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Abstract

This paper explores the use of English in Australia based on the perspectives of Indonesian students. Studies on perception, expectations, and strategies on social experience have been carried out. However, most of these studies have not established models that consider the relationship among the three elements of expectations, perceptions, and strategies of Indonesian students in the host country, particularly in Australia. This paper attempts to capture the holistic picture of English varieties in the Australian higher education context to draw upon the three elements. Demographic questionnaire surveys and semi-structured interviews were employed to obtain data from fifteen Indonesian students studying in three universities in Melbourne, Australia. This paper's findings suggested that Indonesian students' expectations, perceptions, and strategies varied due to limited awareness regarding English varieties, culture gaps between Australia and Indonesia, and the prominent role of individual self-reflection. It is hoped that this paper may shed light on people's understanding of the challenges, experiences, and the general wellbeing of international students who choose to study in Australia for their tertiary education.
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Introduction

The trend of studying abroad, particularly regarding tertiary education, has become more prominent. Many students go abroad to study in the host countries, mostly English-speaking countries, such as Australia. For years, as one of the overseas study destinations, Australia has undergone an increasing number of international students. According to the Department of Education and Training [DET] (2016, para. 1), over 230,000 international students in December 2016 were enrolled in Australia's several universities.

Of these numbers, Indonesia becomes one of the top ten countries among foreign countries of student enrollment in Melbourne, Victoria, Australia (International Student Enrollment Data, 2016). Indonesian students choose Australia due to its abundant lists of world-class universities, conducive campus atmosphere, and relatively close distance from Indonesia (Novera, 2004). In academic situations such as classrooms filled with multilingual and multicultural backgrounds, Indonesian students communicate using English to their fellow Indonesian counterparts and international students and Australian classmates.

Many studies have been conducted in examining international students, especially in terms of profiling their sociolinguistic repertoire. Most of the studies were carried out in American (e.g., Mukminin, 2012; Lopez & Bui, 2014) and European (e.g., Thao, 2015) higher education contexts than in the Australian context. The studies have reviewed international students in Australia, for example, those undertaken by Sawir (2005) and Sawir, Marginson, Forbes-Mewett, Nyland, and Ramia (2012) investigating international students Australian higher education context.

Moreover, many studies on challenges faced by students, particularly international students in Australian tertiary institutions, also indicate that language-related issues become one of the primary sources of difficulty (Paton, 2007; Sawir et al., 2012), in which most difficulties are likely associated with students’ English language proficiency. Nonetheless, given the current sociolinguistic profile of English and the role of globalization, different varieties of English have emerged. Therefore, it is pertinent to conduct a study to increase awareness of language use, mainly English.

Even though many studies have investigated international students in general, there has been little attention to Indonesian students’ perspectives regarding English in Australian post-secondary institutions. Therefore, it is needed to conduct this research since Indonesia becomes
one of the top ten countries among foreign countries of student enrollment in Melbourne, Victoria, Australia (International Education, 2014, 2015).

Thus, this paper explores Indonesian postgraduate students' perspectives regarding their expectations, perceptions, and strategies regarding English use in Australia. This paper also intends to discover the students' strategies whenever intercultural communication issues occur during their study and their strategies to enhance more successful intercultural communication. Moreover, the present study specifically looks at the relationships among Indonesian students' three English elements in Australia. Three research questions are addressed in this paper, namely, 1) what are the expectations among Indonesian postgraduate students regarding the use of English in Australia before they come to Australia, (2) what are the perceptions of English use among Indonesian postgraduate students during their studies in Australia, and (3) what are the strategies to deal with English use during their studies in Australia.

It is hoped this paper can contribute to the development of theories and practices regarding the relationships between expectations, perceptions, and strategies among Indonesian students concerning English in the Australian higher education context. This paper also intends to enrich the current literature regarding the development of World Englishes, English as an International Language (EIL), specifically in terms of Indonesian perspectives. Furthermore, the results suggested in this paper can be taken into account in preparing Indonesian postgraduate students before studying in Australia.

**Literature Review**

**World Englishes**

One of the most influential concepts of the different kinds of English has been put forward by Kachru (1992) regarding the three-circle model of World Englishes (WE), namely the ‘inner circle’ where English is the first language of the majority of the speakers, and it has an official status, such as USA, UK, Australia, and New Zealand. The ‘outer circle’ nations, where English is an institutionalized second language, or it has grown as one of the official languages alongside the national and local languages, are Singapore, Bangladesh, and India; while the ‘expanding circle’ where English does not have an official status yet it is mainly taught in schools as a subject and foreign languages, such as Indonesia, China, and Japan.
As the expanding-circle country, Indonesia uses English as a foreign language among Indonesians and employs English as a lingua franca (ELF) when communicating to its fellow South East Asian (ASEAN) members. In light of this, Indonesians do not seem to directly develop their English variety along with their local languages, while for example, other nations in the ASEAN region have already developed and increasingly exposed themselves to their English varieties, e.g., Malaysian English and Singaporean English daily. Besides, as one of the inner circle societies, Australia provides Australian English among its many different English varieties. Alongside the two ‘standard’ American English and British English, Australian English has its characteristics, such as diphthongs’ distinctive pronunciation and rising intonation (Bernard, 1988; Guy and Vonwiller, 1989, cited in Kirkpatrick, 2007).

‘Standardness’ of English

In the context of international communication, the concept of English ‘standardness’ has considerably become ‘blurred’ (Xu, 2016, p. 196), which brings into question the notion of a ‘standard’ English. The spread of English and the shifting notion of ‘standardness’ are also related to the fact that English has been used widely as a medium of communication by the global citizens who frequently travel from one place to another. The English language has also been experiencing a paradigm shift. The sociocultural reality of English speakers today has made the role and status of English shifted from monolithic ‘standard’ English (e.g., American English, British English, and Australian English) into the emergence of English varieties (e.g., Malaysian English, Singaporean English) as well as departing from ownership of English into gaining access of English (Kachru, 1992).

Intercultural Communication

Intercultural communication occurs whenever individuals or groups from different languages or cultural backgrounds interact (Sharifian & Jamarani, 2013). As a result, people share the values during social interactions since they integrate their cultural features into their communication with their interlocutors. Bowe, Martin, and Manns (2014) illustrated that speakers in intercultural communication “typically bring their sociocultural expectations of language to the encounter,” and they further explained that “speakers’ expectations shape the interpretation of meaning in a variety of ways” (p. 1). Factors such as the amount of information
embedded in the context between multilingual and multicultural backgrounds become characteristics of intercultural communication interaction (Zhu, 2014). Indonesian international students mainly connect with other people using English during intercultural communication as they reside in dense suburbs where people have different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Also, they interact daily with a large number of learners who come from varied nationalities. Therefore, it is expected that Indonesian students are being exposed to varieties of English during the academic and social life.

Competences in Intercultural Communication

The rapid development of English and the dynamics of contact among people from different cultural backgrounds demand certain competence types to facilitate successful and smooth intercultural communication. ‘Metacultural competence’ is defined as “competence that enables interlocutors to communicate and negotiate their cultural conceptualizations during the process of intercultural communication” (Sharifian, 2013, pp. 7-8). Sharifian further explained that metacultural competence is employed ‘through the use of conceptual negotiation strategies’ and it comprises three main components such as ‘variation awareness’, ‘explication strategy’, and ‘negotiation strategy’ (pp. 7-8). For instance, this process is reflected when two language communities incorporate English to encode their cultural conceptualizations.

Another competence regarding learning English has been proposed by Canagarajah (2006) and termed 'multidialectal competence'. Canagarajah asserted that ‘in a context where we have to constantly shuttle between different varieties of [of English] and communities, proficiency becomes complex’, and that ‘one needs the capacity to negotiate diverse varieties to facilitate communication’ (p. 233). He underlined that an individual does not have to be ‘proficient’ in all English varieties and emphasizes negotiation skills such as speech accommodation in ELF and intercultural communication. Xu (2017) explained that the concept of ‘proficiency in EIL appears to require more than just mastery of grammar and lexicon in EIL context’, but rather as to ‘exploring the various system of cultural conceptualizations and practice’ (p. 709) in embracing one’s communicative strategies during EIL communication. The awareness of differences across cultures and the development of negotiation abilities among students is essential in intercultural communication.
Studies on Expectations, Perceptions, and Strategies

Several studies have explored perceptions, expectations, and the use of strategies in an academic setting (e.g., Pudyastuti & Atma, 2014; He, 2013; Bjorkman, 2011). Using a survey research design, Pudyastuti and Atma (2014) highlighted EFL teachers’ perceptions of Englishes. Twenty-two EFL teachers were participated to fill the survey to elicit their voices and preferences concerning teaching preference using English varieties. Their findings indicated that although most participants had positive perceptions about Englishes, they also generated awareness that other English varieties could be incorporated into the English teaching practice. Therefore, there has to be research exploring the strategies carried out by the Indonesian students when interacting with other English varieties. Thus, this research attempts to fill the gap by exploring the expectations, perceptions, and strategies of Indonesian students’ English use, particularly those studying in Australia.

Moreover, in He’s (2013) study, He investigated the reasons for Chinese’s foreign language speaking anxiety (FLSA). Employing a questionnaire survey and focused interview, comprehensive data from 332 participants at two universities in China were obtained. He found 14 primary reasons regarding the Chinese students’ FLSA and a comparison between teachers’ and students’ perceptions. Based on the findings, students’ perceptions affected how students acquired language during language learning. He (2013) argued that understanding the reasons is an essential phase in minimizing the FLSA and improving learning effectiveness.

Another research is undertaken by Bjorkman (2011) to investigate the role of pragmatic strategies in English as a lingua franca context in Swedish higher education. The data comprises comprehensive lectures and student group-work sessions at a Swedish technical university adopting a corpus-based study. The findings showed that lecturers used fewer pragmatic strategies than students who employed more during group-work sessions. Repetition was considered a prominent strategy employed by either students or teachers in class.

Meanwhile, studies regarding the expectation involving Indonesian international students in Australian tertiary education are still limited. Novera (2004) undertook research examining Indonesian postgraduate students in Australia. Her study investigated 25 Indonesian postgraduate students in terms of their adjustment experiences during their studies in Australia. Her research confirmed that cultural issues were apparent during Indonesian postgraduate students’ academic journey using a qualitative-based open-ended questionnaire. The study results
revealed that academic English was the main problem faced by Indonesian students and
Australian academic requirements. The research conducted by Novera (2004) examined the
adjustment experiences of Indonesian students in Australia without considering the elements of
perceptions, expectations, and strategies to overcome academic English. Therefore, the present
explores the above three elements focusing on English use, particularly among Indonesian
students in Australia.

Additionally, despite many studies on perception, expectations, and strategies, most of these
studies have not established models that consider the relationship among Indonesian students'
expectations, perceptions, and strategies in the host country. By examining students from similar
cultural backgrounds, this paper explores, describes, and proposes a model of Indonesian
students' expectations, perceptions, and strategies regarding the use of English in Australia.

**Method**

This research employed qualitative interpretation since the qualitative approach underlines
the descriptive, understanding, and clarification part of a human experience (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 126).
Dörnyei (2007) also defines qualitative research as “fundamentally interpretive” (p.38) since the researcher’s interpretation of the data was involved in processing the research outcome.
Therefore, the qualitative method could elaborate on this study's topic since it attempted to
explore the Indonesian student’s English use experiences regarding expectations, perceptions,
and strategies.

**Respondents**

Fifteen participants (seven males and eight females) agreed to participate in the study. All of
them were postgraduate students in three major universities in the state of Victoria, Australia.

Adapted from Dörnyei and Csizér (2012), the participants’ criteria were based on their study
length, with a minimum of five months’ stay in Melbourne, Australia. These fifteen participants
had stayed and studied in Australia for at least nine months up to 1.5 years. It was done to delve
into a more in-depth experience regarding English among the participants over some time. Their
names are displayed anonymously. Further details and demographic information of the
participants are presented in the Table. 1 to protect the participants' identity.
Table 1. Demographic characteristics of research participants
Source: Author’s Observation

| Participant | Age | Gender | Pre-Departure English language training | Length of Stay |
|-------------|-----|--------|----------------------------------------|---------------|
| Participant 1 | 26  | Male   | No                                     | 1.5 years     |
| Participant 2 | 32  | Female | No                                     | 1.5 years     |
| Participant 3 | 30  | Male   | No                                     | 10 months     |
| Participant 4 | 26  | Female | No                                     | 10 months     |
| Participant 5 | 35  | Male   | Yes, one month in Indonesia             | 10 months     |
| Participant 6 | 26  | Female | No                                     | 14 months     |
| Participant 7 | 25  | Female | Yes, more than 16 years                | 10 months     |
| Participant 8 | 24  | Female | Yes, more than 3 years                | 14 months     |
| Participant 9 | 27  | Male   | Yes, six months intensive in Indonesia | 10 months     |
| Participant 10 | 26  | Male   | No                                     | 1.5 years     |
| Participant 11 | 24  | Female | No                                     | 1.5 years     |
| Participant 12 | 28  | Male   | Yes, one month in Indonesia            | 14 months     |
| Participant 13 | 32  | Female | Yes, one year in Indonesia             | 1.5 years     |
| Participant 14 | 24  | Female | Yes, one month in Indonesia            | 10 months     |
| Participant 15 | 33  | Male   | No                                     | 1.5 years     |

Instruments

A demographic questionnaire and semi-structured interview were used to obtain the data. All participants in the study were self-selected or voluntarily. They were contacted through their leaders of Indonesian society and the postgraduate student community on their campuses. The questionnaire asked participants to provide additional contact information if they were willing to participate in a follow-up interview. The questionnaire comprised questions providing detailed information about participants, namely age group, gender, prior English learning experiences, and length of stay in Australia.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted to elicit data from the participants and confirmed some information from the demographic questionnaire. The interviews were conducted to obtain general ideas as well as in-depth information from each participant. Each one-on-one interview lasted between 30 minutes and 45 minutes. To ensure that all participants amplified their voice, they were given the flexibility to respond to interview questions in Indonesian or English. The data were transcribed selectively to address the research questions of the present study. During the transcribing phase, the researcher contacted the participants through email to ensure their reliability and accuracy.
Data analysis

Using the research questions above as the guideline, the researcher analyzed the interview data to identify overall themes and patterns. The data analysis procedures are described as follows:

1. Selecting excerpts/useful information from the participants’ responses
2. Categorising the selected excerpts of participants’ responses into a table consisting of three main categories, namely expectations (E), perceptions (P), and strategies (S)
3. Coding for both participants and the selected responses and organising them into a table.
4. Identifying the critical themes of each category (expectation, perception, and strategies) from the participants’ responses. In this stage, the researcher then used numbers to identify the responses' occurrences and frequency.
5. Analysing the salient themes and patterns by generating descriptive, contrastive, and comparative analysis from all participants’ responses in the three categories.
6. Interpreting the data and drawing conclusions based on the relevant theories and frameworks.

Findings

Expectations

Participants of this study had various expectations regarding English in Australia before coming to Australia. Among all the expectations articulated by all the participants, the most salient expectations were that (1) Australians would speak British English, particularly in academic settings, for the reasons that Australia was a British colony and it was one of the Commonwealth countries of the UK; (2) there would be many different varieties of English in Australia, specifically on university campuses such as Indian English, Malaysian English, and Chinese English. However, two participants did not expect to come across the prominent English variety in Australia, Australian English.

In terms of the tendency of English variety, I expect that the English accent in Australia tends to follow a British accent but not completely the same. There are some differences in terms of intonation and verb.
[Participant 12]

I expect that Australians speak a ‘thicker’ English than British English. To myself, the term ‘thicker’ here refers to the similarity with the British’s accent but in a more difficult way to understand.
From the response above, participants mainly considered the spoken aspect of the English varieties. Indonesian students had the general expectation that English in Australia was only different because it was ‘thicker’ than British English. They did not expect differences in the use of English in Australia in terms of vocabulary, grammar. Also, this study participants expected that English in Australia was more casual and informal, especially during the academic setting. As seen in the following response:

\[
I \text{ imagine the English use in Australia will be different compared to English use in Indonesia. Back in Indonesia, we use English in such an academic way where we emphasize the proper English structure and grammar, but here the English use is very casual [Participant 7]}
\]

Perceptions

The most noticeable perceptions were that most participants generated self-reflection concerning English and related their experiences in acknowledging the English variety in Australia. These self-reflections influenced how they perceived the language and shaped their awareness of the English language during their studies.

\[
I \text{ don’t directly see the English varieties here, but one thing I underline is my reflection on how they insert their culture when they speak English and also how they think because of their culture. So I think when they talk, there is part of his culture that appears when speaking English. For example, when Chinese people speak English, there is a Chinese style when they talk [Participant 8]}
\]

Participants had similar perceptions regarding the use of English compared with their expectations before they came to Australia. These similar perceptions were related to several points, such as the basic knowledge of the ‘standard’ English (British English and American English) in terms of grammar; the experience of exposure to English spoken in Australia; the tendency to follow British English accent; and the possibility of improving English skills. Of these perceptions, specific English variety in Australia, i.e., Australian English, was not discussed. Participants did not relate any of their perceptions with the possible English variety other than the two standard English. As seen in the following excerpts:

\[
My \text{ perception about English use is still the same, in terms of things like the unclear accent, its own distinct characteristics. I say so because I ever joined a student exchange to Australia}
\]
for a couple of months during my undergraduate, so I already had the perception that Australian English is rather hard to understand [Participant 4]

My perception of English use in Australia is the same compared to when I was still in Indonesia. Here I feel like my listening and speaking skills are developed after I keep in touch with the people here on a daily basis [Participant 13]

There were also participants having different perceptions regarding a variety of English than their expectations before coming to Australia. However, these perceptions were not related to the general knowledge of the so-called standard English, as mentioned in previous perceptions; it was related to Australian English. Participants perceived that Australian English was different in several ways from British English and American English. According to them, the distinctions of Australian English referred to the accent, intonation, and pronunciation. Furthermore, one particular participant regarded Australian English as the ‘combination’ of American and British English.

Once I arrived here, my perception of English is not the same. Australian English is different from British English, and it is more difficult to understand Australian English because it sounds like mumbling... [Participant 6]

My perception of English use is totally different. It is like Australians speak a combination both of American English and British English [Participant 3]

Strategies

All responses were categorized into two main groups considering the third research question addressing strategies: (1) strategies to minimise the miscommunication in comprehending the English use, and (2) strategies to enhance and improve intercultural communication. In the first group, most participants tended to clarify and ask the counterparts directly when they discovered unclear statements or words. These unclear statements included the English variety that the counterparts used. It included questions such as ‘Could you please explain the sentence again?’.

As seen in the following excerpt:

Although I live with Indonesian people, I also have friends coming from China and the local people Australians. When something (is) not clear, for example, misunderstanding, happens, I usually ask directly to them to clarify things. For example, ‘Could you please explain this sentence again?’ This is usually I do when I am experiencing difficulties to understand [Participant 7]
The second group dealt with improving intercultural communication that almost half of the participants (six out of 15) tended to familiarize themselves with the culture of the counterparts (either Australian or international students) first and took the initiative to start the conversation (e.g., raising questions in classroom situations). These participants considered that cultural distinctions could generate possible bondings in mediating the issues in their English use, such as miscommunication and misunderstanding. According to them, these strategies were useful to increase their self-esteem to play a role not only in the academic situation but also daily, as described in the following:

I usually familiarize myself with the culture of my counterparts here so that you can respect each other. And also, I tried to mingle with Australians to make it easier to communicate with them.

[Participant 11]

Indonesian students had tendencies to generate self-reflection on improving their strategies to communicate with others using English. These reflections allowed them to incorporate other factors, such as comfortability and 'pressure' from Australian counterparts that can influence their communication and interactions. For instance, one participant mentioned that he needed to see whether to feel comfortable before exchanging and sharing information; otherwise, he would not have much interest or willingness to do so. While other participants experienced the psychological burden when having a conversation using English with the locals. Interestingly, although all these reflections articulated by the participants seem to be negative, they immediately entailed supportive and positive influence for the participants to improve their English communication skills, as seen in the following:

I feel like there is some kind of inner pressure when Australian students do not understand what I am saying. It is just different when it is with Indonesian classmates. It gives me reflection that I need to practice my English harder so that people will understand me better.

[Participant 4]

When miscommunication happens, it is actually hard to explain. I usually reflect on myself and tried to invite their counterparts to see the solution. It gives me time to reflect that I need to learn English more deeply. [Participant 15]
Discussion

English ‘Standardness’

As the current status of ‘standardness’ of English is challenged in the literature, the expectations and perceptions as the participants reported in this paper may still hold the belief that they will be exposed to the ‘standard’ English varieties, given the fact that Indonesia is one of the expanding-circle countries (Kachru, 1992) which regards English as a foreign language.

Most of the participants have previously been exposed to the so-called ‘standard’ English while in Indonesia, e.g., American English and British English. This case happens since Indonesia, being an expanding circle country, acknowledges that its students were taught using ‘standard’ American English and British English. They expected that they would encounter what they would have imagined and experienced as the ‘standard English’ exclusively in Australia. This research’s findings are in line with the research conducted by Pudyastuti and Atma (2014), stating that most of the students in Indonesia are taught using American and British English due to the ease and familiarity of learning these two varieties compared to other English varieties. Students in Indonesia, having a limited knowledge concerning other English varieties, would feel difficult and unfamiliar to comprehend these varieties, as the researcher captured in the present study.

Australia is an Inner Circle country; therefore, English is widely used, and it refers to different (English) varieties. Thus, the participants’ previous expectations and perceptions of the ‘standardness’ have been challenged and problematized when they encounter different English varieties in Australia. Participants were still accustomed to the traditional monolithic ‘standard’ variety of English.

Since most of the participants were exposed to American English and British English before they arrived in Australia, they consider it relatively easy to understand these two major varieties. They were somewhat entrenched in this notion of ‘standardness’ and how it is related to the ‘ease’ of learning and using English. Thus, when they arrived in Australia and were exposed to Australian English and other English varieties, they might feel that these varieties were not so ‘standard’ to anticipate some ‘difficulties’ in understanding people during their communication with others. This phenomenon contrasts with the statement presented in the literature by Sharifian (2013) that one of the meta cultural competencies should be mastered by international students. This competence includes ‘varieties awareness’ that underlines the awareness and
familiarity of existing English varieties, specifically during intercultural communication. Most participants in this study were not fully aware of the English variety in Australia, i.e., Australian English.

According to Trudgill (1984, as cited in Jenkins, 2015, p. 24), ‘standard’ English is defined as a ‘set of grammatical and lexical forms which are typically used in speech and writing by educated native speakers’. Most participants perceived that they would communicate using the ‘easiest’ English variety in the sense that one would regard or prefer a variety that is considered manageable for them to practice. The findings showed that American English is regarded as the ‘standard’ English variety by most participants (nine out of 15) since their previous exposure to this variety is prominent. They also do not experience difficulties or complexities in practicing the variety. Furthermore, other participants (six out of 15) regard Australian English as relatively straightforward as they find Australian English is not complicated as their expectations.

The role of self-reflection

The involvement of the participant’s self-reflection is prominent during the data collection phase. They have established relationships among the three categories. These participants' self-reflections had affected one another and influenced the way participants generated strategies, mainly when they communicated with others using English, as illustrated in the Diagram 1.

Diagram 1. Relationship of self-reflection among the three categories
Source: Author’s Observation
The majority (ten out of 15) of the participants generated self-reflections about their perceptions to adopt relevant strategies to minimize miscommunication or misunderstanding and improve successful intercultural communication. At this stage, Indonesian students reflect on what strategies might work and what might not work based on their English use perceptions. Additionally, the participants employed self-reflections about to whom they speak. As discussed throughout this paper, Indonesian students may have different English strategies when communicating with international students or local Australian students.

Based on the excerpts of the participants' responses, the most salient strategies about participants' self-reflections to communicate using English were narrowed down into two categories: comfortability and Australians' role in giving correction to participants' English spoken skills.

First, comfortability refers to one’s degree of desire or preference to communicate using English depending on whom he/she is interacting with. The self-reflection becomes the medium to reflect on English communication strategies, mainly to classmates being an international student. This action is also associated with cultural differences among the interlocutors and affects how individuals adjust their English strategies. As Bowe et al. (2014, p. 119) pointed out, ‘cultural differences in the perceptions of the role and ways of speaking are important’ and understand ‘the language used to interpret linguistic meaning in a given interaction’. The participant underlined her encounters in the communication, e.g., close friend or stranger, in generating comfortability in speaking English. She was comfortable speaking in English only to her close friends rather than to the newcomers in the class. She then also has to adapt to whether the particular strategy might work or not. The strategies might have been different. For example, if she deliberately interacted with Australian classmates, she would be ‘careful’ speaking English.

Secondly, Australians' role giving ‘correction’ also becomes one of the participants' sources to adapt their English strategies. The role of so-called ‘inner pressure’ encourages participants to reflect on English communication skills. This particular feeling provides chances for the participants to improve their English skills when interacting with people, whether it is Australian or international students. Thus, the ‘inner pressure’ that has been internalized by the participant to adapt and adjust strategies, in this case, to the Australian counterparts, has emerged. Generally, the self-reflections may come up whenever the participants feel that their perceptions do not meet previous English use expectations.
This paper underlined the participants’ general strategies to overcome the language breakdowns during intercultural communication from these self-reflections. Several strategies were captured on how participants minimized miscommunication. These strategies included ‘Clarifying or asking the unclear statements’ such as ‘Could you please clarify your statement?’ (e.g., in the response uttered by participant S2-1) indicated by more than half of the participants (eight out of 15). Another notable strategy falls in the type of “repeating strategy”. According to the previous study findings, repetition as one of the pragmatics strategies was the most frequently used by students (Bjorkman, 2011). Since Indonesian international students reside in an English as a Lingua Franca atmosphere, for instance, Australia, applying these strategies during intercultural communication is essential for their English language learning and essential for developing their communicative competence in the Australian society’s daily interactions.

Given the current changing sociolinguistic profile of English in Australia, it is thus recommended that Indonesian students need to develop multidialectal competence (Canagarajah, 2006) and meta-cultural competence (Sharifian, 2013; Xu, 2017) for dealing with how individuals can express and negotiate cultural conceptualization among the speakers of English in the process of intercultural communication. It can be argued that negotiation strategy and explication strategy would bridge miscommunication and misunderstanding among Indonesian students.

Conclusion and Implication

The present study on exploring expectations, perceptions, and strategies regarding English use in Australia among Indonesian students found that students’ responses had changed over time and were diverse. They varied due to limited awareness regarding varieties of English, significant gaps of culture between Australia and Indonesia, and the role of individual self-reflection. The majority of participants expected that Australians would speak British English since Australia was historically a British colony, and it was one of the UK’s Commonwealth countries. The findings also indicated that most participants generated self-reflections in perceiving the English use. They employed self-reflections to highlight the influence of English during their studies and daily communication.

The strategies accomplished by participants to solve miscommunication also indicated similarities and differences. Those were categorized as clarifying or asking unclear statements,
repeating sentences, searching word synonym/paraphrasing, and seeking help and support from fellow international, Australian, and Indonesian students. Of these, ‘clarifying or asking’ was the most frequently used strategy.

Since this study is still limited at identifying specific responses on expectation, perception, and strategies regarding English use, future studies should employ different methods to attain more detailed results. This study only involved limited participants; thus, it might not touch the holistic picture of this study's three main aspects. Despite the limitations, this study can be considered one of the materials for future English language programs and in-house training to prepare students prior to departure. Further study is suggested to involve other research subjects from EFL countries other than Indonesia, such as China and Japan, which also dominate international students' prevalence in Australia.
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