

## **Language and Social Identity: Language Choice and Language Attitude of Diaspora Communities in Bali**

**Ni Made Dhanawaty<sup>1\*</sup>, Ni Luh Nyoman Seri Malini<sup>2</sup>, Ni Made Wiasti<sup>3</sup> and Ida Bagus Putra Yadnya<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Indonesian Language, Faculty of Arts, Udayana University, 80114 Bali, Indonesia*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of English, Faculty of Arts, Udayana University, 80114 Bali, Indonesia*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Anthropology, Faculty of Arts, Udayana University, 80114 Bali, Indonesia*

### **ABSTRACT**

Migration contributes significantly to the occurrence of language contact and language changes. Migrant communities as diaspora are always faced with choices whether maintaining the use of mother tongue in interacting, switching to using the word of the host, or using ethnic languages side by side with the host language in a new place. This research is intended to provide evidence of the phenomena of communication and social identity focusing on the language use and attitude of diaspora communities in Bali. It is a sociolinguistic study using descriptive qualitative methods on the Muslim community in three regencies that had lived in Bali for more than a generation. The data were collected through questionnaires, in-depth interviews, and direct observation. The result shows that most diaspora communities see the mother tongue as an essential means of maintaining their social identity. From language choice and attitude perspective, the diaspora community leads to three categories, namely (1) the population that identifies themselves as more diaspora than Balinese; (2) the community claiming themselves as more Balinese than diaspora and (3) the community considering themselves as diaspora and Balinese (dual identity).

*Keywords:* Diaspora community, language attitude, language choice, social identity

### **ARTICLE INFO**

Article history:

Received: 14 May 2019

Accepted: 18 October 2019

Published: 26 June 2020

*E-mail addresses:*

md\_dhanawaty@unud.ac.id (Ni Made Dhanawaty)

seri.malini@unud.ac.id (Ni Luh Nyoman Seri Malini)

mwiasti@yahoo.com (Ni Made Wiasti)

putrayadnya@yahoo.com (Ida Bagus Putra Yadnya)

\* Corresponding author

### **INTRODUCTION**

Human mobility, especially migration and its influence on the practice of language and ideology, has become an attraction for sociolinguistic studies. In reality, migrants as diaspora communities are always to

consider whether maintaining the use of mother tongue in interacting, switching to using the language of the host, or using ethnic languages side by side with the local language in a new place. They strive to establish positive contacts with the host society, and at the same time maintain their ethnolinguistic heritage. The process, on the one hand, causes language phenomenon and cultural communication resulting in mutual influence and enrich the repertoire of language and culture respectively and, on the other hand, can eliminate the purity of language and culture (Dhanawaty, 2002; Hamers & Blanc, 1989; Malini, 2011).

Studies on the relationship between identity and minority language maintenance and shift have been done by many authors (Breitborde, 1998; Carbaugh, 1996; Edwards, 1984, 1988; Edwards & Chisholm, 1987; Giles, 1979; Giles et al., 1977; Giles & Johnson, 1987). In the Indonesian context the development of language has resulted from the interaction between (1) regional languages due to the influence of mobility as happened in border areas and transmigration areas, (2) local language interactions with the national language and (3) various processes of globalization (Abdullah, 2006). As a phenomenon of cultural mobility the diaspora communities can no longer be considered only as a group of people with their demographic characteristics, but as humans who have a culture, including the value system, social system, and material culture. The spread of culture goes hand in hand with the movement of Indonesian human groups,

which are eventually followed by the spread of cultural elements (including language) through the diffusion process (Yadnya & Ardika, 2017).

The Province of Bali is part of Indonesia. The plurality of languages or the presence of various styles in the island resulted from language contact by different ethnic groups who inhabit Bali, both ethnic migrants through migration (such as Javanese, Bugis, Madurese, Sasak, Chinese, and others) and Balinese as natives. Sociolinguistically, research on Balinese diaspora (transmigrants) living in various regions in Indonesia, especially concerning its linguistic aspects, has been carried out. Sutjaja (1992), Kismosuwartono (1991), Dhanawaty (2002), Yadnya et al. (2010), and Malini (2011) examined several social aspects of the language of Balinese transmigrants in Lampung, including the construction of ethnic identity, patterns of language use, linguistic characteristics, and the continued use of Balinese. On the other hand, research on the diaspora community from various regions in Indonesia living in Bali is very limited and it is more studied from an anthropological and historical perspective. This research is intended to fill this gap and provide evidence of the phenomena of language and identity focused on the use and language attitude of diaspora communities in Bali.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The interaction between people with different cultures is a phenomenon that occurs in everyday life. Each interaction indicates

a different intercultural understanding that focuses on the role of verbal and nonverbal communication and is based on the belief that people from various cultural communities will adjust their communication to accommodate other cultures. In each communication event, there is a strategy used by communicators and communicants to stabilize the process by making the connection run well so that it creates a harmonious relationship. Every individual who communicates will surely bring an identity that will determine how the individual behaves.

Cultural identity can be seen as the membership of a group where everyone uses the same symbol system. Sociolinguistics considers the phenomenon of language choice as a social fact and places it in a system of symbols (codes), cultural behavior systems, and logical systems. Fishman (1985) considered that the relationship between language and culture could be seen in three perspectives, namely (1) as part of a culture, (2) as a cultural index, and (3) as a cultural symbol. As part of the culture, language is the embodiment of human behavior. For example ceremonies, rituals, songs, stories, prayers are speech acts or speech events. All who want to be involved and understand a culture must master the language because by learning the language that then they can participate and experience the culture. As a cultural index, language also reveals how to think and organize the experience of speakers appearing on the surface in lexical items and as a cultural symbol, word shows ethnic, cultural identity.

In the event of communication, speakers apply basic assumptions about the linguistic potential of their interlocutors in a bilingual or multilingual society. When a speaker experiences a process of interactive discourse, he may be converging on the language of the other person or diverging on his language code. A person's decision in choosing a style or using one language code depends on the cost or perceived benefit to be obtained. As stated by Fasold (1984) the choice of language was not as simple as imagined, in the sense of choosing a style as a whole in a communication event. The choice of expression in the sociolinguistic paradigm meets not only with linguistic problems, but also with social, cultural, psychological, and situational issues. In the event of interaction, the necessity to choose a language or variety of words that are suitable for an interaction situation cannot be avoided because mistakes in selecting a dialect or type of languages can result in losses for participants in that interaction (Giles & Coupland, 1991). The event of interaction using language as something culturally shaped in the context of social life is clearly presented in Hymes's (1962) ethnography of communication that offers a theoretical basis for language study that accounts for both linguistic variation from individual to individual and relative linguistic coherence across the social realm, while also offering a methodological heuristic for investigating communication, often represented in terms of the SPEAKING mnemonic.

In a multilingual society, various codes are available, both in the form of language, dialect, variety, and style for use in social interactions. With the availability of the codes, community members will choose the available code according to the factors that influence it. In daily interactions, community members constantly change the variety of language uses. According to Giles and Coupland (1991) changes in linguistic behavior can occur because (a) a speaker is trying to adjust to the ability of the interlocutors because he wants to communicate with them and (b) a speaker is not trying to adjust his speech to the interests of the interlocutors and instead deliberately makes his speech utterly not the same as his interlocutors. Furthermore, Giles and Coupland (1991) used the terms convergence to refer to the process if there were two or more speakers who changed speech to adjust to the interlocutor and divergence to refer to the way a person who maintained his speech, both verbal and non-verbal in order to distinguish himself from other speakers. Ervin-Tripp (1964) identified that language choice in bilingual/multilingual social interactions was caused by four main factors, namely (1) setting (time and place) and situation like having breakfast in the family environment, meeting in the household, happy birth in a family, going to college, and bargaining with goods at the market; (2) participants in interaction that includes things like age, sex, occupation, socioeconomic status, and their role in relationships with speech partners, (3) conversation topics such as

topics about work, children's success, actual events, and the topic of prices on the market, and (4) interaction functions like offering information, requests, routine habits (greetings, apologizing, or saying thank you). Theoretically, Hymes's ethnography of communication, Giles and Coupland's linguistic accommodation perspectives, and Ervin-Tripp's arguments on factors of language choice have contributed in this study in the sense that they provided the researcher perspectives of the occurrence of language contact and language changes and a rationalization that migrant communities as diaspora are always faced with choices whether maintaining the use of mother tongue in interacting, switching to using the word of the host, or using ethnic languages side by side with the host language in a new place.

On the empirical level, many studies have been conducted in different parts of the world examining the outcome of language contact and the status of ethnic or immigrant languages such as in the field of social psychology showing that immigrants can feel emotionally attached to the new country without losing their attachment to their homeland (Harris, 1980). Holmes et al. (1993) investigated the language situation among ethnic groups in New Zealand and listed the factors that fostered language maintenance including regular social interaction between community members, use of the mother tongue in the home, positive attitudes towards the language and high values placed on it to retain social identity, and a positive orientation to the

homeland. The result of investigation by Dweik and Al-Obaidi (2014) indicated the different language domains used mainly at home, in religious settings, and their inner speech. The previous studies carried out especially by Fishman (1964, 1966), Dweik (2000), Freed and Collentine (2004), and Al-Khatib and Al-Ali (2005) have contributed to this study methodologically in designing the sociolinguistic survey.

Patterns of language maintenance and shift that are driven by both social and cultural factors have been noted by many authors (Dorian, 1989; Gal, 1979; Giles et al., 1977). Minority languages are identified not to serve only as a means of communication; they are essential tools for expressing cultural heritage and ethnic identity (Auer, 1998; Crystal, 2000; Fishman, 1989, 1991, 1999; Lanca et al., 1994; Padilla, 1999; Spolsky, 1999). Fishman (1989) revealed three consequences of language contact. First, immigrant languages dominate the speech situation and defeat the use of the host language. Second, the opposite situation occurs where the language of immigrants is defeated. The third is the ethnic immigrant language is used side by side with the host language tied by a diglossic relationship where each language is used in specific domains and each language speakers have positive attitudes to it. With reference to the three possible situations, the present study is concerned with the investigation of ethnic identity on the level of group membership identification and seeks for insights into the relationships between ethnic identity and first language maintenance to especially

providing evidence of the language choice and language attitude of the diaspora community in Bali, Indonesia.

## METHODS

This sociolinguistic study was conducted with a qualitative descriptive method supported by a quantitative method to find out the linguistic characteristics of diaspora communities in Bali, including the language choice and attitude of the diaspora in daily communication. This research is not intended to test specific hypotheses but instead describes "as it is" about a variable, symptom or circumstance in three diaspora settlements in Bali, namely (1) Loloan Muslim diaspora community, in Jembrana Regency; (2) Pegayaman Muslim diaspora community in the Regency of Buleleng; and (3) of Tegal Linggah Muslim diaspora community in Karangasem Regency. The selection of the three diaspora communities is based on subject homogeneity in terms of place and time. In terms of location, geographically the three diaspora community groups come from the area or island closest to Bali, namely Java to the west (Loloan and Pegayaman Muslim diaspora Communities) and Lombok to the east (Tegal Linggah Muslim diaspora Community). From a time perspective, the three diaspora communities are the result of migration that has long been in existence, and they have settled in Bali for more than a generation. Besides, the diaspora community has an identical migration history related to the presence of a ruling kingdom in Bali (the Pegayaman diaspora community is associated with the

royal government of Buleleng and the Sasak Muslim diaspora community is related to the rule of King Karangasem).

In the process of collecting data, survey methods, interviews, and participatory observation were used supported by focus group discussion. The survey method was carried out through the distribution of structured and detailed questionnaires to obtain information from informants who were considered representative of the study population. In collecting data the research team was assisted by field staff who had been previously trained and observed and were involved in community activities in the diaspora community in Bali. To get answers to language attitude and language choice questions from the communities in the three research locations, the sociolinguistic questionnaire was distributed to 30 respondents from each district. The sociolinguistic survey was in principle designed based on Fishman (1964, 1966), Dweik (2000), Freed and Collentine (2004) and Al-Khatib and Al-Ali (2005) which of course had been adjusted for this study. The questionnaire consists of three sections including demographic data about their background, the language used in different domains including home, school, neighborhood, workplace, religion, media and self-expression, and their attitudes towards mother tongue, the national language (Indonesian) and the host language (Balinese). The statements in each part are followed by five options: 5- Strongly agree 4- Agree 3- Neutral 2- Disagree 1- Strongly disagree.

The interviews were done in three locations directly by making contact or conversation with the informant as the resource person using Indonesian and Balinese to get information about the profile and historical background of their existence as the diaspora community in Bali. By making direct observations, researchers can find out how the activities of the diaspora community in Bali are in their social life. In this study, the participatory observation method is carried out by participating in the conversation and listening to the conversation conducted by conversing with the speaker. To maintain the validity and reliability of the data a focus group discussion was carried out, as a means for data triangulation. It was carried out by inviting linguists, anthropologists, and cultural experts as well as community leaders and diaspora communities in three research locations. This forum was meant to make some sort of data verification and obtaining additional information and expert judgment for revision and betterment of the result of the analysis.

As a sociolinguistics study, it is focused on the relationship of language with the speaker community with the paradigm of seeing language as a medium for integrating oneself as a social being or as part of society. Data analysis combines qualitative and quantitative methods using communication ethnographic theory (Hymes, 1972), language choice theory (Evin-Tripp in Grosjean, 1982), language accommodation (Giles & Coupland, 1991). The application of communication ethnographic theory is

intended to base the argument that the event of interaction using language is something culturally shaped in the context of social life. Language choice theory is applied to describe the choice of languages of diasporas in interacting in a multilingual Bali area. With the availability of several languages, each speaker is able to choose the language according to the communication situation. The application of accommodation theory is intended to understand the adjustment made by the diaspora community verbally by modifying the speech so that it becomes similar or may be increasingly different from the interlocutors.

The result of the analysis is presented with interpretative descriptive explanations. Descriptive explanations are presented in the form of narrative exposures about the quality of various symptoms that are studied extensively and deeply. While interpretative explanations are intended as an effort to interpret various phenomena that are examined using relevant theories.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

All diaspora communities coming to Bali must have interacted with the local community (Bali) or other communities who have settled in Bali first. In addition to their mother tongue, they also brought identities that determined the way how they made a communication. As a group of migrants with Islamic culture, the diaspora community is faced with a dominant culture, namely Balinese culture which in principle has different features, especially in the field of religion. The intensity of interaction

with Balinese people causes the process of absorbing elements of Balinese culture. In the process of cooperation, of course, they use language as a means of communication. The implication is that language contacts, language choices, or language competition will emerge to smooth the inter-ethnic interaction and communication or maintain their ethnicity and culture. Therefore the following discussion will be focused on two main issues including (1) language choice and (2) language attitude that come from the relationship between acculturation, cross-cultural attitudes, identity, and maintenance and the first language shift.

### Language Choice

A person's decision in choosing a language depends on the cost or perceived reward that will be obtained. The next presentation will reveal the phenomenon of language use in different context situation including the domain of family, school, neighborhood, place of work, religion, media, and self-expression choice made by diaspora community in three research locations. In the family domain, the use of mother tongue by the three diaspora communities is reflected in the following Table 1.

In the Loloan community, most people claimed that the language used by their mother and biological father was Malay. The use of Malay language is still strong and most respondents (93.3%) use Malay when talking daily to family including father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, and siblings especially when they have family gatherings. Demographic data of

Table 1  
*The use of mother tongue in the family domain*

Context of Situation	Community	M	B	S	I	J	O/Mix
		(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
The language used when talking with parents, siblings, and grandparents.	<b>Loloan</b>	93.3	-	-	-	-	-
	Pegayaman	-	100	-	-	-	-
	Tegal Linggah	-	72	33.3	6.7	5	-
The language used when talking with relatives in Bali.	<b>Loloan</b>	63.3	6.7	-	23.3	-	3.3
	Pegayaman	-	100	-	-	-	-
	Tegal Linggah	-	70	10	-	5	15

Note. M = Malay; B = Balinese; S= Sasakese; I = Indonesian; J = Javanese and O = other/mix language

Pegayaman community shows that out of 30 respondents a total of 29 stated that their mother tongue and biological father were Balinese (96.7%) and in the family domain, all respondents (100%) used Balinese when speaking with their parents, grandparents, and siblings. This shows that the Pegayaman diaspora community has considered Balinese as part of their identity. Tegal Linggah community, Karangasem is a community that still considers itself a diaspora and a part of Balinese. Although most of the biological mother and father are Balinese, there is a mixture of language usage found. In the family domain, most respondents use Balinese (72%). The use of Sasak language in the family domain only 33.3%. Aside from Balinese and Sasak words, the choice of the community also exists in other languages such as Indonesian and Javanese (respectively 6.7% and 5%). Thus the choice of language in this community is very flexible and tends to be more in line with the speech situation or with the other participants.

When talking to relatives in Bali, most Loloan respondents used Malay (63.3%) and Indonesian (23.3%). The use of host

language (Balinese) among the Loloan respondent was only 6.7%. In Pegayaman, on the contrary, all respondents (100%) claimed to have used Balinese when talking to their relatives in Bali. Meanwhile, in Tegal Linggah Karangasem, the community used mostly Balinese (70%) and Sasakese (10%) when they had a conversation with relatives in Bali.

In a neighboring environment, the selection of Malay language is mainly seen when talking to neighbors from the same ethnic as reflected in the following Table 2.

Table 2 shows that most respondents in three locations claimed to use mother tongue when talking to neighbors of the same ethnic. This also happens when shopping for vegetables/goods from shops/stalls belonging to the same ethnic neighbor. In terms of talking to neighbors when shopping for vegetables/goods from shops/stalls belonging to different ethnic neighbor respondents from Loloan, Pegayaman and Tegal Linggah prefer to use Indonesian.

In the religious domain, especially when there are religious meetings outside the mosque, 82.8% of Loloan respondents claimed to use Malay. This shows that in



Table 2  
*The language used in neighboring domain*

Context of Situation	Community	M	B	S	I	J	O/Mix
		%	%	%	%	%	%
The language used when talking to the same ethnic neighbor	<i>Loloan</i>	93.5	3.2	-	3.2	-	-
	Pegayaman	-	96.7	-	3.3	-	-
	Tegal Linggah	-	65	25	-	-	10
The language used when speaking with neighbors of different ethnicities	<i>Loloan</i>	32.3	-	-	41.9	-	6.5
	Pegayaman	-	44	-	56	-	-
	Tegal Linggah	-	40	5	35	-	20
The language used when shopping for vegetables/goods from shops/stalls belonging to the same ethnic neighbor	<i>Loloan</i>	100	-	-	-	-	-
	Pegayaman	-	93.3	-	6.7	-	-
	Tegal Linggah	-	70	15	10	-	5
The language used when shopping for vegetables/goods from shops/stalls belonging to a different ethnic neighbor	<i>Loloan</i>	29	6.5	-	48.4	-	16.1
	Pegayaman	-	33.3	-	66.7	-	-
	Tegal Linggah	-	40	-	50	-	10

Note. M = Malay; B = Balinese; S= Sasakese; I = Indonesian; J = Javanese and O = other/mix language

the daily lives of Loloan community, Malay is the primary choice. This is again seen in the use of language when worshipping in the mosque. As many as 51.6% of respondents used Malay to carry out their worship. As a Muslim community, the use of Arabic was high when worshipping (32.3%), and requesting after praying (41.9%). In Pegayaman, the Islamic nuance was more apparent for 73.3% of the Pegayaman community used Arabic when worshipping in the mosque while 16.7% used Indonesian, and only 10% used Balinese. However, when speaking in religious meetings outside the mosque, the community of Pegayaman preferred to indicate their social identity as Balinese by using the local language (60%) and Indonesian (36.7%). The language choices made by Tegal Linggah Muslim community seems to be flexible. When there are religious meetings outside the mosque, 30% of the respondents claimed to use

Balinese, 25% used Indonesian, and 25% Arabic respectively.

The dominance of mother tongue usage in the three diaspora communities is seen significantly in personal emotional expressions. Most respondents in Loloan chose to use Malay to express feelings of happiness, anger, and their ideals. So is the case with Pegayaman respondents who prefer to use the Balinese. This certainly makes sense because all personal feelings or emotions will be more naturally revealed by using the mother tongue. There are variations in the use of language to express feelings with the community in Tegal Linggah Karangasem. When expressing their feelings of happiness, 45% of respondents chose to use Balinese, 15% used Sasak language, and 25% of respondents chose Indonesian. When expressing anger, 45% of respondents decided to use Balinese, 25% used the Sasak language, and 20% Indonesian. Finally,

when expressing dreams/ideals, 40% of respondents chose to use Balinese, 15% used a Sasak word and 40% Indonesian.

To sum up, the existence of the observed variations can be a reliable indicator that, linguistically, the choice and use of language in social interactions seem to signal their respective identity showing that the Loloan community feels more as diaspora than Balinese. The Pegayaman community indicates Balinese as a part of social identity and they consider themselves more Balinese than the diaspora meanwhile Tegal Linggah diaspora community in Karangasem linguistically considers themselves as both Balinese and diaspora. This fact can be explained by Fasold's statement (1984) that language shift is one of the results of a long process of language selection exercised by the speaking community.

### **Language Attitude**

#### **Language Attitude toward Mother Tongue**

Language attitude can take the form of language loyalty, which encourages speakers to maintain their language and if necessary prevent any influence from other languages. A sense of pride in language can also encourage speakers to use it as a symbol of community identity and unity. In general, the three diasporic communities showed a positive attitude towards their mother tongue. Empirically, the Loloan Muslim community considers that their mother tongue (Malay) was the most beautiful language (as many as 74.2% of respondents stated strongly agree, and 22.6% agree) and

a symbol of individual ethnic identity (50% strongly agree and 46.7% agree). Pegayaman community's language attitude towards the native language also tends to be positive. There were 48% of respondents who agreed and added 44% of respondents who stated that their mother tongue was the most beautiful language. Even more significant is that 66.7% of respondents said to agree that their native language was a symbol of their ethnic identity. Language attitude in the Sasak Muslim community of Tegal Linggah Karangasem also showed a definite tendency in which 75% of respondents claimed that their mother tongue was the most beautiful language and 65% agreed that their mother tongue was a symbol of their ethnic identity.

Symptoms of the retention of Malay as a mother tongue in the Loloan community have also been seen. More than half (58.1%) of respondents agreed, and 25.8 strongly agreed to enable children to communicate effectively using their mother tongue. As many as 53.3% of respondents also strongly agreed to consider mother tongue related to ancestral heritage and history. In Pegayaman, 43.3% of respondents agreed that their mother tongue was essential for use in everyday life and 70% agreed for use in religious activities and gatherings. In line with their recognition of mother tongue as the most beautiful language, 75% of respondents in Tegal Linggah agreed that their mother tongue was essential to use in various aspects of daily life and 57.9% agreed that it was essential for use in religious activities. As many as 66.7% of

respondents in Pegayaman and 90% in Tegal Linggah agreed that their mother tongue was related to ancestral heritage and history.

**Language Attitude toward the Host Language (Balinese)**

Language attitude towards Balinese as the host language is reflected in Table 3. All responses to the statements in the above table reinforce that the Loloan community is more powerful concerning Malay as its identity than Balinese. Majority (64.3%) of respondents disagreed with believing that the Balinese language was uniting them with Balinese people although they strongly claimed that Balinese was not the language they hate the most (50% disagreed with the statement, and 46.4% strongly disagreed). Their firm belief to be non-Balinese as social identity was reflected in the absence of response to the statement about the importance of their children to communicate

effectively in Balinese. Although attitudes towards Indonesian also tend to be positive, the Loloan people still tend to be more of a diaspora (Malay) identity. Meanwhile, the people of Pegayaman, on the contrary, tend to be more Balinese than the diaspora. All respondents claimed to believe that Balinese was uniting them with all Balinese people (76% agreed to the statement and the rest 24% strongly agreed). This firm confession is supported by their response to the statement related to the importance of their children to communicate effectively in Balinese (84.6% agreed to the statement and 7.7% strongly agreed). Finally, the Tegal Linggah community showed a dualism between Balinese and diaspora. On the one hand, 57.1% of respondents agreed, and 14.3% strongly agreed that Balinese was uniting them with all Balinese people and 78.6 % agreed and 21.4% strongly agreed to believe that the Balinese language was

Table 3  
*Language attitude toward the host language (Balinese)*

Statement <i>I believe that the Balinese language is...</i>	Community	5	4	3	2	1
		%	%	%	%	%
Uniting me with all Balinese people	<b>Loloan</b>	-	7.1	28.6	64.3	-
	Pegayaman	24	76	-	-	-
	Tegal Linggah	14.3	57.1	14.3	14.3	-
Unifying chain among all Indonesian people	<b>Loloan</b>	7.1	39.3	28.6	25	-
	Pegayaman	7.7	15.4	23.1	53.8	-
	Tegal Linggah	21.4	78.6	-	-	-
The language I hate the most.	<b>Loloan</b>	-	-	3.6	50	46.4
	Pegayaman	-	3.8	3.8	46.2	46.2
	Tegal Linggah	-	-	-	57.1	42.9
It is essential for my children to communicate effectively in Balinese.	<b>Loloan</b>	-	-	-	-	-
	Pegayaman	7.7	84.6	7.7	-	-
	Tegal Linggah	-	-	-	-	-

Note. 5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neutral / doubtful; 2 = disagree; and 1 = strongly disagree)

unifying chain among all Indonesian people but, on the other hand, there was no response as regards the statement whether their children needed to communicate effectively in Balinese. This is an interesting trend to study further before concluding that Tegal Lingsah Muslim community in Karangasem beginning to abandon its old identity and turning to another identity.

## CONCLUSION

The choice of language turned out to be the evidence of the way how local diaspora communities in the three research locations maintain their social identity. There is a relationship between language activation in various domains and self-identities. Diaspora communities in all three locations saw mother tongue as an essential tool for maintaining identity, and an indicator of success for intergenerational survival.

The three communities linguistically have different characteristics and can be grouped into (1) the communities that identify themselves as more diaspora than Balinese. This community is the Loloan Muslim Community of Jembrana who feels that their mother tongue is Malay so that its use in the family domain and kinship is very essential. So is the case in the use of language in the religious realm; (2) the communities who identify themselves as more Balinese than the diaspora group, i.e the Pegayaman Muslim community, Buleleng. They claim to be fully Balinese and Balinese language is seen as their mother tongue and is spoken in the family domain and kinship and non-formal; and (3) those who feel as diaspora

and Balinese communities, namely the Muslim population of Tegal Lingsah in Karangasem. They consider both Balinese and Sasak language as mother tongue and uses it interchangeably in the family domain and neighborhood signaling a dual social identity.

Judging from the language attitude, all diaspora communities have positive attitudes towards their mother tongue and feel the need always to be used primarily in the family and neighbor domain especially in religious activities. Retention of the mother tongue is stated to be very necessary between generations to preserve the language. Nevertheless, the three diaspora communities indicate the need for Indonesian as a unifying and national language that must be used in a formal or inter-ethnic interaction.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research project was funded by Udayana University. Our thankfulness and appreciation are extended to the Rector and the head of Research and Community Service of Udayana University who have decided to support our research through a grant on the Research and Academic Publication for Professorship Grant scheme. We also thank our postgraduate students who helped us in collecting data.

## REFERENCES

- Abdullah, I. (2006). *Cultural construction and reproduction*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Pustaka Pelajar.

- Al-Khatib, M., & Al-Ali, M. (2005). Language and cultural maintenance among the gypsies of Jordan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 26(3), 187-215.
- Auer, P. (1998). *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London, England: Routledge.
- Breitborde, L. B. (1998). *Speaking and social identity: English in the lives of Urban Africans (Studies in Anthropological Linguistics)*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Carbaugh, D. (1996). *Situating selves: The communication of social identities in American scenes (Human communication processes)*. New York, USA: State University of New York.
- Crystal, D. (2000). *Language death*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Dhanawaty, N. M. (2002). *Dialectal variations in Balinese Language in transmigration areas in Central Lampung (Doctoral dissertation)*, Universitas Gajah Mada, Indonesia.
- Dorian, N. (1989). *Investigating obsolescence: Studies in language contraction and death*. New York, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Dweik, B. (2000). Linguistic and cultural maintenance among the Chechens of Jordan. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 13(2), 184-195.
- Dweik, B., & Al-Obaidi, T. (2014). Language contact, use and attitudes among the Chaldo-Assyrians of Baghdad, Iraq: A sociolinguistic study. *Journal of Advances in Linguistics*, 3(3), 219-231.
- Edwards, J. (1984). *Linguistic minorities: Policies and pluralism*. London, England: Academic Press.
- Edwards, J. (1988). Bilingualism, education, and identity. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 9(1&2), 203-210.
- Edwards, J., & Chisholm, J. (1987). Language, multiculturalism, and identity: A Canadian study. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 8(5), 391-408.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1964). An analysis of the interaction of language, topic, and listener. *American Anthropologist*, 66(6, Pt 2), 86-102. [https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1964.66.suppl\\_3.02a00050](https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1964.66.suppl_3.02a00050)
- Fasold, R. (1984). *The sociolinguistics of society*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Fishman, J. A. (1964). Language maintenance and language shift as fields of inquiry. *Linguistics*, 9, 32-70.
- Fishman, J. A. (1966). *Language loyalty in the United States*. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton and Co.
- Fishman, J. A. (1985). Language. In A. Kuper & J. Kuper (Eds.), *The social science encyclopedia*. London, England: Routledge.
- Fishman, J. A. (1989). *Language and ethnicity in the minority sociolinguistic perspective*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J. A. (Ed.). (1999). *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Freed, B., & Collentine, J. (2004). Learning context and its effects on second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 349-356.
- Gal, S. (1979). *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. New York, USA: Academic Press.

- Giles, H. (1979). Ethnicity markers in speech. In K. R. Scherer & H. Giles (Eds.), *Social marker in speech* (pp. 251-289). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Giles, H., Bourhis, R., & Taylor, D. M. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 307-348). London, England: Academic Press.
- Giles, H., & Coupland, N. (1991). *Language: Contexts and consequences*. Keynes, England: Open University Press.
- Giles, H., & Johnson, P. (1987). Ethnolinguistic theory: A social psychological approach to language maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, (68), 69-99.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. England: Harvard University Press.
- Hamers, J. A., & Blanc, M. H. A. (1989). *Bilinguality and bilingualism*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, J. (1980). *Identity: A study of the concept in Education for a Multicultural Australia* (ERDC Report No. 22). Canberra, Australia: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Anthropology and human behavior* (pp. 13-53). Washington, USA: Anthropological Society of Washington.
- Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 35-71). New York, USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Holmes, J., Roberts, M., Verivaki, M., & Aipolo, A. (1993). Language maintenance and language shift in three New Zealand speech communities. *Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 1-24.
- Kismosuwartono, I. (1991). *Parenting system of Javanese and Balinese transmigrant farmers' families in the transmigration area of Ruktiharjo Village, Seputih Raman District, Central Lampung Regency, Lampung Province. Comparative study of Javanese and Balinese farmers' families*. Denpasar, Indonesia: Fakultas Sastra Universitas Udayana.
- Lanca, M., Alksnis, C., Roese, N. J., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). Effects of language choice on acculturation, a study of Portuguese immigrants in a multicultural setting. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 13(3), 315-330.
- Malini, N. L. N. S. (2011). *Dynamics of Balinese Language in transmigrant areas in Lampung Province* (Doctoral dissertation), Universitas Udayana, Indonesia.
- Padilla, A. (1999). Psychology. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity* (pp. 109-121). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Yadnya, I. B. P., Malini, N. L. N. S., & Dhanawati, N. M. (2010). *Linguistic and social accommodation of intra ethnic in Lampung Province: towards the pattern of overcoming social disharmonization*. Research Report on DIKTI's National Strategic Competitive Grants. Available from [www.unud.ac.id](http://www.unud.ac.id)
- Yadnya, I. B. P., & Ardika, I. W. (Eds.). (2017). *Dynamics of human and Indonesian culture from time to time*. Denpasar, Indonesia: Pustaka Larasan dan Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Udayana.
- Spolsky, B. (1999). Second-language learning. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity* (pp. 181-192). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Sutjaja, I. G. M. (1992). *Language change: The case of Balinese in the transmigration areas of Lampung, Sulawesi, Sumbawa, and Timor*. Research Report funded by Toyota Foundation, Tokyo. Available from [www.unud.ac.id](http://www.unud.ac.id)

