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ABSTRACT

ACCULTURATION THROUGH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AMONG CATHOLIC CHINESE-INDONESIANS IN PHILADELPHIA

Paulus Dwintarto

The purpose of this study was to describe Indonesian language maintenance and English acquisition among Catholic Chinese-Indonesian immigrants in Philadelphia in the context of their acculturation. The research was conducted through a qualitative approach that included multiple interviews and observations of twenty participants within the theoretical framework of John Berry’s acculturation strategy, Ying’s domains of acculturation model and “human capital” model of English acquisition of Barry R. Chiswick and Paul W. Miller. Observations and interviews suggested that all of the participants have maintained Indonesian language by using it for communication with their family and their Indonesians fellow. Indonesian Catholic Community of Philadelphia has played a critical role not only in preserving Indonesian language but also other aspects of its culture such as foods, clothing, songs, dance, ethnic identity, ethnic bond, and cultural events. The research also found that the use of English in working place was the most determinant factor of English acquisition among the participants. The second factor was raising American-born children. The finding did not match with previous studies which argue that the age of entry and the length of stay are two most determinant factor of English acquisition. As such future research can examine thoroughly these differences by doing research with quantitative method on a broader
scope or doing qualitative research on different participants. Related with integration, the research found that the English acquisition did not necessarily promote more cultural and social integration. All of the English-proficient participants preferred to socialize with Indonesian fellows rather than with Americans and also maintained Indonesian values in their family. It is open for future research to examine thoroughly about the issue as well as the Berry’s acculturation theory. Culture has multi forms. Acquiring English as a part of integration does not mean acquiring other form of American culture and advancing socialization. The concept of integration might be applied distinctively to a specific form of the culture. An immigrant might choose integration attitude for language but separation for other forms of American culture. The concept of integration might be applied distinctively to a specific form of the culture.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

A 2017 study by the United Nations reported that 50 million immigrants reside in the United States, making it host to the largest number of immigrants in the world (2017). This immigrant population arrived from over 100 different countries, constitutes 19% of the world’s total immigrants, and around 21% of the US population (United Nations 2017). Coming to America involves varying degrees of adjustment for immigrants in relation to America’s distinct social, economic, political and cultural landscape. This is known as the process of “acculturation.” Proficiency in the dominant language of a country can be a critical in an immigrant’s ability to adjust to their new surroundings. One 1997 survey found that seventy two percent of Americans believe it is essential for immigrants in the United States to learn English (Espenshade and Fu 1997). A 2018 Pew Research Center Poll reported that about 26 percent of respondents avoided or disliked interacting with non-English speaking immigrants (Landgrave 2019:1). These surveys also indicate that American citizens are more amenable to those who speak English with accents, than those who could not speak English at all (Landgrave 2019:1). Furthermore, these studies show a strong correlation between proficiency in English and higher educational attainment, income, social assimilation, and mental health (Landgrave 2019:1). For non-native English speakers who immigrate to the United States, it is often the case that the task of learning English happens along side other important issues, such as negotiating one’s new ethnic identity as a minority, maintaining ties to their homeland, connecting with immigrants of similar backgrounds, and also finding inclusive communities in which to forge new social relationships.
To understand further what the experience of English language acquisition is like in the United States, this qualitative research study investigated a Chinese Indonesian immigrant community that currently resides in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Three main questions that directed this qualitative study are:

1) How have the participants maintained Indonesian-language in Philadelphia? What factors have influenced the process?

2) How have the participants learned English in Philadelphia? What factors have influenced the process?

3) How does participant’s proficiency in English influence their cultural activities and social relationships?

Based on their historical experiences in both Indonesia and the United States, Chinese Indonesians offer a unique perspective on the role of language learning in a minority groups’ efforts to acculturate to a dominant culture. Drawing from the theoretical frameworks of John Berry’s acculturation model, Ying’s domains of acculturation model, as well as critical scholarship on “human capital” model, this study considers how one particular immigrant community of non-native English speakers navigate the process of acculturation in terms of everyday spoken language. This study furthermore examines how non-native English speakers engage in meaningful cultural activities, maintain a sense of shared cultural identity, and create new cultural identities for themselves, as they learn to overcome the language barriers of their new surroundings.
Contemporary Chinese Indonesians & the Politics of Language

Indonesia is the world's largest island countries, with more than seventeenth thousand islands. According to National Census in 2010, the Indonesian population was 236.7 million, the fourth in the world, and occupies in an area of 1910,931 square km land area (Arifin 2017). Indonesia consists of more than 600 ethnic groups and over 300 local languages. The largest and politically dominant ethnic group is the Javanese; 40.2% of the population. The number of people identifying themselves as Chinese is about 2.8 million; 1.2% of total Indonesian population (Arifin 2017). This minority population of Chinese Indonesians is conventionally grouped into “Peranakan” and “Totok” (Chong 2018). Peranakans include Chinese people born in Indonesia, as well as ethnic Chinese that are well integrated into majority Indonesian communities. Some Peranakans are products of intermarriage between Chinese immigrants and indigenous Indonesians. Indonesia’s Peranakan community has existed for centuries. They identify themselves as Chinese, adopt many elements of the majority Indonesian indigenous culture, and often do not speak Chinese. Totoks, on the other hand, are understood in Indonesia as “pure-blooded” Chinese people who migrated to the Indonesia, speak predominantly in Chinese, and mostly adhere to Chinese customs and cultural traditions.

The Chinese-Indonesian immigrants who were the subject of this study were predominantly of Peranakan background, but the research on both Peranakan and Totok populations in Indonesia suggest that Chinese Indonesians whom immigrate to the United States bring distinct perspectives on the importance of being proficient in the language of a society’s dominant ethnic group. The national language of Indonesia is known as “Bahasa Indonesia,” which is a variant of Malay that includes some vocabulary from
Chinese, as well as from many of the seven hundred languages spoken across the 17,000 islands of Indonesia (Lie 2017:73). There are around 73 'loanwords' of Chinese language in the Bahasa Indonesia vocabulary (Wu 2004:155). Nearly every Indonesian speaks Bahasa Indonesia, and it has been the language of instruction from primary school through university throughout the country since the country’s independence in 1945 (Lie 2017:74). In *Indonesian Chinese Descent in Indonesia’s Economy and Political Stability* (2009) Justian Suhandinata, a Chinese-Indonesian scholar, describes how Peranakans in Indonesia during the authoritarian rule of President Suharto, between 1967 and 1998, were subjected to stringent cultural assimilation policies that forced them to mix dominant Indonesian cultural traditions into their own, and make the Indonesian language a pillar of their community (Suhandinata 2009:101). Chinese language was officially banned under the Suharto regime (1967 – 1998) and the prohibition of Chinese-language education for 31 years soon produced a new generation of Chinese Indonesians who were illiterate in Chinese. Today, in the post-Suharto era, most Chinese Indonesians speak in Indonesian exclusively (Suhandinata 2009:102).

Bahasa Indonesia remains the official language in Indonesia, however the government allows the use of local languages in the early years of instruction, if necessary, and the use of a foreign language in schools (Lie 2017:74). Elementary schools may choose to include English as part of the local content or extra curriculum, however, the policy on the use of English has not always been consistent, neither in the education sector nor outside schools. Government officials largely view use of English as a medium of instruction would have a negative impact on Indonesian language. This reluctance to make English the country’s official “second language” leads to low
attainment among mostly English language learners (Lie 2017:75). Learning the English language is a challenge for most Indonesians, and especially so for ethnic minorities like Chinese-Indonesians. The exception is for those individuals of middle and upper socio-economic classes who have access and opportunity to enhance their English proficiency beyond that of their peers, through private instruction, computer-based instruction, exposure to English language media, and close ties with expatriate communities in English speaking countries (Lie 2017:75).

Due to social unrest in 1998 during which more than 1000 died and around 160 rapes were reported, a big wave of Chinese-Indonesian migration to the U.S has occurred (Ocampo & Danico 2014:519). The US Department of Justice notes that over twenty thousand Chinese Indonesian asylum cases have been filed since 1998 (Phwan 2009). Despite the increasing number, according to the 2010 census, there were less than one hundred thousand Indonesian Americans, only 14th largest group of Asian Americans (Ocampo & Danico 2014:518). During the late of 1990s and early 2000s, Philadelphia was a home to around 7,000 Indonesians; approximately 80% of the population was Chinese Indonesian (Lee 2015:15). Today, Chinese Indonesians comprise more than 90% of the community’s population, and most live in neighborhoods spreading around west and east of Broad Street – South Philadelphia.
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF EXISTING STUDIES


There are two main theories of acculturation: unidirectional acculturation with an emphasis on assimilation and bidirectional acculturation, which has various results (Berry 2006). Milton M. Gordon, a proponent of the unidirectional theory, argues that acculturation is the first step of assimilation; an absorption’s process of minority immigrants into the dominant culture at the individual and group levels (Gordon 1964). Gordon stated that the core culture in America is the culture of middle-class. It is largely the culture of white Protestants and Anglo-Saxon origins (Gordon 1964). Acculturation, in his view, would require the extinction of any form of ethnic identity in favor of an exclusively national identity. Unidirectional theories, view acculturation as a one way process relevant only to immigrants in their journey toward cultural shedding, and eventual full absorption into the dominant culture. Immigrants are assumed to be able to achieve a good life, similar to that of the dominant culture, once they shed their cultural identity, norms and practices and achieve full assimilation. On the other hand, bidirectional theories perceive that acculturation is a two-way or reciprocal process because it involves contacts of two different cultures. John Berry, a prominent bidirectional theorist, argues that there are four attitudes of acculturation may be used to
negotiate the contacts between minority immigrants and the dominant culture: assimilation, separation, marginalization and integration (Berry 2006). According to this model, assimilation happens when immigrants do not want to maintain their previous culture and prefer to embrace the host culture. Separation is when immigrants want to maintain their own culture and avoid interactions with dominant culture. Marginalization exists when immigrants do not want to maintain their culture and avoid the dominant culture. Finally, integration is when immigrants want to maintain their culture, and at the same time adopt the dominant culture. As such, assimilation is only one of the attitudes or results of acculturation. Related with language acquisition, studies show that immigrants chose integration as their strategy. It means that they maintain their own language while making an effort to learn the language of their host country.

Yu-Wen Ying, a professor at University of California, Berkeley, developed four models acculturation of Berry by connecting Berry’s model with multiple domain of acculturation such as cultural values, ethnic identity, cultural activities, preference of language, and social relationship. She argued that immigrants’ acculturation model or strategy cannot be captured only by an acculturation domain because the immigrants are not equally prepared to learn about and adopt all aspect of new culture (Ying 896). For example a Chinese woman may speak English well but it does not mean that she will automatically make a friendship with a local American or celebrates Halloween festival. On the other hand, she may enjoy American foods even though she cannot speak English. Based on that argument, English proficiency is very important and useful for immigrants but it is not necessary that the skill make them easily acculturate in their cultural activities and social relationships.
Barry R. Chiswick and Paul W. Miller, scholars who did extensive research on immigrant and language acquisition, perceived that language skills are a form of human capital because they involve costs; they are embodied in the person, and they are productive in the labor market (1995). As such, English language acquisition among immigrant non-native speakers is an investment in human capital. Chiswick and Miller argue that second language acquisition is influenced by three variables: economic benefits, exposure to the language, and efficiency in the acquisition (1995). The economic benefits are expectations of the individual that language proficiency will increase income and that work-life expectancy is enough to obtain high returns in exchange for the investment of energy, time and money in studying the language (Chiswick and Miller 1995). The economic benefits are a part of increased market wage rate, a higher rate of employment, and the decrease in the cost of consumption related to a higher level of proficiency. Younger immigrants have greater economic benefits because the expected higher income from the investment extends over more years. The economic benefits also related to the expected future duration in the host country. Immigrants expecting to return to their origin country would have a shorter expected future duration in the host country and, therefore, less of a benefit to make language investments compared with immigrants who have at least a semi-permanent attachment to host country.

Chiswick and Miller documented that immigrants who speak their host country’s dominant language have better socioeconomic outcomes than immigrants who do not (1991, 1995, 2002). Chiswick and Miller describe exposure to the language as contact between immigrants with the language that they are trying to learn (1995). The exposure
includes some factors such as linguistic distance, length of stay in host country, and intensity of post-immigration’s exposure. Linguistic distance is the extent to which languages differ from each other (Chiswick and Miller 2005). The linguistic distance between English and German, for example, is smaller than between English and Chinese. Immigrants also can be classified according to whether they come from countries where (1) English is the dominant language, (2) English is an official (but not the dominant) language, or (3) English is neither the dominant language nor an official language. Therefore, it is important to include language of origin country in an analysis of second language acquisition. Length of stay is duration of immigrant living in the host country. As length of stay increases, immigrants adjust to the language of society through the interactions of everyday life. Thus, it might increase the language proficiency (Chiswick 1991). The intensity of post-immigration’s exposure refers to environment in which immigrant lives such as family, neighborhood, and working place. It relates to language use. Language proficiency generally arises through the linguistic interaction of those living together. Marriage to a spouse from the same linguistic origin will detract from destination-language exposure and thereby reduce fluency, compared to marriage to a native speaker of the destination language. Children in the family, particularly those born in the destination, are more likely to be fluent in the host language because of the effects of age on language acquisition and their enrollment in school. Thus, immigrant parents can learn from their children. The intensity of exposure is smaller for immigrants living with fellow immigrants in an ethnic enclave compared with immigrants who live among natives. The density, size, and residential segregation of non-English speaking immigrant groups foster the maintenance of minority-language institutions and socially structured
encounters, further reinforcing the use of the immigrant's mother tongue and reducing opportunities and incentives to learn English.

Chiswick and Miller describe efficiency as achieving maximum language proficiency productivity with minimum wasted effort (1995). The efficiency includes age of entry and level of education. Age at immigration is recognized as the largest determinant of English language acquisition among immigrants, because there is a critical period in human development when the mind is best able to acquire new languages. The very young have an impressive ability to acquire language skills, even in more than one language simultaneously. With age, however, this ability diminishes. Immigrants who come to the United States at older ages likely have less proficiency in English, even when duration of stay and schooling are controlled. It also relates to economic incentives. Landgrave argues that even if humans are equally able to learn a language at any age, younger immigrants would still have a greater incentive to learn (2019). A twenty-five years old immigrant can reasonably expect to use English longer than a fifty year old immigrant. It justifies the investment of time and energy to become fluent. This should be particularly pronounced among immigrants who seek to permanently reside in the United States. In addition, the fact that migrating at an older age means a greater exposure, and perhaps attachment, to the language and culture of the immigrant's home country.

Furthermore, Chiswick and Miller argue that efficiency in language acquisition is also affected by a higher level of education (1995). The reason is that the more educated people are more proficient of their mother tongue and are more efficient in learning new concepts and new terminology. Moreover, those with schooling in the destination would be expected to be more fluent in the destination language as fluency may be
prerequisite for school enrollment, and the destination schooling itself would enhance fluency. English language proficiency can be both a cause and effect of participation in increasingly formal social domains. The influence of education completed in the United States is expected to be positive. Stevens found that immigrants who are currently enrolled in school are the most proficient in English, followed by current members of the labor force, retired individuals, and lastly by immigrants whose major activity is keeping house (1992). It would be useful to disaggregate immigrants in the workforce by occupational category or skill level because previous research suggests that immigrants with high-status occupations are the most proficient in English.

There are few studies about Indonesian immigrants in the U.S, particularly in Philadelphia. Of scholarship that is presently available, Dahlia Gratia Setiyawan and Faishol Adib’s work are noteworthy. Setiyawan and Adib are both Indonesian researchers whose work focuses on Indonesian immigrants in Philadelphia. Setiyawan research shows that during the late 1990s and early 2000s around seven thousands of Indonesians migrated to Philadelphia (Lee 2015:15). Though Chinese-Indonesian population in Indonesia was only 1.2% of Indonesian population, approximately 80% of the Indonesian immigrants in Philadelphia were Chinese-Indonesians; Christians and Catholics were the two largest religious groups (Lee 2015:15, 24). Push factors for Chinese-Indonesians Immigrants were the late 1990s economic crisis and racial violence toward them in 1998. Anti-Chinese sentiment was particularly strong during Suharto’s New Order regime (1966 - 1998), when outbreaks of anti-Chinese violence were “not only seen as ‘normal’ but inevitable in certain situations. Ethnic Chinese were scapegoated during the economic and political turmoil in 1997 – 1998. The 1998 “May
Riots,” was a manifestation of social hatred toward ethnic Chinese, resulted in rapes, looting, and the destruction of their homes and businesses. When the worst of the violence had passed, Indonesia’s monetary crisis was intensified. Pull factors were an abundance of under-the-table employment in the area, as well as inexpensive accommodations in the working-class neighborhoods of South Philadelphia. Thus the immigration of Chinese-Indonesians to Philadelphia in late 1990s and early 2000s was triggered by political and economic turmoil as well as racial violence targeted ethnic Chinese in 1998.

Adib’s research investigated the living conditions of Indonesian migrant workers in Philadelphia through doing a qualitative research. He observed and interviewed fifteen individuals that were practicing Muslims and members of Al-Falah Mosque’s community at South Philadelphia. Adib found that most of these Indonesian were undocumented workers. They worked in Philadelphia without a work permit or other legal documents. They came to the USA, usually with a tourist visa, for six months and then looked for jobs and extended their stay. Adib focused on issues of how undocumented workers settled and survived in Philadelphia despite of unstable jobs and risk of being laid off. Furthermore, Adib also examined about their relationship with co-ethnic community. He found that there were three factors or motives that make the workers extended their stay. First, they got higher wages compared to what they received in Indonesia. Second, they had the support from Indonesian community. Third, they had a hope of brighter future in Philadelphia.

Finally, in 2004 Donghui Zhang, a graduate student at University of Pennsylvania, researched the maintenance of home language among second-generation
Chinese immigrants. She investigated language maintenance issues among them within the context of their acculturation in the United States by conducting observations and in-depth interviews of 18 participants. The participants were Chinese immigrant parents and children from two distinct Chinese communities in Philadelphia: Chinatown (Fujianese-speaking families) and University City (Mandarin-speaking families). The results from the study show that most second-generation Chinese children maintained home language proficiency to a certain extent. However they preferred using English to Chinese since an early age. On the other hand, most first-generation Chinese parents use Chinese as their dominant language and they see home language maintenance is important to their family cohesion. The second-generation children with bilingual skills can become language and cultural brokers to the whole family, which facilitates their own acculturation and their parents’ acculturation in the US society. The Chinese parents and co-ethnic networks, including extended family ties, children’s co-ethnic peers and the co-ethnic community, are important forces that contribute to children’s home language maintenance.
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

This study examined the stories of Catholic Chinese-Indonesians in Philadelphia about Indonesian language maintenance and English acquisition among them in the context of their acculturation.

This study examined the stories of Catholic Chinese-Indonesians in Philadelphia about their Indonesian language maintenance as well as their English acquisition in Indonesia (prior to immigration) and in Philadelphia. Local churches and fellowships became important places for Chinese Indonesian immigrants in Philadelphia during the 1990s, and Protestantism and Catholicism were reported as the most common religious affiliations among them. One church that was established as a result of this was the Indonesian Catholic Community of Philadelphia (ICCP). Founded in August 1999, this congregation has based its activities in St. Thomas Aquinas Catholic Church, 1719 Morris Street, South Philadelphia, PA. ICCP has around 250 members in 2019. Chinese-Indonesians comprise around 90% of the community’s population. At present, ICCP is the only Indonesian Catholic Community in Philadelphia in which Chinese-Indonesians have been its majority members. I was introduced to ICCP on November 23rd 2016 when I first came to the United States to pursue a Master of Arts in Sociology in New York City. As a fellow Catholic priest, three Catholic Chinese-Indonesians, and members ICCP picked me up at the airport and took me to Philadelphia to rest. After staying for several days, I went to New York to commence my studies; however, I kept contact with this Catholic community, and visited them several times during the next three years. My position as a Catholic priest helped me to connect easily with the participants of this study, as well as with other Catholic Church leaders.
Demographics, statistics and survey research are not enough to capture immigrant struggle to survive in a foreign country. Thus, this research involved several interviews and site visits with participants, which were then examined in relation to current scholarship on Chinese Indonesian immigrants in the United States, and the perceived value of proficiency in English with regard to the process of acculturation. This research focused on the personal experiences of members of the ICCP with regards to being an immigrant in the United States, their sense of Chinese Indonesian ethnic identity, and their perspectives on the importance of English language acquisition and proficiency in their respective process of acculturation. To collect the data, purposive sampling was conducted. Criteria for the selection of this study’s participants were as follows: Catholic, Chinese-Indonesian, age 25 to 70, and capable to communicate their experiences and opinions clearly in Indonesian. In sum, twenty members of ICCP agreed to participate in this study research. The participants eagerly volunteered themselves to be interviewed because they knew that the study was not about a sensitive issue and trusted the confidentiality of the research. Collected data was analyzed thematically to see the common pattern. To protect the identity of these participants, pseudonyms are used in subsequent sections.
### Profiles of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>AGE of IMMIGRATION</th>
<th>LENGTH OF STAY</th>
<th>LEVEL OF EDUCATION</th>
<th># OF US BORN CHILDREN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ambar</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bunga</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Farah</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hasto</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17 years,</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Herman</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21 years</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17 years</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mira</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mulan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sentosa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sisil</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Winda</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13 years</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yandi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17 years</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yosua</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yola</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Julian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Collection Procedures

For this study, interviews were the technique for data collection. Twenty selective participants were interviewed personally or in a small group in Indonesian language.
Interviews were conducted at some settings, such as participants’ house, church, even in their car when we were travelling together. Most of the participants selected the interview site that was convenient for them. They responded open-ended questions about their acculturation experiences in language orientation. The interviews included demographic questions such as gender, age, city of birth, level of education, length of stay in the U.S, marriage status, and number of children who were born in America. The interviews were tapes recorded and transcribed. Each participant spent around 10 to 20 minutes for the interview. Various opportunities for observation were taken. Participant’s observations largely took place at the church and in their houses. For example, when coming into their house for interviews the researcher also observed how they communicated with their children; what language they used the most, how fluent their English and how their children’s skills in speaking Indonesian. Interviews were analyzed thematically in the frame of literature review. Variables were self-categorized. First, a variable “English proficiency” has two categories: “proficient” and “not proficient”. Proficient refers to an ability to understand the main ideas of everything heard in daily conversation and the ability to describe clearly experience, idea, or opinion. Not proficient refers to an ability limited only to understand and to use familiar day expression related to immediate situations such as greetings, basic personal information (name, age, origin), local geography, shopping, and employment. Second, a variable “The age of coming” was grouped into two categories: “young” and “adult”. Based on WHO (World Health Organization) categorization of age, young refers to participants who entered the U.S at 10 - 24 years old whereas adult group consisted of participants who entered the U.S at 25 - 64 years old. Third, a variable “Length of Stay” was grouped
into two categories: “long” and “short”. Long refers to participants who had settled in Philadelphia for 10 years and more. Short refers to participants who had settled for less than 10 years.
CHAPTER 4 RESEARCH SUMMARY

The Observations

Indonesian Catholic Community in Philadelphia (ICCP) has many activities weekly and occasionally at the church: weekly mass, rosary prayer, gym, Sunday brunch, retreat, workshop, food bazaar, bingo, Indonesian independence day festival, Chinese New Year celebration, Christmas, Easter, Thanksgiving celebration, etc. In addition, the community also organizes outdoor activities such as pilgrimage, camping, sport events, parade, picnic and travelling. The researcher has attended all activities mentioned above, at least once, since November 2016. The community also utilized social media for communication and networking such as WhatsApp group for internal members and Facebook for public. The researcher has been a member of both technological means. It was found that all conversations were in Indonesian language.

The biggest event for ICCP is Christmas celebration. Most of the community members attend the celebration. The researcher had opportunity to attend the celebration on December 25th, 2019 at St. Thomas Aquinas Church – South Philadelphia. It was the right moment to observe how the Chinese-Indonesians use Indonesian language and English. The community had two agendas: a mass for Catholics, from 12.00 a.m. to 01.30 p.m. in the church and a dinner party for Catholics and guests. Around 350 Catholic Indonesians, included more or less 50 American born Indonesians (mostly under 20 year old), attended Christmas’ mass. During the weekend, according to a community’s leader, the averages of attendances were 170 people. It doubles during Christmas. Most of the mass attendants dressed well because this is a big and joyful feast for Catholic. Many of them wore “batik”, the Indonesian national outfit. Prayers, songs, readings and sermon
were said in Indonesian. There was a song sung by a 10 year girl in English after communion; the only song in English. In the middle of mass, during offertory, several little girls were dancing to precede offering possession. An Indonesian Priest, who led the mass, sometimes spoke in English during his homily to address the second generation Indonesian who generally could not understand Indonesian language. After the mass ended, the people went to Church Hall to continue the celebration, mix with around 75 guests from other communities. They would have earlier dinner and various performances. The committee had organized people who cooked the foods, prepared and served them to all attendants, who performed on the stage, who welcomed the guests, etc. After an opening prayer by representatives of different communities, volunteers started to serve Indonesian dishes on a big plate to everyone; combination of Indonesian foods. Everybody enjoyed the Indonesian foods. The people could eat and at the same time watching performances on a higher stage in the corner or just talking to the nearby companions. More than 10 different performances and speeches from some notable persons were presented on stage: singing, dancing, short drama, etc. A master of ceremony led the party bilingually, Indonesian and English. Children and youth were singing in English whereas adult were singing in Indonesian. The people were also talking each other; sharing the joy of Christmas. That occasion was utilized to make a networking as well. Some newcomers asked information about available jobs from Indonesians who had stayed longer. The youth and children were speaking in English in their own group and switched to bilingual if they were speaking with adult. The kids and the youth generally could understand some basic Indonesian words but they likely would respond in English or give short answer in Indonesian to adult who talked to them in
Indonesian. Less than ten guests were Americans; the parish priest and a church staff were some among them. The party had lasted until 4 p.m. when a bunch of door prize had been given to the people who were lucky. Everybody went home happily.

It was found that the first generations of Chinese-Indonesian immigrants spoke only Indonesian among them all the time. They were also singing Indonesian songs and dancing in Indonesian style. However, the parents switched to speak in English or bilingual (mix English and Indonesia), when speaking with their kids. The church was not only the place to pray but also became the center of Indonesian culture for Chinese Indonesians. They could speak Indonesian, enjoy Indonesian foods, sing, dance and strengthen ethnic bond as well networking that can be transformed to social capital. There were some groceries and Indonesian restaurant in South Philadelphia. Owners, employees and customers were mostly Indonesians or Americans who have ever visited Indonesia. They were places in which the first generation of Chinese Indonesians spoke Indonesian freely and sometimes made some business deals.

The Interviews

Adi was born in 1971 and grew up in Surabaya, the second biggest city in Indonesia. He learned Indonesian and Javanese from his family and local people. He started learning English in middle school as English was one of the required subjects. It continued until college. After finishing his bachelor in farming he worked in an international company. He was assigned in quality control department. In addition, he served the company as translator if English speaking guests visited the company. Adi migrated to the U.S in 2001 for financial reason and settled in Philadelphia. He married an Indonesian fellow in 2003. They do not have child. He speaks Indonesian with his
wife at home and fellow Indonesians in Philadelphia. He speaks English in work place, in neighborhood and in public space. His English improved, especially in listening and speaking skill. He stated that his motivator of English acquisition was to get better job. He considered his English was proficient.

**Ambar** was born in 1975 and grew up in Chinese Indonesian family’s tradition. She spent her childhood in Jakarta, the capital of Indonesia that has diverse ethnic groups from all around Indonesia. From her parent she learned to speak Indonesia and Chinese dialect. Since Indonesian is official and national language used in school, public institution, media, and public sphere, she used Indonesian more frequent than Chinese. She started learning English in elementary school and continued until college, as English was one of the required subjects. She also took private English course for several months. In addition, she took Chinese language course in Taiwan before coming to the U.S. As such, she could speak three languages well: Indonesia, English, and Chinese. She married in 1998 and followed her husband migrating to Philadelphia in 2001 for financial reason. She has worked in English environment. She had a daughter in 2008. She speaks with her daughter mostly in English even though initially she wants to use Indonesian at home. She said: “I try hard to pass down Indonesian language to my daughter. I want her to understand, to speak, and to write down in Indonesian, but she does not want to do it. If I speak in Indonesian, she would respond it in English. I want to persistently speak with her in Indonesian. Nevertheless, I usually fail. I switch to speak English anyway”. She also helps Sunday school program of Indonesian Catholic Community of Philadelphia. She speaks English with participants during the ministry every Sunday morning. To sum up, Ambar speaks mostly English at home, at work place, and other activities. She speaks
Indonesian only with her husband and with adult Indonesian fellows. She considered her English was proficient.

**Bunga** was born in 1967 and grew up in Chinese Indonesian family’s tradition. She spent her childhood in Jakarta, the capital of Indonesia which has diverse ethnic groups from all around Indonesia. From her parent and her extended family she learned Mandarin, Hokkian, Hakka, and Indonesian. Since Indonesian is official and national language used in school, public institution, media, and public sphere, she has used Indonesian more frequent than the other. She started learning English in middle school and continued until college, as English was one of the required subjects. She also took private English course for few years. She liked reading English novel and book, and watching Hollywood movies. After got Bachelor in Accounting, she worked at an international company as an accountant and got chance to practice her English. Since she had to make a monthly financial report in English, her writing skill improved. Bunga migrated to the U.S in 2001 for financial reason and has settled in Philadelphia. She took an English course around four months to improve her English. She married with an Indonesian fellow in 2003. They do not have child. She speaks English with local people in neighborhood, work place and public places. She watches English programs on local TV. She speaks Indonesian only with her husband and fellow Indonesians in Philadelphia. She said that her English has improved, especially in listening and speaking skill. She stressed that the motivators of English acquisition are human capital and socialization. She expressed: “I have no choice. I live and work in English speaking environment. I have to improve my English to increase my standard of life”. After around 18 years living in Philadelphia, she assessed her English proficiency as advanced in four
Farah was born in Surabaya, East Java. She grew in the second biggest city in Indonesia that has significant number of Chinese ethnic population. She described her first acquaintance with English: “When I was in elementary school, I liked to watch movie in television. I tried to mimic actors or actress’ conversations in English. Eventually I understood the conversations.” She learned English in Middle School until College, as English was one of the required subjects. She learned it more in vocabulary and grammar rather than listening and speaking during her study in Indonesia. Since she loved the language, unsurprisingly she got good grade in English. She followed her fiancée to move to the US for financial reason in 2001. She married and has two children: a girl and a boy. She speaks Indonesian and English with her daughter. However, she mostly speaks English with her son since he has autism and has had treatment in English. She worries that the son would have more difficulties if he learns two languages. I confirmed the information with her husband who told how he and Farah have treated their children differently. Since her children entered school, Farah has spoken English more frequent in home. She works with English speaking people in work place. Moreover, she helps Indonesian Catholic Community as a volunteer in Sunday school program and as a mentor of youth group. They have a meeting every Friday night for the youth group and Sunday morning for the children. The program is in English since most of the children and the youth were born in United States and their English is better than Indonesian. She speaks Indonesian only with her husband and fellow Indonesian Immigrants. In short, she uses English almost all the time. She recognizes that her
English becomes more natural. She thinks in English rather in Indonesian as she described: “I think spontaneously in English now. I have a little difficulty to speak in Indonesia. Sometimes when I am talking with Indonesian fellows, I have to pause and to think about the words”. She considered her English was proficient.

Hasto was born in 1979 and grew up in Chinese Indonesian family’s tradition. He spent his childhood in Jakarta, the capital of Indonesia that has diverse ethnic groups from all around Indonesia. From his extended family he learned Chinese and Indonesian. Since Indonesian is official and national language used in school, public institution, media, and public sphere, he used Indonesian more frequent than the other. He started learning English in middle school and continued until college, as English was one of the required subjects. He also took private English course for few months. He migrated to the U.S in 2002 for financial reason and settled in Philadelphia. She married with an Indonesian fellow in 2004. They have two children. He speaks bilingual, Indonesian and English, with his kids at home. He uses English mostly outside the house: in work place and in public space. He speaks Indonesian only with his wife and fellow Indonesians in Philadelphia. He said that his English had improved, especially in listening and speaking skill. He stated that the motivators of English acquisition are economics and family. He considered his English was proficient.

Herman was born in 1963 and grew up in Surabaya, the second biggest city in Indonesia. He learned Indonesian, Javanese and a little bit Chinese from his family. Since Indonesian is official and national language used in school, public institution, media, and public sphere, he used Indonesian more frequent than the other. He had learned English from middle school to high school, as English was one of the required subjects. He
married in 1989 and has one son. He migrated to the U.S in 1998 for financial and political reason and settled in Philadelphia. His wife and son joined with him later. He speaks Indonesian with his family at home and fellow Indonesians in Philadelphia. He speaks English in work place and in public space. His motivator of English acquisition is work and socialization. After around 21 years living in Philadelphia, he admitted that his English has improved, especially in listening and speaking skill, but not much. He considered his English was not proficient.

**Heidi** was born in 1953 and grew up in Chinese Indonesian family’s tradition. She can speak Indonesian and a little bit Chinese. She learned English in middle school and high school, as English was one of the required subjects. However, she did not speak English outside the classroom. She migrated to Philadelphia in 2002, joining her husband who came earlier. She works at a factory with mostly Indonesian coworkers. She is active in Indonesian Catholic Community. She spends leisure time by hanging out with her husband and Indonesian friends. Therefore, she rarely speaks English. She recognized that her English has not improved much. She is not interested to take English course because she can survive with her basic skill. She considered her English was not proficient.

**Lina** was born in 1953 and grew up in Chinese Indonesian family’s tradition. She can speak Indonesian, Javanese and Maduranese well. She learned the languages from her family and neighborhood. She started learning English in middle school and continued in high school, as English was one of the required subjects. She also took private English course for few months. However, she did not speak English outside the classroom. She migrated to Philadelphia in 2011, joining her daughter who came earlier.
She lives with her husband, her daughter and three grandchildren who were born in America. She works at home, helping out her daughter selling Indonesian food. Majority of her customers are Indonesian. She is also very active in Indonesian Catholic Community. Therefore, she rarely speaks English. However she recognized that her English has improved at least for basic conversation. The grandchildren help her to learn some English words. She considered her English was not proficient.

**Martha** was born in 1953 and grew up in Makassar, South Sulawesi. She learned English in middle school and high school, as English was one of the required subjects. She also took an English course around 3 month. However, she did not speak English outside the classroom. She migrated to Philadelphia in 2016 for financial reason. She works at a factory with mostly Indonesian coworkers. She is active in Indonesian Catholic Community. She lives alone. Her family is in Indonesia. She spends her leisure time by hanging out with Indonesian friends. Therefore, she rarely speaks English. However she recognized that her English has improved at least for basic conversation. She is not interested to take English course because she can survive with her limited English. She considered her English was not proficient.

**Mira** was born in 1958 and grew up in Chinese Indonesian family’s tradition. She never learned English in Indonesia. She only spoke Indonesian in all occasion. She migrated to Philadelphia in 2005 for financial reason. At the beginning she had difficulty to adjust in new place since her English was very poor. She works at a factory with mostly Indonesian coworkers. She is active in Indonesian Catholic Community. She spends her leisure time by hanging out with Indonesian friends. Therefore, she rarely speaks English. However she recognized that her English has improved at least for basic
conversation. She is not interested to take English course because she can survive with her limited English. The most important thing is that her current job does not require English proficiency. She considered her English was not proficient.

**Mulan** was born in 1972 and grew up in Chinese Indonesian family’s tradition. She spent her childhood in Jakarta, the capital of Indonesia which has diverse ethnic groups from all around Indonesia. She learned English in middle school and continued until college, as English was one of the required subjects. After finishing her bachelor, she worked at hotel and practiced her English in many occasions. She lived in Nederland around one year and used English for communicating. She migrated to the U.S in 2005 for financial reason and settled in Philadelphia. She married with Indonesian fellow in 2010 and has a daughter. She speaks bilingual, Indonesian and English, with her daughter. She takes care of her and must bring her to health care facilities, school, and other public institutions. All those activities require English skills. She works at an expedition company and uses English for communicating. She speaks Indonesian with her husband and Indonesian fellows. She considered her English was proficient.

**Sentosa** was born in 1971 and grew up in Chinese Indonesian family’s tradition. He spent his childhood in Jakarta, the capital of Indonesia that has diverse ethnic groups from all around Indonesia. Indonesian is his first language. He used Indonesian in all occasion. He learned English in middle school and continued until college, as English was one of the required subjects. He migrated to the U.S in 1999 to join his parent who came earlier. He married with an Indonesian fellow in 2010. They have a child. He speaks Indonesian with his family at home and fellow Indonesians in Philadelphia. He
speaks English mostly in work place and in public space. He considered his English was proficient.

Sisil was born in Jember, East Java. She started learning English in middle school, as one of required subjects, and continued until finishing her Bachelor in Law in Bandung, West Java. However, since English is not an official language as well as spoken language in Indonesia, she rarely used it. She came to United States in 2001 for financial reason. She married in 2004 and has two children. She speaks bilingual, Indonesian and English, with her kids. She takes care of her children whereas her husband focuses more to work. She must bring the children to health care facilities, school, and other public institutions. All activities require English skills. She works again after her husband was laid off. She speaks English in work place. She considered her English was proficient.

Susan was born in Malang, East Java – Indonesia in 1953. She learned English in middle school and continued until college, as English was one of the required subjects. Since she took secretary major in college, she had to speak English every day during the course. She married with Indonesian fellow in 1989 and has one son. She and her son followed her husband migrating to the US in 2004. She speaks Indonesian with her family at home and fellow Indonesians in Philadelphia. She is active in Indonesian Catholic Community. She spends her leisure time by hanging out with Indonesian friends. He speaks English in work place and in public space. In short she speaks Indonesian more than English in Philadelphia. She admitted that her English was not proficient.
**Winda** was born in 1970 and grew up in Chinese Indonesian family’s tradition in Cirebon, West Java. She can speak Indonesia and Javanese. She started learning English in middle school as English was one of the required subjects. It continued until she finished her college. After got her bachelor, she worked at an American company and got chance to practice her English. She migrated to the U.S in 2006 to marry her Indonesian fellow and settled in Philadelphia. She has a daughter. She wants to pass down Indonesian language to her daughter. She said: “My daughter must learn Indonesian, therefore I speak with her in Indonesian even though she responds in English. She can learn English from the school.” She admitted that working in English speaking environment and raising her daughter make her English improving. She considered her English was proficient.

**Yandi** was born in 1969 and grew up in Sorong, Papua. He learned English in middle school and high school, as English was one of the required subjects. He migrated to the U.S in 2002 for financial reason and settled in Philadelphia. She married with an Indonesian fellow in 2008. They have one son. He speaks English mostly in work place and in public space. He speaks bilingual, Indonesian and English, with his son at home. He speaks Indonesian mostly with his wife and fellow Indonesians in Philadelphia. He considered his English was proficient.

**Yesaya** was born in 1948 and grew up in Chinese Indonesian family’s tradition. He spent his childhood in Padang, West Sumatra. From his extended family he learned Chinese and Indonesian. Since Indonesian is official and national language used in school, public institution, media, and public sphere, he used Indonesian more frequent than the other. He learned English in middle school and continued until college, as
English was one of the required subjects. After finishing his college, he worked in an American company. He used to communicate in English. He migrated to the U.S in 2001 for financial reason and settled in Philadelphia. He works in factory where most of coworkers are Indonesians. His wife came a year later in 2002. He speaks Indonesian with his wife at home. He spends weekend with his wife and fellows Indonesians in various activities of Indonesian Catholic Community or just hanging out with Indonesian friends. As such, he rarely uses English in daily life. He admitted that his English has not improved much. He said: “My English skill in Indonesia was better than here because I don’t use it much in work place”. He said that his English was not proficient.

**Yola** was born in Medan, Sumatera Utara from Chinese Indonesian family. Since Chinese ethnic in Medan speaks Hokkian as local language and Indonesian as official language, she could speak both languages well. She started learning English in middle school, as one of required lesson, and continued until finishing her Bachelor in Jakarta, the capital of Indonesia. In addition, she took English course for 5 years. However, since English is not an official language as well as spoken language in Indonesia, she rarely used it. She came to United States in 2004 for financial reason. She worked in laundry and communicated with her customers in English. She married in 2006 and has two children. She stopped working. Wanting to pass down Indonesian language, she taught the language to her first son. Since the son entered the school and used to speak English, she has spoken English and Indonesians to him. She take cares the kids while her husband more focuses to work. She must bring the children to health care facilities, school, and other public institutions. All those activities require English skills. She also helps Sunday school program of Indonesian Catholic Community of Philadelphia. She
speaks English with participants during the ministry every Sunday morning. To sum up, Yola speaks mostly English at home, at work place, and other activities. She speaks Indonesian only with her husband and with adult Indonesian fellows. She considered her English was proficient.

**Julian** was born at 1973 in South Sulawesi. He started learning English in middle school, as one of required lesson, and continued until finishing her Bachelor in Indonesia. He liked to sing some English songs. However, since English is not an official language as well as spoken language in Indonesia, he rarely spoke the language. He married with Ella and went together to United States in 1999 for financial reason. They worked in store and being forced to speak English to the customer. They have two children; both are girl. They spoke Indonesian language to their little girl but over time they spoke English more since their girls went to the school and after school’s time they joined their mother staying in the store and listening English conversation. He has learned English from their children especially pronunciation and speaking skills. He considered her English was proficient. On the other hand, He has maintained Indonesian language by communicating with his husband and fellow Indonesians.

**Ella** was born in 1974 at Malang-East Java from Chinese Indonesian family. She started learning English in middle school, as one of required lesson, and continued until finishing her Bachelor in Indonesia. In addition, she took English course during high school. She initially wanted to study in America but could not make it. Sometimes she read English novel. However, since English is not an official language as well as spoken language in Indonesia, she rarely spoke the language. She married with Julian and went together to United States in 1999 for financial reason. They worked in store and being
forced to speak English to the customer. They have two children; both are girl. They spoke Indonesian language to their little girl but over time they spoke English more since their girls went to the school and after school’s time joined their mother staying in the store. She admitted that she has learned English from their children especially pronunciation and speaking skills. She considered her English was proficient. On the other hand, she has maintained Indonesian language by communicating with her husband and fellow Indonesians. She was considered as bilingual.
CHAPTER 5 KEY FINDINGS & ANALYSIS

The purpose of this research was to describe Indonesian language preservation and English acquisition among Catholic Chinese-Indonesians in Philadelphia in their process of acculturation.

Indonesian Language Maintenance

Observations and interviews suggested that all of the participants have maintained Indonesian language by using it for communication with their family and their Indonesians fellow. Some participants, like Lina, Heidi, Yosua, Martha almost spoke Indonesian language all the time because they worked at home or their coworkers were Indonesians. ICCP has played a critical role not only in preserving Indonesian language but also other aspects of its culture such as foods, clothing, songs, dance, ethnic identity, ethnic bond, and cultural events.

Literature reviews suggested that the most determinant factor of English proficiency among immigrants is age of coming, followed by length of stay in host country (Chiswick and Miller 1991, 1995). Other factors are linguistic distance, level of education, family, neighborhood, and working place. Furthermore, the literature reviews also suggested that English proficiency is a key element to successful integration in America (Chiswick et. al 2004; Chiswick and Miller 1991, 1995, 1998; Espenshade and Fu 1997). As such, analysis was about determinants factor of English proficiency and correlation between English Proficiency and Integration.
Age of immigration

Five participants (Farah, Hasto, Sisil, Ella, and Yola) came to America at young age (under 25 years). Four participants (Adi, Ambar, Julian and Sentosa) came in young adult age (26 – 30 years) and the rest, eleven participants, came at adult age (30 years above). All of participants who came at young and young adult age had English proficiency whereas only three participants (Bunga, Mulan, and Winda) who came at adult age had English proficiency. The findings matched with the theory that the younger immigrants would have advantage in acquiring the second language.

Length of Stay in Philadelphia

Sixteen participants had stayed in Philadelphia for more than ten years. However this did not directly influence much on their English proficiency. Five participants (Herman, Heidi, Mira, Susan, and Yesaya) who had settled in Philadelphia for more than 14 years (ranged 14 to 21 years) did not have English proficiency. The findings did not match with the theory that the longer immigrant stay, the more proficient in English (Chiswick and Miller 1991, 1995). In this study, the unexpected result might correlate with other factors such as English use at work place and at home which had stronger impact to their English acquisition.

Linguistic Distance

Though all participants are ethnic Chinese but they were born and grew up in Indonesia and acquired Indonesian as their first language. Hart-Gonzalez and Lindemann in 1993 published a report about language scores for 43 languages (including Indonesian language) for English-speaking Americans of average ability after set periods (16 weeks
and 24 weeks) of foreign language training to measure language distance of the 43 languages with English (Chiswick and Miller 2005:4). The scores range from 1.00 (hardest to learn) to 3.00 (easier to learn). Japanese and Korean (scored 1) are being the most distant, followed by Mandarin and Vietnamese (1.50), then Indonesian (2.00) and then Afrikaans, and Norwegian and Swedish as the least distant (3.00) (Chiswick and Miller 2005:5-6). As such the participants were relatively easier to acquire English compared with other bigger Asian immigrant groups such as Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Vietnamese. However, it did not affect much to their English acquisition during pre-immigration since English was neither an official language nor spoken language in Indonesia. However, the language distance would be comparatively an advantage if participants learned English in America.

**Level of Education**

Six participant finished elementary and secondary education in Indonesia; fourteen participants completed post-secondary education (college, university). They learned English when schooling since English was a requirement subject of Indonesian school and university. However not all of them had English proficiency; only thirteen had English proficiency. Two participants who were not proficient in English had completed post-secondary education in Indonesia. It proved that level of education in country of origin is not necessary impacting English proficiency in this study. It might relate to the fact that English was not official language in Indonesia. On the other hand a participant, Bunga, had taken English course for several months in the beginning of her stay in Philadelphia and it contributed to her English proficiency.
**Family**

None of the participants has married with an American. Therefore they did not get benefit to learn English from their spouse. Eight out of eighteen participants have at least one American-born child and all of them had English proficiency. The presence of American-born children is significantly correlated with a higher English use outside home, suggesting that parents must deal with parties which related with children needs such as school, health facilities. In addition the presence of school-age children suggests that the children desire to use English more than Indonesian to communicate with their parent. As a consequence the parents are demanded to learn English to keep communicating and nurturing their children.

**Neighborhood**

All participants did not live in a concentrated Indonesian neighborhood but among natives and others immigrants such as Latino, Pilipino and Vietnamese. As such, they have to speak English with their neighbors as communication means. It was opportunity to advance their English. However it was not the case. They mostly spoke simple English with their neighbors. For the participants who had English proficiency it supposed to be a chance to socialize more in their neighborhood. However, in fact, their English skills did not boost them to integrate more in such multicultural neighborhood. In short, living in such neighborhood did not affect much on English acquisition and integration into local community.
Work Place and the Type of Job

Fourteen participants (Adi, Ambar, Bunga, Farah, Hasto, Herman, Mulan, Sentosa, Sisil, Winda, Yandi, Ella, Julian and Yola) worked with English speaking employers or coworkers or customers. As such they spoke English during working time. Eleven of them eventually could speak English fluently. Only one, Herman, could not speak English fluently. He worked as an *Uber* driver. Though he used English to communicate with his passengers, he relied more on GPS and did not speak much English with the customers. It contributed to his low proficiency in English. After living around 21 years in America, he admitted that his English had not improved much. Six participants (Heidi, Lina, Martha, Mira, Susan, and Yesaya) worked at factory where their coworkers were mostly Indonesians. They were also blue collar workers who worked more physically and not speaking much (packaging department). The working condition affected their English skills. Their English were not proficient. They argued that as long as they could make money in Philadelphia, it would be enough, as Mira said: “I am not interested to learn English because I can survive without having good English skills. I just need to get money and they provide it through my work”.

English Proficiency and Integration

As stated before, previous studies argued that English proficiency is a key element to successful integration in America. The research proved that English Acquisition was vital for economic integration. It gives more opportunity to get variety of work and to deal with English speakers. However, when observed the life of ten participants who were proficient in English, the proficiency did not necessarily mean that
it promote other aspects of cultural and social integration. All of them admitted that they preferred to have Indonesian friends and spent the time with them. The English proficiency did not encourage them to socialize with English native speakers. In addition they said that they maintained Indonesian values and customs rather than adopted American such as relationship between parents and children and how they raised their children in Indonesian values.
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUDING NOTES & FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The use of English in working place was the most determinant factor of English acquisition among Catholic Chinese-Indonesians in Philadelphia. The second factor was raising American-born children. The findings did not match with previous studies which argue that the age of entry and the length of stay are two most determinant factor of English acquisition. As such, future research can examine thoroughly this anomaly by doing research with quantitative method on a broader scope or doing qualitative research on different participants.

Accumulation and conversion of forms of capital is only possible through practice in a social field. It means that acquisition of host country language is conditional on immigrant active integration in different aspect of culture. However one of the findings proved that the ability to speak English well does not necessarily mean that it was actually used in the U.S. in ways that promote cultural and social integration. All of the proficient participants preferred to get along with Indonesians fellow rather than with Americans and also maintained Indonesian values in their family. It is open for future research to examine thoroughly about the issue. This finding also became a challenge to four strategy of acculturation by John Berry. Culture has multi forms. Acquiring English as a part of integration does not mean acquiring other form of American culture and advancing socialization. The concept of integration might be applied distinctively to a specific form of the culture.

A few notes on the limitations of this study: These findings can help advance critical scholarship concerning immigration and acculturation issues, specifically home
language maintenance, English language acquisition, and correlation between English proficiency with participation in cultural activities and social relationships of those immigrants. Nonetheless, this study was limited to a specific religious and ethnic group of immigrants, to a specific country of origin, to a specific site of study, to the participants’ length of stay in the U.S., and to a specific methodology. There might be differences with the Indonesian language maintenance and English acquisition in the context of acculturation experienced by Catholic Chinese-Indonesians who came in a different period of time or who lived in different cities. Thus, while some of the findings may prove applicable to other groups, the results of this study cannot be generalized to similar groups across the U.S.
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