

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1 Ethnography of Communication Approach

This research study uses ethnography of communication as the approach. This theory has been developed by Hymes who best known for his founding role in the ethnography of communication (Johnstone and Marcellino, 2010:3). Johnstone and Marcellino (2010:3) say that ‘ways of speaking’ is the object of study Hymes purposes for linguistics. In Torabi’s journal (p. 37) says that Hymes pointed out ‘analyzed linguistic materials are indispensable, and the logic of linguistic methodology is an influence in the ethnographic perspective. It is rather that it is not linguistics, but ethnography, not language, but communication, which must provide the frame of reference within which the place of language in culture and society is to be assessed.’ He also states that (p. 38):

“Whenever language is part of a whole process of interaction, its meanings are inseparable from its context, and it’s tell us far more than is carried on the surface of words. Language maybe patterned in ways which show or define who the speakers are, what their relationship is and how their perceive the universe of discourse. A socially realistic linguistics tries to account these patterns. It is not concerned with idealized speakers, but with ‘persons in the real social world.’”

Language in ethnography of communication should be considered as dynamic, social, and interactive phenomenon; whether between speaker and listener, or writer and reader. Deborah Cameron (2001) says that ethnography of communication can be thought of as the application of ethnographic method to the communication patterns of a group. As a guide through whom ethnography of

communication researchers can focus their ethnographies, Hymes (1972) offers a “SPEAKING” heuristic. This model is one of the most prominent units of analysis in ethnographies of communication.

The object of study Hymes proposes for linguistics is ‘ways of speaking’ (Hymes 1989). The idea of language as a set of ways of speaking is an alternative to the idea of language as grammar, an abstracted set of rules or norms. Under the rubric of ways of speaking, Hymes offers a bipartite conception of speech that encompasses both the ‘means of speech’ available to speakers, and the ‘speech economy’ these speakers participate in. Thus Hymes 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 (Johnstone and Marcellino, 2010).

Each letter of the SPEAKING model represents one component of the communicative event:

- **S (Situation)**
  1. Setting
  2. Scene
- **P (Participants)**
  1. Speakers or senders
  2. Addressor
  3. Hearer or receiver or audience
  4. Addressee
- **E (Ends)**
  1. Purposes-outcomes

- 2. Purposes-goals
- **A** (Act sequence)
  - 1. Message form
  - 2. Message content
- **K** (Key)
  - 1. Key
- **I** (Instrumentalities)
  - 1. Channel
  - 2. Forms of speech
- **N** (Norms)
  - 1. Norms for interaction
  - 2. Norms of interpretation
- **G** (Genre)
  - 1. Genre

Kovarsky and Crago (1990-1991:50) is briefly reviewed and illustrated each letter of the mnemonic with cultural and clinical examples below:

- **Situation**

Situation within which speech events occur can be characterized according to both setting and scene. The setting refers to the spatial and temporal boundaries of a speech event. The scene represents the culturally bounded definition of a situation, which is not always isomorphic with the physical setting.

- **Participants**

This part distinguishes between four components: (a) the speaker or sender, (b) the addressor, (c) the hearer, receiver, or audience, and (d) the addressee.

- Ends

The analysis of speech events requires an understanding of both the “outcomes (the purposes of the event from the cultural point of view) and goals (the purposes of the individual participants).

- Act Sequences

It places a great deal of emphasis on the recording of message form (how something is said) and content (what is said) since the “painstaking analysis” of these components provides the empirical evidence necessary for documenting the role of language in the conduct of social life.

- Key

A description of keys, which includes the notion of contextualization cue, should contend with the diverse, culturally situated ways in which messages may be framed for interpretation.

- Instrumentalities

Instrumentalities consist of both the channels and forms of communication. The channel refers to the way messages travel from one person to another and may include “oral, written, telegraphic, semaphore, or other medium of transmission. Forms of communication may be realized within a given channel of communication.

- Norms

Norms are those general, expected standard rules for participating in speech events. Competence with the rules governing interactional etiquette includes,

among other things, knowing when to remain silent or speak, and how speakers turn are to be allocated.

- Genre

Although, genre refers to categories such as “poem, myth, tale, proverb, riddle, curse, prayer, oration, or lecture”, there is no one-to-one correspondence between genre and speech event. A speech event may contain several genres or a speech event may be characterized as its own distinct game.

Ultimately, this list of components of speech acts is meant to explore and explain human, social purposes in language. Like all taxonomies, the SPEAKING grid is not an end in itself, but rather a means: ‘the formal analysis of speaking is a means to the understanding of human purposes and needs, and their satisfaction’ (Hymes, 1972b: 70), as well as a way of understanding how language works.

In research conducted on the ethnography of communication, this model is very comprehensive that could have a practical application. Matei (2009:161) added that perhaps some of these model’s aspects represented guidelines for researchers even before the issuing of this model but what is to be acknowledged is that it covers a wide range of components which are inextricably connected to the speech event and which could add valuable information about the purpose, function and nature of the message that is being transmitted.

The study about ethnography of community is to emphasize on human groups or speech community. Ethnographies show us that community differs significantly in ways of speaking, in patterns of repertoire and switching, also in the roles and means of speech. This differences regard to beliefs, values,

reference, groups, norms, and the life, as these enter into the major system of language uses and it's acquisitive by children.

Ethnography of communication is the written description of the social organization, social activities, symbolic and material resources, and also interpretive practice characteristics of a particular group of people.

Hymes proposes a general method of ethnographic investigation through taxonomic, descriptive fieldwork (Hymes, 1972b). He is careful to point out, however, that 'sociolinguistic fieldwork is not an end in itself', but rather 'a necessary part of the progress towards models (structural and generative) of sociolinguistic description, formulation of universal sets of features and relations, and explanatory theories' (1972b:43). Hymes advocates comparative, ethnographic taxonomies as the only way to explore and understand language systematically, because 'communities differ significantly in the ways of speaking, in patterns of repertoire and switching, in the roles and meanings of speech. They indicate differences with regard to beliefs, values, reference groups, norms, and the like ... [I]ndividual accounts that individually pass without notice ... leap out when juxtaposed, as contrasts that require explanation' (1972b:42). Descriptive and taxonomical ethnographic work that allows for comparison between speeches communities allows for systemic classification of ways of speaking in four traditional areas: 'genetic classification' of language descent; 'areal classification' of features spread through an area; 'typological classification' of structural features independent of genetic or areal nature; and usage or role classification (i.e. as a pidgin, trade language, etc).

The sort of fieldwork Hymes advocates ethnographies of communication must ‘discover and explicate the competence that enables members of a community to conduct and interpret speech’ (Hymes, 1972b:52). The exploration and documentation of communicative competence within a speech community is the essence of the ethnography of communication. As a means to this end, Hymes defines the social units and units of analysis for ethnographies of communication and proposes an ethic heuristic for their analysis.

The social unit proper to sociolinguistics is the ‘speech community’. By speech community, Hymes does not mean a community defined by common language, but rather by common linguistic norms: ‘a community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, and rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety’ (Hymes, 1972b: 54). This definition moves the ethnographer away from questions of grammar, and grammatically-possible utterances, to questions of coherence and efficacy in the socially-situated use of language. The question for Hymes is not only whether speakers have a common understanding of syntax and semantics, but also whether or not they share ideas about the use of silence, ideas about the meaning of irony or emphasis, speech taboos, ways of formulating requests or statements, and so on.

Within speech communities, ethnographers must look for ‘speech situations’, ‘speech events’, and ‘speech acts’. By speech situations, Hymes means socially-contextual situations like ‘ceremonies, fights, hunts, meals, lovemaking, and the like’ (Hymes, 1972b: 56). Speech events occur within speech situations, so for example the exchange of vows is a speech event occurring

within a wedding (a speech situation). Speech acts are the individual utterances that form the minimal unit of analysis for ethnographies of communication. Hymes offers the example of ‘a party (speech situation), a conversation during the party (speech event), a joke within the conversation (speech act)’ to illustrate the three terms. Hymes distinguishes speech acts from grammatical conceptions like sentences, because the meaning, status, and function of a speech act are not solely dependent upon grammatical form. The interpretation of speech acts is equally (at times more) dependent upon the social status and relationship of participants, as well as the immediate context of the utterance, and so ‘the level of speech acts mediates immediately between the usual levels of grammar and the rest of a speech event or situation in that it implicates both linguistic form and social norms’ (57).

*In Vain I Tried to Tell You: Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics* (1981, 2nd edn. 2004) is a collection of Hymes’s work in this area. Hymes sets out to show ‘how appreciation and interpretation of performances as unique events can be united with analysis of the underlying rules and regularities which make performances possible and intelligible’ (Hymes, 1981: 79). (All references to *In Vain I Tried to Tell You* are to the 1981 University of Pennsylvania Press edition.) Hymes situates performance in the range of abilities that characterize cultural competence vis-à-vis behaviors: being able to interpret behavior, being able to report on behavior, and being able to repeat behavior. For cultural insiders, these three types of knowledge are in an implicational relationship: people can interpret more behavior than they can report and report less than they can repeat.

In other words, we can sometimes understand what is going on in a situation without being able to say why, and we can talk about some culturally meaningful behaviors without being able to do them. Behavior that can be repeated (a prayer, a dance step, a ritual) can be repeated simply as a way of reporting on its existence or commenting on it, or, at the other end of the axis, it can be performed, that is, done in such a way as to show that one means it and intends it to accomplish something. A person who is performing ‘assumes responsibility to an audience’ (Hymes, 1981: 84; in Johnstone and Marcellino, 2010).

Johnstone and Marcellino in their journal add Hymes is one of the most important figures in sociolinguistics: a founding member of the sociolinguistics movement, the originator of the ethnography of communication, a pioneer in ethno poetics, and a champion in linguistics for those who have been unvoiced in Western educational, anthropological and linguistic traditions. It is in this last set of concerns, where Hymes was an advocate; doing truly applied linguistic work, that we can see the coherence in his work. The repeated theme of Hymes’ scholarship is his insistence that linguistic theory and practice account for the individual, the particular and the actual. In countering Chomskyan linguistics, in proposing the ethnography of communication, and in his ethno poetic approach to Native American texts, Hymes has always centered his theory and practice on what real human beings do with language. This insistence on the rich, socially-contextualized reality of human communication creates a particular affordance: the ability to apply sociolinguistic research to real-world problems of disadvantage and inequity. The ethnography of communication forces the

sociolinguist to describe speech communities on their terms, sensitive to their norms of communication. Ethno poetics forces readers to de-centre themselves and interpret a text within its original context: the communication norms of the speech community that produced it. Hymes' work in voice and education has been marked by an insistence on meeting the unvoiced socioeconomically disadvantaged children, American Indian speech communities within the larger US speech community on their terms, within their context, and using their norms. Because Hymes resists the Western tendency to look only for the universal in language, he has been able to apply sociolinguistic research to the diverse, varied and local voices that have not received the ear they deserved. If we are sensitive to this coherency in Hymes work, the title of his ethno poetics volume, *In Vain I Tried to Tell You*, takes on additional meaning. Hymes' significant contributions to sociolinguistics have helped make the discipline more aware of and accountable to multiple speech communities.

## **2.2 The Culture Characteristics of Peranakan versus Totok**

Following Oetomo (1987) and M. Tan (2002:158–159), some common characteristics which define Peranakan and Totok cultures in contrast to each other are as follow: Based on observations and experience, Lim and Mead (2011:8-9) consider these characteristics to hold true to some extent. Some of them, however, are more stereotypes cast by one group on another. Bearing in mind that the distinction between Peranakan and Totok in actuality is a

continuum, one should be careful not to use the characteristics summarized here as a basis for over-generalization.

<b>Aspect</b>	<b>Peranakan</b>	<b>Totok</b>
Culture	Contains elements from the local Indonesian culture	Contains more elements of Chinese culture
Language	Do not speak any regional Chinese dialect	Speak Hokkien, Teochew, Hakka, Cantonese, Mandarin, etc
Table Manners	Do not use chopsticks but eat from a plate using spoon and fork or just the hand	Use chopsticks and eat from a bowl; eat rice porridge ( <i>bubur</i> ) for breakfast
Food	Combination of local food (characterized by the use of a lot of coconut milk and indigenous spices) and food recognized to be of Chinese origin but with a local flavor	Use traditional spices, such as the Chinese 'five flavors' (known by the Hokkien name <i>ngó-hiong</i> ); vegetables are stir-fried, e.g. Chinese cabbage and/or bean sprouts mixed with tofu or soya bean cake
Way of Dressing	Dress in a fancier manner	Dress in a simple manner and only in certain colors
Life Attitude	Tend to be more leisure-oriented and extravagant, more class-oriented	Tend to be more hard-working, more frugal, and more egalitarian.
Business Attitude	Tend to be reluctant in taking risks in business	Tend to be more willing to take risks in business
Traditional Religion	Most of them no longer worship in Chinese temple and are ignorant about Chinese religion; especially upper class Peranakan are characterized by westernization, including conversion to Christianity	Still keep an altar in their home and practice ancestor and deities worship; still worship in traditional Chinese temple

New-born Celebration	Peranakan usually place the placenta (afterbirth) of a new- born baby in an earthenware urn and throw it into the sea	Totok celebrate the birth of a baby boy by sending out red- dyed boiled duck eggs to neighbors and acquaintances
Wedding and Funeral	Peranakan tend to simplify the traditional Chinese wedding ritual or abolish it altogether; this is also the case in funerals.	Many Totok couples still perform the traditional Chinese wedding ritual and give offerings to the dead at the graveyard

Table 2.1

### 2.3 Hokkien (Fújiàn)

Properly speaking, Fujian is the name of a province in China (capital city Fuzhou), but it is also applied as a name for the variety of Chinese spoken there. Given the location of Fujian Province, it is not surprising that this same variety, or something very close to it, is spoken across the strait on the island of Taiwan. There, however, the language is known as Taiwanese. Fujian and Taiwanese have a very close (and slightly more prestigious) relative, Amoy, spoken in the port city and island of the same name. In the Ethnologue, Fujian, Taiwanese, and Amoy are considered sub-dialects; speakers from these three areas are said to have no difficulty understanding each other. Naming this dialect complex, however, has been problematic. Owing to the earlier importance of Amoy as a seaport, particularly as an offshore center for miss ionization, the name ‘Amoy’ was frequently employed in the West as a cover term intended to include mainland dialects. Other names for Fujian include Fukien, Fuh-kien, Hokkian, and Hokkien. While Hokkien is nothing other than a local pronunciation for ‘Fujian,’

this term has also popularly come to be used in a broader sense (today the Amoy variety is sometimes also described as Amoy Hokkien, and Taiwanese as Taiwan Hokkien). A person originating from Fujian province (including those who have migrated elsewhere) can be called a Hoklo, literally, 'Fujian person', but it would be incorrect to apply this term to the language itself.

Speakers of Teochew (described in a following section) and Hokkien do have difficulty understanding each other. Nonetheless, these two varieties are usually considered to be dialects of a single language, in Mandarin called Mǐn Nán (Ethnologue nan). Because of their different histories, particularly as they relate to Indonesia, we treat Hokkien and Teochew separately. The Hokkien equivalent of Min Nan is *bân-lâm*, therefore, Banlam sometimes also appears in the literature as a name for this language complex. It is said that, because of the mountainous interior, the inhabitants of Fujian province have long been oriented toward the coast. Chinese from Fujian supposedly had begun settling in the Philippines in the first or second century AD, and were the first Chinese to migrate in significant numbers to Indonesia, particularly Java, beginning by the ninth or tenth century AD, in a flow which was to increase over time. In 1935, it was estimated that two-thirds of ethnic Chinese living in Java and Madura were of Fujian origin and, apart from Borneo; they constitute the largest Chinese dialect group in all other areas (Kong, 1987:457, Jones 1996:21–22).

Of all the Chinese languages, Hokkien has had the greatest impact on Indonesian. It is estimated that, of all the Chinese words which have been borrowed into Indonesian, upwards of 90 percent of them have come from



The Hokkien numerals have also been adapted and are widely used in business interactions in the market and other places by Chinese and non-Chinese alike, see table 2.2 (Lim and Mead, 2011:15):

Numeral	Hokkien (POJ Romanization)	Malay Adaptation
One	chí t (literary: it)	cek, ce-, it <sup>a</sup>
Two	nō·n jī	no, jī
Three	Sam	Sam
Four	sì (literary: sù)	si or su
Five	gō· (literary: ngó·)	Go
Six	lá k (literary: lió k)	Lak
Seven	Chhit	Cit
Eight	poeh (literary: pat)	Pak
Nine	káu (literary: kiú)	Kau
Ten	tsá p	Cap
Hundred	pah (literary: pek, colloquial: peh)	Pek
Thousand	chheng (lit.: chhie )	Céng
Ten thousand	Bān	Ban
Million		tiao /tjo/ <sup>b</sup>

Table 2.2

<sup>a</sup> *cek* and *no* are the cardinal numbers ‘one’ and ‘two’ respectively, while *it* and *jī* serve as the ordinal numbers ‘first’, ‘second’. Other numerals do not have distinct ordinal forms. In addition, *jī* is also used in certain numeric expressions, such as *cap jī* ‘twelve’ and *jī cap* ‘twenty’.

<sup>b</sup> The term *tiao* is only known or used in Indonesia. The lack of a corresponding term for ‘million’ in Hokkien probably has to do with the fact that in Mandarin or proper Hokkien, the scale for large numbers was traditionally based on four digits (0000,  $10^4$ ), rather than on three digits (000,  $10^3$ ) as in the West and in Indonesia (cf. thousand =  $10^3$ , million =  $10^6$ , billion =  $10^9$ , etc.).

Figure 1. Hokkien numerals used in Indonesia.

Some combinations based on these numerals are: *jigo* ‘twenty-five’, *gocap* ‘fifty’, *cepék* ‘one hundred’, *gopék* ‘five hundred’, *cecéng* ‘a thousand’, *ceban* ‘ten thousand’, *goban* ‘fifty thousand’, and *cepékcéng* ‘hundred thousand’.

Following are some words and expressions used by a Hokkien community in Palembang, South Sumatra: the first line is the Hokkien phrase written in standard Pé h-oē-jī script, with segmental IPA transcription underneath based on Lim and Mead (2011:16):

English	Hokkien	Indonesian
How are you?	lí hó bô or àn-tsoá <sup>n</sup> /li ho bo/ /an tʃwa/	Apa kabar?
What are you up to?	lí tsò siá <sup>n</sup> -mih <sup>n</sup> /li tʃo ʃa mi/	Sedang apa?
Thank you.	kám-siā /kamsia/	Terima kasih.
How much?	kúi lui /kui lui/	Berapa harganya?
I'm sorry!	tùi m̄ tsū /tui m tʃu/	Maaf!
Can I help you?	goá ē-sái tō-lông lí bô /gwa e sai to loŋ li bo/	Ada yang bisa saya bantu?
What is your name?	lí siá <sup>n</sup> -mih <sup>n</sup> miā <sup>n</sup> /li ʃa mi? mia/	Siapa nama anda?
I am fine.	goá chin-hó /gwa tʃin ho/	Saya baik-baik saja.
I don't know.	goá m̄ -tsai /gwa m tʃai/	Saya tidak tahu.
Congratulations!	kiong-hí /kioŋ hi/	Selamat!
Hurry up!	khám-mé <sup>n</sup> /k <sup>h</sup> amme/	Ayo, cepat!
Wait for me!	tán goá /tan gwa/	Tunggu saya!

Where do you live?	lí toà tī-tá-ló h /li twa ti ta loʔ/	Anda tinggal di mana?
Help!	tō-lông /to loŋ/	Tolong!
Delicious!	hó chiá h /ho tʃiaʔ/	Enak!
No thank you, don't bother.	m̄ -bién /mien/	Tidak perlu.

Table 2.3

Just as Hokkien has influenced some areas, Malay has influenced local Chinese varieties. Even in the small amount of Hokkien data provided here, note *tō-lông* ‘help’, borrowed from Malay *tolong* and *lui* ‘coin, money,’ borrowed from Malay *duit*, formerly a kind of Dutch copper coin of small value, a ‘doit.’ For most Hokkien-speaking areas of Indonesia, however, we lack documentation to know how much the language has changed or adapted to the local context; Lim and Maed added (2011:17).