Shared Identities: Our Interweaving Threads

Personality and study abroad success

Omar Karlin
Megumi Nishikawa
Tokai University

This study examined whether certain personality types were conducive to improving communicative competence after studying abroad for one month. The personality and communicative competence for a group of nine Japanese study-abroad university students were assessed through a pre-departure and post-return personality test and oral interview. The students were enrolled at a private Tokyo-area university, and were drawn from a variety of majors. The study-abroad program in which they participated was based at the University of Queensland in Australia. Five dimensions of personality, extraversion, openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability, were measured using an original personality questionnaire. Communicative competence was assessed through three measures of oral fluency, a words-per-minute (WPM) score, a ratio indicating the number of long utterances in relation to total utterances, and a ratio indicating the number of words spoken by the interviewee compared to the interviewer. Significant increases in elaboration were observed in those with low emotional stability, low openness, both high and low agreeableness, and high extraversion. Those with high extraversion also improved their WPM. All other findings were insignificant.

この研究は、1ヶ月の海外生活後の英語コミュニケーション能力の伸びと性格の関係を調査したものである。9人の日本人大学生に対して、性格とコミュニケーション能力に関するテストと口述テストを渡航前及び渡航後に行った。参加した大学生は全員東京近郊の私立大学に通っている。専攻は多岐にわたり、オーストラリアのクイーンズランド大学で1ヶ月学ぶという渡航プログラムに参加した。外向性、開放性、愛想の良さ、まじめさ、精神的安定性、という5つの性格側面は英語環境における性格アンケートによって測定し、コミュニケーション能力は流暢性、毎分ごとに発せられる単語数、全発話回数に対して長めの発話か占める割合、面接者の総発話語数に対する学生の総発話語数の割合によって測定した。精神的安定性及び開放性が低い学生、愛想の良さが高い学生及び低い学生、そしてより外向的な学生ほど有意な変化が観察された。外向性が高い学生は毎分ごとに発せられる単語数が大きく伸びた。その他の結果には有意な差はみられなかった。

It has been suggested that personality plays a relatively minor role in language development when compared to other individual differences such as motivation and anxiety (Dornyei, 2005). It would be difficult to deny that motivation and anxiety are key factors in language development, yet it may be too early to decry personality as having an insignificant impact. In a pivotal article criticizing the state of research linking personality and language, the SLA field was scolded for trusting research that relied on poor testing

instruments and language assessments, as well as researchers who were not adequately familiar with either linguistics or psychology (Dewaele & Furnham, 1999). In addition to poor testing and under-qualified researchers, the article suggests the reason behind the lack of persuasive research in this area is a misconception that *The Good Language Learner (TGLL)* (Naiman, 1978), one of the first major attempts to link SLA and personality, effectively demonstrated that personality was not linked to second language development. As the first major research attempt at connecting personality to language, its influence was considerable, and its failure to find a connection between these two dimensions was devastating (Dewaele & Furnham, 1999). According to Dewaele and Furnham, the subsequent void in quality research has not been adequately justified; assumptions made by *TGLL* need to be challenged, and neglected issues need to be examined more closely. For instance, one area in which they criticized the *TGLL* was the inadequate nature of its language testing instruments, a dichtgloss (the teaching activity developed by Merrill Swain, in which students listen to a language sample and then need to reconstruct the sample in small groups based on what they heard and their knowledge of grammar) and a verbal repetition activity. Assessing language poses immense challenges, particularly in relation to an area like personality, which can be biased towards a number of orientations. Clearly, language can be assessed at both global (Naiman, 1978) and local (Dewaele & Furnham, 2000) levels, with each involving a myriad of personality biases, limitations, and complications. When using the dichtgloss, for example, certain personality types may benefit through the inherent biases of the activity (i.e., interacting with peers to negotiate an answer may unfairly benefit those high in agreeableness)

and the outcome may be unique to the dichtgloss. If the research instead examined the number of prepositional mistakes in written academic essays, the biases and outcome would likely have been different, possibly favouring introversion over agreeableness because of the need for individual discipline and focus rather than social interaction. Further to this point, it is debatable whether a dichtgloss is a fair representation of language use.

Additionally, of the limited research linking personality and second language acquisition, there has been an almost sole focus on extraversion's relationship to language. As personality research has advanced, personality instruments have moved from those that measure the Big Three (the three-dimension model of personality based on *extraversion*, *emotional stability*, and *psychoticism*) to those that measure the Big Five factors of personality, *extraversion*, *emotional stability*, *agreeableness*, *conscientiousness*, and *openness* (or to use alternative adjective descriptors, *outgoing*, *well-adjusted*, *cooperative*, *hard-working*, and *intellectual*). The comprehensive nature of recent personality models invites more than just an examination of extraversion, but rather of all the five factors and a number of smaller sub-factors (O'Connor & Paunonen, 2007). Furthermore, personality is susceptible to genetic, social, and cultural influence (Piedmont & Aycock, 2006). Suffice it to say, regardless of the number of factors assessed, language, environment, and culture need to be considered in any study discussing personality, something that has not been done, despite promises to do so (Naiman, 1978).

In summation, research in the area of second language and personality is lacking both in quantity and quality.

It is this lack of quality, in particular, an insensitivity to personality dimensions that are unstable in the face of second language influences, that necessitates more research to be conducted. Further, any future research would be well-advised to broaden the exploration of personality beyond the extraversion dimension, and to use more authentic language testing.

Research question

Using the Big Five personality model, which personality orientations increase student communicative competence the most after a month of studying abroad?

Participants

The participants in the present study were nine students enrolled in a study-abroad program at a major private university south of Tokyo. Students were either 18 or 19 years old, with TOEIC scores ranging from 400 to 580. At their university, they participated in a study-abroad preparation course, from April to July of 2008, which relied heavily on textbooks. Classes were conducted using a traditional Japanese approach, with teacher-centered activities such as checking answers after reading a short passage, and with very few free-talking activities.

Setting

Students departed Tokyo in August and returned in early September. They participated in a one-month course conducted by the University of Queensland in Australia,

during which they lived with host families. The course focused principally on the development of communicative competence in all four macro skills (i.e. speaking, listening, reading, and writing) with particular focus on the development of fluency and the enhancement of speaking and listening skills.

There were three basic, integrated elements for this program. The first was class experience. Classes in this program took a communicative approach, which was quite different from those in Japan. The second element was the home stay, and the third was social events, such as barbeque parties and going to festivals. Combined, these three elements encouraged the authentic usage of English.

Instruments

For assessing personality, an instrument was developed to improve upon the perceived shortcomings of established personality instruments, such as the NEO-Pi-R (Neuroticism Extraversion Openness-Personality Instrument-Revised) and IPIP (International Personality Item Pool) instruments. Termed the Questionnaire of English Environment Personality, or QuEEP (see Appendixes 1 and 2), 154 items based on the five-factor model of personality, situated along a 5-point Likert scale from strongly negative to strongly affirmative, were developed. Also, there was an effort made to ensure items were sensitive to language learning contexts. All 154 items were administered to 242 Japanese university students. Using Rasch modeling, the 10 items with the best fit statistics for each of the five personality factors were selected for the final version of the QuEEP. The final version of the QuEEP was comprised of 50 self-report items in Japanese, and was completed by students online

using the website SurveyMonkey (SurveyMonkey, 2009). To confirm reliability, the fit statistics of the 50 QuEEP items were compared with the fit statistics of the IPIP five-factor model. The IPIP included 50 items and were validated by146 students. Ultimately, the QuEEP appeared to have more suitable items than the IPIP.

For communicative competence, students were assessed using an ACTFL SST (Standard Speaking Test)-inspired oral proficiency interview. In the SST, interviewees are asked a series of conversational questions over 10-15 minutes, and rated on their ability to demonstrate English skills in a number of areas such as narrative, comparisons, elaboration, and tense. It was thought that whatever shortcomings a conversational interview may have, it is certainly a frequently occurring language act, so at least in that respect it overcomes some of the failings of the dichtogloss or other infrequently occurring language tasks used as assessments in other research.

Method

To assess the degree to which personality can affect second language development, the communicative competence of study-abroad university students was tested before and after a one-month study abroad program in Australia. Students in this short-term study abroad program took a preparation course in advance of their time abroad, designed to assist them in their social interactions abroad. Personality and communicative competence assessments were administered twice. The first assessments occurred immediately before students went abroad, and the second assessments were conducted when students came back to Japan (either a few days before or after returning to Tokyo).

Since the students would be abroad and it was important to assess their personality and communicative competence before coming back to Japan and being influenced by their surrounding native culture, the only way to assess them in the second interview was over the telephone. It was thought that if only the second interview was conducted over the phone, it would negatively skew scores for the second interview because of the increased difficulty associated with a phone interview due to a lack of visual cues. As a result, both the pre-departure and post-return oral interviews were conducted over the phone. Conversations were recorded using MX Skype Recorder (MX Skype Recorder, 2008) which allowed for the collection of various statistical data.

The communicative competence of each conversation was represented with three different variables: words-per minute (WPM), balance, and elaboration. The WPM score divided the total number of interviewee words spoken by the amount of time used to conduct the interview. It was thought that this statistic would represent each interviewee's ability to generate speech, regardless of accuracy. Many lower-level students have difficulty generating even the simplest of speech, so any increase in a WPM score would indicate an improvement in this regard.

Another communicative competence variable in this study was the degree to which the conversation was balanced. The number of words spoken by the interviewee was divided by the number of words spoken by the interviewer, to give a rough estimation of how much the interviewee spoke in the conversation in relation to the interviewer. A score well below 1 indicated that the interviewer was likely leading the conversation a great deal, while a score above 1 indicated that the interviewee was leading the conversation.

Finally, an elaboration score was also included in the statistical analysis. To obtain this score, the number of interviewee utterances was counted. Any utterances of 5-10 words and more than 10 words were noted, and then divided by the total number of utterances. Utterances of more than 10 words were weighted twice as much as 5-10 word utterances. It is assumed that this score represents a degree of complexity, or at least attempted complexity, in the interviewee's utterances.

Conversations lasted between 15-20 minutes, and all interviews followed the same sequence of questions. While there were occasional divergences from the script in order to maintain naturalness, an effort was made to ask all interviewees the same questions. The scripted questions focused on skills such as simple past tense, past perfect tense, comparatives, numbers, narratives, imperatives, and time sequencing (see Appendix 3).

All of the resulting survey and interview data were analyzed using SPSS (version 16). Students were divided into high and low groups for each personality orientation, for example, high-extravert and low-extravert students. Paired sample *t*-tests were then conducted to determine if there were any significant differences between pre-departure and post-return interview data for any of the personality types.

Results

There was an odd number of participants involved in this research, so the median student in each personality dimension was not included in the statistical analysis. That is to say, the four top-scoring students in each personality dimension were

included in the high-end group and the four bottom-scoring students in each group were included in the low-end group (see Table 1). The pre-departure test descriptive statistics for the high and low groups in each personality dimension can be found in Table 2. Of note, the smallest range between the high and low groups was along the extraversion scale (*M*=.50, *SD*=.29; *M*=-.15, *SD*=.28), respectively. Conversely, the largest disparity between high and low groups was along the emotional stability scale (*M*=.99, *SD*=.38; *M*=-.55, *SD*=1.42). Not surprisingly, the only personality scale in which the low end group actually had a positive value was for the openness scale (*M*=1.52, *SD*=.64; *M*=.10, *SD*=.31). Students who study abroad presumably have a high degree of interest in expanding their horizons in a new culture, thus it is not surprising that the low end group scored as highly as they did along the openness scale.

The descriptive statistics of the communicative competence measures for both the pre-departure and post-return oral interviews can be found in Table 3. Collectively, students benefitted from studying abroad as their scores for each communicative competence measure improved after spending a month abroad. In Tables 4-8, the descriptive statistics for the communicative competence measures for the high and low groups can be found for each of the five personality scales. The most notable finding appears to be along the extraversion scale, where high-extraversion students significantly improved in two of the three measures, with a WPM result of *t*(7)=-5.79, *p*=.01 and an elaboration result of *t*(7)=-4.76, *p*=.02.

The next most notable result was on the conscientiousness scale, with low-conscientious students actually

Table 1. QuEEP pre-departure test for five personality scales

Student	ES	O	A	C	E
Student 1	0.69	0.72	0.08	0.10	-0.09
Student 2	0.37	2.24	-0.49	0.36	-0.54
Student 3	0.05	0.07	0.83	-0.66	0.12
Student 4	0.86	0.33	-0.49	-0.27	-0.09
Student 5	-2.68	1.12	0.83	-1.21	0.12
Student 6	1.54	1.86	0.52	0.10	0.83
Student 7	0.21	0.85	0.67	-0.40	0.52
Student 8	0.21	0.33	-0.21	-0.66	0.12
Student 9	0.86	-0.33	0.52	-0.53	0.52

Note: Underlined denotes students in the upper half of each respective personality trait.

Table 2. Pre-departure and post-return test descriptive statistics for students at opposing ends of personality factors

		Pre-departure			Post-return		
		Mean	SE	SD	Mean	SE	SD
ES	High-end students	.99	.19	.38	.56	.28	.56
	Low-end students	-.55	.71	1.42	.21	.20	.39
O	High-end students	1.52	.32	.64	1.10	.36	.73
	Low-end students	.10	.16	.31	.41	.27	.53
A	High-end students	.71	.07	.15	.56	.31	.61
	Low-end students	-.28	.14	.27	.22	.32	.65
C	High-end students	.07	.13	.26	.15	.11	.21
	Low-end students	-.77	.15	.30	-.55	.21	.42
E	High-end students	.50	.15	.29	.30	.15	.29
	Low-end students	-.15	.14	.28	.49	.12	.25

outperforming the high-conscientious group, significantly improving their elaboration score, $t(7)=-15.50$, $p=.00$. For the emotional stability scale, the low group also significantly improved their elaboration score $t(7)=-4.75$, $p=.02$. On the openness scale, the low group significantly improved their elaboration score $t(7)=-4.23$, $p=.02$. Finally, the high group on the agreeableness scale significantly improved their elaboration score $t(7)=-4.85$, $p=.02$.

To summarize, significant increases in elaboration were observed in those with low conscientiousness, low emotional stability, low openness, high agreeableness, and high extraversion. Those with high extraversion also improved their WPM. All other findings were insignificant.

PAC7 at JALT2008: Shared Identities

Table 3. Pre- and post- descriptive statistics for communicative competence

Test	Mean	SE	SD
Pre- WPM	22.27	1.69	5.06
Post- WPM	28.03	2.85	8.55
Pre- balanced	.75	.08	.25
Post- balanced	.90	.12	.37
Pre- elaboration	.22	.03	.09
Post- elaboration	.28	.04	.11

Note: N-size is 9.

Table 4. Pre- and post- descriptive and paired-sample *t*-test statistics for communicative competence (ES factor)

Group	Test	Mean	SE	SD	t	Sig.
1	Pre- WPM Post- WPM	20.48 27.87	2.08 3.71	4.15 7.42	-2.21	.11
1	Pre- balanced Post- balanced	.72 .88	.12 .17	.24 .34	-1.42	.25
1	Pre- elaborate Post- elaborate	.20 .26	.02 .05	.05 .09	-2.08	.13
2	Pre- WPM Post- WPM	25.71 30.92	2.04 4.70	4.08 9.40	-1.64	.20
2	Pre- balanced Post- balanced	.71 1.02	.15 .22	.30 .43	-2.32	.10
2	Pre- elaborate Post- elaborate	.23 .34	.07 .06	.14 .11	-4.75	.02*

Note: Group 1 denotes higher-level emotional stability scores and group 2 denotes lower-level scores

*significant at .05

Table 5. Pre- and post- descriptive and paired-sample *t*-test statistics for communicative competence (O factor)

Group	Test	Mean	SE	SD	t	Sig.
1	Pre- WPM Post- WPM	24.65 30.09	3.06 4.72	6.12 9.44	-2.24	.11
1	Pre- balanced Post- balanced	.95 .96	.02 .21	.04 .43	-.07	.95
1	Pre- elaborate Post- elaborate	.28 .32	.04 .07	.08 .14	-.71	.53
2	Pre- WPM Post- WPM	21.34 25.67	1.69 4.80	3.37 9.60	-1.19	.32
2	Pre- balanced Post- balanced	.59 .83	.14 .21	.27 .42	-2.66	.08
2	Pre- elaborate Post- elaborate	.17 .27	.04 .05	.08 .10	-4.22	.02*

Note: Group 1 denotes higher-level openness scores and group 2 denotes lower-level scores

*significant at .05

Table 6. Pre- and post- descriptive and paired-sample *t*-test statistics for communicative competence (A factor)

Group	Test	Mean	SE	SD	t	Sig.
1	Pre- WPM Post- WPM	24.39 30.68	2.35 4.65	4.70 9.29	-1.71	.19
	Pre- balanced Post- balanced	.76 1.06	.16 .23	.31 .45	-2.31	.10
	Pre- elaborate Post- elaborate	.25 .36	.07 .06	.14 .11	-4.85	.02*
2	Pre- WPM Post- WPM	19.20 24.44	2.39 4.40	4.77 8.79	-1.64	.20
	Pre- balanced Post- balanced	.69 .75	.12 .16	.24 .31	-.26	.81
	Pre- elaborate Post- elaborate	.20 .21	.02 .04	.04 .08	-.16	.89

Note: Group 1 denotes higher-level agreeableness scores and group 2 denotes lower-level scores

*significant at .05

Table 7. Pre- and post- descriptive and paired-sample *t*-test statistics for communicative competence (C factor)

Group	Test	Mean	SE	SD	t	Sig.
1	Pre- WPM Post- WPM	19.19 23.76	2.38 3.90	4.75 7.81	-1.50	.23
	Pre- balanced Post- balanced	.75 .69	.13 .12	.27 .23	.36	.75
	Pre- elaborate Post- elaborate	.20 .20	.02 .03	.04 .06	.06	.96
2	Pre- WPM Post- WPM	24.08 29.39	2.24 .17	4.47 7.89	-1.63	.20
	Pre- balanced Post- balanced	.71 .95	.15 .17	.29 .34	-2.71	.07
	Pre- elaborate Post- elaborate	.20 .33	.05 .05	.10 .10	-15.50	.00*

Note: Group 1 denotes higher-level conscientiousness scores and group 2 denotes lower-level scores

*significant at .05

Table 8. Pre- and post- descriptive and paired-sample *t*-test statistics for communicative competence (E factor)

Group	Test	Mean	SE	SD	t	Sig.
1	Pre- WPM	25.13	1.46	2.91	-5.79	.01*
	Post- WPM	34.83	1.70	3.39		
	Pre- balanced	.87	.05	.10	-2.31	.10
	Post- balanced	1.20	.14	.28		
	Pre- elaborate	.26	.05	.09	-4.76	.02*
	Post- elaborate	.35	.04	.07		
2	Pre- WPM	17.64	.95	1.90	-.76	.50
	Post- WPM	20.24	2.99	5.97		
	Pre- balanced	.59	.15	.31	-.05	.97
	Post- balanced	.59	.11	.21		
	Pre- elaborate	.16	.04	.08	-.26	.81
	Post- elaborate	.18	.02	.03		

Note: Group 1 denotes higher-level extraversion scores and group 2 denotes lower-level scores

*significant at .05

Discussion

While research findings have been mixed as to whether extraversion is an asset or liability when studying a second language, prior to the present study there had not been any research that had measured personality during a study abroad experience. In this particular context, it does not seem surprising at all that extraversion would be an advantage, since students can easily generate more speaking opportunities based on their degree of extraversion. In Japan, a largely homogenous population with few opportunities to speak with a native speaker, extraversion is a mute benefit, while in a foreign country extraversion can become a powerful advantage. Additionally, it does not seem surprising that the low-conscientiousness students would thrive, since studying abroad is a dramatically different learning experience when compared to the grammar-translation-dominated learning environment of Japan. If some students find grammar-translation, teacher-fronted classes in Japan boring, resulting in lackadaisical effort on the students' part, the same students may become energized when immersed in a learning experience that is based more on social interaction, experimentation, and novelty. Examining Table 1, the low-conscientiousness students did increase in conscientiousness more than the high group over the course of the study. It may also be worth noting that the low-conscientiousness students had a lower score in conscientiousness than any other personality dimension. Perhaps because they were starting from such a low point, even a mild increase in conscientiousness had a large increase in communicative competence. It is difficult to determine without interviewing students and conducting follow-up research, but it is worth considering for future studies.

There are some practical advantages to establishing a personality profile for successful study abroad students. One such advantage may be screening students who are accepted into a study abroad program to ensure the maximum level of language improvement. Studying abroad can be expensive for students, and institutions may be faced with a limited number of available placements at a hosting institution abroad. It would then make sense for both students and

institutions to only include those who are predisposed to success because of their personality orientation. Conversely, establishing a successful personality profile may help students who do not fit the profile in preparing themselves. For example, a student scoring low on the extraversion scale may be prompted to interact more while abroad. Without effective personality testing, this student may remain ignorant of their own negative orientation, but identifying them as lacking in extraversion may give them the impetus to alter their behaviour.

Additionally, understanding which personality types are most likely to enjoy success abroad may give teachers clues as to how to structure study-abroad preparation courses. If low conscientiousness, high extraversion students excel abroad because of the decreased emphasis on grammar-translation and the increased emphasis on social interaction, teachers may want to design courses that are more student-centered or fluency-based, diverging from traditional lectures.

Limitations

The very small *N*-size is a sizable limitation of this study. For any kind of comparison between groups, an *N*-size of at least 30 is desirable. Research in this study is ongoing in order to achieve a suitable *N*-size, but because of the limited enrolment in study abroad programs, this will take a few years.

Also, because each interview was unique to the interviewee, there may be some bias in the resulting data. While there was an interview script that the interviewer tried to adhere to, there were occasional divergences from this script that may have resulted in more difficult questions for some interviewees, thereby affecting the resulting communicative competence data.

Finally, by examining a fluency-based construct like communicative competence, there may have been some bias towards personality types who are more comfortable with speaking tasks. Even though each personality type was measured against themselves, through a pre- and post-test, certain personality types may have felt more comfortable in a foreign setting, and thus been more capable of acquiring language.

Conclusion

While the results of this study are limited by the small *N*-size, the fact that a significant difference was found with such a small *N*-size is noteworthy. The finding that low conscientiousness, low emotional stability, low openness, high agreeableness, and high extraversion students significantly improved their elaboration, and high extraversion students significantly improved their WPM while studying abroad may provide educators ideas on how to better prepare students before going abroad.

Omar Karlin currently teaches at Tokai University near Tokyo. He completed his M.Ed from Temple University, and is currently completing his doctorate, also from Temple University. His research interests include personality and how it relates to second language acquisition. <o_karlin@yahoo.com>

Megumi Nishikawa is a professor at Tokai University, just south of Tokyo. She completed her M.Ed at Columbia University in New York, and is interested in how students learn languages while studying abroad. <meguminishikawa3@hotmail.com>

References

Dewaele, J.-M., & Furnham, A. (1999). Extraversion: The unloved variable in applied linguistic research. *Language Learning, 49*(3), 509-544.

Dewaele, J.-M., & Furnham, A. (2000). Personality and individual differences. *Personality and Individual Differences, 28*(2), 355-365.

Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

MX Skype Recorder (2008). MX Skype Recorder (Version 3.9.1) [Computer Software]. Retrieved 1 August 2008. Available from http://www.skyperec.com/

Naiman, N. (1978). *The good language learner. Research in education series no. 7.* Toronto, ON: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

O'Connor, M. C., & Paunonen, S. V. (2007). Big five personality predictors of post-secondary academic performance. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43*(5), 971-990.

Piedmont, R. L., & Aycock, W. (2006). An historical analysis of the lexical emergence of the Big Five personality adjective descriptors. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*(6), 1059-1068.

SurveyMonkey. (2009). SurveyMonkey.com. Retrieved 1 January 2009 from http://www.surveymonkey.com/.

Appendix 1

QuEEP: English

Scoring order: ES, E, O, A, C

1. Panic when the teacher talks to me

2. Can easily find a partner

3. Love traveling to different countries

4. Think an average grade in English class is fine

5. Do my English homework every week

6. Am worried people will remember my mistakes

7. I like pairs more than individual work

8. Dream about living in another country

9. Help others in class

10. Study for tests

11. Think carefully about every word I say

12. Like English speaking practice

13. Want to date a foreigner

14. Am peaceful

15. Sing karaoke in English

16. Have little stress from this class

17. Prefer free talking

18. Don't need a direct English translation for Japanese words

19. Like my classmates

20. Make foreign friends

21. Am very relaxed

22. Enjoy presentations

23. Change my character when speaking English

24. Am equal to my classmates

25. Read English magazines, books, and newspapers

26. Don't worry much when I speak English

27. Leave class slowly after it is finished

28. Think Japanese movies are best

29. Want the best grade in the class

30. Talk to classmates in Japanese during English class

31. Feel no pressure in English class

32. Talk to the teacher before/after class

33. Want to live in Japan forever

34. Prefer working with good students

35. Ask friends to explain what the teacher said

36. Never think about tests

37. Often speak in English during class

38. Prefer Japanese culture over Western culture

39. Like working alone

40. Don't study extra grammar books outside of class

41. Am fine at English

42. Am shy

43. Prefer Japanese teachers

44. Prefer studying at home

45. Always use subtitles when watching English movies

46. Easily talk to foreigners

47. Leave English class quickly when it is finished

48. Think the world must learn from Japan

49. Don't socialize with students outside of English class

50. Only sing Japanese karaoke songs

Appendix 2

QuEEP: Japanese

Scoring order: ES, E, O, A, C

1. 先生が私に話しかける時、パニックになる。

2. 簡単にパートナーを見つけられる。

3. 違う国に旅行するのが大好きだ。

4. 英語のクラスでは平均的な成績が良いと思う。

5. 毎週英語の宿題をする。

6. 自分の間違いを人々が覚えているのではないかと心配だ。

7. 一人の作業よりペア活動が好きだ。
8. 別の国に住むのが夢だ。
9. 授業では他の人を助ける。
10. テストに備えて勉強する。
11. 自分の全ての発言について慎重に考える。
12. 英語のスピーキング練習は好きだ。
13. 外国人とデートしたい。
14. 自分は穏やかだ。
15. カラオケでは英語で歌う。
16. この授業にほとんどストレスを感じない。
17. フリートーキングを好む。
18. 日本語の英語直訳は必要ない。
19. クラスメイトが好きだ。
20. 外国人の友達を作る。
21. とてもリラックスしています。
22. 発表を楽しむ。
23. 英語を話すときは自分の性格を変える。
24. 私はクラスメイトとは対等だ。
25. 英語の雑誌、本や新聞を読む。
26. 自分が英語を話すときはそんなに気にしない。
27. 授業が終わったらゆっくり帰る。
28. 日本の映画が一番だと思う。
29. クラスでは一番を取りたい。
30. 英語の授業中、クラスメイトに日本語で話す。
31. 英語の授業でプレッシャーを全く感じない。
32. 授業の前後、先生に話しかける。
33. 永遠に日本に住みたい。
34. 良い生徒と作業するのが好きだ。
35. 先生が言ったことを友達に説明してもらうように頼む。
36. テストについて決して考えない。
37. 授業では英語でよく話す。
38. 西洋文化よりも日本の文化が好きだ。
39. 一人で作業することが好きだ。
40. 授業意外では、文法の本を多めに勉強しない。
41. 英語に満足だ。
42. 恥ずかしがりやだ。
43. 日本人の先生の方が好きだ。
44. 家で勉強するのが好きだ。
45. いつも字幕つきの英語の映画を観る。
46. 外国人と簡単に話せる。
47. 英語の授業が終わったらすばやく帰る。
48. 世界は日本から学ぶべきだと思う。
49. 英語の授業以外では生徒と社交的ではない。
50. カラオケでは日本の歌だけを歌う。

Appendix 3

Interview script

Greetings

How are you?

Can you hear me clearly?

Are you enjoying the summer/semester/vacation?

Past perfect

What have you been doing lately?

Have you started packing?

How much have you packed? What have you packed?

Have you been abroad before? If yes, WH questions…

Simple past

What did you do there?

Did you study English?

How much did you study everyday?

Did you miss Japan?

What did you eat?

Why did you choose to study abroad?

Why did you choose Australia / Hawaii / Canada / New York?

Comparative

What do you think are the biggest differences between _____ _____ and Japan?

Can you compare your classes with [native teacher] and _____-sensei? (pre-departure Q)

Can you compare your classes abroad at _____

University and in Japan at _____ University? (post-return Q)

Ranking

Which things will (did) you enjoy the most?

Which things are (were) you worried about the most?

Numbers

How much money will (did) you spend in yen in total?

How much are (were) [various things] in _____ compared to Japan (in yen)?

Narrative

Can you tell me a good memory from a previous travel experience (pre-departure Q)?

Can you tell me a good memory from your time abroad (post-return Q)?

Imperatives

Can you cook?

What are you good at cooking?

How do you cook [any food]?

Thank you very much.

Questions?

Good luck, and study hard!