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ABSTRACT

This study investigates similar and different nonverbal behaviours of Indonesian and Australian students (focusing on proxemics, kinesics, touching and dress codes), examines the students’ perception in relation to the behaviours, and isolates or predicts intercultural problems. It aims at creating learning resources to be used in English classes in Indonesia.

The data collection involved observations and interviews. Initial data analysis was conducted at the same time as the data collection, followed by an intensive analysis using a coding process.

Some similarities were found. There was a tendency among Indonesian students to sit together, reflecting their collectivist value. This tendency may also be evident among Australian students. Similar patterns of eye gazing, hand movements, sitting posture, body position and body orientation probably demonstrate the universality of communicative behaviour. In both cultures, head nodding indicates paying attention, or in certain situations, may be interpreted as a flattering gesture. However, the flattering meaning may result from a different degree of head nodding display in Indonesian and Australian contexts. Many of these similar behaviours need further investigation using video recording.

Many differences were found. In tutorials, Indonesians were more likely to be formal and restrained, in contrast to Australian informality and expressiveness. Different practices in the use of the hand were also identified. Dress code was one of the most significant areas of difference, together with the public display of affective behaviour, and the preference to sit on the floor or to sit and lie on the lawns. Eye contact, gender-mixing in gatherings and some touching behaviours may be problematic for a few Indonesians. Further discussion also shows that smiling to strangers commonly practised by Australians can be unusual in Indonesia. In contrast, head nodding, eye contact and head tossing that have specific cultural meanings in Indonesia appear to be unproblematic in the Australian context.

It was concluded that the different behaviours indicate that several issues – including conflict avoidance, face saving, respect for authority, harmony maintenance, ingroup-outgroup divisions and religious regulations – are practiced in different ways and valued to differing degrees in Indonesia and Australia. The analysis also revealed a strong indication that in
Indonesian culture, nonverbal behaviour has similar emphasis with, and often can be more significant than, verbal behaviour. In Australia, the emphasis would be more likely to be on verbal expression.

It seems that some of the differences did not result in negative perception among students. However, certain things may result in problems at various levels - ranging from uncomfortable feelings, and lack of interactions, up to the formation of negative perception about a culture. Having tolerance and willingness to evaluate a matter from different perspectives can be useful to minimize ethnocentrism and avoid any negative stereotypes.

As part of this study I conducted a literature review about intercultural learning and created two examples of learning material, both focusing on nonverbal behaviours. The first material is intended to raise the issue of cultural difference, and the second one raises the ethnocentrism issue.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Significance of the Research

Australian education has attracted students from many countries. Figures from Australian Education International (2008) show an increasing number of international students commencing studies in Australian higher education institutions, from 60,000 in 2004 to 73,118 in July 2008. Data for Indonesian students show an increase from 4751 in 2004-2005 to 5933 in 2007-2008 (Department of Immigration and Citizenship 2008a). Data from the same department (2008b) show that Australian student visas were granted to students from various countries, such as Bangladesh, Canada, China, India, and Indonesia, to mention some examples. This makes Australian higher educational institutions prime settings for intercultural interactions.

Since students come from various countries, and therefore various cultures, there are more possibilities for intercultural problems to arise. “Culture gives specific, local meanings to language by adding shared connotations and associations to the standard denotation of terms” (Liddicoat 2009, p. 117). Therefore, people from different cultural backgrounds might have different perceptions of the same thing. A study by Jokinen and Wilcock (2006) demonstrates how misunderstandings occurred in conversations between Finnish and English speakers because of different expectations. For example, an English speaker would expect to find the referent of a pronoun in the nearest sentence, while in Finnish expectation, the referent needs to be interpreted by considering the topic of the whole dialogue (Jokinen & Wilcock 2006, p. 294).

Intercultural problems can also happen in the ways people perform and perceive nonverbal behaviours. For example, Panggabean (2004) exemplifies how the display of pointing behaviour can cause misunderstanding between German and Indonesian speakers. In terms of perception, Carroll E. Izard found that while Americans and Europeans can accurately recognize 75-83% of American facial expressions in pictures, Japanese can recognize only 65% and Africans 50% (Elfenbein et al. 2002, p. 75). This lack of ability to recognize expressions may then result in communication difficulty.
In terms of angry expression in particular, it has been argued that the ability to recognize anger in other people can positively contribute to the adjustment process of foreign students because such a skill makes them able to communicate effectively and improve the quality of their relationship with other people (Yoo, Matsumoto & LeRoux 2006, p. 359). Therefore, nonverbal behaviour can be regarded as a significant issue to be investigated in intercultural situations in Australian universities.

Unfortunately, this issue has not been broadly explored in research about international students in Australia. Except for Nakane’s (2006) study about silence of Japanese students in Australian classes, there is little research about international students in Australia that discusses problems related to nonverbal behaviour. This is the first gap addressed by this thesis.

Other research gaps are the limited literature about Indonesian students in Australia, and the very rare current literature comparing Indonesian and Australian cultures. These issues will be discussed later in chapter two.

In my research, I observed the nonverbal behaviours of Indonesian and Australian students in two Australian universities and investigated how they perceive those nonverbal behaviours. The findings were used to isolate and predict intercultural problems that might arise. Based on the research findings, I created two examples of learning materials.

While the learning material can be useful for Indonesian students to improve their intercultural skills, several findings of this study can be useful for Australians, who are interested in going to Indonesia and interacting with Indonesian people.

**1.2 Scope of the Research**

This study focuses on nonverbal behaviour of Indonesian and Australian students in tutorials and in public places around Australian universities. Data were obtained from observations conducted in March to August 2008 and interviews conducted in July – October 2008 in two Australian universities. In terms of nonverbal behaviour, I focus on issues about proxemics, kinesics, touching behaviour and dress codes.
1.3 Research Questions

a. What are the similarities and differences between Indonesian and Australian students’ nonverbal behaviour?

b. How do Indonesian and Australian students perceive and interpret the differences of their nonverbal behaviour?

c. By referring to students’ nonverbal behaviours and their perceptions of the nonverbal behaviours, what intercultural problems can be isolated or predicted?

d. In what ways can the research findings be used to create learning resources for intercultural English learning in Indonesia?

1.4 Research Objectives

The objective of this project is to describe Indonesian and Australian students’ nonverbal behaviour, to analyse students’ perceptions of nonverbal patterns, and to predict some possible intercultural problems. Findings from this study are used as an authentic source in creating two examples of intercultural English learning materials to be used by Indonesian students. The result of this study is expected to be a contribution to the development of intercultural English learning in Indonesia, and more extensively to the promotion of intercultural understanding between Indonesia and Australia, which “is of fundamental importance, not just to support Indonesia’s development but to ensure future generations of Australians and Indonesians know and understand each other better” (Smith 2008).

1.5 Limitations of the Research

This study has several limitations. Firstly, I could not find natural data of conversations between Indonesian and Australian students, probably due to the lack of interactions between international and local students in Australian universities (Takeda, St. John-Ives & McPherson 2005). All data are related to students’ nonverbal behaviour in intercultural settings, when they were not having conversations. Further research to investigate problems in direct interactions might need to use interviews in combination with other techniques, such as what has been done by Wright and Lander (2003) and Panggabean (2004). Wright and Lander investigate the process of interaction within groups consisting of members from different ethnic groups by designing group works for the respondents. Panggabean analyses
Indonesian-German students interactions by triangulating three methods: Syntex (a computer program simulation in which respondents are required to work in groups and solve difficult problems), Syntalk (a discussion about the respondents’ experiences during Syntex), and interviews. These techniques appear to be practicable, and the procedures are so well defined that it can be clearly explained in gaining ethical consideration. However, they are quite experimental, and might result in artificial data. More natural data can be obtained through some programs promoting interactions between local and international students, such as Language and Cultural Exchange Programs that are currently initiated by the University of Adelaide (The University of Adelaide 2009).

Another limitation, while I have done my best efforts to avoid ethnocentrism due to Indonesian cultural influences, “there are no easy solutions to ethnocentrism” (Spencer-Oatey 2003, p. 96). Nonetheless, cooperation between researchers from different cultural backgrounds has been suggested as one way to eliminate ethnocentrism in research (Hofstede 2001, p. 19). Therefore, a replicated research conducted by an Australian or one affiliated to other cultures, would enhance the understanding I offer in this study.

Finally, some behaviours would be more accurately interpreted if they can be recorded. Other research using video recording in data collection can be very beneficial for a more precise explanation.

1.6 Outline of the Thesis

The rest of this thesis consists of six chapters. Chapter two explains the definition and classification of nonverbal behaviour, presents the review of previous research, and elaborates the notion of culture, behaviour, perceptions and stereotypes. It also presents some cultural values of Indonesia and Australia. Chapter three describes the objects, participants, setting, and methods of this study while chapter four presents the findings. Chapter five discusses the findings and some intercultural problems. Chapter six describes and explains the learning materials while the last chapter draws conclusions and gives some recommendations.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The V gesture, which is displayed by showing the index and middle fingers in a V shape, has been widely used to mean “victory” or “peace”. However, when George Bush Senior used this gesture in a visit to Australia in 1992, “the Australians were more dumbfounded than angry; many could not quite believe that a head of state would stoop to such an unpresidential act” (Archer 1997, p. 80). George Bush displayed the gesture “with the palm facing his own face” (Archer 1997, p. 80), resulting in a gesture that has a very negative meaning in Australia, although in America, displaying this gesture by facing the palm inward or outward would not change the meaning (Cassell & Sullivan 2000, p. 7). This story becomes a famous example in demonstrating the role of nonverbal behaviour, the core topic of this thesis.

Nonverbal behaviour will be the focus of the following three sections. The first two sections explain the definition and classification of nonverbal behaviour. I then continue with a review of previous research and identify research gaps to be filled by my study. Two sections after that give a brief explanation about culture and the last section presents several aspects about Indonesian and Australian cultures.

2.1 Definition of Nonverbal Behaviour

This study was conducted after considering that “nonverbal communication involves all those nonverbal stimuli in a communication setting that are generated by both the source and his or her use of the environment and that have potential message value for the source or receiver” (Samovar, Porter & McDaniel 2008, p. 197). These authors explain that their definition covers “unintentional as well as intentional behaviour” since people “send the preponderance of nonverbal messages without ever being aware that they have meaning for other people” (p. 197). This opinion is in line with Argyle’s (1988) argument that “the spontaneous expression of emotions is part of a wider system of communication which has evolved to facilitate social life” (p. 4).
I decided to subscribe to this definition for two reasons. First, conducting a nonverbal behaviour without being aware that the behaviour may have certain meaning to the receivers can frequently happen in intercultural communication, since a symbol, that is meaningless in one culture, can be meaningful in another culture. Second, by including unintentional behaviour as part of nonverbal communication, this definition does not limit nonverbal communication to the conversational level, but encourages me to consider nonverbal behaviour conducted by people when they are not in direct interaction or conversations.

2.2 Classification of Nonverbal Behaviour

Nonverbal behaviour is basically everything other than verbalized words, including vocal signals (such as tone and speaking pace), body movements, facial expressions, physical appearance and setting elements (such as equipment and ornaments) (Hargie, Saunders & Dickson 1981, p. 38). Another classification is proposed by Knapp (1978, pp. 12-20) as follows:

a. Body Motion or Kinesic behaviour: refers to nonverbal signals which involve visible body actions. In this category, a discussion usually focuses on gestures, movement of parts of body, expressions on one’s face, actions with eyes and the ways people stand or walk.

b. Physical characteristics: refers to all unmoving characteristics of a person, such as the appearance of a person in general.

c. Touching behaviour: refers to physical contacts between people.

d. Paralanguage: refers to the way people say something that affects the meaning of verbal messages.

e. Proxemics: refers to the spatial distances between people.

f. Artifacts: refer to the use of certain things, such as perfume and lipstick, to create “nonverbal stimuli”.

g. Environmental factors: refer to things surrounding, such as furniture and lighting, that can indirectly influence people’s interactions.
In another book, based on previous classifications, Samovar, Porter & McDaniel (2008, p. 201) conclude that there are two major divisions of nonverbal behaviours: one group comprises of behaviours related to human body (including physical looks, movements of various parts of body, and nonverbal elements of speech), and another group consists of the combination between human action and situational background (including proximity, “time, and silence”).

These three classifications are quite similar to each other, reflecting the well-established theoretical base of nonverbal communication. The categorization also reflects the large area of nonverbal communication, implying the need to limit the scope of my two year-research. In this study, I focus on four areas of nonverbal behaviours, using consistent terms in the whole thesis as follows:

a. Proxemics (including seating arrangement and physical distance/proximity)

b. Kinesics (including all movements produced by parts of body, from the head to the feet)

c. Touching (including all behaviour that result in physical contact of human body)

d. Physical appearance (focusing on dress code)

2.3 Review of Previous Research: Identifying the Gaps

The importance of nonverbal behaviour in communication has been well established since the early research. It was said that nonverbal actions can influence communicators' verbal communication (Hinde 1972, p. 243). When a contradiction between verbal and nonverbal messages occurs, people prefer to rely on the nonverbal signals (Knapp 1978, pp. 21-22). Furthermore, the important role of nonverbal behaviour can be demonstrated across different areas.

In the literature about interpersonal relationships, the role of nonverbal cues has been well described. For example, Andersen (1985) argued that the most important role of nonverbal communication in communication between human beings is to convey “warmth” and “intimacy” (p.1) through various nonverbal cues, such as physical distance (p. 3) and smile (p. 6). Furthermore, before starting a conversation, people usually start to assess each other to determine the appropriate way of communication to be used, and this can be done
by referring to nonverbal cues. A study by Mast and Hall (2004), for instance, found that people can judge other's status based on nonverbal cues. With female targets, the “downward head tilt” was significantly perceived as a sign of higher status, while for male targets, higher status was perceived more through wearing more formal clothes and leaning forward posture (p. 155).

In the field of psychology, an investigation on how gestures help communicators and recipients in a problem solving task has been conducted by Lozano and Tversky (2006). Their experiment was divided into two parts. The first part examined how gestures help communicators in performing a task (pp. 49-51) while the second part investigated the role of gestures for recipients in understanding information (pp. 55-56). These two experiments led to a conclusion that, being able to act as meaningful actions, gestures are important for both speakers and listeners.

In physical therapy or physiotherapy, research conducted by Roberts and Bucksey (2007) shows that nonverbal actions, such as “eye contact and head nodding”, are involved in the communication between physical therapists and their patients to build harmonious relationship during consultations (p. 592). Although this study was unable to determine the meaning of such specific action as a touch done by therapists (p. 592), at least, it has shown the significant occurrence of nonverbal actions during therapist-patient interactions.

In the legal context, it has also been shown that nonverbal behaviour may significantly affect a law trial (Burnett & Badzinski 2005). In their research, Burnett and Badzinski worked with undergraduate students who became “mock juries” (p. 212). These mock juries were asked to give comments on participants involved in “videotaped trial segments” (p. 213). This study found that although the jurors were not asked to pay attention to the judges (p. 213), they did make comments about the judges’ nonverbal behaviours (pp. 214-215). More negative comments were given to judges who displayed behaviours indicative of disinterest (p. 215) such as the lack of eye contact and backward lean (p. 213). These findings convinced Burnett and Badzinski to conclude the existence of “… a critical link between judge behavior and juror perception …” (p. 217) that may lead to several consequences. One of them “could be that judge [sic] disinterest prompts jurors to perceive that the judge’s mind is made up, and guilty verdicts could more likely occur” (p. 218).
In international diplomacy, some famous examples can be found throughout history. An interesting story happened in Australian history when Queen Elizabeth II visited Australia in 1992. Australian Prime Minister at that time, Paul Keating, “put his arm around the Queen … while introducing her to officials in Canberra” (Probyn-Rapsey 2008, p. 77). This sparked many comments basically saying that the Prime Minister had violated one of the royal rules, the " 'untouchability' " (p. 77) of the Queen. Another example, people involved in diplomatic affairs with Indonesia may still remember the ambiguous smile of Soeharto, that “could mean “yes”, “no”, “maybe”, or “never” (Abdulgani-Knapp 2008, p. 300). The most current example can be seen in how the US president, Obama’s bow in his meeting with King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia resulted in many negative comments. The New York Times described the bow as “a gesture that drew criticism” (Zeleny & Slackman 2009). Most probably, the criticism has been based on the American interpretation of the bow as a submissive gesture although it was probably intended to be respectful.

Another interesting phenomenon appearing in the literature about nonverbal behaviour is the strong indication of cultural influences on various aspects of nonverbal behaviours. Barraja-Rohan (1997, p. 72) states that beside verbal language, conversation involves various nonverbal language that “can be culture specific”. For example, Matsumoto, Yoo & Chung (in press, pp. 7-8) claimed that people from cultures that emphasize an unequal power relationship, togetherness, grades of status and “Long Term Orientation” are more likely to hide their feelings and display neutral expressions, which might not be the case for people from more individualist, autonomous, and egalitarian cultures. Another example, one of several findings in an experimental study that examined pedestrian behaviours in Japanese and American contexts shows only 1 – 2 % of Japanese pedestrians displayed a smile, head nodding or gave verbal greeting, in contrast to 9-25 % of American pedestrians who exhibited such behaviours (Patterson et al. 2007, p. 163).

Cultural nonverbal differences may lead to various problems. In any case of contact between two cultures, there can be a lot of cultural contrasts that might result in problematic situations (Anderson et al. 2002, p. 90). One example has been given in the Bush’s famous “V” gesture case presented at the beginning of this chapter. The following are some more examples.
Nonverbal differences have also been a serious issue in the education of Indigenous children in Australia. The lack of eye contact among indigenous students can be considered as a problem by their non-indigenous teachers, whereas in fact, “the absence of eye contact for Indigenous students should not be interpreted as a sign of ignorance” (Harrison 2008, p. 26). Further, in an analysis of indigenous meetings by Ngarritjan-Kessaris (1997), it was found that, in comparison to the Anglo-Australian meeting, participants in Indigenous people’s meetings moved around during the meeting, but the movements should not be negatively interpreted as a sign of ignorance (p. 86). This finding may explain the low level participation of Indigenous parents in schools. Indigenous parents may have difficulty in adjusting to the rule of the school meetings that is usually established in accordance with the non-Indigenous culture.

Another example is seen when an Australian student who attended an exchange program in Indonesia felt embarrassed in reaction to an offer of a friend of the same sex to hold hands (Atmazaki & Harbon 1999). Such behaviour, in Australian culture, signals a homosexual relationship. On the other hand, Indonesian students who study in Australia may feel embarrassed to see a couple kissing each other in front of other people, a gesture that is not widely approved in Indonesian society.

Many other examples have been given by Samovar, Porter & McDaniel (2008), Argyle (1988) and Hall & Hall (1990), among many others. Their arguments pave a strong foundation to argue the significance of considering cultural nonverbal differences in intercultural communication. Therefore, it is strongly asserted that the issue of cultural differences in nonverbal communication is important, with hypothetical and real life implication, just as Argyle (1988, p. 49) claimed: “cultural differences in NVC are a major source of friction, misunderstanding, and annoyance between cultural and national groups”. This significance of cultural differences is becoming stronger in the light of continuing globalization in various settings.

One setting in which intercultural communication is important is international education. Many universities around the world host international students from various countries, and therefore various cultures. Within such a situation, the ignorance of cultural understanding may lead to very serious issues, such as racism. In fact, Indian students organized demonstrations in Sydney (Stapleton 2009) and Melbourne (World Bulletin 2009) to
demand more attention on what they perceived as “racist violence” (Stapleton 2009), although it can be also an “opportunistic crime” (World Bulletin 2009). The real motive of the attacks is still under investigation, at the time of writing, in a research project lead by Hurriyet Babacan from Victoria University, to be reported in July (Trounson 2009).

On the other hand, there has been a movement from western to eastern countries with various exchange programs of students and academic staff, and also in-country learning programs. In such situations, intercultural communication is central – between international students and academic staff, between local students and exchange academic staffs, between international students and local students, among international students, and between international students and the local society.

To ensure that this process of communication goes smoothly, some work needs to be done systematically, based on a thorough understanding of what is going on. Well justified comprehension can be achieved through academic investigation of intercultural communication in global educational settings, focusing on various aspects, such as nonverbal communication because, as has been explained above, it has a significant role in the whole process of intercultural communication.

Unfortunately, in the literature about international students, there has been little research about nonverbal behaviour. Fettman (1990) conducted a research examining academic achievement and social adjustment among international students from 29 countries. One of the findings shows that “the ability to decipher nonverbal communication cues underlies the ability to function successfully in American culture”. Another study by Wickline (2006) that had 193 international students as its sample found that there is an indirect relationship between the ability to recognize emotional displays with “adjustment outcomes”. This is supported by Yoo, Matsumoto, and LeRoux (2006). One of several findings in this study shows that there is a consistent relationship between one’s ability to recognize the anger emotion with one’s improved adjustment (p. 358).

While these studies have identified the significance of nonverbal issues in the communication of international students, their findings need to be validated with more
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1 The title of the article: ‘Indian students protest Australian violence’
qualitative investigations using natural data, such as the approach used in another study about silence by Nakane (2006). Nakane recorded seminar interactions in Australian universities and interviewed people involved in the seminar, including Japanese students, teachers and Australian students. Other data comprised interviews with 19 Japanese students, questionnaire responses from 34 lecturers and data from interactions in two high schools in Japan (pp. 1814-1815). What is important as revealed by this study is that silence that “is used as realization of face-saving strategies by Japanese students” (p. 1831) is not a common strategy among Australian students (p. 1832). Indeed, Japanese students’ silence is negatively perceived by Australian lecturers, and becomes one indicator of poor performance in Australian context (p. 1832). Nakane’s study is very comprehensive. In my view, this is because the researcher employed triangulation technique (Fetterman 1989, pp. 89-92) effectively, by using several kinds of research techniques, comparing perceptions from different perspectives (Australian lecturers, Australian students and Japanese students), and backed up the analysis with a separate observation of educational practice in the Japanese educational context.

From these few examples, two things can be learnt. First, there is an important reason for investigating the nonverbal behaviours of international students. The investigations would be enlightening for students’ efforts in engaging themselves in their intercultural journey. In fact, lack of nonverbal skill is considered as one of several things needed by international students in pursuing their academic journey (Butcher & McGrath 2004, p. 544). Second, while acknowledging the usefulness of experimental and quantitative analysis, more qualitative research that use natural data are needed to demonstrate that there are, indeed, such nonverbal issues in real life.

Another concern that encourages me to write this thesis is the fact that the literature about Indonesian students in Australia is still limited, despite the fact that Australia remains the preferable studying destination for Indonesian people (Australian Education International 2007). Indonesian students were included as research samples in the studies of Sawir et al. (2008), Mulligan and Kirkpatrick (2000) and Briguglio (1998). There are also three other studies focusing on Indonesian students. The first one was conducted by Novera (2004) who studied the adjustment process of 25 Indonesian postgraduate students. The second one was written by Aan Hasanah (cited in Hasanah & Brownlee 1997) who investigated the learning experiences of Indonesian postgraduate students of three universities in South
Australia. The last one was from Kiley (1999) who wrote a comprehensive thesis, illustrating the whole journey of Indonesian students in three phases: the first six months, feeling settled and returning home. The last three studies have highlighted various issues about Indonesian students, but none of them has focused on nonverbal matters. Besides that, they have relied only on interviews or questionnaires. While these techniques are useful in gaining understanding about students’ experiences, using other techniques that capture students’ behaviour from an “outsider” perspective would give a more complete understanding, as has been shown in Nakane’s study. Therefore, this study combines two methods: observations to describe students’ behaviour from an “outsider” perspective, and interviews to obtain comprehension from the students’ perspective.

Finally, I am also concerned about the very limited academic investigations comparing Indonesian and Australian culture. There were two related studies conducted by Noesjirwan (1977, 1978). The 1977 study compared the “interpersonal closeness” (p. 357) of Indonesians and Australians through an investigation of their behaviour while waiting for medical service. The study found that, in contrast to the Australian emphasis on “individual autonomy and privacy”, there was more interest in “interpersonal closeness and mutual togetherness” among Indonesians (p. 367). The 1978 study was a cross cultural study of Indonesian and Australian social behaviour. The study used three questionnaires that asked respondents to: (1) determine how they will respond to various situations presented, (2) rate their feeling in negative-positive scale, and (3) choose between two alternative statements the one that represents their preferred life value (pp. 307-308). The result conveyed that, compared to Australians, Indonesians were more likely to show collectivist values: the tendency to create harmony with everyone, and the belief that individual interest should yield to group’s interest (p. 314). In addition, compared to Australians, there was a stronger preference among Indonesians to maintain harmonious relationship (p. 314). These two studies were very comprehensive, but are now quite outdated. More efforts are needed to see whether the findings are still relevant to the current situation. There has been also another effort to compare Indonesians and Australians in tourism context (Reisinger & Turner 1996, cited in Reisinger & Turner 1997). Similar research in other contexts would be useful to build a more comprehensive understanding about Indonesia and Australia. The last example is the paper written by Atmazaki & Harbon (1999) that discusses the cultural mismatch experienced by Australian students undertaking a short learning program in Padang, Indonesia.
To sum up, two things can be concluded from the previous research. First, nonverbal behaviours and cultural differences are important issues to be considered in understanding the whole process of intercultural contexts, such as in international universities. Unfortunately, few investigations about international students are concerned with nonverbal issues. Second, there is limited literature about Indonesian students studying in Australian universities and very limited research comparing Indonesian and Australian cultures. In the light of this review, this thesis is written.

In this thesis, after describing Indonesian and Australian students' nonverbal behaviours and their perceptions about the behaviours, I will make further interpretation based on Indonesian and Australian cultural values. Discovering the cultural values is important if we are to understand the real reason of people in displaying and perceiving behaviours.

2.4 Culture and Behaviour

In my research, I refer to culture as “a whole way of life” (Williams 1989, p. 4 cited in Barker 2000, p. 37). Using the definition of culture as the way of life brings a consequence for a cultural analysis to observe human behaviours. Since human behaviour is determined, not only by culture, but also by, at least, three other factors: environment, psychological condition and biological need, a cultural analysis needs to show that an action emerges under the influence of cultural values, and not because of other factors.

Environmental and psychological factors can be distinguished from cultural factors, given that an action is done only in a specific situation and is not repeated in a normal situation. For example, in Indonesia, it is not culturally acceptable for someone to put his/her feet up on the chair in a classroom. Nevertheless, if, for example, a snake or other dangerous animal passes under the table, students should be allowed to put their feet up on the chair or even stand on the table. In this case, students' behaviour is driven by environmental and psychological conditions, rather than by cultural factors.

2 I am thinking of a situation in an Indonesian classroom which is situated in a remote area, where there are many bushes, with some kinds of dangerous animals, around the school.
Biological factors are more universal than cultural factors. For example, human beings, from whatever culture, will feel full when they eat, and starving or die when they do not eat for an extended period.

### 2.5 Culture, Perceptions and Stereotypes

People from different cultures might have different perceptions of exactly the same thing because in the perceptual process, culture partly determines what can be allowed to be perceived by a person and it forms the foundation used by people to learn “perceptual patterns” (Samovar, Porter & McDaniel 2008, p. 130). For example, culture may influence the meaning attached to eye contact behaviour (Mattila 1999, p. 3). Therefore, people from different cultures may have different perception of eye contact behaviour. As part of a discussion about doctor-patient interactions, Rothschild (1998, p. 306) explained that while doctors are trained to introduce themselves and greet patients with direct eye contact and hand shaking, these behaviours may have various meanings in different cultures. For example, Navaho people might not maintain eye contact since for them “direct eye contact may endanger the spirits of both physician and patient” and Asian people may relate eye contact to power relationship (p. 307). In this situation, medical staff who always perceive eye contact as a sign of attentive listening and are not aware of cultural differences might have wrong perceptions of the lack of eye contact.

People learn language signs and the meaning represented by the signs through culture (Samovar, Porter, & McDaniel 2008, p. 172). This statement suggests that signs and their meaning can be culture specific. The cultural differences can be the source of problems in the communication between people from different cultures (Samovar, Porter, & McDaniel, p. 172). In such situations, it is useful to differentiate between what is intended as an input and what is taken as an intake. For example, I remember my experience with an American colleague who beckoned me by raising his palm up and curling his index finger in and out, which made me feel so humiliated. At that time, based on my cultural experience as an Indonesian, I intake the meaning of such gesture as a beckoning of a “bad girl”, while the intended meaning (input) was a neutral beckoning. Such gesture does not have negative connotation among Americans (Axtell 2007, p. 23).
The examples above show that people’s perception might lead to conflicts. Therefore, to find out the potential conflicts that can happen in the communication or interaction between people from different cultures, it is necessary to reveal their perceptions toward each other.

In the process of interaction, people use any information from other people’s appearance - such as skin colour, hair style and fashion style - to make “stereotypical inferences” (Hinton 2000, p. 5). In terms of dress code, for example, there has been a “popular Western stereotype that the veil is oppressive” (Bullock 2002, p. xv). On the other hand, Hizb ut-Tahrir, an Islamic organization³, “has created a stereotype of the Western woman as enslaved by capitalism and the million-dollar fashion industry, obsessed by her appearance to the point of ill-health, imprisoned in a perpetual state of inadequacy, forced to parade herself as a sex object and deluded into thinking she is free to dress as she pleases when in fact her choices are dictated by fashion and her enslavement to the male gaze” (Tarlo 2005, p. 15). It can be seen here that stereotyping can be really problematic when different groups of people stereotype each other in a very contrastive way.

Based on this explanation, this research assumes that Indonesian and Australian students, who have different cultural backgrounds, may have different perceptions of the same behaviour. The cultural reasons behind their perception need to be uncovered in order to minimize the possibility of negative stereotypes developing.

2.6 The Reflection of Indonesian and Australian Cultural Characteristics in Nonverbal Behaviour and Its Effects on Communication

The first important difference between Indonesia and Australia is in the role of nonverbal messages in communication. It has been argued by Thomas Brandt (cited in Panggabean 2004) that “Indonesian communication style is heavily based on non-verbal messages”. The emphasis on nonverbal cues can be seen, for example, in the following interview

³ This organization was originally established in Jerusalem and has London based organization founded in 1986 (Tarlo 2005, p. 17).
between X (the researcher) and R1 (a respondent) presented in Panggabean’s (2004) study:

“X : How do you view your supervisor's character?

R1: Based on our direct contacts, the way he talks. I think people can be evaluated from their speaking manner .. [sic] I prefer to observe it from his attitude toward an issue, for example, how did he judge an issue also from trivial matters, for example if we had lunch together, how did he treat others, how did he appreciate others, or not appreciate others”.

The emphasis on nonverbal elements can be seen in R1’s statement that his/her assessment is based on the way the supervisor talks (“the way he talks”), rather than what the supervisor says. This is quite true. Based on my own experience as an Indonesian, many times people are judged, not based on what they say, but based on the way they say. The way people say something involves various factors, such as facial expression, speech volume (soft versus loud voice), and gesture (such as pointing). Another example, sometimes in Indonesian conversations, people verbally say ‘yes’ but actually they do not really agree with something. In such cases, to know what the “yes” really means, people need to pay attention to nonverbal aspects, such as intonation and facial expressions.

On the other hand, Bello et al. (2006, p. 28) concluded that “unequivocal communication” is the preferable way of communication in Australia. This probably means that in Australian communication, there would be less cases where a speaker’s nonverbal behaviour would contradict the verbal expression.

Another way of comparing Indonesian and Australian cultures is by referring to the cultural dimensions discussed by Hofstede and Hofstede (2005). Below, I would discuss four dimensions that present the data for both Indonesian and Australian cultures.

**Power distance**

This dimension “defines the extent to which the less powerful person in society accepts inequality in power and considers it as normal” (Hofstede 2000, cited in Samovar, Porter
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4 A literature review of cultural differences between Indonesia and Australia based on Hofstede’s cultural dimensions has also been presented in Reisinger and Turner (1997).
and McDaniel 2008, p.146). In terms of power distance, Indonesia’s score is 78 while Australia’s score is 36 (Hostede & Hofstede 2005, pp. 43-44). These figures show that Indonesians are more likely to have higher power distance. One of several characteristics of societies with higher power distance is the strong emphasis on teacher’s status in classroom practices (Hostede & Hofstede 2005, p. 57). In Indonesian classrooms, students show respect toward their teachers, not only in verbal ways, but also in nonverbal forms. In fact, according to Zandpour and Sadri (1996, p. 179), “power distance affects nonverbal behavior”. For example, in Indonesian classrooms, students tend to sit with straight back or leaning forward, not moving frequently.

**Individualism index**

With a score of 90, Australia is regarded as the second most Individualist country, after the United States, while Indonesia’s score of 14 puts the country in rank 68-69 (Hofstede & Hofstede 2005, pp. 78-79). In societies with collective nature, there is a clear division between “ingroup and outgroup” (Triandis 1972, cited in Triandis et al. 1988, p. 325). This assumption is used by Osland et al. (1993, p. 71-72) in explaining why greeting and eye contact might not be displayed by many Costa Rican bank clerks. They argue that “in collectivist cultures such as Costa Rica … Customers are considered as strangers and out-group members who do not warrant the special treatment given to in-group members (family and friends)” (p. 72). This could also explain why to smile to strangers, which is very common in Australia, is considered unusual in Indonesian society, except to people who look quite foreign, such as tourists from western countries. On the other hand, “people in individualist cultures are very good at meeting outsiders, forming new ingroups, and getting along with new people” (Triandis et al. 1988, p.325).

**Masculinity index**

In “Masculinity Index” (Hofstede & Hofstede 2005, p. 121), Indonesia’s score is 46 while Australia’s score is 61. In classroom practices of societies with high masculinity value, it is considered normal to see students who are assertive and forward their arguments without restraint (p. 137). In contrast, in feminine societies, “assertive behaviour and attempts at excelling are easily ridiculed” (p. 137). The lack of assertiveness can be seen, for example, in the display of more restrained facial expression. Fewer displays of facial expression, for Javanese people of Indonesia for instance, can be regarded as an effort to control emotional expression, which is highly valued in Javanese culture (Eisenberg, Liew &
This view, probably, cannot be generalized for the whole Indonesians since expressiveness is part of some cultures in Indonesia, such as Minangkabau, Batak and Madura (Heider 1991, pp. 19-20). On the other hand, having a high score in the Masculinity Index, Australians can be considered as having more expressive behaviours. However, it is important to recognize that Australian people's background can be traced back to various cultures, resulting in more heterogeneous behaviour of individuals within Australian society.

**Uncertainty avoidance**

In terms of uncertainty avoidance, the score of Indonesia (48) and Australia (51) are not significantly different (Hofstede & Hofstede 2005, p. 169). Indonesia has been considered to have low tendency of uncertainty avoidance (Murphy-Berman & Berman 2002, p. 159), similar to Australia (Shanks et al. 2000, pp. 2-3). In communication, it is argued that the level of uncertainty avoidance is useful in explaining how people in different cultures communicate with strangers (Gudykunst & Matsumoto 1996, p. 43). “Because outgroup members may deviate from expectations, members of high uncertainty avoidance cultures tend to have less positive expectations for interacting with outgroup members than do members of low uncertainty avoidance cultures” (Gudykunst 1995, cited in Gudykunst & Matsumoto 1996, p. 43). Considering that Indonesian and Australia are similarly regarded as having low uncertainty avoidance, one may assume that people of both cultures may interact relatively easily with strangers.

However, it is important to argue that the uncertainty avoidance level in intercultural communication can be much influenced by global issues. For example, Kabir (2004) gives a comprehensive explanation of how Islam, that was not seen as a cause of threat during the settlements of Islamic Afghans and Javanese in Australia, has been perceived more and more as a potential threat to Australia during events of World War I and II, Gulf War, September 11, and the Bali Bombing in Indonesia. In Western Australia, for instance, Moslem women who wear veils were intimidated in many ways, such as through threatening writings (Kabir 2004, p. 317). It seems that the veil is a very significant barrier in intercultural communication as a comment by an Australian quoted in a report written by Yasmeen (2008, p. 66) states:
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5 Javanese came to Australia (Queensland) at the end of 19th century (Kabir 2004, p. 84).
“Well the impression I get is that they don't really want to be here. They really don't want to be assimilated, be the same as we are. They don't want to be like us. The men want to wear their little things and the women want to wear their hijabs, and probably that's become more… become more prevalent since 9/11. Now they see themselves as being on one side. (322)”. 

The fear of Islam may have increased the anxiety among Australians, which in turn may increase the level of uncertainty avoidance in communication. In fact, Hofstede and Hofstede (2005, pp. 170-171) argues that there is a connection between anxiety and uncertainty avoidance level.

Finally, it is important to note the influence of religion in Indonesian and Australian cultures. “Indonesia is heavily influenced by Islam-close to 90 percent of the population (roughly 190 million) is Muslim …” (Brenner 1996, p. 676). There has been an increasing influence through Islamic movement within Indonesian society, that can be observed through the building of more Islamic worship facilities, the increasing number of women wearing headscarfs, the increasing tendency to greet people in Islamic way, and the increasing numbers of people asking permission to attend daily Islamic praying (Howell, 2001, p. 701). On the other hand, Christianity is the dominant religion of Australians. Statistical data show that, in 2001, 68% of Australians affiliate with Christianity (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2004). However, the data also shows that there is an increasing number of Australians not affiliating with any religion. It is important to note, though, that religious values affected people’s behaviour to varying degrees depending on the extent of one’s religious understanding and devotion.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

3.1 Ethics Approval

This research is approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of Adelaide. In tutorial observations, students and tutors were informed about the purpose of the research one week before an observation. Observations were conducted after the signed consent forms were collected from students and tutors. Permission was not forthcoming to allow video-recording in any of the tutorials as originally intended, so note taking had to be employed. In interviews, respondents were given time to read the information sheet and the consent form before giving their consent. They were also informed that they had the right not to discuss any topic that they did not want to discuss. Interviews with Australian respondents were conducted in English. On the other hand, as it was preferred by respondents, interviews with Indonesian students were conducted in Indonesian, with only very few cases of code switching into English. All interviews were conducted in university public places.

3.2 Intercultural Analysis

In Fries’ (2008, p. 2) opinion, intercultural analysis deals with interactions between people from different cultures. Intercultural analysis in this study involves three steps: describing the nonverbal behaviours of Indonesian and Australian students and their perceptions about the behaviours, investigating the cultural values attached to the behaviours and determining or predicting intercultural problems.

3.3 Ethnographic Techniques in Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected by using two ethnographic techniques: observations and interviews. In the observations, I used note taking by applying the use of “mental notes”, “jotted notes” and “full fieldnotes” explained by Emerson, Fretz and Shaw (2001, pp. 356-360). I also used “rough counting”, a technique introduced by Efron which refers to “quantitative observations
in the field in respect to specific parameters” (Kendon 2004, p. 331). Beside observations, unstructured interviews that “focus on pre-defined theme or area and allow a discussion to take place between researcher and interviewee on the theme” (Hinds 2004, p. 47) were used.

In tutorial observations, my role was more as an “observer-as-participant” which requires an observer to do observations in a more formal way (Gold 1958, p. 221). Students and tutors in the tutorials were fully informed of my research intention. I was aware that my presence, especially my Islamic dress code might be a distraction, so during tutorials, I did not talk, and often sat at the back.

Similarly, during interviews, I was aware that my veil could restrain certain respondents from expressing their opinion freely. Therefore, I tried my best to make respondents relaxed during interviews. I usually started the interviews by describing my research, explaining items mentioned in consent forms and asking some basic questions about the respondents’ background. Sensitive topics such as dress codes and affective behaviours were usually discussed when I felt that the respondent started to talk in a relaxed manner.

To get the best understanding, I employed a “triangulation” strategy, which is “testing one source of information against another to strip away alternative explanations and prove a hypothesis” (Fetterman 1989, p. 89). As application of this technique, during the interviews, sometimes I asked respondents their opinion about things mentioned by other respondents, and during analysis, I continuously compared respondents’ opinions.

In relation to the triangulation technique, I was aware that it would be very useful for this research to gain information from various sources, such as students, tutors and university administrative staff. However, approaching tutors and university administrative staff would need more time and is a more complex procedure. Beside that, more time would be required for data analysis. With this consideration in mind, I decided to focus on students’ perspectives in order to maximize the analysis during the short period of my research. This limitation would be an interesting gap to be filled by other studies.

In total, I conducted 36 interviews. Five interviews could not be recorded because of technical problems or because respondents did not want to be recorded, so I took notes and
rewrote the notes as soon as possible afterwards. 31 interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim by myself. Considering that listening skills are influenced by many factors (Boyle 1984; Rubin 1994), as a non-native speaker of English, I decided to ask a professional transcriber, a native Australian speaker, to check the transcripts of interviews with Australian respondents to ensure that the transcripts were accurate. I also sent observation notes and transcripts to some respondents who were willing to check them.

It is suggested that ethnographic researchers conduct the data collection and analysis in the same time (Fetterman 1998, p. 2). Therefore, while conducting observations and interviews, I did some initial analysis of data to identify important phenomena that should be investigated further in the next observations or interviews, and started organizing the data.

### 3.4 Research Objects and Respondents

This research focuses on Indonesian and Australian students in two Australian universities. Since it was difficult to distinguish Australian students from students of European countries in observations, any student who had Caucasian appearance was assumed to be Australian student. Validation of observed behaviour as typical behaviour of Australian students was gained in interviews with Australian students.

In interviews, there were nine female and five male Indonesian respondents. 10 students aged between 20 and 29, and 4 students aged between 30 and 40. All of them were born in Indonesia, and had been living in Indonesia since they were born. Three of these respondents have travelled overseas for short visits, ranging from one week up to two months. The rest did not have overseas travelling experience before studying in Australia. The respondents had living experiences in various parts of Indonesia, including Jakarta, Medan (North Sumatra), Padang (West Sumatra), Bandung (West Java), Malang (East Java), Jogjakarta (Central Java), Magelang (Central Java), Manado (North Sulawesi), Gorontalo, Makassar (South Sulawesi), Ternate (Maluku), Ngada (Nusa Tenggara Timur), West Kalimantan, Sangata (East Kalimantan), Sumbawa, and Manokwari (West Papua). 10 respondents had living experience in more than one place. Most respondents considered their behaviours as typical of one specific culture of Indonesia, including Javanese, Buginese, urban Gorontalo, and urban Jakarta. One respondent described her behaviour as a combination of Javanese and urban Jakarta cultures. Two respondents, while saying that...
some of their observed behaviours are typical of their cultures, emphasized that some of their attitudes are not common in their societies. All respondents were studying in Australia at the time of interviews for 4 months up to almost two years. 12 respondents studied as postgraduate students and two respondents were studying in undergraduate programs. Most respondents had pre-departure training before studying in Australia, including cross-cultural training.

Interviews with Australian respondents involved 12 students, including eight male and four female respondents. Most of them aged between 20 and 29, two aged between 30 and 40, and one was 56 years old. All respondents were born in Australia and identified themselves as having typical behaviour of Australian culture. Most respondents had been living in one place in Australia, but some had moved around some places, such as Adelaide, Brisbane, Hobart, Murray Bridge, and Darwin. One particular respondent had been moving around 7 places in Australia. One respondent thought that he was more disciplined than other Australian students on average, one respondent emphasized that some of her attitudes were not typical of common attitudes in Australia (she had 6 month-studying experience in Chile), and one 56 year-old respondent specified that her attitude is typical of the behaviour of Australians of her age group. At the beginning of this study, it was determined that Australian respondents would be those who were born in Australia and have been living in Australia since they were born. After two months, only a few students with such criteria were willing to participate. Therefore, it was decided to include students who had overseas experience as well. Some respondents had living experiences outside Australia from six up to 18 months. Most students were in undergraduate program. Two students were undertaking postgraduate study while working as university teaching staffs.

3.5 Research Time and Place

Data in this study was gained through observations and interviews conducted from March to December 2008, in two Australian universities. Observations were conducted in 24 tutorials and various public places around the universities.
3.6 Steps of Intensive Analysis

Intensive analysis was conducted after the data collection was completed. Fetterman (1998, p.10) suggested that the process of analysis can be continued with a formal step after the researcher finishes the process of data collection.

In general, the analysis was conducted by using a procedure suggested by Creswell (2009, pp. 185-190) that consists of 6 steps: organizing and preparing data for analysis, reading data texts to get general comprehension, analysing data by using coding process, determining categories and themes, discussing the themes, and interpreting the themes. What I did in the last four steps is explained below.

**Analysing data by using coding process**

While collecting data, I started the analysis. In my observation notes, I had coded my data and organized them under categories and sub-categories. As had been determined before data collection, the categories are proxemics, kinesics, touching behaviour and dress codes. Data in each category were divided into sub-categories and each sub-category consists of some topics. However, I was aware that the topics were not consistent yet, because new topics continuously emerged in later observations. Therefore, I reorganized all categories, sub-categories and topics before I started the detailed analysis. Several items are discussed under one heading to show the interconnection between several behaviours. These categories, sub-categories, and topics became the references in the coding process of the interview transcripts.

After that, I reread sections of observations notes and interview transcripts that contain information about one topic, highlighted sentences that I thought contain meaningful information and organized similar information into groups. I started finding several repeated patterns, which became sub-topics under one topic. For example, when I reviewed the topic sitting posture with Indonesian students, I found that there were eight possible positions, creating eight sub-topics under the topic *sitting posture*. Sometimes, I listed the sub-topics as dot points, other times I put them in tables.

Results of these reviews were written in detailed descriptions. At this stage, to avoid overgeneralisation, I frequently revisited original data for a constant confirmation.
Data from observations answer the questions how Indonesian and Australian students behave nonverbally at university. Data from interviews can be divided into two groups. The first group serves two functions: to confirm whether the observed behaviour are really parts of Indonesian and Australian culture or only individual preferences and to give information about the cultural values that motivate or allow students to behave in certain behaviour. The second group consists of data that show how Indonesian and Australian students perceive each other.

Data from observations were matched with data from the first group of interviews to give a complete explanation of the how and the why questions about Indonesian and Australian students’ nonverbal behaviour. The descriptions of Indonesian students and Australian students were compared to establish the similarities and dissimilarities of their nonverbal behaviours. This comparison becomes the base to predict possible problems that may happen in interactions between Indonesian and Australian students.

**Determining, discussing and interpreting themes**

Based on the detailed analysis, I determined general themes. The themes were discussed and interpreted. The interpretation process, according to Lincoln and Guba, is basically a process to answer the question “What were the lessons learned?” (Creswell 2009, p. 189). In this step, following suggestions given by Creswell (2009, pp.189-190), I inserted my personal interpretation, compared my findings with published literatures, established new questions for further research, and recommended further efforts.

### 3.7 Review of Literature about English Learning Material

Finally, library research was conducted to answer the last research question. First of all, I reviewed the literature about intercultural education to answer two questions: (1) “What needs to be learnt in an intercultural learning program?” and (2) “In what way can cultural information be learnt in language classrooms?” After that, I reviewed the literature about learning material development to gain an understanding of what needs to be considered in developing learning material. Based on this literature review, I created two examples of learning material that can be used in intercultural English learning in Indonesia. The result of this library research is presented in chapter six together with the learning materials.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings from observations and interviews. In presenting interview findings, I refer to Indonesian respondents with I (e.g. I2 means Indonesian respondent number 2), and Australian respondents with A (e.g. A3 means Australian respondent number 3). The lines where a respondent’s statement can be found in interview transcripts are also given. For example, I2/20 means that the statement, given by Indonesian respondent number 2, can be found in line 20 of the transcript of interview with I2.

4.1 Students’ Nonverbal Behaviours in Tutorials

4.1.1 Proxemics

Seating arrangement
In some tutorials, the lone Indonesian student did not join groups of students from other cultural backgrounds. This happened in tutorials in which the majority were from a similar cultural background. In tutorial 1a (see diagram below), for example, there were eight Caucasian students and only one Indonesian student. The tutor sat at one end of the row, followed by all Caucasian students and the Indonesian student sat at the other end of the row. A similar pattern was seen the second time the tutorial was observed, also in tutorials 3a and 8a.
This phenomenon could be a reflection of the lack of confidence of Indonesian students in interacting with students from different cultures. In interviews, I2 said: “... kalau juga dia harus duduk di pinggir pada saat itu, dia merasa dia seperti, sendiri di komunitas yang begini banyak. Jadi cenderung dia, sendiri” (I2/461-462) – (… if he/she [a student] sits at the end of a row at that time, that is because at that time he/she feels lonely in such a big community like this. So he/she tends to be alone). Related to this, I4 (139) admitted “Saya tetap gitu jadinya. Merasa underpressure” – (I still feel like that. [I] feel under-pressure).

According to some respondents, the real reason behind such feeling might be because Indonesian students were not confident with their language skill. For example, I6 said: “...
yang dari saya perhatiin sih banyak juga anak Indonesia yang juga tidak PD, untuk ngomong kan” (I6/116-117) – (I noticed that many Indonesian students are not confident to speak).

However, it is interesting to investigate other reasons since I4 said: “Atau mungkin bahasanya udah bagus tapi dia cuman malas aja” (I4/135) - (Or maybe the language is good but he/she was just lazy [to sit together with students from other culture]). Although later he thought that the stronger reason for this phenomenon is communication (I4/136), it is still interesting to explore the possibility as another respondent said: “Orang-orang Australia juga tidak terlalu, artinya, friendly …” (I6/97-98) – (Australians are not too, I mean [they are not] friendly either). Moreover, I7 reported: “... biasanya kita ngelihat-lihat dulu …” (I7/234) - (usually we observed [the situation] first), which is similar to what I5 told me in interview. Based on these comments, it is suspected that there could be also some cultural barriers felt by students in interactions with students from other cultural background.

In some tutorials that have more than one Indonesian student, the students tend to sit together. An example can be observed in tutorial 9a. I came into the room together with an Indonesian student (IF1). At that time, another Indonesian student (IF2) was already in the room. I sat next to IF2 and IF1. After a while, another Indonesian student (IF3) came and sat next to IF2. This pattern was similar in the second observation of the tutorial. In both observations, the pattern was changed only after the tutor initiated group discussions and put each of the Indonesian students in different groups. A similar tendency was also seen in tutorials 2a, 5a, 6b, 8b, and 10a.

In interviews with I4, I5, I6, I7, I11 and I12, there was general agreement that Indonesian students tend to sit together in tutorials (I4/93, I6/93, I7/210,221). I1, I2, and I5 said that sitting together is considered useful for Indonesian students to help each other. For example, I2 said: “Pada saat kita berkumpul itu itu, eh, untuk memudahkan kita untuk saling berkomunikasi ... kita bisa saling bertanya” (I2/457-459) – (When we [Indonesian students] sit together, it is easy for us to communicate each other ... we can ask each other). This was regarded by I12 as a reflection of Indonesian value of collectivism as he said: “... orang Indonesia mengatakan bahwa, makan tidak makan yang penting kumpul, itu saya kira cukup mendominasi alam berpikir, alam berpikir orang-orang Indonesia untuk senantiasa selalu sama-sama ...” (I12/140-142). – (… Indonesians have an expression
saying “it does not matter whether we can eat or not as long as we keep together”. I think, that relatively becomes a dominant value in our mind, [a tendency] among Indonesians to be together all the time ...).

This explanation is similar to the comments of I4, I5 and I7. There was still another kind of explanation, given by I9, saying that this phenomenon was caused by the age gap between Indonesian postgraduate students and Australian undergraduate students (I9/39-43).

The phenomenon of sitting together among Indonesian students changed in several tutorials. In tutorials 4a, 4b, 6b, 8a and 11a, some Indonesian students did not sit together with their Indonesian friends, probably because they did not enter the room at the same time and there were no empty chairs available close to their friends.

The only time when two Indonesian students sat separately although they came together into the room was in tutorial 10b, with two female students. These students were much younger than other Indonesian students. One of them had living experience for four years in America. This age factor and previous background, perhaps, made these students behave differently.

As with Indonesian students, Caucasian students tended to sit alone in classrooms in which the majority of students come from certain ethnic backgrounds. In tutorial 6a, for example, a young Caucasian male student (later he told me that he is an Australian) came into the classroom and sat alone in an empty row. This behaviour was repeated in the second observation of the same tutorial, and also happened in tutorials 12b and 8b.

When there was more than one Caucasian student, two different phenomena were found. In tutorials 2a, 2b, 9a, 9b, and 8b (appendix 1 shows two examples of seating arrangement) Caucasian students did not sit together although they had the opportunity to do so. Perhaps, these students did not sit together because they were international students who did not know each other. Moreover, when one Caucasian student came late, possibly he could not sit together with other Caucasian students.
However, some information in interviews suggests that there is no tendency to sit together among local students. For example, A6 said:

“... I don’t think it’s really taken into consideration when the local groups sort of form together where they’re from, but I guess the person who comes from somewhere else might feel more like an outsider than a local person would, who doesn’t really take that into consideration” (A6/153-156).

Another respondent explained that “... to some extent we’re on our home turf, so we don’t know someone so we don’t need to talk to them ...” (A3B/343-344), although he also said that “… you do notice sort of that the, the big guys down the back who make a lot of jokes, they sit together” (A3/956-957). In the interview with A3, the “big guys” are Australian students who like playing cricket. This suggests that sitting together may also be found among Australian students who have similar interests.

Beside similar interests, age similarity may also become another causal factor of sitting together. Young people may be more interested to sit together with other young students, rather than with older students. This is another issue mentioned by A8 as follows:

“Umm, I, since I’ve started university this year, I have noticed that people keep to themselves very, very much and there is—I mean, there’s a ten or twelve year gap of age between myself and most of students in the courses that I’m doing and that is quite significant. ... Umm, I’ve noticed that no one makes eye contact in the university at all, ... umm and that frustrates me ... umm, and ah people are quite reticent to talk to someone they don’t know which I think is quite sad. ... And once again I think that gets back to the whole high school mentality and a lack of maturity and people just haven’t developed their, their personality and conversational skills as yet because they’re still quite young” (A8/346-356).

This may explain why in tutorials 1a, 1b, 9a, 9b, 10a, 10b, and 12a, Caucasian students sat together. From my observation, they are young students of a similar age. This is in contrast to the case in tutorial 8b, where two Caucasian students did not sit together. I observed at that time that one of the students was younger, while the other one was an older student.
Nevertheless, it is still interesting to question why in tutorials 2a, 2b, 9a and 9b, the students who seemed to be of a similar age did not sit together. Sitting together, usually, can be the first indication that someone wants to initiate a conversation. Therefore, low tendency of sitting together may suggest a lack of willingness to initiate a conversation. I then tried to investigate further if Australian students think that they need to initiate an interaction with other students that they do not know. The responses to this question indicate that this might not be the case.

About this phenomenon, three reasons were mentioned by respondents. The first possible reason is that a lot of Australian students have part time jobs, which make them too busy for social activities. The following interview extract is a good example:

“Yeah, like a friend of mine, like she comes to uni and in her break she’ll go and work and then come back and then work, go home. (I: Ok) So, she doesn’t really have time to really…

………………………………………………………………………………………………

Like sometimes there might be a—like if I catch up with friends too much sometimes but mostly it’s just doing your own thing”.

(A6/168-175)

Beside that, students may not feel a necessity to build a new connection if they already have a friendship circle outside university. About this, one respondent says:

“... what I think is that people tend to nowadays at university have much more strongly umm, much stronger friendship groups in other areas umm such as retaining friends from high school or from their part time job having good friends, and when they come to university, it, it takes up a less smaller part of their life. They don’t feel they the need to bond with other people here quite so much” (A1B/214-218).

This is quite reasonable since university students are adult people who have built various friendship groups. In such cases, unless they study in a new place, they may feel it unnecessary to build a new relationship. Finally, students may not want to initiate a
conversation simply because they do not have a reason to do so. This is very clear in the statement below:

“And some people, some people are more likely to go up and just start talking to a stranger, uhm but I don’t think that is, specific to—well, this person is an international student so I’m not gonna talk to them. Uhm, I don’t know, for me if I’m sitting next to someone I’ll talk to them, but say hello, and talk to them but, yeah, often there is no reason to work with another person, and to, to, to be in contact with them really, though we sit in the same room, but there’s no reason actually to talk to them” (A3B/101-106).

4.1.2 Kinesics Behaviours while Listening

Eye gazing
In tutorials, while listening, Indonesian and Caucasian students gazed toward tutors, projected slides, or students who were speaking.

Gazing is an important behaviour according to Indonesian and Australian respondents. For example, I13, who works as a lecturer in Indonesia, explained that if students do not maintain eye contact, she would think that they did not pay attention (I13/260-263). Similarly, A8 commented that lack of gazing, happens when someone starts looking around the room could be a sign of “impatience” or “boredom” and “may be a sign that the person would rather be somewhere else” (A8/41-49).

Head nodding
Head nodding behaviour of Indonesian students can be interpreted as a yes answer or a sign of paying attention. The first meaning can be interpreted, for example, in tutorial 12a, when a male student confirmed what the tutor said and nodded his head at the same time. An example of the second meaning can be found in tutorial 2a. There was an Indonesian male student who rarely talked but gazed toward the other group members and nodded his head.
An interesting case of head nodding was displayed by an Indonesian student in tutorial 11a who nodded his head frequently while listening to the tutor. His behaviour was quite obvious because other students did not do the same thing, so maybe such behaviour has a cultural interpretation.

In interviews, Indonesian respondents’ comments show that head nodding may have several interpretations. According to I12, head nodding shows that the listener “memperhatikan dan mengerti apa yang dia bicarakan” (I12B/346-347) – (is paying attention, and understanding what [the speaker] is talking about). He also said: “kalau misalnya saya yang pembicara dan ada orang mengangguk-angguk saya senang” (I12B/352-353) – (if I am the speaker and someone is nodding, I feel happy). If someone does not nod her/his head, this respondent said: “… Mungkin saja dia malamun, atau mungkin, bisa saja dia mengerti tapi tidak mengekspresikan pengertiannya dengan cara mengangguk ….” (I12B/362-363) - (maybe he/she is daydreaming, or maybe ... he/she understands but does not express it by using head nodding ...). I12’s explanation shows that head nodding may give a positive meaning. However, I10 felt that this behaviour could also be done because of “perasaan malu” (I10/46-47) – (feeling of embarrassment) to tell the truth that she/he has not understood about something yet. I13 said that this behaviour may have “dobel makna” (I13/580) – (two meanings). Although she explained that this behaviour could be a sign of someone “benar-benar mengerti” (I13/582) – (really understand), she told a story about one of her class mates who like nodding his head and saying yes while listening to an explanation, but then, admitted that actually he does not understand (I13/583-588).

I tried to tell I13 that I often saw this behaviour done by male colleagues while listening to important people talking in a meeting. I13 responded “Sejauh ini, saya kurang memperhatikan sih ya sampai sejauh itu, tapi kalau memang ada yang begitu, kayaknya, yang membuat, asal Bapak senang deh” (I13/609-610) – (so far I don’t really notice to such extent, but if there are people like that, I think it is intended to “make father happy”). The expression “make father happy” is an Indonesian expression meaning that someone talks or does certain behaviours just to make her/his boss happy, something like the “sucking up” or “brown nosing” expression in English.
On the other hand, during my observations I did not find any noticeable head nodding behaviour among Caucasian students. However, interview results suggest that head nodding is also used to show that someone is paying attention and it may suggest a flattering gesture or “sucking up”, only if it is overdone (see section 4.4.3 for more explanation).

**Sitting posture (See appendix 2 for complete data and appendix 3 for some illustrations)**

While reading and writing, the sitting posture of Indonesian students during tutorials was relatively stable. From 10 examples, four students leant forward while writing and six students sat with a straight back. Similarly, eight Caucasian students leant forward while reading or writing, and one sat with a straight back while writing. However, there was one student who leant far backward and far forward while reading. The same student leant far forward while writing as well.

While speaking, more than half of data show Indonesian students leaning forward or sitting with straight back. Only three cases show students combined these two positions with leaning backward. On the other hand, half of the data show Caucasian students sitting with straight backs and 30% of the instances show them leaning backward. Two instances show Caucasian students combined the leaning backward with leaning forward or sitting with straight back and there were only two cases of leaning forward.

While listening, leaning forward is the most preferred position among Indonesian students. In seven instances, students leant forward all the time. One student in tutorial 1a sat in this position while stretching her legs forward. Other instances show students leaning forward sometimes and moving to other positions at other times. Nonetheless, there are five instances showing them leaning far backward. The first instance was done by an Indonesian female student in tutorial 4b while stretching her legs forward, but it happened only in about one minute. In tutorial 11b, a male student sat and put his left leg on his right thigh. He leant far backward and stretched his legs forward. This student was very tall, and his chair was very low, which probably influenced the way he sat. Therefore, there was not enough reason to see these as exceptions to the above explanation. Three other instances were done by one male student in tutorials 6a and 6b. This student said in interviews that he used to study in the Architecture Department in an Indonesian university and explained
that his department was more “flexible” compared to other departments (I5/77). Therefore, his behaviour can be regarded as an exception.

Slightly different from Indonesians, while listening, most Caucasian students sat with straight back. Some other instances show them leaning backward, far backward, or far forward. Some students stretched their legs forward, especially when leaning backward and some crossed their legs. Some behaved in a very relaxed manner while listening to the tutor. For instance, in tutorial 2b, a Caucasian male student leant far backward and stretched his legs forward. He also leant his head against the wall behind him.

It can be seen that generally Caucasian students were more relaxed, compared to the Indonesians. On being asked why Indonesian students tend to sit straight or lean forward, two general reasons were given. First, Indonesian students tend to lean forward to make sure that they can catch the explanation given by tutors or other students (I6/18-20). Secondly, leaning forward and sitting with straight back can be regarded as a signal of paying attention. For example, I7 explained: “ketika aku jadi student ... aku ngelihat dosenku maunya seperti itu gitu. Jadi mereka pengen kita, pay attention gitu” (I7/115-116) - (when I was a student, it seemed to me that my lecturers wanted me to be like that [sitting straight] ... so they wanted us to pay attention).

In contrast, leaning very far backward, according to several respondents, can be interpreted as a sign of not paying attention. According to I13, who works as a lecturer in Indonesia, students who leant far backward, and especially if they do not maintain eye contact, can be considered as not paying attention (I13/260-266). Other explanations sounded more negative. I7, for instance, said that this behaviour can be interpreted as “melecehkan” (I7/129) or “memandang enteng” (I7/132) which mean underestimate.

On the other hand, Australian respondents’ opinions are divided. One respondent said that any sitting posture is acceptable in tutorials as long as it is not lying down (A2/2-3). However, A1 said: “if you’re trying to, to be polite and attentive, you probably sit fairly straight ...” (A1/25-26). A6 confirmed that he leant very far backward a lot (A6/8) and considered it ok to sit like this (A6/12). Another respondent thought that this is not a good posture but still considered it acceptable (A12/23). Other respondents gave some conditions for this posture to be acceptable. A7 thought that “that would be acceptable ...
as long as they’re [students] not disrupting anybody else” (A7/19-20) while according to A11, it may be acceptable if somebody leans far backward but still maintains eye contact (A11/93-95). Similarly, A4 said that this posture may also be an expression of being comfortable (A4/6-7). From these opinions, it seems that leaning backward can be acceptable, although it is not necessarily considered as a “good” posture either.

It is also interesting to see female students’ opinion about relaxed sitting posture. Two respondents (A9/37-39 and A4/6) said that the leaning far backward can be interpreted as a sign of male dominance, but two other respondents (A7/25 and A11/80-81) did not agree. This shows that there may be different interpretations of this sitting posture among Australian female students.

It seems so far that while leaning backward posture may have a negative meaning among Indonesian students, this position can still be considered acceptable among Australians. For example, A3 stated that “... it’s more about whether they are involved in the tutorials, and if someone sitting back and relaxed while they’re doing that, I’m very happy for them” (A3/765-767).

**Leg-Crossing**

A few data show Indonesian students crossed their legs while sitting. For instance, in tutorial 6b, an Indonesian male student leant far backward while crossing his leg. In another instance, a male student in tutorial 11b sat while putting his left leg on his right thigh.

In interviews, three Indonesian students said that leg crossing behaviour can be interpreted negatively. One of them said: “... [menumpangkan kaki tidak berterima kalau] angkat kakinya yang sudah, misalnya sudah angkat kaki [I14 memperlihatkan cara menumpangkan kaki] gitu terus dia agak beginil lho [I14 memperagakan duduk bersandar jauh ke belakang]” (I14/37-39) – ([crossing legs is unacceptable] if [someone] lifts their legs [I14 immitated how to cross legs] and sits slightly like this [I14 immitated leaning far backward]). However, three other respondents said that crossing legs may not be a problem (I8/171-175), (I10/22), (I12/287-305).
Among Caucasian students, seven instances show female students crossed their legs. For Australians, leg-crossing is not a noticeable thing in tutorials (A8/31-35 and A2/11). In fact, “It’s more polite for girl, women to cross their legs” (A9/118-119), especially when they wear skirts (A4/21).

**Putting feet up on chairs**

During my tutorial observations, there were no Indonesian students who put their feet up on chairs. In interviews, respondents who discussed this behaviour consider it unacceptable (I12/271-274, I13/246, I4/178, I6/182-189, I7/173-176). The responses varying from such a very firm answer as “Nah itu benar-benar ... unacceptable“ (I7/174-176) - (Well, it is really ... unacceptable) up to a more realistic answer such as “nggak ada” (I14/20) - (not found). I3 specified that in her department in Indonesia “… memang lebih nyantai sih sama dosennya tapi ya duduk ya, ya nggak bisa, angkat-angkat kaki sih” (I3/51-52) - ( … It’s true that the relationship with lecturers was more relaxed, but when we sit, we cannot put our feet up on chairs).

On the other hand, this behaviour was displayed twice by a Caucasian female student in tutorial 9b. I did not find other instances, but from my conversations with Indonesian students, some said that they observed such behaviours among some Caucasian students in their tutorials.

In interviews, five Australian respondents gave negative comments. A7 for example expressed that “… I think at university in a formal situation and the tutes, even though they’re casual it still meant to be showing, demonstrating yourself as a person, so people need to learn what is it acceptable behaviour in public as opposed to at home …” (A7/60-63). However, some gave positive comments. A3 for example, said that “On a chair, again probably that would be ok” (A3/782). Four respondents still considered to be more careful to put feet up on other people’s chairs. For example, A1 said: “If you’re putting your feet up on the chair across from you I don’t think many people would take kindly to that” (A1/68-70). A4 considered that the acceptability of this behaviour may depend on the tutor because while some tutors do not care, other tutors are very strict (A4/33-34).
Putting feet up on tables in tutorials (Australians)
In interviews, I tried to ask five Australian respondents about putting feet up on tables in tutorials. All of them considered it inappropriate (A11/27-28, A5/84, and A6/53). A4 associated this behaviour with dominance (A4/38). Nevertheless, A2 still thought that this is not something that makes tutors talk to students (A2/19).

Position of hands
Some data show the position of students’ hands when they were listening. Some Indonesian students who leant forward put their arms on the table. Some others put their elbows (or one of their elbows) on the table and used their hands (or one of their hands) to hold their chin, lower jaw, or head.

Interviews with Indonesian respondents revealed that holding one’s chin, lower jaw or head with hand can be interpreted either positively (I4/182, I1/179 and I6/248;250), e.g as a sign of “menyimak” (I6/237) - (being attentive) or negatively, e.g as a sleepy position (I13/258). The ambiguity can be solved by considering the body posture. I2 said:

“... kalau dia begini [I2 bersandar ke depan], dia di, posturnya di atas meja begini, itu tandanya dia serius mendengar ... cuman kalau ada yang begini [I2 bersandar ke belakang dan bertopang dagu] ... [berarti dia] ogah-ogahan …” (I2/170-189).

... if he/she is like this [I2 leant forward and held her face with hand], his/her posture is against the table like this [I2 leant forward and put her arm on the table], that means he/she is listening seriously ... but if [he/she] is like this [I2 leant backward and held her chin with hand] ... [that means he/she] does not care ...

Two cases of this behaviour were displayed by Caucasian students in tutorial 11a and 12a. Two Australian students gave comments about this behaviour in interviews. According to them, it is generally acceptable to hold the face with the hand (A4/17), but if someone does it while looking at other places, tutors might think that the student does not pay attention (A2/8-9).

To sum up, in Indonesia, this hand position may be considered acceptable if it is not conducted while leaning far backward. In Australian culture, it may be fine as long as
students still maintain eye contact, which may be the case in Indonesia as well, considering that maintaining eye contact / gazing is positively valued (see previous explanation about eye gazing in section 4.1.2).

Body movements
Most Indonesian students did not move much. From 24 samples about students' posture, only in seven instances did students change their positions. In interview, I10 said that Indonesian students do not move frequently because “mahasiswa berusaha benar-benar mendengar penjelasan dosen secara focus” (I10/18-19) - (students really try to focus on tutor/lecture's explanation). Beside that, I2 confirmed that students in Indonesia are not supposed to move frequently because it will be considered as a lack of respect (I2/146-153).

Similarly, most Caucasian students did not change their positions frequently while listening to the tutor. However, there were some contrastive cases. In tutorial 6a, a male student changed his position very frequently. He leant far backward in the chair and stretched his legs forward. After that, he leant far forward on the table, putting his right elbow on the table and putting his right hand on his face. After a while, he leant far backward and put his hands behind his neck. Similar behaviour was also displayed by two female students in tutorial 1a. In tutorial 2a, a male student moved, scratched and touched his hair and face very frequently. About this behaviour, A2 said that it might be a little bit annoying for someone who sits beside, but it is not enough for tutor to say something (A2/5-6). So, it is all right to move frequently during a tutorial as long as it does not disturb anybody else (A10/44-54).

Body stretching and yawning
In my observations, I did not find this behaviour among Indonesian students. In interviews, I2, gave a definite response “[saya] tidak pernah [menemukan hal itu] di Indonesia” (I2/318) - ([I] never (found a case like that) in Indonesia). The unacceptability of this behaviour can be seen from lecturers’ reaction. For example, the lecturer might say “kamu tuh tidur jam berapa kemin [teguran tidak langsung]” (I1/249) - (What time did you go to bed last night? [indirect warning]). However, I14, who is now working as a lecturer, said that “kalau saya, ok aja” (I14/52) - (I am ok [if students yawned and stretched their
bodies]). This comment indicates that the acceptability of yawning and body stretching might depend on the lecturers' personal preference.

On the other hand, body stretching and yawning behaviours were several times displayed by Caucasian students in tutorials. A female student in tutorial 9b, for example, stretched her body once. Another example, in tutorial 10b, a male student yawned. He opened his mouth widely and repeated the behaviour twice.

Interviews with Australian students revealed that body stretching and yawning while attending a tutorial might be considered as “acceptable” (A12/57) or “fine” (A10/63) “as long as it’s not err distracting” (A5/146). Body stretching in particular “… wouldn’t be meaningful …” (A11/134) and one might not “see what would be wrong with that” (A6/101-102). There might be nothing wrong with yawning (A2/13), but some respondents still considered it as “a sign of rudeness” (A7/112), “a sign of boredom” (A11/132-133), “not interested” (A1/185) or that one would “rather be somewhere else” (A1/185). Therefore, “… some people might get offended at yawning” (A6/100) although “it depends on the tutor” (A6/101). However, A1 felt “doubt” that tutors will complaint “unless they are really stiff” (A1/187).

4.1.3 Kinesics Behaviours while Speaking

Gazing

One example shows a Caucasian student talked while gazing toward the tutor and other students. However, most of the time, while talking, Caucasian students gazed toward the tutor, similar to Indonesian students.

Sitting posture

While speaking, most Indonesian students leant forward or sat with a straight back. Nonetheless, there were three instances that do not comply with these two patterns. The first instance happened in tutorial 4a. An Indonesian male student moved a lot. In my conversation with him, he told me that he felt bored with the class, because he has learnt much of the learning material in his past study. His frequent movement could be a reflection of his feeling. The second instance happened in tutorial 11b, again with a male
student. He answered the tutor’s question while leaning backward. At other times, although he answered a question while sitting with a straight back, he folded his hands in front of his chest, giving the impression that his behaviour was too different from other Indonesian students. The last instance, in tutorial 12a, an Indonesian male student sat with a straight back or leant backward while speaking.

Only slightly different from Indonesians, most Caucasian students sat with a straight back and some leant backward while talking. Relaxed sitting posture was also displayed by a male student in tutorial 2b. While giving his answer, he leant back, put his left arm on the back of the chair beside him, and put his right arm on the writing tablet in front of him. This behaviour was repeated twice.

**Sitting on tables**

There was an instance showing a Caucasian student sitting on the table while giving his answer in a classroom activity (T9a). I asked an Australian student, who also worked as a tutor, about this and he said “as the tutor I’ll sit on the table to talk to the student and I don’t have a problem with that” (A3/804-805).

On the other hand, this behaviour was not found among Indonesian students and in interview I5 said: “nggak mungkin [duduk di atas meja] kalau bicara dengan dosen” (I5/325) - ([it is] impossible [to sit on the table] while talking to a lecturer or tutor).

**Hand movements, body movements and facial expressions**

Indonesian students often displayed hand movements while talking, either to clarify or to accompany verbal message. One example was found in tutorial 4a when an Indonesian male student said “linear” while moving his right hand as if he was drawing a straight diagonal line.

I also observed that Indonesian students did not move frequently while talking. In terms of facial expressions, a smile was frequently displayed by Indonesian students while talking. Other facial expressions, such as eye and nose movements, did not appear frequently. According to some respondents, the lack of body movements and facial expressions
reflects the absence of freedom of speech in Indonesian classrooms. For example, I3 commented that this is related to the classroom practice in Indonesia. She said:


... all of this is because of educational system in Indonesia. Most Indonesians are trained to be passive. (In our educational system) teachers are at the front, students are there. ... Teachers teach, [students] listen. So, whether [we] like or not, we do not express opinions, everything does not come out ...

The nonverbal unexpressiveness of Indonesians could be a very cultural matter for Indonesians. I4 said: “kalau Jawa sih, kalau Jawa lho ya itu memang menunjukkan ekspresi nggak baek” (I4/363) – (in Java, this is in Java you know, it is true that showing expressions is not good). This is also similar to Buginese culture, according to I12 who said that being too expressive will be considered as “kurang beradab” (I12/613) - (not civilized enough) in Buginese culture, especially for women (I12/617).

In contrast, some instances showed Caucasian students used much body movements and facial expression while talking. In tutorial 8b, for example, a female student talked while using intensive hand movements and facial expressions, including movements of eyes, eyebrows and mouth. This behaviour was repeated every time she talked during the tutorial. Another example, in tutorial 10a, a female student talked while using continuous hand movements and very intensive eye expressions. This behaviour was consistent in two observations I did in this tutorial. The intensity of body movements, hand movements and facial expressions was different from one student to the other student. Some displayed them quite intensively, some displayed them moderately.

In interviews, four Australian respondents commented about facial expressions. For example, A8 thought that facial expressions are still part of Anglo-Saxon Australians, although he thought that Anglo-Saxon Australians “don’t tend to gesticulate as much as
say the European cultures do ..." (A8/247-248). No respondents gave negative comment about students' expressiveness in tutorials.

**Pointing**

Three instances show Indonesian students using pointing behaviour to clarify their verbal message by pointing to objects that they meant. There were not cases of Indonesian students pointing toward a person in tutorials. On the contrary, some Caucasian students pointed toward tutors or other students. In tutorial 1a, a female student (older than other students) was presenting her assignment and said “You could compare” while pointing her finger to other students. In the same tutorial, when the tutor mentioned something, a female student said “No no, that’s Harris” while pointing and waiving her index finger toward the tutor. Another female student in the same tutorial answered the tutor’s question while pointing her pen toward the tutor. Similar behaviour was displayed by a male student in tutorial 10a and a female student in tutorial 12a. In interviews, A1 explained that “if you were just in general pointing, I’d think that’s fine, but if you’re indicating something about them that sounds like YOU ((A1 mentioned this word with strong emphasis)), that’s not acceptable” (A1/573-574). Similar explanation was also given by A3B (310-314). Indonesian respondents (I1/627-636, I2/326 and I5/386-393) gave negative comments. However, when I gave more precise description of the pointing behaviour that I observed, I12 said that it is not a problem (I12/412). There will be a problem only when a student points his/her finger directly toward the lecturer or tutor, which will be considered as aggressive behaviour (I12/413-420).

It may be clear, then, that for Indonesian students, as well as Australian, pointing behaviour can be acceptable in tutorials as long as it does not sound as “You” (in A3’s word) or “aggressive” (in I12’s word). I still suspect, though, that level of acceptance of pointing behaviour in Indonesian and Australian culture would be different. Precise description of accepted pointing behaviour can be obtained with video recording, which could not be done in my study because permission from respondents was not forthcoming.
Smiling and laughing

One of the most frequent behaviours displayed by Indonesian students while talking was smiling. The smiling happened in situations in which students needed to correct the tutor, ask questions, give opinions, and answer questions.

An interesting case of smiling happened in tutorial 5a. At the end of this tutorial, the tutor looked at Indonesian students and asked whether they could understand her explanation. The students smiled and did not say anything. The tutor asked further if they had anything to ask. Again, the students smiled and did not say anything. After the tutorial, one of the students talked to the tutor, probably asking something, so that the tutor gave explanations by referring to what she had written on the whiteboard. Beside that, another student told me that actually it was still difficult for him to understand the tutor’s explanation. This case shows that smile cannot be always interpreted as a sign of positive confirmation.

In interviews, most Indonesian respondents who talked about smile agreed that smile does not always convey positive affirmation. For example, from I11’s explanation below, smile may be a sign that someone is still hesitated about something:

“Eh biasanya kalau saya ya, kalau pertama-pertama nggak ngerti gitu kan, aduh nggak tahu mo jawab apa, ya senyum aja gitu lo biasanya, saya senyum kalau memang saya itu nggak yakin dengan apa yang saya utarakan, gitu gitu. Untuk menyamarkan ((tertawa)) istilahnya” (I11/242-244).

... usually, this is my opinion you know, if I don’t understand [about something], I don’t know what to say, usually I just smile you know, I smile when I’m not sure with what I’m saying. It is to conceal my true feeling ((laugh)).

While I11 was concerned about his own feeling, other comments show that students may smile because they are concerned about other students. For example, I14 said: “saya merasa, nanti pertanyaanya saya ini, mungkin orang lain sudah, mengerti, ... ketika si dosen itu mengulang lagi, menjawab, dia [mahasiswa lain] bosan” (14/120-121) - (I felt that my questions had been understood by other students ... when the lecturer repeated the explanation, [other students may] get bored). Students’ preference to smile, rather than asking questions about something that they do not understand can be also seen as an
effort not to be “too assertive” since the assertiveness, to some extent has negative connotation in Indonesian culture. For example, I11 said: “saya setiap kali mo tanya selalu mikir yang lain ad [sic] uh nanti dibilangnya, saya sok-sok cari, perhatian dosen atau gimana” (I11/261-262) - (Whenever I want to ask a question, I always think about other [people], I am afraid people will think that I am trying to seek attention from the lecturer or something like that6). Further, students may smile because they are concerned about the teacher. I13 said: “kadang kita merasa nggak enak kalau ngomong sama dosennya. Ih! dia udah capek-capek njelasin, kitanya nggak ngerti gitu kan” (I13/497-498) - (sometimes we don’t feel good to talk to the lecturer. How come!, the lecturer has been tired to explain, we still don’t understand). I also investigated whether the reluctance to ask questions is caused by the assumption of students’ questions being a challenge. I4, for example, agreed with my opinion (I4/279) and said: “Guru tuh seumur hidup udah jangan tanya jangan apa, yang dikasih guru itu ya itu kalau aman selesai itu gitu” (I4/282-284) - (Teachers, in all your life do not ask them [teachers ] anything, do not [do anything], what teachers give you, that’s it, [you are] safe). Another reason, students may just smile and not ask questions because they think that asking questions is useless (I7/349-354, see quotation and translation in appendix 4).

Beside the pressures from peers and teachers, this problem can be also caused by the lack of language proficiency (I2/255-256 and I9/58) or because students do not want to think seriously (I9/59-60, I5/184-185).

Smile may also occur when students talked about a bad habit. In tutorial 9b, an Indonesian female student talked about the lateness habit of Indonesians that she considered as a bad practice, but she smiled continuously during her talk. In interviews some respondents confirmed that smile is often displayed either in talk about pleasant or unpleasant topics (I2/409-410, I7/457-458).

Among Caucasian students, smiling or laughing was displayed by some students when they were talking. Many times, smiles were displayed together with other kind of facial expressions. It was also found that in tutorial 1a, 3 students talked very rarely, but they smiled while gazing when the tutor or other students were talking. Another data showed a

---

6 This is similar to English expression “brown nosing” or “sucking up”
Caucasian student smiled toward an Asian student and laughed a little when the tutor was explaining something. I did not find any case of Caucasian students smiling while talking about unfavored topics.

4.1.4 Other kinesics behaviours

Hand raising

Four data show Indonesian students raising their hands before asking questions. In three instances, the students raised their right hand. Only in one case, a student raised her left hand while holding a paper with her right hand. There were also two instances of hand raising recorded from Caucasian students, using the right hand in one case and the left hand in the other case.

In interviews, an Indonesian respondent said that in her classes in Australian university, students can speak up without raising hand, while in Indonesia students need to raise hand before asking questions (I1/332-342). I also discussed this matter with Australian respondents. A10 said that in tutorials, student “might just call out” (A10/229). A1 explained further:

“If it’s a really busy tutorial, you’d put your hand up and, and try to, wait for the tutor to get the tutor’s attention then ask a question and talk about what you don’t understand. If it’s just really a small group, and your tutor’s a bit more casual you’d probably just speak straight out” (A1/111-115).

This respondent emphasized that it would be considered polite to raise “your hand if you have a question instead of just speaking openly” (A1/224-225).

I also discussed the use of the right and the left hands. Indonesian respondents generally thought that the right hand is considered, at least, preferable. I2, for example, said: “[mengangkat tangan] kanan itu lebih cenderung sopan” (I2/352) - ([raising] the right [hand] is more polite). On the contrary, five Australian respondents (A1, A3, A5, A6 and A10) said
that it does not matter whether students raise their right hand or the left one since Australians “don't consider the hands important” (A3/89).

**Using hands to give / receive something**

For Indonesians, it might be also preferable to use the right hand in handing something in. For example, in tutorial 8b, it was observed that a male student gave his paper to the tutor with his right hand. Interviews with Indonesian respondents also reveal that the right hand is preferable while the left hand is considered really impolite (I1/322), maybe because the left hand is identified with dirty things (I1/325-330). In contrast to this, an Australian respondent specified that “we [Australians] don't have the whole like, this is the left hand for, for wiping your bum, or, this is for food, ...” (A5/304-305).

**Kinesics behaviours when students come late**

In some tutorials, Indonesian students did not show significant nonverbal behaviour when they came late. For example, in tutorial 5a, a late student entered the room, stood for a while near the door and looked around the room. She did not give any nonverbal signal to the tutor, who was explaining something in front of the class.

However, in a few cases, Indonesian students displayed interesting nonverbal signals. In tutorial 9a, for example, a late female student opened the door, entered the room and smiled (not to particular person). When she arrived, other students were already engaged in group discussion. The student stood near the door for about one minute until the tutor said “Hello” and asked her to join a group. Another example, in tutorial 10b, a male student came late. He opened the door slowly and quietly, whispered “sorry” and smiled while looking at the tutor.

In the discussion about this matter in interviews, I1 and I2 described that, in Indonesia, the rule depends on the lecturer (I1/751, 756 and I2/415-417). According to I1, if students come late, “... ada [dosen] yang marah, ada yang biasa aja, ada yang udah nggak peduli ...” (I1/756) - ([some lecturers] get angry, [some] is neutral, [some] do not care). With certain lecturers, students “… nggak boleh masuk lagi” (I1/712) - (cannot attend the class anymore). This is confirmed by I2 (417). I5 also said that students can even be sent away by lecturers if they come late (I5/556).
With Caucasian students, there were seven cases of students arriving late in tutorials. In six cases, the students opened the door, entered the room and sat on any chair available. There was only one instance where a male student came late, passed in front of the tutor, smiled to the tutor and said something while walking.

From interviews with some Australian respondents, it seems that students who come late in tutorials do not need to wait for the tutor to give permission to come in. A5, for example, said that “... what I do if I’m late, you know I’d, you know, just nod the head, and you know, ‘sorry’ and just go take a seat ...” (A5/167-169). Another respondent still argued that “if you knock or if you just walk in, either way is a distraction whatever you do, so at least knocking is more polite I think than barging in and setting down” (A7/224-225). However, this respondent admitted that “university is still new” for her so she does not “know what’s normal” (A7/216). Knocking, according to A2 (a PhD student and also a tutor), can be considered rude because it may interrupt the class (A2/37).

4.1.5 Kinesics Behaviour in Conversations and Greetings

Body orientation, eye contact and waving
Few examples of the observations made were related to conversations and greetings. In tutorial 11, two Indonesian students (a male and a female) were having a conversation. They were sitting side by side. The male student bent toward the female students, and the female student turned her body to face the male student. There was a continuous eye contact between them. There was also one instance of waving that happened in tutorial 6a. An Indonesian female student came into the room. She looked at the observer, smiled, and waved. Since these findings are similar to the data that I obtained outside classrooms, detailed discussion about them are integrated into section 4.2.

4.2 Students’ Nonverbal Behaviour outside the Classrooms

4.2.1 Kinesics and Touching Behaviours in Greetings and Leave Taking
I found several examples of smiling, hand lifting, hand shaking, cheek pressing and hugging as greetings among Caucasian people. On one occasion, two young Caucasian
men had a conversation after shaking hands. I also observed a Black woman who did cheek pressing with a Caucasian woman and a Caucasian man. Another time, I observed a young Caucasian woman who hugged a Caucasian man by rounding her two arms around the man’s neck.

In interviews, one Indonesian student commented on Australian people’s smile. She felt that to smile to a stranger, as usually happens in Australia when people meet other people’s eye, is unusual in Indonesia (I1/199).

About hand shaking, two Australian respondents (A1/527, A3/91-92) said that hand shaking is conducted by using the right hand. A1 added that it is conducted only when “you’re meeting someone for the first time” (A1/520) and in “more business-like relationships” (A1/522).

Hugging and cheek pressing are acceptable ways of greeting among Australians according to all Australian respondents who discussed the matters. These respondents said that these two nonverbal forms of greeting are for use with friends.

Hand shaking is also a typical way of greeting and leave taking among Indonesians, although it not usual on a daily basis. I1, for example, said: “… kalau ada keluargalah datang, ketemu, baru ketemu, tetap kalau mau pulang ya, jabat tangan. Kalau di, kampus, mungkin sama dosen tapi kalau ama teman-teman, nggak pernah.” (I1/567-568) - (if my relatives come, [if I’ve] just met them, if I want to go home [I] shake hands with them. At campus maybe [I shake hand] with lecturers but [I never shake hand] with friends). It is important to highlight a statement given by I2 that some Indonesian men do not shake hand with women due to religious [Islamic] teaching that does not allow men to touch women (I2/742).

Other kinds of greeting among Indonesian students that were found in my observations were hand waving and cheek pressing. I was sitting in a tutorial when an Indonesian student came into the room. She saw me and smiled. Then she raised her hands and waved two of her fingers, the index and middle fingers (she was holding a pen with other fingers). On another occasion, when I met an Indonesian female friend, she shook my hand and pressed her cheeks against mine (once on the right and once on the left). About
the cheek pressing I1 explained: “... biasa sih kita kayak gitu kalau udah lama banget nggak ketemu ...” (I1/589) - (usually we are like that [doing cheek pressing] if we do not meet for a very long time). Another respondent explained that, in her university the cheek pressing between males and females is still questionable (I7/633), but she admitted that the behaviour can be seen now in some universities (I7/628). Cheek pressing between males and females was also observed by I2 in high level business meetings (I2/592-610).

Hugging is also another nonverbal form of greeting. Among friends, I2 explained that sometimes she hugs her friends if she meets them after a long period of time not seeing them (I2/731). In observations, I never found hugging between Indonesian male and female students, but the interview with I1 revealed that hugging between male and female friends is common in her university in Indonesia, especially after not seeing each other for a long time (I1/617-622). Another situation where hugging between males and females can be found among Indonesians is in high level business meetings (I2/592-610).

In short, while greeting forms in Indonesia and Australian culture appear to be similar, there might be different meaning attached to hand shaking, hugging and cheek pressing between males and females.

4.2.2 Kinesics and Touching Behaviours in Leave taking

In my observations of Caucasian people, I found pointing was used in leave taking. After a conversation between a woman and a man, I saw the woman walked away after pointing her index finger to the man.

From interviews with Indonesians, it was found that hand shaking, hugging and head tossing (backwards) are nonverbal forms of leave taking in Indonesia. While head tossing can be used with people who can be met frequently (I2/781), hand shaking and hugging happen when people might not meet for a long time (I1/614-618;653, I2/779-781).
4.2.3 Proxemics, Kinesics and Touching Behaviours in Conversations

**Space in conversations**
In conversations among Caucasian people that I observed, space while having conversations was varied. One day, I saw two Caucasian females, sitting face to face within a more or less two-arm distance. On another day, I observed two Caucasian women sitting on a university lawn with a space of about ¼ arm distance. On another occasion, I observed a conversation between a Caucasian woman, a Caucasian man and a Black woman who stood up with a more or less 1-arm distance between them. I also observed two Caucasian men sitting in the library with about half-arm distance, and even closer sometimes. A very close space, almost no space in fact, was also observed between a man and a woman who were in conversation. According to an Australian respondent, space is an important issue in conversations. People are not supposed to “get into someone’s space” (A4/152-153). This means that the different space I observed in different cases may reflect various kinds of relationships.

**Position of body**
When Caucasian people had conversations, some kept standing, some found places to sit. More often, I saw Caucasian people had conversations while sitting, either on the chair (such as in the library), at the lawn, on benches or on the floor in the building foyers and along corridors.

In two observations of conversation between two Caucasian people, one kept standing and the other one kept sitting on the floor. These two cases happened in the building foyer, near classrooms, so I assumed that the people were waiting for the next class. This situation, according to A1 is not “unusual” (A1B/315). “... it probably means that umm the person sitting ... or the person standing probably didn’t expect the conversation to go on for a particularly long time” (A1B/319-321).

**Body orientation**
Three body positions were observed among Caucasian students. The first is the face-to-face position (communicators faced toward each other). This position was observed when people had conversations at the foyer, lawn, or café, where they have big spaces. Another position is the side-by-side position, in which the communicators turned their bodies slightly
to each other, but not fully facing each other. This position was usually observed when people sat in a narrow corridor. The last position is the side by side position which happened when two people need to face another thing, such as in the case of two young men working with a laptop, or when people sat on a bench.

In my observation outside classrooms, I could not find any conversation between Indonesian students that I could observe. However, there was one instance found in tutorial 11b. Two Indonesian students (a male and a female) were having a conversation. They were sitting side by side. The male student bent toward the female students, and the female student turned her body to face the male student.

**Eye contact**

In my observations, Caucasian people usually maintained eye contacts in conversations. Even when they sat side by side, they still gazed toward each other (complete description can be seen in appendix 5). However, in one instance, gazing behaviour did not happen reciprocally. The conversation was between an older Caucasian woman and a younger Caucasian woman.

In interviews, Australian students’ comments gave an impression that eye contact is a significant behaviour in conversations. For example, A3 said that maintaining eye contact is “considered polite” (A3/111-112).

In the conversation between Indonesian students in tutorial 11b above, the students maintained eye contact, suggesting that eye contact might be also applied by Indonesian students in conversations. In interviews, most Indonesian respondents, who discussed this behaviour, do not have problems with eye contact in conversations. I5, for example said: “*mata kita harus tetap ini*” (I5/398) – (eye [contact] should be [maintained]). However, one respondent said that he has problems in maintaining eye contact in conversations with his parents or lecturers. He explained:

I mean, this is my opinion you know, I think, this is a lecturer. Lecturer means well [lecturers have higher status] than me you know … Si if I look into someone’s eye directly like that, I don’t feel comfortable, I don’t dare either. Not dare, I mean, it may offend [people] you know.

The same problem was also explained by I12 who particularly referred to Buginese culture. Interestingly, this is sharply contrast to an Australian student’s opinion that “you’d probably a bit more careful to keep the eye contact” with older people (A1/313).

In general it seems that in the university context, eye contact has more or less similar meaning in Indonesia and Australia. However, it is important to note that eye contact may have a different meaning at home domain for some Indonesian students, which in turn may influence students’ eye behaviour in conversations at university. This issue, together with problems of eye contact in inter-gender interaction will be discussed later in section 5.1.4.

**Facial expressions**

When talking with people of the same age, young Caucasian people looked so expressive. One day I observed a conversation between a young Caucasian woman and a young Caucasian man. Both of them displayed intensive facial expression, especially on eye and mouth area. More data about facial expressions were found in tutorials and have been discussed in section 4.1.3.

Outside classrooms, I could not find conversations between Indonesian students that I could record, but I discussed this matter in interviews with six Indonesian respondents from four cultural backgrounds: Jakarta, Ngada (Flores), Buginese (South Sulawesi) and Central Java.

All respondents, either explicitly or implicitly, agreed that Indonesian students might not be very expressive. I7 expressed this explicitly by saying: “[orang Indonesia] nggak yang jelas nggak ekspresif kayak orang sini ya lah” (I7/467) - ([Indonesians] clearly are not expressive like the people here [Australia]). I14 explained: “kata-kata kritikan yang kurang baik atau kita tidak sepandap dengan orang akan, membuat orang cepat emosi gitu” (I14/223-224) - (rude criticising words or when we do not have the same opinion, people will get angry). However, I3 and I5 said that Indonesians may become expressive when
they talked with friends. The inexpressiveness happened mostly in classrooms (see section 4.1.3).

4.2.4 Other Proxemics Behaviours

Space while walking together
In my observations, compared to the situations of two Caucasian males walking together, the walking space was closer when a female walk together with another female or with a male (see appendix 6).

Quite rarely did I find an Indonesian male student who walked together with an Indonesian female student. Many times I observed two males or two females walking together. The space between female students when they walked together was relatively closer compared to male students. However, the difference was not obvious and not very consistent.

Space between males and females in gatherings
In gatherings, such as at a barbeque, male and female Caucasian people were mixed together. I talked about this with two Australian respondents. One of them, for example, said that “... it’s just free for both of them to talk to anyone else” (A1/550).

In contrast, in Indonesian gatherings, there was a lesser tendency for males and females to mix together. In interviews, one respondent, for example, described this phenomenon as something that happens “rata-rata” (I4/413) - (in average or as a tendency). However, another respondent said: “kayaknya memang harus seperti itu deh” (I5/707) - (it seems that it, indeed, should be like that [to separate males and females in gatherings]). Some respondents gave a more realistic explanation. I7, for example explained:

In my working place, commonly it is like that. So female lecturers [mingle] with female lecturers. But, it is not very strict either. Because [they] are adult already, and usually they have something to talk first.

Younger respondents showed a more relaxed attitude about this behaviour, especially in university context. I1, for example, said: “Kalau aku sih tergantung, mana yang aku nyaman aja” (I1/552) - (For me it depends, whatever makes me comfortable).

It was interesting that I2 emphasized religious influence in her opinion about this tendency (I2/697-704). I explored this possibility in my interviews with some other respondents. I5/767 and I12/649 agreed with this view, but I7 did not view this as a religious influence as she said: “Saya me [sic], saya melihatnya itu, udah umum ya begitu ya di Indonesia” (I7/724) - (I think that's common already, it's a general [practice] in Indonesia). I2, I4, I12 and I7 are Moslem Indonesians so I tried to discuss this matter with a Christian Indonesian student (I8) who described the situation in churches as follow:


In Jakarta, maybe we, husbands and wives sit together, … but sometimes, in North Sumatra, in a remote area, eh maybe on the left is the group of mothers or wives, on the right is the group of fathers … that's what I think. I feel that it is [influenced] by values in each place because maybe, religion and culture are very strongly connected to each other (I8/88-94).

These opinions confirm that the lesser tendency of females and males to mix in Indonesian gatherings may be practised by Christian people as well, not only by Moslem people.

Another thing that should be highlighted in this excerpt is the difference between Jakarta (urban area) and Sumatran remote area. This gives another possibility that this problem can be seen as a different attitude between urban/modern versus rural/traditional society.
It was also found in interviews that, although three respondents (I4, I5 and I12) generally said that there might not be serious consequences for a violation of this tendency, there may be serious consequence if it happens frequently between the same man and woman (I7/681-705).

4.2.5 Other Kinesics Behaviours

Sitting posture on the floor, Sitting and lying on the lawns

Many Caucasian students sat on the floor, while waiting for the next class. For example, one day I saw a middle-age Caucasian lady (between 40-45) who sat on the floor, bent her legs and embraced her legs with her arms. Beside her, a young Caucasian girl sat on the floor and crossed her legs.

Sitting and lying down on the lawn was also quite observable among Caucasian people. For instance, I saw a young man and a young woman having a conversation while sitting on the lawn. The man lay on the lawn once. Not far from them, a young Caucasian woman was sitting on the grass, stretching her legs forward while reading a book. On another day I saw a young Caucasian woman lying down on the lawn. These are all very common scenes around university during my observations, especially in summer and spring. People sat with various positions, including sitting with the legs crossed, stretched, or bent to one side.

Various ways of sitting were also observed when Caucasian people sat on the bench. For example, one day I observed a Caucasian female who was talking with a Caucasian male. The female sat in several positions. One time she sat by putting her feet up on the bench. Another time, she sat by putting one leg on the knee of the other leg. After that, she put her feet on the ground, stretching her legs far forward until she was in a half-lying position. The male put his feet down on the ground all the time.

On the other hand, I did not see any Indonesian student sitting on the floor or on the grass/ground at lawns and courtyards, let alone lying down on lawn. In interviews, I2 said that she rarely sits on the floor “karna ini, ya, unusual …” (I2/776) - (because it is unusual …). Similarly, I1 said that she does not lie down on the lawn because it is dirty (I1/642).
In my observations, many Caucasian students sat on the lawn while eating, which was never observed among Indonesian students.

**Sitting posture in cafes and libraries**

I observed a group of three Caucasian men and one Caucasian woman who sat on four chairs around a table outside a university café. The woman, almost during the whole observation, put her feet up on her own chair, on the table, or on the chair next to her. The men did not put their feet up on chairs or the table, and did not change their position frequently.

Not far from this group, a young girl sat on a bench while reading a book. She leaned back against the wall behind her and stretched her legs on the bench.

I asked Australians respondents about the behaviour of putting feet up on café chairs, tables or benches. A7, A12 and A6 said that it would be fine. A12 commented that it would be “acceptable” especially at cafes in universities (A12/170 – 195). However, according to A7 (70) and A6 (237), putting feet up on café tables is unacceptable. Similarly, one Indonesian respondent said that in Indonesia, some students sit while putting their feet up on the chair in canteens, but not on the table (I1/528-529).

I also found some Caucasian students who put their feet up on library chairs or tables. For example, I saw a young Caucasian man sitting on a library chair, leaning back and put his feet up on the low table in front of him. In interviews, A9 considered this behaviour as “defiant” (A9/27) and “disrespectful” (A9/28). Another respondent said that she would not do it (A12/62-63). However, A7 thought that “... if there weren’t very many people around I might take my shoes off, ... as long as you’re not making a mess I guess” (A7/74-75). Similarly, A3 said: “I don’t think it’s considered impolite to have your feet on another chair while you’re working but ...”, he emphasized, “ ... you wouldn’t while you’re talking to someone” (A3/153-154). Putting feet up on tables in libraries, according to A4 (126), would be unacceptable and impolite, but, this might depend on the type of the table. Putting feet “on the computer tables ... would be a bit strange” (A6/267-268) but if it is a coffee table, it would be considered appropriate, “as long as their shoes are clean or their feet are clean” because “the coffee tables aren’t used for eating ...” (A7/89-90).
Slightly different from Australian students, Indonesian students’ sitting posture in library may be more formal. In interview with I2, for example, she said that some students put their feet up on library chairs, but emphasized that if a lecturer passes, they “Harus kembali ke posisi” (I2/687) - (should get back to the previous [formal] sitting posture).

In general, in Australian universities, there might not be “serious” consequences if someone sits with inappropriate posture in public places. A12 said: “I don’t think they would be approached to umm remove their feet” (A12/62).

4.2.6 Other Behaviours (Combinations of Proxemics and Kinesics)

**Passing people in the corridor**

I tried to discuss this matter in interviews with Australian students. When we need to pass through people who are sitting along a corridor, then normally we would say excuse me (A3/48) while according to A6, we can “just walk through” (A6/300) “unless they [the people who are sitting] have to move out the way for you to pass through ...” (A6/304). It is quite normal just to pass through people, as long as we do not make any kind of “contact”, and if there is such contact, we need to say sorry (A4/147-148). If two people are talking to each other at the corridor, then we “might want to say excuse me or something like that” (A10/241-242). A1 said “if they were two lecturers ... having a conversation ... you might sort of downcast your eyes as go through ... that’s sort of saying you’re sorry to interrupt” (434-437) but then he admitted that he is “not really sure” (435). If there is a wider space behind one of the persons who are talking, according to A1, he will go through behind the person and if the space is too narrow then “you might tap them on the shoulder and say, excuse me as you pass that group” (A1/450-451).

In similar situations in Indonesia, I2 explained in interview that people must ask for permission (I2/485), otherwise, it will be considered as impolite (I2/487). If two persons are having a conversation in the corridor and there is a space behind one of the person, people may pass through the space without asking for permission (I2/521, 525). This is for people of the same age or people that we do not know (I2/530-532). With lecturers or people with a higher status, we still need to ask for permission (I2/525-526). I2 added that sometimes students avoid passing their lecturers because they do not want to disturb them (I2/494-495).
** Skipping over someone’s leg (Australians)**

I saw this behaviour when I observed four Caucasian people sitting along a very narrow corridor. There was only a very narrow space between them. I noticed a young Caucasian girl passed through them without saying anything. One of them moved a little to give a wider space, but the space was too narrow so that the girl (who wanted to pass through) should skip over the knee of one of the students. I did not hear / see any complaint, verbally or nonverbally. In another time, I saw an Asian male student skipped over a Caucasian male student’s leg and there was not any complaint at all.

In general, Australian respondents considered this behaviour as not really appropriate. A12 for example said that “I wouldn’t skip over the person’s leg, I’d walk, just walk around and avoid it but I think that is quite funny that someone did that” (248/249). However, A3 said: “If it’s just over someone’s feet, I don’t think that’s considered as impolite. If you have to go quite close to them, then yes it would be impolite” (A3/65-67).

About this behaviour, three Indonesian respondents’ opinion was stronger that Australian view. For instance, I2 emphasized that people “tidak boleh skali [melangkahi orang]” (I2/500) - (should not [skip someone’s leg] at all).

** 4.2.7 Public Display of Affective Behaviours (Proxemics, Kinesics and Touching Behaviours)**

One day I saw a couple of Caucasian appearance, aged between 20-30 years old, walking within a half-arm distance and holding hands with each other. On another day, I saw a young man and a young woman walking together with a very close space (less than half-arm) and kissed each other, while another couple of Caucasian appearance walked together with a very close space toward a stairs. When they almost reached the stairs, they embraced each other and laughed together. I also observed a Caucasian man and a Caucasian woman who were sitting in the library. The woman leant her head on the man’s shoulder to see something on the laptop that was used by the man. All the touching behaviours that have been described above were very common during my observations. In these descriptions, the touching behaviour was not quite obvious because the people did the behaviour while walking or working.
However, on other occasions, the touching behaviour was very obvious. For example, one day, I saw a young Caucasian couple in front of a university building, a place that was passed by many people. The man sat on a bench and the woman sat on the man’s lap. They embraced each other, caressed each other and also kissed each other. On another day, a young Caucasian couple sat on the lawn while embracing and kissing each other. I also saw several times young Caucasian couples (sometimes group of people) lying side by side on the lawn.

In interviews, A8 (aged 30) thought that displaying affective behaviour in public is “acceptable” and is just “Australian culture or Western culture perhaps” (A8/192). On the other hand, A9 (aged 56) gave negative response about this matter by saying that “... particularly on campus I do find it offensive when young people are very affectionate to one another in my sight” (A9/227-228). Considering that A8 is a young student and A9 is an old student, I then thought maybe that their opinions reflected a generational difference. However, my interview with A11 revealed that actually age gap may not be really the case. She thought that “… there’s just an opinion differences” (A11/491).

I found later that two factors may determine the acceptability of an affective behaviour. The first factor is the level of seriousness. It seems that, in general, sitting closely up to kissing, might be generally acceptable, while really involved kissing might not be acceptable in public. The other factor is the place where the behaviour occurs. In libraries, for examples, it is not acceptable to show affective behaviour (A7/353-358, A10/177-178) but on lawns would be fine (A7/327-329, A10/178-179).

One thing that should be noted is that although several behaviours are not really acceptable, people will not approach couples who do such things in public. A5, for instance, said that “… we’re not going to go and say you shouldn’t do that. We just pretend, try and pretend they didn’t see it ...” (A5/24-25).

During my observations, I did not find any affective behaviour displayed by Indonesian students in public places. I suspected that this is because such behaviour is not
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appropriate in Indonesian universities. Therefore, I tried to investigate in interviews, to know to what extent public display of affective behaviour is or is not acceptable in Indonesian universities. The result is summarized in table 3 in appendix 8.

In table 3, green colour highlights positive attitude, red colour represents negative attitudes, and purple colour represents the “in-between” attitudes. N/D (not discussed) is used both for behaviours that were not discussed and for cases where examples were not provided.

This table shows that displays of affective behaviours in university environments might not be acceptable in Indonesia. Walking together may be the only acceptable behaviour in most places. Walking together with very close space, holding hands, slinging an arm over one’s shoulder, and hugging - although acceptable or common in two universities, are still debatable issues in most other places. Even in Jakarta, which is the most modern city in Indonesia, the acceptability of certain behaviour may depend on the characteristic of the university. As can be seen in row 2 and 3, walking together and holding hand are not an issue in university X, but is considered unacceptable in university Y, which is a teacher college. Lying together in groups was reported only by one respondent who saw the behaviour only in one faculty. Three respondents discussed embracing and kissing, mentioning that such behaviours are not acceptable.

4.2.8 Physical Appearance (Dress Codes)
At the beginning of March 2008, when the weather was still hot, I observed the way Caucasian people and Indonesian students dressed. A summary of the result can be seen in table 4 in appendix 9. The columns of the table show types of upper clothes, while the rows show types of lower clothes (the definition of each kind of clothes can be seen in appendix 10). Numbers in the cells of table 4 show the number of students wearing certain combination of clothes during my observations. “I” stands for Indonesian students while “C” stands for Caucasian people. For example, number 1 appears in the cell situated under the column of “tight t-shirt/blouse” and on the row of “mini skirt”. This means that there was one person who wore a combination of a tight t-shirt/blouse with a mini skirt.
Several things can be concluded based on the data summarized in table 4. First, in hot weather, Caucasian women wore more varied clothes compared to Indonesian women. Almost all kinds of clothes are exemplified by Caucasian people. In contrast, from nine kinds of upper clothes, only four kinds of upper clothes are seen among Indonesian students. For lower clothes, among seven kinds, only three kinds are evident among Indonesian students. Second, it appears that Caucasian women covered less part of their bodies compared to Indonesian students. For upper clothes, more than half Caucasian students that I observed (28 of 41) wore short sleeves tight or semi-tight t-shirts or blouses. In contrast, more than half (28 of 40) of Indonesian students that I observed wore long-sleeves upper clothes. For the lower clothes, although about 41 % (17 of 41) Caucasian students wore pants or trousers, there were about 34 % (14 of 41) students wearing basic shorts. On the other hand, 92.50 % (37 of 40) Indonesian students wore long lower clothes (pants/trousers and long skirts) and only 7.5 % (3 of 40) Indonesian students wore medium shorts. This may show a significant difference of dress codes.

With male students, the difference was seen only in terms of the lower clothes. A nearly equal number of Caucasian male students wore Bermuda / cargo shorts and long pants / trousers. On the other hand, all Indonesian male students that I observed wore long pants/trousers.

The next observation of students’ dress code was conducted between the end of March and the beginning of April. The weather at that time began to be cool. The result can be seen in table 5 in appendix 11. The table is arranged in the same way as table 4. The results for female students were almost the same as the results obtained at the beginning of March, except for the kind of Caucasian female students’ lower clothes. In the second observation, only 15.38 % (4 of 26) students wore basic shorts. 38.46 % (10 of 26) students wore pants / long trousers. Data for male students show a similar change.

In interviews, two Australian respondents confirmed that Australian students’ dress code is very casual (A12/270 and A3/259-260). A3 said in particular that “… dress code in university is very well the same as what you’d wear to go shopping or to do other things like that” (A3/265-266). Wearing casual clothes is quite understandable because students would be “quite active” (A12/276) and the weather is very hot (A12/276 and A7/284-285).
Beside that, it was also confirmed that in hot weather, it is acceptable for students to wear clothes that do not cover arms, some upper parts of one’s torso, some parts of thigh, and lower parts of legs. A1, for example, said: “I don’t think there are really any particular dress standards, as long as I guess having your torso and your, some part of your legs covered” (A1/580-582). However, it is important to see different attitude conveyed by A3:

“... this is probably one of the areas where I’m a little different to most of western cultures uhm [pause] I actually [pause] I’m a Christian and I believe in the value of a degree of modesty ...” (A3/279-281).

When I asked what he meant by modesty, this respondent answered “I actually think that it’s good, so I don’t particularly like it when a girl comes into my class dressed so as to be distracting” (A3/283-284).

In contrast to the situation in Australia, shorts, sleeveless tops and tank tops are not acceptable in Indonesian universities. However, in some private universities in Jakarta, tight clothes and short t-shirts (which could reveal someone’s belly button) are common (I3/214-217, I7/504-517). Two respondents mentioned that jeans and t-shirts are acceptable, even “standard” among students (I3/203) but some respondents said these types of clothes are not acceptable. In terms of shoes and thongs, closed shoes are always “safe”, opened shoes are still unacceptable in certain places, and thongs are not acceptable according to all respondents who talked about it. I2, for example, said “... tidak boleh pake sleeper ... sleeper itu katanya mo pi pasar” (I2/802-803) - ([students] cannot wear sleepers ... [people think that] sleepers are only for going shopping). This comment is very contrast to an Australian respondent’s opinion above: “... dress code in university is very well the same as what you’d wear to go shopping or to do other things like that” (A3/265-266).

In Indonesia, if students do not obey the rules about dress codes, the consequences may vary. At the lowest level, it makes people laugh at the person. At more serious levels, women wearing opened or tight dress might be an object of “cibiran” (I8/233) - (mocking), by male students, and even be considered as “bitchy” (I11/513-514). In one university, according to I7, male students who wore shorts to classrooms “bisa-bisa nggak bisa masuk
kelas” (I7/572) - (may not be allowed to attend the class). Breach of dress codes can even affect students’ final assessment (I2/858).

4.3 Indonesian Students’ Perception

4.3.1 General Perception about Australian Students

Out of 14 Indonesian respondents, I got the impression that only two respondents had special motivation to interact with Australian students. I9b said that the initiative to start an interaction could come from herself, or from Australian students (I9B/17-18). Another respondent explained that he felt a kind of strong motivation to integrate with Australian students (I12/187-191).

Some Indonesian respondents felt that Australian students are arrogant. For example, I11, as can be seen in the extract below, felt irritated when he found that Australian students are not responsive when he attempted to greet them.

R: Dan kayaknya juga, cenderungnya kalo bule kan, kalo misalnya nggak kenal emang, nggak nyapa gitu. Jadi saya juga cenderungnya, waktu pertama-pertama saya datang saya kan, nyapa semua orang yang saya ketemu, tapi lama-lama, kok dikacangin juga, jadinya males itu jadinya. . .

I: Dikacangin itu apa ya?

R: Kayak dicuwekin =gitu lho=


R: Trus, jadinya ya, skarang, kalau misalnya mereka nggak nyapa atau nggak kelihatan antusias dengan kehadiran saya, saya juga nggak yang berusaha, wah gimana itu, soalnya, kesannya, kayaknya ke desperate gitu lho.

(I11B/164-173)

R: … when I had just arrived, I greet all people that I met, but after a while, I was dikacangin, so I just felt lazy ...

I: What does dikacangin mean?

R: It likes, I was ignored, like that.
R: So, now, if they [Australian students] don’t greet [me], or if it seems that they were not enthusiastic with my presence, I don’t try [to initiate an interaction] as well, well what should I say, it’s because, my impression, I feel desperate, like that.

I11’s expression “nggak kelihatan antusias” - (does not seem enthusiastic) could give a clue that the Australian students might answer his greeting, but the way they answer, perhaps from their intonation or facial expression, was not satisfying enough for I11.

The impression that Australian students were unwilling to talk can be also caused by their sitting preference in tutorials. For example, I14 felt that Australian students were unwilling to talk with her and other Asian students, because they tend to sit separately from other students in tutorials (I14/275-282).

Based on the description above, it is not difficult to see that interactions between Indonesian and Australian students are very limited. During my observations, only in one tutorial I could see Indonesian students talk to Caucasian students, and that was not a long conversation. There was just one occasion where I found an Indonesian student talking with some Caucasian students in a group, but that was during a break time, and it seemed to me that they were discussing a project, so it might not have been a social conversation.

In interviews, I asked Indonesian students what they think is the cause of the limited interaction. One explanation was because Australian students looked very busy. I7 said:


I think, there are friends [Australian students] with whom we can’t make any interaction, because it seems to me that they are very busy. So we, usually Indonesians tend to observe first whether a person can be engaged in a
conversation or not, [we try to think first] if we talk to them, will they feel disturbed or not, [it’s like that], isn’t it?

In this case, there might be a tendency to assess someone’s situation before initiating a conversation. Considering that this assessment happens before an interaction, most probably it is done by interpreting someone’s nonverbal behaviours.

One nonverbal behaviour that might prevent Indonesian students from initiating a conversation is the tendency among Australian students to remain within their own group. In tutorials, Australian students tend to separate themselves (I14/279-282) or sit with other Australian students (I8B/175-176). I14 and I8 interpreted this as a sign of disinterest. I8 said:


“[Local students] are relatively passive. Relatively passive. And if there are other Australians, they, or students that they already know, they will talk to them. So, it is still clustered.

It might be clear that the seating arrangement is one nonverbal signals assessed by Indonesian students to decide whether they can initiate an interaction or not. Other behaviours, such as reading and playing with mobile phones can also be interpreted as a sign of disinterest as it is illustrated in the following extract:

R:  ... kalaupun mereka relatif diam, mereka akan cenderung, ya entah ngutang-ngutik hand phone atau apa misalkan, tapi pokoknya kalau selain baca, relatif diam atau apa, gitu aja. Pokoknya tidak akan berinteraksi.
I:  Jadi dengan kediaman mereka itu, R merasa ragu juga ya untuk memulai atau berinisiatif.
R:  Ya karna, kesannya, mereka itu kayak superstar gitu lho. Saya juga sepertinya bosan.
(I8B/209-214)
R: ... when they kept relatively silent, they would tend to, well either playing with mobile or whatever, but in short if they were not reading, they kept silent, or whatever, just like that. In short there was not interaction at all.

I: So because of their silence, R [you] felt hesitated to start or initiate [an interaction].

R: Yes, because is seemed to me that they behaved like a superstar you know. [So], I got bored as well.

Australian students’ facial expression when they talk can be also another nonverbal behaviour that becomes a constraint for an interaction. I8 reported that Australian students’ facial expression when they talked to him was flat and that made him feel uncomfortable (I8B/542-549).

4.3.2 Perception about Australian Students’ Informal Behaviours in Tutorials

As has been explained in section 4.1.2, Caucasian students’ behaviours in tutorials are more likely to be informal compared to Indonesian students. In interviews, it was clear that Australian students consider informal behaviour in tutorials as appropriate. Leaning backward, stretching one’s body, and crossing one’s leg is considered acceptable. To some extent – depending on a particular tutors’ personality – putting one’s feet up on chairs may also be acceptable.

Indonesian students’ perception on this matter ranged from very positive to slightly negative. For example, while laughing, I1 said: “Justru aku kayak asyik bebas ...” (I1/271) - (For me it’s like, enjoyable, free). For some students, the difference was taken as a cultural difference, so it is not considered as an issue. For example, I14 expressed: “Culture dia berbeda dengan kita jadi, jadi nggak ada seperti kaget itu ...” (I14/78) – (His/her (Australian students) culture is different from us so, so there was not any shock like that ...).

Nonetheless, some Indonesian students admitted that they still feel uncomfortable to see Australian students’ behaviour in tutorials. For instance, while admitted that he preferred casual style, I11 said:
“Cuman kadang-kadang tuh suka, suka kayak yang “Ih kok bule itu slengean banget sih?” Soalnya kalau di kelas human right itu, ada yang bule satu ini, emang dia suka kakinya naik, ngangkat-ngangkat ke mejasegala gitu, padahal ada dosen di depannya dan, dan kayaknya dia, nggak sama skali merasa bersalah gitu lho” (I11B/19-23).

Only sometimes [I] tended to think, tended [to think], for example, “Ih, why is that Australian too relaxed?” Because in Human Right class, there was one Australian, he really liked putting his feet up one the table like that, while a lecturer was in front of him/her and, and it seemed that he/she did not feel guilty at all you know.

4.3.3 Perception about Australian Students’ Facial Expression

In section 4.1.3, I have described and discussed Australian students' facial expression, which looks more assertive. While two Indonesian respondents (I8 and I9) did not have special thing to say about this phenomenon, most other respondents were very positive about this matter.

According to I2, the expressive facial gesture of Australian students is a reflection of “freedom of expression” (I2B/23). Another respondent admitted that she preferred the expressive way of Australian students, compared to Indonesian way of expressions, which is heavy with implicit meaning (I3B/115-1340). I6, I11 and I13 basically admired the expressive way of Australian students when they talked (I6B/208-209, I13/441-443, I11B/74-88). I13, for example, said: “Pertama apa ya, kagum, jadi, pintar skali, maksudnya eh, cara mereka berpendapat itu lho, pingin jadi kayak, kayak, kesannya pingin bisa se-pd dia gitu, ngomongnya, seperti itu kan” (I13/441-442) - (First, what is it, [I] admired [them], [it seemed that they were] very clever, I mean eh, the way they expressed opinions you know, [I] want to be like, like, [I] feel [I] want to be as confident as they are you know, the way they talk, like that). Yet, I11 said: “Tapi kadang-kadang annoying juga deh, kalo misalnya mereka menjawabnya ngasal” (I11B/88-89) - (But sometimes it is annoying as well, if for example they answer ngasal [without sufficient reasons or deep thinking]).

Another respondent (I10/56-61) felt that the expressive way of Australian people gives a dramatized effect and she thought that this is because of cultural differences. She gave an
example of an Australian expressiveness while apologizing for being late. For I10, the Australian expression is too much, because lateness is not a very serious problem for her.

4.3.4 Perception about Australian Students’ Dress Codes

It seems to me that most Indonesian respondents do not have problems with casual dress code worn by Australian students. I13B said: “Yang penting nikmatin aja, kapan lagi kuliah pake sandal jepit, nggak pa-pa sih di kelas ya ((tertawa))” (I3B/24-25) - (The important thing, just enjoy, there won’t be another time for us to wear thongs while in classrooms [attending lectures / tutorials] ((laughing))). I9 and I10 seemed to have neutral feeling about this matter. In addition, I11 explained that he does not have problem, because he knows that it is part of Australian culture (I11B/298), which is also expressed by I6 as “it’s just the way they are” (I6B/293). Similarly, for I13, although at first she felt like she wore the wrong dress - “salah kostum” in I13’s word (I13/371), later on she could understand that it is just a matter of cultural preference (I13/419-421). The change of feeling from surprising to understanding was also reported by I2 (I2B/50-52). The only thing that made her still worry is the impact of the fashion style on her daughter, who is now staying with her in Australia (I2B/52-54). Maybe she was afraid that her daughter would imitate the Australian fashion style.

However, problems related to dress code were experienced by two male respondents, I8 and I12. I8 assumed that some females wore certain kinds of dress to attract other people’s attention, while he also knew that some women do not like it when males stare at them (I8B/360-375). This made him feel uncomfortable (I8B/374). I12 admitted that he had problem in interacting with females who wear dresses that reveal certain parts of their bodies (I12B/196-198). He said: “saya merasa sedikit agak, malu-malu sendiri begitulah” (I12B/200-201) – (I feel a little bit, embarrassed like that).

Comments from male respondents above suggest that they perceive this dress code phenomenon from sexual-provocation point of view. This is quite a contrast to the opinion of an Indonesian female respondent (I6): “I do believe in the expression that pornography lies in the eyes of the holder [sic]” (I6B/452-453).

Finally, it might be interesting to review my conversation with a Moslem Indonesian female student below.
I: ... cara mereka berpakaian gitu ya, apalagi kalau summer, kan sangat berbeda
dengan kita, apalagi yang Muslim ya. Itu gimana Mbak perasaannya ngelihat
yang kayak itu?

R: Hu uh tidak comfortable, karna, karna saya tahu, itu sebetulnya tidak boleh,
gitu, dan saya merasa, kasihan sebenarnya, posisinya bukan memebenci tapi
posisinya lebih, kepada kasihan, ...

I: Prihatin gitu ya?

R: Iya, kasihan, kenapa mereka tidak menemukan yang benar itu bagaimana ya,
gitu ...

(I14/258-269)

I: ... their [Australian female students’] dress code, especially in summer, is very
different from ours, especially Moslem students. How do you feel to see that?

R: Hu uh, not comfortable because, because I know that actually it is not
appropriate and I feel sorry [for them] actually, my position is not to hate them,
but my position tends to feel sorry ...

R: Do you mean you are concerned about that?

I: Yes, I feel sorry, because they don’t what the truth is, that’s what I think ...

The respondent’s perception about female dress code that does not cover some parts
of body might be influenced by her Islamic belief. Further discussion about religious influence
on dress code will be presented later.

4.3.5 Perceptions about Public Displays of Affective Behaviours

In terms of the public display of affective behaviours, most Indonesian respondents have a
neutral perception. I6B said that this kind of behaviour does not affect her and she tends to
see that phenomenon as a new experience (I6B/508-511). Similarly, I3 felt that, except for
affective behaviour displayed by people of the same sex, she does not have problem to
see affective behaviour because it does not disturb other people (I3B/214-235). She
understands that it is part of Australian culture. A similar opinion was given by I11 who
said: “Kalau saya melihat mereka, ehm, kayaknya ndak ada yang salah dengan itu itu”
(I11B/274-275) - (If I see them, ehm, I think there is nothing wrong with that). In addition, I8
might not have problem as well since he considered such behaviour as part of Australian value (I8/390-396). Finally, although I10 still felt uncomfortable with this behaviour, she tended to ignore her own feelings (I10/72-73).

A startled feeling on seeing affective behaviours in public might be experienced by Indonesian respondents at the early stage of their settling in process in Australia. I2 and I9 said that they were shocked to see such behaviour for the first time, but later on they could moderate their feeling (I2B/50-52, I9B/42-45). However, I2 was still feeling uncomfortable especially when she considered the effect that it might have on her daughter who is now living with her (I2B/52-54). I9 was also still feeling uncomfortable with kissing (“involved kissing) done by students in public places where many people come and go (I9B/44-45). This shows that although these students can moderate their own feelings, it does not mean that they do not have problems anymore.

Other respondents who also have problem with the public display of affective behaviour are I13 and I12. I13 admitted that until the time of interview, she still felt “risih” (uncomfortable) and “malu” (embarrassed) (I13/375-383) to see such behaviours. I12 honestly confessed that he did not have respect for people who display affective behaviours in university environment (I12B/158-163). For him, it is not appropriate for students to exhibit such behaviours (I12B/147-149) because university is an education environment (I12B/167-168).

4.3.6 Perceptions about Australian Students’ Sitting Behaviour in the Library and on the Lawns

It seems that there is not a problematic impression among Indonesian students about Australian students’ sitting behaviours in public places such as libraries and lawns. A common expression they use in expressing their opinions was “biasa aja” (I3B/199, I6B/273, and I10/64) - (nothing special). This expression is usually used by Indonesians when they feel there is not any issue needing to be raised. However, the fact that I did not find any Indonesian student sitting on the lawn indicates that the students would be less inclined to sit there.
4.4 Australian Students’ Perception

First of all, it needs to be emphasized that some Australian students who participated in my research had overseas living or studying experience. This fact highlights the possibility that most respondents are quite tolerant of cultural differences. Their knowledge that I am an Indonesian and my wearing of a veil may also have made respondents be more careful in giving an opinion. Therefore, the perception presented below might be the moderate perception. Different perception (could be more negative) might be found if interviews are conducted with Australian students who do not have overseas experience or, if the interviewer is a person who has another cultural background and does not wear a veil.

4.4.1 Australian Students’ Perception about International Students

None of the Australian respondents that participated in interviews had ever interacted with Indonesian students before me. This might be due to the small proportion of the number of Indonesian students. Therefore, I tried to ask respondents’ perception about international students in general in order to get some hints for analysing how they may perceive Indonesian students’ behaviour as identified during observations.

In general, it seems that Australian students do not have negative perceptions about the presence of international students. A8, for example, said:

“I really don’t see the local students being too concerned about that at all. Umm, I don’t see why they should be umm. Education is available to everyone in this country” (A8/395-397).

A11 explained more by saying:

“Well, I just think it sort of reflects Adelaide in general, or Australia in general. I mean I think if the university didn’t have international students that would be weird ....” (A11/336-337).

Another example, one respondent thought that “it’s great” to have “such a mix of students” (A12/289). While she admitted that “there are obviously people that aren’t” open minded,
she felt that she and her friends are “open to different appearance, ... different dress” and “different cultures” (A12/301-303).

Being asked why they think there is a lack of interaction between international and local students, four possible reasons were given. The first is the lack of time for interaction (A8/444-445 and A5B/162). The second is international students’ language proficiency that is perceived to be insufficient for smooth interaction with local students. A3 thought that this is a “big issue” (A3B/37) and A8 felt that this become “an excuse not to perhaps engage international students” (A8/439-444). Futher, A9 said: “English speaking Australians are lazy about listening to people that they don’t understand [laugh]” (A9/396-397) and A5 admitted that he “can’t be bothered dealing with someone whose English isn’t that good” (A5B/178-179). The third reason is that because Australians do not talk to strangers. A3 said:

“. . . Australians in general, you don’t talk to a stranger without a reason. You might sometimes for something to do, but overall I wouldn’t—you don’t always just like talking to a stranger, beyond the “Oh, it’s a cold day”. You might say that, but, but that’s hardly interaction. Uhm, and so I think there’s a, there’s an issue that, well people just don’t really have any reason to be in contact” (A3B/127-131).

This thing is reinforced with the fact that many university students are self-contained, reading books with Ipods in the ears. About this, A1 said: “Yeah. It’s something that annoys me actually [laugh] you know; everyone’s got their Ipods on their ears these days. I don’t think—to me it seems like a sort of defence against the world ...” (A1B/167-169).

The fourth reason, Australian students felt that the lack of interaction happens because people remain within their own groups. For example, A1 said:

“. . . it might not be an entirely fair thing to suggest, I would suggest that umm, there is a particularly large umm Chinese international student population here, and umm often you’ll notice that, because I’m sure it’s more comfortable, they group together and speak their own language and umm, often I think international students in general would get I guess pigeon-holed into that same kind of category, but it’s because we can see that there’s a large population of Chinese
who have ah, who like to exclusively mix umm with other Chinese only, and, you, well, I cant, inter... I can't join with them because I can't speak Mandarin...‖ (A1B/120-127).

Similar tendency may also happen among Australian students. “University is very cliquey”, according to A8 (A8/169). He said that he had seen this tendency among “Chinese students”, “Australian students” and “certain groups of people form different schools” (A8/167-169).

**4.4.2 Australian Students’ Perception about Formal Behaviours in Tutorials**

Based on my observations, I found that Indonesian students were more likely to behave formally in tutorials compared to Australian students. I tried to find out how Australian students would feel about this formality.

Two respondents expressed a positive opinion. A7 said: “I would think that they're [students who behave formally] more dedicated and attentive and polite” (A7/132). A8 gave similar opinion by saying

“Umm, I think it indicates that they’re interested in the subject, interested in the topic, umm they’re leaning forward to perhaps engage the rest of the, of the class there and I think it’s just manners” (A8/79-81).

A little bit different from A7 and A8, A3 did not explicitly express a positive perception, but he said that formal behaviours are understandable because “their behaviour is ... not, so atypical that there's any issue” (A3B/70-72). Similar opinion was also given by A1 (A1B/25-29). Problems may happen only when “somebody was sitting up very straight and was really formal and looking all the time (A7/143-145) ... It would look a little bit odd because most people are relaxed” (A7/147).

**4.4.3 Australian Students’ Perception about Head Nodding**

As has been described in section 4.1.2, I found some instances when Indonesian students nodded their heads while listening to the tutor’s explanation. Australians have the
expression “sucking up” which refers to people who “behave obsequiously esp. for one’s own advantage” (Moore 1999, p. 1340). I tried to find out whether a student’s head nodding would be perceived as “sucking up”.

Some respondents expressed that head nodding is more likely to show that someone is being listening / paying attention. For example, A8 said: “… it depends on the person, but ah I think nodding, nodding of one’s head just indicates that person is listening … and that’s, just once again they’re showing politeness” (A8/100-106).

Yet, A3 said that there would be a problem “… if it’s overdone then … it gets annoying, if this person obviously hasn’t understood, and yet they’re still indicating that they have, then that just gets confusing” (A3B/287-289).

4.4.4 Australian students’ Perception about Moslem Female Dress Codes

As has been presented in previous sections, many Indonesian students are Moslem and many of these Moslem students wear veils everyday. This is highly contrastive nonverbal phenomenon. Therefore, it becomes one important point discussed in interviews with Australian students.

Some respondents claimed that wearing veils is not a problem. “… generally Australians are open minded”, according to A12 (301). Another respondent said that he does not “really care what anyone looks like or what they wear … as long as they smile and they’re nice people (A5B/189-190). A8 thought that “women wearing the headscarf is [sic] probably international students” and “that’s about all” (A8/154-156). Another respondent commented that female students who wear veils are “beautiful” and “look so colourful” (A7/238-239). According to this respondent, the opinion that people should change their dress code when they come to Australia is “unfair” (A7/261). She said that women wearing veils remind her “… nuns…” (A7/270) who, she thought, “… deserve more respect …” (A7/276). While A7 saw the connection between veils and religion as respectful thing, A11 thought that “a lot of people feel sorry for people who they feel are trapped in a religion” (A11/415-416). Yet, she continued saying:
“I think that that's a general thing about religion in general and not a personal thing. So for instance if I saw you in summer and I was in shorts and a singlet and you were like that I'd just think, oh I hope, she must be hot in there. And then uhm but not think anything more of it, just think lucky that I don't have to ...” (A11/416-420).

About the astonishment felt by Australian students at women wearing veils in hot weather was also experienced by an Indonesian respondent (I9). An Australian student in I9’s tutorial said that he cannot imagine how it feels to wear veils in hot weather (I9B/37-39).

While, basically, wearing veil is not a problem, it still results in certain effect that may lead to difficulties in interactions. A1, for example said:

“it's [veil] umm something that's from when we were younger, not having to, not seeing a lot of, and umm it definitely makes a solid statement of there being some obvious differences” (A1B/99-101).

Another example, A5 admitted:

“... if I see someone dressed like you, I'm maybe less inclined to go and talk to you because maybe I think oh maybe she doesn't wanna talk to a strange, strange man or something you know. So I, more out of respect than, than maybe fear or you know like ...” (A5/197-199).

The uncertain feeling to initiate an interaction with women in veils might be reinforced when the women are in group as A1 explained:

“... so women such as yourself with the, with the head scarf, if there are a number of them umm, it, it creates sort of an impression of umm of a, of a private club, or sort of a, a group where you don't want to intrude on that, umm or, yeah, I guess it's a sort of, it's a signal of, a signal of umm belonging to a certain club, religion obviously” (A1B/70-74).
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This chapter presents further discussion of the nonverbal behaviours as reported in chapter four. First, I explain and interpret the behaviours by referring to the common beliefs and practices within Indonesian and Australian societies, in order to understand what cultural values lie behind the behaviours. Sometimes, similar findings in other cultures will be used as comparisons. After that, I will discuss some possible problems that may happen because of the cultural differences, either in the Australian or Indonesian context.

5.1 Similarities and Differences between Indonesian and Australian Students’ Nonverbal Behaviour

5.1.1 Similar Behaviours in Tutorials
Firstly, in tutorials, there was a similar tendency among Indonesian and Caucasian students to sit alone when the majority of students came from similar cultural background that was different to their own. When there were two or more Indonesian students, they tended to sit together. Similarly, although in some classes some Caucasian students sat separately, perhaps because they did not know each other, in some occasions Caucasian students sat together in a group.

Some comments from Indonesian respondents suggested that this phenomenon can be regarded as a reflection of collectivist value. It was found that cooperation is more preferable among people who believe in the dependency of people on one another (Wagner III 1995, p. 167). Sitting together is considered to facilitate students helping each other. For example, when Indonesian students do not understand the meaning of an English word mentioned by teachers, students would ask their friends, and the friends would usually help by giving the Indonesian translation of the word. Helping each other is one of the core values taught in Indonesian education. This pattern of helping each other
was also found among Chinese students studying in America, who tend to work in groups rather than working individually (Wagner III 1995, p. 155).

Australia is claimed as the second most individualistic society (Hofstede & Hofstede 2005, pp. 78-79). If the collectivism-individualism dichotomy is used one may hypothesize that Australians will not tend to be together in groups, as happens with collectivist groups. In fact, there was a similar in-group tendency among Australian students. In interviews, an Australian respondent said:

“… it's easier to see Asian students sitting together than Australian students who like cricket sitting together. You just don’t notice it. Uhm and so there’s that, but you do notice sort of that the, the big guys down the back who make a lot of jokes, they sit together …” (A3/954-957).

Moreover, an Australian respondent said:

“I guess from, from my experiences when I lived overseas I associated with people who I felt comfortable with. When I was in Japan, people who spoke English as their first language, and I think in any situation people will naturally gravitate towards groups of people who they can relate to and feel comfortable with, who share the same language umm, but umm I see the same here with the Chinese students. I see it with the Australians students, I see it with certain groups of people from different schools. Umm, university is very cliquey …” (A8/163-169).

Therefore, the tendency to remain within one’s group might happen within both Indonesian and Australian groups. This might be in line with Gudykunst et al. (1996, p. 51) who conclude that “… individualism and collectivism exist in all cultures …”.

It is still questionable whether the motives of Australian students in sitting together is the need for helping each other, which is probably the main motivation for Indonesian students, or because they feel more comfortable to be together with people with similar English / western cultural background. Assuming that independent learning is strongly expected in Australian higher education, the reason could not be for helping each other, as Chalmers and Volet (1997, p. 92) said that, rather than forming an informal helping
network for learning purposes, there was a greater tendency among Australian students to spend time with peers in social and sport activities. Yet, it would be interesting to have a further investigation of whether the tendency to be independent in academic activity would also be maintained when Australian students studying abroad.

It could be speculated that, while the tendency to sit together and remain within one’s cultural groups was more likely to occur among Indonesian students, it may also happen among some Australian students. The motive for Indonesian students can be for both Academic and Social activities. For Australians, the tendency is more likely to be for social purpose, unless we can prove that Australians who study abroad form a pattern of togetherness. While sitting together can be useful for Indonesian students, it can also become a source of misunderstanding among Australian students, a point I will elaborate later in section 5.2.1.

It was similarly found that Indonesian and Caucasian students used eye gaze in much the same way in tutorials. While listening, students gazed toward tutors, except when it was necessary for them to look at the whiteboard, projector screen or books. Similarly, while talking, they gazed toward tutors most of the time. There was only one occasion where I found a Caucasian student talked while gazing toward other students. The student was a mature student, much older than other students. Probably, this age factor made her more confident to talk while looking at other students. In interviews, Indonesian and Australian students similarly confirmed that eye gazing is considered as a sign of attention.

A similar phenomenon was also found in terms of hand movements. I did not find significant differences in the hand movements of Indonesian and Caucasian students. Yet, further research that can capture the hand movements with video recording would be useful since there can be very subtle characteristics that cannot be seen only with ordinary observation.

Head nodding is a similar matter. The display of such a gesture is considered as a signal of attention. However, the possible association of head nodding with flattering gesture (sucking up or brown nosing) is interesting. Interview results suggest that it may happen in Indonesian and Australian context, although, I suspect, the extent that one’s head nodding
can be associated with flattering can be different. Again, video recording would be useful for a detailed and careful analysis of this behaviour.

Finally, data from tutorials show that the sitting posture of Indonesian and Caucasian students when they were talking in tutorials was almost identical. Indonesian students’ sitting posture was still more formal compared to Caucasian students, but the difference was not very obvious. However, there were several sitting behaviours of Caucasian students, confirmed later by Australian students as acceptable behaviours, that were considered unacceptable by Indonesian students. These behaviours will be discussed in section 5.1.2.

5.1.2 Different Behaviours in Tutorials

Smiling
I have described previously that smiling cannot be merely regarded as a sign of understanding. Information from Indonesian respondents confirmed that smiling may be also displayed although students have not understood the subject matter completely.

This tendency may be a reflection of the students’ tendency to avoid conflict, which, according to several sources, happens more in collectivist, rather than in individualist cultures (Obuchi & Takahashi 1994, cited in Haar & Krahé 1999, p. 668). In tutorials that I observed, the conflicts were not obvious, but interviews with Indonesian students suggested that the students might have internal conflicts. They were fearful that they would be considered dumb if they admitted that they did not understand, or that they would make lecturers feel disappointed. This is similar to Japanese students. In a study by Kato (2001), Australian students reported that Japanese students did not ask questions in classrooms, even when they did not understand (p. 62).

In contrast, I did not see any similar instances with Caucasian students in tutorials. However, it does not mean that they do not experience internal conflicts. One Australian respondent told me:
“Most people I know would probably just suggest that they do understand and then later on try to look up the solution by themselves but umm it depends on the person” (A1/123-125).

Yet, my interview with an Australian respondent suggests that smiling may not be a typical facial expression displayed by Australian students when they do not understand (A3B/240-247).

The smiling phenomenon can be also explained by using the face-theory framework. Face, in Brown and Levinson’s study (1987, cited in Mao 1994, p. 454), is defined as “the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself” and it can be categorized into negative face: “one’s want to be unimpeded by others and to one’s claim to freedom of action” (p. 455) and positive face: “one’s want to be appreciated and approved of by others” (p. 455). In the case of Indonesian students’ smile in tutorials (when they did not understand), some comments from Indonesian students (for example one of them said that he did not want to be considered as a slow learner (I14/438-439)) suggest that students were saving their own face. Admitting that they did not understand would threaten their positive face, their desire to be recognized as a good (smart) student. Comments from other students (for example one respondent said that she felt sorry for the teacher who had been tired giving explanation, yet students did not understand (I13/497-498)) gave another explanation that students smiled because they did not want to make the teacher feel bad. In this case, students tried to save the teacher’s positive face, that is the teacher’s willingness to be appreciated for his/her knowledge.

In the latter case, the face issue can be more significant in Indonesian culture, compared to Australian culture. As a comparison, the concept of face in Chinese can be used. In Chinese culture: the concept of face is realized into “miànzi” and “liǎn” (Mao 1994, p. 457). The latter concept, while it is similar to Brown and Levinson’s concept of positive face above, has a “distinctive moral overtone” (Mao 1994, p. 461) and is “more socially situated” (p. 462). In the light of this concept of liǎn, I would speculate that in Indonesian context, the face of teachers is more likely to be a liǎn. Teachers, in Indonesia, are considered, not only as a source of knowledge, but also of moral teaching. That means, to threaten teacher’s face (liǎn), can be considered as to threaten teachers’ moral prestige.

Smiling may have a delicate meaning in the Indonesian context. I remember my experience having a conversation with a school principal in a village in South Sulawesi. At
that time, I was doing field work, normally required to be conducted by university students at the end of their undergraduate study. I and my friends were arranging a leadership training program, and we talked to a school principal about our planning. At that time, we were accompanied by a young boy from the village. We were intending to convince the school principal that it is important for students in his school to attend the training, and we were hoping that he would give permission to all students to attend the training. During the conversation, the principal nodded his head and smiled frequently. He did not say anything that could be literally interpreted as a rejection, nor did he express any agreement. Being a young student, who was not aware of any cultural issue, I insisted on asking the principal whether he agreed or not with my proposal, yet he just smiled. I remember that there was a few minutes silence after that. I thought I kept looking at the principal’s face, still waiting for his answer, until the principal’s smile disappeared. After that, the young boy who accompanied us thanked the principal and asked permission to leave (I thought he was more aware of the problem). I left the principal’s house with a very confused feeling, still not understanding why it was difficult for the principal to express his opinion. If he had expressed his objection, I would have a reason to cancel the program, but since he did not say anything verbally, I did not have reasons for doing so. His smile and silence, for me at that time, were not legitimate enough for me to say that he did not agree with my proposal. In my opinion, the problem in the story above arose because I was not aware of the meaning of the principal’s smile and head nodding. I did not realize that the smile and head nodding was only a matter of keeping one’s face. There could be two explanations. First, the principal did not agree with my proposal, but he did not want to give an impression that he was not supportive, whereas in fact, as an important figure in the village, he was supposed to support students who did fieldwork in his place. In this case, he was saving his own face. Second, the principal maybe knew that not many students would be willing to attend the program, but he did not want to make me feel disappointed, which meant that he was saving my face. In both cases, probably, the principal was having a good intention to maintain harmonious relationship. Whichever was the true case, his smile was probably enough to be an answer, if I had been sensitive to nonverbal issues in communication. This could be a useful insight for Australian students, who might rely more on verbal expression, to interpret smiles in conversations with Indonesians.

---

8 I grew up in another part of Indonesia, where people are culturally more direct in expressing their opinion.
Body posture while sitting, body movements, yawning and body stretching

I have described previously that Caucasian students' behaviours in tutorials were more informal compared to Indonesian students. Students' body posture, body movements, yawning and body stretching showed that Caucasian students might consider tutorials to be an informal situation. In interviews, some Australian respondents considered these behaviours inappropriate but some thought them acceptable as long as they do not create any disturbance. The fact that some respondents considered such behaviour as acceptable, confirmed by the absence of complaint from tutors during my observations, is an indication that display of the behaviours might not be a serious issue in Australia.

On the other hand, my interviews with Indonesian students revealed that for them, sitting posture is an important behaviour in classes. Students are expected to restrain their body movements. Yawning and stretching the body in the classroom, in Indonesian context, can be considered as a sign of inattentiveness or boredom.

It can be seen here that the meaning of 'good' sitting posture, body movements, yawning and body stretching in showing the attentiveness, or otherwise boredom is more likely to be emphasized in Indonesian context. In my opinion, what creates the different level of meaning in Indonesian and Australian context is the degree of verbal participation. Higher degree of verbal participation, such as in Australian classrooms, makes some nonverbal signals be disregarded, and lower degree of verbal participation increases people's attention on the nonverbal signals. This is in line with the difference between low-context cultures that put high emphasis on verbal expressions and high-context cultures in which nonverbal signals have important functions (Hall 1976, p. 79; Gustafsson 2009, p.16).

Sitting on the floor in classrooms

In Australia, it seems that under certain circumstances, such as when students doing group work, or when there are no available seats, it is acceptable for students to sit on the floor in the classroom. On the other hand, in one tutorial that I observed, I noticed that some Asian students who came late kept standing until the tutor took the initiative to take some chairs from the next room for them. The same thing may also happen with Indonesian students considering that in Indonesia, I never found any student sitting on the floor. More explanation can be found on page 96-97.
Body movements and facial expression (including smiling) while talking

I have explained previously that Indonesian students' body movement and facial expressions were constrained when they offered opinions in tutorials. The only facial expression that was frequently displayed was a smile. In interviews, Indonesian respondents claimed that Indonesians were not expected to be expressive or assertive in giving opinion.

On the other hand, some Caucasian students were more expressive. Later in interviews, Australian students confirmed that it is common for students to be expressive when they give opinions.

The expectation in Indonesian culture for people not to be very expressive in giving opinions can be related to the value of maintaining harmony. In Indonesian conversations, people are expected to keep the harmony, that is, they try to avoid creating any negative emotions in their interlocutors. “… sensing the feelings of others thus becomes an art, the art of staying out of trouble and, naturally, of getting one’s way” (Mulder 1996, p. 102, cited in Haar & Krahé 1999, p. 668). Disagreement needs to be conveyed in such a way that it does not cause any negative feeling or reaction. This tendency to neutralize disagreement might be the reason why Indonesian students were constrained from being too expressive in giving opinions.

The tendency to maintain a harmonious situation, reflected in the inexpressiveness of Indonesian students, is more likely to be preserved in classroom interactions where teachers are regarded as having more power than students. One Indonesian respondent commented in the interview that Indonesian students’ inexpressiveness reflects how Indonesian students were accustomed to the educational system in Indonesia, which placed teachers ‘on a pedestal’. In fact, as a reaction to a project promoting students’ participation in the classroom, many Indonesian education practitioners felt that the program can make students “deviate from the norms of a school culture which has been based on conformity, obedience, and passive reception of ideas and information from the teacher” (Tomlinson 1990, p. 33). This is also highlighted in the following description of a typical day of Santoso, an Indonesian primary school student in 1980s.
“The classroom environment is characterized by strictness and formality. Santoso’s teachers firmly discipline those who misbehave and maintain their authoritarian position at all times. Santoso is taught to memorize facts using routine and repetition; there is very little space to debate or discuss the “whys” of the lecture. Instead, Santoso is instructed to listen, comply, and repeat what he is taught” (Christano & Cummings 2007, p.134).

This description is based on the situation in 1980s, the year when most of my Indonesian respondents had their primary education, suggesting that they might have similar experiences. Indeed, this is reflected in my interviews with them. This schooling culture might have been internalized and was being reflected in the behaviour of Indonesian students.

On the other hand, Australian students’ expressiveness may reflect the absence of fear among them in asserting ideas. In fact, one of the nine values taught in Australian education is “freedom”, which ensures that students “enjoy all the rights and privileges of Australian citizenship free from unnecessary interference or control, and stand up for the rights of others” (Department of Education, Science and Training 2005, p.4).

This tendency to neutralize other people’s feeling may lead Indonesians to smile a lot. Probably, it is hoped that by smiling, people can reduce the possible negative impact of disagreement. In the classroom, smiling displayed by Indonesian students while giving opinions might also be intended to reduce their nervous feelings. This may also happen in Australian culture but the cause might be more psychological in nature. One Australian respondent told me that he also smiled to reduce his nervous feelings.

**Pointing behaviour**

In my observations, I found some Caucasian students who pointed directly toward the tutors. In one case, the tutor mentioned a name, and a student, said “No, no, that’s Harris”. While saying this, the student stretched out her arm and pointed toward the tutor using the pen she was holding at that time. I did not see any specific negative reaction from the tutor. The very first impression I felt was that I would not do such pointing behaviour with
my lecturers in Indonesia. In contrast, interviews with Australian respondents reveal that pointing behaviour can be acceptable as long as it does not sound like ‘you’.

Actually, there was an indication in interviews with Indonesian students that pointing behaviour can be also acceptable in Indonesia if it is not meant to intimidate other people. However, I was told a real story about this (N Otoluwa 1994, pers. comm., 20 June). He was presenting his thesis in front of some examiners. While talking, he moved his hands and fingers, as if he was pointing toward the examiner. He was quite sure that he was not intimidating the examiner. In fact, he was explaining a theory at that time, far from any intimidating purpose. But, interestingly, the examiner hit his hand and asked him to be more careful not to do the pointing. This story gives a clue that Indonesians are very sensitive with the pointing behaviour. Such gesture can be quickly recognized as a dominant gesture.

Therefore, I suspect that the acceptability of pointing behaviour in Indonesian context has something more to do with power relationships. The content of verbal speech can be easily ignored when people start to talk with dominant gestures. On the other hand, Australians, as I have described in the example above, may have a lower sensitivity toward nonverbal gesture. This speculation needs further research using videotapes of students’ pointing behaviours. The recording could be used to elicit opinions from both Indonesian and Australian viewers, so the factors influencing the meaning of the behaviour can be convincingly explained. With more findings, we can be more confident to determine the position of Indonesia and Australia within Hall’s (1976, p. 79) high- and low-context culture theory, especially when we refer to what Gustafsson (2009, p.16) said, in explaining Hall’s idea, that high-context culture is greatly characterized by the use of nonverbal messages, in strong contrast to low-context culture that puts much emphasis on verbal messages.

**Hand raising to ask questions in tutorials**

During my observations, I never found any Indonesian student who asked questions or gave opinions without raising their hands as an indication of their intentions. There were two similar instances among Caucasian students, but there were also some Caucasian students who talked straight, even (from my perspective) interrupted the tutor. In
interviews, according to some Australian respondents, it is considered acceptable for students just to speak out without raising their hands first.

In my experience in Indonesia, students need to raise their hands to indicate their intention to ask a question. I could not recall any moment when students just speak out to give comments. Most of the time, lecturers would speak for a certain duration of time. Some lecturers would pause several times to check whether students want to ask questions, while other lecturers prefer to teach the whole lesson first, and use the rest of the time for question and answer session.

In contrast, in Australian tutorials, it seems to me that tutors were more likely to make the flow of discussion rather informal. Many times, there was no clear division of time indicating the turns for tutors and students to talk. It seems also that Caucasian students were very relaxed and talk whenever they want to talk. Many tutors welcome spontaneous participation and interruptions as long as students stayed on the topic and do not dominate the discussion (R Amery 2009, pers. comm., 18 June).

This difference reflects how the classroom atmosphere is different in Indonesian and Australian cultures. Indonesian students who are accustomed to classrooms operating in more formal way might face some problems as will be discussed on page 114.

**The use of hand**

The use of the right and the left hand is still an issue in the Indonesian context, especially among Moslem people. The preference of the right hand for eating and for giving or receiving things is still emphasized in educating young children either at schools or informal religious courses.

On the other hand, as has been indicated in interviews with Australian students, there is no such restriction on the use of the right and the left hand. Handedness, that can be genetic or biological in nature (Denny & O'Sullivan 2007, pp. 356-357), is more likely to be the determinant factor of hand preference in Australia.
Nonverbal behaviour when students come late

There was a slight difference in the way that students deal with coming late in Indonesian and Australian contexts. From seven cases of late arrival among Caucasian students, only one student walked in while smiling and saying sorry to the tutor. In six other cases, Caucasian students walked into the class and had a seat. In interviews, Australian respondents’ comments suggested that this behaviour may be acceptable. Similar behaviour was also displayed in five late arrival cases of Indonesian students, but in three other cases, students displayed interesting nonverbal behaviours, including opening the door carefully and smiling to tutors, or not to any particular person.

The interesting nonverbal behaviour of Indonesian students might reveal that they tried to minimize the effect of the lateness. Results from interviews with Indonesian students convey that in Indonesian universities, some lecturers did not allow students to come into the class when they come late. This might be the result of schooling practices in Indonesia where teachers are encouraged to maintain their “responsibility as authoritarians and disciplinarians” (Noel, Shoemake & Hale 2006, p. 431). In my interview, an Indonesian respondent who worked as a lecturer in Indonesia felt that “menjadi bagian dari seorang pengajar untuk memberitahukannya” (I12/84) - (it is one of teachers’ responsibilities to tell them [to admonish students for showing unexpected attitude]). This is, again, a reflection of the greater strength of the power relations and resulting distance between teachers and students in Indonesia, which is in contrast to Australian higher education practices that promote egalitarian values.

However, the similar behaviour between Indonesian and Caucasian students mentioned above needs to be explained. There can be two possibilities: the practice is considered acceptable in Indonesian classrooms, or the students learned the behaviour in Australia. Information from Indonesian respondents, as well as my own experience, shows that lecturers in Indonesia may have varying attitudes about late students. While some are quite strict, some others tolerate the habit. Quite probably, some Indonesian students are familiar with the different attitude among their Indonesian lecturers, which makes them easy to learn quickly the acceptable practice in Australian classes.

This is not to suggest that coming late is acceptable in Australia. In fact, lateness has been considered as one of the problems that can disturb group discussion, according to a study about problem-based learning in a medical program of University of Sydney (Hendry, Ryan
Therefore, it was surprising for me to find some Caucasian students in the observed tutorials come late. I thought that maybe the students were not Australians, but in interviews with Australian students, I did not find a very serious comment, let alone any discussion about punishment, regarding the late arrival. The Australian students that I interviewed in general were more concerned with whether the coming late is disrupting the class or not. In the study of Hendy, Ryan and Harris (2003) mentioned above, teachers and students did not mention setting up classroom regulation and punishment as the way to solve the problems of unpunctuality (p. 612). This moved me to another alternative explanation. Perhaps, in Australia, especially in university, students are supposed to be responsible for their own learning process. There might not be a feeling of obligation among teachers to tell students what they should or should not do.

5.1.3 Similar Behaviour in Public Places around Universities

In my observations, I found some behaviour of Caucasian students that seem to be similar to Indonesian students' behaviour. Firstly, I found that, while having conversations, some Caucasian students kept standing, some others found places to sit. There was an instance when two students were having a conversation. One of them was sitting on the floor, the other one was standing. The positions of the body displayed by Caucasian students when they talked were similar to those of Indonesian students. Secondly, I found that while having conversations, Caucasian students were either in face-to-face or side-by-side-positions. In observations of Indonesian students, apart from observations of one conversation where students sat side-by-side while having a conversation, I did not find any other observable conversation. However, based on my personal experience as an Indonesian student, I felt that the behaviours of Caucasian students above are similar to those of Indonesian students, and there might not be any problems related to these behaviours.

5.1.4 Different Behaviours in Public Places around Universities

Smiling at strangers

An Indonesian respondent said that the smile displayed by Australians to strangers can be considered as unusual in the Indonesian context. I reflected back on my experience during
my stay in Australia. Many times, Australian people, whom I do not know, smiled to me whenever I met their eyes by chance. At first, I felt such behaviour was strange, although I felt happy and welcomed. I tried to reflect back on my experiences in my home town. I felt that not many Indonesians are willing to smile at strangers.

The difference between Australians and Indonesians in this regard is similar to the explanation given by Osland et al. (1993, pp. 71-72) about Costa Rican bank clerks who tend not to greet and maintain eye contact with costumers. The tendency is regarded as a reflection of ingroup-outgroup difference (Triandis 1972, cited in Triandis et al. 1988, p. 325) (see my previous explanation on page 18). In the Japanese context, Patterson et al. (2007) have conducted experiments to investigate the behaviour of Japanese and Americans when they walked passing a stranger (acted by a confederate). It was found that, compared to Americans, Japanese displayed fewer examples of glances, smiles, head nodding and greetings (p. 163). The authors, based on the concept of ingroup-outgroup distinction and face saving, argued that “in Japan there is little pressure to reciprocate the smile of the confederate because there is no relationship with the confederate and because it might risk unwanted exposure to a stranger” (p. 164). This argument, I think, can also explain the similar tendency within the Indonesian context.

Another explanation can be given from a religious (Islamic) point of view. Indonesian Moslem females might be restrained from smiling to a male since in Islam, males and females are required to lower their gaze. More explanation will be given in another section about eye contact.

**Head nodding, head tossing, eye contact, inter-personal space and passing people in the corridor: the significance of status awareness**

There are several contrasting behaviours in Indonesian and Australian cultures that might be problematic for Australian students if they have interactions in an Indonesian context. The first thing is the difference between head nodding and head tossing⁹. In Indonesia, both behaviours can be used for greeting, but whether one will use head nodding or head tossing would depend on the age and status of the person. Head tossing can be used to greet people with lower status. It can be also used to greet other people with similar age or

---

⁹ Head tossing is conducted by moving the head backward.
status. On the other hand, head nodding is usually used to greet older people, or people with a higher status. When there is an overlapping between age and status, the action would depend on individual preference. Some young people with high status are keen to greet older people with lower status with head nodding, and this is usually appreciated as a ‘down to earth’ behaviour.

In contrast, I cannot recall head tossing displayed in Australian context. Head tossing, especially if it appears to have connotation with status maintenance can be perceived negatively. An Australian expression for this is ‘nose in the air’.

With the head nodding, I found only a very few cases. More common gestures I observed when people meet or passed each other are hand waving and smiling, which are usually accompanied with verbal greetings. In daily interactions, I greet my lecturers and supervisor in the same way as I greet my friends, usually with smiles and verbal greetings, although sometimes I cannot help not to nod my head.

Another behaviour related to the status awareness is eye contact. I have explained in chapter 4 (page 33) that in both Indonesian and Australian cultures, lack of eye contact in conversation can be regarded as not paying attention. For most Indonesian respondents, maintaining eye contact is not problematic. This could be understood since Indonesian students who are now studying in Australia had pre-departure training before they came to Australia, in which cross-culture training was also taught. In my experience attending this course, I was told that in Australia, people are expected to maintain eye contact while having conversations. However, one respondent still said that he had difficulty to maintain eye contact with people whom he considered as having higher status than him, such as lecturers.

In the case of interactions with parents and lecturers, I would argue that the tendency not to maintain eye contact can be a reflection of a power distance value. Teachers are considered as having a higher status than students. So “when speaking with a teacher, a student usually will not maintain direct eye contact, instead keeping his head tilted slightly forward with chin down to show a respectful demeanor” (Noel, Shoemake & Hale 2006, p. 433). In such interactions, eye contact would be considered as a challenge.
On the other hand, eye contact is positively valued in Australian interactions, and it might not have any association with the power-distance matter. Absence of eye contact when the interlocutor is addressed by an authority figure (e.g., teachers, policemen, doctors, etc.) may be interpreted as inattention, insolence, defiance, dishonesty or being uncooperative (R. Amery 2009, pers. comm., 21 May).

In addition, in the Indonesian context, space may be also quite related to social status. In gatherings for example, there is an unwritten rule that the front row is the place for ‘important’ people. The special significance of the front row is strengthened by the practice of having special kinds of furniture. For example, sofas with soft cushions are used for the front row, and wooden chairs for the rest.

In interpersonal interaction, one needs to be aware of the status difference as well. Increased space is usually maintained in conversations between people with different status, while closer space is considered as a signal of more equal relationship. A very interesting phenomenon can be seen in the way people passing other people in the corridor. In Indonesian context, some students are still reluctant to pass their lecturers in the corridor. These students would usually try to find another way. If they cannot find, they would nod their head while saying permisi (excuse me) and pass the lecturers after the lecturers say silahkan (please). While passing through, a few students still bow their back.

**Space while walking**

My data show that the space in Caucasian male-male dyads compared to female-female or male-female. A study found that there was less touching behaviour in male-male interactions compared to female-female, and males have a more homophobic nature than females do (Roese et al. 1992, p. 256). Possibly, the homophobic nature is the source of explanation why there was wider space when two males walked together.

The situation in Indonesia is the contrast. Males walking together with close space, sometimes with the display of hand holding and the slinging of arm over a partner’s shoulder, are perceived as being friends only. The same thing applies for females as well. This phenomenon shows that there might be less impact of homophobic nature in Indonesian society. Gay (or banci in Indonesian term) has a special place in Indonesia (see Boellstorff 2004 for a very interesting anthropological research). They usually gain
good reputation because of their skills in beauty, fashion, cooking and art related jobs. Homosexuals may not be totally free from problems in Indonesia, but the problems tend to be increasingly reduced, even when religion is considered. Dorce, a very famous Indonesian gay celebrity, can publicly announce her hajjah, a title given to Moslem women who had been to Mecca for pilgrimage.

**Eye contact, hand shaking, hugging, cheek pressing, and space in inter-gender interactions**

Beside being associated with power-distance, eye contact can be also associated with male-female intimacy. This assumption might be universal, but the degree of the eye contact and also the range of situations where eye contact between males and females is considered appropriate can be culture specific, especially in cultures with certain religious influence.

In the Indonesian context, Islam has a big influence on the way people interact with each other. In Islam, there is a basic rule that limits interactions between males and females who do not have parental, marital, or close familial relationship. In the Holy Qur'an, the main source of Islamic regulation, Allah says:

> “Say to the believing men
That they should lower
Their gaze and guard
Their modesty: that will make
For greater purity for them:
And God is well acquainted
With all that they do”


The command to lower the gaze is also given to women in the next verse.

About the command to lower one’s gaze, an author says: “Islam wishes to establish a pure society in which there is no room even for adultery of the eye” (Hasan 1999, p. 21). Clearly, this interpretation assumes that avoiding eye contact can be beneficial in
preventing people from having further interactions that may lead to zina: the “extramarital sexual relations” (Quraishi 1997, p. 288), which is considered as a sinful act in Islam. Therefore, some people prefer to completely avoid the eye contact in inter-gender conversation. Yet, others prefer to maintain eye contact up to the point that they think would not make them have a sexual desire.

Islamic views might be also the source of issues about hand shaking, hugging and cheek pressing in greeting among Indonesian students. For most Indonesian students, hand shaking is acceptable, either in male-male or male-female interactions. However, some Moslem Indonesian students have a different attitude because they believe that Islam does not approve of males touching females, which also includes hand shaking. Although this cannot be generalised to be the case for all Moslem Indonesians, indeed, there are people who have such a belief.

Slightly different from hand shaking, almost all Indonesian respondents in my study considered hugging and cheek pressing as acceptable only in female-female interactions. There are some exceptions among certain groups of young people or people from a higher class level of society, who might be very keen to adopt Western cultural practices.

Finally, it is worthwhile to review the question of space in inter-gender interactions. I have described how inter-gender interactions were more clearly observable in Australian gatherings, compared to Indonesian gatherings. I have presented comments from Indonesian students who generally consider the behaviour as a common tendency, although it is not very strictly applied. I have also highlighted some statements viewing this phenomenon resulting from Islamic values. However, the fact that some Indonesian respondents, who are Moslem people, said that this phenomenon is not a big problem shows the practice might not be strictly applied in Indonesian gatherings.

This could be seen as a reflection of how Islamic values are interpreted and adapted differently by individuals in Indonesian society. In my experience, very few people would avoid eye contact in inter-gender conversation and some people would not do the hand shaking. The tendency to separate male and female in formal gathering is widely practised, especially in religious meetings. In Indonesia, one may speculate that the tendency would be more likely to appear in areas dominated by Moslem people, but this opinion is subject to further investigation.
It would be more reasonable to see this phenomenon as a dichotomy between rural and urban societies. Compared to the situation in rural societies, females in urban societies have more equal function to males. They go to schools and workplaces together with their male counterparts, so they have more reasons for having interactions. Therefore, male-female interactions in Indonesian urban society might not be perceived as a cultural or religious violation, which might be the case in rural societies, where females and males are more likely to function in different domains. This could explain why some Indonesian students, mostly coming from middle class urban society, did not have problems with inter-gender interactions.

All three tendencies mentioned above might not be considered as problematic matters in Australia. Eye contact, hand shaking, and inter-gender interaction are quite acceptable in Australian culture. Therefore, this phenomenon can be another source of intercultural problem, although limited to a few Indonesian students only.

**Facial expression (including smiling)**

In the explanation about students' behaviour in tutorials, I have described how Indonesian students' smiling cannot be merely interpreted as a sign of understanding or agreement. Rather, it may have other meanings due to the values of face saving and harmony. Such behaviour might be also maintained in casual conversations, so it can also be problematic in daily interaction.

**Sitting on the floor, sitting and lying down on the lawns**

I have presented some data showing that it was common during my observations to see students in Australian universities sitting on the floor, or sitting and lying down on the lawn. On the other hand, I did not see any Indonesian students doing so.

This behaviour can be viewed as an interplay of environmental, religious and cultural influences. In the dry season, floors become dusty very quickly, especially in university classrooms that do not have air conditioners. In wet season, there would be rain almost every day, resulting in a similar consequence of people not sitting, let alone lying down, outside. In Indonesia, not much ground is covered with grass, which makes the lower part of shoes full of dust in the dry season, and muddy in the wet season, so it is easy to imagine that floors would be dirty. Moreover, in many populous places in Indonesia, it is
difficult to maintain the cleanness of floors. In this situation, it is understandable why Indonesian students are not willing to sit on the floor in public places, although they may sit on the floor at home, where people usually do not wear shoes to maintain the cleanness of the floor. From a religious view, the unclean condition might become the reason for Moslem students not to sit on the floor, because they are required to maintain clean clothes, which is assumed as one requirement for people when they do the praying. Finally, from a cultural point of view, there could be a power-distance issue. Stratification in Indonesian society used to be reflected in many daily practices. In the past time, for example, servants should sit on the floor, while masters could sit on chairs. Although a very few people still have this attitude, the present situation is quite different. If all people sit on chairs, and one person sits on the floor, it would be considered very unusual. If there is not any chair available, younger people or people with lower status would give their chairs to older people or people with higher status, and they would try to find another chair, or sit in one chair with another person. In short, whatever the situation will be, people will do every effort to make sure that everybody sits on chairs.

**Sitting posture in cafes and libraries**

Another different behaviour is putting feet on chairs or tables in public places, such as cafes and libraries. While this behaviour may not be problematic in Australia, display of such behaviour can be very unusual in Indonesian context. Usually, Indonesians consider such behaviour impolite.

**Dress codes**

In terms of male dress, a significant contrast was found in the wearing of shorts. I have described that shorts were commonly observed among Caucasian students, especially in summer, and some Australian respondents confirmed that shorts are acceptable in university. In contrast, I never found an Indonesian male student wearing shorts at university. According to Indonesian respondents who talked about this, shorts are not acceptable in Indonesian university.

The unacceptability of wearing shorts is mentioned in written regulation of some Indonesian universities. For example, in the “*Pedoman Etika Dosen, Pegawai Administrasi*

---

10 Moslems are required to perform the praying at least five times every day.
Students, while in the campus attending learning and teaching activities (in lectures, in laboratories, in the library, in examination, in consultation sessions with supervisors and other academic activities), are not allowed to wear t-shirts (original italics) without collars, shorts, torn trousers, thongs or to be barefoot. (My translation)

All kinds of clothes that are prohibited in this example are casual clothes\(^{11}\), that are worn at home or informal occasions, such as going to parties or shopping. On the other hand, they are not acceptable in formal occasions, such as wedding party and attending lecturers.

The explicit prohibition of wearing thongs and being barefoot is also interesting, especially if we go further into the history. Shoes, according to Nordholt (1997) became a symbol of segregation between the ruler and the ruled in colonial Indonesia, and became a symbol of modernity and a marker of one’s social status in post-colonial Indonesia (pp. 33-34). At present, shoes still become the symbol that distinguishes the official from unofficial areas. Wearing shoes are required when someone enters any institution of the authority, including government offices, police stations, schools and universities. Similar explanations can be applicable for the dress code in general.

Another explanation is that wearing ‘polite’ dress code might be considered as a way of showing appreciation. In attending a class, students and teachers need to dress properly

---

\(^{11}\) This consideration is for adult men, not for male children. Male children can wear shorts to parties. Shorts are also part of the official uniform for public primary schools. However, in Islamic schools, the dress code for primary school-age children includes long trousers, not shorts.
to appreciate the learning ritual and the people involving in the learning: teachers and students. About this, one of my colleagues (a female lecturer) told her students that she wears shoes to show her respect to the students, so she wants the students to show their respect by wearing shoes. She would send her students away and allow them to enter the class only when they could get a pair of shoes. Some lecturers do not bother with this matter anymore, but some still show concern.

The dress code of the Moslem Indonesian female students contrasts sharply with Australian female students' casual dress. The difference was very obvious during hot weather, when many Australian students wear casual clothes, such as shorts, t-shirts and singlets – while many of their Indonesian Moslem female counterparts still cover the whole body, except their faces and hands.

The Indonesian Moslem female dress code reflects the Islamic value. Islam has been influencing the cultures, including the clothes of Indonesians throughout Indonesian history (see appendix 12). The motivation for wearing veils was not the same for every individual. A study by Smith-Hefner (2007) argued that while for some women veils are already part of their identity (pp. 402-403), others wear veils to show an “antigovernment solidarity” (p. 398), as a symbol of “religious transformation” (p. 402), and for security in engaging with modern life-style (pp. 401-402).

On the other hand, many Australian students covered less of their bodies, compared to Indonesian students. One Australian respondent thought that Australians “dress for comfort and lifestyle” (I12/276). With this reason, it is quite understandable to see Australian students dress in casual clothes in hot weather. One additional factor that can be added is to be fashionable, and, perhaps, nothing more than that. Some people think that women dress in order to get attention from men, but it is doubtful to say so since in Australian university, many students who wear casual clothes display very modest behaviour. The tendency to wear clothes for comfort also explains why many students wear thongs at university in summer.

In short, the dress code has a very different meaning in Indonesian and Australian cultures. With this difference, there can be some intercultural problems, as I will discuss later in section 5.2.1.
Public display of affective behaviours

As I have shown previously, the only widely acceptable behaviour in male-female interactions in Indonesian university is walking together. Several behaviours such as walking together with a very narrow space, holding hands and slinging an arm over one’s shoulder could be acceptable in several places, while embracing and kissing are totally unacceptable. On the other hand, it seems that the public display of affective behaviours can be easily observed in Australian context.

The unacceptability of these behaviours can be similarly viewed from a religious point of view, as I have explained in discussing eye contact, cheek pressing and hugging. The influence of religion in one’s affective behaviour is also found in research by Vaquera and Kao (2005). In their study, the occurrence of intimate behaviour is lower among young people who have strong beliefs in religion (p. 501). In countries where Islam is the dominant religion, the rule of showing affective behaviours in public is very strict. One may still remember the story of a British couple who suffered legal punishment for having intimate intercourse on a beach in Dubai (The Daily Telegraph 2008). That is why the travelling suggestion given to Australians going to United Arab Emirates specific warnings about the display of affective behaviour in public (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2009b). Interestingly, the travel advice to Indonesia does not give similar warning (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2009a). In Bali, western tourists can freely show affective behavior in public places. However, one cannot assume that such behavior is acceptable within Indonesian culture. Moreover, some areas in Indonesia have strict rules. In Aceh, for example, Islamic law has been implemented and there is Wilayatul Hisbah or ‘moral police’ who monitors the community (see Chamim 2006).

Formal legal consequences can be very strict in Aceh, but in other parts of Indonesia, especially in big cities like Jakarta and Surabaya, the consequence may not be more than strange or disapproving stare from other people. This explanation also applies on the issue of dress above
5.1.5 Summary of the Factors behind the Similarities and Differences between Indonesian and Australian students' Nonverbal Behaviours

Togetherness
The sitting together phenomenon was found to be more obvious among Indonesian students, but it can also be found among Australian students. The phenomenon can be interpreted as the reflection of collectivism with different degrees among Indonesians and Australians. However, while the motivation behind the Indonesian collectivism can be academic and social, the Australian motivation is more likely for social purpose.

Similar classroom behaviours
In tutorials, Indonesian and Australian students displayed relatively similar eye gazing behaviour while listening, hand movements while speaking, body posture while speaking and head nodding while listening, indicating that the classroom behaviour of Indonesians and Australians can be similar in some aspects. These similarities were based on ordinary observations only. Further investigations using detailed videotaped data may reveal subtle differences. A certain degree of head nodding, for example, may reveal flattering meaning in both Indonesian and Australian contexts. However, the degree can be different. A display of head nodding that is considered normal in Indonesia may be considered as a flattering in the Australian context, and vice versa.

Similar communicative behaviours
In conversations, Indonesians and Australians may have a similar tendency in terms of body position and body orientation. This can be an indication that some communicative behaviours of Indonesians and Australians are similar in several aspects.

Conflict avoidance tendency
Indonesians are more likely to avoid conflict. This is shown in the analysis of smiling behaviour displayed by Indonesian students in tutorials when they do not understand. Some indication of conflict avoidance may also happen among Australians, but at a lower level.
Face saving
The smiling behaviour can be also explained as the effort to save, either students' or teachers’ face. In saving teachers’ face, especially, the tendency might be stronger in Indonesia, because within Indonesian society, teachers’ positive face has a moral dignity. With Australians, comments from a few respondents show that there can be an effort among some students to save their own face by not saying anything when they do not understand, but there was not anything mentioned about saving the teacher’s face.

Power distance: respect to authority and the importance of status awareness
The analysis shows that respect to authorities have a strong emphasis in Indonesian culture. The respect can be assessed, not only from one’s verbal expression, but also (and maybe more significantly) based on one’s nonverbal behaviour.

In classrooms, teachers are regarded as the authorities. To show their respect to teachers, students need to display respectful nonverbal behaviour, including straight body posture, less body movement, less (or not at all) stretching, not yawning (or covering the mouth when yawning), careful pointing, and a hand raising before asking questions. For some lecturers, respectful nonverbal behaviour also includes knocking on the door and giving a reason when coming late, wearing appropriate clothes, and wearing appropriate shoes.

On the other hand, In Australian tutorials, it seems that there is less connection between students’ nonverbal behaviours with being respectful. For example, although sitting straight is still considered good posture, leaning backward does not have serious implications or result in punishment. Similarly, stretching the body and yawning can be considered rude, but they are not things that would make lecturers admonish the students. This phenomenon indicates that, in Australian universities, respect is based more on other things (most probably verbal engagement), rather than nonverbal behaviour.

Outside classrooms, Indonesian nonverbal behaviour would be much determined by status consideration. It determines what dress to be worn and whether people need to nod their head, or toss their head to greet other people. The status also determines where people should sit in a gathering and to what extent they need to maintain the space in a conversation. The status even determines what people do when they pass two people having conversations in a corridor, whether they can just pass, need to ask for permission
first, bow their back or maybe, ‘to be save’, choosing another way. For some people, status may also determine the eye contact behaviour.

Emphasis on nonverbal behaviour
The whole analysis indicates that nonverbal behaviour has different emphasis in Indonesia and Australia, with more emphasis appears in Indonesian culture. In Indonesian classroom context, nonverbal behaviours can be significant indicators of respect. In Australian classrooms, I have argued, the strong emphasis on verbal engagement make some nonverbal aspects become less important. For example, students are not reprimanded for leaning back or stretching their body as long as they are still engaged in classroom discussion.

Outside the classroom, similar thing can be observed. For example, in Indonesian context, there is still a tendency to judge people based on their appearance, rather than on what they say. On the contrary, in Australia, many Indonesians may be surprised to know that someone wearing a t-shirt and riding a bicycle to university is a university lecturer with a PhD degree, or even a university professor.

Religious influence
Indonesian culture has a very strong mark of Islamic influence. Some Indonesians do not want to sit on the floor in order to maintain the cleanliness of their clothes, which is one of the requirements when praying. Islamic rules are the source of the right hand preference among many Indonesians, and the avoidance of eye contact and hand shaking among a few Indonesians. Hugging, cheek pressing and any further affective behaviour are not shown in public because they violate the religious regulation. Religious influence may be also the reason of limited gender mixing in some Indonesian gatherings. Finally, Islamic influence can be seen in the widespread use of veils and Islamic dress code.

On the other hand, it seems that religious perspective is not dominant in Australian culture, at least in my interviews with Australian respondents. Religion-related perspective was not mentioned in discussions about the use of hand, touching behaviour (hand shaking and hugging), and gender mixing in gatherings. In the discussion about public display of affective behaviour, respondents’ opinion was somewhat divided, but there was not any respondent who gave opinion based on religious perspective. The only religious hint that I
obtained was when I discussed dress code issue with an Australian student who also worked as a university teaching staff (A3/279-284):

R: ... this is probably one of the areas where I'm a little different to most of western cultures uhm (pause) I actually (pause) I'm a Christian and I believe in the value of a degree of modesty uhm . . .

I: Eh can you please explain to me what you mean by eh modesty?

R: Modesty. I, I actually think that it's good, so I don't particularly like it when a girl comes into my class dressed so as to be distracting.

It is too early, though, to claim that religion is not the main consideration of Australian young people like my respondents. Such a claim needs more data and more careful analysis.

**Harmony maintenance**

The strong tendency to maintain harmonious relationships explains why most Indonesian students were less expressive while giving opinions, reflected in more restrained facial expression, limited body movements and frequent use of smiling, even while talking about a rather unpleasant topic. On the other hand, Australians were more expressive, reflected in more intensive use of facial expressions and more body movements.

Yet, this is not to say that there is not such a willingness to maintain harmony within Australian culture. I think there is a willingness to maintain harmony in every society, only the way of maintaining the harmony is different. In Australia, as I have shown in the analysis, it seems that there is a clear division between criticising one’s argument and attacking someone personally. In such a situation, it is possible for people with different preferences, and even different philosophies (for example consider the very contrasting differences between liberal, labor and green party supporters), to live together in harmony as long as they do not conduct any harmful acts. Indonesia is the contrast. For many Indonesians, criticising one’s argument is almost the same with attacking someone personally. Indonesian language has a word *menghujat* which means saying very bad things about other people. Based on my daily experience in having discussions with
Indonesians, many people still consider criticism, no matter how reasonable, as *menghujat*, if it goes against their opinion. Some debatable issues in official discussions (such as in meetings in working places) can be taken personally, and may have a very negative impact in personal relationships.

**Ingroup-outgroup division**

The division between ingroup and outgroup can be clearer in Indonesian culture. I have argued this point by referring to the Indonesian tendency not to smile at strangers, except to people with foreign appearance (such as tourists from western countries). This evidence might be too little to make an argument, but it is supported in comparison to other studies in Costa Rican and Japanese contexts. More investigation is needed to gain a stronger argument.

In Australia, on the other hand, the division may not be so clear. People smile to strangers, not only to people that they know. The wide practice of volunteer work supports this argument. People are willing to help anybody and any community, not only family members or friends.

**Environmental factor**

Apart from the various cultural factors above, environmental factor has certain influence on students' behaviour. Very hot and dusty weather in dry season, daily rain in wet season, and the difficulty to maintain the cleanliness in Indonesia prevent students from sitting on the floor and grass lawn. This habit may explain why not many Indonesians are willing to sit, let alone to lie on the lawn, or to sit on the floor in classroom. In contrast, warm sunny days during summer are quite inviting for Australians to sit and lie on the lawn. Clean condition inside and outside university also make them feel free to sit on the floor inside university building.

Environmental factor is also the reason behind dress preference among Australian students. They wear closed clothes in cold weather and casual clothes in hot weather. This is reasonable, especially if people consider the active life style of university student.
5.1.6 Some Important Considerations

It is important to consider two things: the periodical change happens within Indonesian and Australian cultures, and the internal varieties within the two cultures.

In terms of the first consideration, it is necessary to note that culture entails dynamic change. What I have presented in this thesis may be different from what happened in the past, and what will happen in the future. In regard of this periodical change, dress is a very clear example as dress becomes a cultural display of problems and obligation of societies along their history (Maynard 1994, p. 2). In certain points in the human history, clothes are associated with social status. Very often, the higher the social status people have, the more clothes they need to wear. This could be seen in the fact that kings and queens wore more closed clothes, compared to the ordinary people. The wearing of clothes can be also closely related to morality. In Australian open convict period, uniforms were used as the means to distinguish convicts from free settlers (Maynard 1994, p. 9-40). With the change toward a more egalitarian society, people started to have a tendency to have similar appearance. Observers of 19th century Australia, for example, could not distinguish without difficulty the social class of Australians based on their dress (Maynard 1994, p. 96), particularly for men, not for women (p. 98). The movement of “rational dress” for women that “was to be light, warm, healthy and unrestrictive (Dawn 1890, p. 12 and Court 3, 1985, p. 48 in Maynard 1994, p. 90) was another explanation why women dress code changed in the later periods. Slowly, the association of dress with status and moral dignity disappear. Most people are now more likely to wear clothes that are suitable with climate condition, rather than with any status or moral considerations. This explains why shorts and tank tops are considered suitable with summer season in Australia. However, the currently increasing promotion of wearing closed clothes to avoid skin cancer may change Australian dress consideration in the future.

Such process can be observed in Indonesia and Australia. But, if we put these two cultures in a continuum, Australia would be at the far end point of the change, where dress might not be perceived as the sign of status and morality. On the other hand, Indonesia is in the middle of the continuum, where, for many people, the association between dress and social status is still very clear. The middle point is also the place where religious values hold some people’s belief on the function of dress as a signal of morality and, for the case of wearing veils, as the signal of Moslem identity.
For the second consideration, within Indonesian and Australian cultures, there can be many internal varieties, either in the display or the perception of nonverbal behaviours. These varieties can be caused by various things.

In Indonesia, there can be three causes of variation. The first one is the ethnic difference. For example, some ethnic groups, such as Batak and Manado, are more expressive compared to other ethnic groups, such as Javanese. The level of expressiveness can be seen in the intonation, speech volume and facial expressions. It is common to hear people say that *Halusnya orang Manado sama dengan marahnya orang Jawa* (meaning: the softness of Manado people is equal to the angeriness of Javanese). Another important cause of variation is the common attitude within different groups of people. Some groups of people may be very keen to adopt western way of life, because it is perceived as the modernity. That is why it is common to see music and film celebrities in Indonesia wearing western fashion style and display the hugging and cheek pressing between males and females. On the other hand, many Indonesians consider hugging and cheek pressing between males and females unacceptable and condemn the wearing of shorts and tank tops in public places. Religion is also another cause of variation. In Aceh, where people’s behaviour is monitored by morality police, public display of affective behaviour and the wearing of ‘impolite’ dress would result in a serious legal consequence. In many other parts of Indonesia, the punishment may not be more than a strange stare from other people.

In Australia, youth cultures might be the first sources of variation. Goths fashion style that generally display dark and gloomy outlook (Monden 2008, p. 6) and hip-hop are two popular dress styles among young people in Australian universities. Another possible cause of varieties is ethnic background. To the best of my knowledge, there is not any research investigating the possibility of ethnic differences in Australian nonverbal behaviour, but a comparable study has been conducted in the area of verbal Australian English. For example, Barbara Horvath (1991) conducted a study of speech community in Sydney. She used four categories of “phonetic variants” - namely “Cultivated”, “General”, “Broad” and “Ethnic Broad” – and added accented category to label the use of vowels that result from the influence of ethnic languages (p. 307). Her data, gathered from 177 speakers, show that the language of Sydney community can be divided into “the periphery” and “the core” (p. 308). The periphery, identified with the presence of accented variants, was divided into two sociolects based on the level of accented variants (pp. 308-309). The core, identified with the absence of accented variants, was also divided into four sociolects
based on the level of the use of cultivated variants (pp. 308-310). The factors influencing Horvath’s division were various, including ethnic, social class, gender and age differences (pp. 308-317). This complex division of verbal Australian English give a hint that there could also be differences in terms of nonverbal language. For example, Australians with certain ethnic background could be more expressive than those from other ethnic background. In addition, some of my Australian respondents admitted that they have friends or work with people from various cultural backgrounds. Such interactions may influence their perception of nonverbal behaviours, and to some extent may result in some modification of their own nonverbal behaviour. It is also necessary to consider that, among Australian university students, there are groups who maintain and express their religious faith more than other students. They may be more modest in appearance and more conservative in perception, for example in perceiving the acceptability of certain kind of dress code (as can be seen in the quotation of one respondent’s opinion on page 64) and public display of affective behaviour. Finally, it is necessary to note that homosexual people are parts of Australian society who exhibit different patterns of nonverbal behaviour and have different perceptions about this matter. The link between sexual orientation and nonverbal behaviour has been shown in a study conducted by Knöfler and Imhof (2007). They found, for example that in conversations where one or both participants are homosexual, there was less gaze behaviour, compared to the conversations where both participants were heterosexuals (p. 201).

5.2 Intercultural Problems

5.2.1 Problems (and Possible Problems) in Indonesian-Australian Intercultural Interaction within Indonesian and Australian contexts

Similar tendency in seating arrangement in tutorials: barriers of intercultural interaction

Although sitting together can be very useful for Indonesian students to help each other, the phenomenon can be regarded as a nonverbal indication of the lack of interaction between Indonesian and Australian students. It also becomes a nonverbal signal that can prevent Indonesian and Australian students from initiating interactions.
Lack of interaction is not only a problem between Indonesian and Australian students. It is observable in general between international students and Australian students. According to a 2005 survey in the University of Adelaide, international students interact more with friends of their own cultural group or with other international students, and local students also interact more with other local students (Takeda, St. John-Ives and McPherson 2005, p. 7). The causes of the limited interaction identified in the survey include the lack of time for interaction inside and outside classrooms due to busy schedules, limited linguistic skills, different cultural practices, a tendency for international students to remain within their cultural groups, and the lack of interest among local students in engaging with international students (p. 8). This interaction problem has been also reported in New Zealand and America. In a 2007 survey in New Zealand, one of the findings was that less than half the respondents agreed that there was a good relationship between students with different cultural backgrounds (Deloitte 2008, p. 67). This indication is worse than the finding of a 2003 survey that found that more than half respondents believed that a good cooperation exists among students despite cultural differences (p. 67). Another study in America found that generally overseas students have only a few Americans in their friendship network (Hechanova-Alampay et al. 2002, p. 471). The author suggested three possible explanations: a greater tendency to remain within cultural groups, limited chances for networking with Americans, or a combination of the two factors (p.471).

In the report of Takeda, St. John-Ives and McPherson (2005), international students perceived that there was a limited attempt among local students to interact with international students (p. 8). This assumption was also revealed as Indonesian students’ perception (see section 4.3.1). Related to this, based on my interviews, I found very subtle issues related to nonverbal behaviours that can make Indonesian students think that Australian students are not interested in interacting with them. One respondent reported:

Then if for example, eh, I have an Australian friend. Eh, I, for example, personally will observe the situation and condition first. After one or two meetings I see, how is the [character of] the person. If then, there was one [student] who looked [my emphasis] very busy you know. So I felt like, he/she was untouchable [my emphasis]. He/she could not be touched.

It seems that what made I7 decide not to initiate an interaction was because the Australian students “looked very busy” [my emphasis]. This statement suggests that I7 had the impression from nonverbal signs, and not from verbal expression. The impression made I7 think that the Australian student was “untouchable”. This information suggests that in assessing the possibility of interaction, Indonesian students can be very sensitive to the nonverbal cues. This tendency is also implied in the following extract:


So, now, if they [Australian students] don’t greet [me], or if it seems that they were not enthusiastic with my presence, I don’t try [to initiate an interaction] as well, well what should I say, it’s because, my impression, I feel desperate, like that.

It is clear here that I11’s impression about his Australian friend was also based on a nonverbal cue (“it seems that they were not enthusiastic with my presence”), in addition to the verbal one (“did not greet”). The effect mentioned here (“desperate”) was very strong.

Another respondent (A8) reported that his Australian friends were relatively silent. For him: “kesannya, mereka itu kayak superstar.12 Saya juga sepertinya bosan” (I8B/214) – (it seemed to me that they behaved like a superstar you know. [So], I got bored as well). He

---

12 Based on the context of conversation, A8’s term “superstar” can be translated as a snob: “person with an exaggerated respect for social position, wealth, or certain tastes and who despises those he or she considers inferior” (Hawker & Cowley 2004, p. 390).
continued saying: “ibaratnya mereka itu tidak terlalu butuh sama kita gitu” (I8B/233) - (It seems that they [Australian students] don't need us you know).

It is clear here that actually, the respondents were willing to initiate more interactions. But, if they were willing to interact, why was there a tendency to remain within their groups? I would propose the following explanation. The Indonesian students, being in a new place, tended to remain within their own group in order to have a secure feeling. While staying in this “safe” environment, they started to do the “group-atmosphere assessment” (Panggabean 2004), which is “an effort to build and maintain pleas-ant [sic] interpersonal atmosphere in earlier phase of work, while searching for “the righteous role” “ (Magnis-Suseno 1996, cited in Panggabean 2004). In this process, they tended to rely on nonverbal cues. Things like dress, seating preference, facial expression, and some actions like reading books and using iPods, can be potential signals to be interpreted. Once the students interpreted the nonverbal cues as a sign of “untouchability” (in I7’s case), “not enthusiastic” (in I11’s case), or “arrogance” (in I8’s case), the possibility for an interaction to occur might be reduced, if not disappear altogether.

This process might not exclusively happen among Indonesian students. This may also explain the lack of interaction from Australian students’ perspective, as I have found that some Australian respondents were restrained by, for example, Moslem dress code and the tendency among international students to go together in groups. However, the effect of nonverbal cues can be more significant for Indonesians as they rely so much on nonverbal behaviour (Brandt 1997, cited in Panggabean 2004). As an illustration, in Panggabean’s (2004) study, in explaining what he did in judging an interaction partner, an Indonesian respondent said:

“I looked [my emphasis] through him ..he looked [my emphasis] through me ..I tried to know.. what is his intention I mean some kind of goodwill, like that whether he is a good person or not”.

In this case, the eye and maybe the whole body movement can be perceived as a reliable source of information about one’s genuine intention.
The optimistic view of this problem may argue that interactions would be increased naturally when Australian students are more accustomed to the presence of international students, and when both groups of students know each other better. However, no one can know for sure how long it will take for the natural process. Therefore, real efforts by universities might be needed to foster the natural process. In the report of Takeda, St. John-Ives and McPherson (2005), both international and local students thought that students have the main responsibility in initiating the interaction, but part of the responsibility is also expected to be taken by the educational institution (p. 9).

**Smiling and other facial expression: indication of lack of freedom in expressing ideas**

It might be clear that Indonesian smiles may have a double meaning, and this can be problematic for Indonesian students. The issue is not the smile, but the cultural assumption behind the smile. The tendency to avoid conflict and to save other people’s face creates a dilemma for Indonesian students in expressing their opinion freely. Indonesian respondents’ comments in interviews show that actually they were aware of this. They could even give the reasons for such behaviours. Maybe the behaviour had been so internalized for a long time that it is very difficult to change.

Fortunately, the students had further strategies, including asking help from friends or asking for individual consultation time with tutors. The first strategy could be very useful if they really have friends that can help them. In fact, everybody is so busy that it might be difficult to find peer support. The second strategy can be a good solution too, but considering that tutors’ consultation time is very limited, not all students may get the opportunity for an individual consultation.

In addition, smile, restrained body movements and restrained facial expressions can be an indication of a hesitant feeling in the expression of disagreement. This is an unnecessary hesitancy because being critical and independent in offering opinions are highly valued in Australian tutorials. The solution for Indonesian students is not to modify the smiling expression, but to change their attitude. There is a strong possibility for this change of attitude to happen since Indonesian students’ perception about the expressiveness of Australian students was mostly positive (see section 4.3.3)
However, the last suggestion could be problematic when Indonesian students go back to Indonesia and engage within the local system. Critical opinion\textsuperscript{13}, especially if it is offered with an intensive facial expression, can be condemned as impolite manners. Indonesian students need to learn how to mediate the new ways of thinking and behaving they learnt in Australia in terms of their local tradition.

I had tried to find out whether there would be negative response among Australian students if they see someone speaking without much expression. The response was not satisfactory, probably because I did not have any video recording on which Australian respondents can base their judgment. I do not have any reason, at this stage, to say that there will be problems resulted from Indonesian students’ inexpressiveness. However, I can safely say that the inexpressiveness can be a reflection of lack of confidence among Indonesian students in giving opinions. They might need more encouragement to express their own opinion in tutorials.

On the other hand, Australian facial expressions can be misinterpreted by Indonesian students. One day, in a conversation with an Australian student, the student mentioned some Australian slang that I could not understand. When I asked the meaning of the word, the student displayed an eye movement accompanied by a short breath, followed by a little sound “agh”. At that time, I felt so annoyed with the student’s facial expression. Her eye movement made me feel stupid, whereas from my point of view, it was normal that I could not understand Australian slang since I had just stayed in Australian for three months at that time.

This personal experience is very limited evidence, but it can be an initial hypothesis to be proved with more investigation. The extent to which an expression is acceptable might be different in Indonesian and Australian cultures. One’s expression might be considered normal in Australia, but could be perceived as an aggressive or offensive expression in Indonesia. In many cases, Indonesians would not display their negative feeling in public, even when they get angry. Further investigations that can record Indonesian and

\textsuperscript{13} In my experience, disagreement with one’s opinion can be taken as a personal attack. When I read an article criticizing a theory offered by an academician and found the expression “…before I am accused of attacking the man and not the argument …” (Ashley 2009, The Australian 9 May 2009), I started to realize that in Australia, there might be clear separation between personal attack and disagreeing with someone’s opinion, which might not be the case for many Indonesians.
Australian students’ facial expression would be needed to determine the relative limit of acceptance of facial expressions in both groups.

**Body posture, body movements, yawning and body stretching: formality vs informality**

Australian students’ body posture, body movements, body stretching and pointing behaviour show that Australian students are conditioned to behave more informally in tutorials, compared to Indonesian students. Probably, there may not be serious consequence with Indonesian students’ formality, although to some extent it may create an impression that Indonesian students are old fashioned. Indonesian students’ perception about the casual behaviour of Australian students is divided. However, the opinion did not give any indication that the perception may lead to a serious problem.

On the other hand, Australian students who want to engage in Indonesian culture might need to be aware that to some extent, students’ relaxed posture and much body movements can be interpreted as a lack of respect toward the teacher as Indonesian respondents have explained in interviews (see chapter 4). Leaning backward while maintaining the straight position of the back can be acceptable, but leaning far backward and sliding forward can be negatively perceived. A little yawning, accompanied by covering the mouth with hand, may not be a problem, but a yawning without covering of the mouth is considered impolite. Stretching body can be considered very impolite.

**Hand raising as signal of asking questions**

Hand raising may be also another source of potential problems for Indonesian students. Indonesian students may think that they need to raise their hands to indicate their intention to give comments or ask questions, and speak when they are given the time to speak. In this situation, one can predict that Indonesian students might miss many opportunities to participate in tutorials, which put them in disadvantaged situations. On the other hand, Australian students who do not know about this matter might be considered as ‘aggressive’ or arrogant in the Indonesian context. Speaking directly without raising one’s hand first is usually considered as a disturbance to the flow of discussion.
Nonverbal behaviour when students arrive late

Indonesian students’ experience in previous education may still have some influence on their behaviour. Beside that, many Indonesian students have been told that punctuality is highly valued in western culture, such as Australia. In my experience, this information is always emphasized by contrasting it to the habit of lateness in Indonesian culture. Indonesian students who had negative experience with strict lecturers may think that they will be treated in the same way in Australia, which might not be the case, based on my observations. I do not mean to suggest that Indonesian students do not need to be punctual, but there are times where coming late is unavoidable, so rather than having unnecessary hesitation, Indonesian students, especially newly arrived students, might need to know the accepted way of dealing with lateness in Australian universities. Still related to late arrival cases, considering that Indonesian students are not accustomed to sit on the floor in the classroom, a problem may occur when students come late and there are no chairs available.

In contrast, information from Indonesian respondents suggests that one’s behaviour in dealing with lateness in the Indonesian context would depend on the personality of lecturers. Therefore, this can be another tricky issue for Australian students who are willing to study in Indonesian universities, although presumably Australian students are very punctual. Many Indonesian lecturers make clear regulations about this. If it is not the case, Australian students need to ask or seek information from other students.

Smiling at strangers

For Indonesian students studying in the Australian context, smiling at strangers might be perceived as a new positive experience. In daily conversations with Indonesian friends, some of them expressed a spontaneous appreciation of this smiling habit.

In Indonesia, there could be an assumption that people smile at other people who they do not know if they have a specific intention. For example, in Indonesian context, if I am walking on the street, and someone whom I do not know smile to me, I would think that maybe the person is lost and needs my help. Another example, if a girl was walking on the street and a boy smiles to her, she might think that the boy is interested in knowing her, and in most cases, unless the girl is interested as well, she would not smile back to the boy.
Eye contact
As I have said previously, many Indonesian respondents do not have problems anymore in maintaining eye contact in their conversations with lecturers. Nevertheless, I have highlighted some minor cases to raise awareness that for some people, depending on the respective practice in their family, eye contact avoidance is so internalized that it might be difficult to change it.

In interactions between Australians and Indonesians who consider themselves as having high status, Australians’ eye contact could be interpreted as a challenge. In contrast, in interactions between Indonesians and Australians who are considered by Indonesians as having high status, Indonesians’ avoidance of eye contact would be interpreted as a sign of disrespect.

Passing people in the corridor
Indonesian students need to know that in Australia, passing their lecturers in the corridor while smiling or saying hello would be fine. They might need to ask for permission (e.g. saying excuse me), only when the lecturers do not see them, or when there is only a very little space to pass through. Any gesture more than this might be considered strange, although it might not be negatively perceived either. On the other hand, in Indonesian context, an Australian needs to know that for some lecturers, asking permission and passing after the lecturers say “please” are still considered polite.

Eye contact, hand shaking, hugging, cheek pressing, and proximity in inter-gender interactions
Hand shaking could be problematic, since it might create a feeling of hesitation, a lack of certainty about what to do. This matter could be one particular factor that needs to be clarified in the task of encouraging intercultural interactions in Australian universities. I remember my experience when I first enrolled my son in an Australian primary school. I and my son met a member of the teaching staff, who greeted me with a hand shake, but then asked my son “Do you shake hands?”. I was struck by that question, since for me, at that time, such a question is not necessary. But then I realized that the school had students from various cultural background including Moslem people, and maybe some of them do not shake hands. In this case, although it sounded strange, I think that the school staff’s direct question can be a safe strategy to avoid any embarrassment.
In interviews with some Australian students, I was told that hugging and cheek pressing are considered common between friends, and some emphasized that it needs to be between close friends. Therefore, in initial interactions between Indonesian and Australian students, when they are not yet close friends, there might not be any problem with hugging and cheek pressing. Whether there would be any problem when the relationship continued into a close relationship would depend on the quality of communication and the level of accommodation of the students of both cultural groups.

However, one Australian respondent told me that there are situations where hugging may happen between people who are not close friends to each other. She told me one of her experience as follow:

R: ... Like some people, uhm, I'm in a play at the moment and uhm, I've only had two rehearsals and at the very first rehearsal I was meeting everybody else in the play for the first time and there was one person in the play and he was hugging people that he knew from previously, but he didn't know me but I gave him hug anyway and ...

I: Oh ya because other friends of the people ...

R: Well I didn't know anybody. I was completely new but I guess—it made me feel nice because I didn't feel left out. I guess if he'd been, because he's gone hug, hug, hug and then just said 'hi' to me I'd feel a bit, oh ((laugh)) ...

(A7/393-401)

In this case, one may see that hugging can be also an effort to create a feeling of being included in a group, which, I guess, might not become the first thing thought by an Indonesian student. In such a situation, an Indonesian might feel embarrassed, while an Australian would just think that he/she is just giving a warm friendly welcoming gesture.

**Sitting on the floor, sitting and lying down on the lawns**

In Australia, it is not unusual for students to sit on the floor while attending lectures or tutorials, if there are no more empty chairs available. However, I never saw Indonesian students sitting on the floor in the classrooms. Let us imagine what will happen if the
Indonesian students come late to a tutorial, and there are no empty chairs available. As a comparison, in one tutorial that I observed, some Asian students came late, and there were no empty chairs available. Rather than sitting on the floor, the Asian students kept standing, until the tutor took the initiative to take some chairs from the next room. This could also happen with Indonesian students considering that they are not accustomed to sitting on the floor.

In the incident above, there were no complaints from other students. I suspect that it was because most students were Asians. If there were more Australian students in the classroom, the situation might be different. My interviews with Australian respondents gave a general impression that Australians are really careful not to create any distraction in the classrooms. Coming late is already a distraction, so tutors taking chairs from other rooms would be more distracting. In fact, the tutorial would be stopped for a moment, and students would need to reconcentrate on the learning.

So, there could be some possibilities if an Indonesian came late. If the student does not mind sitting on the floor, there might not be any problem. If the student keeps standing, it would be strange for other students and the tutor. If the tutor initiates to take a chair from another room, the tutorial would be stopped for a while, and other students might have negative impression about the Indonesian student.

In contrast, in Indonesia, if an Australian sits on the floor in the classroom, it would be very distracting. Usually, in Indonesian context, students would try to find chairs in other rooms. As I have explained, before, Indonesians would make every effort to ensure that everybody sits on chairs.

**Dress codes**

Within Australian universities, Moslem female dress code can also be another barrier in intercultural contact. Although some Australian respondents told me that they did not have a negative perception of Islamic dress code, some admitted that they felt hesitant to initiate interactions with Moslem females. Frankly speaking, they were not sure how to behave properly, so rather than taking the risk, they tend not to initiate a conversation. Therefore, there could be a reason to say that dress codes can inhibit people from initiating an interaction.
The avoidance strategy implied in the comments of some Australian respondents can be related to my explanation in chapter two about the uncertainty avoidance in Australian culture (see pages 19-20). Australia is considered as having low uncertainty avoidance based on the study of Hofstede & Hofstede (2005) so theoretically, Australians can make connection with new people easily. However, I have also argued that global issues may have a certain influence on the level of uncertainty avoidance. The wearing of veils as a symbol of oppression (Bullock 2002, p. xv) has been a global western stereotype, which in turn, may influence Australian perceptions about women wearing Islamic headscarf. This perception could be worse because of the terrorism issue, which is usually linked to Islamic fundamentalists.

In short, one can see that the dress code of Australian and Indonesian students (especially the female Moslem) show a very striking contrast because of cultural religious values. The potential of the dress code to be a barrier in intercultural interaction cannot be underestimated since "dress readily becomes a flash point of conflicting values, fueling contests in historical encounters … and in recent global cultural and economic exchanges" (Hansen 2004, p. 4).

In section 4.3.4, I have presented the perception of Indonesian students about Australian female students’ casual clothes. The opinion was divided. A few said that they did not have problems at all, a few others felt strange at the first time they saw the phenomenon, although they could understand later on. Two male students reported an uncomfortable feeling, and one female reported that she felt sorry.

In giving her comment, I14 perceived the wearing of casual clothes from her point of view as an Islamic person. This is another example of how religious values influence, not only one’s behaviour, but also one’s perception of other people’s behaviour. Good interaction is usually based on the interlocutors’ good perception toward each other. Negative perceptions can be a potential barrier for the interaction. Since the root of the perception is religious value, the solution would be difficult.

In the Indonesian context, Australian students’ casual dress code can be very problematic. As comparable evidence, it was found that 51.8% of respondents who took part in a study
about tourism in Komodo National Park Indonesia had a negative perception of tourists’
dress code (Walpole & Goodwin 2001, p. 163). Therefore, dress code is one of the most
important issues to be considered by Australian students if they want to engage in
Indonesian context. The source of the problem can also be the religious values.

However, it is necessary to mention that the acceptability of casual clothes in Indonesia
would depend on various factors. In universities, there are usually detailed regulations
about dress code, although the degree of its implementation would depend on the nature
of the faculty and lecturers’ personality. In my university, for example, female students
from the medical faculty are required to wear skirts, while female students in many other
faculties can wear long trousers freely. Certain lecturers do not allow students wearing
thongs to attend their classes but others do not care at all. Within this pattern of flexibility,
t-shirts and jeans trousers are acceptable in some places and the wearing of thongs are
still considered impolite but can be tolerated in a few places, but the wearing of singlets,
shorts and mini skirts are unacceptable in almost all places within the university context.
Therefore, the regulation setup by university gives the ‘safe’ limit, but one needs to learn
quickly from the real situation.

Outside university, the situation is more relaxed, although one still needs to learn that
different places have different norms. The wearing of singlets in combination with long
trousers or long skirts could be acceptable, although it may still invite strange stares.
Similar consideration applies to the wearing of mini skirts in combination with t-shirts,
short-sleeved shirts, or long-sleeved blouses. However, the wearing of shorts by female is
still quite unacceptable and definitely would invite disapproving stare in many places. Of
course, there are some exceptions, such as pubs, high-class malls and other places where
the audience are people who are much more tolerant of western fashion styles.

Regional variation needs also to be mentioned. As I have mentioned before, Bali is the
place where I saw many foreign tourists wearing shorts and singlets. The same thing can
be also observed in big cities, like Jakarta, Bandung and Surabaya. In Manado, North
Sulawesi, girls wearing singlets, mini skirts and shorts in public places are not unusual.

14 Most tourists coming to this tourism site were from Europe and North America (Walpole 1997, cited in Walpole & Goodwin 2001, p. 161).
But, in Makassar, South Sulawesi, the wearing of shorts by females in public places is very unacceptable. In Aceh, a man was arrested by the morality police and was told: “Your knees are not properly covered” (Chamim 2006).

Finally, I need to stress again the importance of dress as a source of status inference in Indonesia. In Australia, I noticed that generally people wear more or less similar fashion styles. Only after I became familiar with the kinds of clothes, the price, and the shops, can I infer which people do shopping in which shops, so I can estimate how much money they spent for their clothes. Only in this way, I think, a careful observer can judge people from their appearance. In Indonesia, the process would be easier, since an ordinary observer can judge people from their dress. Like some of my examples before, girls wearing skirts in my university are more likely to be medical students, rather than engineering students, and boys wearing t-shirts are more likely to be engineering students, rather than medical students. Similarly, students with long hair who wear thongs are usually student activists. Sometimes, even one’s morality is judged from their dress. Girls wearing certain casual clothes, such as tank tops and shorts, as one of Indonesian respondents said, can be judged as bitchy (I11/513-514).

Public display of affective behaviour
Similarly, the public display of affective behaviour commonly found in Australian universities can be also another source of serious offence in the Indonesian context. The value behind the unacceptability is also similar, but the level of discomfort caused by the public display of affective behaviour is stronger than the one caused by the wearing of ‘impolite’ dress. The consequence might be different, again depending on regional differences. While in Jakarta and Surabaya, the behaviour would invite disapproving stare, in Aceh, it will lead to severe consequences (consider the quotation above). Even married couples do not kiss each other in public places, and many of them do not even hold hands.

Queuing behaviour
Finally, it is necessary to talk about queuing behaviour. Absence of a queue is one of the most common complaints among western people who visit Indonesia. In Australia, queue-jumping is considered very impolite.

15 These students are usually very critical and tend to be rebellious.
For Indonesian students studying in Australia, in my daily interaction with them, there is a double standard of behaviour. It seems that they can be very patient standing in line together with other Australians, for example in BBQ events or when boarding on the bus. In contrast, in Indonesian gatherings, the behaviour completely disappeared.

In the Indonesian context, certain places such as airports, banks and department stores do not show a queuing problem. Usually, in these places, the queue line is already marked. Some banks have used an automatic number system so people would sit and wait, rather than making a crowd in front of the bank teller. In such situations, queue-jumping would be considered impolite.

However, queue is not well practised in many places. When boarding a bus, a train, or a ship, people would just compete with each other to get into the vehicles.

### 5.2.2 Other Nonverbal Behaviours that Might be Problematic for Australian Students Studying in Indonesia

Some problematic issues for Australian students, such as expressive behaviours and dress code, have been explained above. Below are some behaviours that might not be problematic for Indonesian students who study in Australia, but can be problematic for Australian students who go to Indonesia.

**Pointing behaviour**
Indonesian students might not have problems with this behaviour. On the other hand, Australian students need to understand that pointing has a very limited level of acceptance in Indonesian classrooms. Pointing gestures displayed by a student toward the teacher can be perceived as an offence, attacking the face of the teacher. This perception may lead to a serious problem since teachers’ face in Indonesian context, as I have explained before, is more likely to be considered as a matter of moral dignity.

**The use of hands**
Another issue that could be a problem for Australian students who want to come to Indonesia is the use of the right and the left hand. Probably, in the case of hand raising,
which hand is used may not be a problem, but it may still be problematic when giving something to other people. Since this behaviour is meaningful only in the Indonesian context, there will be no problems for Indonesian students, but it is necessary for Australian students to be aware of this matter.

**Head nodding and head tossing**
This subtle meaning of head nodding and head tossing may seem confusing for people who come from a strong egalitarian society like Australia. It might be even more confusing if one realizes that the “hierarchical distribution of power in Indonesia” is determined by various factors including “age, socioeconomic status, educational level, political affiliation and gender” which are mainly conveyed “through nonverbal or paralinguistic stances” (Noel, Shoemake & Hale 2006, pp. 432-433).

**Sitting posture (putting feet up on chairs and tables)**
This behaviour might also create a very bad impression in the Indonesian context. Many Indonesian people, especially the older generation, still consider this behaviour as totally unacceptable. In previous discussion about similar behaviour in tutorial contexts, I have argued that the disapproval of such behaviour is a reflection of power-distance between younger and older people, or between people from lower and higher status.

### 5.3 Theoretical and Practical Implications of the Research Findings
Based on interviews with some Indonesian respondents, I learned that many Australian students’ behaviours, that are not appropriate for Indonesian culture, are not considered as problems by Indonesian students, not only because they have been trained before coming to Australia, but also, probably, because of the nature of tolerance among Indonesian students. This lesson might not be learnt if this study is conducted as a contrastive analysis or cross-culture study which, according to Fries (2008), compares separate cultural situations. Therefore, as a methodological implication, this study supports the notion of intercultural analysis as a more useful tool in understanding problems that might occur because of cultural differences.
The analysis in this study shows that some nonverbal behaviour displayed by Indonesian and Australian students has a different meaning across the two cultural systems. Certain behaviour may be positively valued in one culture, but has negative connotations in another culture. This means that, theoretically, within an intercultural experience, it is necessary for people to sometimes withdraw from the situation, evaluate both her own and the new culture and make decision of what to do.

I hope that these findings can be useful for teachers in adjusting their teaching practice and creating a more conducive classroom atmosphere for interaction, both in Australia and Indonesia. For Indonesian students, the findings can be a reference for adjusting their learning and in gaining more meaningful intercultural experience in their daily life. Therefore, as a practical implication of this study, two learning materials are created based on the findings. The learning materials are aimed at use in EFL classes in Indonesia. It is intended to raise some nonverbal issues that have been found in this research, in order to increase the cultural awareness among Indonesian EFL learners. This is part of my initial effort to develop intercultural English learning materials for EFL classes in Indonesia. In addition, some findings can be a useful reference for Australian students who are interested in engaging with Indonesian society.
CHAPTER 6
THE LEARNING MATERIALS FOR
INTERCULTURAL ENGLISH LEARNING

6.1 The Conceptual Foundation of the Learning Material

6.1.1 Learning Materials

“Materials development refers to anything which is done by writers, teachers or learners to provide sources of language input and to exploit those sources in ways which maximize the likelihood of intake” (Tomlinson 1998, p. 2). This statement shows two basic issues: “sources of language input” and the exploitation of the sources. The sources can be anything we have around us (Tomlinson 1998, p.2), so it might be very easy to obtain. The more difficult part of creating a learning material is the process of exploiting the sources, because it needs creativity and imagination, just as a poet transforms the value of ordinary things into a poetical phenomenon.

The findings that I have presented and analysed in several chapters before may remain ‘only’ as ‘findings’ if they are not exploited in creative ways. To be more meaningful, they need to be enlivened, and one way to do so is by processing them creatively as learning material, so they can be explored in language classrooms to enhance learners’ cultural knowledge.

6.1.2 Nonverbal Behaviour as the Main Topic

From the very beginning of this thesis, I have emphasized the significant role of nonverbal behaviours in communication. I have discussed previously that certain kinds of Indonesian students’ nonverbal behaviours can be problematic in their interactions in tutorials. I have also shown that a similar proxemic tendency among Indonesian and Australian students is more likely to result in the maintenance of distance and become the main barrier for the students to initiate intensive voluntarily interactions. In addition, I have shown how the Indonesian Moslem female dress code can cause hesitation among Australian students in
starting a conversation. These findings, in short, have shown that having verbal skills of English does not guarantee that Indonesian students will be able to engage themselves intensively in intercultural interactions in Australian ‘international’ universities. There are problems that need to be addressed, and some of them, as this thesis has shown, are such subtle things as nonverbal behaviours. For this reason, I tried to create learning material with nonverbal behaviours as the themes.

6.1.3 Intercultural Competence, Intercultural Learning and EFL
Based on my explanation in previous chapters, there are two groups of intercultural problems that were experienced by Indonesian students studying in Australian universities. The first group includes problems that happened in tutorial settings, which mostly related to face saving and power distance cultural values of Indonesia. The second group includes problems that might happen in interactions between Indonesian and Australian students. One problem that has been very obvious since the very first stage of this study is the lack of interaction between Indonesian and Australian students. All these problems can be manageable if one has “intercultural communication competence” which is “the overall internal capability of an individual to manage key challenging features of intercultural communication: namely, cultural differences and unfamiliarity, inter-group posture, and the accompanying experience of stress” (Kim 1991, p. 259, cited in Samovar & Porter 2004, p. 303). Being intended to address intercultural competence as the main objective, intercultural learning offers a method for learners to enhance their intercultural knowledge and skills.

A potential place for the implementation of intercultural learning is a foreign language classroom. In fact, communication skill that has been the main objective of any language classroom cannot be achieved without a good knowledge about the culture of the language being learnt. Comprehension of a meaning can be achieved when, in addition to having the same linguistic knowledge, communicators are also aware of what previous knowledge they had before and what is expected from them in particular communicative circumstances (Bredella 2003b, p. 33).
6.1.4 Basic Concepts of Intercultural Learning as the Foundation of the Learning Material

The very first question to be dealt with is what needs to be learnt in an intercultural learning program. This question is important in material development because it determines what to be included in the learning material.

In intercultural learning, learners need to: (1) identify the things that would be significant in a cultural system, and (2) learn how to use the information appropriately in communicating with people from other cultures within various situations (Ramsey 1996, p.1). These two processes are usually called didactic and experiential learning (Behnd 2008, p. 51).

Regarding the didactic learning, it might be difficult to determine what to be taught. Culture is very complex. Teaching all significant details of a cultural system would not be possible (Corbett 2003, p. 24). Beside that, the notion of national culture that has been the main reference point for most intercultural studies, may not be very helpful since in one culture, there is always a possibility of variation due to social groupings (e.g. high class culture vs middle class culture), age group (e.g. youth culture vs well established mainstream culture), ethnicity, regions and individual differences. As a solution to this problem, it is necessary for an intercultural learning program to adjust the material to learners’ need.

Experiential learning is considered as the best method in training someone to communicate with people from different cultures because it gives the opportunity to operate oneself within the target cultural system (Valentine & Cheney 2001, p. 92). However, implementing experiential learning of this kind might be too costly for EFL learners in developing countries, such as Indonesia. As an alternative, internet-based activities can be useful. For example, O'Dowd’s (2007) study found that e-mail exchange can be a very useful tool in intercultural education. Other learning materials - such as magazines, internet websites, and films – can be also very useful for students to get more clear pictures of the target culture.

In the process of learning, it is crucial for learners to learn how to determine their stance in an intercultural interaction, that is, to determine the “third place” as “the core of intercultural competence” (Crozet, Liddicoat & Lo Bianco 1999, p. 5). Considering that “the third place is negotiated by each user as an intersection of the cultural perspectives of self and other”
(Liddicoat, Crozet & Lo Bianco 1999, p. 181), it is important for learners to learn to make decisions independently.

The next question to be addressed concerns the way cultural information can be learnt in language classrooms. It is commonly assumed that people experience intercultural problems because they operate themselves within a cultural system that is different from their home culture. Therefore, it might be reasonable to put more emphasis on the contrastive nature of the home and the target culture. The purpose of showing the difference is not to determine which of the cultural values being compared, is the ‘correct’ one. Rather, it is intended to pave a way to an understanding that “people must be allowed to be different from each other” (Ramsey 1996, p. 11).

Furthermore, it is important to emphasize the role of learners as “meaning makers” (Ramsey 1996, p. 14). Therefore, intercultural learning needs to create adequate opportunities for learners to develop their own ability in evaluating and understanding the differences, making their own solution, and being responsible for their own solution.

Based on this framework, I include contrastive behaviour as the main issue in the learning material that I created. The differences become a starting point of a series of activities including describing the differences, reviewing the differences by referring to both home and target cultural values, and discussing some possible solutions of appropriate ways to operate within such differences.

6.1.5 Aspects of Consideration in Learning Material Development

In developing a learning material, Tomlinson (1998, p. 7) suggested material developers take account of some fundamental considerations of secondary language acquisition. He proposed that learning materials have to:

1. leave certain effects on the users and be designed in such a way so learners can use the materials without too many difficulties;
2. present practicable task that can increase learners’ belief of their own competency, and topics that are suitable with the learners’ interest and needs;
3. use activities where learners are helped to search for knowledge independently and take into account that learners would learn something when they are well prepared;
4. show how language is used in genuine situations and draw learners’ attention on communicative aspects that become the focus in the lesson;
5. give changes to learners to engage in communication by using the target language and consider that learners need time to really learn from a set of tasks;
6. consider the variation of “learning styles” and emotional situations among the learners;
7. give sufficient time for learners to absorb language input at the beginning of a lesson, and combine activities aimed at improving “intellectual, aesthetic and emotional” capacities so learners are stimulated to use both sides of their brains;
8. avoid using an excessive number of tasks conducted under direct instruction;
9. invite learners to give comments at the end of activities.
(Tomlinson 1998, pp. 7-21).

6.2 Description of the Learning Material and Recommendations for Using the Learning Material

The learning materials that I present here will be the first two lessons of a course. The whole material is designed in a way that makes participants imagine that they are going to experience a journey called an ‘intercultural journey’. The journey is described in the learning material as a ‘bus trip’, in which the teacher is the ‘bus driver’ and learners are ‘passengers’.

The first lesson is intended to raise learners’ awareness that differences are unavoidable. Throughout the lesson, while having opportunities to defend their own opinions, learners are encouraged to listen and appreciate opinions different from their own. In this lesson, dress code is chosen as the topic of discussion because my findings reveal that it can be the most obvious difference in Indonesian-Australian intercultural situation. I hope that this first lesson can highlight one important characteristic of being an intercultural person, that is “… to be able to accept the others’ beliefs and values, even if we cannot approve them” (Bredella 2003a, p. 237).

The second lesson aims to raise the issue of ethnocentrism, and to challenge learners to question their own culture. In this lesson, I choose smiling as the topic because I was inspired by an Indonesian student’s comment in my research saying that smiling to strangers
is considered unusual in Indonesian culture. Whereas in fact, I and some of my friends highly appreciate the common practice among Australian people to smile even to a stranger. Overall, this second lesson is expected to meet the necessity for an intercultural person to “… reconstruct the others’ frame of reference and see things through their eyes in order to overcome our ethnocentric tendency to impose our categories and values on their behaviour” (Bredella 2003a, p. 237).

The current learning materials use the methodological procedure suggested by Gupta (2003, pp. 167-169) which basically includes three aspects: (1) “dynamic and interactive” classroom environment that encourages learners to share their own experiences, (2) discussions, and (3) a reflective journal. The dynamic and interactive activities are applied in lesson 1 by encouraging learners to share opinions in small groups, and move to another group and share opinions with different learners. Lesson two offers more dynamic and interactive activities through experiments at a larger scale outside the classroom. In both lessons, discussions become the central activity. All discussions in the presented lessons are conducted in classrooms, but in the whole course, students are encouraged to have informal discussions in small groups outside the classroom, where they can safely talk about their own ideas, and formulate several arguments to bring into class discussions. The journal writing is also part of learning activities. I prefer to use the term ‘diary’, which is a more familiar term for young learners. The diary is used in the whole course material, which, at some points, asks learners to write about their experiences and their feelings or thoughts about the experiences. In some stages of the course, learners are required to refer back to the diary, review their previous experiences and compare their experiences in some points of the whole course.

This material is meant to encourage active interactions between teachers and learners. Therefore, I wrote the learning materials by using a first person narrative point of view to create an effect that the teacher is talking to the learners. Creating an interactive situation, in my view, can reduce the distance between learners and teachers and can make learners feel safe in their classrooms. Without the safe feeling, learners may not get the optimal benefit of their intercultural learning because they would be tired, bore and unable to get the real point of the lesson (Gupta 2003, p. 161).
Therefore, it is important for teachers not to take a dominant role in the classroom. Instead, teachers need to encourage learners to learn how to make decisions independently in reacting to any intercultural problem, based on a complete understanding of their own culture and a non-judgemental appreciation of the foreign culture. Whatever decision would be made by learners in such situations, "one option for teacher is to refer learners to internationally agreed human rights as a basis for making a decision, rather than attempting to impose their own views from their position as teachers (Byram 1997a, pp. 44-6 in Byram 2003, p. 64).

6.3 Some Considerations in Implementing this Learning Material in Indonesian EFL Classrooms

The implementation of intercultural English learning may be a challenging idea in Indonesia. For example, while it has been maintained that addressing "intercultural communication skills" would be useful in increasing students' ability to communicate (Ariyanto 1996, p. 57), there is an indication that "cultural sensitivities", which lead to an unwillingness to discuss cultural differences, is still a hindrance in achieving communicative competence especially among Islamic teacher trainees (p. 181). Therefore, discussions on topics related to Islamic values need to be wisely managed.

The topics that I have chosen, dress code and smile, have the potential to be related to Islam. Islamic identity can be posed as the basic argument by learners who prefer wearing veils. Similarly, Islamic disapproval of much interaction between males and females without marital, parental or familial relationship can be used by learners to support their tendency not to smile to strangers. Addressing these issues can give opportunities to Indonesian Muslim students to learn how to react to any problematic difference. However, teachers need to be well prepared and wise in leading the discussions.

In these learning materials, I have offered several techniques that I think would be interesting for young learners. In the real implementation, teachers need to find more creative ways. Using local theatrical techniques, such as wayang (puppets) in Java or other kinds of theatrical performance, would be very interesting. Beside that, using theatrical technique would enable learners to experience 'other kinds of personalities'. In that way, provided that teachers can arrange a good preparation, learners have the opportunity to act in various
roles, and know how it feels to be in certain positions. A debriefing session after the performance, where learners can share what they think about their roles, would be very useful in concluding what could be learnt from the performance in terms of intercultural issues.

6.4 Learning Materials

6.4.1 Lesson 1

Warming up

Welcome to the Intercultural Journey. Before we start, we’ll have some warming up activities in this lesson.

Pre-activity

Please find some pictures from magazines, newspapers, shopping catalogues or internet websites of Indonesian and Australian publications. Cut the pictures and glue them to a piece of paper (using used paper is a good idea). You can bring as many pictures as you want. Try to find out the English word of each kind of dress that you have in your pictures. Try your best, using your best dictionary or asking the smartest people you know, but if you can’t make it, don’t worry. Bring the pictures to the class. I and your friends will try our best to help you.

Activity 1: Small-group discussions

Choose one picture which shows the dress that you think you will wear comfortably in most situations. Choose also one picture that represents the kind of dress that you don’t think you will wear. Give this second picture to me.

Sit in pairs or groups and show the dress picture that you like to your friends. Ask your friends what they think about your choice.

If your friends have different opinions, try to work out why they have different ideas. At this point, do not try to defend yourself. Just try to find out, as much as you can, why your friends have different ideas. Write your and your friends’ opinion on the first page of your diary. Now, give your friends the time to talk about their pictures.
If by chance you and all your friends like the same kind of dress, list the reasons on the second page of your diary why you and your friends like the dress.

**Activity 2: Presentations**
Now you and your friends have to talk to the rest of the class. Show the class the picture of dress that you like and tell them why you like it. You also need to mention if some of your group members do not agree with your choice. Tell the rest of the class why your friends do not agree with you. At this point, feel free to defend yourself if you like. If your group has a similar opinion, you can still sit together. Otherwise, ask the rest of the class who agree with your opinion and sit with them. At the end of this activity, your class will be divided into several groups. Each group has similar dress preference. I hope you won’t find yourself sitting alone, but if that happens, cheer up! It’s not the end of the world.

**Activity 3: Exhibition**
Now you are sitting with people who have similar ideas with you. Imagine that this means that you are sitting together with people from the same “culture”. All of you have similar preferences. That means you all believe, more or less, in the same thing. Again, if you are alone, don’t be nervous. Focus yourself on how to defend your own opinion. Remember, everybody has the right to be different.

I will divide the room into several spaces. Each group occupies one space. You can have a special name for your “culture”. Write “Welcome to (your culture’s name)” on a piece of paper and glue the paper on the wall you have in your space. Glue your favourite dress picture on the wall. All your friends will glue their pictures on the wall too. I will have my own space too. Remember the picture that you don’t like? It will be one of the pictures in my space.

Now go to another culture’s space and have a look on the pictures they have. Your “friends” from other cultures will visit your culture space and see your pictures too. Please remember to come to my space. I will be more than happy to welcome you. I have a surprise for you there! Do come along and join me in my space.
When you go back to your culture, talk with your friends how you feel when you see the other cultures’ picture. Express your and your friends’ impression in sentences and write it on the next page of your diary.

**Activity four: Class discussion**
I will show you a table showing the findings from my research comparing the dress worn by Indonesian and Caucasian students in Australian universities during hot weather. The findings show a sharp contrast. I will also show some pictures showing how students in Australia dress when attending classes in hot weather.

Feel free to give comment whenever you want to. You don’t need to wait until I give you time to ask questions or give comment. You don’t even need to raise your hand up! Simply say “Excuse me”, “Sorry”, and talk, or just talk! Don’t worry how I will think about you. Well, actually I’m trying to show you the way Australian students participate in tutorials. Be patient, this is the topic for another session.

**Self-reflection**
This lesson simulates the intercultural situation you may find if you study in Australian universities. You might find that what you think is true is not necessarily the truth in other cultures. So, how do you think you will react to the situation? Read again the sentences that you have written in your diary. They can be your feelings in the real intercultural situation.

At the end of this activity, I will distribute some cards, containing some comments given by Indonesian and Australian students when I asked how they feel about dress that are different from their own dress. Some comments are negative, but some others are positive. You can take the cards with you, read the comments, think about them and think also what you will do if you are in the same situation. Write your decision on your intercultural diary. On a certain point in your intercultural journey, you may revisit your decision and see how far you have gone in your intercultural experience.

---

16 Learning resource number 1 (see table 4 in appendix 9)
17 Teachers need to find pictures from various sources: magazines, shopping catalogues, websites, etc.
18 Learning resource number 2 (see page 143)
So, WELCOME AGAIN. Let’s start our journey! Sit back and enjoy your trip. The next stop would be the Smiling Island.

6.4.2 Lesson 2

First Stop: The SMILING Island

Activity 1: Experiment

This is our first stop and here we’ll find out when, with whom, how and why we smile. First of all, we need to do a little experiment about smiles. Don’t worry, this is not a difficult experiment and it does not cost much money, you know. You just need to be more confident than usual. If you are too shy, encourage yourself to be confident. If you are still very shy, it’s a good idea to do the experiment with a friend who is not too shy. I should remind you though, that this could be a little bit uncomfortable for you, so be patient, read this instruction to the end.

What you need to do is to go around this island. Whenever you meet people, try to smile to them and see how they react to you. Do they smile back or not? Record their reaction in your diary, on the page entitled “Do they smile back?” Just put a tick in “Yes” or “No” column. You need to do this experiment with at least 10 persons.

People in this island are very welcoming, especially to new people like you. If they approach you, and you are not comfortable with having a long chat, just tell them that you need to catch your bus, so you can go safely, without hurting their feeling. Again, going together with your friend would be a very good idea for your convenience.

GOOD LUCK !!!

---

19 See page 141
Activity 2: Class Discussion

How’s the experiment? I hope you enjoyed your activity.

We’ll talk about your findings shortly. Please mention how many “yes” and “no” you have and I will record them in the table I have now on the whiteboard. You can also do the same thing using the table in your intercultural diary page 5. Ok, let’s start!

Now we have the overall result. As a comparison, let’s see what an Indonesian student told me when I met her in Australia.20

Do you agree with her opinion?

Why do you agree or disagree with her opinion?

Do you smile at strangers in your culture?

Why do you think you smile or not smile to strangers?

If you are not accustomed to smile to strangers, how will you feel when a stranger smiles at you?

Self-reflection

If you are accustomed to smile at strangers, please think how you will feel if you smile at someone and the person just look down and not smile back. If you feel bad about it, please think how you will reconcile your feeling. If you are not accustomed to smile at strangers, please think how you will react if a stranger smiles at you. Will you smile back? How will you feel about it?

Write your feeling in your diary for your future reference. There will be a time in our journey when you can ask people who do smile at strangers why they do smile at strangers.

20 Learning resource number 3 (see page 144)
Pack your bag now, and hurry up. A more challenging activity is waiting in the next destination.
### 6.4.3 The Intercultural Diary

**Page 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MY OPINION</th>
<th>MY FRIENDS OPINION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We like the dress, and we think that we will wear this kind of dress most of the time because:

- ………………………………………………………………………………………………
- ……………………………………………………………………………………………
- ……………………………………………………………………………………………
- ……………………………………………………………………………………………
- ……………………………………………………………………………………………
- ……………………………………………………………………………………………
- ……………………………………………………………………………………………
- ……………………………………………………………………………………………
- ……………………………………………………………………………………………
- ……………………………………………………………………………………………
- ……………………………………………………………………………………………
My/Our first impression!
Do they smile back?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People’s number</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' Names</td>
<td>Number of People who Smile Back</td>
<td>Number of people who do not smile back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.4 Learning Resources

Learning Resource Number 1 (see table 4 in appendix 9)

Learning Resource Number 2

CARD 1

Indonesian respondent:
“… tidak boleh pake sleeper … sleeper itu katanya mo pi pasar”

(students) cannot wear sleepers [thongs] … sleepers [thongs] are, people say, for going shopping.

Australian respondent:
“… dress code in university is very well the same as what you’d wear to go shopping or do other things like that.”

CARD 2

Indonesian student:
“Yang penting nikmatin aja kapan lagi kuliah pake sandal jepit nggak pa-pa sih di kelas ya (tertawa)”

Just enjoy, there won’t be another time for us to wear thongs while in classrooms attending lectures / tutorials.

Australian student:
“I don’t really care what anyone looks like or what they wear or you know, as long as they smile and they’re nice people.”
Indonesian student

Kalau di Indonesia, justru kalau senyum-senyum sama orang, dikiranya nanti, eh aneh banget sih!

In Indonesia, if [we] smile at strangers, they will think, eh it's very strange!
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

This study set out to: (1) find out similarities and differences between Indonesian and Australian students’ nonverbal behaviour, (2) investigate the perception and interpretations of students from both cultural groups about the nonverbal behaviours, (3) isolate and predict intercultural problems that may arise because of different nonverbal behaviours, and (4) formulate the way of using the research findings in creating intercultural learning materials.

In terms of the first objective, this study has revealed several similarities between Indonesian and Australian students’ nonverbal behaviour. Students’ eye gaze while listening, their hand movements while speaking and their sitting posture while speaking were quite similar. These similarities can be considered as an indication of a universal pattern of communicative gestures, which may also explain the similarity of students’ body position and body orientation while having conversations. There was also an indication that head nodding can be similarly perceived as a signal of attention in Indonesian and Australian cultures, but it can give a flattering impression if it is displayed too frequently. The degree of the ‘too much’ head nodding can be culture specific and needs further investigation. Students’ seating preference was also similar. However, while the motive for Indonesians was more likely to help each other academically and socially, the motive for Australian was more for social purpose.

Many differences were found in various aspects. In tutorials, compared to Australian students, the Indonesian students were more formal. The level of formality / informality can be seen through students’ relaxed / unrelaxed body posture, their willingness / unwillingness to sit on the floor in the classroom, the practice of hand raising before asking questions versus speaking out directly, and students’ nonverbal behaviour when they come late. The level of expressiveness was also significantly different. Indonesian students were more likely to talk with restrained body movements and facial expression. Smiling was frequently displayed in speech on any topic, either the pleasant or the unpleasant type, even when someone does not understand yet. Pointing behaviour was never displayed by
Indonesian students. On the other hand, Australians were more likely to talk with more varied facial expressions. They moved their body freely and there were some cases when they displayed the pointing behaviour toward the tutor. Another difference was in terms of the use of the hand (the right versus the left hand). The differences can be seen as a reflection of different values in Indonesian and Australian cultures. Indonesian formality reflects the Indonesian tendency to promote order and respect for authority (teachers / lectures in classroom context). On the other hand, Australian informality reflects the Australian tendency to promote a relaxed atmosphere and a more equal power relationship between students and teachers. Indonesian inexpressiveness and smiling behaviour indicate an Indonesian preference to maintain harmonious relationship. In contrast, Australian expressiveness indicates an Australian preference for critical and independent thinking. In addition, the use of the hand is a matter of Islamic influence in Indonesia, while it is more likely to be only a genetic and biological handedness matter in Australia. Finally, the practice of sitting on the floor, which indicates the informality of Australians, is not possible in the Indonesian context due to the environmental factors and also because it is very unusual.

Many differences were also found outside tutorials. Dress code in hot weather days is the most significant difference. Another difference of significance is found in terms of the display of affective behaviour. Sitting on the floor and sitting / lying down on the lawns, commonly practised by Australians on sunny days, was very rarely observed among Indonesian students. Other differences, concluded from interviews, were in the practice of eye contact, hand shaking, hugging, cheek pressing and the gender-mixing in gatherings. As well, different levels of expressiveness found in tutorial observations may also happen in conversations outside the classrooms. In addition, the analysis also showed that smiling to strangers commonly practiced by Australians can be unusual in the Indonesian context. In contrast, head nodding, eye contact and head tossing that have specific cultural meanings in Indonesia appear to be unproblematic in Australian context.

The differences can be also related to different values maintained in Indonesian and Australian cultures. Limitation in the dress code and public display of affective behaviour in Indonesian culture can be traced to the strong religious influence. For Australian context, preference of casual dress code indicates the wearing of clothes for comfort and life style (e.g. students’ active lifestyle). Although one Australian respondent expressed his dislike of
the casual dress code because of his strong religious background, more careful investigation is needed before we made any conclusion related to the effect of religious values. Similar considerations apply to the issue of public display of affective behaviours. It seems that individual choice in these two areas is more likely to be limited by religious and social expectation in Indonesia, than in Australia. Other differences can be traced back to religious influence, the importance of status consideration and the preference for harmony maintenance in Indonesian culture.

Despite the various differences, it was found that Indonesian and Australian students' perception toward each other, mostly, was not negative. However, the interaction between them were still very limited, indicating that there might be still some hidden problems. This lack of interaction is a crucial issue, especially for Australian international universities. Since the problems were on both sides, the solution would also depend on both groups.

Indonesian students may find Australian tutorials less formal and students are encouraged to speak up. The hesitation among Indonesian students was reflected through their nonverbal behaviours. Changing the behaviours would not be useful. Rather, changing the attitude that lies behind the behaviour is the effective solution.

On the other hand, Australian students coming to Indonesia may find the situation, inside and outside the classroom as too formal, especially when some behaviour is linked to the matters of respect and social status. Limitations of the wearing of casual dress may be very annoying. Solutions to these problems would very much depend on the level of tolerance.

It is important to maintain that “… not all people in a particular culture engage in the same nonverbal actions, so interpretations of nonverbal communication must be carefully evaluated before generalizations can be made” (Samovar, Porter & McDaniel 2008, p. 200). What I have presented so far is really far short of an adequate base from which to draw valid generalizations. Perhaps, we would not be able to achieve real generalizations since Indonesia is not ‘one’ culture, as well as Australia. I believe that there would be continuous revisions of our understanding about a society, since there would be always a change in a society. Culture does not remain unchanged and one person’s observation will never be enough to cover the whole possible variation within ‘one’ culture. Yet, outlining
the differences is important, because that is the point from where people can start an intercultural journey, while maintaining an awareness that it is always possible to come across the ‘unexpected’ along the journey.

Based on these findings, I have created two learning materials. In creating the materials, I incorporated interactive activities that are aimed at encouraging learners to actively put aside their ethnocentrism, adopt an open-minded attitude, and negotiate their own stance in engaging in any kind of intercultural encounters.

I created this material with an expectation that Indonesian students would be able to prepare themselves before entering new situations in different cultures, such as Australia. However, a complete solution would not be achieved without an equal effort on the side of the host culture. One may assume that newcomers are expected to adjust themselves to the cultural expectation in the new place. This assumption may be true to some extent, but there are several things, such as those related to religious beliefs, that cannot be negotiated anymore. In such cases, a proactive communication between the two sides is important, because only through communication, problems can be identified and solved. In this matter, Australian universities, at least based on my two-years experience studying in Australia, have initiated sufficient efforts. Information about Australian culture is widely available for international students. Furthermore, in some aspects, the university has also initiated innovative academic and non-academic programs to create opportunities for interaction between local and international students. Such efforts need to be continued and improved to ensure the smoothness of learning experience within universities. Yet, outside universities, the attitude and expectation of the rest of community, comprised as it is of people from various cultural backgrounds and various levels of tolerance, is still a big challenge for international students.

This thesis leaves several gaps to be filled by other research. Firstly, although I have focused on nonverbal behaviours, I could not videotape students’ behaviours because permission was not forthcoming. Further research that can use video recording can clarify some problematic behaviours such as pointing and smiling. Beside that, I have also concentrated on students’ perspectives in most of my analysis. Analysing data obtained from other relevant sources, such as tutors and university administrative staff, will give a
more comprehensive understanding of the intercultural problems. In addition, similar research conducted by people from other cultural backgrounds can be useful to give alternative interpretations of students’ nonverbal behaviours. Also, considering that Indonesian and Australian culture are not homogenous, it would be valuable to conduct research comparing the “cultures” existing within these two cultures.

Finally, I have learned throughout this study that some crucial parts of communication are realized and interpreted through nonverbal symbols. Even one’s decision to communicate can be based on nonverbal cues, before verbal interactions are started. About this, an author said: “... it isn’t the rational verbal language that moves human beings to action, but the great, underlying force that actually causes interaction between people and nations is the emotional, attitudinal communication” (Key 1975, p. 21). This opinion has been propounded many years ago, but it is still relevant to the current situation. The only world that we have is still witnessing wars and serious violence, partly because of the lack, or even the unwillingness to communicate.
Appendix 1: Seating arrangement in tutorials 2a and 8b

Tutorial 2a

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>AM1</td>
<td>AM2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM1</td>
<td></td>
<td>AM3</td>
<td>AM4</td>
<td>AM5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM2</td>
<td>AM6</td>
<td>AM7</td>
<td>AM8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>CM3</td>
<td>AM10</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM4</td>
<td></td>
<td>AF11</td>
<td>AF12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AF13</td>
<td>Obs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T = Tutor
IF = Indonesian female student
IM = Indonesian male student
AF = Asian female students
AM = Asian male students
CM = Caucasian male students
P = Pakistani student
Obs = Observer
Notes:

T = Tutor
Com = Computer
CF = Caucasian female students
AM = Asian male students
AF = Asian female students
IM = Indonesian male student
Obs = Observer
Appendix 2: Sitting posture of Indonesian and Caucasian students in tutorials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sitting Postures</th>
<th>While Listening</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaning far forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(16.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaning forward</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(66.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight back</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(16.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaning backward</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaning far backward</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaning forward + Straight back</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaning forward + leaning backward</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaning forward + Straight back + leaning backward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight back + leaning backward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight back + leaning far backward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaning far backward and leaning far forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Illustrations of Some Sitting Posture

Leaning far forward

Leaning forward
Sitting with straight back

Leaning backward

Leaning far backward

Source: Personal collection
Appendix 4: An interview quotation and its translation

Interview quotation


English translation

... just by chance yesterday, what my lecturer eh the lecturer explained bla bla bla. Actually I didn't agree with his/her opinion. And there are many parts of that [the explanation] that I couldn't understand. But finally I thought, I had ever asked him/her the same question once. His/her answer was different [unsatisfied]. So [in the next classes], I just smiled like that. Maybe when I asked a question, he would answer my questions in the same way when I asked the same question before so I still didn't understand. It's like that.
Appendix 5: Description of a conversation

In a conversation between a man and a woman, the man gazed toward the woman's face (eyes and other parts of the woman's face) almost all the time. He looked away only when he stopped talking, but then gazed toward the woman's face again once he started talking again. Since he talked almost all the time, the frequency of his gazing was very intensive. The woman also gazed toward the man almost all the time. She bent her head downward only a few times. When the man stopped talking and looked away, she looked away as well, but once the man started talking, she gazed toward the man again. In this conversation, the eye gazing was very intensive from both communicators.
Appendix 6: Table 1 - Space while walking (Caucasian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair Combinations</th>
<th>Space / numbers of data</th>
<th>SUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 30 cm</td>
<td>± 30 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian Females +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian Females</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17 (80.95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian Females +</td>
<td>2 (7.41%)</td>
<td>20 (74.07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian Males +</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 7: Table 2 - Australian respondents’ comments about public displays of affective behaviours by male-female couples in Australian university environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS’ AGE</th>
<th>Sitting close together</th>
<th>Walking together with a very close space</th>
<th>Holding hands</th>
<th>Hugging</th>
<th>Cheek pressing</th>
<th>Lying side by side on lawns</th>
<th>Leaning head on other people’s shoulder</th>
<th>Stroking head</th>
<th>Caressing</th>
<th>Embracing</th>
<th>Kissing</th>
<th>Really invloved kissing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Between 20-29</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>depends on the space, not always mean having a relationship (A10/210-212)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>no problem (A10/190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Between 20-29</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>acceptable between female friends and male-female couples or friends (A4/49-52)</td>
<td>acceptable between female friends and male-female couples or friends (A4/42-46)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>quite acceptable/ more friend based (A4/86)</td>
<td>generally among girls (A4/88-90)</td>
<td>It is acceptable, but some people (who are conservative) do not like it (A4/96)</td>
<td>acceptable between female friends and male-female couples or friends (A4/89-74)</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>not acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>Between 20-29</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>common, acceptable (A12/206)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>annoyed but common and acceptable (A12/212-217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>fine (A7/339)</td>
<td>fine, also among friends (A7/342)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>fine, (A7/344), depends on the place, library no, lawn ok (A7/353-358)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Ok (A8/203)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Ok (A8/203)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>&quot;fine&quot; (A5/22)</td>
<td>&quot;not really acceptable&quot; (A5/23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older generation (information according to A1)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>No (A1/505)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>&quot;...I guess umm kissing of most varieties among the older generation wouldn't be so acceptable.&quot; (A1/498-499)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>\footnotesize{Ok (A9/239-240)}</td>
<td>\footnotesize{N/D}</td>
<td>\footnotesize{Ok (A9/233)}</td>
<td>\footnotesize{&quot;That's not a problem,&quot; also among close friends (A9/260-263)}</td>
<td>\footnotesize{Ok, also among close male and female friends (A9/265-269)}</td>
<td>\footnotesize{N/D}</td>
<td>\footnotesize{N/D}</td>
<td>\footnotesize{N/D}</td>
<td>\footnotesize{N/D}</td>
<td>\footnotesize{N/D}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 8: Table 3 – Indonesian respondents’ comments about public displays of affective behaviours by male-female couples in university environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Place of origin in Indonesia</th>
<th>Walking together</th>
<th>Walking together with a very narrow space</th>
<th>Holding hands</th>
<th>Slinging an arm over one’s shoulder</th>
<th>Hugging</th>
<th>Lying together (in groups)</th>
<th>Embracing</th>
<th>Kissing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I11</td>
<td>Bandung (West Java)</td>
<td>Often found</td>
<td>Not obvious</td>
<td>Not found, but acceptable</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Common (between friends)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Not acceptable</td>
<td>Never found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>Jakarta (University X)</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>No problem</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Common (between friends)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Not acceptable</td>
<td>Not acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I7</td>
<td>Jakarta (University Y)</td>
<td>Common (558)</td>
<td>Uncommon (598)</td>
<td>Uncommon (598), strange (690)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td>Malang (East Java)</td>
<td>Acceptable (572)</td>
<td>“No problem”</td>
<td>“Vulgar” (584)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I13</td>
<td>Manokwari (West Papua)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Maybe Yes (385-387)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Not at all (387)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I9</td>
<td>Gorontalo (Northern part of Sulawesi)</td>
<td>Acceptable (618)</td>
<td>Not acceptable (620)</td>
<td>“bad attitude” (548), “negative perception” (548), “unusual” (553, 555), uncommon (572)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I9</td>
<td>Gorontalo</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Students start</td>
<td>Students start</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Can be found</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern part of Sulawesi</td>
<td>doing</td>
<td>doing</td>
<td>with certain groups of students (e.g., Mahasiswa Pecinta Alam)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ternate (Maluku), Makassar (South Sulawesi)</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Rarely found</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9: Table 4 – Clothes wore by Caucasian people and Indonesian students in hot weather in two Australian universities

Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Clothes</th>
<th>Backless/ Tube Tops Tunic</th>
<th>Short Dress (with / without sleeves)</th>
<th>Cropped Blouses / Shirts</th>
<th>Singlet / Tank Tops</th>
<th>Tight t-shirts / blouses</th>
<th>Semi-tight t-shirts / blouses</th>
<th>Ordinary T-Shirts / Blouses</th>
<th>long-sleeves blouses / t-shirts</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Skirts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic shorts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium shorts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Skirts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three quarters pants / trousers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pants / trousers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Skirts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Male

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Clothes</th>
<th>Singlet</th>
<th>Ordinary T-Shirts / Shirts</th>
<th>Polo Shirts</th>
<th>Long-sleeve T-shirts / shirts</th>
<th>Jumpers / Jacket</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda / Cargo Shorts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pants / Trousers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
I = Indonesian students (Yellow)
C = Caucasian people (Green)
Appendix 10: The definition of some types of clothes

1. Tube tops: Tops that do not cover the shoulders
2. Cropped blouses / shirts: a blouse or shirt that does not cover the middle part of the trunk
3. Tank tops: sleeveless tops that fit the body
4. Tight t-shirts / blouses: t-shirts / blouses that fit the body
5. Semi-tight t-shirts / blouses: t-shirts / blouses that do not fit the body, but are not as loose as ordinary t-shirts / blouses
6. Basic shorts: tight shorts that cover half or less part of one’s thigh
7. Medium Shorts: loose shorts that cover one’s whole thigh
8. Medium Skirts: skirts that cover one’s whole thigh
9. Three quarter pants / trousers: pants / trousers that cover one’s thigh, knee and half of the limb
10. Bermuda / Cargo shorts: loose shorts (looser than medium shorts) that cover one’s whole thigh and knee.
Appendix 11: Table 5 – Clothes wore by Caucasian people and Indonesian students in cool weather in two Australian universities

Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Clothes</th>
<th>Backless/Tube Tops</th>
<th>Short Dress (with / without sleeves)</th>
<th>Cropped Blouses / Shirts</th>
<th>Singlet</th>
<th>Tight t-Shirts / blouses</th>
<th>Semi-tight t-shirts / blouses</th>
<th>Ordinary T-Shirts / blouses</th>
<th>Long sleeves blouses/ t-shirts/ cardigans/ jackets / jumpers</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Skirts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic shorts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium shorts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Skirts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three quarters pants / trousers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pants / trousers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Skirts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Clothes</td>
<td>Upper Clothes</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singlet</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda / Cargo Shorts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pants / Trousers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
I = Indonesian (Yellow)
C = Caucasian (Green)
Appendix 12: Additional information about Indonesian Moslem female dress

Clothes wrapped around the head has been recorded as part of traditional female dress in Batak and Minang\textsuperscript{21} (Niessen 1993, Parker 2005, both cited in Warburton 2006, p.14). Another evidence can be obtained from Geertz (1976), who described that in Modjokuto\textsuperscript{22} females with Islamic educational background wore “Moslem head shawl or kudung” (p. 57). Indeed, religious value has been considered as one of several factors influencing dress code of Indonesian community (Nordholt 1997, cited in Hansen 2004, p. 11).

However, the *kudung* is different from the current veils (*jilbab* in Indonesian term, derived from Arabic word) currently popular in Indonesia. A *kudung* covers the head, but still reveals the neck, and sometimes ears and hairs at the front part of the head. On the other hand, a *jilbab* covers the head, the ears, and the neck. According to Brenner *jilbab* (1996) gained popularity since the beginning of 1980s mostly among “young, urban women” (Brenner 1996, p. 674), which could be the social background of most Indonesian female students in Australia.

\textsuperscript{21}Batak and Minang are two of many ethnics in Sumatra, Indonesia.

\textsuperscript{22}Modjokuto is located in Central Java, Indonesia.
Appendix 13: An Illustration of Acceptable Clothes in Indonesian Universities

NOTE: This illustration is included on page 169 in the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

Appendix 14: Examples of Interview Transcripts

Notes:

= ... = : Overlapping

(( ... )) : Nonverbal behaviours and unclear speech

( ... ) : Names of people, places and institutions

[ ... ] : Translator’s interpretation based on the context of the conversation and the translator’s knowledge about Indonesian language and culture in general.

[sic] : Errors made in the original conversation

... : Unfinished sentences: usually it continues to a later line that begins with three dots.
Interview transcription  
Respondent Number: Indonesian 4

I: Ok pertama kita, ini dulu, yang di tutorial ya.

R: Ha ah, ha ah,

I: Yang di tutorial itu pertama mengenai, apa itu, cara, cara orang duduk gitu. Kalau dari pengamatan saya, ehh kelihatannya, kita itu kan jarang duduk yang ehh, senak, seenak-enaknya gitu.

R: Hm, maksudnya =ini …=

I: =Maksudnya= bersandar =atau apa gitu.=

R: =Hmm=. 

I: Paling kita itu duduknya, lurus gini =atau …=

R: =iya=.

I: … paling banyak kayak gini ((I duduk condong ke depan)).

R: iya ha ah.

I: Ber …

R: ((Tidak jelas))

I: … ke depan gitu =ya=.

R: =Ha ah ah=

I: Ah itu, ehh, dulu (Nama R) kuliah di mana ya?

R: Saya di (Kota X), (Nama Universitas X)

I: Ah, ok, (Nama Universitas X) (Kota X). Berarti, oh iya tunggu dulu. Kalau lahir dulu dimana?

R: Di (Kota X).

I: Terus memang besar di (Kota X)?

R: Ha ah. Sampe sampe, saya lulus kuliah.

I: Sampai lulus kuliah?

R: Ha ah.

I: Ah terus kerja sudah pernah di mana saja?

R: Kerja aku baru sekali di, ini (Nama Institusi X)

I: Oh jadi ndak pernah, artinya blum pernah berpindah-pindah …?

R: Ehh, cuma proyek-proyek kecil begitu.

I: Oh, tapi maksudnya untuk dari dalam hal prilaku atau budaya itu memang ehh, apa Jawa gitu ya.

R: Ha ah.
I: Jawa apa ya kalau boleh tahu?
R: (Propinsi X).
I: (Propinsi X) gitu ya. Itu beda nggak dengan (Kota Y)? Maksudnya, =kalau (Kota X) ...
R: =Hm, hampir sama.= Hampir sama. =Hampir sama.=
R: Kalau konsekuensi negatif secara, secara real nggak ada sih =kali ya.=
I: =Hu uh.= Hu uh.
R: =Dalam hal ini dosen ya?= =Dosen=, dosen dalam hal ini iya kan. Kan nggak mungkin kita mau sender atau gini, kita nggak mungkin karna ya, ...
I: =Ha ah.= Ok.
R: =Uh, saya saya kira nggak sopan gitu lho.
I: Jadi memang dalam hal ini posisi duduk itu salah satu, ehh, perwujudan ya dari, sikap kita yang memang menghormati orang yang lebih, senior atau lebih, ...
I: =Ha ah.= Nah senior di sini maksudnya, cuma dari, dari segi usia atau dari segi status juga?
R: =Yah= iya, iya, iya, ha ah, =ha ah.=
I: =Ha ah.= Nah senior di sini maksudnya, cuma dari, dari segi usia atau dari segi status juga?
R: Karna kita bilang masalah pada waktu pembelajaran berarti, =di kelas kali ya.=
I: =U uhm, kalau misalnya=
R: Di kelas ya karna, ya karna dia, status dia sebagai seorang, dosen atau guru dia menyampaikan ilmu kepada kita kan.
I: Ha ha.
R: Itu beda skali sama, culture barat ...
I: Ha ah.
R: =Tapi ...=
I: =Ha ha.=
R: =Di kelas kali ya= yang mungkin menganggap sama. =Tapi ...
I: =Ha ha.=
R: =Tapi ...
I: =Tapi ...
R: =Tapi ...
I: =Tapi ...
R: ... kalau culture kita kan tetap, mereka dianggap lebih tua lebih menguasai ...
I: Ha ha.
R: ... jadi sudah kewajiban kita sebagai yang menuntut ilmu =untuk ...=
I: =Oh=.
R: ... hormat sama dia.
I: Jadi dengan kata lain misalnya, kalau misalnya dosennya itu, taruhlah misalnya dosennya lebih muda dari kita gitu.
R: Ya.
I: Apakah cara kita tetap sama atau kira-kira ada beda sedikit atau beda?
R: Saya kira tetap sama di konteks, =pembelajaran itu=.
I: =O oh= konteks kelas itu ya.
R: Iya. Ha ah. Ha ah.
I: Oh ok, jad [sic] dengan kata lain mungkin saya bisa bilang bahwa, dalam hal ini yang menentukan bukan cuma umur, ...
R: Ha.
I: ... tapi juga status ehh, =status ...=
R: =iya=.
I: ... orang ...
R: Status.
I: ... itu ya?
R: Iya betul.
I: Jadi walaupun dosennya itu, taruhlah lebih muda dari kita, kan biasa kan kalau dalam ...
R: Ya ya ya.
I: ... di Pasca Sarjana kan ada dosen-dosen yang muda =gitu ya=.
R: =iya ha ah=.
I: Ah, tetap ya ini, kita tetap respek gitu eh respek kita terhadap dosen itu tetap sama.
R: Ya.
I: Walupun dia lebih muda dari kita.
R: Iya menurut saya seperti itu. Tapi kan, jaman sudah berubah sekarang. Di satu sisi dosen udah mulai terbuka kan artinya, dia, apalagi dosen mulai menganggap ...
I: Hm.
R: ... kita equal karna antara murid dan guru adalah, sama.
I: Hm.
R: Cuma kebetulan yang cuma fasilitator aja kayak gitu. Jadi mungkin dia lebih terbuka. Tapi kalo, dosen-dosen masih, masih sudah tua atau sudah anu …
I: Oh,
R: Kan =masih … =
I: =Oh=
R: … udah kultur seperti =itu.=
I: =Yang …=
R: Feodal.
I: … old generation itu ya?
R: Iya seperti itu. Menurut saya seperti itu.
I: Jadi memang itu ehh apa, terbawa juga dari, maksudnya itu bagian dari, ehh, ehh apa namanya kebiasaan-kebiasaan kita di rumah, dengan keluarga =juga,=
R: =Iya=
I: Seperti itu.
R: Iya saya rasa begitu.
I: Kalau di rumah me, di rumah juga seperti itu maksudnya?
R: Eh …
I: Kalau …
R: Maksudnya nggak terlalu sih.
I: O oh.
R: Nggak terlalu tapi cuma, ya mungkin, nggak nggak terlalu seperti itu. Tapi kita tetap respek tapi, kalau di rumahkan lebih, tidak ada…
I: Agak lebih santai =gitu?=  
R: =Agak= lebih santai gitu lho. Kan tapi memang ada, ada batas-batas yang memang harus di ..
I: A ah.
R: … nggak boleh dilanggar seperti itu. =Kayak …=
I: =Oh.=
R: … kita, ada depan orang tua kita cigan gitu rasanya kan nggak pantas.
I: Cigan =apa itu?=  
R: =Cigan= seperti ini. Satu kaki di atas …
I: Ngangkat kaki gitu?
R: Ngangkat kaki, =taruh …=
I: =Ngangkat kaki.=
R: ... di paha gitu.
I: Oh itu, oh, oh, oh, ok, ok ...
R: Iya, iya, =kayak gitu =
I: =Kaya crossing ...=
R: Cros=sing ...=
I: =Cross=ing leg gitu ...
R: A ah.
I: ... itu nggak bisa ya?
R: Kayak gini.
I: Hm.
R: Kayak gini, kayak bos gini.
I: ((tertawa)).
R: Iya begitu kan? ((Tidak jelas.))
I: A ah.
R: Ya mungkin itu kurang, bisa sih, tapi mungkin kurang, pantas.
I: Kurang pantas lah.
R: Kurang pantas lah.
I: Jadi kalau dalam latar belakang keluarganya (Nama R) memang yang kayak kayak
   gitu memang masih kuat ya?
R: Uhm ...
I: Masih, masih dijaga gitu ya?
R: Iya. Masih diini, mungkin, mungkin ini ya karna dulu kecil memang di, ...
I: Di ...
R: ... dibuat seperti itu kali ya. Dikasihtanamkan kayak gitu ya kali ya.
I: Oh.
R: Jadi sampai sekarang, agak ini. Biarpun mereka sebenarnya, mungkin nggak
   keberatan tapi nggak disampaikan secara langsung kalau keberatan kalau
   ngangkat kaki =kayak gini.=
I: =Ha ah.=
R: Tapi mungkin kita juga harus ngejaga kan?
I: Oh kayak gitu ya. Ya anak-anak skarang kan, ada juga yang sudah ndak seperti itu
   ya mungkin dari keluarga yang, berarti mungkin tergantung dari pendidikan di
   keluarganya juga ya?
R: Iya iya.
Kalau keluarga yang sudah agak, ya dalam tanda kutip moderen gitu atau, moderat gitu, mereka mungkin ndak terlalu lagi, memperhatikan hal-hal seperti itu.

Mungkin seperti itu. Kan kesopanan kan ini, kayak dialektika gitu kan.

((tertawa))

Iya kan gitu. Kadang satu generasi ini masih sopan, abis itu nanti akan lebih ...

Hm.

... ke maju nanti kan =lebih ...=

=Hu uh.=

... kendur kendur kendur.

((tertawa))

Ini bisa di, =masih toleransi ...=

=Oh makin hari makin ...=

Iya seperti itu.

Ok. Ah trus yang kedua mengenai seating arrangement dalam tutorial itu kan, ya seperti kita ini sudah sudah isyu lama gitu bahwa, eh Indonesian student itu cenderung berkumpul dengan sesama Indonesian student lain.

Iya.

Nah ini saya mau konfirmasi, kalau (Nama R) sendiri merasa seperti itu atau nggak ya?

Iya memang ...

Kalau ada satu atau dua orang atau ...

Hm.

... ada teman itu memang cenderung, dengan teman itu ya?

Iya karna kult eh =secara norm ...=

=Itu kenapa tuh?=  

Normanya seperti itu. Kalau kita di, tempat asing habis itu kita ketemu sama teman yang mungkin, sama dari mana misalnya saya ketemu sama orang Indonesia satu gitu, oh iya kerasa satu. Apalagi kita minoritas seperti itu.

Oh ok.


Oh gitu ya.

Ha ah.
I: Oh dengan kata lain, karna tadi (Nama R) sebut minoritas, di sini ada isyu ehh, merasa safe gitu ya? Lebih kita lebih safe kalau ada dengan teman itu?
R: Ya. Kupikir bukan karna kita merasa aman apa nggak. Tapi memang, memang, ...
I: Nyaman aja?
R: Ck, apa tuh, ...
I: Comfortable ((tertawa))
R: Ya naturalnya seperti itu kan?
I: ((tertawa))
R: ((tertawa)) Kan itu.
I: Kalau misalnya, kalau misalnya ada teman yang tidak, yang agak lain itu. Maksudnya dia ndak kumpul dengan kita atau gimana. Itu ada, ada, ada, ada persepsi negatif ndak ya?
R: Eh kalau bagi saya pribadi sih nggak, =nggak masalah=
I: =Uh huh=
R: Eh, kan tiap-tiap orang beda gitu lho?
I: Uh huh.
R: Mungkin dia lebih suka, misalnya ada orang yang, saya di sini kan kumpul sama siapa-siapa yang baru, mungkin mereka bisa terbuka gitu sama orang lain mungkin ada yang nggak. Ada yang mungkin nggak bisa begitu suka sama yang bareng-bareng gitu, ya nggak ada salahnya.
I: Ya.
R: Cuma yang jadi masalah kalau dia benar-benar menutup diri seperti itu kan.
I: Uhm. Ndak maksud saya gini, misalnya kalau di kelas itu, eh trus kita kan cenderung, kalau misalnya ada orang, eh, teman kita datang gitu kita panggil ayo sini-sini duduk dekat sini …
R: Hu uhm.
I: … atau apa =gitu kan.=
R: =Hu uhm=.
I: Ah trus kalau misalnya, dia lebih suka dengan yang lain itu, atau nggak, …
R: Ya nggak …
I: … nggak kumpul dengan kita ya ndak apa-apa juga ya?
R: Ehm ndak ada masalah.
I: Oh, ndak ada masalah ya.
R: Preferensi mereka kan? =Ndak ada masalah kan=
I: =Eh Jadi kecenderungan= setiap orang beda ya?
R: Iya, gitu.
I: Ok. Ah trus itu kalau ada beberapa orang di dalam. Eh kebalikannya kalau
misalnya cuman satu atau dua eh, misalnya cuman kita sendiri gitu ya.
Pengamatan saya itu, menunjukkan, kalau cuma ada satu orang, itu mereka
biasanya, duduknya ya, di pinggir, atau di blakang gitu.
R: Hm.
I: Jarang gitu yang duduk di, di tengah-tengah atau apa gitu. Itu kira-kira apa
penyebabnya?
R: Ehm mungkin dia, ya pertama mungkin karna tempat duduknya, kebetulan ada
yang, cuma itu yang di pinggir mungkin dia pilih di situ toh. Atau mungkin, karna dia
mungkin, komunikasinya belum lancar kali ya, tapi ya …
I: Oh bahasa gitu, maksudnya bahasa?
R: Mungkin. Atau mungkin bahasanya udah bagus tapi dia cuman malas aja. Karna
orang yang kayak itu gitu kan, lagi malas aja sama, itu kan gitu. Tapi saya pikir, kalau,
yang mungkin komunikasi sih.
I: Ada ndak isyu-isyu seperti merasa, merasa under pi, apa, merasa underpressure
atau merasa tidak percaya diri, atau apa gitu?
R: Ada saya rasa. Saya tetap gitu jadinya. Merasa underpressure maksudnya nggak
ada percaya, tapi akhirnya ya, ya harus diterima seperti itu. Kalau kita
underpressure tapi nyatanya kita hidup di sini ya, terpaksa kita harus cope sama
itu. Maksudnya =ya…=
I: =Selama= ini (Nama R) sering, ada ndak maksudnya, keinginan untuk eh, punya
teman juga dari local student atau apa gitu?
R: Ehm keinginan itu ada. Ya tapi kan kalau dari kita sendiri yang membuka diri buat
orang lain, tapi orang lain menutup diri kan nggak bisa?
I: Maksudnya orang lain yang menutup diri ini siapa?
R: Dalam artian bukan bahwa maksudnya, kalau misalnya dua orang mau teman,
temenan gini kan, kalau satu nih, mungkin "Ayolah temenan" gini-gini gitu kan. Tapi
yang satu nggak mau kan juga susah. Maksudnya sperti itu kan. Jadi nggak bisa
dilihat dari satu sisi gitu. Kalo, kalo saya sebutulnya yah, saya kepingin berteman
dengan siapa pun gitu kan. Ketika terima kanyataan bahwa "Oh ini nggak, nggak,
belum bisa" maksudnya ya cuma, sebatas, yang say hello atau apa, ya memang
cuma segitu.
I: Oh, dengan kata lain menurut pengam [sic], pengamatannya (Nama R) itu ad, perasaannya (Nama R) gitu ya. Mereka itu kelihatan ada semacam keengganan untuk menerima kita nggak ya?

R: Eh keengganan itu ada tapi keengganan itu karna mereka mungkin belum terlalu mengenal kita sih.

I: Ok.

R: Seperti itu kan.

I: Kayak itu ya.


I: Kayak itu.

R: Ah hah.

I: Ok jadi keinginan ada. Kalau usaha atau inisiatif untuk, untuk itu ndak pernah?

R: Oh saya, ada inisiatif juga seperti itu. Jadi mis, =cuma kan …=

I: =Dalam= bentuk apa misalnya?

R: Eh kayak kita menyapa gitu kan.

I: Ok.

R: Ngobrol atau apa biarpun ngobrolnya cuma ya, masalah kuliah …

I: Yang …

R: … atau apa, nggak terlalu dalem lah seperti itu kan gitu.

I: Oh. Tapi ndak pernah lebih dari itu ya?

R: Ehm sampai saat ini saya belum …

I: Belum pernah?

R: Belum pernah.

I: Kalau ikut-ikut anu yang kegiatan-kegiatan klub, student club atau apa, ndak, ndak pernah?

R: Aku nggak. Masalahnya ya, beban kuliah terlalu =saya rasa …=

I: =Banyak tugas gitu ya?= ((tertawa))

R: Karna tambah lagi kan kita scholarship. Scholarship itu kan udah ada waktu.
I: Ada ikatan.
R: Iya. Cuman itu doang.
I: Terus yang ketiga ini mengenai ini masih dalam konteks tutorial gitu ya. Kalau misalnya kita, ini mo konfirmasi aja ya beberapa hal yang bisa atau tidak. Kalau di, di, dulu di (Universitas X) di (Universitas X), di (Universitas X) ya kalau kuliah atau ada diskusi-diskusi di kelas itu, eh apa, apa yang boleh dan tidak kita, apa yang tidak boleh kita bikin gitu, dalam segi gerakan tubuh? Kalau misalnya angkat kaki jelas mungkin nggak bisa ya?
R: Hu uh.
I: Angkat kaki yang pertama ndak bisa.
R: Angkat kaki atau berkacak pinggang atau apa.
I: Kalau bertopang dagu?
R: Bertopang dagu sih, nggak ada masalah sih. Karna itu nggak offend orang lain kali ya.
I: Ah hah. Kalau misalnya bertopang dagu seperti ini gitu, bertelekan di meja itu.
R: Ehm well, nggak ada masalah sih kalau, saya rasa itu kan, ...
I: Oh ok.
I: Uh huh.
R: Tapi kalau, di tempat, …
I: Uh huh.
R: … mungkin, saya gitu kan, kita juga mikir. Kadang-kadang orang kalau diam ini artinya apa?
I: =((tertawa))=
I: =((tertawa)) kayak gitu.
R: Ya untuk jag, kita kan nggak bisa ekspresi maksudnya ya, kita kan menjaga perasaan orang jadi, kita, =kita berlebihan gitu lho. Sebenarnya …=
I: =Kita juga merasa, terbatas jadinya=
R: … iya, kita berlebihan mikirnya, orang ini mungkin nggak suka kalau saya gini gini.
I: Padahal mungkin tidak juga ya.
R: Ya padahal mungkin nggak juga seperti itu =(tertawa) =
I: =(tertawa) Ya susah juga. Ah kalau eye contact itu gimana? Selama ini?
R: Eye contact, iya, iya.
I: Kalau bicara dengan dosen, itu, =kita jaga gitu ya?= 
I: Oh gitu ya?
R: Kadang lebih, )))((tertawa)) apalagi kalau rasa bersalah masak melihat gini.
I: Jadi melihat gimana )))((tertawa))? 
R: Ya, yang maksudnya … 
I: Atau mungkin jangan =terus-terusan gitu ya?= 
R: Jangan terus-terusan, abis itu gimana-gimana seperti itu.
I: Oh ok. Emangnya kalau misalnya ada orang kayak gitu gimana? Apa kesannya gitu?
R: Uhm?
I: Nggak sopan? Atau...
R: Nggak. Ceritanya, ceritanya masalah kayak, kayak wibawa gitu ya )))((tertawa)).
I: Oh contohnya …
R: Contohnya uhm …
I: Kita bicara dengan dosen.
R: Ya kayak feudal gitu ya. Maksudnya, kalau saya lho ya, pikiran saya tuh, ini dosen.
   Dosen berartikan ya lebih lah daripada saya.
I: Ya jelaslah.
R: Nah itu, seperti itu kan. Jadi, secara kultural kalau misalnya masalah gitu tuh,
   rasanya ya sungkan seperti apa seperti itu. Jadi kalau menatap secara langsung
   tuh rasanya juga nggak, nggak enak, juga nggak brani. Nggak brani dalam artian,
   bisa menyinggung juga gitu.
I: Uhm.
R: Susahnya gitu jadi …
I: Menyinggung, maksudnya menyinggung apa ini?
R: Oh …
I: Kira-kira, kira-kira dia akan berpikir apa?
R: Uhm, =ya anak brani begitu=
I: =Menangant gitu?=
R: Menantang tapi …
I: Oh begitu?
R: Tapi tapi, tapi ini nggak, nggak semuanya kayak gitu lho. Ini cuma cuma, mungkin mungkin untuk saya sendiri gitu kan?
I: Hu uh.
R: Ya saya juga merasa seperti itu gitu lho.
I: Ini untuk yang dosen yang old generation saja, atau yang dosen-dosen muda juga atau apa?
R: Kebanyakan old generation masih pake kayak gitu kan?
I: Kalau dulu waktu kuliah dosennya yang, kebanyakan yang bagaimana?
R: Kebetulan masih le [sic], mix sih. Mis xih.
I: Oh, uh huh.
I: Kalau di rumah gimana? Kalau dengan orang tua, eye contact, no problem ya?
R: Eh saya nggak brani. Kalau saya.
I: Oh gitu ya?
R: Dalam artian…
I: Dengan bapak saja, eh dengan bapak ibu atau salah satunya saja?
R: Eh mas [sic], eye contact maksudnya menatap langsung …
I: Uh huh.
R: … gitu secara anu ya? Tapi nggak brani terlalu, saya nggak kuat kalau terlalu ((tertawa)) ini.
I: Uhm kayak gitu ya.
R: Ya kayak gitu.
I: Jadi kalau bicara melihat kemana dong?
R: Oh kita melihat mereka, dengar atau, ya kita dengar atau kita melihat mereka, tapi kalau melihat secara langsung kayak gitu kan, melihat makanya, face to face gitu ...
I: Jadi kita nunduk?
R: Nggak, nggak nunduk. Ya kita lihat sebentar habis itu kita agak …
I: Lihat lagi ke lain, ke, arah-arah lain gitu ya?
R: Ya gimana ya maksudnya, secara, konstan waktu dalam berapa anu ya terus, terus ...
I: Oh ok. Iya saya ngerti. Jadi maksudnya, kalau lekat-lekat gitu ya ...
R: Iya iya.
I: ... nggak boleh kan ya?
R: O oh nggak boleh kayak ...
I: Tapi kita lihat, kemudian mungkin =ke arah apa atau gimana=
I: Oh ok. Oh iya. Itu memang masih, masih kuat ya, yang eye con [sic] masalah eye contact ini? Masih kuat ya kalau di keluarganya (Nama R)?
R: Uhm ...
I: Dan atau di masyarakatnya gitu?
R: Kalau saya sih sama orang tua sih kayaknya ((tertawa)) ...
I: Masih ya?
R: Dari kecil.
I: Ok. Eh itu mengenai eye con [sic], tapi kalau dengan teman biasa ya?
R: Biasa kalau saya.
I: Ah ok. Poiting finger nggak usahlah. Pointing finger jelas nggak bisa kan ... 
R: A ah.
R: Hu hum.
I: Senyum. Nah pada saat mereka senyum ini ...
R: Uh huh.
I: … atau ketawa gitu ...
R: Uh huh.
I: Itu, kita, interpretasinya gimana? Apakah mereka sudah mengerti atau ja [sic], “Tunggu dulu”, kayak gitu?
R: Itu susah juga ya.
I: O oh.
R: Kalau masalah nonverbal itu ya. Senyum juga kan, juga susah sih kayaknya. Tapi kalau saya sih, karna ditanya, juga bingung kalau maksudnya ...

I: O oh.

R: Kalau ditanya =begitu= ...

I: =Atau= kalau misalnya ditanya kayak gitu ...

R: Biasanya ...

I: Biasanya gimana?

R: Ya, yes, ya saya ngerti, gitu saya nggak ngerti ((tertawa)).

I: Uh huh.

R: Ya mungkin, bawaan, culture zaman, dahulu kala juga model gitu kan. Kalau di skolah kan ditanya kan istilahnya, orang ketahuan bodoh kan malu.

I: Ketahuan sama sapa nih? Teman atau dosen?

R: Ya maksudnya di depan kalo, dulu saya lihat depan kelas gitu kalo, "Ah nggak bisa wah..." =gitukan=

I: =Oh gitu= jadi dengan teman-teman ya ada semacam keengganan untuk dibilang, ...

R: Iya.

I: ... lemah atau apalah gitu.

R: Iya, untuk kop, semuanya juga gitu sih.

I: Oh ok. Jadi maksudnya di sini, maksudnya kita, kadang-kadang kalau, eh, dosennya tanya "Ngerti ndak? Ya kita =ketawa aj=a=

R: =Ya dijawab mengerti.=

I: Pura-pura aja ngerti gitu? Dengan kata lain untuk, supaya kita, tidak dianggap ...

R: Bodoh.

I: Bodoh gitu aja?

R: Ya saya rasa begitu.

I: Kalau dengan dosennya sendiri ada perasaan lain nggak?

R: Gimana sih?

I: Maksudnya, kan kadang -kadang gini. Ada kan yang, pernah juga sih ada kasus. Misalnya dikelas gitu, dia bilang, kita kan bertanya gitu, bertanya, bertanya. Trus, ada teman yang mengingatkan. Dia bilang "Eh kamu kalau bertanya di kelas jangan terlalu banyak." Saya bilang "Kenapa emangnya?", "Nanti dosennya tersinggung.", "Lho, apa maksudnya tersinggung?", "Nanti kamu dikira ngetes," ...

R: Ya ya itu ada betul, =betul=
I: =… dosennya.= Itu ada juga ya, seperti itu ya?
I: Ya betul betul.
R: Adjust ke situ.
I: Jadi memang ada, untuk mengatakan bahwa kita “I don’t understand” gitu.
R: Mung …
I: Atau “Bisa nggak diulangi lagi” gitu, itu memang agak masih berat?
R: Mungkin berat karna mungkin ya, ada tempat kelas, satu kelas gitu ya. Tapi kalau misalnya, misalnya kita sama dosen =terus kita berdua …=
I: =Individual?=  
R: … begitu kan …
I: Oh ok.
R: … mungkin, lebih terbuka. Oh saya nggak ngerti ini-ini. Satu sisi kan kita, kita sendiri yang maksudnya, kita langsung tanya apa kita nggak perlu lihat orang lain, mungkin orang lain pada mau tanya, kita juga mikir kan. Ini mungkin kalau saya seperti ini, orang lain mungkin, juga mau tanya, atau apa kita nggak bisa terus.
I: Ok jadi karna (Nama R) sudah bilang itu kan, berarti di sini, pressurenya itu justru bukan dari guru, tapi pressurenya itu, justru lebih dari, teman gitu ya. Karna ternyata kalau individual kan kita lebih terbuka jadinya. Kayak gitu ya? Kalau di sini ya?
R: Sebenarnya pressure-nya, bukan mereka mem-pressure kita tapi perasaan kita aja.
I: Oh perasaan kita.
R: Ya betul.
I: Dan perasaan di sini bukan juga, bukan, lebih besar sebenarnya perasaan kita dibandingkan dengan teman-teman yang lain kan.
R: Iya.
I: Jadi, ((tertawa)) kayak gitu ya?
R: Hu uh hu uh.
I: Ok, ok, karna kan ada litre [sic], di dalam literature itu katanya eh, itu, nggak eh, Indonesian student itu katanya jarang bertanya, karna katanya dianggap, sebagai challenge pada guru.

R: Ya ya. Hu uh.

I: Ya kan. Tapi kan ternyata skarang, bukan cuma dari guru pressurenya, tapi juga dari peer student yang lain to.

R: Ya bu [sic] …

I: Artinya kita ndak mau dibilang …

R: Iya kayak gituan masuk perasaan open sama student lain seperti itu kan.

I: Iya, nah itu baru.

R: Hah?

I: Itu baru blum ada dalam literature ((tertawa)).

R: Masa?

I: Hu uh.

R: Nggak kan, kalau di culture kita kan kayak harmoni gitu. Seperti masing-masing itu jaga posisi jangan sampai satu …

I: Lebih di …

R: … nyomplang, yang satu anu.

I: Oh maksudnya?

R: Maksudnya, kalau misalnya dalam satu kelas jangan sampe satu yang terlalu menonjol jangan sampe terlalu ini.

I: Oh gitu ya ada ya kayak gituan.

R: Kayak harmoni.

I: Dengan kata lain kalau misalnya, kalau misalnya anak itu pintar gitu. Dia diharapkan gimana ekspektasinya?

R: Yah jang …

I: Jangan terlalu show off gitu?

R: Ya jangan terlalu show up ya cukup, ya kan ilmu padi kan makin merunduk aja nggak usah terlalu, gitu.

I: Jadi kalau dia misalnya, misalnya kan kalau di Indonesia kan dosen suka tanya- tanya itu. Jangan menjawab-jawab terus gitu?

(R menjawab telepon).
I: Jadi berarti kalo yang pintar itu diharapkan ekspektasinya itu jangan juga terlalu show off gitu? Dengan kata lain kalau misalnya nanya-nanya jangan jawab terus. Gitu ya? ((tertawa))

R: Kalau, jawab tuh boleh asal, kalau kita dijawab kita jawab tapi kalau kita suruh sukarela itu kan …

I: Angkat tangan terus gitu? ((tertawa))

R: Ya kalau angkat tangan terus ya, ya nggak apa-apa sih. Tapi kan ada perasaan kayak gitu kalau saya sih. Tapi memang itu kan birokrasi ya kayak gitu. Jadi kalau misalnya kan, kalau birokrasi kan, ya kita masih muda masih pinter kayak gimana nggak bisa mendahului yang paling senior biarpun senior itu, nggak bisa apa-apalah kita kan gitu.

I: ((tertawa))

R: Kan gitu.

I: Hu uh, hu uh.

R: Nggak nggak anu, nggak sopan maksudnya nggak, nggak bisa diterima kayak gitu.

I: Unacceptable itu. Ok itu mengenai smile, eh, ada juga yang bilang, eh ini dia bilang “Indonesian student itu kok kalau cerita, itu ya kalau cerita”, pernah ada yang bilang gini. Eh itu dia cerita mengenai tsunami waktu itu kan. “Itu dia cerita mengenai tsunami tapi kok sambil ketawa sambil senyum gitu?”. Orang Australi ini ya orang bulenya yang bilang. Dia bilang itu “Dia cerita mengenai tsunami tapi saya heran itu kenapa dia ceritanya itu sambil senyum?”. Itu memang se [sic], benar apa?

R: Ya itu kemungkinan sama, apa ya?

I: Dia kan maunya mungkin kayak orang bulenya ini, kalau misalnya memang cerita mengenai sesuatu yang menyedihkan itu kayak, mukanya itu kayak gimana itu. Kalau bilang sorry “Oh I’m sorry” ((I menunjukkan expresi wajah sedih)) atau apa gitu.

R: Ya karna mungkin dia nggak pernah merasa tsunami kali ya. Kan kita empatinya kurang kalau ini. Dalam artian ya …

I: Empati …

R: Ya?

I: Empati, maksudnya? Kita ini siapa? Kita?

R: Ya kayak, apa Indonesia ya? Indonesia terlalu tinggi sekali kalau mungkin…

I: Beberapa mungkin. Beberapa …
R: Ha ah.
I: Ada orang yang ...
R: Maksudnya ada yang aku pernah membaca itu, kita tuh terlalu sering lupa itu. Kayak tsunami itu angin lalu. Tsunami itu angin, selesai, dibangun lagi, selesai, nggak ada tsunami. hepi-hepi.
I: Hu uh.
R: Kan kayak itu maksudnya ya cepat lupa. Kan kupikir nggak bisa, kayak contohnya kayak kerusuhan um di Jakarta.
I: A ah.
R: Sembilan lapan itu kan. Itu brapa yang kena, brapa yang terbakar. Tapi udah brapa tahun dia jadi mall.
I: Iya. Hu uh.
R: Cepat dilupakan rasa duka itu ((tertawa)). Cepat dilupakan kayak gitu.
I: Cepat melupakan rasa duka itu ((tertawa)).
R: Rasa duka ya, buat apa susah, lagunya buat apa susah ((tertawa)).
R: Ya kalau Jawa sih kalau Jawa lho ya. Itu memang menunjukkan ekspresi nggak baek. Kurang ...
I: Jadi memang ada nilai cultural ...
R: Ada.
I: ... situ ya?
R: Kamu, coba lihat ...
I: Menunjukkan ekspresi disini maksudnya apa?
R: Ya, kalau senang ya, ya senang aja. Tapi jangan sampe ...
I: Yang kayak itu.
R: Oh gini gini gitu gitu ((R menunjukkan ekspresi yang, dari sudut pandang Indonesia, terlalu gembira)). Tapi kalau susah ya, ya susah aja tapi jangan sampe susah sampe betul betul susah banget ((tertawa)).

I: Oh begitu.

R: Coba kalu kemarin, kayak SBY itu kan. Presiden kita ketemu sama presiden Brazil kemarin kan beda skali itu kayanya.

I: Hu uh hu uh ya SBY kan =memang kalem orangnya=.

R: =SBY kan kal [sic], kalem ya maksudnya ya, kayak, kayak raja kayak itu kan ya, memang, ya jangan kelihatanlah itu. Harus slow, tenang, harmoni kayak itu kan.

I: Oh gitu. Jadi memang dalam kebudayaan Jawa khususnya, (Propinsi X). Ini kan (R's name) =tadi ngomongnya, budaya Jawa ...=

R: =Itu secara secara umum sih.=

I: ... atau budaya...

R: Umum sih tapi, tapi jangan aku, aku jangan bilang budaya Jawa nanti salah lagi ((tertawa)).

I: Pokoknya dalam keluarga taruhlah misalnya ...

R: Eh, aku pernah baca sih model-model itu. Jadi kayak, itu ya ekspresi itu jangan-jangan di ...

I: Perlihatkan?

R: Karna semakin orang bisa mengontrol emosi itu kelihatan dia semakin bijak.

I: Ok. O oh. Jadi semakin dia tidak, memperlihatkan emosi secara berlebihan itu ...

R: Dia berarti bisa gontrol dirinya.

I: Oh ok jadi =mengontrol ...=

R: =Kontrol ...=

I: ... emosi ya.

R: Mengontrol diri kayak itu.

I: Oh ok.

R: Kalau aku di teman-teman kita sendiri kayak, kayak Mbak (Nama teman R) itu ya. Mbak (Nama teman R) itu kan memang kelihatannya ...

I: Mbak (Nama teman R), =Mbak (Nama teman R) (Nama kota tempat teman R bekerja)?=

R: =(Nama teman R) teman kita.= Kan modelnya kan itu. Senang ya senang tapi nggak, nggak terlalu ini, gembira ya gembira nggak terlalu ...

I: Ok
R: Saya pernah baca sih memang itu, memang agak, kontrol diri sendiri gitu.
I: Kalau di lingkungan keluarga atau lingkungan kerjanya (Nama R) eh, lingkungan kerja skarang bukan di Jawa kan (Nama kota tempat R bekerja).
R: Hu uh
I: Eh misalnya taruhlah misalnya di lingkungan masyarakat di (kota X) =di tempat tinggal …=
R: =(Kota X) nggak sih= (Kota X) tempat saya kan kultur ini keras maksudnya …
I: Oh lain beda ya.
R: Beda.
I: Kalau ((Propinsi X)).
R: ((Propinsi X)) berbeda. ((Propinsi X)) ama (Kota Z) ini kan, kalau (Kota Z) emang modelnya gitu kalem, tenang, anteng …
I: (Propinsi Z)
R: Kalau (Propinsi X) kan modelnya memang agak, agak berontak gitu agak lepas dari mulai lepas dari, norma-norma kayak gitu. Culture dia mulai, equal sama …
I: Kayak gitu ya. Ok, all right. Ya jadi itu mengenai yang ekspresif. Eh apa tadi itu, eh, mengontrol emosi gitu ya. Ok. Ah itu sudah yang tutorial, skarang yang di luar kelas itu ya. Di luar kelas. Eh, pertama mengenai, eh apa itu, ini aja dulu. Ini kalau kita kan kalau barbeque-an, atau ada meeting-meeting gitu kan ya, eh kita kan kecenderungannya itu, laki-laki ama laki-laki gitu ya, perempuan sama perempuan. Itu kalau di Jawa atau di (kota X) dulu waktu kuliah, atau skarang di tempat kerja memang juga seperti itu kecenderungannya? Kalau ada pertemuan atau acara-acara apalah gitu?
R: Ya rata-rata seperti itu.
R: Ah tergantung sih. Kalo, eh beda sih kalo, kadang tuan rumah ngadain cuman sunatan yang datang satu-satu kan dene, suami sama istri bareng itu kan abis itu ngobrol-ngobrol sebentar abis itu makan bareng nggak masalah. Ada juga yang den istrinya dipisahkan.
I: Oh ada juga?
R: Ada juga gitu hu uh.
I: Kalau di rapat-rapat?
R: Rapat-rapat ...
I: Di kantor maksudnya.
R: Ya ada juga sih seperti itu.
I: Kecenderungannya kan seperti itu ya?
R: Ha ah. Ada. Tapi ...
I: Walaupun tidak dipisahkan =secara ini tapi kan jadinya seperti itu ya?=
R: =Tidak dipisahkan tapi kadang-kadang ibu-ibu biasanya= eh ngumpul sama ibu-ibu.
I: Kalau menurut (Nama R), eh kalau misalnya, kalau misalnya ada yang ibu-ibu, misalnya dalam rapat gitu ya. Atau misalnya barbeque taruhlah kita punya barbeque di sini kan ya. Trus kalau ada anak eh, tapi kalau di barbeque sini, kalau di barbeque sini misalnya ada student perempuan gitu, trus dia gabungnya dengan student laki-laki, itu gimana tanggapannya? Persepsinya? =Ada persepsi ...=
R: = Kalau persepsi= pribadi?
I: U uh. Ada persepsi ...
R: Nggak, nggak nggak, =kalau di ...=
I: =Nggak apa-apa ya?= 
R: ... barbequan seperti itu biasa nggak, nggak saya rasa nggak.
I: Nggak pa pa ya?
R: Ha ah.
I: Kalau dalam meeting?
I: Oh kayak gitu. Kalau (Nama R) sendiri, kalau dalam meeting, memang kecenderungannya dengan Bapak-bapak juga gitu?
R: Ya.
I: =Sesama laki-laki gitu?= 
R: =lya. Ha ah, ha ha.=
I: Itu kenapa ini gitu? Rasanya apa sih? Alasan di balik itu apa? Apakah...
R: Sebenarnya bagi ...
I: ... alasan ini alasan, saya mau cari tahu apakah dia itu alasan, yang dilihat dari aspek agama atau dilihat dari aspek budaya itu.
R: Oh gitu. Kalau saya pribadi sih sebenarnya nggak ada masalah mau dimana gitu kan.
I: U uh.
R: Tapi kalau, ini mungkin ya ngikut, arus aja.
I: U uh. Ikut arus.
I: Ok kayk gitu ya.
R: A ah.
I: Jadi memang ndak, ndak, ya sebenarnya ndak masalah cuma memang, kecenderungannya memang seperti itu.
R: Iya kecenderungannya seperti itu memang.
I: Atau mungkin kalau dilihat dari topik pembicaraan atau gimana?
R: Bisa juga sih. Kalau ibu-ibu kan ((tertawa)) ...
I: ((tertawa))
R: Iya mungkin topik pembicaraan gitu.
I: Hm.
I: Iya.
R: Tapi terus terang kalau misalnya sendiri mungkin nyaman sama perempuan sepertinya nggak ada masalah. Maksudnya nyaman juga sih kalau ngobrol sama perempuan itu.
I: Oh ok. Itu Barbeque, meeting. Ah skarang eh, ah ini yang dress code. Dress code. Eh, kita saya mau konfirmasi saja kan ya. Kalau misalnya di (kota X) itu ya. Di (kota X) kalau, perempuan itu, normalnya itu, maksudnya batas-batas wajarnya itu dia, pakaiannya yang gimana gitu?
R: Kalau secara umum?
I: Kalau jil [sic] kalau jibab mungkin, kalau ndak berjilbab ndak apa-apa kan ya?
R: Nggak ada masalah.
I: Nggak ada masalah kan?
R: Ha ah.
I: Jadi maksudnya, walaupun dia Islam tapi kalau dia ndak, walaupun dia Islam trus ndak pake jilbab ndak masalah gitu. Ndak ada kesan negatif atau apa gitu kan ya?
R: Ngak ada.
I: Ah trus eh, tapi kalau misalnya, taruhlah baju ketat. Baju pakaian yang ketat-ketat gitu itu, masalah juga ya?
R: Ehm enggak, enggak pernah sih ada yang, kalau uhm, ngak ada masalah sih dengan pakaian ketat. Tapi kelihatannya mulai ini kan kalau berjilbab pakaian ketat nah itu biasanya udah mulai …
I: Oh justru yang kontraksi gitu?
R: Kontradiktif ya "Itu gimana nih?" kayak gitu.
I: Jadi kalau misalnya orang pakaian ketat tanpa jilbab itu justru tidak apa-apa gitu kan? Tapi kalau dia berjilbab trus pakaianya gitu nya ((tertawa))?
R: Ya mungkin …
I: Ah itu yang …
R: … ada pertanyaan gitu lho =maksudnya.=
I: =Ha ha= ((tertawa)).
R: Dia ngak diapa-apain, tapi cuma mungkin ada pertanyaan "Oh ini!" ((tertawa)) …
I: Di luar ekspektasi ya.
R: Ya kayak gitu.
I: Kalau yang pakaian terbuka?
R: Nggak sampe terbuka itu. Lebih lebih, lebih free Bali deh. Kalau Bali sih …
I: Nah skarang yang terbuka ini, yang bisa terbuka itu apa saja?
R: Saya udah lama ngak di (Kota X) sih ((tertawa))
I: Oh =ok.=
R: =Tapi,= yang terbuka, paling ya, apa ya? =Ya mungkin bawah …= 
I: =Kalau misalnya…= 
R: Hm? Gimana gimana?
I: Kalau misalnya yang baju tanpa lengan itu?
R: Oh jarang-jarang.
I: Jarang.
R: Karna dingin di sana jarang.
I: Oh kayak gitu. Oh itu faktor cuaca saja ya?
R: Faktor cuaca dan itu, masih, masih jarang sih. Maksudnya pada kehidupan normal maksudnya pagi hari, siang hari, kan itu jarang kan. Kecuali kalau malam mungkin malam di, di mana, tempat-tempat hiburan mungkin ada kayak gitu.
I: Kalau misalnya di lingkungan universitas?
R: Ha ah.
I: Di lingkungan kampus, lingkungan kampus?
R: Jarang.
I: Mahasiswa itu harusnya pakaian apa kalau di lingkungan kampus? Pakaiannya bisa bebas aja gitu?
R: Bebas, bebas, ho oh.
I: Ok. Kalau pake rok mini dulu gimana?
R: Gimana?
I: Rok mini.
R: Rok mini kelihatannya kalau jaman-jaman, kalau pas jaman saya itu nggak ada.
I: Hm.
R: =Biasanya …= 
I: =Itu= tahun brapa?
R: Tahun Sembilan eh … 
I: Ok.
I: =Oh berarti kurang lebih sama.= Rok mini jarang ya?
R: Rok mini jarang orang pake rok. Ya mungkin karna kan dia baru SMA kan. SMA ke universitas masih baru masih ya masak pake rok, mahasiswa pake rok ((tertawa)).
I: Jadi lebih baik pake apa?
R: Pake celana jeans =celana jeans=.
I: =Celana jeans= yang celana panjang itu ya.
R: A ah.
I: Sama t-shirt.
R: Atau ada juga pake, pake apa, ya pake yang rok tapi panjang.
I: Rok panjang ho oh. Kalau kaos, bisa ya? Baju kaos?
I: Nggak apa-apa ya?
R: Nggak masalah.
I: Trus kalau laki-lakinya, laki-laki pakai baju kaos nggak apa-apa juga ya?
R: Nggak apa-apa.
I: Oh ok. Karna ada kan di universitas lain katanya harus kemeja gitu kan.
R: Uhm.
I: Ok. Nah itu mengenai ini. Eh terus pengamatan, kita kan di sini, eh, kalau eh yang anak Indonesia yang laki-laki itu, itu kan eh kalau yang Australian student yang laki-laki kalau summer kan mereka pake short. Ya bukan short sih, tapi maksudnya medium short yang …
R: Oh iya ha ah.
I: … eh stengah yang sampe di lutut itu atau lewat lutut sedikit. Indonesia student kan nggak ada yang kayak gitu ya?
R: Uhm.
I: Itu kenapa ya memang ndak bisa atau gimana?
R: Kurang bisa ya karna nggak, bagi mereka pun nggak sopan.
I: Nggak sopan? =Nggak so [sic] Nggak sopan?=
R: =Ke ke ke,= ke kampus? =Pake short?=
I: =Ho oh.= Ke kampus.
R: Abis itu ke kuliah itu?
R: Ya mungkin mereka nggak nyaman atau mungkin dingin. Atau mungkin nggak nyaman sama ini, masak ke kampus pake celana pendek ((tertawa)).
I: Oh kayak gitu ya.
R: A ah mungkin kayak gitu.
I: Memang ada rasa tidak nyaman gitu ya? Uncomfortable…
I: Uh u uh. Oh jadi dengan kata lain kalau di kampus di sana memang ndak bisa ndak, ndak sopan gitu?
R: Ndak so [sic], ndak sopan.
I: Oh.
R: Ndak sopan pake celana pendek ke…
I: Ke ruang kelas.
R: Ke ruang kelas itu wah kayaknya …
I: Kalau di sekitar kampus saja?
I: Oh ya ya ya.
R: =Kalau= cuma mau …
I: O oh.
R: … jalan-jalan nggak ada urusan kantor cuma jalan doang, tapi kalau mau ketemu siapa gitu lho pake celana pendek itu ya nggak, nggak …
I: Oh ya ya ya. Jadi, termasuk, =maksudnya …=
R: =Bukan= nggak boleh, nggak nggak, nggak sopanlah gitu jadinya (( tertawa))
R: Uhm (( tertawa)) persepsi maksudnya gimana nih? Kenapa …
I: Maksudnya dalam, dalam pikiran kita apa. Persepsi itu maksudnya apa yang ada dalam pikiran kita.
R: Iya. =Ah …=
I: =Dalam= pikirannya, orang gitu.
R: Ya mungkin, “Ini mau ke kampus atau mau ke mana?” (( tertawa))
I: Ehh, pertama kalau di kampus?
I: Kalau ke kampus?
R: Ke kampus a ah.
R: Ya, ya “Brani skali cewek itu pake gitu” (( tertawa)).
I: Ok.
R: Tapi juga nggak terlalu ini kok. Kalau saya sendiri sih, whatever dia mau pake model apa terserah.
I: Hm, hm =kayak gitu ya.= 
R: =Ha ah ha ah=, kalau saya ya sih.
I: Tapi tetap ada, =semacam ...=
R: =Perasaan ...=
I: ... tidak wajar gitu ya? Atau ya biasa saja?
R: Kalau saya biasa aja mungkin udah kama udah lihat ke mana-mana kali. Udah pernah ke Bali abis itu ke (Kota Y) oh ini masih di bawah Bali jadi biasa. Ya bergeser sedikit kali ya.
R: Hu hm.
I: Ok. Ah kalau di sini kan biasalah kita lihat kayak gitu ya.
R: Ya ha ah.
I: Di sini kan, wa [sic], selalu kan ((tertawa)) mereka kayak gitu kan ya.
R: Iya ha ah.
I: Ah skarang kalau misalnya di anu, di, di (Universitas X) dulu gitu. Kalau misalnya orang, jalan sama-sama itu nggak apa-apa acceptable aja ya?
R: Ya.
I: Laki-laki perempuan ...
R: Ha ah, ha ah.
I: ... jalan =sama-sama ...=
R: =Ha ah=
I: ... acceptable gitu?
R: Hu uh.
I: Ah skarang walking together, kalau misalnya space-nya dekat?
R: Hm.
I: Spacenya, jaraknya gitu?
R: =Kalau saya sih ...=
I: Taruhlah spacenya sangat dekat gitu?
R: Nggak ada masalah kalau saya sih nggak anu, apa, nggak ...
I: Kalau orang la, kalau secara umum?
R: Eh, secara umum nggak sih. =Nggak masalah gitu kalau deketan.=
I: Secara umum =nggak masalah juga ya?= 
R: Nggak masalah.
I: Ada, kalau orang jalan laki-laki sama perempuan, trus spacnya dekat gitu ada
    ndak, eh berarti itu, tandanya apakah memang menandakan ada hubungan atau
    apa gitu?
R: Hm ...
I: Atau biasa saja?
R: Kelihatannya ada hubungan sih. Hubungannya, biarpun hubungan bukan
    hubungan apa cuma teman, teman dekat kalo ...
I: Kalau misalnya pegangan tangan?
R: Wah itu udah ini, aku pikir udah cukup vulgar ya ((tertawa)) kayak gitu.
I: Kayak gitu ya?
R: Eh kalau aku lho pegangan tangan.
I: Walaupun suami istri?
R: Ehh, suami istri sih nggak masalah sih tapi di kultur kita nggak bisa kayak gitu.
    Suami istri ...
I: Walaupun suami istri gitu.
R: Mungkin mereka anggap, ya malu juga sih =di culture kita kayak gitu.=
I: =Oh kayak gitu ya ((tertawa)).=
R: Masak udah tua masih pegangan tangan ((tertawa)).
I: ((tertawa)) Ah itu berarti kan kalau tu [sic] sudah tua kayak gitu berarti yang muda
    bisa gitu ya? ((tertawa)) Um, anak-anak mudanya? ((tertawa))
R: Bisa aja sih tapi, kalau saya sendiri sih, kalau udah, kalau udah suami istri nggak
    masalah. Tapi kalau masih ini sih juga ((tertawa)) malu juga ((tertawa)).
I: ((Lertawa)) ok ok ok.
R: Tapi skarang lebih ekspre ekspresif skarang sih.
I: Eh jadi, jadi pokoknya pegangan tangan itu rasanya, udah berlebihan ya kalau ...
R: Iya.
I: … maksudnya …
R: Hah.
I: … level …
R: Hah hah.
I: … ehh, sudah di atas, sudah di luar yang acceptable gitu ya?
R: Iya kalau menurut saya gitu.
I: Apalagi kalau yang ((tertawa)), apalagi kalau yang pelukan, ciuman sama, hugging itu …
R: Hu uhm, hu uhm.
I: … kissing dan sebagainya itu, tentu lebih, tidak, acceptable lagi ya? Ndak bisa kan?
R: Iya tapi, iya ya ha ah. Tapi kalau aku selama di sini kok makin menerima ((tertawa)).
I: Hmm? Kenapa?
R: Kok selama di sini kok lebih menerima ((tertawa)) kayak gitu ((tertawa)).
I: Ya karna, karna yang melakukan bukan kita kan.
R: Iya iya betul.
R: Hmm.
I: Tapi kalau misalnya kalau ada orang Indonesia yang kayak gitu, rasanya, gimana? Sama saja atau beda?
R: Kalau saya di sini sih, kalau misalnya saya ada di sini …
I: Iya kalau settingnya di sini.
R: Settingnya di sini ya …
I: Terus yang kita lihat yang kayak gitu adalah orang Indonesia itu?
R: Saya sih biarin aja ((tertawa)).
I: ((tertawa)) ho oh.
R: Nggak, nggak terlalu maksudnya ya, ya mungkin, ya biasalah, tapi kalau, beda lagi kalau di Indonesia, ah itu beda skali.
I: Oh kalau konteksnya di Indonesia …
R: Ah, ah, ah.
I: … justru oh. Jadi yang, bedanya di sini kalau di Indonesia negatif atau yang di sini positif biasa aja?
R: Kalau saya lihat saya biasa aja.
I: A ah kalau di …
R: Maksudnya lebih acceptable lah.
I: Kalau di Indonesia jadinya?
R: Jadinya ya, nggak nggak, nggak boleh
I: Negatif gitu. Dengan kata lain mungkin orangnya, orangnya ndak tahu tempat gitu ya.
R: Iya. Kayak gitu.
I: Ok, berarti yang masalahnya di sini bukan prilakunya tapi …
R: Tempatnya.
I: … setting tempat terjadinya gitu ya?
R: Ehh …
I: Faktor situasi.
R: Harusnya kembaliannya harusnya ke masalah sikap ya.
I: U uh.
R: Bukan faktor situasi. Harusnya kan, idealnya sih, idealnya gitu kan.
I: U uh.
R: Kalo sesuatu yang salah tapi dila [sic], menurut kita salah dilakukan di mana saja pasti dia salah kan gitu.
I: U uh.
R: Tapi saya lebih, lebih ke, faktor situasi ((tertawa)).
I: ((tertawa)) Kayak gitu ya.
R: Manfaatkan iya. Kalau saya pribadi sih. Tapi kupikir idealnya memang kalau misalnya sana nggak bisa, sini juga nggak bisa gitu kan.
I: U uhm. U uhm.
R: Nggak tahu pikiranku udah semakin liberal gini.
R: Hm.
I: Kalau di tempat kerjanya (Nama R), apa apa sudah seperti itu atau nggak?
R: Nggak, nggak, nggak sampe. =Tetap masih …=  
I: =Jadi …=
R: ... karna pegawai negeri. Lingkungan gua kan =pegawai negeri ...=
I: =Oh iya= pegawai negeri ya, ha ah kantor.
I: Berarti eksplisit ya diberi tahu?
R: Iya secara anu.
I: Tidak hanya secara implicit ya. Dan formal kan, jadinya. Maksudnya pemberitahuannya jadinya formal kan karna diberitahu dalam pertemuan dalam training gitu ya?
R: Hu uh, hu uh.
I: Dalam briefing kan?
R: Iya memang gitu, iya memang.
I: Oh saya kira sih, tadinya saya pikir itu hanya ((tertawa)) hal-hal yang informal gitu.
R: Nggak dalam artian ya, mereka tetap, ya tetap umur ya tetap menghormati yang tua, yang sudah lama kerja di sini biarpun anda mungkin lebih pinter atau, artinya kan gitu. Nggak bisa disamakan kayak di swasta kan, swasta kan, kalau swasta kan modelnya udah siapa bisa ya =dapat kan gitu ...=
I: =Ya dia yang ini=
I: Oh gitu ok. Berarti ehh, oh ya ini terlupa ini hampir. Berarti ini kalau misalnya, kembali ke tadi toh, kalau menurut (Nama R) hubungan antara guru atau dosen ya, dengan mahasiswa itu, dalam budaya kita di Indonesia secara umum itu hubunganya equal atau, hubungan hirarki? =Equal ...
R: =Saat= saat a ah, saat saya dulu masih hirarki, tapi nggak tahu skarang. Kelihatannya udah banyak banyak dosen muda, yang baru datang, mungkin dia mulai gerus sedikit, sedikit sedikit.
I: Oh.
R: Tapi jamanku dulu ya
I: Yang dulu ...
R: ... saya rasa ya masih =hirarki gitu ...
I: =Masih hirarki=
R: Ho oh.
I: Dan, dan faktor-faktor nonverbal, seperti tadi misalnya cara kita duduk cara kita bicara, cara kita, taruhlah cara kita berpakaian di kelas itu ya, termasuk eye contact tadi itu memang masih sangat berpengaruh, dalam hubungan kita dengan dosen itu?
R: Iya karna itu terbentuk dari mulai dari mulai pendidikan sebelumnya.
I: Dari pendidikan dasar maksudnya?
R: Iya. SD, SMP, SMA kan, kalau saya dulu ya seperti itu. Diajarinya ya kayak gitu.
I: Jadi walaupun sudah di universitas, tetap, tetap kayak gitu ya?
R: Eh, ada teman-teman yang bisa berubah, kayak gitu aja. Ada teman-teman yang bisa berubah, ada teman-teman yang masih, masih ber karna itu, sudah dibiasakan dia masih anggap itu saya masih menganggap seperti itu sih. Tapi ada teman-teman yang sudah langsung apalagi dia campur sama organisasi apa kan yang equal, equal, equal kayak gitu.
I: Ok jadi ini menarik yang menurut (Nama R) teman-teman yang bisa berubah, ...
R: Hm.
I: … itu adalah teman-teman yang, pada umumnya ya?
R: Ha.
I: Pada umumnya teman-teman yang aktifis itu?
R: Iya. Rata-rata seperti itu.
I: Hm.
R: Karna mereka kan, bukan, dia sudut pandangnya beda. Maksudnya dia mulai baca masalah pendidikan andagogi atau pedagogi atau seperti itu kan. Abis itu mulai baca pendidikan masalah, sosialis =atau barangkali equality ...
I: =Soal equality apa segala macam... =
R: … abis itu kayak filsafat =kan gitu. Dia lebih ...=
I: =A ah ohh=
R: … saya manusia mereka manusia saya sama. Begitu. =A ah=
I: =Oh= ok ok ok. Mungkin jarang baca buku-buku budaya ya ((tertawa)).
R: Kupikir mereka ...
I: Maksudnya tulisan-tulisan yang dibahas dari perspektif culture atau apa mungkin jarang.
R: Ok. =Mereka lebih ...=
I: =Aktifis itu ...=
R: ... mungkin lebih ke itu maksudnya, ke po, yah kan jaman segitu kan, namanya kebebasan udah mulai kerasa kan. Mereka membaca buku-buku filsafat, apalagi filsafat kan lebih, ditanya masalah manusia, bukan karna kau guru saya murid habis itu ((tertawa))
I: iya ya ya.
R: Saya nggak bisa, sebagai manusia kan. Namanya manusia siapa...=
I: Kalau filsafat kan melihat entity secara murni kan.
R: iya. =Filsafat (tidak jelas)=
I: =Tanpa ada pengaruh dari apa dari apa. Oh iya menarik ini = berarti itu, berarti ada perbedaan antara mahasiswa, jadi tadi seperti (Nama R) bilang, ada yang bisa berubah ada yang tidak bisa berubah. Nah yang bisa berubah ini cenderung ehh, yang bisa berubah ini pada umumnya adalah mahasiswa yang, aktifis, dalam tanda kutip ya. Aktifis-aktifis di sini maksudnya, yang banyak, yang sangat concern, sangat concern dengan hal-hal yang, tadi itu, yang ...
R: Feodal.
I: ... equality ...
R: Equality
I: =... menghapus feodalisme=
R: =Atau feudal, a ah, a ah kayak gitu= Bukan cuma itu sih. Soalnya bukan cuma yang teman-teman yang, ada juga teman-teman yang kebetulan nggak ikut organisasi tapi dia mempunyai, mungkin dia keluarganya memang dibuat kayak gitu. Mungkin ada ...
I: Oh ok.
R: ... kultur kayak gitu kan.
I: Berasal dari lingkungan keluarga yang sudah moderat gitu ya?
R: Bukan moderat maksud, ah bisa juga moderat bisa juga yang uhm, ...
I: Tidak lagi mem ...
R: Tidak lagi ...
I: Tidak lagi memegang =tradisi secara kuat?= 
siapa siapa harus, lebih brani harus lebih ini maksudnya, nggak boleh dikekang lagi
gitu lho. Semuanya kan harus diungkapin (tidak jelas).
I: Ok. Ehm trus formalitas informalitas, ah trus kalau yang seperti tutorial di sini, ehh
perasaannya (Nama R) itu masih, lebih cenderung ke formal atau informal?
Situasinya?
R: Informal sih sebenarnya.
I: A ah.
R: Informal. Tapi saya lihat di sini tuh juga kalo, semua ngerti, iya, semua mengerti
gitu. Tanyanya, trus tanya teman kamu ngerti ini? Nggak tahu. Artinya, mereka
nggak terlalu concern sama tutorial, maksudnya mereka punya cara sendiri gitu
lho. Tutorial cuma ya formalitas datang udah.
I: Ikut saja =gitu=.
R: =Ha ah, ha ah.=
I: Tapi kalau situasinya sendiri memang situasi yang, ...
R: (Tidak jelas)
I: … maksudnya perasaannya itu informal saja ya?
R: Informal.
I: Tidak terlalu resmi seperti kalau …
R: Tapi saya kadang juga bisa resmi gitu, kadang ((tertawa)). Perasaanku sih.
I: Tergantung apa? Tergantung dosennya ya?
R: Hm, tergantung, nggak sih.
I: Hm.
R: Sebenarnya semua tergantung kita sendiri kali ya.
I: ((tertawa))
R: Biarpun situasi model apa kalau kita anggap hepi ya hepi, …
I: ((tertawa)) (Tidak jelas)
R: Susah ya susah.
I: Ok. Ah trus dari hal-hal yang tadi saya (tidak jelas), tadi kita sudah bahas gitu, itu
ada ndak di situ yang menurut (Nama R) hal-hal yang sifatnya reli ehh,
berhubungan dengan value, agama? Dengan religious values.
R: Uhm =maksudnya gimana?= 
I: =Misalnya tadi= cara berpakaian atau, hubungan antara laki-laki dengan
perempuan. Itu apakah memang ada hubungannya dengan, isyu-isyu eh apa,
dengan aspek-aspek agama atau bagimana?
R: Saya kira ada sih. Karna kita kan, kayak culture kan biasanya dipengaruhi agama.
I: Iya, ha ah.
R: Iya. Kalau begitu karna kita udah terbiasa hidup dalam suatu culture itu kita, akan, menilai sesuatu berdasar culture kita.
I: Hu uh.
I: Ok ok. Jadi taruhlah misalnya seperti, seperti misalnya agama Islam kan itu, tidak mengijinkan ada hu apa namanya, eehm, taruhlah misalnya, sikap antara perempuan dengan laki-laki di tempat umum itu malah, sangat, sangat dibatasi gitu kan, kalau dalam, agama Islam begitu kan? Kayak gitu. Tapi kalau misalnya di Jawa, trus, misalnya ada orang Jawa trus bukan agama Islam. Agama lain misalnya, apakah kemudian dia, bebas saja begitu di tempat umum?
R: Nah itulah dia ada ini nggak, ada rasa toleransi nggak gitu kan. Maksudnya, aku bilang kan tadi, seperti harmoni gitu kan.
I: Uhm.
R: Mereka ada nggak perasaan itu apakah mereka itu me, menyinggung (tidak jelas) yang lain atau gimana, …
I: Uhm.
R: … kayak gitu.
I: Ok.
R: Begin tu. Tapi kalau kita sendiri sih, kita nggak bisa maksa, mereka kan. Maksudnya kita kembali terserah, mereka mau, gimana kan. Kadang kita cuman diam aja tapi padahal di hati ya, …
I: ((tertawa))
R: ((tertawa)) gimanaaa gitu =((tertawa))=
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I: Ok first we, this one first, in the tutorial ok.
R: Ha ah, ha ah.
I: In the tutorial first about, what is it, the way, the way people sit. Based on my
   observations, eh, it seems that we rarely sit as we wish.
R: Hm, you mean this …
I: =I mean= leaning backward =or things like that.=
R: =Hmm=
I: Usually we sit, straight like this =or …=
R: =Yes.=
I: … mostly like this ((I leant forward)).
R: Yes ha ah.
I: Lean …
R: ((Unclear speech))
I: … forward like that =isn’t it?=  
R: =Ha ah ah=
I: Ah that, ehh, ehh, where did you study [in Indonesia]?
R: I am in (city X), (University X).
I: Ah, ok, (University X) (City X). So, oh yes wait. Where were you born?
R: In (City X).
I: And did you grow up in (city X)?
R: Ha ah. Until until, I finished my studying in the university.
I: Until you finished your study in the university?
R: Ha ah.
I: Ah then working, in what places have you ever worked?
R: My work experience is just this one, in (institution X).
I: Oh so you never, I mean you never moved … ?
R: Eh, only for doing small projects like that.
I: Oh, but I mean for from [sic] in terms of behaviours or culture that’s indeed [sic]
   ehh, is Java?
R: Ha ah.
I: Which Java may I know?
R: (Province X)
I: (Province X) ok. Is it different from (City Y)? I mean, =if (City X) …=
R: =Hm, almost the same.= Almost the same. =Almost the same.=
I: =Almost the same.= Ok. So ehh, sitting posture. So if for example, for example I mean indeed [sic] [sic], is it like that? Or how is it? When you studied if, eh for example we sit in a different position, do you think there will be negative consequence or how is it?
R: If it is the negative consequence that, that is real I don’t think there are real negative consequences =maybe=
I: =Hu uh.= Hu uh.
R: But we are in Java, I mean in, our culture is like that isn’t it, it’s like respecting people. If for example in the class there is a more senior or more, senior or more,…
I: Ha ah. =In this case do you mean a lecturer?=
R: =A lecturer, a lecturer in this case ok. It is impossible that we will lean backwards or like this, impossible, because well, …
I: Ok.
R: … I I think it’s impolite you know.
I: So indeed in this case sitting posture is one of, ehh, the realization of, our behaviour that really respects more senior people, =is it like that?= 
R: =Yah= iya, iya, iya, ha ah, =ha ah.=
I: =Ha ah.= Well senior here means, only based on, on the age or based on the status as well?
R: Because we talk about problem in learning, it means, =in the classroom maybe.=
I: =U uhm, if, for example=
R: In the class yes, because, yes because he/she, his/her status as a, lecturer or teacher he/she gives us knowledge, doesn’t he/she?
I: Ha ha.
R: That’s totally different from the western culture …
I: Ha ah.
R: … that maybe considers the relationship between teachers and students as equal.
   =But …=
I: =Ha ha.= 
R: ... our culture is still, they [teachers] are considered as the older [people who]
knows more …
I:  Ha ha.
R:  … so it’s our obligation as the knowledge seeker =to ...=
I:  =Oh.=
R:  … respect him/her.
I:  So in other words for example, if for example the lecturer, say for example that the
lecturer is younger than us ok.
R:  Yes.
I:  Is our behaviour still the same or do you think it a little bit different or [very]
different?
R:  I think it’s the same in the context, =of learning like that.=
I:  =O oh= classroom context like that isn’t it.
R:  Iya. Ha ah. Ha ah.
I:  Oh ok, so In other words maybe I can say that, in this case the determining factor
is not only the age, …
R:  Ha.
I:  … but also the status ehh, =status ...=
R:  =Yes.=
I:  … of the person …
R:  Status.
I:  … isn’t it?
R:  Yes, that's right.
I:  So although the lecturer, say, is younger than us, usually if, usually if in  …
R:  Yes, yes, yes.
I:  … in postgraduate program there are young lecturers, =aren't there?= 
R:  =Yes ha ah.=
I:  Ah, Is it still like that, we still respect like that eh our respect for the lecturer is still
the same.
R:  Yes.
I:  Although he/she is younger than us.
R:  Yes, I think it's like that. But, it is changed now. On the one side, lecturers are now
more open aren’t they? I mean, he/she, moreover, lecturers start to consider …
I:  Hm.
R:  ... us as equal because students and teachers are equal.
I:   Hm.
R:  Just by chance [teachers] just become facilitators like that. So maybe he/she is more open. But if, lecturers who are still, still already [sic] old or already anu\textsuperscript{23} /senior] ...
I:   Oh,
R:  Isn't it =still ...
I:  =Oh=
R:  ... the culture is already like =that.=
I:  =That is ...
R:  Feudal.
I:  ... the older generation, isn't it?
R:  Yes, [the older generation] is like that. I think it's like that.
I:  So indeed that ehh what [sic], it's been influenced by, I mean that is part of, ehh, ehh what's it called our habit at home, with family =as well,=
R:  =Yes=
I:  Like that.
R:  Yes, I think it's like that.
I:  What about at home me [sic], I mean are you like that at home as well?
R:  Eh ...
I:  If ...
R:  I mean not too much actually.
I:  O oh.
R:  Not too much but only, well maybe, not not too much like that. But we still respect but, at home it's more, there is no ...
I:  A bit more relaxed =like that?=
R:  =A bit= more relaxed you know. Isn't it but there is indeed, there are limit lines that should really be ...
I:  A ah.
R:  ... cannot be crossed like that. =For example ...=

\textsuperscript{23} The word anu is frequently used in Indonesian language to refer to anything. The precise meaning can be usually guessed based on the whole context of the conversation. In this sentence, I think the word anu meant "senior", because the word "senior" were used by R to describe as the characteristic of teachers who still maintain the traditional view that teacher-student relationship is a hierarchy one.
I: =Oh.=
R: ….we, in front of our parents and we *cigan* like that I feel it is impolite.
I: Cigan =what’s that?=  
R: =Cigan= like this. One leg is on …
I: Lifting the legs like that?
R: Lifting the leg, =put …= 
I: Lifting the leg.=  
R: … on the thigh like that.
I: Oh itu, oh, oh, ok, ok …
R: Yes, yes, =like that= 
I: =Like crossing …=  
R: Cros=sing …=  
I: =Cross=ing leg like that …
R: A ah.
I: … can’t we do that?
R: Like this.
I: Hm.
R: Like this, like a boss, like this.
I: ((laugh))  
R: Yes, it’s like that, isn’t it? ((Unclear speech))  
I: A ah.
R: Well maybe that’s a little bit, it’s okay, but maybe not really appropriate.
I: Not really appropriate.
R: Not really appropriate.
I: So in your family background, things like that are still strong, aren’t they?
R: Uhm …
I: They are still maintained like that?
R: Yes, it is still [maintained], maybe, maybe this is well because since I was still a child it is, …
I: Di [being] …
R: … [we’ve been told to behave] like that maybe. [we’ve been told to behave] like that maybe.
I: Oh.
R: So until now, it is still a little [strict]. Although they [parents] actually, maybe they don't mind but they don't say that directly that they mind if we lift our leg =like this.=
I: =Ha ah.=
R: But maybe we have to behave ourselves, don't we?
I: Oh it's like that then. Yes at this time children, some of them are not like that. Well maybe they are from a family that, so maybe it depends on the education in the family as well?
R: Yes, yes.
I: For family that is already a little, well in quotation marks modern you know or, moderate you know, maybe aren't any more concerned about things like that.
R: Maybe it's like that. Politeness is dialectic, isn't it?
I: ((laugh)).
R: It's like that, isn't it. Sometimes this generation is still polite, after that it will be more …
I: Hm.
R: … the next will [be less polite] isn't it, =less] …=
I: =Hu uh.=
R: … less less less.
I: ((laugh))
R: This can still be, =tolerated …=
I: =Oh later on it will be [more and more relaxed] …=
R: Yes it's like that.
I: Ok. Ah next the second is about seating arrangement in tutorials, well like we this is already already an old issue, eh Indonesian students tend to be together with other Indonesian students.
R: Yes.
I: So now I want to confirm, do you feel like that?
R: Yes, I do …
I: If there are one or two people [friends] or …
R: Hm.
I: … if there are friends like that, do we really tend, to be together with friends like that?
R: Yes because of kult [sic] eh = the norms …=
I: Why is it like that?
R: The norm is like that. If we are in, foreign place and then we meet friends who are
maybe, from the same place, for example, I meet one Indonesian like that, oh yes
it’s feel like we are one. Especially because we are minorities like that.
I: Oh Ok.
R: Like those. Even the Chinese friends, they are the majorities. But, when I ask,
“You are comfortable here because you have many friends” like that. He/she said
“Ah no, I don’t know many of them.”
I: Oh so it’s like that.
R: Ha ah.
I: Oh in other words, because you’ve just mentioned minority, here there is an issue
of ehh, feeling safe like that? We feel more safe if we have friends, is it like that?
R: Well. I think it’s not because we feel safe or not. But it is, it is, …
I: Just comfortable?
R: Ck, what is it, …
I: Comfortable ((laugh)).
R: Well naturally it’s like that, isn’t it?
I: ((laugh))
R: ((laugh)) It’s like that, isn’t it?
I: If for example, for example, there are friends who are not, who are a bit different
you know. I mean they don’t come together with us or things like that. Is there, is
there, is there, is there any negative perception?
R: Ehm for me personally, no, = no problem=
I: =Uh huh=
R: Eh, everybody is different, isn’t it?
I: Uh huh.
R: Maybe they prefer, for example there are people who, here I live together with
other new students. Maybe they can be open like that to other people, maybe
some others cannot. Some maybe do not really like to be together, well it’s not
wrong.
I: Yes.
R: But it becomes a problem if they are really closed like that.
I: Uhm. No, I mean like this, for example in the classroom, eh, then we tend to, if, for example, there are people, eh, our friends come like that, we call [them] “Come here, sit closely here” …

R: Hu uhm.

I: … or things =like that.=

R: =Hu uhm.=

I: Ah then if for example, they prefer [to sit] with others like that, or not, …

R: Well it's not …

I: … not come together with us well is it okay?

R: Ehm no problem.

I: Oh, it’s not a problem then?

R: It’s their preference isn’t it? =It’s not a problem, is it?= 

I: =Eh so the tendency= of each person is different, isn’t it?

R: Yes, it’s like that.

I: Ok, Ah then that's if there are some [Indonesian] people in [the classroom]. Eh in contrast if, for example, there are only one or two eh, for example [there is only one Indonesian student]. My observation shows that if there is only one person, they usually, sit well, at the end [of a row], or at the back.

R: Hm.

I: Very rarely they sit in, in the middle or things like that. What do you think is the cause?

R: Ehm maybe he/she, well first, maybe because the seat, by chance there is, the seat at the end of a row is the only one available so he/she choose to sit there. Or maybe, because he/she maybe, his/her communication is not yet fluent maybe, but well …

I: Oh [you mean] language, [Do you] mean language?

R: Maybe. Or maybe the language is good but he/she was just lazy, because people like that, [they] are just lazy to, that, aren't they? But I think, if, well maybe [the problem is the] communication.

I: Are there issues like a feeling, a feeling of underpres [sic], what, feel under-pressure or not feeling confident, or things like that?

R: I think yes. I still feel like that. [I ] feel under-pressure. I mean I do not have self-confidence but finally well, well I have to accept you know. If we feel under-
pressure but in reality we live here well, [we don't have choice] we have to cope
with that. I mean =well ...=

I: =[Until]= now do you often, is there I mean, a willingness to eh, have friends from
local students as well or things like that?
R: Eh I have that willingness. But if it is only ourselves who are open to other
people, but other people close themselves well we can't [make a friendship], can
we?
I: Who are the people who close themselves that you mean?
R: I mean not that it means, if, for example two people want to be friends, to be
friends like this ok, if this one, maybe “Let's become friends” blah blah blah. But
the other one does not want to [be friends] it's difficult, isn't it? That's what I mean
you know. So it can't be seen from one side only. If, if I actually well, I don't mind
to make friends with anybody. When [I have to] accept the reality that “Oh not this
one, no, [we] can't be [friends]” I mean well it's only, [that's the limit], to say hello
or whatever, well that's all indeed.
I: Oh, in other words according to observ [sic], your observation there is, do you feel
like that? [Do you think] there is the reluctance among them to accept us?
R: Eh the reluctance is there but the reluctance is because they don't know us very
well maybe.
I: Ok.
R: It's like that, isn't it?
I: It's like that then.
R: When there is an opportunity, for example, after we become friends for a long
time. We don't meet often, do we. Sometimes [the way we choose the courses] is
not like the way we do in Primary Schools or Junior High Schools like that when
we meet in class, so it was good. So we know [each other], but [here we rarely
meet each other] you know. So maybe there is a friendship, but also, well it's
difficult but maybe there are things like that.
I: It's like that then.
R: Ah hah.
I: Ok so there is the willingness [to make friends]. What about the effort or initiative
to, to [make friends], never?
R: Oh I, I have initiatives like that. So for, =but ...
I: =In= what way for example?
R: Eh like we greet [them] like that.
I: Ok.
R: Having conversation or things like that although the conversation is only well, about courses ...
R: That ...
R: … or things like that, it's not very deep you know; it's like that isn't it.
I: Oh. But [do you] never [do] more than that?
R: Ehm until now I haven't …
I: Never?
R: Never.
I: What about attending anu club activities, student club or things like that? No? Never?
R: I don't [attend any club]. The problem is well, [there are] too [many] course assignments =I feel …= many assignments do you mean?= ((laugh)).
I: Ah hah. It's not, well how is it, the problem, eh this is very different from our culture [I mean] learning style you know. If we use our old way of learning well, not not, [we will] not [be able to pass the course] = ((laugh))=.=(laugh))=. Yes yes yes, you are right, you are right. So [learning] load as well isn't it. Because of [learning] load as well, isn't it?
R: Because we are also on scholarship. A scholarship has time limit you know.
I: There is a contract.
R: Yes. That's all.
I: Next, the third, is about this still in the context of tutorials you know. If, for example we, here [I] just want to confirm several things that we can or we cannot do. If in, in, when you studied in (University X) in (University X), in (University X) in lectures or if in discussions in classrooms like that, eh what, what things that we can or we cannot, what are the things that we cannot do you know, in terms of body movements? If, for example lifting our feel clearly maybe we can't, can we?
R: Hu uh.
I: First, we can't lift our feet.
R: Lifting the feet or putting hands on hips or things like that.
I: What about *bertopang dagu* [sitting with our chin leaning on our hands]?
R: *Bertopang dagu* well, not a problem I think, because it doesn’t offend other people maybe.

I: Ah hah. If, for example *bertopang dagu* like this, *berdekan* [leaning one‘ elbow] on the table like this.

R: Ehmm well, not a problem I think if, I feel that …

I: Oh ok.

R: … But in our culture well but we are like this you know, Aren’t we, here [people speak up what they like or not like]. If for example [they] don’t like they speak up you know, if [they] don’t like they speak up. It’s like that isn’t it?

I: Uh huh.

R: But if, in the place …

I: Uh huh.

R: … maybe, I you know, we also think. Sometimes [when] people are silent what does it mean?

I: ((laugh))

R: Or like [or] what. We don’t know, do we? Sometimes isn’t it like that?

I: ((laugh)) it’s like that then?

R: Yes to maintain, we can’t express I mean well, we [keep trying to make people feel good] don’t we? So, we, =[that feeling is] too much you know. Actually …=

I: =So we also feel, limited=

R: … yes, we think too much that this person may not like it if I’m like this blah blah blah.

I: Whereas in fact, it’s not like that, isn’t it?

R: Yes whereas in fact maybe it’s not like that actually =((laugh))=

I: =((laugh)) well it’s difficult as well. Ah what about eye contact? [How is it so far?]

R: Eye contact, yes, yes.

I: If [you] talk with lecturers, that, =so we maintain eye contact as well?= 

R: =That’s also you know.= O hoh, that’s also you know. We, sometimes if, in my place if we look at [people’s] eye directly like this it doesn’t feel comfortable either.

I: Oh is it like that?

R: Sometimes more, ((laugh)) especially when we feel guilty [how can you look someone’s eyes] like that.

I: So what do you look at ((laugh))?

R: Well, it’s, I mean …
I: Or maybe not a =continuous [look] like that?=
R: Not continuous, after [we look into someone’s eyes we look at other things] like that.
I: Oh ok. [What do you think of people who look into someone’s eyes directly?] What would be the impression do you think?
R: Uhm?
I: Impolite? Or …
R: No. The thing, the thing is problem like, like wibawa [the image of having] the [authority] you know ((laugh)).
I: Oh for example …
R: For example uhm …
I: [When] we talk with lecturers.
R: Yes it’s like feudal you know. I mean, this is my opinion you know, I think, this is a lecturer. Lecturer means well [lecturers have higher status] than me you know.
I: Yes of course.
R: Well that, it’s like that isn’t it. So, culturally for things like that, I feel like reluctant, that kind of feeling. So if I look into someone’s eye directly like that, I don’t feel comfortable, I don’t dare either. Not dare. I mean, it may offend [people] you know.
I: Uhm.
R: That makes it difficult so …
I: Offensive, what do you mean by offensive?
R: Oh …
I: [What do you think, what do you think they] will think?
R: Uhm, =well anak brani [a child who dares to challenge] like that=
I: =To challenge like that?= 
R: To challenge but ..
I: Oh is it like that?
R: But but, but this is not, not all people are like that you know. This is only only, maybe maybe for myself you know.
I: Hu uh.
R: Yes I feel like that as well you know.
I: Is this for lecturers of older generation only, or also for younger lecturers or how is it?
R: Most older generations still [think like that], don't they?
I: When you studied for your undergraduate degree the lecturers were, [how do you
describe most of your lecturers? ]
R: By chance [they were] still le [sic], it was a mixture actually.
I: Oh, uh huh.
R: But because it's already since past time eh, because that was started in primary
school you know. In primary schools and junior high schools the model was like
that, wasn’t it? I mean, “Stop it, don’t say or do anything other than what you are
told to do.” Students could not say or do what they want you know. “Stop it, obey
what the teacher says A B C D like that don’t, don’t challenge [them]” It’s
continuously the same like that.
I: What about at home? What about with parents, eye contact, is it not a problem?
R: Eh I don’t dare. [If you ask me]
I: Oh is it like that?
R: I mean …
I: With your father only, eh with your father and mother or with one of them only?
R: Eh mas [sic], eye contact, do you mean to look directly …
I: Uh huh.
R: … like that? But I don’t dare [to look into other people’s eye] in too [long time], I
am not strong [to look into other people’s eye in] too [long time] ((laugh)).
I: Uhm it’s like that then.
R: Yes it’s like that.
I: So when [you] talk where do [you] look at?
R: Oh we look at them, listen or, well we listen or we look at them, but to look directly
like that well, look so, face to face like that …
I: So do we bend our [head] down?
R: No, not bend down. Well we look a minute and then we a little bit …
I: Look at other direction, at, other directions do you mean?
R: Well how is it well I mean, it’s like, [we look in a minute and then] anu [look in
other directions] and then, and then …
I: Oh ok. Yes I understand. So you mean, to look continuously, isn’t it …
R: Yes yes.
I: … [we] can’t do that, can we?
R: O oh [we] can’t [look] like …
I: But we look, and then maybe to [this] direction or [that direction] =
R: =Yes maybe [we should be] discipline or things like that= [we say] “Oh yes” [and then we] we bend our head down, [and we say again] “Oh yes” like that.
I: Oh ok. Oh yes. Does it still, still have strong [meaning for you? ], The eye con [sic] this eye contact problem? Is it still strong in your family?
R: Uhm …
I: And or in society as well?
R: For me, well with parents, well maybe ((laugh)) …
I: [Does it still have a strong meaning for you? ]
R: [Yes. I've been told to behave like that] since I was still a child].
I: Ok. Eh that's about eye con [sic], but if with friends is it not like that?
R: [Not like that] in my case.
I: Ah ok. Pointing finger, is not necessary [to be discussed]. Pointing finger is definitely unacceptable, …
R: A ah.
I: … in tutorials. Ah ok. Now about the issue of eh, this issue of smiling. For example, in tutorials, or in lectures like that. Eh, for example the lecturer asks like this, “Do you understand my explanation?” Ha it’s like this, [this is] my experience as well you know. Sometimes students smile you know.
R: Hu hum.
I: Smile. So when they smile …
R: Uh huh.
I: … or laugh like that …
R: Uh huh.
I: That, we, what would be the interpretation? Do they understand or ja [sic], “Hold on”, is like that?
R: That’s also difficult you know.
I: O oh.
R: [If we talk about] nonverbal problems like that. Smiling is also, it’s difficult maybe. But for me, because I am asked, I feel confused as well if I mean …
R: O oh.
I: If [I] am asked =like that= …
I: =Or= if for example you are asked like that …
R: Usually …
I: How is it usually?
R: “Yes, yes, yes I understand”, when I don’t understand ((laugh)).
I: Uh huh.
R: Well maybe, it’s a habit, of the culture in, the past it’s like that as well, isn’t it. At
schools, [if someone] asked well, [we feel embarrassed if people think that we are
stupid].
I: [Who do you mean by people]? Friends or lecturers?
R: Well I mean [if we are] in front of if, in the past I saw [when we were] in front of the
class like that if [we said we didn’t understand], “Ah you can’t [understand] wah
…”24 =It’s like that, isn’t it?=
I: =Oh it’s like that then= so with friends well there is a kind of a [fear that people will
say that] …
R: Yes.
I: … [we are] weak or things like that.
R: Yes, for kop [sic], every[body] is like that you know.
I: Oh ok. So you mean here, I mean we, sometimes if, eh, the lecturer asks
“Understand or not? Well we =just laugh=
R: =Well [we] said understand.=
I: Just pretend [that we] understand like that? In other words, so that we, [people will
not consider] …
R: Stupid.
I: [So that people will not consider us as] stupid, [Is it the only consideration?]?
R: Yes I think it’s like that.
I: What about with the lecturers? Is there a certain feeling?
R: What do you mean?
I: I mean, sometime it’s like this isn’t it. There are [people] who, there was a case
[like this] actually. For example in the classroom like that, he/she said, we asked
questions like that, asking questions, asking questions. And the, a friend reminded
[me]. He/she [the friend] said “Eh if you want to ask questions in the classroom,
don’t ask too many.” I said “Why?”, [My friend said] “The lecturer will feel
offended.”, [I said] “Well, what do you mean by being offended?”, [My friend said]
 “[The lecturer] will think that you are testing …”

---

24 This is an expression of mocking from other students.
R: Yes, yes there [are cases like] that really, =really=
I: = …the lecturer.= Are there [cases] like that, [cases] like that?
R: There are [cases] like that. It comes back to, to well, the culture you know.

Teachers in the past aren’t they, well, teachers well, teachers are teachers. In the
time of I mean, teachers [are always like that] you know. Teachers, in all your life
do not ask them [teachers] anything, do not [do anything], what teachers give you,
that’s it, [you are] safe, finished, [it’s like] that. But here it’s different. I mean
teachers [here in Australia] will not, not, think of themselves like that actually. But
it’s difficult for us who come from traditional culture [to come] here isn’t it? We also
need time to adjust ((laugh)).
I: Yes that’s right, that’s right.
R: To adjust [to the situation here].
I: So there is actually [a fear], to say that we, [to say] “I don’t understand” like that.
R: Mung [sic] …
I: Or [to say] “Can you repeat, please?” like that, Is it still a little bit difficult?
R: Maybe it’s difficult because maybe well, there is a class, a class like that. But if for
example, for example we are with lecturers =and [there are only] two of us …=
I: =Individual [consultations]?=
R: … like that …
I: Oh ok.
R: … maybe, [we are] more open. [So we can say that I don’t understand this and
this. On the one side, actually we can ask directly, we don’t need to see other
people. We also think maybe other people want to ask questions. This, maybe if I
am like this, other people maybe, want to ask questions, or what, we cannot
continuously [ask questions.]
I: Ok so because you have said like that, it means that here, the pressure is not
from the teacher, but the pressure, is more from, friends like that. Because in fact
[in] individual [consultations] we are more open. Is it like that? Here I mean?
R: Actually the pressure, [I don’t mean that] they press us but [it’s] only a matter of
our feeling.
I: Oh our feeling.
R: Yes that’s right.
I: And the feeling here is not, is not, it is actually more an issue of our feeling about
other friends isn’t it?
R: Yes.
I: So, ((laugh)) it's like that then?
R: Hu uh hu uh.
I: Ok, ok, because in the litre [sic], in the literature it is said eh, that, not eh, it says that Indonesian students do not ask questions frequently, because the questions would be considered, as the challenge to the the teacher.
R: Yes yes. Hu uh.
I: It's like that, isn't it? But in fact now, the pressure does not only come from teacher, but also from other peer students.
R: Yes *bu* [sic] …
I: It means we don't want to be considered …
R: Yes things like that include open feeling to other students like that.
I: Yes, well that's new.
R: Hah?
I: That's new. It's not mentioned yet in the literature ((laugh)).
R: Really?
I: Hu uh.
R: No. Isn't it, in our culture, isn't it like harmony you know. Like each of us maintains [our] position [and not let] one of us …
I: More than …
R: … *nyomplang*\(^{25}\), the other one *anu*.
I: Oh [what do] you mean?
R: I mean, if, for example, in one class [we should maintain the balance, don't let one of us becomes too dominant while the other one becomes] too *ini* [passive].
I: Oh it's like that then; there are things like that.
R: Like harmony.
I: In other words if for example, if for example the student is smart like that, how should he/she behave?
R: Well don't …
I: Don't show off too much like that?
R: Yes don't show up [sic] [show off] well just, well isn't it like the paddy wisdom\(^{26}\). [Paddies would] just be more down to earth; don't be too [show off], like that.

---

25 Nyomplang is a Javanese word meaning "unbalanced".

26 Paddies would just be more down to earth; don't be too [show off], like that.
I: So is he/she [smart students] for example, for example in Indonesia lecturers like asking questions you know. [The smart students are] not [expected to] answer the questions all the time like that?

(Respondent answered a phone call).

I: So it means it is expected that the smart [students] not to be too show off like that? In other words if for example lecturers ask questions [smart students are] not [expected to] answer all the time. Is it like that? ((laugh))

R: If, [you] may answer but, if we are answered [sic] [asked to answer] we give the answer but if we are asked to volunteer isn’t it …

I: What about raising hand all the time? ((laugh))

R: Well if [you] raise your hand all the time well, well it’s fine actually. But don’t we have a feeling like that [a fear that people will think that we are showing off] [that’s what I feel]. But bureaucracy is like that actually. So for example, isn’t in bureaucracy, well we are still young no matter how smart we are, we can’t overtake the most senior [people] even though the senior, cannot do anything. We are like that, aren’t we?

I: ((laugh))

R: Aren’t we?

I: Hu uh, hu uh.

R: It’s not not anu [polite], not polite I mean not, unacceptable like that.

I: Unacceptable like that. Ok that’s about smiling, eh, there are also [some people] who say, eh this, he/she said “Why are Indonesian students like that when they are talking?”. There was [someone who] said like this. Eh [at that time] he/she talked about the tsunami. [The person said] “He/she [Indonesian students] talked about tsunami but why do they [talk] while smiling like that?”. [It was an] Australian well [it was] the bule27 [an Australian who] said [this]. He/she “He/she [an

26 Paddy Wisdom, is an Indonesian idiom. It refers to paddy: the more it ripens, the closer it goes down to the earth. It means people who have much knowledge are expected not to show off their knowledge.

27 Bule is an Indonesian expression referring to people with white skin in general. Here it refers to an Australian. Although this word, according to some studies, may be offensive for Western people, from Indonesian point of view, it has neutral meaning, and in some cases can be very positive. Some Indonesians would feel happy if someone says that they have white skin like a bule.
Indonesian student] was talking about the tsunami but it was strange for me why he/she talked while smiling?". Is that right se [sic], [do you think] that's right?

R: Well that's maybe similar, what is it?

I: He/she [the Australian] maybe expected [the Indonesian students] to behave like Australians here, if for example [they are] talking about sad things, it's like, they will display a sad expression. If [they] say sorry "Oh I'm sorry" ([I displayed sad facial expression]) or things like that.

R: Well maybe because he/she [Indonesian students] never experienced the tsunami maybe. We have less empathy, don't we, in this case. [I] mean well ...

I: Empathy ...

R: Pardon?

I: Empathy, what do you mean? Who do you mean by we? We?

R: Well like, is it Indonesian? Maybe it's too big if I say Indonesia ...

I: Some maybe. Some ...

R: Ha ah.

I: Some people are ...

R: I mean there is, I ever read that, we forget [things] too frequent you know now. Like the tsunami, well it's just like the wind that passes us. Tsunami [is just] tsunami, it's finished, build again, that's the end, no more tsunami, be happy [R talks in sarcastic tone].

I: Hu uh.

R: Isn't it like that? I mean well we forget quickly. I think [we] can't, for example the riots um in Jakarta.

I: A ah.

R: [The riot of] ninety eight [1998] you know. How many [people become the victims], how many [buildings] were burnt. But after several years it [the place where the riot happened] became a mall.

I: Yes. Hu uh.

R: There is [an attitude] like that. [It's finished, isn't it] ((R talked in a sarcastic tone)). [People forget] it quickly like that.

I: Quickly forget the sad feeling like that ((laugh)).
R: Sad feeling, well, Why should we feel sad, the song\textsuperscript{28} says: “Why should we feel sad?” ((laugh)).

I: ((laugh)) yes. Eh the next one is what about expression you know, because it is still related to the previous issue [smiling], but this is more general. Eh with Australians you know, we see that they are very expressive when they talk, aren’t they? If they talk about happy things, ah say for example he/she talks about, do you notice if, for example they talk like that. They [display] various expressions, don’t they? Their eyes show their expressions you know. But if, Indonesian students, not many of us are like that, especially when [we] talk in, talk in the classroom for example, say for example in the classroom. Maybe if [we] talk with friends especially close friends maybe not, but, this is public speaking, public, public what, public speaking like that.

R: Well in Java, this is in Java you know, it is true that showing expressions is not good. A little …

I: So is there really a cultural [value]…

R: There is.

I: … there?

R: You, let’s see …

I: [What do you mean] by showing expression here?

R: Well, if we feel happy, well just be happy. But don’t be [too]…

I: It’s like that then.

R: “Oh like this, like this, like that, like that!” ((R displayed facial expressions and body movements that, according to Indonesian point of view, are too happy)). But if we feel sad, well just be sad but don’t be too sad so [we become] really really sad ((laugh)).

I: Oh [it's] like that then.

R: [Let’s see] yesterday, like SBY\textsuperscript{29} you know. Our president met the president of Brazil yesterday. Didn’t [they look] very different.

I: Hu uh hu uh yes SBY =is a calm person indeed=.

\textsuperscript{28} R refers to a very popular Indonesian song lyric that says: \textit{Buat apa susah, buat apa susah, susah itu tak ada gunanya} (idiomatic translation: Why should we feel sad, why should we feel sad, it’s useless to feel sad).

\textsuperscript{29} SBY stands for Susilo Bambang Yudoyono, the president of Indonesia at the time of interview.
R: =SBY is kal [sic], calm isn’t he? I mean well, like, like a king like that isn’t it, indeed, well [don’t let people know how you feel]. It should be slow, calm, harmony like that you know.

I: Oh it’s like that then. So, indeed, in Javanese culture especially, Province X. You have =talked about Javanese culture, don’t you …=

R: =Well that’s in general.=

I: … or culture …

R: Actually it’s in general but, but I can’t, I can’t say that Javanese culture because it might be, be wrong ((laugh)).

I: Basically, say if in the family for example …

R: Eh, I’ve read [things] like that. So like, the, well, the expressions should not be …

I: Displayed?

R: Because the more people are able to control their emotion, the wiser they will look.

I: Ok. O oh. So the more people do not, display too much emotion like that …

R: [That means] they can control themselves.

I: Oh ok so =to control …=

R: =To control …=

I: … emotion then.

R: To control ourselves like that.

I: Oh ok.

R: For me among our friends like, like Mbak (a friend’s name) you know. Mbak (a friend’s name) really looks …

I: Mbak (a friend’s name), = Mbak (a friend’s name) from (name of city where the friend works)?=

R: =(The friend’s name) our friend. =Isn’t it her behaviour like that. [When she is] happy [she would just be] happy but [she would] not, not [display too much expression of happiness], [When she is] happy [she would just be] happy but [she would] not, not [be] too …

I: Ok.

R: I’ve read it’s like that indeed, indeed, it’s a little bit, to control oneself like that.

---

30 Mbak is a Javanese word that is used before a woman’s name. Rather than just mention a woman’s personal name, it is considered more polite to use this word before a woman’s name.
I: What about in the family domain or your working place, eh, [your] working place now is not in Java right? Isn’t it (name of a city where R works).

R: Hu uh.

I: Eh for example for example in the society of (city X) =in your living place …=

R: =In (City X) not actually= in my place the culture is strong [expressive] I mean …

I: Oh it’s different then.

R: Different.

I: What about province X.

R: Province X is different. Province X is different from (City Z) you know, [people in]
(city Z) are really like that calm, quiet, easy going …

I: (Province Z)

R: [People] in (Province X) you know their character is really a little bit, a little bit rebellious like that [they don’t really hold they don’t really hold], the norms [anymore] like that. Their culture begins to, be similar to …

I: It’s like that then. Ok, all right. Well so that’s about expressiveness. Eh what is it, eh, to control emotion like that. Ok. Ah that’s in tutorials … Now [about behaviours] outside classrooms like that. Outside classrooms. Eh, first about, eh what is that, this one first. This is if we are having barbeque, or [when we are in] meetings like that, eh we tend [not to mix males and females], males with males like that, females with females. What about in Java or in (city X) when you were studying [in university], or now in your working place is there really a tendency like that, when [people are having] meetings or gatherings things like that?

R: Yes on average it’s like that.

I: On average it’s like that. In (city X) in occasions, for example, sunatan31 party or occasions well any parties like that. [Do people] separate the seats of [males and females]? Males and females.

R: Ah it depends actually. If, eh it’s different actually if, sometimes the host have only sunatan people come one by one so, husbands and wifes come together like that and then they would talk [with the host] for a while and then eat together, no problem. There are also some occasions where the wife is separated.

I: Oh there are [occasions like that] as well then?

R: There are [occasions] like that hu uh.

---

31 Sunatan is an occasion held by a family after the young male children in the family get the circumcision.
I: What about in meetings?
R: Meetings …
I: In the office I mean.
R: Yes there is also the [separation between males and females] like that.
I: Is the tendency like that as well?
R: Ha ah. There is [a tendency like that]. But …
I: Although [males and females] are not strictly separated =but [it will still be like that], isn’t it?=
R: =Not being [strictly] separated but sometimes females usually= eh [sit] together with females.
I: What do you think, eh if for example, if for example there are females who, for example in meetings like that, or for example at barbeques say like our barbeques here you know. So if there are students eh, but this is if [we talk about] the barbeques here, if at the barbeques here for example there is a female student like that, and then she joins [the groups of] male students, [what will people think about it?] [What would be] their perception? =Is there any perception …= 
R: =Do you mean my= personal perception?
I: U uh. Is there [any] perception …
R: No, no no. =if [it is] in …=
I: =It’s not a problem then?=
R: … barbeques like that usually no problem, no I think no.
I: It’s not a problem then?
R: Ha ah.
I: What about in meetings?
R: In meetings, no no. For me actually it’s not a problem. There is not a problem. There is not any [negative] perception.
I: Oh it’s like that then. What about yourself, if you are in meetings, do you really tend to [sit] together with males like that?
R: Yes.
I: =With males like that?= 
R: =Yes. Ha ah, ha ha.=
I: [What is the reason?] How does it feel actually? What is the reason behind that? Is it …
R: Well actually …
I: ... what I mean by reason here, I want to know is the reason related to religious aspect or cultural aspect you know.

R: Oh ok. For me personally well actually it is not a problem. [People can sit wherever they want to sit] you know.

I: U uh.

R: But if, this is maybe well to follow, the mainstream practice only.

I: U uh. To follow the mainstream practice.

R: Yes. I mean although I feel more comfortable to sit together with males but I am not, more, more comfortable maybe, it’s also strange how can I am the only male [sitting] in female groups, it’s strange to be like that, isn’t it?. So well, to follow, to follow the anu [the mainstream practice] you know. But [if you me ask whether I have a problem with that], for me actually, it’s not a problem if we just have a conversation like that it’s not a problem actually.

I: Oh it’s like that then?

R: A ah.

I: So indeed it’s not, not, well actually it’s not a problem but really, the tendency is like that indeed.

R: Yes it is, the tendency is like that.

I: Or maybe if we see from the topics of conversation or what do you think?

R: [It could because of the topics of conversation]. Females you know ((laugh)) ...

I: ((Laugh))

R: Well maybe [it’s because of] the topic of conversations.

I: Hm.

R: What do males talk about [in their conversations] actually. Well, they only talk about things like cars or other things. Females maybe [talk about] well things like, [they have] many stories, don’t they.

I: Yes.

R: But honestly if you ask me personally maybe it’s comfortable [to talk] with females; I think there is no problem. I mean it’s also comfortable actually to talk with females like that.

I: Oh ok. That’s about barbeques, meetings. Ah now eh, ah this //one about/ dress code. Dress code. Eh, we I just want to confirm okay. If for example in (city X). In (city X) if, women, normally, I mean what are the appropriate limits of [women’s] clothes?. 
R: [Do you] mean if it is in general?
I: What about jil [sic] what about maybe jilbab\textsuperscript{32} [veils], if [women] do not wear jilbab it’s not a problem, isn’t it?
R: It is not a problem, is it?
I: It is not a problem, is it?
R: Ha ah.
I: So I mean, although she is a Moslem but if she does not, although she is a Moslem and then she does not wear the veil it’s not a problem then. There are not negative impressions or things like that, are there?
R: There are not [negative impressions].
I: Ah and then eh, but if for example, say, for example, tight clothes. Clothes tight clothes like that are problematic as well?
R: Ehmm no, I never heard someone who, is uhm, there is not a problem actually with tight clothes. But it seems that it begins to [be strange] isn’t it if [a woman] wear a veil [but she wears] tight clothes well that usually begins to …
I: Oh [so only if there is a] contradiction like that then?
R: Contradictive, well [people would say] “[How come]?” like that.
I: So if for example [a woman] wears tight clothes without veils it’s not a problem, is it? But if she wears a veil and her clothes are tight like that (:(laugh)))?
R: Yes could be …
I: Ah that is about …
R: … it is questionable you know =(I mean,= 
I: =Ha ha= (:(laugh))
R: [People will not do or say anything, but maybe they will start to question it] Oh [how come!] (:(laugh))…
I: It’s beyond the expectation do you mean?
R: Yes it’s like that.
I: What about opened dress?
R: [Women do not wear opened dress in my place]. Bali is more free you know. If [you talk about] Bali, well …

\textsuperscript{32} In Indonesia, Jilbab means a piece of cloth that is used to cover the hair, the neck, and, the bosoms of a Moslem woman. However, some Moslem women wrapped the whole ends of the clothes around their neck so it does not cover the bosoms actually, but, in many cases, they would wear clothes that cover whole part of the upper trunks of their bodies.
I: Okay now let’s talk about the opened [dress], which part of a woman’s body that can be revealed?

R: I’ve left (City X) for a long time you know ((laugh))

I: Oh =ok=.

R: =But= parts of body that can be revealed, only well, let me think. =Well maybe the lower [part] …=.

I: =If for example …=.

R: Hm? Pardon pardon?

I: What about clothes without sleeves?

R: Oh rare.

I: Rarely.

R: Because it is cold there, so it’s rare.

I: Oh it’s like that then. Oh that’s because the weather factor only then?

R: Weather factor and that is, still, still rare actually. I mean in normal, I mean in the morning, during the day, it’s rarely found you know, except if in the evening maybe in the evening in, where, in entertainment places [night clubs] maybe there are [women who wear clothes without sleeves].

I: What about around university?

R: Ha ah.

I: Around university, around university?

R: Rare.

I: What should students wear in the university? Can they wear any kind of clothes they want?

R: Free, free, ho oh.

I: Oh. What about wearing mini skirts?

R: Pardon?

I: Mini skirts.

R: Mini skirts I think [when I studied at university, when I studied at universities] there were not [girls wearing mini skirts].

I: Hm.

R: =Usually …=.

I: =That= what year was it?

R: Year Nine, eh …

I: Ok.
R: 90s, 2000, =say 2000s=
I: =Oh so more or less the same,= Were mini skirts rare?
R: Mini skirts, not many people wore skirts. Well maybe because they had just finished high schools. [When they move from] high schools to universities they have just, well, how come they wore skirts, [it was strange for] university students to wear skirts (laugh)).
I: So what was better to wear?
R: Wearing jeans trousers =jeans trousers=.
I: =Jeans trousers= the long trousers like that.
R: A ah.
I: With t-shirts.
R: Or there were also [female students] who wear, wear what, well wear skirts but the long ones.
I: Long skirts ho oh. What about t-shirts, Could [students wear t-shirts at that time? ] T-shirt?
R: They could. Yes they could. No problem.
I: It's fine then?
R: No problem.
I: And then what about male students, [was it fine for male students to wear t-shirts?]
R: No problem.
I: Oh ok. Because in other universities, people said, [students] should wear shirts you know.
R: Uhm.
I: Ok. So that's about [dress code]. Eh then in my observations, aren't we here, eh, if eh Indonesian male students, aren't they eh Australian male students wear shorts in summer, don't they. Well it’s not short actually, but I mean medium shorts that …
R: Oh yes ha ah.
I: … eh half the [knee-length shorts] like that or [the ones that go] a little bit [below] the knees. There are not Indonesian students [who wear shorts], aren't there?
R: Uhm.
I: [What’s the reason do you think? ] Is it really unacceptable or [what do you think?]
R: [A little bit unacceptable] well because it's not, for them [wearing shorts] is not polite.
I: Not polite? =Not so [sic] Not polite?=
R: =To to to,= to university? =Wearing shorts?= 
I: =Ho oh.= To university.
R: And attending lectures like that?
I: Hu uh. Like [the students] here I mean.
R: Well maybe they are not comfortable or maybe because the weather is cold. Or maybe they are not comfortable with [shorts]; How come we go to universities wearing shorts ((laugh))
I: Oh it’s like that then.
R: A ah maybe it’s like that.
I: Is there really uncomfortable feeling like that? Uncomfortable …
R: [That’s my opinion you know]. I mean it’s also not, ((ck33)) not appropriate. [We still have our attitude that, this one is] still appropriate [and that one is] not appropriate. It’s like that, isn’t it? [That’s my opinion you know].
I: Uh u uh. Oh so in other words if it is in the university, in [Indonesia], it’s true we can’t, not, not polite Is it like that?
R: Not so [sic], not polite.
I: Oh.
R: It’s not polite to wear shorts to …
I: To the classrooms.
R: To the classrooms like that, well, I think …
I: If it is only around the university?
R: Around university well, well if they don’t [go into the classroom], no problem actually. Or [if they want to] go jogging around university there is not a problem. It depends on the time you know.
I: Oh yes =yes yes.=
R: =If= [they] only want …
I: O oh.

33 Ck is a sound produced by the quick touch of the tongue with the hard palate of the mouth. This sound is usually interpreted as a sign of disapproval. The production of this sound accompanied by the display of certain facial expressions would be interpreted as a “no”.
R: … to walk around, and they don't have official things to do only [want to walk] around, but if they want to meet someone you know, wearing shorts well, it's well not, not …
I: Oh yes ye yes. So, including, =I mean …=
R: [It doesn't mean that you can't wear shorts; it's just], not polite you know ((laugh)).
I: ((laugh)) Of course it's not polite ((laugh)) ho oh ok. Ok that's dress code. If for example there is a perem [sic] in, for example in your previous university in (University X) like that. Eh, if a woman, wears opened clothes, you know, she wears opened clothes. Well say [she looks] sexy like that. [What would be the perceptions] of males?
R: Uhm ((laugh)) perception [what do you mean by perception?] Why…
I: I mean in, what we have in our mind. Perception means what we have in our mind.
R: Yes. =Ah …=
I: =In,= [I mean] what will people think?.
R: Well maybe, “Does this woman want to go to campus or other places?” ((laugh))
I: Eh, first for example what about on campus?
R: Yes if, no I mean people will think like that if there is [a woman wearing opened clothes] like that [people will] think, “Does this student want to go to campus or want to have a party?” or things like that maybe it’s wrong, because maybe it’s true that [wearing opened clothes to campus is] wrong you know. But, in general [from the perspective of], is it ethical perspective? Eh no, culturally, maybe it’s not appropriate to wear [opened] clothes like that.
I: If people go to campus?
R: To campus a ah.
I: Now if for example, for example in the mall like that, in the mall like that. Eh, and then if a woman [for example, wears] opened clothes like that, that, /what do you think? [What will people think about it?] Especially males for example.
R: Well, well "How dare that woman wear opened clothes like that"((laugh)).
I: Ok.
R: But it won't be to much like that actually. For me actually, whatever fashion styles she wants to wear it's up to her.
I: Hm, hm, =it's like that then.=
R: =Ha ah ha ah=. [that's my opinion] you know.
I: But there is still, a kind ...
R: Feeling ...
I: ... unusual [feeling] like that? Or, well, are you just neutral about that?
R: For me, I feel neutral maybe, I have already, because I've seen many places maybe. I've been to Bali and then to (City Y) oh this [is nothing compared to what I've seen in] Bali so I feel neutral. Well [there is a little change] maybe.
I: Oh yes hu uh. Ok. Yes. Ok that's about dress code, ah now about, eh public affection. Public affection like, ehh, what's it called? You know public affection, don't you? I mean like, for example like holding hands, or embracing, or the, between males and females.
R: Hu hm.
I: Ok. Ah here we usually see things like that, don't we?
R: Ya ha ah.
I: Isn't here, wa [sic], we always see it, don't we? ((laugh)) We've seen them displaying the affectionate behaviour like that.
R: Yes ha ah.
I: Ah now if for example in anu, in, in (University X) [when you were studying there]. If for example people, walk together, is it acceptable?
R: Yes.
I: Males and females ...
R: Ha ah, ha ah.
I: ... walk =together ...=
R: =Ha ah=
I: ... is it acceptable?
R: Hu uh.
I: Ah now walking together, if for example the space is narrow?
R: Hm.
I: The space, the space you know?
R: =For me you know ...=
I: =Say= if the space is very narrow like that?
R: Hm it's not a problem for me you know it's not anu, what, not, not, ...
I: What about people la [sic] what about, in general?
R: Eh in general it's not [a problem] actually. It's not a problem like that, if [males and females walking and sitting with a] close [space].
I: In general =it’s not a problem either then=?
R: =Not a problem.=
I: There, if a man and a woman walk together, and the space is narrow like that, is there, eh it means, a sign of, does it show that they have relationship or things like that?
R: Hm …
I: Or is it just normal?
R: [It would give an impression that they have] relationship actually. [The relationship], although the relationship is not a [serious] relationship just friends, close friends if …
I: What about holding hands?
R: Well, that’s [too much] already, I think it’s vulgar you know ((laugh)) it’s like that.
I: It’s like that then?
R: Eh that’s what I think you know about holding hands.
I: [What about between] husband and wife?
R: Ehh, [it’s not a problem if they are husband and wife but in our culture people can’t do that. Husband and wife …
I: Even though they are husband and wife like that?
R: Maybe they [Indonesian people] think, well it’s embarrassing as well you know =[it’s] like that in our culture.=
I: =Oh it’s like that then ((laugh)).=
R: How come old people still hold hands ((laugh)).
I: ((Laugh)) Ah that’s it. That means if tu [sic] [it’s not appropriate for] old [people] like that so young people can do that, is it like that? ((laugh)) Um, the young people? ((laugh))
R: [They can] actually but, for me you know, if they are already, if they are husband and wife already no problem. But if they are not married yet, it’s also ((laugh)) embarrassing as well ((laugh)).
I: ((Laugh)) ok ok ok.
R: But now people are more expressive now actually.
I: Eh so, so basically holding hands make people feel, it’s too much already if …
R: Yes.
I: … I mean …
R: Hah.
I: … the level …
R: Hah hah.
I: … ehh, it’s beyond, already beyond what is acceptable, is it like that?
R: Yes, I think it’s like that.
I: Moreover if the ((laugh)), moreover with the embracing, kissing and, hugging …
R: Hu uhm, hu uhm.
I: … kissing etc., of course they are more, unacceptable, aren’t they? People can’t do that, can they?
R: Yes but, yes yes ha ah. But for me during my stay here [how can I become more tolerant] ((laugh))
I: Hm? Pardon?
R: [Why do I become more tolerant during my stay here?] ((laugh)) like that ((laugh)).
I: Well because, because [people who do it are] not Indonesians, are they?
R: Yes yes [that’s] right.
I: [People who do it are other people. Ok. Ah now, ah that’s so if for example [we are] here and then, if [people who display the public affection] are Australians, we feel neutral, don’t we?
R: Hm.
I: But if for example there are Indonesians who do that, how do you feel? Just the same or different?
R: If I am here you know, if for example I am here …
I: Yes if the setting is here.
R: If the setting is here well …
I: And then [the people who display the affective behaviours are] Indonesians like that?
R: I don’t care ((laugh)).
I: ((Laugh)) ho oh.
R: Not, not really I mean well, well maybe, well just normal, but if, it would be different if I am in Indonesia, ah that’s very different.
I: Oh if the context is Indonesia …
R: Ah, ah, ah.
I: … so oh. So the, the difference here is, if the setting is Indonesia [you will feel] negative or if the setting is here [you will feel] positive or just neutral?
R: I think I will feel neutral about it.
I: A ah that's if in …
R: I mean it is more acceptable you know.
I: If it is in Indonesia [how will you feel]?
R: I will feel, well, not not, not appropriate.
I: Is it negative? In other words maybe the people, people who do it do not know the appropriate place, [is that what you mean?]
R: Yes. It's like that.
I: Ok, so the problem here is not the behaviour but …
R: The place.
I: … setting of place where the behaviour occurs, Is that what you mean?
R: Ehh …
I: Situational factor.
R: It should go back, it should go back to the attitude actually.
I: U uh.
R: Not the situational factor. It should be, ideally you know, ideally [it should go back to our attitude] like that.
I: U uh.
R: If it is wrong but it is dila [sic], if we think that it's wrong wherever the setting it must be wrong it's like that, isn't it?
I: U uh.
R: But I am more, more to, the situational factor ((laugh)).
I: ((Laugh)) It's like that then.
R: I use the situation [as an excuse]. That's my personal opinion you know. But I think ideally, actually, if for example we can't do it there, we can't do it here either, it's like that.
I: U uhm. U uhm.
R: I don't know why my thinking is becoming more liberal like this.
I: Yes. Well it's fine. Isn't it what we call as a process, it's like that isn't it. Ok, eh, lifting the feet etc, what else. Oh, that means, oh this one, this is the last thing, about meeting, if we meet someone like that. I don't know in your working place but [another respondent], she was active in, ehh, she was active in meetings with important businessmen like that. So [she is active] in business [meetings]. Well just call it business meetings like that. So, the audiences are directors, managers like that you know, important persons like that. Well according to her,
in that situation, they, for example eh, what, doing the cheek pressing, well, between males and females is not unusual you know.

R: Hm.
I: What about in your working place, is it like that already or not?
R: No, no, not to that far. =Still ...=
I: =So ...=
R: ... because we are civil servants. People in my working place are =civil servants ...=
I: =Oh yes= civil servants yes, ha ah office.
R: So we tend to be more, feudalistic like that. So, so, I still remember when the first time I was in City Y, we've been told in the briefing you know. In the first briefing we were told like this, “Although you are still fresh, well, don't be too rebellious or things like that, you should respect your seniors it's like that you know. It means that we cannot do many things. The culture is already like that, still like that. It's feudalistic like that.
I: So [you were told] explicitly like that?
R: Yes.
I: Not just implicitly then. And it was formal, isn’t it? I mean the information was formal because it was given in the meeting in the training, wasn’t it?
R: Hu uh, hu uh.
I: It was in the briefing, wasn’t it?
R: Yes, it was like that, yes indeed.
I: Oh I think, I thought it was only ((laugh)) informal things like that.
R: No I mean, well, they are still, well, it’s a matter of age you know [you still have to] respect older people, who have been working here for a long time although you are smarter or, that what it means. It’s different from private [companies] you know, private like that, in private [companies] the model is already who can work well, well =they get [the benefit] you know ...=
I: =Yes it was like this=
R: A ah. “Here you can’t be like that, should be like this.” [We were] told like that.
I: Oh it’s like that ok. So ehh, oh yes this I almost forget. That means if for example, back to the previous topic, do you think the relationship between teachers or lecturers you know, with students in our culture in Indonesia in general, is it an equal relationship or, hierarchical relationship? =Equal ...=
R: =When= when a ah, [I was studying at university it was] still hierarchical, but [I
don't know the] current situation. It seems that [there are already] many, many
young lecturers, who have just come, maybe they begin to eliminate [the
hierarchy] a little bit, little by little.
I: Oh.
R: But that was in my time you know.
I: The past …
R: … I feel well it was still =hierarchical like that …=
I: =Still hierarchical=
R: Ho oh.
I: And, and nonverbal factors, like [what we have been discussing] for example
the way we sit the way we talk, the way we, say the clothes we wear in the
classroom, including eye contact like that. Indeed, it is still very influencing, in
our relationship with lecturers, right?
R: Yes because it was shaped since since we were in previous education.
I: Do you mean since we were in primary schools?
R: Yes. Primary schools, Junior High Schools, Senior High Schools, I was like that
in the past. I was taught like that.
I: So although you are already in the university, it was still, still like that then.
R: Eh, [some] friends can change [their attitude], it’s just like that. There are
friends who can change [their attitude], there are friends who are still, still ber
[sic] because it, they still [think like] that I still [think] like that you know. But
there are friends who [changed quickly]. Moreover when they joined
organisations [that promote] well, equality, equality, equality like that.
I: Ok so this is interesting [to know what you said about] friends who could
change [their attitude], …
R: Hm.
I: …, are they friends who, is it generally …
R: Ha.
I: … in general student activists like that?
R: Yes. Generally like that.
I: Hm.
R: Because aren’t they, not, they, their point of view is different. I mean they
began reading about education problems, anagogic or pedagogic or things like
that. After that they started reading educational problems, socialist =or maybe equality ...

I: =Equality issue and various things ...

R: … beside that they read things like philosophy =like that, They were more ...

I: =A ah ohh=

R: … I am a human being they are human being so we are equal. Like that. =A ah=

I: =Oh= ok ok ok. Maybe they rarely read books about culture ((laugh)).

R: I think they …

I: I mean maybe they rarely read articles that discuss cultural perspectives or things like that.

R: Ok. =They were more ...

I: =Those activists ...

R: … maybe more to that I mean, to po [sic], well in that time, we began to feel the freedom didn’t we? They began reading Philosophy books, moreover Philosophy is more, asking about human being, not because you are a teacher I am a student and then ((laugh)).

I: Yes yes yes.

R: I cannot, as a human being. What is a human being …=

I: Philosophy looks the real entity only, doesn’t it?

R: Yes. =Philosophy (unclear)=

I: =Without any influence from this, from that, from this. Oh yes this is interesting =that means, that means there is a difference among students, so like you said, some students can change their attitude some cannot change. Now those who can change tend to ehh, those who can change generally are student activists, in quotation marks you know. These activists I mean are very, very concern, very concerned with those things, that we’ve just talked about, the …

R: Feudalistic.

I: … equality …

R: Equality.

I: = … to eliminate the feudalism=

R: =Or feudal, a ah, a ah like that= Not only that, you know; because not only friends who, there were also friends who didn’t join organizations but they have, maybe they were taught like that in their family. Maybe there are …
I: Oh ok.
R: …cultural things like that.
I: Do you mean they come from a family who is more moderate like that?
R: Not moderate I mean, ah it could be moderate, it could be also uhm, …
I: Not anymore …
R: Not anymore …
I: Not maintain the tradition anymore?
R: =I didn’t mean that they don’t maintain I mean,= maybe, I didn’t mean that they
don’t maintain maybe they know that the tradition is not really good actually.
Later, if, but that’s true you know. If we want to maintain the tradition like that
well, do you think we can survive in the future years? We will compete with
other people like that. Not anymore, not anymore in the scope, our own scope,
limited scope like that. We’ve met many people we should, be braver, should
be more I mean, people cannot be pressed like that anymore you know.
Everything should be said ((unclear speech)).
I: Ok. Eh now let’s talk about formality and informality, ah then if it is like here in
tutorials, ehh do you feel it still, more formal or informal? The situation [I
mean]?
R: It’s informal actually.
I: A ah.
R: Informal. But I see here it’s not really, “Does everybody understand?”, “Yes”,
everybody says that they understand like that. But when I asked a friend “Did
you understand?” She/he said ‘I don’t know”. That means, they aren’t really
concerned with tutorials, I mean they have their own way you know. Tutorials
are, well, for formality only.
I: Just attend =like that=.
R: =Ha ah, ha ah.=
I: But if we talk about the situation, the situation is indeed …
R: ((Unclear speech)).
I: … I mean do you feel it is informal?
R: Informal.
I: Not really formal like in …
R: But sometimes I feel it is formal you know, sometimes ((laugh)). It’s just my
feeling you know.
I: What is the cause? Does it depend on the lecturer?
R: Hm, it depends, not really.
I: Hmm.
R: Actually everything depends on ourselves I think.
I: ((Laugh))
R: In whatever situation if we think that it’s happy, it will be happy, …
I: ((Laugh)) ((unclear speech))
R: If we think it’s difficult, it will be difficult.
I: Ok. Ah so from what we have been discussed so far, what we have been talking about so far, is there anything that you think is related to religious values? With religious values?
R: Uhm =What do you mean?=
I: =For example= dress code or, relationship between males and females. Is there any relationship with, issues like, with religious aspects or what do you think?
R: I think yes. Because we, like culture is usually influenced by religions.
I: Yes, ha ah.
R: Yes. So because we have been accustomed to living in a culture we, will, judge something based on our culture.
I: Hu uh.
R: We are not, in Indonesia it’s impossible for dos [sic] no tutor would wear tight clothes like that. We will think whether it is appropriate or not. From our Indonesian point of view, well it is not appropriate if lecturers ((laugh)) are like that. But well, there are some of our views that are influenced by our religion.
I: Ok ok. So say, for example, like, like for example Islam, Islam does not approve any hu [sic] what is it, ehhm, say for example, the attitude about females and males in public places, it is very limited, isn’t it. It’s like that in Islam, isn’t it? It’s like that. But if for example in Java, and then, for example there is a Javanese who is not a Moslem. For example he/she believes in another religion. Does it mean that he/she can be just free like that in public places?
R: Well that’s it. Does he/she have, tolerance like that. I mean I said it should be like harmony.
I: Uhm.
R: Do they have that feeling that they are offending ((unclear speech)) or things like that, ...
I: Uhm.
R: … [it’s] like that.
I: Ok.
R: Like that. But for ourselves, we cannot force them. I mean again it’s up to them, what they want to do. Sometimes we keep silent but actually in our heart well, ...
I: ((Laugh))
R: ((Laugh)) [we don’t like it you know] =((laugh))=
I: ((Laugh))= ok, ok. All right. Yah ok. I think that’s enough, finish. It’s finished. Ho oh.
Interview transcription
Respondent Number: Australian 1

I: So in my observations, I did many observations in tutorials and also in many public places, can you understand my ...

R: Yes.

I: ... pronunciation because (laugh) this is the international English (laugh).

R: Hm.

I: Ok so also in various public places around the university ...

R: Hu uh

I: ... and I found several things that and I need to confirm whether this behaviour is really you know acceptable in Australian context ...

R: Yap.

I: ... especially in university context.

R: Hu uh.

I: All right. Ok so . . .

(I took some personal data of the respondent).

Start from minute 02.45

I: Ok all right, so now then eh I will confirm about several behaviours here, maybe we can start with the tutorials first eh let’s talk about something like eh what is it (pause) sitting posture, ...

R: Uh huh.

I: ... about sitting posture. Is there any special expectation for students about the, you know, the way they sit in a tutorial?

R: In a tutorial?

I: Yeah.

R: No. I’d, I’d say you have to be, you should be sitting rather than lying down or standing, but besides that I don’t think there’s anything ...

I: Yeah.

R: ... that you need to observe posturally.

I: Eh what ah how is the normal position of sitting which is eh acceptable in Australia eh in in a tutorial?
R: Ah, do you mean if you looking to be polite or just …
I: Yeah yeah ((not clear)), is there any specific thing like that?
R: I guess ah specifically if you’re trying to, to be polite and attentive, you probably sit fairly straight umm rather than …
I: With a straight back?
R: Yeah, you don’t have to be completely straight but not just slouching around.
I: Ok so if someone eh sit eh if someone lean backward …
R: Mmm.
O: … very far backward like this, is there any, will there be any eh negative eh impression about that?
R: I’d say you’d probably would get a bit of a negative impression. You’d probably say that they were treating it in a really casual way, the tutor in a really casual way, but umm, I don’t think it would have any really negative consequences besides just maybe changing your opinion a little bit of that person. You might think they were rude, ah, that they didn’t put a lot of, place a lot of importance on being in the tutorial; they didn’t feel they needed to impress the tutor or anything like that.
I: All right ok. So it doesn’t have any, you know a very big problem?
R: No.
I: But people will still think that it’s not appropriate to sit like that?
R: Yeah you would, umm, I’m not sure if you’d say it’s not appropriate; it just perhaps sends a message that umm …
I: Uh huh.
R: You’re, you think it’s pretty casual …
I: Uh huh.
R: … yeah.
I: Is it good or not?
R: Umm …
I: Can we say that …
R: It is, is not as good as sitting straight ((laugh)).
I: ((Laugh)) ok yeah but it’s still acceptable.
R: Yeah.
I: I mean yeah it doesn't make people have negative impression about us then.

R: No.

I: But only pretty casual but not really impolite or inappropriate?

R: No.

I: All right ok. All right so that's about the sitting posture. Eh what about if we put our you know if we put our foot on the chair?

R: Ah.

I: We lift our foot and put it on the chair would that be ...

R: Ah.

I: ... acceptable?

R: Ah, I'm not ...

I: In a tutorial.

R: ... the chair, the chair with you like this, or the chair across from you?

I: Eh where I sit the chair where I sit.

R: Umm, I don't think that that would be a problem.

I: In a tutorial?

R: Yeah, but I haven't seen though—I guess I haven't seen anyone do it though.

I: Ok.

R: But I don't, I don't think that it would be a problem. If you're putting your feet up on the chair across from you I don't think many people would take kindly to that.

I: Ok. I've seen once eh a female student ...

R: Uhm.

I: ... she put her foot on the on the chair while talking you know while talking to the tutor.

R: Ok.

I: Would that be ...

R: Oh ...

I: ... acceptable or ...
R: Umm, I'm not sure. Hard to say. I don't really think of I've seen that before. I guess ...

I: How, at least how will you feel about that kind of ...

R: It would surprise—if someone did that while addressing people it would surprise me.

I: Ok.

R: Umm, if they were, if they were listening and ...

I: Yeah.

R: ... to the tutor and they had their feet up on their own chair, ...

I: Uhm.

R: I know some people keep feel quite comfortable sitting like that and it wouldn't bother me. If they were addressing people, it would seem to me a really odd way to posture to try and get people's attention, if you have people's attention.

I: Yeah because it seems to me that there is no complaint from the tutor as well ...

R: Uhm.

I: ... or from the lecturer ...

R: Uhm.

I: ... so I just think that it might be just acceptable to ...

R: Yeah, I guess it would be acceptable but surprising (laugh).

I: ((Laugh)) It's just surprising then? (laugh)

R: Yeah.

I: Ok. Eh is there any change of this kind of things I mean several years before and eh today's situation? Or it's just the same?

R: At the university?

I: Yes.

R: Well, that's really hard for me to say because when I was studying, err when I first start studying here, I was studying a Bachelor of ...

I: When was it?

R: In 2003. I was doing just a Jazz Music degree and there are no international students there and it's very divorced from the main campus, so umm I, I mean, no
one I saw there would have sat like that. Umm, so again I couldn’t say if anything in that manner has changed.

I: Oh ok all right then. All right. What about if we cross our legs, crossing legs?

R: Umm, no, I don’t think that’s a problem.

I: So it’s not a problem then?

R: No.

I: All right. Ah in a tutorial when so when you don’t so, I am talking about eh Australian eh Australian behaviour Australian habit, so when you don’t understand eh one part of explanation from the tutor so what will you do?

R: Umm, if you want ask a question it really depends on the tutor because some of the tutors here are really casual and some tutors are a lot more formal …

I: So let’s talk about the casual tutors then.

R: The casual, yeah, and also it depends on the size of the tutorial. If it’s a really busy tutorial, you’d put your hand up and, and try to, wait for the tutor to get the tutor’s attention then ask a question and talk about what you don’t understand. If it’s just really a small group, and your tutor’s a bit more casual you’d probably just speak straight out.

I: So we don’ need to raise our hand? But if it is with the formal tutor?

R: I’d say yeah, you’d raise your hand.

I: Even though it’s a small group?

R: Umm, yeah, probably.

I: If the tutor asks, after he explains something and then he asks you “Can you understand my explanation?” and when you cannot really understand the explanation what will you do? Will you ask again or…

R: Most people I know would probably just suggest that they do understand and then later on try to look up the solution by themselves but umm it depends on the person.

I: What do you mean depends on the person?

R: Some people are more assertive and some people umm less assertive, and if you don’t understand something of course if you more assertive and more confident in the tutorial, you would just definitely suggest that you don’t understand and maybe ask if there’s a different way or if he actually could explain, but umm I know a lot of people who are not particularly assertive, not very confident in a tutorial and if they feeling like they don’t understand something, they’d probably just keep it to themselves and then try to go it over again later.
I: But what, what would be the expectation from the teacher actually when they ask whether we can understand or not? Are we expected to say yes or just no or…

R: Oh, the tutor would expect you to ask if you didn’t understand, yeah.

I: Is there any specific thing that will constrain that will you know that will prevent you from saying that you don’t really understand?

R: Umm, yeah, I think perhaps if it—I think one of the problems with tutorials, especially big tutorials, is that if it seems like everyone else understands …

I: Oh yes.

R: You don’t wanna seem like you don’t understand. There’s that sort of, that feeling of you don’t want to be seen as, well, not as bright as everyone else in the group.

I: So in that case what is the cause actually? Is that because you don’t feel “well I don’t want to be I don’t want people will think that I’m not, just slow or something or…

R: Ah, yeah, I think that’s, that will be part of it. ((laugh))

I: Ok all right so if it seems to us that everybody else just understand the explanation then you might not say that you don’t understand then?

R: Yeah, yeah, I think so.

I: Yeah that’s interesting. But in terms of our expression we will not I mean if someone because one problem with the international students here I read somewhere that when the tutor ask them whether “Can you understand the explanation?” some of them just smile, umm even though they don’t understand but they will smile. In that case what would the what will you think about whether they can understand?

R: You would think they can understand.

I: Ok so for example if you ask me “Can you understand?” and I smile, will you think that I understand?

R: Ah, yes.

I: Ok so in Australia if you, smile means that we can understand, we accept something, or we agree with something

R: Umm, yes.

I: All right yeah. When we still confuse, we can’t smile then? Because sometimes I just smile even though I’m still confused.

R: Well, yes. So I guess it depends on the subject matter as well. If, if you’re talking about something obvious and you understand it, you might smile, but if you’re talking—at the same time, if you’re talking about something that seems really,
really complicated to you, and you think it’s so confusing that you don’t even know where to start, you might smile because you might think it’s ridiculous and then you don’t understand, so perhaps it depends on what’s being discussed.

I: All right. So it’s about sitting posture and smile, what about you know yawning and body stretching. You know, I noticed that in some tutorials some students yawned and also stretched their body, would that be acceptable in tutorial situation?

R: Umm, acceptable yes, but not polite though.

I: Not polite in students’ perspective or in tutor’s perspective?

R: Umm, probably more a tutor’s perspective. Umm, I say, well, as I say, it’s probably, it’s acceptable because I don’t think it would have any consequences, but it’s polite—it’s impolite in that your tutor wouldn’t want you to do it, umm, because it’s sort of, if you’re yawning it’s like umm, it can sort of give the impression that you’re not interested or you’d rather be somewhere else.

I: But the tutor will not complain about that?

R: Ah, I doubt it. Unless they are really stiff, unless they were a really formal old fashioned tutor, they wouldn’t. ((unclear))

I: Ok. So if I did something like that, there will be no complaint from the tutor?

R: No, I wouldn't think so.

I: What about eating? Eating while attending a tutorial?

R: I would say most tutors wouldn’t, wouldn’t find that acceptable. Most tutors would probably umm ask you to ...

I: Not to eat?

R: Not eat, not eat—leave it for later.

I: While attending the tutorial?

R: Yeah.

I: Ok. How do you describe our, how do you describe your relationship with a tutor or teacher in university setting in Australian university?

R: Umm, most of the time, because tutors, a lot of the tutors are really umm still students as well, as you’d probably understand, a lot of tutors are still like Honours students or Master students. Umm a lot of the time the tutor to student relationship is more one of umm I guess umm, peer support kind of relationship as in they’re sort of, they’re to be your friend and to help you understand things. Umm, but it can really depend on, on their age as to how you perceive them, because as I said, a lot of the younger tutors you’ll feel a lot more, you’ll feel a lot more casual because they still have the attitude of students...

I: Oh yes.
R: And they’ll talk to you sort of as if they’re on your level umm, and so that’s sort of more a really, a friendly relationship but then some tutors are the lecturers or outside academics and usually, not always, but usually they’ll be older of course, umm, and in that situation—again it depends on them, but in that situation often they might be more formal and it might be more of a teacher to student relationship and you’d be expected to show a little bit more respect, or maybe not expected to show more respect, but you would probably maybe feel that you should.

I: So in other words when the lecture is older than us then students tend to be to show that they respect the teacher or the the tutor?

R: Yeah.

I: To be more polite?

R: Yes.

I: All right, so how do you how do students, what do the students do to show that they are polite or …

R: Umm, well, I’d say things like raising your hand if you have a question instead of just speaking openly. Umm, ah, I guess posture-wise, I, I mean, I can’t speak for everyone but I guess I would probably try to sit straighter and try and appear a bit more interested.

I: All right ok and if the tutor come to us and then he talked to us while standing and we are sitting on the chair, can we just sit on the chair or should we stand up as well to talk to the tutor?

R: No, you still have to sit.

I: So we can just sit while talking to the tutor then?

R: Mmm.

I: What about if we are in the same corridor? So if we pass, what is it, how do we say that, each other on the corridor and then oh no no no, we are walking in the corridor and we are going to same direction, can we just go before the lecturer or …

R: Ah …

I: Or we …

R: … yes.

I: Which one will you do? Just go before the lecturer?

R: Umm, you mean if we’re coming up to, like a doorway?

I: Yes.

R: No, you should let them go first.
I: Ok. So we should let him go first. Ok so that's for male then. But if if the, something like if the student is female and then the lectuer is a male, what will the female do?

R: Umm, I don't know. Not being a female umm, I guess you would probably still expect them to wait and see if the tutor goes first but then if the tutor was being polite then he would let the female go first.

I: Ok ok but in that case that the lecturer is male and the student is male as well then you will still let her the lecturer to go first before?

R: Yes.

I: All right, because one of my lecturers told me that it's a universally acceptable to let the ladies to go first so...

R: Yeah, yeah, well usually it's generally considered polite to let ladies go first but umm, I would probably expect just anyone younger to allow someone older to go first. However, then if she was a girl and the older guy was, he might be allowed to go first but then he would probably just gesture the younger one to go through if she was a lady.

I: Do you think that things like this is an influence of your family practice or, I mean do you practice the same thing when you in your family for example or your parents eh...

R: Umm, no, I don't think, well, your parents might tell you so. I don't think it would be practiced in your family. It's just something you would be taught to practice among strangers.

I: Oh I see. Strangers.

R: Mmm.

I: Something like university setting then.

R: Mmm.

I: Oh ok. So if with one of our family you might we will behave in rather different behaviour then?

R: Umm, you might or you might not, I couldn't say for sure. It just would depend. I don't think it matters.

I: Ok

R: Umm, if, if you were trying to be polite to your sister, then I would let her go first but in most cases with my sister I probably wouldn't really think about it.

I: Uhm hm hm so because because your relationship is...

R: Is closer.
I: Is close so …

R: Yeah you’re not expected to be so polite.

I: In other words then eh students in another words then the eh the close relationship, the relationship whether it is close or distance is really an influential issue to be in in eh in our effort to be polite then?

R: Yes.

I: All right.

R: I think among my immediate family, among my immediate family, it’s not so important for me to be polite to any of them because they all know…

I: To your father for example?

R: Yeah.

I: You don’t need to be very polite?

R: No, well, I don’t think so because they’ve known me my whole life. They know what sort of person I am, they can judge me on a lot of my actions; but to a stranger I haven’t met before they’re only going to be able to judge me on a few of my actions so I should make them…

I: Ok so in Australian family in your family for example can you talk to your father while putting your foot on the table or on the chair? Would that be acceptable?

R: Yeah.

I: All right yeah. Ok so, oh yes about eye contact, eye contact do you think that eye contact is really a what is it an important issue in conversations among Australians?

R: Ah, yes.

I: So what will people feel if I don’t keep the eye contact when I talk to you for example?

R: Ah, it would, it would be impolite I’d suggest. It would seem like again you’ve got other things on your mind that you’d be more interested in ((laugh)) rather than the conversation. I guess if you’re talking and not looking at someone like looking around the room, it looks, it would look to me like you’re not so interested in what we’re talking about and it’s a bit rude.

I: Is there any difference between when we talk to someone older than us and someone younger than us?

R: Ah, I’d guess so. Umm, I mean I think the implications wouldn’t, wouldn’t change. It’s always good to have eye contact but umm, umm someone generally who is older than you, you going to want to show them a bit more respect so you’d probably be a bit more careful to keep the eye contact, whereas if it’s just someone
younger than you or someone ((unclear)) you’re equal umm, it’s not so important to keep eye contact.

I: Is there any situation where you find that it’s difficult to keep the eye contact?
R: Oh, of course, if you’re, if you’re taking notes or …
I: I mean is there any when we talk to someone else …
R: Yes.
I: For example, maybe I can give you an information like in Indonesia for example we feel that it’s more difficult for us to keep eye contact when we talk with our lecturer or tutor or our parents compared to when we talk to our friends. Is there any similar issue like this with Australian students?
R: No I don’t, I don’t think so.
I: So it’s just the same when we talk to the people when you talk to your parents is just the same it’s still easy for you to keep the eye contact then?
R: Yeah.
I: ‘Cause it’s really problematical … ((laugh)). What about if eh if you are late in a tutorial? Can we just go straight into the room or …
R: Ah, yep, umm.
I: Or do we need to ask for permission or something.
R: No, you don’t need to ask. Oh well, some, some lecturers I know umm have gotten really frustrated and will sometimes lock the door and once a certain amount of time has passed, and not letting anyone late in, umm, but if the door is open and, you should probably take care not to walk between the tutor and the students. You should try to walk around the back, but besides that umm it’s obviously not a good thing being late, but umm sometimes it happens and you don’t need to wait for permission; just go straight in.
I: So you don’t need to wait for a permission then?
R: No.
I: We don’t need to for example eh wait until the tutor say “Yes you can come” and then no?
R: No.
I: All right. And would that be really unacceptable or …
R: If you were to wait?
I: Yeah eh yeah what happen if we still wait for ((laugh)) or asking for permission?
R: The tutor might either just ignore you or if you were there for a while they would probably notice something was wrong and tell you to come in.

I: Ok, ok. So really different then. What about going out in the middle of tutorial? So the tutorial is not finished yet but you really need to go out, do we need to ask for permission first?

R: I'd, I would suggest, I mean for me, I would notice most of the students—I don't think they do this—but for me, I would suggest it's probably polite if you know you're going to have to leave earlier to tell your tutor at the beginning...

I: Before...

R: ... of the tutorial umm, and so your tutor knows that ten or fifteen minutes before the end, you're going to have to be getting up and leaving, so you're not disrupting or distracting him, umm, but if you have to leave early it's probably not really necessary to do that. Again I would say though as more polite if you thought you might have to leave, to let the tutor know beforehand.

I: So when we have told the tutor beforehand that we are going to leave earlier and then when the time is come for us to go then we don't need to you know to rise our hand or

R: No.

I: Ok just go

R: Yeah.

I: I found some situations like this, this is the seating arrangement and there is a very narrow space behind and the tutor ask one of the students to write something on the whiteboard and the student jumped over the table, would that be acceptable here? To jump over the table in front of the...

R: No, I don't—well, again I would say it would depend on the tutorial. If it was ...

I: Yeah the tutor was a PhD student

R: Was a?

I: PhD student.

R: Yeah, see if the tutor is younger, and again it depends on the tone of the tutorial; some, even some of the younger tutors have everything a lot more formal, behave a lot more formal manner, and then that—I definitely wouldn't do that unless, if it was really crowded.

I: Yeah it was really crowded

R: If it was really crowded, then ...

I: And it’s difficult to pass through behind these chairs.
R: Yeah, well then I don’t, don’t think it would be a real problem if it was fairly casual. Umm, if it was a lot more formal I would try not to do that and—do you mean jump, as in put their feet on the table and then jump out?

I: No, jump and then go the whiteboard and then when he came back here he just jumped over the table again sit on the chair again.

R: So, I, I think that’s pretty unusual.

I: Ok. So it is still pretty unusual.

R: Yeah.

I: When you say that it’s unusual or pretty casual, does it mean that it is impolite?

R: Yes.

I: Inappropriate?

R: Yes I think it’s inappropriate.

I: But it doesn’t mean that there will be negative consequence…

R: No.

I: … something like punishment or negative feeling or …

R: Oh—yeah. Some tutors would take offence to that umm, and they might, I don’t know. See I don’t know, I don’t know exactly what sort of recourses to punishment the tutors have here umm. thein a really extreme case they might ask you to leave because I don’t think it is an appropriate behaviour, umm, but I think it would be rare to find a tutor who would actually do that, and beyond that I don’t know what other punishments they could have.

I: Yeah ok so at least I know that it’s just well people will think that it’s really casual and well we cannot say that it is unacceptable but something strange and not usual to happen it is not normal then?

R: Mmm.

I: Ok, when you rise your hand to ask question, does it matter whether we rise right hand or left hand or just the same?

R: Uh hu, the same.

I: There’s no any meaning of that?

R: No.

I: Also when we give something to somebody else?

R: No, the same.
I: Ok so we can just give with right hand also the left hand?
R: Mmm.
I: Ok. What about if you past through a corridor and then there are two persons talking each other on the corridor, can we just, can we just,
R: In a, in a corridor, and they’re standing in …
I: Eh … this is the corridor, there are two persons here and you are going to you are coming from this direction, will you just past in the middle of them?
R: Yes.
I: Is there anything that you need to do something like asking for permission or…
R: No.
I: No. We don’t need to say anything all right.
R: If they want to have their conversation interrupted, they shouldn’t be standing in corridors.
I: Does it happen to all the people? Older people younger people or …
R: I guess if there were two lecturers having a conversation, you might umm …
(Irelevent: I was looking for her mobile)
(Start from minute 31.54)
I: So we can just go straight then?
R: Yea. I’m just thinking about it and I think perhaps if they were two lecturers, they’re having a conversation umm, again I’m not really sure because I haven’t studied it, but I guess you might sort of downcast your eyes as go through as in sort of that’s the sort of, that’s sort of saying you’re sorry to interrupt umm I guess.
I: Umm if they are lecturers or tutors that you know will you say something to them or
R: No.
I: Ok. So it’s just ok to pass the through in the middle of this space then?
R: Yeah.
I: Ok. So what about like this if someone here and there is someone another here and there is a little space here, which one do you prefer, will you go through this space or this one?
R: Yeah, yeah, we could have a try going around.
I: If it is a very little space, is it …
R: Umm, well, if there’s a very little space, but if there was more space here than there was space here, you might tap them on the shoulder and say, excuse me as you pass that group.

I: Do we need to say excuse me when if it is a little space then?

R: Yeah. Mmm.

I: But if it is you know just enough a bigger big enough space then we still ...

R: Just walk through.

I: … do we still have to say excuse me?

R: No.

I: All right ok. ((I checking her notes)) And if a man and a woman walk together here in university context, is it acceptable when they hold hand each other?

R: Uh hu.

I: Ok so that’s acceptable then?

R: Yep.

I: Umm. What kind of nonverbal behaviour that would not be acceptable between man and woman here?

R: Mmm …

I: In university just in university environment.

R: Umm, just I guess umm really involved kissing would probably not be acceptable.

I: Really involved kissing?

R: Really involved, yeah.

I: A serious kissing or something like ((laugh)) because I watch oh yes ok so holding hands is fine, what about eh what is it hugging?

R: Yeah.

I: Hugging is fine as well.

R: Uh hu.

I: If a man eh if a woman meet a man and they hug each other does it give an impression that there is a special relationship between them?

R: Ah, you’d say they’re probably quite close.

I: Quite close friends or more than friends?
R:  Umm. Well, friends, possibly friends who have known each other for a long time.
I:  Oh okay.
R:  Not friends you’ve only known for six months or a year but, well maybe a year; really close friends, yeah.
I:  Ok. But if it is between females, just between females, does it …
R:  Probably more frequent, ah I guess among just friends of any variety.
I:  Oh ok, All right so it’s not should be you know close friends and not only someone that you just know for a couple of months then?
R:  Yeah.
I:  Oh ok. All right. ((Pause)) I saw somewhere in TV news a topic something like a public affection and in the news it is said that now there are different opinion between older generation and younger generation, is that true from your perspective?
R:  Yes.
I:  Something that is eh acceptable for younger generation but not acceptable for older generation.
R:  Ah, yeah, I think there would be a few things,
I:  What are the few things?
R:  As in public, public displays of affection. Umm, I think ah I guess umm kissing of most varieties among the older generation wouldn’t be so acceptable.
I:  Ok. So kissing for more for older generation are not really acceptable?
R:  Well, besides just very gentle, I guess, umm also perhaps umm, like on lawns on the sunny day you might see a boyfriend and girlfriend lying next to each other. Umm and perhaps I think that might be ah not so appropriate to…
I:  For older generation?
R:  Well, for the people of older generation to see that? They might not be so…
I:  What about for the younger generation?
R:  I wouldn’t say it’s a problem.
I:  It’s not a problem?
R:  No.
I:  Ok, If you if I see that a man and a woman lying what is it side by side, there must be a close relationship between them?
R:  Ah, yeah …
I:  They can’t only be friends?
R:  Probably not, no.
I:  Ok. All right. What about eh hand shaking?
R:  Hand shaking?
I:  Hu uh, is it common to shake our hands here?
R:  Ah, yes.
I:  When do you do the hand shaking?
R:  When you’re meeting someone for the first time.
I:  For the first time ok.
R:  Or in, I guess ah in any kind of I guess, more business-like relationships.
I:  Ok. So formal situation something...
R:  Yeah, formal situations, umm, not—I guess in, in large groups you wouldn’t shake everyone’s hand just because it’s time consuming but sort of two people or three people or four people, meeting people for the first time, you’d shake their hand. It’s always the right, right hand.
I:  So when you meet your friend here in university what will you do? Will you do anything?
R:  No, we wouldn’t shake hands; just say hi.
I:  Say hi and just go on then? What about sitting in the library? We talked about the body posture in tutorial, what about in the library? Would that be more casual or just the same with the tutorial?
R:  Well, more casual because you’d be meeting within the Library, if you’re just meeting with your friends.
I:  Ok So if someone is sitting in the library something like here and then he put his feet on the table or you know just lying around would that be all right?
R:  Umm, I don’t think it would be fine. In general, putting your feet on the table isn’t so acceptable unless it’s your table, umm, so …
I:  So if someone do …
R:  If someone were to put their feet on the table here, umm, it would, like if I, if I was observing someone else and I saw them put their feet on the table, it would probably annoy me a little bit, not enough to say anything, but I don’t think it’s, it’s not something I would advise anyone to do.
I: Oh. Ok. But it's still not really acceptable then?

R: No, I don't think so.

I: Ok. What about in a barbeque can the Australian students do they just mixed up each other or man will talk with man or woman will talk with woman and ...

R: No, it's just free for both of them to talk to anyone else.

I: Is there any different topics of conversation between males and females do you think?

R: Umm, I guess so but that's probably more just based on common interests rather than any form of politeness or, yeah, just based on stereotypes. I guess men would be like more to discuss sports and women would be more likely to discuss what their friends did last night?

I: Ok so when female and male talk for example in a barbeque or a meeting what sorts of topic that will we talk about?

R: Or well, anything they're interested in. If they're talking to each other they've got some reason.

I: OK.

R: Some reasons to.

I: So something like sport can be also a female topic then?

R: Yeah.

I: So it's not, there's no any a what is it significant difference between male and female in terms of topic of conversation.

R: No, I don't think so.

I: Ok. That's very good. If, if you talk with a tutor do you think it would be acceptable if you point your finger toward the tutor?

R: No.

I: Something like I talk like this and I just you know moves my hand and pointing toward the tutor

R: Umm, well if you were just in general pointing, I'd think that's fine, but if you're indicating something about them that sounds like YOU ((A1 mentioned this word with strong emphasis)), that's not acceptable.

I: Ok so in general it's fine then.

R: Yeah.
I: Ok. So the last thing I think it's about dress. What kind of dress that is acceptable in university for male students? Is there any significant thing about dress issue?

R: No, not really. I think—I don’t think there are really any particular dress standards, as long as I guess having your torso and your, some part of your legs covered. Besides that, no.

I: So in summer for example is it really acceptable to wear short and t-shirts then?

R: Yeah, absolutely.

I: Ok so for male students which part of our body that definitely should be closed then? Ah it sound a silly question.

R: Well, your chests and your thighs, I guess.

I: So under the thigh is ok from knee to the, to the foot to the and what is it arms?

R: I think, I guess it depends. I wouldn’t, I would never come to university in a singlet you know, with all my arms uncovered but some people do and I've never thought it inappropriate.

I: Ok. What about female students?

R: Umm, I think basically the same?

I: Ok eh so I mean for female students which part of body they should cover?

R: Umm, well again, chest and umm thighs, yeah

I: Especially in summer ok so it really depends on the season as well so.

R: Yeah.

I: But in summer just the same then?

R: Yeah.

I: Ok. So if a female student wear shorts, a short, a very short, a basic short in the half of the thigh would that be acceptable?

R: Yeah, that's acceptable.

I: Ok. What about the what is it unsleeved shirt?

R: Umm, still acceptable, I think, yeah.

I: If it is the what is it what is the name of, topless, the topless shirt?

R: As in to here, but not off the shoulders?

I: Yes.
R: Umm, that would be un-, that probably would be unusual I guess.
I: Unusual? But I've seen I mean just many students wear that kinds of things?
R: Yeah? ((Surprise)) Okay ((sounds surprising)). I don't much …
I: Especially in summer.
R: All right.
I: Oh not many but I mean one.
R: I don't think it's inappropriate but I don't think I've seen that many girls do that. I still think it would be a little bit unusual coming to Uni like that. If, if you're wearing something, if a girl's wearing something with no shoulders, but still coming up to here, that to me suggests like, she really looks like she's sort of going out to a party or something, rather than just come to uni. It would seen a bit odd.
I: Ok. Bit odd then. Yeah I see that most of them wearing shorts so, but short is really acceptable then?
R: Mmm.
I: Yes short the maybe I need to I should bring some picture then so if this is the leg right this is the what you call waist yeah so if the short is, this is the this is the ankle oh not the ankle
R: Knee.
I: So this the knee, so if the short yeah it's fine it's fine. For male and female? Just fine.
R: Ah. Actually, well …
I: Oh ya what about male?
R: For males, it's probably …
I: Because I saw that male, they wear …
R: Usually to the knees more for males, yeah.
I: Yeah.
R: Yeah.
I: So this is for male ((drawing)).
R: Yeah ((laugh)).
I: While this is for female.
R: Yes. Again I, if, if a guy was wearing shorts to there, again I don’t think it would really be inappropriate, but it would it would be pretty unusual.

I: For male?

R: Yeah.

I: Ok alright so for, so for female so this kind is fine for female but is not un but is unusual …

R: Yeah.

I: For male.

R: Yeah, yeah. I think it’s probably, you might, you might, that might be just a fashion thing, because short, shorts for men were more popular twenty years ago but not so much now.

I: Ok what about this one? So this is eh fine for male. Right?

R: Yeah.

I: But what about female?

R: Ah yes.

I: That’s also just fine?

R: Umm.

I: Ok. It’s new for me. I mean ((laugh)) ok alright. So and this is the body ((while drawing)) and this the, ok this is the neck, this the solders [sic] …

R: Shoulders.

I: Soldiers—shoulder ((laugh)) yeah my English is very. Ok so if ha I don’t know how to ok like this so this what they call a a toless?

R: Umm, tube, tube top, I think.

I: Yeah, yeah. Like this? Tube top?

R: Yeah.

I: Ok. So there’s nothing here?

R: Nothing over the shoulders?

I: Yeah, yeah.

R: Yeah, see it’s, it’s, yeah acceptable I guess but pretty unusual. I mean I would expect to see that if someone was going out to like a nightclub to do some dancing or going out to a party where they wanted to impress the men you know, umm, but
just coming to uni, I wouldn’t say it’s unacceptable, but it’s, it’d probably draw a bit of attention.

I: Alright ok. Eh what about some kind of dress like this where...

R: Where the belly button shows?

I: Yeah.

R: Yeah, would that just ...

I: Would that be fine?

R: That’s fine.

I: So it if a female student wear something and reveal the what they call this kind of stuff?

R: Belly button.

I: Belly button then it is just fine then?

R: Mmm.

I: All right so that’s in summer. All right. Ok, so here there’s no really any significant issue about you know nonverbal behaviour because in some Asian culture it’s really you know it’s really a potential problem, especially when they talk about our relationship with the tutor or with the teacher because the teacher they will not only think about our they will not consider, they they don’t consider only the our knowledge but also you know things like that, behaviour verbal and nonverbal will become but what about in Australia is it really a a big issue or not?

R: Umm, I’d, I’d, my girlfriend here is an international student as well. She’s from Vietnam, and one of the things I find interesting is we had, we’ve had a few discussions about this and she’s, what you bring up, that there’s really negative consequences to like some non-verbal behaviour and things like that, and I feel, often I feel like there, like some of the behaviours we’ve brought up, they’re, they’re still impolite here and they sort of might show a lack of respect, but they’re local. I mean, there wouldn’t be significant negative consequences but at the same time it’s still not something that you should do umm. So I guess, I mean in, in tutorials here you could get away of a lot stuff umm without really significant consequences. Like the tutor won’t send you away or yell at you but at the same time they’re probably they’re probably not going to think very highly of you either because it’s still not polite.

I: Yes, yeah that’s really eh I guess oh so it’s still unusual but there will be no very serious consequences then?

R: No.
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