

Attila Gyula Kiss

Language Ideologies
about Learning Historical
Minority Languages

Hungarian in Romania
and Swedish in Finland



JYVÄSKYLÄ STUDIES IN HUMANITIES 267

Attila Gyula Kiss

Language Ideologies
about Learning Historical
Minority Languages

Hungarian in Romania
and Swedish in Finland

Esitetään Jyväskylän yliopiston humanistisen tiedekunnan suostumuksella
julkisesti tarkastettavaksi yliopiston vanhassa juhlasalissa S212
joulukuun 1. päivänä 2015 kello 14.

Academic dissertation to be publicly discussed, by permission of
the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Jyväskylä,
in building Seminarium, auditorium S212, on December 1, 2015 at 14 o'clock.



UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

JYVÄSKYLÄ 2015

Language Ideologies
about Learning Historical
Minority Languages

Hungarian in Romania
and Swedish in Finland

JYVÄSKYLÄ STUDIES IN HUMANITIES 267

Attila Gyula Kiss

Language Ideologies
about Learning Historical
Minority Languages

Hungarian in Romania
and Swedish in Finland



UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

JYVÄSKYLÄ 2015

Editors

Petteri Laihonen

Centre for Applied Language Studies, University of Jyväskylä

Pekka Olsbo, Ville Korhokangas

Publishing Unit, University Library of Jyväskylä

Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities

Editorial Board

Editor in Chief Heikki Hanka, Department of Art and Culture Studies, University of Jyväskylä

Petri Karonen, Department of History and Ethnology, University of Jyväskylä

Paula Kalaja, Department of Languages, University of Jyväskylä

Petri Toiviainen, Department of Music, University of Jyväskylä

Tarja Nikula, Centre for Applied Language Studies, University of Jyväskylä

Epp Lauk, Department of Communication, University of Jyväskylä

URN:ISBN:978-951-39-6412-2

ISBN 978-951-39-6412-2 (PDF)

ISSN 1459-4331

ISBN 978-951-39-6411-5 (nid.)

ISSN 1459-4323

Copyright © 2015, by University of Jyväskylä

Jyväskylä University Printing House, Jyväskylä 2015

ABSTRACT

Kiss, Attila Gyula

Language Ideologies about Learning Historical Minority Languages: Hungarian in Romania and Swedish in Finland

Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2015, 89 p.

(Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities

ISSN 1459-4323; 267 (nid.) ISSN 1459-4331; 267 (PDF))

ISBN 978-951-39-6411-5 (nid.)

ISBN 978-951-39-6412-2 (PDF)

This article-based dissertation examines the problems of learning, teaching, and organizing adult education on minority languages in a collection of four articles (Kiss 2015a; 2015b; 2013; 2012), and this summary. My PhD dissertation addresses the question of teaching and learning historical minority languages by the majority population in voluntary settings both from a theoretical and a practical viewpoint. The original point of departure for my dissertation was to present an image of Hungarian language learning in Romania, where I initiated teaching Hungarian to Romanian speakers in 2009. Later, I followed my course participants into a Study Abroad context to the Debrecen Summer School. Finally, a comparative perspective from a distance (Finns learning Swedish in a voluntary setting) was included in order to reframe and generalize on my findings from the Hungarian context. My data consists of ethnographic observations, interviews, and various materials gathered during fieldwork in these three sites: Nagyvárad/Oradea (Romania), Debrecen (Hungary), and Jyväskylä (Finland). My research combines several qualitative, sociolinguistic approaches and methods: language ideologies, ethnography, discourse analysis, and nexus analysis. All of them are needed to combine the parts of my dissertation. However, the approach of studying language ideologies is present in all four articles and it is therefore very important for my work. Historical discourses of the other bear resemblances both in Romania and Finland. The grievance narratives have been passed down through generations and they hinder openness towards the learning of a historical minority language. However, the contemporary socio-cultural context in both cases can favor the learning of a historical minority language. In the future, a general language ideological reorientation of historical metanarratives is necessary. That is, by learning and acknowledging the other's perspective of history and linguistic belonging, we can focus on shared history and multilingual practices instead of nation-state antagonisms and monolingual preferences.

Keywords: language ideologies, learning historical minority languages, discourse analysis, adult learning, voluntary learning, study abroad, Hungarian, Swedish, ethnography

Author's address	Attila Gyula Kiss Department of Art and Culture Studies University of Jyväskylä, Finland attilagyulakiss@yahoo.com
Supervisors	Petteri Laihonen, PhD Centre for Applied Language Studies University of Jyväskylä Professor Åsa Palviainen Department of Languages University of Jyväskylä
Reviewers	Professor Juliet Langman The University of Texas at San Antonio, The United States of America Ildikó Vančo, PhD Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Slovakia
Opponents	Professor Juliet Langman The University of Texas at San Antonio, The United States of America

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Department of Art and Culture Studies has offered me an academic home since February 2012, and I met a group of remarkable people in Jyväskylä.

First and foremost, I wish to express my deepest and sincere gratitude to my supervisor Petteri Laihonen, who never hesitated to go the extra mile to support me, and whose guidance helped me overcome the difficulties of entering a new field of research. Without his interest in the topic, this dissertation could not have even commenced or reached its final form. I am grateful for the many hours he has given to reading and commenting on my writing and correcting innumerable drafts, and just as many grant applications. He often challenged me to think outside my boxes. This was sometimes difficult, but he always nudged me in the right direction. From the beginning of my work, I trusted his intentions and knowledge, and my dissertation would be a lesser thing were it not for his patience and dedication and his wish for me to achieve the best possible outcome and to complete the dissertation in due time. I also thank Emese and Petteri for hosting me in their home and offering many a tranquil family evening, great food, and exciting chess games with your three lovely, gifted daughters. They meant a lot to me, especially on the long, dark winter days.

My second supervisor, Professor Åsa Palviainen, was always there whenever I needed her assistance. She always found time to read my texts and comment on them. The dissertation benefitted greatly from her insightful comments on learning Swedish in Finland. I am grateful to have had such great professional role models as Åsa and Petteri.

I am equally deeply grateful to Professor Tuomo Lahdelma's advice on scientific and life issues, and especially for his unwavering support of me, as well as for forging such a supportive community at the Hungarian Studies Institute. I consider myself lucky to have had such a mentor as Tuomo.

I also wish to express my gratitude to the reviewers of my thesis, Professors Juliet Langman, and Ildikó Vančo, whose valuable comments I have strived to address in order to improve the introduction. I am thankful that you accepted taking part in this process.

Without financial help from the Institute of Hungarian Studies, the Department of Art and Culture Studies, the Faculty of Humanities, and The Science Council at the University of Jyväskylä, my work in Finland would have been impossible. I cordially thank Svenska Kulturfonden, and CIMO, who also supported my work throughout its various phases. I am grateful to all of them.

I also extend my gratitude to the head of the Department of Art and Culture Studies, Prof. Heikki Hanka, for facilitating my being here, and always being very helpful. Thanks to the wonderful staff of TAIKU, with whom I could take part in department excursions, or different social events like "pikkujoulut" and "virkistyspäivät". I thank Urpo Kovala, Prof. Raine Koskima, Prof. Annika Waenerberg, Tarja Pääjoki, Prof. Jarmo Valkola (Univ. of Tallin) and Prof. Magdolna Kovács (Univ. of Helsinki) for organizing PhD research seminars,

and their kind interest in my work. Over the years, I have benefitted greatly from discussions with my many colleagues in the Department of Art and Culture Studies. Since it is impossible to thank each of them individually, I would like to express my gratitude to them collectively for creating an inspiring work environment.

I thank all the colleagues and visiting scholars at the Hungarian Studies Dept. for providing a great family style community. I treasure the friendship of Kristóf Fenyvesi, who was my office mate throughout all of these years. His insightful comments on some of my writing, and discussions during our lunches and conversations during free-time activities, helped me to much better cope with occasional difficulties and life in Jyväskylä. Thank you Katja Fält and Rita Vargas for your refreshing company in our shared offices. It was always a pleasure to have discussions with my fellow Hungarian Studies PhD candidates and collaborators: László Péter, Melinda Szarvas, Arja Johanna Raimi, Krisztina Karizs, Klaudia Kiss, Márta Fodor, Beáta Korodi and Dalma Tóth. I also wish to thank Tamás Péter Szabó for reading my Hungarian article and his friendship throughout these years.

Coffee room and corridor chats in the A, later Educa buildings, and gatherings with Katja Fält, Tiina Koivulahti, Ljiljana Radosevic, Heidi Kosonen, Zuzanna Kurlikowska, Jonne Arjoranta, Antti Vallius, Lauri Ockenström always cheered me up, as well as lunches with Osmo Pekonen.

I also wish to thank the researchers and fellow PhD candidates at the Department of Languages and Department of Applied Linguistics, who accepted me in their community. Those who made me feel welcome in their group are far too numerous to list here by name. The many research seminars organized by Professors Sirpa Leppänen, Sari Pietikäinen, Sari Pöyhönen, and Åsa Palviainen in the course of these three years helped me gain knowledge in so many areas of contemporary sociolinguistics. I am absolutely certain that I could not have wished for a better place for my PhD training. I am grateful for all of your hard work in creating such a stimulating academic environment, one that attracts, from all over the world, the most influential experts in sociolinguistics and applied linguistics. My articles and thesis partly emerged from these seminars.

I would like to thank Prof. Joan Pujolar for his interest in my work.

I also thank the Kielikampus for the post-grad bootcamps at Vesala, which offered a welcome break from daily life, as well as valuable tips and techniques on how to cope with the challenges of being a PhD student.

Special thanks to the leaders and members of the following associations: LANGNET, the Finnish doctoral programme in language studies, and the International Association for Hungarian Studies.

A special salute of gratitude goes to my long-time friend and mentor Anssi Halmesvirta, whose initial assistance was crucial for helping me to begin my studies at the University of Jyväskylä.

I wish to thank Prof. Péter Szaffkó, not just for his generous and invaluable help during research at the Debrecen Summer School, but also for

his friendship, and his support in terms of encouragement throughout the decade we worked together.

Many thanks are extended to the Departmental coordinators of TAIKU: Heli Niskanen, Juha Teppo, and Salla Kujala.

Finally, I owe an enormous debt of gratitude to my family, and all of my nearest and dearest, each of who gave me their support over the years while I was away from home.

I dedicate this dissertation to my loving parents, Éva and Gyula, and to my dear sister Erika.

Attila Gyula Kiss

Jyväskylä, December 2015

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

FIGURES AND TABLES

1	INTRODUCTION	11
1.1	Disciplinary contexts	12
1.2	Research sites.....	17
1.3	Research questions	26
1.4	The structure of this summary.....	26
1.5	Articles included	27
2	METHODOLOGY	29
2.1	Introduction.....	29
2.2	Approach: Language ideologies.....	30
2.3	Conversation Analytic methods and language ideologies.....	32
2.4	Nexuses of learning a historical minority language.....	33
2.5	Conclusions	35
3	FIELDWORK, DATA, AND SOURCES.....	36
3.1	The process of data collection	36
3.2	Language courses and data sources.....	38
3.3	Fieldwork in Nagyvárad/Oradea 2010-2012.....	40
3.4	Fieldwork at the Debrecen Summer School in 2012	44
3.5	Fieldwork in Jyväskylä in 2013.....	46
3.6	Ethical questions and summary conclusions.....	48
4	RESULTS	49
4.1	Overview	49
4.2	Article 1	49
4.3	Article 2	51
4.4	Article 3	55
4.5	Article 4	57
4.6	Answers to research questions	59
5	CONCLUDING DISCUSSION.....	66
6	SUMMARY	69
	REFERENCES.....	72

FIGURES

FIGURE 1	Debrecen Summer School Poster from ca. 1938	45
----------	---	----

TABLES

TABLE 1	Mother tongue and mono/ multilingualism in Nagyvárad 1880-1910	19
TABLE 2	Table of informants:.....	38

1 INTRODUCTION

Despite its significance in promoting mutual understanding and improving interethnic relations in Europe, the voluntary learning of historical minority languages has been broadly neglected both as a subject of study, and as a tool to foster tolerance and understanding between cohabitating and neighboring ethnicities. Such a need has been noticed, for instance, by EU institutions (Rindler Schjerve & Vetter 2012: 34–35). In particular, the learning of East-Central European historical minority languages has remained devalued and unexplored.

A *historical minority language* is a language that is spoken in a state, typically before its establishment, or before the annexation of a territory, and not one that has come to be spoken due to recent immigration. Furthermore, the language is considered to be in minority status typically due to measures implemented in modern nation building, where the hegemony and dominance of the majority culture and language are enshrined in the constitution and other laws (see May 2012).

My PhD dissertation addresses the question of teaching and learning historical minority languages by the majority population in voluntary settings, both from a theoretical and a practical viewpoint. In the Western European context, there have been a number of parallel studies focusing on other subthemes of learning historical minority languages. There are studies on the learning of, amongst others: Basque (see Ortega et al. 2015; Cenoz & Perales 2010; Azkue & Perales 2005); Provençal (Costa 2015); Catalan (Walsh & O'Rourke 2014; Pujolar & Gonzales 2013); Galician (O'Rourke & Ramallo 2015), Welsh (Blackledge 2002); Irish (Zenker 2014); Turkish (Rampton, Charalambous, & Charalambous 2014); Spanish (Oh & Nash 2014); French (Brogden 2009), and Gaelic (McLeod, O'Rourke, & Dunmore 2014; McEwan-Fujita 2010).

However, no comprehensive attempt has been made to present the complexities of voluntary, adult-learning of historical minority languages.

I focus on the language ideologies about learning a historical minority language. Various previous studies on learning historical minority languages suggest that language ideologies are central to understanding issues involved

in the learning and teaching of the language of a historical minority (e.g., McEwan-Fujita 2010; Brogden 2009; Blackledge 2002). Language ideologies are defined as “cultural, metapragmatic assumptions about the relationship between words, speakers, and worlds” (Gal 2006: 388). As Langman observes, “taking a language ideology approach is a good choice for research in contexts where language is a key source of political and national tension” (2013: 248). My aim is not to give an “exhaustive” inventory of the sociolinguistic situation of the studied context, but I aim to analyze the interpretations that were made about the teaching and learning of a historical minority language in three different research sites: Nagyvárad (in Romanian Oradea, Romania), Debrecen (Hungary), and Jyväskylä (Finland).

My research was initiated by my observations and needs during my teaching practice between 2009 and 2012. I initiated teaching Hungarian to Romanian speakers under the auspices of the Debrecen Summer School in Romania, first and foremost in the city of Nagyvárad/Oradea. The organization of the courses itself was a new venture. During the teaching, I noticed that the learners reflected on their practice of learning Hungarian. They described learning as a fundamentally positive phenomenon, but they also pointed out that it is unusual that adults should invest money and time in learning Hungarian in Romania. Due to the negative image of Hungary and Hungarians among Romanians, they also deemed it unlikely that there would be significant numbers of people starting to learn Hungarian in organized courses. Later, I followed my course participants into a Study Abroad context, 50 kilometers west, to the Debrecen Summer School. There I investigated the general issue of teaching Hungarian to the majority populations of the neighboring countries (Romania, Slovakia, Austria etc.). Finally, a comparative perspective from a distance (Finns learning Swedish in a voluntary setting) was included in order to reframe and generalize on my findings from the Hungarian context. It is also notable how little attention the contemporary voluntary learning of Swedish in Finland has received so far.

1.1 Disciplinary contexts

I position my study in contemporary sociolinguistics, SLA, and Discourse Studies. My study intends to align with the research tradition of (interactional) sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, ethnography, and socio-culturally inclined discourse analyses (for similar approaches see also Kytölä 2013; Langman 2013, 2003; Szabó 2012; Laihonen 2009a, 2005).

I wish to anchor my study to the above mentioned fields, and I analyze empirical data and carry out a sociolinguistics of language learning. I posit my study along others (Blommaert 2010; Heller 2007; Langman 2013, 2003; Rampton 2006).

I am interested in discursive constructions about historical minority languages, and the voluntary learning of these by the majority language

speaker population. More precisely, I investigate what language ideologies arise in the emerging possibilities of their study and what implications they may have for the future. The analyzed discourses occur in relation to a marginal topic therefore, my articles contribute to these fields in different ways. While the need for empirical analyses of the study of learning historical minority languages has been articulated by many recent studies, there is still scope within the study of minority languages, discourse analysis, and the sociolinguistics of adult education for research from different sociolinguistic contexts and domains, such as Romania, and the learning of Hungarian in Romania.

Langman (2013: 253) draws attention to the general import of studying Hungarian contexts. Most recent studies using current approaches, theoretical and methodological toolkits of contemporary sociolinguistics, have been carried out in speaker communities beyond the borders of Hungary by Csernicskó, Laihonen, and Tódor (see Csernicskó & Laihonen 2015; Laihonen 2015; Laihonen & Tódor 2015). I applied such contemporary approaches to the learning and teaching of Hungarian as an additional language.

In the traditional framework a majority language is defined as the “language of a dominant group, in terms of numbers and/or power” (Skutnabb-Kangas & McCarty 2008: 9). Usually, this serves as a background for the study of historical minority languages, but ethnic identity is attributed as equally important in the traditional paradigm. A minority means having less power than some other group, thus being “minoritised” is being in a relationship with another group which is in turn is “majoritised”. An ethnic minority can be national/autochthonous, or it can have immigrant origins. In Hungary, for example, an ethnic minority is considered autochthonous after 100 years of residence in the territory (Skutnabb-Kangas & McCarty 2008: 9). As a corollary, minority language in this approach is a language that is not the dominant language of a territorial unit, in most cases a state, because its speakers have less power, and it is generally spoken by a smaller number of people (Skutnabb-Kangas & McCarty 2008: 9). Lanstyák (2006) also points out that language minority is subservient to the majority language, or languages from the perspective of power. A power relation extends to culture, in some cases religion, yet in most cases language minorities are also ethnic minorities and their language constitutes but one aspect of being an ethnic minority (2006: 223).

Lanstyák defines minority languages oriented by European guidelines and international documents as they state the rights of individuals belonging to language and ethnic minorities. Regional and minority languages that are subordinate to the official or state language. These language speakers are in numerical inferiority to the number of speakers of a state’s official language. A regional language for example is German in South Tyrol/Alto Adige in Italy where German speakers form the numerical majority (Lanstyák 2006: 224). Hungarian is also the numerical majority in some areas, Szeklerland in Romania, along with Swedish in the Åland Islands, and some municipalities on the east and

south coasts of Finland. For the purposes of my dissertation, I do not elaborate on these territories, but I look at contexts where these languages are the numerical minority strictly from the quantity of speakers. Therefore, the phrase “minority language” can be used in both cases. Hungarian is clearly a minority language by any definition in the parts of Romania where Hungarian speakers do not constitute the numerical majority, as in my context of Nagyvárad/Oradea.

Minority languages are usually in different degrees of endangerment since the number of the speakers has been continuously decreasing. In other cases, the language spoken by the numerical minority can have a high official status throughout the country, as is the case with Swedish in Finland, or with Irish in Ireland.

Framing the contexts in European Union terminology, each of the languages discussed in this dissertation (Hungarian, Swedish, Romanian, and Finnish) are often referred to as a *Lesser Used Language*. The term refers to languages that have either have no official status in any of the member states of the EU, or those languages which are the official languages in a member state, but in respect to the number of their speakers, they are minority languages, and also languages which are official languages of the EU, but from the perspective of power they are minority languages (e.g., German in all states of East-Central Europe) (Lanstyák 2007: 224). According to The European Bureau for Lesser-Used Languages (EBLUL), the Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) promoting languages and linguistic diversity, “in today's EU there are some 46 million speakers of European lesser-used, regional and minoritised languages” and the role of EBLUL is to represent “the interests of these language communities at regional, state and European level” (EBLUL website).

Spolsky (2010) argued that the learning of minority languages first gained ground during the ‘ethnic revival’ that proliferated in North America, and Western Europe, in the 1960s. The phenomenon was closely linked to the idea of language heritage, suggesting a high degree of identification of the learner with the studied language. Language learning was regarded as an act of reclaiming one’s ethnic identity (e.g., Zenker 2014). Nevertheless, recent developments in the theory and practice of language teaching highlight the multifarious contexts of learning historical languages (e.g., Duff 2009). For example, the *revival* of languages, such as Gaelic, Welsh, or Manx, is highly dependent on language enthusiasts (Zenker 2014: 64). There may not be anybody who speaks the language in question in the learner’s family (cf. McEwan-Fujita 2010), or some languages may not even have “traditional native speakers” (Ó hlfearnáin 2015) anymore. Most studies on linguistic minorities and language learning have been conducted in the traditional nationalistic framework. For example, heritage language-learning studies usually focus on language as inheritance and the reproduction of native speakers, disregarding out-group learners (cf. Guardado 2014; Spolsky 2010 for exceptions see Oh & Nash 2014; Pujolar & Gonzales 2013). Pujolar and Gonzales (2013), for example, advocate the “de-ethnicization of language choice”. I rely upon current sociolinguistic theory. In Western European settings, emerging research focuses

on *new speakers* in the broadest sense. This line of research uses the term new speakers in reference to both multilingual minority and immigrant language learners (e.g., Pujolar 2007a, 2007b). Learning a language may not automatically lead to using it in social life and one's becoming functionally bilingual. Often, the language is learned through the language socialization of young adults (see Langman 2003). The new speakers approach could thus be applied to the Romanian context as well.

I do not use the coinage "new speakers" in my article, but my research draws upon and contributes to research carried out on the new speakers of historical languages school of research. My research takes a parallel approach, and could be easily incorporated into the new speaker paradigm. Next, I briefly review some parallels of that approach to my dissertation.

Linguists working in the new speaker paradigm (e.g., Pujolar & Puigdevall 2015; Pujolar & Gonzales 2013) propose the life-story approach, paying special attention to biography, life junctures which sometimes can be reversible turning points that he calls "mudes" and which prove to be essential, as in social and linguistic performance (see also Walsh & O'Rourke 2014). My informants also reflect upon how their linguistic practices have evolved throughout their life cycles. Such an approach is valuable, because we can then analyse language ideologies and the representations of social practices. Research on "new" Catalan-speakers revealed that linguistic practices and language ideologies are not static, but undergo changes throughout life (Woolard 2013, 2011; Pujolar & Puigdevall 2015).

In the traditional Hungarian Studies framework, the teaching of Hungarian as an additional language in Romania has for some time been the profile of the Hungarian Studies Department at the University of Bucharest (Murvai 2010, 1997; Kádár 2008; Péntek 2002; Molnár 2000). Since 1998 Hungarian as a foreign language "magyar mint idegen nyelv" has figured as an optional course at the Babeş-Bolyai University, too (Kádár 2008; Limba maghiară). Concerning Romania in general, we can find only brief remarks expressing that there has not been significant demand on the part of Romanian dominant speakers to learn Hungarian voluntarily (but see Marton & Vincze 2011). Hungarian language teachers in Romania also have language ideologies, but they have rarely reflected upon them in studies. For example Molnár (2000: 211), the head of the Hungarian Studies Department in Bucharest, opined that Romanian nationalism has nourished false images and prejudice against Hungarian language and culture, and the language teacher has the task to deconstruct these. With regards to teaching Hungarian in the multicultural Timișoara (Hungarian: Temesvár), Magyarai (2009) discusses such beliefs about Hungarian. From a wider perspective of Hungarian Studies, the history of teaching Hungarian to the majority populations in the neighbouring countries has been described by Nádor (1998, 2007, 2011a, 2011b) and Berecz (2013). In the traditional Hungarian Studies framework it is often argued that Hungarian can be useful to new speakers to conduct daily tasks in eight-nine East Central

European countries (cf. Balázs in Péntek 2001: 75, Nádor 2011). Currently, interesting work is also carried out in Slovakia (see e.g., Szilvási 2010, 2011).

Péntek, in his essay “A magyar nyelv értékelése szomszédaink körében” [The evaluation of Hungarian by our neighbours] made some interesting remarks in relation to the perception of the Hungarian language in 1997. He argues that the influence of Romanian on Hungarian is regionally significant, and Hungarian upon Romanian is also remarkable; however, Romanian linguistics generally tends to downplay this influence; moreover, some use the coinage “barbarism” when mentioning contact elements, which shows that even linguists may have deprecating language ideologies (Péntek 2001a: 7, Péntek 2001c: 80). Péntek also expresses the opinion that Hungarian studies is not in demand, or even rejected by the neighbouring countries. He sees signs that the prestige of the Hungarian language has fallen in the eyes of the ‘majority peoples’ [többségiak] in the neighbouring countries (2001b: 73), and recalls the Romanian public consternation and outcry at the so called “permissiveness of the educational law” that made possible the optional learning of Hungarian by Romanian students in the public education system. An interesting formulation by Péntek, which he calls a paradox, is that the minority language’s appreciation by the majority is “reversely correlated” with the number of speakers and their influence in the given context” (2001b: 74). He supports this by his observation that in Kolozsvár/Cluj the study programs of Jewish and German Studies, as well as Finnish Studies, are very popular with Romanian speakers while Hungarian Studies are not at all.

Finally, he also remarks that “[t]he obstacles are in the substrata of historical consciousness, and they are strengthened by modern-age nationalism and xenophobia” (Péntek 2001b: 78), but, at the same time, Péntek points out that there are promising signs from language schools where Hungarian is learned in Romania.

In Hungarian, research often focuses on Hungarian speakers in minority contexts, and their attitudes towards the state language such as Slovak or Romanian (e.g., Bilász 2013, Veres 2000). Péntek (2001c: 78-79) argues that there is need to see what is the images of neighboring countries majority groups like Slovaks, Slovenes, Austrians etc. of the Hungarian language. My research answers his calls inasmuch as I have researched Romanian’s language ideologies.

As my research progressed, I became acquainted with contemporary approaches to language and second language acquisition that challenge underlying assumptions about who is or who can be a Hungarian learner. Like Garcia, I also gradually realized that “identifying the students’ mother tongue” (2007: xii) or first language is far from being a straightforward matter, and there are greater complexities in what it means to be a ‘Hungarian-learner’.

Traditional SLA generally used the term *foreign language* for a language that is not learned in the environment where it is generally spoken and *second language* for one that is present in the environment. In Hungarian *anyanyelv* (‘mother tongue’) and *idegen nyelv* (‘foreign language’) are still normal terms

used to categorize and speak about languages in education. However, these terms are critiqued in the new approaches (Makoni & Pennycook 2007). I have analysed the language ideologies behind this practice and their consequences for teaching new speakers of Hungarian in different contexts in article 2 and 3.

A result of my study was that new speakers of Hungarian already possessed varying repertoires in the language that could be built upon, but which were not recognized. Blommaert draws attention to the fact that “the inequality of repertoires requires us to use a sociolinguistic backdrop for discourse analysis because what people actually produce as discourse will be conditioned by their sociolinguistic background” (2005: 15). Some learners of Hungarian were already in possession of a relatively high number of linguistic resources that they can deploy in different contexts (cf. Blommaert 2005: 28). I also demonstrate that learners have competences in registers of several languages and such competences change during their life span. These repertoires are overlooked by such terminology as “mother tongue”, which is traditionally used in the Hungarian context. According to McGroarty (2008), in a nationally-minded milieu, like those in Romania and Hungary, the term “foreign language learning” has frequent political uses. Therefore, I will use the phrase *new speakers* for the remaining part of this introduction since it is the least ideologically-loaded phrase. Other terms and phrases are used only when citing a source.

Novel approaches to language teaching advocate that one must not focus on proficiency in an invented ‘target language’, but more at developing “negotiation strategies” and “repertoires of codes” (Canagarajah 2007: 238).

I demonstrated in article 3 that Romanian interlocutors actively engage in trans-languageing when talking about Hungarian and Hungarian language courses in a regional Romanian television show in Romanian. Due to traditional normative and purist language ideologies (see Laihonen 2009), ideas of “mixing” languages, or the idea of using multilingual repertoires in Hungarian and Romanian educational settings, are generally frowned upon; however, I argue that this would be beneficial in developing new repertoires of codes where languages coexist, such as in my case with historical minority settings.

1.2 Research sites

Nagyvárad/Oradea

The original point of departure for my dissertation was to present an image of Hungarian language learning in Romania. My primary site of research, the city of Nagyvárad/Oradea, is situated in Western Romania, 10 kilometres from the border of Hungary. Until 1920, it belonged to the Kingdom of Hungary, and for a long time it used to be a major cosmopolitan city and centre of the then dominant literary cultural life in Hungary. Since then, the state language has solidified its dominant position in Romania, supported by government offices and education (Benő & Szilágyi 2005). Moreover, Hungarian has been perceived

in terms of its former dominance, and as a threat to be counterbalanced in a post-colonial venture with regard to integrating the region into the Romanian Nation State.

In the Hungarian historical narrative, the city of Nagyvárad for several centuries was one of the centres of Hungarian cultural life. One can recall the founder king Saint Ladislaus (in Hungarian Szent László), the outstanding humanist Janus Pannonius (1432–1472), and much later the vibrant coffeehouse culture of the cosmopolitan city at the turn of the 20th century, which is often referred to as the breeding place for modern Hungarian literature. A great many nonconformist poets, and intellectuals – like Endre Ady, Gyula Juhász, and the poets of the “Tomorrow” anthology – started out from here. Lately, their statues can be seen in a central location of the city, in a busy pedestrian area. At the beginning of the 20th century, while still part of Hungary, the Hungarian language monopolized the landscape of the city with marked official and social pressures to “magyarize” the Romanian minority speakers (Nemes 2010).

In his monograph on the politics of teaching Hungarian in the late Dual Monarchy, Berecz (2013) does not discuss the historical situation of Nagyvárad. Varga (2014) is one of the few who deals with Nagyvárad’s linguistic situation. In a recent study Varga argues that the city was overwhelmingly Hungarian speaking. He distinguishes between “the macro-level heterogeneity of languages” versus the monolingual linguistic practices of the citizens, saying that “current scholarship, alongside nostalgic literature, mistakes the multilingualism of the Habsburg Monarchy and that of its citizens in their everyday lives” (Varga 2014: 965). Berecz (2013) reached the same results in respect to the efficiency of teaching Hungarian in the Hungarian Kingdom, contending that this rarely resulted in children becoming functionally bilingual.

Varga argues convincingly that “macro-level multilingualism is thus often blurred within the individual, and while the former can be supported by satisfactory sources, the latter is poorly underpinned by evidence” (Varga 2014: 966). According to Varga, multilingualism was a far less dominant and widespread phenomenon, especially on the eastern fringes of the Monarchy. In his view, nineteenth-century observations about linguistic practices were made by the well-to-do and better-educated strata of society, but features of multilingualism were closely connected to the local market of languages and social relations (religion, gender, etc.). At the same time, the “nationalism promoted by the Hungarian government and the expansion of Magyar public space had an ambiguous impact on multilingualism, depending on the local society” (Varga 2014: 966).

When looking at the historical situation of language use, Nagyvárad was populated mostly by Magyar speakers in the early eighteenth century Hungary while the Orthodox population spoke Romanian, Greek, and Serbian. By World War I – after their appearance in the eighteenth century, and due to their constant immigration – the Jewish community became one of the largest in provincial Hungary (Lakos 1912 in Varga 2014). Fleisz (2005: 44 and 2011:154), a

historian of the city, also states that from the mid-nineteenth century up to 1910, while still a part of the Hungarian Kingdom, the population of Nagyvárad spoke chiefly Magyar (around 90%), Romanian (one-sixth), and German – spoken by the Jewish population – (one-sixth).

TABLE 1 Mother tongue and mono/multilingualism in Nagyvárad 1880–1910

	Nagyvárad			
	1880		1910	
Total population	31,324		61,034	
<i>According to mother tongue</i>				
Magyar	27,219	86.89%	56,527	92.62%
German	1171	3.74%	1098	1.80%
Slovak	344	1.10%	173	0.28%
Romanian	2050	6.54%	2870	4.70%
Ruthenian	46	0.15%	23	0.04%
Serbo-Croatian	33	0.10%	–	–
Croatian	–	–	26	0.04%
Serbian	–	–	22	0.04%
Other	461	1.47%	295	0.48%
<i>According to knowledge of languages</i>				
Monolingual	18,789	59.98%	43,018	70.48%
Multilingual	12,535	40.02%	18,016	29.52%

Source: Varga 2014: 973, for a similar compilation see also Fleisz 2011: 154.

As the above table illustrates, German did not have great vitality in this city of the Monarchy and the number of native German speakers gradually dwindled, while the Jewish community was rapidly Magyarized (Lakos 1912 in Varga 2014). In the interwar period, the Jewry in the Hungarian-Romanian multilingual cities was predominantly Hungarian speaking and claimed a Hungarian identity in censuses etc. (see Bárdi 2013: 150). At the same time, partly due to confessional differences, native Romanian speakers did not Magyarize into the dominant Hungarian-speaking population of the city. Both Varga (2014: 973) and Fleisz (2011) argue that the preference and demand for Hungarian monolingualism grew so much that in 1910 even the majority of Jews (56%) declared knowledge of Magyar only.

In 1910 about one-third of Greek Catholics and half of the Orthodox Catholics declared Romanian as their mother tongue. Apart from Greek Catholic institutions, the public space of Nagyvárad was monolingual Magyar throughout the entire era (Fleisz n.d.). According to the 1880 Hungarian census around three-quarters of native Romanians and four-fifths of native Germans

spoke a second language, in most cases Magyar. Over the next 30 years, even more native Romanian speakers learned Magyar; however, in 1910, only 18% of ethnic Romanians reported speaking Hungarian.

The Hungarian dominance lasted until 1920 – when Transylvania, including Partium, was ceded to the Romanian state –, but cultural, social, and linguistic strategies to make Transylvania Romanian would continue for many decades to come (Livezeanu 2000). According to 1910 census data, the percentage of inhabitants claiming Hungarian nationality (ethnicity) was 91.1% (Szarka 2002, 198) – this number included the large local Jewry, the majority of which perished in the Holocaust. According to the 2011 census, Nagyvárad/Oradea had 184,861 inhabitants of whom 23,81% registered Hungarian as their mother tongue.

For my discussion of learning Hungarian as a historical minority language, it is important to situate the theme in both regional and historical contexts as well as to examine the influence of changes in Hungarian and Romanian national politics and how they impacted this geographical region. Since the history of the city has been written by many (for a Hungarian perspective see e.g., Fleisz 2011; Dukrét & Péter 1998; Bálint 1990 etc.), in what follows I offer only a snapshot of some historical turning points so as to contextualize my dissertation in more detail than was possible within my articles.

From a Romanian perspective, Teodor Neş wrote about the most outstanding intellectual Romanian figures in Bihar (Romanian: Bihor) County, and through their lives and activity, presents the national aspirations of Romanians, active in the second part of the 19th century, and up until 1918. It is worth taking a closer look at Neş's work because he focuses on the regional perspective. He notes that while researching the Hungarian press he found that social phenomena related to Romanians was reported only fleetingly, and often in mockingly (Neş 2006: 3). The main narrative presented as the framework of his book is that of the emancipation of Romanians vis-à-vis the privileged groups of Hungarian, Szeklers, and Saxons who benefited from the oppressed Romanians in the Hungarian Kingdom. Neş describes the region as the historical "Hungarian Partium" that lay in the Hungarian Kingdom between historical Transylvania and Hungary proper. He explains how the Romanians in the Bihar, under Hungarian rule, felt themselves on the borderland between nations (see also Nemes 2010 on the language border). He draws attention to the particular local context that is often neglected by grand national narratives. Neş argues that, in spite of the occasional social revolts and uprisings, upward social mobility for the Romanian speakers was virtually impossible in the Hungarian Kingdom. In order to illustrate the different statuses of language use under Hungarian rule, he remarks that Hungarian and German were the only languages "worthy to be used in the world and in prayers to God" (Neş 2006: 5). When discussing Romanian cultural life in Hungary in the 19th century, Neş also describes the Romanian intellectuals and their fight for cultural affirmation on an ethnic and linguistic demarcation line – an idea that crops up frequently in academic writing – between Transylvania and Hungary proper. On 4 March

1849, these territories were delimited from the somewhat autonomous Transylvania, and they were eventually left to the direct reign of Budapest. Romanian bishops under centralized Hungarian rule, Andrei Şaguna and Vasile Erdeli, expressed a wish to be aligned with a more autonomous Transylvania again, and envisioned a union with Romania (Neş 2006: 14).

In this period, when the region belonged to the Hungarian Kingdom, Romanian intellectuals saw their only chance in adapting to the situation and approached Hungarian officials under the slogan: “With Budapest against Vienna”. And such was how certain Hungarian-Romanian cooperations characterized this period in Bihor (Neş 2006: 8).

The idea that Romanians in the Hungarian Partium should fight for their liberties within the framework of the Hungarian Kingdom led to the formation of the Romanian Hungarian Party (*Ungurenilor*) in 1848. Prominent leaders of the group included intellectuals from Bihor, most of them residing in Nagyvárad/Oradea: Emanuel Gojdu, Ion Dragoş, Nicolae Jiga, G. Fonnai, and other Romanian representatives in the Parliament in Budapest. They adopted an attitude of brotherly understanding between Hungarians and Romanians under the Hungarian crown, and the policy of this party was, for the most part, supported by the representatives of the Romanian Orthodox and Greek Orthodox bishopric and clergy. Among others, the Bihor politicians formulated demands in respect of the expansion of Romanian language use in Hungary: e.g., the unrestricted use of native language in churches, schools, and all matters of the Romanian nation, and the emancipation of the Orthodox church from under Serbian supremacy (Păcăţianu in Neş 2006: 20).

In the 19th century Hungary adaptation did not equal giving up “Romanian ethnic individuality”. As the prominent Romanian Nagyvárad lawyer, and a Member of Hungarian Parliament stated: “The Romanians rank the maintenance of nationality higher than personal liberty, for they consider national life as the basis of liberty” (Păcăţianu in Neş 2006: 19). During his exile, Lajos Kossuth gave an interview that was published in the Hungarian language newspaper *Nagyvárad* in 1893. Kossuth formulates there his position on historical minority languages in Greater Hungary and the magyarization of that time. “With the nations in Hungary you may not deal like with some newcomer immigrants. These peoples have lived there many centuries, and they – rightly so – are very much attached to that land. The language and religion of these nations is to be regarded as an ancient and sacred treasure which cannot be confiscated. The politics that would carry out this does not hold moral grounds”. Regarding language, Kossuth stated that: „each clerk in a village, county, or district has to speak the language of the people perfectly and use it in contact with the people... Of course, only Hungarian can be used as the state language in the parliament” (Nagyvárad, 14 May 1893 in Neş 2006: 36). The reality in the country was of another nature from Kossuth’s ideals (see Berecz 2013), and Faur (2008) notes that the Dual Monarchy followed a denationalization policy of Romanians and “their spiritual potential was silenced”.

My aim through recounting these historical precedents was to show that the context of Partium and Oradea mainly conformed to the larger national politics, and only rarely were there times that favoured mutual accommodation on the local (Nagyvárad) or regional level (e.g., Bihar County).

In regards to the historical precedence of teaching Hungarian to adult native Romanian voluntary learners in the larger Transylvania region, Berecz (2013) mentions voluntary free Hungarian language courses for adults in the last two decades of the 19th century, but he found no record of such courses after 1900. Hungarian cultural associations offered these courses; however, no trace of such courses can be found in Nagyvárad/Oradea. Berecz points out that after the initially well-disposed adult public's interest, the desire to learn Romanian eventually slacked, and such ventures were soon no longer offered in the multilingual cities of the Hungarian kingdom. He finds that learning the language in formal classes without genuine social interaction may have been boring and demotivating for the adult course participants (Berecz 2013: 151).

After a turbulent period following the First World War, when Nagyvárad/Oradea for a brief time became a "red city" in the Soviet Republic of Hungary, there followed a counter revolution during which the mayor and other leaders of the city handed over the keys of the city to the Romanian army under the command of Traian Moşoiu, who had hence been commemorated as liberators in the official Romanian historiography of the city (e.g., Borcea 2003: 54).

In regards to the ethnic make-up and the linguistic situation in the city in the following interwar period, which is now under Romanian reign, the centrally appointed mayors were Romanians, but they had to work with elected councils dominated by the Hungarian parties. The city governance "had to govern the city in conformity with the interests and values of the Romanian state, but in conditions in which the Hungarian and Jewish population remained in numerically majority and economical superiority to the Romanian population, in spite of its massive increase" (Cornea 2003: 66). It is often stated that the Hungarian-speaking Jewish population have long stood behind the culture and interest of Hungarians (Cornea 2003: 66). (For a detailed account on Jewish life and history in Oradea and their deportation see Mózes 1997).

The Romanian state fostered the establishing of many cultural and educational institutions "on the ethnic fringes of the Romanian nation and it was in need of more centres of culture" (Savu 1995: 14). Românaşu (2008) also points out the discrepancies in development between Hungarian and Romanian cultural organizations in Oradea, and Bihor County after Transylvania's annexation to Greater Romania in 1918. In his monograph, Românaşu describes in detail the coordinated efforts and urgency of the state through the organization of cultural associations aimed at "a cultural Reunion with the Unitary Romanian National State" (2008: 457). For example the establishment of the Romanian Orthodox Theological Academy in Oradea took place in 1923 (Savu 1995: 14). According to Savu, the aims of the founding bishop, Roman Ciorogariu, were twofold: "to save the souls, as well as strengthen their

patriotic feeling towards their new fatherland, Greater Romania” (1995: 13). In the period when Nagyvárad was briefly returned to Hungary (1941–1944), the teachers and students of this institution fled to Arad, and for the greater part of the war, they remained in Romania (Maghiar 1995: 6).

In the interwar period the loss of dominance frustrated the Hungarian population. Public life in Nagyvárad/Oradea, a border city, was marked by tensions between forces of Hungarian border revisionism and Romanian anti-revisionism. Despite the tensions in the interwar period the city maintained its peaceful multi-ethnic character, and there were no ethnic or racial incidents until the deterioration of international politics. (For more on everyday life in the interwar period from a Romanian perspective, see Crăciun 2010.)

Another major turning point in the life of the city was the incorporation of northern Transylvania, including Nagyvárad/Oradea, into Hungary. The Vienna accord on the fate of Transylvania, decided by the Axis powers Germany and Italy, was interpreted as a homecoming (in Hungarian: *visszatérés*) from the Hungarian perspective while Romanian historiography deems it an unjust Dictate and a “day of national grief” (Bihoreanu, Moșicat & Tulvan 2004: 17). On 6 September 1940, Hungarian troops entered the city and celebrations were organized in honour of Regent Horthy on the main square. On 4 October, 285 Romanian intellectuals (amongst them the last interwar Romanian mayor, Augustin Chirilă) were arrested and embarked on freight wagons and expelled across the new border to Romania. This incident of the “Hungarian occupation” is often recounted as a major moment of the transfer of power (Cornea 2003: 120), moreover as “a national tragedy” (Bihoreanu, Moșicat & Tulvan 2004: 6). One of the interviewed participants also referred to these events as “the Hungarian occupation” (see article 3).

At the end of World War II battles for the city were fought outside the city. The Romanian and Soviets troops ultimately “liberated the city on October 12, 1944” (Cornea 2003: 126; Moisa 2003: 149; Faur 2004: IV), and Oradea returned to the Romanian fatherland (for more on this and the Romanian nationalist discourse, see Bihoreanu, Moșicat & Tulvan 2004).

As we previously saw, the now “liberated” city was still dominated by Hungarian speakers, and they remained the local majority, until the middle of the 1970s. The ethnic balance changed as a result of the massive influx of Romanian speakers during the period of Socialist industrialization between 1944–1989 (Moisa 2003: 147). The city experienced great transformations in this period when many new factories were established and living districts were built and the number of inhabitants increased accordingly from 77,509 in 1945 to 250,000 in 1998 (Dukrét & Péter 1998: 21;). Later, the population of the city decreased to 183,123 by 2011 (Institutul Național de Statistică 2011) as a result of the process of deindustrialization that characterized the years following the regime change in 1989.

Since the relation between majority and minority languages has been asymmetric in most cases, the study of language ideologies around the learning of historical minority languages deserve attention. May (2012) has pointed out

that many Western intellectuals share the idea according to which majority languages stand for modernity and progress whereas minority languages are positioned as reminders of cultural disintegration, moreover, separatism. From such a modernist vantage point, it comes as little surprise that the practice which majority language speakers would set out to learn the languages of the minorities has not become a widespread practice (for a similar argument, see Nekvapil & Sherman 2009), and the opportunities for learning are more often than not also very limited. Notwithstanding these obstacles, I managed to set up a private venture in order to teach the Hungarian language in several courses to Romanians in Nagyvárad/Oradea.

The Debrecen Summer School

Another important site of study that connects my main context to the larger national and historical discourses that circulate around the topic is an adult training institution, the Debrecen Summer School (DSS) in Hungary. The institution offers short-term intensive language courses. For a long time it has been the most important institution with a declared goal to teach Hungarian as a foreign language “magyar mint idegen nyelv”, and it has received many thousands of language learners from all over the world throughout its 85 years of existence. The DSS has been a part of the University of Debrecen for most of its existence, too. The second or third largest city in Hungary, Debrecen is situated in the eastern part of the country in the Great Plains region, next to Hortobágy Puszta. The city of Debrecen has supported the DSS from early on, since it has brought significant revenue for the city by attracting numerous foreign visitors. However, the establishment of the DSS is to be attributed to the particular Hungarian circumstances of the times.

The DSS was founded in 1927 at a time when Hungary was still recovering from the shock of the Peace Treaty following the First World War when Hungary lost two-thirds of its territory, and 30.2% of its ethnic Hungarian population to the successor states (Romsics 1999: 123), of which 1.6 million were located in Romania. Between 1922 and 1931, Kuno Klebelsberg, the Minister of Religious Affairs and Public Education, orchestrated a major reform of Hungarian education. Klebelsberg professed that the only way for Hungarians to escape the lethargy of territorial losses and economic collapse after the First World War, was to aspire to cultural supremacy by preserving and improving the cultural and educational achievements of the nation (see Ormos 1994). At the time, the main aim of Hungarian politics was territorial revision. The concept of “Hungarian cultural superiority” was to become the ideological basis “on which the revision of the Trianon treaty was justified, and politicians hoped that their cultural policy would attract not only Hungarians, but even the non-Hungarians living in the lost territories across the borders” (Ormos 1999: 325). However, investing in the teaching of Hungarian to the neighbouring ethnicities was not part of the agenda.

In her discussion of ethno-linguistic nationalism and language ideology in Hungary, Gal points out that there have been two definitions of the nation:

“political nation” and “cultural” (2008: 221). While before the First World War Hungarian elites preferred the first, after the Treaty of Paris, Hungarian politicians embraced the idea of the “cultural nation”. This ideology, which would serve the unity of the Hungarian cultural nation across state borders, became dominant (Gal 2008; see also Langman 2002: 60–61). In this vein, an aim of the DSS was to offer the Hungarians in the so-called “successor states” (Romania, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia) opportunities to maintain links with the “kin-state”, and remain up-to-date on Hungary’s cultural and political developments, within a basically non-political framework (Gellén 2002; Némédi 1988: 179).

Jyväskylä

Jyväskylä, a municipality in Central Finland, is officially monolingual. The city was founded in 1837, and was chosen as a site for the first Finnish medium high school and teacher education thus becoming a Finnish language education centre. At the same time the capital, Helsingfors/Helsinki, was predominantly Swedish speaking in the 1860s (for more on Swedish-speaking Finns see Liebkind, Tandefelt, & Moring 2007; McRae 2007; Tandefelt & Finnäs 2007). Development was rapid, and the 19th-century settlement has come to be a major university city. In 2014, out of the 131,000 inhabitants, 312 are registered as Swedish speakers, around 0.2% of the population (Statistics Finland 2015; for a historical development of the number of Swedish speakers see Official Statistics Finland, McRae 2007, Tandefelt, & Finnäs 2007). The existence of Swedish daycare and schooling are proof of Swedish bilingualism even in this predominantly Finnish-speaking municipality (see Palviainen 2013b).

In order to better understand the Jyväskylä context, it is necessary to briefly elaborate the language policy of the country and the historical developments that led to the particular contemporary sociolinguistic situation. In present Finland, the first written sources in Swedish can be traced back to the 12th century. The present area of Finland was part of the Swedish Empire before it became part of the Russian Empire in 1809. The territory enjoyed autonomy as a Grand Duchy of Finland, and this was in fact the predecessor state of modern Finland. Independence of Finland was declared in 1917. As concerning language policy, Finland is an officially bilingual country, where Swedish and Finnish have equal status (The Constitution of Finland 2000). Intellectuals and state officials have used both Swedish and Finnish for some time and the elite did not enact resistance against learning Finnish, or later Swedish. Education is conducted either in Finnish or Swedish on an equal basis (see Laihonen 2015c); furthermore, as to the general educational reform of 1968, the other national language is a compulsory subject in both Finnish and Swedish medium schools (Palviainen 2010a).

Despite the fact that Swedish is not widely used in Jyväskylä, or Central Finland, nor is it present in the local linguistic landscape, the university and city offers many opportunities for learning Swedish (e.g., Palviainen 2012). A particularity of the Finnish context is that students are required to prove

proficiency in the second national language (for a large scale analysis see Palviainen 2010a). Most students are interested in obtaining the Degree Certificate of Studies in Swedish for civil servants (see Palviainen 2010a). Controversies about the compulsory learning of Swedish are general in Finland (e.g., Palviainen & Jauhojarvi-Koskelo 2009; Palviainen 2013a).

My studies and location at the University of Jyväskylä have given me the opportunity to look at the context and issues also from a theoretical perspective, framing it in contemporary sociolinguistics and SLA perspectives and comparing it to the voluntary learning of Swedish by Finnish speakers in order to bring the PhD dissertation into a more general and theoretical perspective. Like many modern European states, Romania upholds the ideology of the unitary nation state with one national language (The Constitution of Romania 2003), in comparison, in Finland, Swedish retained its function as a co-official language along with Finnish (The Constitution of Finland 2000, McRae 2007). This fact prompted Kamusella to remark that Finland is not a “‘true’ ethnolinguistic nation-state” (2009: 57). I compared these two contexts of language learning in order to see whether, and what kind of consequences the above approach has had for language ideologies with respect to the voluntary learning of the historical minority language.

1.3 Research questions

My research questions are based on the first practical acquaintances with the field and therefore include practically-oriented questions as well as more theoretical ones. The research questions for this study are formulated as follows:

- *Which are the typical learner types that study the historical minority’s languages in the given contexts?*
- *What are the language ideologies of the learners, society, and the organizers of voluntary education towards learning a historical minority language as an additional language?*
- *What are the representations, descriptions, or evaluations of the Hungarian (and Swedish) language and its varieties in the opinion of the majority learners?*
- *What underlying ideological considerations hinder or facilitate learning in the Romanian (and Finnish) contexts?*
- *What political positions and cultural notions in the anthropological sense are linked to the learning of the local historical minorities’ language in Romania (and Finland)?*

1.4 The structure of this summary

Next, I present a section (2) detailing the methodological procedures and considerations followed in my articles and discuss how my overarching approach of studying language ideologies offers cohesion to my PhD work. I

will also elaborate on the uses of conversation analytic methods for the study of language ideologies. In the Methodology section, I further explicate how the Nexus Analysis meta-method contributed to my better understanding and describing the complexities of the discourses and navigating practices around the learning of historical minority language voluntarily. I also draw some conclusions about the implications, restrictions, and benefits of following these methods.

In section 3, I present my data and sources in a chapter dedicated to the detailed description of my fieldwork. This includes the presentation of the language courses in Nagyvárad/Oradea 2010–2012 and fieldwork at the Debrecen Summer School in 2012 as well as fieldwork in Jyväskylä in 2013. Finally, I conclude the discussion with some ethical questions.

In section 4 of this summary, I present the results of my PhD process, highlighting the main contributions of my four articles to the results of the dissertation. Subsequently, there is a section that includes my answers to research questions on the basis of the articles. Finally, I conclude the summary with a discussion where I write about the implications and possible future directions for research.

1.5 Articles included

The present work is a doctoral dissertation in the form of a selection of articles and a summary. I have included the following articles:

- 1) Hungarian as a Second Language in Oradea/Nagyvárad: Cultural Reflections and Language Ideologies. In Fenyvesi, K. (ed.) *Transition and difference: Hungarian Perspectives On East and Central European Studies, Symposium for PhD Students, 7th International Congress of Hungarian Studies*, Kolozsvár/Cluj-Napoca, 2011. Budapest: International Association for Hungarian Studies, 279-293.
<http://issuu.com/kristoffenyvesi/docs/transition2012/281>
- 2) A magyar mint második nyelv tanításának nehézségei és sikerei Nagyváradon. [The difficulties and successes of teaching Hungarian in Oradea] *THL2 A magyar nyelv és kultúra tanításának szakfolyóirata – The Journal of Teaching Hungarian as a Foreign Language* (2012/1–2), 97–115.
www.epa.hu/01400/01467/00009/pdf/EPA01467_thl2_2012_1-2_097-115.pdf
- 3) Teaching the neighbours Hungarian: language ideologies of Romanian voluntary learners and the Debrecen Summer School. *Multilingua. Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*. Ahead of print, 14 July 2015. Doi: 10.1515/multi-2014-1030.

www.degruyter.com/view/j/mult.ahead-of-print/multi-2014-1030/multi-2014-1030.xml

- 4) Language Ideologies and Learning Historical Minority Languages: A comparative study of voluntary learners of Swedish in Finland and Hungarian in Romania. Apples – *Journal of Applied Language Studies* Vol. 9 (1), 2015, 87-109.
<http://apples.jyu.fi/article/abstract/352>

The articles were written in English (articles 1, 3, 4) and Hungarian (article 2). They were published in international forums. The articles were adjusted to meet the requirements of the editors, as well as the expectations of different audiences. The first English language one was written with an international audience in mind that was not foreign to the field of Hungarian Studies; the second one for a Hungarian reading audience, while the latter two were written for a specialized audience interested in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics.

To conclude, Article 1 introduces the topic and places it in the framework of international scholarship and samples some possible avenues of research for future investigation. It served as a starting point to my PhD work. Article 2 places the study within the framework of Hungarian Studies, and at the same time situates it in a historical perspective while pointing to international trends in the field of reflective ethnography. Article 3 refines the approach of language ideologies and the methodology of analysis on study abroad and language ideologies. It opens the scope of research internationally, and shows larger cycles of discourses. Finally, Article 4 formulates results in the light of the voluntary learning of historical minority languages in general. All four articles have unifying themes as the uniformity of approach, language ideologies, the consistency of methods ethnography, and discourse analysis. The results of all four articles can be read as part of discourse cycles about the same topic, and they can be organized into a consistent whole with the help of Nexus Analysis meta-theory (see section 2).

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Introduction

The first Hungarian courses preceded my idea of developing the topic into a dissertation. First I gathered various kinds of data about the teaching and the topic and started my work with an open mind in a way to see what methodological issues it will raise (Blommaert 2006). Eventually, I conducted an ethnographic study of learning and teaching Hungarian for Romanians as well as organizing such education and carried out an exploratory comparison with Finns learning Swedish in voluntary settings. That is, I approach the field from the emic perspective of anthropological sociolinguistics applying ethnographical data collection methods as outlined by Ten Have (2004), Heller (2008), and Blommaert & Dong (2010), which to some extent preceded the establishment of research questions. In this manner, my study can be defined as data-driven and qualitative minded. In the articles, close attention is given to the ethnographic data in respect that it prompted the research questions and guided the ways of reporting it. In this sense, I follow a concept of ethnography developed by Geertz (1973), who considers it more a viewpoint than a method. In the study of the complexities and particularities of social scenes, Geertz aimed at "thick description". The ethnographic approach of stressing the open-ended nature of research aims at "getting quality from the actor's point of view" (Atkinson 2005: 50), which is particularly congruent with the approach of language ideologies.

In my articles and in this introduction I take a broad definition of discourse as "all forms of meaningful semiotic human activity seen in connection with social, cultural, and historical patterns and developments of use" (Blommaert 2005: 3). Blommaert and Verschueren also point out that "empirical ideology research is almost necessarily discourse-centred" (2002: 26) and "the level of implicit meaning is of particular importance because of the common sense nature of ideology: a world of ideas and attitudes which is basically taken for granted as a yardstick" (Blommaert & Verschueren 2002: 26).

Blommaert & Verschueren oppose “transcendental linguistic views” of discourse (2002: 27). They also advocate an “ethnographic and historical approach to the data, complementing the discourse-analytical approach which focusses on the structure of the data itself. The ethnographic approach compels us to analyse the data in the context of a synchronic pattern of social relations and practices” (Blommaert & Verschueren 2002: 27). This approach is congruent with Scollon & Scollon’s, who also conceptualize discourse analysis as a field of study in which microanalysis allows for “unfolding moments of social interaction or a much broader socio-political-cultural analysis of the relationships among social groups” (2004: 8).

2.2 Approach: Language ideologies

I approach the study of the voluntary learning of minority languages by the majority through exploring language ideologies in interviews. Before I introduce the language ideology framework (Schieffelin, Woolard & Kroskrity 1998), I would like to point out some tenets about language and the sociolinguistics context that stand at the basis of my understanding of language ideologies in relation to language learning. In her monograph, *The Multilingual Subject*, Kramsch emphasizes how “symbolic forms construct subjective realities such as perceptions, emotions, attitudes, and values” (2009: 7). In my study I am interested in this aspect of the multiple subjective realities, and ideological horizons created by the language learners in relation to their languages. I consider both of them fluid and emerging in the context (Laihonon 2008). Langman points out the concerns in current sociolinguistics, as “the moment-to-moment actions of one speaker in a particular time and place affect both the form of what is said and the meaning that is intended, as well as the manner in which it is interpreted by the others in the interaction” (2013: 244). A combination of this concern for interaction and going “beyond the propositional meaning to the ideologically enriched meaning” (Langman 2013: 246) in order to analyse and link micro- and macro-level discourses can best be done by applying the language ideological framework.

Susan Gal (2006a) conceptualizes the field of language ideologies as a form of discourse analysis, and defines it as “cultural, metapragmatic assumptions about the relationship between words, speakers, and worlds” (388). Gal (2006b: 15) argues that, in order to unfold language ideologies, we need to analyse the configuration of these sometimes unconscious cultural assumptions and notions that serve as a frame for linguistic practices (cf. Woolard 1998).

McGroarty notes that “language ideologies have both personal and societal valence[s]” (2008: 98). Surveying different contexts, she demonstrates that language ideologies are expressions and consequences of socio-political conditions, and they can be directly political inasmuch as policy can influence what languages or varieties are favoured or prohibited.

As Wortham (2008) and Spolsky (2010) have established in their reference works, language ideologies constructed by language learners are considered central to understanding issues involved in the learning and teaching of additional languages. Other studies (see Rampton, Charalambous, & Charalambous 2014; Zenker 2014; Cenoz & Perales 2010; McEwan-Fujita 2010) have pointed out that this applies in particular to the context of adults learning the language of a historical minority voluntarily. This seems to hold even in the case of elementary schoolchildren (Martínez-Roldán & Malavé 2004). The implications of language ideologies for language learners can be far reaching since, as Duszak notes: “Ideologies, whether invited or imposed, normally come and go with a language” (2006: 95). Language ideologies also offer insights into “the microculture of communicative action to political economic considerations of power and social inequality, confronting macrosocial constraints on language behavior” (Woolard & Schieffelin 1994: 72).

The study of ideas, beliefs, and theories of language have developed into an important field. Earlier research was mostly contextualized in psycholinguistic theory. In research, both traditional and contemporary attitudes are studied in the socio-psychological framework (Baker 1992; Marton & Vince 2011); where the method of study has been hypothesis driven and quantitative (Kalaja 1999; Kalaja & Barcelos 2006; 2012a; 2012b).

The proponents of folk linguistics (Niedzielsky & Preston 2000) offer a somewhat more socially grounded and qualitative analysis of language perceptions. However, they do not include conceptions in their analysis, which separates them from the study of language ideologies (see Silverstein 1979).

The literature of ideology has seen a burgeoning since the 1990s. Woolard and Schieffelin’s (1994) seminal study remained the most important contribution that summarized the tenets of the field. In the Hungarian literature, language ideological discussions started somewhat later, but they gained terrain amongst Hungarian linguists in the 2000s. Language ideological discussion was at the centre of the Conferences for Hungarian Sociolinguistics [Előnyelvi konferencia] in 2008 and 2010 (see Hires, László, Karmacs, & Márku 2011; Borbély, Vančoné Kremmer, & Hattyár 2009). Without the intent to compile a comprehensive list, important contributions to the field in Hungarian include Domonkosi (2010), Kontra (2006, 2008a, 2008b, 2009), Laihonon (2004, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2010a, 2010b, 2011, 2013a), Lanstyák (2003-2004, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2010a, 2010b, 2011), Sándor (2001a, 2001b, 2006), and Szabó (2012).

In the Hungarian minority context, a more refined and interpretative social psychology framework has been offered in the sociolinguistic study of Langman and Lanstyák (2000), who analyse the cognitive processes behind the informants’ accounts. Finally, Langman (2013) summarizes her qualitative studies in different Hungarian minority contexts and combines the approach of language ideologies with social psychology. Such a move is not present in this dissertation, since the goals and interpretative framework was ethnographic and interactional from the beginning.

2.3 Conversation Analytic methods and language ideologies

Implicit and explicit statements as well as conceptions about languages occur frequently in interviews (Laihonen 2009a, 2008). As we saw above the Language ideologies approach not only allows the use of fine grained methods, but it considers it useful, because applying such methods allows us to gauge how “local practices in local contexts are negotiated” while “powerful external discourses are imposed” (Langman 2013: 247). Therefore, in the analysis of the interview data, I was oriented by applied Conversation Analysis (CA) as a suitable method for its valuable practices as well as for its insights into analysing spoken interaction. In comparison to the generally more static ethnographic accounts, “CA portrays social behaviour as dynamic, emergent and situated vis-à-vis the interactional contingencies of the moment” (Atkinson, Hanako & Talmy 2011: 88). I was interested in the ideas interviewees have about the historical minority languages they are learning, and what kinds of explicit evaluations they make about the learning of said languages. Interactional data is also used by Jaffe (1999) and Heller (2011a; 2011b), largely from the discourse analytic perspective of analysing the content of turns by different actors, however, Laihonen (2008, see also Ten Have 2004) brings together insights from Language Ideologies and Conversation Analysis in order to show how the contents and details of shifts in interaction are actually co-constructed and how language ideas are intertwined with the interactional structure in interviews.

My investigation focuses on the transparent, explicit talk about languages, their value, and how and why they are learned. My interpretations are framed in a large ethnographic analytical framework, but at the same time during the course of the analysis of the data it became obvious that the interviews themselves need to be tackled, therefore I focus my attention on the analysis of the interviews as interactive events (Laihonen 2008). I recognized the problem, that in my case also, the interviewer could influence the account; therefore, it is necessary to examine interactional shifts that can occur in the interview data. To address this concern, I also needed another methodological framework besides ethnography. I decided to use an applied form of Conversation Analysis and this helped augment my analysis of the interview data. At the same time, for me, it is relevant to see what larger discourses the interviewees orient to, reproduce, or dispute. The applied CA approach complements well the approach of Language Ideologies in my case, since ideologies “have foundations in interaction and in the normative framework that speakers invoke in and through their talk” (Laihonen 2009: 24).

My interview data consists of open-ended, semi-structured interviews (see Hutchy & Wooffit 1998: 173; see Ten Have 2004 for different interview types) with Romanians about learning Hungarian and Finns about learning Swedish voluntarily. I point out how the “metalanguage is connected to the social situation” (Laihonen 2008: 671), as well as how “world views or social

positions" (ibid.) are co-constructed together during interview interaction (see also Mori 2012; De Fina 2009). That is, when a story is told, it is told for this interviewer (me) in the interactional context of the interview; for instance, because the interviewer asked a question and perhaps did not understand the answer, the interviewee ended up clarifying his answer with a [new] narrative.

In my articles, I use the interactional analysis of discourse in order to better understand how social realities are constructed. According to Heller (2001: 251), we should also examine "patterns of discourse as they emerge in interaction", and understand them as "primary acts of meaning-making". Therefore, I take the interpretivist stance of linguistic ethnography, describe practices and address questions to shed light on language ideologies in order to gain insights into the relation of social action and language learning. In the analysis of my data, I combine the epistemological principles of conversation analysis and discourse analysis. That is, I use an integrative approach and look at larger social and historical processes and structures beyond the interaction. The circumstances of observation are as important as the observed phenomena itself. Langman also argues that it is the job of the researcher to analyse "potential sets of meanings that words have and to place them in the context in which they are uttered" (2013: 256).

Even though I find poststructuralist approaches to identity useful (Norton & McKinney 2011; Block 2007a, 2007b; Norton 2000), since they view identity as multiple, fluid, fragmented, and conflicting, I do not pursue the identities (Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004), or community of practice approach (Wenger 1998; Lave & Wenger 1991). I chose to combine discourse analysis of different data in order to uncover language ideologies. I adopt the Conversation Analysis-SLA approach and demonstrate the nexus of these "performed," "co-constructed," and "situated," identities (Benwell & Stokoe 2010). Szabó (2013), in his studies on the metalanguage of school children, has demonstrated that Conversation Analysis can pinpoint the co-constructed nature of knowledge by locating changes in metalanguage within the same interview. I also found that language ideologies are constructed and re-constructed in the case of Romanians learning Hungarian.

In the analysis of my data, I use integrative approaches and consider the larger social and historical processes and structures beyond the interaction. Furthermore, I take the ethno-methodological perspective (e.g., Ten Have 2004) against prior exogenous theorizing, which looks at participants in the interaction as competent agents who constantly produce and understand their social world together, and no aspects of the data will be dismissed a priori (Kasper & Wagner 2011).

2.4 Nexuses of learning a historical minority language

My multiple and complex data (learners, different contexts, media and institutions, locations and teachers, in Nagyvárad/Oradea (Romania), Debrecen

(Hungary), and Jyväskylä (Finland); see chapter 3) can be organized through the concepts of Nexus analysis as defined by Scollon and Scollon (2004). I am inspired by Nexus analysis in the first place as a practical research procedure, not using it as an overarching general method (cf. Tapio 2013). In other words, Nexus analysis being grounded on the ethnographic research paradigm offers a suitable analytical framework to refer to large-scale discourses by examining small scale situated actions.

My dissertation draws on different types of data from educational settings aiming at an examination of situated social actions from many perspectives (cf. Tapio 2013). In nexus analytical terms, my work can be interpreted as mapping social actions about the learning of Hungarian through ethnographic fieldwork, and then navigating through these social actions to see how they are interconnected with other social practices and discourses relating to the teaching and learning of Hungarian in this particular context (see especially articles 1 and 2).

While my focus is on the discourse about learning a historical minority language 'on site' (Gee 2005), I also point out aspects of interaction from a wider viewpoint, showing how learning these languages is also a social action and has semiotic cycles of discourse (article 4) that can help us better understand the history and meaning of that social action. According to nexus analysis discourse, analysis carries two meanings: "the micro-analysis of unfolding moments of social interactions", and the "broader socio-political-cultural analysis of the relationships among social groups and power interest in the society" (Scollon & Scollon 2004: 8). This study does not focus on power interests in particular, as in critical discourse analysis (cf. e.g., Fairclough 1989); my interest is, rather, to explore how the activity of learning the local historical minority language links to 'social, historical patterns and developments of use' (Blommaert 2005: 3). At the same time, I intend in my analysis to follow "not only a close, empirical examination of the moment under analysis but also an historical analysis of these trajectories or discourse cycles that intersect in that moment" (Scollon & Scollon 2004: 8).

I am influenced by nexus analysis, precisely, because it offers a connection to the two levels of discourse analysis; namely, the micro-analysis of interaction, and a broader analysis of social and power relationships. In my studies, I also examine social action, discourses in place, and interaction order; however, I do not use terms such as *historical body*, as the scholars of nexus analysis (Scollon & Scollon 2004; see article 2). In this way I am not only describing what is happening but also touch upon the historical antecedents of what the informants refer to in the interviews. Furthermore, nexus analysis helped me to acquire researcher's awareness, that is, to understand/realize that the researcher is a constitutive part of the research scene (cf. Langman 2013, 2002) (see chapter 3).

In article 4, analysing the institution of the Debrecen Summer School, I draw on Heller's argument (2007) in the analysis of French-language minority schools. According to Heller, it is useful to examine "discursive practice for

understanding basic dimensions of social organization and for understanding them as process and not as object" (2007: 651). Following Heller (2007), my intention was to analyse the historical trajectories in the Debrecen Summer School as a discursive space, alongside the interests and mobilized resources that framed the distributed knowledge in the case of the Debrecen Summer School. Inspired by Scollon and Scollon (2004), my intention was also to present an institutional ethnography. Rather than a case study, the Debrecen Summer School presents a nexus of activities and discourses in time and space. I located the language ideological discourses around the Debrecen Summer School in their changing historical contexts. That is, I adopted a historical perspective (cf. Heller 2007; Scollon & Scollon 2004) in examining the Debrecen Summer School from its foundation to the present.

2.5 Conclusions

My research combines several qualitative, sociolinguistic approaches and methods: language ideologies, ethnography, discourse analysis, and nexus analysis. All of them are needed to unite the distinct parts of my dissertation. However, the approach of studying language ideologies is present in all four articles, hence it is the most important for my work. Again, working with other methods, such as language attitudes (e.g., Veres 2000, Marton & Vince 2011, Bilász 2013), could have resulted in different perspectives, interpretations, and findings. Nevertheless, my findings (see chapter 4) could hardly have been reached by hypothesis driven and quantitative methods.

3 FIELDWORK, DATA, AND SOURCES

This section provides the description of fieldwork, data, and additional sources of my dissertation. First I present my data, and give an account about how I carried out observations in Romania, Hungary, and Finland. This is followed by a description of the ways in which I used the data as well as the process of selecting data for the articles and a brief record of what was left as background knowledge and how it was used in the articles.

3.1 The process of data collection

I first got acquainted with the topic of teaching a minority language to the majority in 2008 when I started teaching Hungarian as a foreign language at the Debrecen Summer School, in Debrecen, Hungary. I was teaching “Hungarian for foreigners” in Hungary; however, during my first teaching experience, the fact that I came from Nagyvárad, Romania, was noticed and the idea to teach Hungarian for adults there as well was discussed with the Debrecen Summer School management, who had ideas about extending the courses to other countries (see article 2 for details). My research intentions to study the voluntary learning of the historical minority language by the majority language speakers did not appear until 2010. It was then that I drafted the first proposals, sketches, and ideas about the learning and teaching of Hungarian in Nagyvárad/Oradea.

The first Hungarian course in Nagyvárad/Oradea was held in 2009. It was followed by courses in 2010 and 2011, and by courses in nearby locations in 2012. In 2010 I started collecting research materials, kept a research diary, and gathered information about my Hungarian courses as they appeared in the Romanian mass media. I collected everything in Nagyvárad/Oradea that seemed relevant to my topic, and contained metapragmatic reflections on the use and learning of Hungarian in Nagyvárad/Oradea. Later, my observations and research of background materials became more systematic and my work

was focused more on including background materials reflecting larger societal issues about language learning and use.

The core period of my data collection and observation falls between the years 2010 and 2013 when I organized and taught several Hungarian language courses in Nagyvárad/Oradea, the main focus of my study. I worked also as a teacher of courses in different locations close to my main field that presented many similarities as well differences to my main area of research. I taught short intensive courses of usually two weeks to one month in the multilingual city of Arad, the administrative centre of the neighbouring Arad County (2010). Further courses were held in the bilingual town of Élesd (in Romanian Alesd), a town in Bihor (in Hungarian Bihar) County, as well as two Romanian villages near Nagyvárad/Oradea: Madaras, and Homorog (2012). In order to maintain the focus on my main area and core research foci, concerning Nagyvárad/Oradea, these courses were not presented in the articles. However, the conducted research and interviews offer some important insights, too. They serve as background knowledge that enabled me to formulate relevant observations and substantiate certain arguments.

In 2012 I conducted research at the Debrecen Summer School in order to present the teaching of Hungarian in a more historical and general perspective. Furthermore, in 2013, I gathered data in Jyväskylä. This data was used in article 3, which presents the learning of Hungarian in Romania in a comparative perspective to that of the learning of Swedish by Finnish speaking adult learners.

Data collection followed the epistemology of ethnography. Aside from the primary sources already noted, I collected large amounts of supportive background materials (brochures, photographs, photocopied documents, etc.). My field notes and observations amounted to 50 handwritten and word-processed pages. In 2011–2012 I also devoted time to mapping the Internet for personal websites, blogs, forums, and educational and commercial sites in order to chart all these digital affordances and sources related to Hungarian language learning addressed to Romanians. I also recorded local and national television broadcasts on teaching and learning Hungarian in Nagyvárad/Oradea from 2011–2012, and this data provided important insight into how the teaching of Hungarian is discussed in the public sphere. Article 4 includes a detailed analysis of a local television programme, whereas accounts in the Hungarian Duna TV are briefly examined in article 2. I also followed and observed the social media at large and comments made to local digital newspapers, collected interactive commentary about the organization of the courses, and Hungarian language learning. This data is briefly touched upon in article 2, but a bulk of it was left for further use. In all research sites also some linguistic landscape (see Cserniczkó & Laihonen 2015; Laihonen 2015a, 2015b, 2013b, 2012; Laihonen & Tódor 2015; Szabó 2015) data was gathered, especially from the history of the Debrecen Summer School (see article 4); however, this data awaits further analysis. Aside from the primary data, auxiliary data was collected after these dates in libraries, internet databases, and scientific journals. All of these

resources that I accumulated over the years contributed to the formation of my dissertation.

3.2 Language courses and data sources

The fieldwork was initiated in 2010 when I started teaching Hungarian courses in Oradea. The data is restricted in locale and time. I focus on Oradea, and courses organized and taught by me in the years of 2010–2013. Aside from interviews conducted in Nagyvárad/Oradea, I also interviewed people in other locations in Bihor County: in the second biggest city Élesd/Aleşd, and in two villages near Nagyvárad/Oradea: Madaras and Homorog. I also conducted research in Debrecen, a site that is in the nexus with teaching Hungarian to Romanians through its traditional summer language courses.

There were different stages to the interview collections. Most interviews with Romanian participants in Nagyvárad/Oradea were conducted in 2011, and complemented by Romanian participants at the Debrecen Summer School in 2012 in Debrecen. In the same year, these interviews were complemented by interviews in the neighbouring villages to Nagyvárad/Oradea. Interviews for a comparative study were conducted with Finns learning Swedish in Jyväskylä in 2013. Below I present the table of the semi-structured interviews:

TABLE 2 Table of informants

Place of the interview	Year of birth	Education	Interview length
Nagyvárad/Oradea			
Woman	1965	University	25 min
Woman	1962	University	1hr 20 min
Woman	1973	University	30 min
Woman	1975	University	35 min
Man	1957	University	25 min
Woman	1961	High School	30 min
Man	1980	University	25 min
Debrecen			
Woman	1970s	University	20 min
Woman	1970s	University	32 min
Woman	1970s	University	35 min
Woman	1980s	University	28 min
Woman	1970s	University	26 min
Woman	1970s	University	15 min
Hungarian male teacher	1960	University	50 min

Jyväskylä			
Woman	1950s	University	20 min
Woman	1970s	University	34 min
Man	1950s	University	27 min
Man	1960s	University	23 min
Woman	1980s	Vocational	15 min
Woman	1980s	Vocational	21 min
Woman	1950	College	17 min
Woman	1950	College	22 min
Background interviews			
Madaras & Homorog			
Woman	1994	Secondary School	22 min
Woman	1993	Secondary School	34 min
Man	1990	Secondary School	14 min
Woman	1972	Secondary School	24 min
Man	1980	Secondary School	21 min

In addition to these tape-recorded interviews, there were informal discussions with other course participants and staff at each sites. I conducted each interview and each of them contained similar closed and open-ended questions, but the order of the questions was free. Typical questions included the following: “Why do you learn Hungarian?”; “Where do you use Hungarian?”; and “What was the reaction of your circle of friends, acquaintances” etc. The questions were adjusted to the interactional context, which was analysed (to some extent) in my articles as well (see especially articles 3 and 4). My/The research objectives were not precisely delineated; however, the interview questions were planned in advance. Therefore, I could develop alternative questions freely during the interview and be flexible while conducting my fieldwork. I usually started the interviews with general questions about the informants’ age and background, and followed with general questions about the informants’ relationship to their respective historical minority languages, and their language learning experiences. In the course of the interviews I intended to gather views and reflections about the languages each participant were learning. I allowed the interviews to be guided by the informants in the direction they felt most at ease with. The issues that each informant felt important were then explored in detail. Even though the interviews were not structured along rigid lines, they still cannot be posited as spontaneous conversations between peers (cf. Laihonen 2009a; 2008). The topic itself gives cohesion to the interviews because each of them had the learning of historical minority languages as their central theme.

I started the interviews by asking why the participant has learnt the language, as well as asking how other people reacted to their decision to participate in a course on the historical minority language. I enquired about their trajectories as learners of Hungarian, or Swedish, and the areas of use of these languages as well as relations to members of the historical linguistic

minority. Beyond the fact that each of the interviews were conducted by the author, the uniformity of approach and areas of interest resulted in comparable data sets.

3.3 Fieldwork in Nagyvárad/Oradea 2010–2012

I started teaching Hungarian to Romanian speakers in 2009. The interviews in Nagyvárad/Oradea were carried out with the course participants in the classroom where they had their classes twice a week. In the case of Nagyvárad/Oradea, I was present as a teacher (for details, see Kiss 2013). In Nagyvárad/Oradea I documented three courses from 2010 to 2011. I asked the course participants who attended their second course to participate in an interview around the middle of the semester-long course. The data consists of individual interviews, or pair interviews, which usually lasted from 30 to 90 minutes, resulting in a total of circa 4 hours of tape-recorded audio material. The interviewees are mostly middle-aged intellectuals, who worked in education, healthcare, business, or were civil servants. In general I can say that my informants in Nagyvárad/Oradea can be identified as ‘white-collar workers.’

Interviews were conducted mostly in Romanian, because interviewees as a rule preferred to use Romanian with me. One interview was also carried out in Hungarian with a participant whose knowledge of Hungarian was already very advanced. This happened a year later when one of the interviewees also participated at the Debrecen Summer School and she gave me an interview in Hungarian in addition to the one in Romanian a year earlier.

All interviews were concerned with language issues, but sometimes the informants tackled various other issues, like the coexistence of ethnicities, recent developments in the cultural life of the city (such as controversies related to the preservation of built heritage), or the split of the theatre into a Hungarian and Romanian section.

In Nagyvárad/Oradea, aside from the interviews, I collected other material connected to my courses from the media and the internet (e.g., messages from social media and video documents), brochures, posters, and other relevant written material related to learning and teaching Hungarian. I also recorded television programs about my courses (ca. 3 hours of video data). One of the television programs is analysed in article 3. Other programs included for example a newsreel by the Hungarian Duna TV, which showed the interest my course produced in Hungary. These were either newscasts about the course, or talk shows about learning Hungarian at my courses in Nagyvárad/Oradea, or at the Debrecen Summer School (Kárpát Expressz 2010, Híradó. Duna TV 2011). My articles mainly present interview data gathered during the fieldwork in my project.

As mentioned earlier, I also conducted ethnographic research in some additional sites in Romania. That is, at intensive Hungarian language courses in

Arad (2011 November-December) and Élesd/Aleșd (2013 July-August). I also collected interviews with Romanian learners in the villages Madaras, Homorog, where I taught summer courses in 2012. The participants at these courses in the villages were unemployed and their courses were set up by the local employment office and funded through a cross-border cooperation project. Thus, I could contact a larger demographic; however, they did not belong to the group of voluntary learners, and this data was thus not examined in detail.

Some of the participants declined to give an interview, or they did not agree to being tape-recorded; others agreed to an interview and note-taking of what they said. As I spent relatively long periods of time with the informants, I could conduct a research diary and write vignettes. I also visited different institutions where these languages were taught, or I myself taught in these schools. I taught Hungarian at five sites and also conducted interviews with other teachers who taught these languages (see article 2 for details and reflections). These conversations also serve as background material in order to better understand the topic of research. At the different sites I also took photographs of signs in order to document the visual representation of languages (e.g., street signs, commercial signs, private signs, etc.). However, they were not used as data in my articles; the informants referred to when they talked about their motivation to learn Hungarian e.g., some classified advertisements what the interviewees occasionally referred to in reference to knowledge of Hungarian constituted an additional advantage.

In regards to the general demographics, the data has its limitations since it concerns only those who attended formal language courses. In the case of Nagyvárad/Oradea, I organized these courses, while in the other Romanian locations, I was only one of the teachers. A diversity of demographics could not be achieved because those attending courses in Nagyvárad/Oradea were mostly highly trained professionals, while the group in Élesd (Aleșd) was offered to healthcare staff, the participants being medical nurses and doctors, while the villagers consisted of mostly young people, secondary school graduates, and middle-aged persons who were mostly unemployed. The different make-up of the courses offered a rather general overview of the demographics, but the issue of limitations of the validity of research cannot be overruled altogether. The number of those Romanians who have various degrees of proficiency in Hungarian is much larger. Since I was interested in the language ideologies of the learners', in my articles I analysed the interviews of those who took part at formal language courses voluntarily. The number of bilinguals who live in ethnically-mixed relationships, or marriages, or bilingual children growing up in such households can have a good working knowledge of Hungarian (on the influences of the environment and school education upon bilingual development see Vančo 2011: 46–48). However, my intention was not to describe the sociolinguistic situation of Nagyvárad/Oradea, but to present the socio-cultural phenomenon of the voluntary learning of historical minority languages, and to describe an image of those who are learning the language.

My data was gathered in connection to language courses, mostly after the classes, and therefore other research directions, like the mapping of social networks, was not possible; even though some informants refer to these in the interviews, this was not my main interest and so I did not pursue it. I was more interested in gathering interaction data in order to unravel language ideologies on learning Hungarian and I followed other strands of information only to the extent that it could be significant for such ideologies on the spot.

To sum up, I do not claim that my data can be generalized to the larger region of or Nagyvárad/Oradea. In any case, I am convinced that the Language Ideologies present in the data are generally known to most people in the city and its surrounding region, and they are thus part of the repertoire for local Romanians of talking about learning Hungarian (cf. Laihonen 2009a; Gal 1993).

In relation to analysing the interviews gathered in Nagyvárad/Oradea, some aspects of the interviews can not be interpreted easily after the interviews, because the interviewees do not explain many things since they consider it common knowledge. The explicit character of many references or trajectories (Jaffa 2015; Heller 2007) became clear to me when I compared the interviews made in Nagyvárad/Oradea, Romania, to those made in Jyväskylä, Finland (see Article 3).

Social media comments also contributed to my general knowledge of the theme. In order to illustrate the general attitude to Hungarian, I include a few snippets from comments sections (in Romanian) after the brief factual newspaper article announcing my course in the local paper¹:

Excerpt 1

Nu inteleg de unde ura asta pentru neamul maghiar... aici se vede ce inchisi la minte sunt unii dintre romani in loc sa invete ceva nou si folositor mai bine isi baga capu in nisip precum strutii...is mai avantajati cei care stiu mai multe limbi mai ales la angajari dar in fine ura e mai presus de orice...

I do not understand where this hate for the Hungarian nation comes from... This shows how narrow-minded some of the Romanians are. Instead that they should learn something useful they hide their head in the sand like the ostrich. Those who speak more languages have an advantage over those who don't. Especially when applying for a job. But after all hate seems to be above everything ...

Excerpt 2

Frustrare. Vorbesti mai bine pe dreacu. E doar atitudinea specifica a unguirilor de a se crede superiori. Cind ajungeti, in cele din urma, sa va dati seama ca sunteti varza, va puneti streangu' la gat. Hai slabiti-ne cu limba voastra marginala cu tot.

Frustration. The hell you speak better [Romanian than Romanians]. It is only the specific attitude of Hungarians to think of themselves to be superior. In the end you realize that you are nothing, you put your neck in the rope. Spare us with your marginal language and all.

¹ The comments were posted at: <http://www.bihon.ro/cursuri-de-limba-maghiara-pentru-romani/news-20100922-02332979>, last visited 2 September 2015.

Excerpt 3

E jenant. XY. De ce n-ai curajul de a semna articolul? Ti-e frica de repercursiuni? :) In fine... Oare cetatenii de etnie maghiara (nu toti) nu ar vrea sa invete limba romana, ca doar traiesc in Romania?

It's embarrassing. XY, why don't you sign the article? Are you afraid of repercussions? :) Anyway... Why Romanians of Hungarian ethnicity (not all) do not want to learn Romanian, even though they live in Romania?

Many negative opinions were expressed in the comment section of the digital newspaper. Such comments strengthened my initial observation that there is a general negative attitude towards learning Hungarian. There were even harsher ones (see the first article) than those I present here. For instance, excerpt 1 illustrates the typical discourse of how Romanians in Nagyvárád/Oradea do not know the Hungarian culture and past, because Hungarians are presented in their education as "evil", which is discussed in detail in articles 1 and 4. Such comments also add up to the idea that Romanians look askance to those who learn Hungarian, bearing some resemblance to Cypriots ideas about learning Turkish as analysed by Rampton, Charalambous, and Charalambous (2014), and the opinions of Slovaks in internet media comments about the language rights and language use of Hungarian in Slovakia (Szabó Mihályi 2009). This also contributes to the fact that Nagyvárád/Oradea has a very difficult language ideological atmosphere to organize the teaching of Hungarian, a historical minority language (see article 2 for details).

At the same time, language ideologies among Romanian speakers in Nagyvárád/Oradea are not uniform, and I managed to organize several courses with voluntary students paying for learning Hungarian after all. The changes for teaching Hungarian and interest in learning it were present in the ideological "battlefield" of newspaper comments as well. For instance:

Excerpt 4

pe bani - slabe sanse

Ceva similar ar trebui făcut din grădinița, când mintea reține mai ușor (cursuri opționale). La liceu- cursuri de civilizație maghiară - chiar în românește - problema e să știi ce au dat culturii universale și să-i apreciezi pentru asta, chiar dacă nu le știi limba - a învăța o limbă străină e totuși un efort, ce crește cu vârsta. Desigur efortul aduce și o răsplată invizibilă: creierul iese fortificat din acesta gimnastică. Pentru premianți - o excursie la Budapesta.

For money - poor chances

Something similar should be done starting from kindergarten, when you memorize more easily (in the form of optional course). A course on Hungarian civilization should be offered in secondary schools - even in Romanian -, the issue is to learn about what they gave to world culture and appreciate them for this, even if you do not speak their language - to learn a foreign language after all requires effort that increases with the age. Of course it also has some invisible rewards, because you mind can grow stronger through this mental gymnastics.

Excerpt 5

hai sa fim seriosi.... de cate ori a-ti dorit sa stiti maghiara pt ca va ajuta mult. Pt noi ii un avantaj mare daca stim...

Come on let's be serious... how many times you wished you spoke Hungarian because it helps you a lot. For us it is a great advantage that we speak it...

Excerpt 6

Eu cred ca vor fi doritori ...

I think there are those who would attend ...

Such comments, which were somewhat similar to the views of those who actually took part in the research, gave hope for organizing new courses, and they also indicate that a change in Language Ideologies is possible on a more general scale in this realm as well (cf. articles 3 and 4).

3.4 Fieldwork at the Debrecen Summer School in 2012

In Debrecen, Hungary, I conducted research in the university library and archives, as well as at the Debrecen Summer School Archive, and collected course books from different periods used at the Debrecen Summer School, the institution teaching Hungarian to foreigners. I also interviewed the leaders of the institution and conducted interviews with Romanian learners who visited the institution in 2012. In addition to the interviews, I kept a diary about the locations where I did research, and the conversations I had. I also took photos, copied documents, and documented events at the Debrecen Summer School (see article 4).

In Debrecen I interviewed Romanians who studied Hungarian there during a one-week course. They were each teachers at different secondary schools in the cities of Satu Mare (in Hungarian Szatmárnémeti) or Cluj (in Hungarian Kolozsvár). Their program was focused on the teaching of less widely spoken languages, and they expressed that they would find it useful to learn Hungarian because they were teachers of Romanian in Hungarian language schools; according to their own views, even basic skills would facilitate their work.

An important, but often neglected aspect of language learning is how it is advertised, what images are used, and what materials are available to the learners. Therefore, I collected brochures, posters, and analysed textbooks from different periods of the Debrecen Summer School. Due to reasons of space, the analysis of course books used at the Debrecen Summer School had to be cut from article 4. However, it is still referred to as background material illustrating the impact of historical changes, especially the effect of Socialism upon language teaching (see also Fischer 1996, Maticsák 2002). That is, the ideas

presented in article 4 are well manifested in course books too. For instance, in the course books in use at the Debrecen Summer School, the idea of the Puszta evolved from a national Romantic pastoral imaginary, where learners were Austrian intellectuals to a socialist Hortobágy as a site of modern agriculture to be visited by East German workers (see Fülei-Szántó & Mihályi 1966, Magyar világhíradó 1936–1948).

Also, some linguistic landscape (see Laihonen 2013b; Laihonen & Tódor 2015; Szabó 2015) data was gathered, especially from the history of the Debrecen Summer School; however, this data awaits further study and remained only as background data for article 4. One example on how visual communication can construct and support dominant language ideologies is provided here:

FIGURE 1 Debrecen Summer School Poster from ca. 1938



A brief analysis of the poster:

Key words like Summer Holiday Course and Debrecen are in orange and printed much larger print than other parts of the text. The program starts with “A WEEK IN BUDAPEST”. This signals that the attraction of the capital city was acknowledged by the organizers as a strong enticement for participants. We see how the leaders of the institution recognized and actively used touristic stock images in order to market their course. Under the invitation for “the most ideal summer-holiday”, the organizers mean the concerts, festivals, bathing, and sports events offered. The excursions

offered include Hortobágy Puszta and Lake Balaton. The Puszta has been a part of Hungarian national imaginary since the 19th century, elevated to its status by the famous romantic poet Petőfi. These romantic national images have been converted to 'Hungarian' touristic objects, which are further connected to learning Hungarian in a Study Abroad context. That is, the puszta presents a "landscape as an identity icon" (Pujolar & Jones 2012: 109).

The analysis of the poster, which had to be cut from article 4 due to reasons of space, supports claims based on other data in article 4.

During the research visit to Debrecen in 2012, I also collected interviews with other foreigners who were learning and/or teaching Hungarian in their home countries and were taking part at refresher courses in Hungarian at the Debrecen Summer School. These interviews would also be very interesting in respect of language ideology studies, although they were not included in the present dissertation, but could serve as data for later studies. In addition to the interviews, following guidelines of the ethnographic method, here too I collected supporting material like: brochures, internal documents, yearbooks, and old magazines so that I could gain insight into the historical discourses about this topic.

3.5 Fieldwork in Jyväskylä in 2013

My third site of data collection was in Jyväskylä, Finland. The historical minority language studied this time was Swedish, which is in fact the second national language of Finland. Furthermore, there appears to be a populist campaign against learning Swedish in Finland as part of compulsory education. I examined Finnish speakers who despite of such ideologically loaded views of language still learn Swedish voluntarily in a city where Swedish is seldom used. To answer such questions, I gathered ethnographic data from the Community College (*Kansalaisopisto*) where Swedish courses are held. My fieldwork there included participant observation, collecting teaching materials and interviews with the teacher, as well as comparative interviews with 10 Finns learning Swedish. Such people consisted mostly of intellectuals, who were asked about whether they use Swedish personally, or need it for employment purposes. In Jyväskylä, I took part and observed some Swedish courses, but the interviews were conducted with another group. The interviewees were mostly university graduates, or worked in the service industries. In Jyväskylä, there were more elderly, pensioner participants than in Romania. In Jyväskylä, I visited the *Kansalaisopisto* 10 times. Research diaries and institutional course brochures serve as sources of background information.

I scheduled the interviews before or after their weekly Swedish classes at the Community College. We usually sat down in the cafeteria of the City Library in Jyväskylä, where *Kansalaisopisto* has its premises. Article 3 in my

dissertation is based mainly on the findings of semi-structured interviews that were conducted by me in English in Jyväskylä.

Due to my personal background I was looked upon as a visitor in Finland. In Jyväskylä, the process of interviewing was different than at the other sites. In Nagyvárad/Oradea, my role in the field was foremost that of a teacher of Hungarian for the informants, a person who organized and taught Hungarian evening courses at the premises of a Hungarian high school, and a member of the ethnic Hungarian minority. As someone who lived most of his life in the city, I was looked upon as a person who did not need an introduction to the local situation.

The problem of the researcher position has become an important question. As a reaction to the former, the authoritative, privileged view of the researcher was challenged by Woolard (1998: 26), who points out that the researcher's position, previous knowledge about the field, and personal history in relation to the research field and informants should be included in the researcher's previous knowledge and personal history (Woolard 1998: 26-27) in relation to the topic described. In certain fields like language anthropology this is firmly embedded in the research tradition. Various branches of sociolinguistics and critical discourse analysis (Fairclough 1989: 5) emphasize that the researcher can no longer be purported to be an objective observer, or an analyst of the phenomena described by him (see also Laihonen 2005). The viewpoint of the researcher cannot be purported to be objective. As many sociolinguists point out, the researcher unavoidably becomes a key actor in the research, and the nature of his/her relationship to the informants has to be considered in order to understand its possible implications upon the analysis of the data (e.g., Langman 2013, 2015; Fairclough 1989). Reflecting upon this relationship is then a necessary part of the research process.

I was an insider in Romania, but an outsider in Finland. That is, in Romania I was treated as a person who possesses a great deal of emic and local knowledge. Due to my shared background and our classes, I had developed a closer personal relationship with the Romanian informants than with the Finnish informants, whom I met for the first time when I solicited their interviews as a foreign researcher. Therefore, they looked upon me as an outsider, who is not likely to be familiar with the ethnographic and political details of learning Swedish in Finland (for details, see article 3).

In relation to qualitative and ethnographic sociolinguistics in multilingual contexts, Langman remarks that the researcher's stance emerges and develops over time and he/she needs to develop some new competences, too (2013: 257). In order to be able to carry out this research in addition to my proficiency in Hungarian and Romanian, it was necessary that I acquired some Finnish and Swedish skills, too.

3.6 Ethical questions and summary conclusions

While the interview data could be considered limited, the number of interviews was restricted to the number of those attending these formal voluntary courses; in addition, not every participant wished to give an interview, or be tape-recorded. Tape-recorded consent to use the data for research was requested for interviews with the remark that the participants will remain anonymous (in the articles pseudonyms are used) and I assured the interviewees that they would remain unidentifiable (only minimal personal data, such as age and education, is provided).

In spite of the fact that I recognize limitations of space and time for the practical narrowing of scope, I consider that the data contains discussions about language, language learning, multilingualism, and a wealth of language ideologies about these local situations which allow me to carry out qualitative analysis of discussions about language and language learning.

For the purposes of this collection, only a part of my data was analysed in the articles; some of this additional data was described and briefly discussed in this chapter since it served as a significant source of background information and point of reference for the claims made on the basis of the core data results.

4 RESULTS

4.1 Overview

My dissertation research began in 2011. In my article-based dissertation, I examine the problems of learning, teaching, and organizing adult education on minority languages in a collection of four articles (Kiss 2015a; 2015b; 2013; 2012), and this summary. All four have been published in peer-reviewed compilations and journals. Here I will briefly summarize the articles. I also aim to reframe the earlier articles (1 and 2), according to the knowledge I have acquired during the dissertation process. Article 2 is described in more detail, since it was published in Hungarian. Finally, I will indicate how the articles answered my research questions.

4.2 Article 1

Hungarian as a Second Language in Oradea/Nagyvárad: Cultural Reflections and Language Ideologies. In Fenyvesi, K. (Ed.) *Transition and Difference: Hungarian Perspectives on East and Central European Studies*. Symposium for PhD Students, 7th International Congress of Hungarian Studies, Cluj-Napoca, 2011. Budapest: International Association for Hungarian Studies, 279-293. <http://issuu.com/kristoffenyvesi/docs/transition2012/281>

Article 1 marks my entrance to the study of the field of language ideologies research in relation to voluntary learning of a historical minority language. In this article, I give a general outline of the approach within which I position my subsequent articles, too. Here I argue that my topic requires closely examining language ideologies and interaction in a socio-historically sensitive arena in which the language-learner identity is socially negotiated (Gal 1979). I position my study in the qualitative methods.

Already in article 1, I formulate my intention of carrying out a multi-disciplinary approach in my dissertation and the use of selected theories of discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, cultural studies as well as second-language acquisition studies. At the same time, after researching the critical literature, I argue for the necessity of the ethnographic approach and language-ideology framework, because there are no similar studies on my subject in the region.

In the interview excerpts analysed in Article 1, I illustrate some typical areas of bilingual language encounters. I also raise problems of language contact, and what my participants call 'mixing languages'. These topics could have taken my research into another direction, but my intention was not to pursue areal linguistics. It was also later during the research that I became acquainted with modern approaches to language learning and the concepts of trans-languaging (Garcia 2007). Therefore these approaches do not figure in this first article.

Based on interview data, I elaborate on the consequences of nationalistic discourses in the 1990s and how these shaped language ideologies about Hungarian and learning Hungarian for Romanians at that time. An important result of this article is that it illustrates a so far neglected aspect in Hungarian SLA, namely how the individual language learner is biographically shaped (see De Fina and Georgakopoulou 2008; Wetherell 2008; Blommaert 2005). In the article, I raise the validity of small stories research and the intersectionality of identity (see Georgakopoulou 2007; Ochs and Capps 2001). Another contribution this article makes is the discussion of mediation in the case of Hungarian through television, which used to be a much more important aspect in the past than it has been as of recent. I will become more aware of this problem when I gain greater familiarity with the works of the Scollons (2004) in mediated action and the nexuses of social reality. In the article I present excerpts that would lend themselves to this approach that will be the practical organizing principle of my article into a dissertation. Subsequently, I analyze some excerpts that make explicit the motivation of the learners.

In Article 1, I illustrate how the linguistic situations in the field resist easy categorization and sociolinguistic ethnography can deliver more accurate answers in a context where it has rarely been applied. Based on interview data, I presented how language learners are acutely aware of the fact that language itself is not a neutral medium, but that it reflects a great deal of the symbolic power differences (Bakhtin 1994; Bourdieu and Thompson 1991), and it is not only native speakers of minority languages who encounter this power position of the dominant language, but the dominant language speakers themselves as well.

I argue that in order to facilitate communication in border regions like Oradea, which have a very distinct character, we should closely examine the chances we have of learning each others' languages in diverse minority situations, identities, practices, and hitherto unanalysed language ideologies that exist and operate in these regions. Additionally, we should also closely

examine how the learners can become members of their new imagined communities (Anderson 2006), and where there exist gateways into the historical minority language communities (Peirce 1995).

4.3 Article 2

A magyar mint második nyelv tanításának nehézségei és sikerei Nagyváradon. [The difficulties and successes of teaching Hungarian in Oradea]. *THL2 A magyar nyelv és kultúra oktatásának szakfolyóirata – The Journal of Teaching Hungarian as a 2nd Language*, 2012 (1-2), 97-115.
www.epa.hu/01400/01467/00009/pdf/EPA01467_thl2_2012_1-2_097-115.pdf

This article describes a state of the art of Hungarian language learning and teaching in Romania. I give an overview of the field from the vantage point of Hungarian studies, and survey Hungarian language literature on the topic, as well as present some contemporary approaches to the topic from international sociolinguistics. Most importantly, however, as a new contribution to the field, I deliver an auto-ethnographical account in order to illustrate, through my own endeavours, what it means to organize, teach, and research courses of Hungarian in Romania. My intention in this article was to map the possibilities and challenges for organizing and teaching Hungarian as an additional language in the context of Nagyvárad/Oradea through my own example as a teacher and organizer.

The article contains marked self-reflection because it presents my own development as a second-language teacher. I reflect upon my changing attitudes towards the transmission of Hungarian language and culture at the start of my own teaching practice. I place this article in the framework of language ideologies, and argue that the success of teaching Hungarian as a second language hinges on positive language ideologies, and the mitigation of negative ones. One of the conclusions of the article is that only the reinforcement of positive language ideologies favour the study of minority languages. I point out that in spite of its importance, the study of language ideologies was generally neglected. I bring up the importance of the socio-cultural approach to language learning (see Block 2003: 6), an approach that so far was ranked second behind the cognitive school, markedly more forceful in the Hungarian language literature, and I argue that the teaching of Hungarian to the neighbouring majority language speakers was not dealt with sufficiently. The very idea was generally downplayed with remarks that there is very limited request on the part of Romanians to study Hungarian.

In Article no. 2, I review the background of teaching Hungarian as a second language in Romania, and I give an overview of the fairly scant literature on it (see Murvai 2010, 1997; Magyari 2009; Kádár 2008; Molnár 2000). Another important contribution of this article is that I use an autobiographical perspective inspired by Lankshear-Knobel (2004: 8) in order to unravel how our

own predispositions, values, and worldviews influence our practices, and argue that this cultural self-reflection is especially useful when one attempts to tackle the complexities of teaching a minority language and one is himself/herself a member of that minority. I draw attention to the need that teachers not only have to improve themselves professionally, but that they also need to be aware of the particular social-historical relationships which influence their conceptions and actions (e.g., Horváth 1998: 309; Kalaja & Barcelos 2012b).

Since my article was published in Hungarian, it also serves the knowledge transfer in the sense that it draws attention to the developments which long gained ground, and for some time defined the paradigm but have not fully been incorporated into the research literature in Hungarian. For instance, I present to the Hungarian reading public the narrative analysis of learners' and teachers' narratives as advocated by e.g., Pavlenko (2007; see also Todeva-Cenoz 2009; Kalaja, Menezes, and Ferreira 2008). Langman (2003) pioneered this approach in relation to Hungarian learning. It is significant because narrative analysis represented a shift towards exploring the emic perspectives of the learners. Therefore I exemplify this through my own activity, at the same time, being aware of how these autobiographical narratives are cultural products that reflect the expectations of literary and social norms or structures (Pavlenko 2007: 175). In my case, in the spirit of ethnography, the researcher is looking for an active relationship with the object of research, and the interpretation happens through self-reflection, so in Article no. 2, I depict how the course organizer-teacher, and the researcher in one person uses himself as a means/tool in order to construct the phenomenon of teaching Hungarian in Oradea. I give a brief account of my linguistic development into a Hungarian-Romanian bilingual, and through my example how the possible Hungarian language teacher is socialized in this bilingual context. Through my own coming of age, I exemplify some of the difficulties of learning and areas of use of the state language, Romanian as discussed by sociolinguists (e.g., Szilágyi N. 1998: 131-148) for the same period. This section of Article 2 is an important piece in the construct of Nexus Analysis, the methodological tool that I will make use of and complement in other articles (Articles 3 and 4), too.

Here I give a description of my own historical condition from the years of being socialized into a Hungarian-dominant bilingual place in a particular period of one of the most oppressive social systems, the national socialist dictatorship of Ceaușescu in the 1980s. I recount my subsequent student years in the Hungarian world of Kolozsvár/Cluj (cf. Brubaker 2006: 266-267), and how my training as a Hungarian and English teacher, and becoming an English teacher later on, opened opportunities to become a teacher of Hungarian as an additional language. I relate how becoming a Hungarian second language teacher was not a planned choice, but more an outcome of circumstances.

Next, I describe the practical steps taken in the organization of the first courses. Here I give an outline of the market of previous Hungarian courses for Romanians. I enlist all institutions and language schools, and private or state schools where courses had been taught. I give a brief general description of the

courses, write about the number of participants, and the impressions of the organizers.

Thus, in this article, through ethnographic research, I employ the methodological tool-set of nexus analysis as an organizing principle, by giving a detailed description of who were the agents acting in this field, their historical bodies, and how they influenced the social action (see Scollon & Scollon 2004) that is the teaching of Hungarian as a historical minority language in Nagyvárad (Oradea). I also present some discourses in place (Scollon & Scollon 2004) as they can be observed to circulate in the brochures, leaflets of the language schools, as well as reports on this social practice in the media.

An important contribution of Article no. 2 is that it gives a detailed depiction of how I set out on navigating, mapping, and circumferencing (Scollon & Scollon 2004: 87) the complexities of the field before I engage in the social action of teaching Hungarian in Nagyvárad/Oradea. In this study I also describe my expectations about the start of the courses, the concrete marketing steps taken, the advertisements, and the expectations on my part. For example, I describe how I approached local Hungarian decision-makers and representatives of business in order find sponsors for my courses and advertise them among the Romanian-speaking employees and colleagues of Hungarian-owned firms.

In addition, I survey the available Hungarian language textbooks and resources on the internet since they represent the interaction order and mediation (Scollon & Scollon 2004) through which one can perform the social action of teaching Hungarian as a minority language to the majority. I enlisted the resources developed with a beginner Romanian learner in mind. I could appreciate that they are few and far between; locating these resources is difficult, and this in itself already sets the first obstacle for those who want to start learning Hungarian through Romanian as an intermediary language. There are older books that could be found only in libraries (e.g., Balogh, Pamfil, & Balázs 1986), but even the newer resources went out-of-print a decade ago (Koháry & Fazakas 2006; Magyari 2004; Ganz & Ganz 2004). I point to an internet resource which seems to enjoy some degree of popular success among the learners (www.nebulo.ro) which was developed by enthusiastic Hungarians from Transylvania; however, they are not professional language teachers. The popularity of the site and the favourable feedback from the visitors suggests that there would be a need for similar web resources.

In the article I contend that the mediation of Hungarian as a second/additional language through Romanian is deficient both in print and in digital formats. I also dedicate more attention to the *Hungarolingua* series, and especially the textbook *Hungarolingua Basic*, because this was the textbook that I used for the beginner courses and I translated this textbook into Romanian while making minimal cultural changes (for example in the names).

There was no room for a detailed analysis of the course book. An example of the analysis on which I based my claims is provided here: Besides the traditional clientele, it began by providing intensive Hungarian language

courses for foreign medical students. Since 2010, the Debrecen Summer School has produced study materials for this new target group. Another significant new group of language learners are the Erasmus students who also use the same textbook for their intensive Hungarian courses. In the newest Debrecen Summer School course book, the *Hungarolingua Basic* (Marschalkó 2012, 2011), we find names like Iran Parvin, Latifah, Renee (p. 11). The intermediary language of the book is English. This reflects the idea that it mainly caters to international students with a non-European, predominantly Arab background. There are plans to publish the Arabic translation of the book, too. All these measures mark a clear extension of the Hungarian language target group to a global audience. *Hungarolingua Basic* contains no cultural references or information about Hungary. The focus is mainly on practical everyday situations like ordering pizza, buying coffee, etc. There is a list of names indicating that a significant number of Hungarian proper names have English equivalents: György (Hungarian) for George (English) etc. This implies a turn from the intellectual and professional language learner to a learner type who needs survival skills. However, this learner type is not a tourist, but students who need basic skills for studying and living in Debrecen.

The Debrecen Summer School was the first to recognize the market potential and need to develop bilingual textbooks of the neighbouring languages. The first Romanian translation of the original English edition of *Hungarolingua Basic* (Marschalkó 2011) was published as *Hungarolingua Basic: Curs de limba maghiară pentru începători* (2012). The adaptation of the book to Romanian contains grammar explanations in Romanian and from a contrastive point of view. Only minor changes have been made in respect to the content of the book. One interesting detail could not fit in the scope of my article, namely that these changes include proper names: In the Romanian version we find in each example George for György, Paraschiva for Piroska, Victor for Győző. Other Romanian names appear in the book, too: Ioan, Paul, Vasile, Margareta, Iosif, Alexandru, Elena, Maria. Equivalents of common surnames are also given in both Romanian and Hungarian: "Mare = Nagy, Croitoru = Szabó, Lăcătuș = Lakatos, Grădinaru = Kertész, Fieraru = Kovács" (Marschalkó 2012: 13).

Article no. 2 also refers to the extensive media attention that followed my course. Most of these media reports have remained unanalysed, but some of them have been presented in other articles (see excerpts in Article no. 4). Many of the comments in the media were very negative (see a few excerpts in the Fieldwork and data section), which supports Molnár's (2000: 309) observation about the existence of stereotypes and prejudice in Nagyvárad (Oradea) more than a decade later. I also quote Magyari's (2004: 1) claim that one needs a certain degree of courage in order to organize, teach, or even just learn Hungarian in Romania.

In the article I give an account of all the attempts of offering courses in other regions of Romania, too. According to Péntek (2002), the prestige of Hungarian has increased. To this I add my practical observation that the good will of Romanian would-be course participants is essential. They could play a

major role in popularizing the courses in their own circles. The article concludes that there is a need for methodological training and development for those Hungarian teachers who would be willing to embark on teaching Hungarian as an additional language in this context.

I also argue for a reconceptualization of the traditionally used L2 term *magyar mint idegen nyelv*, Hungarian as a foreign language. Though my self-reflection I illustrated how a teacher in a minority context faces dilemmas about his role. The aim is often to convey knowledge about Hungarian culture and society, and also about Hungary as a cultural nation, including historical Hungary, and the regions and cities in the neighbouring state in question, in order to illustrate the values of Hungarian culture in their own surroundings. The role of the teacher as intercultural communicator should be more pronounced because the majority of voluntary course participants expressed have limited knowledge of the local Hungarian minority's cultural achievements. The very concept of Hungarian as a foreign language, Hungarian for foreigners – and the approach that it suggests – could be even counter-productive for the Hungarian minorities in the surrounding countries to Hungary. It is not appropriate in the context where Hungarian is the language of the environment, or as is the case with some of my course participants, it could be a heritage language, or the language of a spouse. In order to increase familiarity and closeness, I suggest that teachers should use more teaching sources from the Hungarian language surrounding the majority language speakers (the local linguistic landscape, local Hungarian newspapers, etc.). These would offer more links to the local historical minority's language and culture (cf. Murphy & Carpenter 2008: 17). Another idea promoted by the article is that the teaching of Hungarian should also follow the trend started by Hungarian linguists living in minority settings (in Romania, Slovakia, Serbia, etc.) by seeing Hungarian as a polycentric language, and make the teaching of Hungarian more accessible by for example introducing some contact elements that are proof of the centennial coexistence with the neighbouring peoples in the Danube region. It was only later that I learned that the educational material that takes into account the heteroglossia of the learners already exists elsewhere (Busch & Schick 2007).

4.4 Article 3

Teaching the neighbours Hungarian: language ideologies of Romanian voluntary learners and the Debrecen Summer School. *Multilingua. Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*. Ahead of print 14 July 2015. DOI: 10.1515/multi-2014-1030.
www.degruyter.com/view/j/mult.ahead-of-print/multi-2014-1030/multi-2014-1030.xml

In Article no. 3, I enlarge the cycle of discourses and present an institutional ethnography, focusing both on the large historical discourses as well as on contemporary discourses circulated in interviews about the learning and teaching of Hungarian to Romanians at the Debrecen Summer School. I also examine the learning of the historical minority language abroad, that is, in the country where that language is the official language (Hungary).

In article no. 2, I presented the discourses with regards to Nagyvárad/Oradea in a larger historical framework while the goal in Article no. 3 was to analyse the issue by adopting a more encompassing focus, and situating my topic in a larger, East-Central European context through an important institution. Only few attempts have been made to present the institutional complexities of voluntary learning in East Central European contexts (for an alternative see Jaworska 2009).

In my study, I unravel a set of political positions and cultural notions in the anthropological sense (e.g., Talburt & Stewart 1999), which are linked to teaching Hungarian to the "titular" speakers of the neighbouring countries. "Titular" here means the dominant ethno-linguistic group of a country, typically after which the state has been named in East Central Europe, too, such as Slovaks (Slovakia), Serbs (Serbia), Croats (Croatia), and Romanians (Romania). More specifically, I look into the conceptions of Romanian speakers in respect of learning Hungarian.

I outline the major turning points in the history of the Debrecen Summer School in order to demonstrate that language ideological positions in relation to the teaching and learning of Hungarian have been firmly located in historical and cultural contexts. I also investigate how Romanians as potential participants have been perceived by the leaders of the Debrecen Summer School.

Ethnographic study and discourse analysis of various data presented in article 3 demonstrates that, on the one hand, the course providers have espoused competing ideologies of who the learners should be, as well as how to present the country and the culture, while, on the other hand, showing that the learners have had to negotiate prejudices and stereotypes rooted in discourses about the (often burdened) history. I applied the language ideologies approach to SLA's Study Abroad setup to the Hungarian context where, to my knowledge, it has not yet been used. I combined this with a sociolinguistic orientation and diachronic perspective, through the history of an institution I demonstrated how this has become a very important nexus for Romanian learners, and I illustrated how learning Hungarian as a second language has always been context sensitive and imbued with cultural political considerations about who the learners should be, and what values language course should convey.

I presented some segments from the historical trajectories of the DSS as a discursive space, alongside the interests and mobilized resources that framed the distributed knowledge in relation to language learners from the neighbouring countries. I compiled data about the number of Romanians attending the institution throughout its history, and I drew the profile of those

taking part in the courses. Findings show that, aside from the scholarship recipient students, the intellectual type was a typical participant. They may have studied the language not solely for professional reasons, but – as is usual in the Study Abroad context – as form of “active relaxation”.

I applied CA inspired discourse analysis in the analysis of media interviews in order to unravel ideologies in the “microculture of communicative action” (Woolard & Schieffelin 1994: 72) as presented to a larger Romanian audience.

The intellectual learner type is reflexive of the discourses surrounding her chosen language and her identity as a heritage language learner emerges in the interview, but does not take central place rather it remains as one element of her identities.

I gave insights into language ideologies of Romanians, namely, how they talk about using and learning Hungarian among other Romanians. The discourses which arose were framed against a historical background and, on the part of the interviewees, to some extent, against traditional Romanian nationalism. I demonstrated in the analysis how Romanian-Hungarian translanguaging (see, e.g., Garcia 2007) is used to create a situated regional identity by the Romanian interlocutors on Romanian medium television. They use a significant number of Hungarian expressions, which are not translated into Romanian for the audience either.

I illustrated how – for the greater part of the 20th century – Hungarian elites have favoured the “cultural nation” definition of Hungary while the neighbouring nations in East Central Europe have emphasized the importance of the “civic or political nation” stance (e.g., Langman 2002). Such conceptual antagonisms have rarely fostered the learning of a historical minority language by the dominant ethnicity.

4.5 Article 4

Language Ideologies and Learning Historical Minority Languages: A comparative study of voluntary learners of Swedish in Finland and Hungarian in Romania. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies* 9 (1)/2015, 87–109. <http://apples.jyu.fi/article/abstract/352>

In this article I set out from the idea that Language ideologies surrounding the learning of historical minority languages deserve closer attention because due to the strong nation state ideology, the relation between majority and minority languages has long been problematic. The outcome of the gaining of terrain of this ideology has been that the native speakers of majority languages do not typically learn the languages of their co-inhabiting historical minorities voluntarily. I enlarge my focus even further in this article by discussing two European contexts from a comparative perspective, namely, the language ideologies of voluntary learners of Swedish and Hungarian in two sites

(Nagyvárad/Oradea and Jyväskylä) where these languages are historical minority languages.

The data of this article was collected at evening courses in Nagyvárad/Oradea, Romania, and Jyväskylä, Finland. Like in my other articles, I analyse my ethnographic data from a discourse analysis perspective and the language ideologies are unravelled in their interactional form. Despite the two very different contexts, the results show that there are also similarities in the language ideologies of the learners and they seem to be significantly influenced by the dominant historical discourses in place about the use and role of these languages. I expose some calcified historical metanarratives, and suggest that the challenges related to the learning of historical minority languages lie in the historical construction of modern ethno-linguistic nation-states and the present trajectories of such projects. I conclude that the learning of historical languages in contemporary globalized socio-cultural contexts can build on new post-national ideologies, such as the concept of learning historical minority languages as commodities.

One important contribution of this article was to illustrate the diversity of discourses related to the learning of historical minority languages that circulate among the language learners. I demonstrated that, as in the case of other contexts of learning (German in Poland: Mar-Molinero & Stevenson 2006; South Tyrol: Cavagnoli & Nardin 1999), discourses of historical “metanarratives” and references to contemporary social/cultural contexts were frequent. Another result of the analysis was that I could demonstrate how the language ideologies were clearly co-constructed in the interviews, and the positionality of the answers. In the interviews with Finnish interviewees, the subjects often hinted that I was a foreigner in Finland, and certain things that would not be explained to other Finns were explained to me. In the Romanian context, however, I was treated as a local, and cultural references were often left open to interpretation (on my role as a teacher-organizer of Hungarian courses, see Article 2). The voluntary adult learners not only voiced but also reflected and contested the widespread beliefs and ideas over the minority language and learning it in the majority communities. The self-reflexive discourses of adult learners provide further proof of how important the language ideological approach is. It is notable that even though Swedish learning is supported by the Finnish language policy, the stereotypes about the language still linger. At the same time, in clear contrast to the Finnish signs of mutual accommodation, we saw how Romanians learning Hungarian still struggle with the fact that common elements of history are neglected, or are outright rejected by both parties.

Finally, I conclude that, from a political perspective, there is a need to replace the one state one language idea with the ideology of mutual linguistic accommodation to create a cohabitating state or region. This would imply a possible change within a lifetime (Woolard 2013; Pujolar & Gonzales 2013) in order to replace the common concept of minority languages as “parochial and destabilizing” (May 2012: 84) to a minority language as a resource ideology.

4.6 Answers to research questions

In the following section I provide a brief summary of the results of the thesis grouped into answers to the research questions.

4.6.1 Research question 1: *Which are the typical learner types that study the historical minority's languages in the given contexts?*

In the case of Nagyvárad/Oradea, region informants often point out the multi-ethnic, and multilingual nature of the area and the high number of ethnically mixed marriages that have existed for generations. Some informants themselves live in such inter-ethnic marriages where, to varying degrees, both Romanian and Hungarian are used. The interviews revealed complex issues of identities and trajectories where relations in ethnically-mixed and multilingual families that facilitated the acquisition of Hungarian (cf. Vančo 2012; 2011). E.g., some informants related that in certain situations, Hungarian was used even though Romanian was the default language of communication. Language socialization later in life was also pointed out in the case of those who encountered Hungarian when moving into the bilingual city Nagyvárad/Oradea from a monolingual Romanian region. In fact the importance of the “environment” as a whole in teenage years, here also, seems to be most important in some cases (see Article 1). The existence of cultural organizations and free time activities offer gateways for Romanians into Hungarian language communities, but entering them are not always unproblematic, and sometimes raise issues of authenticity on the part of the naive speakers (article 1, 4).

As based on my Debrecen Summer School experience, at the beginning of my fieldwork, and before the commencement of my courses, I projected a possible group of those who would embark on studying Hungarian in Nagyvárad/Oradea. Most of my preliminary hypothesis about the possible group of learners turned out to be correct (article 2). Two main groups were made up of those who had had some private life nexuses with Hungarian. Aside from Romanian people living in ethnically-mixed families, heritage language learners could be an important group, and those who belong to the first, second, or third generation and went through language attrition typical to language minority contexts. The number of those who study Hungarian for subjective reasons was very limited. Usually a combination of motives was present.

The second group included those with more utilitarian motivations. Here I outline that in the economic field there will be people who study Hungarian because they would have business interest in close-by Hungary, or move into Hungarian villages across the border, which, for a time, presented attractive alternatives to city living, but no such Romanian speaker commuters have found their way to my courses. This shows that this was a different demographic of people who could not dedicate time, or resources, to formal language classes (article 2).

People with administrative positions, and for whom Hungarian skills should be an advantage in principle, attended formal Hungarian courses when they were organized during working hours, but these were in the city of Arad. They expressed that for them Hungarian skills were attractive because they facilitated cooperation with their partners from Gyula and Békéscsaba (e.g., participation in EU projects) across the border in Hungary. It is likely that when such projects include a language training component, and they are offered free of charge, then there would be interest.

Informants often expressed that they often travelled to Hungary and could carry out mundane tasks like shopping, but they have no deeper knowledge of culture and language. Some informants contended with such touristic survival skills in the Hungarian language (articles 2 and 4).

My research showed that the number of participants from Romania to the Debrecen Summer School fluctuated, and following a peak in the 1990s, it dwindled again. The number of paying participants from the former Socialist countries was generally low, and their number was closely linked to the number of scholarships available. Aside from university students, the intellectual-learner type participant is typical. Among learners with an academic background, there were many who needed Hungarian for work linked in some way to the study of historical documents or other sources to be found in Hungarian. This is a characteristic of the Jyväskylä context of Finns learning Swedish, too (article 4).

A typical learner group in Jyväskylä were participants of the third age, or as they defined themselves: pensioners. They often expressed that they took up studying Swedish in their spare time because they looked upon it as a not too difficult hobby language. Having learned it compulsorily in their school, they recall positive memories in relation to it. In Oradea, there was also interest on the part of the third age generation, but their numbers are not as significant as in Finland.

Some younger people who recently moved to Jyväskylä from a Swedish speaking area in Finland wanted to maintain their language skills. Simultaneously, utilitarian purposes were also a component: some participants attended the courses because they need Swedish for immediate work purposes, since state employees, or the ones working in customer service, as well as physicians and nurses, are required to have working-knowledge of Swedish. Younger course participants as well as university students took part in Swedish courses because they felt that they needed a basic course in order to be able to obtain the certificate in Swedish for civil servants.

In Nagyvárad/Oradea, similar language courses were organized by the Municipality, wherein members of the community police attended the classes on a voluntary basis, but no exams for civil servants in Hungarian exist in Romania. The most numerous group in Romania were teachers who considered that Hungarian would be useful in their profession, which involves interacting with minority language students.

4.6.2 Research question 2: *What are the language ideologies of the learners, society and the organizers of voluntary education towards learning a historical minority language as an additional language?*

Those who teach Hungarian in a language minority context conceptualize Hungarian following two ideologies. On the one hand, they teach Hungarian as a “minority language”, “language of the environment”, or “heritage language”, a language that is not only the language of Hungary, but also the language of the environment in, e.g., Romanian cities and villages and that of the historical Hungarian minority community in the given context. This ideology is in conflict with the mainstream conceptualization of Hungarian as “a foreign language” beyond Hungary. That is, the participants often ask teachers to speak about the “country where Hungarian is spoken” and convey its cultural achievements through the language. At the same time, this practice means neglecting the local Hungarian culture and institutions, which are part of the teacher’s “historical body”.

“Hungarian as a foreign language” ideology, is often imposed on the teachers by the participants and by Hungarian institutions. In Hungary, there is little research, nor practical advice, or at times even will, to demonstrate how Hungarian as a second language (heritage language/ language of the environment, etc.) could be conceptualized or taught. The ones who practice it are often trained in the traditional framework of Hungarian as a foreign language (*magyar mint idegen nyelv*) in Hungarian universities, even though sociolinguists such as Péntek (2001a, 2001c) have established that conceptualizing Hungarian as “a foreign language” in East Central Europe goes with denying the multilingual past and present.

Informants generally report that the reaction of society in both the Nagyvárad/Oradea and Jyväskylä context is that of bewilderment and some find such undertakings bizarre. What is more, hostile reactions are not uncommon either. A general positive common ideology in Romania is that knowledge of Hungarian facilitates cross-border communication in the region.

In the context of Debrecen, the courses were targeted to a global audience in the framework of Hungarian as a *foreign language*, with varying preferences for certain typically influential Western ‘foreign’ nationalities throughout the history of the institution. Such ideologies were closely linked to Hungarian national politics and cultural policy. Only recently was special attention paid to the needs of native Romanian learners and Romanian bilingual course materials was developed. The teaching of Hungarian as a language became more pragmatic. Currently, in the context of globalization and European integration, the free circulation of ideas and material goods have created challenges as well as offer new opportunities to the Debrecen Summer School. The current ideologies are more commercial than nationalistic and cultural-politics based, and the Debrecen Summer School is now teaching practically any language there is demand for, such as Swedish or Ukrainian.

In Jyväskylä, similar to other parts of Finland, evening classes for adults have a long tradition. In Jyväskylä, the classes were held at the local Community College (*Kansalaisopisto*), a nationwide network that offers a framework for the courses. Governed by the idea that every Finn is competent at speaking a certain level of Swedish, *Kansalaisopisto* offers only refresher courses, the lowest level being intermediate. In Romania such an assumption does not exist, thus almost always and exclusively beginners' courses are offered.

Many Finns express that Swedish is but one of the possible languages they took up as a 'hobby language', which suggests an ideologically neutral position, even though they may sense that Finnish people in general are not that interested in learning Swedish. Finnish informants generally present an image of themselves as Swedish learners who liked the language in school, during their compulsory classes. They found the language easy despite the fact that they may not have had chance to use it in "natural circumstances".

4.6.3 Research question 3: *What are the representations, descriptions or evaluations of the Hungarian (and Swedish) language and its varieties in the opinion of the majority learners?*

The issue of language standard was also recounted in the interviews. Ideologies about the national standard were observed in the form that the "true Hungarian language" was to be found only in Hungary. Despite the fact that differences between the local and the Hungarian national standard are minimal, the learners overemphasize them by pointing out few contact elements, which are supposedly not used in Hungary.

The analysed interviews show that there are similarities between heritage language learners and those who (perhaps passively) have learnt the language through their environment. Romanians may position themselves differently to those learners who first encounter the language as adults. It was evident that stereotypes played a role in the development of the language learners' attitudes towards the Hungarian language. Language ideology, which creates hierarchies between vernacular and formal language learning, is in operation.

I argued that an expanding of the framework is necessary in these contexts that would include a paradigm shift and be more inclusive towards local ways of speech and present Hungarian to the learners as the language of the environment. In the same spirit, it is necessary to take into account that, for some learners, Hungarian is a heritage language.

In the Finnish data, informants point out the great differences in the regional varieties of Swedish and the lack of tones in Finnish Swedish. Some would also express preference to the "Imperial" variant, as "real Swedish", over the Swedish variant in Finland.

We encounter many formulations about the usefulness of Swedish as the common language of Scandinavia. Swedish appears as a Scandinavian lingua

franca in the eyes of interviewees. This seems to be in line with a common ideology in favour of Swedish in school education. A consequence of the ideology that there is solidarity between the Scandinavian people, and that Scandinavian languages are mutually comprehensible, is that the Finns should use Swedish in those situations. However, due to the lack of sufficient skills in Swedish, some Finns are of the opinion that while using Swedish as a Scandinavian lingua franca is in principle a good idea, the use of it is problematic in practice. The common counter-argument to learning Swedish is that English might be the de facto lingua franca of Scandinavia.

4.6.4 Research question 4: *What underlying ideological considerations hinder or facilitate learning in the Romanian (and Finnish) contexts?*

Linguistic contact between Romanian and Hungarian children is typical and shared by many Varadians. These early encounters with Hungarian and the mundane acquisition of a second language correspond well to the writer's own childhood memories. This might facilitate language learning for some of the inhabitants who wish to continue this at a later age. Indeed, here are signs that in Nagyvárad/Oradea and Partium, among certain social groups, the prestige of Hungarian seems to have increased, in the shadow of general prejudice against learning Hungarian.

In Nagyvárad/Oradea, Hungarian community infrastructure offers a basis and help is available to the organizers, but the resources are limited. Marketing in Romanian media and the help of Romanian intellectuals was essential for the commencement of the courses. Needs for Hungarian skills in local administration can facilitate the organization of courses and the employees typically attend such courses when they do not have to pay for them, and this seems the only way for enlisting larger numbers of participants.

For the generations socialized before 1989, the availability of Hungarian-language television in this border region was an important luxury for the learning of Hungarian. Alongside Hungarians, many Romanians also followed programs broadcast from Budapest. However, since 1989, not so many Romania speakers watch Hungarian channels any more. A hindering factor has been the nationalist politics of the first half of the 90's in Romania as well.

Besides mentioning access to material goods (e.g., communication in tourism, shopping), both Hungarian and Swedish are seen as languages that are important tools for accessing spiritual and cultural goods like education, knowledge of fine arts, and poetry.

Learning Swedish at school is unanimously given as the basic reason for voluntarily learning Swedish. The second national language is a part of the general compulsory education. That means, learning Swedish is compulsory for the Finnish-speaking majority. However, there is a paradox, because this both motivates and hinders adults from learning the minority language. For those few capable of a language ideological reorientation free from the stereotype of

“pakkoruotsi” (‘compulsory learning of Swedish’), the previous experience at school motivates them to refresh their Swedish knowledge later on.

4.6.5 Research question 5: *What political positions and cultural notions in the anthropological sense are linked to the learning of the local historical minorities’ language in Romania (and Finland)?*

The informants often consider personal multilingualism natural, and value societal multilingualism as a positive phenomenon, too. Romanians encounter Hungarian in its double quality; the language of the local minority and that of Hungary. Among the learners there are language enthusiasts with truly impressive linguistic trajectories. A large segment of the population encounter bilingualism in a natural way, e.g., learning from each other while playing and socializing freely in ethnically and linguistically mixed groups acquiring both Romanian and Hungarian (cf. Vančo 2012).

Informants often express disinclination with the existence of prejudice and state that learning Hungarian could also be practical for Romanians because it is the first language that they could encounter in this region. For them Hungarian is looked upon as a matter of fact and communication between ethnicities a normal state of affairs.

Interest in culture and the language of the local minority and that of the neighbouring country is intended as a gesture of openness and good will. On the other hand, other informants encounter the suspicion and bafflement of some of their friends and acquaintances, who do not understand why a Romanian should learn Hungarian. Behind this allegation there is “the one nation state, one language concept”, which disregards completely the reality of multilingual regions within the borders of one country, together with the existence of minority languages and their potential usefulness within a country other than the nation state itself.

In the case of Jyväskylä, being a monolingual Finnish-speaking city, first encounters with a second language generally happen later in the school where Swedish is taught as the second national language. Early childhood socialization is much less characteristic. In relation to meta-narratives about history, different approaches surface in Finnish and Romanian data sets. In the Finnish data, the learners who studied Swedish voluntarily expressed acceptance of the historical past and view Swedish language as a part of Finnish history.

In Finland, intellectuals express a cultural interest in Swedish language as the historic heritage and see it as part of Finland. In many interviews, the joint history offers a basis for a better understanding of other Scandinavian countries, and of the history of the Finns. In relation to meta-narratives about history, different approaches surface in the two data sets. That is, there are signs of mutual accommodation of Finnish and Swedish history, culture, and language in Finland. In a clear contrast to the Finnish signs of “mutual accommodation” (May 2012), we saw how Romanians learning Hungarian still

struggle with the fact that common elements of history are neglected, or outright rejected by both Romanians and Hungarians.

Despite the very different backgrounds, historical discourses of the other bear resemblances in both countries. The grievance narratives have been handed down through generations and they obstruct openness towards the learning of the historical minority language. To some extent, both Swedish and Hungarian are still perceived by many interviewees as the language of the former elites. It is still hard to contest and change the historical metanarratives (e.g., that Hungarians “occupied” Oradea between 1941 and 1944, or that Swedish speakers form the “upper class” in Finland). At first sight, the situation appears more favourable in the case of Finland; however, it is notable that even though Swedish learning is supported by the Finnish language policy, the stereotypes about the language still linger.

5 CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

The aim of my study was to explore the language ideologies of voluntary adult learners learning historical languages. In my study, I used theories of current sociolinguistics as a framework. One of the intentions of my work was to draw attention to an often-neglected topic of learning dominated historical minority languages by the dominating majority. I applied an ethnographic, approach to the voluntary learning and teaching of historical minority languages, and combined it with a language ideological approach. Ethnography in general aims at presenting the unfamiliar or making visible the unseen or overlooked agents and discourses and implies an intensive research process and the collection of a wide variety of data. I made use of the nexus analysis framework to sort out this data and applied conversation analysis to examine interaction, such as combination, which is still a rather novel approach in Hungarian sociolinguistics (but see Szabó 2012; Laihonon 2009a). I combined the larger contextual and historical data with a meso and micro level analysis in order to show the emergent nature of language ideologies in context.

The study began with fieldwork in 2010 but my familiarity with my topic goes back many years, for example, in the case of the Debrecen Summer School, as far back as 1996, when I first became acquainted with Hungarian language courses for adult learners. My emic knowledge of the sociolinguistic situation of Hungarian in Romania both facilitated and to a certain degree hindered my understanding of the field. It was not until I placed myself into the ethnographic framework that I tried to untangle the complex nature of the insider-outsider positions. My position as a researcher-teacher-organizer brought about the necessity of adopting a partly auto-ethnographic stance in article 2.

Article 1 was written when my approach was already clear, but the focus of my research was still not very clearly delineated. Therefore, I enlisted possible avenues for further research such as post-structuralist theory, identity approach, language biography, narrative analysis or language socialization, etc. At the time, I surveyed related scholarship in these fields. These openings were ultimately abandoned and the theoretical part of my work was anchored in ethnography and discourse analysis. The last two articles and this summary

offer full expression of my theoretical anchoring and my understanding of research in the topic.

Another result of my work is that I make a distinction between attitudes, beliefs, and folk ideologies, and deal with the so-far neglected language ideologies of “majority ethnicities” (May 2012). In the articles, due to space limitations, I could not elaborate on the background of my sites, but this is augmented in the present summary, where I offer a somewhat more detailed review of previous research and the history of learning Hungarian by adults, as well as some elite language ideologies (Laihonen 2009a) by local Romanian authors.

I anchored my study in the field of linguistic anthropology and my main influences were Blommaert’s, Gal’s and Heller’s writings. In the analysis of the interviews, I followed the data closely, but aimed to also look beyond the given interaction (Laihonen 2009a; Heller 2007). Following my data I had to pursue lengthy discourse trajectories in order to gain understanding into “references to the histories of that interaction” (Heller 2007: 634). Examining the circulation of metalanguage about learning Hungarian took me further into discourse cycles (Scollon & Scollon 2004) that reach across places and decades (articles 3). I also compared similar discourses in two very different settings (article 4).

At the same time, I do not purport to give a complete picture of the reality of my study. Conversation Analysis (e.g., Ten Have 2004) warns us that discourses do not render reality, but they present a certain account of a phenomenon. Moreover, I also demonstrate how some discourses were co-created between the interviewer and the interviewee. As characteristic of ethnography, my data collection and analysis were on-going, and the collection and analysis often intertwined, so as the analyses advanced, I complemented the original set of data with more data and also different types of data. The multiple data sets allowed for some triangulation of the data; however, my main focus remained on the interviews. As the research progressed, I managed to develop a closer relationship to the informants, which resulted in deeper dialogues between the ethnographer and the participants, which in turn fostered reflecting together and developing a co-researcher relationship. This was the case with my teacher colleagues at the Debrecen Summer School and some Romanian course participants. In concordance with nexus analysis, I revisited the data. Many insightful reflections were carried out in the form of field notes, and in background conversations. Ideas that could not be included in some of my articles will be developed into future articles on the topic.

Effective ethnography is an interpretive analysis that contends complexity and raises further questions (Blommaert 2005, 2010; Blommaert & Dong 2010). The topic lends itself to future research in the critical ethnography paradigm (see, e.g., Heller 2011; Blommaert 2010; Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004; Kroskrity 2000) on how the ideologies are formulated, communicated, and maintained. Future directions of research could be, on the one hand, expanding the research geographically to other regions in Romania. We are likely to find variations and different positions to the ones presented in other distinct regions that present

different sociolinguistic contexts, e.g., in the Szeklerland, where Hungarian is in a dominant position (see Laihonen 2015), or in the Banat, where the number of Hungarian speakers is but a fraction of what it used to be even a decade ago (see Laihonen 2009a). Another possibility would be to further refine the nexus, opening it up to larger scales, such as to Eastern Central Europe, to cities and regions similar to Nagyvárad/Oradea, where Slovaks, Serbs, or Ukrainians learn Hungarian.

Research could be also made in the field of applied linguistics, e.g., research into the affordances, mediation, and multimodality of voluntarily learning a historical minority language; the autonomy of the adult language learner; teacher research teachers' autonomy and ability to develop methods; linguistic landscape, the linguistic landscape of the spaces where the courses were held.

Nexus analysis aims at changing the social issues under scrutiny. My practice as a teacher-researcher, and joint thinking about issues of language ideology, contributed to such a change. Future research is needed to indicate general and context-bound ways to achieve an ideological reorientation that supports the voluntary learning of historical minority languages by the majority on a European scale.

The contemporary socio-cultural context, partly due to globalization and the spread of post-national ideologies as a grand framework in both cases, can favour the learning of the historical minority language. In the future, a general language ideological reorientation of historical metanarratives is necessary. That is, by learning and acknowledging the other's perspective of history and linguistic belonging, we can focus on shared history and multilingual practices instead of nation-state antagonisms and monolingual preferences.

6 SUMMARY

My dissertation is based on four articles and includes an introduction. The dissertation addresses the question of teaching and learning historical minority languages by the majority population in voluntary settings, both from a theoretical and a practical viewpoint. In the Western European context, there have been a number of parallel studies focusing on other subthemes of learning historical minority languages, amongst others: Basque, Provençal, Catalan, Galician, Welsh, Irish, Turkish, and Gaelic. However, no comprehensive attempt has been made to present the complexities of voluntary, adult learning of historical minority languages.

My research is data driven sociolinguistic ethnography, and I focus on the language ideologies about learning a historical minority language. Various previous studies on learning historical minority languages suggest that language ideologies are central to understanding issues involved in the learning and teaching of the language of a historical minority.

I look at two contexts where these languages are a numerical minority strictly from the number of speakers. Therefore, the phrase “minority language” can be used in both the Nagyvárad/Oradea and Jyväskylä cases. Hungarian is clearly a minority language by any definition in Western parts of Romania, while in the case of Swedish in Finland, the language spoken by the numerical minority has high official status throughout the country. In my articles, I analyse interpretations that were made about the teaching and learning of a historical minority language in three different research sites: Nagyvárad (in Romanian Oradea, Romania), Debrecen (Hungary), and Jyväskylä (Finland).

I present discursive constructions about historical minority languages, and the voluntary learning of these by the majority population. More precisely, I investigate what language ideologies arise in the emerging possibilities of their study, and what implications they may have for the future. My main site of research is the city of Nagyvárad/Oradea, where 23,81% of the inhabitants registered Hungarian as their mother tongue. Here the organization of Hungarian courses for adults was itself a new venture started by myself. They described learning as a fundamentally positive phenomenon, but they also point-

ed out that it is unusual that adults should invest money and time in learning Hungarian in Romania. I followed my course participants into a Study Abroad context, 50 kilometres west, to the Debrecen Summer School. There I investigated the general issue of teaching Hungarian to the majority populations of the neighbouring countries (Romania, Slovakia, Austria, etc.). Finally, a comparative perspective from a distance (Finns learning Swedish in a voluntary setting) was included in order to reframe and generalize on my findings from the Hungarian context.

I do not use the coinage “new speakers” in my article, but my research draws upon and contributes to research carried out on new speakers of the historical languages school of research. My research takes a parallel approach, and could be easily incorporated in the new speaker paradigm.

I draw attention to the particular local context that is often neglected in grand-national narratives. Here I present the Romanian perspective, too, which is often neglected in the Hungarian-studies context, and which was not possible to include in my articles due to their scope.

As regards methodological procedures and considerations followed in my articles, I discuss how my overarching approach of studying language ideologies offers cohesion to my PhD work. I will also elaborate on the uses of conversation analytic methods for the study of language ideologies. In the Methodology section, I further explicate how the Nexus Analysis meta-method contributed to my better understanding and description of the complexities of the discourses and navigating practices around the voluntarily learning of a historical minority language. I also draw some conclusions on the implications, restrictions, and benefits of following these methods.

In a nutshell, Article 1 introduces the topic and places it in the framework of international scholarship and samples some possible avenues of research for future investigation. Article 2 places the study within the framework of Hungarian Studies, and at the same time situates it in a historical perspective while pointing to international trends in the field of reflective ethnography. Article 3 refines the approach of language ideologies and the methodology of analysis on study abroad and language ideologies. It opens the scope of research internationally, and shows larger cycles of discourses. Finally, Article 4 formulates results in light of the voluntary learning of historical minority languages in general. All four articles have unifying themes as the uniformity of approach, language ideologies, the consistency of ethnography methods, and discourse analysis. The results of all four articles can be read as part of discourse cycles about the same topic, and they were organized into a consistent whole with the help of Nexus Analysis meta-theory

Language ideologies constructed by the learners are considered central to understanding issues involved in the learning and teaching of additional languages. Therefore, in the analysis of the interview data, I was oriented by applied Conversation Analysis as a suitable method for its valuable practices and insights into analysing spoken interaction. I was interested in the ideas interviewees have about the historical minority languages they are learning,

and what kind of explicit evaluations they make about the learning of said languages.

My investigation focuses on the transparent, explicit discussion of languages, their value, and how and why they are learned. My interpretations are framed in a large ethnographic analytical framework. Following my data, I had to pursue lengthy discourse trajectories in order to gain understanding into what histories the interaction showed references in a particular interaction. At the same time, during the course of the analysis of the data, it became obvious that the interviews themselves needed to be tackled; therefore to focus my attention in the analysis on the interviews as interactive events in comparison to the generally more static ethnographic accounts.

I do not purport to give a complete picture of the reality of my study. Conversation Analysis warns us that discourses do not render reality, but they present a certain account of a phenomenon. Moreover, I also demonstrate how some discourses were co-created between the interviewer and the interviewee. As characteristic of ethnography, my data collection and analysis were on-going, and the collection and analysis often intertwined, so as the analyses advanced, I complemented the original set of data with more data and also different types of data. The multiple data sets allowed for some triangulation of the data; however, my main focus remained on the interviews.

Despite the very different backgrounds, historical discourses of the other bear resemblances in both countries. Grievance narratives have been handed down through generations, and they obstruct openness towards the learning of the historical minority language. To some extent, both Swedish and Hungarian are still perceived by many interviewees as the language of the former elites. It is still hard to contest and change historical metanarratives. At first sight, the situation appears more favourable in the case of Finland; however, it is notable that even though Swedish learning is supported by the Finnish language policy, the stereotypes about the language still linger.

The contemporary socio-cultural context, partly due to globalization and the spread of post-national ideologies as a grand framework in both cases, can favour the learning of the historical minority language. In the future, a general language ideological reorientation of historical metanarratives is necessary. That is, by learning and acknowledging the other's perspective of history and linguistic belonging, we can focus on shared history and multilingual practices, instead of on nation-state antagonisms and monolingual preferences.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. 2006. *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Atkinson, D. 2005. Situated qualitative research and second language writing. In: P. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.) *Second Language Writing Research: Perspectives on the process of Knowledge Construction*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 49-64.
- Atkinson, D., Okada, H. & Talmy S. 2011. *Ethnography and Discourse*. In K. Hyland & B. Paltridge (Eds.) *Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum, 85-101.
- Azkue, J. & Perales J. 2005. The teaching of Basque to adults. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 174, 73-83.
- Berecz, Á. 2013. *The politics of early language teaching: Hungarian in the primary schools of the late dual Monarchy*. Budapest: Pasts Inc., Central European University.
- Bakhtin, M. M. 1994. *The Bakhtin reader: selected writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, and Voloshinov*. London; New York: E. Arnold.
- Balogh, D., Pamfil, V. & Balázs, L. *Manual reactic de limba maghiară*. București: Erdélyi Magyarok Egyesülete.
- Bálint, I. J. 1990. *Boldog Várad*. Budapest: Héttorony.
- Bárdi, N. 2013. *Otthon és haza: tanulmányok a romániai magyar kisebbség történetéről*. Spectrum Hungarologicum 6. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Bartha, Cs. & Péntek, J. 2011. Bevezetés. In Bartha Cs., Nádor O. & Péntek J. (szerk.) *Nyelv és oktatás kisebbségben. Kárpát-medencei körkép*. Budapest: Tinta kiadó, 7-21.
- Benó, A. & Szilágyi N. S. 2005. Hungarian in Romania. In A. Fenyvesi (Ed.) *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: studies on Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia, Pa.: J. Benjamins, 133-162.
- Benwell, B. & Stokoe, E. 2010. *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bihoreanu, Gh. T., Moșicat, C., & Tulvan, I. 2004. *30 de zile în fața morții*. Bătălia pentru Oradea. Oradea: Tipo.
- Bilász, B. 2013. *Nyelvi ideológiák kétnyelvű szlovákiai középiskolások körében*. In Kontra, M., Németh, M. & Sinkovics, B. (szerk.). *Elmélet és empíria a szociolingvisztikában (Válogatás a 17. Élőnyelvi Konferencia – Szeged, 2012. augusztus 30. – szeptember 1. – előadásaiból)*. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó, 69-83.
- Blackledge, A. 2002. 'What sort of people can look at a chicken and think dofednod?': Language, ideology and nationalism in public discourse. *Multilingua* 21, 197-226.
- Block, D. 2003. *The Social Turn in Second Language Acquisition*. Edinburgh Textbooks in Applied Linguistics.

- Block, D. 2007a. The Rise of Identity in SLA Research, Post . The Modern Language Journal 91(1), 863-876.
- Block, D. 2007b. Second language identities. London: Continuum.
- Blommaert, J. 2005. Discourse: a critical introduction. Key Topics in Sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. 2006. Language ideology. In K. Brown (Ed.) Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics. Oxford: Elsevier, 510-522.
- Blommaert 2010. The Sociolinguistics of Globalization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. & Dong, J. 2010. Ethnographic fieldwork: A beginner's guide. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Blommaert, J. & Verschueren, J. 2002. Debating diversity: Analysing the discourse of tolerance. London: Routledge.
- Brogden, L. M. 2009. Francois, f/ Fransask-qui? Franco-quoi? Constructions identitaires d'un enseignant en formation en situation linguistique minoritaire. Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes (CMLR) 66(1), 73-99.
- Bourdieu, P. & Thompson, J. B. 1991. Language and symbolic power. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Borcea L. 2003. Oradea. Evoluție administrativă în evul mediu și epoca modern. Instituția primarului între anii 1850-1918. In A. Chiriac (Ed.) Oradea. Pagini de istorie: instituția primarului. Evoluție administrativă. Realitate urbanistică și arhitecturală. Oradea: Editura Muzeului țării Crișurilor.
- Brubaker, R. 2006. Nationalist politics and everyday ethnicity in a Transylvanian town. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Busch, B. & Schick, J. 2007. Educational Materials Reflecting Heteroglossia: Disinventing Ethnolinguistic Differences in Bosnia-Herzegovina. In Sinfree Makoni & Alastair Pennycook (Eds.), Disinventing and reconstructing languages. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 216-233.
- Canagarajah, S. 2007. After Disinvention: Possibilities for Communication, Community and Competence. In Sinfree Makoni & Alastair Pennycook (Eds.), Disinventing and reconstructing languages. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 233-240.
- Cavagnoli, S. & Nardin, F. 1999. Second Language Acquisition in South Tyrol: Difficulties, Motivations, Expectations. Multilingua 18, 17-45.
- Cenoz, J. & Perales, J. 2010. Minority Language Learning in the Administration: Data from the Basque Country. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 18 (4), 261-270.
- Csernicsekó, I. & Laihonen, P. 2015. Hybrid practices meet nation-state language policies : Transcarpathia in the twentieth century and today. Multilingua. [online] <http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/mult.ahead-of-print/multi-2014-0073/multi-2014-0073.xml>
- Cornea L. 2003. Instituția primarului și primarii Oradiei între 1918-1944. In A. Chiriac (Ed.) Oradea. Pagini de istorie: instituția primarului. Evoluție administrativă. Realitate urbanistică și arhitecturală. Oradea: Editura

- Muzeului țării Crișurilor. Oradea: Editura Muzeului țării Crișurilor, 61-145.
- Costa, J. 2015. New speakers, new language: on being a legitimate speaker of a minority language in Provence. *International Journal for the Sociology of Language* 231, 127-145.
- Crăciun, C. 2010. *Viața cotidiană în Oradea interbelică*. Oradea: Editura Primus.
- De Fina, A. & Georgakopoulou, A. 2008. Narrative analysis in the shift from texts to practices. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- De Fina, A. 2009. Narratives in interview: for an interactional approach to narrative genres. *Narrative Inquiry* 19 (2), 233-258.
- Domonkosi, Á. 2010. Értékek és vélekedések. Gondolatok Lanstyák István A nyelvi babonák életéről című előadása kapcsán. In Beke, Zs., Lanstyák I. & Misad K. (szerk.) *Hungarológia a szlovák kultúra kontextusában*. Pozsony: Stimul, 107-110.
- Duff, P. 2009. Indigenous, Minority, and Heritage Language Education in Canada: Policies, Contexts, and Issues. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 66 (1), 1-8.
- Dukrét, G. & Péter, I. Z. 1998. *Városismertető*. Nagyvárad/Oradea: Partiumi és Bánsági Műemlékvédő és Emlékhely Bizottság-Királyhágómelléki Református Egyházkerület & Nagyvárad/Római Katolikus Püspökség.
- Duszak, A. 2006. Why 'New' Newspeak?: Axiological Insights into Language Ideologies and Practices in Poland. In C. Mar-Molinero & P. Stevenson (Eds.) *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe*. Houndmills: Palgrave, 96-103.
- European Bureau for Lesser-Used Languages. [online]
http://eblul.eurolang.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=14&Itemid=33
- Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and power*. London; New York: Longman, 1989.
- Faur, V. 2004. Prefață. In Bihoreanu, Gh. T. (Ed.) *C. Moșicat & I. Tulvan. 30 de zile în fața morții. Bătălia pentru Oradea*. Oradea: Editura Tipo, I-IV.
- Faur, V. 2008. Prefață. In Românașu, R. *Asociațiile culturale românești din Oradea și Județul Bihor în perioada interbelică*. Oradea: Editura Universității din Oradea, 9-11.
- Fenyvesi, A. 2011. Nyelvi attitűdök kisebbségi kontextusban: erdélyi, vajdasági és felvidéki magyar diákok viszonyulása anyanyelvükhöz, az államnyelvhez és az angolhoz. In Hires-László K., Karmacs Z. & Márku, A. (szerk.) *Nyelvi mítoszok, ideológiák, nyelvpolitika és nyelvi emberi jogok Közép-Európában elméletben és gyakorlatban*. A 16. Élőnyelvi Konferencia előadásai. Budapest, Beregszász, II. Rákóczi Ferenc Kárpátaljai Magyar Főiskola Hodinka Antal Intézete: Tinta, 227-235.
- Fischer, H. 1996. Puszta és Balaton, paprika és gulyás A magyar nyelvkönyvek országismereti Magyarország-képe. *Hungarologische Beiträge: Finnisch-Ungarische Kontrastive Untersuchungen* 6, 129-149.
- Fleisz, János. 2011. *Nagyvárad várostörténete: kismonográfia*. Oradea: Europrint.

- Fóris-Ferenczi, R. & Péntek J. 2011. A romániai magyar közoktatás, különös tekintettel az oktatási nyelv(ek)re. In Bartha Cs., Nádor O. & Péntek J. (szerk.) *Nyelv és oktatás kisebbségben. Kárpát-medencei körkép.* Budapest: Tinta kiadó, 73-133.
- Fülei-Szántó, E. & Mihályi, J. 1966. *Magyar Nyelvkönyv külföldiek számára: Jegyzet a TIT nyári egyetemei és nyelvtanfolyamai számára.* Budapest: Tudományos Ismeretterjesztő Társulat.
- Gal, S. 1979. *Language shift: social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria.* New York: Academic Press.
- Gal, S. 2006a. *Language, its stakes and its effects.* In R. Goodin & Ch. Tilly (Eds.) *The Oxford handbook of contextual political analysis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 376-391.
- Gal, S. 2006b. *Migration, minorities and multilingualism: language ideologies in Europe* In C. Mar-Molinero & P. Stevenson (Eds.) *Language ideologies, policies and practices: language and the future of Europe.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 13-27.
- Gal, S. 2008. *Hungarian as a minority language.* In G. Extra & D. Gorter (Eds.) *Multilingual Europe: Facts and Policies.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 207-232.
- Gal, S. 2011. *Polyglot nationalism: Alternative perspectives on language in 19th century Hungary.* *Langage et Société* 136 (2), 31-54.
- Ganz A. & Ganz M. 2004. *Limba maghiară pentru tine: Manual de conversație.* Iași: Polirom.
- Garcia, O. 2007. *Foreword. Intervening discourses, representations and conceptualisations of language.* In Sifree Makoni & Alastair Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstructing languages.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, xi-xv.
- Gee, J. P. 2005. *An Introduction to discourse analysis: theory and method,* 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Geertz, C. 2000 (1973). *The interpretation of cultures.* New York: Basic Books.
- Gellén J. 2002. *Az alapítástól a rendszerváltásig.* In Dobi E. & Gellén J. *75 éves a Debreceni Nyári Egyetem.* Debrecen: Debreceni Nyári Egyetem, 11-34.
- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2007. *Small stories, interaction and identities.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Giddens, A. 1999. *Runaway world: How globalisation is reshaping our lives.* London: Profile Books.
- Guardado, M. 2014. *The Discourses of Heritage Language Development: Engaging Ideologies in Canadian Hispanic Communities.* *Heritage Language Journal*, 11 (1), 1-27.
- Hankiss, J. 1932-1942. *Jelentés a Nyári Egyetem [Report on the Summer course].* In *Évkönyv a Debreceni M.Kir. Tisza István-Tudományegyetem 1932-1942. tanévéről.* Debrecen: Debreceni M. Kir. Tisza István Tudományegyetem.
- Heller, M. 1999. *Linguistic minorities and modernity: a sociolinguistic ethnography.* London: Longman.

- Heller, M. 2001. Discourse and interaction. In (eds.), D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 250-264.
- Heller, M. 2007. Distributed knowledge, distributed power: A sociolinguistics of structuration. *Text & Talk* 27: 633-653.
- Heller, M. 2008. Doing Ethnography. In L. Wei & M. Moyer (eds.), *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 249-262.
- Heller, M. 2011a. *Paths to Post-Nationalism: A Critical Ethnography of Language and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heller, M. 2011b. Du français comme "droit" au français comme "valeur ajoutée" : de la politique à l'économique au Canada. *Langage et société* 136 (2), 13-30.
- Hires-László K., Karmacs Z. & Márku, A. (szerk.) 2011. *Nyelvi mítoszok, ideológiák, nyelvpolitika és nyelvi emberi jogok Közép-Európában elméletben és gyakorlatban. A 16. Élőnyelvi Konferencia előadásai*. Budapest, Beregszász, II. Rákóczi Ferenc Kárpátaljai Magyar Főiskola Hodinka Antal Intézete: Tinta.
- Hornsby, M. 2015. The 'new' and 'traditional' speaker dichotomy: bridging the gap. *International Journal for the Sociology of Language* 231, 107 -125.
- Hornsby, M. & Quentel, G. 2013. Contested varieties and competing authenticities: neologisms in revitalized Breton. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 223, 71-86.
- Horváth, M. 1998. A magyar mint környezeti nyelv diszciplináris és oktatási kérdései. In Giay B. & Nádor O. (szerk.) *A magyar mint idegen nyelv hungarológia: Tankönyv és szöveggyűjtemény*. Budapest: Janus & Osiris, 304-310.
- Hutchy J. & Wooffit, R. 1998. *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Institutul Național de Statistică (INS) 2011. *Recensământul populației și al locuințelor*. [online] <http://www.recensamantromania.ro/rezultate-2/>
- Irvine, J. T. 1989. When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy. *American Ethnologist* 16 (2), 248-267.
- Jaffe, A. 1999. *Ideologies in action: language politics on Corsica*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jaffe, A. 2015. Defining the New Speaker: Theoretical Perspectives and Learner Trajectories. *International Journal for the Sociology of Language* 231, 21-44.
- Jaworska, S. 2009. The German language in Poland: The eternal foe and the wars on words. In J. Carl & P. Stevenson (Eds.) *Language, discourse and identity in Central Europe: The German language in a multilingual space*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 51-73.
- Jyväskylä Kansalaisopisto 2013-2014. 2013. *Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä kaupunki*.
- Kamusella, T. 2009. *The Politics of Language and Nationalism in Modern Central Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Kádár, E. 2008. Az erdélyi nyelvészeti kutatások jelenlegi helyzete. Kolozsvár: Kolozsvári Akadémiai Bizottság Nyelvtudományi Szakbizottság. [online] www.sztanyi.ro/download/ErdelyiNyelveszetiKutatasok.pdf
- Kalaja, P. 1999. Kieli ja asenteet. In K. Sajavaara & A. Piirainen-Marsh (eds.) *Kielen oppimisen kysymyksiä*. Jyväskylä: Soveltavan kielentutkimuksen keskus, Jyväskylän yliopisto, 45-72.
- Kalaja, P. & Barcelos, M. 2006. *Belief about SLA*. New York: 2006.
- Kalaja, P., Menezes, V. & Barcelos, M. (Eds.) 2008. *Narratives of learning and teaching EFL*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kalaja, P. & Barcelos, M. 2012a. Beliefs about second language acquisition: learner. In C. Chappelle (Ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Chichester, UK: Blackwell Publishing. [online] onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0082/pdf
- Kalaja, P. & Barcelos, M. 2012b. Beliefs about second language acquisition: the teacher. In C. Chappelle (Ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Chichester, UK: Blackwell Publishing. [online] onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0083/pdf
- Kárpát Expressz 2010. Magyarul tanulnak a Románok Nagyváradon. Duna Tévé 2010. október 14. 18:29. [online] premier.mtv.hu/Hirek/2010/10/14/18/Magyarul_tanulnak_a_romanok_Nagyvaradon.aspx (2012-05-10)
- Híradó. Duna TV 2011. Románok tanulnak magyarul Nagyváradon. www.youtube.com/watch?v=U40WIhb0q6M (2012-05-10)
- Kasper, G. & Wagner, J. 2011. A Conversation-analytic Approach to Second Language Acquisition. In A. Dwight (Ed.) *Alternative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition*. London: Routledge, 117-142.
- Kiss, A. 2012a. Hungarian as a Second Language in Oradea / Nagyvárad: Cultural Reflections and Language Ideologies In K. Fenyvesi (Ed.) *Transition and difference: Hungarian Perspectives On East and Central European Studies*. Budapest: International Association for Hungarian Studies, 279-293.
- Kiss, A. 2013. A magyar mint második nyelv tanításának nehézségei és sikerei Nagyváradon. *THL2 A magyar nyelv és kultúra oktatásának szakfolyóirata - The Journal of Teaching Hungarian as a 2nd Language* 2012 (1-2), 97-115. [online] epa.oszk.hu/html/vgi/kardexlap.phtml?aktev=2012&id=1467
- Kiss, A. 2015a. (ahead of print) Teaching the Romanian neighbors Hungarian: language ideologies and the Debrecen Summer School. *Multilingual-Journal of Cross Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*. [online] www.degruyter.com/view/j/mult.ahead-of-print/multi-2014-1030/multi-2014-1030.xml
- Kiss, A. 2015b. Language ideologies and learning historical minority languages: a comparative study of voluntary learners of Swedish in Finland and Hungarian in Romania. *Apples-Journal of Applied Language Studies* 9(1), 87-109. [online] apples.jyu.fi/article/abstract/352

- Kinginger, C. 2009. *Language learning and study abroad: a critical reading of research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kramsch, C. 2009. *The multilingual subject*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koháry I., & Fazakas E. (Eds.) 2006. *Magyar iskola Romániában*. Budapest: Hungarian Language School.
- Kontra M. 2006. A magyar lingvicizmus és ami körülveszi: Sipőcz K. & Szeverényi S. (szerk.) *Elmélkedések népekről, nyelvekről és a profán medvéről. Írások Bakró-Nagy Marianne tiszteletére*. Szeged: SZTE Finnugor Nyelvtudományi Tanszék, 83-106.
- Kontra M. 2008a. Bevezető gondolatok az Anyanyelvvaltozatok, identitás és magyar anyanyelvi nevelés című szimpóziumhoz. In Cserniczkó, I. & M. Kontra (szerk.) *Az Üveghegyen innen. Anyanyelvvaltozatok, identitás és magyar anyanyelvi nevelés*. Ungvár; Beregszász, II. Rákóczi Ferenc Kárpátaljai Magyar Főiskola: Poliprint, 7-9.
- Kontra M. 2008b. Hol tartunk 2008-ban? In Cserniczkó, I. & M. Kontra (szerk.) *Az Üveghegyen innen. Anyanyelvvaltozatok, identitás és magyar anyanyelvi nevelés*. Ungvár; Beregszász, II. Rákóczi Ferenc Kárpátaljai Magyar Főiskola: Poliprint, 10-16.
- Kontra, M. 2009. Mivel korrelálnak a nyelvi előítéletek Budapesten? In Borbély A., Vančóné Kremmer I. & Hattyár H. (szerk.) *Nyelvideológiák, attitűdök és sztereotípiák. Segédkönyvek a nyelvészet tanulmányozásához 101*. Budapest; Dunaszerdahely; Nyitra: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet; Gramma Nyelvi Iroda; Konstantin Filozófus–Egyetem Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kar; Tinta, 37-51.
- Kontra M. 2010. *Hasznos nyelvészet*. Somorja: Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet.
- Kramsch, C. J. 2009. *The multilingual subject: what foreign language learners say about their experience and why it matters*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kroskrity, P. V. 2000. *Regimes of language: ideologies, politics, and identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Kytölä, S. 2013. *Multilingual language use and metapragmatic reflexivity in Finnish internet football forums: a study in the sociolinguistics of globalization*. Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 200.
- Laihonon, P. 2001. *Multilingualism in the Banat: Elite and Everyday Language Ideologies*. In B. Lönnqvist, P. Hannonen & G. Barna (Eds.) *Ethnic Minorities and Power*. Helsinki: Fonda Publishing, 11-45.
- Laihonon, P. 2004. *A romániai bánági (bánáti) tolerancia és többnyelvűség a nyelvi ideológiák tükrében*. In Kovács N. & Szarka L. (Eds.) *Tér és terep: tanulmányok az etnicitás és az identitás kérdésköréből (3)*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 81-97.
- Laihonon, P. 2005. *Multilingualism and language ideologies in the Romanian Banat*. Licentiate thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of English. [online] <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/8414>
- Laihonon, P. 2008. *Language ideologies in interviews: A conversation analysis approach*. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12 (5), 668-693.

- Laihonen, P. 2009a. Language Ideologies in the Romanian Banat: Analysis of Interviews and Academic Writings among the Hungarians and Germans. *Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities* 119.
- Laihonen, P. 2009b. A magyar nyelvi standardhoz kapcsolódó nyelvi ideológiák a romániai Bánságban. In Lanstyák I., Menyhárt J., Szabó Mihály G. (szerk.) *Tanulmányok a kétnyelvűségről IV.* Dunaszerdahely: Gramma, 47-77.
- Laihonen, P. 2010a. Lanstyák István a nyelvi babonák című cikkéről. In In Beke Zs., Lanstyák I. & Misad K. (szerk.) *Hungarológia a szlovák kultúra kontextusában.* Pozsony: Stimul, 110-112.
- Laihonen, P. 2010b. Ideológia és nyevművelés. Hozzászólások Lanstyák István *Nyelvhelyesség és nyelvi ideológia* című cikkéhez. In In Beke Zs., Lanstyák I. & Misad K. (szerk.) *Hungarológia a szlovák kultúra kontextusában.* Pozsony: Stimul, 133-137.
- Laihonen, P. 2011. A nyelvi ideológiák elmélete és használhatósága a magyar nyelvvel kapcsolatos kutatásokban. In Hires-László K., Karmacs Z. & Márku, A. (szerk.) 2011. *Nyelvi mítoszok, ideológiák, nyelvpolitika és nyelvi emberi jogok Közép-Európában elméletben és gyakorlatban.* A 16. Élőnyelvi Konferencia előadásai. Budapest, Beregszász, II. Rákóczi Ferenc Kárpátaljai Magyar Főiskola Hodinka Antal Intézete: Tinta, 20-27.
- Laihonen, P. 2012. Nyelvi tájkép egy csallóközi és egy mátyusföldi faluban. *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle*, 14 (3), 27-49.
- Laihonen, P. 2013a. Nyelvi ideológiák és regionalitás. In Szoták Sz. & Vargha S. (szerk.), *Változó nyelv, nyelvváltozatok, területiség.* Kolozsvár: Egyetemi Műhely Kiadó & Bolyai Társaság, 81-89.
- Laihonen, P. 2013b. Csíkszentdomokosi nyelvi tájkép. *Székelyföld* 17 (7), 157-177.
- Laihonen, P. 2015a. Beware of the dog! Private linguistic landscapes in two 'Hungarian' villages in South-West Slovakia. *Language Policy* [online first]. doi:10.1007/s10993-015-9358-y
- Laihonen, P. 2015b. Linguistic landscapes of a minoritized regional majority: Language ideologies among Hungarians in South-West Slovakia. In M.-P. Laitinen & A. Zabrodszkaja (Eds.) *Dimensions of sociolinguistic landscapes in Europe: Materials and methodological solutions.* Sprachkönnen und Sprachbewusstheit in Europa/Language Competence and Language Awareness in Europe (7). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang publishing group, 171-198.
- Laihonen, P. 2015c. Theory and practice of language education today: insights from teaching Finnish and beyond. In I. Vančo & I. Kozmács (eds.) *Language learning and teaching: state language teaching for minorities.* Nitra: Constantine the Philosopher university in Nitra.
- Laihonen, P. & Tódor E-M. 2015. The changing schoolscape in a Szekler village in Romania: signs of diversity in rehungarization. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.* [online] <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1051943>

- Limba maghiară pentru arhivistică 2008-2009. University syllabus. [online] http://hiphi.ubbcluj.ro/Public/File/syllabus/istorie/lb_maghiara_2.pdf
- Langman J. 2002. Mother-tongue education versus bilingual education: shifting ideologies and policies in the Republic of Slovakia. *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 154, 47-64.
- Langman J. 2003. Growing a Bányavirág (Rock Crystal) on Barren Soil: Forming a Hungarian Identity in Eastern Slovakia through Joint (Inter)action. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.) *Language Socialization in Bilingual and Multilingual Societies. Bilingual Education and Bilingualism: 39*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 182-199.
- Langman, J. 2013. Analyzing qualitative data: mapping the research trajectory in multilingual contexts. In R. Bayley, R. Cameron & C. Lucas (Eds.) *The Oxford handbook of Sociolinguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 241-260.
- Langman, J. 2015. (Re)considering Reflexivity in the Research Process: Examining Multiple Stances to the Research Context. In M. Kovács, P. Laihonen & H. Snellman (Eds.) *Culture, Language and Globalization among the Moldavian Csángós Today. Uralica Helsingiensia 8*. University of Helsinki: Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies & Finno-Ugrian Society, 217-230.
- Langman J. & Bayley, R. 2004. Variation in the group and the individual: evidence from second language acquisition. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 42 (4), 303-318.
- Langman J. & Lanstyák I. 2000. Language negotiations in Slovakia: views from the Hungarian minority. *Multilingua* 19(1-2), 55-72.
- Langman, J. & Sayer, P. 2013. Qualitative sociolinguistics research. In C. Chapelle (Ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Chicester, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 1-6.
- Lankshear, C. & Knobel, M. 2004. *A handbook for teacher research: From design to implementation*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Lanstyák I. 2003 (2004). Helyi "értékes" nyelvváltozatok, "tisztos" idegen szavak, "visszás" jelentések, "agresszív" rövidítések, "kevercs" nyelv és társai. I-II. *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle* 2003 (4), 69-98; 2004 (1), 51-76.
- Lanstyák, I. 2006. A kevésbé használt nyelvek és az Európai Unió. In Benő A. & Szilágyi N. S. (szerk.) *Nyelvi közösségek - nyelvi jogok*. Kolozsvár: Anyanyelvpolók Erdélyi Szövetsége Kiadó, 222-233.
- Lanstyák, I. 2007a. A nyelvhelyesség mint nyelvi probléma. *Kisebbségkutatás* 2, 199-213.
- Lanstyák, I. 2007b. A nyelvi tévhitekről. In Domokosi Á., Lanstyák I. Pozsgay I. (szerk.) *Műhelytanulmányok a nyelvművelésről*. Dunaszerdahely: Gamma Nyelvi Iroda, 154-173.
- Lanstyák, I. 2007c. Általános nyelvi mítoszok. In Domokosi Á., Lanstyák I. Pozsgay I. (szerk.) *Műhelytanulmányok a nyelvművelésről*. Dunaszerdahely: Gamma Nyelvi Iroda, 174-212.

- Lanstyák, I. 2009a. Nyelvi ideológiák és filozófiák. Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle 11 (1), 27-44.
- Lanstyák, I. 2009b. Nyelvművelés, nyelvtervezés, nyelvmenedzselés. Pozsony: Stimul.
- Lanstyák I. 2010a. Nyelvhelyesség és nyelvi ideológia. In Beke Zs., Lanstyák I. & Misad K. (szerk.) Hungarológia a szlovák kultúra kontextusában. Pozsony: Stimul, 95-107.
- Lanstyák I. 2010b. A nyelvi babonák életerejéről. In In Beke Zs., Lanstyák I. & Misad K. (szerk.) Hungarológia a szlovák kultúra kontextusában. Pozsony: Stimul, 137-145.
- Lanstyák, I. 2011. Nyelvi problémák és nyelvi ideológiák. In Hires-László K., Karmacs Z. & Márku, A. (szerk.) 2011. Nyelvi mítoszok, ideológiák, nyelvpolitika és nyelvi emberi jogok Közép-Európában elméletben és gyakorlatban. A 16. Élőnyelvi Konferencia előadásai. Budapest, Beregszász, II. Rákóczi Ferenc Kárpátaljai Magyar Főiskola Hodinka Antal Intézete: Tinta, 48-58.
- Lantolf, J. P. 2000. Sociocultural theory and second language learning. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, É. 1991. Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liebkind, K., Tandefelt, M. & Moring, T. 2007. Introduction: why a special issue on the Swedish-speaking Finns? International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 187-188, 1-11.
- Livezeanu, I. 2000. Cultural Politics in Greater Romania: Regionalism, Nation Building, and Ethnic Struggle, 1918-1930. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Lynch, A. 2003. The Relationship between Second and Heritage Language Acquisition: Notes on Research and Theory Building. Heritage Language Journal, 1-18.
- Maghiar, T. 1995. Înăptuiri și perspective. In Academia teologică ortodoxă română Oradea: 70 de ani de la înființare. Oradea: Universitatea din Oradea, 5-6.
- Magyari, S. 2004. Magyarul nem magyaroknak. Temesvár: Marineasca.
- Magyari, S. 2009. Hiedelmek a magyar nyelv körül. THL2 A magyar nyelv és kultúra oktatásának szakfolyóirata - The Journal of Teaching Hungarian as a 2nd Language, 2009 (1-2), 150-155.
- Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. 2007. Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages. In Sinfre Makoni & Alastair Pennycook (Eds.), Disinventing and reconstructing languages. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1-42.
- Mar-Molinero C. & P. Stevenson (Eds.) 2006. Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe. Houndmills: Palgrave.
- Mar-Molinero, C. 2006. The European Linguistic Legacy in a Global Era: Linguistic Imperialism, Spanish and the Instituto Cervantes. In Clare Mar-Molinero & Patrick Stevenson (Eds.) Language Ideologies, Policies and

- Practices: Language and the Future of Europe. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 58-76.
- Marschalkó, G. 2011. *Hungarolingua Basic: A Hungarian Course for Beginners*. Debrecen: Debreceni Nyári Egyetem.
- Marschalkó, G. 2012. *Hungarolingua Basic: Curs de limba maghiară pentru începători*. Translated and adapted by Kiss Attila Gyula. Debrecen: Debreceni Nyári Egyetem.
- Martinez-Roldan, C. M. & Malave, G. 2004. Language ideologies mediating literacy and identity in bilingual contexts. *Journal of Early Childhood Literac* 4 (2), 155-180.
- Maticsák, S. 2002. A magyar nyelv oktatása a Debreceni Nyári Egyetemen In: Dobi E. & Gellén J. (szerk.): *75 éves a Debreceni Nyári Egyetem*. Debrecen: Debreceni Nyári Egyetem, 35-53.
- Marton, E. & Vincze, L. 2011. Tanuljuk-e a másik nyelvet?: Megértés, attitűdök és az egymás nyelve iránti érdeklődés erdélyi magyar és román fiatalok körében. *Modern Nyelvoktatás* 17(2-3), 101-107.
- May, S. 2012. *Language and minority rights: ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language*. New York: Routledge.
- McEwan-Fujita, E. 2010. Ideology, affect, and socialization in language shift and revitalization: The experiences of adults learning Gaelic in the Western Isles of Scotland. *Language in Society* 39, 27-64.
- McGroarty, M. 2008. The Political Matrix of Linguistic Ideologies. In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult *The handbook of educational linguistics*. Blackwell handbooks in linguistics. Malden, MA: Blackwell publishing, 98-112.
- McLeod, W., O'Rourke B. & Dunmore S. 2014. 'New Speakers' of Gaelic in Edinburgh and Glasgow. *Soillse Report*. [online] <http://www.soillse.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/New-Speakers%E2%80%99-of-Gaelic-in-Edinburgh-and-Glasgow.pdf>
- McRae, K. D. 2007. Toward language equality: four democracies compared. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 187-188, 13-34.
- Menard-Warwick, J. & Palmer, D. 2012. Bilingual Development in Study-Abroad Journal Narratives: Three Case Studies from a Short-Term Program in Mexico. *Multilingua* 31 (4), 381-412.
- Mihalache, C. 2010. O lecție de istorie în perioada interbelică: 1 Decembrie 1918. In O. Pecican (Ed.) *România interbelică: Istorie și istoriografie. Analize istorice*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Limes, 11-26.
- Moisa, G. Instituția primarului și primarii Oradiei între 1945–2003. In A. Chiriac (Ed.) *Oradea. Pagini de istorie: instituția primarului. Evoluție administrativă. Realitate urbanistică și arhitecturală*. Oradea: Editura Muzeului țării Crișurilor.
- Molnár, Sz. 2000. Megjegyzések a hungarológiáról Bukarestből. In Tverdota Gy. (szerk.) *Hungarológia 2–3*. Budapest: Nemzetközi Hungarológiai Központ, 210-214.

- Mori, J. 2012. Tale of Two Tales: Locally Produced Accounts and Membership During Research Interviews With a Multilingual Speaker. *The Modern Language Journal* 96, 489–506.
- Mózes, T. 1997. *Evreii din Oradea*. București: Hasefer.
- Mungiu-Pippidi, A. 1999. *Tansilvania subiectivă*. București: Humanitas.
- Murphy-Lejeune, E. 2002. *Student mobility and narrative in Europe: the new strangers*. New York: Routledge.
- Murphy, T. & Carpenter, C. 2008. The Seeds of Agency in Language Learning Narratives. In P. Kalaja, O. V. Menezes & Ferreira A. (Eds.) *Narratives of learning and teaching EFL*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 17-34.
- Murvai, O. 1997. *Gramatica comparată maghiaro română. Micellanea*. Bukarest: Callioti.
- Murvai, O. 2010. Búvárkodás szavak között. Készítette: Máthé Éva. *Krónika*, Aug. 6. [online] www.kronika.ro/index.php?action=open&res=41000
- Nádor, O. 1998. A magyar mint idegen nyelv/hungarológia oktatásának története. In Giay B. & Nádor O. (szerk.) *A magyar mint idegen nyelv hungarológia: Tankönyv és szöveggyűjtemény*. Budapest: Osiris, 39-99.
- Nádor, O. 2007. A Kárpát-medencei nyelvtanulás hagyományai. In Benő A., Fazakas E. & Szilágyi N. S. (szerk.) *Nyelvek és nyelvváltozatok*. Kolozsvár: Anyanyelvápolók Erdélyi Szövetsége Kiadó, 148-158.
- Nádor, O. 2011a. Nyelvpolitika és oktatás – történeti háttérvázlat. In Bartha Cs., Nádor O. & Péntek J. (szerk.) *Nyelv és oktatás kisebbségben. Kárpát-medencei körkép*. Budapest: Tinta kiadó, 21-57.
- Nádor, O. 2011b. A magyarról mint idegen nyelvről – nyelvideológiai közelítésben. In Hires-László K., Karmacs Z. & Márku, A. (szerk.) *Nyelvi mítoszok, ideológiák, nyelvpolitika és nyelvi emberi jogok Közép-Európában elméletben és gyakorlatban. A 16. Élőnyelvi Konferencia előadásai*. Budapest, Beregszász, II. Rákóczi Ferenc Kárpátaljai Magyar Főiskola Hodinka Antal Intézete: Tinta, 211-218.
- Nebuló webpage [online] www.nebulo.ro
- Nekvapil, J. & Sherman, T. 2009. Czech, German and English: Finding Their Place in Multinational Companies in the Czech Republic. In J. Carl, & P. Stevenson (Eds.) *Language, Discourse and Identity in Central Europe: The German Language in a Multilingual Space*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 122-146.
- Nekvapil, J. 2000. On non-self-evident relationships between language and ethnicity: How Germans do not speak German, and Czechs do not speak Czech. *Multilingua* 19 (1-2), 37-54.
- Némedi, L. 1988. *Emlékek, adatok és gondolatok: A Debreceni Nyári Egyetem hatvan esztendejéről 1927-1987*. Debrecen: Tudományos Ismeretterjesztő Társulat.
- Nemes R. 2010. A coffeehouse on the linguistic frontier. *Hungarian Studies* 24 (2), 215-224.
- Neș, T. 2006. *Oameni din Bihor 1848–1918*. Oradea: Biblioteca Revistei Familia.
- Norton, B. 2000. *Identity and language learning: gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow: Longman.

- Norton, B. & McKinney, C. 2011. An Identity Approach to Second Language Acquisition. In A. Dwight (Ed.) *Alternative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition*. London: Routledge, 117-142.
- Nyugati Jelen 2004. Módszertani továbbképzés magyar nyelvtanároknak. Dec. 10. [online]
<http://archiv.nyugatijelen.com/2004/2004%20december/dec.%2010%20pentek/PDF/7.pdf>
- Ochs, E. & Capps, L. 2001. *Living narrative: creating lives in everyday storytelling*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Official Statistics of Finland: Population structure [e-publication]. ISSN=1797-5395. annual review 2010, Appendix figure 1. Swedish-speakers' proportion of the population in 1900-2010 . Helsinki: Statistics Finland [Online].
http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/2010/01/vaerak_2010_01_2011-09-30_kuv_001_en.html
- Oh, J. & Nash, A. 2014. Attitudes and motivations of Adult Spanish Learners: A comparison of Heritage Language Learners and Second Language Learners. *Heritage Language Journal* 11 (1), 29-44.
- O'Rourke, B. & Ramallo F. 2011. The native-non-native dichotomy in minority language. Comparisons between Irish and Galician. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 35 (2), 139-159.
- O'Rourke, B. 2011. Whose Language is it?: Struggles for Language Ownership in an Irish Language Classroom. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education* 10 (5), 327-345.
- O'Rourke, B. & Pujolar J. 2013. From Native Speakers to "New Speakers" - Problematizing Nativeness in Language Revitalization Contexts. *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 35 (2), 47-67.
- O'Rourke, B. & Ramallo F. 2013. Competing ideologies of linguistic authority amongst new speakers in contemporary Galicia. *Language in Society* 42 (3), 287-305.
- O'Rourke, B. & Walsh J. 2015. New Speakers of Irish: shifting boundaries across time and space. *International Journal for the Sociology of Language* 231, .
- O'Rourke, B. & Ramallo F. 2015. Neofalantes as an active minority: Understanding language practices and motivations for change amongst new speakers of Galician. *International Journal for the Sociology of Language* 231, 147-165.
- O'Rourke, B., Pujolar J. & Ramallo F. 2015. New speakers of minority languages: the challenging opportunity - Foreword. *International Journal for the Sociology of Language* 231, 1-20.
- Ormos, M. 1990. The early interwar years 1921-1938. In P. Sugar, P. Hanák & T. Frank (Eds.) *A History of Hungary*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 319-339.
- Ortega, A., Urla, J., Amorrortu, E., Goirigolzarri J. & Uranga, B. 2015. Linguistic identity among new speakers of Basque. *International Journal for the Sociology of Language* 231, 85-105.

- Ó hlfearnáin, T. 2015. Sociolinguistic vitality of Manx after extreme language shift: authenticity without traditional native speakers. *International Journal for the Sociology of Language* 231, 45-62.
- Palviainen, A. 2010a. The Proficiency in Swedish of Finnish-speaking University Students: Status and Directions for the Future. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies* 4 (1), 3-23.
- Palviainen, A. 2010b. Sprakval och vagval - en valfraga 2011? *Kieli, koulutus ja yhteiskunta*. [online] <http://www.kieliverkosto.fi/article/sprakvaloch-vagval-en-valfraga-2011/>
- Palviainen, A. 2011. Frivillig svenska? Utbildningsrelaterade konsekvenser. *Magma Finlands svenska tankesmedja*. [online] http://www.magma.fi/images/stories/reports/ms1103_frisv.pdf
- Palviainen, A. 2012. Larande som diskursnexus: Finska studenters uppfattningar om skoltid, fritid och universitetsstudier som larokontexter for svenska. *Nordand Nordisk tidsskrift for andersprakforskning* 7 (1), 7-35.
- Palviainen, A. 2013a. National identity and a transnational space: the strength of tradition in a time of change. *Sociolinguistica* 27, 1-18.
- Palviainen, A. 2013b. Att utveckla en Jyväskyläidentitet: Undervisning pa svenska i en finskdominerad miljo. In *Kieli, koulutus, ja yhteiskunta*. [online] <http://www.kieliverkosto.fi/article/att-utveckla-en-jyvaskylaidentitetundervisning-pa-svenska-i-en-finskdominerad-miljo/>
- Palviainen, A. & C. Jauhojarvi-Koskelo 2009. Mitt i brytpunkten: Finska universitetsstudenters asikter om svenskan. In L. Collin & S. Haapamaki (Eds.) *Svenskan i Finland 11. Foredrag vid elfte sammankomsten for beskrivningen av svenskan i Finland, Åbo den 16-17 maj 2008*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 125-133.
- Pavlenko, A. & Blackledge A. (Eds.) 2004. *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pavlenko, A. 2007. Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics* 28 (2), 163-88.
- Peirce, B. N. 1995. Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning. *TESOL Quarterly* 29(1), 9-31.
- Péntek, J. 2001a. Nyelvjárásaink és a román nyelvi hatás. In *A nyelv ritkuló légköre: szociolingvisztikai dolgozatok*. Kolozsvár: Komp-Press, Korunk Baráti Társaság, 7-12.
- Péntek, J. 2001b. A magyar nyelv értékelése szomszédaink körében. In *A nyelv ritkuló légköre: szociolingvisztikai dolgozatok*. Kolozsvár: Komp-Press, Korunk Baráti Társaság, 73-79.
- Péntek, J. 2001c. Idegen-e a magyar nyelv a Kárpát-medencében. In *A nyelv ritkuló légköre: szociolingvisztikai dolgozatok*. Kolozsvár: Komp-Press, Korunk Baráti Társaság, 80-91.
- Péntek, J. 2002. Örökség és kihívás. Az erdélyi Magyar nyelvtudomány a század- és ezredfordulón. In Tánzos V., Tőkés Gy., Moldován I. & Góczán A. (Eds.) *Tizenkét év: Összefoglaló tanulmányok az erdélyi*

- Magyar tudományos kutatások 1990-2001 közötti eredményeiről. Cluj-Napoca/Kolozsvár: Scientia, 15-50.
- Phipps, A. 2007. *Learning the Arts of Linguistic Survival: Languaging, Tourism, Life*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Pritchard Newcombe, L. 2007. *Social context and fluency in L2 learners: the case of Wales*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pujolar, J. 2007a. The future of Catalan: language endangerment and nationalist discourses in Catalonia. In A. Duchene & M. Heller (Eds.) *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and Interest in the Defence of Languages*. London: Continuum, 121-148.
- Pujolar, J. 2007b. Bilingualism and the Nation-state in the Post-national Era. In A. Duchêne & M. Heller (Eds.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-McMillan, 71-95.
- Pujolar, J. & Jones, K. 2012. Literary tourism : new appropriations of landscape and territory in Catalonia. In A. Duchêne & M. Heller. *Language in late capitalism pride and profit*. New York: Routledge, 93-116.
- Pujolar, J. & Gonzales, I. 2013. Linguistic “mudes” and the de-ethnicization of language choice in Catalonia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16 (2), 138-152.
- Pujolar, J. & Puigdevall, M. 2015. Linguistic “Mudes”: How to Become a New Speaker in Catalonia. *International Journal of the Sociology for Language*. Issue 231, 167-187.
- Rindler Schjerve, R. & Vetter, E. 2012. *European multilingualism: current perspectives and challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Recensământul populației și al locuințelor 2011. [online]
<http://www.recensamantromania.ro/rezultate-2/>
- Românașu, R. 2008. *Asociațiile culturale românești din Oradea și Județul Bihor în perioada interbelică*. Oradea: Editura Universității din Oradea.
- Romsics, I. 1999. *Hungary in the twentieth century*. Budapest: Corvina & Osiris.
- Sándor, K. 2001a. Nyelvművelés és ideológia. In Sándor K. (szerk) *Nyelv, jog, oktatás*. Szeged: JGYF Kiadó, 57-84.
- Sándor, K. 2001b. A nyílt társadalmi diszkrimináció utolsó bástyája: az emberek nyelvhasználata. *Replika* (nov.), 241-259.
- Sándor, K. 2006. Nyelvtervezés, nyelvpolitika, nyelvművelés. In Kiefer F. (szerk) *Magyar nyelv*. Budapest: Akadémiai, 958-995.
- Savu, T. 1995. Lupta episcopului Roman Ciorogariu pentru înființarea Academiei Teologice Ortodoxe din Oradea. In *Academia teologică ortodoxă română Oradea: 70 de ani de la înființare*. Oradea: Universitatea din Oradea, 11-14.
- Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. 2004. *Nexus Analysis: Discourse and the Emerging Internet*. London: Routledge.
- Schieffelin, B. K., Woolard, K. & Kroskrity, P. 1998. (Eds.) *Language Ideologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

- Silverstein, M. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In *Parasession on the Elements*, et al. The elements, a parasession on linguistic units and levels, April 20–21, 1979. Chicago, Ill.: Chicago Linguistic Society, 193-247.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & McCarty, T. L. 2008. Key concepts in bilingual education: ideological, historical, epistemological, and empirical foundations. In J. Cummins & N. Hornberger (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, Vol. 5, Bilingual Education, 2nd ed. New York: Springer, 3-17.
- Spolsky, B. 2010. Second-Language Learning. In J. A. Fishman & O. García (Eds.) *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 172-185.
- Statistics of Finland 2011. Swedish-speakers' proportion of the population in 1900–2010.[online]
http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/2010/01/vaerak_2010_01_2011-09-30_kuv_001_en.html
- Statistics Finland 2015. [online] <http://pxweb2.stat.fi/Dialog/Saveshow.asp>
- Szabó, T. P. 2012. “Kirakunk táblákat, hogy csúnyán beszélni tilos”: a javítás mint gyakorlat és mint téma diákok és tanáraik metanyelvében. *Dunaszerdahely: Gamma*.
- Szabó, T. P. 2013. Egy megfigyelés – több interpretáció. In Kontra, M., Németh, M. & Sinkovics, B. *Elmélet és empiria a szocilingvisztikában. Válogatás a 17. Élőnyelvi Konferencia – Szeged, 2012. augusztus 30. – szeptember 1. – előadásaiból*. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó, 380-399.
- Szabó, T. P. 2015. The management of diversity in schoolsapes. In *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 9(1), 23–51.
- Szabómihályi G. 2009. Szlovák fórumozók véleménye a szlovákiai magyarok nyelvhasználati jogairól és nyelvhasználatáról. In Borbély A., Vančóné Kremmer I. & Hattyár H. (szerk.) *Nyelvideológiák, attitűdök és sztereotípiák. Segédkönyvek a nyelvészet tanulmányozásához* 101. Budapest; Dunaszerdahely; Nyitra: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet; Gramma Nyelvi Iroda; Konstantin Filozófus–Egyetem Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kar; Tinta, 223-231.
- Szarka, L. 2002. A városi magyar népesség a Magyarországgal szomszédos országokban (1910–2000). In Kovács N. & Szarka L. (szerk.) *Tér és terep: tanulmányok az etnicitás és az identitás kérdésköréből* (2). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Szilágyi N. Sándor 2008. De ce nu-și pot însuși copiii maghiari limba română în școală? *Altera* 1998/7, 131-148.
- Szilvási, A. 2010. A magyar mint idegen nyelv/Hungarológia műhelyei Szlovákiában. A magyar nyelv és kultúra oktatásának szakfolyóirata – *THL2: The Journal of Teaching Hungarian as a 2nd Language*, 2010 (1–2), 16-23.
- Szilvási, A. 2011. A magyar mint idegen nyelv Szlovákiában. In Misad K. & Csehy Z. (szerk.), *Nova Posoniensia*. Pozsony/Bratislava: Szenczi Molnár Albert Egyesület & Kalligram, 91-99.

- Talbert, S. & Stewart, M. A. 1999. What's the subject of study abroad? Race, gender and "living culture". *Modern Language Journal* 83 (2), 163-75.
- ten Have, P. 2004. *Understanding Qualitative Research and Ethnomethodology*. London: Sage Publications.
- Todeva, E. & Cenoz, J. (Eds.) 2009. *Multiple Realities of Multilingualism: Personal Narratives and Researchers Perspectives*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Trosset, C. 1993. *Welshness performed: Welsh concepts of person and society*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Tandefelt, Marika and Fjalar Finnäs. 2007. Language and demography: historical development. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 187-188, 35-54.
- Tapio, E. 2013. *A nexus analysis of English in the everyday life of FinSL signers: a multimodal view on interaction*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University Printing House.
- The Constitution of Finland 2000. [online]
<http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/1999/en19990731.pdf>
- The Constitution of Romania 2003. [online]
<http://www.cdep.ro/pls/dic/site.page?id=339&par1=1&idl=2>
- Vančo, I. 2011. The development of speech perception: longitudinal study. In I. Vančo (Ed.) *Language policy, dialect, and bilingualism: a focus on Hungarian language use in Slovakia*. Nitra: Arany A. László Civic Association, Gramma Language Office, Faculty of Central European Studies, Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra.
- Vančo, I. 2012. Characteristics of the development of naturalistic Hungarian-Slovak bilingualism. In I. Vančo (Ed.) *Language policy, dialect, and bilingualism: a focus on Hungarian language use in Slovakia 2*. Nitra: Institute for Minority Studies Centre for Social Sciences Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
- Varga, B. 2014. Multilingualism in urban Hungary, 1880–1910. *Nationalities Papers* 42 (6), 965-980.
- Verdery, K. 1996. *What was socialism and what comes next?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Veres, M. 2000. Attitűdvizsgálat és nyelvhasználat a kolozsvári magyar fiatalok körében. In Borbély A. (szerk.). *Nyelvek és kultúrák érintkezése a Kárpát-medencében. A 10. Élőnyelvi Konferencia előadásai*. Budapest: Az MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézetének Élőnyelvi Osztálya, 239-247.
- Walsh, J. & O'Rourke B. 2014. Becoming a new speaker of Irish: linguistic mudes throughout the life cycle. *Digithum* 16, 67-74.
- Weiss, R. S. & Bass, S. A. 2001. Introduction. In R. S. Weiss & S. A. Bass (Eds.) *Challenges of the third age: Meaning and purpose in later life*. New York: Oxford University Press, 3-12.
- Wenger, É. 1998. *Communities of practice: learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Wolff, S. 2000 (Ed.) *German minorities in Europe: ethnic identity and cultural belonging*. New York: Berghahn.
- Wetherell, M. 2008. Subjectivity or Psycho-Discursive Practices? Investigating Complex Intersectional Identities. *Subjectivity* 22, 73-81.
- Woolard, K. 1998. Introduction: language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard K. & P. Kroskrity (Eds.) *Language Ideologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3-47.
- Woolard, K. 2008. Language and identity choice in Catalonia: the interplay of contrasting ideologies of linguistic authority. In K. Süselbeck, U. Mühlischlegel & P. Masson (Eds.) *Lengua, nación e identidad. La regulación del plurilingüismo en España y América Latina*. Frankfurt am Main; Madrid: Vervuert; Iberoamericana, 303-323.
- Woolard, K. 2011. Is there linguistic life after high school? Longitudinal changes in the bilingual repertoire in metropolitan Barcelona. *Language in Society* 40 (5), 617-648.
- Woolard, K. 2013. Is the personal political? Chronotopes and changing stances toward Catalan language and identity. *International of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16 (2), 210-224.
- Woolard, K. & Schieffelin, B. 1994. Language ideology. *Annual Reviews Anthropology* 23, 55-82.
- Wortham, S. 2005. *Learning Identity: The Joint Emergence of Social Identification and Academic Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wortham, S. 2008. The Political Matrix of Linguistic Ideologies. In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds.) *The handbook of educational linguistics*. London: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 83-98.
- Zenker, O. 2014. Linguistic Relativity and Dialectical Idiomatization: Language Ideologies and Second Language Revival of Northern Ireland. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 24(1), 68-83.

ORIGINAL PAPERS

I

HUNGARIAN AS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN ORADEA/NAGYVÁRAD: CULTURAL REFLECTIONS AND LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES.

<http://issuu.com/kristoffenyvesi/docs/transition2012/281>

by

Attila Gyula Kiss, 2011

In Fenyvesi, K. (Ed.) *Transition and Difference: Hungarian Perspectives on East and Central European Studies*. Symposium for PhD Students, 7th International Congress of Hungarian Studies, Kolozsvár/Cluj-Napoca, 2011.
Budapest: International Association for Hungarian Studies, 279–293.

Reproduced with kind permission by
International Association for Hungarian Studies.

Kiss Attila Gyula

**Hungarian as a Second Language
in Oradea / Nagyvárad:
Cultural Reflexions and Language Ideologies**

Introduction

My study branches out into the area of language, teaching and learning in an intercultural context which is at the crossroads of sociolinguistics, applied linguistics and cultural studies. The research area deals with a broad range of phenomena related to language and culture focusing on values, goals and beliefs, which at times lie behind and are embedded in actual educational cultures and practices. I approach the issue from the vantage point of 'language ideologies' as formulated by American sociolinguists (e. g. Gal 1979; Kroskrity 2000; Schieffelin, Woolard, and Kroskrity 1998; Blommaert 2005).

Little attention has been given to the role of language ideologies in Hungarian language acquisition. In spite of its potential in improving the sometimes troubled interethnic relationships, no attention has so far been given to learners of Hungarian with a Romanian dominant background. Therefore I sense the need for better conceptualization of the problem of teaching and learning Hungarian in this specific context.

Present paper makes part of my PhD research project whose principal aim, through the case of Oradea / Nagyvárad, is to explore the possibilities of teaching a minority language and culture for majority inhabitants. My main goal is to conduct ethnographic research and analyze interview data on how different local inhabitants interpret the need and consequences of learning Hungarian and the linguistic situation they live in. I follow the discourse approach to map the content and structure of these discourses about language.

Even though minority linguistic rights are guaranteed by Romanian law (e.g. bilingual street names and inscriptions and the possibility of minority language use in public institutions), many of these practices have not been put into action in Nagyvárad / Oradea¹. The state language is in dom-

¹ Not even a very summary history of Nagyvárad / Oradea can fit into the restraints of this paper. The city for several centuries was one of the centers of

inant position in Romania, supported by government offices, education and police (Benő and Szilágyi 2005). Furthermore, Romanian national and local media has treated bilingualism – at least the pairing of Romanian with Hungarian – with great suspicion. Against this background the idea for local Romanians to learn Hungarian often seems rather unpopular and bizarre. Finally, there are also economic, political and historical positions of the region, which have complex linguistic consequences for learning Hungarian.

Research method and data

Learning of a minority language requires a close look at language ideologies and interaction in a socio-historically sensitive arena in which the language learner identity is socially negotiated (Gal 1979). My general framework is the study of Language Ideologies. For analysis, I will use a combination of qualitative methods. Silverstein (1979, 1993) in an early formulation postulated language ideologies as “sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use”. A decade later Irvine (1989, 255) points out the social, political and cultural elements. In her opinion linguistic ideology is: “the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests”.

Hungarian cultural life. One can recall the founder king Saint Ladislaus, the outstanding humanist Janus Pannonius (1432–1472), and much later the vibrant coffeehouse culture of the cosmopolitan city at the turn of the 20th century which was breeding place for modern Hungarian literature. A great many non-conformist poets, and intellectuals – like Ady Endre, Juhász Gyula and the poets of “Tomorrow” anthology started out from here. At the time Hungarian monopolized the linguistics landscape of the city with marked official and social pressures to “magyarize” the Romanian minority speakers (Nemes R. 2010). The Hungarian dominance lasted until 1920 – when Transylvania, together with Partium, was ceded to the Romanian state –, but cultural, social, and linguistic strategies to make Transylvania Romanian would continue for many decades to come (Livezeanu 1995). According to the 1910 census data the percentage of inhabitants claiming Hungarian nationality (ethnicity) was 91,1% (Szarka 2002, 198) – this number included the large local Jewry, the majority of which perished in the Holocaust. Based on the preliminary results of the 2011 census, out of the total 184.861 inhabitants, the percentage of those who claimed Hungarian mother tongue was 23,81% in Nagyvárad / Oradea.

There has hardly been any ethnography applied in this field and there are no similar studies on this subject about the region. But studies from Western Europe on the learning of minority languages like Welsh (Trosset 1993) and Catalan (Woolard 1989) show the validity and necessity of this research in this area. Only by introducing the ethnographic and discourse perspectives may we get closer to the heterodox data of what it means to be a Hungarian second language learner in Nagyvárad / Oradea. An ethnographic study of state language speakers learning Hungarian is carried out as it was first outlined in Susan Gal's ground breaking work (1979) and recently by Heller (2007; 2011) and Blommaert and Jie (2010). I will integrate the discussion of particular formulations with theories of discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, cultural studies as well as second language acquisition studies.

Data was gathered during fieldwork in Oradea / Nagyvárad where I organized and taught several Hungarian as a second language courses for adult learners. The informants in this research were among the participants to my courses. In relation to fieldwork my goal is to find out how informants explain or understand issues connected to Romanian-Hungarian bilingualism.

In the following I will analyse some interview excerpts in which informants speak about language contact among Hungarians and Romanians, encounters with bilingualism, and their experiences. As sites of encounters are the ethnically mixed families, circle of friends or acquaintances, as well as the television as a means to learn the language. We will see bilingualisms for some informants it was a matter of the every-days while others were rudely reminded about the subordinate position of the language in the early 90's.

Romanian learners of Hungarian and language contact

In this section I will illustrate—through some interview excerpts – possible encounters of Romanians with the Hungarian language, in its double quality, the language of the local minority and that of the Republic of Hungary, just 20 kilometers away from the city.

KA: Unde v-ați întâlnit cu limba maghiară prima dată?

Loredana (W1975, teacher): Da, sînt din Oradea, m-am născut aici.

Prima dată, de fapt în copilărie, din copilărie. În cartier am avut prietene foarte bune care vorbeau limba maghiară. Și de la ele jucându-ne ne-am învățat una pe cealaltă. Ele m-au învățat limba

maghiară eu i-am învățat limba română. Încă de pe atunci am învățat accentul... dacă pun accentul pe *á*, cum se citește, dacă este cu accent, dacă nu este cu accent cum se citește sau unele cuvinte în limba maghiară *víz* sau *ablak* sau *ház* foarte... preponderent vocabular.²

KA: When did you meet with the Hungarian language for the first time?

Loredana (W1975): Well, I am from Oradea. I was born here. For the first time in my childhood. In the neighbourhood I had very good friends who were speakers of Hungarian. And from them, playing together with them. They taught me Hungarian and I taught them Romanian. I learned the accent at that time, how to put the accent on the *á*, how to read it with an accent and without in some words like *víz* or *ablak* or *ház* mainly vocabulary.

The informant's depiction about the lieu and form of linguistic contact between Romanian and Hungarian children may be typical and shared by many Varadians. These early encounters with Hungarian and the mundane acquisition of a second language correspond well to the writer's my own childhood memories.

A contemporary source describes the social circumstances of Romania in the early 1980's in the following terms: "After 1947, the new government followed the Soviet example of agricultural collectivization and forced industrialization accompanied by a remodelling of the state along totalitarian communist lines" (United States Department of State 1983, 1). The Romania of late 70's and early 80's could be characterized as the climax of the politics of *forced industrialization* and urbanization under the directives of the Communist Party and its leader Nicolae Ceaușescu. There were minimal differences in the lifestyles of most people. References to "cartier" evoke the social and linguistics realities of the childhood of an entire generation, who are in their thirties now. The informant recalls that by living in a neighbourhood made up of socialist style blocks of flats the children played together in front of their apartment buildings and they

² All interviews were carried out in Romanian, but due to space limitations in the following only the English transcripts will be given. Speech data was recorded digitally with the consent of informants in the course of multiple sessions conducted by me. The names of informants have been changed for the sake of protecting their identity. In brackets after the names I indicate the informants sex (Man / Woman) and year of birth together with the occupation (e.g. W1975, teacher).

encountered bilingualism in a natural way, learning from each other while playing there. Usually both parents were employed in the recently set up industrial manufacturing sector of the town and worked long hours, Saturdays included, but nor was it unusual that they had to contribute to the *building of Socialism* by working on Sundays, or in three shifts, too. In these circumstances the many children from the years of demographic peaks could be barely supervised by their parents, but mostly left to their own devices to socialize freely in ethnically and linguistically mixed groups acquiring both Romanian and Hungarian. The iconic image of these times is the youngster – carrying the keys to the family’s flat on a line around his/her neck –, who due to the lack of social institutions to organize their free-time hung out in front their block of flats, or the numerous construction sites that were mushrooming in and all around the city in a frenzy of building new housing for factory workers. Depending on their temperament and individual inclinations they roamed the concrete of their *cartier*, and sometimes fought turf battles with other groups of the neighbourhood, or kids from the other neighbourhoods. Some of them would have been called juvenile gangs if the societal framework of the Ceaușescu regime had allowed for the existence of such *decadent* categories.

However linguistic and ethnic affiliation function as very strong markers in the world of adults, and society at large, these ethnic and linguistic boundaries rarely influenced one’s group of friends between children, and adolescents in those times.

When the researcher enquires another informant, belonging to the older generation (b.1957), about her relationship to languages she gives a different account of her childhood memories spent in a nearby provincial town where the family was the source of bilingualism.

Ana (W1957, teacher): Strange, but also familiar because my grandmother spoke it. But the environment where I grew up as a child Hungarian was not spoken. And when my father and mother spoke it I looked at them in amazement because they could speak this language, and could speak it well. But I was not brought up in a Hungarian speaking environment. My sole contact [to the language] was my grandma.

The importance of environment is highlighted by this informant, too. The fact that Hungarian was spoken in the family seems to be much less of importance on the “environment” as a whole, than in the previous case. This example also draws attention to the very complex issues of identities in multi-ethnic regions and multilingual families. Even though many peo-

ple spoke Hungarian in the family they did not consider it important for the child to become proficient in Hungarian. In this case only the grandmother spoke Hungarian to her. It is the language of communication with the grandmother.

When the informants speak about their family ties we see that the situation is not less complex and this brings about complex linguistic situations, as is highlighted in the interview excerpt below:

KA: And in the family aren't there Hungarians? What about kinship, cousins?

Loredana (W1975): Yes, I have kins, cousins. My mother's sister is married to a Hungarian. My boyfriend is Hungarian, namely his father is Hungarian, and his mother is Romanian. He knows Hungarian. I talk to him, I *pilfer words* from him.

In ethnically mixed family contexts like the one above there could arise situations when members of the family in certain situations will use Hungarian even though the Romanian is the language of communication by default. The communication between the couple usually takes place in Romanian, but when the boyfriend talks to somebody in Hungarian she pick up words inferring meaning from the context. When discussing about the region other informants also point out the multi-ethnic nature of the area and ethnically mixed marriages. Some informants themselves live in such inter-ethnic marriages.

Ana (W1957, teacher): In the background there are a lot of [ethnic] mixing. Families and mixed friendships. It is a very well-welded-together-area. This situation has existed for a long time [it has] deep roots.

Corina (W1960, entrepreneur): So that of tolerance?

Ana: Namely there are inextricable ties. Families, generations of ethnically mixed families, so there is no question about it.

Ethnically mixed marriages and families that go back for generations are not only the reality but generally accepted as the norm by this informant. This is indicative of the use of the value laden adjective "inextricable" indicates this, which also suggest that there were times, when this *mixing* was frowned upon and not considered normal. As another informant recalls:

Corina (W1960, entrepreneur): Yes, yes, yes... , but I had to suffer as an adult. They wanted to throw me out of my job. My first job when I came to Oradea, for I am married to a Hungarian. *Vatra Românească* was very powerful at the time.

In order to fully understand the significance of this brief remark it is worth to say a few words about the background, and cast some light on the immense personal implications of the intolerant nationalist politics of the first half of the 90's. The *Vatra Româneasca*, the *Romanian Hearth* that the informant refers to is a cultural association that together with the *Party of the National Unity of Romanians* (PUNR), and the *Great Romania Party* (PRM) promoted ultra-nationalism and were as Andreescu puts it the “main extremist actors” of Romanian politics: “The ideological foundation of the Romanian Hearth was the anti-Hungarian sentiment. The founders have been involved, at the end of January 1990, in anti-Hungarian provocations, some hidden but some manifest (in the local press and especially in *Cuvântul liber*, the organ of the future Hearth, as well as on TV). The anti-Hungarian feeling was supported by the media in the country's capital, and it reached a peak around the middle of March 1990.” (Andreescu 2003, 29)

As the informant points out their activity permeated the everyday life, made itself felt not only on the level of national politics, but down to the individual. Even though, informants would characterize the inter-ethnic relations in Oradea as one of mutual appreciation, and acceptance there have been lurking forces which made it their political agenda to untie the above mentioned “inextricable links”. The National Unity of Romanians (PUNR), and the Great Romania Party (PRM) have not gained the support of the majority of citizens—as it happened in Cluj at the time—, but they were active in Oradea, too, and made felt their ideology based on the intolerant brand of nationalism.³

Former theories showed a neglect for the individual, but contemporary research points out how the individual is also biographically shaped (Blommaert 2005; Wetherell 2008; De Fina and Georgakopoulou 2008). Or we can refer to the small stories research and propositions about the intersectionality of identity as proposed by other researchers (Ochs and Capps 2001; Georgakopoulou 2007). When I asked about the places where

³ Andreescu also quotes a representative sample of the very vocal and aggressive discourse that presents the mind-set of these political forces: “As it is well-known, the nomad spirit and the barbarian style of the Hungarian people and its minority in Romania did not disappear in the last 1000 years. Maybe we, Romanians, will have to cure them of this embarrassment and turn them into a peaceful, civilized European people that will no longer covet foreign lands. God forbid they should once again extend their paws toward Romanian territories.” Gheorghe Funar, *Informația Zilei*, Satu-Mare, October 27, 1994.

one could encounter the Hungarian language informants point out the availability of Hungarian language television:

Loredana (W1975, teacher): For television I was watching Hungarian television all the time. There were cartoons and films dubbed into Hungarian, absolutely everything, and I learned many words. I understood, not all but roughly everything, spoken Hungarian, after which there was a void concerning Hungarian language use.

This interview points out that an important aspect for Hungarian Second Language Acquisition for the generations socialized before the 1989 Romanian Revolution, is the availability of Hungarian language television in this border region. Programs broadcast from Budapest, were followed by Hungarians and Romanians alike because practically it was the sole television channel available, not counting the daily few hours broadcast of propaganda on Romanian national television. It was not uncommon that people living beyond the Eastern Carpathians—mountain range that obstructed the Hungarian television signal to reach their homes in inner Transylvania—, came to spend their holidays at Felix Baths, or with relatives in Oradea in order to follow e.g. the football World Cup, or in general Hungarian television programs, which offered the only window to the outside world. Many Romanians in the border region picked up substantial passive knowledge of Hungarian, because Hungarian language television channel was running in their home. The practice of watching Hungarian television by Romanians ceased after 1989 when the Hungarian channels lost their monopoly due to the appearance of free Romanian media. It did not take long before numerous channels in Romanian language started vying for the viewers attention.

The younger post-revolution Romanian generation could already polish their English pronunciation on subtitled, but undubbed Hollywood cartoons and movies. Not many of Romania speakers would surf the Hungarian channels any more.

Motivation for studying Hungarian and the reactions of acquaintances

In the face of it, it may seem strange that the very decision of taking part at Hungarian language classes can bring about negative reactions on the part of fellow Romanians. The informants often indicate that some of their fellow Romanians look in askance at them for attending Hungarian lessons. Even if they were not directly asked by the interviewer why they took up Hungarian,

and about their motifs of starting the course they feel the need justify their position. They voice that their interest in culture and the language of the local minority and that of the neighbouring country is intended as a gesture of openness, and good will:

Sandu (M1957, civil servant): I started to learn Hungarian out of the respect that I feel towards Hungarians, my colleagues, the citizens of Oradea.

Loredana (1974): [I learn Hungarian in order] to be able to understand, to be able to say a few sentences in the language of the other one // and he/she could understand you. I think it has to do with respect that you want to show towards the other one. To show him/her that you know the language he/she uses.

These accounts indicate that there exist goodwill, openness, and interest on the part of those who take up studying Hungarian. On the other hand other informants encounter the suspicion and bafflement of some of their friends and acquaintances who do not see the point in why a Romanian should learn Hungarian. These reactions put our informants on guard and in a position of defence. When I asked them about the reaction of their immediate surrounding, some would relate the following:

Sandu (M1954, civil servant): Some of my acquaintances congratulated me and appreciated positively that I study Hungarian. Others were bewildered and asked me: “Why precisely Hungarian? Why not another language? Why not a world language?”

Maria (W1961, physician): They found it funny. First of all they found it cool, but how should I say? They were surprised. Something like that.

KA: They wondered why?

Maria: Yes first they asked me: “Why? Do you want to move to Hungary?” But, noooo I said “Why should I want to?”

KA: This was their reaction?

Maria: Yes this was the first reaction: what is the hidden reason... .

As we see from the above interview the informant also has to take a defensive position, because she encounters surprise as a reaction to her account of studying Hungarian. Her interlocutor could see no other reasonable explanation for such an endeavour than, that she might consider emigration to 6 kilometres to the west, where we find the neighbouring Hungarian Republic. In the background of this allegation there is “the one nation state, one language concept” which disregards completely the reality of multilingual regions within the borders of one country, together with the

existence of minority languages and their potential usefulness within a country other than the nation state itself.

However, the informant personally considers multilingualism a natural state, explaining it with the fact that she is from the multi-ethnic Banat region. She attended a German language high school in Timișoara / Temesvár / Temeschwar and there she learned that a “real citizen of the city should speak at least three of the languages” of this region. Because of her family background she could also understand Serbian. In school she had French and Russian, and after adding English to her linguistic repertoire she started to study Hungarian when she moved to Oradea. This is truly impressive linguistic trajectory of one person however, it is not all that unusual because people who have their roots in the Banat region of Romania have traditionally esteemed multilingualism as a positive phenomenon (Laihonen 2009). The informant words her credo in the following way:

Maria (W1961): To be able to speak a language, it opens up the path to another culture, another civilization. It is very important. For me by any means it is important to be able to understand some neighbors. Because I do not know if you realize that Romanians know very little about Hungary and Hungarians, not counting their daily experiences. But they do not know anything about civilisation, history. I do not know whether this is a mutual problem. Probably not because... so

KA: What is the reason for that?

Maria: There is prejudices here. They do not have the inclination. And for me it is most curious for one to learn German first, because Hungarian is the first language that you bump into in our region.

The informant expresses disapproval with fellow Romanians not being interested about things Hungarian, and blames their shortsightedness and the prejudiced approach towards the Hungarian language and culture. She explains their disinclination with existence of prejudice, and expresses that learning Hungarian could be also practical for Romanians because it is the first language that they could encounter in this region.

In other situations the study of Hungarian is looked upon as a matter of fact and normal state of affairs. The informant speaks about how much bilingualism is accepted and embraced by her circle of friends, because she mostly socializes with people who come from ethnically-mixed backgrounds where bilingualism is the norm. Therefore they take it for granted that one takes up a Hungarian course, especially if one works in a Hungarian environment.

KA: And your friends how did they appreciate the fact that you attend Hungarian language courses?

L (W1974): And my friends, most of them speak Hungarian. XY my best friend at her turn has a Hungarian father and a Romanian mother, or YZ, he too speaks Hungarian, his mother is Hungarian

Most of them speak Hungarian, it was not at all a big surprise for them. It was understood that now, of course why should you not know Hungarian. They saw it as a matter of fact.

Bilingualism, or a multilingual linguistic repertoire is presented as natural in the circle of friends of this informant. As opposed to the previous situations, likely because of the mixed ethnic background of this informant's circle of friends, bilingualism is the unmarked case, a feature of the every-days.

Conclusions

As we could see from above interviews the linguistic situations in the field defy easy categorization, therefore only sociolinguistic ethnography can deliver more accurate answers. According to the post-structuralist definitions of language societal practices themselves are sites of struggle. Heterogeneous linguistic societies all want power and truth to themselves. According to Bakhtin (Bakhtin et al. 1994) and Bourdieu (Bourdieu and Thompson 1991) language itself is not a neutral medium, but it reflects a great deal of the symbolic power differences. Speakers of minority languages frequently encounter this power position of the dominant language.

The educationalist theoreticians (Vygotski, Valsiner, and Veer 1994) Kramsch (2009), and Lantolf (2000) in their educationalist studies also point out that in the course of language learning it is not the cognitive linguistic competences that are the most important. They suggest that we should not focus on the individual language learner as a generator of linguistic form, but consider the individual as a member of the given community. This aspect has special import for those who want to teach Hungarian to the members of neighbouring nations.

Hungarian classes can not only serve as a framework for meeting with one another but also make necessary the reflection in relation to the Hungarian culture. They give not only an opportunity to present cultural representations, but also serve the development of a dialogical situation. Mapping societal, cultural, and scientific reflections is a must. Benedict Anderson's (2006) concept about nations crops up in the works of Wenger (1998) in

relation to the identity and the language learner. He points out that the language learner also sets up *imagined communities*. There are individuals who serve as gateways into the foreign/second language communities (Peirce 1995).

In order to facilitate communication in border regions like Oradea with a very distinct character, we should have a close look at the chances to learn each others' languages in diverse minority situations, identities, practices and hitherto unanalysed language ideologies that exist and operate in these regions. In the search for linking points with the neighbouring peoples it is of great importance how these investments into the language and the people could become productive and pay dividends. Teaching Hungarian as a Second Language in minority circumstances can furnish important answers to Hungarian Studies in general.

References

- Anderson, Benedict R. O. 2006. *Imagined communities : reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Rev. ed. London: Verso.
- Andreescu, Gabriel. 2003. *Right-wing extremism in Romania*. Cluj: Centrul de resurse pentru diversitate etnoculturală.
- Bakhtin, M. M., et al. 1994. *The Bakhtin reader : selected writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, and Voloshinov*. London; New York: E. Arnold.
- Benő A. and Szilágyi N.S. 2005. Hungarian in Romania. In Fenyvesi, A. (ed.). *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary : studies on Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia, Pa.: J. Benjamins Pub., 133–162.
- Blommaert, Jan. Discourse a critical introduction. in Cambridge University Press [database online]. Cambridge, UK; New York, 2005.
- Blommaert, Jan, and Jie, Dong. 2010. *Ethnographic fieldwork : a beginner's guide*. Bristol; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Thompson, John B. 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- De Fina, Anna, and Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2008. *Narrative analysis in the shift from texts to practices*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gal, Susan. 1979. *Language shift : social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2007. *Small stories, interaction and identities*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co.

- Heller, Monica. 2011. *Paths to post-nationalism : a critical ethnography of language and identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heller, Monica. 2007. *Bilingualism : a social approach*. Basingstoke [England]; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Irvine, Judith T. 1989. When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy. *American Ethnologist* 16, no. 2:248–267.
- Szarka, László. 2002. A városi magyar népesség a Magyarországgal szomszédos országokban (1910–2000) In: Kovács, N. and Szarka, L. (ed.) 2002. *Tér és terep: tanulmányok az etnicitás és az identitás kérdésköréből*. Vol. 1-<2>. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kramsch, Claire J. 2009. *The multilingual subject : what foreign language learners say about their experience and why it matters*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kroskrity, Paul V. 2000. *Regimes of language : ideologies, politics, and identities*. Santa Fe, NM : School of American Research Press,.
- Laihonen, Petteri. 2009. *Language ideologies in the Romanian Banat: analysis of interviews and academic writings among the Hungarians and Germans*. Studies in Humanities, Vol. 119. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Lantolf, James P. 2000. *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford [Eng.]; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Livezeanu, I. 1995. *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania: Regionalism, Nation Building, and Ethnic Struggle, 1918–1930*.
- Nemes R. 2010. A coffeehouse on the linguistic frontier. *Hung.Stud.Hungarian Studies* 24, no. 2:215–224.
- Ochs, Elinor, and Capps, Lisa. 2001. *Living narrative : creating lives in everyday storytelling*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.
- Peirce, Bonny N. 1995. Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning. *TESOL Quarterly* 29, no. 1:9–31.
- Schieffelin, Bambi B., Woolard, Kathryn A., and Kroskrity, Paul V. 1998. *Language ideologies: practice and theory*. Vol. 16. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Silverstein, M. (1979) “Language structure and linguistic ideology”. In: Parasession on the Elements, et al. 1979. *The elements, a parasession on linguistic units and levels, April 20–21, 1979*. Chicago, Ill.: Chicago Linguistic Society. 193–247.
- Trosset, Carol, 1993. *Welshness performed : Welsh concepts of person and society*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- United States. Department of State. Bureau of Public Affairs. 1983. Romania. *Department of State publication. Background notes series* 1–7.

- Vygotski, Lev S., Valsiner, Jaan, and Veer, René v. d. 1994. *The Vygotsky reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publ.
- Wenger, Etienne. 1998. *Communities of practice : learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, U.K.; New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.
- Wetherell, M. 2008. Subjectivity or Psycho-Discursive Practices? Investigating Complex Intersectional Identities. *SUBJECTIVITY*no. 22:73–81.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. 1989. *Double talk : bilingualism and the politics of ethnicity in Catalonia*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

II

A MAGYAR MINT MÁSODIK NYELV TANÍTÁSÁNAK NEHÉZSÉGEI ÉS SIKEREI NAGYVÁRADON. [THE DIFFICULTIES AND SUCCESSES OF TEACHING HUNGARIAN IN ORADEA].

www.epa.hu/01400/01467/00009/pdf/EPA01467_thl2_2012_1-2_097-115.pdf

by

Attila Gyula Kiss, 2012

In THL2 A magyar nyelv és kultúra oktatásának szakfolyóirata – The Journal of Teaching Hungarian as a 2nd Language, 2012 (1-2), 97-115.

Reproduced with kind permission by
THL2 A magyar nyelv és kultúra oktatásának szakfolyóirata – The Journal of Teaching Hungarian as a 2nd Language.

Kiss Attila Gyula*

A MAGYAR MINT MÁSODIK NYELV TANÍTÁSÁNAK NEHÉZSÉGEI ÉS SIKEREI NAGYVÁRADON

Bevezetés

Az írás egy hosszabb kutatás egy részéről számol be, amely a *magyar mint második nyelv* (ezután L2) oktatásának lehetőségeit, akadályait térképezi fel etnográfiai szociolingvisztikai szempontból olyan kontextusban ahol a magyar kisebbségi nyelv. A kutatási helyszín a történetileg magyar kultúrközpontnak számító nagyváros, Nagyvárad, amely 1920-ban 10 kilométerrel a magyar államhatártól keletre került.

Ez az írás egyben önreflexió is, mivel magamon keresztül mutatok be egy másodnyelv- tanári pályát. Nagyvárad kontextusban saját tanfolyam-szervezési kísérleteimet elemzem, és azt vizsgálom, hogyan alakult személyes viszonyom a magyar nyelv és kultúra közvetítéséhez. Teszem ezt egyrészt kutatási célokból, másrészt attól a gondolattól vezérelve, hogy tanulságul és ösztönzéseképpen szolgálhasson a hasonló kísérleteken gondolkodóknak, emellett általános következtetések is levonhatók belőle a határon túli másodnyelv-oktatás lehetőségeit illetően.

A nyelvvideológiák nézőpontját követem, amikor azt elemzem, hogy mihez kapcsolják a magyart mint második nyelvet, hogyan viszonyulnak a magyar nyelv oktatásához és a magyarnyelv-tanfolyamok szervezéshez Nagyváradon. Susan Gal szerint a nyelvvideológiák a beszélő, a nyelv és a világ kapcsolatáról szóló metapragmatikai/metanyelvi feltevések (2006: 388). Véleményem szerint az L2-oktatás sikere az utódállamokban a nyelvvideológiákon áll vagy bukik. Ennek ellenére a szomszédos népek L2 körüli nyelvvideológiáinak tanulmányozására ezideig nem igen fordítottak figyelmet Románián kívül sem. Jelen cikkben tanulói ideológiákat nem elemzek, mivel ezek későbbi tanulmányaim témájául szolgálnak.

A nyelvtanulás társadalmi körülményeinek fontosságát hangsúlyozó iskola képviselői is amellet érvelnek, hogy a második nyelv elsajátításában a szociokulturális megközelítés legalább olyan fontos, akár csak a mentális folyamatok (Block 2003: 6). Annak ellenére, hogy a Kárpát-medencében a tartós etnikai ellentétek bizonyára áthidalhatóak, vagy legalább enyhíthetőek lennének egymás kultúrájának megismerése és nyelveinek megtanulása által, a szomszédos országokban a magyarokkal együttélő népek számára felkínálható L2 oktatással ezidáig keveset foglalkoztak. Ami Romániát illeti, a témáról általában is csak rövid megjegyzésekkel találkozunk. Ezek többnyire arról szólnak, hogy a magyar nyelv iránt csekély érdeklődés figyelhető meg a románok körében, és hogy Romániában a magyar mint idegen nyelv oktatására a bukaresti hungarológiai

* Kiss Attila Gyula, PhD hallgató, Jyväskyläi Egyetem, Bölcsészettudományi Doktori Iskola, Hungarológia program; tanársegéd, Partiumi Keresztény Egyetem, Nagyvárad, attilagyalakiss@yahoo.com

tanszék szakosodott (Murvai 1997, 2010; Molnár 2000; Péntek 2002; Kádár 2008). 1998 után fakultatív óraként megjelent a *magyar mint idegen nyelv* tantárgy a kolozsvári Babeş-Bolyai Tudományegyetem Magyar és Általános Nyelvészet Tanszékének kínálatában is (Kádár 2008).

A magyar mint másodnyelv-oktatóknak Romániában is vannak nyelvi ideológiái, viszont ezideig kevés írás reflektált a romániai gyakorlatra. Molnár Szabolcs (2000: 211) a Bukaresti Tudományegyetem Hungarológia Tanszékének akkori vezetője megállapítja, hogy a román nacionalizmus hosszú ideig előítéleteket, sztereotípiákat és hamis képeket táplált a magyar nyelvvel és kultúrával szemben, melyeket a sikeres nyelvtanulás érdekében a tanárnak meg kell próbálnia feloldani. A több nemzetiség lakta Temesváron L2-t tanító Magyar Sára (2009) be is mutat egy sor általános hiedelmet a magyar nyelvvel kapcsolatban, viszont az L2-re vonatkozó vetületeivel nem foglalkozik.

1.1. Önreflexió és tanárnarratívák

Munkánknak fontos része az önreflexió, mert ez a személyes szakmai fejlődés elengedhetetlen feltétele. A másokkal való találkozás során olyan perspektívák nyílnak meg, amelyekben jobban megérthetjük saját gyakorlatunkat, hitünket, előfeltevéseinket, értékeinket, véleményünket, világnézetünket (Lankshear–Knobel 2004: 8). Az L2-t, környezeti- vagy idegen nyelvet oktató tanárok számára szükséges a megtermékenyítő, gyakran feszültségektől sem mentes, de az egyént gazdagító kulturális önreflexió. Talán hatványozottan igaz ez a kisebbségi létben élők esetében.

Írásom azon tanárnarratívák sorába illeszkedik, amelyek elfogadják az elmúlt 30 év tanárkutatásának azon alapfeltevéseit, miszerint „a tanítás felismert és megélt szakmai elhivatottság” és „a tanárkutatás nem kvantitatív jellegű, azaz nem pszichometrikus, nem pozitivistá, sem pedig kísérleti kutatás” (Lankshear–Knobel 2004: 4)¹.

Az újabb nyelvpedagógiai irodalom szerint a tanárnak nem elsősorban a legújabb nyelvoktatási módszertani ismeretek folyamatos frissítésére van szüksége, hanem arra, hogy saját gyakorlatát folyamatosan mérlegelje, értelmezze, és eközben az önreflexió során szakmailag fejlődjön. Ezt a folyamatot mindig abban a környezetben kell értékelni, amelyben a tanár megszerzi képesítését, majd később hivatását végzi. A tanároknak, kutatóknak figyelembe kell venniük a sajátos társadalmi-történelmi viszonyrendszereket, amelyek befolyásolják az elképzeléseiket, cselekvéseiket és elméleteiket (l. pl. Horváth 1998: 309; Kalaja 2008: 20). Írásom egyik célja, hogy ráirányítsa a figyelmet erre az angol nyelvű szakirodalomban már a kilencvenes évektől kezdődően mind nagyobb teret hódító, az oktatáskutatásban jelentkező paradigmaváltásra is, amely a magyar nyelvű szakirodalomban még kevésbé ment végbe.

Már az 1960-as 70-es évektől kezdődően „a narratívák nem csak mint orális vagy irodalmi műfaj jelentek meg, hanem mint központi eszközök, amelyekben az emberek értelmet adnak életüknek az időben” (Pavlenko 2007: 164). A nyelvelsajátítást vizsgáló

¹ Az angol idézeteket itt és a következőkben a saját fordításomban közlöm.

szakirodalom is egyre nagyobb teret szentel a narratívák vizsgálatának. Ezek önreflexív írások, amelyekben nyelvtanulók és tanárok az életük során tapasztalt nyelvi, nyelvtanulói vagy -oktatói élményeikről számolnak be (l. pl. Todeva–Cenoz 2009; Kalaja–Menezes–Ferreira 2008). A szóbeli interjúk vagy írott naplók alapján, a nagyon eltérő életutak és élmények etnográfiai vizsgálatából vonnak le általános érvényű következtetéseket. Ez jelentős váltást hozott, hiszen a külső szemlélő perspektíváját felcserélte a résztvevők nézőpontjával.

Szándékom szerint írásom ebbe a műfaji keretbe kíván illeszkedni. Egy induló hungarológus számol be életútja néhány olyan eseményéről, amelyeknek nagy hatása volt arra, hogy most ezzel a témával foglalkozzon. Az autobiografikus narratívák „kulturális, intézményi és társadalmi produktumok, amelyek műfajként működnek és visszatükrözik egy adott hely által támasztott irodalmi, társadalmi normák, struktúrák elvárásait” (Pavlenko 2007: 175).

Az etnográfiai kutatások egyik alapelve, hogy a kutató keresi az aktív kapcsolatot kutatása tárgyával, így a kutatás során saját magát is vizsgálja, és a kutatott jelenség értelmezése az önértelmezésen keresztül valósul meg. Akárcsak a kutató, a szervező-tanár is eszközként használja önmagát, hogy képet alkosson, és közösen konstruálja meg a nagyvárad L2 oktatás jelenségét.

Az első részben ezért saját többnyelvűségemről írok. Elsősorban a román nyelvhez fűződő emlékeimet próbálom meg saját magam számára is rendszerezni. Korosztályomból biztosan sokaknak voltak hasonló élményei. A későbbiekben többek között arra is keresem a választ, hogy milyen nyelvideológiák mentén értelmeztem a helyzetet, és ezek hogyan változtak. A második részben a nagyvárad tanfolyamszervezés nehézségeiről és sikereiről számolok be.

2. Reflexiók a kétnyelvűvé válásommal kapcsolatban

Családban mindenki magyarul beszélt. A nyelvi érintkezés első alkalmi egy kétnyelvű városban azok a helyek, ahol mindkét beszélőközösség megfordul. Nagyváradon a magyar, akárcsak a román gyerek, ha nem a családban, a baráti vagy ismeretségi körben, akkor a városban az utcán, játszótéren, az üzletekben találkozhat először a másik nyelvvel.

Gyermekkorom a hetvenes évek második felében, iskolás éveim nagyrészt a nyolcvanas években teltek. Tanulmányaimat a nagyvárad iskolák magyar nyelvű tagozatán végeztem egy olyan romániai városban, ahol a magyar kultúra és intézményrendszer párhuzamosan létezett a román mellett. A református templom volt a közösségi élet első színtere, ahol magyarul szólt az istentisztelet, s ahol a zsoltárok éneklése mellett kigyerekként karácsonyi verset is magyarul mondtam. Működött a városban magyar nyelvű bábszínházi és színházi tagozat, ahová rendszeresen jártam szüleimmel és iskolatársaimmal. Románnyelvű sajtótermékeket az érettségi táján kezdtem el fogyasztani, és a román színházat is csak felnőtt koromban kezdtem el látogatni.

Először a szomszédságban is túlnyomóan magyarok éltek. Kisgyerekként akkor hallottam román szót, amikor ismerősök jöttek látogatóba nagyszüleimhez. Később

egy tömbháznegyedbe költözött a család, és itt már kétnyelvűvé vált a nyelvi környezetem. A tömbház előtti játék során nem volt olyan, hogy a magyar gyerekek elkülönültek volna. Román gyerekekkel spontán nyelvi érintkezésekre került sor. Vegyes csoportokban magyarul és román nyelven is beszéltünk. A különféle játékhelyzetekben egyre inkább tudtam használni a román nyelvet.

Én magam is megtapasztaltam, hogy a Romániában használt román nyelv és irodalom tankönyvek egy elképzelt, idealizált román anyanyelvű diák számára íródtak, aki nemcsak a magas kultúra iránt érdeklődik, hanem irodalmi ambíciói is lehetnek, és ezért a nyelv mélyrétegei, például különböző román regionalizmusokkal teli szövegek befogadására is nyitott. Gyermekként ezek a tankönyvek inkább elriasztottak, mintsem megkedveltették velünk a román nyelvet. Ezekből az anyanyelvi nyelvhasználóknak készült, a nyelv megtanulására teljesen alkalmatlan tankönyvekből, versek és irodalmi szövegelemzések bemagolásán keresztül kellett volna megtanulnunk románul, ami csak kisebb-nagyobb sikerrel járt (a kérdés tárgyalását I. Szilágyi N. 1998: 131–148). A román gyerekekkel, eladókkal vagy orvosokkal való hétköznapi kommunikációs helyzetekben megjelenő nyelvhasználatról ez a nyelvi modell igen távol állt.

Az iskolában a román nyelv és irodalom órák mellett Románia történelmét és földrajzát is románul tanultuk. A rendszer bukását megelőző időszakban már az osztályfőnöki órát is románul kellett tartani. A román köznyelv elsajátítására mégis inkább a játszótér, vagy ezek hiányában a panel, vagy, ahogy nálunk mondják, a *blokk* környéke adott lehetőséget, ahol román és magyar gyerekek együtt játszottak. Az iskola közös, és ezért kizárólag románnyelvű tevékenységei, mint például a testnevelés órák, közös reggeli torna, pionírgyűlések és tömegrendezvények sokkal kevésbé voltak a kétnyelvű nyelvi szocializáció helyszínei, mint a szakkörök – például Váradon a Pionírház különböző tanfolyamai –, ahol magyar és román gyerekek változó szinten elsajátíthatták egymás nyelvét. Ezeken a helyeken a tevékenységet vezető felnőtt románul beszélt, és a magyar és román gyerek között is általában románul folyt a beszélgetés, de amikor megakadt a kommunikáció, akkor egy másik gyerek segítette, aki ismerte az illető román szót, kifejezést.

A román nyelvvel és román anyanyelvű gyerekekkel való érintkezés terei voltak továbbá azok a sajátosan a rendszerre jellemző kötelező közösségi foglalkozások, mint például a lövészgyakorlatok, vagy a félélévente sorra kerülő mezőgazdasági kampányok, ahová ingyenes kötelező munkára – például a kukorica, cukorrépa, vagy gyümölcs betakarításra – vetették be az ifjúságot. Az instrukciók ezeken a helyeken is mindig románul hangzottak el. Amint román fiatal került a brigádba, a beszélgetés általában románul folyt tovább.

1992-ben nyertem felvételt a kolozsvári Babeş-Bolyai Egyetem magyar–angol szakára. Évfolyamom egyike volt a változást követő első évfolyamoknak, amikor ismét lehetőség nyílt arra, hogy nagyobb számú hallgató kezdhesse el a magyar nyelv és irodalom szakos képzést magyar–néprajz, vagy valamilyen idegen nyelv párosításban.

A Szamos-parti városban már más nyelvi közeg fogadott. A valamikor kincsesnek mondott városban a magyar beszéd sokkal kevésbé volt hallható az utcákon, mint ott-hon Nagyváradon. A gimnáziumban az erdélyi magyar irodalom óráinkon megismert,

a valamikor toleranciájáról híres tündérbertnek hitt Erdély transzilvanista eszméire inkább csak a Házsongárdban nyugvó nagyjaink síremlékei emlékeztettek. A Funar-féle városvezetés gondoskodott róla, hogy Erdély nem hivatalos fővárosában ezeknek az eszméknek a mindennapokban nyomát sem találjuk. Ekkor készültek el rekordidő alatt a város tereit a román nemzeti eszme jegyében kisajátító emlékművek, kerültek fel különböző műemlék épületekre plakettek, vagy hatalmas zászlóoszlopok a Főtérre, amelyeknek mind az volt a célja, hogy kiszorítsa, relativizálja a város magyar történelmi múltját.

A 90-es évek eleji nacionalista fordulat idején a helyi román nyelvű sajtót és közbeszédet a *nagyromániás*, *Vátrás* magyarellenes diskurzus jellemezte. Ilyen körülmények között a Kolozsvári Magyar Diákszervezet szervezésében zajló programokon való részvétel, mint például a magyar táncházak, vagy koncertek többet jelentettek számunkra, mint egyszerű szórakozást. Baráti köröm és talán korosztályom számára is a magyar identitás megélésének területei voltak. Ezeken a helyeken és alkalmakon magyarul beszélünk, és mondhatni kizárólag magyarok vettek részt a rendezvényeken. Kollégiumi bulikban, koncerteken vegyes volt ugyan társaság, de oda is általában baráti körökkel együtt jártak el az egyetemisták, és ritkán került sor hosszabb nyelvi érintkezésre. A nagyváradai magyar világból átléptem a kolozsvári magyar világba (l. Brubaker 2006: 266–267).

Az egyetemen az angol nyelv oktatói mind románok voltak, habár volt közöttük, akikről sejteni lehetett, hogy van magyar kötődésük, vagy legalábbis tudhatnak magyarul. Ők a legkisebb jelét sem adták annak, hogy megpróbálnának velünk magyarul beszélni. Angolorákon volt, hogy közösen vettünk részt a román hallgatókkal, de mivel itt a szemináriumok, előadások nyelve az angol volt, keveset beszélünk románul. Esetleg szünetekben egy-két közvetlenebb tanársegéddel. A fordítási tárgyak esetében viszont hátrányos helyzetbe került a magyar hallgató, amikor románra kellett fordítania. Néhány székelyföldi hallgató csak nehezen tudott megbirkózni ezzel a feladattal.

Habár az ártándi határátkelő Nagyváradtól csak 10 kilométerre van, 1990 előtt Románia a világtól elzárt ország volt. Magyarországra nem lehetett átmenni. Mivel egy távoli rokoni szálat leszámítva Magyarországgal kapcsolata nem volt a családnak, ezért gyermekkoromban főleg olvasmányaimból, tanulmányaimból és a nálunk fogható magyarországi televízióadások alapján alakult ki bennem egy Magyarország-kép. Ehhez az idealizált képhez képest jelentős különbséget tapasztaltam, amikor a politikai rendszerváltást követően, megnyílt az utazás lehetősége, és először sikerült átjutni a határon.

Általában hosszú órákat kellett várni a határ mindkét oldalán. Családommal együtt néhány alkalommal jártunk mi is a szomszédos Berettyóújfaluban és Debrecenben, de aztán inkább lemondott róla a család, hogy a határkereskedelemmel foglalkozók százaival együtt, sorban állással töltsük az időt (a határátkelésről a 90-es években l. Feischmidt 2004).

Ilyen körülmények között nagy élmény volt, amikor másodéves ösztöndíjasként részt vehettem a Debreceni Nyári Egyetemem, ahol a rendszerváltást követő időkben is több száz külföldi tanult magyarul. Számomra az irodalomórák jelentősége eltörpült

amellett az élmény mellett, hogy nyelvem és magyarságom a külföldiek szemében is érték. Érdekelte őket az erdélyi magyarság helyzete is, és szívesen beszélgettek velünk is, kisebbségi magyar egyetemistákkal. Olyan szoros barátságok kötődtek ezen a nyáron, amelyek hosszú évekig elkísértek.

Egyetemistaként még nem fordult meg a fejemben, hogy Nagyváradon vagy Kolozsváron magyar nyelvet lehetne oktatni román anyanyelvűeknek, és az sem, hogy egyszer majd én is az L2 tanára leszek. Kolozsváron azokban az időkben olyan nagyra éreztük a magyar nyelvvel szemben az általános ellenállást, hogy kizárnak tűnt, hogy a románokat érdekelné nyelvünk elsajátítása. Az egyetem oktatói sem vetették fel, hogy a magyar nyelv és kultúra oktatása idegeneknek, esetleg éppen románok számára, valamikor karrierlehetőség lehetne. Ezekben az években a magyar tannyelvű osztályokban történő magyar- vagy angoltanári pálya volt a legkézenfekvőbb jövőképem. Már egyetemista éveim alatt tartottam magánórákat, viszont mindig csak angol nyelvből. Magántanítványaim között voltak román gyerekek is, akikkel a románt használtam mint közvetítőnyelvet. Személyes érdeklődésem is egyre inkább az angol nyelv és irodalom, ezen belül az amerikanisztika felé fordult.

Az egyetemi oklevél megszerzése után visszatértem Nagyváradra, ahol két évig magyar- és angolnyelv-tanárként működtem a nagyváradai Szent László Gimnáziumban. A középiskolai óráimon túl angol nyelvet tanítottam magánórák és nyelviskolai nyelvtanfolyamok keretében. A nyelviskola, ahol a kilencvenes évek közepén tanítottam, próbált magyar tanfolyamot indítani, de nem volt rá elég jelentkező. A környezetemben ekkor még olyanról nem hallottam, hogy valaki román anyanyelvűként magyar órákat szeretne venni.

Később főiskolai, majd egyetemi oktató lettem a Sulyok István Főiskolán, majd ennek jogutódjaként, Nagyváradon létrehozott Partiumi Keresztény Egyetemen (a Partiumi Keresztény Egyetemről és annak tannyelvpolitikájáról I. Szűcs 2005). Különböző angol nyelvű tárgyakat tanítottam, miközben magyartanári *énem* teljesen háttérbe szorult. A munkahelyemen, ahol néhány tanárkollégát kivéve mindenki beszélt magyarul, a kommunikáció általában magyar nyelvű volt.

Amint a fentiekből kiderült, román nyelvtudásomat csak kisebb részben szereztem meg az iskolapadban ülve. A román irodalmat, történelmet és több más tárgyat is szervezett formában románul oktatták ugyan, de gyakorló tanárként már tudom, hogy a nyelvszajátításra csak kis mértékben alkalmas tananyagokból, sőt gyakran a diákok fejlesztő módszerek alkalmazásával. Saját esetemben a román nyelv elsajátítását sokkal inkább tulajdonítom az órákon kívüli informális tanulásnak, a társadalmi tevékenységekben való részvételnek, és az önképzésnek, mintsem a szervezett oktatásnak. Amíg gyermekkoromban sokkal kevésbé volt jelen a magyar–román kétnyelvűség, felnőttkoromban már a mindennap élet ügyes-bajos dolgainak intézése mellett, szórakozáshoz, továbbá kulturális és audiovizuális média-termékek fogyasztása során is napi szinten használom a román nyelvet.

Ezek után sem váltam tökéletesen kétnyelvűvé. Továbbra is vannak az életnek olyan területei, amelyek kívül estek tevékenységi, vagy érdeklődési körömon. Az ezeken a területeken szokásos nyelvhasználatot csak részben sajátítottam el. Ha ilyen helyzetek

ben kell megnyilvánulnom, akkor rajtam is úrrá lesz a nyelvi bizonytalanság. Ez viszont nem akadályozott meg abban, hogy a magyar mint másodnyelv oktatásával foglalkozzam, amelynek során megfelelő szinten és gond nélkül tudom használni a románt mint közvetítő nyelvet. Amint a fentiekből látható, az én nyelvtanulói önéletrajzom is „egy hosszú, kalandos út a (csak)nem tökéletesség felé” (Popovic 2009: 33), amelynek bemutatásával arra szeretnék ösztönözni minden hozzám hasonló életúttal rendelkezőt, hogy többnyelvűségünket bátran állítsuk a magyar nyelv oktatásának szolgálatába – akár többségi környezetben is.

3. Magyar nyelvtanfolyamok Nagyváradon

3.1. Magyar nyelvoktatás felnőtteknek és nagyváradi nyelvviskolák

Az internetes keresés tanúsága szerint minden erdélyi, partiumi nagyvárosban vannak olyan nyelvviskolák, amelyek hirdetnek magyar tanfolyamokat is. Nagyváradon is több nyelvviskola működik. Három nyelvviskoláról tudok, amelyek a legnépszerűbb idegen nyelvek mellett magyar nyelvoktatást is hirdetnek internetoldalukon (l. Centrul de limbi străine YES, Bridge Language Study House, Colloquia). Az első cég volt tulajdonosa elmondta, hogy magyarul kevesen tanultak, akik viszont elkezdték, *elhivatottakká* váltak, és több tanfolyamot is elvégeztek náluk (Antal János szíves közlése, 2010). Később – egy nemzetközi projekt kapcsán – a DNYE is kapcsolatba került a másik, kolozsvári központú céggel. Megtudtuk, hogy főleg gyerekekkel foglalkoznak. Váradon csak egy képviselőjük van, és nincs magyar képzésük. A Partiumi Keresztény Egyetem nyelvviskolája is szerepelteti kínálatában a magyart. Ezen a kurzuson két román kollégám tanult. A tavalyi év végén találkoztam a felnőttképzéssel foglalkozó nagyváradi Eurolingua nyelvviskola vezetőjével is, aki elmondta, hogy habár több száz embert képeznek és vizsgáztatnak angol nyelvből, évente csupán egy-két érdeklődő jelentkezett, aki magyarul szeretett volna tanulni, ezért kínálatukban már nem is szerepeltetik többé a magyart. 2011-ben a Duna Tévé a Híradó adásában számolt be róla, hogy tíz fővel a Don Orione Gimnáziumban indult magyarnyelv-tanfolyam. Megállapíthatjuk, hogy próbálkozások vannak, viszont úgy tűnik, Nagyváradra is igaz Szilvási (2010: 21) megfigyelése, hogy gyakran azért nem indul tanfolyam, mert az egyébként is kevés önfinanszírozó érdeklődő nem jelentkezik ugyanabban az időben és helyen.

3.2. Tanfolyam indítása a Debreceni Nyári Egyetem égisze alatt

A Debreceni Nyári Egyetem (DNYE) a magyar nyelv és kultúra terjesztésének első ilyen jellegű intézménye volt. Először 1927-ben nyitotta meg kapuit (l. Gellén 2002: 11; Nádor 1998: 81). Napjainkban több hasonló is működik Magyarországon. A képzés és a programok költségeit különböző ilyen célú ösztöndíjak vagy munkahelyi támogatók fedezik a résztvevők számára. Sokan vesznek részt a tanfolyamokon önköltségesen is. Az intézmény honlapján ezt olvashatjuk:

Az elmúlt időszak tapasztalatai alapján egyre fontosabbnak tűnik a mindenkori viszonyokhoz való gyors és rugalmas alkalmazkodás. [...] jól látható, hogy bizonyos szokások megváltoztak: az anyagi háttér, az állami ösztöndíjak csökkenése és a folyamatos áremelkedések – különösen a fiatalok számára – nehezítik a Debreceni Nyári Egyetem által kínált lehetőségek igénybe vételét. Ez egyértelműen arra készítette a magyar nyelv és kultúra ügyét 1927 óta töretlenül szolgáló intézmény vezetőségét, hogy változtasson a korábbi évek gyakorlatához képest. (<http://nyariegyetem.hu>, 2012-05-10)

2010-től Szaffkó Péter lett a Nyári Egyetem új igazgatója. A bevezetett változásnak egyik eleme, hogy már nem csak Debrecenbe várja a magyarul tanulni vágyókat az intézmény, hanem a budapesti nyelviskolájuk mellett más, külföldi helyszíneken is indít tanfolyamokat. Nagyvárad mellett voltak még magyarnyelv-kurzusok New York-ban és Antwerpenben is.

Az elmúlt évek statisztikái szerint a DNYE-en résztvevők legnagyobb számban – a felnőttoktatásban hagyományokkal rendelkező, és ezt inkább megfizetni tudó – Nyugat-Európából és Egyesült Államokból érkeztek. Ami a Debrecenben magyarul tanuló, az utódállamokból érkezők számát illeti, az intézmény nyilvántartása nem mindig jegyezte fel a résztvevők állampolgárságán túl a nemzetiségi hovatartozást, illetve az anyanyelvet (Gellén 2002: 15). Csak a nevekből lehet következtetni, hogy a múltban az évek során Debrecenben megfordult hallgatók közül ki az, aki a magyar nyelvet tanulta a tanfolyamok keretében, illetve például jugoszláviai vagy romániai magyarként a magyar nyelv és kultúra órákat látogatta. Az 1960-as programban a szomszéd országok egyetemlein tanítókat a „külföldi magyar lektorok” elnevezéssel illették. Ők lehetnek született magyarok, vagy a nyelvet csaknem tökéletesen beszélők (Gellén 2002: 16). A rendszerváltást követően a DNYE vezetősége úgy ítélte meg, hogy határon túli magyarok szakmai továbbképzése túlfeszítené az intézmény profilját és ezért „bábáskodott” a szintén Debrecenben beinduló és a határon túli magyar pedagógusok szakmai továbbképzését felvállaló Ady Akadémia létrehozásában (Gellén 2002: 24).

A jelenlegi jelentkezési űrlapok már nemcsak az állampolgárságot rögzítik, hanem rákérdeznek a beiratkozók anyanyelvére is. 2000-es évek első felében a DNYE-en 9 és 18 között volt azoknak a száma, akik a románt jelölték meg anyanyelvként, míg 2005-től évente két-három román anyanyelvű résztvevő volt a nyári kurzusokon (a DNYE irodájában tanulmányi ügyekért felelős Kulcsár Judit szíves közlése, 2012). Ezek a számok leképezik a Magyar Ösztöndíjbizottság által biztosított ösztöndíjak számát.

Szaffkó Péterrel már hosszú munkakapcsolatban álltunk, hiszen a Partiumi Keresztény Egyetemen ő volt az angol nyelv és irodalom szakalapító tanszékvezetője. Beszámoltam neki róla, hogy milyen jó emlékeim vannak az intézménnyel kapcsolatban, és hogy szívesen dolgoznék ismét magyartanárként. Az elképzelésünk már az induláskor az volt, hogy a Debrecenben megszerzett tapasztalatokat a nagyváradi románajkúak tanításában, a DNYE kihelyezett tanfolyamain kamatoztatom majd.

Első lépésként egy kulturális kirándulást szerveztem Nagyváradra a debreceni nyári kurzus résztvevőinek angol nyelven. Az egész napos idegenvezetés során a városnak a magyar történelemben és művelődéstörténetben játszott fontos szerepéről beszéltem.

A magyar vonatkozású épített örökség megtekintése mellett kiemeltem a városnak a magyar irodalomban elfoglalt helyét is. Megnéztük az Ady által is látogatott helyeket, említést tettem a Holnaposokról.

Ezt követően kaptam lehetőséget arra, hogy belülről is megismerjem a DNYE oktatói tevékenységét. Magyar nyelv és irodalom főszakos lévén, középiskolai oktatási gyakorlattal, továbbá az egyetemen angol nyelvi módszertan tantárgyak oktatásának tapasztalatával már rendelkeztem. Az intézmény képzési rendszere pedig segítséget nyújtott az L2 módszertanának elsajátításában. Először kollégák óráin hospitáltam. Ezen kívül kézikönyvtár áll rendelkezésre, valamint rendszeres módszertani továbbképzéseket is szerveznek az intézmény tanárai számára. Az előadások, bemutatók mellett gyakran nyílik alkalom a szakmai eszmecserére a kollégákkal. A folyamatos minőségbiztosítási értékelések és kedvező visszajelzések fényében több tanfolyamot tarthatam Debrecenben. A kezdő tanfolyamok közvetítő nyelve többnyire angol volt, illetve két alkalommal német. Csoportjaim tagjai Európa számos országából érkeztek, de csak egyszer fordult elő, hogy román hallgató is volt köztük. Velük inkább csak a kulturális programok, kirándulások alkalmából találkoztam, társalogtam.

A nagyváradai tanfolyamok indítását illetően eleinte szkeptikus voltam. Úgy gondoltam, hogy a gazdasági és pénzügyi világválságra válaszként hozott romániai megszorító intézkedéscsomag – amelyben a közalkalmazottak fizetését 25 százalékkal csökkentették – épp azt az értelmiségi réteget sújtotta a legjobban, akiknek a köréből a magyar nyelvtanulók kikerülhetnének. Másrészt pedig úgy gondoltam, hogy nem várható akkora érdeklődés, ami gazdaságilag fenntarthatóvá tehet egy tanfolyamot. Itt a terembérletre és a tanár fizetéséből adódó költségekre gondoltam.

A debreceni tapasztalatok és előzetes elképzeléseim alapján egy nagyváradai tanfolyam lehetséges résztvevőinek két körét körvonalaztam. Az első a különféle magánéleti okokból tanulókból állt: a vegyes házasságokban élők, a másod- vagy hamadgenerációs magyar gyökerekkel rendelkező személyek, vagy akik gyermekként valamilyen szinten tudtak magyarul, de felnőttkorukra elfelejtettek. Egy másik pedig a szakmai, anyagi motivációval rendelkezők köre: a turizmusban, az üzleti szférában, a határ másik oldalán üzleti érdekeltséggel rendelkező vállalkozók.

Mióta könnyebbé vált a határforgalom, és főleg mióta Románia csatlakozott a schengeni határegyezményhez, a határközeleli nagyvárosok ingatlanpiaca számon tartja a közeli magyarországi települések általában jelentősen olcsóbb kínálatát is. Az egész Partiumi határmenti régióban megfigyelhető, hogy akár kizárólag románul beszélő családok is vásároltak ingatlant a közeli magyarországi településeken. Ezek egy részét hétvégi háznak használják, mások pedig Magyarországról járnak be Nagyváradra dolgozni. Rájuk is gondoltam, amikor meghirdettem a tanfolyamot.

3.2.1. A tanfolyamot népszerűsítő anyagok, tevékenység és az elindulás nehézségei

A tanfolyam megtartásához alkalmas helyiségre volt szükség, és mivel valószínűsíthető volt, hogy az elején nagy anyagi hasznot nem fog termelni a vállalkozás, ezért fontos volt, hogy lehetőleg alacsony rezsiköltséggel számoljunk.

Az előző munkahelyemre gondoltam és megkerestem a Szent László Katolikus Gimnázium igazgatónőjét, aki készségesen felajánlotta, hogy ingyenesen a rendelkezésünkre bocsát egy osztálytermet a város központjában. Cserében felajánlottuk, hogy a gimnázium egy tanára részt vehet minden induló tanfolyamunkon. Az igazgatónő megerősített abban, hogy vannak Nagyváradon olyan román értelmiségiek, akik szakmai okokból is szeretnének magyarul tanulni. Ilyen volt Nagyvárad román kulturális életének egyik kiemelkedő alakja, egy művészettörténész és egyetemi oktató, aki aztán később tevékenyen segített azzal, hogy barátainak és ismerőseinek szólt az induló tanfolyamról. 2010-ben ő kapta meg Debrecen egyik testvérvárosi ösztöndíját a DNYE nyári kurzusára.

További finanszírozási lehetőségeket, támogatókat is megpróbáltunk keresni. Úgy gondoltunk, hogy nagyobb érdeklődésre akkor számíthatunk, ha nem a résztvevőnek kell megfizetnie a tanfolyam teljes tandíját. Feltételeztük, hogy a részben magyar városvezetés támogatja majd, hogy olyan román munkatársai legyenek, akik magyarul is beszélnek. Szaffkó Péter megbeszélést kezdeményezett Nagyvárad magyar alpolgármesterével, hogy segítsen a polgármesteri hivatalban dolgozó közalkalmazottak körében tanfolyamot szervezni, illetve hogy ezt a Polgármesteri Hivatal finanszírozza. Felajánlotta, hogy a DNYE-en elkészítik a speciálisan ennek a célközönségnek szóló tananyagokat is. A tervek szerint 100–120 alkalmazottról lett volna szó, akik három tanfolyammodult végeztek volna el. Egy modul negyven órából állt: az első kettő általános nyelvi alapképzés, a harmadik pedig az közigazgatás szakszókincset oktatta volna. Az alpolgármester asszony nagyon nyitott volt a kezdeményezés iránt, és megígérte, hogy megnézi, mit tehet. Árajánlatot is adtunk, és vártuk a választ. Hosszas csend után, többszöri érdeklődésünkre, azt a választ kaptuk, hogy adott időben nem tud, de majd később foglalkozik az ügyel. Végül informális csatornán keresztül jutott el hozzánk a hír, hogy a román polgármester nem akar ilyen kurzust, és ebben a helyzetben az alpolgármester asszony sem tud segíteni.

Fontos volt, hogy a híreink jussanak el a helyi román közösséghez, ezért a román napilapokban szerettem volna céges hirdetések feladni. El is készítettem a grafikai kivitelezést – az intézmény logójával, célratörő román nyelvű szöveggel –, amikor viszont felkerestem a helyi lapok reklámozástályát, kiderült, hogy cégek számára négyzetcentiméterben szabják meg a reklámfelület költségét, és egy kisméretű hirdetés is akkora összegbe került volna, amelynek kigazdálkodására nem számíhattunk. A nagy reklámköltség miatt csak a magánszemélyek számára rendelkezésre álló ingyenes apróhirdetési oldalon adtam fel hirdetést a két román nyelvű napilapban a *Jurnal Bihorean*-ban és *Crișana*-ban. Habár az internetes oldalukra is bekerült a hirdetés, ezekre senki sem jelentkezett.

A leghatásosabbnak egy a *Jurnal Bihorean*-ban megjelent, hosszabb Szaffkó Péterrel készített interjú és egy általam írt tanfolyam ismertető szöveg bizonyult, amelyet egy ismerős újságíró jóvoltából kerülhettek be az újságba. Ezek az írások nagyon tárgyyszerűen arról tudósítanak, hogy a Debreceni Egyetem Nagyváradon is megkezdte a magyarnyelv-oktatást és a magyar nyelv és kultúra megismertetésével kapcsolatos tevékenységét.

A tanfolyamot a következő feltételekkel hirdettem meg: 40 órás tízhetes tanfolyam heti 2X2 órában. A tanfolyam ára 600 RON volt, amit a résztvevők két részletben fizethettek. Az ár kialakításában, a részletfizetés felajánlásakor a helyi viszonyokat, és a többi nyelviskola árait is figyelembe vettem. Kilenc hallgatóval, egy haladó és egy kezdő csoporttal 2010 év októberében sikerült beindítanom az első tanfolyamot. A szintfelmérés szóban történt. A legtöbben az abszolút kezdő csoportba kerültek, mivel még nem tanultak magyarul. A már magyarul beszélőknek néhány kérdést tettem fel magyarul. A válaszaikból kiderült, hogy milyen szinten beszélnek nyelvünket.

3.2.2. További próbálkozások a résztvevők számának növelésére

A továbbiakban két újabb 10 hetes magyarnyelv-tanfolyamot szerveztem és oktattam Nagyváradon. A második tanfolyam 2011 februárjában indult, a harmadik pedig 2011 októberében. Folyamatosan fejlődést okozott, hogyan bővíthetnénk a résztvevők körét. Próbáltam a digitális reklám és informálás lehetőségeivel élni, mivel a nyomtatott médiában való reklámozásra egyrészt nem volt megfelelő anyagi forrásom, másrészt pedig nem tűnt költséghatékónak. Felkerült egy román nyelvű értesítés a DNYE honlapjára, amiben az állt, hogy Nagyváradon kurzus indul román közvetítő nyelven. Készítettem egy Facebook-oldalt is, amire feltettem, hogy Nagyváradon is lehet magyarul tanulni, megadtam a telefonszámom. Belinkeltem néhány helyi szervezetet. Feltettem a szöveget néhány helyi hírportál apróhirdetés oldalára. Írtam az ismerőseimnek, hogy mivel foglalkozom és megkértem őket, hogy küldjék tovább a hírt és elérhetőségem esetleges érdeklődőknek.

Plakátolási akciót is folytattam a városban. A most már a DNYE nagyváradon bázisának számító Szent László Gimnázium portáján és bejáraton több mint fél évig volt kint a Nyári Egyetem nagyméretű plakátja. Folyamatosan voltak szórólapok az iskola portáján is. Mivel az előzetes tapasztalatok alapján feltételeztem, hogy a magyar nyelv iránt érdeklődők, az értelmiség, egyetemi hallgatóság köréből kerülhetnek ki (habár az utóbbi rétegnek nem volt valószínűsíthető, hogy lesz rá pénze), az egyetemekre vittem a Nyári Egyetemről kért plakátokat, amelyekre román címkét ragasztottam az induló tavaszi tanfolyamról. Több plakátot ragasztottam fel a Nagyváradon Egyetem kampuszán, és az Orvosi Egyetem bejáratánál is, abból a megfontolásból, hogy a leendő orvosok esetleg magyarul is szót szeretnének érteni az idős magyar betegekkel.

2011 novemberében, attól a gondolattól vezérelve, hogy egy Romániában sikeresen működő magyar érdeklőségű cég számára fontos lehet munkatársai magyar nyelvtudását elősegíteni, személyesen kerestem fel egy nagyváradon OTP-fiók magyar igazgatóját ajánlatommal. Ő is jó kezdeményezésnek tartotta a tanfolyamok ügyét. Támogatását kértem, hogy legalább a belső levelezőlistájukra tegye fel az ajánlatunkat. Elmondta, hogy az ő általa irányított fiókban sok magyar munkatárs van, de Nagyváradon van még két másik OTP-fiók is, ahol többnyire románok dolgoznak. Ott több érdeklődésre lehetne számítani. Azzal érveltem, hogy egy magyar háttérű cégtől szép gesztus lenne, hogyha az erre érdeklődést mutató román anyanyelvű munkatársakat, akár részleges ösztöndíjjal támogatnák. Egyetértett velem, és támogatásáról biztosított, de

elmondta, hogy az összes anyagi vonzatú döntést a bukaresti központban hozzák meg, viszont vállalta, hogy az e-mailben megküldött ajánlatomat továbbítja a központba.

Egy szerintem előnyös ajánlatot készítettem, amelyben vállaltam, hogy az általuk kijelölt helyre is kiszállhatok órákat tartani. A levelemre és újabb személyes megkeresésemre visszajelzést viszont nem kaptam. Habár a nagyváradi OTP-fiókban vannak magyar nyelvű reklámanyagok, a román munkatársaknak viszont már nem ajánlották fel a magyar nyelv tanulásának lehetőségét. Ekkor tudatosult számomra, hogy nyelvpolitikája nemcsak az államoknak, hanem a magánszféra vállalatainak is van (Kontra 2010: 187).

3.3. Magyarnyelv-tanfolyam Aradon

Habár Nagyváradon nem sikerült bővítenem a jelentkezők körét, váradai munkám eredményeként 2011 decemberében érkezett hozzám egy váratlan megkeresés: tartsak magyar kurzust az Arad Megyei Tanács dolgozóinak. A tanfolyamra egy, az Európai Unió által finanszírozott oktatási csomag keretében került sor, aminek több képzés is részét képezte pl. gyermekvédelem, számítógép-kezelői tanfolyam, angol nyelv, és 15 munkatárs tanulhatott egy 40 órás kezdő tanfolyam keretében magyarul.

A nyelvi képzéseket egy nagyváradi cég kapta meg, amelynek a cégvezetője, a fent vázolt hirdások alapján, az interneten talált rám. Mint később kiderült, eredetileg egy helybeli magyar nyelvtanárt akart felkérni, de a tanfolyam szervezői kifejezésre juttatták, hogy nem szeretnének helybeli tanárt. A tanfolyamszervező cég is inkább olyavalakivel dolgozott volna, akinek már van tapasztalata az L2 oktatásában. Így jelentem meg én a képzésben, mint egy magyarországi intézmény, a DNYE tanára.

A tanfolyamra munkaidőben került sor, és a résztvevőknek nem kellett fizetniük érte. A többnyire vezető funkciót betöltő résztvevők elmondták, hogy elsősorban azért jelentkeztek a tanfolyamra, mert a szomszédos Gyulával és Békéscsabával közös regionális fejlesztési projektekben vesznek részt. Ezek kapcsán is ismeretségek, barátságok kötődtek és gyakran járnak át Magyarországra. Néhány résztvevőnek magyar csengésű neve volt. Egyesek a szünetekben be is számoltak nekem magyar gyökereikről. Mások magyar párú házasságokban éltek, és ezért is örültek az alkalomnak, hogy részt vehetnek a tanfolyamon, mert ugyan egyedül próbálkoztak már a magyar nyelv tanulásával, de túl nehéznek találták és feladták. Ez volt az első alkalmuk szervezett képzésben tanulni, ami módszeres bevezetést adott a nyelv rendszerbeli sajátosságaiba. Mások meglepéssel nyugtázták, hogy a megszerzett alapszintű magyarnyelv-tudást jól tudják majd hasznosítani a bevásárló-turizmusban.

4. A kétnyelvű tananyagok kérdése

Maticsák Sándor a *Hungarolingua* tankönyvcsalád kapcsán egy évtizeddel ezelőtt írt a jövő lehetőségeiről és kihívásairól. Megállapítja, hogy az utóbbi évtizedekben számos új nyelvkönyv, munkafüzet és kiegészítő oktatóanyag segíti a tanárok munkáját, viszont számuk még nem elegendő. Felhívja a figyelmet arra is, hogy a nyelvkönyvek egy

évtized alatt elavulnak, ezért folyamatosan újabb tananyagokat kell írni és kiadni (2002: 53). Szavai most is aktuálisak. A Nyári Egyetem gondozásában, különböző közvetítő nyelveken megjelenő új *Hungarolingua Basic* nyelvkönyvek erre az igényre kívánnak válaszolni (Marschalkó 2011, 2012).

Az első találkozáskor bemutattam azokat a tankönyveket, amelyeket Debrecenből hoztam. A Marschalkó Gabriella által írt új tankönyvre egyrészt azért esett a választásom, mert angol–magyar kétnyelvű, amit a tanfolyam résztvevői akár önállóan is használhatnak, és a jövőbeni terveinkben szerepelt, hogy ennek az akkor még csak kéziratban létező könyvnek elkészítem a román változatát is. Már többször tanítottam belőle, és a debreceni angolul nyelvű csoportjaim nagyon kedvezően fogadták. A hallgatók azért is kedvelték, mert kommunikatív szemléletű, a magyar nyelvtannak csak a leglényegesebb aspektusait mutatja be. A könyv ára jóval alacsonyabb, mint a *Hungarolingua*-sorozat már hagyományosnak számító könyvei. A különösen árérzékeny romániai piacon ez sem volt elhanyagolandó szempont. A könyv ekkor még csak angol közvetítő nyelven, fűzött formában állt rendelkezésre. A hallgatóknak minden óra előtt emailben elküldtem, és nyomtatásban is megkapták tőlem a leckék román nyelvre lefordított változatát is. Ez a módszer alkalmat nyújtott számomra a román változat kipróbálására, ellenőrzésére is. Időközben elkészült a könyv nyomdai változata is, aminek forgalmazásáról egyeztetések folynak egy romániai országos könyvforgalmazó lánccal. A középfeladók csoporttal a *Hungarolingua 2*-t használtam alap tankönyvként.

A fent említett *Hungarolingua*-tananyagok mellett, csak egy régi román közvetítő nyelven írt könyvet könyvet sikerült beszerezniem (Balogh–Pamfil–Balázs 1986). A rendszerváltás előtt íródott, koncepciójában elavult, egyes olvasási szövegeinek politikai tartalma, szókinccse miatt meg egyenesen használhatatlan könyvet mégis még mindig több helyen használják – például a Babeş-Bolyai Egyetem román tannyelvű Levéltár szakán kötelező magyaróráin tankönyvként volt megjelölve, egy másik, szintén nem az optimális megoldást jelentő társalgási kézikönyv (Ganz–Ganz 2004) mellett (I. Limba maghiară 2008–2009). Ez is azt tükrözi, hogy nagy szükség van az alapszókinccset bemutató szöszedetekre és társalgási útmutatókon túl új kétnyelvű L2 tankönyvekre, valamint a már megvalósított projektek és megjelent munkák népszerűsítésére. Az említett könyvek annyiban mégis hasznosnak bizonyultak, hogy felfrissíthettem belőlük a magyaroktatáshoz szükséges román nyelvtani terminológia egy részét. Hamar rájöttem viszont, hogy mivel a hallgatók már régen végezték el a középiskolát, sokuknak már csak halvány emlékei vannak egyes nyelvtani alapfogalmakról, és ezért a legszükségesebb nyelvtani kategóriák megnevezésén túl eltekintettem azoknak az órákon való használatától.

Tovább kutattam román közvetítőnyelven írt tananyagok után, és ekkor szereztem tudomást Magyarai Sára (2004) tankönyvéről, valamint a kolozsvári Magyar Tanszék által – széles nemzetközi együttműködési projekt keretében – fejlesztett L2-tananyagról (Koháry–Fazakas 2006). Megállapítható, hogy ezek az új tananyagok nehezen, vagy egyáltalán nem hozzáférhetőek, nemhogy a román nagyközönség, de még az L2 oktatására vállalkozó tanár számára sem. Az interneten is kerestem románoknak írt tananyagokat. Egyet találtam is, amit lelkes, de a nyelvoktatásban nem képzett magyar

egyemisták kezdtek el írni román kollégáik számára (www.nebulo.ro). A gyakorlattal rendelkező L2-tanár hamar felfedezi az itt megjelenő, kezdők számára írt 10 lecke hiányosságait – melyek ezért az órán csak néhány példa erejéig hasznosíthatóak. A kezdeményezés viszont mindenképpen dicséretes. A legnépszerűbb internetes közösségi oldalon 440 ember fejezte ki tetszését az oldallal kapcsolatban. Elgondolkodtató, hogy ez a műkedvelő L2-tanárok által működtetett honlap ismertségi és hatáskör tényezőiben talán a sokszorososa lehet annak, amit a fent említett jól elkészített, szakmailag nem kifogásolható projektek mondhatnak magukénak. Ha nem is tulajdonítunk túl nagy jelentőséget ennek a dolognak, ez is azt jelzi, hogy igény van modern, kétnyelvű, magyar nyelvet oktató tananyagokra. A megfelelő magyar-tankönyvek hiányát mutatja az is, hogy amikor nemrégiben bevittem a *Hungarolingua Basic* román változatát egy nagyváradi magyar könyvesboltba, az üzletvezető nagy örömmel fogadta. Elmondása szerint volt rá kereslet, de hasonló könyv még nem szerepelt kínálatukban.

Az órák tartalmi bemutatása nem célja a jelen írásomnak. Csak röviden említem meg, hogy jól bevált kommunikatív nyelvoktatási gyakorlatomra és a debreceni munkám során továbbfejlesztett L2-oktatási tapasztalataimra hagyatkoztam. Számos oktatási segédanyagot, pl. Powerpoint-os bemutatásokat, a *Hungarolingua 1* videófilmjeit is használtam. Integráltam a *HL 1* könyvből is megfelelő oldalakat, gyakorlatokat. Több magyar népdalt (pl. *Hull a szilva*, *Erdő-erdő* stb.) is felhasználtam már a kezdő órákon is. A felnőttek is szívesen tanulnak népdalokat elemezve, énekelve. A középfeladók csoportban népszerű magyar előadók (Bródy, Koncz) dalait is elemeztük. Egyes foglalkozásokon integráltam a Balassi Intézet által fejlesztett *eMagyarul* programot is. E-mailben aktuális információkat, érdekességeket is küldtem a résztvevőknek: például október 23. környékén két román történésznek a magyar forradalomról, annak romániai hatásairól folytatott beszélgetését is. A kezdő nyelvtanfolyamnak is így próbáltam interkulturális párbeszéd formát adni. A résztvevők értékelték, hogy a magyar kultúra, történelem egyes részleteibe is betekintést nyertek.

5. L2 Romániában és a nagy nyilvánosság

A hasonló tanfolyamokról szóló híradásokban még mindig kiemelik, hogy ezek a projektek milyen különlegesek, és ha már sikerül beindulni, akkor mint érdekességekről számol be róluk a helyi, és az anyországbeli média is.

A *Jurnal Bihorean* című napilapban megjelent cikket követően, megkeresett a Duna TV helyi szerkesztője, hogy szeretne a csoport tagjaival interjút készíteni, mivel különleges vállalkozásba kezdtünk azáltal, hogy románoknak tanítjuk a magyar nyelvet. Már az első alkalommal ott akart lenni, amikor a tanfolyam indult. Ezt a tudósítást először a Duna Televízió *Kárpát Expressz* műsorában mutatták be, majd rövidített változatát a Magyar Televízió M1 *Híradója* is átvette. Már maga a tény, hogy ilyen tanfolyam működik Nagyváradon, érdekesnek bizonyult a Duna Tévé számára (2010).

Egy másik székelyföldi tudósításban a Gyergyó Tévé szintén „az országban egyedülálló képzésről” számol be a székelyföldi, vaslábi tanfolyamok kapcsán, ahol helyi alkalmazottak tanulhattak magyarul több hónapon át a Hargitta Megyei Tanács finanszírozásában (Demeter 2011).

Amint látjuk, ebben a megközelítésben még mindig szenzációként hat, hogyha a többség tagjai tanfolyam keretében kezdenek el magyarul tanulni. Egy másik megközelítés úgy mutatja be a helyzetet, mintha ez már a megszokott normalitás lenne: „Egyre több magyar környezetben élő román ajkú tanul magyarul Romániában” (*Kárpát Expressz* 2010). A magaryelvű sajtó kétféleképpen számol be a magyar-tanfolyamokról, de milyen kép él a román nyelvű sajtóban?

2009-ben került sor egy három hónapos, összesen 96 órás L2 tanfolyamra, melynek keretében nagyváradi rendőrök tanultak magyarul. Ezt a helyi RMDSZ kezdeményezésére, a helyi közigazgatás finanszírozta, mivel a határmenti és nagy arányban magyar lakosságú városban csupán két-három rendőr tudott társalgási szinten magyarul (Pop 2009). A kezdeményezésnek nagy sajtóvisszhangja volt. Az román olvasóközönségnek is élénken reagált a hírre. A helyi napilap és hírportál híradására több mint 240 hozzászólás érkezett. Az ezekre, és a saját tanfolyamomról tudósító sajtóanyagokra érkezett hozzászólások többnyire megbotránkozó és gyűlölködő hangneme alátámasztja a Molnár (2000: 309) által is megfigyelt sztereotípiák és előítéletek létezését Nagyváradon is.

Őket olvasva kerül kontextusba Magyar tankönyvének előszava is, amelyben könyvét azoknak ajánlja: „akik elég bátrak ahhoz, hogy magyarul tanuljanak illetve, hogy tanítsák nyelvünket” (2004: 1). Sok évvel a rendszerváltás után még mindig egyfajta civil kurázsira van szükség ahhoz, hogy valaki az L2-t a többség számára oktassa, illetve már ahhoz is, hogy nyelvünket tanulja. Sajnos, nem sokban különbözik a helyzet még napjainkban sem és Nagyváradon sem.

A továbbiakban is kerestem a médiában való megjelenés lehetőségeit. Személyes ismeretség útján sikerült a TV5 televízió, a DigiTV regionális szórású csatornájában két 50 perces román nyelvű kulturális tévéműsorban is beszélnem a váradi tanfolyamról, a Debreceni Nyári Egyetemről és általában a felnőttkorban való nyelvtanulásról. A műsorok után a szerkesztő hölgy elmondta, hogy ő nagy örömmel adott helyet a témának és nekem a műsorban, viszont kicsit tartott tőle, hogy milyen reakciók, esetleg támadások érkeznek majd személye ellen.

A romániai kontextusban a bátorságot szakmai bátorságként is lehet értékelni, amelyben a tanár *mer* tankönyvet írni és úttörő munkát végezni (*Nyugati Jelen* 2004: 7). Kerestem magyar szakos kollégákat is, hogy közösen indítsunk tanfolyamot. Ők viszont nem vállalták a munkát, mert úgy érezték, hogy nem rendelkeznek az L2 oktatásához szükséges módszertani háttérrel, vagy megfelelő szintű román nyelvismerettel. Tudok esetről, amikor valaki azért hagyta abba az L2 oktatását, mert tananyagok és módszertani felkészülés hiányában túl sok munkát vett igénybe számára az órákra való felkészülés.

6. Konklúziók

A saját tanári pályám alakulásán keresztül bemutattam a tanár-szervező munkáját és hogyan lettem az L2 tanára Nagyváradon. Amint kiderült, nem Kolozsváron kaptam ilyen irányú képzést, mivel az egyetemen akkoriban még L2-tantárgy sem volt. L2-tanárképzés csak Magyarországon működik. Én a DNYE programjában, más környező or-

szágokban oktató kollégák pedig például Budapesten részesülhettek L2 módszertani továbbképzésben. Az, hogy L2-t kezdtem el tanítani, nem tudatos pályaválasztás eredménye, hanem a véletlenek összejátásából adódott.

A folyamatos tanulás és a tapasztaltakra való reflektálás elengedhetetlen része a munkának. Az oktatás nehézségei közé tartozik, hogy a tanárnak magának kell felkutatnia a tananyagokat. Nincs elég jó, a felnőttek által igényelt román közvetítő nyelven írott tankönyv, illetve a meglévők nehezen hozzáférhetőek. Ezért a tanárnak gyakran magának kell összeállítania a tananyagot.

Romániában több helyen is kínálnak magyar tanfolyamokat. Vannak hasonló kezdeményezések Kolozsváron, Marosvásárhelyen és a Székelyföldön is. Jelzések vannak arra, hogy Erdélyben (Péntek 2002), a Bánátban (Magyari 2004) és a Partiumban egyes román nyelvű rétegek körében bizonyos mértékben nőtt a magyar nyelv presztízse. Viszont tovább élnek a magyar nyelvvel szembeni előítéletek is.

A tanfolyamszervezés tanulságai azt mutatják, hogy a magyar oktatási intézmények szívesen nyújtanak segítséget, ami az infrastruktúra biztosítását illeti, de anyagi lehetőségeik korlátozottak. A tanfolyamok reklámozása és indítása szempontjából alapvető fontosságú a helyi többségi értelmiséggel és sajtóval való jó kapcsolat. Az ő jószándékuk kulcsszerepet játszhat a kurzusindításban és a későbbi népszerűsítésben is. Amennyiben megvan a szándék, az állami hivatalok támogatott képzéseket tudnak felajánlani munkatársaiknak, amit ezek szívesen végeznek el, ha nem kell érte fizetniük. Egyelőre úgy tűnik, hogy nagyobb létszámú képzés indítása csak ilyen formában képzelhető el.

Az L2 oktatását kisebbségi környezetben végzők érzik, hogy munkájukat kettőség jellemzi. Egyrészt a szűken értelmezett, Magyarországról szóló ismeretek átadásaként értelmezhetik azt – melynek célja a magyar társadalom, a magyarországi valóság hiteles bemutatása – másrészt a magyar mint kultúrnemzet, a történelmi Magyarország értékeinek, így saját régiójuk, városuk magyar értékeinek közvetítése is része lehetne a munkájuknak. Csak utólag tudatosult bennem, hogy óráimon nem jelent meg elég markánsan Nagyvárad és Arad magyar világa, habár ezeket a külföldieknek előzőleg kirándulások alkalmából bemutattam. Feltett szándékom, hogy következő tanfolyamom központi szervező eleme lesz a helyi magyar nyelvi táj, és a többség által túl kevésbé ismert magyar kulturális élet. Mindezt csak kis mértékben hasznosítottam talán azért is, mert tevékenységem első fázisában a magyarországi szemlélet és nyelvhasználat, debreceni gyakorlatom alapján saját váradi tanfolyamomat is *magyar mint idegen nyelv* kurzusként fogtam fel. Hamar kiderült azonban, hogy a tanfolyamokon résztvevők számára, miután évtizedeket éltek kisebbségi magyarnyelvi környezetben – esetleg egyes magyar párú házasságban, és magyar családokban – a magyar nem lehet idegen nyelv. A magyar nyelvet Nagyváradon, Aradon idegen nyelvként felfogni kérdéses. Sokkal megfelelőbb a második nyelv, a környezeti nyelv, és egyesek számára pedig a származási nyelv paradigmája. Az órán nagyobb szerephez lehetett volna juttatni a partikuláris órán kívüli magyar világ nyelvi jeleit. Többet használhattam volna a helyspecifikus szövegeket például a helyi napilap és más kiadványok magyar nyelvű anyagait, helyi magyar nyelvű rádió- és tévéadásokat. A nyelvtanulók számára ez bátorítólag hatott

volna, hogy maguk is tovább keressék a kapcsolódási pontokat és párbeszédekben vegyenek részt az órákon kívül is (Murphy 2008: 17).

Saját nyelvideológiáinkat is meg kell vizsgálnunk, és a hátrányból előnyt lehetne kovácsolni. Az L2 tanuló számára még élesebben jelentkezik az általuk ismert és kedvelt otthonos partiumi nyelvváltozat és a magyarországi standard közötti különbség. Ennek a feszültségnek egyik lehetséges feloldási módja, a kilencvenes évek eleje óta a magyar nyelvészetben zajló, a határon túli nyelvészek és magyar szociolingvisták által folytatott ún. határtalanítási folyamat, amelynek célja, hogy befogadóbbá tegyék a magyar nyelvet a határon túli nyelvi gyakorlattal szemben (Laihonen 2009). Felvetem, hogy a sok esetben Budapest-központú, standardizált *magyar mint idegen nyelv* helyett az L2 határtalanítására is szükség lenne. Ebben helyet kapnának a helyi nyelvhasználatra jellemző változatok is. Esetleg az általános L2-tananyagokban szerepelhetnének a teljes magyar nyelvterületről szóló szövegek is. Lehetnének példák a határon túli magyar városnevekkel. A kisebbségi helyzetben oktató L2-tanárnak a nehézségek ellenére is könnyebb lenne a feladata, ha tanulóinak több kapaszkodót kínálhatna abban, hogy az általuk tanult magyar nyelv mégsem annyira *idegen*.

Irodalom

- Balogh D.–Pamfil, V.– Balázs L. 1986. *Manual Practic de limbă maghiară*. Bukarest: Erdélyi Magyarok Egyesülete.
- Block, David 2003. *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Brubaker, Rogers 2006. *Nationalist politics and everyday ethnicity in a Transylvanian town*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Centrul de limbi străine YES honlapja. www.yes-training.ro/index.php (2012-05-10)
- Colloquia Nyelvizsgaközpont honlapja. www.partium.ro/colloquia (2012-05-10)
- Demeter Katalin 2011. *Magyarul tanuló románok*. Gyergyó TV adása 2011.04.06 [http://erdely.tv/hirek/magyarul-tanulo-romanok\(2012-05-10\)](http://erdely.tv/hirek/magyarul-tanulo-romanok(2012-05-10))
- Fábián Pál 1998. A magyar nyelv és irodalom tanítása a külföldi egyetemeken In: Giay Béla–Nádor Orsolya (szerk.) *A magyar mint idegen nyelv/hungarológia: Tankönyv és szöveggyűjtemény*. Budapest: Janus/Osiris. 152 – 161.
- Feischmidt Margit 2002. A határ és a román stigma. In: *Tér és terep: Tanulmányok az etnicitás és az identitás kérdésköréből: Az MTA kisebbségkutató intézetének évkönyve*. Kovács Nóra–Szarka László (szerk.) III. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Gal, Susan 2006. Language, its stakes and its effects. In: Goodin, R. & Charles T. (eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 376–391.
- Gellén József 2002. Az alapítástól a rendszerváltásig. In: Dobi E.–Gellén J. *75 éves a Debreceni Nyári Egyetem*. Debrecen: Debreceni Nyári Egyetem. 11-34.
- Gancz, Andrei–Gancz, Margareta 2004. *Limba maghiară pentru tine: Manual de conversație*. Iași: Polirom.
- Horváth Máttyás 1998. A magyar mint környezeti nyelv diszciplináris és oktatási kérdé-

- sei. In: Giay Béla–Nádor Orsolya (szerk.) 1998. *A magyar mint idegen nyelv hungarológia: Tankönyv és szöveggyűjtemény*. Budapest: Janus/Osiris. 304–310.
- Kádár Edit 2008. Az erdélyi nyelvészeti kutatások jelenlegi helyzete. Kolozsvári Akadémiai Bizottság – Nyelvtudományi Szakbizottság. www.sztanyi.ro/download/ErdelyiNyelvezetiKutatasok.pdf (2012-05-10)
- Kalaja, Paula–Menezes, Vera–Barcelos, Ana Maria (eds.) 2008. *Narratives of learning and teaching EFL*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kárpát Expressz 2010. *Magyarul tanulnak a Románok Nagyváradon*. Duna Tévé 2010. október 14. 18:29. http://premier.mtv.hu/Hirek/2010/10/14/18/Magyarul_tanulnak_a_romanok_Nagyvaradon.aspx (2012-05-10)
- Híradó. Duna TV 2011. *Románok tanulnak magyarul Nagyváradon*. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U40Wlh0q6M> (2012-05-10)
- Koháry Ilona–Fazakas Emese (szerk.) 2006. *Magyar iskola Romániában*. Budapest: Hungarian Language School.
- Kontra Miklós 2010. *Hasznos nyelvészet*. Somorja: Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet.
- Laihonen, Petteri 2009. A magyar nyelvi standardhoz kapcsolódó nyelvi ideológiák a romániai Bánságban. In: Lanstyák István–Menyhárt József–Szabó Mihály Gizella (szerk.): *Tanulmányok a kétnyelvűségről IV*. Dunaszerdahely: Gramma. 47–77.
- Lankshear, Colin–Michele Knobel 2004. *A handbook for teacher research: From design to implementation*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Limba maghiară pentru arhivistică 2008–2009. Egyetemi szillabusz http://hiphi.ubbcluj.ro/Public/File/syllabus/istorie/lb_maghiara_2.pdf (2012-05-10).
- Magyari Sára 2004. *Magyarul nem magyaroknak*. Temesvár: Marineasca.
- Magyari Sára 2009. Hiedelmek a magyar nyelv körül. *THL2A magyar nyelv és kultúra tanításának szakfolyóirata* 1–2: 150–155.
- Marschalkó Gabriella 2011. *Hungarolingua Basic: A Hungarian Course for Beginners*. Debrecen: Debreceni Nyári Egyetem.
- Marschalkó Gabriella 2012. *Hungarolingua Basic: Curs de limba maghiară pentru începători*. Fordította és adaptálta Kiss Attila Gyula. Debrecen: Debreceni Nyári Egyetem.
- Maticsák Sándor 2002. A magyar nyelv oktatása a Debreceni Nyári Egyetemen In: Dobi E.– Gellén J. (szerk.): *75 éves a Debreceni Nyári Egyetem*. Debrecen: Debreceni Nyári Egyetem. 35–53.
- Molnár Szabolcs 2000. Megjegyzések a hungarológiáról Bukarestből. In: Tverdota György (szerk.): *Hungarológia 2*. Budapest: Nemzetközi Hungarológiai Központ. 210–214.
- Murphy, Tim–Carpenter, Christopher 2008. The Seeds of Agency in Language Learning Narratives. In: Kalaja, P.–Menezes de Oliveira V.–Ferreira A. (eds.): *Narratives of learning and teaching EFL*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 17–34.
- Murvai Olga 1997. *Gramatica comparată maghiaro română*. Micellanea. Bukarest: Callioti.
- Murvai Olga 2010 (interjú). Búvárkodás szavak között. Készítette: Máthé Éva. Krónika, 2010. augusztus 6. www.kronika.ro/index.php?action=open&res=41000 (2012-05-10)

- Nagy Károly 1998 [1977]. Külföldi magyartanításunk módszereinek kialakításáról. In: Nagy Károly: *Tanítsunk magyarul!* New York: Püski. 39-49. és In: Giay Béla–Nádor Orsolya (szerk.): 1998. *A magyar mint idegen nyelv/hungarológia: Tankönyv és szöveggyűjtemény.* Budapest: Osiris. 311–317.
- Nádor Orsolya 1998. A magyar mint idegen nyelv/hungarológia oktatásának története. In: Giay Béla–Nádor Orsolya (szerk.): *A magyar mint idegen nyelv hungarológia: Tankönyv és szöveggyűjtemény.* Budapest: Osiris. 39–99. <http://vmek.oszk.hu/01700/01702/01702.pdf> (2012-05-10)
- Nebuló honlap. www.nebulo.ro/ (2012-05-10)
- Nyugati Jelen 2004. *Módszertani továbbképzés magyar nyelvtanároknak.* 2004. december 10. <http://archiv.nyugatijelen.com/2004/2004%20december/dec.%2010%20pentek/PDF/7.pdf>(2012-05-10)
- Pavlenko, Aneta 2007. Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics* 28 (2): 163–88.
- Péntek János 2002. Örökség és kihívás. Az erdélyi Magyar nyelvtudomány a század-és ezredfordulón. In: Tánzos Vilmos–Tőkés Gyöngyvér–Moldován István–Góczán Andrea (szerk.): *Tizenkét év: Összefoglaló tanulmányok az erdélyi Magyar tudományos kutatások 1990-2001 közötti eredményeiről.* I. Kolozsvár: Scientia. 15–50. mek.oszk.hu/01700/01764 (2012-05-10)
- Pop, Mălina 2009. *Politiştii învaţă limba maghiară.* Bihor online 2009. február 25. www.bihon.ro/stiri/oradea-bihor/articol/politistii-invata-limba-maghiara/cn/news-20090225-04092626 (2012-05-10)
- Popovic, Radmilla 2009. A long, adventurous road to (im)perfection. In: Todeva, E.–Cenoz, J. (eds.): *Trends in Applied Linguistics: Multiple Realities of Multilingualism: Personal Narratives and Researchers Perspectives.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 33–52.
- Szilágyi N. Sándor 2008. De ce nu-şi pot însuşi copiii maghiari limba română în şcoală? *Altera* 1998/7: 131–148.
- Szilvási Andrea 2010. A magyar mint idegen nyelv/hungarológia műhelyei Szlovákiában. *THL2* 1–2: 16–23.
- Szűcs István 2005. A Partiumi Keresztény Egyetem Tannyelvpolitikája és a román oktatáspolitikai összefüggései In: Kontra Miklós (szerk.): *Sült galamb? Magyar egyetemi tannyelvpolitika.* Somorja: Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet, Liliium Aurum könyvkiadó: Somorja–Dunaszerdahely. 135–144.
- Todeva, Elke–Cenoz, Jasone (eds.) 2009. *Multiple Realities of Multilingualism: Personal Narratives and Researchers Perspectives.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

III

TEACHING THE NEIGHBOURS HUNGARIAN: LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES OF ROMANIAN VOLUNTARY LEARNERS AND THE DEBRECEN SUMMER SCHOOL.

www.degruyter.com/view/j/mult.ahead-of-print/multi-2014-1030/multi-2014-1030.xml

by

Attila Gyula Kiss, 2015

In *Multilingua. Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*.
Ahead of print 14 July 2015. DOI: 10.1515/multi-2014-1030.

Reproduced with kind permission by *Multilingua. Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*.

IV

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND LEARNING HISTORICAL MINORITY LANGUAGES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF VOLUNTARY LEARNERS OF SWEDISH IN FINLAND AND HUNGARIAN IN ROMANIA.

<http://apples.jyu.fi/article/abstract/352>

by

Attila Gyula Kiss, 2015

In Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies 9 (1)/2015, 87-109.

Reproduced with kind permission by
Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies.

Language Ideologies and Learning Historical Minority Languages: A comparative study of voluntary learners of Swedish in Finland and Hungarian in Romania

Attila Kiss, University of Jyväskylä

Language ideologies surrounding the learning of historical minority languages deserve more/closer attention because due to the strong nation state ideology, the relation between majority and minority languages has long been problematic, and native speakers of majority languages do not typically learn the languages of the minorities voluntarily. This article discusses the language ideologies of voluntary learners of Swedish and Hungarian in two contexts where these languages are historical minority languages. Data was collected at evening courses in Oradea, Romania and Jyväskylä, Finland on which a qualitative analysis was conducted. In the analysis, an ethnographic and discourse analysis perspective was adopted, and language ideologies were analyzed in their interactional form, acknowledging the position of the researcher in the co-construction of language ideologies in the interviews. The results show that the two contexts are very different, although there are also similarities in the language ideologies of the learners which seem to be significantly influenced by the prevailing historical discourses in place about the use and role of these languages. In the light of resilient historical metanarratives, I suggest that the challenges related to the learning of historical minority languages lie in the historical construction of modern ethnolinguistic nation-states and the present trajectories of such projects. At the same time, the learning of historical languages in contemporary globalized socio-cultural contexts can build on new post-national ideologies, such as the concept of learning historical languages as commodities.

Keywords: language learning, language ideologies, discourse analysis

1 Introduction

The language ideologies constructed by the learners are considered central to understanding issues involved in the learning and teaching of additional languages in general (see Wortham 2005, 2008; Spolsky 2010), even in the case of elementary school children (Martínez-Roldán & Malavé 2004). This applies in particular to the context of adults learning the language of a historical minority voluntarily (see Azkue & Perales 2005; Cenoz & Perales 2010; McEwan-Fujita 2010; Zenker 2014).

Corresponding author's email: atgykiss@student.jyu.fi

ISSN: 1457-9863

Publisher: Centre for Applied Language Studies, University of Jyväskylä

© 2015: The authors

<http://apples.jyu.fi>

In this article, I report the findings of an ethnographic research that I conducted about adult voluntary learners' language ideologies. The focus is on majority language speakers who learn historical minority languages, and more precisely on speakers of Finnish learning Swedish, and speakers of Romanian learning Hungarian in two sites: Oradea, Romania and Jyväskylä, Finland. I focus on two minority language contexts in the European Union, where the official policies and nation state ideologies show significant differences. I approach the issue from the vantage point of language ideologies, and I conduct a discourse analysis (see section 5 for details on methodology) on empirical data collected through interviews.

Spolsky (2010) pointed out that the learning of minority languages first became popular during the 'ethnic revival' that flourished in Western Europe and North America in the 1960s. In practice, this phenomenon is related to the concept of language heritage, which means that the learners viewed/looked at the language that they were learning as their own, and this ownership and identification with the language can be seen as part of reclaiming their ethnic identity (e.g. Zenker 2014). However, recent developments in the theory and practice of language teaching have revealed that the contexts of learning historical languages are, in fact, manifold (e.g. Lynch 2003; Duff 2009). For instance, *reviving* languages, such as Gaelic or Welsh, are often learned by language enthusiasts (Zenker 2014: 64), who do not have anybody who speaks the language in question in their family (cf. McEwan-Fujita 2010).

Most studies on linguistic minorities and language learning have been conducted in the traditional nationalistic framework. For example, heritage language learning studies usually focus on language as inheritance and the reproduction of native speakers, disregarding out-group learners (cf. Spolsky 2010; Guardado 2014; for exceptions see Pujolar 2007; Pujolar & Gonzales 2013; Oh & Nash 2014). My approach draws on current sociolinguistic theory and is not committed to the traditional perspectives. Similar emerging research on Western European settings focuses on *new speakers* in the broadest sense, referring to multilingual minority and immigrant language learners (e.g. Pujolar 2007). Parallel to such ventures (Pujolar & Gonzales 2013), my study concerns voluntary adult learners, which is a relatively under-researched area in general (but see Oh & Nash 2014). Studies on "new" Catalan-speakers have demonstrated that linguistic practices and language ideologies may change throughout life (Woolard 2013; for a similar case in South Tyrol, see Cavagnoli & Nardin 1999).

In the contexts under examination, that is members of the titular group learning a minority language, May (2012) has directed the attention to the relations between the legal-political and the cultural-historical dimensions of nationhood. He argues that, in order to become a nation state in modern Western European terms, the hegemony of the majority culture and language needs to be secured. The projection of majority nationalism upon minorities is thus considered to be the naturalization of the nation state model with an integrative core language and core-culture. Greater representations of the minority language and culture, such as teaching a minority language to the titular group, "are viewed as parochial and destabilizing" (May 2012: 84), or in terms of historical development "essentially anti-modern" (May 2012: 27). Like most European countries, in Romania the ideology of the unity of nation, state and one language is normative and enshrined in the constitution, while in the case of Finland, Swedish retained its functions as a co-official language along

with Finnish. As Kamusella (2009: 57) notes “this disqualifies Finland from the exclusive club of ‘true’ ethnolinguistic nation-states”. I have chosen to compare these two contexts of language learning in order to explore whether the above approach has consequences for language ideologies with respect to the voluntary learning of the historical minority language.

In the light of its historical dominance in relation to other East-Central European languages, the former imperial contexts of German bear a gross resemblance to the position of Hungarian in the multiethnic Hungarian Kingdom before 1920 (see Duszak 2006; Jaworska 2009; Nekvapil & Sherman 2009; Berecz 2013). German also serves as a basis of comparison in respect to the language policy developments of a privileged historical minority language in the present day because we can draw a parallel between Swedish in Finland and German in South Tyrol, Italy, where it has a similar position on a regional level (see Cavagnoli & Nardin 1999; Wolff 2000).

In this article, I approach the study of the voluntary learning of minority languages by the majority by exploring the language ideologies of the subjects through interviews. Gal (2006a) conceptualizes the field of language ideologies as a form of discourse analysis. Language ideologies have been defined as “cultural, metapragmatic assumptions about the relationship between words, speakers, and worlds” (Gal 2006a: 388). In interviews, implicit and explicit statements as well as conceptions about languages occur (Laihonen 2008, 2009). My investigation mostly focuses on the transparent, explicit talk about languages, their value, and how and why they are learned.

The implications for the learners can be far reaching since: “Ideologies, whether invited or imposed, normally come and go with a language” (Duszak 2006: 95). Following Gal (2006b: 15), in order to unfold language ideologies we need to analyze the configuration of these sometimes unconscious cultural assumptions and notions which serve as a frame for linguistic practices as well (cf. Blommaert 2006). Language ideologies also offer insights into “the microculture of communicative action to political economic considerations of power and social inequality, confronting macrosocial constraints on language behavior” (Woolard & Schieffelin 1994: 72). The language ideologies around the learning of historical minority languages deserve attention, especially since, in most cases, the relation between majority and minority languages has been asymmetric, as May stresses (2012), e.g. for many Western intellectuals majority languages represent modernity and progress whereas minority languages are tokens of cultural separatism and disintegration. From this perspective, it is no wonder that it is not a widespread practice that majority language speakers would embark on learning the languages of the minorities, if such an opportunity is offered at all (for a similar argument, see Nekvapil & Sherman 2009).

In the analysis of research interviews, I subscribe to the tradition that illustrates how “talk about language is constructed to meet the expectations of the question, the general orientation of the interview and the amount of shared knowledge” (Laihonen 2008: 678). In the article I also point out how the “metalanguage is connected to the social situation” (Laihonen 2008: 671), as well as how “world views or social positions” are co-constructed together during interview interaction (Laihonen 2008: 671; see also De Fina 2009; Mori, 2012). That is, when a story is told, it is told for this interviewer (me) in the interactional context of the interview; for instance, because the interviewer

asked a question and perhaps did not understand the answer, the interviewee ended up clarifying his answer with a narrative.

My study is guided by the following questions: what are the language ideologies as displayed and co-constructed in interviews with the author, of the learners towards learning a historical minority language in voluntary courses? What underlying ideological considerations hinder or facilitate learning in both Romanian and Finnish contexts?

2 Background: basis of comparison

Despite the relatively high proportion of the historical minorities of Finland and Romania (ca. 6 per cent in both countries, Official Statistics Finland 2010; Institutul Național de Statistică 2011), the general perception in both contexts is that only few people voluntarily study Swedish in Finland and Hungarian in Romania. In the following, I present the contexts of two research sites, Jyväskylä and Oradea, placing them in the larger frameworks of the status of Hungarian in Romania and Swedish in Finland. In Finland, the status of Swedish is much different compared to the status of Hungarian in Romania. Romania defines itself as a nation state with Romanian as its sole national language (The Constitution of Romania 2003) while Finland is officially bilingual and Swedish and Finnish have equal status (The Constitution of Finland 2000).

In the present territory of Finland, Swedish dates back to the first written sources of the 12th century. The area formed a part of the Swedish Empire before it became an autonomous Grand Duchy under Russia in 1809. Finland declared independence in 1917. Swedish and Finnish have been used and spoken by intellectuals and state officials for long, and it has not caused a problem for the elite to learn Finnish and later Swedish. After the general educational reform of 1968 (Palviainen 2010a), learning Swedish became compulsory for the masses.

In Finland, education is conducted in Finnish and Swedish on an equal basis (Palviainen 2010a). Furthermore, *the other national language* is a compulsory subject in both Finnish and Swedish medium schools. Compulsory Swedish classes have been the subject of populist campaigns and have lately received some publicity in the Finnish media. The derogatory Finnish word *pakkoruotsi*, 'forced Swedish' (Palviainen 2013a: 4), designates Swedish as a compulsory subject in school. The idea of making Finland a monolingual nation state surfaces in populist political discourses, but so far it has been rejected by the majority of the educated Finnish speaking population. However, in a longitudinal survey carried out with the participation of altogether 1591 Finnish speaking students in 2006/2007 and 2010 (Palviainen & Jauhojärvi-Koskelo 2009; Palviainen 2010b), a significant decrease was observed in the numbers of those who expressed willingness to study Swedish if it were not compulsory in secondary education.

In the context of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, the learning of each other's languages was a general practice that disappeared in the 20th century (Gal 2011: 32). In Transylvania, Romanian and Hungarian played out the 'dominated dominant' dichotomy as German and Czech did in the Czech lands (see Nekvapil 2000). In Transylvania, the end of the 19th century was characterized by the policy of 'Magyarization', which was carried out mainly through compulsory Hungarian education in state schools. Romanian speakers generally resisted this, and in Romanian villages, few used Hungarian outside of school

(see Berecz 2013). In 1920, Transylvania was ceded to Romania. Since then, the Hungarian language has been perceived in terms of its former dominance, to be counterbalanced in a post-colonial venture to integrate the region into the emerging Romanian Nation State. From this background, the idea of learning the culture and language of the historical minority seems perhaps even bizarre for the members of the titular culture. The teaching of Hungarian for Romanian speakers is provided in the framework of supplementary classes in school education, provided demand for it exists. For example, in Oradea, there was only one occasion when a Hungarian optional language course was organized. Therefore, we can state that there is largely no formal Hungarian language teaching in the Romanian schools, such as there is Swedish in the Finnish educational system.

3 Sites of research

I conducted research in Jyväskylä and Oradea. Jyväskylä is an officially monolingual Finnish municipality in Central Finland. Founded in 1837, the city was chosen to host an education center for the first Finnish medium high-school and teacher education, partly due to the fact that the new capital Helsinki (Helsingfors) was predominantly Swedish speaking in the 1860s. The 19th-century hamlet has grown into a major university city. Out of the 131,000 inhabitants, 312 are registered as Swedish speakers. In Finland everyone is officially registered at birth as a speaker of either Finnish/Swedish or a speaker of another language (Statistics Finland 2015). The existence of Swedish daycare and schooling indicate that there is Swedish bilingualism even in this overwhelmingly Finnish speaking city (see Palviainen 2013b).

My second site, the city of Oradea (Hungarian: Nagyvárad, German: Grosswardein), is situated in Western Romania, 10 kilometers from the border of Hungary. According to the 2011 census, out of the total 184,861 inhabitants, the percentage of those who claimed Hungarian as a mother tongue was 23%. Before 1920 the city belonged to the Kingdom of Hungary. Generally depicted as a major center of Hungarian culture and literary life, Oradea is also significant to Romanian culture since it was an important site in the region for Romanian national awakening. The Hungarian-speaking Jewish population played an important role in the development and cultural life of the city (e.g. Mózes 1997). Nagyvárad was considered to be a cosmopolitan city despite the fact that Hungarian had the dominant position in administration and education, and Hungarian served as a *lingua franca* for the various ethnicities, even as late as the 1960s. In comparison to Jyväskylä, Romanian learners in Oradea frequently hear the historical minority language in everyday life.

Next, I will take a brief look at the institutions where the voluntary learning of historical languages was investigated. In Finland evening classes have a long tradition. At Jyväskylä the classes were held at the local Community College (*Kansalaisopisto*), a nationwide network dedicated to adult education. Finnish interviewees often recall that they attend these classes because a good framework exists for it. After the 1968 educational reform in Finland, everybody has learnt Swedish on a compulsory basis in secondary education. Thus, there are no beginner courses offered at *Kansalaisopisto*, but only refresher courses, and the lowest level is intermediate. The study brochure of the institution advertises the courses as follows: “Did you forget the Swedish that you studied

in school times? We will repeat the basic grammar structures and practice” (Jyväskylän Kansalaisopisto 2013: 36). This seems to resonate for example with the needs of participants of the third age¹ in my data: “when I retired I think I must have some hobby (.) and then I thought I have three nights per week to study here something (.) so I began to learn Swedish because it isn’t so difficult now. (...) I want to repeat what I learned before” (woman in her 60s). From another perspective, according to a teacher in Jyväskylä, it is more characteristic that participants attend the courses because they need Swedish for work purposes, or they moved to Jyväskylä from a Swedish speaking area in Finland and they want to maintain their language skills. The teacher recalled that among the learners there were employees in customer service, physicians, and nurses.

In Romania there is no similar nationwide adult training network. Interviewees in Oradea were taking part in a course organized and taught by me under the auspices of the Debrecen Summer School in the building of a Hungarian medium high-school (see Kiss 2012). In Oradea, there was also interest on the part of the third age generation, but their numbers are not as significant as in Finland. The most numerous group in Romania were teachers who considered that Hungarian would be useful in their profession, which involves interacting with language minority students.

In Jyväskylä there were also younger course participants as well as university students. For example, Jussi (all names are pseudonyms, Jussi was in his 20s) and Maiju (in her early 30s) were taking part in the course because they felt that they needed a basic course in order to be able to obtain the Degree Certificate of Studies in Swedish for civil servants (in Finnish often referred to as *virkamiesruotsi*) (see Palviainen 2010a). In Oradea, similar language courses were organized by the Municipality wherein members of the community police attended the classes on a voluntary basis, but no exams for civil servants in Hungarian exist in Romania.

4 Data

The present article is based mainly on the findings of semi-structured interviews that were conducted by me in English in Jyväskylä, and in Romanian in Oradea. In the case of Oradea, being present as a teacher (for details see Kiss 2013), I documented three courses from 2010 to 2011. In Jyväskylä, I visited the *Kansalaisopisto* 10 times in 2013.

Research diaries and institutional course brochures serve as sources of background information. The interviews in Romania were carried out after a period of around half a year when the participants were attending a second course. There were individual interviews and interviews conducted with two participants together.

In Oradea my role in the field was foremost that of a teacher of Hungarian for the interviewees, a person who organized and taught Hungarian evening courses at the premises of a Hungarian high school, and a member of the ethnic Hungarian minority. As someone who lived most of his life in the city, I was looked upon as a person who did not need an introduction to the local situation. That is, I was treated as a person who possesses a great deal of emic and local knowledge. I had not known the course participants prior to the course, but due to our classes I had developed a closer personal relationship more with the Romanian interviewees than with the Finnish participants, whom I met for the

first time when I solicited their interviews as a foreign researcher. Therefore, they looked upon me as an outsider not likely to be familiar with the ethnographic and political details of learning Swedish in Finland.

I scheduled the interviews before or after their weekly Swedish classes at the Community College (*kansalaisopisto*). We usually sat down in the cafeteria of the City Library in Jyväskylä, or in the classroom where we would have our class in Oradea. I conducted interviews with 25 informants (12 in Oradea and 13 in Jyväskylä), and the interviews usually lasted from 30 to 90 minutes, resulting in a total of ca. 6 hours of audio material in both the Jyväskylä and Oradea cases. The interviewees were mostly college graduates, employed in education, or in the service industries. In Jyväskylä there were more third-age informants than in Oradea. I started the interviews by asking why they learnt the language, as well as how other people reacted to their decision to participate in a course on their respective minority language. I enquired about their trajectories as learners of Hungarian or Swedish and the areas of use of these languages as well as relations to members of the linguistic minority. Beyond the fact that the author conducted all of the interviews, the uniformity of approach and areas of interest resulted in comparable data sets.

5 Research methods

I use Discourse Analysis as complementary with ethnography. In approaching the language ideologies of majority language learners of historical minority languages, I adopt Geertz's (1973/2000) approach to ethnography, who considered it a viewpoint rather than a method. He suggested "thick description" in the study of the complexities and particularities of whichever social scenes are under scrutiny. The other two constitutive components of his approach were an emic, or insider perspective mainly in the Romanian context, and partly in the Finnish context, as well as the researcher's awareness that the researcher is a constitutive part of the research scene. The ethnographic approach stresses the open-ended nature of research and "getting quality from the actor's point of view" (Atkinson 2005: 50). This is especially relevant in the case of Language ideologies.

In the analysis of the interview data I consider applied Conversation Analysis (CA) as a suitable method for its valuable practices and insights into analyzing spoken interaction. In comparison to the generally more static ethnographic accounts "CA portrays social behavior as dynamic, emergent and situated vis-à-vis the interactional contingencies of the moment" (Atkinson, Hanako & Talmy 2011: 88). I was interested in the ideas interviewees have about the historical minority languages they are learning, and what kind of explicit evaluations they make about the learning of said languages. I always include the questions and interviewer reactions to answers in the examination of interviewees' statements since I consider them relevant to the form and occurrence of metalinguistic comments. Another interviewer, posing other questions and reacting differently to the answers, would have received different accounts on learning a historical language. Interactional data is also used in Jaffe (1999) and Heller (2011) largely from the discourse analytic perspective of analyzing the content of turns by different actors, however, Laihonen (2008; see also ten Have 2004) brings together insights from Language Ideologies and Conversation Analysis in order to show how the contents and details of shifts in interaction are actually co-

constructed and how language ideas are intertwined with the interactional structure in interviews.

I analyze semi-structured interviews (see ten Have 2004 for different interview types). I approach the Second Language Acquisition of historical minority languages from the perspective of anthropological sociolinguistics applying ethnographical data collection and analysis methods as outlined by Heller (2008) and Blommaert and Dong (2010). Therefore, I take the interpretivist stance of linguistic ethnography, describe practices and address questions to shed light on language ideologies. In the analysis of the interviews I also look at “patterns of discourse as they emerge in interaction”, and as “primary acts of meaning-making” (Heller 2001: 251). I use an integrative approach (Heller 2008) and look at larger social and historical processes and structures beyond the interaction, too.

6 Language ideologies: insights from the interviews

6.1 Why people learn a historical minority language?

I started each interview by asking about the reasons for the interviewees’ learning Hungarian or Swedish in order to map the most important factors that prompted interviewees to enroll in the voluntary learning of these two languages. One of the Finnish research participants in Jyväskylä, Leila, is a pensioner in her 60s, and beside from helping out her family dedicates two evenings to herself:

Excerpt 1*

- 1 AK: what makes you study Swedish in your free time?
- 2 Leila: I thought that I would love to have a language course as a
- 3 hobby and I liked Swedish (.) it is easy (.) but I never had the chance
- 4 to speak it in natural circumstances (.) I went to the discussion course
- 5 for the second time (.) first I was surprised that there are so many
- 6 people (.) first, I thought that it would not be a popular choice (.)
- 7 in general people were not that interested in Swedish (.)
- 8 you probably heard already that it is not a popular topic in school (.) or
- 9 people don’t need it in work life being in Central Finland (.)
- 10 but anyway (.) the course it was almost full (.) it was 20 people.

* (.) denotes micro pauses less than 0.2 seconds. In the transcription of the interviews a simplified version of transcription conventions of Conversation Analysis is used. The list of transcription symbols can be found at the end of article.

The interviewer in this question positions adult language learning as a free-time activity. Further, the question explicitly concerns *learning Swedish in one’s free time*. Learning Swedish is an ideologically loaded question in Finland as the informant also mentions later (in line 8). In comparison, an alternative format would have been a general question (e.g. ‘what makes you study languages in your free time?’) or an ideologically more *neutral* ‘hobby language’ in this context, such as Italian or Spanish. Leila’s answer implicates the ideological encumbrance of learning Swedish as a free time activity. First, Leila accepts the stance about learning languages as a hobby, which she explicitly states in her

answer (“I would love to have a language course as a hobby”), then, in her next remark, she evokes ideological images of learning Swedish as a subject at school. That is, the informant presents an image of herself as a Swedish learner who liked the language in school, and finds it easy despite the fact that she did not have a chance to use it in “natural circumstances”. This reflects the conception that Swedish is not used in this part of Finland. It was voiced in other interviews as well that Swedish is not needed in the region of Central Finland because it is a Finnish-speaking region (see also Palviainen 2012: 20). However, other interviewees claim seeing both private sector and government job advertisements where Swedish skills were a requirement: “Swedish is still strong (.) or in demand in customer service (.) Swedish, it is required on a level to get by” (Tuija). In sum, there are contradictory evaluations, sometimes even within the same interview, as regards to the usefulness of Swedish in Central Finland.

Leila is “surprised” (line 5) that there were many people attending the course, and recalls that her presumption was that “in general people were not interested in Swedish”. The next sentence introduced by “you probably heard” shows that the remark is clearly addressed to the interviewer, who is thus depicted as an outsider who might not have basic knowledge of the discourses on learning Swedish in Finland. In this way the interviewer’s position as a foreigner was reflected in other interviews with Finns as well, but not in the interviews with Romanians, where he had the position of a local, an issue to which I return later.

Leila voices the stereotype “not a popular subject in schools” (line 8), introducing the interviewer to the widely circulated language ideologies in Finland. She explains this with the remark that “people don’t need it in work life being in Central Finland” making the instrumental connection between learning a language and acquiring a job. She also points out the different approaches to language learning. That is, the conversation course is different from the school education that she had experience with.

Romanian informants from Oradea reflected upon the fact that they learned the language in informal settings through interacting with Hungarians. For reasons of space I present only the English translations of the interviews carried out in Romanian:

Excerpt 2

- 1 AK: how typical do you think your experience is? that er (.) you learned
- 2 Hungarian by (.) being in touch with the Hungarians from here?
- 3 Liliana: so (.) that most of the Romanians learn the language due to the
- 4 contacts that they have?
- 5 AK: yes
- 6 Liliana: I think that quite many (.) I don’t know but I have always been in
- 7 touch with (---) if it was neighbours (.) or family friends (.) or
- 8 acquaintances in general (.) and for me (.) at least it was like a game that I
- 9 can say something (.) or I could understand (.) to be able to understand (.)
- 10 to be able to say a few sentences in the language of the other one and he
- 11 she could understand (.) you I think it has to do with respect that you want
- 12 to show towards the other one (.) to show him=her that you know the
- 13 language he uses.

The interviewer introduces the idea that Romanians from Oradea acquire some Hungarian through interaction with Hungarian speakers. Aligning to this

conception, the informant (Liliana, a Romanian in her late 30s) presents her personal experience, which sees language as a tool for communication among co-inhabitants (neighbors, friends). As this excerpt shows, proficiency in the language may not be very high, or go beyond a few sentences, but it serves the purposes of indexing respect.

Liliana also introduces the idea that language learning was a game for her “and for me (.) at least it was like a game that I can say something (.) or I could understand” (line 8, 9). Due to the lack of formal language teaching, the learners often express that they were not acquainted with Hungarian grammar, and their knowledge is based on what they picked up from natural interaction with Hungarians, or from Hungarian television.

Later in the interview she also refers to occasional job advertisements in the local newspapers that list Hungarian as an additional advantage. In other interviews, Romanian learners also mention that it could be useful to speak Hungarian in customer service. Here the instrumentality of Hungarian appears as a potentially useful tool for future possibilities and it is opposed to the traditional ideologies of ethno-linguistic group membership, or political division.

From a comparative perspective, we can sum up that Finns in Jyväskylä acquire the basics of Swedish in the framework of formal school education whereas Romanians in Oradea acquire it from their environment. Finns can build on their school language courses at a later stage of their life when they decide to voluntarily study the language. Refreshing knowledge resulting from the previous formal training and knowledge is given as the reason for continuing their voluntary Swedish learning. Many Romanian learners could fall in the heritage learner category, and they too have surpassed the basic level of proficiency in Hungarian – mostly through picking up different elements of the language from the environment (see Kiss in press for details). In this respect they are different to most Finnish speakers. In sum, learners in both interview groups expressed that they feel they have the survival skills and feel able to perform simple touristic or border crossing tasks in their respective target languages.

6.2 *Ideologies of transnational communication*

Olli is a Finnish speaking man in his 60s who started studying Swedish both for personal and professional reasons. A significant part of the next interview is concerned with the areas of use of the languages as well as transnational communication. In the following excerpt the informant describes in detail his ambivalence regarding language choice at academic conferences:

Excerpt 3

- 1 AK: how often does it happen that Swedish is a common language?
- 2 Olli: when Scandinavians meet at conferences we have a feeling that we
- 3 belong to the same group of people: Finns, Norwegians, and so on, and
- 4 quite often when nations are grouped together (0.2) it is not nice when I
- 5 am not able to speak Swedish, because then all other people will speak
- 6 Swedish (0.2) Norwegians, Danes, Swedish people, and so this happens
- 7 quite often to me that I participate in a conference and we should have a
- 8 geographical meeting.
- 9 AK: mhm
- 10 Olli: and then Swedish, Norwegians and Finns we are put together. and

- 11 then it is a real, real problem, because Swedish people they know that we
 12 do not want to speak Swedish
 13 AK: mhm
 14 Olli: and there is always discussion that er we have Finns there should we
 15 speak Swedish or something else, and very often the solution is that all
 16 Scandinavians just start to speak English.
 17 Interviewer: mhm
 18 Olli: and it would be very nice if we could say that just speak Swedish
 19 AK: mhm
 20 Olli: they know that they don't like or cannot speak very well Swedish
 21 and then it is not nice for Scandinavian people that they cannot use their
 22 language but this is quite common this happens almost every year
 23 somewhere to me.

Some interviewees state that they feel too insecure about their Swedish skills to use it in a business context, and therefore, English is used. Based on another part of the interview where Olli mentioned Swedish as his *lingua franca*, the interviewer in line 1 requests clarification about the idea that Swedish could act as a *lingua franca*. I enquire into the frequency of such cases, and Olli answers with examples of situations where such a thing happens, and what problems it involves. Olli constructs an ideology that Finns are either “not able”, or “do not want to” speak Swedish in international contexts, and this “is not nice for Scandinavian people that they can not use their language” (line 4,5). In this ideology, Swedish is the transnational language of Scandinavia, or the regional language of access for cooperation. Olli builds his answer on the ideology that there is solidarity between the Scandinavian people and that Scandinavian languages are mutually comprehensible, therefore the Finns should use Swedish in those situations. However, due to the lack of skills in Swedish, some Finns are of the opinion that using Swedish as a Scandinavian *lingua franca* is best, but the use of Swedish is problematic and fraught with many challenges.

In the Finnish data we encounter many formulations about the usefulness of Swedish as the common language of Scandinavia. Swedish appears as a Scandinavian *lingua franca* in the eyes of interviewees. This seems to be in line with a common ideology in favor of Swedish in school education. In current debates one of the arguments is that Swedish skills enhance Nordic cooperation and may contribute to a sense of unity with other Nordic nations (cf. Palviainen 2011: 18). The common counter-argument is that English might be the *de facto lingua franca* of Scandinavia. In excerpt 3, and in other interviews, it was voiced, however, that knowledge of Swedish could be expected from Finnish speakers because of their school education.

In Oradea interviewees also reflect upon the proximity of the border and language contacts.

Excerpt 4

- 1 AK: do you think that learning Hungarian will give you a chance to
 2 meet more Hungarian speakers
 3 Maria: [...] not necessary for this [...] to be able to speak a language (.)
 4 it opens up the path to another culture, another civilization (.)
 5 it is very important (.) for me by any means
 6 it is important to be able to understand some neighbors (.) because I do not
 7 know if you realize that Romanians know very little about Hungary and

- 8 Hungarians, not counting their daily experiences (.) but they do not know
 9 anything about civilisation, history (.) I do not know whether this is a
 10 mutual problem (.) probably not because (0.3) so
 11 AK: what is the reason for that?
 12 Maria: there are prejudices here (.) they do not have the inclination (.) and
 13 for me it is most curious for one to learn German first, because Hungarian
 14 is the first language that you bump into in our region.

This sequence starts with the interviewer's question as to whether the interviewees learn Hungarian in order to meet more Hungarian speakers. First, the informant develops a more general approach by saying that the more languages one knows the better it is: Maria (Romanian woman in her 50s) argues that she is learning Hungarian for more general reasons than just "meeting Hungarians", but in fact "to be able a language (.) it opens up the paths to another culture, another civilization"(lines 3, 4). That is, she builds a discourse that resonates with the late-modern and neo-liberal entrepreneurial project of self-improvement (see Giddens 1999).

The informant says that she became interested in the language because she has Hungarian neighbors (line 6). The word has twofold significance because on the one hand it refers to her next-door neighbors, and on the other hand to the neighboring country, for the close proximity of the border and cross-border commerce is significant in the case of Oradea. Many Romanian speakers may regularly go shopping in Hungary, and some would even purchase a house, or weekend house, with possessing just basic knowledge of Hungarian. Some interviewees say that they do not intend to learn more than necessary to conduct these activities. Maria points out that there is a discrepancy between these day-to-day language contacts and a deeper knowledge of civilization and history. She says that "Romanians know very little about Hungarians" (line 7, 8). She explains this with the existence of prejudice and a lack of disposition (line 12) to language learning. By recalling prejudice as a politicized stance Maria references here the larger socio-cultural framework, describable as traditional ethno-nationalist discourse, which typically works against the learning of historical minority languages.

Just like in the case of Finland and Sweden, tourism and visits to each respective country are of the highest number between the citizens of Romania and Hungary. In the Romanian data we also find examples of trans-border communication:

Excerpt 5

- 1 AK: and how do you evaluate, are Romanians from Oradea interested
 2 in Hungarian language and culture (0.2) do they get necessary information to
 3 be interested (0.2) to bring it to their (0.2)
 4 Corina: [here the worlds
 5 AK: [attention?
 6 Corina: [are really split (0.2) linked to the ↑real identity er of each one
 7 (0.2) they have a lot of contact (.) and they are appreciative (.) of Hungarian
 8 ↑civilisation (.), and in relation to what happens there

The interviewer asks the interviewees to speak about whether they think Romanians from Oradea are interested in Hungarian language and culture. Considering that the interviewer is a Hungarian from Oradea the interview can

be looked upon as a kind of intercultural encounter with Romanians who gained intercultural experience by being bilinguals, and by taking part in Hungarian language courses.

The informant, Corina (a Romanian woman in her 50s), resists the interviewer's generalizing category of "Romanians from Oradea". She begins speaking of other Romanians by consequently using the third person plural pronoun "they", instead of using the pronoun we, which would signal in-group affiliation: e.g. "they have a lot of contact (.) and they appreciative" (line 7). In this way she adopts the discursive role of an intermediary and positions herself as knowledgeable about both categories. She rejects the negative stereotypes and says that there is more communication and contact between the speakers of these two languages than may be evident from a superficial glance.

6.3 Negative stereotypes on learning a historical minority language

The next interview excerpt is typical of how many interviewees refer to widely circulated negative discourses about Swedish in Finland:

Excerpt 6

- 1 AK: and what was the first reaction of your acquaintances when
- 2 you told them that you learn Swedish in your free time?
- 3 Tuija: first reaction is @WHAT? WHY?@ (everybody laughs) @WHY@
- 4 would you do such a thing? it is because Swedish language is so hated
- 5 when we grow up in high school.
- 6 Mari: because you have to learn it
- 7 Tuija: you have to, so it becomes hated, and it is mandatory to hate it and
- 8 if you do not hate it you are discarded from the community so you have to
- 9 hate it (.) that kind of thing.
- 10 Tuija: it is a really ancient rivalry between Finnish and Swedish because
- 11 Sweden used to be our mother nation (---) for six hundred years (0.2) they
- 12 were the better people at the time (.) so all the nobles were Swedish
- 13 AK: does this still live on?
- 14 Tuija: yeah, yeah [...] it lives on. it is kind of (.) not a real hatred it is a fun hatred (0.2)
- 15 you know it's like ice hockey
- 16 Mari: ice hockey is a good example

Even though not elicited by the interviewer, almost all Finnish informants speak about their school experiences as Swedish learners. Tuija and Mari, participants who belong to the younger generation (in their late 20s), reflect on the idea of the "compulsoriness" of Swedish in school. Tuija distances herself from this negative view of Swedish by ironically quoting some stereotypical voices. She enlists the negative stereotypes against Swedish, which include that it is not popular, moreover that it is "hated" because it is compulsory. Quoting the voices of others, laughter, and the use of the words "mandatory to hate it" (line 7) signals that she uses irony and constructs a subversive critique of the populist ideology, indexed through her deliberately choosing to study Swedish. Tuija takes this further by explaining that the relationship to learning Swedish is greatly influenced by generational peer pressure, which creates a culture of resistance among teenagers against the "compulsory" learning of Swedish. By giving a direct quotation (note also the change in voice) Tuija attributes these stereotypes held against Swedish to other people. The interviewee says that

there is “ancient rivalry between Finnish and Swedish” (line 10), and the expression “they were the better people” (line 12) refers to a widespread historical stereotype in the Finnish data.

When asked to reflect upon culture, some informants claim they know Sweden and Swedish culture quite well. Some stereotypes, however, seem to linger when one of the informant expresses that: “people in Sweden are *iloisempi* happier (.) more money” (Maiju, a woman in her 60s). In a reaction to this remark the interviewer asks: “do you think that you have a different persona when you speak Swedish? / Maiju: yes I think so.” The interviewer introduces the ideology that language learning seems to go hand in hand with identity work, and the informant gives an affirmative answer. I interpret this co-constructed exchange, as an illustration how language “elicits subjective responses in speakers themselves: emotions, memories, fantasies, projections, and identifications” (Kramsch 2009: 2).

Similarly, in the Oradea data, Ileana (a Romanian woman in her 50s) speaks of how her acquaintances reacted to the news when they learned that she studied Hungarian at evening classes:

Excerpt 7

- 1 AK: what did your acquaintances say when you told them that you study
- 2 Hungarian?
- 3 Maria: they found it funny (0.2) first of all they found it *cool* but how to
- 4 say it they were surprised (.) something like that
- 5 AK: weren't they wondering why?
- 6 Maria: yes first they asked why? @do you want to move to Hungary?
- 7 @but NOO. I say no (.) why should I?
- 8 AK: this was the first reaction?
- 9 Maria: this was their first reaction. (0.2) what is the hidden motive?

Learning a historical minority language, for instance Hungarian in Romania, and Swedish in Finland, as a subject of study in self-financed evening classes is a marked choice. In a manner similar to the analysis of the interviewer's questions in excerpt one, we can establish that inquiring into the learning of a historical language awaits some sort of denial of the negative stereotypes that go along with such languages due to the dominant nation state ideology in Europe. Here the interviewer can be seen to be probing for these stereotypes. That is, the question already implicates that whoever learns Hungarian in Romania has to take into account the reaction of the environment. The informant's (Maria, a Romanian woman in her 30s) response confirms that she has perceived this stance. In her response Maria relates that surprise was the first reaction of her acquaintances, and uses the English word “cool” in order to say that they found attending evening classes a novel and interesting activity. This is interesting since *historical* minority languages are often conceptualized as a thing of the past, and thus rather more “passé” than “cool”. When asked to give details, she further clarifies that others in fact thought she might emigrate to Hungary. Ileana uses the same strategy of directly quoting the reaction of her acquaintances, and also her own answer. According to this stereotype in Oradea, language study must be instrumental and one is likely to study a language in order to move to the country where it is an official language. The general opinion is that one should learn a language of much wider circulation than Hungarian. A common trait in both the Western Romanian and Central Finland

contexts are that the learners mention that their acquaintances were surprised when they mentioned their choice of language. English, however, is generally accepted as a language to study in adult age both in Finland and Romania, and Finns often mention Russian and Spanish as languages of choice in competition with Swedish.

6.4 Joint histories, common traits, and aspects that hinder language learning

Informants, especially in the case of Romania, evoke the common historical past, which was often charged by episodes of conflict, and this may create resistance to learning these languages. As we could see previously, Finnish interviewees from the younger generation might express a critical opinion concerning the past.

In respect to the recollection of stereotypes and historical grievances, there are even more marked examples in the Romanian data set. The popular oral histories between Romania and Hungary seem to have retained memories more of the offences of the earlier historical – and often more recent – conflictual periods:

Excerpt 8

- 1 AK: Did you speak Hungarian in the family?
- 2 Marcel: my father spoke the language (.) but did not support me learning it because
- 3 he had unpleasant memories of the Hungarian occupation.

Marcel (Romanian man in his 60s) recalls stories of his father that evoked the Hungarian rule during the Second World War. In Hungarian nationalist discourses, Nagyvárad was “liberated” and “returned” to Hungary in 1940, whereas from the Romanian point of view, the city was “occupied” by the Hungarian army.

Next, I will present a longer interview excerpt in which two Romanian learners of Hungarian reflect upon Hungarian language and culture. Both interviewees are highly educated women in their early fifties and are interested in the arts and architecture:

Excerpt 9

- 1 AK: what motivates you to study Hungarian?
lines 2-21 omitted [the interviewees, Ana and Corina, first develop their answers into a long reflection about Hungarian culture, especially in the context of arts, architecture and arts education]
- 22 Ana: er for me (0.2) the area of the city and surroundings (.) is a matter of
- 23 legitimacy (.) on a background where there are very many mixtures (.) mixed
- 24 families (.) friendships very (.) so it's a very well welded together area (.) existing
- 25 (.) for many (0.2) with pa ... with roots (0.2) with past
- 26 Corina: so that of this tolerance?
- 27 Ana: yes (.) so there is texture (.) inextricable (.) of families
- 28 Corina: so it is
- 29 Ana: [for generations there are mixed families (.) isn't it (.) so here you can
- 30 not meddle (.) you can meddle in the zone (.) where I felt tension (.) even in my
- 31 family (.) this rapport not [yet clarified (.) distorted and perverted between er
- 32 masters and servants (.) so there exists this Romanian complex of the servant. of

- 33 the serfs (.) while Hungarians are the noblemen (.) and er they've been masters all
 34 the time but (.) masters good or bad (.) well, it doesn't matter (.) so this complex
 35 of superiority and respectively of inferiority [...]
- At this point, she continues the interview by blaming politicians of manipulation of these feelings and by fueling these antagonisms. Here in the interview the informants tell two narratives in order to illustrate these points and continue by saying the following:
- Ana: so this er (0.2) how you said it. how did you say? (.) national fracture slit
 58 (sighs) and which touches the ethnic side (.) which is very sensitive especially in
 59 these areas it remained it remained (.) and it is ↑perpetuated now I think for
 60 political motives. and for interests to manipulate in all ways but it exists, it exists
 61 Corina: it seems to me
 62 Ana: [we grew up in it
 63 Corina: that here in this area where exercises of superiority are attempted, to be
 64 made. it is exasperating sometimes ones sometimes the others. it depends who the
 65 victim is and er (.) ignorance is: how to say it is at hand (.) so the history of the
 66 Oradea is not known. it is not known who the architects were who built the
 67 palaces on the main street (.) er and newly they are irritated if they have
 68 Hungarian names. yes? I think that this is a part of the history that has to be
 69 assumed it must be known for once and for all who build why they built (.) it is a
 70 building, an edifice that will stay there BUT it has its right for its own history [...]
- 71 Ana: yes, I know what ↑you are talking about, but I am telling you what ↑others are saying.
 72 So ↑others try to adjudge these values er (.) that are in a way already TRANSnational, and
 73 which are related to a history. but they try to rebuild a neoimperialist map through culture.
 74 namely, @we always dominated you through culture@. a kind of er intertextual message

In line 22 Ana (Romanian woman in her 50s) takes her turn. She starts out with the words “for me”. This and what follow shows that she has an alternative agenda for the discussion. The talk about Hungarian language in Oradea gives her a good platform to engage in two meta-narratives. First, she engages into a meta-story in a dialogue, not initiated by the interviewer, recounting the story of feelings of superiority and inferiority and inoculation against Hungarians and Hungarian language (lines 22–35). The second meta-story is that of cultural neo-imperialism (lines 71–74), which she gives as an answer on the loss of identity and the history of the built heritage. Both of these stories have long trajectories outside the surface context of the interview and they can be interpreted only by taking into account the historical and social contexts. These stories contain numerous references to issues that are not explained to the interviewer, since it appears that a common understanding for the needs of the interview situation can be reached without such explanations, which are more typical in the Finnish data.

The informants are well aware of and engage in complex discourses on Hungarian in Oradea. This is exemplified by the second meta-story about the use of names in the city and the topic of cultural neo-imperialism. Corina (Romanian woman in her 40s) relates how the history of Oradea is not known, and how a “newly they are irritated” (line 67) if the architectural structures have Hungarian names. She distances herself from this group, the dominant Romanian elite and states that history should be accepted.

The last section of the excerpt (lines 71–74) is particularly interesting because of Ana's use of the pronoun “they”, which changes its reference multiple times: Ana first agrees with Corina and uses marked intonation and stresses in order to make her words more emphatic. The referent of “others” changes. The first “others” are Romanians who blame Hungary for engaging in a neo-imperialist

cultural restoration. The second “others” in this reply, however, refer to the Hungarians who want to see the built heritage as their own. Ana argues in favor of transnational values, and by doing so she opposes such tendencies. The next “they” are the Hungarians who try “to rebuild a neo-imperialist map through culture” and there is “a kind of intertextual message”. By evoking such discourses she voices typical Romanian resentment and the fears caused by these cultural attempts at reclamation. She seems to elaborate, and makes more concrete, the theme introduced by her in lines 29–35. In the quoted excerpts we see how the trajectories of historical discourses from the 19th-century Hungarian Kingdom are intertwined with the trajectories of local discourses concerning the preservation and naming of the built heritage of the city of Oradea in the second decade of the 21st century.

In the next example, Olli, (see also section 6.2 and excerpt 3) reflects upon the historical background of Swedish in Finland:

Excerpt 10

- 1 AK: so the general public usually doesn't make this gesture (.) doesn't
- 2 make the gesture towards er the Swedish speaking Finns or it's not (.) common?
- 3 Olli: no I don't think so (.) and perhaps you are right that (.) it's not very popular
- 4 to read Swedish (.) or to use Swedish this (.) for Finns (.) but I have some=some
- 5 (.) I have an intuition (.) or impression that (.) it's becoming perhaps not so
- 6 popular
- 7 Interviewer: ahm
- 8 Olli: the need of understanding Swedish (.) and we know that=that the history
- 9 (sighs) is long together with Swedish
- 10 Interviewer: mhm
- 11 Olli: to=to be in the same monarchy a:nd we know that the most important poems
- 12 is written in Swedish.
- 13 Interviewer: yeah
- 14 Olli: they were Finns but the most important literature was written in Swedish
- 15 Interviewer: I see
- 16 Olli: so it's quite important for Finns that we understand what our (.) Finnish (.)
- 17 Swedish speaking Finns wrote
- 18 Interviewer: ya
- 19 Olli: of course there are translations (.) but that's another thing
- 20 Interviewer: hmm
- 21 Olli: it's not the same that you read what Runeberg or Lönnrot or other Finns wrote

Based on previous interviews, the interviewer asks the informant whether or not he considers it common that Finns make a gesture toward Swedish speakers of learning the language. The interviewer already positions himself as someone who knows about the situation of Swedish in Finland. He constructs the idea that language study is a gesture toward the “Swedish-speaking Finns” (line 2). Olli then takes up this phrase and uses it throughout the entire interview.

In a matter of fact statement, the informant refers to the joint history of Sweden and Finland by evoking the common monarchy. As opposed to other interviewees this gives him a reason to be interested in the language. Recalling the joint history does not seem to convey negative undertones to him. Also, later in the interview he says: “we were the same monarchy we were one country” (Olli). Moreover, it seems to be an important aspect, or an added value, for him to learn the language. The informant here begins to build an ideology that the Swedish language belongs to Finland. Olli points out that there are similarities

between the two countries and the two cultures. The “history is long together with Swedish” (lines 8, 9). History is evoked in a generally positive light. Next, he refers to the long joint-history of Finnish and Swedish speakers in the Swedish monarchy, and the lasting influence of literature in Swedish. He says that it is important that Finns should know the language in which significant pieces of Finnish literature was written. He gives Runeberg and Lönnrot as examples, and argues that Finns should know Swedish so that they can read their works in the original and not only in translation.

Finally, we can recall how the informant talks about the 19th-century intellectual heritage of Swedish in present-day Finland, and that many outstanding Finnish intellectuals were speakers of Swedish. For example, Olli, in other parts of the interview not presented here, mentions Sibelius, and speaks of other prominent Swedish speakers, like Runeberg and Lönnrot, who had played a major role in the development of Finnish literature. The discourse is typical of an intellectual. In the Romanian context there are no similar Hungarian literary figures who would be accepted by Romanians.

7 Conclusions

The main objective of this analysis was to illustrate the diversity of discourses related to the learning of historical minority languages that circulate among the language learners. In the interviews, historical “metanarratives” and references to contemporary social/cultural contexts were frequent. This was fairly expected, since, for example, in the context of learning German in Poland (Mar-Molinero & Stevenson 2006) or South Tyrol (Cavagnoli & Nardin 1999), similar discourses are ubiquitous.

Applying the qualitative interview format, I asked informants about their voluntary learning of the major historical minority language in Romania and Finland. Finding language ideologies in these interviews with learners of historical minority languages was easy. The language ideologies were clearly co-constructed in the interviews and the answers by the interviewees were clearly geared to my question interactionally, and in regards to my position as a researcher as well. In the interviews with Finnish interviewees, it was often made explicit that I was a foreigner in Finland, and certain things that would not be explained to other Finns were explained to me. In the Romanian context I was treated as a local and cultural references were often left open to interpretation (on my role as a teacher of Hungarian, see Kiss 2013). The voluntary adult learners not only voiced general stereotypes like children in other studies (Martínez-Roldán & Malavé 2004), but as adults they also reflected on them in detail and contested many of the widespread beliefs and ideas over the minority language and learning it in the majority communities. The adult learners provide a good example of what is required in regards to a language ideological reorientation—a possible change during the lifetime (Woolard 2013; Pujolar & Gonzales 2013)—to replace the common concept of minority languages as “parochial and destabilizing” (May 2012: 84) to a minority language as a resource ideology. As a conclusion, from a political perspective, there is a need to replace the one state one language idea, with the ideology of mutual linguistic accommodation toward cohabitating a state or a region. Following May, I find that “the retention of a minority language and culture is an enduring need *for the majority as well*” (2012: 186, emphasis in original).

My main analytical goal was to compile the research results into themes and provide a discourse analysis of the themes that occur in both data sets in order to examine the similarities and differences of the two contexts. Learning Swedish at school is unanimously given as the basic reason for voluntarily learning Swedish. In comparison, Romanians had not previously attended language classes. However, family ties, geographical proximity, and economical interest as well as contact with the neighboring country were mentioned as reasons for learning Hungarian. Besides the mention of access to material goods (e.g. communication in tourism, shopping), both Hungarian and Swedish are seen as languages that are important tools to access spiritual and cultural goods like education, knowledge of fine arts, and poetry.

Despite the very different backgrounds, historical discourses of *the other* bear resemblances in both countries. The grievance narratives have been handed down through generations and they obstruct openness towards the learning of the historical minority language. To some extent, both Swedish and Hungarian are still perceived by many interviewees as the language of the former elites. It is notable that even though Swedish learning is supported by the Finnish language policy, the stereotypes about the language still linger.

In Finland, intellectuals express a cultural interest in Swedish language as the historic heritage and see it as part of Finland. In many interviews, the joint history offers a basis for a better understanding of other Scandinavian countries and of the history of the Finns. In relation to meta-narratives about history, different approaches surface in the two data sets. In the Finnish data the learners who studied Swedish voluntarily expressed acceptance of the historical past and Swedish language as a part of Finnish history. That is, there are signs of mutual accommodation of Finnish and Swedish history, culture, and language in Finland. Perhaps this is a consequence of Finland not being a part of “the exclusive club of ‘true’ ethno-linguistic nation states” (Kamusella 2009: 57). In a clear contrast to the Finnish signs of mutual accommodation, we saw how Romanians learning Hungarian still struggle with the fact that common elements of history are neglected, or are outright rejected by both parties. One explaining factor can be that Finland was under Swedish rule as late as 1809, whereas Transylvania belonged to Hungary until 1920 and still in 1941–1944. That is, in Finland the 19th century Finnish linguistic nationalism was not a threat to the national unity of Sweden, and thus the Swedish speaking intelligentsia in Finland supported it to a certain extent. In contrast, the national movements of the Romanians in 19th century Transylvania were relegated to rebellious groups in the eyes of the emerging Hungarian nation state. The brief interlude of Hungarian rule in northern Transylvania during 1941–1944 is still referred to as “returning to home” (‘visszatéres’ in Hungarian) from the Hungarian point of view, whereas Romanian official and popular narratives refer to that period as “Hungarian occupation”.

The study in the two contexts shows that historical metanarratives about the joint historical past can hinder, or outright block, language learning of the respective minority languages, as we can witness in other contexts as well. The contemporary socio-cultural context, partly due to globalization and the spread of post-national ideologies (Heller 2011), is in both cases favorable toward the learning of the historical minority language. At first sight, it appears more favorable in the case of Finland, since learning Swedish is a part of the compulsory education for the majority. However, there is a paradox, for this both motivates and hinders the adults from learning the minority language. For

those few capable of a language ideological reorientation free from the stereotype of *pakkoruotsi* ('compulsory learning of Swedish'), the previous experience at school motivates them to refresh their Swedish knowledge later on: "I didn't want to start a new language" as one of my interviewees put it. In general, the learning of historical languages can build on the contemporary socio-cultural context in Europe. At the same time, it is much harder to contest and change the historical metanarratives (e.g. that Hungarians "occupied" Oradea between 1941–1944, or that Swedish speakers form the "upper class" in Finland). For the future, where the learning of one another's language would also become standard for the majority, a general language ideological reorientation of these historical metanarratives is necessary. That is, by learning and acknowledging the other's perspective to history and linguistics belonging we can focus on shared history and multilingual practices instead of nation state antagonisms and monolingual preferences. Future research is needed to indicate general and context-bound ways to achieve such an ideological reorientation, which supports the voluntary learning of historical minority languages by the majority on a European scale.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful for the University of Jyväskylä, CIMO, and Svenska Kulturfonden for grants that have enabled me to carry out the research reported here. I would like to thank Petteri Laihonen, Åsa Palviainen, Sabine Ylönen and the two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on earlier versions of this article. Any remaining shortcomings are solely my responsibility.

Endnote

¹ The definition of the "third age" essentially refers to older adults (aged more or less in the 50–75 age band) "whose everyday lives are no longer tied to the responsibilities of regular employment and/or raising a family" (Weiss & Bass 2001: 3).

References

- Atkinson, D. 2005. Situated qualitative research and second language writing. In P. Matsuda & T. Silva (eds.), *Second Language Writing Research: Perspectives on the process of Knowledge Construction*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 49–64.
- Atkinson, D., O. Hanako & S. Talmy 2011. Ethnography and Discourse. In K. Hyland & B. Paltridge (eds.), *Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum, 85–101.
- Azkue, J. & J. Perales 2005. The teaching of Basque to adults. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 174, 73–83.
- Berecz, A. 2013. *The politics of early language teaching: Hungarian in the primary schools of the late dual Monarchy*. Budapest: Pasts.
- Blommaert, J. 2006. Language ideology. In K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Elsevier, 510–522.
- Blommaert, J. & J. Dong 2010. *Ethnographic fieldwork: A beginner's guide*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Cavagnoli, S. & F. Nardin 1999. Second Language Acquisition in South Tyrol: Difficulties, Motivations, Expectations. *Multilingua*, 18, 17–45.

- Cenoz, J. & J. Perales 2010. Minority Language Learning in the Administration: Data from the Basque Country. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 18 (4), 261–270.
- De Fina, A. 2009. Narratives in interview: for an interactional approach to narrative genres. *Narrative Inquiry*, 19 (2), 233–258.
- Duff, P. 2009. Indigenous, Minority, and Heritage Language Education in Canada: Policies, Contexts, and Issues. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66 (1), 1–8.
- Duszak, A. 2006. Why 'New' Newspeak?: Axiological Insights into Language Ideologies and Practices in Poland. In C. Mar-Molinero & P. Stevenson (eds.), *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe*. Houndmills: Palgrave, 96–103.
- Gal, S. 2006a. Language, its stakes and its effects. In R. Goodin & T. Charles (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of contextual political analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 376–392.
- Gal, S. 2006b. Migration, Minorities and Multilingualism: Language Ideologies in Europe In C. Mar-Molinero & P. Stevenson (eds.), *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe*. Houndmills: Palgrave, 13–27.
- Gal, S. 2011. Polyglot nationalism: Alternative perspectives on language in 19th century Hungary. *Language Et Société*, 2 (136), 31–54.
- Geertz, C. 1973/2000. *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Giddens, A. 1999. *Runaway world: How globalisation is reshaping our lives*. London: Profile Books.
- Guardado, M. 2014. The Discourses of Heritage Language Development: Engaging Ideologies in Canadian Hispanic Communities. *Heritage Language Journal*, 11 (1), 1–27.
- Heller, M. 2001. Discourse and Interaction. In D. T. Schiffrin & H. E. Hamilton (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 250–264.
- Heller, M. 2008. Doing Ethnography. In L. Wei & M. Moyer (eds.), *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 249–262.
- Heller, M. 2011. *Paths to Post-Nationalism: A Critical Ethnography of Language and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Institutul Național de Statistică (INS) 2011. *Recensământul populației și al locuințelor*. [Retrieved February 18, 2014]. Available at <http://www.recensamantromania.ro/rezultate-2/>
- Jaffe, A. 1999. *Ideologies in action: language politics on Corsica*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jaworska, S. 2009. The German language in Poland: The eternal foe and the wars on words. In J. Carl & P. Stevenson (eds.), *Language, discourse and identity in central europe: The German language in a multilingual space*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 51–73.
- Jyväskylän Kansalaisopisto 2013–2014*. 2013. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän kaupunki.
- Kamusella, T. 2009. *The Politics of Language and Nationalism in Modern Central Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kiss, A. 2012. Hungarian as a Second Language in Oradea/Nagyvárad: Cultural Reflexions and Language Ideologies. In K. Fenyvesi (ed.), *Transition and difference: Hungarian Perspectives On East and Central European Studies*. Budapest: International Association for Hungarian Studies, 279–293.
- Kiss, A. 2013. A magyar mint második nyelv tanításának nehézségei és sikerei Nagyváradon. [The difficulties and successes of teaching Hungarian in Oradea]. In O. Nádor (ed.), *THL2: The Journal of Teaching Hungarian as a Foreign Language*, (1–2), 97–115.
- Kiss, A. in press. Teaching the Romanian neighbours Hungarian: Language ideologies and the Debrecen Summer School. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross Cultural and interlanguage Communication*.
- Kramersch, C. 2009. *The multilingual subject*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Laihonen, P. 2008. Language ideologies in interviews: A conversation analysis approach. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12 (5), 668–693.
- Laihonen, P. 2009. *Language Ideologies in the Romanian Banat: Analysis of Interviews and Academic Writings among the Hungarians and Germans*. Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 119. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Lynch, A. 2003. The Relationship between Second and Heritage Language Acquisition: Notes on Research and Theory Building. *Heritage Language Journal*, 1–18.
- Mar-Molinero C. & P. Stevenson (eds.) 2006. *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe*. Houndmills: Palgrave.

- Martínez-Roldán, C. M. & G. Malavé 2004. Language ideologies mediating literacy and identity in bilingual contexts. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 4 (2), 155–180.
- May, S. 2012. *Language and minority rights: ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language*. New York: Routledge.
- McEwan-Fujita, E. 2010. Ideology, affect, and socialization in language shift and revitalization: The experiences of adults learning Gaelic in the Western Isles of Scotland. *Language in Society*, 39, 27–64.
- Mori, J. 2012. Tale of Two Tales: Locally Produced Accounts and Membership During Research Interviews With a Multilingual Speaker. *The Modern Language Journal*, 96, 489–506.
- Mózes, T. 1997. *Evreii din Oradea* [The Jews from Oradea]. București: Hasefer.
- Nekvapil, J. & T. Sherman 2009. Czech, German and English: Finding Their Place in Multinational Companies in the Czech Republic. In J. Carl, & P. Stevenson (eds.), *Language, Discourse and Identity in Central Europe: The German Language in a Multilingual Space*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 122–146.
- Nekvapil, J. 2000. On non-self-evident relationships between language and ethnicity: How Germans do not speak German, and Czechs do not speak Czech. *Multilingua*, 19 (1-2), 37–54.
- Oh, J. & A. B. Nash 2014. Attitudes and motivations of Adult Spanish Learners: A comparison of Heritage Language Learners and Second Language Learners. *Heritage Language Journal*, 11 (1), 29–44.
- Official Statistics of Finland (OSF) 30.9.2011. *Swedish-speakers' proportion of the population in 1900–2010*. [Retrieved February 18, 2014]. Available at http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/2010/01/vaerak_2010_01_2011-09-30_kuv_001_en.html
- Palviainen, Å. 2010a. The Proficiency in Swedish of Finnish-speaking University Students: Status and Directions for the Future. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, Vol. 4, 1, 3-23. [Retrieved February 2, 2014]. Available at http://apples.jyu.fi/article_files/Articles_2010a_Palviainen.pdf
- Palviainen, Å. 2010b. Språkval och vägval - en valfråga 2011? *Kieli, koulutus ja yhteiskunta*. [Retrieved February 18, 2014]. Available at <http://www.kieliverkosto.fi/article/sprakval-och-vagval-en-valfraga-2011/>
- Palviainen, Å. 2011. *Frivillig svenska? Utbildningsrelaterade konsekvenser*. Magma Finlands svenska tankesmedja. [Retrieved February 2, 2014]. Available at http://www.magma.fi/images/stories/reports/ms1103_frisv.pdf
- Palviainen, Å. 2012. Lärande som diskursnexus: Finska studenters uppfattningar om skoltid, fritid och universitetsstudier som lärokontexter för svenska. *Nordand Nordisk tidskrift för anderspråkforskning*, 7 (1), 7–35.
- Palviainen, Å. 2013a. National identity and a transnational space: the strength of tradition in a time of change. *Sociolinguistica* 27, 1–18.
- Palviainen, Å. 2013b. Att utveckla en Jyväskyläidentitet: Undervisning på svenska i en finskdominerad miljö. In *Kieli, koulutus, ja yhteiskunta*. [Retrieved February 18, 2014]. Available at <http://www.kieliverkosto.fi/article/att-utveckla-en-jyvaskylaidentitet-undervisning-pa-svenska-i-en-finsksdominerad-miljo/>
- Palviainen, Å. & C. Jauhojärvi-Koskelo 2009. Mitt i brytpunkten: Finska universitetsstudenters åsikter om svenskan [In the middle of a crossroads: Finnish university students' views on Swedish]. In L. Collin & S. Haapamäki (eds.), *Svenskan i Finland 11. Föredrag vid elfte sammankomsten för beskrivningen av svenskan i Finland, Åbo den 16–17 maj 2008*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 125–133.
- Pujolar, J. 2007. The future of Catalan: language endangerment and nationalist discourses in Catalonia. In A. Duchene and M. Heller (eds.), *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and Interest in the Defence of Languages*. London: Continuum, 121–148.
- Pujolar, J. & I. Gonzales 2013. Linguistic “mudes” and the de-ethnicization of language choice in Catalonia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16 (2), 138–152.
- Spolsky, B. 2010. Second-Language Learning. In J. A. Fishman and O. García (eds.) *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 172–185.
- Statistics Finland 2015. [Retrieved June 28, 2015]. Available at <http://pxweb2.stat.fi/Dialog/Saveshow.asp>

- ten Have, P. 2004. *Understanding qualitative research and ethnomethodology*. London: Sage Publications.
- The Constitution of Finland* 2000. [Retrieved February 18, 2014]. Available at <http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/1999/en19990731.pdf>
- The Constitution of Romania* 2003. [Retrieved February 18, 2014]. Available at <http://www.cdep.ro/pls/dic/site.page?id=339&par1=1&id1=2>
- Weiss, R. S. & S. A. Bass 2001. Introduction. In R. S. Weiss & S. A. Bass (eds.), *Challenges of the third age: Meaning and purpose in later life*. New York: Oxford University Press, 3–12.
- Wolff, S. 2000 (ed.). *German minorities in Europe: ethnic identity and cultural belonging*. New York: Berghahn.
- Woolard, K. 1998. Introduction: language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language Ideologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3–47.
- Woolard, K. 2013. Is the personal political? Chronotopes and changing stances toward Catalan language and identity. *International of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16 (2), 210–224.
- Woolard, K. & B. Schieffelin 1994. Language ideology. *Annual Reviews Anthropology*, 23, 55–82.
- Wortham, S. 2005. *Learning Identity: The Joint Emergence of Social Identification and Academic Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wortham, S. 2008. The Political Matrix of Linguistic Ideologies. In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics*, London: Wiley–Blackwell Publishing, 83–98.
- Zenker, O. 2014. Linguistic Relativity and Dialectical Idiomatization: Language Ideologies and Second Language Revival of Northern Ireland. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 24 (1), 68–83.

Appendix: Transcription symbols

=	latched to the previous talk
(0.4)	measured pause
(.)	micro-pause less than 0.2 seconds
@	change of voice
well-	cut off of the preceding sound
?	question intonation
,	continuing intonation
.	falling intonation
↑	rising intonation
[]	overlapping talk
word	an utterance in another language than the rest of the interview
(--)	unclear
CAPITALS	stressed volume

Received February 20, 2014
 Revision received October 28, 2014
 Accepted June 17, 2015