

NO. 80

THE SOCIAL ALIGNMENT PATTERNS  
OF THE CHINESE IN 19TH-CENTURY PENANG\*

MAK Lau Fong\*\*

\* This research is made possible by a grant from the Tan Kah Kee Foundation and another from the Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore.

\*\* Senior Lecturer, Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore.

All Rights Reserved

1987

## ABSTRACT

Based mainly on a collection of Chinese inscriptions in Malaysia, 14,500 names of donors who contributed to various Chinese voluntary associations in 19th-century Penang have been processed. Donors who had contributed to two specific speech types of voluntary associations are termed cross participants. A case of cross participation suggests the lowest level of openness of system boundary of each group/association.

The findings show that system boundary of the Hokkien people in 19th-century Penang was least rigid compared to that of the Cantonese, Hainanese and Hakkas, for the majority of the Hokkien cross participants were involved in the unrestrictive integrative type of voluntary associations. The overall pattern of social alignment reveals that the ideological/believed-in models were more prevalent than the immediate and observers' models proposed by Barbara Ward.

Competitiveness of the socio-economic environment as measured by the demographic composition of local ethnic groups, and social differentiation as measured by the sequential development of the three settlements are used to account for the differences in the social alignment patterns among the Chinese immigrants in Malacca, Singapore and Penang. The Penang Chinese are found to have followed the alignment patterns of the Chinese in Malacca.

# THE SOCIAL ALIGNMENT PATTERNS OF THE CHINESE IN THE 19TH-CENTURY PENANG

## INTRODUCTION

The immigrant Chinese community in the early Straits Settlements has been perceived as a segmented as well as fragmented society. This perception of heterogeneity is partly derived from the proliferation of speech bound voluntary associations founded by the immigrant Chinese. Analyses of the discrete phenomenon are fundamentally structural (e.g., Freedman, 1957).

Recent intensive field studies have in principle confirmed, retrospectively, the structuralistic findings about segmentation of the immigrant Chinese society. For instance, the Chinese in the State of Kelantan, Malaysia, may grossly be identified as 'Cina Kampung' (Village Chinese) and 'Cina Bandar' (Town Chinese). The labels of 'village' and 'town' are not merely geographical or demographic, they have special reference, for they "embody an ethnic distinction which in turn reflects the lengthy and complex pattern of Chinese settlement in the state." (Winzeler, 1985:14). Tan's (1982) study shows that the Chinese in Northern Kelantan are in reality more heterogeneous than the rural-town dichotomy. They could be further divided into a few more types according to degree and type of acculturation (e.g., into Siamese or Malay culture).

The Kelantan Chinese and the babas in Malacca and similarly, the peranakan Chinese in general, are certainly not the only, nor are they the major Chinese groups in the Malay Peninsula. They are, nonetheless, relatively homogeneous in terms of speech or means of verbal communication, compared to the non-peranakan Chinese.

The heterogeneity of the non-peranakan Chinese in Kelantan is not a subjective construct on the part of the observer. Rather it is derived from the mutual stereotyping resultant from social interface between speech groups. Below are some examples (Winzeler, 1985:55-6): "Hokkien people are very good businessmen", "Hakka people live in the interior because they are sturdy and like hard work", "The Shanghainese (Hupei) don't intermarry with us (Cantonese) because they have strange customs", "The Teochieu people sell their daughters" (as wives) and "Henghua are pushy and not polite".

Moreover, it is also observed that inter-marriage between speech groups among the Cina Bandar is a rarity (Winzeler, 1985:60-2). Each major dialect group, in Kelantan or elsewhere, is further said to be different from the other in its subculture which comprises folk songs, cuisine and food habits, rites of passage, and even temperament (Carsten, 1980; Lo, 1933; Moese et al., 1979:29ff.).

Studies using inscription data to analyze the different levels of social interaction of the Chinese communities in both early Singapore and Malacca have revealed that some speech groups or organizations in these two settlements were more closed and exclusive than others (Mak, 1980; 1985). For instance, in 19th-century Singapore, briefly, the Hokkiens and especially the zhang, chuan and yongchun Hokkiens produced more economic leaders than any other dialect group and were highly exclusive in their social system boundary. Located at the lower socio-economic stratum were the Cantonese and the Hakka people who showed some clear tendency to attempt to unite themselves on certain occasions.

The Hokkiens were demographically as well as economically also the dominant group in Malacca. They were, however, more willing to take part in

activities sponsored jointly with other dialect groups, especially in religious/temple activities, albeit the system boundary of their own voluntary associations was as rigid as that of their Singapore counterpart. In other words, their own organizations were still closed to members of other dialect groups.<sup>1</sup>

The present study is basically the concluding part of a research project about the Chinese community in the 19th-century Straits Settlements. The focus of the present inquiry is on the rigidity of system boundary, or the patterns of alignment of the major speech groups in 19th-century Penang. This will include particularly the frequency, the form and intensity of social alignment of the major dialect groups in terms of cross system participation.

Penang was one of the three settlements of the British Straits Settlements, the other two being Singapore and Malacca. In the course of economic and political development of the Settlements,<sup>2</sup> Malacca was the first port opened up to foreign powers and for foreign trade. It had been the site of the Malay Kingdom in the early 16th-century, also the colony of the Portuguese, the Dutch and the British alternately from 1511 till 1826 when the British officially and permanently occupied Malacca. The first instance of the British occupation of Malacca was in 1795, only temporarily till 1801.

Penang was the second port to be taken possession in 1798 by the British. About 21 years later in 1819, Singapore became the third settlement to form the Straits Settlements. Singapore has since been fast developing into the biggest entrepot of the Straits Settlements and also of the later Federation of Malaya. A substantial number of Chinese were already present in Malacca as early as 17th-century, but not until the

19th-century was there any sign of a sizeable Chinese population in Penang. Singapore began to attract Chinese immigrants from China as well as in-migrants from the surrounding areas after its founding in 1819.

We have no attempt to measure the definite magnitude of effects of urbanization and modernization on social differentiation in the three settlements. But it can be very certain that such effects are differentially distributed in the three settlements. While Singapore have been primarily a commercial centre and Malacca a politically and historically colourful town up to the 19th-century, Penang was probably then in the midway in terms of social differentiation. Based upon this assumption and the sociological axiom that mechanical social solidarity prevails in a highly differentiated society, we expect the Chinese in Penang to exhibit an alignment pattern dissimilar to that in both Singapore and Malacca.

The demographic composition of the Chinese communities along speech lines could also have some effects on the patterns of social alignment. Numerically dominant groups are more likely to be free from exterior influences on the rigidity of their system boundaries. These influences could be financial as in the case of soliciting funds externally to finance projects for a group which is too small in size and economically deprived. The Hakkas and Cantonese in 19th-century Singapore provide a good example. Both of them were minority groups in late 19th-century and their system boundaries were relatively open. The Hokkien group, on the other hand, (including the Straits born) had a clear dominance of 52% in Malacca, and about 47% in Singapore over other speech groups (Mak, 1985:71, Table 3.11), and had imposed a much more rigid system boundary than the two other speech groups.

The Hokkiens in Penang for the same period also constituted the dominant speech group (55%). The demographic composition of the Chinese community in Penang is similar to that in Singapore with the Cantonese as the second largest minority speech group which accounted for well over 20% of the Chinese population. In Penang, the Hakkas and the Hainanese together had less than 10%.

The two ports resembled each other also in the size of the Chinese population relative to other ethnic groups residing in the same settlement. During the last quarter of 19th-century, the total Chinese population in Penang was about 56%. In Singapore it was 65%, showing an upward trend, while for Malacca the Chinese population was only 20% (Mak, 1985:52, Table 3.2). Penang and Singapore were thus comparable in both the external and internal socio-demographic environments.

Given the historical development of the three settlements as indicative of degree of social differentiation, we would expect of the various major Chinese speech groups in Penang a pattern of social alignment dissimilar to that of their counterparts in both Singapore and Malacca. However, the demographic profile of the Chinese communities as indicative of economic power or self-sufficiency is in favour of projecting some degree of similarity between Penang and Singapore. In the final analysis, the social alignment patterns of the various speech groups in Penang are likely to be closer to that of Singapore than that of Malacca.

#### METHODS OF DATA PROCESSING

The most single important source of information that the present study relies upon is inscription data compiled and edited by Franke and Chen (1985). This collection contains Chinese inscriptions of the earliest

possible period till present for most cities and towns in Malaysia.

Altogether about 14,500 entries or names of donors are processed for 19th-century Penang alone. In principle, only inscriptions erected before 1900 would be included for the present study.

However, in limited cases, inscriptions created in the early 19th-century have also been included, if they were related to a major speech group who had not erected any single piece of inscription in the 19th-century. In yet a few other cases, the inclusion is allowed for the sake of continuity, because they contain names of prominent figures living in 19th-century Penang. But under no circumstances the study includes any piece of inscription that was erected in and after 1910. In effect, the latest piece for the present inquiry was dated 1907.

The 14,500 names were methodically processed through the use of a personal computer package.<sup>3</sup> The original Chinese characters of the names of the donors to various voluntary associations were first romanized. Names that appeared more than twice were then grouped together, which were later sorted out on the name and nature of the associations, amount of donation, year of donation and the speech origin of the association. Donors who had made multiple donations to more than one single type (speech) of associations are defined here as cross speech group participants or for short, cross participants. The first sorting yields some 1,200 names which appeared more than once, among whom are also donors who had made multiple donations to only associations belonging to a single speech origin.

We are finally left with 183 names of cross participants who had made a total of 691 donations to the various types of voluntary associations. While the speech origin of the specific cross participants is not known



because of the method of data processing, that of the integrative cross participants are by and large can be established by inference.<sup>4</sup>

Since our main interest lies in the rigidity of system boundary, a brief description on the rationale and procedure for classifying the many voluntary associations in 19th-century Penang is instructive. The main criteria used for the classification, which are derived from the structure of most inscriptions, are three. Firstly, if the speech origin of the founders and/or members is already given in the title or in the text of the inscription, that would be taken as conclusive. Should such an identity not be available in the two contexts, the cited birthplace of the founders would be considered. At yet a lower level for establishing the speech characteristic of the organization is the search for the speech origin of the principal donors and/or directors of the organization. This approach requires the search for biographic data or notes about these figures, part of which may be found in the Collection's footnotes provided by the editors. Commemorative magazines published by the respective locality organizations are a valuable source too.

Of the 35 identifiable Penang associations recorded in the Collection (Table 1), seven belonged to the Cantonese alone, three jointly to the Cantonese and the Hakkas, other three to the Hakkas exclusively, 15 to the Hokkiens, one each to the Hainanese and the Teochius respectively, and the remaining seven to all of the major dialect groups in an amalgamated manner. The speech identity of two such associations cannot be established and they are labelled as unidentified associations.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

## THE FINDINGS

### Cross Participation

Rigidity of system boundary of voluntary associations can be measured in a number of ways insofar as its degree is concerned. A single case of cross participation indicates the lowest level of system openness, along a continuum with the founding of an all inclusive integrative association patronized by all speech groups to mark its highest level. But within these two extremes there are intermediate levels. One such level is indicated by the presence of any integrative association at the provincial level, e.g., the Guangdong and Dingchou Public Cemetery in Penang. Another one which reflects a lower degree of system openness is the existence of any association which involves only two exclusive dialect groups, e.g., Singapore's Teluk Ayer Daibogong Temple which was at one time maintained by both the Cantonese and Hakkas only. Cross participation is defined as specific so long as it is confined to only financial contributions, irrespective of the level of involvement. On the other hand, cross participation that involved management in any joint manner will be deemed integrative participation. Table 2 below details out the degree of system rigidity in an unidimensional scale.<sup>5</sup>

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

Integrative participation may be restrictive, semi-restrictive and unrestricted. The fully integrative participation is by definition unrestricted. Nevertheless, an association which extends its membership to only people from a particular province is deemed semi-restrictive which may be exemplified by the aforementioned public cemetery in Penang. On the other hand, the Singapore's temple mentioned above illustrates the most restrictive type of integrative organization.

In 19th-century Singapore, there were 34 cases of definite specific cross participation which take the following distribution: 20 pairs between the Cantonese and Hakkas, five between the Hokkiens and Cantonese, eight between the Hakkas and Hokkiens, and lastly the remaining definite one between the Hokkiens and the Cantonese/Hakkas combined (Mak, 1980). On the other hand, in 19th-century Malacca, 21 out of 28 specific cases involved the Hokkiens and Hakkas. The rest of the pairs have only two or less in each instance (Mak, 1985: 130ff.).

Much fewer specific cross participation cases are found in Penang for the same era. Altogether only nine such cases are registered: one case between the Cantonese and Hokkiens, two between the Cantonese and Hainanese, and lastly six involved the Hokkiens and Hainanese. (Table 3).

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

For the distribution of integrative cross participation, there were 30 cases at the provincial level and 154 at the inter-provincial level. Among the semi-restrictive integrative cases involving the Guangdong provincial associations, 11 donations were made to Hokkien associations, 10 to Cantonese associations, and another six to Hainanese associations. The remaining three pairs of donations were made to Hakka associations and the same type of semi-restrictive integrative organizations.

Apparently, Penang was very much behind the other two settlements insofar as specific cross participation is concerned. This discrepancy begs for an explanation which is in fact rather simple, although interpretation of it calls for some effort: Penang scored high on two kinds of integrative participation which would naturally have reduced the frequency of specific cross participation.

At the inter-provincial level, Singapore had had no such type of organization in the 19th-century. Like Malacca which recorded a high volume of cross participative cases (163) between the various speech groups and the unrestrictive integrative associations, Penang had 154 similar cases. The majority (114) of them involved Hokkien associations.

### Intensive and Preferential Participation

Frequency of cross contributions is only a very general and rudimentary measure of cross group involvement. To gauge the intensity of participation and preferential involvement, other dimensions of cross participation should be examined. These other dimensions will be expressed in terms of some basic statistical concepts.

It can be seen from Table 3 that six pairs of specific cross participants had donated to both Hokkien and Hainanese organizations respectively, the mean value of the differences<sup>6</sup> for all pairs of donations made to the two associations is \$85.17, with a standard deviation (SD) of \$82.15 and a coefficient of variability (CV) of 0.99. A mean value in the present context indicates the intensity of participation and the degree of preferential involvement as well, of a specific group of donors who had made contributions to two types of associations, presumably his own and that dominated by another speech group. The CV which is the result of dividing the SD by the Mean, almost reaches unity — a level that reflects a high degree of diversity or disagreement between two paired donations for all the cross donors concerned.

We however do not know whether the substantial imbalanced donations were actually in favour of Hokkien or Hainanese associations. Table 5 has the answer that of the six cases in question, the difference in each paired donation is in favour of Hokkien associations. That is, when each of the

six cross participants made two donations, with one to a Hokkien association and the other to a Hainanese based association, the major or bigger donation was given to the former.

[TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE]

There does not seem to be any comparable case from other speech groups in Penang itself, nor are there sufficient comparable cases from both Malacca (only two similar cases) and Singapore. Chinese voluntary associations in Penang seemed to be a deviant case. There were in Penang inter-provincial integrative associations that Singapore had not; there were truly provincially integrative associations that Malacca had not.

Shortly we shall examine how the members of each major speech group in Penang related themselves to these two types of integrative organization.

#### Participation in Integrative Organizations

The Quangdong & Dingzhou Public Cemetery, Haizhoyu Dabogong Temple, and the Wufu School and its subsidiary groups are the integrative organizations at the provincial level. The Hokkiens are most heavily involved in these organizations. There were ten cross participants connecting both the Guangdong provincial associations and Hokkien associations. Out of the ten donors, nine had made known their specific amounts of donations. Judging by the manner the paired donations were made, the nine were very much biased in terms of preferential group alignment. This behavioural pattern is indicated in Table 4 where the large mean value of \$906.88 is noted in the differences between donations made to both Hokkien associations and the Guangdong provincial associations. But not all the nine donors uniformly held the same degree of bias. A phenomenal SD of \$2,106.07 certainly suggests that a number of the cross participants were extremely discriminating.

What is worthy of further analysis is that of the nine paired donations, except for one tied case, the remaining eight major donations were equally shared by both types of associations. This appears that the cross participants involved were truly unbiased. This piece of finding might also make the donation patterns involving the Hokkiens look unique in the 19th-century Straits Settlements, for cross participants donating to Hokkien associations elsewhere were consistently more in favour of Hokkien associations. These are unfortunately misconceptions.

Further analysis (Table 5) demonstrates that the averaged amount of the four major donations to Hokkien associations was a hefty \$1,760, compared to the \$104 given to the Guangdong provincial associations, a difference of approximately 17 times. This difference suggests that those who made major donations in favour of Guangdong integrative associations had actually donated a very much smaller amount, or themselves were small-time donors. Thus the richer cross participants were on the whole donating in favour of Hokkien associations. The uniqueness of the alignment pattern in question is therefore more apparent than real. This is not surprising at all, for after all the Hokkiens had not found their domiciles in the Province of Guangdong. It would have been more puzzling to find the people from Guangdong following suit. So, had the people living in the same Guangdong Province contributed favourably and fairly to their own provincial associations?

For cases involving Hakka associations are for technical reasons difficult to judge, because there are only two. Between the cross participants involving Cantonese/Guangdong associations and Hainanese/Guangdong associations, the former group seemed to be more discriminating, for they show a much larger mean value of the differences

in their paired donations. It is \$84.38 for the former and only \$28.67 for the latter, while the CV values of 1.66 and 1.26 respectively are quite agreeable to each other. Despite these internal discrepancies, the cross participants from Guangdong were on the whole much less discriminating towards their own provincial integrative associations as compared to donors primarily from the province of Fujian.

Another piece of meaningful finding lies perhaps in the activities involving the inter-provincially integrative, or simply integrative organizations. As many as seven such organizations could be found in the inscription data. These include Quangfu gong, Kaishanwang miao, Dasheng futang, Dayuan futang, Jile si, Wangshi zhongchi, and a congress like organization by the name Pingzhang huiguan, or later known as the Chinese Town Hall.

Cross participants who had made donations to the integrative organizations had also donated to voluntary associations respectively dominated by the Cantonese, Hakkas, Hokkiens and the Hainanese. The number of explicit donations involving both the integrative and Hokkien associations stands at 111, dwarfing the rest of the combinations -- it is almost three times as many as the total number of donations made by the rest.

There is also a significant difference in the averaged amount of differences in the amounts of paired donations made by this group of Hokkien-integrative cross participants compared to other Chinese groups. (Table 4). These 111 cross participants generated a mean value of the averaged differences in donations of \$434.70, which is 2.8 times higher than that of the cross participants involving Hakka associations (\$153.65), 4.5 times more than that involving Cantonese associations (\$97).

and well over 186 times more than that involving Hainanese association (\$2.33).

Standard deviation values for the four groups vary tremendously, with cross participation involving the Hokkiens topping the list at a very high value of \$1,445.60, and a large CV of 3.33. This finding indicates that some cross donors' contributions could be as much as three times higher than the average cross participants in the same group; or that their contributions to one type of associations were several times more than that to another type. While the imbalance in these cross participants' donations is noted, more of them were in favour of the integrative organizations.

Firstly, the ratio of the number of major donations made for the two types of associations is negligible. Of the 111 pairs of donations, 53 were in favour of Hokkien associations, 50 were for the integrative associations, and the remaining eight were taken as equal. Secondly, the averaged amount of the major donations given by these 111 donors to the integrative organizations was \$815, compared to only \$308 to Hokkien associations (Table 5). If this group of donors were Hokkiens, of whom some of the more prominent ones in fact are, the Hokkiens in 19th-century Penang ought to be more community oriented than their counterparts in the other two settlements as well as in Penang itself. So far there is no evidence to show otherwise that those integrative organizations were actually Hokkien dominated associations with a pseudo integrative frontage.

On the contrary, it can be said that compared to the Hokkien-integrative cross participants, the Cantonese-integrative, the Hakka-integrative, and the Hainanese-integrative donors seemed to be less discriminating, favourably or otherwise to the two types of associations. Their respective mean value is much smaller than that of the



Hokkien-integrative connections. Of the three groups of cross participants, the Hakkas were the most discriminating (mean value of \$153.65), followed by the Cantonese with a mean value of \$97. Cross participants with a Hainanese base were not only least discriminating for its having a small mean value of \$2.33, but also seemed to be uniform and consistent in alignment behaviour among themselves.

The CV of 3.13 (Table 4) for the cross participants involved the Hakkas implies that some of them were behaving very discriminatorily on group alignment. Furthermore, data in Table 5 affirm that this group of cross participants were less enthusiastic about the integrative associations, as compared to the groups involving the Cantonese, the Hainanese and the Hokkiens. This group as a whole had made 14 major donations with a mean value of \$507 to Hakka associations. However, their major donations to the integrative associations numbered 11 and averaged at \$76.

In general, compared to cross participants involving the Hokkiens, that involved the various Quangdong dialect groups had not made more major donations to the integrative associations. Neither were any of their respective averaged donations to the integrative associations, which are also the major donations, higher than that donated to the respective speech bound associations.

These findings indicate that cross participants involving Hokkien and integrative associations, both provincial and above, were more active, enthusiastic and financially more generous. The next most active speech group were the Hakkas whose participation at the provincial level was a disappointment.

Finally, a noteworthy finding is that while the Hainanese were the smallest minority in late 19th-century Penang, as they were in Singapore and Malacca for the same epoch (Mak, 1985: Tables 4.2 to 4.4), they had nevertheless left some definite traces of their activities in the particular settlement. However, the methodological procedure keeps signalling the inference predicament that exists between the specific cross participants and attribution of them to a particular speech group.

#### CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

The social alignment patterns among major dialect groups in 19th-century Penang seems to be closer to the Malacca model and drastically distinct from the Singapore model. In Singapore, only the Hakkas and the Cantonese had jointly erected and maintained certain temples and public burial grounds. But the involvements of other Guangdong dialect groups, e.g., the Hainanese and Teochius, were not evident or not provided in the Collection by Chen and Tan (1972). In Singapore, one could find only restrictive integrative organizations. They were restrictive because they were not organized, or they failed to attract other major speech groups of the same province other than the Cantonese and Hakkas. The sequence and pace of the development of the Straits Settlements might help to explain the alignment patterns among the Penang Chinese who were relatively more active in integrative organizations. A possible explanation is that the Chinese populations in both 19th-century Penang and Malacca were relatively smaller and the communities less differentiated; these conditions could have facilitated a social environment conducive for the Chinese to forge closer ties among themselves.

Even though the two ports were opened up earlier, they were never developed into an important entrepot or a commercial centre like Singapore. Since its founding, Singapore has been a busy business city in the Settlements and also in the region. Social stratification of a higher level within the Chinese community was thus a natural development, which would in turn inevitably entail some loss in the sense of community among the Chinese. If the Chinese were fundamentally segmented, turning to closer solidarity only as a response to external stimuli, it could be argued either that the environment in Malacca and that in Penang were too competitive for the Chinese to be divisive, or alternatively that the contemporary Singapore was relatively free from similar external strains.

If racial composition roughly reflects the degree of competitiveness in the environ, then both Malacca and Penang scored high on it, because a higher proportion of other ethnic groups was present in both settlements. The Singapore Chinese, on the other hand had existed without severe competition from outside the community; their need for integrative organization was less therefore strongly felt by the Chinese in Singapore than those in Malacca and Penang.

The Penang Chinese however did not follow the path of the Malacca Chinese in terms of types of integrative mechanism. In the Malacca case, the three integrative organizations were all temples (Mak, 1985:130). On the other hand, a variety of types of integrative associations had been founded in Penang in the 19th-century, which included temples, a relatively open clan association, and a community association.

Referring to Table 1 where rigidity of system boundary is arranged in an unidimensional scale for a range of participative behaviour, the most

open system boundary is one which accepts as members of all speech groups. At the other extreme are organizations which accept a donation from any individual of another speech group. Of the associations dominated by the Cantonese, Hainanese, Hakkas and Hokkiens respectively, that by the Hokkiens were most flexible, followed by the Hainanese and the Cantonese. The Hakka dominated associations were most rigid, for they did not even accept a single individual donation from any of the other three speech groups. Despite the exclusive nature of Hakka associations, the Hakka people were rather active, after the Hokkiens, in the inter-provincial associations.

The overall pattern of social alignment in 19th-century Penang is able to shed some light on the nature of the three conscious models which Ward (1965) derived from Levi-Strauss. The manifest and intense involvement of the various speech groups in the inter-provincial organizations suggests the prevalence of a ideological or believed-in model which originally refers to the normative pattern commonly held by the Chinese literati or gentry. The popularity of the model certainly reflects the fact that gaps were narrower between the immediate and internal observers' models which are thought to be constructed by members of a particular social group and by outsiders respectively. In other words, both the immediate and internal observers' models were overshadowed by the ideological model.

The three models have been more or less assumed to be self generated. The present study is in a position to propose that the perceived or objectively existing levels of competitive environment and social differentiation are related to the emergence, if not creation of the three models, especially the ideological models. This proposition is derived primarily from the observations on the relationships between the

participation patterns and both the ethnic composition and social differentiation in the three settlements.

The ideological model consists of some essential elements extolled by the Chinese gentry, e.g., Confucianism and respect to deceased ancestors. These universal elements are intrinsically moralistic and religious, both of which are sometimes interwoven. In the case of the 19th-century Straits Settlements, temples or religious organizations had attracted the interest of most of the cross participants. Empirically it has yet to be verified if such religious elements corresponded to that conceived by the literati at home, for the deities worshipped by the immigrant Chinese included also local ones such as daibogong. Nevertheless, all deities are thought to be supernatural conceptually.

Participative behaviour at the intermediate, or the provincial level may assume a conscious model beyond the three mentioned above. This is especially the case where the highest level of involvement is only provincial, as in the case of 19th-century Singapore. This and other similar findings about the cross participation patterns of the Chinese immigrants in the three settlements strongly suggest that the immediate and observers' models may be graded according to degree or intensity. In fact, our analysis on the rigidity of system boundaries of the various major speech groups can be considered to be fruitful in stratifying the levels of the conscious models.

## NOTES

1. The Chinese in Penang were not well-researched then, because the the inscription data were at that time only partially available.
2. The sequence of development is, however, not reflected in the appearance of the published collections of inscription (Chen and Tan, 1972; Franke and Chen, 1985). The Singapore inscriptions appeared first, followed by that of Malacca and that of Penang. Because of this sequence of availability of the inscription data, comparisons of the Chinese communities can be made more meaningfully only at the present stage when the Penang inscriptions were available.
3. This package is known as dBase III or its later version dBase III Plus.
4. We identify the speech origin of an integrative cross participant to be the same as that of the dialect association to which he had made a donation. For example, when an integrative cross participant made a pair of donations to both a Hokkien and an integrative association, the cross participant is assumed to be a Hokkien. It would be illogical to associate him with another speech group to which he had not even contributed.
5. This is a revised and expanded version of one constructed earlier on (see Mak, 1980).
6. When a donor made two or a pair of donations, unless they were exactly the same, there would be a difference between the two amounts. The difference for each pair of cross participative donations, specific or integrative, is taken to be a case/variable for computing the mean value. Cases involved three speech bound associations would be removed from the list of cross participation. No such cases have been found.

In the event that multiple donations were made to two different speech types of associations by the same cross participant, the donations for each association will first be averaged up.

## REFERENCES

- Carstens, S.  
1980 "Puali: Memories of a gold mining settlement in Ulu Kelantan."
- Franke, W. and Chen, T.F.  
1985 Chinese Epigraphic Materials in Malaysia, Vol. 2. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press.
- Freedman, M.  
1957 Chinese Family and Marriage in Singapore. London: HMSO.
- Mak, Lau Fong  
1980 "Rigidity of system boundary among major Chinese dialect groups in 19th-century Singapore." *Modern Asian Studies* 17, 3: 465-88.
- 1983 "Subcommunal participation: and leadership cohesiveness of the Chinese in 19th-century Singapore." *Modern Asian Studies* 17, 3: 437-53.
- 1985 Fang Yuan Qun Ren Tong (Dialect Group Identity). Taipei: Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, Monograph Series B, No. 14.
- Moese, W., G. Reinknecht, and E. Schmitz-SeiBer  
1979 Chinese Regionalism in West Malaysia and Singapore. Hamburg: Gesellschaft Fur Natur- and Volkerkunde Ostasiens e.V. Mitteilungen LXXVII.
- Tan, Chee Beng  
1982 "Peranakan Chinese in North West Kelantan." *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* LV, 1: 25-52.
- Ward, Barbara E.  
1965 "Varieties of the conscious model." M. Banton, eds., *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*. ASA Monograph No. 1. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Winzeler, R.L.  
1985 *Ethnic Relations in Kelantan*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Yen, Ching Hwang  
1981 "Early Chinese clan organizations in Singapore and Malaya, 1819-1911." *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* XII, 1: 62-92.

Table 1 List of associations according to speech origin, Penang, 19th century.

Name of organization [Code]	Type	Year
<b>Cantonese Associations</b>		
Luban gu miao [H1.9] (粵班古廟)	OC	1865
Ningyang huiguan [H1.33] (寧陽會館)	DA	1860
Nanyi gongsi [H1.35] (南邑公司)	DA	1904
Xiangyi guan [H1.36] (香邑會館)	DA	1907
Huqin gu miao [H1.7] (胡堉古廟)	OC	1871
Wushi jia miao [H1.51] (伍氏家廟)	C	1896
Meishi zhongchi [H1.52] (梅氏宗祠)	C	1842
<b>Cantonese &amp; Hakka Associations</b>		
Quangdong & Dingzhou yishan [H1.23] (廣東暨汀州義山)	PC	1795
Haizhoyu Dabogong miao [H1.3.2] (海珠嶼大伯公廟)	T	1865
Wufu shuyuan (Wufu tang/Qianyi yinhui) [H1.34] (五福書院/五福堂/千益銀會)	S	1898
<b>Hakka Associations</b>		
Jiaying huiguan (Renhe guan) [H1.29] (嘉應會館/仁如館)	DA	1803
Shenzhi xueshu [H1.53] (慎之學塾)	S	1886
Dabogong fuyuan sanqing bei [H1.3.3] (大伯公祈緣善慶碑)	T	1868
<b>Hokkien Associations</b>		
Fengshan si [H1.5] (鳳山寺)	T	1862
Qingyun yian (Fuxing gong/Qinglong miao/She miao) [H1.8] (清雲巖/福興宮/清龍廟)	T	1873
Fushou gong [H1.11.1] (福壽宮)	T	1877
Chenghuang miao [H1.12.1] (城隍廟)	T	1879
Qinglong gong [1.16] (清龍宮)	T	1888
Baozhu she [H1.18] (寶珠社)	T	1902
Fujian yishan [1.24] (福建義山)	PC	1805
Pulau Tikus gongchong [H1.24.16] (波地滑公塚)	PC	1856
Batu Gantong gongchong [H1.24.9] (巴都眼東公塚)	PC	1886
Qiushi longshan tang (Wenshan tang/Yigu tang) [H1.46] (邱氏龍山堂/文山堂/詔毅堂)	C	1851
Xieshi zhongchi [H1.47] (謝氏宗祠)	C	1858
Linshi zhongchi (Jiulong tang) [H1.48] (林氏宗祠)	C	1872
Shuimei gong (Xing, Ke & Cai zhongchi) [H1.4.1] (水美宮/辛柯蔡宗祠)	C	1862
Chenshi zhongchi (Kaizhang sheng wang bei/Yinchuan tang) [H1.50] (陳氏宗祠/開漳聖王碑/鎮川堂)	C	1878
Yangshi jiachi (Yingyuan gong etc.) [H1.54] (楊氏家祠/應元宮)	C	1900



Table 1 List of associations according to speech origin, Penang, 19th century. [Contd.]

Name of organizations [Code]	Type	Year
<b>Hainanese Associations</b>		
Qiongzhou gongguan (Tienhou gong) [H1.31] (瓊州公館 / 天后宮)	DA	1870
<b>Teochiu Associations</b>		
Caozhou huiguan (Hanjiang jiamiao) [H1.30.1] (潮州會館 漳江家廟)	DA	1870
<b>Unrestrictive Integrative Associations</b>		
Guangfu gong [H1.2.1] (廣福宮)	T	1800
Kaishanwang miao [H1.6] (開山王廟)	T	1866
Dasheng futang [H1.10] (大生佛堂)	T	1875
Dayuan futang [H1.15] (大圓佛堂)	T	1883
Jile si (gongde bei) [H1.17] (極樂寺)	T	1892
Wangshi zhongchi (Taiyuan tang) [H1.55] (王氏宗祠)	C	1895
Pingzhang huiguang (gongguang) [H1.32] (平章會館)	CC	1886
<b>The Undetermined Associations</b>		
Liu, Guan & Zhang miao [H1.13]* (劉關張廟)	T	1880
Qingguan si (Caoyuan miao) [H1.14] (清觀寺 / 朝元廟)	T	1881

Notes: OC=Occupational guild; T=Temple; S=School;  
 DA=Dialect Association; C=Clan association;  
 PC=Public cemetery;  
 CC=Chamber of Commerce/United association.

All codes are given by Franke and Chen (1985).

\*Yen (1981: n.38) attributes a similar association in Singapore to the Cantonese group, based on the speech of a list of members since 1949.

Table 2. Defining rigidity of group system in an unidimensional scale

Specific Cross Participation			Integrative Cross Participation		
Contributions		Membership/ Individual	Corporate Membership		
Individual	Corporate		Restri.	Semi-Restri.	Unrestri.
Hengsan Ting (S) (恒山亭)	Hanjiang Huiguan(M) (韓江会馆)	Baochi Gong (S) (保赤宮)	T. Ayer Dabogong (S) (直落 阿逸大伯 公)	Guandong & Dingchou P. Cemetery (P) (廣東登江 廿廿塚)	Hosheng Gong(M) (和勝宮)
+	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	+	+	+	-
+	+	+	+	-	-
+	+	+	-	-	-
+	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-

Most Rigid <-----> Least Rigid

Notes: S=Singapore; M=Malacca; P=Penang  
 C.P.=Cross Participation  
 Restri.=Restrictive

Table 3. Frequency of cross participation among the major dialect groups or their organizations

	Hainanese	Hakkas	Hokkiens	Guangdong People	All Origins
Cantonese	2	0	1	10*	10+
Hainanese	-	0	6	6	3
Hakkas		-	0	3+	27+
Hokkiens			-	11*	114§

\* Including two cases where the cross participants were only directors/managers of one of the paired associations without mentioning the actual amounts of donations made, or without any donations at all. These cases have been excluded pairwise from all subsequent statistical computations.

+ Including one case similar to the abovementioned.

§ Including three such cases.

Table 4. Mean(M), standard deviations(SD) and coefficient of variability (CV) of the differences in donations given by cross participants

	Hainanese	Hakkas	Hokkiens	Guangdong People	All Origins
<b>Cantonese</b>					
M=	\$23.50	-	-	\$84.38	\$97.00
SD=	\$15.20			\$140.31	\$100.50
CV=	0.64			1.66	1.04
<b>Hainanese</b>					
M=	-	-	\$85.17	\$28.67	\$2.33
SD=			\$82.15	\$36.88	\$1.88
CV=			0.99	1.29	0.53
<b>Hakkas</b>					
M=	-	-	-	\$128.00	\$153.65
SD=				\$75.00	\$481.12
CV=				0.59	3.13
<b>Hokkiens</b>					
M=	-	-	-	\$906.88	\$434.70
SD=				\$2106.07	\$1445.60
CV=				2.32	3.33

Table 5. Characteristics of major contributions made to each pair of associations by cross participants

Contributions made to:														
Total Cases	Can- tonese		Hai- nanese		Hakkas		Hokkiens		Guand- dong		All Origins		On Par	
	N	M(\$)	N	M(\$)	N	M(\$)	N	M(\$)	N	M(\$)	N	M(\$)	N	M(\$)
2	1	5	1	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
8	4	231	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	18	-	-	-	0
9	4	189	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	188	1	5
6	-	-	0	-	-	-	6	89	-	-	-	-	-	0
6	-	-	2	37	-	-	-	-	3	39	-	-	-	1 3
3	-	-	2	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	8	-	0
2	-	-	-	-	2	130	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	0
26	-	-	-	-	14	507	-	-	-	-	11	76	1	12
9	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1,760	4	104	-	-	-	1 2
111	-	-	-	-	-	-	53	308	-	-	50	815	8	16

Keys: N=Number of major contributions  
M=Mean value of major contributions

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE  
Department of Sociology

WORKING PAPERS

The Department of Sociology of the National University of Singapore publishes, presently under the editorship of L.F. Mak, Eddie C.Y. Kuo and K.C. Ho, reports of ongoing research by staff members, postgraduate students and visitors to the Department. Views expressed are the author's, so is the copyright.

1. Riaz Hassan and Geoffrey Benjamin, "Ethnic Outmarriage Rates in Singapore: The Influence of Traditional Socio-Cultural Organisation," 1972, 26p.
- \*2. Hans-Dieter Evers, "Urban Involution: The Social Structure of Southeast Asian Towns," 1972, 19p.
- \*3. Erik Cohen, "Social Ecology -- A Multidimensional Approach," 1973, 97p.
4. Noeleen Heyzer and Wee Gek Sim, "Trade Union Leaders in Singapore," 1972, 92p.
5. Peter S.J. Chen, "The Political Course of Singapore," (in English and Chinese), 1972, 23p.
6. Chan Heng Chee and Hans-Dieter Evers, "National Identity and Nation Building in S.E. Asia," 1972, 29p.
- \*7. Peter Weldon, "Indonesian and Chinese Status Differences in Urban Java," 1972, 41p.
- \*8. Geoffrey Benjamin, "Austroasiatic Subgroupings and Prehistory in the Malay Peninsula," 1972, 63p.
- \*9. Aline K. Wong, "Job Satisfaction among Higher Non-Expatriate Civil Servants in Hong Kong," 1972, 64p.
10. Peter S.J. Chen, "Modernisation in Singapore: Changing Values and the Individual," 1972, 16p.
- \*11. Geoffrey Benjamin, "An Outline of Temiar Grammar," 1972, 41p.
- \*12. Peter S.J. Chen, "Social Stratification in Singapore," 1973, 99p.
- \*13. John S. Western, Peter D. Weldon and Tan Tsu Haung, "Housing and Satisfaction with Environment in Singapore," 1973, 30p.
- \*14. Mochtar Naim, "Penghulu di Minangkabau (Penghulu as Traditional Elite in Minangkabau)," 1973, 41p.

15. Michael A.H. Walter, "A Comparative Examination of Systems of Kinship and Marriage in Fiji," 1973, 41p.
- \*16. Hans Dieter-Evers and Daniel Regan, "Specialisation and Involvement: The Modernising Role of Doctors in Malaysia and Indonesia," 1973, 33p.
17. Myrna L. Blake, "Kampong Eurasians in Singapore," 1973, 45p.
- \*18. Mak Lau Fong, "The Forgotten and the Rejected Community -- A Sociological Study of Chinese Secret Societies in Singapore and West Malaysia," 1973, 150p.
- \*19. Erik Cohen, "Southeast Asian Urban Sociology -- A Review and a Selected Bibliography," 1973, 53p.
- \*20. Thelma Kay, "Group Cohesion and Productivity among Dockworkers -- A Study of Stevedores in Singapore," 1973, 28p.
21. Eddie Kuo, "Industrialisation and the Family Type: An Overview," 1974, 45p.
22. Hans-Dieter Evers, "Changing Patterns of Minangkabau Urban Landownership," 1974, 45p.
- \*23. Peter S.J. Chen, "Social and Psychological Aspects of Fertility: Findings from Family Planning Research in Singapore," 1974, 27p.
24. Hans-Dieter Evers, "The Role of Professionals in Social and Political Change," 1974, 28p.
- \*25. Geoffrey Benjamin, "Prehistory and Ethnology in Southeast Asia: Some New Ideas," 1974, 32p.
26. Mochtar Naim, "Voluntary Migration in Indonesia," 1974, 41p.
27. Lawrence Babb, "Walking on Flowers in Singapore -- A Hindu Festival Cycle," 1974, 46p.
28. Geoffrey Benjamin, "Indigenous Religious Systems of the Malay Peninsula," 1974, 27p.
29. Aline K. Wong, "Women as a Minority Group in Singapore," 1974, 46p.
30. Michael A.H.B. Walter, "Co-operation in East Fiji: A New Traditionalism?" 1974, 30p.
31. Aline K. Wong, "The Continuous Family Revolution in China -- Ideology and Changing Family Patterns," 1974, 28p.
- \*32. Eddie C.Y. Kuo and Riaz Hassan, "Some Social Concomitants of Interethnic Marriage in Singapore," 1974, 28p.
- \*33. Riaz Hassan, "Symptoms and Syndromes of the Developmental Process in Singapore," 1974, 11p.

34. Hans-Dieter Evers and Riaz Hassan, "Studies on Social Stratification in Southeast Asia," 1974, 141p.
35. Pang Eng Fong and Thelma Kay, "Change and Continuity in Singapore's Industrial Relations System," 1974, 27p.
36. Eddie C.Y. Kuo, "Field Theory as a Conceptual Framework for Divorce Study," 1974, 25p.
37. Riaz Hassan, "International Tourism and Intercultural Communication: The Case of Japanese Tourists in Singapore," 1974, 23p.
38. Riaz Hassan, "Towards a Dialectic Anthropology -- A Comment on Professor M. Freedman's Paper, Social and Cultural Anthropology," 1974, 7p.
39. Hans-Dieter Evers, "Urbanisation and Urban Conflict in Southeast Asia," 1974, 16p.
40. Michael A.H.B. Walter, "The Gardening Game," 1975, 15p.
41. Frederic C. Deyo, "Organisation and Its Socio-Cultural Setting: A Case Study of Structural Compensation in an Atomistic Society," 1975, 31p.
42. Mak Lau Fong, "Chinese Secret Societies in Ipoh Town, 1945-1969," 1975, 17p.
43. Vivienne Wee, "A Preliminary Account of 'Buddhism' in Singapore," 1975, 56p.
44. Geoffrey Benjamin, "The Cultural Logic of Singapore's 'Multiracialism'," 1975, 34p.
45. Eckehard Kulke, "Social Class and Primordial Loyalty in Rural India - An Approach to the Study of Indian Untouchables," 1975, 31p.
46. Peter S.J. Chen, "Elites and National Development in Singapore," 1975, 15p.
- \*47. Riaz Hassan, "Social and Psychological Implications of High Population Density," 1975, 30p.
48. Rory Fonseca, "Planning and Land-use in Singapore," 1975, 26p.
- +49. Lawrence A. Babb, "Thaipusam in Singapore: Religious Individualism in a Hierarchical Culture," 1976, 19p.
50. Rory Fonseca, "Growth, Transition and the Urban Environment; A Reference Frame for Singapore," 1976, 19p.
- +51. Peter S.J. Chen, "Asian Values in Modernising Society: A Sociological Perspective," 1976, 17p.
- +52. Eddie C.Y. Kuo, "A Sociolinguistic Profile of Singapore," 1976, 20p.



72. Habibul H. Khondker, "Is There a Dependency Paradigm?," 1986, 52p.
73. Mak Lau Fong, "The Locality and Non-Locality Organising Principles: A Technical Report on the Taxonomy of Chinese Voluntary Associations in the 19th Century Straits Settlements," 1986, 29p.
74. Chua Beng Huat, "Reading Foucault as a Conservative," 1986, 36p.
75. Vivienne Wee, "Material Dependence and Symbolic Independence: Constructions of Melayu Ethnicity in Island Riau, Indonesia," 1986, 41p.
76. Habibul Haque Khondker, "Famine Response: The 1984-85 Ethiopian Famine," 1986, 33p.
77. Allen J. Chun, "Conceptions of Kinship and Kingship in Classical Chou China," 1986, 45p.
78. V. Selvaratnam, "Ethnicity, Inequality and Higher Education in Peninsular Malaysia: The Sociological Implications," 1987, 44p.
79. Trevor O Ling, "Buddhism, Confucianism and the Secular State in Singapore," 1987, 42p.

---

\* Out of print

+ Chopmen Enterprises  
#428-429 Katong Shopping Centre  
Singapore 1543

@ Select Books  
19 Tanglin Road  
#03-15  
Tanglin Shopping Centre  
Singapore 1024

72. Habibul H. Khondker, "Is There a Dependency Paradigm?," 1986, 52p.
73. Mak Lau Fong, "The Locality and Non-Locality Organising Principles: A Technical Report on the Taxonomy of Chinese Voluntary Associations in the 19th Century Straits Settlements," 1986, 29p.
74. Chua Beng Huat, "Reading Foucault as a Conservative," 1986, 36p.
75. Vivienne Wee, "Material Dependence and Symbolic Independence: Constructions of Melayu Ethnicity in Island Riau, Indonesia," 1986, 41p.
76. Habibul Haque Khondker, "Famine Response: The 1984-85 Ethiopian Famine," 1986, 33p.
77. Allen J. Chun, "Conceptions of Kinship and Kingship in Classical Chou China," 1986, 45p.
78. V. Selvaratnam, "Ethnicity, Inequality and Higher Education in Peninsular Malaysia: The Sociological Implications," 1987, 44p.
79. Trevor O Ling, "Buddhism, Confucianism and the Secular State in Singapore," 1987, 42p.

---

\* Out of print

+ Chopmen Enterprises  
#428-429 Katong Shopping Centre  
Singapore 1543

@ Select Books  
19 Tanglin Road  
#03-15  
Tanglin Shopping Centre  
Singapore 1024

No. 81

DURKHEIM RECONSIDERED: A CRITIQUE  
OF PRIMITIVE STRUCTURALISM

Allen J. Chun

Dr. Allen J. Chun is Associate Research Fellow with the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, Taiwan. At present, he is Teaching Fellow in the Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore.

All Rights Reserved

1987