

THE EFFECTS OF INTERCULTURAL CONTACT FOR LEARNING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

© Rita Szaszko
(Szent István University)

rita.szaszko@freemail.hu

The present paper attempts to gain an insight into the nature of intercultural contact effects on adult Hungarians' motivation for learning English as a foreign language (EFL). The present study aims to highlight the interrelationship of the motivation and intercultural contact dimensions of a questionnaire. The data gathered in this questionnaire study involving 100 adult Hungarian participants aged 19+ from Budapest and eastern Hungary was subjected to factor analysis and to correlation analysis. This paper discusses the correlations regarding different types of motivation, motivated learner behaviour, contact with cultures other than Hungarian and contact effect, through which we gain deeper understanding of how and what components of motivation and intercultural contact are related to one another in a Hungarian context. The results revealed that different factors of the contact dimension (integrativeness, instrumentality, attitude, self-confidence) affect different factors of the motivation dimension, contact in private sphere, written/electronic communication, information from others, contact through cultural products and use of English at work, and the motivated learner behaviour dimension, effort and persistence. Furthermore, intercultural contact was found to have a more significant effect on communicative competence than on language learning motivation.

Key words: motivation, motivated learner behaviour, intercultural contact and contact effect, questionnaire study, correlation analysis

Globalization in the 21st century has resulted in a change of inter-ethnic attitudes worldwide (Brislin, 2001). With regards to Hungary, there has been an unprecedented increase of intercultural contact since the end of the 1980s with the appearance of foreign TV channels, opened up borders etc. along with an increasing demand on learning foreign languages (FLs), in particular English (Csizér and Dörnyei, 2005).

Arising from these facts, an investigation into the importance of intercultural contact related to FL learning in the Hungarian context can be seen as a relevant issue. The present study can fill research niche since a limited number of motivational contact studies have been carried out to highlight the relationship of intercultural contact and EFL learners' motivation. Furthermore, to date no research has been done to investigate the adult Hungarian population's motivation for learning EFL and how it is influenced by intercultural encounters. The present research is related to the

findings of previous intercultural contact investigations in social psychology (Allport, 1954; Nemetz-Robinson, 1985; Clément and Kruidenier, 1985; Pettigrew, 1986, Stephan, 1987; Green, Adams and Turner, 1988; Islam and Hewston, 1994)) which pointed out that social contact has its effect on attitude and on behaviour one form of which is language learning, where attitudes play a significant part.

There are two further reasons why research on the relationship of intercultural contact and learner motivation can be welcome. Firstly, intercultural contact is a *means* in learning a FL - that is, during the different phases of language development, contact with other cultures can help students advance on the language proficiency continuum (Dörnyei and Csizér, 2005). Secondly, such a contact is an *end* in learning a FL as FL learners' goals involve communicating with representatives of other cultures. Moreover, it has been found that such a contact with a member of another cultural group can enhance developing learners' *cultural awareness*, when they compare and appreciate similarities and differences, which help them to perceive cultural differences and they can have an objective view of their own native culture (Byram and Fleming, 1998). Not much is known, however, about the precise characteristics of intercultural effects and how they operate during the FL learning process in terms of students' motivation for learning. It is still debated whether the influences can be regarded as purely unidirectional or there is reciprocity of effects between the contact variable and the learner motivation and the attitude towards the target culture dimensions (Dörnyei and Csizér, 2005).

Kormos and Csizér's (2005) research highlights the effects of intercultural contact on Hungarian children's motivation for learning FLs. Their study addressed the question of how intercultural contact in a FL environment is related to intercultural and language attitudes, and subsequently to second language motivation. The present research intends to gain an insight into the question of how intercultural contact affects English language learning motivation among adult Hungarian language learners. In the present study, the concept, *adult Hungarian EFL learners* implies Hungarian non-university/college students aged 19+ learning EFL at the time of the data collection at language schools/company courses at any levels except the absolute beginner and proficient ones. The reason why research into the adult Hungarian population was carried out is that intercultural contact can have different effects on children and on adult FL learners' motivation. The scope is restricted purely to EFL as it is used as a *lingua franca* and therefore, it can be related to more than one nation.

In order to highlight the theoretical background to the present research, I first need to define its two key concepts, namely *intercultural contact* and *motivation*. I also provide an overview of *intergroup contact* literature and discuss how various motivation researchers conceptualize motivation in particular *integrativeness*, *instrumentality* and *motivated learner behaviour* as these concepts of motivation research are the key dimensions of the present questionnaire study. Finally, I will present the findings of the most relevant motivational research done in the Hungarian context.

The two key concepts of this study are *motivation* and *intercultural contact* and are defined as follows. *Intercultural contact* in general terms means an instance of meeting and communication between two or more non-identical ethnic groups. An operationalized definition specific to the present investigation is, that *intercultural contact* is the Hungarian participant's outside-classroom a) interpersonal exposure to a person who is a member of a cultural group whose native language

is not Hungarian and where during interaction English is used as *lingua franca* (direct/interpersonal contact), b) non-interpersonal exposure to any cultural product of a cultural group whose native language is not Hungarian and where the means of mediation between the product and the Hungarian recipient is spoken or written English (indirect/non-interpersonal contact).

In this research context, a distinction is made between intercultural contact with persons/products of a group the mother tongue of which is English and persons/products of a group whose mother tongue is a foreign language other than English. It was aimed to focus on participants' intercultural contact outside the classroom. Obviously, students have some kind of intercultural contact in the classroom via their course-books, native-speaker teacher, or classmates in an international class. I planned to get background information about these issues concerning the participants because these details can be informative. However, the focal point of the present study was meant to be outside-classroom intercultural contact.

In the present research *motivation* was looked upon as a phenomenon that "explains why people decide to do something, how hard they are going to pursue it and how long they are willing to sustain the activity" (Dörnyei, 2001, p.7).

Literature review. Intercultural contact research

Research into intercultural contact is rooted in Allport's pioneer Contact Hypothesis (1954), which consisted of four optimal contact conditions that are assumed to reduce prejudice against members of another ethnic group: *equal status, common goals, cooperation not competition, and support of authorities and institutions* (as cited in van Dick, Pettigrew, Wolf, Castro, Wagner, Christ, Petzel and Jackson, 2004).

Up to the 1980s, this theory was unchallenged, only the list of optimal conditions was extended resulting in a long list of crucial factors that can inhibit a participant from developing prejudice during an intercultural encounter. However, new problems emerged that were centred on two critical issues concerning Allport's (1954) general model. First, the large list of determining factors was challenged by Pettigrew (1986) and Stephan (1987) and secondly, it was also claimed that there was a lack of a process model to explain the constantly changing nature of contact effects. That is, it could be questioned whether it is feasible to fulfil all the requirements of the list of crucial factors in a specific act of intercultural contact. Moreover, this list implied a uniform nature of intercultural contact neglecting the fact that such an encounter is situation and subject specific. In sum, much was known about *when* intercultural contact can contribute to positive attitude change while research into *why* or *how* these changes tend to happen was neglected.

Gaertner, Rust, Dovidio, Bachman and Anastasio (1994) emphasise that by doing research within laboratory and field settings Cook (1969, 1985) Green, Adams and Turner (1988) pointed out that Allport's (1954) prerequisite conditions of successful intercultural contact promote improved intergroup relations. However, Gaertner et al. claim that the Contact Hypothesis (1954) fails to provide a unifying conceptual ^conceptual^ framework and an explanation for how these prerequisite features are activated to become effective. Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachmand and Rust (1993), Islam and Hewstone (1994) and other researchers developed a theoretically unifying model, in which they suggest that the way individuals process social information about members of another group enhances

intercultural contact to be experienced in a positive way. Gaertner et al. also cites Stephan and Stephan (1984), who found that the theoretically unified prerequisite features also can prevent the ignorance about members of another cultural group and therefore reduce perceived intergroup anxiety.

The aforementioned questions of why and how can also be approached through the discussion of the significance of subjective perception of contact and the effects of *cognitive biases*, which were highlighted by Nemetz-Robinson (1985), who claimed that contact with other cultures has its effect on how a person perceives other members of another cultural group. He also asserted that during intercultural contact *cues* and *schemas* are applied. Cues are the perception of the other's physical appearance, behaviour, verbal characteristics, language, paralinguistic, and the context of exposure while *schemas* are cognitive structures in terms of a person and event, through which information is interpreted. As a result, Nemetz-Robinson concluded that: "Positive perceptions of other people are related to perceptual matches between what is anticipated and what is perceived, the positivity of traits perceived and the extent to similarity perceived... negative perceptions and cross-cultural misunderstandings are related to perceptual mismatches and differences perceived" (Nemetz-Robinson, 1985, p. 71).

Nemetz-Robinson's theory highlighted the situation and subject specific nature of intercultural encounters, whose components were missing from Allport's (1954) theory. Nemetz-Robinson (1985) also claimed that certain cognitive biases can be responsible for the negative perception of exposure to another culture, such as *first impressions* experienced due to limited information and access to the target culture. Furthermore, he discussed the *tendency for consistency*, which implies that we tend to interpret new information in a way to fit the above impressions, and *judging causality* – that is, the failure of judging ourselves as we judge others.

Pettigrew's (1998) model also describes the factors whose nature can determine whether an intercultural encounter is experienced in a positive or negative way by a participant. These components are *participants' characteristics* (individual differences), *situational factors* (circumstances of encounter) and *societal factors* (participants' social status).

Although Nemetz-Robinson (1985) and Pettigrew (1998) emphasised the importance of subjective perception of contact in their theory, it was Van Dick et al. (2004), who introduced the *perceived importance of contact* or *personal relevance of contact* as an element of the contact variable dimension in their study on the role of perceived importance in intergroup contact. They claimed that perceived importance acts as a mediator with regard to the prejudice and the intergroup friendship components.

Contact research literature tends to focus on *direct* intercultural contact while focus on *indirect* contact seems to be a neglected area despite the fact that in certain learning environments direct contact with the members of the target culture is rather limited. However, it is a crucial factor that even in a unicultural context, FL learners can get exposure to the target cultural products, such as screen media, press, books, works of art etc. Clément and Kruidenier (1985) found a dimension that they named the "social-cultural" dimension of second language motivation. This variable implies an interest in the lifestyle, art and artefacts of the target culture. Furthermore, Clément, Noels and Deneault (2001b) did research into language learners' indirect intercultural contact in the Hungarian context, which is typically unicultural, and detected a factor called "English media", which refers to the consumption of English cultural products in Hungary.

Motivation research

Motivation research is rooted in Gardner and Lambert's (1959, 1972) theory, which was the guiding paradigm in the social psychological period of learner motivation research from 1959 to the end of the 1980's. The focal point of this period was particularly the influence of learners' attitude towards the target language population, which was seen as the most crucial factor concerning motivation in second language acquisition (SLA) research. Dörnyei (2006) pointed out that in motivation literature it is often stated that Gardner and Lambert (1959, 1972) distinguished *integrative* motivation, a person's aim to become identical to a native speaker and to assimilate into the target cultural group, and *instrumental* motivation, a person's desire to improve his/her foreign language proficiency to achieve goals set by an outside authority. According to Dörnyei (2006), even in the most recent version of Gardner's Socio-Educational Model of SLA (2001), some confusion of ideas can be detected. To start with, the model itself is a schematic outline depositing the interactions concerning integrative motivation, language aptitude and a lot of other components. The term 'motivation' appears at three different levels in Gardner's (2001) model, namely: *integrative orientation*, *integrativeness* and *integrative motive/motivation*, which led to ambiguity. Furthermore, another source of confusion was that 'integrative motivation' is regarded as an overall construct while a subcomponent is also named as 'motivation'. Consequently, when interpreting Gardner's works, his use of 'motivation' can lead to misunderstandings among researchers, who might have difficulties in deciding whether in a particular context Gardner is discussing the overall construct or the subcomponent.

As far as the conceptualization of *integrative motivation* is concerned, in Gardner's Socio-Educational Model of SLA (2001) it is defined as a "detailed, empirically based construct" consisting of *integrativeness*, *attitude toward the learning situation* and *motivation* as the main constituent. Furthermore, *integrativeness* is looked upon as integrative orientation, curiosity and concern to learn foreign languages and attitude towards the second language community (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993a). *Attitude toward the learning situation* refers to the language teacher and course, while *motivation* comprises effort, desire and attitude towards learning. Consequently, the dimension of integrativeness is a detailed construct in the model, but this model lacks the instrumental motivation construct. In consequence Dörnyei (2006) asserted: "Instrumental orientation/motivation is not part of Gardner's core theory. Although the concept of instrumental orientation does derive from Gardner's writings, in actual terms it only appears in his motivation test battery without real theoretical clarification. This misinterpretation of Gardner's theory as the sum of integrative and instrumental motivation has been pervasive, as evidenced even today by the many manuscripts submitted to international journals which start out by conceptualizing motivation purely (and poorly) along the instrument-integrative dichotomy" (Dörnyei, 2006, p. 70).

McCain (2000) illustrated motivation along a continuum, a spectrum from integrative at one end to instrumental at the other. According to her, instrumental motivation is characterised by wants to become a member of the target population, contact with it and interest. On the other hand, integrative motivation is characterised by longing for some reward (diploma, employment etc.).

In the cognitive situated period of the motivational field in SLA research, Noels (2003) argued that there is a motivation construct that consists of three

interrelated substrates: *intrinsic reasons*, *extrinsic reasons* - according to Dörnyei (2006), Gardner's instrumental motivation belongs to this group - and *integrative reasons* that relate to positive contact with the target population.

Instead of focussing on the long-lasting tradition of the distinction between integrative and instrumental motivation, new trends in the 1990's looked upon learner motivation not as a single unit but rather as a 'multifactorial entity'. Oxford and Shearin (1994) analysing 12 motivational theories and models involving the fields of socio-psychology, cognitive development, socio-cultural psychology, found six components that influence language learning motivation. These factors are: *attitudes*, *beliefs about the self*, *goals*, *involvement*, *environmental support* and *personal attributes* (aptitude, age, sex etc.). That is, instead of the two mutually exclusive categories of integrativeness and instrumentality, motivation was investigated from a different aspect when it was divided into several elements.

The contemporary paradigm in the field of learner motivation research is rooted in Dörnyei and Ottó's process model of L2 motivation (1998), which laid emphasis on the dynamic nature of language learner motivation. That is, the findings of Dörnyei's (1994) model, which pointed out that learner motivation is *learner* (different learning and personality types), *language* (idiosyncratic characteristics of each language) and *situation* (setting, teacher and time) specific, were further elaborated on.

Dörnyei and Csizér (2005) investigated the effects of intercultural contact and tourism on language attitudes and language learning motivation among 13/14-year-old Hungarian children. Their large-scale repeated cross-sectional survey involved 8,593 participants in a national sample. The results of Dörnyei and Csizér's (2003) investigation revealed a "curvilinear contact attitude" association, which meant that the amount of contact could be related to the lowest motivation and attitude measures.

Kormos and Csizér's (2005) interview study involved 40 13-14 year-old Hungarian children learning English or German from various parts of Hungary. They found that according to the students, intercultural contact can be rewarding due to a number of reasons. Their study was also revealed that exposure to other cultures contribute to improving the students' linguistic and socio-linguistic competence, to the increase of their motivation and to the decrease of their anxiety in language use. Finally, the participants also noted that their attitude towards the target language speakers was influenced in a positive way by experiencing inter-ethnic contact.

Method

Participants

In the present questionnaire study a minimum of 100 participants were needed to yield the data for factor analyses, which were regarded as essential to check whether the particular question items covered the dimensions the researcher intended to focus on this statistical procedure. The target population of the present study involved 51 female and 49 male adult Hungarians aged 19-60 (average age 32) learning English currently at the time of the questionnaire study. 73 of the participants were learning English at a language school or company language course, 27 were taking lessons from a private tutor, while 29 persons were learning English both at a private school/company course and with a private teacher at the same time. 44

participants' studies were supported financially by their companies by ensuring courses, teachers, classroom etc.

55 out of the 100 the participants had had to take part in a placement test before starting their studies in their present English course. As far as the intensity of the English courses is concerned, the participants fell in the range of 1-30 English lessons per week (average 5.25) learning from a large diversity of English course books.

Regarding the professional background of the participants, a wide range of occupations (computer programmer, teacher, engineer, secretary etc.) could be found in the data involving qualifications gained at secondary-school, college or university level.

The data was collected in two big towns in the east of Hungary as well as in the capital city and its outskirts. Though in this study solely 19 participants indicated that they live in the capital, the number of participants related to Budapest can be estimated to 45, based on the number of questionnaires distributed in Budapest. The remaining 26 participants work in Budapest but most probably live in the surrounding towns.

The choice of participants was based on convenience and snowball sampling, whose method of choosing participants is regarded appropriate in terms of a small-scale study aiming to analyse factors (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 1994).

Instrument

The validated questionnaire was used with 100 participants and the data was submitted to factor analysis by SPSS to check whether the questionnaire items covered the factors I intended to investigate and the finalized form of the questionnaire was created. The completion of the questionnaire took on average 15 minutes for the participants.

Dimensions of the questionnaire

In this section of the paper, all of the factors of this questionnaire that investigate adults' motivational patterns affected by intercultural contact and that revealed correlations will be defined and illustrated with a questionnaire item. The *motivation* dimension consists of the traditional variables of motivation, that is *integrativeness*, *instrumentality*, *vitality*, *attitude* and *self-confidence*. *Motivated learner behaviour* is regarded as a separate dimension as its components, *effort* and *persistence* are the input essential for the activation of the actual learning process. In the present study *intercultural contact* is represented by two variable groups, namely *contact* and *contact effect*, which represent the input and output of intercultural encounters.

Table 1. Factors of the questionnaire

Factors	Related questionnaire items	Alpha values
<u>Motivation:</u>		
<i>Integrativeness</i>	1, 3, 4, 10	$\alpha = ,6320$
<i>Instrumentality</i>	6, 9, 27, 31	$\alpha = ,7788$
<i>Vitality England</i>	16, 17	$\alpha = ,8821$
<i>Vitality USA</i>	16, 17	$\alpha = ,8136$
<i>Vitality Australia</i>	16, 17	$\alpha = ,7191$
<i>Affective attitude component England</i>	15, 18, 19, 21, 22	$\alpha = ,7873$
<i>Affective attitude component Usa</i>	15, 18, 19, 21, 22	$\alpha = ,8408$
<i>Affective attitude component Australia</i>	15, 18, 19, 21, 22	$\alpha = ,8211$
<i>Affective attitude component else</i>	62	$\alpha = ,9719$
<i>Cognitive attitude component</i>	60	
<i>Action attitude component</i>	40, 44	$\alpha = ,5099$
<i>Self-confidence</i>		
<u>Motivated learner behaviour:</u>		
<i>Effort</i>	55, 58, 59	$\alpha = ,6143$
<i>Persistence</i>	56, 65	$\alpha = ,5775$
<u>Contact:</u>		
<i>Contact in private sphere</i>	20, 24, 25	$\alpha = ,5642$
<i>Written/electronic communication</i>	28, 29, 30, 37	$\alpha = ,7749$
<i>Information from others</i>	33, 34	$\alpha = ,7456$
<i>Contact through cultural products</i>	35, 36, 38, 39	$\alpha = ,7244$
<i>Use of English at work</i>	67, 68, 69	$\alpha = ,7242$
<i>Use of English abroad</i>	23	
<i>Travelling abroad</i>	66	
<i>Contact at work</i>	32	
<u>Contact effect:</u>		
<i>Effect on communicative competence</i>	46, 47, 48, 50	$\alpha = ,7706$
<i>Effect on motivated behaviour</i>	51, 52, 53	$\alpha = ,5522$
<u>Stereotype:</u>		
<i>American stereotype</i>	11, 43, 61	$\alpha = ,7175$
<i>English stereotype</i>	42, 54, 63	$\alpha = ,5412$
<i>Difference from the English</i>	13	

The motivation variable group consists of seven factors. Question items, such as "To what extent are you interested in the culture and art of English speaking countries?" describe the *integrativeness* factor, which in this research is conceptualized as an inner drive in the language learner to achieve near native-like command of English and/or to gain insights into the target culture as much as possible due to personal interest in the target language and culture.

The *instrumentality* factor implies learning EFL in order to achieve goals in the learner's profession or private sphere to have a higher standard of living or to get access to information of personal interests via the use of English. An example of eliciting information about this type of motivation was "To what extent do you need your English knowledge in your work?"

Attitude, another factor of this variable group is divided into *affective*, *cognitive* and *action* attitudes. These three types of attitude were identified by Scott (1966) as the components of intercultural attitudes. Affective attitude implies feelings and emotional reactions towards a country or another cultural group, which was manifested in a question, such as "To

what extent would you like to get to this country?". Scott's cognitive attitude relates to attributes, like size, military power and wealth of a particular country or ethnic group while action attitude means how a person responds to a nation or other cultural group, whether he/she would be willing to help them or rather perform a hostile attitude towards them.

Another factor that belongs to the motivation variable group is linguistic *self-confidence*, which is claimed to have a cognitive component. However, it is seen as a largely socially grounded construct by Clément, Gardner and Smythe (1977), who introduced self-confidence into SLA motivational research. They identified self-confidence as self-assessments regarding the target language proficiency or as self-perceptions of communicative competence and therefore they claimed that self-confidence is a dimension of motivation. Furthermore, Clément, Gardner et al. (1977) also found that linguistic self-confidence plays a significant role as a motivational subsystem of EFL when learners do not have the opportunity to have direct contact with the native speakers of the target language. Clément, Kruidenier (1985) and Clément, Dörnyei and Noels (1994) also found that self-confidence significantly affects SLA. To gain insights into this personality trait of the participants a statement, like *"I'm sure I will be able to speak good English."* was formulated that the respondents had to evaluate on a five-point Likert-scale.

The *motivated learner behaviour* dimension implies *motivational influences*, such as energy sources, motivational forces that underlie behavioural processes. This dimension is regarded as a complementary one, which can fuel the actional sequence. Whether these energy sources can be interpreted as enhancing or inhibiting, depends on the fact how successfully they can contribute to the implementation of the learner's goal. In this research context, *effort* and *persistence* act as the two factors of the motivated learner behaviour constituent. *Effort* refers to the amount of energy a learner devotes to learning the target language (Gardner, 2001) while *persistence* implies continuation of effort that learners perform during their SLA process. The statement *"In my view, I could be more hard-working in terms of learning English."* aimed to elicit answers regarding effort while *"I would like to improve my English as much as possible."* was formulated to investigate the participant's persistence in learning the English language.

Intercultural contact was divided into eight factors. *Contact in private sphere* was investigated with a question item, such as *"How often do you speak English to a foreigner of any nationality living in your neighbourhood?"*. A question related to *information from others* was *"How often does a member of your family speak about the ways of life in an English-speaking country?"*. *Written/electronic communication* was covered by questions, such as *"How often do you chat on the Internet?"*. The factor *contact through cultural products* was investigated by means of questions, such as *"How often do you read books in English?"*. *Use of English at work* is tapped by questions worded as *"Have you ever made a presentation in English at your workplace?"* *Contact at work* was focussed on with the questionnaire item, such as *"How often do you meet foreigners in your work?"*.

Use of English abroad was covered by the question, like *"How often do you speak English during your journey to any foreign countries?"* Finally information about *travelling abroad* was elicited by the item *"Have you ever been to a foreign country where people speak English?"*

The factor *contact effect on motivated learner behaviour* aims to measure how the amount of an EFL learner's effort and persistence is related to the frequency of intercultural encounters as experienced by the participant. *"In*

my view, it's good to speak English to foreigners of any nationalities because if I have difficulties in communication I decide to be more hard-working in learning the language." In a similar vein, the *contact effect on communicative competence* factor investigates the perceived impact of the degree of exposures to foreign cultures on EFL learners' communicative competence, which is a collection of linguistic skills and modes of behaviour a communicator possesses and applies at a particular time in a particular place where message is exchanged between sender and receiver in turns. *"In my view, it is good to speak to an English native-speaker, because it is different to communicate with such a person in person to learning this language in the English lesson."*

Procedures

The majority of the questionnaires were completed in a pen or pencil format while some of them were distributed and returned via e-mail during the period of January-February, 2006. The printed or electronic forms of the questionnaire were sent to some of the researcher's present and former students belonging to the target population, who completed as well as distributed the questionnaires to other members of the target population. Altogether 104 filled in questionnaires were returned and 100 of them were found to be suitable for data analysis. After factor analysis, five questions were found not to cover the dimensions that they meant to investigate and therefore were completely deleted while five questions needed to be reformulated to a minor extent. The data yielded by the non-problematic question items was subsequently subjected to correlation analysis.

Results and discussion

Table 2. Mean and Standard Deviation values of the variables

<i>Motivation dimension</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>
Integrativeness	3,9747	0,60976
Instrumentality	3,3075	1,05998
Affective attitude England	3,6020	0,84111
Affective attitude USA	3,2820	0,97515
Self-confidence	2,9400	0,97515
<i>Motivated learner behaviour dimension</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>
Effort	2,5522	0,88341
Persistence	4,0500	0,99112
<i>Contact dimension</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>
Contact in private sphere	2,2424	0,78202
Written/electronic communication	2,2725	1,01882
Information from others	2,4950	1,06243
Contact through cultural products	2,5600	0,89620
Use of English at work	1,9333	0,74007
<i>Contact effect dimension</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>
Effect on communicative competence	3,8325	0,91498
Effect on motivated learner behaviour	3,3267	0,91745

Table 2 displays the mean values of the respondents' answers provided on a five-point Likert scale, where 1 stands for 'not at all' or 'not true at all' (low motivation/low contact) and 5 represents 'very much' or 'absolutely true' (high motivation/high contact). The results of the present descriptive statistics reveal that the majority of the mean values fall within the range of

2,2 and 3,9, which is the middle section between 1 and 5, which are the extreme values of the scale. However, two outstanding mean values can also be pointed out. The highest mean value characterises *persistence* ($\Sigma=4,05$, Std=,99), a variable of the *motivated learner behaviour* dimension. Although the other component of the *motivated learner behaviour* dimension, *effort* shows a lower mean value ($\Sigma=2,55$, Std=,88) these results of this dimension suggest that *motivated learner behaviour*, that is the fuel, the energy source, which is vital to operationalize the learning process, is a significant factor in Hungarian adults' motivation for learning EFL.

Surprisingly the lowest contact was detected in the participants' *use of English at work* ($\Sigma =1,93$, Std=,74), which implies that despite public opinion, there is not such a great demand for the *actual* English usage at work. On the one hand, most employers require particular level of English knowledge from the candidates applying for a given position. On the other hand, employees' English knowledge is activated in their work to a much lesser extent than it is required at job interviews. Probably employees of multinational companies can be regarded as exceptions as they are more bound to use EFL at work due to foreigner superiors, associates, and business clients.

Another significant finding is that the mean value of *integrativeness* ($\Sigma=3,97$, Std=60) exceeds the mean value of *instrumentality* ($\Sigma=3,30$, Std=1,05), which also reinforces the fact, that adult Hungarians are not expected to use EFL as a working tool at their workplaces to a great extent. Kormos and Csizér (2005) investigating 13-14 year old Hungarian children's motivation for learning German and English as a FL found a similar pattern, that is instead of instrumental, integrative orientations characterised their participants.

Table 3. Correlations between the variables of Motivation and Attitude, Motivated Learner Behaviour and the Contact dimensions of the questionnaire

	Contact in private sphere	Written / electronic communication	Information from others products	Contact through cultural	Use of English at work	Use of English abroad	Contact at work
Integrativeness	0,130	0,236*	0,276**	0,368**	0,373**	0,237*	0,034
Instrumentality	0,325**	0,645**	0,242*	0,489**	0,618**	0,238*	0,657**
Affective attitude USA	-0,079	-0,040	0,143	0,208*	0,043	0,067	-0,232*
Self-confidence	0,035	0,183	-0,010	0,205*	0,118	0,090	0,020
Effort	0,056	0,074	-0,052	0,265**	0,020	-0,013	-0,198*
Persistence	0,033	0,161	0,142	0,045	0,312**	0,131	0,175

* $p < 0,05$ ** $p < 0,01$

Table 3 shows the correlation matrix of the variables of the *motivation, motivated learner behaviour* and *contact* dimensions of the present questionnaire study. This matrix of analysis revealed that *contact in private sphere* moderately correlates with *instrumentality* ($r=0.325$, $p < 0.01$) implying that despite the opened up borders of Hungary, for Hungarian adults having a certain level of knowledge in English is rather an instrumental need even in their private life than a goal to become similar to the members of the target culture. That is, the increasing opportunities for intercultural encounters, exposures to other cultures do not prominently enhance integrative orientations among adult Hungarians. Instead, Hungarian adults tend to use English as a *lingua franca* in order to get access to information related to their private sphere, regarding a wide range of topics, like world news, sports, entertainment, keeping in touch with foreign

friends, reading books etc., which corresponds to Dörnyei and Csizér's (2005) findings.

Furthermore, a strong correlation ($r=0.645$, $p<0.01$) can be detected between *written/electronic communication* and *instrumentality*, while a mild association ($r=0.236$, $p<0.05$) can be observed with *integrativeness*. These results suggest that the surveyed members of the target population write letters and use the Internet mainly to retrieve information related to their personal and professional interests and also, although to a lesser extent, to keep in touch with foreigner friends, to gain knowledge about and understanding of a foreign culture out of personal interest.

Information from others (about cultures other than Hungarian) is moderately related to *integrativeness* ($r=0.276$, $p<0.01$) and also modestly related to *instrumentality* ($r=0.242$, $p<0.05$). It means that providing facts about other peoples, the way of their lives, cultural values and products etc. can enhance Hungarian adult learners' motivation for learning EFL, regardless of the fact whether their inner drive is integrative or instrumental in nature.

Contact through cultural products correlates with *integrativeness* ($r=0.368$, $p<0.01$), *instrumentality* ($r=0.489$, $p<0.01$), *effort* ($r=0.265$, $p<0.01$) *affective attitude to the USA* ($r=0.208$, $p<0.05$) and *self-confidence* ($r=0.205$, $p<0.05$). Having pointed out that adult Hungarian EFL learners show a dominantly integrative motivational disposition, it is not surprising to see that *contact with cultural products* is most significantly related to *integrativeness* besides *instrumentality*. It can be claimed that for Hungarian adults exposure to different forms of the media and press as well as all other types of written or spoken forms of the English language are realised either to gain a wider knowledge and a greater understanding of foreign cultures or to gain information, to develop their English language knowledge and for this a huge effort is needed. It can be claimed, that language learning *effort* can be affected by the extent of exposure to cultural products of foreign cultures (Dörnyei and Csizér, (2005). Therefore it is argued that Hungarian adult EFL learners tend to invest more energy into their English studies if they have the opportunity to have first-hand experience in encountering and making use of a foreign cultural product. However, this effort, energy input is also beneficial due to the fact that it can build language learners' self-confidence and can also contribute to a positive affective attitude towards the USA. Moreover, similarly to *information from others*, *contact through cultural products* influences the nature of attitude that language learners develop towards English during their SLA process. On the one hand, correlation regarding *contact through cultural products* and *attitude to the USA* suggests that the more pieces of information are gathered about the USA, the more probable that they have an impact (positive or negative) on the adult Hungarian language learner's attitude towards this country. On the other hand, the fact that a similar correlation was not revealed in terms of *attitude towards Britain*, can be due to a more limited access to British and other foreign cultural products, to sampling error, or to the small-scale sample size of the present study.

Use of English at work has a moderate association with *integrativeness* ($r=0.373$, $p<0.01$) and it is strongly related to *instrumentality* ($r=0.618$, $p<0.01$) and to a lesser extent to *persistence* ($r=0.312$, $p<0.01$). This finding reveals that the participants use EFL at their workplaces as a means to be able to communicate with their foreign associates and clients, which can contribute to their knowledge of other cultures and can arouse their interests towards them. Those language learners who have to use EFL in their work are characterised by instrumental motivation.

Use of English abroad displays a mild relationship with both *integrativeness* ($r=0.237$, $p<0.05$) and *instrumentality* ($r=0.238$, $p<0.05$), which suggests that Hungarian adults tend to use English both as a means of communication and via this channel of communication they perceive the other culture with higher awareness.

Contact at work strongly correlates with *instrumentality* ($r=0.657$, $p<0.01$), mildly and negatively with *affective attitude USA* ($r=-0.232$, $p<0.05$), and *effort* ($r=-0.198$, $p<0.05$), which suggests that for Hungarian adults to accomplish their professional goals and to build their career, English knowledge is crucial. This finding is supported by the fact that the Hungarian job market sees a growing number of vacancies for a wide range of positions where certain levels of English knowledge are required as a necessary qualification. Consequently, given this Hungarian situation, it is reasonable to assume that better job prospects are the main driving force for adults to get engaged in learning EFL. However, as it was pointed out when discussing the mean values of the motivation and contact dimensions, it must be noted that *contact at work* and the actual *use of English at work* do not correspond. Although good English knowledge can enhance better professional prospects, this knowledge is not always activated in a participant's work. The fact that there was negative association detected in terms of *contact at work* and *affective attitude USA* and *effort*, most probably is due to sampling error as other studies do not support the fact that the use of English at work to communicate with colleagues or clients promotes negative attitudes towards the USA and that consequently less effort is operationalized for further interactions in workplace-related contexts. Another implication of this finding is that participants formed a negative opinion about their American clients or associates, and therefore they do not invest considerable energy into further contact and communication with them.

The results of the correlation analysis of the data collected during the present questionnaire study show that similarly to children (Kormos and Csizér, 2005), the degree of adults' language learning motivation is probably dependent on contact with foreign cultures through personal encounter and cultural products at work and in private sphere, and the amount and nature of information compiled about other cultures. An act of intercultural contact with a culture where English is spoken as a second language or it is used as a *lingua franca* can be no less effective than an exposure to the target native English speaking countries, like Great Britain, the USA etc.

Finally, the Paired Samples Test of 'effect on communicative competence' and 'effect on motivated learner behaviour' shows a statistically significant difference ($t=5,583$, $p<0.05$) regarding the probability of *intercultural contact* effect on *communicative competence* and *motivated learner behaviour* as experienced and interpreted by the participants. Based on the results, it can be claimed that the participants perceive that intercultural contact has a stronger influence on their communicative than on their motivated learner behaviour. Therefore it can be stated that having the opportunity to experience intercultural encounters of any types, adult Hungarian EFL learners experience and regard themselves as being more sensitive to improve their English language skills as communicators in the English language than to activate effort and perform persistence while learning English and experiencing different types of intercultural contact.

Conclusion

The aim of the present investigation was to gain insights into the effects of intercultural encounters on adult Hungarian EFL learners by collecting data from 100 participants and carrying out correlation analysis regarding the *motivation, motivated learner behaviour, contact* and *contact effect* variable groups of the questionnaire used in this study.

In order to have content and face validity, the present questionnaire was validated and submitted to factor analysis using the data yielded by the 100 completed questionnaires.

Subsequently, the correlation analysis statistical procedure was carried out. Based on the findings, it is concluded that intercultural contact has its effects rather on communicative competence than on language learning motivation as perceived by adult Hungarian EFL learners.

The most consistent overall finding in the present study was that the highlighted variables of *intercultural contact* promoted most significantly instrumental orientation (regarding *contact in private sphere, written/electronic communication, contact through cultural products, use of English at work, contact at work*), and integrative orientation (regarding *information from others, contact through cultural products, use of English at work*) and to a lesser extent, *effort* and *persistence*, which are the driving forces of motivated learner behaviour.

The limitation of this investigation is that it is based on a small-scale study with a relatively small sample size. Consequently no generalizations can be drawn from this investigation, which was meant to be a descriptive study to reveal the *status quo* regarding the dispositions of the effects of intercultural contact on adult Hungarian learners' motivation for learning EFL in the capital, and in two towns in the east of Hungary in the first half of the year 2006. As the results can contribute to theory as well as to the work of practitioner EFL teachers working with adult learners, I intend to develop the present research further and to include all the regions of Hungary in this line of investigation.

References

- ALLPORT, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Inc.
- BRISLIN, R. W. (2001). *Intercultural contact and communication*. In: Adler, L. L. & Gielen, U. P. (Eds): *Cross-cultural topics in psychology*, pp. 213-227. Westport: CT: Praeger.
- BYRAM, M. & FLEMING, M. (1998). *Introduction*. In: Byram, M. & Fleming, M. (Eds): *Language learning in intercultural perspective. Approaches through drama and ethnography*, pp. 5-12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CLÉMENT, R. & DÖRNYEI, Z. & NOELS, K. (1994). *Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom*. *Language Learning*, 44, 417-448.
- CLÉMENT, R. & GARDNER, R. C. & SMYTHE, P. C. (1977). *Motivational variables in second language acquisition: a study of francophones learning English*. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 9, 123-133.
- CLÉMENT, R. & KRUIDENIER, B. G. (1985). *Motivation, self-confidence and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom*. *Language and Social Psychology*, 4, 21-37.
- CLÉMENT, R. & NOELS, A. N. & DENAULT, B. (2001b). *Interethnic contact, identity and psychological adjustment: The mediating and moderating roles of communication*. *Journal of Language and Psychology*, 22, 2, 190-209.

- COHEN, L. & MANION, L. & MORRISON, K. (1994). *Research methods in education*. London, New York: Routledge Falmer.
- COOK, S. W. (1969). *Motives in a conceptual analysis of attitude-related behaviour*. In: Arnold, W. J. & Levine, D. (Eds.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (pp. 179-235). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- CSIZÉR, K. & DÖRNYEI, Z. (2005). *The internal structure of language learning motivation and its relationship with language choice and learning effort*. *Modern Language Journal*, 89:1, 9-36.
- DICK, R. VAN & WAGNER U. & PETTIGREW, T.F. (2004). *Role of perceived importance in intergroup contact*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 211-227.
- DÖRNYEI, Z. & OTTÓ, I. (1998). *Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation*. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 4, 43-69. Thames Valley University.
- DÖRNYEI, Z. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. Harlow: Longman.
- DÖRNYEI, Z. & CSIZÉR, K. (2005). *The effects of intercultural contact and tourism on language attitudes and language learning motivation*. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 24, 1-31.
- DÖRNYEI, Z. (2006). *The psychology of the language learner individual differences in SLA*. Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum.
- GARDNER, R. C. & LAMBERT, W. (1959). *Motivational variables in second language acquisition*. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13, 266-272.
- GARDNER, R. C. & LAMBERT, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers.
- GARDNER, R. C. & MACINTYRE, P. D. (1993a). *A student's contributions to second language learning*. Part II: Affective variables. *Language Teaching*, 26, 218-233.
- GARDNER, R. C. & TREMBLAY, P. F. & MASGORET, A. M. (1997). *Towards a full model of second language learning: An empirical investigation*. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 344-362.
- GARDNER, R. C. (2001). *Integrative motivation and second language acquisition*. In: Dörnyei, Z. & Schmidt, R. (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 1- 19). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.
- GAERTNER, S. L. & RUST, M. C. & DOVIDIO, J. F. & BACHMAN, B. A. & ANASTASIO, P. A. (1994). *The contact hypothesis, the role of a common in-group identity on reducing intergroup bias*. *Small Group Research*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 224-249.
- GREEN, C. W. & ADAMS, A. M., & TURNER, C. W. (1988). *Development and validation of the school interracial climate scale*. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16: 2, 1988.
- ISLAM, M. R. & HEWSTONE, M. (1993). *Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived out-group variability, and out-group attitude: an integrative model*. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19: 6.
- KORMOS, J. & CSIZÉR, K. (2005). *The effects of intercultural contact on language attitudes and motivation: results of an interview study*. Unpublished manuscript.
- MACINTYRE, P. D. (1999). *Language anxiety: A review of the research for language teachers*. In: Young, D. J. (ed.), *Affect in foreign language and second language learning: a practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere* pp. 24-45. New York: McGraw Hill.
- MCCAIN, J. (2000). *Language acquisition and affective variables*. Retrieved May 19, 2006, from Serendip 1994-2006.
- NEMETZ-ROBINSON, G. L. (1985). *Cross-cultural understanding. Processes and approaches for foreign language ESL and bilingual educators*. London: Prentice Hall.
- NOELS, K. A. (2003, May). *Context, communication style, and motivation to learn a new language*. Paper presented at the International Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

- OXFORD, R. & SHEARIN, J. (1994). *Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework*. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 12-28.
- PETTIGREW, T. F. (1986). *The Intergroup contact hypothesis reconsidered*. In: Hewstone, M. & Brown, R. (eds.), *Contact and Conflict in Intergroup Encounters* (pp. 169-95). New York: Basil Blackwell.
- PETTIGREW, T.F. (1998). *Intergroup contact theory*. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65-85.
- SCOTT, W. A. (1966). *Measures of Cognitive Structure*. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1, 391-395.
- STEPHAN, C. W. & STEPHAN, W. G. (1984). *Reducing intercultural anxiety through intercultural contact*. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16, 89-106.
- STEPHAN, W. G. (1987). *The contact hypothesis in intergroup relations*. In C. Hendrick (ed.), *Review of Personality in Social Psychology*. Newbury Park CA: SAGE Publications.