got untuk jaga basa Leupung nyoe?</td>
<td>If you think so, that it will disappear, how to best prevent it from happening?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 5  **Semi-structured interview of Non-LD parents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions in Acehnese</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Padum na umu dron ka?</td>
<td>1. What is your age?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pat lahe dron?</td>
<td>2. Where were you born?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pajan phon dron tinggai di Leupung?</td>
<td>3. When did you moved to Leupueng?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Seugolom tinggai di Leupung, pat na tom tinggai dron (di ateuh 6 beuleun)?</td>
<td>4. Before moving to Leupueng, did you live anywhere else (more than six months) apart from your hometown?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Peue basa dron neumarit watee dron mantong ubit uroejeh?</td>
<td>5. Which speech form did you use when you grew up in your hometown?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Acehnese

1. Dron peu na neuteupeue basa di Leupung sinoe beda ngen basa Aceh di Teumpat laen?  
   a. Kiban cara neu teupeu?  
   b. Ngen basa Daerah peu meuseue jih beda?  
   c. Kiban contoh jih?  
2. Kiban tanggapan dron watee neudeungo ureung Leupung peugah aba?  

### English Translation

1. Do you know/notice that Leupueng dialect is different from dialect at other places?  
   a. How do you know?  
   b. Can you mention from which dialect it is different, for example?  
   c. Can you think of any example of the differences?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Peu dron na neuci marit lagee ureung Leupung marit watee neupeugah aba ngen ureung Leupung sinoe?</th>
<th>2. What is your impression when you first listened to Leupueng speakers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Dron na tom neu usaha untuk beujeuet neumarit lagee ureung Leupung?</td>
<td>3. Do you try to speak Leupueng dialect when speaking to the local Leupueng people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Meunyo na, peu na kendala?</td>
<td>4. Do you make any effort to be able to speak Leupueng dialect?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kiban tanggapan ureung Leupung inoe watee geudeungo dron marit basa Leupung?</td>
<td>5. If you do, do find any hurdles/difficulties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dron na neutham atau neuyue aneukmit dron marit basa Leupung?</td>
<td>6. When listening to your speaking Leupueng dialect, how would the local Leupueng people react? What would they say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dron na tom meuseue neuyue linto/ureung inong dron beu le geumarit ngen aneukmiet dron bah jeuet dimarit ngen basa Leupung?</td>
<td>7. Do you ask your child to speak LD or not to speak LD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Na tom neupeukhem watee neudeungo linto/ureung inong dron marit basa Leupung?</td>
<td>8. Do you ask your husband/wife to speak LD so that your child would be able to speak it too?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you laugh at your husband’s speaking LD?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dron ek setuju meuseue ureung nyang meukawen keunoe u Leupung payah beujeut basa Leupung?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you agree that all people marrying into Leupueng have to be able to speak LD?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>