SURVIVAL STRATEGIES AND HYBRID IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION AS PORTRAYED ON *LONDOKAMPUNG*'S VIDEOS

Farah Anjanillah
Universitas Gadjah Mada
Email: farah.anjanillah@mail.ugm.ac.id

Abstract: A group of people dispersing transnationally is called diaspora (Chiang, 2010; Wei & Hua, 2013). Moving to the host country means adjusting the cultures and language(s) to survive. Viewing this phenomenon, the researcher was intrigued to carry out an inquiry exploring the survival strategies and hybrid identity construction on *Londokampung*'s videos. The data of this study were in the form of utterances exhibiting survival strategies and hybrid identity formation. The data were obtained through *Londokampung* youtube channel. The findings uncover three survival strategies employed; 1) adaptation, 2) integration, and 3) latency. Adaptation strategy is done by creating Indonesian nicknames to be readily accepted in the host community. Meanwhile, integration strategy embeds hybrid loanword and linguistic hybridity such as code-switching and code-mixing. Hybrid loanword is opted due to non-structural and structural motive (Weinreich, 1968). Code-switching is done for two factors; specifying the addressee and excluding the participants. Meanwhile, reiteration and lacking of equivalent word become the two points underlying the use of code-mixing. Ultimately, in terms of latency, *Cak* Dave constructs hybrid identity to negotiate his "in-between-ness".

Keywords: *diaspora, hybrid identity, survival strategies, Londokampung*

INTRODUCTION

The terminology of diaspora refers to a group of people who disperse transnationally (Chiang, 2010; Wei & Hua, 2013). Diaspora come from similar cultural traditions or homeland (Chiang, 2010). Safran (1991) and Cohen (2009) classified a number of criteria to consider people as diaspora. In general, those scholars share similar key criteria embedding three points; 1) dispersion, 2) home-orientation and 3) boundary-maintenance (Safran, 1991; Cohen, 2009).

Furthermore, diaspora is also associated to the notion of hybridity. Hybridity could be conceived as a mixture of two distinct cultures or languages (Bhabha, 1994). As we know, diaspora is a group of immigrants Thus, they

come to the host country by bringing their own local cultures and languages. From this point, they strive to maintain their identities, known as boundary-maintenance (Safran, 1991). Nevertheless, they also experience a dilemma in the host country, for instance, alienation (Safran, 1991). Therefore, the host community might not entirely accept them. Standing from this point, they have to negotiate their identities and adapt with the host community. One of the ways is that by constructing hybrid or layered identities which are dynamic or fluid (Hall, 1990; Bhabha, 1994; Brubaker, 2005; Canagarajah & Silberstein, 2012). As suggested by Foucault, it is noteworthy that meanings do not emerge in an empty space (Walshaw, 2007), and neither do identities. They are the products of other people's and other text's meanings (Walshaw, 2007). As a result, it is also crucial to discuss diaspora's subjectivities or how they constructed their hybrid identities. Weedon (1987) explicated that subjectivities deal with the ways someone grasps the world. By extent, this scholar illuminated that social, political, cultural and economic practices might historically construct someone's subjectivities. To wrap those all up, there is a strong strand between diaspora and hybrid identity construction.

There are proliferating interests on the grand theme of diaspora community such as the studies carried out by Hinnenkamp (2003), Pujiastuti (2007), Hua (2008) and Backus et al (2010). Specifically, those existing inquiries concentrated on investigating the diaspora's language choices, code-switching and mixing in the host country. Subiyantoro (2014) then further explored linguistic hybridity among diaspora by relating it to the notion of survival strategies. Nevertheless, there is an absence of discussion of survival strategy concerning identity construction. Thus, this study has filled this lacuna by discussing the hybrid identity construction to overcome a dilemma within the diaspora community. The present study links the point of hybrid identity construction with the survival strategies proposed by Parsons (2005).

Parsons (2005) proposed AGIL notion to make a system survive. Referring to Subiyantoro (2014), Parson's tenet could also be re-contextualized and applied into survival strategies for diaspora community. This schema comprises four facets; (A) adaptation, (G) goal attainment, (I) integration and (L) latency. The tenet of hybrid identity would be linked with the point of latency. Latency could be perceived as the ways diaspora maintain their identities in the host country (Subiyantoro, 2014).

By those points, the researcher was intrigued to investigate the survival strategies and hybrid identity construction on *Londokampung*'s videos. *Londokampung* (lit. a foreigner living in a village) is the name of youtube

channel owned by Australian diaspora, named *Cak* Dave (*Cak*: Javanese addressing system for older man, similar to "Big Bro"), who has lived in Dukuh Kupang village, Surabaya, Indonesia since 1989. When he was 2 years old, he and his family moved to Indonesia because his parents were looking for a job. *Cak* Dave's mother has learned Indonesian language since she was 11 years old. Furthermore, his mother also undertook Indonesian language department during her higher degree study in Australia. In paradox, *Cak* Dave's father had just learned Indonesian language while arriving in Indonesia. He took an Indonesian language class before finally working as a Physiology lecturer at Wijaya Kusuma University, Surabaya. Hence, *Cak* Dave's parents are bilingual. Meanwhile, *Cak* Dave is a multilingual speaker, besides English, he is really fluent in speaking Indonesian and Javanese language. Even, his Javanese accent sounds like Javanese native-speaker. He can speak three languages because his parents allowed him to interact and play with the children in the village when he was a kid. Therefore, this study aims to reveal the survival strategies and hybrid identity construction on *Londokampung*'s videos.

To a further extent, the status of *Cak* Dave's parents as bilingual speakers and *Cak* Dave as a multilingual speaker might predispose them to be the language contact agents (Weinreich, 1968). In the same spirit, Kachru & Nelson (2006) also argued that multilingual speakers' understanding on more than one linguistic system enables them to create more nuanced language use. Those statements seem to emphasize Kachru's & Nelson's ideas (2006) asserting that multilingual speakers are facilitated by a prominent device that is competent to mix, switch, and adopt a number of discourse strategies and stylistics from the cultural and verbal repertoire. That is why multilingual speakers seem to have various expressive resources to be opted in the different situational contexts (Kachru & Nelson, 2006). By this point, it could be grasped that bilingualism and multilingualism appear to propel the production of linguistic hybridity as proposed by Bakhtin (1996) on his book entitled "The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays".

Inspired by Bakhtin (1996), Subiyantoro (2014) defined linguistic hybridity as the incorporation of two different languages as the embodiment of two fluid cultures combination. In addition, Subiyantoro (2014) discovered that hybrid lexicons, code-switching, and code-mixing are forms of linguistic hybridity. Hence, linguistic hybridity should not be viewed as an 'error' form or 'language deficiency', instead it should be perceived as a legitimate language variety. This appears to be in tune with Pennycook's (2000) & Gao's (2014) statement asserting that hybridization of localities and English might be

perceived as a medium of expressing identity. It should be seen as an acceptable variety.

In a broader sense, the forms of linguistic hybridity as mentioned above are not merely a matter of language choice, rather it is indeed an identity negotiation tool. It seems to resonate with Spolsky's notion (2003), elucidating that code-switching done by bilingual or multilingual speakers strongly represents rich social meanings. Spolsky (2003) further elaborated that each language opted by the speaker might function as a tool for disguising and negotiating identities as well as social relations with the addressee. Standing from the discussion as mentioned above, it could be grasped that the investigation of survival strategies and hybrid identity construction is crucial since those two points appear to share a strong strand within the diaspora community.

METHOD

Data collection

The data of this study were the utterances containing of survival strategies and hybrid identity construction. Meanwhile, in terms of the data sources, the data were gained from *Londokampung*'s YouTube channel. The data were gathered and transcribed in the range of time May 17th until 23rd, 2021. In the data collection, the researcher looked for the relevant videos containing the Javanese nicknames of *Londokampung's* family, code-switching, code-mixing, borrowing and identity construction to portray the survival strategies. Hence, the researcher focused on watching the videos that have titles pertaining to *Londokampung*'s life in Indonesia and his perspectives in viewing Indonesian and Javanese language and cultures. Moreover, the researcher also watched numerous videos to uncover various motives on why *Londokampung* uses code-switching, code-mixing, and borrowing. After watching numerous videos, the researcher found the 9 most relevant videos. Afterward, the researcher transcribed the relevant utterances as the data to be analyzed.

Data analysis

After gathering the data, the researcher undertook the data analysis process. First of all, the researcher read the transcribed data and identified the survival strategies by bolding them on *Microsoft word*. Then, the researcher classified the utterances based on survival strategies as proposed by Parsons (2005). Next, in terms of the linguistic hybridity facet, the researcher categorized the types and motives of code-switching and mixing under the analytical framework of Gumperz (1982). Meanwhile, the researcher classified the data exhibiting integration by using Weinreich's notion (1968). Next, the researcher analyzed the hybrid identity construction by utilizing Weedon's (1987) tenet on subjectivities. Overall, the researcher also employed other scholars' relevant tenets to reach the findings validity, known as theory triangulation (Ary et al, 2010). Ultimately, the researcher drew a conclusion.

FINDINGS

Survival Strategies

1. Adaptation

The survival strategy in terms of adaptation appears to be portrayed on the video entitled "*Kenapa kami pilih Indonesia? Ngobrol sama keluarga Londokampung*" (Why do we choose Indonesia? Having a chit-chat with *Londokampung*'s family), "*Londokampung Q&A Part 1*" (Part 1 of Londokampung's Q&A session), and "*Kok gak nikah cewek bule aja? Ngobrol sama keluarga Londokampung Part 2*" (Why don't you marry a foreigner? Having a chit-chat with *Londokampung*'s family: Part 2).

Jenkins (2015) explicated that English is a type of language in which the words are pronounced differently from the orthography. This status quo seems to be a problem for Indonesian society since Indonesian words are pronounced the same as the orthography. Hence, Indonesian society who do not learn English seem to face difficulties in pronouncing English words. As the result, to deal with this issue, *Londokampung*'s family makes their own Indonesian nicknames and addressing system as reflected in the subsequent data:

Hume Jephcott → *Pak Hendro*
Heather Jephcott → *Bu Heda/Ida*
David Andrew Jephcott → David /dafet/

> *Cak* Dave /def/

Aragorn Jawa Cillian Jephcott → *Jago*

The data above might sketch out the use of adaptation strategy in *Londokampung*'s family. On that video, Mr. Hume (*Cak* Dave's father) asserted that when at the first time he came to Indonesia and introduced himself to his friend, named Ali, Ali said that it was hard to call Mr. Hume's name. Hence, Ali directly suggested Mr. Hume a Javanese nickname "Hendro". Then, Mr. Hume agreed. Since that time, Mr. Hume is called as *Pak* Hendro (*Pak* is "Mr"). Notwithstanding Mr. Hume did not create the Javanese nickname by himself, the way he agrees to be called as *Pak* Hendro strongly exhibits that he has a willingness to adapt with the new environment to be easily accepted in the host country (Parsons, 2005; Ritzer, 2011; Subiyantoro, 2014). Therefore, it is classified as a survival strategy in terms of adaptation (Parsons, 2005).

After knowing that her husband had just had a Javanese nickname, Mrs. Heather had also created her own Indonesian nicknames "Bu Heda" or "Bu Ida" (*Bu* means "Mrs"). However, different from his parent's names which are a little bit hard to be pronounced by Indonesian society, the name "David" is also commonly used in Indonesia, thus *Cak* Dave does not have his own Indonesian nickname. Notwithstanding, he also appears to employ adaptation strategies in two ways. First by adjusting the pronunciation of his name with the incorporation of Indonesian and Javanese pronunciation. This seems to be proven on the video entitled "*Bule Jowo pertama kali sungkem ke Orangtua*" (A foreigner *sungkem* for the first time to his parent), when *Cak* Dave came to his neighbor's house as being exhibited below:

    Pak Parto : Natan?
    Cak Dave   : David, *Pak*. (David, Sir.)
                /dafet/

From the aforementioned excerpt, it could be grasped that *Cak* Dave pronounces his name "David" as /dafet/, not /ˈdeɪvɪd/. This pronunciation appears to demonstrate the mixture between Indonesian and Javanese pronunciation. The Indonesian pronunciation seems to be illustrated on /f/ sound, whereas the use of /e/ sound indicates Javanese pronunciation. If it is fully pronounced in Indonesian language, it will be /dafit/, whilst Javanese pronunciation will be /dapet/. There is an absence of /f/ sound in the *aksara Jawa* (Javanese alphabet). Thus, Javanese people pronounce /f/ with /p/ sound. Moreover, Indonesian pronunciation does not distinguish /f/ and /v/ sound. Different from English, both of those sounds are pronounced in the same way as /f/ sound. That is why, "David" is pronounced by /f/ not /v/ sound in

Indonesian pronunciation. All in all, his pronunciation adjustment might portray adaptation strategy (Parsons, 2005).

The next adaptation strategy implemented by *Cak* Dave is by attaching an addressing system "*Cak*" preceding his name. Besides, the word "Dave" is pronounced as /def/ not /deɪv/. This seems to depict that he strives to be included and recognized as an individual coming from the same ethnicity background as the host community, Javanese society. In another word, he strives to lessen differences and interact with the new environment he lives in (Parsons, 2005; Subiyantoro, 2014).

The adaptation strategy with regard to names applied by the first generation of *Londokampung* as immigrant family, and the second generation. *Cak* Dave also created Indonesian nickname for his son. Taking into account that the word "Aragorn" is hard to be pronounced by Indonesian people, thus he and his wife are worried if Indonesian society call their son "*arogan*" (arrogant). Hence, they decided to give their son a nickname "Jago". "Ja" is taken from the word "Jawa" (Java island), whilst "go" is taken from the word "Aragorn". In terms of meaning, *Cak* Dave elucidated that *Jago* refers to the Indonesian language, which means "great", "masterly", "smart" or "skillful".

Furthermore, on the video, *Cak* Dave also explicated that the combination of those words exhibits the status of his marriage as inter-country/interracial couple. *Cak* Dave gets married with a Chinese-Javanese, named Santi. Thus, the word "Jawa" represents that the mother is a Javanese, whereas English word "Aragorn" demonstrates that the father is an Australian. Moreover, when being asked by netizen "Why does *Cak* Dave undergo an exogamy marriage?", *Pak* Hendro answers as the following:

> *"Karena memang kami, sebagai warga negara Australia punya nilai yang paling tinggi 'egalitarian', semua orang sama derajatnya, martabatnya. Jadi, kami tidak membedakan. Kami senang sekali dengan menantu, namanya Santi itu."*
> [Because we are an Australian citizen, we have our highest value, called as 'egalitarian', which means every people have the same degree, prestige. So, we do not differentiate any race. We are really happy in having our daughter-in-law, Santi.]

From the excerpt above, it could be conceived that although living in Indonesia, *Londokampung*'s family still preserves Australian's value, egalitarian, in a particular case like marriage. It is in accordance with Cohen's tenet (2009) on the diaspora criterion called "maintenance". It means the diaspora family attempts to maintain their local cultures or values (Cohen, 2009). In further exploration, Garcı́a (2006) asserted that migrating transnationally and living in the host country for a long time possibly lead to an

exogamy marriage. This type of marriage might also propel the transcultural identities construction (Garcı´a, 2006). In this study, the researcher uncovers that the mixed couple, *Cak* Dave and Santi, negotiate identities by creating linguistic hybridity on their son's name (Bhabha, 1994). Thus, incorporating the two different cultures and languages into one united name appears to be the solution of to represent the intersected identities (Bhabha, 1994). In a nutshell, the adaptation strategy discussed above might also imply that the diaspora attempt to decrease the social distance with the host community to be more intimate.

2. Integration and Linguistic Hybridity
a. Borrowing
- **The stem is transferred and the affix is indigenous**

Table 1. Hybrid loan-words comprising of English suffix and Javanese stems

No	Hybrid loan-words	Affixes	Morphemes
1	*Dulurs, lurs* (noun): Guys	English suffix: -s	*Dulur/lur* (n) + s
2	*Endogs* (noun) : Eggs	English suffix: -s	*Endog* (n) + s

On the video entitled "*Apa yang kita makan selama 30 tahun di Indonesia?*" (What do we eat along 30 years in Indonesia?), and "*Serasa di luar negeri! Piknik bersama keluarga di taman terbesar di Jatim"* (Feeling like being abroad! Having a picnics with family in the biggest park in East Java), *Cak* Dave appears to utter hybrid loanwords as presented subsequently:

> *Datum 1: Halo **dulurs**! Iki Londokampung sekeluarga wes tutuk nang Kebun Raya Purwodadi* [Hello, guys! Londokampung and family have arrived at Purwodadi Botanical Garden]
>
> *Datum 2: Dongo sek **lurs**! Ndongo!* [Pray first, guys! Pray!]
>
> *Datum 3: How many **endogs** do you want?* [How many eggs do you want?]

The bolded words demonstrate the use of hybrid loanwords (Haugen, 1950; Subiyantoro, 2014). Those data are categorized as a hybrid compound since each word comprises two morphemes from distinct languages (Weinreich, 1968). Those words are composed from Javanese words as the stems and English plural marker **–s**. Taking into account that English is *Cak* Dave's first language (L1), the suffix **–s** is considered indigenous (Weinreich, 1968). In paradox, the nouns "*dulur*", "*lur*" ("*lur"* is taken from the word "*dulur*" in which both of them mean "guy") and "*endog*" (egg) are transferred from Javanese language (Weinreich, 1968). Furthermore, the hybrid loanwords *"dulurs"* (guys)*, "lurs"* (guys) and *"endogs"* (eggs) denote inflectional morpheme

indicating the grammatical function of the word, in which –s represents plural marker of a noun (Yule, 2010). In a nutshell, these findings are also considered as inter-lingual portmanteaus referring to a new word formed by joining two elements of different languages and combining their meanings (Weinreich, 1968).

Concerning the motive underlying the use of hybrid loanword, it is possibly underlain by the structural motive (Weinreich, 1968). The way Indonesian language forms plural noun is by using reduplication. Hence, this type of word formation in the Indonesian language is longer than English. Thus, it could be the limitation of Indonesian language's internal structure (Weinreich, 1968). Compared to *dulur-dulur, lur-lur,* and *endog-endog* consisting of two words, *Cak* Dave considers that the words *dulurs, lurs* and *endogs* are more concise and effective. In the further investigation, another plausibility why he uses the hybrid form might be underlain by non-structural factors (Weinreich, 1968). Hybridization or a mixture between local and global elements enables him to be a global part of society and express identity as Javanese (Pennycook, 2000). Thus, attaching suffix –s might become a medium for negotiating and projecting his identity as an Australian.

After scrutinizing the data, the researcher also reveals another type of hybrid loanword. This is a type in which is the stem is indigenous from English and the affix is from Indonesian language (Weinreich, 1968).

- **The stem is indigenous and the affix is transferred**

Table 2. Hybrid loan-words comprising of Indonesian prefixes and English stems

No	Hybrid loan-words	Affixes	Morphemes
1	*Ter-publish (verb): be*	Indonesian prefix: *ter-*	*Ter+ publish (v)*
2	*Di-monetize (verb): be monetized*	Indonesian prefix: di-	*Di+* monetize (v)

On the video entitled "*Jago dan Bree main ke rumah mbah bulenya!* (Jago and Bree visit their grandparents!) *Cak* Dave appears to utter hybrid loanwords as presented subsequently:

Datum 1: Wes, ter-publish [Done, it's already published]
Datum 2: Sudah di-monetize? [Has it been monetized?]

The analysis demonstrates that prefix "*ter-*"and *"di-"*are Indonesian prefixes to indicate a passive verb. The reason why *Cak* Dave borrows Indonesian prefixes indicating passive voice is possibly due to the message qualification (Gumperz, 1968). Thus, he possibly regards that the interlocutors (*Londokampung*'s working team) he is interacting with, will be confused

whether the words are active or passive if he says them in English "published" and "monetized". Hence, to make sure that the interlocutors grasp his utterance, he adopts Indonesian prefixes for passive verb. Besides, those hybrid loanwords also appear to depict that he attempts to exhibit his identity through the use of his mother tongue and to project his Indonesian identity through the use of prefixes.

b. Code-switching
• Addressee specification

Besides borrowing, another survival strategy is also reflected on the use of linguistic hybridity, code-switching, on the video entitled "*Bule Jowo pertama kali sungkem ke Orangtua*" (A foreigner *sungkem* for the first time to his parent) as presented below:

> *Cak Dave: Iki lo Bu Mul, aku bagi-bagi klambi. Sampeyan gelem ta?*
> *Gae arek-arek.*
> *Bu Mul : Gelem yo.*
> *Cak Dave:Tak goleki sing L yo. Oh, iki M. siji maneh yo*
> *Pak Parto :Tak kiro Natan.*
> *Cak Dave: Hahaha, Natan nang Ostrali, Pak.*
> *You wanna replace an L with an M?*
> *Bu Heda : No, no, no. that's okay. That's one for Ibu, one for…*
> *Cak Dave: One for Pak Parto, one for Dorinda, one for Vita.*
> [Cak Dave: Mrs. Mul, I give t-shirts to people. Do you want some?
> For your daughters.
> Bu Mul : Yeah, I want those.
> Cak Dave: Let me find the L size. Oh, this is the M size. One more t-shirt, right?
> Pak Parto : I've thought that you are Natan.
> Cak Dave: Hahaha, Natan is in Australia, Sir. You wanna replace an L with an M?
> Bu Heda : No, no, no. that's okay. That's one for Mrs. Mul, one for…
> Cak Dave: One for Mr. Parto, one for Dorinda, one for Vita]

From the conversation above, it could be conceived that there is an inter-sentential code-switching from Javanese language to English indicated on the bolded sentences (Romaine, 1995). *For example, Cak* Dave uses Javanese language when he talks to his neighbors, *Bu* Mul and *Pak* Parto. He adjusts with whom he talks to. The interlocutors are his neighbors who live in the village and whose ages are quite old. Therefore, he opts to speak Javanese language to be in the same frequency and ethnicity as the interlocutors. Thus, he could be included as the same group membership and the social distance would decrease (Spolsky, 2003; Holmes, 2013). In other words, speaking Javanese

also enables him to bond more intimate relationship with his neighbors (Holmes, 2013).

After speaking the Javanese language, *Cak* Dave directly switches his speech when he talks to his mother. Thus, it indicates that he specifies his language choice based on the addressee (Gumperz, 1982; Crystal, 2003; Holmes, 2013). He speaks English with his mother since it is his mother tongue. Notwithstanding *Cak* Dave and his mother speak in English, they still use Indonesian addressing system "*Ibu*" and "*Pak*" in their speeches. Hence, it mirrors intra-sentential code-switching, commonly known as code-mixing (Romaine, 1995). The code-mixing in this case occurs in the form of word (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2013). It might function to establish more solid rapport with their neighbors.

- **Excluding the participants**

  The next usage of code-switching is shown on the video entitled "*Bikin penasaran! Kenapa bule Jowo mau dibesarkan di kampung?*" (Rising curiosity! Why did a foreigner want to be grown up in a village?), this code-switching is used for excluding the participants (Crystal, 2003). It is reflected in the subsequent conversation:

  Cak Dave   : I wanna say also thank you that you brought us kids here, so that I could become rich and famous (joking)
  Pak Hendro : hahaha
  Bu Heda   : hahaha, or less rich?
  Cak Dave   : not so rich. Duik e akeh wong tuoku timbang aku. Njaluk.. Aku utang seket ewu durung ngomong, durung tak balekno. Hihi.. gak eruh boso Jowo (pointing to his parents). (My parents have much money compared to me. I asked.. I have a debt to them 50.000 IDR, but I have not said to them, I have not returned that money. Hihi.. they do not understand Javanese language) (pointing to his parents).

  From the conversation above, it could be conceived that there is an inter-sentential code-switching from English to Javanese indicated on the bolded sentences (Romaine, 1995). *Cak* Dave switches his utterance into Javanese language since he wants to tell about a secret he does not want his parents to know it. He reveals his secret to the cameraman, who is also a Javanese person. His parents are able to speak Indonesian, but not Javanese language. Hence, he intentionally alters his speech to Javanese language to exclude his parents from the conversation (Crystal, 2003).

  c. **Code-mixing**

- **Reiteration and Lacking of equivalent word**

Besides code-switching, the researcher also discloses the use of code-mixing in *Londokampung*'s family. For example, it could be seen on the video entitled "*Bule Jowo pertama kali sungkem ke Orangtua"* (A foreigner *sungkem* for the first time to his parent) as presented below:

Cak Dave: Oh yeah, Thobib shows me how to do it. So, is it okay for you if I *sungkem* you?

Bu Heda : Okay, what are you doing? Mm.. *sungkem*?

Cak Dave: So, basically, hi guys, if I'm wrong, you can correct me (talking to the camera). So I think, so it's the same as *"mohon maaf lahir dan batin"*, but with parents. You give them extra respect by…so, kneeling in front of them and you know, holding their hands with a certain way. And, some Javanese, they actually have certain words to say, in high Javanese, in *kromo alus.*

From the conversation above, it could be conceived that there are several usages of intra-sentential code-switching or commonly known as code-mixing (Romaine, 1995). The code-mixing occurs in the form of word, phrase, and clause (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2013). Code-mixing in the form of word demonstrated on the word "*sungkem*", whereas "*kromo alus*" belongs to code-mixing in the form of phrase. Meanwhile, "*mohon maaf lahir dan batin*" is classified as code-mixing in the form of clause. Based on KBBI (Indonesian language dictionary), the word "*sungkem*" refers to prostration as a signal of respect. It is usually done to apologize to the parents in Eid Al-Fitr (Festival of fast-breaking for Muslims). Hence, it demonstrates a cultural-specific terminology. As a result, *Cak* Dave decides to use its original word since there is no culture in Australia. This resonates with Crystal's idea (2003) asserting that code-mixing might occur due to the lack of equivalent words.

Furthermore, he also elaborates his explanation by switching to the Indonesian language and mentioning "*mohon maaf lahir dan batin*". It is because his parents are able to speak the Indonesian language, and he postulates that the type of expression has already been commonly heard during Eid Al-Fitr day. So basically, that clause is an Eid Al-Fitr expression to seek for forgiveness.

Finally, the last code-mixing could be seen in the use of the phrase "*kromo alus*". "*Kromo alus*" is the highest or the most polite speech level in Javanese language. Actually *Cak* Dave explains it in English by stating "in high Javanese". Nevertheless, he directly switches his speech by mentioning "*kromo alus*". It is possibly underlain by the lack of equivalent word (Crystal, 2003). Similar to "*sungkem"*, *kromo alus* is a cultural-specific terminology. Thus, he might be worried that it would create a misperception when he said "in high

Javanese". That is why, he decides to do a code-mixing in order to clarify the information (Gumperz, 1968). This sort of function is called as reiteration (Gumperz, 1968).

3. Latency

The last survival strategy found is latency or the identity maintenance (Parsons, 2005; Subiyantoro, 2014). Formerly, *Cak* Dave appears to encounter a dilemma to construct his identities, yet finally he decides to negotiate his identities by foregrounding hybrid identity. It is shown on the video entitled "*Akhirnya terungkap! Londokampung WNI atau WNA?*" (Finally revealed! Is *Londokampung* an Indonesian or foreigner citizen??), as presented in the following excerpts:

Excerpt 1

> *Wong koyok aku iki onok sebutane, bahasa Inggrise "third cultural kid". Dadi, wong sing lahir di satu negara, terus pindah ke negara lain, pindah nang kono. Trus, tau mbalik nang negoro e maneh. Sering wong koyok aku iki lek wes gedhe, wes dewasa, rodok bingung. "aku iki wong endi se?". "aku iki diterimo nang ndi?". Nang kene, umpamane dadi warga negara Australia, umpamane wong takok "lapo gak dadi WNI?". Selalu dianggap pendatang. Masio wes suwe ndek kene, didelok nang embong "eh onok bule! Onok bule!". Trus, aku mbalik nang Australia yo gak nyaman. Gak paham budayae, konco-konco gak onok.*

> [A person like me has an English terminology, called as "third cultural kid". So, it refers to someone born in a certain country, then moves to another country, lives there. Then, he/she has ever returns to his/her homeland. This type of person often encounters a dilemma when he/she grows older, mature "what nationality am I?" "in what country am I accepted in?". For example, being an Australian citizen, there are many people here (in Indonesia) who ask "why don't you become an Indonesian citizen?". I'm always considered as an immigrant, although I have lived here for a long time. When people meet me in the street, they say "there is a foreigner! A foreigner!". Then, when I go home to Australia, I also don't feel comfortable since I don't understand the cultures and I don't have any friends.]

Excerpt 2

> *Aku nang Australi, ilat Jowoku kenek panganan kono rodok gak seneng. Mesti nggolek panganan Indonesia,…… Lek aku nang kene dianggap pendatang, nang kono yo sek merasa lek aku iki pendatang, bukan wong kono asli. Aku tau ngrasakno koyok ngono. Tapi saiki wes gak se. aku saiki luweh ngroso koyok.. wah iki kewarganegaraan buat aku pribadi gak terlalu penting. Gak usah mek milih sak negoro. Dadi, aku gak nganggep wong Indonesia lebih penting, wong Australi luweh penting.*

[When I'm in Australia, my Javanese tongue does not like the cuisine there. I always look for Indonesian food, ... In paradox, when I'm here (Indonesia), I'm always considered as an immigrant. I also feel that I'm like an immigrant in Australia, not a native person there. I had ever felt those dilemmas, but now I don't feel those any longer. Now, I feel like.. nationality is not too important, for me, personally. I can choose both of the two countries. So, I don't consider Indonesian people more important than Australian people, and vice-versa.]

Excerpt 3

Aku sak jane pengen dadi.. duduk WNI, duduk WNA. Tapi, WNAI. Warga Negara Australia dan Indonesia. WNAI, rek.

[Actually, I want to be, neither Indonesian nor foreign citizen. But, I want to be both Indonesian and Australian citizen, guys.]

Those excerpts might sketch out that *Cak* Dave had ever encountered a dilemma in constructing his identity. It is in accordance with Zhao's statement (2015) pointing out that many diaspora face a disorientation due to the dichotomous concepts on the society viewing that identity only comprises "all-or none" and "either-or" option. Zhao (2015) deconstructs that argument by asserting that identities are layered in essence rather than holistic. Therefore, it also resonates with Morgan's tenet (2007) considering identities as "subject-to-change" or dynamic entity instead of static. By this point, it seems to be possible to construct a third space or hybrid identity (Bhabha, 1994). Inspired by Ang, Zhao (2015) also amplifies it by stating that one of the ways to make diaspora comfortable with their dynamic identities is by admitting and celebrating hybridity. In another word, Zhao (2015) suggests that we should embrace fluidity and "in-between-ness" of diaspora. Therefore, it is in accordance with this study's finding revealing that *Cak* Dave appears to negotiate his identities by constructing hybrid identities as both Australian and Indonesian. As being discussed previously, he is still able to speak English. Besides, it is also exhibited in the excerpt below:

Logat itu nggak penting, yang penting kita semua bisa berbahasa Indonesia. That we can understand each other, the way we say our language doesn't matter if we all understand and accept each other. Sing penting, wong Jowo ojok lali Jowone. Oiya satu lagi, wong bule ojok lali bulene, aku gak lali, aku sik iso boso Inggris, ya kan?

[Accent is not important, the most important is that we can speak Indonesian. We can understand each other, the way we say our language doesn't matter if we all understand and accept each other. The important thing is that as Javanese people, don't forget your "Javanese-ness" (identity). Oh yeah, one more point, as foreigners, don't forget your language, I remember it, I'm still able to speak English, right?]

Humanities across Histories and Trajectories in the Glocal Contexts

From that extract, it could be grasped that *Cak* Dave still maintains his identity as Australian by being able to speak English. It is in tune with Cohen's idea (2009) on the criteria of diaspora in terms of "maintenance". Thus, his parents have successfully transmitted English as L1 for *Cak* Dave although living in Indonesia. Moreover, *Cak* Dave also transmits English, Indonesian and Javanese to his son, Jago. Thus, his son is also a multilingual speaker. It strongly depicts language transmission as a way to preserve the existence of languages (Austin, 2007).

Besides, the excerpt above also demonstrates that he attempts to counter the society's perception downgrading people who speak Indonesian with Javanese accent. He emphasizes the point of how the message is understandable instead of accent. It strengthens Gao's notion (2014) asserting that people should concern with the understandable interaction rather than accent. Furthermore, he also encourages Javanese people not to forget their identities. His parents' perspectives possibly underlie cak Dave's subjectivities in viewing the Javanese language. When *Cak* Dave asks to *Bu Heda* and *Pak Hendro* about their perspectives to view Javanese language, they explicated as the following:

> *Bu Heda*: *Saya tidak pernah anggap bahasa Jawa, bahasa yang lebih jelek daripada bahasa Indonesia.* (I never regard that Javanese language is worse than Indonesian language)
>
> *Pak Hendro* : *Bahasa Jawa kaya sekali, kekayaan kosakata, perbendaharaan kata luar biasa. Jadi, dunia rugi kalau bahasa Jawa itu hilang.* (Javanese language is rich of vocabularies. The vocabularies are amazing. Thus, the world will gain loss if Javanese language is extinct.)

From the conversation above, it could be grasped that *Bu Heda* and *Pak Hendro* encourage us to be proud of Javanese language. From this point of view, they allowed *Cak* Dave to interact and play with the children in the village since he was a kid. That is why *Cak* Dave is fluent in speaking Javanese. Overall, this analysis appears to exhibit that *Cak* Dave's subjectivities might be affected by his parents' perspectives in viewing the Javanese language. Hence, this strongly amplifies Varghese et al's (2005), Manathunga's (2015) and Yayli's argument (2015) stating that subjectivities might be shaped from personal history. Wahyudi (2018) elucidated that personal history refers to how someone grew and socialized in a family and culture. Besides, *Cak Dave*'s movement from Australia to Indonesia might also predispose his subjectivities, known as cultural geography factor (Manathunga, 2015). Manathunga (2015) and Wahyudi (2018) pointed out that different places and cultures possibly propel the subjectivities constructions. All in all, these analyses appear to support

Weedon's tenet (1987) illuminating that subjectivities are historically shaped through amount of practices like social and culture.

From the aforementioned extracts, it might be perceived that *Bu Heda* regards that Javanese language has equal position as other languages. It seems to portray Sapir's-Whorf's linguistic relativism since every language has its own uniqueness, thus there is no language which is more superior or inferior than others (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2013). Besides, it also strongly demonstrates the feature of diaspora to have tolerance with the host country's pluralism (Cohen, 2009). Meanwhile, *Pak Hendro*'s utterance might depict linguistic pride (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2013). Wijana's & Rohmadi's statement (2013) asserted that language maintenance could be done by attaching linguistic pride within oneself. By doing so, there might not be ethnocentrism anymore (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2013).

DISCUSSION

The finding pertaining to the survival strategies in terms of adaptation appears to underpin Subiyantoro's inquiry (2014). Subiyantoro (2014) found out that Javanese diaspora living in New Caledonia employ adaptation strategy for administration by using their Javanese names as the family name and adding a French name to be used as the given name. Notwithstanding, this previous study only deals with adaptation strategy in the form of lexicon. Hence, the present inquiry seems to expand and enrich it by finding out that adaptation strategy with regard to the name adjustment might also be done in the phonological level.

Whereas, the finding of hybrid loan-word discovered in this study seems to support Subiyantoro's (2014) and Subiyantoro et al's research (2017) disclosing that Javanese diaspora in New Caledonia used hybrid loanword incorporating French stem and Javanese suffix –an on the word *lafetan* (party) which is similarly formed as the word *slametan* to gain more *njawani* (having a quality, characteristics of Javanese) sense. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the present study has given more nuanced by utilizing Weinreich's notion (1968) to unpack the motives of using hybrid loanword.

To further extent, the results regarding linguistic hybridity in terms of code-switching and mixing appear to resonate with the existing inquiry undertaken by Backus et al (2010). This scholar figured out that code-switching used by diaspora might indicate a transnational identity. Meanwhile, the

motives behind the use of code-switching found in this study also amplifies Pujiastuti's finding (2007), indicating that Indonesian diaspora in the US used code-switching for excluding/including other people and expressing solidarity. Moreover, the reason of unavailability of relevant vocabulary underlying code-mixing exhibited in this study seems to confirm Hinnekamp's (2003), Pujiastuti's (2007) as well as Subiyantoro's research (2014). These scholars also revealed that the absence of equivalent terminology triggered the immigrants to mix their codes. Besides, the result uncovered that diaspora uses code-mixing to reinforce messages likely shares similarity with Hua's finding (2008).

Finally, the result disclosing that *Cak* Dave seems to construct hybrid identity as the solution of his 'in-between-ness' might be in tune with Hinnekamp's finding (2003). This scholar also discovered that people might interact, operate and struggle with distinct identities, thus possibly possessing more than one identity (Hinnekamp, 2003). Despite this similarity, it is noteworthy that the present study provides more nuanced analysis by employing Weedon's (1987) subjectivity notion.

CONCLUSIONS

As the closing remarks, the researcher reveals three survival strategies employed by *Londokampung*'s family; 1) adaptation, 2) integration, and 3) latency. Adaptation strategy is implemented by creating Indonesian nicknames. It is done to be easily accepted in the host community. Whereas, the integration strategy is employed in linguistic hybridity such as borrowing, code-switching and code-mixing. The factors underlying the use of hybrid loanwords are non-structural and structural factors (Weinreich, 1968). Meanwhile, code-switching is done for two reasons; specifying the addressee and excluding the participants. Whereas, the code-mixing is done due to reiteration and lacking of equivalent vocabulary. To survive in Indonesia as a diaspora, the last way done by *Cak* Dave is by projecting third space identity to negotiate his ambivalence.

SUGGESTIONS

In consolidation, through the results of this study, the researcher expects the readers of this article to be encouraged to be proud of local languages and

AIC❂LLIM 3ʳᵈ Annual International Conference on Language, Literature and Media

cultures. It might be ironic if diaspora as the outsiders are more 'Indonesian' and *njawani* than the true Indonesian society or the insiders. Considering that Indonesia comprises various tribes and languages, it is highly recommended that we escalate our awareness to preserve those local languages and cultures in this global era. By doing so, we might maintain our identities as Indonesian and Javanese (or other tribes) society.

To wrap those all up, this study does not discuss the survival strategy in terms of goal attainment as proposed by Parson (2005) because of the limited space. Hence, this lacuna could be further explored by the next scholars. Besides, the future researchers could also expand and enrich it by combining Parson's tenet (2005) with other scholar's survival strategies theories. It is noteworthy that the inquiry of diaspora seems to be underexplored, thus the future researchers could also investigate the grand theme of Indonesian diaspora and how they maintain Indonesian and local language(s) in the host country.

REFERENCES

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C. K., & Walker, D. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th Ed). Cengage Learning.

Austin, P. K. (2007). Survival of languages. In Emily F. Shuckburgh (Ed). *Survival: Darwin College Lectures,* pp. 80-98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Backus, A., Jørgensen, J. N., & Pfaff, C. (2010). Linguistic Effects of Immigration: Language Choice, Codeswitching, and Change in Western European Turkish. *Language and Linguistics Compass 4*(7), 481-495.

Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. (2016). KBBI Daring. https://kbbi.kemendikbud.go.id/.

Bakhtin, M. (1996). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture.* London: Routledge.

Humanities across Histories and Trajectories in the Glocal Contexts

Bhabha, H. (1999). Staging the politics of difference: Homi Bhabha's critical literacy (Interview). In G. A. Olson & L. Worsham (Eds.). *Race, rhetoric, and the postcolonial* (pp. 3–42). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Brubaker, R. (2005). The 'diaspora' diaspora. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 28*(1), 1-19.

Canagarajah, S., & Silberstein, S. (2012). Diaspora Identities and Language. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education,* 11, 81–84.

Chiang, C. Y. (2010). Diasporic Theorizing Paradigm on Cultural Identity. *Intercultural Communication Studies,* 19, 29–46.

Crystal, D. (2003). *Encyclopedia of language* (2nd Ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, R. (2009). *Global diasporas: An introduction* (2nd Ed). New York: Routledge.

Gao, Y. (2014). Faithful imitator, legitimate speaker, playful creator and ideological communicator: Shift in English learners' identity prototype. *Language and Intercultural Communication 14*(1), 59-75.

Garcı´a, D. R. (2006). Mixed Marriages and Transnational Families in the Intercultural Context: A Case Study of African-Spanish Couples in Catalonia. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies 32*(3), 403-433.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.). *Identity, community, culture, difference* (pp. 222–237). London, UK: Lawrence & Wishart.

Haugen, E. (1950). The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing. *Language 26* (2), 210-231.

Hinnenkamp, V. (2003). Mixed Language Varieties of Migrant Adolescents and the Discourse of Hybridity, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 24(1-2), 12-41.

3rd Annual International Conference
on Language, Literature and Media

AIC LLIM

Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (4th Ed.). New York: Routledge.

Hua, Z. (2008). Duelling Languages, Duelling Values: Codeswitching in bilingual intergenerational conflict talk in diasporic families. *Journal of Pragmatics 40,* 1799–1816.

Jenkins, J. (2015). *Global Englishes: A resource book for students* (3rd Ed)*.* New York: Routledge.

Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian Context.* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Manathunga, C. (2015). Transcultural and postcolonial explorations: Unsettling education. *The Educational Journal: Comparative Perspectives, 14*(2), 10-21.

Morgan, B. (2007). Post-structuralism and applied linguistics: Complementary approaches to culture and identity in ELT. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds). *International Handbook of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1033-1052). New York: Springer.

Parsons, T. (2005). *The social system*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group.

Pennycook, A. (2000). English, politics, ideology: From colonial celebration to post-colonial performativity. In T. Ricento (Ed). *Ideology, politics, and language policies: Focus on English*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp.107-119.

Pujiastuti, A. (2007). Code-Switching as a Multilingual Strategy in Conversations among Indonesian Graduate Students in the US. *Journal of English and Education 1*(2), 10-34.

Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd Ed). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Ritzer, G. (2011). *Sociological theory* (8th Ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Safran, W. (1991). Diasporas in modern societies: Myths of homeland and return. *Diaspora 1*(1), 83-99.

Subiyantoro. (2014). Survival strategies of the Javanese language in New Caledonia. *Humaniora 26* (1), 43-55.

Subiyantoro, Marsono, & Udasmoro, W. (2017). Integration of French lexicons in New Caledonian Javanese. *Humaniora 29* (1), 85-93.

Spolsky, B. (2003). *Sociolinguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., and Johnson, K. (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of language, identity and education, 4*(1), 21-44

Wahyudi, R. (2018). Situating English language teaching in Indonesia within a critical, global dialogue of theories: A case study of teaching argumentative writing and cross-cultural understanding Courses. Unpublished Dissertation: Victoria University of Wellington.

Walshaw, M. (2007). *Working with Foucault in education.* Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Cambridge MA & Oxford UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Wei, L., & Hua, Z. (2013). Diaspora Multilingual and intercultural communication across time and space. *AILA Review* 26, 42-56.

Weinreich, U. (1968). *Language in contact*. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Wijana, I. D. P., & Rohmadi, M. (2013). *Sosiolinguistik: Kajian teori dan analisis* [Sociolinguistics: Theory and Analysis]. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Yayli, D. (2015). Tackling multiple identities in an EFL teaching context. In Y.L. Cheung, S.B. Said & K. Park (Eds). *Advances and current trends in language teacher identity research* (pp.186-200). London/New York: Routledge.

Zhao, Q. V. (2015). The Loss of Chinese Language in Chinese Diasporas in the U.S. *MALS Journal of Dartmouth,* 41-57.