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Possible selves research aims to ascertain the relationship between a participant’s current self and potential, or future, self. Research into Japanese study abroad programs have focused on curriculum, student motivation, language gains, and cultural awareness. This study connects the budding possible selves research to the established study abroad and motivation literature by comparing university students’ current selves to their perceptions of their future selves. Participants were 33 second-year Japanese students studying intercultural communication at a private university in Tokyo. Nineteen of the participants had experience living abroad, while 14 did not. Data collection took place two months prior to participant departure for a one-semester study abroad program. A questionnaire was developed using a possible selves approach focused on the following motivational orientations: integrative, instrumental, international posture, travel, language use, and cultural awareness. Results showed that there was not a significant difference on the measured variables between students who had experience living abroad and those who did not. However, the results suggest that it may be easier for students who have lived abroad to formulate a working self-concept as a person functioning overseas.

This study emanated from a student-generated class discussion about the possibility of finding clues about future career paths while studying abroad. Students expressed uncertainty about this possibility and drew no conclusions. Yet this student discussion showed that students were curious about the possibilities of studying abroad and how they felt the experience might shape their futures.

A great deal has been learned about how study abroad shapes university students. McKeown (2009) demonstrated that study abroad students with no significant international experience tended to have notable gains in their intellectual development. Clarke, Flaherty, Wright, and McMillen (2009) showed that study abroad experiences lead to students having more global-minded awareness and increased intercultural sensitivity. Williams (2005) has found that studying abroad also promotes the development of intercultural skills.

While most will regard these changes as unambiguously positive, what do we know about students’ desires for themselves as whole, complex individuals? Study abroad is not exclusively a cultural experience, nor is it solely linguistic in nature. Rather than focus on a specific cultural or linguistic change, the aim of this study was to see how study abroad students perceived their possible selves. In other words, this was an investigation about the self concept of university students in a study abroad program and how they saw themselves at the time of data collection (before departure) and how they envisioned themselves both during and after the study abroad experience. It would be plausible to expect that a group of first-year university students who were all enrolled in the same study abroad program would
have similar current selves. However, we were not sure if this would be true if students were grouped into those who had lived abroad and those who had not. Furthermore, we were unsure if this difference in background would affect their future selves, particularly with respect to such topics as careers, non-L1 language competence, and culture.

**Possible Selves Research and its Introduction into SLA**

In their influential introduction of possible selves, Markus and Nurius (1986) presented a useful framework for viewing self-concept and motivation. In essence, they stated that each person carries a collection of possible selves, some positive and some negative, that guide behavior. There are possible selves that the individual envisions as ideal and sets out to become. There are also possible selves that one wishes not to become. At the same time, there are varying degrees of realistic possibility. Markus and Nurius (1986) stated:

> (Individuals) have ideas, beliefs, and images about their potential and about their goals, hopes, fears. This is particularly so in those domains that are important for self-definition. To be sure, this self-knowledge is of a different type than the self-knowledge of one’s gender, or race, or the self-knowledge of one’s preferences or habits. Most obviously, as representations of the self in future states, possible selves are views of the self that often have not been verified or confirmed by social experience. (p. 955)

Thus, a desirable possible self may motivate a person to move towards the actualization of becoming such an individual whereas a negative self may motivate avoidance behaviors. Given this general description of possible selves, it is easy to see how it would aid in understanding motivation and behavior in any endeavor. Holding a collection of possible selves seems to be natural to the human experience.

Researchers have applied the possible selves approach to such areas as the academic achievement of ethnic groups (e.g., Kao, 2000), gender-based studies (e.g., King & Raspin, 2004; Packard & Nguyen, 2003), injury recovery (e.g., Smith & Sparkes, 2005), social identity (e.g., Cinnirella, 1998), and even the effects of reading on identity development (Richardson & Eccles, 2007). This study aimed to uncover the possible selves of study abroad students.

In order to better define the link between motivation and second language (L2) attainment, Dornyei (2005) introduced the concept of possible selves into the SLA field. In doing so, he brought together the research paradigms of integrative motivation (Gardner, 1985), individual differences (Skehan, 1989), and communities of practice (Norton, 2001; Wenger, 1998). It is beyond the scope of this paper to provide a full overview of these three areas of study. However, in order to provide a theoretical context a brief description of each follows.

Gardner based his socio-educational model (1985) upon the key supposition that L2 learners felt the need and/or desire to integrate into the L1 community (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). Numerous studies have followed based upon motivational orientations of ESL/EFL
learners. In addition, this line of research also identified other orientations, such as international posture (Yashima, 2002) and travel (Irie, 2003). Noting the incongruous nature of the socio-educational model in some EFL contexts (e.g., Dornyei, 1990; Nakata, 2006; Norris-Holt, 2001) and in relation to individual differences (e.g., Dornyei 1994; Williams & Burden, 1997), some researchers began to re-think the foreign language learner in the global context and began further analysis of how and why individuals differ in achievement.

Skehan (1989) called for the investigation of individual differences in SLA and what has followed are studies focused on language aptitude, language learning motivation, language learning styles, and language learning strategies (for a summary see Dornyei, 2005). The study of individual differences has traditionally focused on the cognitive and affective nature of individuals, which are also then further debated as to be more influenced by the nature of the individual or the socially constructed environment.

Wenger (1998) further defined the concept of communities of practice, the idea that all learning is situated in a socially constructed environment (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Norton (2001) used the community of practice framework and the concept of non-participation (Wenger, 1998) in her qualitative study on imagined communities. In short, membership in a community, real or imagined, is defined by what one does and does not do because of real or perceived success or failure.

Thus, by incorporating motivation, individual differences and the idea of a socially constructed environment, Dornyei (2005) proposed the L2 Motivational Self System. The L2 Motivational Self System consists of three components: (a) the Ideal L2 Self, (b) the Ought-to L2 Self and (c) the L2 Learning Experience. The Ideal L2 Self focuses on the motivation of bridging the current self to an L2 possible self. The Ought-to L2 Self is the perceived necessities one must attain “in order to avoid possible negative outcomes” (pp. 105-106). The L2 Learning Experience pertains to behaviors associated with the learning environment.

Dornyei (2005, 2009, p. 18) listed the following conditions which aid or obstruct the realization of the ideal and ought-to selves:

1. Availability of an elaborate and vivid future self image.
2. Perceived plausibility.
3. Harmony between the ideal and ought selves.
5. Accompanying procedural strategies.

The aim of this study was to investigate the first three conditions as an initial step in understanding the possible selves of Japanese university students in a study abroad program.

Study Aim and Research Questions

Study abroad research currently views the study abroad experience as one of change, that is to say, it is often viewed as a time period overseas during which gains in areas such as language ability, cultural awareness, and intellectual growth, are said to occur. Seeking to
complement existing research, this study looks to the individuals themselves in order to find evidence of desires and goals, current and future. It further aims to find if there is a difference among individuals who had prior experience living abroad as opposed to those who had not. To this end, the following research questions are posed:

Q1: To what degree are university students in a study abroad program motivated with regard to an array of motivational items?
Q2: To what degree is their motivation different from their self-report of future states?
Q3: To what degree are students who have experience living abroad different from those students who have not lived abroad with regard to Research Questions 1 and 2?

Method

Participants

Participants were second-year Japanese university students enrolled in the same department of intercultural communication at a private institution located in Tokyo. All 120 students enrolled in the department were to spend their second semester of their second year at an affiliated university overseas. The one-semester (approximately 20 weeks of total time) study abroad program involved various locations, including non-English speaking countries. In total, 33 students, 19 who had experience living abroad and 14 who did not, took part in this study. Living abroad experience was determined by self-report information gathered as biographical data. Participants who had lived abroad with family, on their own or while on a homestay, regardless of duration, were grouped together as having lived abroad.

Instrument

The bilingual instrument was developed with two facets in mind (see Appendix for a list of the items). First, items were based largely upon previous motivational studies. Items that seemed to best reflect Japanese second-year intercultural communication majors were used, covering areas such as integrative and instrumental orientations (Dornyei, 2003; Gardner, 1985; Masgoret & Gardner, 2003), international posture (Yashima, 2002), and travel (Irie, 2003). Prior experience with Japanese university students who have studied abroad also informed the creation of other items, such as, Item 21: *I want to study abroad because I want to get away from my life in Japan.*

Second, the structure of the instrument was primarily based upon the work of MacIntyre, MacKinnon, and Clement (2009). In order to investigate possible selves, MacIntyre et al. (2009) suggested that a unified approach in the study of possible selves in SLA should be undertaken, and thus developed an instrument in order to have a consistent empirically-based approach across all studies. Previous research has relied upon the use of Likert-type scales in
order to collect self-report data based upon the moment of data collection; however, possible selves research aims also to investigate future moments in time. To this end, five variables ((a) Describes me now, (b) Describes my future, (c) Is this desired or undesired in your future?, (d) How often have you thought about this?, and (e) How likely is this to happen?) were used to collect data in response to 34 motivational items. Table 1 shows Item 22 as an example.

In order to find out how students perceived their future while studying abroad in addition to their long-term future (i.e., life after college), the 34 items were divided into two sections. Items 1 to 21 were thought to reflect the study abroad period specifically, and so participants were not asked to respond to “Describes my future” for these items as to avoid confusion with their general future. On the other hand, items 22 to 34 reflected the future in general, and so participants were asked to respond to all five variables of the questionnaire. However, this division did not allow for group comparisons across all variables for all of the same items. Therefore, this study only presents findings with regard to group comparison on the four other variables.

Procedures

Data were collected two months prior to the participants’ departure for a one-semester study abroad experience. Administrators at the university asked that the questionnaire not be distributed in class as originally planned. Instead the questionnaire was distributed after a two-hour study abroad orientation meeting for the program’s 120 students. The organizers of the meeting did not allow for data collection, and so participants were asked to fill out and return the instrument voluntarily within two days. We believe this led to the small number of participants.

Data Analysis

Data from the 33 returned questionnaires were entered into SPSS 17.0. Exploratory analysis showed that there were a number of missing values for 13 of the cases and that Item 34 was not answered by many of the participants. Therefore, the 13 cases and Item 34 were
Table 2

*Variables Used in Data Collection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Measure type</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describes me now.</td>
<td>Dichotomous (yes / no)</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this desired or undesired in your future?</td>
<td>Likert scale: 1 (low) to 4 (high)</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you thought about this?</td>
<td>Likert scale: 1 (low) to 4 (high)</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely is this to happen?</td>
<td>Likert scale: 1 (low) to 4 (high)</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Items 14, 16, 19, 21 and 34 were deleted from this and all subsequent analyses.*

Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics for Each Variable by Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Var.</th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Var.</th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Var.</th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Var.</th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Var.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes a</td>
<td>No a</td>
<td>Total a</td>
<td>Yes a</td>
<td>No a</td>
<td>Total a</td>
<td>Yes a</td>
<td>No a</td>
<td>Total a</td>
<td>Yes a</td>
<td>No a</td>
<td>Total a</td>
<td>Yes a</td>
<td>No a</td>
<td>Total a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How desirable</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Now represents the dichotomous variable Describes me now (Yes = 1, No = 2). Responded to each of the three other variables were made on 4-point scales (1 = low, 4 = high). a n = 10 for each group; n = 20 for Total.*

Not incorporated into any subsequent data analysis. After the case deletions, there were 20 participants, 10 who had lived abroad and 10 who had not.

Upon further item analysis, Items 14, 16, 19, and 21, were deleted from analysis. Items 14, 19, and 21 could only be answered in relation to the time of study; that is, there would be no logical future possibility for them to occur. The deletion of Item 16 enhanced the overall reliability of the instrument (α = .931). After item deletion, there were 29 items. Table 2 shows the four variables used in this study and the respective measure type and reliability coefficients.

Due to the small n size of this study, parametric inferential statistics could not be conducted. However, non-parametric analysis comparing the two groups was conducted.
Table 4

Results of the Mann-Whitney U-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have lived abroad?</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>97.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>113.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How desirable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>116.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>94.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>127.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>82.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>118.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>92.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n = 10 for each group; Yes = have lived abroad, No = have not lived abroad

Results

The descriptive statistics for each variable by group and by total number of participants are shown in Table 3. Participants who had lived abroad prior to this study show higher affirmation on all variables with less deviation and less variance.

In order to identify if there were differences between participants who had prior living abroad experience and participants who had not lived abroad before, the Mann-Whitney U-Test was employed. This non-parametric test is designed for small groups and does not need to meet the assumption of normality (Elifson, Runyon, & Haber, 1998). A significant result would suggest that the two groups belonged to two different populations.

Table 4 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U-Test, comparing the participant groups on each variable. Table 5 shows that subsequent analysis found no statistical difference between the two groups on the four variables.

A subsequent item-by-item analysis was conducted to further investigate the possibility of a difference between the two groups. Table 6 shows that there were a total of eight significant differences between the two groups, and in particular, Item 30 was significant across all variables. In order to illustrate the meaning of a significant difference between groups, consider Item 30: I want to work for an international organization or international company in Japan.
Table 5

**Test of Significance Between Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>How desirable</th>
<th>How often</th>
<th>How likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>42.000</td>
<td>39.000</td>
<td>27.500</td>
<td>37.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.607</td>
<td>-.833</td>
<td>-1.706</td>
<td>-0.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 10 for each group
*p < .05

Table 6

**Between Group Item Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>20.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How desirable</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>17.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>24.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>14.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>25.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>21.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Now represents the dichotomous variable *Describes me now* (Yes = 1, No = 2.)
Responses to each of the three other variables were made on 4-point scales (1 = low, 4 = high).
²n = 10 for each group; Yes indicates participants who lived abroad prior to this study and No indicated participants who had not lived abroad prior to this study.
*p < .05
For the dichotomous variable, *Describes me now*, results indicate that there is a significant difference between the participants. Those who had lived abroad prior to the study reported that they wanted to work for an international organization or an international company in Japan whereas the participants who had not lived abroad before reported that they did not. With regard to how desirable it would be to work in such a setting, how often they thought about working in such a setting and how likely they believed it to be that they would work in such a setting, the participants who had lived abroad before clearly show that they highly desire, often think about, and believe in the likelihood of such a work setting in their futures. On the other hand, as the future possibility of such a work setting becomes more focused (from desire to actual likelihood), they indicate that they believe working in such a setting is not as likely to happen for them. Students who had not lived abroad did not desire to work in such a setting, and they did not see it as likely.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to introduce possible selves to the study abroad literature by ascertaining how a group of students viewed themselves and their futures prior to departing upon a one-semester study abroad experience.

The study abroad literature has focused largely on the potential gains made during and because of study abroad programs (for a review see Freed, 1998). If living abroad was responsible for the advancement of skills, knowledge and/or overall awareness, it is thus likely that participants who have lived abroad would be more in tune to such potentials. Erikson (2007) argued for the inclusion of experience within the possible self concept in order to better define future selves as something more than mere hopes, but a future self in relation to the current “working self-concept” (p. 353). It is possible that participants who had lived abroad would have a more realistic self-concept with regard to what could actually occur when abroad than participants who had never live abroad or even been abroad. Therefore, the first two research questions asked to what degree university students in a study abroad program are motivated with regard to an array of motivational items and to what degree their motivations are different to their self-report future desires. Results showed that both groups of students by and large held a positive disposition toward current and future desires, yet as the future possibility became more concrete as to how often they thought about such possibilities and how likely they thought such possibilities would occur, all participants became less certain.

However, in answer to the third research question, it was shown that for a number of motivational items crossing the temporal boundaries from the moment of data collection (the current self) to far off into the distant future (future possible self), the students who had lived abroad before were not significantly different from students who had not lived abroad before.

There could be a number of reasons for such findings. One such factor could be in relation to experienced meaning. Erikson (2007) suggested that possible selves are made meaningful due to their “social and cultural context” (p. 354). According to Erikson, such concepts as shame and rewards are shaped by the social and cultural situation of the self and others, who are in a sense mirrors responsible for the meaning one gives to one’s own
behavior or non-behavior, real or imagined. For example, the concept of “good feelings” in Japan is very different than the same concept in the United States (Kitayama, Markus, & Kurokawa, 2000). Thus, if some concepts are heavily tied to the social and cultural situation, it is possible to imagine that Japanese university students in a study abroad program have similar understandings of what, for example, being culturally aware means. This division between the self and the socially constructed self is an area within study abroad that needs further investigation.

Yet, there was a significant difference between the two groups with regard to working in an international setting. Within the social and cultural context in Japan, there are positive meanings given to being able to work in such a situation. Furthermore, second year Japanese university students are at the age when they generally begin to think about future employment. It could also be said that participants who have lived abroad may be able to better imagine a future self working in an international setting because their experience living abroad allows them to formulate a working self concept as a person dealing with such a community of practice. The two groups were also significantly different with regard to how often they thought about making foreign friends while abroad and how likely they believed speaking another language would be a big part of their identity. It could be said of each of these items as well that the students who had experience living abroad already had a working self concept of making foreign friends and an identity as a speaker of another language.

**Pedagogical Implications**

It is the idea of experience that Erikson (2007) believes is essential when defining what a possible self is. Dornyei (2009) suggested that six conditions were important in the realization of possible selves, the first three of which informed this study. The remaining three, (a) necessary activation/priming, (b) accompanying procedural strategies, and (c) the offsetting impact of a feared self (p. 18), could be supported by an other, such as a teacher, caregiver, or informed friend. This seems especially true in the case of adolescents or university students who would benefit from understanding and implementing the concept of self. However, rather than the goal setting of life tasks, Erikson (2007) advocates that all possible self configurations should incorporate the self as an agent of action, “personal context (oneself as an agent in a future situation) compels the participant to focus on the personalized meaning” (p. 356) of a future event. Within SLA, and more specifically within study abroad, courses or events that focused on envisioning oneself as an agent of cultural awareness, an active member of a role-play, a discussion member focusing on one’s own real opinion, or a researcher to identify future possibilities in relation to one’s own desires, would all keep “the vision alive” (Dornyei, 2009, p. 37).

**Limitations and Suggestions for Future Studies**

There were numerous limitations to this study. The participant number was small, and the participants came from the same department at the same university. In addition, the instrument had not been piloted, and upon analysis and review, a number of items did not
match the time frame. Moreover, two different time frames were combined causing potential confusion. Lastly, this was a cross-sectional study, which despite the small sample size, inherently prohibits any generalization outside of the participants.

Future studies should correct the most fundamental limitations of this study, but also go beyond this study. Future studies should compare study abroad and non-study abroad students in both inter- and intra-departmental groups and consider comparing students from different universities as well as students from different years of education. Future instruments should incorporate the notion of agent into the wording of the items as to differentiate life tasks from that of a possible self (Erikson, 2007). We also believe it would be valuable to continue to look at the differences and similarities between students who have lived and/or study abroad and students who have not. Further investigation of a learner’s self concept is warranted. And a final suggestion would be to operationalize what an instructor may or may not be able to do to activate the notion of possible selves within students.

Conclusion

As investigators, we became energized by the concept of possible selves in relation to study abroad students. With more opportunities to study abroad now becoming possible and as more universities in Japan create such programs, the potential of viewing study abroad as the development of the self is invigorating. We believe such research will have profound implications upon students’ lives, department curriculums, and course content and delivery.

Yet we do not envision the implications as dictating what or how to teach, but rather provoking a change of focus that has students, teachers, and researchers looking at individuals’ self concepts, the meanings in experience, and how to enable people to connect the present to the possible future.
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Appendix

Questionnaire Items: For Possible Selves Analysis of Study Abroad Students

1. I think studying abroad will be easier than my university classes in Japan.
   留学を希望したのは、通常の授業より簡単だと思ったからだ。
2. I want to learn about my study abroad country's culture.
   私は留学先の文化について学びたい。
3. Speaking a second (or third) language well is a big part of who I am.
   第2（あるいは第2）言語をしゃべることは、自分にとってとても重要なことだ。
4. My university classes are preparing me well for an experience in a different culture.
   大学の授業を通じ異文化経験をするため充分な準備をしてくれている。
5. I think I will learn more about my own culture when I am studying abroad.
   私は留学をしている間、もっと自分の国について学べると思う。
6. I think I will broaden myself as a person by studying abroad.
   私は留学することにより人間として幅が広がると思う。
7. I think studying abroad will give me confidence in using my second (or third) language.
私は留学を通して、第2（あるいは第3）言語を使用するうえで自信をつけさせてくれると思う。
8. I think studying abroad will help me gain a new perspective on how to think.
9. I think studying abroad will make me more appealing to future employers.
10. I want to find out if I can work in my study abroad country.
11. I plan on participating in social activities at my study abroad university.
12. I want to exchange ideas and opinions with the people of my study abroad country.
13. I want to make foreign friends at my study abroad university.
14. It would be great if I could live with a non-Japanese university student when I am studying abroad.
15. If I can, I would like to do a lot of sightseeing while studying abroad.
16. I want to do a lot of shopping while studying abroad.
17. I want to travel to another foreign country while studying abroad.
18. I have done an adequate amount of research about my study abroad university.
19. I decided to enroll in the study abroad program because my parents recommended me to.
20. I want to explain about my culture to the people of my study abroad country.
21. I want to study abroad because I want to get away from my life in Japan.
22. I pay attention to news about foreign countries or the world in general.
23. I want to be a culturally aware person.
24. I want to share my views about the world with others.
25. I plan to study my second (or third) language throughout my life.
26. Having an understanding of other cultures will be useful for me in my future.
27. The world needs more Japanese people who are able to share their views about international issues.
28. I want to understand foreign people’s views.
   私は外国人がどういうものの見方をするのか理解したい。

29. I feel at ease with foreign people.
   外国人といると居心地がいい。

30. I want to work for an international organization or international company in Japan.
   私は日本の国際機関あるいは国際企業で働きたい。

31. I want the experience of working in a foreign country.
   私は海外で将来働きたい。

32. I want to develop friendships with foreign people.
   私は外国人と友人関係を築きたい。

33. I want to live in a foreign country permanently.
   私は海外に永住したい。

34. I want to speak a second (or third) language on a daily basis.
   私は日常的に第2（あるいは第3）言語をしゃべりたい。