INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION IN THE TRILOGY OF RUSH HOUR

I Gede Agus Sastrawan

gede.agus.s@mail.ugm.ac.id
Universitas Gadjah Mada
Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract: Intercultural communication (ICC) is a dynamic communicative phenomenon due to the cultural value presented in the multicultural communication exchange. The present study aims to explore the intercultural communication between Black and Chinese speakers in the trilogy of Rush Hour. Specifically, this study aims to see the characteristics of Black English and the communicative effects of conversation among speakers of different cultural backgrounds. Through the methods of qualitative descriptive, linguistic behavior is justified to show whether the conventions are acceptable to each community group. The results show that as an American English-speaking, Carter, a Black American is more expressive in using English because he is a native speaker, while Lee, as an L2 English from China, faces more communicative barriers. The cultural value of non-standard forms also adorns such conversation, e.g., phonological and sentence structures stigmatization. Not to mention, Chinese surnames produce homonyms with English pronouns.

Keywords: intercultural, communication, linguistics, Black, Chinese.

INTRODUCTION

Why do people communicate with each other? Essentially, the response would be because people belong to society (read: a community) which constructs their behavior, attitude, and belief. Thus, they exchange because of their needs; they share or look for information, express ideas, or even close themselves with others in phatic communication – building relationships. Essentially, individuals do not want live in solitary. Tannen (2005, p. 4) explains that solitary leads a human being to face the danger of connection or could die at the worst level. However, being close to anyone does not mean that an individual would likely be undertaken either (ibid).

When they are socializing, many things, e.g., age, ethnicity, religion, community, social identity, status, etc., come out along the process. It helps the interactant to conclude with whom the speaker is dealing. Consequently, the background knowledge will avoid or minimize misunderstandings between the interactants. The problem typically happens in intercultural communication. Someone may connote one thing culturally different from the other, for example, by mentioning the cultural contestation in between, e.g., the word *nigga*. It may raise a cultural issue if a non-Blackman, a Whiteman, uses this to call a Blackman. The word *nigga* exhibits the inferiority of Blackman over Whiteman. Otherwise, this expresses the solidarity if uttered in the Black men community. It concludes that such a term has its cultural background that needs to be understood.

The previous paragraph shows the notion of intercultural communication. This term introduces cultural differences between the speaker and the interlocutor, who are members of different groups (Scollon & Scollon, 2001, p. 14). For example, a conversation between Asian to American, English to Japanese, or vice versa, respectively. Each group has its conversation style, e.g., English and French are more direct than

Japanese and Indonesian. As for Wierzbicka (2003), intercultural communication or cross-cultural communication is not only about the conventions in some groups but also about cultural values that appear in the communication process. Wierzbicka (ibid) also presents that Chinese immigrants as non-English native speakers should be aware of using imperative speech to the Anglo in Australia because it might sound offensive or rude. Conversely, the Anglo-Australians need to perceive Chinese mode as not natural but culturally shaped.

Some linguists make no difference between intercultural communication and cross-cultural communication, meaning they are referring to the same thing. Meanwhile, some of them show that both terms have distinct qualifications. Firstly, it admittedly has a slight resemblance. Both of these terms explain the different cultures of the interactants: the speaker and interlocutor have no such cultural thing in common. Also, they might have some interaction difficulties thereof. Secondly, (1) intercultural communication (henceforth: ICC) refers to the participants of the conversation with cultural differences interacting with each other (Lüdi, 2006, p. 11; Scollon & Scollon, 2001, p. 13) – culture-to-culture communication; on the other side, (2) cross-cultural communication (henceforth: CCC) is talking about the different modes when the interactants produce their speech (Hurn & Tomalin, 2013, p. 1). From this definition, those terms should not be used interchangeably.

In daily life, culture impacts individual language productivity. It shapes how people think and uses language. Fundamentally, culture is like a vast ocean, an abstract concept that should be retrieved substantially. Its presence denotes norms and behavior constructed or deconstructed (Lee, 1993, p. 383; Lüdi, 2006, p. 11). In cultural communication, culture has various ways that accommodate how people think about the environment nearby (Jandt, 2018, p. 34). Hence, there is cultured conversation when the communication exchange happens. This phenomenon also explains why individuals from one culture have a different communication pattern from other cultures.

This research focuses on Chinese and Black communication in the Rush Hour trilogy. It is a comedy movie starring Jackie Chan as Lee and Chris Tucker as James Carter. They are both a detective but they are mismatched to solve problems related to the Chinese and the Ambassador, Mr. Han. The genre of the story has the most considerable interest in American movies as Buddy Cop. Besides Rush Hour, such genres can be found in the Bad Boys, Men in Black, Shanghai Noon, and many more. The IMDb has 250 movies on its web (o-kholjavko, 2019).

The Rush Hour franchises have a long successful journey. After the first movie in 1998 and the second sequel in 2001, the producer decided to make the third movie in 2007. Commencing the trilogy, the first movie starts with the kidnapped daughter of Mr. Han, Soo Yung Han. He called his best cop from China, Detective Inspector Lee, to rescue his daughter. Arrived in Los Angeles, Lee paired with Carter, an LAPD Detective. It is the first time they know each other, but they have yet to have an excellent first impression; the second sequel tells that Carter and Lee are on vacation in China. Unfortunately, they have yet to spend a proper vacation, and Lee got informed that US Consulate General is just bombed. Long story short, Carter ruined the investigation and was ordered to fly back to the US. However, before leaving, he convinces Lee to come with him because the incident is related to the rich White man, Steven Reign; the last sequel shows that Lee and Carter fly to France and complete the mission by saving the Chinese semi-myth, Shy Shen.

Lee and Carter have so many days to work together. Thus, their speech is the most exciting phenomenon in this study. When the interaction happens, they need proper communication as wished because their different backgrounds share varied linguistic behavior. In real life, both come from different community members, and so do in the movie, as Chinese and Black. Therefore, this event exhibits a distinct communication style. Lee is natively Chinese-speaking and considered L2 for his counterpart, while Carter is native English-speaking and categorized as Black English or Black speech. His words are much more expressive than Lee, and he finds Carter's speech difficult to understand at some points. Hence, misunderstandings come up in the conversation.

Based on their exchange, this research also tries to characterize the Black English pronounced by James Carter. He has a distinctive structure and diverse word choices compared to Lee as a non-native-English-speaking. On the other side, it also concerns the effect of communication between Black and Chinese; other than Lee and Carter, all the Chinese ethnicity and Black race found in the movie are not excluded.

Cross-cultural communication has developed for decades. As part of sociology studies, Gardner (1962, p. 241) defines the phenomenon as the nature of an individual showing the "dynamic of encounter"; from a linguistics perspective, Tannen has voluminous works on communication. She (1962, pp. 3–9) presents eight aspects of communication in which CCC can further. The two studies conclude that CCC is necessary to distinguish how the interactants communicate – from a comparative perspective (Carter, 1991), while intercultural communication is a more interactive and practical phenomenon in "culture to culture" interaction. Consequently, it drives the interactants to show someone's cultural ideology, which causes stereotypes, ethnocentrism, prejudice, stigma, misunderstandings, and socialization, such as enculturation to acculturation (Scollon & Scollon, 2001).

The CCC also caught Morand's (2003) attention in terms of different politeness norms; also held in the medicine sector (Bastien, 1987, 1995; Bodenmann et al., 1998; Jirwe et al., 2010; Johnson, 2004); in terms of ICC, Froese et al., (2012) mention the urgency of intercultural communication and cross-cultural adjustment between foreign workers with host country nationals (HCNs) in South Korea; Knutson et al., (2003) aim to compare the rhetorical sensitivity between Thai and American; then, the economic interest has an eye in cross-culture study to survey the level of acculturation and customers attitudes (Lee, 1993).

The present study is interested in the communication that encompasses the cultural boundaries between the Chinese and Black communities from the linguistics perspective. This research tried to follow Froese et al. (2012), explaining the phenomenon of ICC & CCC in the Black and Chinese exchange. His works conveyed general occurrences between foreigners and South Korean natives. On the other hand, referring to intercultural communication effectiveness by Knutson et al. (2003), more is needed to compare places such as Thai in Thailand and Americans in the USA. They should interact with each other to see the communication phenomena (Kotthoff & Spencer-Oatey, 2007; Scollon & Scollon, 2001). Furthermore, many researchers have already focused on one culture communication, e.g., between the Chinese (Fang & Faure, 2011; Hong & Engeström, 2004); and Black (Baldwin, 1997; Brewer, 1973; Smitherman, 2017). This research gave a profound analysis of the original culture, while our society nowadays presents a multicultural setting that needs to be explained.

At this point, sociolinguistics is necessary because its presence mentions the relationship between language and society and how community members use language to communicate (Trudgill, 2000, p. 21; Wardhaugh, 2010, p. 12). Besides, this relation shows that the linguistic productivity of the interactants are affected by numerous social factors, e.g., gender, ethnicity, age, social class, education, etc. Thus, communication styles varied, e.g., Black English or Black Speech, which are massively found in the north and south America (Wardhaugh, 2010, pp. 363–364; Wolfram & Schilling, 2016, p. 239).

As for linguistics and culture, CCC and ICC help explain culture-to-culture communication. Thus, it justifies the phenomenon of language used by the Black people and Chinese ethnicity as culture shapes how people think about the world and identifies others (Tannen, 1983, p. 3; Thomas et al., 2004, p. 158; Wolfram & Schilling, 2016, p. 9).

METHOD

This research methodology is designed to see the dynamics of linguistic behavior. It includes three phases, i.e., choosing the data source, defining the analysis methodological, and presenting the results.

For commencing, the research is interested in the conversation between Chinese and Black, which was retrieved from the Rush Hour trilogy watched on Netflix as the data source. Justifying the relation between their language usage and socio-cultural context makes the study apply the descriptive and

qualitative methods. The initial data collection is a clip of a conversation between the speaker and the interlocutor; this is not limited to the conversation between Lee and Carter, but every conversation between Black and Chinese matter. Moreover, this exchange conveys the speaker's word choice preference; what is behind the "what is said" will be measured as the background knowledge that leads the data interpretation to what is considered a cultured conversation between Chinese and Black. Also, the triangulation method is applied to give the best interpretative gloss to their speech.

The focus remains on sociolinguistics to define each participant's membership of a community; how an individual belongs to their group by looking at the language behavior. As their speech also exhibits different modes and patterns, the CCC maintains the peculiarity of each member's characterization; then, ICC introduces how they face cultural boundaries when people with different cultures interact.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

People would not stop communicating, and communication would not stop in an intracultural situation as this research mentions the communication within cultures, i.e., Black and Chinese in America. Such things might drive the environment into cultural contact (Morgan & Tuijnman, 2009, p. 5). Furthermore, having cultural intelligence, someone will quickly recognize the speaker's counterparts and how they should react to something that comes up in the conversation.

However, the result shows that the interactants face more communication barriers. For example, some of their conversations show misheard (e.g., *mi* for me or *yu* for you) and misused (e.g., *nigga*) words; the frequency of using figures of speech by native English speaking or L1 (e.g., *Berry Bonds* or *a giants California Roll*); as well as cultural stances where the communicators failed to build inclusiveness in diversity at the beginning. Eventually, they need time to adapt to each other. In this initial summary, the researcher agrees with Jirwe et al. (2010), who stated that first meeting people with different cultures quickly face many difficulties in their exchange. Thus, the interactant needs to have the same background to acknowledge other cultures (ibid); for example, the communication between Capt. Diel (Standard English) and Carter (Black English). As they both live in America, using figures of speech or stigmatized phonological features would not perturb the communication (see: data 5).

By researching this phenomenon, findings also provide implications that: (1) the interactants of intercultural communication may face cultural barriers at the very first meet; (2) there is a subject culture – a term introduced by Lee (1993) – as ethnic affirmation of a consistent one; (3) inclusiveness is reached by the acceptance of these different cultures instead of accommodate the dominance of one culture or no culture contestation was deliberately intended.

Black English Characterization

Black English is typically spoken in America amongst the Black community. Its existence is interested many linguists for years (Baldwin, 1997; Smitherman, 2017; Thomas et al., 2004; Trudgill, 2000; Wolfram & Schilling, 2016). Furthermore, Wardhaugh (2010, pp. 363–366) explains that Black English has particular characteristics compared to Standard English in terms of linguistic unit, i.e., phonological, morphological, and syntactic forms. James Carter's speech gets the most attention in cross-cultural communication in the film. He is depicted as a Black protagonist and plays a Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD). His speech attributes the following data.

(1)	Carter	:	"Okay, I tried talking. Now, about the beat of puberty out of **y'all**. You **ain't** gonna see it **comin'**"
(2)	Carter	:	"Lee, I got a big problem, man. This boy's on steroids. He got a head like a **Berry Bonds**. Lee, get him, Lee."
(3)	Carter	:	"Lee, let's get the **hell** out of here."
(4)	Carter	:	"Aaaaaa, I **bout'** to slice you like **a giant California roll**."

Carter presents these types of speech as a part of the Black community found in Rush Hour. For most, he characterizes with the use

of language economics, e.g., *y'all* instead of 'you all,' stigmatized phonological features as *comin'* 'coming' (Wolfram & Schilling, 2016, p. 174), or *bout'* 'about.' This phenomenon also involves morphological issues. As for Rickford et al. (2015, p. 1), the mentioned data exhibits a simplification or diverse non-standard English by the speaker who was also constructed in their neighborhood. Moreover, this type of language productivity is associated with African-American Vernacular English (AAVE) (ibid).

Naturally, Carter, as an English native speaker, is more expressive than his partner, Lee, because he was born and raised in America, while Lee grows in China. Most of their conversation delivers how Carter uses metaphor to create an analogy, e.g., "Berry Bonds" or "A giant California roll." His background facilitates him to swear as well. Despite this diversity of languages, a non-Black interlocutor, White or Chinese, who socializes with Black speakers has no problems understanding their linguistic behavior. Consider the below example. Capt. Diel has no problem facing Carter's speech.

	Carter	:	"FBI want me?"
	Capt. Diel	:	"That's right."
(5)	Carter	:	"Stop **lyin.'**"
	Capt. Diel	:	"I don't lying."
	Carter	:	"Tell (me) the truth."
	Capt. Diel	:	"I'm telling you the truth."

When Carter meets with Lee for the first time, he does not care with whom he speaks and what kind of relationship they have to maintain: is Lee a person he has known for a long time, or had they just met? If he does so, this can lead him how to start a conversation politely or give the best first impression. In general, almost all languages use a form of politeness when the interactants communicate with new people. However, Carter is different. Instead, he seems to be talking to someone he has known for ages.

On the other hand, Lee may expect a proper welcome meeting conversation. For the Chinese, it is important to have genuine communication. In business communication behavior, the Chinese tend to be more sensitive to hierarchical status (Hong & Engeström, 2004, p. 544; Spencer-Oatey & Xing, 2003, pp. 35–36), or in daily exchange, e.g., a young person bows their head to respect the elder (Fang & Faure, 2011, p. 328). In the below circumstance, Lee does not find it related to his culture. Hence, he only answered with a minimal response that explained his disinterest in discussing the topic.

(6)	Carter	:	"All of a sudden, you **(are)** speaking english now, huh?"
	Lee	:	"A little"
(7)	Carter	:	"A little, my **ass**, you lied to me."

It is emphasized that Carter's communication skill is constructed by his community. It refers to Tannen's (1998, p. 11) statement that conversations shape the speakers' world – not only occurring in the family environment but also in conversations with friends, coworkers, and even in public spaces. In addition, it is found that he employs zero/deletion of copula and the use of "*ain't*," a negation form, more regularly used as a Black community (Fought, 2006, pp. 48–49). The communication experience passed by the speaker will form a specific pattern and a particular conversation style. Therefore, Carter's utterances employ particular linguistic characteristics associated with what we know today as Black English.

Miscommunication between Carter and Lee

The preceding paragraphs argue that people's linguistic behavior is shaped by their socio-cultural background and the community where the speaker lives and grows. However, communication does not stop in a community, as every country shows a diverse society. Thus, intercultural communication might arise that could be improved for the interactants to communicate across cultures, e.g., miscommunication effectively. What makes this likely to happen? Based on the data, miscommunication is majorly caused by the need for more information or broad awareness of someone's culture. Besides, cultural diversities imply specific capabilities for individuals and societies to learn, re-learn, and unlearn concerning personal fulfillment and social harmony (Leeds-Hurwitz, 2013).

(8)	Carter	:	"Hold up, wait a minute. She's goin' to the door. She's

			openin' the door. Look like somebody **droppin'** off the package. Wait a minute. Look like the same girl who dropped off the package to your office."
	Carter & Lee	:	"IT'S A BOMB!!!"
	They rushed to the building in front, where they conclude that there is a bomb. After they arrived and talked to Isabella, the below conversation happened.		
(9)	Carter	:	**"Now why'd you say it was a bomb?"**
	Lee	:	"No, you said that"
	Carter	:	"You said it"
	Lee	:	"You said that in the hotel room."
(10)	Carter	:	**"I said, she was the bomb."**
(11)	Lee	:	**"She was the bomb??"**

In the second sequel, Lee and Carter are following Isabella as they suspect she has something to do with Steven Reign for money laundering. Far away from the opposite hotel, they saw someone bringing a package, the same person that bombed the US General Consulate in China. At this time, they think that Isabella is about to die because of it. Then, they rushed to Isabella's room to ensure she was okay. Consequently, these detectives could get some more information about Steven Reign. However, when they arrived at Isabella's hotel, they got explained that it was not a bomb in the box. Carter was embarrassed and started to blame Lee.

Again, there are some typical Black English by Carter from the above conversation, e.g., *openin'* & *droppin'*, but this is not the most concerning in this section, whether they have effective communication. Regarding the conversation topic, Lee and Carter clearly and intentionally said that "*it is a bomb*."

Even so, Carter was playing around with his words. He does not want to look stupid in front of the girl. So he tried to say that it was not what he meant by saying, "She was the bomb." For Lee, he cannot find out what this utterance means, whereas Carter tries to use *the bomb* as a metaphor meaning 'gorgeous girl.' The difficulty arose because the interactants do not share the same cultural and linguistic background (Akinnaso & Ajirotutu, 1982, p. 124) or they are not sharing a contextualization convention which may lead to a conversational breakdown (Gumperz, 1982, p. 179).

When Carter and Lee said, "IT'S A BOMB!!!" they referred to the same thing, conventionally semantical. However, Carter changed what he meant by using the word *bomb*. As a non-native English speaker, Lee needed help to retrieve the word's meaning. Thus, it can be understood why Lee repeated, "She was the BOMB?" and was confused looking for the meaning. His lack of information led to confusion in the conversation. It may fail the communication between the interactants as the locutor is not using a familiar word to describe an event, and the interlocutor misses the meaning built by the context.

At this point, we can see that the speaker's utterance always has its background on what affects the speaker to produce X. Furthermore, the slang of *bomb* used by Carter has a pragmatic inference implying that 'Isabella is flawless.' This pragmatic utterance exhibits that slang cannot be interpreted casually. As for Fought (2006, p. 225), slang is a word with a special connotative meaning compared to its denotative meaning. Thus, Lee needs help understanding what Carter means by using the bomb in that conversation.

	Carter	:	"We can't go in there like this"
	Lee	:	"Why?"
(12)	Carter	:	**"We gotta look fly."**
(13)	Lee	:	**"What you mean fly?"**
(14)	Carter	:	**"Mack out. We can't go in there like this"**
(15)	Lee	:	**"What does it mean, mack out?"**
	Carter	:	"Follow me, my Asian brother. I'll show you."

As the word *bomb*, Carter presents a native slang to their fellow from a different country. They just got pushed into the ditch and cannot enter the Red Dragon casino. Thus, they need to clean up themselves. Carter is like using the word *fly* or the phrase *mack out*. These words have their conventions in America, and every American people might know it. But, when it comes to Lee, who grew up in China, he has yet to learn how to understand what Carter meant. For most, Lee just arrived in a week. But, then, he keeps questioning what those words mean in (13) and (15).

As for L2 learners, they need time to adapt to understand and use language practically to the situation and context. Lee is one of the L2 learners that lack colloquial language. Thus, he cannot retrieve what is behind "what is said" by Carter.

Cultured Words and Misheard amongst Black and Chinese Social Groups

The socio-cultural background between Black and Chinese exhibits what this research defines as cultured words: delicate words that the ownership group might only accept. The other groups might misinterpret the cultural background and end up mistreated.

> *"The danger of misinterpretation is greatest among speakers who speak different native tongues or come from different cultural backgrounds."*
>
> (Tannen, 1998, p. 24).

As Tannen mentioned above, the situation of ICC makes the interactants pass any troubles that slow down the communication thereof; how to say something of what is about to be said is the most crucial thing in the ICC (ibid., p. 27). It might prevent the interactant from facing any cultural clashes. Now, consider the below conversation.

(16)	Carter	:	**"What's up my nigga?"**
	People 1	:	"What's up?"
(17)	Lee	:	**"What's up my nigga?"** with confidence
	People 2	:	"What did you just say?"
(18)	Lee	:	**"What's up my nigga?"** said it doubtfully
	People 3	:	"Watch your mouth"
	People 4	:	"What did you say?"
	Lee	:	"I don't want any trouble."

Carter and Lee go to a bar in which Carter has an informant. All the people here are Black and Black English is frequently used by them. Based on the above conversation, Lee tried to imitate Carter to greet someone just to be friendly. However, Lee does not understand how the word *nigga* culturally works. For one more time, the lack of knowledge of someone's culture can lead the interactant to clash. Here, the other Black guys get angry when Lee spontaneously uses *nigga*. Sensing this environment to worsen, he repeats doubtfully what he said in (18) to make sure his words raise something wrong or not to his counterparts.

Much research talks about Black English and the kind of culture being delivered along with their speech. For example, the word *nigga*, Mocombe (2016, p. 49) explains that *my nigga* correlates with the ideology of the lower class within Blacks. On the other hand, compared to *negro* – it is associated with Blacks with a better educational background, bourgeois, and professionals (ibid). Thus, the notion of *nigga* mentions solidarity between Blacks in the lower class in America. Meanwhile, when people of different races use *nigga*, it will be considered as a mocker that might degrade Black existence. That is why Lee's utterance provoked his interlocutor, and they fought.

	Master Yu	:	"May I help you?"
	Carter	:	"We'll be asking the questions, old man. Who are you?"
(19)	Master Yu	:	**"Yu"**
(20)	Carter	:	**"No, not me, you!"**
	Master Yu	:	"Yes, I am Yu"
	Carter	:	"Just answer the damn question. Who are you?"

	Master Yu	:	"I have told to you."
	Carter	:	"Are you deaf?"
(21)	Master Yu	:	**"No, Yu is blind"**
	Carter	:	"I'm not blind. You blind"
	Master Yu	:	"That is what I just said"
	Carter	:	"Shut up!!! You?!" pointing someone else
	Master Yu	:	"Yes?"
	Carter	:	"Not you. Him. What's your name?"
(22)	Mi	:	**"Mi"**
	Carter	:	"Yes, you!"
	Mi	:	"I am Mi"
	Master Yu	:	"He's Mi and I am Yu"
	Carter	:	"Then, Imma whoop your old ass man. Cause I'm sick of playing games. You, Me, everybody's ass around here. Him?!! Imma kick your ass..."

In the latest sequel, Carter and Lee need to see Soo Yung's locker where she learns Kungfu, in Chinatown. When they had just arrived, Carter asked everybody in the room and did not get the answer. Then, Master Yu came out, and they interacted with the above data. However, the conversations seem so complicated to each of them, and it is not effective communication because the interactants cannot meet their communicative goals.

Consistently, Carter never commences communication properly with Lee or even Master Yu. Instead, he prefers to strike to the point and can end the communication quickly upon he gets the information needed.

Lastly, the data have proven that Lee constantly mistreats Black terms and does not even get Carter's slang. However, the above conversation shows how Carter face the same thing in Chinese circumstance. He looks complicated with the homonym between Chinese names and English pronouns, e.g., *Yu* and You, then, *Mi* and Me. These homonymies seem big trouble for him because he needs to learn that Chinese names can be sounded similar to English pronouns. As for Tannen (1998, p. 23), such interaction will lead to something she called "a deadlock conversation" because the interactants do not reach the communicative goals.

The utterance of (21) also facilitates the communication to be gone too far. At this moment, Carter does not feel anything wrong with the response because "No. Yu is blind" can be understood as "No. You is blind". It is a thing in non-standard English compared to Mainstream American English (MAE) where subject concord matters little. Standard English will explain that *You* should be followed by *are* in this chat (Wolfram & Schilling, 2016, p. 13). But Black English is socially stigmatized structures from *you are* to *you is*. Brewer (1973, p. 3) analyzed this typical structure for years and was interested to see the use of *"be"* in early Black English linguistic history. Black habits of interchangeably using copular verbs from *are* to *is* are lasting the problem in the above exchange.

CONCLUSION

In this decade, the ICC would not be avoidable. Communication amongst different cultures drives the interactants into several causes. It can be harmful as miscommunication or mistreatment of a cultural word from one culture. This research shows practical analyses of daily life in multicultural settings, i.e., within Black and Chinese, whereas other research focuses on one of them to show or strengthen its existence (see: Rickford et al., 2015; Smitherman, 2017); or in the structural and working environment (see: Hong & Engeström, 2004; Jirwe et al., 2010).

The result shows that Carter's speech is closely connected to Black English as non-standard English. Therefore, it will not raise any crucial issues amongst the American people. However, communication would not last in the ICC of Black and Chinese who are not growing up and raised in America. In other words, they face some difficulties in reaching their communicative goals as they have their cultural embedment within their speeches, e.g., stigmatized phonological features as *comin'* 'coming'; the use of language economics, e.g., *y'all* instead of 'you all'; cultural background as

nigga, etc. On the other hand, Chinese people tend to prefer a professional conversation in a professional setting.

This research focuses on linguistic elements where socio-cultural value is decoded into linguistic matters. Meanwhile, there are a lot of options to do contextual research from the perspective as in the view of anthropology, communication, or interdisciplinary study proving how people with different cultures communicate with each other. Also, it is possible to characterize one culture's speech in the view of CCC.

REFERENCE

Akinnaso, F. N., & Ajirotutu, C. S. (1982). Performance and ethnic style in job interviews. In *Language and social identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Baldwin, J. (1997). If Black English isn't a Language, Then Tell Me, What Is? *The Black Scholar*, *27*(1), 5–6. https://doi.org/10.1080/00064246.1997.11430831

Bastien, J. W. (1987). Cross-cultural communication between doctors and peasants in Bolivia. *Social Science & Medicine*, *24*(12), 1109–1118. https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(87)90025-6

Bastien, J. W. (1995). Cross cultural communication of tetanus vaccinations in Bolivia. *Social Science & Medicine*, *41*(1), 77–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(94)00297-7

Bodenmann, G., Kaiser, A., Hahlweg, K., & Fehm-Wolfsdorf, G. (1998). Communication patterns during marital conflict: A cross-cultural replication. *Personal Relationships*, *5*(3), 343–356. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.1998.tb00176.x

Brewer, J. (1973). Subject Concord of Be in Early Black English. *American Speech*, *48*(1/2), 5. https://doi.org/10.2307/3087888

Carter, R. F. (1991). Comparative Analysis, Theory, and Cross-Cultural Communication. *Communication Theory*, *1*(2), 151–159. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1991.tb00011.x

Fang, T., & Faure, G. O. (2011). Chinese communication characteristics: A Yin Yang perspective. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *35*(3), 320–333. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2010.06.005

Fought, C. (2006). *Language and ethnicity*. Cambridge Univ. Press.

Froese, F. J., Peltokorpi, V., & Ko, K. A. (2012). The influence of intercultural communication on cross-cultural adjustment and work attitudes: Foreign workers in South Korea. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *36*(3), 331–342. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.09.005

Gardner, G. H. (1962). Cross Cultural Communication. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *58*(2), 241–256. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1962.9712373

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). Fact and inference in courtroom testimony. In *Language and social identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Hong, J., & Engeström, Y. (2004). Changing Principles of Communication Between Chinese Managers and Workers: Confucian Authority Chains and Guanxi as Social Networking. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *17*(4), 552–585. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318903262266

Hurn, B. J., & Tomalin, B. (2013). *Cross-Cultural Communication*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.

https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230391147

Jandt, F. E. (2018). *An introduction to intercultural communication: Identities in a global community* (Ninth Edition). SAGE.

Jirwe, M., Gerrish, K., & Emami, A. (2010). Student nurses' experiences of communication in cross-cultural care encounters: Communication in cross-cultural care encounters. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, *24*(3), 436–444. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6712.2009.00733.x

Johnson, M. R. D. (2004). Cross-cultural communication in health. *Clinical Cornerstone*, *6*(1), 50–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1098-3597(04)90007-5

Knutson, T. J., Komolsevin, R., Chatiketu, P., & Smith, V. R. (2003). A cross-cultural comparison of Thai and US American rhetorical sensitivity: Implications for intercultural communication effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *27*(1), 63–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(02)00060-3

Kotthoff, H., & Spencer-Oatey, H. (Eds.). (2007). *Handbook of intercultural communication*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Lee, W.-N. (1993). Acculturation and advertising communication strategies: A cross-cultural study of Chinese and Americans. *Psychology and Marketing*, *10*(5), 381–397. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.4220100503

Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (2013). *Intercultural competences: Conceptual and operational framework*. 46. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000219768

Lüdi, G. (2006). Multilingual repertoires and the consequences for linguistic theory. In K. Bührig & J. D. ten Thije (Eds.), *Beyond misunderstanding: Linguistic analyses of intercultural communication*. J. Benjamins.

Mocombe, P. C. (2016). The Negro, The "My Nigga," and The African. *Race, Gender & Class*, *23*(1–2), 46–60.

Morand, D. A. (2003). Politeness and the clash of interaction orders in cross-cultural communication. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, *45*(5), 521–540. https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.10089

Morgan, W. J., & Tuijnman, A. C. (2009). Europe and China: A new era of cultural contact and cooperation in education. *European Journal of Education*, *44*(1), 5–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-3435.2008.01366.x

o-kholjavko. (2019). *Top 250 Buddy Cop Movies List*. IMDb. http://www.imdb.com/list/ls046960732/

Rickford, J. R., Duncan, G. J., Gennetian, L. A., Gou, R. Y., Greene, R., Katz, L. F., Kessler, R. C., Kling, J. R., Sanbonmatsu, L., Sanchez-Ordoñez, A. E., Sciandra, M., Thomas, E., & Ludwig, J. (2015). Neighborhood effects on use of African-American Vernacular English. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *112*(38), 11817–11822. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1500176112

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2001). *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.

Smitherman, G. (2017). BLACK IDIOM. *African American Review*, *50*(4), 499–505.

Spencer-Oatey, H., & Xing, J. (2003). Managing Rapport in Intercultural Business Interactions: A comparison of two Chinese-British welcome meetings. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, *24*(1), 33–46. https://doi.org/10.1080/07256860305788

Tannen, D. (1983). *Cross-Cultural Communication*. CATESOL. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED253061

Tannen, D. (1998). *That's not What I meant! : How conversational style makes or breaks your relations with others*. Virago.

Tannen, D. (2005). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends* (New ed). Oxford University Press.

Thomas, L., Wareing, S., Singh, I., & Peccei, S. (2004). *Language, society and power: An introduction*. Routledge.

Trudgill, P. (2000). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. Penguin.

Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Wierzbicka, A. (2003). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction* (2. ed). Mouton de Gruyter.

Wolfram, W., & Schilling, N. (2016). *American English: Dialects and Variation* (3rd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.