

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL REVIEW

A. Sociolinguistics

Discussing language and society, people deal a kind of study called sociolinguistics. It is a subfield of linguistics which is categorized as a part of macro-linguistics. According to Holmes (1992: 1), it is mainly concerned with the study of the relationship between language and society. It explains how and why human beings tend to speak differently in different social contexts and provides some information on how language works and how the social relationship in a community influences language use.

Sociolinguistics was firstly studied by Indian and Japanese linguists in the 1930s. The term *sociolinguistics* was firstly introduced by Thomas Callan Hodson in 1939. In the United States, it was brought and spread by William Labov. On the other hand, it is brought to the United Kingdom by Basil Bernstein in the early 1960s (Joseph, 2004: 15). Based on an interview conducted by ReVEL (Revista Virtual de Estudos da Linguagem), Labov (2007: 2) introduces his newest perspective of sociolinguistics. He described how this branch of linguistics studies language and sees it as the instrument to communicate, which is concerned more with social attitudes, social planning, and social interaction as the consequences of linguistic changes in social issues.

Wardhaugh (1990: 13) states that sociolinguistics is concerned with investigating the relationship between language and society with the goal of a better understanding of the structure and functions of language in communication.

The definition of sociolinguistics is also stated by Hudson (1996: 4), who states that it is a study of language in relation to society. In other words, in sociolinguistics people study language and society in order to find such information as much as they can collect about what kind of thing a language is.

In addition, Chaika (1982: 1) says that sociolinguistics is the study of the ways people used language in social interactions. It is concerned with the stuff of everyday life, for example, how to talk to a friend, family, shopkeeper and even stranger. In short, it is a specific study of examining and investigating how language can function as the means of communication in social life. On the other hand, Meyerhoff (2006: 1-3) states that sociolinguistics can be used to describe many different ways of studying language. The most basic way of studying language is by using the language itself, which enables people to speak differently to others. To sum up, sociolinguistics is a study in which languages and society are well mixed to integrate the quality and quantity of language functions in a social community.

B. Language, Society and Intercultural Communication

Language and society can be related in many ways. Essentially, language is a set of items called 'linguistic items', such as entities like sounds, words, and grammatical structures (Hudson, 1996: 21). In addition, Coulmas (1997: 5) sees language in the form of individual competence, in actual dialogues (or discourse)

among groups of individuals, as a formal system of signs, as a cultural system, and in numerous other ways. In fact, Crystal (1997: 11) has defined language as the systematic, conventional use of sounds, signs, or written symbols in a human society for communication and self-expression. He also adds the fact that language is socially determined and its use is governed by social convention. He moves it within the realm of social studies, as an important element in human social behavior and as a social institution. Furthermore, Wardhaugh (2001: 10-11) proposes that there are several possible relationships between language and society. One is that social structure may either influence or determine the linguistic structure and behavior. The second possible relationship is directly opposite with the first; linguistic structure and behavior may influence and determine the social structure. The third possible relationship is that the influence is bi-directional: language and society may influence each other. The fourth possibility is to assume that there is no relationship at all between linguistic structure and social structure and that each is independent of the other.

In any cultural contact, people unconsciously learn the tradition, attitude, even the culture of others. These phenomena, then, lead to intercultural communication. The discussion of intercultural communication in multicultural society cannot be separated from the explanation about culture, communication and intercultural communication itself. Particularly, culture is a modern concept based on a term first used in classical antiquity by the Roman orator, Cicero: *cultura animi*. The term *culture* appeared first in its current sense in Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries, to connote a process of cultivation or improvement, as in

agriculture or horticulture. In the 19th century, the term developed to refer first to the betterment or refinement of the individual, especially through education, and then to the fulfillment of national aspirations or ideals (Levine, 1971: 6).

Lustig and Koester (1996: 29) define communication as a symbolic process in which people create shared meanings. A symbol in this definition refers to a word, action or object that represents a meaning. Meaning, then, is a perception, thought or feeling experienced and communicated by a person.

Communication is a dynamic process. It changes, moves and develops all the time. All the communication situations are unique in nature and the process can be seen as a sequence of distinct but interrelated steps (Lustig and Koester, 1996: 30). Finally, communication involves shared meanings. This means that as people experience the world and everyday activities, they create and share meanings with other people and groups. Communication is interpretive in nature and people actively attempt to understand and organize their experiences in the world.

C. American Culture

According to Wright & Rogers (2010: 13), it is always difficult to make simple characterizations of something as complex as “culture”, particularly since all national cultures are heterogeneous and contradictory. Nevertheless, in a somewhat stylized manner some of the salient features of what can be broadly termed “American Culture” would include pluralism and tolerance, individualism, religiosity, commercialism and consumerism.

In terms of *Pluralism and tolerance*, the United States is characterized by a deeply diverse array of what might be termed “subcultures”: Amish communities; urban cosmopolitans; Southern traditionalists; educated “highbrows” and NASCAR sports fans; lovers of country-music, hip-hop, easy-listening, and opera; and so on. By and large this pluralism exists in a broader culture of tolerance. Most people accept this diversity as a good thing, or at least have learned to live with it. Despite the recent “culture wars” in the U.S., the U.S. surely rates as one of the most tolerant societies in the world. (Wright & Rogers, 2010: 13)

Regarding *Individualism*, the United States is generally thought to be a fairly individualistic society, a society in which individual autonomy and “freedom” are considered more important than collective welfare, and in which individuals are held pretty much responsible for their own fate. It is easy, however, to exaggerate this cultural element, since many Americans also deeply value *community* and have a strong sense of shared fate with others. Still, on the spectrum of contemporary societies it is probably fair to say that American culture is marked by higher levels of individualism than most other places. (Wright & Rogers, 2010: 13)

In terms of *Religiosity*, by every measure, Americans are among the most religious people in the contemporary world, at least if we define this by formal beliefs and church-attendance. A very large proportion of Americans profess a belief in God – upwards to 90% depending upon precisely how the question is asked. This is much higher than any other comparably developed country. And a smaller percentage of the population believes in the scientific validity of

biological evolution than in any other economically developed country: In the 2004 General Social Survey (a regular, large, attitude survey of American adults), 12.4% of respondents agreed that human beings evolved without any divine guidance; 42% said that humans evolved, but with guidance from God; and another 42% rejected biological evolution altogether. In another question on the same survey, 54% said it was either definitely not true or probably not true that humans evolved from earlier species of animals. Church attendance is also higher than in any European country. (Wright & Rogers, 2010: 13)

Finally, related to *Commercialism and consumerism*, American culture is known to acknowledge the importance of commercial forms of culture, especially consumerism, in American life. This underwrites the fact that Americans save less and buy more things on credit than in other comparable countries. Shopping is a major recreational activity. Success in the market is a source of high status and “keeping up with the Joneses” is a major motivation for working hard. (Wright & Rogers, 2010: 14)

D. Chinese Culture

According to Leigh (2006: 8), the Chinese tend not to greet those close to them with greetings that may bear a negative slant such as ‘you’re looking sad’ or ‘you are looking tired’ – this is deemed improper. The concept of ‘face’, which involves avoiding making someone embarrassed, is very common among the Chinese in considering their choice of action. Punctuality issues – lateness or cancellation can be a serious affront. This pertains to business and social

occasions. Chinese culture would includes *family, daily routine, religion, food and diet and health.*

In terms of *family* structure, China largely operated as a male-centred society, in which the family name is passed down through the male line. Family plays a fundamental role within Chinese culture and there are strong conceptions of what marriage and family should be. The Chinese man continues to occupy a dominant position in the family in terms of decision-making. Chinese women are acquiring greater equity with men as they contribute their income or labour often in a family business. The stereotyped view of the Chinese family is that of a large extended family, with several generations and immediate families all living under one roof, being a self sufficient and self-help institution for its members, providing child care and the care for of the elderly. (Leigh 2006: 9)

Regarding *daily routine*, Chinese people like a routine (eg time for meals, bath and activities) and generally have a structured pattern to the day and like sticking to these times. (Leigh 2006: 12)

In terms of *religion*, while China is officially an atheist state, religion still plays a significant role for many Chinese. Confucianism is the basis around which the cultural aspects of Chinese life is organized. Confucianism is practiced more as a philosophy, than a religion. Although Chinese people might not all be religious, going to the temple or church can have spiritual value and can provide them with social interaction. The 2001 Census shows the major religions amongst China-born persons were Buddhism and Western Catholicism. (Leigh 2006: 16)

In terms of *food and diet* is a very important part of Chinese culture. The Chinese not only enjoy eating but believe eating good food can bring harmony and closeness to the family and relationships with the types of foods considered auspicious varying from province to province. Shopping daily for fresh food is essential for all Chinese cooking. Chinese people in general are not as concerned about nutrition as Western culture. They are more concerned with the food's texture, flavour, colour and aroma.

Chinese daily meals consist of four food groups: grains, vegetables, fruits and meat. Because big numbers of people are lactose intolerant, they try to not consume large amounts of dairy products. Instead, Chinese substitute these with soymilk and tofu, which contain large amounts of protein and calcium. (Leigh 2006: 18)

Finally, in terms of *health*, many older Chinese speaking people have been born in different countries including China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan, Malaysia, Singapore, Laos, Vietnam and Cambodia and have lived through a very traumatic time from wars and violation of human rights. It is also likely that many families were split up and dislocated to different parts of the world. (Leigh 2006: 21)

E. Stereotype

Race means a group of people with the same history, language and so on. According to Omi and Winant (in Fought, 2006: 10), race is a concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies. In addition, Andersen and Taylor (2010: 26) state, the idea

of race in the United States is based on physical characteristics and skin colors and has played an essential part in shaping American society.

Living in society, people would find some different cultures. In this situation, they have a description toward the others whether it is positive or negative. This cultural ideology is called stereotype (Scollon and Scollon 1998: 155). The term *stereotype* refers to the process of assigning people, groups, or events to a particular and conventional category (Pearson, 1958: 44). When people are stereotyping someone, they do not take into consideration the individualistic, unconventional or unique characteristics of a particular person, group, event or issue. They have their judgment or characterization on an oversimplified concept opinion, or belief.

In other words, stereotype comes up when someone believes that any culture or social group can be treated as they are different. According to Jandt (2004: 93), the notion of stereotype is a broad term which refers to a negative or positive judgment about someone based on any observable or believed membership.

The statement is in line with Dunn (2005: 107) who said that stereotype is an exaggerated perception or belief to justify people based on their group category. Stereotyping is not only hurtful, it is also wrong. Even if the stereotype is correct in some cases, constantly putting someone down based on your preconceived perceptions will not encourage them to succeed.

Stereotyping can lead to bullying from a young age, stereotyping is encouraging bullying behavior that children carry into adulthood. Stereotyping

can also lead people to live lives driven by hate, and can cause the victims of those stereotypes to be driven by fear.

Moreover, Lee, Jussim and McCauley (1995 : 6) state that stereotypes have been condemned as factually incorrect, illogical in origin, and irrationally resistant to new information about the stereotyped group. Each of these charges is well-founded if a stereotype is understood as an exception less generalization about the target group (e.g., “All Asians are smart”). However, each is baseless if a stereotype is understood as a probabilistic prediction about how the target group differs from others.

Stereotypes are factually incorrect. This must be true if a stereotype is an all-or-none generalization about members of the stereotyped group. It cannot be the case that every German is efficient. If there is even one inefficient German, the stereotype is incorrect. (Lee, Jussim and McCauley, 1995: 6)

Stereotypes are illogical in origin. It is often suggested that stereotypes are based on illogical or irrational foundations because they do not arise from personal experience. (Lee, Jussim and McCauley, 1995: 7)

Stereotypes are based in prejudice. This is actually a variant of the “illogical in origin” charge, and it reflects an assumption underlying much of the first 30 years of research in stereotypes. Especially if prejudice is considered an affective predisposition to a group (an attitude of liking or disliking a social group), there is considerable historical evidence suggesting that stereotypes may sometimes serve to justify prejudice. National stereotypes, in particular, can change quickly with

changing international attitudes and alliances. (Lee, Jussim and McCauley, 1995 : 7)

Stereotypes are irrationally resistant to new information. People rarely change their beliefs about groups when confronted with a single individual who does not fit their stereotype. Does this represent irrational resistance to new information? The answer to this is yes under only one condition: when the stereotype is an all-or-none generalization. If one meets a German who is all thumbs, never has a plan, and takes forever to accomplish anything, and still maintains a stereotype of all Germans as efficient, then one is clearly being irrational. Stereotypes as probabilistic predictions that are not known to be wrong. They argued that what is wrong with stereotypes is that they are likely to be exaggerations of real group differences, that they are ethnocentric, and that they imply genetic rather than environmental causes of group differences. (Lee, Jussim and McCauley, 1995: 8)

Stereotypes are exaggerations of real group differences. The substantial literature on contrast effects in human perception to suggest that contrast effects in perception of group differences are essentially unavoidable. As dark grey looks darker and light grey looks lighter across a contour line, so Germans should look more efficient and Italians less efficient across a group boundary. In general, if there is a real difference between two groups, the perception of that difference-the stereotype-should be incorrect at least to the extent of exaggerating the real difference. (Lee, Jussim and McCauley, 1995: 9)

Stereotypes are ethnocentric. The easiest way to put the ethnocentrism charge in perspective is to recognize that personality-trait words are only one of many kinds of characteristics on which groups can be seen to differ. Perceptions of group differences may include physical appearance, behaviors, occupations, preferences, and values. At most, the charge of ethnocentrism is an argument against personality-trait stereotypes. The ethnocentrism charge has little relevance for more objective attributes. In addition, although stereotypes regarding personality attributes may be more subject to ethnocentrism than are more objective characteristics, there is no evidence suggesting that even stereotypes about personality attributes are always influenced by ethnocentrism. Like the exaggeration hypothesis, the ethnocentrism hypothesis is an interesting one. Although ethnocentrism undoubtedly sometimes influences evaluations, it is premature to conclude that even stereotypes about personality necessarily reflect ethnocentrism. (Lee, Jussim and McCauley, 1995: 10)

Stereotypes imply genetic origins of group differences This charge implies that we already know that many or most group differences do not have substantial genetic foundations. The truth is, of course, that we do not know any such thing. Indeed, many have been surprised by recent evidence suggesting that even political and religious views may be more similar in separated monozygotic twins than in separated dizygotic twins. (Lee, Jussim and McCauley, 1995:)

“They all look alike to me” (outgroup homogeneity). Another more sophisticated accusation against stereotypes is that they lead people to assume that members of outgroups are more similar to one another than they really are (the

outgroup is seen as more homogeneous than it really is). This is one of the few accusations against stereotypes that have received some empirical attention. Although there may be some tendency for people to see outgroups as less diverse than they really are, outgroup homogeneity is far from universal. In fact, outgroup and minority group members often see themselves as more homogeneous than they see ingroup or majority group members. Americans and Chinese perceivers both judge Americans to be more diverse than are the Chinese-which, on many dimensions, they really are. Like many of the other charges, outgroup homogeneity seems to be a hypothesis worth pursuing rather than an established fact.

Stereotypes lead people to ignore individual differences. This is a variant on the “rigidity” claim: Not only is it difficult to change people’s perceptions of groups, but people supposedly automatically assume that each member of a group fits the group stereotype, no matter how different any particular member may be. Before obtaining individuating information about a particular target person, perceivers often do expect that person to fit a stereotype of their group, but this is completely appropriate. (Lee, Jussim and McCauley, 1995: 12)

Stereotypes lead to biased perceptions of individuals. This is a weaker counterpart to the “ignore individual differences” charge. That is, although people may not *ignore* individual differences, stereotypes may still influence or bias judgments. For example, teachers may evaluate students who perform above the mean on a math test more favorably than students who score below the mean; but regardless of where students score, teachers may evaluate most boys more

favorably than they deserve, and they may evaluate most girls less favorably than they deserve. Stereotypes do sometimes lead to these types of biases (see Jussim, 1990, 1991, for reviews). Interestingly, however, stereotypes sometimes lead to counterstereotypic judgments of individuals. Girls have been viewed as more aggressive than boys (Condry & Ross, 1985), and African American job applicants and law school candidates have been evaluated more favorably than equally qualified Whites. (Lee, Jussim and McCauley, 1995: 13)

Stereotypes create self-fulfilling prophecies. A self-fulfilling prophecy occurs when “an originally false definition of a situation becomes true”. Stereotypes create a self-fulfilling prophecy, then the stereotyped belief becomes true (even if it was false to begin with). For example, we know that at least part of the physical attractiveness stereotype is not self-fulfilling. That is, people believe attractive individuals are smarter than less attractive individuals, which is false. But if it is false, we know that this stereotyped belief cannot possibly be self-fulfilling. Although understanding when and how stereotypes may be self-fulfilling is an important and interesting question, it is also a misrepresentation of the research evidence to claim or imply that stereotypes generally lead to self-fulfilling prophecies. (Lee, Jussim and McCauley, 1995: 14)

Although no single definition of *stereotype* is unanimously accepted, most researchers agree that stereotypes involve ascribing characteristics to social groups or segments of society. These characteristics may include traits, physical attributes, societal role or even specific behaviors. When focusing on stereotype accuracy, it is useful to distinguish *heterostereotypes* from *autostereotypes*. A

heterostereotype is simply one group's stereotype of another group. An autostereotype is defined as a group's stereotype of its own group members: a kind of self-image defined at the group level. In some cases, it is possible to compare stereotypic perceptions of a social group with more objective indicators of that group's characteristics. When these correspond, it is extremely difficult to argue that stereotypes are bereft of an accuracy component. Evidence of this nature occurs in a variety of domains. These include occupational stereotypes, gender stereotypes, and stereotypes based on physical appearance. (Lee, Jussim and McCauley 1995: 6)

According to Bar-Tal and Teichman (2005: 23), the concept of "stereotype" pertains to the cognitive repertoire (i.e., beliefs) that people have about the characteristics of other groups, and "prejudice" refers to the attitude that people hold toward another group. Stereotypes as "pictures" of national and ethnic groups, which reflect attitudes toward them. These "pictures" include traits that produce varying levels of aversion or acceptance. The results indicate that people hold a shared repertoire of traits that characterize other groups, and that the observed sharing of traits is a result not of personal knowledge but of public fiction, when "individuals accept consciously or unconsciously the group fallacy attitude toward place of birth and skin color".

Bar-Tal and Teichman also state that stereotypes tend to be activated and used to characterize a group, especially in situations of intergroup interactions, when no information is available about individual group members, or when the social category is easily accessible and/or the goal of the perceiver is to explain

intergroup relations. Special interest in this stereotyping process is the finding that individuals tend to disregard individual differences in their stereotypic perception of outgroups by homogenizing their characteristics. This tendency is especially strong when stereotyping occurs within the context of intergroup interaction and when the stereotyped characteristic is seen to differentiate between the ingroup and the outgroup. (Bar-Tal and Teichman, 2005: 24)

The individualistic views of stereotyping, stressing that “stereotypes held in common by large numbers of people are derived from, and structured by, the relations between largescale groups or entities. The functioning and use of stereotypes result from an intimate interaction between this contextual structuring and their role in the adaptation of individuals to their social environment”. (Bar-Tal and Teichman, 2005: 25)

The children living in a context of intractable conflict are strongly affected by the rivalry and the violence. They acquire the commonly accepted stereotype of the adversary group and tend to discriminate against this group. Also, growing up in a conflict affects children’s mental health. (Bar-Tal and Teichman, 2005: 25)

Stereotypes have been seen as structures of knowledge that perform important functions in people’s lives on an individual and group level. They fulfill a variety of needs, and individuals and groups use them differently, depending on their needs.

Bar-Tal (2005: 23) defines stereotypes as beliefs that come from different characterizing aspects such as physical appearance, traits, abilities, attitudes, emotions, goals, and behaviors.

Ashmore and Del Boca (1979: 222) defined gender stereotypes very broadly as “structured sets of beliefs about the personal attributes of women and men”, and these beliefs were assumed to include pictorial, behavioral, and affective components. Deaux and Lewis (1983, 1984) have distinguished among traits, roles, physical characteristics, occupations, and assumptions about sexual orientation as components of gender stereotypes; emotional dispositions may be reflected in stereotypes as well.

F. American Stereotype towards Chinese

Lee, Jussim & McCauley (1995) state that the belief that the “Chinese are industrious” implies that the Chinese are more industrious than most other ethnic groups. Many scholars make a distinction between the mean and variance of each dimension composing a stereotype. For example, an individual may believe that the average basketball player is extremely tall but also recognize that there is considerable variability among basketball players along this dimension. A stereotype may be accurate or inaccurate in either of these respects.

G. Chinese Stereotype towards American

According to Gu (2006: 17-18), multiculturalists perceive American society as a heterogeneous collection of racial and ethnic minority groups. They believe

that immigrants are active actors who shape their lives rather than passive victims of Americanizing forces. From this viewpoint, pre-migration cultural attributes are not inferior traits that will necessarily be obliterated by the mainstream culture. Rather, these “primitive” characteristics persistently interact with the host society to reshape and recreate themselves. Through a process of reconfiguration and recreation, immigrants’ original cultural attributes are transformed to ones that characterize an ethnicity which deviates from both homeland and host cultures.

Acculturated immigrants may hold more realistic perceptions about American society than newcomers and thus, become more critical concerning its shortcomings such as racial discrimination. They also believe that acculturation may itself be a traumatic process rather than a simple solution to the traumas of immigration. gender, parental nationality, family context, perceptions of discrimination, and residential location are all determinant factors that affect the self identifications and mental health of second-generation immigrants. (Gu, 2006: 21)

Parent-child conflict, followed by gender, is the most significant factor that correlates with low self-esteem. Other factors such as economic stress and perceived discrimination are also somewhat associated with low self-esteem. English-language proficiency and educational achievement are positively related to self-esteem. (Gu, 2006: 21)

While migration background demonstrates Asian Americans’ historical and cultural origins, minority status illustrates their position in American society. The former significantly shapes Asian Americans’ social practices and values, where

the latter to a large extent determines the ethnic and racial relations in which migrants are embedded. These two structural factors are inseparable; they interweave with each other in shaping Asian Americans' social life. (Gu, 2006: 25)

H. Fresh Off The Boat TV Series (Season 1)

Fresh Off The Boat is the one of famous TV Series in America. Set in 1995, and based loosely on the memoir of Viceland TV chef Eddie Huang, Fresh Off the Boat is about the fictionalised Huangs, a family of Taiwanese-Americans who move from Washington DC's Chinatown to a mostly white neighbourhood in Orlando, Florida, so dad Louis can open a cowboy-themed steakhouse.

Episode 1 (Rating: 7,6 / 10)

The first episode is entitled Pilot. It was released on 4 february 2015. It was written by Eddie Huang and Nahnatchka Khan and directed by Lynn Shelton. Starred by Randall Park, Constance Wu and Hudson Yang, it tells about Huang family move to the suburbs in Orlando, Florida, they discover life is a lot different than in the Chinatown area of Washington, D.C.

Episode 2 (Rating: 7,9 / 10)

The second episode is entitled Home Sweet Home-School. It was released on 4 february 2015. It was written by Eddie Huang and Nahnatchka Khan and directed by Max Winkler. Starred by Randall Park, Constance Wu and Hudson

Yang, it tells about Jessica thinks school must be too easy for the boys and gives them extra homework; Louis tries to get Jessica to ease up on her strict approach.

Episode 3 (Rating: 8,1 / 10)

The third episode is entitled The Shunning. It was released on 10 february 2015. It was written by Nahnatchka Khan and Eddie Huang and directed by Jake Kasdan. Starred by Randall Park, Constance Wu and Hudson Yang, it tells about Louis urges the family to make new friends at a neighborhood block party. Eddie tries to earn respect in the neighborhood.

Episode 4 (Rating : 8,0 / 10)

The fourth episode is entitled Success Perm. It was released on 10 february 2015. It was written by Eddie Huang and Nahnatchka Khan and directed by Gail Mancuso. Starred by Randall Park, Constance Wu and Hudson Yang, it tells about Eddie's cousin introduces him to white-lady song, while the family is visited by Jessica's sister.

Episode 5 (Rating: 7,9 / 10)

The fifth episode is entitled Persistent Romeo. It was released on 17 february 2015. It was written by Eddie Huang and Nahnatchka Khan and directed by Lynn Shelton. Starred by Randall Park, Constance Wu and Hudson Yang, it tells about Louis must hire an instructor to give the restaurant staff a sexual harassment seminar. Eddie attempts to impress his friends during a sleep over.

Episode 6 (Rating: 7,9 / 10)

The sixth episode is entitled Fajita Man. It was released on 24 february 2015. It was written by Eddie Huang and Nahnatchka Khan and directed by Matt Sohn. Starred by Randall Park, Constance Wu and Hudson Yang, it tells about Eddie takes a job at the family restaurant to earn money for a new video game, and Jessica searches for a job of her own.

Episode 7 (Rating: 7,6 / 10)

The seventh episode is entitled Showdown at the Golden Saddle. It was released on 3 March 2015. It was written by Nahnatchka Khan and Eddie Huang and directed by Matt Sohn. Starred by Randall Park, Constance Wu and Hudson Yang, it tells about The Huangs get a billboard for the restaurant, but it keeps on getting vandalized. Eddie tries impressing a girl that he likes.

Episode 8 (Rating: 7,7 / 10)

The eighth episode is entitled Phillip Goldstein. It was released on 10 March 2015. It was written by Nahnatchka Khan and Eddie Huang and directed by Phil Traill. Starred by Randall Park, Constance Wu and Hudson Yang, it tells about Eddie tries to make friends with the only other Chinese kid in school.

Episode 9 (Rating: 7,6 / 10)

The ninth episode is entitled License to Sell. It was released on 24 March 2015. It was written by Nahnatchka Khan and Eddie Huang and directed by Alisa

Statman. Starred by Randall Park, Constance Wu and Hudson Yang, it tells about Eddie's mom worries she can't compete with a top realtor and puts off taking the exam for her license.

Episode 10 (Rating: 8,1 / 10)

The tenth episode is entitled Blind Spot. It was released on 31 March 2015. It was written by Nahnatchka Khan and Eddie Huang and directed by Claire Scanlon. Starred by Randall Park, Constance Wu and Hudson Yang, it tells about Eddie's mom is annoyed that Eddie's dad isn't jealous when her college boyfriend, Oscar, visits.

Episode 11 (Rating: 7,7 / 10)

The eleventh episode is entitled Very Superstitious. It was released on 7 April 2015. It was written by Nahnatchka Khan and Eddie Huang and directed by Alex Hardcastle. Starred by Randall Park, Constance Wu and Hudson Yang, it tells about Eddie's mom's superstitions get the best of her when she sells a house with the address 44 West 44th Street - the number 4 being bad luck in Chinese culture.

Episode 12 (Rating: 7,5 / 10)

The twelfth episode is entitled Dribbling Tiger, Bounce Pass Dragon. It was released on 14 April 2015. It was written by Nahnatchka Khan and Eddie Huang and directed by Robert Cohen. Starred by Randall Park, Constance Wu and

Hudson Yang, it tells about Eddie's mom and Eddie's dad get pressured into volunteering at the kids' schools because of budget cuts. Eddie sees a whole other side of his dad when Louis - a former semi-pro basketball player back in Taiwan - coaches the basketball team, while Emery and Evan see a side of Jessica they wish they hadn't when she grudgingly takes on producing their school play, and puts her own spin on it.

Episode 13 (Rating: 7,8 / 10)

The thirteenth episode is entitled So Chineez, It was released on 21 April 2015. It was written by Nahnatchka Khan and Eddie Huang and directed by Chris Koch. Starred by Randall Park, Constance Wu and Hudson Yang, it tells about Jessica is worried that their family is not Chinese enough. Because their attitude and habit are change into American.