

Character traits and language proficiency in EFL

Schiavon, Anna

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2023

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Zagreb, Faculty of Teacher Education / Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Učiteljski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:147:606039>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-07-18**

Repository / Repozitorij:

[University of Zagreb Faculty of Teacher Education - Digital repository](#)



SVEUČILIŠTE U ZAGREBU
UČITELJSKI FAKULTET
ODSJEK ZA UČITELJSKE STUDIJE

Anna Schiavon

CHARACTER TRAITS AND LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY IN EFL

Diplomski rad

Zagreb, travanj, 2023.

SVEUČILIŠTE U ZAGREBU
UČITELJSKI FAKULTET
ODSJEK ZA UČITELJSKE STUDIJE

Anna Schiavon

CHARACTER TRAITS AND LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY IN EFL

Diplomski rad

Mentor rada:
izv. prof. dr. sc. Kristina Cergol

Zagreb, travanj, 2023.

ABSTRACT

This research paper investigates the language effect on EFL students' character traits and emotions with an emphasis on different language proficiency levels. Among many bilinguals and multilinguals, it is common to experience an effect called "cultural frame switching"; a phenomenon where bilingual or multilingual individuals feel different when switching languages.

The aim of this research was to investigate if Croatian speakers of English report having different character traits depending on their language use.

94 students participated in the study of which 50 students were future English teachers and 44 were future preschool teachers. The participants were given a language proficiency test which divided them into different proficiency levels. They also completed two Big Five Inventory (BFI) questionnaires. One BFI questionnaire required them to self-report in their character traits when they use English and the other one when they use Croatian. The two BFI questionnaires were used in order to investigate if they reported different personality traits depending on the language they use at a given moment.

The results show that using English did cause an effect on students' character traits and emotions. However, the psychological changes occurred for different reasons. When comparing the results of the Croatian and English parts of the BFI questionnaire, future English teachers scored higher on Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness in English than in Croatian, and scored higher on Neuroticism in Croatian than in English. On the other hand, future preschool teachers scored lower on Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness in English than in Croatian.

An Independent samples T-test was used to compare the English parts of the BFI questionnaire between the two participant groups. Future English teachers scored higher on Extraversion and Openness than future preschool teachers whereas future preschool teachers scored higher on Neuroticism than future English teachers. The scores on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness showed no significant differences.

Since the research was conducted on a small group of students from one faculty, the results should not be used for generalisation for all EFL students in Croatia. However, they could be used as an inspiration for further research on the same topic.

Key words: EFL, language proficiency, character traits, emotions, biculturalism

SAŽETAK

Ovaj istraživački rad istražuje utjecaj jezika na karakterne osobine i emocije studenata engleskog jezika kao stranog jezika s naglaskom na različite razine znanja jezika. Među mnogim dvojezičnim i višejezičnim osobama moguće je uočiti pojavu pod nazivom *cultural frame switching*; fenomen u kojem se dvojezične ili višejezične osobe osjećaju drugačije pri mijenjaju jezika kojim komuniciraju.

Cilj ovog istraživanja bio je ispitati imaju li hrvatski govornici engleskog jezika različite karakterne osobine ovisno o upotrebi jezika.

U istraživanju je sudjelovalo 94 studenta od kojih je 50 studenata učiteljskog studija s engleskim jezikom i 44 studenta studija ranog i predškolskog odgoja. Sudionici su riješili test znanja jezika koji ih je podijelio u različite razine znanja. Također su ispunili dva upitnika Velikih pet dimenzija ličnosti (Big Five Inventory - BFI). U jednom upitniku ih je zamoljeno da ocijene svoje karakterne osobine kada koriste engleski, a u drugom kada koriste hrvatski. Dva upitnika korištena su kako bi se istražilo jesu li prijavili različite osobine ličnosti ovisno o jeziku koji koriste u određenom trenutku.

Rezultati prikazuju da je korištenje engleskog jezika utjecalo na karakterne osobine i emocije studenata. Međutim, psihičke promjene dogodile su se iz različitih razloga. Uspoređujući rezultate hrvatskog i engleskog dijela BFI upitnika, kod studenata učiteljskog studija s engleskim jezikom na ljestvici rezultata za ekstrovertiranost, ugodnost i savjesnost uočavaju se veće vrijednosti u engleskom nego u hrvatskom jeziku, te na ljestvici rezultata za neurotičnost veće vrijednosti u hrvatskom nego u engleskom jeziku. S druge strane, kod studenata studija ranog i predškolskog odgoja na ljestvici ekstrovertiranosti, savjesnosti i otvorenosti uočavaju se niže vrijednosti u engleskom nego u hrvatskom.

T-test neovisnih uzoraka korišten je za usporedbu engleskih dijelova BFI upitnika između dviju skupina sudionika. Studenti učiteljskog studija s engleskim jezikom prikazuju više rezultate u ekstrovertiranosti i otvorenosti od studenata studija ranog i predškolskog odgoja, dok studenti studija ranog i predškolskog prikazuju više rezultate u neurotičnosti od studenata učiteljskog studija s engleskim jezikom. Rezultati u ugodnosti i savjesnosti nemaju značajne razlike.

Budući da je istraživanje provedeno na maloj skupini studenata s jednog fakulteta, rezultati ne bi trebali poslužiti kao generalizacija za sve studente engleskog jezika kao stranog jezika u Hrvatskoj. Međutim, mogli bi poslužiti kao inspiracija za daljnja istraživanja na istu temu.

Ključne riječi: engleski kao strani jezik, znanje jezika, karakterne osobine, emocije, bikulturalnost

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. BILINGUALISM, MULTILINGUALISM, AND SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING	1
2.1. <i>Bilingualism and multilingualism</i>	1
2.2. <i>Language acquisition vs language learning</i>	6
3. LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TESTS	8
4. LANGUAGE EFFECT ON EMOTIONS AND PERSONALITY	9
4.1. <i>Language effect on emotions</i>	9
4.2. <i>Language effect on personality</i>	10
5. BICULTURALISM AND CULTURAL FRAME SWITCHING	13
6. PREVIOUS RESEARCH	15
7. AIM AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	20
8. METHODOLOGY	20
8.1. <i>Participants</i>	20
8.2. <i>Instruments and procedure</i>	20
9. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	22
9.1. <i>Results</i>	22
9.1.1. <i>BFI results of the Croatian part of the questionnaire</i>	22
9.1.2. <i>Comparing Croatian and English BFI scores by group</i>	23
9.1.3. <i>Conjoined BFI results and analysis of the English part of the questionnaire</i>	25
9.2. <i>Discussion</i>	26
9.2.1 <i>BFI results of future English teachers</i>	26
9.2.2 <i>BFI results of future preschool teachers</i>	28
9.2.3 <i>BFI scores between the two groups of participants</i>	29
9.2.4 <i>Other interesting results for both participant groups</i>	31
10. CONCLUSION	31
11. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	32
REFERENCES	33
APPENDIXES	36
Appendix 1: <i>Front page of the questionnaire</i>	36
Appendix 2: <i>Big Five Inventory questionnaire</i>	37
Appendix 3: <i>Language proficiency test</i>	39
IZJAVA O SAMOSTALNOJ IZRADI RADA	43

1. INTRODUCTION

In today's society language learning has almost become a norm among people of all ages. Most people tend to learn new languages as it is prescribed by the school curriculum. However, there are also individuals who start learning languages on their own initiative with different intrinsic or extrinsic motives. No matter the motive for learning different languages, the process of language learning may have an impact on an individual. For instance, language learning leads to greater academic achievements and is necessary for success in life, language learners have more positive attitudes towards other languages and cultures, language learning enables greater cognitive development as it improves verbal and spatial abilities, it improves memory functions, and it enhances the creative thinking capacity (ACTFL, n.d.).

Moreover, languages can also have an impact on the way a person thinks, behaves, and expresses themselves. There is a famous Turkish proverb which states: "One who speaks only one language is one person, but one who speaks two languages is two people" (Lewis University, n.d.). Bilinguals and multilinguals in some cases report feeling different and behaving differently when switching languages. Studies conducted on bilinguals (and multilinguals) noted that bicultural bilinguals (and multicultural multilinguals) may demonstrate different verbal behaviours in two (or more) languages and may be perceived differently by others depending on the language they use in that particular moment (Pavlenko, 2006, p. 27). These slight changes can be expressed in different forms such as altered body language, facial expressions, voice intonation, etc. (Ożańska-Ponikwia, 2011, pp. 217-218).

However, this phenomenon raises several questions regarding foreign language learners. Is this strange occurrence also applicable to non-native speakers and to what extent? Also, does language proficiency play an important role to determine who is more susceptible to these personality changes?

This research paper is focused on investigating whether Croatian EFL students of different language proficiency level backgrounds experience changes in their character traits when switching languages.

2. BILINGUALISM, MULTILINGUALISM, AND SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

2.1. Bilingualism and multilingualism

Multiple authors argue on how to define bilingualism and multilingualism as it differs depending on the context, e.g., whether is viewed as "knowing", "recognising" or "using regularly" two or more languages (Myers-Scotton, 2006, p. 38). In the past, the definitions of

bilingualism and multilingualism were strongly biased from a monolingual's point of view. Monolinguals thought bilinguals (and multilinguals) had to have "native-like control" of the two (or more) languages, but with time the definitions became broader (Dewaele, 2015, p. 1). Quay and Montanari (2019) define bilingualism as learning and using more than a single language or learning and using just two languages. They define multilingualism as learning and using three or more languages (Quay & Montanari, 2019, p. 544). Butler (2013) explains that bilingualism and multilingualism are "highly complex social, psychological, and linguistic "phenomena" and introduces a new term "multilanguage user", which refers to both bilinguals and multilinguals. They define the term as "individuals or groups of people who obtain communicative competences in more than one language, with various degrees of proficiencies, in oral and/or written forms, in order to interact with speakers of one or more languages in a given society" (Butler, 2013, pp. 110-112). Grosjean (2013) includes dialects when defining bilingualism and multilingualism: "...we will define bilingualism, and indeed multilingualism, as the use of two or more languages (or dialects) in everyday life" (Grosjean, 2013, p. 5). Dewaele (2015) defines bilinguals and multilinguals as individuals who "have minimal competence in one of the four skills (speaking, listening, reading, writing) in language that is not the first language, or anyone who controls two or more languages..." (Dewaele, 2015, p. 1). Myers-Scotton (2006) suggests that a person can be considered as a bilingual (or multilingual) if they have grammatical competence and communicative competence in a certain language, as well as if the individual has the ability to use two or more languages sufficiently enough to carry on a conversation (Myers-Scotton, 2006, p. 38 and 44).

Myers-Scotton (2006) describes how an individual becomes a bilingual on two main sets of conditions:

1. Close proximity – the speaker lives in the close proximity to speakers of another language; type of bilingualism for many people
2. Displacement – the speaker has a need or desire to learn another language, which results in their physical movement or a change in their psychological outlook (Myers-Scotton, 2006, p. 45)

The conditions of close proximity include living in a bilingual nation (minority group members), living in border areas between ethnic groups or nations, living in a multi-ethnic urban area, engaging in an occupation that involves many contacts with out-group members, marrying outside one's ethnic group, having a parent or grandparent outside one's ethnic group (Myers-Scotton, 2006, p. 46). On the other hand, the condition of displacement includes speakers' moving their place of residence (voluntarily or involuntarily; migration), the ruling

class changes (wars and colonialism), changing of borders (peace settlements), circumstances which encourage speakers to learn the territorially dominant language (incorporation for national integration), speakers admiring/espousing the characteristics of an attractive group (acculturation), education in an L2 as a prerequisite for socio-economic mobility (Myers-Scotton, 2006, p. 53).

Another important aspect of bilingualism and multilingualism is the time of language acquisition. Włosowicz (2014) differentiates three types of bilinguals/multilinguals according to the time of language acquisition: early multilinguals, early-bilingual-late-multilingual, and late multilingual. Early multilinguals are those who acquired three or more languages in early childhood. Early-bilinguals-late-multilinguals are those who learnt L3 much later in life (e.g., after puberty). And finally, late multilinguals are those who learnt other languages at a later age (e.g., at school or at university) (Włosowicz, 2014, p. 27). Butler (2013) differentiates bilinguals according to the dimension of the age of acquisition as simultaneous, sequential, and late bilinguals. Simultaneous bilinguals were exposed to two languages from birth. Sequential bilinguals were exposed to L2 after their L1 had some foundation while late bilinguals were exposed to L2 during adulthood (Butler, 2013, p. 112).

It is also important to differentiate bilinguals and multilinguals according to a certain type. Edwards (2013) describes bilinguals according to their knowledge of the languages and the environment of acquisition. Based on their knowledge of languages, bilinguals can be balanced bilinguals/ambilinguals/equilinguals which are individuals whose language capacities are great. Secondly, there are receptive (passive) bilinguals who are individuals that can understand a language exclusively in spoken or written form but cannot produce it themselves. On the other hand, there are productive (active) bilinguals who can do both i.e., use all four language skills to communicate (speaking, listening, writing, reading). Next, additive bilingualism is a phenomenon in which an individual's new language helps them with repertoire expansion. While on the contrary, subtractive bilingualism is a phenomenon in which the new language replaces an old one as the new language is dominant and more useful to an individual. When describing the environment of acquisition there are primary bilingualism and secondary bilingualism. Primary bilingualism was acquired in a natural environment through contextual demands, while secondary bilingualism was acquired through systematic and formal instruction (e.g., school) (Edwards, 2013, p. 13). Włosowicz (2014) differentiates multilinguals according to their usage of languages and the learning and/or acquisition context. Based on their usage of languages multilinguals can be described as:

- The additive multilingual –an individual who has a good command of several languages and uses them in everyday situations (e.g., an interpreter)
- The subtractive multilingual – an individual who has learnt several languages throughout their lifetime but has lost the ability to use one or more languages due to not using them
- The complementary multilingual – an individual who knows several languages but does not possess a high level of proficiency in each language (attains only the competence necessary for a particular function)
- The transitory multilingual –an individual who is in the process of learning a new language(s) but is forgetting another (or other) languages as a function of their language needs
- The alternative multilingual –an individual whose languages become more or less strongly activated due to their use and may regain access to a deactivated language
- The beginning multilingual – a bilingual who is in the process of learning L3 or a monolingual who is learning two languages
- The dormant multilingual –an individual who uses only one or two languages, while the other languages are deactivated (Włosowicz, 2014, pp. 27-28)

Based on the learning and/or acquisition context a multilingual can be a natural multilingual, a formal-context multilingual, and a mixed-context multilingual. A natural multilingual has acquired all of their languages in a naturalistic setting. A formal-context multilingual has acquired all of their foreign languages in a formal context, while a mixed-context multilingual has partly acquired and partly learnt their languages (Włosowicz, 2014, pp. 27-28). Butler (2013) describes types of bilinguals according to different dimensions:

- The relationship between language proficiencies in two languages
 - Balanced bilinguals
 - Dominant bilinguals
- The functional ability
 - Receptive bilinguals
 - Productive bilinguals
- The age of acquisition
 - Simultaneous bilinguals
 - Sequential bilinguals

- Late bilinguals
- The organisation of linguistic codes and meaning units
 - Compound bilinguals—individuals who have two sets of linguistic codes stored in one meaning unit
 - Coordinate bilinguals—individuals who have two sets of linguistic codes stored separately
 - Subordinate bilinguals—individuals who have L2 access through L1
- Language status and learning environments
 - Elite/elective bilinguals—individuals who have an additive value of L2
 - Folk/circumstantial bilinguals—individuals who have no or little additive value of L1 as a language minority status
- The effect of L2 learning on the retention of L1
 - Additive bilinguals
 - Subtractive bilinguals
- Cultural identity
 - L1 monocultural—individuals whose cultural identity is shaped by one culture
 - Bicultural—individuals whose cultural identity is shaped by two cultures
 - L2 accultural—individuals who lost L1 cultural identity
 - Deculturated bilinguals —individuals whose identity is in neither culture (Butler, 2013, pp. 112-114)

When further examining bilingualism and multilingualism, there are some key differences between them which are not related to the number of spoken languages. Firstly, bilinguals acquired their languages simultaneously or sequentially. On the other hand, multilinguals can have different orders of acquisition. A multilingual can have several L1s and/or L2s depending on the time of acquisition which results in different outcomes. Also, the order of acquisition does not align with the language proficiency of each language. Secondly, multilinguals' proficiency in each language varies as it depends on factors such as register, occupation, and education, as each language has a different function and role in a multilingual's life. On the contrary, that can be partially true for bilinguals. Thirdly, society has higher expectations of balanced proficiency and/or literacy among bilinguals, than they have among

multilinguals. These high expectations can result in serious implications for everyday life, effects on social interactions, educational policies, professional opportunities, and overall well-being. Next, becoming a multilingual needs less effort than becoming a bilingual. Individuals who are already bilingual acquire languages faster due to their linguistic and mnemonic strategies, they are more efficient and flexible when using a language, they do not experience language anxiety, and they use their other languages as base languages to acquire other languages. Finally, multilinguals have higher crosslinguistic and metalinguistic awareness than bilinguals (Quay & Montanari, 2019, pp. 554-557).

The society, and mostly monolinguals, have certain misconceptions about bilinguals and multilinguals. They think that bilinguals/multilinguals are highly fluent in all of their languages, that they do not have an accent in either language, that they learnt all of their languages in childhood, and that they are usually seen as two monolinguals in one person. When in reality, many bilinguals/monolinguals are not equally fluent in their languages, many of them have accents in at least one of their languages, and many of them acquired their other language(s) in adolescence or adulthood (Grosjean, 2013, p. 7).

2.2. Language acquisition vs language learning

The terms “language acquisition” and “language learning” may seem identical; however, their meanings are completely different. Li (2009) defines acquisition as a process where learners subconsciously acquire a language through large amounts of contact and usage of the target language. Learners care more about the meanings of language but not its form. On the other hand, they define learning as a process where the learner consciously learns to master it. In language learning, the language form is the core of learning (Li, 2009, p. 125). Moeller and Catalano (2015) define acquisition as a process of learning first and second languages naturally, i.e., without formal instruction, and the term learning as a process of a formal study of second foreign languages usually in classroom settings (Moeller & Catalano, 2015, p. 327). Shine and Phil’s (2011) definition of acquisition is “... the process of natural assimilation, involving intuition and subconscious learning, which is the product of real interactions between people where the learner is an active participant” (Shine & Phil, 2011, p. 738). On the other hand, they define learning as a process that is “focused on the language in its written form and the objective is for the student to understand the structure and rules of the language through the application of intellect and logical deductive reasoning” (Shine & Phil, 2011, p. 738). To put it simply, language acquisition is usually implicit and subconscious, it usually occurs in informal situations, its speakers use grammatical “feel”, and there is a stable order of

acquisition. On the contrary, language learning is explicit and conscious, it occurs in formal situations, its speakers use grammatical rules, and the speakers learn the language in a simple to complex order (Krashen, 1981).

Most of the time, the terms “language acquisition” and “language learning” are closely connected with the terms “second language” and “foreign language”. Moeller and Catalano (2015) define a foreign language as a non-native language which is taught or learnt outside the environment where it is usually spoken, e.g., learning English in Croatia, whereas a second language is taught or acquired in the environment where the language is spoken, e.g., children living in Quebec, Canada who acquired both English and French through their environment (Moeller & Catalano, 2015, p. 327).

Ringbom (1980) explains several distinctions between “second language acquisition (SLA)” and “foreign language learning (FLL)”. Firstly, it depends on the learning situation and not on the learning process. Secondly, it depends on the particular environment the learner happens to live in. For example, in the coastal areas of Finland, Swedish is considered a second language as it is used in the community, while other parts of Finland have individuals who learn Swedish as a foreign language as they are not surrounded by the language. Thirdly, second language learners do not automatically reach higher language proficiency than foreign language learners. And lastly, there is a difference in the learning environment. In SLA the language is spoken in the immediate environment of the speaker, which leads to many opportunities for the speaker to practice and use the language in a natural situation. On the other hand, in FLL the language is not spoken in the immediate environment of the speaker which leads to few opportunities to practice language skills in natural communication situations (although, mass media may provide practice for listening and reading skills) (Ringbom, 1980, pp. 37-39). Ringbom also names four situational differences between second language acquisition and foreign language learning:

1. Time
 - a. SLA - more time is spent on the acquisition
 - b. FLL - less time can be spent on learning
2. Input
 - a. SLA – the input is rich and varied as the learner is exposed to samples of language which are rarely organised
 - b. FLL – the input is usually highly structured, selected, and sequenced
3. Teacher’s role

- a. SLA – mainly unguided discovery, i.e., learners acquire from peers which may be supplemented by classroom teaching
 - b. FLL – mainly guided discovery, i.e., it usually takes place in artificial classroom situations and/or by studying at home, there is hardly any learning from peers
4. Skills
- a. SLA – oral skill is highly important, comprehension of natural speech is important from the beginning
 - b. FLL – oral skills are less important as there is a dependence on written materials and there is an absence of a genuine need for communication. The skills are sequentially learnt as it depends on the aims and the methods of the course (Ringbom, 1980, p. 39)

3. LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TESTS

Language proficiency can be defined as the language learner's or user's communicative abilities, knowledge systems, and skills in that specific language (Harsch, 2017, p. 250). Stem (1991) introduced five language proficiency levels: elementary proficiency, limited working proficiency, minimum professional proficiency, full professional proficiency, and native or bilingual proficiency (Gharbavi & Mousavi, 2012, p. 113). These abilities and skills can be evaluated by solving language proficiency tests (Gharbavi & Mousavi, 2012, p. 111). Some well-known language proficiency tests are International English Language Proficiency Test (IELTS), Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), Occupational English Test (OET; designed for healthcare professionals), Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC), University of Cambridge English Language Assessment (UCELA), European Consortium for the Certificate of Attainment in Modern Languages (ECL), Oxford Test of English (OTE), etc. These tests measure a language user's four language skills, which are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The results of these tests are graded based on a certain scale (e.g. CEFR, ACTFL, ILR). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) is the most commonly used scale to grade someone's language proficiency. It uses six ascending levels of proficiency with a set of letters and numbers (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2) which can be regrouped into broader levels: Basic User, Independent User, and Proficient User (Harsch, 2017, p. 251) (Council of Europe, n.d.).

4. LANGUAGE EFFECT ON EMOTIONS AND PERSONALITY

People's emotions and personality traits are often linked to certain cultural aspects. As language and culture are closely connected, the properties of a specific language can play a role in how an individual expresses their emotions. This means that when switching languages, people may change the way that they express emotions, and their overall behaviour may become different. Chen et. al (2013) explain this phenomenon by stating: "Language use guides people's perceptual focus toward different aspects of the self and the world, and influences the way they see, think, and act" (Chen, Benet-Martínez, & Ng, 2013, p. 10).

4.1. Language effect on emotions

Ożańska-Ponikwia describes emotions as a "complex psychological experience of an individual's state of mind as interacting with biochemical (internal) and environmental (external) influence" (Ożańska-Ponikwia, 2013, p. 3). They continue the definition by citing Myers' (2014) description of emotion which states that "emotions involve 'psychological arousal, expressive behaviours, and conscious experience' which are associated with mood temperament, personality and disposition, and motivation" (Ożańska-Ponikwia, 2013, p. 3). Some emotions are universal and innate to everyone such as joy, distress, anger, fear, surprise, and disgust, while other emotions are learnt through culture which provides means of expressing them and/or a set of culture-specific emotions (Ożańska-Ponikwia, 2013, pp. 3, 5, 6). When analysing how and why language influences the expression of emotion it is important to state that languages supply speakers with certain labels of emotions which create the availability of certain emotional concepts. These emotional concepts are used to identify, understand, and label what an individual feels and how they experience certain events (Martinovic & Altarriba, 2013, p. 294).

Language teachers and learners often report that language learning is associated with strong emotions, such as positive and negative emotions. These emotions may play a great role in motivation for learning languages. Individuals who experience positive emotions while learning languages will be more motivated to continue learning the language, whereas individuals who experience negative emotions will probably quit learning the language (Stern, 1991, p. 375).

The individual's first language is mostly used for coding experiences in childhood which provide context for thoughts and feelings in the future. As late bilinguals usually learn their second or other languages in a formal environment (schools or universities) which are emotionally neutral, there is little or no opportunity to code emotional experiences (Martinovic & Altarriba, 2013, p. 294). These situations result in some key differences in emotional

expressions based on the used language. Firstly, multilinguals show bias when answering questions related to emotional topics in their native languages. When talking in their first language, they use a stronger expression to describe their feelings towards a certain topic than when describing the same thoughts and feelings in their other languages. Secondly, taboos and swear words are easier to express in the other languages than in the first language as the emotional connection to these types of words is weaker or non-existent in the other known languages (Martinovic & Altarriba, 2013, p. 294). As described in the examples it can be assumed that “the first language is the language of personal involvement and the second language is the language of distance and detachment or the language of lesser emotional hold on the individual” (Pavlenko, 2002, p. 47). Some studies show that bilinguals may perceive and discuss emotional states differently depending on the context of the event and the language in which it is recounted (Pavlenko, 2002, p. 50).

However, depending on the learning environment and situations, some late bilinguals may acquire emotional connections in their second language and express their thoughts and feelings to the same extent as in their first languages (Martinovic & Altarriba, 2013, p. 294). Pavlenko (2002) further elaborates by stating: “This possibility of internalization of new emotion categories, discourses, and scripts in adulthood – which, in turn, may lead to creation of new emotion links between the self and second language” (Pavlenko, 2002, p. 50).

Dewaele (2013) explains how the frequent use of languages can affect the emotional expressions, perceptions, and thoughts of multilinguals. Firstly, frequent use of language helps individuals gain confidence and makes them stop worrying about their accent or possible errors. Secondly, when using other languages to socialise, it increases the use of other languages to express emotions in the same way as in the first language. Lastly, the knowledge and use of more languages lowers the levels of foreign-language anxiety and individuals self-perceive higher in their language proficiency (Dewaele, 2013, pp. 3-4).

4.2. Language effect on personality

Eysenck (1971) defines personality as: “...the more or less stable and enduring organization of a person’s character, temperament, intellect and physique, which determines his unique adjustment to the environment” (Eysenck, 2013, p. 2). Eysenck elaborates some terms used in the definition:

Character denotes a person’s more or less stable and enduring system of affective behaviour (“will”); Temperament, his more or less stable and enduring system of affective behaviour (“emotion”); Intellect, his more or less stable and enduring system of cognitive behaviour (“intelligence”); Physique, his more or less stable and enduring system of bodily configuration and neuro-endocrine endowment. (Eysenck, 2013, p. 2)

Medved Krajnović and Juraga use and translate Petz's (1992) definition of personality as: "...a relatively stable whole which includes temperament, abilities, beliefs, interests, attitudes, values and motives, and is usually reflected in the person's behaviour in the environment" (Medved Krajnović & Juraga, 2008, p. 350). The term "character trait" is also simultaneously used with the term "personality". The word "trait" can be described as a habitual pattern of behaviours, thoughts, and emotions. Character traits are divided into "central" and "secondary" traits. Central traits are those traits by which an individual can be recognised or characterised, whereas secondary traits are those traits that can be recognised within a certain culture (Ożańska-Ponikwia, 2013, p. 10).

Psycholinguists, psychologists, and linguistic anthropologists who conducted studies on bilinguals noted that bicultural bilinguals (biculturalism further explained in the next chapter) may demonstrate different verbal behaviours in the two languages and may be perceived differently by others depending on the language they use in that particular moment (Pavlenko, 2006, p. 27). Some bilinguals notice these slight changes when responding to interviews and questionnaires by stating that they make different responses to objective or projective questions, some responses may be more emotional in one language than in the other, and their ethnic identity may be stronger in one language than in the other, and so forth (Edwards, 2013, p. 21). There are also instances in which bilinguals change their body language, facial expressions or intonation while switching languages. For example, in some cases, bilinguals become loud and energetic and in other instances, they become more reserved and distanced after switching languages (Ożańska-Ponikwia, 2011, pp. 217-218). Wilson (2008, cited in Ożańska-Ponikwia, 2011) describes a situation that happened with their mother where their behaviour visibly changed with a language switch:

One day, I was talking on the telephone in Italian while my mother, who was visiting me from England, was sitting nearby. When I finished the call, she commented, "I only know it's you when you laugh." Did I really sound so different in another language? I was aware that I must look different because my right hand had been gesturing and waving of its own volition while I talked. Speaking English felt different from speaking Italian, but surely that was because I was talking to my Mother. (Ożańska-Ponikwia, 2011, p. 218)

When late bilinguals were asked to describe how they "feel" different when switching languages, they reported by saying that in L1 they feel "real" and "natural", whereas in their learnt languages they feel "fake" and "artificial" (Dewaele & Nakano, 2012, pp. 3-4). Wilson (2008, cited in Dewaele and Nakano, 2012) reports that female participants and participants with a higher level of education are more likely to affirmatively report feeling different when using a different language (Dewaele & Nakano, 2012, p. 4). Dewaele and Nakano (2012)

conducted a study among late multilinguals and they reported based on the results that multilinguals feel more authentic, more logical, more emotional, and more serious in their L1 with gradually lower values for languages they acquired later in life and in which they felt less proficient (Dewaele & Nakano, 2012, p. 11).

When talking about language's effect on personality it is important to mention the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. E. Sapir states that languages influence the way a person views the world (Medved Krajnović & Juraga, 2008, p. 354). B. Whorf states that the language a person uses in their mind organizes the impressions they get from the world (Medved Krajnović & Juraga, 2008, p. 354). When combining both of their hypothesis it can be concluded that thought is influenced by the semantic categories of one's native language, and as a result, speakers of different languages think differently (Regier & Xu, 2017, p. 1).

Many authors try to explain why this behavioural change happens in many bilinguals. A bilingual individual who has a deep linguistic and cultural burrowing into another community will feel a great impact on their identity (Edwards, 2013, p. 21). Pavlenko (2006) explains that to a person each language is “linked to different linguistic repertoires, cultural scripts, frames of expectations; autobiographic memories, and levels of proficiency and emotionality” which contribute to “feeling” different when switching languages (Pavlenko, 2006, p. 27). Pavlenko (2002) also adds that when learning a new language, a person not only learns new vocabulary and the rules of syntax but also learns “to associate words and verbal patterns with particular scripts” which hold certain values in the culture associated with that language (Pavlenko, 2002, p. 72). Dewaele and Nakano (2012) explain that certain perceptions of languages sometimes have an impact on the way a person sees themselves when using the language: “...a language perceived to be more colourful, rich, poetic and emotional seems to make the pentilinguals feel more colourful, rich, poetic and emotional” (Dewaele & Nakano, 2012, p. 11).

Not only does language affect personality, but personality itself can have great effects on language acquisition and production, as well as cross-cultural adaptation. According to Stern (1991), certain character traits can be crucial for successful language acquisition such as positive task orientation, ego-involvement, need for achievement, high level of aspiration, goal orientation, and perseverance (Stern, 1991, p. 380). Furthermore, extraversion can be a benefit when learning languages as it helps with the development of communicative skills as an extravert will more likely actively use their language knowledge to talk with others, while an introvert will keep their thoughts to themselves. Stern continues by stating that empathy also helps language learners as they try to understand and copy the behaviour of the users of the

target language (Stern, 1991, pp. 380-381). Another character trait that can help language learners is tolerance of ambiguity. Language learners who accept with patience the frustrations that come with language learning will have no problem emotionally coping with ambiguous situations (Stern, 1991, p. 382). Kim states that (2001) character traits such as Openness, Personality Strength, and Positivity have an impact on cross-cultural adaptation. Openness helps individuals to minimise their resistance and maximises their willingness to be a part of new and changed environments and also to perceive and interpret various events with no ethnocentric judgements. Openness helps people to acquire new knowledge, and to participate in communicative situations in a new environment. It is also connected with other character traits such as flexibility, open-mindedness, and tolerance for ambiguity. Personality Strength enables an individual to absorb culture shocks and bounce back without serious emotional damage. People with high levels of personality strength often have attributes such as resilience, risk-taking, hardiness, persistence, elasticity, and resourcefulness. On the other hand, people with low levels of personality strength can be described as shy, fearful, and feeling distress in unknown situations. Finally, Positivity (which is linked to Personality Strength) helps an individual to have an optimistic outlook on life and the “capacity to defy negative prediction”. It helps people to endure stressful situations better and it encourages the acceptance of others regardless of their differences. It is often connected with other attributes such as self-esteem, self-trust, and self-efficacy. These character traits help language learners develop communication competence and make self-adjustments for intercultural transformation. Language learners who lack these character traits have no adaptive capacity to interculturally transform (Kim, 2001, pp. 84-85).

However, certain language learners may experience negative effects of language learning on their personalities. Learners may experience “infantilization” a state where language learners sense disorientation and loss of status as they are dependent on others such as their language teacher and their friends in the language setting. This is only a phase of personal development as with time the learner will acquire internal language standards and competences to become independent. Individuals who are mature, mentally healthy, detached, self-critical, and have a sense of humour will cope with this phase much better than those who do not have those character traits (Stern, 1991, p. 382).

5. BICULTURALISM AND CULTURAL FRAME SWITCHING

Language and culture are inseparable. While speaking a certain language we express our thoughts, beliefs, and values which are closely connected to our culture. Bilinguals who

have lived or are living in an environment where two cultures mix may be influenced by both cultures which makes them bicultural individuals. Nguyen and Benet-Martínez (2007) define biculturalism as “...the synthesis of cultural norms from two groups into one behavioural repertoire, or the ability to switch between cultural schemas, norms, and behaviours in response to cultural cues” (Nguyen & Benet-Martínez, 2007, p. 102). Biculturalism has a large impact on certain bilinguals especially on their personal level (psychological and cultural) and on their cognition, language knowledge, and language processing (Grosjean, 2013, pp. 21-22). Some characteristics of bicultural bilinguals are that they take part in the life of two or more cultures; they adapt their attitudes, behaviours, values, etc. to these cultures; and they combine and blend aspects of both cultures (Grosjean, 2013, p. 22). Nguyen and Benet-Martínez (2007) name four types of acculturation positions that a bilingual may experience:

1. Assimilation - a bilingual involves and identifies only with the dominant culture
2. Integration - a bilingual involves and identifies with both cultures (biculturalism)
3. Separation – a bilingual involves and identifies only with the ethnic culture
4. Marginalization – a bilingual lacks involvement and identification with either culture (Nguyen & Benet-Martínez, 2007, p. 103)

These acculturation changes can happen in different domains of life, such as language use or preference, social affiliation, communication style, cultural identity and pride, and cultural knowledge, beliefs, and values (Nguyen & Benet-Martínez, 2007, p. 103).

It is also important to emphasise that not all bilinguals are bicultural, nor are all biculturals bilingual (e.g., British living in the USA). There are two types of bilinguals: monocultural bilinguals and bicultural bilinguals. Monocultural bilinguals are those individuals who never internalised the culture of their second language. On the other hand, bicultural bilinguals are those individuals who have internalised two cultures and speak the languages related to those cultures (Luna, Ringberg, & Peracchio, 2008, pp. 279-278). There are some key differences between monocultural bilinguals and bicultural bilinguals. Firstly, the monoculturals’ knowledge of the other culture is not linked to their self-relevant identity construct. In other words, their knowledge of the other culture has no effect on how they view themselves. Secondly, biculturals have a richer and more complex knowledge about their belonging to each of the two cultures. And finally, biculturals have two distinctive and complete sets of knowledge structures for each culture, while monoculturals have one set of such structures for their own culture and have “second-hand” knowledge of the other culture (Luna, Ringberg, & Peracchio, 2008, p. 280). Grosjean (2008) to further explain this

phenomenon states that: “bilinguals can usually deactivate one language and only use the other in particular situations (at least to a very great extent), whereas biculturals cannot always deactivate certain traits of their other culture when in a monocultural environment” (Grosjean, 2008, p. 215).

Some bicultural bilinguals experience a change in their thoughts and behaviour when speaking in the other language. This phenomenon is called “cultural frame switching” or “cross-cultural code-switching”. This switch occurs because bicultural bilinguals have “distinct cognitive frameworks” which are related to each of their cultures and languages and those “mental frames” have different ranges of values, beliefs and behaviours and also separate worldviews and identities (Luna, Ringberg, & Peracchio, 2008, p. 279). Molinsky (2007) defines “cross-cultural code-switching” as “the act of purposefully modifying one’s behaviour, in a specific interaction in a foreign setting, to accommodate different cultural norms for appropriate behaviour” (Molinsky, 2007, p. 623). In order for an individual to switch correctly and effectively, they have to possess knowledge of the appropriate norms and behaviours in the other culture (Molinsky, 2007, p. 626). While performing a switch, it may have a psychological toll on the individual. If the switch was performed poorly, it threatens the individual’s face and sense of efficacy which results in embarrassment and performance anxiety. On the other hand, if the switch was performed correctly, the individual feels positive emotions such as pride, confidence, contentment, and excitement (Molinsky, 2007, p. 627).

6. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Before explaining the present research, some pieces of previous research should be introduced that were on the same or similar topic which is personality changes in bilinguals. Roselli, Vélez-Urbe, and Ardila (2017) conducted a study among Spanish-English bilinguals from South Florida. Participants were 134 college students who were also members of the community and lived in a bilingual environment. Most participants stated that Spanish was their native language, except 11 participants who stated both languages as native. On average they started acquiring English at the age of 5.29 years. Their language proficiency was tested using the self-rated Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (abbr. LEAP-Q) which showed that the participants were highly proficient in both languages, although, showed higher results in English due to their formal education being conducted in that language. In order to test their cultural identity, language competence, and cultural competence, participants were given the Abbreviated Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (abbr. AMAS-ZABB). The results also showed similarity between languages which means that biculturalism was detected

and confirmed. To evaluate their personality dimension, the researchers used the Big Five Inventory (BFI) (by John et. al, 1999) which was conducted both in Spanish and English. The BFI results showed that Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness were higher in English than in Spanish. On the other hand, Neuroticism was higher in Spanish than in English. When further analysing results from the AMAS-ZABB and BFI the authors made a conclusion that: “Neuroticism in English was significantly correlated with US cultural identity meaning that higher neuroticism was associated with less cultural identity to the US culture...” (Roselli, Vélez-Urbe, & Ardila, 2017, p. 265). Also, 46.2% of the participants reported feeling like a different person when switching languages. However, this feeling did not correlate with scores with other subscales which indicates that the participants had: “...a subjective feeling induced by other factors, or to limitations in the ability to notice subtle changes in behaviour, rather to the lack of them” (Roselli, Vélez-Urbe, & Ardila, 2017, p. 266).

One of the most important research projects related to this topic was conducted by Ramírez-Esparza, Gosling, Benet-Martínez, Potter, and Pennebaker in 2006. They conducted 4 studies among Spanish, English, and Spanish-English bilinguals to establish and document the “cultural frame switching” effect in the personality domain. They used Spanish-English bilinguals as there is a belief that Spanish speakers have different values and attitudes than English speakers. In the first conducted study the participants were already part of the Gosling-Potter Internet Personality Project. They chose participants who lived in Mexico or the USA and had not taken the BFI test before. In total there were 168 451 participants from the USA and 1031 participants from Mexico. The participants solved the BFI test through the website www.outofservice.com and were given the results immediately for the purposes of self-insight and/or entertainment. The results of the BFI for study 1 showed that participants from the USA had higher means of Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness. On the other hand, participants from Mexico had higher means of Neuroticism. Through studies 2-4, the authors tested 3 independent samples of bilinguals: 25 bilinguals from Austin, Texas; 54 bilinguals from the USA and Mexico; and 170 bilinguals from the San Francisco Bay Area, California. To ensure the criteria for bilingualism were met the participants went through two interviews. The first interview was conducted by phone in both languages to test the confidence in using the languages. The second interview was conducted as a face-to-face interview to gather information about the general background and again test the confidence in using the languages. Also, to ensure bilingual proficiency the participants were given questionnaires for self-reporting of proficiency and experience in both languages. After this careful participant

selection, they were given two BFI questionnaires; one in English and one in Spanish. The results partially matched the results from study 1 as all three groups of bilinguals scored higher on Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness in English than in Spanish, and scored higher on Neuroticism in Spanish than in English. However, the score for Openness was higher in Spanish than in English which differed from the results in study 1. In the discussion, the authors concluded that: "...an extrovert does not suddenly become an introvert as she switches languages; instead a bilingual becomes more extraverted when she speaks English rather than Spanish but retains her rank ordering within each of the groups" (Ramírez-Esparza, Gosling, Benet-Martínez, Potter, & Pennebaker, 2006, p. 115).

Chen and Bond (2010) conducted two studies among Chinese-English bilinguals in Hong Kong in order to uncover the mechanisms underlying the language effect on personalities in the bilingual context. In the first study, the participants were asked to self-identify their bilingual perception of their traits and prototypic traits in Chinese- and English-speaking cultures. The participants were 213 university students who were born and raised in the Chinese culture, but all were compound bilinguals. The instruments used in this study were a BFI questionnaire that was translated into Chinese and the Language proficiency and usage test which enabled the participants to self-report on both their first and second languages in the following domains: language ability, past and present language usage, and media exposure. Participants were asked to report how they perceive native English speakers, native Chinese speakers, and themselves as Chinese-English bilinguals. The results showed that native English speakers were perceived to be higher on the Extraversion, Agreeableness and Openness to Experience dimensions of personality than native Chinese speakers. On the other hand, native Chinese speakers were perceived to be higher on the Neuroticism and Conscientiousness dimensions of personalities than native English speakers. The participants' self-rating results corresponded with the results of native English and Chinese speakers. In the second study, the authors evaluated whether bilinguals change their perceived prototypic traits of the culture when primed by the spoken language and interlocutor ethnicity. In addition to the self-reports used in the first study, the researchers also used behavioural observation to assess the self-perceived personality and the personality perceived by others. The used instruments were the Language proficiency and usage test and the Sino-American Person Perception Scale (abbr. SAPPs) which measures individuals on eight orthogonal dimensions of personality: Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Application, Openness to Experience, Assertiveness, Restraint, Helpfulness, and Intellect. The chosen participants were 76 female Chinese-English bilinguals whose grades were C or above in both languages. The study also used four interviewers, who

were male and were fluent in English and Cantonese, but two interviewers were Caucasian and the other two were Hong Kong Chinese. After the participants filled in the BFI questionnaire, they were interviewed for 10 minutes by one Caucasian interviewer and one Hong Kong Chinese interviewer in both languages. The content of the interviews was general information about the participants, their hobbies, and their social activities. The interviews were video recorded (but showed only the participant) and those videotapes were independently shown to two bilinguals who observed and assessed the participants' behaviours during the experiment. After the interviews, the participants were asked to rate themselves on a scale from 0 (no difference) to 5 (very different) on how they perceived their own personality change when switching languages. The results of the study showed that participants perceived English native speakers as more emotionally stable, extroverted, open to experience, assertive, and helpful than Chinese native speakers. On the other hand, they perceived Chinese native speakers as more restrained and higher on application than English native speakers. They rated themselves between English native speakers and Chinese native speakers, except for Helpfulness which was closer to Chinese native speakers. After reviewing the footage, the two observers concluded that the participants were more extroverted, open to experience, assertive, helpful, and higher on application and intellect when communicating with Caucasian interviewers than with Hong Kong Chinese interviewers. When talking with Hong Kong Chinese interviewers in English they were perceived as more extraverted, open, assertive, helpful, and higher on application and intellect than when talking with them in Cantonese. No difference in emotional stability was detected. The participants also seemed more reserved and restrained when conversing in English with Hong Kong Chinese interviewers than with Caucasian interviewers. However, there was no difference when conversing in Cantonese. The authors concluded the findings by saying: "When bilinguals interacted with interlocutors from different cultures, they showed characteristics corresponding to their perceptions of normative personality in those cultures" (Chen & Bond, 2010, p. 1526).

Veltkamp, Recio, Jacobs, and Conrad conducted a study in 2013 where they wanted to find out whether similar results could be achieved by late German-Spanish bilinguals as the results found by Ramírez-Esparza et. al research in 2006. Their participants were 68 university students from the Freie Universität in Berlin, Germany. 40 participants were German native speakers, and the other 28 were Spanish native speakers. All the participants acquired their second language after the age of 12. All participants were also multilingual as they reported knowing at least two other languages. Participants self-assessed their language knowledge by filling in the Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (abbr. LEAP-Q), and they

also underwent a brief interview to further determine their bilingual skills. To assess their dimensions of personality the participants were given two NEO-Five Factor Personality Inventory (abbr. NEO-FFI), one in German and one in Spanish. The questionnaire consisted of 60 questions divided into Big Five domains (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness). The result of the conducted research showed that participants scored higher on Extraversion and Neuroticism in the Spanish version of the questionnaire, but they scored higher on Agreeability in the German version of the questionnaire. There was no significant difference in scores between both versions of the questionnaire on personality domains Conscientiousness and Openness (Veltkamp, Recio, Jacobs, & Conrad, 2013).

Medved Krajnović and Juraga (2008) conducted a study among two groups of 186 students at the University of Zagreb. The first group were students of the English language and Literature from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, and the second group were students of Economics and Public Administration from the Faculty of Economics and Business. The main research question was: “Do bilingual or multilingual Croatian speakers of English as a foreign language feel that their personality, or part of it, changes when they communicate in their respective languages?” (Medved Krajnović & Juraga, 2008, p. 358). The participants were given a questionnaire in which they had to answer a question: “Do you think that language and personality are connected, in the sense that an individual’s personality, or some of its parts, changes when using different languages?” (Medved Krajnović & Juraga, 2008, p. 360). The results for the entire sample showed that 24% of the participants chose the option “Yes” and the option “There is only one personality, but language learning changes it”. Only, 4% of the participants chose the option “It depends”. And the majority of participants (48%) chose the option “No”. When analysing the answers from the two groups separately, options “No” and “It depends” show little variations between the two groups. On the other hand, the results of the options “Yes” and “There is only one personality, but language learning changes it” have a significant difference between the groups, and they are inverted. Group 1 answered 31% for the option “Yes” and 17% for the option “There is only one personality, but language learning changes it”. Whereas group 2 answered 17% for the option “Yes” and 31% for the option “There is only one personality, but language learning changes it”. Even though the majority of the participants think that language does not change personality, the 24% of students who answered affirmatively should not be ignored as these individuals put a special emphasis on foreign language learning by stating that language creates “a possibility for developing and enriching one’s personality and worldview” (Medved Krajnović & Juraga, 2008, p. 369).

7. AIM AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The aim of this study was to investigate if Croatian speakers of English report having different character traits depending on their language use.

Research questions:

- Do Croatian EFL students experience a change in their character traits when using English?
- Is there a difference in the participants' reported character traits while using English between different EFL proficiency groups?
- Which of the Big Five Factors dimension of personalities change the most and which the least in Croatian EFL students when using English?

8. METHODOLOGY

8.1. *Participants*

The participants were students from the Faculty of Teacher Education in Zagreb. One part of the participants were fourth- and fifth-year students who are enrolled in the study programme which specialises in primary education and the English language, while the other part were second-year students who are enrolled in the study programme which specialises in preschool education. In total there were 94 participants of whom 50 (53%) participants were future teachers of English to primary school pupils, and the rest 44 (47%) participants were future preschool teachers.

Students of English have learnt English as a foreign language for 17 years ($M = 16.88$), while students of preschool education have learnt it for 13 years ($M = 12.95$). When it comes to the level of knowledge of the English language, students of English throughout their study program have in total 41 compulsory courses which are mostly conducted in English, which ensure students to reach the C1 (or C2) language level according to the CEFR. On the other hand, students of preschool education have in total only 2 compulsory courses related to the English language and most of them reach the B2 language level according to the CEFR. The results of the language proficiency test used in the research project coincide and confirm that English teacher students have higher language proficiency ($M = 12.10$) than preschool teacher students ($M = 9.34$).

8.2. *Instruments and procedure*

Each participant was given two sets of questionnaires and one English language proficiency test (Appendix 2 and Appendix 3). Firstly, the participants were given some general information about the research. Before handing out the instruments, the participants gave their

consent to take part in this research. As the procedure was done in a live environment, the participants gave their consent verbally. However, they could withdraw from the research at any moment without providing an explanation for doing so. Prior to filling in the instrument, participants were given detailed instructions on how to fill in the two questionnaires and the language proficiency test. The instructions were given in Croatian to avoid confusion. Also, they were encouraged to ask further questions if something was still unclear. The estimated time for filling out the instruments was approximately 15 to 20 minutes.

The instrument consisted of two sets of the same questionnaire and one English language proficiency test. The questionnaires were written in Croatian, while the English language proficiency test was written in English. On the first page of the instrument (Appendix 1), there was general information about the research and the consent form for the research in a written form. At the bottom of the page, there were three questions related to general information about the participant. The first two questions were related to the type of study programme in which the participants were enrolled, and the last, third question asked their number of years of studying English as a foreign language.

The first part of the instrument is the questionnaire (Appendix 2). The questionnaire was a Big Five test created by O. P. John and S. Srivastava in 1999 which consisted of 44 statements that measure individuals on the Big Five Factors dimensions of personality. The Big Five Factors dimensions of personality are extraversion vs. introversion, agreeableness vs. antagonism, conscientiousness vs. lack of direction, neuroticism vs. emotional stability, and openness vs. closedness to experience. The participants were required to answer each statement with a number from 1 to 5, or to be more precise, answer on a scale from disagree strongly (number 1) to agree strongly (number 5) to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with a certain statement. An example of a statement: "Do you agree that you are someone who likes to spend time with others?" The participants in this research were given two sets of the same Big Five test. One test asked the participants to answer the statements while thinking about how they act, feel, or think while they speak in Croatian, and in the other test how they act, feel, or think while they speak in English.

The second and last part of the instrument is an English language proficiency test (Appendix 3). The test was given to the participants to avoid generalizing their levels of language proficiency in English. The questions were taken from the British Council mobile app called *British Council English Score* as the given questions seemed the most reliable and the given results were accurate. When taking the actual test via the mobile app, the language proficiency test takes approximately 30 to 45 minutes to complete it. However, due to time

efficiency, the actual proficiency test was shortened for research purposes. The language proficiency test had 11 multiple-choice questions, and it was organized into two parts. The first part consisted of 10 questions related to grammar, vocabulary, and syntax in which the participants had to fill in the correct word structure to complete the sentences. Lastly, the second part of the test was a reading comprehension task in which the participants had to read a short text and answer 3 questions related to the given text.

9. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

9.1. Results

The data collected in this research were analysed with the statistical program *the jamovi project* (Version 2.3). In order to answer the research questions, a descriptive and a comparative analyses were carried out.

9.1.1. BFI results of the Croatian part of the questionnaire

Table 1

Descriptive analysis of BFI scores of the Croatian part of the questionnaire divided by groups of participants

	Group	N	M	SE	Mdn	SD
Extraversion CRO	USENG	50	28.0	0.91	29.0	6.42
	RPOO	44	27.1	0.88	28.0	5.83
Agreeableness CRO	USENG	50	35.1	0.63	35.0	4.46
	RPOO	44	35.0	0.63	35.0	4.18
Conscientiousness CRO	USENG	50	31.0	1.02	31.0	7.24
	RPOO	44	32.3	0.57	32.5	3.77
Neuroticism CRO	USENG	50	25.2	0.81	24.5	5.75
	RPOO	44	25.3	0.75	24.5	4.97
Openness CRO	USENG	50	37.4	0.92	37.5	6.52
	RPOO	44	36.7	0.85	37.0	5.62

The results presented in Table 1 show that future English teacher students scored higher on Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Openness, and future preschool teachers scored higher on Conscientiousness and Neuroticism in the Croatian part of the BFI questionnaire. However, this can only be interpreted as a trend as the mean differences between the groups are minimal and not statistically significant. The greatest mean difference was found for Conscientiousness (-1.3); whereas the smallest mean difference was found for Agreeableness and Neuroticism (-) (0.1).

9.1.2. Comparing Croatian and English BFI scores by group

Table 2

Descriptive analysis of Croatian and English BFI scores of future English teachers

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>SE</i>
Extraversion CRO USENG	50	28.0	29.0	6.42	0.91
Extraversion ENG USENG	50	29.7	30.0	5.80	0.82
Agreeableness CRO USENG	50	35.1	35.0	4.46	0.63
Agreeableness ENG USENG	50	36.4	37.0	4.46	0.63
Conscientiousness CRO USENG	50	31.0	31.0	7.24	1.02
Conscientiousness ENG USENG	50	32.8	34.0	5.86	0.83
Neuroticism CRO USENG	50	25.2	24.5	5.75	0.81
Neuroticism ENG USENG	50	22.6	21.5	6.05	0.86
Openness CRO USENG	50	37.4	37.5	6.52	0.92
Openness ENG USENG	50	37.6	38.0	6.74	0.95

By comparing the results in Table 2 it can be depicted that future English teachers experience a change in their character traits when switching languages. They scored higher on Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness in English, and scored higher on Neuroticism in Croatian. The greatest mean difference can be depicted for Neuroticism (2.6) and the smallest mean difference for Openness (-0.2).

Table 3

Paired Samples T-Test of Croatian and English BFI scores of future English teachers

			<i>statistic</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>SED</i>
Extraversion CRO USENG	Extraversion ENG USENG	Student's t	-2.834	49.0	0.007	-1.78	0.63
Agreeableness CRO USENG	Agreeableness ENG USENG	Student's t	-3.052	49.0	0.004	-1.30	0.43
Conscientiousness CRO USENG	Conscientiousness ENG USENG	Student's t	-3.126	49.0	0.003	-1.78	0.57
Neuroticism CRO USENG	Neuroticism ENG USENG	Student's t	4.596	49.0	<.001	2.68	0.58
Openness CRO USENG	Openness ENG USENG	Student's t	-0.340	49.0	0.735	-0.18	0.53

Note. $H_a \mu_{\text{Measure 1}} - \mu_{\text{Measure 2}} \neq 0$

To compare the Croatian and English BFI results of future English teachers, a Paired Samples T-Test was conducted (Table 3). The results of the test show that when talking in English, future English teachers scored meaningfully higher in Extraversion ($t(49) = -2.834$, p

= 0.007), Agreeableness ($t(49) = -3.052, p = 0.004$), and Conscientiousness ($t(49) = -3.126, p = 0.003$), and scored lower in Neuroticism ($t(49) = 4.596, p < .001$). The score for Openness shows no meaningful difference between the languages ($t(49) = -0.340, p = 0.735$).

Table 4

Descriptive analysis of Croatian and English BFI scores of future preschool teachers

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>SE</i>
Extraversion CRO RPOO	44	27.1	28.0	5.83	0.88
Extraversion ENG RPOO	44	24.3	23.5	7.29	1.00
Agreeableness CRO RPOO	44	35.0	35.0	4.18	0.63
Agreeableness ENG RPOO	44	36.0	36.0	3.43	0.52
Conscientiousness CRO RPOO	44	32.3	32.5	3.77	0.57
Conscientiousness ENG RPOO	44	30.5	31.0	5.39	0.81
Neuroticism CRO RPOO	44	25.3	24.5	4.97	0.75
Neuroticism ENG RPOO	44	25.1	25.0	5.84	0.88
Openness CRO RPOO	44	36.7	37.0	5.62	0.85
Openness ENG RPOO	44	33.2	34.0	7.43	1.12

As seen in Table 4, future preschool teachers also experience a change in their character traits when switching languages. They scored lower on Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness, and scored higher on Agreeableness in English. The greatest mean difference can be depicted for Openness (3.5) and the smallest mean difference for Neuroticism (0.1).

Table 5

Paired Samples T-Test of Croatian and English BFI scores of future preschool teachers

			<i>statistic</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>SED</i>
Extraversion CRO RPOO	Extraversion ENG RPOO	Student's t	3.208	43.0	0.003	2.82	0.88
Agreeableness CRO RPOO	Agreeableness ENG RPOO	Student's t	-1.990	43.0	0.053	-1.00	0.50
Conscientiousness CRO RPOO	Conscientiousness ENG RPOO	Student's t	2.506	43.0	0.016	1.70	0.72
Neuroticism CRO RPOO	Neuroticism ENG RPOO	Student's t	0.230	43.0	0.819	0.14	0.59
Openness CRO RPOO	Openness ENG RPOO	Student's t	3.841	43.0	< .001	3.48	0.91

statistic *df* *p* *MD* *SED*

Note. $H_a \mu_{\text{Measure 1}} - \mu_{\text{Measure 2}} \neq 0$

A Paired Samples T-Test (Table 5) was used to compare the Croatian and English BFI results of future preschool teachers. The results of the test show that when talking in English, future preschool teachers scored meaningfully lower in Extraversion ($t(43) = 3.208, p = 0.003$), Conscientiousness ($t(43) = 2.506, p = 0.016$), and Openness ($t(43) = 3.841, p < .001$). The score for Agreeableness and Neuroticism shows no meaningful difference between the languages ($t(43) = -1.990, p = 0.053$; $t(43) = 0.230, p = 0.819$).

9.1.3. Conjoined BFI results and analysis of the English part of the questionnaire

Table 6

Descriptive analysis of BFI scores of the English part of the questionnaire divided by groups of participants

	<i>Group</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>SE</i>
Extraversion ENG	USENG	50	29.7	30.0	5.80	0.82
	RPOO	44	24.3	23.5	7.29	1.00
Agreeableness ENG	USENG	50	36.4	37.0	4.46	0.63
	RPOO	44	36.0	36.0	3.43	0.52
Conscientiousness ENG	USENG	50	32.8	34.0	5.86	0.83
	RPOO	44	30.5	31.0	5.39	0.81
Neuroticism ENG	USENG	50	22.6	21.5	6.05	0.86
	RPOO	44	25.1	25.0	5.84	0.88
Openness ENG	USENG	50	37.6	38.0	6.74	0.95
	RPOO	44	33.2	34.0	7.43	1.12

By comparing the results of the English part of the questionnaire between groups (Table 6) it can be concluded that future English teachers scored higher on Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness in English than future preschool teachers. Whereas preschool teachers scored higher on Neuroticism in English than future English teachers.

Table 7

Independent samples T-test analysis of BFI scores of the English part of the questionnaire

		<i>Statistic</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>SED</i>
Extraversion ENG	Student's t	4.028	92.0	< .001	5.45	1.35
Agreeableness ENG	Student's t	0.489	92.0	0.626	0.41	0.83

		<i>Statistic</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>SED</i>
Conscientiousness ENG	Student's t	1.917	92.0	0.058	2.24	1.17
Neuroticism ENG	Student's t	-2.076	92.0	0.041	-2.55	1.23
Openness ENG	Student's t	2.977	92.0	0.004	4.35	1.46

Note. $H_a \mu_{USENG} \neq \mu_{RPOO}$

An Independent Samples T-Test (Table 7) was conducted to find out whether there is a difference in the participants' reported character traits while using English between the two different EFL proficiency groups. As a result of the Independent Samples T-Test analysis, this study found that future English teachers scored significantly higher on Extraversion ($M = 29.7$) than future preschool teachers ($M = 24.3$), $t(92) = 4.028$, $p < .001$. Furthermore, they also scored somewhat higher on Openness ($M = 37.6$) than preschool teacher students ($M = 33.2$), $t(92) = 2.977$, $p = 0.004$. On the other hand, future preschool teachers scored slightly higher on Neuroticism ($M = 25.1$) than future English teachers ($M = 22.6$), $t(92) = 2.076$, $p = 0.041$. The results for Agreeableness and Conscientiousness show no significant score differences ($M = 36.4$, $M = 36.0$, $t(92) = 0.489$, $p = 0.626$; $M = 32.8$, $M = 30.5$, $t(92) = 1.917$, $p = 0.058$).

9.2. Discussion

The aim of this research was to investigate if Croatian speakers of English report having different character traits depending on their language use. To answer the formed research questions the scores of the BFI questionnaire between two groups of participants, future English teachers, and future preschool teachers, were analysed. The results showed some significant differences between the two groups.

9.2.1 BFI results of future English teachers

When comparing results between the Croatian and English parts of the BFI questionnaire, future English teachers scored higher on Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness in English than in Croatian. On the other hand, their score for Neuroticism was higher in Croatian than in English. However, it should be pointed out that the significant differences between the Croatian and English parts of the questionnaires were in Extraversion ($p = 0.007$), Agreeableness ($p = 0.004$), Conscientiousness ($p = 0.003$), and Neuroticism ($p < .001$). The difference in scores on Openness is minor and cannot be considered as a statistically significant difference ($p = 0.735$). However, it does show a trend in the Openness the participants report when using the English language.

The results obtained in this research share similarities with the previously conducted research, especially with the research conducted by Ramirez-Esparza et al. (2006) and Roselli et al. (2017). In their studies, where the participants were native English and Spanish speakers

and Spanish-English bilinguals, they also found out that the personality dimensions Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness were higher in English whereas Neuroticism was higher in Spanish. There are even some similarities with the research conducted by Chen and Bond (2010) with Chinese-English bilinguals. In their results, personality dimensions Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Openness were higher in English and Neuroticism and Conscientiousness were higher in Chinese. It is important to mention that the results for certain character traits may change as they are closely intertwined with the culture where the research was conducted. McCrae (2005) explains that certain personality domains can be attributed to certain cultures. For example, societies that score high on Extraversion have cultures that have democratic values and put an emphasis on individualism, which is common among Western cultures. Openness and Agreeableness are also connected to high individualism as open cultures can be characterised by independence and unconventionality (McCrae, 2005, p. 416).

Based on the obtained research results, it can be concluded that future English teachers do experience changes in character traits, which share similarities with the results obtained from previous research done on bilinguals. However, it poses some questions about whether these changes in character traits are the result of the influence of languages on personality or the influence of cultural and ethnic communities from the target language (Medved Krajnović & Juraga, 2008, p. 36).

Grosjean (2008) names the three factors which are needed for a person to become a bicultural bilingual: acquaintance with the two languages and cultures, family and personal experience, and general perception and reception of the two cultures (Grosjean, 2008, p. 219). With certainty, it can be confirmed that future English teachers are acquainted with both the languages and cultures in question. The results of the language proficiency test confirm that they are fluent in English ($M = 12.10$) and by analysing the syllabus of the study programme it can be concluded that future teacher students have a broad knowledge of the English-speaking culture. As future English teachers have only been exposed to the English-speaking culture indirectly (mostly through media), most of the participants do not have family in the English-speaking countries or personal experience related to such countries. However, some general perceptions and the reception of the target language's culture should have developed through learning and exposure to other cultures.

Some other factors that contribute to achieving biculturalism and can be attributed to future English teachers are that their frequent language use and language knowledge increase the use of the target language to express emotions in the same way as in the first language

(Dewaele, 2013, pp. 3-4). Also, each language has its own linguistic repertoires and cultural scripts which prompt bicultural bilinguals to feel different when switching languages (Pavlenko, 2006, p. 27). When presented with stimuli relevant to a particular culture, bicultural bilinguals change their values and self-image (Dewaele & Nakano, 2012, p. 2).

It is important to clarify that none of the participants identify themselves as citizens of an English-speaking country. However, based on these results it can be confirmed that future English teachers show signs of biculturalism and “cultural frame switching” when using English.

9.2.2 BFI results of future preschool teachers

As already stated, future preschool teachers scored lower on Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness in English than in Croatian. However, their score on Agreeableness was higher in English than in Croatian. The results for Extraversion ($p = 0.003$), Conscientiousness ($p = 0.016$), and Openness ($p < .001$) should be taken into consideration as they show statistically significant differences between the Croatian and English BFI scores. Scores for Agreeableness ($p = 0.053$) and Neuroticism ($p = 0.819$) show no significant difference.

When further analysing the meaningful significant difference between the Croatian and English scores in Openness of preschool teacher students, it should be pointed out that the given results related to this personality trait could be related to other personality traits. When closely examining the statements used in the BFI questionnaire related to Openness, it can be seen that several statements are more closely related to statements regarding self-esteem and cultural knowledge. The statements in question are 5 Originalna i kreativna (Is original, comes up with new ideas), 10 Znaželjna oko mnogih stvari (Is curious about many different things), 15 Inteligentna, domišljata, dubok mislioc (Is ingenious, a deep thinker), 20 Ima bujnu i živahnu maštu (Has an active imagination), 25 Domišljata (Is inventive), 40 Voli promišljati, igrati se idejama (Likes to reflect, to play with ideas), and 44 Puno zna o umjetnosti, glazbi ili književnosti (Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature) (John & Srivastava, 1999). Statements 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 40 may be interpreted as statements related to a person’s self-esteem, and statement 44 is closely related to the cultural knowledge of a certain language-speaking country. When comparing results from the Croatian and English part of the BFI questionnaire in these statements, they showed drastic changes. Participants rated themselves as intelligent, inventive, original, and curious when answering the statements in the Croatian part, but when answering the English part of the questionnaire, they rated themselves as unintelligent, uninventive, unoriginal, and not curious. The results indicate that the participants’ self-image

changes when speaking English, and not their actual openness to experiences. Statement 44 is closely related to the cultural knowledge of English-speaking countries. Preschool teacher students' English lessons throughout their education did not include enough content related to the culture of English-speaking countries which results in limited knowledge of art, music, and literature in those parts of the world.

From the results, it can be depicted that only certain domains of personality are changing in future preschool teachers when using English. When they use English, they are more introverted, less sociable, shyer, and not self-confident, they describe themselves as unintelligent, unoriginal, and not curious. The received results can be interpreted in several ways. First, it could be that future preschool teachers lack the character trait Positivity when learning English. Kim (2001) states that Positivity is connected with self-esteem, self-trust, and self-efficiency (Kim, 2001). Second, the results could indicate that the participants are still in their "infantilization" stage (Stern, 1991) and they do not feel competent enough to use their language skills and show off their language proficiency. And finally, according to Molinsky (2007) people who performed in "cultural frame switching" poorly have their faces threatened which leads to embarrassment and performance anxiety (Molinsky, 2007). It is impossible to determine the real reasons for these behavioural changes as in some character traits participants portray usual signs of language anxiety (introversion, low self-esteem, shyness, etc.), but on the other hand, their Croatian and English score difference in Neuroticism is insignificant (mean difference 0.1) and their scores on Conscientiousness are higher in Croatian than in English when in reality it should be the opposite. Also, the lack of research done on EFL students on the topic of "cultural frame switching" allows only speculation.

9.2.3 *BFI scores between the two groups of participants*

The results confirm that across all Big Five Factors dimensions of personality, both future English teacher students and future preschool teacher students experience a change in personality when using English. Future English teachers scored higher on Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Openness and scored lower on Neuroticism in English than in Croatian. Whereas future preschool teachers scored lower on Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness and scored higher on Agreeableness in English than in Croatian. These results are inconsistent with the results obtained by the research conducted by Medved Krajnović and Juraga in 2008 where 48% of the participants answered "No" when answering the question: "Do you think that language and personality are connected, in the sense that an individual's personality, or some of its parts, changes when using different languages?" (Medved Krajnović & Juraga, 2008, p. 360). The inconsistencies with the results

from the previous research could be explained that when participants were asked that question, most of them looked at the question from the general perspective and not really thinking about themselves. On the other hand, the participants in this research had to thoroughly think about their personalities when changing languages, which made them realise that there were some changes in personalities when switching languages.

On the other hand, the results of this research share some similarities with the results obtained in the research conducted by Veltkamp et al. in 2013. Their research, as well as the present one, confirmed that non-native speakers who are not living in the target language country can also experience changes in character traits when switching languages. However, their research did not take into consideration the level of language proficiency. This research can confirm that language proficiency is also an important factor in experiencing “cultural frame switching”.

When comparing the BFI scores in English between the two groups of participants with different levels of language proficiency, it can be concluded that future English teachers scored higher on Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness whereas future preschool teachers scored higher on Neuroticism. However, only the scores on Extraversion ($p < .001$), Neuroticism ($p = 0.041$), and Openness ($p = 0.004$) show a statistically significant difference.

From the results, it can be concluded that levels of language proficiency have an impact on certain dimensions of personality, especially on Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Openness. As already stated, future English teachers are experiencing “cultural frame switching” whereas future preschool teachers are not. It would be important to analyse what the main differences between the two participant groups are and the reasons why one group is more prone to experience “cultural frame switching” than the other.

The most obvious reason is the level of language proficiency. Future English teachers have a higher level of language proficiency than future preschool teachers (confirmed by the results of the language proficiency test: $12.10 > 9.34$). Based on previous research, language proficiency is positively related to indicators of psychological adjustments (Kim, 2001, p. 102). When comparing the linguistic skills of the two groups, future English teachers are aware of different language rules, such as phonemic, syntactic, and semantic rules, but also pragmatic rules (e.g. slang, idioms, jokes, humour, satire, metaphors, etc.) which contribute the most to understanding the cultural and subcultural connotations (Kim, 2001, p. 105). Pavlenko (2002) states that when learning a new language includes learning about the syntax and vocabulary of

the target language, but also the use of words in specific situations which are culturally important (Pavlenko, 2002, p. 72).

Another important difference between the two participant groups are the classroom environment and lesson content. It can be concluded that future preschool teachers are not bicultural as their English classes were mostly conducted in a classroom environment without enough exposure to the English-speaking countries' cultural content and context (Luna, Ringberg, & Peracchio, 2008, p. 280). On the other hand, future English teachers have a broad knowledge of the target language's culture because they have learnt about English-speaking countries' history, policy, economy, religion, education system, ideologies, art, sciences, technologies, attitudes, beliefs, values, etc. (Kim, 2001, p. 104).

In conclusion, language proficiency and cultural knowledge of the target language are the important factors which contribute to becoming bicultural and experiencing "cultural frame switching". These factors are the main reasons why future English teachers are bicultural and future preschool teachers are not. However, it should be pointed out that the participants from the group of future preschool teachers who scored high on the language proficiency test and/or had been learning English as a foreign language for approximately the same number of years as future English students have portrayed similar results as future English teachers in the English part of the BFI questionnaire. These results confirm that higher language proficiency enables bilinguals to experience "cultural frame switching".

9.2.4 Other interesting results for both participant groups

An interesting result was noted in statement 35 *Preferira rutinsku vrstu posla* (Prefers work that is a routine). Almost 82% of participants have the same scores for that statement in both Croatian and English parts of the questionnaire. It seems that the type of job preference remains the same no matter the spoken language. Furthermore, most of the participants did not prefer routine type of work.

Another interesting result was depicted in statement 2 *Pronalazi greške kod drugih* (Tends to find fault with others). As the participants were students from the Faculty of Teacher Education most students strongly agreed with that statement which is a preferable characteristic in teachers as they have to evaluate students' work. However, John and Srivastava, who were the authors of the used BFI questionnaire, probably intended to ask participants whether they easily notice others' flaws such as negative character traits. As the participants strongly agreed on the statement the results had a negative impact on their scores for Agreeableness.

10. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis of the results of this research it could be concluded that Croatian EFL students of different language proficiency level backgrounds do experience changes in their character traits when switching languages, however, it happens for completely different reasons.

English teacher students based on the BFI results scored higher on Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness in English than in Croatian, and scored higher on Neuroticism in Croatian than in English. The scores for Openness showed no meaningful difference between the two languages. These results could indicate that English teacher students may be bicultural and are experiencing “cultural frame switching” as their results share similarities with the results from previously conducted research, as well as their linguistic competence and their broad knowledge of the target language’s culture reach the same levels as English native speakers.

On the other hand, preschool teacher students based on the BFI results scored lower on Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness in English than in Croatian. The scores on Agreeableness and Neuroticism showed no meaningful difference between the two languages. As not enough research has been conducted among EFL students on this topic, the obtained results cannot provide accurate conclusions which can only lead to speculation. It can only be concluded that future preschool teachers also experience changes in their character traits when using English.

An independent samples T-test was used to compare the English parts of the BFI questionnaire between the two participant groups. Future English teachers scored higher on Extraversion and Openness than future preschool teachers whereas future preschool teachers scored higher on Neuroticism than future English teachers. The scores on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness showed no significant differences. It can be concluded that different levels of language proficiency affect certain personality dimensions among EFL students. It is also important to mention that language proficiency, classroom environment, and lesson content are important factors which contribute to transforming EFL bilinguals into EFL biculturals.

Since the participants included in this research are all from the same faculty and are small in number, the results cannot be used as a generalization for all EFL students in Croatia, but they could be used as an inspiration for further research on this topic. As far as we know, there has not been a similar study conducted on this topic in Croatia, which should prompt other researchers to further investigate this topic to provide more results and findings.

11. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The aim of this research was to find out whether EFL students of different levels of language proficiency are aware of how the English language can have an effect on their character traits. To fully investigate this phenomenon, future researchers could find out what the main triggers in EFL students are to (un)consciously change their behaviour when switching languages (e.g., the language itself, the learning environment, the contents of the lessons, professors or teachers, etc.). Also, it would be important to investigate which aspects of a language enable EFL students to be able to become bicultural and how many years are needed for an EFL student to become bicultural. These unanswered questions could potentially change the lesson contents that are taught in schools to make EFL students not only speak fluently like native speakers, but to actually become like ones.

REFERENCES

- ACTFL. (n.d.). *Benefits of Language Learning*. Retrieved January 24, 2023, from ACTFL: <https://www.actfl.org/resources/guiding-principles-language-learning/benefits-language-learning>
- Bakić, A., & Škifić, S. (2017). The Relationship between Bilingualism and Identity in Expressing Emotions and Thoughts. *Íkala*, 22(1), 33-54. Retrieved January 18, 2023
- British Council. (2019). British Council EnglishScore. *Version 2.3.3*. App Store. Retrieved from <https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.englishscore>
- Butler, Y. (2013). Bilingualism/Multilingualism and Second-Language Acquisition. In T. Bhatia, & W. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing. Retrieved December 7, 2022
- Chen, S. X., & Bond, M. H. (2010, October 13). Two Languages, Two Personalities? Examining Language Effects on the Expression of Personality in a Bilingual Context. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(11), pp. 1514-1528. doi:10.1177/0146167210385360
- Chen, S. X., Benet-Martínez, V., & Ng, J. C. (2013, April). Does Language Affect Personality Perception? A Functional Approach to Testing the Whorfian Hypothesis. *Journal of Personality*, 82(2), 1-14. doi:10.1111/jopy.12040
- Council of Europe. (n.d.). *The CEFR Levels*. Retrieved January 18, 2023, from Council of Europe Portal: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/level-descriptions>
- Dewaele, J.-M. (2013). Multilingualism and Emotions. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 1-7). Hoboken, New Jersey, USA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. doi:10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0795

- Dewaele, J.-M. (2015). Bilingualism and Multilingualism. In K. Tracy, C. Ilie, & T. Sandel (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. doi:10.1002/9781118611463/wbielsi108
- Dewaele, J.-M., & Nakano, S. (2012). Multilinguals' perceptions of feeling different when switching languages. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1-14. doi:10.1080/01434632.2012.712133
- Edwards, J. (2013). Bilingualism and Multilingualism: Some Central Concepts. In T. Bhatia, & W. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism* (pp. 5-25). West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing. Retrieved December 8, 2022
- Eysenck, H. J. (2013). *The Structure of Human Personality* (3rd ed.). Hove; New York, UK; USA: Routledge. Retrieved March 10, 2023
- Gharbavi, A., & Mousavi, S. A. (2012, July). Do Language Proficiency Levels Correspond to Language Learning Strategy Adoption? *English Language Teaching*, 5(7), 110-122. doi:10.5539/elt.v5n7p110
- Grosjean, F. (2008). *Studying Bilinguals*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Retrieved March 10, 2023
- Grosjean, F. (2013). Bilingualism: A Short Introduction. In F. Grosjean, & P. Li, *The Psycholinguistics of Bilingualism* (pp. 5-25). West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing. Retrieved December 8, 2022
- Harsch, C. (2017, April). Proficiency. *ELT Journal*, 71(2), 250-253. doi:10.1093/elt/ccw067
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin, & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (Vol. 2, pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kim, Y. Y. (2001). *Becoming Intercultural*. Thousand Oaks, California, USA: Sage Publications, Inc. Retrieved March 10, 2023
- Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press Inc. Retrieved December 11, 2022
- Lewis University. (n.d.). *Language proverbs and sayings*. Retrieved January 25, 2023, from Lewis University: <https://www.lewisu.edu/academics/foreignlang/proverbs.htm>
- Li, Z. (2009, February). A Probe into Classroom Teaching and Second Language Acquisition. *International Education Studies*, 2(1), 124-128. Retrieved December 9, 2022
- Luna, D., Ringberg, T., & Peracchio, L. A. (2008, August). One Individual, Two Identities: Frame Switching among Biculturals. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35, 279-293. doi:10.1086/586914
- Martinovic, I., & Altarriba, J. (2013). Bilingualism and Emotion: Implications for Mental Health. In T. K. Bhatia, & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism* (pp. 292-320). West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd. Retrieved December 20, 2022

- McCrae, R. R. (2005). Universal features of personality traits from the observer's. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 547-561. Retrieved January 3, 2023
- Medved Krajnović, M., & Juraga, I. (2008). Perception of Influence of Foreign Language Learning on Personality. *SRAZ*, 53, 349-372. Retrieved December 18, 2022
- Moeller, A. J., & Catalano, T. (2015). Foreign Language Teaching and Learning. In J. Wright (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 327-333). Elsevier Ltd. Retrieved December 9, 2022
- Molinsky, A. (2007). Cross-Cultural Code-Switching: The Psychological Challenges of Adapting Behaviour in Foreign Cultural Interactions. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 622-640. Retrieved December 12, 2022
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple Voices*. West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing. Retrieved December 8, 2022
- Nguyen, A.-M. D., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2007). Biculturalism Unpacked: Components, Measurement, Individual Differences, and Outcomes. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1(1), 101-114. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00029.x
- Ożańska-Ponikwia, K. (2011). What has personality and emotional intelligence to do with 'feeling different' while using a foreign language? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(2), 217-234. Retrieved January 3, 2023, from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.616185>
- Ożańska-Ponikwia, K. (2013). *Emotions from a Bilingual Point of View: Personality and Emotional Intelligence in Relation to Perception and Expression of Emotions in the L1 and L2*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. Retrieved December 20, 2022
- Pavlenko, A. (2002). Bilingualism and emotions. *Multilingua*, 21, 45-78. Retrieved December 27, 2022
- Pavlenko, A. (2006). Bilingual Selves. In A. Pavlenko (Ed.), *Bilingual Minds* (pp. 1-33). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd. Retrieved January 6, 2023
- Quay, S., & Montanari, S. (2019). Bilingualism and Multilingualism. In A. De Houwer, & L. Ortega (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Bilingualism* (pp. 544-560). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved December 7, 2022
- Ramírez-Esparza, N., Gosling, S. D., Benet-Martínez, V., Potter, J. P., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2006). Do bilinguals have two personalities? A special case of cultural frame switching. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, pp. 99-120. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2004.09.001
- Regier, T., & Xu, Y. (2017). The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and inference under uncertainty. *WIREs Cognitive Science*, 8, 1-15. doi:10.1002/wcs.1440
- Ringbom, H. (1980). On the Distinction between Second-Language Acquisition and Foreign-Language Learning. *Papers in Language Learning and Language Acquisition*, (pp. 37-44). Espoo, Finland. Retrieved December 11, 2022

- Roselli, M., Vélez-Urbe, I., & Ardila, A. (2017). Personality Traits in Bilinguals. In A. Ardila, A. B. Cieślicka, R. R. Heredia, & M. Roselli (Eds.), *The Bilingual Mind and Brain Book Series: Psychology of Bilingualism: The Cognitive and Emotional World of Bilinguals* (Vol. 5, pp. 259-268). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. Retrieved December 14, 2022
- Shine, K. P., & Phil, M. (2011, November 11). Differences between Second Language Learning and. *Language in India*, 11, 736-744. Retrieved December 11, 2022
- Stern, H. H. (1991). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching* (7th ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Retrieved March 10, 2023
- Veltkamp, G. M., Recio, G., Jacobs, A. M., & Conrad, M. (2013). Is personality modulated by language. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 17(4), pp. 496-504. doi:10.1177/1367006912438894
- Włosowicz, T. (2014). Multilingualism and Foreign Language Learning: Some Terminological and Methodological Issues. In K. Warchał, & A. Łyda (Eds.), *Cultural interfaces in academic setting and beyond* (pp. 19-34). Katowice, Poland: Uniwersytet Śląski. Retrieved December 8, 2022

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1: Front page of the questionnaire

Character traits and language proficiency in EFL

(Osobnost i znanje engleskog jezika u EFL)

Poštovani/a,

zahvaljujem Vam na iskazanom interesu za sudjelovanje u istraživanju.

Ovo istraživanje provodi Anna Schiavon, studentica učiteljskog studija s engleskim jezikom na Učiteljskom fakultetu u Zagrebu, u svrhu izrade diplomskog rada, a pod mentorstvom izv. prof. dr. sc. Kristine Cergol.

Pred Vama se nalaze tri testa kojim želim ispitati povezanost osobnosti i znanja engleskog jezika kod govornika kojima je engleski jezik drugi jezik.

Sudjelovanje u upitniku je anonimno te će svi prikupljeni podatci biti obrađeni samo na grupnoj razini za svrhe ovog istraživanja. Sudjelovanje je u potpunosti dobrovoljno te u bilo kojem trenutku možete odustati.

Vrijeme potrebno za ispunjavanje ovih testova je 15-20 minuta.

Za sva dodatna pitanja o ovom istraživanju možete se javiti na anna.schiavon998@gmail.com

Vrsta studija:

- a) učiteljski studij
- b) studij rani i predškolski odgoj i obrazovanje

Vrsta učiteljskog studija:

- a) US 835 – smjer engleski jezik
- b) US 903 – modul hrvatski jezik
- c) US 903 – modul informatika
- d) US 903 – modul likovni
- e) US 903 – modul odgojne znanosti

Broj godina učenja engleskog jezika kao stranog jezika: ___

Appendix 2: Big Five Inventory questionnaire

U prilogu je naveden broj karakteristika koje se mogu ili ne moraju odnositi na Vas. Na primjer, slažete li se da ste netko tko voli provoditi vrijeme s drugim ljudima? Molimo Vas da napišete jedan od navedenih brojeva pored svake izjave, kako biste naznačili mjeru do koje se slažete ili ne slažete s izjavom.

Uopće se ne slažem	Ne slažem se	Ne mogu procijeniti	Slažem se	Potpuno se slažem
1	2	3	4	5

Kada pričam **hrvatskim jezikom/engleskim jezikom** sebe vidim kao osobu koja (je)...

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>___ 1. Pričljiva</p> <p>___ 2. Pronalazi greške kod drugih</p> <p>___ 3. Temeljito obavlja zadatke</p> <p>___ 4. Depresivna, potištena</p> <p>___ 5. Originalna i kreativna</p> | <p>___ 12. Započinje svađe s ostalima</p> <p>___ 13. Pouzdan radnik</p> <p>___ 14. Može biti napeta</p> <p>___ 15. Inteligentna, domišljata, dubok mislilac</p> <p>___ 16. Stvara velik entuzijazam</p> |
|--|---|

- ___ 6. Rezervirana i povučena
- ___ 7 Voljno i nesebično pomaže drugima
- ___ 8. Može biti nepažljiva
- ___ 9. Opuštena, dobro podnosi stres
- ___ 10. Znatijeljna oko mnogih stvari
- ___ 11. Puna energije
- ___ 17. Oprostiva po prirodi
- ___ 18. Sklona lošoj organizaciji
- ___ 19. Mnogo brine
- ___ 20. Ima bujnu i živahnu maštu
- ___ 21. Sklona šutnji
- ___ 22. Osoba od povjerenja
- ___ 23. Sklona lijenosti
- ___ 24. Emocionalno stabilna, flegmatična
- ___ 25. Domišljata
- ___ 26. Ima asertivnu osobnost
- ___ 27. Zna biti udaljena i hladna
- ___ 28. Uporno radi sve dok zadatak nije gotov
- ___ 29. Sklona promjenama raspoloženja
- ___ 34. Ostaje mirna u stresnim situacijama
- ___ 35. Preferira rutinsku vrstu posla
- ___ 36. Otvorena prema ljudima, društvena
- ___ 37. Ponekad nepristojna prema ostalima
- ___ 38. Stvara planove i drži ih do kraja
- ___ 39. Lako postane nervozna
- ___ 40. Voli promišljati, igrati se idejama

- | | |
|--|--|
| ___ 30. Cijeni umjetnička i estetička iskustva | ___ 41. Ima nekoliko umjetničkih hobija |
| ___ 31. Ponekad plaha i sputavana okolnostima | ___ 42. Voli surađivati s drugim ljudima |
| ___ 32. Razumljiva i ljubazna prema većini | ___ 43. Lako ometena |
| ___ 33. Učinkovito obavlja posao | ___ 44. Puno zna o umjetnosti, glazbi ili književnosti |

Appendix 3: Language proficiency test

Pažljivo pročitajte pitanja i zaokružite točan odgovor.

1. A: Have you met the new employee before?

B: Yes! She lived next door to me when I was younger. We were ___ friends.

- a) too good
- b) such good
- c) so good

2. Sales have been strong in Manchester. We are ___ opening an office there.

- a) frequently
- b) therefore
- c) somehow

3. A: Well, I think ___ they are building a new arena, don't you?

B: Definitely! I can't wait to see it.

- a) that's great
- b) it's great that
- c) there's great

4. With the new road system people will be able to travel into the city centre ___ than before.

- a) more quicker
 - b) quickly
 - c) more quickly
5. Expensive materials and cheap imports from other countries _____ impossible for us to do business.
- a) we are
 - b) mean that's
 - c) make it
6. Sales in Asia are looking promising at the moment. _____, there has been an increase in some European markets too.
- a) Granted that
 - b) Likewise
 - c) On the other hand
7. Studies have shown that _____ abroad is likely to reduce your anxiety levels. Although difficult at first, people who do this generally go on to become more self-confident.
- a) lives
 - b) living
 - c) live
8. A: Have you brought a packed lunch today or shall we go out for something?
B: No, I haven't and I'm _____ starving, so let's go.
- a) incredibly
 - b) positively
 - c) absolutely
9. I wouldn't have bothered doing all that annoying paperwork _____ that the company was thinking of offering the drop to someone else anyway.

- a) have I known
- b) would I have known
- c) had I known

10. Please do not leave valuables unattended. We are not _____ for any personal belongings left in unlocked areas in the building.

- a) liable
- b) authorized
- c) eligible

Pročitajte ponuđeni tekst i odgovorite na pitanja.

11. It goes without saying that if a company wants to be successful, it must build a loyal, experienced team. Unfortunately, many businesses struggle to keep their employees from quitting. Big companies in particular loose staff within the first two years of hiring them. What is it that makes employees want to leave, and why do so many companies fail to prevent it?

It's easy to blame the departing employees when this happens. especially younger workers are often - for no good reason - described as lazy and as having no work ethic or loyalty. It's true that workers priorities have shifted in recent decades. Most employees under 40 now value a decent work/life balance more than their parents did. The problem is not this shift in attitude, however; it is the fact that companies have failed to adapt to it. This isn't the only attitude they've failed to adapt to, either.

Workers today do not want to change jobs frequently any more than workers in the past did. What they want is to know that their work is valued, and that there is an opportunity for them to progress within a company. Acknowledgement of hard work does not come only in the form of promotions. Offering the right benefits and competitive pay is important, as is allowing flexibility for workers with families, students, etc. This is the only way businesses can break the cycle of constantly recruiting new employees: by appreciating the ones they have already.

What does the author think about younger employees?

- a) Younger employees are not the cause of recruitment problems.

- b) Younger employees are less loyal than the previous generation of workers.
- c) Younger employees have more time off work than their parents.

What does the text mention about today's workforce?

- a) Employees are less interested in praise and more interested in good salaries and benefits.
- b) Employees work much harder when they know there are opportunities for career progression.
- c) Employees want to stay at the same job, but only if the working conditions are good.

What is the author's overall opinion about recruiting and keeping employees?

- a) Companies have responded poorly to changes in work preferences.
- b) It's not possible for companies to stop having to always hire new people.
- c) Companies offer pay rises more often than they offer promotions.

IZJAVA O SAMOSTALNOJ IZRADI RADA

Ovom izjavom, ja, Anna Schiavon, studentica Učiteljskog fakulteta u Zagrebu, izjavljujem i svojim potpisom jamčim da sam samostalno istražila literaturu, provela istraživanje i napisala diplomski rad na temu: Character traits and language proficiency in EFL. Izjavljujem da ni jedan dio diplomskog rada nije napisan na nedozvoljen način ni prepisan iz kojega necitiranog rada.

Zagreb, travanj 2023.

Potpis studenta: _____