

**This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.**

**Author(s):** Szabó, Tamás Péter

**Title:** Reflections on the Schoolscape : Teachers on Linguistic Diversity in Hungary and Finland

**Year:** 2018

**Version:** Published version

**Copyright:** © Szabó & the Editors, 2018.

**Rights:** CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

**Rights url:** <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

**Please cite the original version:**

Szabó, T. P. (2018). Reflections on the Schoolscape : Teachers on Linguistic Diversity in Hungary and Finland. In M. Palander, H. Riionheimo, & V. Koivisto (Eds.), *On the Border of Language and Dialect* (pp. 156-190). Finnish Literature Society, SKS. *Studia Fennica Linguistica*, 21.  
<https://doi.org/10.21435/sflin.21>

# Reflections on the Schoolscape: Teachers on Linguistic Diversity in Hungary and Finland

## *Abstract*

This article<sup>1</sup> focuses on ideologies that pertain to linguistic diversity and multilingualism from a linguistic landscape approach to education. It is to be emphasised that ideologies pertaining to multilingualism and monolingualism have strong systematic resemblances. So-called monolingualist labeling, management, and control over linguistic varieties is something similar to multilingualism-related practices described in Nikula (et al. 2012). For example, dialects are often evaluated positively, but dialect users are generally criticized because they deviate from the so-called standard (cf., Milroy 2001; Kontra 2006).

In order to investigate a wide range of diversity-related ideologies, two communities with different social and historical backgrounds are compared: Hungarians who are considered standard-oriented (e.g., Kontra 2006) and Finns whose ideologies are generally not considered to be so standard-oriented (Laihonen 2010). This study investigates how teachers co-construct language ideologies in conversation with the researcher during co-exploratory walking tours through their school premises.

The results support theory building, and enhance further research on ideologies, e.g., in minority settings, where an adequate management of linguistic diversity and variability is essential for the maintenance of various indigenous languages. Other important fields of application are L1 and L2/L3 education.

1 This research was funded by the European Union's Research Executive Agency under Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship for Career Development within the EU's Seventh Framework Programme for Research (grant nr. 626376) and the Kone Foundation in Finland (grant no. 44-9730). I am grateful to Petteri Laihonen and the anonymous reviewers for their insightful mentoring of earlier drafts.

## *1 Introduction*

Many actors and sources contribute to the complexity of school interaction practices. Students and teachers, family members, peers, administrative personnel, political leaders, as well as textbooks, IT devices, and other objects influence interaction to various extents, through different modalities and media. ‘Diversity’, ‘multilingualism’, and related concepts may refer to what emerges interpersonally, in general, and in education, in particular. But how, in line with what terms and points of reference, do people speak about the heterogeneous and multi-layered sense-making that takes place in education? Examples in this article show different ways of speaking about ‘diversity’ or ‘multilingualism’ in educational research settings.

In order to investigate a wide range of diversity-related ideologies (Silverstein 1979), data sources from two countries with different social and historical backgrounds were built on: Hungary and Finland. In doing so, the point of departure is that Hungarian is generally described as a standard language culture (e.g., Kontra 2006; cf., Milroy 2001), while the current Finnish is often considered less standard-orientated (e.g., Laihonon 2010). As a focal point, the discursive reconstruction of school community members’ linguistic repertoires were selected (e.g., Busch 2015). Concepts such as ‘mother tongue’, ‘foreign language’, ‘normality’, ‘standard’, ‘acceptable’, ‘proper’, ‘formal’, or ‘informal’ emerged in interaction and became distinguished, identified, labelled, and evaluated in relation to other persons and groups. In this data, interactants co-constructed linguistic boundaries – and boundaries between speakers of languages and varieties – while making accounts of linguistic and educational practices they were engaged in. In other words, the analysed discussions did not merely reconstruct persons’ and groups’ repertoires as inventories of codes they possessed; rather, in accordance with Busch’s (2015, 14) definition of repertoire, participants reflected on the ‘synchronic coexistence of different social spaces’ and ‘different levels of time’ while reconstructing their lived experiences. Based on the idea that classroom interaction, socialisation and the material environment of formal teaching are closely connected elements of the same ecosystem (cf., Shohamy and Waksman 2009), teachers’ accounts, which emerged during reflections on the material environment (i.e., the schoolscape; Brown 2012) of the schools in question, were worked with.

Speakers’ perceptions, definitions, and evaluations of languages, varieties and societal groups are discussed in other articles of this volume as well (e.g., Preston, Palander and Riionheimo, Laakso, Koivisto, Kunnas). Most of these authors organize their studies along geographical borders vis-à-vis perceptions of dialects. This article elaborates on a spatial approach to language practices in educational settings, investigating how teachers establish relationships between languages, states, and speakers. The focus is on ways in which they co-construct geographical and political formations while reflecting on school spaces and institutional language policies in conversation with the researcher.

This study is based on fieldwork in eight schools, i.e., the goal was not to make comparisons of teachers’ ideologies in Hungary and Finland, at

a general level. The goal was to show different settings in the reconstruction of relationships between categories that emerged during the interviews. It is asserted in this study that different ways of constructing ideology can be associated with different explicit or hidden policies in education (cf., Shohamy 2006).

This article begins with a brief description of the cultural differences between Hungary and Finland that led the author to the idea of comparing emerging ideologies in these two school systems. Then the visual approach used in data collection and analysis is described in connection with related methodological and theoretical considerations. The subsequent section provides information about the corpus collected, and the research questions formulated. The microanalyses of examples (pictures and interview excerpts) are followed by Discussion and Conclusions in Sections 6 and 7. The conclusion contains proposed ideas for the application of the results in educational practice.

## *2 Hungary and Finland: different approaches*

'Diversity', 'multilingualism', and other concepts appear in metadiscourses (discourses about language; e.g., Kroskrity 2000) in various forms. For example, in policy documents, these can be read as technical terms, accompanied by definitions, evaluations, and descriptions. However, policy documents may also be versatile in their practice of making relations between these terms and others, according to, for example, the purpose or the argumentation of the text. According to Nikula et al. (2010, 2012), 'diversity' and 'multilingualism' are often presented with a celebratory tone in the official documents of language policies in the European Union, but, at the same time, are conceptualised as threats to social cohesion. Further, Blommaert et al. (2012) have claimed that, from the individuals' and communities' point of view, there are many conflicts and difficulties in managing actual multilingual practices.

The idea of comparing ideologies in Hungarian and Finnish educational contexts came from the analysis of various texts. In the following paragraphs, characteristic descriptions of Hungarian and Finnish education culture will be briefly presented. Policy documents and a Eurobarometer survey will be built on while certain contrasts that can serve as a basis of comparison will be presented.

Kontra (2006) argues that Hungarian can be generally described as a standard language culture (Milroy 2001); that is, the so-called 'standard Hungarian' variety together with 'correct orthography' is at the centre of linguistic evaluation. Further, Kontra (2006, 97) argues that in Hungarian contexts, 'intra-lingual discrimination' is part of the metalinguistic traditions and social practices that influence education and lead to linguisticism (e.g., Skutnabb-Kangas 1988). As part of practices linked to 'intra-lingual discrimination', the cult of 'correctness' is intertwined with the notions of 'mother tongue' and the 'native speaker' in Hungary (cf., Doerr 2009; Bonfiglio 2010), and these three are often referred to in metadiscourses

circulating in and around the practice of ‘language cultivation’ (Hung. *nyelvűvelés*; Sándor 2001). Although there are efforts to make ‘standard language ideologies’ visible and explicit in order to deconstruct them (e.g., Kontra 2006, 123), standard-oriented practices still play an important role in education. For example, competitions in orthography and ‘proper speech’ are equally common in elementary, secondary, and higher education (e.g., articles in Bozsik ed. 2005–2007).

In contrast, the role of the so-called ‘standard’ does not seem to be so influential in contemporary Finland. According to Laihonen (2010), the use of a ‘standard’ is expected mainly in writing: spoken language (Fin. *puhekieli*) is accepted in great variety, including urban dialects in teaching as well. Mantila (2010) further argues that destandardisation and counter-normative ideologies have spread throughout Finland in the last few decades.

At the level of education policy documents, both the Hungarian and the Finnish national core curricula contain statements concerning linguistic and cultural diversity. For example, the Hungarian National Core Curriculum (NAT 2012) emphasises the importance of ‘intercultural competence’ in connection with learning ‘foreign languages’, with the stated goal of shaping attitudes that include “the appreciation of cultural diversity and interest in and curiosity about communication across languages and cultures” (translated from Hungarian). However, the document refers only to the cultures of recognised national minorities and ‘the universal culture’ (in singular!). That is, NAT makes a distinction between Hungarian national culture (which includes the cultures of recognised national minorities) and a ‘universal’ culture, and treats them as stable and separate entities. What is lacking in this setting is a dynamic approach that considers contemporary migration trends as influential factors. This approach is present in the Finnish National Core Curriculum (eight years older than the Hungarian one), for example in the statement that “the instruction must also take into account the diversification of Finnish culture through the arrival of people from other cultures” (NCC 2004, 12).

Speakers’ self-assessments of language proficiency also illuminate some differences in discourses on ‘diversity’ and ‘multilingualism’ in the two countries. According to the latest Eurobarometer results (EBS 2012), only 35% of the survey participants in Hungary responded that they “are able to speak at least one foreign language well enough to hold a conversation”, while 75% of the respondents in Finland claimed so. Further, only 13% of respondents in Hungary indicated that they speak at least two languages “well enough to hold a conversation”, while 48% of the participants in Finland answered this statement affirmatively. What seems to be the most relevant in this data set from the point of view of ideology studies is how people portray themselves as speakers (or non-speakers) of various languages. While the majority of respondents in Hungary projected the image of a monolingual person, the majority of participants in Finland constructed a bi- or multilingual self (cf., Leppänen et al. 2011). The fact that Hungary has one official national language while Finland has two (Finnish and Swedish) could also contribute to differences in the reconstruction of ideologies concerning ‘diversity’ and ‘multilingualism’.

In summary: according to the literature, ideologies seem to be more pluralistic in Finland, in general, if we consider that (i) there are two national languages; (ii) variants in spoken Finnish are widely appreciated without stigmatisation in education, and, as Eurobarometer data suggest, (iii) Finnish inhabitants portray themselves as bi- or multilingual rather than as monolinguals.

### 3 *A visual approach: principles and methods*

An approach is proposed in this article that integrates visual semiotics and interaction analysis into the investigation of language ideologies. Some fundamental terms for the study will be defined in the following paragraphs, and the study will be placed in relation to previous ones.

In line with Silverstein's classical formulation (1979, 193), 'ideology' is defined herein as a set of explanations and descriptions that are predominantly made in order to rationalise and/or justify observed phenomena. That is, ideologies are often constructed in discussions on debated issues where the way of presenting and, thus, reconstructing some phenomena or social structures is relevant in evaluation and argumentation. In the consideration of the interpersonal and social context, the present study builds on Potter and Edwards' (2003, 93) discursive psychological views according to which 'mental phenomena' are both constructed and orientated towards in people's practices. It means that the 'borders' and 'categories' analysed may dynamically change in interaction, generally in negotiations between participants. This approach is in accordance with Laihonen's (2008, 668) findings that "interaction shapes and (re)constructs" language ideologies.

This author's previous studies on language ideologies (e.g., Szabó 2012, 2013) have been built on questionnaires, research interviews, and classroom observations, initiating dialogue between etic and emic perspectives on education. However, the combination of these data types still seemed insufficient in the exploration of complexities in education. Semiotically orientated studies on schools (e.g., Cohen 1971; Johnson 1980; Scollon and Wong Scollon 2004; Kress and van Leeuwen 2006; Brown 2012) have highlighted the significance of the material environment in education, and, further, visual methodologies (e.g., Rose 2012) have greatly enhanced the collection of education-related narratives and ideologies.

A brief review of previous research in the following paragraphs will help to explain why and how visual methodologies help ideology studies. Brown (2012, 282) has coined the term *schoolscape* in reference to the school-based material environment where text, sound, images, and artefacts "constitute, reproduce, and transform language ideologies". Her observations are in line with the earlier findings of Cohen (1971) and Johnson (1980), according to whom symbolisations play an important role in formal education. Further, as Scollon and Wong Scollon (2004) and Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) have demonstrated, students and teachers do not merely perceive the semiotic environment they are situated in, but, at the same time, they learn to interpret and reconstruct signs, such as texts and pictures on the wall, or

the spatial organisation of desks. That is, recurring patterns in the display and arrangement of artefacts and furniture in the school space are connected with school practices: for example, the teacher-fronted arrangement of desks can be a sign of the dominance of lectures (e.g., instead of group work), or the overwhelming display of student art work may refer to efforts that promote student creativity (e.g., Szabó 2015; Laihonen and Szabó 2017).

The investigation of the schoolscape has many branches. First, Johnson (1980) recorded and analysed American schoolsapes without engaging in interaction with members of the school community. Similarly, Gorter and Cenoz (2014) built predominantly on their etic perspectives in their quantitative study. Making efforts towards the integration of emic accounts, Brown (2012) conducted research interviews while Dressler (2015) organised a post-hoc focus group discussion of some pictures she had taken during her fieldwork. Khan (2012) incorporated the topic of schoolscape into his multi-sited ethnography of Pakistani schools, using his observations and interviews in analyses. That is, in these three latter studies, community members helped the researchers to illuminate what was hidden or implicit for them (e.g., Shohamy 2006) and, in turn, they could gain insights into the ways researchers perceived and interpreted their working environment.

In accordance with the principles of involving research participants in the interpretation of the research site, I developed the 'tourist guide technique' as a method that enhances education-related discussions through the mobile co-exploration of school spaces. In practice, the 'tourist guide technique' means that I photo-documented the schoolscape while I was guided by a teacher from each school. The teachers were requested to comment on the choice of language and symbols on display as if they were tourist guides and I was a tourist. No list of questions was prepared beforehand, but, reflecting on the teachers' comments, questions were occasionally posed or further details were requested. This setting was easily accepted by the teachers because, in most cases, the tour gave me the very first occasion to enter a school building, and the tours often started at the entrance hall.

In its basic structure, the 'tourist guide technique' shares similarities with other mobile data collection methods, like the 'walking tour methodology' (Garvin 2010), 'narrated walking' (Stroud and Jegels 2014), or child-led 'tours' (Clark 2010), as the researcher and research participants co-explore the space in which their interaction is situated. What distinguishes the 'tourist guide technique' from other methods is the division of roles according to which the researcher acts as a tourist, equipped with a digital camera, who needs guidance for orientation. At the beginning of the tour, it was made explicit that the guide chose what to show and what to skip. Further, the length of the 'tour' was also greatly influenced by the guides. The teachers were asked beforehand, via e-mail, to be available for a tour of about 40–50 minutes, and they were informed, at the same time, that it was possible to deviate from this time frame and take shorter or longer tours. On several occasions, teachers became enthusiastic, explicitly noting that it was inspiring to have the opportunity to act as a 'guide'; in these cases, the tours became longer, a 135-minute tour was the longest. The interviewees were

also physically in control of the voice recorder, thus adding their influence to the implementation of the interview.

The ‘tourist guide technique’ was designed in order to provide an alternative to the basic research interview format (ten Have 2004), positioning the guide as the more agentive participant in the interview; that is, the researcher’s position is not of the ‘conductor’ or ‘interviewer’ in this setting. Although the guides were highly agentive and influenced the recorded interaction greatly, the collected materials still should be analysed as “local collaborative ‘constructions’, rather than purely individual expressions of ‘mind’ ” (ten Have 2004, 76). That is, general statements such as ‘this teacher thinks X’ or ‘that teacher stands for Y ideas’ would be oversimplifying. Rather, the analysis highlights the dynamic nature of the co-construction of ideologies since the interviews were analysed as both data and topic (ten Have 2004), emphasising that the recorded utterances give evidence of both co-constructed language ideologies and interactional structures (Laihonen 2008). In order to illuminate these structures, ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis was applied to the data interpretation.

#### *4 Data and research questions*

The analysis is built on data from ongoing fieldwork in elementary and secondary schools in Hungary and Finland. This study includes approx. 2,100 pictures and more than 10 hours of voice recorded interviews from 8 schools. This data was collected in 2013 and 2014. The language of the interviews was Hungarian in Hungary, and English and partly Finnish in Finland. Informed consent was requested from and given by all the participants. Personal details such as names or addresses were altered in the transcription, and pseudonyms were used in the excerpts and the analyses. The initial ‘T’ in the excerpts refers to me, the researcher.

This article analyses how metadiscourses that reflect on the schoolscape may contribute to the co- or de-construction of notions about linguistic boundaries and categories. Micro-analyses provide examples of the complexity of meaning-making in interaction. Analyses are organised around the following questions:

1. What reconstructions of categories and boundaries emerge in meta-discourses on language teaching and language use in the school? Are there identifiable foci in the accounts?
2. How does the interactional setting contribute to the emergence of ideologies in the interviews?

#### *5 Persons and communities with diverse repertoires: different approaches in the interviews*

This section presents analyses that are based on the simultaneous investigation of the photographs and the audio recordings. Excerpts have been chosen



that demonstrate contrasts between the co-construction of ideologies in different contexts.

The Hungarian examples come from a secondary school in Hungary. This choice was motivated by several considerations. First, the excerpts show the competitive and assessment-centred characteristics of Hungarian education, in general, and foreign language education, in particular (cf., Csapó et al. 2009; Nahalka 2011). Second, this interview was recorded with a teacher of English and Hungarian; that is, the guide was a local language expert who was experienced both in ‘mother tongue’ and ‘foreign language’ education. Finally, Exc. 2 shows the dynamics of ideology construction in a condensed way; that is, many different aspects of language teaching are discussed within a short time.

Two interviews from Finnish primary schools were selected. The excerpts show how the topic of ‘international students’ was discussed. Although students “who have another mother tongue than Hungarian” (Gabriella, teacher in Exc. 1–2) were mentioned in Hungary, as well, it was only in Finland that their role and position in the school community were discussed in detail. Further, one of the Finnish schools (see Exc. 4) had an English CLIL program (Content-and-Language Integrated Learning; Dalton-Puffer 2011) and an English-medium program so the inclusion of this school in the analysis can help to better understand institutional multilingualism.

Before the detailed analysis, it is important to emphasise that the interview interaction reflected on the very schoolscape that was co-explored. The design of the space and the use of the available surfaces were quite different in the example schools. For example, in the Hungarian school (Exc. 1–2), there were many certificates on display, announcing student success at local and nation-wide competitions in various school subjects, while such signs were absent from the visited Finnish schools (Exc. 3–4). These differences in the available and perceived material environment meant that, for example, ‘competition’ or ‘good grades and scores’ were not discussed in Finland in as much detail as in Hungary. At the same time, for example, the display of student art work was common to all of the schools, so it was one of the central topics of each interview.

Further differences in the discussions could be due to the fact that I was socialised in the Hungarian school system and speak Hungarian as a first language, while in Finland, I was a newcomer at the time of recording the interviews with limited proficiency in Finnish (that is why we chose to converse in English). That is, while I was mainly considered an ‘expert’ in Hungary, I was often addressed as a ‘novice’ in Finland. However, it was not only the teachers who addressed me differently: it was also the interpretation of my contribution in general that differed significantly. For example, if I asked a question in connection with any sign in Finland, it was generally taken as a simple request for information because I was not expected to understand the sign. Conversely, if I asked about the significance of a sign in Hungary, it was sometimes interpreted as a challenge on my behalf.



Figure 1. Flags of Italy, the United Kingdom, and Germany in a Hungarian classroom.

### 5.1 HUNGARY

The Hungarian example shows how the co-construction of strict distinction between ‘mother tongue’ and ‘foreign language’ as well as the focus on ‘objectives’ influence the emergence of language ideologies in an interview. These notions are regularly intertwined with the ideal monolingual speaker of the ethnolinguistic tradition (Blommaert et al. 2012): the ‘native speaker’ (Doerr 2009; Bonfiglio 2010). ‘Natives’ are generally linked to their countries (of origin); or, more precisely, it is languages and not speakers, personally, that are linked to certain states where those languages are spoken in their ‘proper’ way (cf., Gal 2007). As a consequence, visual references to nation states, such as flags (cf., Halonen et al. 2015), were common in the Hungarian school that was visited. For example, Figure 1 shows a scene from a classroom.

When entering the classroom depicted in Figure 1, Gabriella, the teacher guide, started to comment on it as follows (Jeffersonian [2004] notation is used):

#### (1) Hungary, secondary school. “Obvious”

- 1 G: ez szin [tén egy]  
it's al [so a ]
- 2 T: [igen ]  
[yes ]
- 3 G: nyelvi előkészítő terem,=  
language preparatory class, =
- 4 T: =ühm  
=mhm

- 5 G: gondolom,  
I guess,  
6 (.82)  
7 ((nevet)) egyértelmű, hogy [milyen]  
((laughs)) it's obvious [what ]  
8 T: [hát én]  
[yeah I]  
9 G: nyelveket tanulnak  
languages they learn  
10 T: ez látszik, azt hiszem, igen, hogy ez egy  
it looks so, I think, yes, that it's a  
11 ((nevet)) előkészítő terem  
((laughs)) preparatory class

In this particular school, 'language preparatory' class means that students learn foreign languages intensively when they start their secondary studies (according to the teacher, they have 12 lessons of the first foreign language, and six of the second foreign language per week). In this excerpt, both the teacher and I constructed the ideology that languages are linked to (linguistically homogeneous) nation states: e.g., "it's obvious [what] languages they learn" (lines 7, 9). That is, on Gabriella's initiative, it was implied that the countries indexed by the flags could be associated with one language each – in this case, with English, German, and Italian. In line with this implication, the teacher and I did not start, for example, to explicate the languages in question, nor to discuss where these languages are spoken outside the indexed countries, nor mention more languages other than English, German, and Italian that are spoken in those countries. Thus, these languages were linked to states (i.e., geographical and political formations).

Differentiating between languages and varieties, that is, labelling and evaluating them, continued later in the same interview. After entering the classroom designated for the purposes of teaching English, I made a comparison between that very room and another I had visited in another school. I recalled my memories that in the other school, only the map of the UK was on display, while in the very room in which we both were standing, the UK map was accompanied by maps and tableaux of the US, Canada, New Zealand, and other countries that are often associated with 'inner circle' Englishes (Kachru 2008). When asked whether the display of these artefacts referred to a teaching practice that is aware of the differences between various Englishes around the globe, Gabriella responded that the textbooks they used sometimes provided information on some differences between the so-called British and American English, and she added that the students learnt about 'English-speaking countries' within the framework of a course called 'English civilisation.' That is, from the implication that geographical maps depicting states may refer to varieties of a language (which, again, establishes a relationship between state and language), we arrived at the formal curriculum of the preparatory class, which includes cultural studies. I then asked whether the students were aware of English varieties, but, without giving space for a reply at that point, I raised another question as follows. (I present the full excerpt in four parts in order to make the analysis easier to follow):

## (2a) Hungary, secondary school. "American English picked up"

- 1 T: és egyébként felfigyelnek ezekre a: a diákok,  
and, by the way, are the: the students aware of these  
2 hogy mondjuk (- -)  
that, let's say,  
3 (.38)  
4 vagy egyáltalán mi mi mondjuk a központi nyelvváltozat?  
or, actually, what what is, let's say, the central variety?  
5 hogy itt is a: (.) ez a BBC English, vagy inkább  
that here it's the: (.) this BBC English, too, or rather  
6 (.47)  
7 valamiféle=  
something=  
8 G: =már az iskolában?  
=you mean, in the school?  
9 T: igen, hogy [a: a tanításban ]  
yes, that in [the: the teaching ]  
10 G: [hát igen, a Bri]tish Englisht  
[well, yes, it's Bri]tish English  
11 T: ühm  
mhm  
12 G: ö: szoktuk tanítani, .hh mivel  
e:r what we teach, .hh cause  
13 ugye hát az Oxford University Press az maxi [máli]san  
you see, well, Oxford University Press maxi [mal ]ly  
14 T: [ühm ]  
[mhm ]  
15 (.25)  
16 G: teret hódított, azt gondolom, a leg[több isko]lában,  
gained ground, I think, in the majo[rity of sch]ools,  
17 T: [ühm ühm ]  
[mhm mhm ]  
18 G: .hh és hát ők azt azt közvetítik  
.hh and, well, it's what they distribute  
19 T: ühm ühm  
mhm mhm  
20 G: ö: és azt gondolom egyébként, hogy hogy mi tanárok is  
and, by the way, I think that that we teachers also  
21 az:zal találkoztunk leginkább [akár]  
encountered that the most [even]  
22 T: [ühm ]  
[mhm ]  
23 G: az egyetemen  
at the university  
24 T: ühm  
mhm  
25 (.79)  
26 G: tehát nagyon-nagyon  
so very-very  
27 (.35)  
28 nekem volt egy skót ö: tanárom például az egyetemen,  
I had a Scottish e:r teacher, for example, at the university  
29 .hh de:: (.) nem jellemző.  
.hh but:: (.) it's not usual  
30 T: ühm  
mhm

- 31 (.5)  
32 G: amerikaiak elvétve itt-ott. az amerikaiit (.) amerikai  
some Americans here and there. but the American (.) American  
33 angolt viszont a gyerekek  
English is picked up  
34 (.4)  
35 n- nagyon gyorsan  
v- very quickly  
36 T: ühm  
mhm  
37 G: fölszedik magukra, hiszen  
by the children, because  
38 T: >ühm ühm<  
>mhm mhm<  
39 G: ha (.) ha: valaki veszi a fáradságot, hogy (.) angol  
if (.) if: somebody makes the effort to (.) watch a film  
40 nyelven nézzen filmet [vagy]  
in English language [or ]  
41 T: [ühm ]  
[mhm ]  
42 G: z- hallgasson zenét, akkor mindenképpen=  
m- listen to music, then definitely=  
43 T: =igen=  
=yes=  
44 G: =az amerikaival fog találkozni.  
=s/he will encounter American.

In this excerpt, a complex set of categories was established in interaction. Talking about languages and varieties in connection with foreign language teaching, it was possible to appoint some coordinates according to which we positioned our practices and evaluations. First, I did not finish the initial question about the students' perceptions of language varieties (lines 1–2; consider the pause before repair in line 3); rather, I addressed the question of a so-called 'central variety' of English. By doing so, I implied that this latter topic was more relevant or important at this point of our discussion, and, further, that a 'central variety' might or should exist. I also referred to a candidate 'central variety', namely, 'BBC English' – using the name of the broadcasting company as an index of the UK. I did not use the word 'standard', but the term 'central variety', which can be associated with 'standard' as it also refers to a variety that has a distinguished position according to which language use can be evaluated. How I prefaced the term ("this BBC English", line 5) shows that I used it as a pre-set category that is presupposedly known by Gabriella. After negotiating that my question concerned the school context (lines 8–9), Gabriella said that it was 'British English' that she taught (relabelling the term, but keeping the reference to the same state). Gabriella justified this preference with two arguments. First, according to her, it is in line with the textbook publisher's influence on teaching practices because of its economic position in the Hungarian market (lines 13–14). Second, she linked the hegemony of 'British English' to her personal teacher training experience when she presented herself as a typical case (see "we teachers also encountered..." in lines 20–21). She

added that her university teachers, too, mostly used what she called ‘British English’, with only a few exceptions (lines 20–32).

It is noteworthy that the analysed interaction emerged from a note on artefacts that referred to countries, and that the labelling of Englishes was predominantly based on indexes that pointed to countries (mainly to the UK and the US). Beyond the name of nations (British, American), the countries or regions of origin (in the case of university teachers), brands like the name of a broadcasting company (BBC) and a publishing house (Oxford University Press) can all be associated with countries. However, the mention of the latter two brands might also be associated with media contexts and global trends in content production and consumption. This ‘media’ line was taken further in the continuation of Gabriella’s account. In line 32, she uttered the word ‘American’ three times, first in connection with university teachers, but in the second utterance, she switched back to my initial question in line 1 (“are the: the students aware of...”) and reflected on the students’ informal English learning habits. She said that students ‘quickly pick up’ (lines 35–37) ‘American English’. This description implies that students learn ‘American English’ features in an effortless manner since media content is dominantly produced in that very variety (lines 42–44). According to Gabriella, the students needed extra effort to read or listen to English (lines 39–42).

With Gabriella, we labelled English varieties and distinguished some contexts that may influence language use (teacher training, classroom teaching, and media consumption – both in and out of school). What I initiated at this point was a comparison between the English the students ‘pick up easily’ and the English they learn formally in lessons. With my question in line 45, I strengthened the dichotomy between ‘school English’ and ‘informal English’:

(2b) Hungary, secondary school. “I’m lovin’ it”

- 45 T: >igen, és mondjuk van, amikor ez órán így< fel;merül,  
>yes, and let’s say does it happen that it ↑raises< in class  
46 hogy (ezt hallottam egy filmben), hogy  
that (I heard this in a film), that  
47 (.79)  
48 [dalba máshogy mondják ]  
[they say it differently in a song ]  
49 G: [ó persze, persze, ez ez ] folyamatos harc, tehát=  
[oh of course, of course, it’s it’s] a constant fight, so=  
50 T: =aha  
=aha  
51 G: a a legjobb ez az I’m lovin’ it, az a kedvencem,  
the the best is this I’m lovin’ it, that’s my favorite,  
52 T: ((nevet)) hahhahahaha  
((laughs)) hahhahahaha  
53 G: ott ugye megtanítom a gyerekeknek, hogy oké, love,  
there, y’know, I teach the children that OK, love,  
54 nincsen inges alakja,  
it has no -ing form,  
55 T: ((nevet)) hahaha  
((laughs)) hahaha

- 56 G: és akkor de, Tanárnő, hát a re- reklámban (.) hát, mondom  
and then, but Miss, wait, in the a- ads (.) well, I say,  
57 T: ((nevet)) haha  
(laughs) haha  
58 G: költői szabadság.  
poetic licence.  
59 T: ((nevet)) haha [és akkor ]  
(laughs) haha [and then ]  
60 G: [mással nem] nem tudok ((nevet))  
[I can't ] defend with ((laughs))  
61 védekezni.  
anything else.

In the form of a polar question, I initiated an iterative narrative (line 45: “does it happen?”; cf., Baynham 2011); that is, I asked Gabriella to say whether or not it happened regularly that her students contrasted the English they had learnt in a lesson and what they had encountered in the media. I also incorporated voicing (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998, 225–228) into my question, mimicking an imagined student voice (line 46: “I heard this in a film”, line 48: “they say it differently in a song”). Through voicing, I provided examples of potential contexts other than ‘school English’, recycling Gabriella’s previous references to cinema and music (lines 39–42). Gabriella recalled that in her practice, such cases were natural (“of course, of course” in line 49), and, further, she re-established the relationship between these varieties. What I identified as ‘difference’ (“they say it differently”; line 48) became a constitutive element, a counterpoint in a ‘constant fight’ (line 49) in Gabriella’s interpretation. This war metaphor interprets American English as offensive, and, together with the verb choice in line 60 (“defend”), strengthens the opposition of competing Englishes. Or, rather, the opposition of competing groups – students and teachers – who make their stances through debates on language use. With an example (“I’m lovin’ it”, line 51), Gabriella illustrated how English norms were usually negotiated in her lessons. She provided a short narrative (lines 51–58) in which she first voiced herself in her teacher position in a context where she gives grammatical explanations (“OK, love, it has no -ing form”; lines 53–54). She quoted an exclusive formulation of a rule from herself, claiming that the described case is the only possible and, thus, correct, rejecting any alternative usages. Next, Gabriella voiced a student who challenged the claimed general validity of the rule she had taught (“but Miss, wait, in the a- ads”; line 56 – the ads’ refer to the McDonald’s slogan [“I’m lovin’ it”] that was widely advertised globally as well as locally, close to the research site). Gabriella finished the short narrative with self-voicing (“well, I say, poetic licence”; lines 56 and 58), claiming that, as a reaction to the opponent student’s claims, she did not reformulate the exclusive rule but treated the student’s example as an exceptional case. The term “poetic licence” is associated with restrictions (certain persons: poets, or genres: poetic works) that make some linguistic forms acceptable in certain circumstances, while the general validity of the basic rule (here, “love has no -ing form”) still applies. As Gabriella recalled (lines 60–61) she could not make any other counter-argument. During

Gabriella's account, from the point where she mentioned "I'm lovin' it", I accompanied her narrative with laughter. This action can be interpreted as a display of sympathy on my part; that is, at this point, I did not challenge Gabriella's arguments. I challenged them later, as demonstrated in Exc. (2c).

In the interviews, either in Hungary or Finland, discussions about English varieties dominantly remained at the level of general terms and labels, lacking examples or references to empirical observations. Accordingly, in this interview, the example in (2b) was the only case in which a linguistic form illuminated differences between the established categories, "I'm lovin' it" being interpretable as both 'American' and 'informal' English. In the further course of the interview, we turned back to general terms while continuing our work with positioning and categorisation.

(2c) Hungary, secondary school. "That's how it should be"

- 62 T: ((nevet)) hahah (.) egyébként szükségesnek tartod, hogy  
 ((laughs)) hahah (.) by the way, do you find it necessary  
 63 ezt így meg- (.) védj úgymond a a a:: brit  
 that you (.) defend it, so to speak, the the the:: British  
 64 angolt, hogy  
 English, that  
 65 (.79)
- 66 G: nem önmagában azt, hogy a brit angolt és nem=  
not in itself that that the British English and not=  
 67 T: =ühm=  
 =mhm=  
 68 G: =nem azért, mert nekem ez ö::  
 =not cause cause for me it's e::r  
 69 (.65)
- 70 lelki szükség[tem ]  
 my spiritual [need]
- 71 T: [aha ]  
 [aha ]
- 72 G: vagy ilyesmi, hanem azért, mert a mindenféle vizsgákon  
 or something like this, but because they expect this  
 73 ezt kérik tőlük.  
 from them at all kinds of exams.
- 74 T: ühm ühm  
 mhm mhm
- 75 G: ö: és hogyha:  
 e:r and if:  
 76 (.43)
- 77 arra akarom felkészíteni, hogy neki, és sajnos ez a  
 I want them to be prepared to, and unfortunately it's the  
 78 helyzet, hogy nem arra készítem fel, hogy  
 case that I don't prepare them to {the case} that  
 79 T: ühm  
 mhm
- 80 G: hogyha majd kiköltözik, akkor ö tudjon kommunikálni,  
 if s/he moves abroad then er s/he should be able to communicate,  
 81 T: ühm  
 mhm
- 82 G: hanem arra, hogy le tudjon érettségizni és esetleg  
 but rather that s/he could pass the matriculation exam or





tasks was to prepare the students for conforming to the expectations of testing authorities (“if: I want them to be prepared to...”; lines 75–83).

Gabriella elaborated on the implicit category of ‘exam English’ that differs from ‘school English’ in the sense that it is expected to be used only in exam situations. Stressing that she worked under pressure, she added that it was “unfortunate” (line 77) that her work focused on training the students to pass the exams rather than to communicate efficiently in real-life situations. Interestingly, in the context of establishing functional-situational categories like ‘school’ or ‘exam English’, she again reconstructed the ideology that ‘foreign languages are spoken abroad’: when she included a context in which English should be used in communication functionally, she mentioned “moving abroad” (line 80). That is, at this point the purpose of teaching English was not linked to the informal, actual everyday English use of the students. Rather, the use of English was future-orientated: to the moment when the students must pass exams (i.e., achieve ‘objectives’) or when they move to live abroad (as if English was not that relevant in Hungarian contexts).

In contrast with the language use of those who hold a certificate or live abroad, the students’ actual, everyday English use appeared to be non-acceptable in the excerpt. Earlier, ‘American’ or ‘informal’ English was also labelled as problematic (consider the restrictions of “poetic licence” in line 58), but at this point, in relation to ‘exam English’, Gabriella voices a stronger opposition (e.g., “and then I always note...”; lines 96–101) that nothing but one variant is acceptable (“that’s how it should be at the exam”; line 101). In line with the general practice, here she did not mention concrete examples either. What she did when making a contrast is pronominalisation (“this way” and “that way” in line 99).

To justify her preferences, Gabriella further emphasised the importance of her task as a pre-exam trainer in a side sequence (lines 83–91) in which she presented (unfavourable) statistics of their students who pass the state language exam. In Hungary, besides the matriculation exams, state language exam certificates are very important when applying to or graduating from a university, or when applying for a job. That is why a high percentage of students who hold a state language exam qualification make a secondary school very attractive in the highly selective Hungarian educational system. In this context, Gabriella joined widespread discourses circulating in the competitive Hungarian educational culture according to which the improvement of test results and the increasing number of Hungarian state language exam certificates are claimed to be priorities in foreign language education (e.g., Gál 2015).

Although an implicit ‘proper English’ category had already emerged in the previous excerpt (e.g., “that’s how it should be at the exam”; line 101), next I initiated discussion about the relationship between ‘exam English’ and ‘proper English’. Interestingly, the reconstruction of interplay between ‘school English’, ‘exam English’ and ‘proper English’ emerged in the course of the conversation:

(2d) Hungary, secondary school. “Scores”

- 102 T: >ühm ühm< (.) igen. és hogyha valaki dolgozatban leír egy  
>mhm mhm< (.) yes. and if somebody writes such a form in  
103 ö ilyen alakot, akkor azt  
a test, then that  
104 (1.65)  
105 G: el [vileg hogyha]  
in [theory if ]  
106 T: [ ( - - - ) ]  
107 G: hogyha az érettségi: javítási szempontjait  
if I follow the principles of correcting the  
108 veszem figyelembe, akkor nem szabad elfogadnom.  
matriculation examination, I shouldn't accept that.  
109 T: ühm ühm  
mhm mhm  
110 G: én a dolgozatban alá szoktam húzni, el szoktam  
I usually underline that in the test, I accept that  
111 fogadni és oda szoktam írni, hogy .hh de ugye tudod,  
and I comment that .hh don't you know that  
112 hogy egy vizsgaszituáció[ban ez ]  
in an examination situa[tion this]  
113 T: [aha ]  
[aha ]  
114 G: nem érne pontot?  
wouldn't score a point?  
115 T: >ühm ühm< igen, igen.  
>mhm mhm< yes, yes.  
116 G: és akkor általában nem olvassák el a megjegyzéseimet,  
and then they usually don't read my comments,  
117 [tehát fogalma ]  
[so s/he has no]  
118 T: [((nevet)) ]  
[((laughs)) ]  
119 G: sincs róla, hogy mi volt az üzenet mellé, csak azt érzékelté,  
idea what the comment was, what s/he perceived is that  
120 hogy hát az úgy jó volt, mert kapott rá pontot.  
it was good as it was because s/he got the mark.  
121 T: aha, aha, aha.  
aha, aha, aha.

In my question, I did not mention concrete examples either; I followed Gabriella in keeping the construction of dichotomies at a general, abstract level. Thus, I initiated an iterative narrative on what happens in a case when “such a form” (line 102) is used in a test. It is clear from Gabriella’s narrative that she interpreted “such a form” as ‘unacceptable’. First, she referred to the “principles of correcting the matriculation examination”, according to which – as Gabriella claimed – certain variants cannot be accepted (lines 105–108). Starting with “in theory” (line 105), she implied that something else can happen ‘in practice’. Accordingly, as she narrated, she regularly differentiated between ‘school English’ and ‘exam English’ for the students in the form of explicit side notes. She voiced one of her potential side notes claiming that the evaluation of the answers in the lesson and the (matriculation and

state) exams may differ (lines 110–114). In this part of Gabriella’s account, earning a point (line 114) implied ‘proper’ language use. This equation was explicated in a comment in which she explained that it was not easy for her to make the students aware of the differences between ‘school English’ and ‘exam English’, because the students often ignored her side notes. According to Gabriella’s critique, earning a point simply meant to the students that their performance “was good as it was” (line 120).

Table 1 summarises the categories and the contexts that were co-constructed in Excerpt 2.

Table 1. Categories and connections in Excerpt 2

Labels in the excerpts	‘central variety’ ‘BBC English’ ‘British English’	‘American English’
Labels/descriptions in the analysis	school English exam English proper English	informal English counter-English (cf., ‘fight’) unacceptable English
Media associated	textbook	films songs
Brands associated	BBC Oxford University Press	McDonald’s
Users associated	teacher examiner	student
Locations associated	university (teacher training)	out of school (home)
	classroom foreign countries (‘abroad’)	

As Table 1 shows, a dichotomy of two opposed, more or less acceptable Englishes was reconstructed in different contexts. These Englishes were primarily labelled in accordance with references to two countries, the UK and the US. However, this localisation appeared at the level of general terms. In narratives on actual situations, global brands (such as Oxford University Press and McDonald’s), societal roles (teacher, examiner, and student) and different physical locations were mentioned. University and out-of-school locations were associated with the dominance of ‘British’ and ‘American’ English, respectively, while both classroom and foreign countries were given a special role in the contextualisation of English usage. The classroom was reconstructed as an arena where competing Englishes are used and negotiated in regard to their acceptability both in the form of personal and mediated interaction (conversation and tests). Further, the classroom, in general, and as a location for exams, in particular, was opposed to (unnamed) foreign countries where a great diversity of Englishes can be found. That is, classroom negotiations on correctness were reconstructed as ‘school problems’, in relation to test scores. Out-of-school English use and the students’ linguistic needs were mentioned only peripherally or with



*Figure 2. Classroom scene from Finland.*

negative evaluation. The appreciation of these two latter contexts appeared in the Finnish interviews analysed in the next subsection.

## 5.2 FINLAND

The following two excerpts come from Finnish elementary schools that are located in an officially monolingual Finnish-speaking municipality. The following examples are intended to demonstrate that making a distinction between ‘mother tongue’ and ‘foreign language(s)’ in parallel with keeping the focus on students’ activities result in a significantly different construction of linguistic boundaries and categories than in the Hungarian example.

The first excerpt is from a tour led by Juho, the principal of an elementary school. During the tour, we spent time in a third-grader classroom, co-interpreting what was visible there. For example, we tried to make sense of the numerous references to the sea. As Figure 2 illustrates, there were fishing nets, paintings of sea scenes (e.g., sailboats on the sea), and models of lighthouses (see one in the table in Figure 2) on display.

At one point Eeva, the class teacher entered the room. Juho, taking the role of an interviewer, asked Eeva about the purpose of sea references. Eeva answered that currently the students were learning about the sea in an integrated way: for example, they dealt with this topic in geography and also in religious studies (e.g., symbolic lighthouse references in the Bible). Juho thanked Eeva, thus initiating the closure of the sequence, but Eeva continued and switched to the topic of English in a self-initiated way, as follows in Exc. (3a).

## (3a) Finland, elementary school. “That’s the point”

1 E: we have that English s- er  
 2 (.98)  
 3 er theme also here (.) because I have many (.) children  
 4 from (.) who have English (they) other language  
 5 J: [yeah, yeah I told]  
 6 E: [(there was) so ] that’s the point we have the:se

The “English theme” was manifested in different ways. Among others, there were white cards attached to or placed next to objects, with their English names. For example, there was a sign that read “a clock” next to the clock in Figure 2. Further, there were cards that showed the name of the day, or a chart with English colour names. Pointing to these signs, Eeva named another thematic visual program in the classroom, besides the ‘sea’. Eeva justified the presence of English with the composition of the class, claiming that many students “have English” as their “other language” (lines 3–4). First, she started to describe the students by localising their places of origin (“children from”; lines 3–4), but, then, through self-initiated self-repair (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977), she switched to a possessive grammatical structure that implies that, according to Eeva, the students in question have a command of English, so that they understand the words on display. Eeva also claimed that the presence of English words was to the advantage of these children (“that’s the point” line 6). Here, Juho negotiated with Eeva on how much detail was needed; that is, they both acted as my guides, and they elaborated on their roles in this situation (lines 5–6). In overlapping speech, Eeva repaired herself in line 6, transforming a candidate detailing (“there was”) to a summarising statement.

What followed later was Eeva’s account of the composition of the class (lines 7–22, not included in the excerpts). According to Eeva, there were students who spoke Spanish, Swedish, German, and Russian as their first languages. After providing these details, she continued that this school introduced English in first grade; that is, two years earlier than the norm in Finland. It is this early commencement of English teaching that she called useful in the following excerpt:

## (3b) Finland, elementary school. “I’m including here”

23 E: and it’s it’s helping  
 24 (.52)  
 25 J: yeah=  
 26 T: =yeah [yeah]  
 27 E: [beca]use it’s not only in third grade when it’s  
 28 starting  
 29 T: yeah  
 30 (.34)  
 31 E: [so ]  
 32 T: [it’s ] a nice introduction[then]  
 33 E: [yeah] and so and so those

34 (.53)  
35 those children  
36 (.41)  
37 who have  
38 (1.25)  
39 e::r  
40 (.48)  
41 both language in home,  
42 (.36)  
43 Finnish and English  
44 (.3)  
45 T: [yeah ]  
46 E: [or some ]  
47 (.78)  
48 children they have the whole day >they are only< speak  
49 in English (at) home=  
50 T: =[yeah ]  
51 J: =[mhm ]  
52 E: so it's  
53 (.33)  
54 I have noticed that it's  
55 (.58)  
56 when we are s- using English more than normally  
57 T: yeah  
58 (.51)  
59 E: they feel that I'm inclu:ding here  
60 T: yeah [yeah] yeah  
61 J: [mhm ]  
62 E: it's it's my place  
63 J: yeah  
64 E: and it's normal to speak English

Eeva evaluated early English teaching as beneficial (“it’s helping”; line 23), arguing that it enhanced the integration of those students who speak English in out-of-school contexts, for example at home: she portrayed these students as bi- or multilinguals (e.g., lines 41–43 or 48–49). According to her, creating and maintaining a multilingual classroom environment can enhance the inclusion of multilingual students. In her argumentation, she voiced a student (“I’m including here it’s my place and it’s normal to speak English”; lines 59, 62, 64) in support of the described practice. As Hutchby and Wooffitt write (1998, 226), voicing “can be used in a number of ways to warrant the factual status of claims and undermine the possibility of skeptical responses”. The teacher further emphasised that the use of English was natural, and that it was part of the classroom interaction routine (line 64).

Eeva’s arguments can be better understood if what she later says in other parts of the interview is taken into consideration. In line 56, “using English more than normally” referred to situations where English was used in other contexts than the English lesson (such cases in Hungarian schools were not mentioned). Eeva also mentioned (not included in the excerpt) that she sometimes asked the students in any kind of lesson to name something in English, or to answer a question in English. Further, it was not only English that was promoted through her practices. Eeva told me that she sometimes

asked questions or counted in Spanish, German, or other languages, or asked the students to provide translations in their first language (e.g., she pointed to a helmet and asked a Spanish-speaking student, “what is this called in Spanish?”). She also recalled cases when she asked a Swedish-speaking student about Swedish. According to her, this action prepared the students’ for Swedish studies and brought Swedish, the second national language, closer to them. Eeva also referred to the dynamically changing schoolscape, revealing that previously German or Spanish words were also on display, for example, the names of the days were on the blackboard for a period of time. What Eeva strongly emphasised was the socialising and integrating function of English as a *lingua franca* (“I’m including here” line 59). The inclusion of the other languages (e.g., German, Russian, Swedish, and Spanish) served similar integratory goals according to Eeva (implied in accounts that are not included in the excerpt).

It is noteworthy that the ideologies on the beneficial impact of multi-lingual practices were co-constructed with the continuous support of Juho and I. With continuers (e.g., “yeah” in lines 25–26, 29, 45, 50, 57, 60) or explicit positive evaluations (e.g., “it’s a nice introduction then” in line 32), we encouraged Eeva to continue and elaborate on further details.

Eeva’s account of her own practice can be associated with integration, but she did not use this term in the excerpt (see, e.g., “it’s helping”, “I’m including here” instead; lines 23, 59). Integration was mentioned in explicit terms in another Finnish elementary school where Maija guided me through the building. This tour was started as a standard research interview: we sat around a table and I conducted the interview according to pre-set questions. At the point we agreed that the pre-set questions had been answered, Maija offered to answer other, spontaneously emerging questions. I proposed “a short walk in the corridors” saying that “I very liked” the ‘decorations on the wall’ (I had visited lessons earlier, so I was familiar with the corridor). Maija agreed and started to guide me immediately. Initially I pointed to a board where some student artwork was posted.

(4a) Finland, elementary school. “You can see some English”

1 T: er  
 2 (.31)  
 3 T: these things ((door shut)) for example?  
 4 M: yes there are some handicrafts work=  
 5 T: =aha  
 6 (1.27)  
 7 M: and then (.) usually we have the handicrafts work here and=  
 8 T: ((chuckles)) =yeah yeah yeah  
 9 M: then it seems that there’s a  
 10 (.57)  
 11 sweets  
 12 (.32)  
 13 store a [candy store]  
 14 T: [<yeah>] (.) yeah yeah yeah ((chuckles))  
 15 M: and then here you can see some English  
 16 (.24)







Figure 3. “Good table manners” board in English in a Finnish school.

first called the latter group “normal” (line 30–31) probably because, as she told me in other parts of the interview, CLIL students are predominantly first language speakers of Finnish, while the English speaking classes were intended mainly for immigrant children with a good command of English. That is, speakers of Finnish were established as the unmarked or default group in the reconstruction of school multilingualism. Generally, Maija evaluated the assumed integrational efforts positively (“it’s very nice way” line 22). It is noteworthy that her continuous positive adjectives could be indirectly recycled from my proposal for a “short walk” (“I very much liked these decorations”; not included in the excerpt) and in connection with my status as a foreign visitor.

Further, Maija guided me to the doors of the English speaking classes:

(4b) Finland, elementary school. “They can come and read”

43 M: =and here (.) for instance here we have the two  
 44 (.3)  
 45 er English speaking classes here we have=  
 46 T: =aha=  
 47 M: =from one to six (.) and here’s from (.) e:r three to four.  
 48 (.55)  
 49 T: aha  
 50 (.73)  
 51 M: and as you can see if you t- want to take a closer (.) picture  
 52 [here]  
 53 T: [yeah] yeah

54 M: so you you can see that.  
55 (.37)  
56 T: aha, yeah yeah the=  
57 M: =there are [the]  
58 T: [the] introductions and [er ]  
59 M: [pic]tures and  
60 (.31)  
61 T: yeah=  
62 M: =things like that  
63 (1.19)  
64 T: so [( - - - )]  
65 M: [so this is quite] nice so that the  
66 (.27)  
67 the other  
68 (.32)  
69 the the [kind of] the (.) normal classes where they  
70 T: [aha aha ] [ah hah ]  
71 M: have the clil teaching=  
72 T: =aha  
73 M: .hh they can come and rea:d  
74 (.37)  
75 [these sto:]ries so that [I'm sure] that they can they  
can  
76 T: [aha aha ] [ah hah ]  
77 M: understand something that=  
78 T: =(chuckles) hah hah hah [hah]  
79 M: [is ] being said here.

This school had classes that predominantly used English as the language of instruction. These classes are meant for students with linguistic and cultural backgrounds other than Finnish. These classes have the official label *englanninkielinen luokka* ‘English-speaking class’ that appeared on the doors in an abbreviated form *EKL*.

This excerpt provides a complex example of co-exploration. First Maija pointed to the doors of the classrooms, thus, introducing the classes as topics for a detailed account (“here we have”; lines 43, 45 and pronominal reference also in line 47 – it is probably by accident that she said “one to six” instead of “one to two” when referring to the grades). Next, in reference to my photo documenting activity, she offered angles for my pictures (“if you want to take a closer picture”; lines 51–54). That is, she extended her role as a narrator or commentator guide to a guide who shares authority with the researcher in photo composition. After this point, the interpretation of the signs was closely collaborated on, including overlapping speech (lines 57–59).

As Figure 4 shows, there were self-introductory notes on the door together with a flag that indexed the home country of each student. Flags indexed countries and, in an indirect way, nationalities, but in this case, in contrast with Figure 1, these were not directly linked to classroom language policies. That is, in this context, the flags did not index the languages the students learnt but rather identified the students’ country of origin while introducing them to an audience that uses English as a lingua franca. Accordingly, Maija portrayed the CLIL students as members of the target audience who are



Figure 4. Students' self-introductions on the door of the classroom in a Finnish school.

capable of reading and interpreting the texts on display (lines 75–77). She further constructed an active initiator role for the students, emphasising how they can find and use opportunities provided by the schoolscape (“they can come and read”; line 73). Again, she interpreted this practice as integratory, this time in an indirect way, mentioning the ‘normal’ CLIL students who could approach the spaces of the English speaking classes. Thus, the corridor was reconstructed as a space where students could move both physically and culturally-socially. Again, Maija evaluated such integratory practices positively (“quite nice”; line 65).

Table 2 summarises the categories and connections that emerged in Excerpts 3 and 4.

Table 2. Categories and connections in Excerpts 3 and 4

Labels/ descriptions in the analysis	(Spanish, Russian, German, Swedish + many other languages)  English as a foreign language English as a mother tongue / 'home' language / 'other' language English as a lingua franca / integratory language	
Media associated	artwork on display	
Users associated	teacher	
	international students (who 'have English' / who are in the 'English speaking class') international students' family members	local students ('normal' / CLIL students)
Locations associated	home native country	
	classroom corridor	

As Table 2 summarises, various languages were mentioned as separate entities (especially in the interview in Exc. 3), and some functions of English in school activities were elaborated in detail in both schools. Otherwise, dichotomies were constructed between the users of English (and not between various Englishes); that is, mainly two student groups, the 'locals' and the 'international' students were in opposition in connection with their needs for integration. As a consequence, spaces, where these student groups meet (i.e., the classroom and the corridor), were constructed as spaces of integration. The out-of-school (home and native country) context was highlighted only in the case of 'international' students, both in terms of reference to their daily language use habits (Exc. 3) and their self-introductions on the classroom door (Exc. 4).

## 6 Discussion

In this article, I have analysed different types of co-construction of ideologies on diversity and multilingualism. I investigated reconstructions of linguistic borders and categories as well as the interactional contexts in which these were co-constructed. The contexts differed at various levels: the interviews were recorded in two countries, both in elementary and secondary schools, and, of course, local characteristics of the school communities also had an impact on the course of interactions. Further, and this was the focus of my analyses, the interaction during the "guided tours" was shaped by continuous reflections on the schoolscape and by negotiations between the

participants of the interactions. The following paragraphs summarise some consequences of the applied methodology, and the discussion is followed by examples in relation to some major discourses that circulate in Hungarian and Finnish education.

Both the Hungarian and the Finnish examples departed from reflections on the actual space that was co-explored, often leading to detailed discussions on current school practices. That is, the method was successful in addressing social meanings through the discussion of visual elements (cf., Rose 2012). Since I analysed interaction at a micro level, some basic comments on the interactional organisation are necessary. First, as there were no pre-set questions during the guided tours, the participants chose what to talk about. This is one of the reasons why I analysed and compared the data at a micro level: the point of the investigation was not to make systematic cross-cultural or cross-country case-to-case analyses; it was instead based on continuously emerging reflections. What is systematically observable in the data is the interactional organisation. The findings include the fact that there were continuous negotiations in the interviews that contributed to the re-positioning of all participants. For example, guides often initiated a topic by themselves (e.g., in Exc. 1, 3), but there were cases in which the conversation returned to a more traditional, interview-like setup with researcher questions and respondent answers (e.g., Exc. 2). In general, the guiding teachers made use of the position that was offered to them; that is, not only the route and the length of the tour was their choice, but they were also free to involve others in the tour. As a consequence, the guide frequently directed the voice recorder towards students or colleagues, asking them about certain issues and acting as an interviewer (e.g., Exc. 3). What I controlled in my 'tourist' role was the photo documentation of the environment (cf., Clark 2010). However, as Exc. 4 shows, sometimes I was instructed by the guide to take pictures of particular scenes and from certain angles.

From the point of view of co-construction, some comments on the nature of my contribution are needed because it is especially important to make the researcher's position explicit in ideology studies (e.g., Dallyn 2014). As a professional linguist, I work with models that do not separate languages into isolated entities but conceptualise 'language' as the interactive, dynamic, and multimodal use of semiotic resources that often show signs of hybridisation (e.g., Dufva, Aro, and Suni 2014). I also aim to promote linguistic diversity and multilingualism through my professional activities; that is why I tended to challenge some monolingualistic and monoculturalist ideologies in the interviews, for example in Exc. 2c. However, as the examples show (e.g., Exc. 1, 2b) I sometimes appear to agree with explanations or justifications that are not compatible with the above mentioned professional principles. Thus, the analysis of the materials provides opportunities for researcher self-reflection as well.

As pertains to the linguistic boundaries and categories that emerged during the conversations, I will compare how languages, persons, loci of language use, and school places were discursively reconstructed in different settings.

The labelling of languages and varieties in the Hungarian example was based on the distinction between two Englishes (labelled variedly), keeping these varieties and the contexts of their use apart. In Exc. 2, language learning was primarily portrayed as a way of preparing for something in the future; that is, it targets potential future events, such as ‘passing an exam’ or ‘moving abroad’. Varieties of English were separated in line with a distinction between their typical users: ‘British English’ was mainly linked to teachers and examiners while ‘American English’ was linked to students. As the latter variety was evaluated as less acceptable, this parallel dichotomy implied that the students’ English proficiency was not desirable in light of school expectations (claims about test scores and exam certificates strengthen this implication).

Discussions about the ‘central’ variety of English, acceptability, and some tensions between teachers’ and students’ norms (see the ‘fight’ metaphor) linked the discussions to standard language ideology (Kontra 2006; Milroy 2001) and the notion of deficit. That is, what students were actually capable of doing in English (e.g., watching films, listening to songs) was elaborated on less, implying that their existing skills are less relevant than others that, according to the teacher, are to be developed (e.g., conforming their language to the norms of tests, passing exams). Although there were maps and tableaux of countries other than the UK in the co-observed classroom space, the classroom was discursively reconstructed in a way that strengthened the hegemony of learning and teaching British English. This reconstruction was enhanced by the teacher’s short narratives of classroom scenes.

In the Finnish examples, linguistic forms or varieties were not the focus of discussion but distinct languages and their users together with the contexts of usage in and outside the school. The emerging accounts were closely connected to the co-explored sites, which brings me to the discussion of the discursive reconstructions of school spaces. Classrooms (Exc. 3) and corridors (Exc. 4) were constructed as spaces in which and with which students could interact both directly (in classroom interaction) and through media (reading the words or artefacts on display). Consequently, students were portrayed as persons who already had resources that they used in interaction and when interpreting the schoolscape (e.g., “children [...] who have English” in Exc. 3; “they can come and read” in Exc. 4) and, thus, took opportunities to establish relationships with others. That is, the students were taken as functionally bi- or multilingual persons. As part of the students’ repertoire, English was constructed as a lingua franca, as a language of integration that bridges local (“normal” Exc. 4) students and those students who have “other languages”. In the interviews, “other” meant ‘other than Finnish’.

This way of creating the category of ‘other’ languages and their speakers through English raises some issues. First, it was clear from the analysis of Exc. 3 that the role of English was dominant in the construction of a multilingual classroom that served as a space for a multilingual community. In the condition that we co-explored, only English (and Finnish) signs were on display in the classroom even though the teacher mentioned that ‘other’ languages were also previously represented. The integratory role of English

was also complex in Exc. 4. The teacher presented the use of English as a lingua franca as a successful practice in the integration of the ‘English speaking’ (EKL) students into the school community. However, while the first language of the majority of the ‘normal’ (CLIL) students was apparently and visibly Finnish (as was revealed during the tour of the school), not all of the EKL students’ languages appeared. In other words, through the English-medium self-introductions and the English-medium signs on “good table manners” some languages that the EKL students spoke were erased from the schoolscape (for the notion of ideological erasure, see Irvine and Gal 2000). That is, the reconstruction of linguistic diversity was predominantly carried out through the creation of oppositions between ‘normal’ students who learn English as a foreign language and ‘other’ students who can be integrated through their higher than average level command of English. In summary, the Finnish examples relate to efforts in implementing integratory tools both at the levels of designing classroom interaction and the schoolscape. That is, the students’ proficiency in different languages was treated as a resource (Nikula et al. 2012) in formulating the answers to the ever-growing challenge of educating students with diverse cultural and linguistic background in Finnish schools (e.g., Voipio-Huovinen and Martin 2012; Suni and Latomaa 2012).

## *7 Conclusions*

With a focus on labelling and boundary-making practices, this study showed how the integration of visual methodologies into ideology research can be used in a complex interpretation of educational practices. The interaction between the participants in reflections on the schoolscape enhanced the construction of evaluations of, and narratives and explanations about education. In general, it was the discursively reconstructed context of notions such as ‘mother tongue’ and ‘foreign language(s)’ that made a difference in the presented examples.

The results of the study can be adapted in educational contexts in which an adequate management of diversity is essential. For example, similar ‘guided tours’ can be led with the participation of several school community members, providing space for them to discuss their own interpretations of the spaces they collectively use. Separate or joint tours can be organised for students (cf., Clark 2010), teachers, principals (cf., Shohamy 2014), optionally requesting the contribution of a researcher or other ‘foreigner’ whose outsider perspective can add to the articulation of potential problems, difficulties, or special needs. That is, ‘guided tours’ can contribute to the local management of diversity and, hopefully, to the utilisation of the diverse repertoires of school community members as resources.



*Transcript symbols* (cf., Jefferson, 2004)

[	the point of overlap onset
]	the point at which two overlapping utterances end
=	no break between the two lines
( 1 . 21 )	elapsed time by hundredth of seconds
( . )	a brief interval (shorter than 0.2 seconds)
::	prolongation of the immediately prior sound (the longer the colon row, the longer the prolongation)
-	cut-off
word	stress via pitch and/or amplitude
↑ ↓	shifts into especially high or low pitch
.hh	inbreath
> <	talk speeded up compared to the surrounding talk
< >	talk slowed down compared to the surrounding talk
(( ))	transcriber's description
(- -)	the transcriber could not get what was said

## References

- Baynham, Mike. 2011. "Stance, Positioning, and Alignment in Narratives of Professional Experience." *Language in Society* 40:63–74.
- Blommaert, Jan, Sirpa Leppänen, and Massimiliano Spotti. 2012. "Endangering Multilingualism." In *Dangerous Multilingualism*, edited by Jan Blommaert, Sirpa Leppänen, Päivi Pahta, and Tiina Räisänen, 1–21. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Bonfiglio, Thomas P. 2010. *Mother Tongues and Nations: The Invention of the Native Speaker*. New York: De Gruyter.
- Bozsik, Gabriella, ed. 2005–2007. *Két évtized a helyesírásért*. [Two decades for orthography]. Eger: EKF Líceum.
- Brown, Kara D. 2012. "The Linguistic Landscape of Educational Spaces." In *Minority Languages in the Linguistic Landscape*, edited by Durk Gorter, Heiko F. Marten, and Luk Van Mensel, 281–298. New York: Palgrave.
- Busch, Brigitta. 2015. *Linguistic Repertoire and Spracherleben, the Lived Experience of Language*. Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies 148. London: King's College.
- Clark, Alison. 2010. *Transforming Children's Spaces*. New York: Routledge.
- Cohen, Yehudi A. 1971. "The Shaping of Men's Minds: Adaptations to Imperatives of Culture." In *Anthropological Perspectives on Education*, edited by Murray Lionel Wax, Stanley Diamond, and Fred O. Gearing, 19–50. New York: Basic Books.
- Csapó, Benő, Gyöngyvér Molnár, and László Kinyó. 2009. "A magyar oktatási rendszer szelektivitása a nemzetközi összehasonlító vizsgálatok eredményeinek tükrében" [The selectivity of Hungarian educational system in the light of international comparative studies]. *Iskolakultúra* 3–4:3–13.
- Dalryn, Sam. 2014. "Naming the Ideological Reflexively." *Organization* 21:244–265.
- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane. 2011. "Content-and-Language Integrated Learning: From Practice to Principles?" *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 31:182–204.
- Doerr, Neriko Musha, ed. 2009. *The Native Speaker Concept. Ethnographic Investigations of Native Speaker Effects*. New York: De Gruyter.

- Dressler, Roswita. 2015. "Signgeist: Promoting Bilingualism through the Linguistic Landscape of School Signage." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 12:128–145.
- Drew, Paul. 1998. "Complaints about Transgressions and Misconduct." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 31:295–325.
- Dufva, Hannele, Mari Aro, and Minna Suni. 2014. "Language Learning as Appropriation: How Linguistic Resources Are Recycled and Regenerated." *AFinLA-e Soveltavan kielitieteen tutkimuksia* 6:20–31.
- EBS. 2012. *Europeans and Their Languages. Report*. Special Eurobarometer 386. Accessed December 4, 2016. [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs\\_386\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_386_en.pdf).
- Gal, Susan. 2007. "Multilingualism." In *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*, edited by Carmen Llamas, Louise Mullany, and Peter Stockwell, 149–156. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Gál, Lilla. 2015. "Nyelvtanítás, nyelvtudás és media." [Language teaching, language proficiency and media] *Taní-tani*. Accessed December 4, 2016. [http://www.tani-tani.info/nyelvtanitas\\_nyelvtudas\\_media](http://www.tani-tani.info/nyelvtanitas_nyelvtudas_media).
- Garvin, Rebecca Todd. 2010. "Responses to the Linguistic Landscape in Memphis, Tennessee: An Urban Space in Transition." In *Linguistic Landscape in the City*, edited by Elana Shohamy, Eliezer Ben-Rafael, and Monica Barni, 252–271. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Gorter, Durk, and Jasone Cenoz. 2014. "Linguistic Landscapes inside Multilingual Schools." In *Challenges for Language Education and Policy: Making Space for People*, edited by Bernard Spolsky, Ofra Inbar-Lourie, and Michal Tannenbaum, 151–169. New York: Routledge.
- Halonen, Mia, Tarja Nikula, Taina Saarinen, and Mirja Tarnanen. 2015. "'Listen, There'll Be a Pause After Each Question': A Swedish Lesson as a Nexus for Multi-Sited Language Education Policies." In *Language Policies in Finland and Sweden*, edited by Mia Halonen, Pasi Ihalainen, and Taina Saarinen, 220–243. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Hutchby, Ian, and Robin Wooffitt. 1998. *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Irvine, Judith T., and Susan Gal. 2000. "Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation." In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*, edited by Paul V. Kroskrity, 35–84. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Jefferson, Gail. 2004. "Glossary of Transcript Symbols with an Introduction." In *Conversation Analysis: Studies From the First Generation*, edited by Gene H. Lerner, 13–31. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Johnson, Norris Brock. 1980. "The Material Culture of Public School Classroom: The Symbolic Integration of Local Schools and National Culture." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 11:173–190.
- Kachru, Braj B. 2008. "World Englishes in World Contexts." In *A Companion to the History of the English Language*, edited by Haruko Momma, and Michael Matto, 567–580. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Khan, Muhammad Ali. 2012. "Social Meanings of Language Policy and Practices: A Critical, Linguistic Ethnographic Study of four Schools in Pakistan." PhD diss., Lancaster University.
- Kontra, Miklós. 2006. "Sustainable Linguicism." In *Language Variation – European Perspectives*, edited by Frans Hinskens, 97–126. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kress, Günther, and Theo van Leeuwen 2006. *Reading images*. New York: Routledge.
- Kroskrity, Paul V. 2000. "Regimenting Language." In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*, edited by Paul V. Kroskrity, 1–34. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Laihonen, Petteri. 2008. "Language Ideologies in Interviews: A Conversation Analysis Approach." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12:668–693.
- Laihonen, Petteri. 2010. "A finn nyelv korpusztervezése, korpuszpolitikája." [The

- corpus planning and corpus policy of the Finnish language] *Magyar Nyelvjárások* 48:169–190.
- Laihonen, Petteri, and Tamás Péter Szabó. 2017. “Investigating Visual Practices in Educational Settings: Schoolscapes, Language Ideologies and Organizational Cultures.” In *Researching Multilingualism: Critical and Ethnographic Approaches*, edited by Marilyn Martin-Jones and Deirdre Martin, 121–138. London: Routledge.
- Leppänen, Sirpa et al. 2011. *National Survey on the English Language in Finland: Uses, Meanings and Attitudes*. Studies in Variation, Contacts and Change in English 5. Accessed December 4, 2016. <http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/series/volumes/05/>.
- Mantila, Harri. 2010. “Suomalaisen kielenhuollon periaatekeskustelu 1990- ja 2000-luvulla.” [The discussion on the principles of language planning in Finland in the 1990’s and the 2000’s] In *Kielellä on merkitystä*, edited by Hanna Lappalainen, Marja-Leena Sorjonen, and Maria Vilkkuna, 179–205. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Milroy, James. 2001. “Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization.” *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5:530–555.
- Nahalka, István. 2011. “Az iskolai esélyegyenlőtlenségéről vallott kisebb és nagyobb tévhiteink.” [Our minor and big misconceptions concerning inequalities in the school] *Tani-tani*. Accessed December 4, 2016. [www.tani-tani.info/kisebb\\_es\\_nagyobb\\_tevhiteink](http://www.tani-tani.info/kisebb_es_nagyobb_tevhiteink).
- NAT. 2012. “Nemzeti Alaptanterv.” [National Core Curriculum] *Magyar Közlöny* 66:10639–10847.
- NCC. 2004. *National Core Curriculum for Basic Education*. Helsinki: National Board of Education. Accessed December 4, 2016. [http://www.oph.fi/english/curricula\\_and\\_qualifications/basic\\_education](http://www.oph.fi/english/curricula_and_qualifications/basic_education).
- Nikula, Tarja, Sari Pöyhönen, Ari Huhta, and Raili Hildén. 2010. “When MT + 2 Is Not Enough. Tensions with Foreign Language Education in Finland.” *Sociolinguistica* 24:25–42.
- Nikula, Tarja, Taina Saarinen, Sari Pöyhönen, and Teija Kangasvieri. 2012. “Linguistic Diversity as a Problem and a Resource.” *Dangerous Multilingualism*, edited by Jan Blommaert, Sirpa Leppänen, Päivi Pahta, and Tiina Räisänen, 41–66. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Potter, Jonathan, and Derek Edwards. 2003. “Sociolinguistics, Cognitivism, and Discursive Psychology.” *International Journal of English Studies* 1:93–109.
- Rose, Gillian. 2012. *Visual Methodologies. An Introduction to Researching with Visual Materials*. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) London: Sage.
- Sándor, Klára. 2001. “Language Cultivation in Hungary: Further Data.” In *Issues on Language Cultivation*, edited by Klára Sándor, 43–61. Szeged: JGYTF Kiadó.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson, and Harvey Sacks. 1977. “The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation.” *Language* 53:361–382.
- Scollon, Ron, and Suzie Wong Scollon. 2004. *Nexus Analysis: Discourse and the Emerging Internet*. New York: Routledge.
- Shohamy, Elana. 2006. *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. New York: Routledge.
- Shohamy, Elana. 2014. “School Principals as Makers of School Language Policy.” Paper presented at the University of South Australia, August 20.
- Shohamy, Elena, and Shoshi Waksman. 2009. “Linguistic Landscape as an Ecological Arena: Modalities, Meanings, Negotiations, Education.” In *Linguistic Landscape. Expanding the Scenery*, edited by Elena Shohamy and Durk Gorter, 313–331. New York and London: Routledge.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1979. “Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology.” In *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*, edited by Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks, and Carol L. Hofbauer, 193–248. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove. 1988. "Multilingualism and the Education of Minority Children." In *Minority Education: from Shame to Struggle*, edited by Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Jim Cummins, 9–44. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Stroud, Christopher, and Dmitri Jegels. 2014. "Semiotic Landscapes and Mobile Narrations of Place: Performing the Local." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 228:179–199.
- Suni, Minna, and Sirkku Latomaa. 2012. "Dealing with Increasing Linguistic Diversity in Schools – the Finnish Example." In *Dangerous Multilingualism*, edited by Jan Blommaert, Sirpa Leppänen, Päivi Pahta, and Tiina Räisänen, 67–95. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Szabó, Tamás Péter. 2012. "Kírákunk táblákat, hogy csúnyán beszélni tilos". *A javítás mint gyakorlat és mint téma diákok és tanáraik metanyelvében* [Repair as communication practice – repair as discourse topic. A multi-faceted investigation of Hungarian school metalanguage]. Dunajská Streda: Gramma.
- Szabó, Tamás Péter. 2013. "A Corpus-Based Analysis of Language Ideologies in Hungarian School Metalanguage." *Research in Corpus Linguistics* 1:65–79.
- Szabó, Tamás Péter. 2015. "The Management of Diversity in Schools: an Analysis of Hungarian Practices." *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies* 1:23–51.
- ten Have, Paul. 2004. *Understanding Qualitative Research and Ethnomethodology*. London: Sage.
- Voipio-Huovinen, Sanna, and Maisa Martin. 2012. "Problematic Plurilingualism – Teachers' Views." In *Dangerous Multilingualism*, edited by Jan Blommaert, Sirpa Leppänen, Päivi Pahta, and Tiina Räisänen, 96–118. Basingstoke: Macmillan.