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Abstract

This study investigates intergenerational language transmission amongst Hungarian immigrants, using in-depth interviews and participant observation as the main methods. The analysis examines the experiences of parents and their school-aged children in 61 families living in Sweden’s two main cities, Stockholm and Göteborg.

The sample families were separated into four groups, based on two pre-contact factors, namely (1) the parents’ linguistic environment and (2) their social identity prior to migration. Three of the four groups turned out to be comparable in size and serve as the focus groups of the study. Group 1 comprises families in which one or both parents are former majority members from monolingual parts of Hungary. Group 2 comprises families in which one or both parents are former majority members from Hungary, but in contrast, these parents grew up in bilingual areas, being exposed to other languages in their childhood settings. Group 3 comprises families in which often both parents grew up as members of a vital ethnic minority in bilingual or multilingual settings in Transylvania (Romania).

It was hypothesised that the parents’ childhood experiences would have an effect on their ways of raising children in a migrant situation, which, in turn, will affect children’s bilingualism as well as the group’s maintenance chances. The results of the statistical analysis confirm the hypothesis and show significant differences between the focus groups in a number of factors, e.g. marriage pattern, religious engagement, cultural orientation, children’s opportunities to meet other group members, and language awareness. Most importantly, the investigation revealed broad variation in language use norms among the sample families, especially for family and group internal communication. This, together with the poor demographic conditions of the group, seriously threatens group cohesion. The prospects for Hungarian language maintenance in Sweden are therefore seen as limited.

Keywords: language maintenance and shift, intergenerational language transmission, childhood bilingualism, simultaneous and consecutive bilingualism, heritage languages, Hungarian, Swedish as a second language, migrant families, Sweden.
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Chapter One

Introduction

The present thesis is a sociolinguistic study of language use among Hungarian immigrants and their school-aged children born and raised in Sweden. However, while many issues addressed relate to general concerns of bilingual upbringing in our days, the study has a very specific focus in mind. By subsequently widening the perspective from individual families and children to different subgroups represented in the sample, the thesis aims to (re)connect issues of language transmission and children’s language acquisition to issues of language maintenance and shift on a group level.

Despite a growing number of case studies, when it comes to bilingual language acquisition, our knowledge is still limited to settings comprising mainly white, middle-class families, where highly educated (often linguist) parents describe their efforts to raise bilingual children and, as a result of thorough considerations, high ambitions and consistency, succeed in their efforts (e.g. Ronjat, 1913; Leopold, 1939-49; Hoffmann, 1985; Saunders, 1988, Döpke, 1992; Caldas, 2006). Moreover, these cases exemplify all too often the most demanding approach to raising bilingual children, namely the one-parent-one-language method, also known as the OPOL approach. According to this approach, each parent has to stick to one language in communication with the child, irrespective of all other circumstances. Ethnographic studies on language socialisation in non-European cultures (cf. Kulick, 1992; Obondo, 1996; Zentella, 1997) suggest, however, that this approach is far from usual.¹ In fact, we still do not know much about the reasoning and strategies of ordinary people (i.e. non-linguists) regarding their children’s bilingual upbringing, and even worse, we do not know anything about people who initially were interested in raising children bilingually but along the way became discouraged in their efforts to do so. Studies that build on larger corpora, including a wider range of people, often address questions of language choice in terms of how people act (e.g. Boyd, 1985; Barron-Hauwaert, 2004; Okita, 2002) rather than why they act as they do. Thus, when it comes to parental

¹ See also Gupta (2000) for an overview of language practices in multiethnic metropolises around the world.
responsibility and initial differences between parents, the question remains: Why and in which way may parents differ from each other with regard to their linguistic practices and their decisions related to childrearing? Does the behaviour of parents really matter that much as some of the “raising bilingual children” literature suggests? Or are environmental factors possibly more important when it comes to the generation born and raised in the new country?²

This chapter provides an introduction to the thesis, including a description of the aims of the study. A detailed presentation of the research questions is, however, only possible in chapter 4, after a more thorough review of the theoretical frameworks (chapter 2) and a description of Hungarians and Hungarian language contact in their original settings (chapter 3).

1.1 Aims of the study

This thesis takes its departure in the assumption that parents’ childhood experiences might be of special importance in a migratory context as they may largely affect people’s ways of raising children. In linguistic terms one could say that much of the immigrants’ linguistic behaviour might be an effect of attitudes and linguistic experiences prevalent in their own childhood environments.

On the other hand, intergenerational language transmission is not one-sided. Children’s personalities and their everyday experiences surely form their language practices, which in turn also affect the language use practices of all family members, including their parents. If we want to understand language use in migrant families, I strongly believe that we need, therefore, to take into account both parents’ and children’s perspectives. This means not only including both parts’ reports on the matter, but also, and even more importantly, to explore the relation between parents’ former and their children’s current everyday practices and linguistic experiences.

The aim of the study³ is to investigate

1) what difference it makes to raise children bilingually in a 21st century urban western society depending on one’s social identity and linguistic experiences prior to migration, and also,

2) what a small group’s heterogeneity and a few of its members conscious efforts mean for the whole group’s language maintenance prospects in the future.

² This is at least what is suggested by most educational research (cf. Glenn & de Jong, 1996; Haglund, 2005a), as well as sociolinguistic approaches to language planning (cf. Stubbs, 1991; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997).

³ Note that this is only an introduction to the thesis. The research questions are described in detail in section 4.1.
Most importantly, the study assumes a tight connection between children’s everyday experiences and language practices in Sweden and their parents’ childhood experiences in their country of origin. Questions of how to raise children bilingually (in the case of parents) and what language to use when speaking with friends (in the case of children) then become related to questions of why it might be worth the effort. What language strategies parents use to raise their children are in this thesis seen in relation to what they have experienced as possible language use models during their childhood. Children’s language use in turn is seen in relation to their everyday experiences and what they perceive as most advantageous for their personal future.

1.2 Some methodological considerations

The method chosen to investigate the role of parents’ former linguistic experiences in intergenerational language transmission was to concentrate on a single, though linguistically diverse migrant community and include a wide range of families irrespective of the achieved level of bilingualism among the children.

Well-grounded conclusions regarding the very process of intergenerational language transmission would preferably be based on ethnographically grounded longitudinal observations of language usage in individual families. However, as long as we do not know which families should be regarded as representative for the group in question, the cases one might pick would necessarily be random cases; this method would in turn not allow us to draw any conclusions regarding the group’s language maintenance chances. The methods I have chosen for data collection are thus a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods.

The main source of data derives from separate in-depth interviews with family members in 61 Swedish-Hungarian families living in Sweden’s two main cities, Stockholm and Gothenburg, and their surroundings. To increase reliability, the survey data were enhanced by field notes in connection to home visits and community activities.

There are two important differences compared to earlier studies in the area of bilingual upbringing that I would like to highlight here. The first is that there is a conceptual difference in regard to the children’s role in family discourse: earlier investigations into language use in bilingual families have largely relied on parents’ (often mothers’) reports concerning the language use and language proficiency of family members; children and adolescents’ views were often ignored (cf. Boyd, 1997), or at best treated as additional sources of information (cf. Okita, 2002; Barron-Hauwaert, 2004). The present study seeks to challenge this one-way view of socialisation by acknowledging all children, irrespective of their age or generation, as social actors equally contributing to family dynamics (see also Li, 2008: 13 f. for more details regarding sociolinguistic perspectives on bilingualism); consequently, in all vital issues related to language use, parents’ and children’s perspectives are analysed as two (complementary) sides of the same coin.
Second, there is a difference in frames of reference towards earlier studies in the area. This method implies that families that constitute the corpus of data are here emphasised as part of a larger context: as members of an immigrant community in an urban space in a Western society at the beginning of the 21st century. Placing the families in time and space is considered necessary because of the interconnections between the families’ past and future. It helps us also to better understand the (sometimes broken) links between the parental hopes and efforts to maintain the ancestral language, and the children’s multidimensional language views and diffuse identities in a challenging era of globalisation and transnationalism (for further details on this aim, see Heller, 2007a).

In order to highlight the complex nature of these issues, the study makes use of/integrates theories from several related areas, drawing especially on research on bilingual (first and second) language acquisition and research on language maintenance and shift. Most studies on bilingual language acquisition have stressed the importance of parental attitudes and their actual behaviour for children’s language development (see section 2.2). There is a widespread assumption among linguists, especially within this latter tradition, that “attitudes and decisions about bilingual upbringing are interconnected and that parents who choose to raise their children bilingually already in one way or another deviate from other parents” (Huss 1991: 34, my translation; see also similar thoughts expressed by King & Fogle, 2006 and 2008). Research on bilingual language acquisition is, nevertheless, only one side of the coin, often based on an individual-level approach. In this thesis, I argue that the full picture cannot be obtained without the other, less obvious side of the matter – the macro-level perspective. This perspective may be gained by studying theories of language maintenance and shift. Within this latter tradition (see section 2.1), researchers have emphasised the combined effect of different environmental factors on the process and outcomes of minority language transmission. Researchers applying social network analysis (e.g. Gal, 1979, Li, 1994) have contributed to our understanding of the phenomena involved by connecting macro and micro levels of analysis. Other researchers, such as McNamara (1987), Kulick (1992), Zentella (1997), etc., have revealed the dynamics of the social context in which such phenomena occur as salient, and by doing so, they lifted away stress from parental guilt. In a similar way, although by a different approach, this study explores the potential of some variables lying beyond language for explaining parallel language maintenance and shift in an immigrant group.

However, because of the special segment of Swedish Hungarians that the sample represents (see chapter 4 and 5), a caution might be necessary to avoid a possible overgeneralisation of the results. The proportions of different linguistic behaviour described in the thesis cannot be said to be representative of the entire Swedish-Hungarian population, and even less of other migrant groups in Sweden.

The languages involved in the study are mainly Hungarian and Swedish. Citations from the interviews are my own translations. Swedish language use and code-switching to Swedish in the citations has been marked by italics. Some
children and adolescents also report use of other language(s) in everyday communication, most often in relation to their non-Hungarian, non-Swedish parents. These latter languages are, nevertheless, not discussed in detail other than when it has a significant relevance for the aim of the study.

1.3 Swedish Hungarians as an object of inquiry

The current Swedish-Hungarian group was seen as especially suitable for such an investigation for several reasons. First of all, it is a largely heterogeneous group with regard to the parents’ childhood settings, descending both from monolingual as well as bilingual and multilingual environments, and from both majority and minority settings. Secondly, the group has a documented history of more than 50 years in the country, comparable to the history of immigration and minority education in Sweden. Furthermore, my own membership in the Swedish-Hungarian community was also considered to be an advantage, especially during data collection.

At the same time, Hungarians are nearly invisible as a group in Swedish society; this is partly explainable by the fact that they are a small group, numbering around 30,000 first-generation immigrants as compared to the whole population of 10 million inhabitants of Sweden, of which 1.3 million are first-generation immigrants. The main reason for Hungarians “invisibility”, however, is, that it is a positively selected immigrant group that is relatively well integrated into the majority society: many of them are middle-class and have high status jobs, and marriages to Swedes are relatively common. Moreover, Hungarians are not that different in their physical appearance from Swedes, and they tend to live incorporated in Swedish-speaking neighbourhoods; however, this also means that as a Hungarian speaker one cannot just accidentally meet someone from the same ethnic group. Given these outer circumstances, the sociolinguist would expect a very smooth and rapid language shift from Hungarian to Swedish over one or, at most, two generations. As will become clear in this thesis, this does not necessarily have to be the case.

1.4 Outline of the thesis

The thesis consists of ten chapters and is organised as follows.

Chapter two functions as the theoretical framework of the study by presenting different approaches related to language transmission in diaspora, such as research on language maintenance and shift, research on bilingual first and second language acquisition and language socialisation studies, and research on language choice. At the end of the chapter, a model of intergenerational language transmission will be introduced that is intended to be the overall frame of the study. Chapter three

---

introduces the reader to the diverse backgrounds of the Hungarian diaspora in Sweden, and reviews earlier research on Hungarian language contact outside Hungary. Chapter four presents the research questions of the present study introduces the reader to the methods applied in the work.

The following three chapters, i.e. chapters five, six and seven, aim to present some background data on the families involved in the study. These data are devoted three different chapters as they are seen as different stages in the migration process. Chapter five introduces the reader to parents’ experiences during childhood and youth, i.e. pre-contact factors. Chapter six presents factors connected to initial stages of contact, such as marriage patterns, initial language concerns in childrearing, and children’s enrolment in heritage language instruction. Chapter seven provides some figures on the families’ everyday life at the time of data collection, factors that may have major effects on children’s linguistic environment, such as the linguistic composition of the families’ neighbourhood, their religious engagement, cultural orientation, contact to other Hungarians in Sweden and Hungary, and language resources found in the homes.

In chapter eight, language use data are presented mainly in a quantitative manner, including analysis of reported and observed language use of different generations within as well as outside the family, in interactions with community members and (more or less) monolingual speakers of different age. The qualitative part of this chapter consists of the way the data have been collected and analysed, i.e. during the whole process, all language use data were connected to a social context with the explicit aim of recording the respondents’ own views on and norms of language use.

Chapter nine presents some additional data on children’s bilingualism: children’s self-reported language skills in Hungarian and Swedish and their reported language dominance and language preference in interaction with other bilinguals, and last, but not least, it also addresses the issues of language motivation and language shift from the perspective of the children.

Chapter ten represents the final chapter of the thesis; it summarises the work by listing the main results and sketches some possible areas for further research.
Chapter Two

Theoretical Frameworks

The aim of this chapter is to build a theoretical framework that matches my original intentions, i.e. to investigate language maintenance and shift in the Swedish-Hungarian community, and at the same time enables me to analyse mechanisms of intergenerational language transmission on a family level according to the obtained empirical data.

Using the family as a link between the individual, the migrant community and the wider society, this study seeks to integrate two major fields of applied linguistics: research on language maintenance and shift on the one hand, and research on bilingual language acquisition on the other. There is a vast literature in both of these fields; however, this overview is only able to present a brief selection of them, focusing on issues that connect the different fields to each other.

Research on language maintenance and shift has investigated the past and present of minority groups and has provided predictions for their future, building a societal framework for this study. This tradition provides us with several concepts and analytical tools that will be presented in the first section of this chapter (2.1).

Research on bilingual first and second language acquisition, on the other hand, has contributed to our understanding of the phenomena involved in language transmission by linking individuals’ language proficiency and actual language usage to their prior experiences and their future orientation, including circumstances of language learning, attitudes towards languages, motivation, etc. This research area is of special interest when it comes to childrearing and language decisions connected to it. Relevant models and theories of the latter research area will be discussed in the second section of this chapter (2.2).

Language choice among bilinguals is a topic addressed by studies in both traditions, although from different angles. Language choice will therefore be introduced as subsections within the two areas. Additionally, there is also a more general approach within linguistics discussing language choice in face-to-face interactions in bi- and/or multilingual settings. Concepts such as ‘language mode’, ‘code-switching’, ‘borrowing’, ‘language mixing’, ‘interference’ and ‘transfer’ are crucial to this topic and will be introduced in the third section of this chapter (2.3).
Despite long-standing calls for more interdisciplinarity/transdisciplinarity in the study of bilingualism (cf. Mackey, 1968; Edwards, 1985; Baetens Beardsmore, 1986; Romaine, 1995; Li, 2008), these adjacent fields of research seldom converge. In section 2.4, I will therefore make an attempt to reconnect the theories mentioned previous to it and build a framework for my study by introducing a tentative model of intergenerational language transmission.

2.1 Research on language maintenance and shift

2.1.1 Basic principles

Research on language maintenance and shift is concerned with the relationship between stability and change in language use in relation to changing patterns of social, psychological and/or cultural orientation in minority groups. Language choice in this tradition is viewed in a larger context, as governed by social expectations and communicative norms, which in some cases might be in conflict with each other on the micro and macro levels of speech. The individual choices are then observed, compared and analysed in order to investigate their level of institutionalisation and its impact on the group’s linguistic repertoire.

In migrant settings, bilingualism has mainly been seen as a transitory phenomenon, and a gradual decline in the use of immigrant languages over generations has been documented in numerous studies, first of all in the United States and Australia. In two groundbreaking studies, both published in 1953, Uriel Weinreich and Einar Haugen concluded independently of each other that language shift may be traced in two dimensions: as a structural change in the language competency of individuals and as a social change affecting patterns of language use in the community. Weinreich’s initial interest concerned interference, studying changes on the structural level of language, but while doing so, he became more and more interested in socio-cultural aspects of language contact, and, by combining these two views, he provided a wider framework for studies in contact linguistics. Haugen, in turn, was initially interested in documenting language use in a bilingual community of Norwegian immigrants in America. In addition to observations concerning his informants’ linguistic profiles (and the Norwegian dialects they spoke), he offered the first detailed analysis of social determinants of language shift. Haugen (1953) discusses language use within the family and in religious settings in relation to language attitudes and the external pressures his subjects experienced from English via the media and work life.

However, within sociolinguistics, Haugen is best known for connecting language shift in immigrant populations to the fading language proficiency of speakers in the language of their ancestors. According to this model (Haugen 1972: 334), language shift may be seen as several steps on a continuum stretching from monolingualism in the mother tongue of the immigrants (language A) through a transitional period of bilingualism in the second generation, to monolingualism in the language of the host society (language B) in the third or fourth
generation. Capital letters represent here high proficiency, while small letters indicate a weaker command of the given language:

\[ A > Ab > AB > aB > B \]

Over the years there has been debate on how fast this language shift actually happens, with studies showing that several stages may be connected to the same generation, resulting in a rapid language shift within two generations or even a single generation.\(^5\) On the other hand, there are immigrant groups that managed to maintain their language over five or six generations and even more.\(^5\) Nevertheless, Haugen’s notion regarding a change in language domination over time still seems to be valid in most migrant settings.

The explanation for this gradual shift in language proficiency is relatively simple, at least from the perspective of individual families: Due to migration, people need to adapt to new circumstances, not least of all linguistically. They have to learn a new language relatively fast in order to communicate with institutions and with the people they meet in their new country, and over time, the use of their mother tongue becomes restricted to communication with members of their own group. Most often, this also implies a limitation in time and space, but most importantly, to a restricted set of settings and topics. Hence, most children born and raised in the new country have limited access to the minority language compared to children growing up in territorial settings. Moreover, immigrants also need to make difficult decisions regarding their choice of housing areas, childcare and schooling, building new networks, etc., not always being aware that these initial decisions may shape the language use and thus also the future of their children.

Since Haugen’s and Weinreich’s seminal works, much sociolinguistic work has, however, tended to view processes of language maintenance and shift from a macro-perspective, emphasising factors working on group and societal level. A large number of factors have been identified as accounting for processes of language maintenance and shift, e.g. concentration and size of the group, social class, religious and educational background, urbanisation, marriage patterns, majority and minority attitudes towards groups and their languages, language ideologies, state policies regarding education and language rights of minorities, degree of similarity or dissimilarity between the two languages in contact, etc., and last, but not least, the language use of minority members (overviews of such factors are presented e.g. by Fishman, 1964; Clyne, 1991a; Hyltenstam & Stroud, 1991, 1996; Fase, Jaspaert & Kroon, 1992). However, as shown by a growing number of case studies, no list of factors can ever be exhaustive, nor are these factors independent of each other (for examples cf. Tosi, 1999). A common point in most of these studies seems, however, to be of language use connected to power

\(^5\) For example, Israelis in Melbourne, Australia (McNamara, 1987). A short review of this study is provided in section 2.1.2.

\(^6\) For example, Romani speakers in Sweden (Språkrådet, 2008).
relations in the host society, i.e. status and prestige, a fact that has also gained much attention in language acquisition studies in connection to language attitudes, and in critical social research dealing with language ideologies (see 2.2.3).

In the following sections (2.1.2 and 2.1.3), I would like to introduce some theories and studies of language maintenance and shift that have implications for my own study. However, before turning to concrete examples in the literature, some basic terms need to be clarified.

2.1.1.1 The notion of domain and diglossia

In a series of articles, Fishman (1964, 1965, 1967, 1968a/1972; 1968b/1972; 1980) argues that in order to understand language practices in bilingual communities, we have to find out who speaks what language to whom and when. In these papers, he introduces the terms ‘domain’ and ‘diglossia’, both of which have become widely used in contact linguistics.

The term domain, as proposed by Fishman, stands for certain “institutional” contexts, in which one language is seen as more appropriate than the other. These contexts might be best described as referring to an aggregation of specific topics, settings and role relationships. The family domain, for example, can be described as a private domain that comprises family members engaged in everyday communication in certain locations about a certain set of topics. In stable bilingual communities, these conversations typically take place in the minority language, whereas in public domains, for example, a visit to a government office, the use of the majority language is required. In unstable bilingual communities, however, this distribution of roles and language use expectations becomes blurred, and the majority language may also be used in private domains, such as the family. On the basis of their observations and interviews in the Puerto Rican community in New York, Fishman, Cooper and Ma (1971) claimed that five domains were salient in the language choice between Spanish and English in the community. These were the domains of family, friendship, religion, employment and education. Later studies have shown that different distribution of domains might be relevant in different communities.

However, it is important to note that although domains can be valuable as a point of departure in investigating the language use patterns of a group, later investigations have shown that they might be hard (if not impossible) to identify in cases of potential language shift. Susan Gal (1979), for example, notes:

A few weeks of observation in Oberwart made it clear that no single rule would account for all choices between languages. Statements to the effect that one language is used at home and another in school-work-street would be too simplistic. (Gal, 1979: 99)

Furthermore, as Li Wei (1994) points out, apart from differences between different subgroups, there will also be conceptual differences between individuals within the same group:
Speakers’ perception of domains may differ depending on the backgrounds and social positions of the speakers in question. A British-born Pakistani graduate working as a computer programmer in a law firm will hardly have the same idea of an ‘employment’ domain as his immigrant parents working in a family-run corner shop. (Li, 1994: 10)

This implies that a thorough investigation of language shift situations has to take into account the individual views of the informants as well as differences between different groups of informants (see also the discussions conducted by Hymes, 1968, and more recently Auer, 1998, both of which argue for the so-called internal perspective, i.e. an approach to the data from the informants’ point of view). For more details on the implications of this idea for the present study, see section 8.1.

In order to address the connection between changes in language use over time and changes in social structure, Fishman borrowed the term *diglossia* from Charles Ferguson, who originally developed the term for monolingual settings. Ferguson (1959: 336) defines diglossia as a specific relationship between two or more varieties of the same language in a speech community. Most importantly, there is a functional differentiation between the different varieties. The superposed (i.e. most prestigious) variety, referred to as ‘High’ or H, is preferred in formal settings, like in church, at school, in written literature, etc, whereas the other variety (or varieties) referred to as ‘Low’ or L, is preferably used in more familiar settings for ordinary communication. According to Ferguson, these varieties also differ in several other ways, such as level of standardisation, phonology, grammar and partly in their vocabulary. Typically, L varieties are learned from family members at home, whereas the H variety is largely learned through formal education. This, in turn, provides the two varieties with separate institutional support systems. Ferguson’s classic examples included Standard German/Swiss German in Switzerland; Standard Arabic/vernacular Arabic in the Middle East; Standard French/Krèyòl in Haiti; Katharevousa/Dhimotiki in Greece; and Bokmål/Nynorsk in Norway.

Fishman (1967) extends the use of the term for functional differentiation between different languages. According to his definition, “diglossia exists, when one language is reserved for certain domains and one or more other languages are reserved for other domains.” Whereas Ferguson distinguishes nine different areas in which H and L may differ, Fishman focuses mainly on two of these: the functional division and the status of the languages, or, in other words, *function* and *prestige*. Somewhat simplified, we could say that in Fishman’s interpretation diglossia is a state in which different domains require different language choices.

In addition, Fishman (1980: 3-4) notes that “The concept of diglossia is sociological, as opposed to the more vague concept of bilingualism, which is merely an individual skill used for communicating in two or more languages in as many domains as possible.” Most importantly, he argues that the relationship between individual bilingualism and societal diglossia is neither necessary nor causal. Accordingly, he distinguishes between four possible cases:
1. Diglossia with bilingualism,
2. Diglossia without bilingualism,
3. Bilingualism without diglossia, and
4. Neither diglossia nor bilingualism.

In a linguistic situation of *combined diglossia and bilingualism* (case 1), speakers often engage in a variety of contexts, and access to several roles is encouraged and supported by institutions as well as by social processes. Nevertheless, the languages and roles are clearly defined as to when, where, and with whom they are considered appropriate. According to Fishman (1968a/1972: 137), it is not uncommon for H to be recognised as the official language alone, without this fact threatening the acceptance or the stability of L within the speech community (e.g. Standard French/Alsatian in Alsace). Most importantly, the two languages are allocated different functions, which, according to Fishman is the prerequisite for stable bilingualism. However, this setting also implies that people’s proficiency in the involved languages is not overlapping but is rather connected to certain domains (compare with the notion of ‘functional bilingualism’ in section 2.2.1). As will become clear in section 3.2, this is the language situation for a large part of the autochthonous Hungarian minorities living in Transylvania.

Case 2, i.e. *diglossia without bilingualism*, refers to a situation where two or more different monolingual speech communities are brought together under one political roof. In these cases, there may be an institutional protection for more than one language at the state level. However, the speakers of the different languages form distinct speech communities and only seldom interact with each other. Switzerland is often mentioned as an example of this case, as it recognizes four official languages: German, French, Italian and Rhaeto-Romanic. However, these languages are allocated to different regions, which means that in each region only one (or two) of the four official languages are used in everyday public life (business, schools, administration, recreation).

Case 3, i.e. *bilingualism without diglossia*, is perhaps best described as a situation where language choice is not governed by internal rules but is negotiable and subject to change. The two languages are not allocated different functions but compete for use in the same domains. In these cases, minorities might be bilingual but native-like skills in the majority language are required for status jobs in the society. This is often the case in many immigrant populations, especially in Western societies. In section 2.1.2, I will return to the issue of language shift in

---

7 In order to decide which kind of case is applicable for a certain situation, it is also important to distinguish between different parts of the population. Global changes have affected language use in Switzerland as well. Due to massive migration during the last decades, approximately 20% of today’s Swiss population are immigrants with various backgrounds. Consequently, there are many individuals who do not speak one of the official languages as their mother tongue. For these people, the use of the official language of the region (German, French, Italian) is the only practical way to communicate when talking to native Swiss people or immigrants from other countries. The same applies for the education of their children as for immigrants in most
migrant populations to highlight some additional details concerning their specific situation.  

Case 4, in which *neither bilingualism nor diglossia* applies, is relatively common. This case refers to countries with few, if any, inherent minorities or immigrants; inhabitants in these countries share the same language and form a monolingual speech community. Fishman cites Korea, Cuba, Portugal and Norway as examples; Hungary after WW II might also have been mentioned in this context (see section 3.1). It is noteworthy that the present study also comprises a group of Hungarian speakers in Sweden who originated in this setting. The informants I am referring to have grown up in monolingual areas that, according to them, totally lacked contact with speakers of other languages. A more detailed description of the groups involved in this study and the possible implications of Fishman’s theories will follow in chapter 3.

Ferguson (1959: 240) argues that diglossia between H and L varieties is stable, tending to persist over several centuries. Fishman (1980) takes it even further, stating that diglossia is a prerequisite for the maintenance of minority languages:

> With diglossia, there is a clear separation between languages and values remain distinct, yet complementary, in the various social domains. Without diglossia, one language would replace the other as the roles and values that separate them soon merge together and become blurred. (Fishman 1980: 102)

From a practical standpoint, this means that if a minority language does not have a functional differentiation towards the majority language it is condemned to death. This implication has received considerable critique, especially for its monolingual bias. Cromdal (2000: 57) argues, for example, that by highlighting language separateness Fishman does not take into account mixed speech modes and code-switching as a way of strategies for social negotiation by individuals (see also Bani-Shoraka, 2005: 30). Nevertheless, the model has inspired numerous scholars concerned with linguistic minorities. For example, McCartney (2002) uses this theory to explain the decline of the Irish language since the establishment of the Irish Free State in 1922. Amongst other sources, he recalls a report of the committee on Language Attitudes Research, concluding that in the 1970s “language use in Ireland was not based on domains but on networks; i.e. Irish and English

European countries: They have to accept that their children are educated in the majority language solely, which in this case means the official language of the region (source: www.all-about-switzerland.info/swiss-population-languages.htm, retrieved 2009-02-06). See also Tiselius (2002/2010) who discusses a parallel development and its consequences for immigrants in Belgium. Thus, in all these cases, from the immigrants’ perspective, we are dealing with case 3 (i.e. bilingualism without diglossia) rather than case 2.

8 It should here be noted that there is a group among the Swedish-Hungarians that originates from a setting that might at first sight seem like case 3 (bilingualism without diglossia). The group I am referring to has lived in Transylvania (a part of Romania) side by side with other ethnicities, including majority members who speak Romanian. Nevertheless, in their original settings, they formed a stable bilingual community with combined bilingualism and diglossia, i.e. case 1 (For further details see section 3.2).
were not used for different purposes; language choice depended on who people were talking to.” Referring to O’Riagáin (1997), he further argues that as a result of “wider contact and the spread of English through the population, Irish-speaking communities survived only in the most isolated and economically backward areas”. Boyd and Latomaa (1996) use Fishman’s diglossia related typology in their comparative study of language use in four immigrant groups in the Nordic region (North Americans, Finns, Turks and Vietnamese). Surprisingly, the authors found relatively stable levels of bilingualism among the North Americans and Turks not predicted by Fishman’s typology. The authors argue that it is probable that the “stability” is the result of the relative status of the languages involved and the way these minorities have been received by the host societies rather than from the pattern of language use within the groups (for more details on Boyd & Latomaa’s study see section 2.2.3.4).

2.1.1.2 Covariation of different factors

The situation of the Welsh language in Britain may serve as another example of how different factors covary in language shift and subsequent revival. Romaine (1995: 41-43, referring to Ambrose & Williams, 1981, and Williams, 1987) provides an overview of the Welsh language situation in the early 1980s. At that time, areas of Wales differed considerably in terms of the proportion of Welsh speakers and also between urban and rural areas. Similarly to other Celtic languages in the region (Irish and Gaelic), there was no urban area where the language was secured. Industrialisation led to a significant in-migration of English monolingual speakers into the area. Although Welsh has gained institutional status (it is the language of the Methodist church and it has also been introduced in public administration and education), as a consequence of an increase in mixed (exogamic) marriages, the home was no longer able to reproduce the language. Marilyn Martin-Jones and Saxena (e.g. 2001 and 2003) and Nigel Musk’s (2006) investigations in the Welsh educational context show a picture of ethnic revival and associated language revitalisation efforts at the turn of the century. Coupland, Bishop, Evans and Garrett (2006) widen the perspective and place the surprisingly successful case of Welsh language revitalisation in the context of globalization, and by doing so they show the increasingly positive impact of mobility and transnational networks on language use processes. Rather than relying on census data and large-scale studies, these examples emphasise the need for investigation of real-life opportunities for minority language usage. (More emphasis on children’s actual language usage in the minority language will follow in sections 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.)

The educational background of immigrants is often mentioned as a primary factor affecting the outcome of language contact. Immigrants with a higher educa-

---

9 Lainio (1996) relates similarly the decrease in minority language usage to an increased tendency for exogamy, i.e. interethnic marriages among the Finnish-Swedes.
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...tion usually have better prospects for economic success in the host country, whereas those with lower education have considerably more difficulty finding job opportunities in Western countries. The effects of a group’s overall level of education on the group’s language maintenance are nevertheless ambivalent. On the one side, low education might favour language maintenance, as shown by Haugen’s (1953) investigation of Norwegian settlers in America; Fishman (1966/1972: 63ff.), on the other side, argues that the poor, rural background explains the relatively low ethnic consciousness and the following rapid language shift of immigrants to the United States prior to World War I. According to Fishman (1966/1972, 1980, 1991), well-educated members in a minority are needed to establish institutions supporting the language maintenance efforts of the group and to look after the group’s interests towards the majority. Boyd (1985: 8) notes in contrast that the high education level among Finnish immigrants in Sweden, especially if their education has included learning the language of the dominant majority, might explain the high rate of language shift within this group.

When large groups settle in particular geographic areas, they are often in a better position to preserve their language and mobilize the group members toward support of their language. Haugen (1953), for example, observed that a strong religious cohesion in rural areas in combination with the Norwegian language as a symbol of unity provided an effective guard against a shift towards the English language. Nevertheless, when Norwegian Americans left their rural areas for work in urban areas, rapid language loss was the result. As shown in the Welsh case, urbanisation seems to have similar effects even in cases where the minorities do not leave their original settlement area (see also Gal, 1979, for Hungarian in Austria, and O’Riagáin, 1997, for Irish in Britain), which leads me to conclude that it is more a question of cohesiveness contra dispersedness that makes the difference.

2.1.1.3 The links between intergenerational language transmission and language shift

In 1991, Fishman constructed a graded intergenerational disruption scale (GIDS) for threatened languages to support work on reversing language shift (RLS). As shown in figure 2.1 the scale is modelled on the Richter Scale and includes eight steps: stretching from stage 1, which represents the least vulnerable state for minority groups, to stage 8, which stands for the most disturbed situation, where only elderly and geographically isolated people can speak the language in question. Transmission of the community language in the homes is crucial for language maintenance, according to Fishman. Although he acknowledges the importance of mother-tongue schooling for minorities, he argues that without

Note that the list presented here is a synthesis of Fishman’s 1991 and 2001 versions of the scale. For the sake of clarity, I have also changed the original wording “Xish/Xmen” to “minority language”/“minority language users” and “Yish/Ymen” to “majority language”/“majority language speakers”.
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community support, this is not enough for language maintenance (1991: 87). Intergenerational language transmission is thus placed on stage 6, representing the watershed between language maintenance and language shift. Different levels of institutional support for minority language maintenance follow on lower stages, schooling in minority language being placed on stage 4 and supplementary education in the minority language outside school on stage 5. According to Fishman, at stage 5 a speech community has “guided literacy” (ibid., 96), the purpose of which is aiding oralcy. Most importantly, stage 5 is “primarily under intragroup sponsorship, with respect to both its acquisition, its content and its control” and “agencies of RLS-oriented literacy acquisition will receive no governmental funding on the one hand, and will not satisfy compulsory education requirements, on the other hand” (ibid., 98).

As Fishman sees it, “Education links those who receive it to the reward system controlled by those who provide it. That is its function and that is what motivates its success. RLS activists must make sure that the education of Xish children links them as early as possible and as closely as possible to the maximal possible Xish cultural reward system” (ibid, 102). Stages 4 to 1 “represent the focus on language maintenance…i.e. on the creation of the broader societal environment (going beyond childhood and adolescence to adulthood) in which the transmitted
language can prosper and move toward a growing pool of speakers for subsequent intergenerational transmission” (ibid., 113 f., my italicisation).

The GIDS scale has been questioned mainly as a tool of implicationality, i.e. whether it can be interpreted as a process, so that a group starts on the lower stages and advances stepwise higher. Fishman himself indicates that this is the case (1991: 87). However, several revitalisation studies have shown that stage 4 may be a necessary prerequisite of stage 6 (cf. Jansson, 2003, for Inari Sami in Sweden). Hornberger and King (2001: 186), who investigated Quechua revitalisation in the Andes, argue for the same reason that the scale should be regarded as a “heuristic device” with no implicationality. In the present study, the GIDS scale is mainly used as a description of the situation at a certain moment, serving as a basis of comparison between the pre- and in-contact situation of the immigrants featuring in this study (see chapter 3).

The term intergenerational language transmission is nowadays less emphasised in the literature,11 and the focus has been transposed to parts of the process, viewing the issue from either the children’s (referring to the language acquisition process) or the group’s perspective (language maintenance and shift).

The role of the school in supporting or repressing minority languages has been discussed by many researchers before and after Fishman (e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984; Garcia, 1997; Baker, 1996; Baker & Prys-Jones, 1998). To which degree and in which way the language maintenance efforts of immigrants have been assured in different countries has nevertheless been shown to depend mostly on the host societies and their language and/or educational policy and only minimally on the immigrants themselves (cf. Fishman, 1966/1972; Glenn & De Jong, 1996; Baker & Prys-Jones, 1998). If offered at all, it is usually the standard variety of the minority language that is emphasised to children at school; speakers of other varieties might feel diminished or offended and thus choose to not take part in this education. Religious and/or ethnic schools substantially under minority control (Fishman’s stage 4b on the GIDS scale) might play an important role in the language maintenance efforts of large and/or cohesive migrant groups (such as the Finns and Islamic groups might be in today’s Sweden). In case of small and dispersed groups, supplementary education outside mainstream institutions (Fishman’s stage 5) might be the only way of promoting minority language development, often only possible through voluntary engagement on behalf of the minority (cf. Glenn & de Jong, 1996; Martin, 2007; for an overview of available supplementary education for Hungarian speaking pupils in Sweden, see György-Ullholm, 2004 and 2002/2010).

11 As one of a few counterexamples, however, see the investigations of Helen Borland (2005 and 2006) in the context of Australia.
2.1.1.4 Research on immigrant languages in Europe

According to Extra & Verhoeven (1993b: 3), research concerning immigrants’ linguistic repertoires in Europe has long been characterised by a “biased interest in L2 acquisition and L2 use”, mainly as an “accurate reflection of the vast American literature on bilingualism” but also due to “the traditionally philological orientation of European research on non-indigenous languages such as Turkish, Arabic, or South-Asian languages.” Some efforts to counteract this one-sided perspective emerged throughout Europe during the late 1980s. A landmark, in terms of both scope and size, was the Linguistic Minority Project (1985), which was followed up by a study of Alladina & Edwards (1991) on languages other than English in Great Britain. Similar studies have been published in Sweden (see section 3.3).

Hungarian immigrants’ language use has hitherto been studied in the United States (e.g. Kontra, 1990; Bartha, 1993, 1995/96 and 2002; Fenyvesi, 1995 and 2005), Australia, (Kovács, 2001 and 2005), and Austria (Gal, 1979; Bodó, 2005). However, despite the fact that Germany, Sweden and Norway have received large groups of Hungarian refugees in several waves during the second half of the 20th century (see chapter 3), linguistic studies of these groups are still missing.

2.1.2. The social psychology of language and the significance of earlier experiences in migrant settings

Language as a group marker and/or as a symbol of ethnic identity has been addressed by many researchers. In an anthology exploring the links between language and ethnicity, Fishman and his co-authors (1985) point to the triple character of language, regarding it simultaneously as a part of culture, an index of the culture with which it is associated, and as a symbol of that culture. Because of its multiple affiliations, they argue, language has been tightly implicated in the development of ethnicity, nationalism, imperialism at both national and international levels.

Although language does not necessarily have to be a central part of a group’s culture, when it comes to intra- and inter-group relations, it might play a major role in shaping these relations. It is exactly in this context that another research area evolved in the beginning of the 1980s, establishing itself as a potentially important field of sociolinguistics, namely the social psychology of language; later on it became associated primarily with the works of Howard Giles, John C. Turner and Nicolas Coupland.

The notion of language as a core value was launched by Smolicz (1980, 1992) in connection to his investigations of language shift in the Australian context. Although Smolicz does not explicitly belong to this tradition, his work has many connections to the early social psychological theories of language and language use. Smolicz’ main point is that the more important the language appears to be as a marker of ethnic identity, the more probable it is that people will make an effort to preserve it. Apart from demographic explanations, such as group size and concen-
tration of speakers within a given area, he also underlines social reasons for language maintenance. Polish is mentioned as one of the languages having a high core value in Australia. The explanation Smolicz offers is that the language was oppressed for a long time in its original settings, and as such, it became a symbol for its people. Welsh serves, on the contrary, as an example for immigrant languages that have been abandoned relatively fast. Smolicz argues that this might have happened due to the low status of the Welsh language in its original settings (see discussion in the previous section), which, according to Smolicz, let the speakers believe that their language had no future.

Smolicz’ results on immigrant languages in Australia resemble another influential idea in the field of social psychology, namely Giles, Bourhis and Taylor’s concept of *ethnolinguistic vitality*, used to refer to “that which makes a group likely to behave as a distinctive and active collective entity in intergroup situations” (1977: 308). According to the original concept, the relative vitality of an ethnolinguistic group can objectively be determined by analysing three different types of factors, i.e. status factors, demographic factors, and institutional support and control. The relative vitality of the group could then be determined by analysing these three main factors together and by classifying groups along a continuum from high to low (ibid. p. 317). Among other discussions, they also point out that language can be a strong symbol of ethnic identity as a link to the group’s past (ibid., 307 and 328; see also Fishman 1977: 25).

Following the sociolinguistic trend towards micro levels of analysis, Giles, Leets & Coupland, later (cf. 1990) modified their approach for defining ethnolinguistic vitality. Most importantly, they urged for studying the variation of language shift factors on the individual level rather than the group level and to focus on the *subjective perception* of the earlier claimed vitality factors (i.e. socio-economic status, group size, group spread, and institutional support).

Past and current research dealing with cross-cultural communication in multilingual settings has been guided mainly by the so-called *Speech Accommodation Theory* (cf. Giles & Smith, 1979), which is better known nowadays by the name *Communication Accommodation Theory* (cf. Sheppard, Giles & Le Poire, 2001; Sachdev & Bourhis, 2001). The theory aims to explore the interplay between individuals’ linguistic behaviour and their social relationships in inter-group communication. The underlying assumption is that all humans strive for acknowledgement and make appropriate choices in life to raise their status and self-esteem. Language use in this view is understood as being governed by the person’s social identity. Convergence and divergence as individual and group strategies are central to this theory. Wanting to be appreciated by other people encourages us to

---

12 It is, however, worthy to note that identification with a language and positive attitudes towards it do not guarantee its maintenance in itself. Romaine (1995: 43) refers to the case of Ireland as an example, where “the necessity of using English has overpowered antipathy towards English and the English people.” Thus, besides analysing language attitudes, it is still necessary to take account of power relations, and the cultural and socio-historical frames in which language use is embedded.
act more like them and to accommodate (converge) to their communication styles when interacting with them. In multilingual settings, the theory predicts that members of ethnolinguistically vital minorities are experiencing a positive social identity, seeing themselves as bearers of a high status culture and/or language. This in turn may account for divergence in language use towards the majority, something that in the long run may facilitate language maintenance for the group. Ethnolinguistically unconscious minorities, on the other hand, are often experiencing negative social identity, which makes them more vulnerable in inter-group relations; convergence towards the majority norms serves as a way to raise their individual status in inter-group relations and thus also their self-esteem. If we interpret these theories in a language contact situation, a preference for the majority language is to be expected for members of ethnolinguistically non-vital groups and, as a consequence, rapid language shift on a group level. Ethnolinguistically vital groups, on the other hand, have a more positive view of themselves and are expected to maintain their language to a higher degree.

Both concepts, i.e. core value and ethnolinguistic vitality,\footnote{Many researchers have, however, used the term in a more pragmatic way than it was probably intended: as a symbol of language maintenance. In a review on the extent of English use in different immigrant groups in Australia, Clyne (1982: 36) concludes, for example, that Greek-Australians, of which only 3% claimed to use English regularly, showed the greatest ethnolinguistic vitality, and Dutch-Australians, of which 44% claimed to use English regularly, displayed the least amount of ethnolinguistic variety (for a similar example, see Yagmur & Akinci, 2003, or Yagmur, 2004).} have originally been ascribed to a group level. The main difference between the two approaches is that Smolicz applies an in-group perspective to language and language maintenance, whereas Giles and his co-workers emphasise the role of inter-group relations. Although these ideas might seem quite different at first sight, the parallels between the two approaches become transparent when we apply them to the same language settings. Polish speakers may in Giles’ terms exemplify an ethnolinguistically vital minority in the Australian context, whereas the Welsh group might be understood as an ethnolinguistically non-vital minority in inter-group relations; however, the underlying assumptions of both concepts, namely people’s attitudes towards languages and groups, strongly influence the language choice of individuals. (For an overview of different factors influencing individual language choice, see section 2.3. For a discussion concerning language attitudes and their impact on language acquisition, see sections 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.) Paulston (e.g. 1994) discusses in a similar manner the issue of ‘unreflected ethnicity’ as a kind of unawareness threatening group cohesion (as opposed to ‘ethnic movement’). She argues that if a group’s members take their ethnicity for granted they are not prepared to reproduce it when confronted with an assimilative context.

Tim McNamara’s study (1987) on language shift among Israelis in Australia is of special interest in this context as well, emphasising the precluding intergroup situation as a trigger of rapid language shift in a migratory context. The analysis
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provided by McNamara is based on Tajfel’s *Social Identity Theory* (1974 and 1981), one of the most influential theories within social psychology, although seldom applied directly to linguistic research. According to Tajfel (1981: 255), “the knowledge of our group membership and the positive or negative values attached to them is defined as social identity, which has meaning only in comparison with other relevant social groups”. McNamara conducted interviews with Israelis in Melbourne in order to investigate their language attitudes and, most importantly, their perceptions of the new inter-group setting. First of all, he found strong evidence for language attitudes favouring English over Hebrew among his informants. The results also showed that in Australia, the Israelis experienced negative social identity in a multiple sense: as immigrants they felt stigmatised by the Australians, and as yordim (a Hebrew word with negative connotations meaning native Hebrew speakers who chose to leave Israel) by the members of the local Jewish community. The only way to get rid of this stigma was to converge linguistically to the majority language English. This in turn, argues McNamara, serves as the main explanation for the rapid language shift of the group within one generation. A more recent example of a social identity inspired approach is Vera Irwin’s (2007) study in progress, which addresses the language use practices of different groups of Russian speaking immigrants in Germany.

In addition to the theories presented here, there are several scholars from other research areas who point to the relevance of earlier experiences for a group’s language maintenance efforts. As early as the mid-1960s, Kloss (1966: 206 ff.), for example, was arguing that minorities have accumulated strategies that might help them to cope with an emerging need of a similar kind in the future. Fishman (1972: 66) notes, on the other hand, that immigrants originating from majority settings are often overwhelmed by the demands of the new society they encounter, and as they often lack a consensus regarding language ideology, they struggle more internally before they are ready to build institutions supporting the groups’ language maintenance efforts. Boyd (1985: 8) suggests that a group that had succeeded in maintaining its language as a minority language in the homeland would have better chances of surviving as a linguistic minority in a new language contact situation, i.e. following a migration.14

John Ogbu’s (e.g. 1997, 1998) work in the area of minority status and schooling might also be relevant in this context. Through comparative and ethnographic

---

14 In her investigation of language use among immigrant adolescents in Sweden, Boyd (1985) explicitly distinguishes a pre-contact phase from a contact phase. In the analysis of her data, however, she does not follow up the possible correlations between these factors with the (reported) degree of bilingualism in her informants. A possible motivation for avoiding such a comparison of data might be the vague operationalisation of pre-contact factors: besides the immigrants’ situation in the home country, among the pre-contact factors she also includes the relation between homeland and host country as well as the ideologies and attitudes towards diversity in the host country. As immigrants usually become affected by these two latter groups of factors after rather than prior to migration, in my analysis they are considered as in-contact factors.
research in several communities in the United States, he found that the reaction of minorities to assimilative efforts on behalf of the host society greatly depends on their history and reason for migration, voluntary minorities being more eager to accommodate to the new context, while involuntary minorities prefer sticking together, a social behaviour associated with better language maintenance chances for the group.

As mentioned earlier, the Hungarian immigrants in Sweden represent not one but several different groups in regard to the theories presented here, some of them originating from minority settings, while others from majority settings of a different kind. In chapter 3, I will present the focus groups of the present study in more detail and relate the theories presented here to their situation in their respective homelands.

2.1.3 From the notion of speech communities to the network concept: search for the mezzo level of analysis

It is commonly argued that where intelligibility is not in question, language differences serve primarily to mark social identity and are perpetuated in accordance with established norms and traditions. But what are the conditions that determine when such traditions are preserved or eliminated? (Gumperz, 1982: 39)

The necessity of identifying the socio-cultural context, role expectations, norms, and other societal phenomena in order to fully understand the meaning of language choice has been repeatedly emphasised in different studies (e.g. Hymes, 1968 and 1972a; Scotton 1986; Milroy & Li 1995). According to Gumperz (1982: 24), the speech community is the unit that must be the starting point of all linguistic analysis, not the individual speakers or their linguistic competence. A basic definition of the term is that of a group of people who are defined by density of communication and/or by symbolic integration with respect to communicative norms, regardless of the number of languages or varieties employed (Gumperz, 1964 and 1982). According to Dell Hymes (1972a: 54 f.), the term “postulates the basis of description as a social, rather than a linguistic, entity”, defined by “shared rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, and rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety”.

However, as Hudson (1996) points out, no matter the specificity of its definition, the term ‘speech community’ has still little applicability as an analytical tool in sociolinguistic work. In contrast to Gumperz (see above), Hudson (1996: 229) declares that “it is impossible to understand the relationships that really matters to a sociolinguist except at the micro level of the individual person and the individual linguistic item. […] [Speech communities] turn out to be too fluid and ill-defined to be seriously studied in their own right.” Additionally, he also argues that the term is misleading, “by implying the existence of ‘real’ communities ‘out there’, which we could discover if we only knew how […] Our socio-linguistic world is not organised in terms of objective ‘speech communities’” (Hudson, 1996: 28 f.).
Another major problem with terms like ‘speech community’, ‘language community’ and ‘language group’ is that language tends to be overemphasised as a base of group formation. As indicated in the section above, language use may be one means of setting a boundary (Barth, 1967), but it is far from being the sole determiner of social groupings. Besides people’s linguistic repertoire, several other characteristics might serve as a common ground in building relationships. A group might as well be based on social, ethnic, economic, cultural, political affiliation as on language. As Baker & Prys-Jones (1998: 97) point out, “Age and gender, sociocultural and socioeconomic interests, common beliefs and values will always play a part in the formation and continuation of groups.”

It is in this context that the notion of social network becomes essential. Gumperz himself used a method of systematic tracing of networks of social relationships in an ethnographic study on the social and linguistic determinants of language shift in a small Slovenian-German bilingual community in Kärnten, Austria. Within this framework, Gumperz (1982: 38) recognizes frequency and intensity of communication to be the main force both in upholding and changing communicative norms (in his own wording “language usage conventions”) and states that networks “associate classes of individuals with interactive experience” (ibid., 41). A network is then, in contrast to the vaguer notion of speech community, best described as a group of people who actively uphold a personal relationship through regular interaction with each other.

Note that members of a network do not necessarily belong to just one speech community; for purposes of interaction, however, members of a network need to share at least one common language. Through regular interaction, members of a network develop similar language practices and language attitudes, including understanding which language choice is appropriate in a given situation. This implies also that if a network consists of both monolingual and bilingual members, the more prestigious language will become the dominant language of the network, accordingly affecting the linguistic repertoire of the bilingual speakers included in the network.

Susan Gal, who investigated language shift in a Hungarian-German bilingual community in Burgenland, Austria, was one of the first sociolinguists to base her conclusions on the concept of networks. Although not expressed explicitly, Gal’s study (1979) reveals the cruciality of power relations in language contact situations. By observing the language choice of community members towards given interlocutors and comparing their choices with the networks these individuals were part of, Gal discovered that language choice patterns in the community reflected the social contrast between rural and modern urban life styles. The more peasants a speaker had in her networks, the greater the tendency was to use Hungarian, whereas urban workers with a modern lifestyle tended to use German to a higher degree. In this context, Hungarian was associated with older generations and a traditional life style, thus symbolising backwardness, whereas German became a symbol of upward striving and high social status. Gal found apparent
signs of this attitudinal change occurring in both in-group and inter-group interactions. She notes, for example, that children of peasants were no longer using German simply out of necessity but as a way of being dissociated from the local peasant identity, which had apparently become a stigma (Gal 1979: 63). Interestingly, she also observed that in the presence of monolingual Germans, bilingual speakers tended to speak only German. When asked for the reasons, her informants stated it was out of politeness.\(^{15}\) Gal concludes that language choice in Oberwart has become restricted; however, she does not discuss the question of how this relates to the concept of speech community.

The list of interlocutor types\(^{16}\) Gal used in her study reflected a combination of age and contextual settings that each type was associated with. The results were presented in an implicational scale, which has since become an important point of reference in bilingual literature. However, as Gal (1979: 110 f.) points out, conversations where younger members of the community speak German to the older members, who in turn speak Hungarian to them, are difficult to display using scales of this kind. They are, nonetheless, important indicators of an ongoing social change.

Li Wei’s study (1994) on language choice in the Chinese community in Tyneside, England, is an even more sophisticated network-based approach found in the field. Developing and expanding Gumperz’ ideas on language shift and code-switching, Li interprets language choice primarily as an ‘act of identity’. Inspired by the works of Gal (1979), Milroy (1987) and Milroy and Milroy (1992), he acknowledges *societal network analysis* as the only approach being “capable of bridging the macro and micro approaches as well as accounting for the interrelation between them” (Li, 1994: 34 f.). By means of ethnographical descriptions of linguistic practices in ten Chinese immigrant families, he proves the feasibility of the approach. Moreover, by offering detailed description of the social, economical and political factors involved, he also shows how language use practices are embedded in the larger societal context.

Similarly to other studies of language shift, Li found that the shift in language choice patterns over generations is also accompanied by intergenerational variation in what he calls ‘language ability’. Most importantly, he observes that this also implies a difference between the generations in “the ability to use the two languages in speech and writing” (Li, 1994: 114). Nevertheless, generation was not the only explanation for difference in language use. Gender and occupation associated with different kinds of interpersonal network ties proved to be similarly

\(^{15}\) It is noteworthy that this was the same reason given by Gumperz’ informants in Kärnten, who switched from Slovenian to the local German dialect whenever an outsider came within hearing distance. It was also a reason mentioned by several informants in my investigation for switching to Swedish.

\(^{16}\) The 11 categories on Gal’s list of possible interlocutors were, in order of their implicationality: God, grandparents and their generation, black market clients, parents and their generation, age-mates, brothers and sisters, spouse, children and their generation, government officials, grandchildren and their generation, and doctor.
important in this respect. In the implicational scales of language use patterns adapted from Gal (1979), Li also includes an *ethnic index* for three types of network ties in addition to the list of possible interlocutors. By doing so, he is able to show that a social division based on gender, generation and occupation are also connected to different sets of networks and the different language use patterns of their informants. Most importantly, Li found that speakers with more Chinese ties generally had a better command of Chinese, which they used for a wider range of communicative purposes, but that the same speakers had a rather restricted use of English; conversely, those who had more English speakers among their network ties were generally better in English, whereas their Chinese was rather limited (ibid., 142).

However useful the network approach might be in the case of the Hungarian community in Oberwart and the Chinese community in Tyneside, it is not universally applicable to all minority contexts. As Li notes, “[a] network approach is more feasible with groups who may be economically marginal, or powerless, and resident in homogenous neighbourhoods and territorially well-defined neighbourhoods” (ibid., 33). As will be clear in the consecutive chapters, Hungarian immigrants in Sweden instead represent a case of well-integrated, high-status immigrants, with a widespread geographic distribution. This is not to say, however, that it is useless to study network approaches and their bearing on such a population.

First of all, we may reflect on what functions networks perform in people’s lives and what kind of information they might reveal for us researchers. As indicated through the approaches of social psychology (see above), our attitudes and social practices (including linguistic practices) are highly dependent on the people we interact with, and especially of those we are in touch with on a regular basis. Networks are created by people for special purposes, as Li points out (1994: 32). Within the category of first-order ties, i.e. with whom individuals stay “in direct and regular contact” (ibid, 118), it is possible to distinguish between exchange and interactive networks. Exchange networks are traditionally formed by relatives and close friends. These ties are considered strong, as the probability of rewarding exchanges is high. Interactive networks, on the contrary, are considered weak because of their more limited purposes. Li mentions the relation between shop owners and their regular customers as an example. For Hungarian immigrants in Sweden, we might mention the relation between parents and school teachers as another typical example of weak ties. Most importantly, individuals do not rely on these contacts for personal favours and other material or symbolic resources. In addition to first-order ties, there is also a subset of personal networks called ‘passive ties’. Typically, friends and/or relatives living in other parts of the world constitute this part of an individual’s network. As Li points out, the wording ‘passive’ might be misleading in the context of migrants, as this kind of ties, despite the absence of regular contact, might still be regarded as important relations for the individual, providing important sentimental and moral support.
The ties presented above (exchange, interactive and passive)\(^{17}\) are arguably equally relevant for all migrants, irrespective of their status in society or the settlement pattern of the group. We might, however, expect a higher proportion of majority members among the exchange and interactive networks of high-status immigrants as compared to those of more marginalised groups. At the same time, the proportion of group members (in our case, Hungarian speakers) among the passive ties might still be comparable to those of other groups in the society.

Which languages minority children actually use and are exposed to on a regular basis as they grow up might also be seen as a reflection of their communities’ language ideologies and linguistic practices, which, in the long run, highly affect the community’s ability to maintain its distinctiveness through their specific set of languages. Minority children’s language acquisition might thus be understood as the other side of the coin as opposed to studies of language maintenance and shift. In the next section, I therefore turn my attention to research areas concerned with the bilingual development of children.

2.2 Bilingual language acquisition

As a result of increasing social mobility and internationalisation, studies addressing bilingual language development and education of bilingual children have increased dramatically over the past two decades, especially in the Western world. In contrast to other linguistic or psycholinguistic publications, the issue of childhood bilingualism also attracts considerable public interest. This raised awareness in issues concerning bilingual children in general and childrearing in particular is also reflected in a growing number of parents’ and teachers’ guides (e.g. Harding & Riley, 1986; Arnberg, 1987/2004; Cunningham-Andersson & Andersson, 1999; Baker 2000; Barron-Hauwaert, 2004). The public debate frequently reflects strong emotional involvement on the part of all participants, scholars, teachers and self-ascribed minority representants. Media campaigns pro or contra child bilingualism (Ebba-Witt Brattström senast!) do not, however, only influence the public climate but also the implications drawn by parents confronted with these issues on a day-to-day basis. As Lanza (2007: 45) points out, “attitudes towards bilingualism in general and bilingualism in early childhood in particular may vary considerably and have an impact on parents’ conception of their linguistic practices.” Thus, when examining questions of intergenerational language transmission, we need to take account not only of the psycholinguistic factors surrounding the acquisition of two languages but also of the broader socio-cultural frames in which children acquire those languages.

In the following section I will address joint issues of bilingualism (2.2.1), language acquisition (2.2.2 and 2.2.3) and language socialisation studies (2.2.4).

\(^{17}\) For a detailed overview of network types, see Li (1994: 118 f.), for a detailed description of network analysis, cf. Li & Milroy (2000).
with special relevance for this study. Topics covered include effects of language exposure, age of onset, and the interaction between the two languages involved, as well as important socio-cultural aspects of bilingual first and second language acquisition, such as motivation, language attitudes and linguistic practices in the family as well as language ideologies and schooling. However, before actually proceeding to the related theoretical and methodological issues, some basic definitions and major typologies for classifying bilingual individuals need to be introduced.

2.2.1 Definitions of individual bilingualism

Bilingualism is usually defined as an individual skill of people mastering more than one language. Bilingualism is, however, a complex psychological and socio-cultural linguistic behaviour with multidimensional aspects. It is not just a matter of proficiency, but also that of the functions and attitudes attached to the languages and cultures involved. To what extent and in which domains, stylistic aspects, etc. one actually “masters” two (or more) languages, depends on myriad factors. There is thus no agreed-upon definition of bilingualism among researchers. Which aspects of the phenomenon are accentuated in a concrete study is therefore largely defined by the theoretical framing, the focus and the aims of the study in question.

In this study, bilingualism is understood as a functional characteristic of individuals who actively use two (or more) languages in their everyday lives (Grosjean, 1982) and who thus are able to produce meaningful utterances in both languages according to the sociocultural demands of their communities. In this context, I largely rely on Hymes’ (cf. 1972b, 1987) notion of ‘communicative competence’, which involves not only the language code but also the social and cultural rules of language use; in the case of bilinguals this also includes appropriate language choice (see also section 2.3). The linguistic repertoire of an individual at a certain point in time will thus be seen as a reflection of the individual’s language use during this (and partly earlier) period(s) of his or her life. Consequently, instead of emphasising differences in proficiency level between an individual’s two languages, I prefer to discuss the overall linguistic repertoire of these individuals as consisting of a (partly overlapping) combination of different registers and vocabularies in the two languages, depending on the needs of the individual in question (see chapter 9).

---

19 Different registers or styles are included here, defined as socially conditioned forms of oral and written discourse. Jokes, requests, cursing, and apologies require, for example, certain expressions and conventionalised patterns of language use. Implicit in the ethnography of communication is that such conventions of social discourse are acquired through everyday interactions in the family and the surrounding community (see also Saville-Troike, 2003). Children growing up in bilingual settings will accordingly cover these areas of competence in one or both languages, depending on the linguistic input and the expectations they are exposed to. See also the description of functional bilingualism presented later in this work.
The term bilingualism often occurs in the literature modified by such terms as ‘fluent’ vs. ‘non-fluent’ and ‘balanced’ vs. ‘unbalanced’ (dominant) referring to the competency level in the languages involved; ‘simultaneous’ vs. ‘sequential’ (consecutive) referring to the order in which the two languages have been acquired; and ‘active’ (productive) vs. ‘passive’ (receptive), as well as ‘additive’ vs. ‘subtractive’, and ‘functional’ referring to outcomes of different kinds of bilingual language usage. Often, these concepts are interconnected; we might thus touch upon all of these modifiers during the overview of the literature. However, of major concern for this study are the latter terms of this series, i.e. those used to distinguish between active/passive, additive/subtractive, and functional, as they are closely linked to aspects of language use.

The term ‘functional’ refers to the fact that bilingualism is a necessity for the individual in question, which is a circumstance that has several implications for the linguistic repertoire of the individual child. First of all, the two languages may serve different purposes for the individual, thus leading to a difference in vocabulary and linguistic style repertoire in the two languages and potentially also to different levels of literacy skills in the languages involved. Additionally, there might be a difference in ‘language ability’ between the two languages in which one language is dominant, i.e. stronger than the other. Dominance in one of the languages is most obviously reflected in greater fluency and easier access to vocabulary and appropriate expressions in that language. This dominance might, however, reflect a state of the art at a certain moment and can be affected by change several times during an individual’s life (see section 2.2.2). Additionally, dominance might also be connected to several linguistic levels in the involved languages; for migrant children, literacy skills are, for example, typically more developed in the majority language, but at the same time it is still possible that the richness of the vocabulary in the minority language overpowers that of the majority language.

The distinction between ‘active’ and ‘passive’ bilinguals lies in the fact that not all bilinguals, and certainly not all bilingual children, might be able to actively use both of their languages. They might, nevertheless, be able to understand longer stretches of speech when exposed to their weaker language. These individuals are sometimes referred to as passive or receptive bilinguals. The status of these speakers might be very different in different minority groups, highly dependent on the status of language as a core value (section 2.1.2) for the group. A related, though entirely different concept is that of the ‘semi-speaker’, developed by Dorian (1981) in the Scottish Gaelic context. Dorian points out the need to include marginal members of a speech community in order to adequately address issues of language shift (and loss). The concept of ‘semi-speaker’ refers to people who actually speak a restricted and incomplete form of the minority language (in some cases reduced to a few words and expressions), but most importantly and, in contrast to ‘passive bilinguals’, Dorian’s ‘semi-speakers’ are aware of the social
rules governing interactions in the minority language and act in accordance to these norms (Dorian, 1981: 84 and 116f.).

The concept of ‘additive’ bilingualism (Lambert, 1974) addresses the most desirable outcome of second language learning, when learning a second language is associated with positive attitudes towards both languages and cultures involved and the further development of the child’s first language continues uninterrupted. ‘Subtractive’ bilingualism refers to the opposite, i.e. when the functions of the first language are taken over by the second language and learning the second language means losing the first. From a practical perspective, this means that the child becomes monolingual (or passive bilingual) in the majority language of the society. Which of these actually occurs has been found to be highly dependent on the type of educational programme children are exposed to. This issue has been addressed in a large number of educational studies, and I shall briefly address some of their findings in section 2.2.3.

2.2.2 Psycholinguistic accounts of early childhood bilingualism

Research on language acquisition is traditionally associated with psycholinguistics, which is divided into two focus areas: 1) research on bilingual first language acquisition, and 2) research on second language acquisition. The underlying assumption behind this division is that there are two distinct types of bilingualism: 1) simultaneous bilingualism, referring to children who are exposed to two (or more) languages from birth, and 2) sequential (also referred to as successive or consecutive) bilingualism, referring to children who start their linguistic development as monolinguals and are exposed to a second language considerably later, namely after the age of 3 years, and typically in institutionalised settings. The two research areas coined BFLA (Bilingual First Language Acquisition) and SLA (Second Language Acquisition), respectively, address childhood bilingualism in their own rights and highlight the differences between the two approaches for their cognitive and educational implications.  

Unfortunately, studies within these two areas apply different research methods. Recent studies in developmental psycholinguistics dealing with simultaneous bilingualism typically investigate the language development of individual children of a very young age, most often around 2 years of age. Their aim is to describe (and eventually compare) a parallel development in the child’s two languages over a longer period of time on the basis of participant observation and qualitative data analysis. Studies concerned with sequential bilinguals are in contrast usually based on quantitative measures and focus on specific aspects (phonology, morphosyntactic development or vocabulary size) of language acquisition in a larger group of children.
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20 For overviews of these areas, see McLaughlin (1984) and (1985), De Houwer (1995, 2009) and Meisel (2004).

21 There are, of course, a few exceptions to this trend represented by more traditional case studies describing the linguistic development of the authors’ own children (e.g. Leopold, 1939-1949; Caldas, 2006).
informants. Moreover, the subjects of these studies are considerably older, usually over the age of 6 years. Typically, these studies are also restricted to just one of the involved languages; most often, they are addressing questions of second language acquisition and the educational implications connected to it. These differences in focus and methodology make the results of the two areas difficult to compare.

Furthermore, there is also a practical problem with this division, namely that many children who might start as monolingual speakers of a minority language are exposed to influences from the majority language much earlier than the time they enter childcare. Even though they are not necessarily addressed in the language, minority children may hear, and thus also acquire, certain features of the majority language through the media, on the playground and also as it is spoken by older siblings, other family members and/or acquaintances of the family. The strict boundary between simultaneous and sequential bilingualism is especially questionable in the Swedish context, as most children enter daycare as early as by the age of one year, i.e. before many of them utter their first words. De Houwer (e.g. 1995) indicates that these children should be categorised as simultaneous bilinguals, similarly to children of intermarried couples. Nevertheless, because of the different sites and circumstances of exposure to the two languages, I do not consider them either as being simultaneous or sequential bilinguals, but rather something in between (see also Lanza, 2007: 48). This is especially true in cases where the minority language serves as the main source of communication within the family and the majority language is used exclusively in institutional settings during the child’s early childhood. Based on these observations, rather than focusing on the distinction between these two types of language acquisition devices, I shall highlight the most relevant theories and findings of both traditions in the following by addressing each question from a more holistic, socio-cultural perspective. Also, when addressing issues of common concern related to language acquisition by children born and raised in a new country, I will use the terms early childhood bilingualism and bilingual language acquisition insofar as possible.

Developmental psycholinguistics is of special interest here, especially as a source of advice on bilingual childrearing. Early studies in this field have followed the language development of a single child over several years, typically starting at the beginning of their first utterances. The two most famous studies in this tradition are those of Jules Ronjat (1913), and Werner Leopold (1939-1949), both of whom provided meticulous diary records on their children’s language development. Ronjat continued keeping records until his son reached the age of five, Leopold until his first-born daughter reached the age of 12 (although the records are less detailed after 8 years of age). While living in Paris, the Ronjats decided to raise their son, Louis, bilingually. Following the advice of a friend and fellow
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22 There are also a few psycholinguistic studies investigating certain aspects of bilingual children’s first language development, which in most cases also means investigating the development of the weaker language (cf. Namei, 2002).
linguist, Maurice Grammont, the parents applied a strict separation of the languages according to the speaker. The approach they applied became known as the one person - one language method, or OPOL,\[^{23}\] which refers to the requirement that parents (and preferably all other people around the child) remain consistent in talking in one language to the child. Later on, this method became grossly over-represented in the research literature (e.g. Arnberg, 1987; Taeschner, 1983; Meisel, 1990; De Houwer, 1990; Huss, 1991; Döpke, 1992; Okita, 2002; Caldas, 2006), and it is also the method that is advocated for in the majority of parental guides (e.g. Arnberg, 1987; Cunningham-Andersson, 1999; Baker, 2000). In section 2.2.3 and 2.3.4, I will address the issue of parental strategies in more detail and discuss different strategies applied in bilingual families.

Apart from some recent theoretical and methodological advancements in the field (such as the use of video- and tape-recordings, and the computerisation of diary records), studies in developmental psycholinguistics have largely maintained the same method over the years, longitudinal studies of a small number of very young children from privileged families still being the most common approach (De Houwer, 2009). Typically these studies also focus on children of intermarried families in which the parents speak different languages, whereas developmental studies of childrearing in immigrant families with parents sharing a minority language are still very limited in number.\[^{24}\] After a period of intense interest in the evolving linguistic repertoire of young children and the debate concerning early vs. gradual differentiation of the two language systems\[^{25}\] (cf. Volterra & Taeschner, 1978; Vihman, 1985; Meisel, 1989; Genesee, 1989; De Houwer, 1990), the main change in this tradition may be seen in the form of more focused micro-level analysis of parent-child conversations and particularly as an increased interest in studying the effect of parental input on the young child’s output (cf. Lanza, 1992, 1997; Huss, 1991; Döpke, 1992, Rontu, 2005).

Elisabeth Lanza (1997) investigated the language choice of two English-Norwegian bilingual toddlers in dialogues with their American mother and Norwegian father and compared these observations to other examples found in the literature. Lanza’s findings indicate that parental discourse strategies provide important guidance for the children on their way to becoming competent members
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\[^{23}\] The principle is sometimes also referred to as Grammont’s principle, e.g. by Hamers & Blanc (2000).

\[^{24}\] This imbalance in the literature may be due to the assumption that children in endogamic minority families acquire the majority language considerably later and, even more strikingly, outside the home (cf. Fishman, 1980); thus they are perceived as cases of second language acquisition. As my study shows, however, this is seldom the case for children born and raised in Sweden.

\[^{25}\] Today there is great consensus among researchers that simultaneous bilingual children do not go through an initial unitary stage of language development (i.e. they do not start with one system), but that even in the earliest stages of acquisition (i.e. the one-word stage and onward), they are able to differentiate between two languages they are addressed in and use their repertoire appropriately towards different interlocutors (cf. Lanza, 1997; Meisel, 2001; Genesee, 2003, 2006; De Houwer, 2009).
of the family, matching the bilingual practices of their environment. More precisely, Lanza found that the more consistent and rigorous the parent is in using his or her own language and rejecting child utterances containing elements from the other language, the more it facilitates the child using the parent’s language, at least in these dyadic conversations (for more details, see section 2.3.4). Lanza’s findings (most recently summarised in 2007) have important implications for this study, as several of the parents included in the study gave explicit examples of the strategies they applied to get their school-aged children to speak more Hungarian in certain situations (see 2.3.4 and 8.4.1).

The usefulness and generalisability of discourse analysis as described above has been questioned by some researchers because of its boundedness to the immediate context; the main critique concerns the lack of details on the children’s language learning history (e.g. Okita, 2002: 29). However, what these narrow analyses do reveal is that children are already aware of adult expectations and act as socially competent speakers at a very young age. This fact has recently also been confirmed by Yip & Matthews (2007), who conducted systematic observations alongside spontaneous speech data recordings of six English-Cantonese bilingual children in the Hong Kong area. Even in this detailed study, the authors conclude that, despite their low age, children, if given the choice, usually address an adult in the adult’s dominant language, thus showing evidence for their ability to detect such a detail.

The importance of language exposure is underlined by several other studies that use quantitative approaches. Yukawa (1997), for example, shows that her two children’s abilities to use certain structures and lexical elements in Japanese drastically decreased a short period after the family moved to Sweden and increased as a consequence of their return to Japan. Pearson, Fernandez, Lewedeg and Oller (1997) reported some similar findings in their study of young Spanish-English bilinguals; in particular, they found that the size of the children’s vocabulary in each language was closely related to exposure to the language in question. Along the same line, Yip and Matthews (2007) note that “due to contact time spent with the child”, the dominant language of the children was usually that of the mother. Another relevant study in this context is De Houwer’s (2004, 2006 and 2007) investigations on minority language usage among children based on written survey data from 1,899 families in Flandern with children 6-10 years of age. In 2007 De Houwer reported on children’s active bilingualism in these families, concluding that nearly one-quarter of all bilingual families in the sample had no children who spoke a minority language. Families where both parents spoke the minority language at home and where at most one parent spoke the majority language had a high chance of success. The ‘one parent-one language strategy’ did, however, not present a necessary nor sufficient precondition for children’s bilingual use. In her 2004 paper De Houwer analysed results concerning possible
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26 Yip & Matthews’ observations were stretched over a time of one to two years for each individual child, and the age range of the six children was between 1;6 to 4;6 years of age.
trilingualism among the children of her study and found that majority language (i.e. Dutch) input in the home was linked to lack of active trilingualism among the children, whereas active trilingualism was associated with the use of both minority languages in the family by the parents. Other potentially important factors reported in these studies were the relative frequency of language use by the children and the parents’ interactional strategies with their children.

Interlocutor has been found to be the earliest and most important contextual frame determining children’s language choice as early as in their second year (e.g. Vihman, 1985; Lanza, 1992 and 1997). Also, some evidence for style shifting related to roles and situations requiring different levels of politeness and formality has been found in children around the age of three (e.g. Andersson, 1990; Saville-Troike, 2003: 218). Recent studies of childhood bilingualism also emphasise the combined effect of different factors, such as input, interlocutor, age and gender (e.g. Yip & Matthews, 2007; David & Li, 2008). However, as David and Li (2008: 614) conclude, “Most importantly perhaps, parental input plays a crucial role in children’s lexical development. The amount of language exposure in each language significantly affects the children’s vocabulary size and language dominance. In addition, the way parents talk to their child influences the size of their lexicon.”

No matter the type of bilingual language acquisition, most psycholinguistic studies of childhood bilingualism show significant interactions between the developing grammars and vocabularies of children (cf. Taeschner, 1983; De Houwer, 1990; Meisel, 1990; Yip & Matthews, 2007). The circumstance that a change in environment often causes a change in language dominance in the bilingual child (the more striking the younger the child is when this happens) is known already from Leopold’s description of Hildegard’s sudden change in language dominance between the age of five and six, that is, during the period the Leopold family changed their residence between the United States and Germany. Also, other aspects of bilingual development that are found in Hildegard’s case have been repeatedly emphasised in the literature on bilingual children (including those who have acquired a second language in early childhood): an initial mixed language stage, the influence of the dominant language over the weaker one (on grammatical, lexical, and semantic levels), and the avoidance of difficult expressions and structures in the weaker language. As there is strong evidence that, given positive psycho-social circumstances, children acquiring a second language in childhood may not be distinguished from native speakers later on, I see no further reason to

27 The Critical Period Hypothesis (Lenneberg, 1967) predicts that after puberty, the “cerebral plasticity” of the brain is lost and the language learning ability becomes limited. This would imply that it is actually possible to acquire a language on native-like levels up to puberty. Later investigations have found that many speakers who started their second language acquisition in childhood do reach near-native levels in that language; some of them might even be indistinguishable from native speakers in everyday oral communication. Hyltenstam and Abrahamsson (e.g. 2003, and Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam, 2009) present clear evidence, however, that a detailed linguistic analysis is able to reveal significant differences compared to
discuss the differences between these two groups of children with respect to this study.

2.2.3 Social, cultural and psychological factors

The most essential factor in the context of childhood bilingualism (and hence, also for the maintenance of the minority language) is that the child feels the need to use two (or more) languages in his or her everyday life (Grosjean 1982: 175). Parents’ language choice has been emphasised as one important factor in this regard (see above), although the family’s residence might be even more important, as indicated by Barron-Hauwaert’s investigations (2004). Another crucial factor addressed in the literature is the medium of instruction at school, and closely connected to it, the (often implicit) language ideologies expressed in the educational and societal context. In the following, I will review these different areas one by one.

2.2.3.1 Romaine’s typology of parental strategies

Parental strategies for raising children have been shown to be quite diverse in bilingual settings (cf. Schmidt-Makey, 1977; Harding & Riley, 1986; Romaine, 1995). According to Romaine (1995: 183-185), six basic types of parental strategies can be identified in the literature depending on factors such as

- the native language of parents,
- the language of the surrounding society and
- the parents’ conversational strategies towards the child.

Relevant for this study are four out of the six types of overall strategies described by Romaine:

‘One person – one language’ approach (OPOL) – Type 1 in Romaine’s typology

In this case, one of the parents is a representant of the majority, as was the case in Ronjat’s (1913) and Leopold’s (1939-49) families. Other examples of this kind of approach are presented by e.g. De Houver (1990), Huss (1991), Döpke (1992), Barron-Hauwaert (2003), Caldas (2006), and several other examples have been mentioned in the previous section of this chapter. As described earlier, the approach involves a strict compartmentalisation of the languages by the caregivers. Jules Ronjat and his wife were, for example, talking German to each other and using their respective mother tongues when addressing their son. Additionally,
they also hired a German-speaking nanny to increase minority language usage at home. As a result of their continuous and conscious efforts, Louis became bilingual in French and German. Since then, the majority of parental guides advocate for this approach (e.g. Arnberg, 1987; Cunningham-Andersson, 1999; Baker, 2000). Many of these descriptions are success stories, giving the impression that this rule will automatically result in linguistic success. In reality, there are, nevertheless, quite a few challenges that parents might encounter if choosing this strategy (cf. Okita, 2002; Barron-Hauwaert, 2004; Caldas, 2006). In some cases, the initial difficulties might lead parents to give up their original aim of raising bilingual children (cf. Sondergaard, 1981). As Hoffmann (1991: 45) points out, long-term success in these matters requires high motivation, constant effort, much creativity and economical sacrifice on the part of the parents, and this is especially true in cases in which the family lacks the support of a bilingual community. Interestingly, we have some information on Louis Ronjat and Hildegaard Leopold as 15-year-olds. Ronjat’s son is reported to have remained what today might be called a “functional” bilingual, preferring to read in German and take his school exams in French. Hildegaard, on the other hand, became clearly English dominant as she grew older and was reluctant to use German. Romaine (1995: 183) also points out that dominance in the majority language is probable for children in this kind of family setting if not counterbalanced in some other way.

‘Non-dominant home language without societal support’ - Type 3 in Romaine’s typology

A more transparent term for this strategy might be ‘minority language at home’ (mL@H, as suggested by Barron-Hauwaert in 2004). In this case, the parents share the same native language, which differs from that of the surrounding society at large. The parents speak the minority language to the child and most often also between themselves. Despite the fact that this type of family is typical among both autochthonous and migrant minorities, studies describing this sort of family are considerably fewer, and, most regrettablly, those that do exist are restricted to children below school age. Romaine mentions Pavlovitch (1920), Ruke-Dravina (1967) and Oksaar (1977) as studies that take this approach. The first two of these

29 A quite unique exception to this one-sided perspective is Harding & Riley’s short but highly informative parental guide written in 1986.
30 Romaine applies the term ‘non-dominant home language without community support’. As this study uses the term community with a narrower meaning, I have changed the terminology to what Romaine actually intended to refer to, namely societal support.
31 Note that Barron-Hauwert (2004) applies a different kind of typology, and in this particular strategy (minority language at home), she also includes mixed couples, both of them speaking to the child in the minority language. This latter type of family instead fits in Romaine’s category type 2.
32 The studies mentioned by Romaine cover the age span from birth to 2, 6 and 4 years, respectively.
same mother tongue – different origins
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studies represent classical cases of the ‘minority language at home, majority language in public’ strategy. Oksaar’s (1977) description of her Swedish-Estonian son acquiring German at the age of 3;11 may, however, in my opinion, be a better fit for the next category.

‘Double non-dominant home language without societal support’ - Type 4 in Romaine’s typology

In this case the parents have different native languages, but neither of them is identical with that of the surrounding society. The parents speak their own language to the child from its birth. This strategy is highly related to that of type 1 (OPOL), but instead of bilingualism it can lead to trilingualism. However, because of a more restricted access to one of the languages, many children in this type of family become bilingual rather than trilingual, possibly with a passive knowledge of a third language (cf. De Houwer, 2004, 2006; Barron-Hauwaert, 2004). Despite a growing interest in trilingualism during the last decade (cf. the contributions in Cenoz, Hufeisen & Jessner, 2001a & b; Hoffmann & Ytsma, 2004), there are still relatively few studies addressing the issue from a developmental perspective. In this respect, Romaine mentions Elwert (1959) and Hoffmann (1985). Navracsic’s thesis (1999) describing the acquisition of Hungarian as a third language by two young English-Persian bilingual siblings residing in Hungary might also be added to this category.

‘Mixed languages’ - Type 6 in Romaine’s typology

As indicated by its name, this is a case in which both parents are bilingual and speak both languages to the child without a strict compartmentalisation of the two, i.e. with frequent code-switching (2.3.3) involved. Romaine concludes that this is probably the “most frequently occurring context for ‘natural’ bilingual acquisition” (1995: 185), “where the child is exposed to two languages in the home in an apparently unsystematic fashion” (ibid., 186). Romaine mentions Tabouret-Keller (1962) and Ellul (1978) in this regard; a more detailed and recent description of this kind of bilingual socialisation practices is provided by Zentella (1997). Most importantly, within this category, we have to distinguish between mixed language use with and without community support. As pointed out by Barron-Hauwaert (2004: 172 f.), families applying this strategy with success usually live in bilingual areas, where frequent code-switching is a social norm. In addition to these settings, Barron-Hauwaert (ibid., 174) further asserts that there are also families who initially devoted themselves to OPOL, but “often find themselves mixing more and more, […] and all members of the family can understand each other.” It is important to note that this is a very different situation as compared to raising children in a more coherent bilingual community where code-switching is accepted and regulated by communicative norms. Unfortunately, the effects of frequent code-switching without societal support have (to my knowledge) not
been investigated longitudinally yet, and thus, we do not know but might expect that it represents a transitory state to majority language use solely (see De Houwer, 2007; and Lanza, 2007).

2.2.3.2 Language use of significant people around the child

In addition to the parents’ language use with their child, families may also differ with regard to the language used between parents. This might also be considered an important factor for the language dominance of the children, especially in intermarried families (=exogamic marriages). Within each pattern, the parents may choose to address each other (a) in the majority language, (b) in the minority language, (c) in the language they usually speak to the children, (d) in a third language, or even (e) mixing both languages. While option (b) is recommended in the first place (cf. Arnberg, 1987; Baker, 2000) because it “guarantees a more extensive and more diversified exposure to the minority language” (Döpke, 1992: 12), Barron-Hauwaert (2004: 164) reports that the majority of interethnic families she came in contact with used the majority language together (a) and that option (c) was rarely chosen. Option (d) requires two bilingual parents with a good understanding of a third language, which also makes it infrequent.

Typologies of the above kind are of course simplifying, developed by having just one or at least the first-born child in mind. Also, they usually assume that the child is brought up in a nuclear family, i.e. by two parents. However, parents may separate or divorce and build new families (which, in turn may apply different conversational strategies), and in the case of three-generation families, the grandparents might be monolingual (or passive bilinguals) and spend more time with their grandchildren than the parents do. In addition to the relative frequency of language exposure accounted for by different kinds of interlocutors, these relatives and peers also provide another type of linguistic style repertoire for the child, depending on the generation they are part of, such as storytelling vs. chatting, traditional gender roles and respect towards elderly vs. rebelling against old norms, formal speech vs. youth jargon, etc. (cf. Saville-Troike, 2003). Additionally, Barron-Hauwaert (2004: 182) also asserts that parents usually choose one strategy to start with and adapt it to changing circumstances.

Besides the initial decisions taken by the parents, there are obviously also many individual factors that may affect the outcome in each family. Among these are parents’ consistency in applying the chosen language strategy (cf. Huss, 1991) and attitudes towards bilingualism in the extended network of the family and in the society at large, as well as the individual personalities of children and parents. Thus, it is hard to say which strategy is most effective in the long run, especially as it interacts with additional factors, such as the family’s neighbourhood and its linguistic composition, the medium of instruction at school, access to leisure activities in the minority language, parents’ educational background, language ideologies, etc. (see section 2.4 below).
Some studies indicate that children develop stronger ties to their mothers, interacting more frequently with them as compared to interactions with their fathers (e.g. Williams, 1987; Guttorm, 1987; Yip & Matthews, 2007), a relation that seems to hold also as they get older (Noller & Callan, 1990). In line with this sociological research, Sirén (1991) claimed in her study of nearly 600 bilingual families that mothers’ language use is critical; a re-examination of her data by De Houwer (2007: 417), however, revealed that her conclusions did not hold. Two other survey studies, conducted by Boyd (1997) in Sweden and De Houwer (2007) in Flanders, respectively, show no difference either in regard to minority language maintenance between families where the minority language was spoken by the mother vs. the father. Part of the explanation could be that sources of input may vary considerably depending on social and cultural factors (Saville-Troike, 2003: 215 ff.). Mother’s talk has often been assumed to provide the greatest, and hence, most important source of early language input, but fathers, grandparents, older siblings, servants, babysitters and childcare personnel might have major responsibilities in many cultures, including in modern Western societies, where women often return to their jobs relatively soon after childbirth. Saville-Troike (ibid., p. 216) also notes that there might be differences in acquired communicative strategies by children attending childcare as compared to those raised in the family home.

*Sibling*s can either increase or decrease minority language usage in the family. The new sociology of childhood (cf. Corsaro, 1997 and 2003; Ambert, 1997) and language socialisation studies (see section 2.2.4) emphasise children as active, creative social agents, who produce their own unique children’s culture (see also Piller, 2001). The arrival of a second child changes the power structure of the family (instead of 2:1, the relation becomes 2:2) and each additional child allows for re-evaluation of family practices. For second or third children growing up in a family where the older siblings chat in the minority language between themselves, with their parents, or with same-age peers, the language can be given a real boost. In the best case, there is a shared identity and support in the family connected to minority language usage. Charmian Kenner (2002) reports, for example, on several families in London, where children spend a long time with each other to learn the basics of Chinese, Arabic or Spanish literacy. Through role-playing activities, older children also help their younger brothers or sisters to adjust to the majority schools’ demands. A competitive relation between siblings has, on the contrary, been shown to affect children’s communicative practices negatively (Obied, 2002). However, supportive siblings, especially if they are close in age and share networks that are majority oriented (peers at school and in the neighbourhood), have also often been observed using the majority language between themselves, thus leading to a decrease in minority language input for their younger siblings as well. Susanne Döpke (1992), who studied six German-Australian children raised by the OPOL approach, found, for example, that children born later often became passive bilinguals, only able to understand but
not actively use the minority language. Parents may, of course, have changed strategies over time without noticing it, and may become less strict in their language usage compared to their strategies applied with the first-born child (cf. Barron-Hauwaert, 2004: 96). Through children’s increased use of the majority language at home, the language might also strengthen its status as a family language and lead to parental accommodation towards children’s language usage (cf. Luykx, 2005).

*Same age peers* who use the minority language might help to counterbalance the dominance of the majority language. One way families might encourage this type of relations is through their family networks, starting with monolingual cousins or children of close friends (cf. Barron-Hauwaert, 2004: 98). Parents might also encourage engagement in relations to bilingual mates sharing the same language pairs, although this might be more difficult for speakers of small and dispersed languages, like Hungarian in Sweden. It is also uncertain whether these contacts will facilitate or inhibit minority language usage because the children might prefer to communicate in the majority language between themselves. This is especially probable, as I have observed, if the communicative norms between the two families differ considerably with regard to minority language usage. There are, unfortunately, few studies focusing on same-age relationships among minority speakers and their implications for language maintenance. One exception is Winter and Pauwells’ (2006) macro-survey study, which focuses on Australian children of migrants from three ethnolinguistic groups (German, Greek, and Vietnamese) in their same-age peer friendships. The results of this study indicate that bilingual peers are a minimum but not sufficient condition for language maintenance. Winter and Pauwells found instead that the main aim of these groups was of a social nature: “Hyphenated belongings construct varying language maintenance alignments that reflect shared histories and authenticities (the migration experience) and the localizing of settlement (Australia).”

Today’s computer-based *technology tools* allow for a much greater and cheaper way of communication over long distances, connecting people around the world, often by means of the written word. It is especially in this context that literacy skills in the minority language might be of greatest relevance for minority children, a tendency that has gained special relevance during the 21st century. Different Internet communities, such as msn, youtube, facebook, myspace, twitter etc., provide rich opportunities to get acquainted with age-mates, both monolingual and bilingual, living in the same city or other parts of the world, many of them sharing the particular child’s minority language. However, the use of Internet sites most often requires basic literacy skills in the site’s working language. Also, the existence of these tools in family homes does not automatically mean having access to minority language sites, and without parental awareness of these matters, children and youngsters end up using these tools in the majority language, or today’s European lingua franca - English. Moreover, several sites using the minority language as its working language do allow communication in other
languages in private, especially English (e.g. facebook for Hungarian speakers: www.iwiw.hu).

2.2.3.3 Language attitudes and motivation

*Language attitudes* can be expressed in explicit talk about language but can also be implicit in the way people talk, e.g. in their language choice (e.g. Giles et al., 1977; Baker, 1992) and, if given the option, also in the educational decisions they make, e.g. choice of school and medium of instruction for their children (cf. Ambert, 1997; Kjellman, 2001; Tryggvason, 2002/2010). Attitudes count as a basic construct in social psychology and are usually described as an evaluative stance of an individual towards a certain phenomenon. Most definitions (cf. Ryan et al., 1982: 7) distinguish between three components of the concept: (a) a cognitive element, often described as “beliefs”; (b) an affective or emotional element; and (c) a behavioural element, which is a predisposition to act in a certain way (most likely in accordance with the other components). Usually, it is the affective component (b) that is considered to be the most central aspect of attitudes. The study of language attitudes is a complex area of research because it includes attitudes towards several aspects of language: language as a form (different languages and different varieties of the same language, as well as certain features of these varieties, i.e. certain sounds, expressions or grammatical formulations), language as behaviour (the use of different linguistic varieties), and the social and political implications of language use (e.g. standardisation, legislation concerning the use of certain languages in education). For some implications from the Social Psychology of Language, see section 2.1.2.

Day (1982) reviews research concerning the development of language attitudes during childhood from the perspective of communicative ethnography, emphasising attitudes as an integral part of children’s evolving communicative competence, including norms of interaction and norms of interpretation of discourse in the child’s speech community. The different studies presented by Day indicate that children acquire attitudes toward language at a very young age: around the age of three or four, they are able to recognize “own-group members and other-group members” (Day, 1982: 127), and between the age of five to seven years, they clearly show evidence of having particular language preferences (ibid., 120-125). Although this preference in the early ages is for the most part connected to the language spoken in the children’s homes (ibid., 120), by the age of ten, minority children attending majority schools seem to have internalised the dominating discourse and assign a higher value to the majority language than to their own varieties. Day’s (1982: 124) general conclusion is that “both minority and majority [children], reflect the attitudes toward language variation which are consistent with those of members of their immediate speech community” (or their immediate

---

33 For a short description of the concept of communicative competence in Hymes’ sense, see section 2.2.1.
networks, as we might interpret it in our context). However, it is important to note that the circumstances of data-gathering as well as research design might play a crucial role in these results. A considerable part of attitudinal research has been conducted in school settings, which in most cases demands the use of the standard code, in multilingual settings often implying the use of the majority language (cf. Parszyk, 1999; Haglund, 2005a, b, for school-aged children expressing such expectations in Sweden). Thus, as Day (ibid., 125) points out, minority children’s preference for the majority code in a survey or experimental setting might not be taken as a sign of rejection or devaluation of the minority language(s), but rather as a sign of highly developed social sensitivity; they have simply “come to recognize the value of the majority language”, at least in the given circumstances (see also Corsaro, 2003). Unfortunately, we still know very little about how children acquire their attitudes towards their first language; the only evident point is that the family is the primary source of these attitudes, but we do not know much about how children transform and use these attitudes as they are exposed to wider contexts (other than starting from late adolescence, e.g. Haglund, 2005a, b; Engblom, 2004; Kahlin, 2008, in the Swedish context).

In a paper published in 1999, De Houwer introduces the concept of ‘impact belief’ to the area of language acquisition research, referring to the cognitive component (see above) of parental attitudes. The aim of her paper is to construct a framework “to help explain the development of early active versus early passive bilingualism, and indeed early monolingualism in what is potentially a bilingual input condition.” Most importantly, De Houwer argues that besides parents’ affections and feelings towards particular languages, bilingualism and different aspects of language choice, researchers should also pay attention to another important variable for language transmission, namely the strength of impact belief, i.e. “the belief that parents can exercise some control over their children’s linguistic functioning” (De Houwer, 1999: 83). Her main claim is that the best chances for active bilingualism are those families in which the parents “have an impact belief concerning their own possible role in the language acquisition process, and where there is a general positive attitude towards the languages involved and to be bilingual” (De Houwer, ibid.). However, as Lanza (2007: 45) points out elsewhere, “attitudes towards bilingualism in general and bilingualism in early childhood in particular may vary considerably and have an impact on their [i.e. parents’] linguistic practices.” The situation of families that lack general support from a bilingual community is especially difficult in this regard, as many bilingual families are exposed to unfounded advice on bilingualism and childrearing from sources that may not be up-to-date with current research findings (Barron-Hauwaert, 2004: 46; King & Fogle 2006; Lanza, 2007: 52). By means of detailed analysis of bilingual couple’s reflections on childrearing, King and Fogle (2006), nevertheless, found that parents are not passive receivers of information provided

34 De Houwer uses the term ‘attitudes’ here, although she is clearly referring to the affective component of attitudes.
in the media and elsewhere but that they rather adapt these advices to fit their own beliefs and circumstances. Out of these discussions, we might conclude that parents who even before the birth of their children were convinced about the benefits of bilingualism and were committed to raising their children bilingually are more sensitive to and embrace positive feedback also later on, while parents who are initially unsure about issues connected to bilingualism in general and bilingual childrearing in particular will probably tend to overemphasise doubts and negative comments expressed in the media and by people in their networks.

Motivation, i.e. the driving force for learning a language, has been another vital topic of inquiry in SLA research and is closely related to research on language attitudes, aptitude, and learning strategies (cf. the contributions in Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001). Following Gardner’s (1985: 10) definition, motivation can be described as a complex of constructs involving “the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favourable attitudes toward learning the language.” Although there are a great number of approaches to the issue, two orientations have received the most empirical attention: integrative and instrumental motivation, which refers to differing motives or reasons for learning a language and emphasising the role of the social context in which language acquisition occurs.35 According to Gardner (undated paper: 12), integrativeness “involves emotional identification with another cultural group”, which “will be reflected in an integrative orientation toward learning the second language, a favourable attitude toward the language community, and an openness to other groups in general (i.e., an absence of ethnocentrism).” Instrumental motivation, on the other hand, refers to more practical reasons, such as attaining an academic goal or learning an additional language for job advancement. In their early work, Gardner and Lambert (e.g. 1972) suggested that because it was related to positive attitudes towards the second language community, integrative motivation would be a better predictor of eventual proficiency than instrumental orientation would be. A similar distinction in motivation connected to different levels of attainment was suggested in the 1950s by Haugen in the context of language shift in the United States:

Mere communication may be satisfied by a relatively modest mastery of the second language, social identification with the dominant group may require something approaching native command. (Haugen, 1956: 96, my italics)

However, studies over the past forty years have found evidence both for and contra this hypothesis, with later accounts suggesting that the two types of motivations are not mutually exclusive and that both could sustain effort (cf. Gardner, 1985). However, although instrumental and integrative reasons might lead to equally high attainment in linguistic terms, one might suppose that there will still be a difference in the outcome with regard to communicative competence, i.e.

---

35 Integrative vs. instrumental motivations have often been associated with the distinction between second language acquisition and foreign language learning.
awareness concerning norms of interaction and interpretation of (written and spoken) discourse in a particular speech community and willingness to apply these norms in interaction with speakers of the target language. For larger and/or more coherent immigrant groups, there is of course much less need to learn the majority language for means of social identification, whereas the need is more obvious for immigrants speaking dispersed languages with relatively few speakers (see sections 2.1.2 and 2.1.3).

During the 1990s, a discussion and debate about the nature of second language motivation emerged, suggesting a variety of motivational constructs in addition to those already in focus. In the context of language learning, MacIntyre, Noels, Clément and Dörnyei (1998) propose, for example, that an important outcome of any language class is the “willingness to communicate”. They further hypothesize that use of the language is the ultimate goal and that achievement in the language and ‘willingness to communicate’ are two of many steps along the way to this goal.

Another dimension of motivational aspects that has been discussed in the literature is related to the individual’s self-determination (cf. Noels, 2001), which might be described as a series of different orientations on a continuum stretching from intrinsic through extrinsic motivation to amotivation. Intrinsic motivation refers in this context to reasons derived from an individual’s inherent pleasure and interest in the activity in which the target language occurs; in other words, “the activity is undertaken because of the spontaneous satisfaction that is associated with it” (Noels, 2001: 45). The emphasis is then on the process and not the end result. Someone enjoying the sounds of a language when reading a piece of poetry in that language will, for example, not necessarily need to understand every word of the lyrics, but the joy it offers to understand the whole context will motivate the learner to find out the meaning of the missing words, thus expanding his or her repertoire in the target language. Extrinsic orientations can be of various types, but the common point is that they refer to reasons that are instrumental to some consequence of language learning. There might, for example, be an external motive (e.g. material reward), or the end result might be connected to one’s self-concept (e.g. someone who describes himself as a “cosmopolite”, capable of moving across cultural boundaries, and viewing language learning as part of his self-concept rather than an enjoyment per se). Amotivation, on the other hand, can be characterised as the opposite of motivation. People who are amotivated tend not to value the activity; they do not feel competent and do not expect any positive outcome of the activity they are engaged in. Thus, when people lack personal interest in the activity or its outcome, they might “passively go through the motions if necessary” but would like to quit the activity as soon as they find it feasible. During the interviews undertaken for this study, I have observed very different motivations for Hungarian usage on behalf of the children involved. Amotivation was perhaps easiest to detect, as it was often difficult to make an appointment with these
children, and when we finally did meet, the children most often chose to speak Swedish to me and showed no or very little interest in the study as a whole.

Noels (2001: 53, Figure 2) proposes an integrated model of the motivational process, connecting the context of language learning (including the social identity of the language learner) through different types of motivations, his or her willingness to communicate, and his or her personal engagement (effort and persistence) in the linguistic and non-linguistic outcomes of this process. Noels’ main point is that self-determined orientations can be linked to all of these aspects of language learning. She does, however, argue that the two approaches presented above (i.e. Gardner’s integrative/instrumental and the intrinsic/extrinsic/amotivational) represent two separate motivational substrates, the first one pertaining to the intergroup situation, thus being a better predictor of various contact situations, whereas the second one applies more to the interpersonal level and to the immediate learning context.

Although these theories have been developed with the second language learner in mind, some researchers have suggested that they are equally relevant for the development of minority language skills in the children of migrants (Hene, 1997; Kondo-Brown, 2001; Clyne, 2003). The motivational aspects presented here are thus relevant for this thesis for two reasons: (a) for the second language acquisition of the immigrant generation, and (b) for the acquisition of minority language skills by their children. The implications I draw from Noels’ conclusions (see above) is that the self-determinacy continuum is especially useful when analysing language use in a particular family, whereas the distinction between integrative and instrumental motivation might be of greater relevance on a group level, i.e. when comparing language use patterns with different types of reasons (motivations) for minority language transmission (presented by parents) and the desired level of minority language skills (presented by children).

2.2.3.4 Language ideologies, status and power

Another construct closely related to attitudes is that of language ideologies. However, as opposed to the two concepts presented above, language ideologies are usually asserted on a societal (or at least group) level and might be defined as a system of values, ideas and beliefs about language “constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group” (Kroskrity, 2000: 8). Language ideologies can be overtly reflected on a legislatational level, i.e. in a state’s immigrational, educational, occupational, housing and/or language policy, but most often they are covertly reflected in local praxis (sometimes even contradicting the explicit claims of the state) as well as in people’s language attitudes towards certain ways of speaking, language use in general and in education and public in particular (cf. 36 This idea is further supported by some recent psycholinguistic studies suggesting that there are many similarities between the ultimate attainment of minority language speakers (as a result of incomplete acquisition in a second language dominated environment) and different stages of second language development (e.g. Montrul, 2002, 2008).
A common type of language ideology is the Standard Language Ideology, the belief that language homogeneity is beneficial to society, as expressed, for example, by the English-only movement in the United States (Lippi-Green, 1997). As Lanza (2007: 51) points out elsewhere, “Ideologies about language are of course not about language alone, rather they reflect issues of social and personal identity”, an idea expressed already 1986 by Martin-Jones and Romaine in connection to the public debate concerning presupposed language deficits of bilingual speakers (for similar discussions in the Swedish context, see Stroud & Wingstedt, 1989, and Stroud, 2004).

Which attitudes and language ideologies children encounter during their upbringing might certainly affect their motivation for using languages in certain settings. The relative status of the languages involved can affect both parents’ and children’s use of the language, especially in public. The status differences involved in Japanese-English bilingual settings are addressed by two relatively recent studies of intergenerational language transmission. The high prestige of English as a global language is used as the main explanation for its maintenance by intermarried families in Japan (Yamamoto, 2001), and also as an argument for why Japanese mothers experience much greater difficulties in maintaining Japanese in Britain (Okita, 2002). In the Nordic context, Boyd and Latomaa (1996 and 1999) also point to the importance of status and prestige in the life of immigrants’ children. Through survey analysis in two generations of four immigrant groups residing in different Nordic countries, the authors found that, due to greater group cohesiveness and family structure, children of Vietnamese and Turkish descent use their minority language to a greater degree than children of North-Americans and Finns. Nevertheless, with respect to linguistic skills, the North American and Turkish children were found to outscore the two other groups involved in the study (Vietnamese and Finns). In the case of North Americans, Boyd and Latomaa point to the prestige of the English language as well as the group’s high status as the main explanation for the children’s continued minority language use; while in the case of Turkish they suggest rather low group status associated with social marginalisation (further enhanced by group cohesiveness) as the main factor facilitating language maintenance.

Children of Hungarian origin who were born and raised in Sweden might, for example, while visiting relatives in Hungary, encounter expectations they were not exposed to in bilingual settings in Sweden. Taking the current puristic, monolingually biased language ideologies of Hungary into account (see section 3.1.1), one might suppose that using an incomplete Hungarian language variety in Hungary might affect children’s status rather negatively, while using Swedish for internal and English for external communication might raise their status as Westerners.
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37 The wording ‘incomplete’ refers to Silvina Montrul’s (2002, 2008) use of the term in connection to her adult informants’ incomplete acquisition of Spanish in a migrational context.
However, as will become clear in subsequent chapters of this thesis (especially chapters 8 and 9), the relative status of these languages and the value attached to their usage is perceived differently by different groups of speakers in my sample.

A relatively new area of research, Critical Social Research on Language (which includes the fields of Critical Discourse Analysis and Language Ideology) views language primarily as a social phenomenon and analyses the *power aspects* embedded in it, i.e. how social action and social structure are linked through language. During the last twenty years or so, scholars within this field have been engaged in a demascation process concerning “the overt and covert mechanisms deployed by SOME individuals in order to determine the VALUE of certain linguistic practices, thereby defining what counts as “good”, “correct”, or “appropriate” language” (Milani, 2008: 32, original capitals). The main point is that not anybody can claim authority in a given setting, but only those who are capable of using the appropriate language by saying the right things at the right time. What language counts as appropriate will of course differ between different sets of groups; the parliament, different newspapers, a schoolyard in a multilingual suburb, an academic journal and a meeting at the local immigrant association will all require different codes. Who will be taken seriously and can make his or her voice heard is hence tightly connected to the language ideology predominant in that setting. As Monica Heller recently expressed it:

> Our ideas about language(s) are […] not neutral; we believe what we believe for reasons which have to do with the many other ways in which we make sense of our world and make our way in it. (Heller, 2007b: 15)

It is noteworthy that not all settings are equally important for all citizens of a state (or, for that sake, for all members of an immigrant group). Majority members will, for example, for understandable reasons, not be interested in language use in the local immigrant organization, whereas the decision to abandon or uphold relations with the institution might be crucial for an immigrant of the same minority group. Language is at the same time the medium and the object of all language politics on a societal (and group) level, dominant ideologies tend therefore to be reproduced on higher levels of society, whereas grassroots movements are there to contest, resist or oppose these efforts through different strategies. In chapter 3, I will briefly present the past and present language ideologies of two of the countries at stake in this study, i.e. Sweden and Hungary (or at least, what is known about them).

According to Stubbs (1991), a clear sign of a government’s hidden agenda to assimilate minorities, or spread the national language, is that the minority languages are excluded from the national curriculum. Promoting active bilingualism among minority children (including those of migrants) implies the existence of an open-minded, pluralistic society with conscious and well-implemented language planning strategies to protect minority languages. However, the reality is rather complex, as the national, regional and local policies are often contradictory,
and a pluralistic language policy might fail on the level of implementation (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). This kind of paradox might be exemplified by the case of the mother-tongue instruction system in Sweden, where the explicit goal of minority education to promote active bilingualism among the inherent and migrant minorities has been inhibited by economical decisions made at local levels (Municio, 1987; Nauclé, 1996; Hyltenstam & Tuomela, 1996; Lainio, 1997; György-Ullholm, 2004 and 2002/2010; see also section 3.4.5 for the case of Hungarian in the Swedish educational system).

2.2.3.5 Language use in educational settings

The educational model, more precisely the medium of instruction at school, and the circumstances in which a minority child gets acquainted with the majority language have been pointed out as highly affecting not just the outcome of second language acquisition, but as earlier indicated, also the fate of the minority language in the family (e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984; Baker, 1996; Garcia, 1997) and, thus, also the prospects for language maintenance of particular minority groups (cf. section 4 in Baker & Prys-Jones, 1998; see also section 2.1.1 in this thesis). As indicated in the introduction to this section, the occurrence of additive bilingualism requires an environment in which the first language and culture are actively promoted and developed also at the time the child’s competency in the second language has reached a level that enables the child to follow instructions in the second language (e.g. in dual-language programs or developmental bilingual education programs). High levels of additive bilingualism have been linked to high self-esteem, increased cognitive flexibility, higher levels of second language proficiency (Hill 1995; Cummins, 2000; Baker, 2000) and a high degree of academic success (Thomas & Collier, 1997, 2002). Nevertheless, by far the most common way of educating both indigenous and immigrant minorities in most countries of the world is still submersion programs (where children are exposed to the majority language from the start), which lead to a heavy dominance in the majority language at the expense of the minority language, often also followed by poor school achievement (cf. Skutnabb-Kangas, 1988; Glenn & de Jong, 1996; Garcia, 1997; Baker, 1996; Hvenekilde, Hyltenstam & Loona, 1996; Baker & Prys-Jones, 1998).

Sociocultural studies of second language learning and schooling have further widened our views of what it means to grow up bilingually. In this tradition, the home and the neighbourhood are emphasised as the source of primary socialisation and the school and peer groups as the source of the children’s secondary socialisation (see also 2.2.4). What kind of schooling seems to be the best for a child is often decided by the parents. Their choice of school is, of course, limited by the available options, but within the given frames, parental decisions have been
shown to be highly dependent on the parents’ former experiences and the stance taken by their immediate networks\(^\text{38}\) (e.g. Ambert, 1997; Tryggvason, 2002/2010).

In the Swedish context, several researchers who have applied a sociocultural perspective have pointed to the fact that minority children and adolescents who speak a language other than Swedish are often categorised by teachers and other majority members as having limitations (of a linguistic and/or social kind) and that attempts are made to replace, rather than to develop, their mother tongue in the educational context (cf. Naucclé, 1996; Sjögren, 1997, 2003; Runfors, 1997, 2003a, b; Parszyk, 1999; Haglund, 2005a, b). In the context of school choice, it has been proposed that segregation might have both positive and negative effects for minority children’s language development and identity formation and that attending schools with an ethnic profile might facilitate minority children’s development (Rojas, 1995; Parszyk, 1999: 248). Obondo (1999) and Ambert (1997: 111) came to the same conclusion in their studies, namely that the most important factor for predicting school success is that the school norms match that of the home. These findings are especially relevant in connection to the discussions conducted in section 2.1.2, where negative social identity has been pointed out as being a main indicator of language shift in contact situations.

2.2.3.6 Culture and immigrants’ adaptation to the norms of the host society

Culture has been described by ethnographers and anthropologists as a set of behavioural norms, values and beliefs shared and further developed by a group of people and reflected in the artefacts of life, such as clothes, food, religious symbols, etc.\(^\text{39}\) Most important for this study are the set of norms, values and beliefs that immigrants take with them from their original environments (see section 2.2.3.4 above), especially those connected to language use.

Grosjean (1982: 157-166) discusses the cultural implications of bilingual settings\(^\text{40}\) on this issue and provides an overview of studies addressing immigrants’ adaptation processes in the host society. As an example of bilingualism associated with monoculturalism, Grosjean mentions bilinguals living in Luxembourg, Switzerland, Kenya and Tanzania who, despite their regular use of several languages, mainly have one culture: that of their own ethnic group. Vagstein (2000), who conducted an ethnographic study of ethnic affiliation and cooperation in Transylvania,\(^\text{41}\) concluded, in contrast, that Hungarians, Rumanians and Saxons, despite their struggles and narrated differences, do share some similar

\(^{38}\) King and Fogle’s (2006) and King, Fogle and Logan-Terry’s (2008) findings also support this view, although their investigations involved parents of younger children.

\(^{39}\) Ulf Hannerz (1992), for example, describes culture as “sharing and communicating”, referring to the two aspects of culture: (a) a cultural content that is shared (and transformed) through (b) interaction between members of that cultural group.

\(^{40}\) See also the contributions to this issue in Reynolds (1991), especially the papers of Taylor, Gardner, and Swain and Lapkin).

\(^{41}\) Today, part of Romania. For more details, see section 3.2 in this thesis.
conceptions, referred to as a kind of “transylvanism” (for further details on multi-ethnic Transylvania, see section 3.2).

Immigrants differ, however, from inherent minorities in that they are seldom self sufficient as a group; thus, they are often forced to adjust to the new culture and, although different immigrant groups might adjust in different ways, there are certainly also individual differences in the degree of adjustment within the same group. When the difference between the two cultures is very large (such as between Chinese and British), the adjustment between them is much harder (certainly for the immigrant generation) compared to cases in which the two cultures are similar or even overlapping (such as, perhaps, Dutch and Swedish). However, a certain degree of difference always exists, Grosjean argues, for example, in eating habits, courting behaviour, childrearing, family organisation, religious beliefs, education, etc.

Some immigrants never adjust to the norms of the host society and, although they might learn the majority language, they continue to interact with their own group members, and thus, largely remain monocultural (e.g. Li’s first-generation Chinese immigrants who are involved in the food trade). This is especially true for migrants who plan for a return to the old homelands. Children of these migrants, if they attend mainstream schools, are often confronted with competing demands on behalf of the school and the home. Additionally, some people growing up in minority families that emphasise old ties have been described in the literature as experiencing marginalisation and rootlessness, not feeling at home in either of the cultures (Sjögren, 2006; for some subgroup’s of Hungarian immigrants, see Hamberg, 1995, 2000). Rejecting the parents’ language might offer these children a way out of their marginalised position, argues Grosjean.

Other immigrants adjust their ways of living to a certain amount but retain some central aspects of the old culture (core values) such as religion and/or language. In their child-rearing practices, these migrants often combine traits from both cultures, thus facilitating the adaptation of their children to the demands of the host society. In such cases of combined biculturalism and bilingualism, parents are often very supportive of both cultures as well as of their children’s efforts at school and are often also actively engaged in their bilingual development. It is often in these cases that we find what has been described in the literature as additive bilinguals.

At the other end of the continuum, we find individuals who overadjust to the host society and do everything to adapt their way of life to what they perceive as central in the new culture. As we have seen in the case of Israelis in Melbourne (McNamara, 1987, discussed in section 2.1.2), a strong wish to change social identity from minority to majority membership goes hand in hand with the abandonment of central aspects of the old culture, including the ancestral language. Immigrants who actively wish to assimilate raise their children in their second language, which will in turn become the first language of their children.
Thus, at this end of the continuum, we find monoculturalism and monolingualism in the majority language of the host society.

As indicated earlier, language learners’ social identity, i.e. how they are categorised and treated by majority members (in intergroup settings), as well as by those they consider as their own (in ingroup settings), have implications indirectly for their motivation to acquire certain languages, but even more directly for their opportunities to use the acquired knowledge in those languages, and thus, to further develop their existing linguistic repertoires. Many potentially bilingual children face competing demands in this regard and have to learn to cope with them in some way. Sociocultural approaches to language development view the path to knowledge (including that of a certain language) from the perspective of a child who learns to become an accepted member of his or her community. In the case of bilingual children, this would in the best of cases mean to be accepted as a member of several different groups: (a) their own bilingual community (if there is a coherent one and if the child has access to it), (b) the host society, and eventually (c) the dispersed community of relatives and family friends (who might live in other parts of the world, including the old homeland). In order to understand how community practices form their members’ linguistic repertoire (section 2.2.1) and social identity (section 2.1.2), a closer look at these communication processes might be necessary. This closer view is provided by ethnographic studies of language socialisation, a relatively new area of linguistic anthropology, which I will address in the next section.

2.2.4 Language socialisation studies and their implications

A highly relevant tradition concerned with children’s language development is that of language socialisation studies associated with the works of Ellinor Ochs and Bambi Schieffelin. Research in this tradition is anthropologically grounded (i.e. longitudinal, descriptive and analytic) and emphasises the impact of culture on our way of thinking, acting and learning. Language and culture are seen as interwoven, inseparable entities in the process of socialisation. Becoming a member of a cultural group means to acquire socioculturally specific ways of acting and using language (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1995). Communication is emphasised not just as an integral part of, but also as a reflection of our social life. In Heath’s words (1983: 11): “the place of language in the cultural life of each social group is interdependent with the habits and values of behaving shared among members of that group.” In fact, this tradition has many linkages to that of interactional sociolinguistics, according to which social background knowledge is implicated in the signaling and interpreting of meaning (cf. Gumperz & Hymes, 1972; Gumperz, 1982).

---

42 Some examples of the sociopsychological implications of language use among Hungarian-Swedish children and adolescents are provided by György-Ullholm (in press).
43 See section 2.1.3 and the discussion on the relevance of different kind of network ties.
Initially, research within this tradition has focused on very young children acquiring their first language in culturally specific ways (Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin, 1990), and on the relationships between socialisation and school achievement, particularly in the first years of school (e.g. Heath, 1982 and 1983). In recent years, however, the study of socialisation has broadened its focus and now also includes studies on older children, i.e. adolescents learning to function in new cultural contexts (e.g. Eckert, 2000; Haglund, 2005a), as well as research in multilingual settings (e.g. Kulick, 1992; Schecter & Bayley, 1997; Zentella, 1997; Wedin, 2004; see also the contributions in Bayley & Schecter, 2003).

Don Kulick’s study (1992) of language use practices in Gapun, a rural Papua New Guinean village, is of special relevance in this context as it draws our attention to factors that have been largely missed in sociolinguistic accounts addressing issues of language maintenance and shift. The most striking difference between “classical” descriptions of language shift and Kulick’s study is the community’s isolated location (Gapun lies in a rural and remote area surrounded by swamps and rainforests) together with the fact that at the time of Kulick’s investigations, it was practically unaffected by industrialisation and outside pressures of the market economy. Moreover, the adults in the community explicitly claimed that they wished their children would learn the vernacular language Taiap (Kulick, 1992: 7, 13). Nevertheless, Kulick found that the children were instead actively acquiring Tok Pisin, the most widespread language of the region. Despite the adults’ attachment to their vernacular language, and the role it played in villager identity, not least of all as a tie to their lands, Kulick found that in their interactions with children, the adults were engaged “in a system of code-switching, biased toward Tok Pisin.” Interestingly, the villagers were convinced that their young (often preverbal) children were the initiators of this shift. Kulick’s explanation is slightly more complicated. According to him, the link is provided by a dual system of community beliefs involving concepts of language, knowledge, children, and the self. More precisely he argues that the existence of a pre-Christian system of beliefs was a prerequisite of language shift, and that a “duality split along linguistic lines” (ibid., 20) was inevitable once Tok Pisin (along with Christianity) was introduced into the community’s everyday practices. In this new concept of self, Taiap became linked to individualism, paganism and backwardness, while Tok Pisin became associated with collectivism, Christianity, knowledge and modernity. The parallels to Gal’s Hungarian peasants (see section 2.1.3) are apparent. What makes Kulick’s study especially relevant for this study is the emphasis on the impact of beliefs on child-rearing practices in bilingual settings, which were not at stake in Gal’s study. In the conclusions to his study in Gapun, Kulick summarises the reasons for language shift as follows:

The reasons for the enthusiasm toward and the spread of Tok Pisin throughout the verbal repertoires of all villagers, (…), were not so much ‘pragmatic’ or ‘socioeconomic’, as those terms are commonly used in sociolinguistic literature, as they were ‘cosmological’ in the broadest anthropological sense of that word.” (Kulick, 1992: 249)
Heath’s study from 1983 describes the language use practices in three Piedmont Carolina communities only a few miles away from each other: 1) Roadville (a white working-class community whose members worked in the textile mills); 2) Trackton (a black working-class community originally comprising farmers who increasingly came to work in the mills); and 3) the “townspeople”, another name for American middle-class people, with whom Heath contrasts the socialisation practices of the first two groups. Although her study is conducted in a monolingual setting, a brief summary of Heath’s work is in order, not only because it is an outstanding example of the research tradition it represents, but also because of its implications for the present study.

As a result of systematic observations stretching over ten years, Heath describes the language socialisation practices surrounding preschool children and the communities’ differing norms and beliefs concerning the roles of men and women, schooling, and expectations for their children. Two very different kinds of childhood environments evolve from Heath’s descriptions. In Roadville, the mothers are engaged early on in interaction with their children, whereas in Trackton the children interact more with their peer groups already at early ages, and when it comes to verbal interaction, boys are clearly in a more favourable position than girls. The Roadville mothers are eager to prepare their children for school. Memorization and repetition as learning strategies are emphasised in all activities, and children are expected to answer and perform for adults in both church and at home. In Trackton, on the other hand, “Flexibility and adaptability are the most important characteristics of learning to be and to talk” (ibid., 111). Furthermore, Heath also introduces the reader to the literacy practices in the two communities and discusses their implications for the children’s future schooling. Roadville children are surrounded by books and specific child-directed reading materials, and the written word is seen as an authority. When it comes to reading, Trackton people, on the other hand, emphasise creativity rather than repetition, similar to the oral-based storytelling practices of the community. Additionally, Heath relates the practices of these two communities to those of a third community made up by ‘the townspeople’, who are the managers of the Trackton and Roadville workers and whose children attend the same schools as the Trackton and Roadville residents. Mothers are the primary caregivers among the townspeople, and early on children are treated as potential conversational partners. Heath underlines that the townspeople’s reading and writing practices are more appropriate to the expectations of the schools, such as using written sources to find information and adapt it to their own needs. Reading and writing are natural activities for the townspeople, and their children learn to be engaged in these activities from early ages. Throughout the analysis, Heath repeatedly emphasises that values are primarily formed by family structures, religious groups, and concepts of childhood. With respect to the children’s future, she concludes: “For Roadville, the written word limits alternatives of expression; in Trackton, it opens
alternatives. Neither community’s ways with the written word prepares it for the school’s ways” (ibid., 235).

While I do not attempt to provide in-depth ethnographic analysis of the families involved in the present study, there are several implications of this tradition that must be taken into account in the context of intergenerational language transmission.

First of all, studies of language socialisation highlight the fact that language practices are part of an interrelated system of social behaviours, acquired within a given sociocultural context (see also Saville-Troike, 2003). Moreover, they are formed during childhood, by the respective group’s cultural norms, including language use and values attached to different language varieties (see also Haglund, 2005a and b). Secondly, these studies draw our attention to the fact that language socialisation is bidirectional, involving the actions of both adults and children. Schieffelin (1990: 17) has, for example, pointed out that “socialisation is a product of interaction”, emphasising the dialogic nature of socialisation. In relation to this thesis, we can draw the conclusion that language shift at the group level, as well as the fading communicative competence of individual speakers in the minority language, must be analysed as the result of an interaction process formed by both sides (see also Schecter & Bayley, 1997; Luykx, 2005). Thirdly, language socialisation studies emphasise the importance of available language resources as well as the literacy related activities in children’s home environment not only for their early language development but also for their future prospects (Heath, 1982, 1983, 1989; Wedin, 2004; Haglund, 2005a and b). An implication for this study is that in order to make any predictions for the children’s possible linguistic repertoires, one has to consider not just the spoken input but also the available language resources in these children’s everyday lives.

2.3 Language choice on the micro-interactional level

Language choice of individuals in bilingual and multilingual settings, and research on code-switching in particular, has expanded considerably since the beginning of contact linguistics in the 1950s, and, especially during the last decade, it has become one of the most vital fields of applied linguistics. In the following, some relevant theories of this area will be presented, and in addition, I will introduce the basic terminology necessary for the presentation of language use data in my thesis (see chapter 8).

2.3.1. A rough model of language choice

Due to competing pressures, it is not always easy to predict which language bilinguals will use in a particular situation. In an attempt to systematise possible options a bilingual person may encounter when entering a conversation, Grosjean (1982) presented a rough model for individual language choice (see figure 2.2. for an adaptation of the model). Additionally, in 1985 and in some later accounts (cf.
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1992, 1995, 1998), he introduces the concept of ‘speech mode’ (later ‘language mode’) to refer to different cognitive states in bilinguals’ language processing during interaction. When speaking to a monolingual person (or if other circumstances of the situation require), Grosjean argues that the bilingual may enter a ‘monolingual language mode’, which restricts his/her utterances to one language (A or B). The other language may never be deactivated totally, but in this case, the bilingual is aware of the fact that he or she has no use of the other language but has to rely on the language ability he or she possesses in the language of the given interaction.

Conversations between bilinguals (supposing that both participants are aware of the other’s bilingualism) most often involve both languages, although not to the same extent. In a ‘bilingual language mode’, the bilingual chooses a base language (A or B), but resources from both languages are available for the individual’s needs. In this case, the bilingual makes use of his or her whole linguistic repertoire and switches to the other language whenever he or she feels the need for it.

2.3.2 Functions of language choice

However, a simple description of which languages individuals use towards different interlocutors tells us little about why they are using that particular language. As discussed in earlier sections (2.1. and 2.2), there is an intricate interplay among factors influencing language choice. With the possible exception of metalinguistic comments, the appropriate language is usually chosen unconsciously. As Gumperz (1982: 49) points out: “Language choice is thus better understood as a reflection of context dependent interpretative preferences rather than a conscious choice between alternating codes.” Some of the main factors found to be crucial in this respect are:
Before actually engaging in a conversation, people are usually identified as primary speakers of a certain language. Such identification is often provided by the immediate context in which people meet; they might, for example, have heard parts of an ongoing conversation their potential interlocutor was participating in, or they are presented to each other by a third part in a given language. As Clyne (1998: 308) points out, once a relationship has been established, “it is difficult to break the nexus between interlocutor and language”. However, people sharing two or more languages might prefer one over the other in certain situations. One might for example use the minority language when speaking to his wife at home or by telephone but prefer to address her in the majority language when picking her up at her workplace. The presence of other people, whether they are (perceived as) monolingual or bilingual and whether they are considered to be a part of the conversation or not, may also be a part of the explanation for choosing one language over the other. The topic or content of discourse is often mentioned by bilinguals as being connected to certain languages. For many migrants, talking about their jobs or new technologies often trigger a switch to the majority language, while issues concerning religious gatherings or family traditions might be easier to discuss in the minority language. As the explanation in these cases is that of different types of experiences associated with each language, a sociolinguist might point to the notion of domain (see 2.1.1).

Without diglossia (see 2.1.1), language choice is often negotiable on the spot. Besides more apparent factors, such as the language proficiency and language preference of the speakers (see chapter 9), language choice will then in the first place be dependent on the power relations between the participants in the conversation, that is

- the status they hold vis-à-vis each other (in society at large and/or in the group);
- attitudes towards the languages at stake, the groups, certain varieties of the languages involved, bilingualism and code-switching;
- their roles in the particular conversation (e.g. teacher-student, shop owner-customer, schoolmates, colleagues, interviewer-interviewee);
- their mutual expectations of each other; and
the “hidden agenda” (social functions) of their interaction, e.g. to raise or mark status, to create or diminish social distance, to request or command, to exclude or include somebody in the conversation, etc.

In contexts where both languages might be acceptable, the most important function of minority language use has been claimed to be boundary marking (e.g. Fishman, 1964, 1966; Lieberson, 1980), symbolic identification (e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984; Clyne, 1998), or, as Gumperz would have put it, an “act of identity” (see also e.g. Heller, 1988; Li, 1994; Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2004).

There are, nevertheless, cases in which frequent switching between languages occurs in a conversation without an apparent change in topic, interlocutor, setting, etc. These cases represent examples of conversational code-switching, a typical behaviour between bilinguals.

2.3.3 Code-switching

Code-switching (henceforward CS) is here defined in line with Grosjean (1982: 145) as “the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation.” The focus of the present study is on the social implications of language use, and code-switching is understood as an integral part of the speaker’s discourse strategy (Gumperz, 1982).

Folk attitudes concerning CS have for a long time been surrounded by misunderstandings. CS has often been seen as a sign of deficit, a lack of mastery of both languages, or a result of sloppy language habits. Although clearly descending from monolingual linguistic ideology, these negative attitudes have often been internalised by minorities as well (cf. Grosjean, 1982: 147f.; Romaine, 1995: 122, for some examples). During the last decades, code-switching has, however, been “greatly rehabilitated”, as Gafaranga pointed out recently (2007: 279). Thorough investigations on the micro-level of speech have shown that CS is not random but governed by certain grammatical rules and constraints (cf. Poplack, 1980; Myers-Scotton, 1993a). Furthermore, it has also been shown that, as part of bilinguals’ overall communicative competence, an extra dimension is added to their conversations (e.g. Gumperz, 1982; Auer, 1984; Myers-Scotton 1993b; Li, 1998, 2005; Jørgensen & Quist, 2007; Heller, 1988, 2008).

John Gumperz (1982) was among the first to suggest that CS might be seen as a bilingual discourse mode or conversational strategy with a pragmatic meaning, similarly to monolinguals who switch between different styles or varieties of the same language:

Code switching signals contextual information equivalent to what in monolingual settings is conveyed through prosody or other syntactic or lexical processes. It generates the presuppositions in terms of which the content of what is said is decoded. (Gumperz, 1982:98)
Romaine (1995: 121), drawing on Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Model (see below), similarly draws parallels to monolinguals’ choice between different varieties of the same language: “at the pragmatic level, all linguistic choices can be seen as indexical of a variety of social relations, rights and obligations which exist and are created between participants in a conversation.” Among possible motives for CS, Gumperz (1982: 75-82) mentions reported speech or quotation marking, reiteration (to clarify or emphasise a message already said in another language), to comment or qualify a message expressed in another language, or “personalization versus objectivization”, i.e. to specify an addressee as the recipient of a message (which takes us back to the idea that people are identified as primary speakers of a certain language). Gumperz suggests that the list of six CS functions “holds across language situations” (ibid., 75), but notes that it is “by no means exhaustive” (ibid., 81).

Although there exist several sophisticated ways to analyse and systematise CS according to their function (cf. Myers-Scotton, 1993b; Auer, 1988, 1998; for a recent overview of different accounts, see Gafaranga, 2007), for the purposes of this study, i.e. in the context of intergenerational language transmission, I will focus on the distinction between marked and unmarked language choice, initiated by Gumperz and further developed by Carol Myers-Scotton (1983, 1993b, 1998, 2002).

The markedness idea was launched by Blom and Gumperz (1972: 27) in connection to a study of variation in language choice patterns in a coastal community in Norway. In their discussion of findings from Hemnesberget, Blom and Gumperz distinguished between ‘we-code’ and ‘they-code’, the former referring to the local dialect of Ranamål and the latter to the standard variety Bokmål. They concluded that there were certain settings requiring a we-code and others requiring a they-code; at the same time, the individual language choice was not easily predictable. According to Myers-Scotton (1993a: 84f.), interaction types are to a large extent conventionalised in all communities; thus, at the pragmatic level, all linguistic choices in a multilingual community can be associated with particular social roles, which she calls rights-and-obligations sets (henceforth RO sets). By choosing a particular language as the medium of communication, the speaker signals his/her understanding of the current situation, particularly emphasising his/her role within the context. By using more than one language, i.e. code-switching, speakers may initiate negotiation over relevant social roles (see also the contributions in Heller & Martin-Jones, 2001; Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2004). The ‘negotiation principle’ Myers-Scotton suggests in this context is modelled on

45 Gumperz (1982) expresses caution for generalizing the we- and they-code to other (particularly to bilingual) contexts because of the complexity of relationships that may exist between minority groups and the majority.
Grice’s (1975) cooperative principle, defined in terms of participant rights and obligations:

Choose the form of your conversational contribution such that it indexes the set of rights and obligations which you wish to be in force between speaker and addressee for the current exchange. (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 113, original italics)

It is suggested that speakers have an innate knowledge or mental representations of a matching between code-choices and RO sets. This means that a speaker is able to distinguish a marked choice from an unmarked one because it contradicts the expected RO set. A change in the constellation of co-speakers or the topic of interaction might imply a change in RO sets calling for a switch to another language. This instance of CS is understood as unmarked. A CS without an apparent change in RO sets counts, however, as a marked choice per definition. In some bilingual communities, there is also an alternative of CS as an unmarked choice, given that this mixed code is a socially accepted way of interaction between bilinguals. Finally, there is also a possibility of CS as an exploratory strategy, resulting from a speaker’s uncertainty of “the expected or optimal communicative intent”, when speakers are not sure which code “will help to achieve their social goals” (1993a: 142).

The general objective of the markedness model is to explain the social motivations for CS; here it is used to relate individual language choice to processes of language shift and maintenance. Using CS as a conversational strategy is, to be explicit, only meaningful if speakers share, at least to some extent, an understanding of the social meanings of each available code. If no such norms existed, Myers-Scotton argues, participants in a conversation would have no basis for understanding the significance of particular code choices.

The Markedness Model has sometimes been criticised for not taking account of the creative nature of bilingual interactions (Li, 1998: 162) and the local creation of social meaning (Auer, 1998; Cromdal, 2000: 67; Bani-Shoraka 2005: 48). Later on, Myers-Scotton claimed that this was a misunderstanding. In cooperation with Agnes Bolonyai (2001), she has also tried to deal with this critique by recasting the original model and introducing the Rational Choice Model to make her points more clear (see also Myers-Scotton, 2002), adding further evidence to the idea that people do choose from the available options in their interactions. Informed by several social theories, the Rational Choice Model emphasises individuals’ rational choice and purposeful action, through which they try to optimize social rewards and minimize costs; when it comes to CS, this means choosing a code for

---

46 In many parts of the world, code-switching has become the norm (cf. Gupta, 2000; Zentella, 1997). In such cases, CS counts as unmarked and does not have a stylistic or sociological significance as in the cases discussed above. Rather, it is a general marker of a mixed identity. However, a power conflict between different ethnic groups may initialize language as a prime marker of identity, and CS may then become unacceptable (and thus, also marked). Baker & Prys-Jones (1998: 61) mention French-Flemish CS in Brussels as an example.
one’s message from a variety of communicative options available in the societal repertoire.

As Milroy and Li (1995: 147) point out, different speakers from the same community (also within the same generation) might differ considerably in their discourse behaviour, something that is clearly associated with their socialisation patterns, but also to their differing levels of ability in the two languages. Which type and how much CS actually occurs during a conversation is also dependent on the power relations between ethnic groups as well as puristic notions of language use in the given community, which in some cases might also favour ‘monolingual language mode’ in intimate relations (for examples, see e.g. Romaine, 1995: 169 ff.).

Besides CS there are various other terms that have been used to describe switches between languages, e.g. ‘borrowing’, ‘code-mixing’, ‘mixed speech’, ‘language mixing’, ‘transfer’ and ‘interference’. There is, nevertheless a general lack of agreement in definitions in relation to the functions of these phenomena in bilingual speech (cf. Romaine, 1995: 124 ff; Gafaranga, 2007). Borrowing is often, but not always, defined as a socially established way of incorporating a word or an expression from another language to the base language of the conversation (e.g. Myers-Scotton, 1993, 2002). In some accounts, interference has, on the other hand, been used to refer to an individual case of borrowing, induced by an individual’s immediate need for an adequate expression during the course of a conversation (e.g. Mackey, 1968: 569); Within SLA, transfer and interference have, however, been used in a more general way, referring to an impact of the dominant language on the weaker one on all linguistic levels, including phonological, syntactic, semantic and sometimes also pragmatic features (e.g. Gass & Selinker, 1983). Transfer also appears in the literature on early bilingual language acquisition, referring to cross-linguistic influences in young children’s speech production (e.g. Müller, 1998; Genesee, 2003; Mc Laughlin, 1985; Meisel, 1989, 1990, 2004; Yip & Matthews, 2007). In the same literature, code-mixing refers to young bilingual children’s (under the age of 3 years) use of mixed utterances as opposed to adult’s CS (e.g. Meisel, 1995; Genesee, 2003). Within Conversational Analysis, Auer (1999) has developed a typology of bilingual speech based on the meaning creating function of different types of code alternation. According to this typology, language mixing represents the middle stage of a continuum that stretches from CS asserted with the strongest pragmatic meaning to fused lects with no pragmatic function at all. This kind of unmarked CS has also been called mixed code. Myers-Scotton (1993b, 2002) argues that (lexical) borrowing arises as CS and suggests that the two phenomena should be seen as two poles of a continuum stretching from marked CS to total acceptance, i.e. borrowing. Heller (1988: 9), on the other hand, argues that CS should be regarded as a comprehensive term for a wide variety of language contact phenomena.

In the analysis of parental strategies, I will use the term ‘mixed language use’ to refer to an unmarked CS behaviour of some parents in the sample, in accordance
with Auer’s (see above) and Lanza’s (see below) use of the term. In the discussion of my findings (chapter 10 of this thesis), I will also address the distinction between CS and borrowing and the issue of acceptance of certain lexical items in settings perceived as monolingual by participants of the study. However, because of the methodological limitations of the investigation⁴⁷ (see chapter 4), in the rest of the study, I see no point in holding other contact phenomena apart. Thus, I will use the term CS as an overall term, i.e. to mark a language choice that differs from the language used in earlier passages, including intersentential and intrasentential, as well as tag-switches (Poplack, 1980). Furthermore, only a limited number of examples involving code alternation will be taken up for discussion, in order to exemplify overall tendencies in language use patterns (e.g. as an indicator of language dominance), or in some cases, to highlight the differences between the observed and reported language use of the participants.

2.3.4 Parental discourse strategies – framing the context of conversation

Based on theories of discourse analysis (especially Goffman’s work) and in accordance with Grosjean’s ideas of the cruciality of the linguistic context for bilinguals’ language choice, Lanza (1997) has proposed five parental discourse strategies that parents may apply in the course of face-to-face interaction with their children. These parental strategies are best understood if placed on a monolingual-bilingual context continuum, she argues (ibid, 267). Most importantly, Lanza argues that “the parent frames the context as one appropriate or inappropriate for mixing through his or her discourse strategy in response to the child’s language mixing, that is, through the use of contextualization cues in conversation” (Lanza, 1997: 268 f., my emphasis). The context Lanza refers to is negotiated on the spot, which means that there might be several changes during the course of a parent-child conversation. Note that despite its similarity, Lanza’s use of the term ‘parental strategy’ is a narrower one than the one used in Romaine’s previously mentioned typology (see section 2.2.3.1).

The five parental discourse strategies proposed by Lanza are presented in figure 2.3. Although Lanza’s study is based on observations of very young children (>3 y, see section 2.2.2), they also turned out to be highly relevant to my study, even in families with considerably older children (7-18 years); as mentioned earlier, during the data collection for this study, I observed similar strategies used by parents with their children. Many parents also explicitly reported using these strategies to make their children speak more Hungarian. In the following, I will therefore exemplify and discuss the different strategies in relation to the material collected for this study.

⁴⁷ The main parts of the data in this study were obtained through sociolinguistic interviews and observations in connection to them. Thus, the investigation does not fulfil the requirements of an ethnographic study, which would be necessary to obtain a full picture of actual code-switching behaviour in the community(ies). For more detail, see chapter 4.
The minimal grasp strategy (number 1 on the continuum) is the most rigorous parental strategy, as it requires the child to reformulate his or her utterance in the appropriate language. The strategy implies an explicit call for repair by the child by using, for example “I don’t understand”, “Say it again” or Wh-interrogatives. One might of course object that the most rigorous strategies (especially 1=minimal grasp, i.e. ignoring child utterances in the “wrong” language) might work for young children but would be rather inappropriate after the age of 3, i.e. after the child becomes aware that the parent actually does understand both languages. However, according to my observations, the more explicit call to “Say it in Hungarian” or “We talk Hungarian at home” have also been used by parents in my sample and should be counted as part of this category, although they have been adapted to older children. Lanza also counts prosodical solutions as being of this category, such as “the mother’s use of a high rise intonation pattern, typical of echo-questions” (Lanza, 1997: 263). Similar examples are found also in my sample.

With the expressed guess strategy (number 2 on the continuum), the parent reformulates and questions the child’s utterance in the other language, providing the right expression and at the same time signalling for the child which language is expected. This type of adult request for clarification often takes the form of yes-no questions but might sometimes also include an expansion of the child’s utterance (ibid.: 263), as seen in the following example:

Example 2.1. Family S2 is making preparations for an excursion with friends to the nearby woods.

Fiú (8 éves): Visszük a pulka-t is?
Anyá: A pulka-t? (kérdő hangsúly, magas hangfekvés) Úgy érted, a szánkót?
Fiú: Igen.
Anyá: Jól van, hozd csak magaddal! Jól jöhet még egy szánkó
Son (8 y): Are we taking the pulka as well?
Mother: The pulka? (high pitch intonation) You mean the sled?
Son: Yes.
Mother: Okay, take it with you! We can surely use one more sled.

The repetition strategy (number 3 on the continuum) implies that the parent repeats the child’s utterance in the other, more appropriate language in a non-question form. According to Lanza, the parent’s role as a “backstage” bilingual becomes more evident in this case (ibid.264); the parent, nevertheless, still signals
the appropriacy of one language over the other in the given discourse. Lanza means that the role of the monolingual is highlighted more with the minimal grasp strategy and the expressed guess strategy (see above), because the repetition strategy does not call for a response by the child (ibid, 265). At the same time, there are several examples in Lanza’s material, where a parent’s repetition is followed by a repetition by the child in the required language, which might be seen as a voluntary repair by the child, similar to the response provided to an expressed guess strategy. During data collection, I further observed that – when applied towards older children - this strategy might have two different functions, depending on the aim of discussion and the relative frequency of the expression used by the child in the mixed utterance. In one, this parental strategy might function as either help or correction; in the case of non-frequent expressions in school-aged children’s weaker language, however, the parents may use this strategy as a necessary linguistic aid for the child.48 In these cases, the intonation pattern of the parent is not marked (in contrast to the expressed guess strategy, where there is often a high pitch), probably because parents are usually less surprised by the lack of the given expression in their children’s vocabulary.

Example 2.2 Family G10 is having a conversation around the dinner table.

**Fiú** (14 éves): És akkor jött ez a tanár, tudod, s épp ráordított, hogy miért mond ilyet, meg hogy ez, ööö, ez, hogy is mondják, mobbning.

**Apa:** [csend] Zaklatás, kiszúrás.

**Fiú:** Igen, hogy ez zaklatás. Mi meg csak álltunk ott. Azt se tudtuk, mit mondjunk.

**Son** (14 y): And then, this teacher came, you know, and yelled at him and asked why he says such things. That this counts as, it’s like, eee, how do you say, mobbning.

**Father:** [pause] Bullying.

**Son:** Yes, that this is bullying. And we were just standing there and didn’t know what to

Notably, in contrast to the code mixing of Lanza’s toddler, the son’s CS in example 2.2 is highly marked. The false start, his hesitation, and lastly, the explicit question about the appropriate expression all signal the older child’s awareness about the adult expectations. Furthermore, his phrase “how do you say” signals that he is not trying to negotiate the context but acknowledges the appropriacy of monolingual context (or, using Grosjean’s term, monolingual language mode). As a response, the parent offers an appropriate expression in Hungarian. The child incorporates the expression into his narrative, and the conversation goes on smoothly, as if no interruption had happened.

However, in the case of frequent expressions, the repetition strategy might have the function of *correction*, that is, to remind the child about maintaining the appropriate language and recalling the adequacy of monolingual speech for the course of interaction. This type of strategy is then similar in function to the expressed guess strategy (2) discussed above. In such cases, several children in my

48 See the citation of parent G10 in the description of parental strategy 2 in section 8.4.1.
sample reported that they perceived the parent’s intervention as calling for minority language use and felt that a repetition of the right expression was expected of them. An example for such an exchange can be seen in the following:

*Example 2.3.* Mother in family G7 is preparing to get the children to sleep.

**Anya:** Tedd már el ezeket a ceruzákat! Úgyse less rájuk szükséged éjszaka.  
**Lány** (7 éves): Jól van, betezzem ebbe a lâda-ba.  
**Anya:** Ne a lâda-ba, inkább a dobozba!  
**Lány:** A dobozba.

**Mother:** Put these pencils away, please!  
**You won’t need them at night anyhow.**  
**Daughter** (7 y): all right, I’ll put them in the box/lâda.  
**Mother:** Not in the lâda, but in the box!  
**Daughter:** In the box.

Lanza discusses similar options (help/correction) in her description of the repetition strategy, but uses term repair for both types of occurrence (ibid, 265). She does this, however, in conversations involving toddlers. I ascribe this difference between our evaluations to the fact that parents’ expectations considering their child’s vocabulary at the age of 2 years is considerably lower compared to what they expect from older children, for example, at 6, 10 or 16 years of age.

With the *move on strategy* (number 4 on the continuum), the parent does not interrupt the conversation because of the child’s CS but does not accommodate to the child’s language use either. The parent merely continues the conversation in the language he or she was using previously, as seen in the following excerpt from a father-child conversation:

*Example 2.4.* A conversation preceding dinner by family S7.

**Apa a gyerekekhez:** Na, gyertek, üljetek le!  
**Fíú** (14 y): Var skall jag sitta?  
**Apa:** Ide, K. mellé jó lesz?  
**Father to children:** Please, come and sit down!  
**Son** (14 y): Where should I sit?  
**Father:** Here, next to K, if it’s okay.

Lanza asserts (ibid, 266) that the move on strategy emphasises the parent’s role as a bilingual as well as a monolingual. Although the parent does not use the language proposed by the child (= monolingual stance), he or she does show bilingual competence by comprehending the message of the child’s utterance and taking account of it when responding. This way the parent sanctions the use of both languages and creates a bilingual context for the interaction.

The final strategy, *code-switching* (number 5 on the continuum), refers to both intersentential and intrasentential CS by the parent. Sometimes the parent incorporates the child’s utterance into his or her own utterance, continuing the conversation without a repair. This type of intrasentential CS can be seen in the following example:
Another form of the CS strategy involving intersentential CS by the parent is found in the following conversation:

**Example 2.5.** Daughter in family G18 is asking her mother to help find her binder for schoolwork.

*Lány* (10 y): Anya, nem láttad, hova tettem a păr-m-omat?
*Anya*: Melyik păr-m-re gondolsz? Erre a kékre?

*Daughter* (10 y): mom, did you happen to see where I put my folder?
*Mother*: Which folder? You mean this blue one?

In the following section, I attempt to summarize the different issues presented throughout this chapter by introducing a family-based framework for the study. At the end of the section, I will return to discuss the relation between language use patterns of individual families and minority language maintenance on a group level.

2.4 **Reconnecting the theories: Placing the immigrant family in time and space**

In most Western societies, bilingualism has long been seen as a characteristic of minorities, assumed to be a deviance from the norm and a state that should be overcome in order to achieve national unity (cf. Baker & Prys Jones, 1998). However, as a consequence of increased social mobility, the spread of global Internet communities, consumerism and internationalisation of world economies in the late 20th century, this unbiased view of language and language use has been greatly challenged (cf. Boyd & Huss, 2000; Heller, 2003, 2007a, b, 2008; Fraurud &
Hyltenstam, 2003; Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2004; Martin, 2007), and this development will probably become even more apparent in the future.

Language campaigns and new language policies affect not only public opinion but necessarily also minority members’ everyday lives and language views. Changes in language practices have already been documented in young multilingual peoples’ discourses and identity negotiations on a micro-level (e.g. Martin-Jones & Saxena, 2001; Eckert, 2000; Heller, 2006 and 2008; Haglund, 2002, 2005a, b; Jørgensen & Quist, 2007). What still remains to be understood is how these changes in lifestyle and language practices affect the maintenance of minority languages. In order to capture this multi-layered linguistic reality, we need a framework that enables us to discuss family dynamics and language use in its socio-historical context. In the following, I propose a model of intergenerational language transmission (presented in figure 2.4.) that offers a solution to the problem. The model is designed to make several kinds of family data manageable and serves as an analytical tool and a structuring principle throughout the present study.

The main structuring principle of the model is the integration of two essential aspects of language transmission in a migrant setting, namely time and space; these two aspects are located on the respective axis of the diagram. The horizontal axis marks geographical space, stretching from the country of origin to the children’s future country of residence (which might be different from their present country of residence). The vertical axis then marks chronological time, stretching from the immigrant (or parental) generation’s childhood to their children’s late adolescence (or early adulthood, depending on the focus of the particular study).

Most importantly, I would like to investigate how these two aspects interact in shaping language practices in immigrant families and also how they affect minority language maintenance and shift over generations. In the following, I will thus use the two aspects time and space to reorder factors concerning bilingual language use in general and childrearing in particular in accordance with the research traditions presented in the previous sections.

Grey windows in the model represent core issues of the study, displaying social and psychological factors on the family level. White windows, on the other hand, represent outer circumstances that will have an impact - although sometimes bidirectional - on these family-related issues. Arrows in the diagram indicate the direction of these relations; in some cases, the arrows are unidirectional, indicating a predictive power, in other cases they are bidirectional, indicating that forces are expected to work in both directions.

The first window in the left corner of the diagram named Pre-contact factors includes some factors connected to the immigrant generation’s (i.e. the parents in our sample) childhood and young adulthood prior to migration, more precisely it refers to:
Figure 2.4. A model of intergenerational language transmission.
• the linguistic composition of the person’s childhood environment, i.e. if the person grew up in a monolingual or bilingual environment
• the person’s social identity during childhood, i.e. if the person had belonged to a minority or a majority, and in the case of minority background, it is also important to note if it was an ethnolinguistically vital or non-vital minority group
• the level of education acquired in the old home country, including
• the medium of instruction on different stages of education, and
• their marriage pattern, i.e. whether they chose to marry someone outside or within the group.

According to the theories presented in sections 2.1.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4, pre-contact factors are expected to be the main force responsible for the system of values, beliefs and future plans a person brings with him/her to the new country. These attitudes, together with two other clusters of factors (see below), are in turn expected to have a certain impact on the individual choices taken during Initial stages of contact. More precisely, these refer to

• the establishment of a certain type of family system, i.e. whether grandparents and/or other relatives, servants, babysitters form part of the new household
• initial language decisions within the family (i.e. language use between the couple as well as with the children)
• educational decisions concerning choice of childcare for the first child born in the new country\(^{49}\) (babysitter or pre-school/nursery, the language use between the chosen caretaker and the child) and eventually choice of school for the children that may have followed their parents to the new country.

The vitality of the minority group that awaits the immigrants in the host country, i.e. their relative status in relation to the majority as it is perceived by the new immigrants, the size and concentration of the group, and the level of institutional support it has built up, will certainly influence the immigrants in their initial decisions; if there is a large and coherent group of speakers of the same language in the host country, there is a greater chance that people will meet and marry somebody from their own group. Intergenerational language transmission is also more secure if there are schools that have the particular minority language as the medium of instruction. The language ideologies inherent to the minority, whether language is considered as a core value or not, and whether it is considered

\(^{49}\) The formulation “the first child born in the new country” might seem odd; it is nevertheless necessary in this context. It refers to the fact that at the time of migration, some couples might already have had some children, which means that the first child born in the new country is not necessarily the first-born child of the couple, but may be the second, third, or forth.
worthwhile to preserve the language for following generations or not, will also affect people’s initial language decisions. However, because parents in the first place seem to seek encouragement for their own beliefs and attitudes (cf. King & Fogle, 2006; King, Fogle & Logan-Terry 2008), a language ideology that considerably differs from (or in some cases even contradicts) people’s previous experiences and attitudes will probably discourage tighter relations to people who represent them and encourage relations towards others holding values and beliefs similar to one’s own.

The societal framing, that is, the impact of language ideologies implicit in the government’s language policy, educational policy and housing policy and explicit in majority members’ expressed attitudes and other minorities’ language choice will certainly have an impact on the immigrant family, not only in its initial stages but even later during long stages of contact. If, for example, it is difficult to get a flat or house in (what they consider to be) a decent area in the city, newcomers are forced to start a new life in socially and/or ethnically segregated areas. Thus, people will in initial stages of contact already perceive their situation as marginalised and their status as low. If there are only a few native speakers of the majority language in the area, the same might apply to the nearby school, which in turn might worry immigrant parents with respect to their own and their children’s future, if they will be able to get a good job, how they will manage to learn the main language of the country, etc. Some of these newcomers will find support and solidarity through their in-group networks in the area, others will ally with local networks of differing ethnic backgrounds, while still others will try to move to less segregated areas to raise their status in the host society. A country’s educational policy is also important, as indicated earlier (see section 2.2.3), especially as it determines the options of minority children’s language use during a considerable part of the day. If the state allows the operation of bilingual schools for minority children, parents have a real option of letting their children attend or at least parents might initiate such schools; otherwise they have to find other ways to counterbalance the dominance of the majority language in their children’s lives. To find a minority-speaking babysitter is in this case more important among the parents’ initial decisions (see above) than it would be in the case that further development of the minority language can be assured through the school.

As it became clear by the theories presented in this chapter, personal, social, cultural and political factors all contribute to the acquisition and maintenance of bilingualism (or language shift) in migrant families. Language acquisition takes place in many different contexts, so the first thing that I believe must be considered is the nature of the context itself in which this acquisition takes place. This might be an obvious point to make, but there are many different ways to use language, and in the case of bilingualism, this might be even more important, as it influences not only the linguistic repertoire of individuals but also the prospects of language maintenance. If linguistic norms, including language choice practices, greatly overlap among individual speakers with the same configuration of
languages, the coherence of the group (and the perception of language as a symbol of this coherence by the group members) is strengthened, and the prospect of language maintenance is as well. In the cases in which rules of language use differ considerably between different families, we cannot speak of a coherent community supporting language maintenance on a group level. Language transmission to the next generation is, of course, still possible in individual cases, but without a supporting community, the success of this endeavour is largely dependent on the individual families’ conscious efforts and persistence in counterbalancing the domination of the majority language and the host society, on the one hand, and their children’s future opportunities and motivation to further develop their linguistic heritage, for example, by profession (i.e. as translators, bilingual staff at call centres, etc.), on the other hand.

As Seliger and Vago (1991: 4) point out, a bilingual typically “develops patterns of dominance or strength, usually in relation to the domains in which the languages are used.” The richness of a speaker’s linguistic repertoire, including several registers in different languages, is determined by the access this person has to a variety of speakers and situations calling for differentiated speech patterns. Similarly, minority language use restricted to a few interlocutors (most often, older members of the family), not only affects the frequency of usage negatively (e.g. Boyd, 1985; Li, 1994), but crucially it often goes hand in hand with a restricted register in the minority language among the children. This is especially true if the conversations conducted in the minority language are characterised by a casual, conversational speech style, and a restricted set of topics focusing on routines of everyday life (cf. Saville-Troike, 2003). A restricted register in the minority language, in turn, calls for a switch to the majority language in conversations concerning other matters, an effect that will increase its influence on the family domain as times goes by and the children get older.

Despite its central position within sociolinguistics, language use within and outside the family is in this specific context understood as “an intervening variable between the social factors of language contact and the long term development of language maintenance and shift” (Boyd, 1985: 208). Consequently, in the diagram, this very important issue appears quite low and to the right of the diagram. Furthermore, instead of the more general label “language use” or “language use patterns,” I have chosen to use the label “language choice” in the diagram in order to signal that the analysis has to start on a family level. Although the issue of language use is quite complicated and, as indicated in previous sections, could be addressed in several subsections (including e.g. power aspects, domain analysis, conversational strategies), most importantly we have to distinguish between parents’ and children’s language choice. This is essential not only for the ability to detect changing language use patterns between different generations, but more importantly, to draw attention to the fact that the social factors that influence parents’ and children’s choice might be quite different (or, in optimal cases, largely overlapping).
The children in the present study are between 7 and 18 years old. This age span has been chosen not only for practical reasons (see 4.1), but also because it is during this period that children’s world opens up and they enter scenes where their secondary socialisation occurs. From evidence presented by sociocultural approaches to language acquisition (see 2.2.3) and studies in language socialisation (2.2.4), we know that at the age of 7 the influence of the home still dominates, while this is gradually challenged by other, more majority-oriented and age-related networks in the wider environment of the child as he or she becomes older. It is thus expected that children’s language use, despite the apparent parental influence, now also becomes affected by several other factors, such as the linguistic composition, language ideologies and linguistic practices of their local networks, represented by the school, the neighbourhood, and the leisure time centres, as well as the social networks of the family locally and world-wide. Most importantly, however, they will be influenced by the linguistic composition and the practices of their own evolving age-related networks, i.e. peer groups, which might be of local, virtual, national and/or transnational importance.

Most families are in possession of a considerable amount of books, magazines, music collections, films, computer games, etc. and all these items transmit information in certain languages. In general, these might be referred to as language resources. A wide range of language resources in the minority language in the child’s immediate environment is of special importance for assuring a continuous widening of the growing child’s vocabulary and style register in that language, especially as this development almost inevitably occurs in the majority language, which is facilitated by classmates and guided instruction at school. Which kinds of language resources are available for children of different ages in their home environments is important, as it highly affects the potential opportunities for the children. For instance, if there are no interesting children books in the minority language at home, but a lot of printed media (books, magazines, folders etc.) in the majority language at the mainstream school, the child will be guided to develop his or her literacy in the majority language rather than both. Which language resources are to be found in different family homes is in the first place dependent on the family’s personal acquaintances: people receive and share such items in the form of presents and temporary loans within their social networks. If a family’s network includes both minority and majority members, an enriching environment facilitating additive bilingualism will even in this regard be noticeable, in contrast to families that isolate themselves from either group. The neighbourhood, the kindergarten or school will probably also have libraries that might or might not have language resources available in the minority language but will surely provide a large selection of language resources in the majority language. Thus, counter-balancing the dominance of the majority language and the availability of materials in the minority language as the child gets older is primarily dependent on the parents’ awareness and conscious efforts with regard to these matters.
At the same time, parents’ and children’s beliefs, language attitudes and hopes for the future, will continuously be affected by national ideologies, both directly, e.g. through media (which might be connected to either language) and school, and indirectly, through the government’s education policy, language policy, immigration policy and/or housing policy. Additionally, unforeseen changes in outer circumstances induced by, for example, relocation of the family in a new area may affect family dynamics and also their future plans, thus leading to a necessary revision of language use strategies on the part of both parents and children.

In an era of globalisation and unstable world economies, many families have to count on changing residences. The importance of new technology tools (see section 2.2.3) and a raised parental awareness in these matters have increased enormously during the last two decades. Therefore, it has become even harder to predict the fate of bilingualism in individual family cases than it was in the 1990s, the time when the majority of parental guides were written. Nevertheless, it is still worth knowing what the major features of these are. It is in this context that sociolinguistic investigations of bilingual families might be useful.

As indicated earlier, linguistic studies of language contact in Europe have often focussed on several immigrant languages in their host countries (e.g. The Linguistic Minority Project in Britain, 1985; Boyd, 1985; Extra & Verhoeven, 1993a, b and 1999; Extra & Gorter, 2001; Nygren-Junkin & Extra, 2003; Extra & Yaegmur 2004). While these studies have offered valuable information on overall tendencies concerning minority language use in the investigated countries, they were not designed to take into account group-specific factors. However, when investigating intergenerational language transmission, we need to take into account that every language contact situation is unique, which means that some factors that seem to be crucial for a minority language in one case might be marginal for another language group or even for the same group in another contact situation.

In the discussion of my findings (chapter 10), I will revisit the model presented here to draw some group specific conclusions regarding the situation of Swedish-Hungarians. As indicated earlier, my hope is, nevertheless, that this model can be applied to other combinations of languages, i.e. to investigate other immigrant group’s language maintenance chances. Of course, only a relatively large number of families will allow for statistical analysis, but the model is designed to make such comparisons between individual family cases possible, the main aim being to facilitate generalisations on a group level.

---

50 An exception to this trend is presented in Broeder & Extra (1998).
Chapter Three

Hungarians and Hungarian Language Contact

This chapter is intended as an introduction to the history of Hungarians in the Carpathian Basin and in the rest of the world — a necessary prerequisite for understanding their relation to their language and surrounding people. The chapter also provides some basic sociolinguistic facts concerning Hungarian language use within and outside Hungary. The last section of the chapter presents some basic facts concerning Hungarians living in Sweden.

3.1 A short history of ‘the divided nation’ or how Hungarian became a world language

Hungarian is a Finno-Ugric language, however, it is only distantly related to Finnish and Estonian; at the same time, it is the largest branch of the Finno-Ugric family, with more than 14 million native speakers. Approximately 10 million of them live within the borders of Hungary, a small country of approximately 93,000 square km in Eastern Europe; around 2-3 million speakers are autochthonous minorities in neighbouring countries, and another 1-2 million are scattered in diaspora over the whole world.

Hungarian is a fully standardised language with script traditions dating back to the 11th century. Because of the language’s conservatism and its speaker’s keen use of synonyms, these early documents are fully understandable to today’s readers. Mutual intelligibility applies also to speakers of the regional varieties of Hungarian, although there are some differences in vocabulary (mainly concerning preferences for certain lexical items) and pronunciation (however, this is only noticeable for certain dialects, such as the Székely and Palóc dialects used in Transylvania and Northeast-Hungary, respectively) (cf. Benő and Szilágyi, 2005: 160; Kiss, 2001).

In linguistic terms, Hungary is one of Europe's most homogeneous countries. According to the 2001 census, the country’s minority population is smaller than

51 The Carpathian Basin is surrounded by the Alps and the Carpathian Mountains and refers to the area where Hungarians traditionally have lived since the 9th century.
6% of the total population. At the same time, in a survey initiated by the European Commission in November 2005 allowing multiple answers, 100% of the Hungarian citizens surveyed claimed to have Hungarian as their mother tongue, only 0.8% another official EU-language and 0.6% some other language as their mother tongue (Special Eurobarometer 243, 2006: 7-8). Even more striking, 58% of the population declared that they do not know any other language than Hungarian (ibid., p. 9). The country’s linguistic homogeneity is a relatively new phenomenon, a consequence of its political history during the 20th century.

Hungary has, since the Hungarian tribes’ arrival in the Carpathian Basin around 896, formed a border region between East and West, and between Christianity and paganism, which has greatly affected the country’s history and political development (cf. Lendvai and Major, 2003). Although Hungarian is a relatively large language, it is the only Finno-Ugric language in Eastern Europe, surrounded by Indo-European languages (Slavic, Romanian and Germanic). These circumstances (the country’s political as well as linguistic singularity may in turn have contributed to its people’s perception of themselves as foreign elements in their own environment. A feeling of being alone and being misunderstood is often emphasised in internal public discourse, especially in connection to political events with negative consequences for the “nation’s” development (e.g. the Treaty of Trianon 1920, the Battle of Mohács in 1526, the defeated revolution against the Soviet Union in 1956, etc.).

Although Hungarian has a long history of language contact with several Indo-European languages in the area (Slavic, Romanic and Germanic languages), it has a relatively short history as a minority language. For almost a thousand years (i.e. from the Hungarian conquest at the end of the 9th century until World War I), Hungarian was the major language of a large, multilingual and multiethnic state (Thomason, 2005: 21). However, during the same period, Hungarian was almost exclusively spoken inside Hungary’s borders (Fenyvesi, 2005a: 2).

---

52 The national census of Hungary in 2001 recognised 16 ethnic groups in addition to Hungarians (based on self-identification). According to the same census, 99.8% of the country’s inhabitants speak Hungarian on a native level, around 10% declared speaking German reasonably well, and 9% declared speaking English; 2% reported speaking Russian and 1% French, and knowledge of other languages make up less than 1% of the total population (cf. www.nepszamlalas2001.hu, retrieved 2009-10-23)

53 The document is available at http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_243_en.pdf (retrieved 2009-10-26). In comparison, the corresponding numbers for Romania are 95%, 6%, 0.4%, and 53% do not know any other language; the numbers for Sweden are 95%, 5% and 2%, and 10% do not know any other language.

54 Cf. many of the articles published in the formerly Central European Review, especially those written by Gustáv Kosztolányi, including translated citations of Hungarian politician’s speeches to the ’nation.’ http://www.ce-review.org/authorarchives/csardas_archive/csardas_main.html (last visited 2009-10-23)
Mass emigration of Hungarians started in the 1880s and changed this relationship. During a period of 40 years, more than 2 million emigrants left Hungary due to economic reasons, first to North America (for a brief description of immigration to the United States, see Várdy, 1983) and also in smaller-scale migrations to other destinations. Mass emigration did not stop until the 1920s, i.e. after the end of WW I. As the Kingdom of Hungary abolished on the German side, the country was dissolved by the Allies in the Peace Treaty of Trianon (1920) and was forced to cede two-thirds of its territory and population to its neighbouring countries. Beside scattered Hungarian settlements, various extensive areas were composed of concentrations of Hungarians. The largest part, i.e. multiethnic Transylvania (almost 100,000 square km), was assigned entirely to Romania; some other areas including considerable numbers of Hungarians came to be parts of Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Austria, mainly along the newly formed borders. All in all, the lost territories included 10 million inhabitants, out of which more than 3 million were ethnic Hungarians, i.e. one third of the total number of Hungarians at the time (Fenyvesi, 2005a: 2). Despite the harsh demographic, economic, and military consequences of the Treaty for Hungary and Austria, by far the most serious social blow was dealt to the Hungarians who came under foreign rule over one night. Even though borders were redrawn, most people remained in their hometowns, which resulted in large groups of Hungarian-speaking minorities in the Carpathian Basin.

As a consequence of the Hungarian state’s deliberate magyarisation (assimilation) policies during the interwar period, and the forced population movements

---

55 Note, however, that only a minority of those who immigrated to the United States were “Magyars” (Várdy, 1983: 196). This has to be accounted to the large ethnic diversity of Hungary at that time (cf. the census of 1910 from the Kingdom of Hungary, referred to later).

56 The Allies’ main priority was to prevent Germany from acquiring substantial influence in the future. It was mainly due to this reason that the German-friendly states, Austria and Hungary, were “redesigned”, i.e. shrunk. It was decided that in the future, they should be surrounded by a ring of states friendly to the Allies, each of which would be bigger than either Austria or Hungary (cf. Macmillan, 2003). For a collection of relevant maps from that time, see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treaty_of_Trianon (last visited 2009-10-21)


58 At the beginning of the 20th century, the Kingdom of Hungary was an ethnically diverse state with a considerable number of minorities. According to the census of 1910, the Hungarians made up the largest ethnic group of Hungary with only 54.4% of the entire population in the Kingdom (excluding Croatia-Slavonia). It is noteworthy that the census did not include any explicit questions about ethnicity, which was instead defined in linguistic terms as equal to “the native language” or “the most frequently spoken language.” However, according to the census in 1920, on the post-Trianon territory, Hungarian was spoken by 96% of the population and was the mother tongue of 89%. At the same time, approximately 10% of the population had another mother tongue (in decreasing order: German, Slovak, Croatian, Romanian, Serbian, etc.) and bilingualism was relatively common. Due to heavy assimilation, the number of all non-Hungarian minorities decreased in the next decades. Prior to World War II, in the census of 1941, minorities made up only 7% of the total population (Dányi, 2000: 153 f.). For more details, visit the
During the years 1945-47, the newly formed People’s Republic of Hungary became almost an ethnically homogeneous country (cf. Dányi, 2000: 153).

During and after World War II, further waves of Hungarian emigrants left the area, mainly heading to the United States, but also bound for other destinations in large numbers. The tumultuous and often dramatic political events that shaped the country's development during the 20th century, and its unresolved political, social and economic problems have led to a continuous stream of emigration and internal population movements in the area. As a result, there are large groups of Hungarian diaspora communities throughout the world today, mainly in North America (1.9 million) and Western Europe (360,000). According to the estimates of the World Federation of Hungarians, considerably numbers of Hungarian speakers live also in Australia, Asia and Africa (cf. A. Kovács, 1999).

During the second half of the 20th century, two larger waves of Hungarian emigrants can be discerned, both of which left the area mainly because of political reasons:

- Around 200,000 people left Hungary after the defeated revolution against the Soviet in 1956.
- Similar numbers of Hungarians left Romania during the 1980s and 1990s, because of the persecution of minorities (and especially the intelligentsia) by the authorities (cf. Varga, 1999; Benő and Szilágyi, 2005: 136f.).

In comparison, it was primarily for economic reasons that Hungarians left the former Yugoslavia in the 1970s and 1980s and Hungary in the 1980s and onwards.

In contrast to the so-called 'nation-state' based on citizenship (typical for most Western societies), Hungarians usually think of themselves as belonging to a cultural nation, an imaginary unity based on shared language and cultural values. Hungary is often called ‘the motherland’ (anyaország) in Hungarian, even by speakers who have never put a foot there. The core value of the language is very...


59 After World War II about 200,000 Germans were deported to Germany according to the decree of the Potsdam Conference. Under the forced exchange of the population between Czechoslovakia and Hungary, approximately 73,000 Slovaks left Hungary. At the same time, about 2.6 million former Czechoslovak citizens of German and Hungarian ethnicity were deported to Germany, Austria and Hungary.

60 The World Federation of Hungarians (Magyarok Világszövetsége) is a non-governmental organisation founded in 1938. It is based in Budapest and has three parts: Hungary Region, Carpathian Basin Region and Hungarians in the West Region. Prior to the fall of communism, it was mainly a meeting platform for Hungarians in Western diaspora. Since 2000, they gradually lost significance. http://www.magyarokhaza.hu/index_mvsz.htm (last visited 2009-10-27)

61 We lack exact numbers for these emigrants because of the ethnic diversity in the area; the dramatically decreasing numbers of Hungarians during this period makes it nevertheless almost certain that several hundred thousands of Hungarians left the area (see section 3.2).
strong; the language functions not only as an identity marker in minority settings, but also as a national symbol in political discourse in both minority and majority settings, uniting all Hungarians, no matter of where they might live (Kontra, 2005: 29ff and 44; Puskás, 2009: 24-27; see also the papers in Kontra and Saly, 1998, and in Bárdi, Ferdinec and Szarka, 2008). However, there is often a discrepancy between the political discourse about the Hungarian nation as an undividable unity and the public narratives of Hungarians from Hungary vis-à-vis Hungarians living in minority settings in the neighbouring countries (Transylvanian Hungarians, Vojvodina Hungarians, Transcarpathian Hungarians, etc.) as the former often fail to convey the deep symbolism of “doing ethnicity” in the areas beyond the borders (Puskás, 2009: 139-152; see also Szarka, 2004).

Until the 1980s, there was a public neglect in communist Hungary of the situation of Hungarians “beyond the borders” (határon túli magyarok), and these communities were left to resolve their ethnic, social and linguistic problems on their own. Since the late 1980s, and especially since the collapse of communism in 1989, several foundations and political and cultural institutions were set up in Hungary as well as abroad to promote relations between Hungarians living in different countries in the Carpathian Basin. A large amount of money from the state budget are spent yearly for active promotion of Hungarian minorities, mainly by several educational programs, stipends for academic studies in Hungary, and a worldwide accessible Hungarian TV channel (Duna TV). However, according to Puskás (2009: 24f.), in these activities, the Hungarian state clearly favours Hungarians “beyond the border” rather than those living in diaspora communities in other parts of the world.

Similarly, during the communist era, research on Hungarian minorities in the neighbouring countries was impossible, mainly because it inevitably tied into political issues (Kontra, 2005: 33). The only study on Hungarian bilingualism during that time was the one conducted in Burgenland by Susan Gal (1979). After the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe, Hungarians beyond the borders “rapidly came to center stage in Hungarian linguistics” (Kontra, 2005: 33). The first study written by a Hungarian linguist focusing on Hungarian outside Hungary dealt with a small community in South Bend, Indiana (Kontra, 1990; for reports in

62. E.g. Szülőföld Alapítvány, Pro Minoritáte Alapítvány, webpages are listed in the reference list of the thesis.
63. Of special importance was the Hungarian Standing Conference / Magyar Állandó Értekezlet, see Puskás (2009: 27).
64. The Balassi Bálint Institute was launched in 2002 as a legal successor of the Hungarian Language Institute (with a history of nearly half a century) and the International Hungarology Centre (established in 1989) “to perform all the duties related to the preservation, development, presentation, spreading and research of the Hungarian language and culture,” and to unify the previously “disorganised system of institutions of Hungarology.” Besides the duties of popularizing Hungarian language and culture abroad (similarly to the well-known British Council, Goethe Institute, the French Institute and the Swedish Institute), it also aims to support “Hungarians living beyond the borders of Hungary in preserving their native language” http://www.bbi.hu/index.php?id=99&fid=110#intro (retrieved 2009-10-25).
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English, see Kontra, 1993a and b). This study was followed by several others on English-Hungarian contact overseas (e.g. Bartha, 1993, Fenyvesi, 1995). Finally, in the middle of the 1990s, a large state-funded research project was initiated and led by Miklós Kontra. The Hungarian outside Hungary (SHOH) project set up a unified approach to the sociolinguistic study of contact varieties of Hungarian spoken in the neighbouring countries. Several case studies of this project are now also accessible in English in a volume on Hungarian language contact outside Hungary (Fenyvesi, 2005b). The same volume also comprises overviews of Hungarian language contact in the United States and Australia.

3.2 Transylvania and its significance for Hungarians

Transylvania is a historical region in Eastern Europe, today part of Romania. Geographically it is defined by the Carpathian Mountain range (55,146 square km), but today’s region also includes some areas east of the mountain chains (Maramures in the north – 10,497 square km, Crisana in the northwest – 12,238 square km, and the Banat subregion in the southwest - 18,966 square km).

Besides its history, which for several centuries was separate from both Hungary and Romania (cf. Köpeczi, 1986, in Hungarian and 1994, in English), the region is also interesting from a sociological, linguistic and anthropological point of view because of its great ethnocultural diversity (cf. Bugajski, 1995; Varga, 1999; Vagstein, 2000).

There is an ongoing scholarly debate concerning the population of Transylvania, but it is almost certain that in the 9th century, when the Hungarians (Magyars) conquered the area, they found elements of a mixed Daco–Roman population in the area. The Hungarians established their control over the area in the early 10th century (east and south by the Carpathian mountain chains), and

---

65 Kontra and Sally (1998) published a rich selection of writings preceding the project; the idea caused great polemics among Hungarian linguists, some of which feared that “such a recognition of language differences by professional linguists may lead to the fragmentation of the nation” (Kontra, 2005: 33).
66 The Latin designation Transylvania means ‘land beyond the forest.’ The Hungarian name for the region is Erdély (forest-covered land), which was then also adopted by the Romanians with a slightly different pronunciation and written as Ardeal. The Saxon German of historic Transylvania is Siebenbürgen (the land of seven castles) (Köpeczi, 1994; Király, 1994).
67 The area measures were retrieved from http://romaniatraveltourism.com/transylvania.htm on 2009-10-20.
68 Since medieval times, the population of Transylvania has been a mixture of different ethnic groups, mainly Romanians (also known as Vlachs), Hungarians, the Székely people (who speak a dialect of Hungarian), Saxons (who speak different dialects of German), Bulgarians, Armenians, Jews and Roma. For current conditions on the ethnic, linguistic and religious diversity of the region (rubricised as “central Romania”), visit the database of the Romanian Ethnocultural Diversity Resource Center (Centrul de Resurse pentru Diversitate Etnoculturala) http://www.edrc.ro/recensamant.jsp?regione_id=2568&judet_id=0&localitate_id=0 (last visited 2009-10-20).
Transylvania became a voivodeship (in Hungarian: vajdaság) of the Kingdom of Hungary. The area continued to be connected to Hungary until 1526, when the Hungarian king was defeated by the Turks in the Battle of Mohács\(^70\), and as a consequence, Hungary was divided between the Habsburgs and the Turks. At the same time, Transylvania became effectively\(^71\) an independent principality and remained so for almost two centuries, ruled primarily by Calvinist Hungarian princes. Besides being a place where the noble families of Hungary could take refuge/cover during the Ottoman rule of their country, Transylvania came to play an important role also as the beholder of the Hungarian language and culture and the region became economically and culturally prosperous (cf. Sugar, 1983: 163 ff.). The Habsburgs acquired the territory shortly after the Battle of Vienna in 1683. Although the region was officially attached to the Habsburg Empire, the Habsburgs recognised the Hungarian sovereignty over Transylvania. At the same time, the region became separated in all but name from Habsburg-controlled Hungary and was subjected to the direct rule of the emperor’s governors (cf. Lendvai and Major, 2003: 146). After the Ausgleich of 1867 between Hungary and Austria, the region was fully reabsorbed into Hungary as a part of the newly established Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Following the Austro-Hungarian defeat in WW I in 1920, Transylvania (together with the counties Szatmár/Satu Mare, Bánát/Banat and Máramaros/ Maramures) was attached to Romania by the Treaty of Trianon (see above). These areas included approximately 1,600,000 Hungarians, living in large homogenous Hungarian settlement areas in the eastern part of the region called Szeklerland (Maros/Mures, Kovászna/Covasna and Hargita/Harghita counties) and in ethnically more mixed territories; however, many of the border areas had a Hungarian majority.

Today, Hungarians still constitute the largest ethnic and linguistic minority in Romania. According to the 2002 census, approximately 1.4 million Hungarians made up 6.6% of Romania’s total population and 19.6% of the population in Transylvania with a population of 7 million (Benő and Szilágyi, 2005: 134). These numbers should be examined in relation to the 1.7 million Hungarians living in the region during the 1980s, i.e. preceding an era of political oppression, direct persecution and purposeful discrimination of minorities (cf. Stewart, 2008) and the consecutive emigration waves\(^72\) from the area (cf. Varga, 1999).

\(^{70}\) The 16th century in Southeastern Europe was marked by the struggle between the Muslim Ottoman Empire and the Catholic Habsburg Empire. After the Hungarian defeat at Mohács, Hungary was divided between the Ottoman and Habsburg empires.

\(^{71}\) The princes were paying tributes to the Ottoman Empire, who in return accepted the sovereignty of Transylvania.

\(^{72}\) Varga E. (1999) concludes that “The regional distribution of emigration partly explains the fall in the Hungarian population in certain counties. Approximately three-quarters of the officially registered 483.5 thousand emigrants from the country (two-thirds of them non-Romanians) between 1977 and 1991 left Transylvania, most of them from Timis/Temes, Sibiu, Arad and Brasov/Brassó counties, as a result of German emigration, but a considerable number (tens of thousands) left Cluj/Kolozs, Bihor/Bihar and Mures/Maros counties as well” (my emphasis).
During the communist era, especially under Ceausescu’s rule beginning in 1965, there was an enhanced industrial migration of Romanians from regions outside Transylvania to Transylvanian cities (Benő & Szilágyi., 2005: 137), strongly promoted by the state (cf. Stewart, 2008). These circumstances changed the demographic relations in many of the cities that had earlier had a Hungarian majority (e.g. Nagyvárad/Oradea, Marosvásárhely/ TirguMures, Kolozsvár/Cluj, Brassó/Brasov, etc.)

In the following, I will summarise some findings of the renowned Hungarian demographer Árpád Varga E. (1998 in Hungarian, English translation published in 1999) regarding the demographic structure of Transylvanian-Hungarians during the period between 1870 in 1995, i.e. a period including major political changes in the area. In connection to these demographic data, some sociolinguistic data will also be presented; in this respect, I will rely on the 2005 study by the Transylvanian-Hungarian linguists Attila Benő & Sándor Szilágyi that was part of

These latter counties represent traditional Hungarian settlement areas. Moreover, all of them are represented among the home counties of my adult informants, i.e. the parents referred to as former minorities with a multilingual background (=group 3; see section 5.3.3 and 5.3.8).
the SHOH project conducted in 1995-1996. Most interesting for my purposes is the period elapsed between the national censuses of 1977 and 1992, i.e. the period when most of my Transylvanian informants left their home country.

During this fifteen-year period, Transylvanian Hungarians formed an absolute majority in a quarter of all Transylvanian settlements inhabited by Hungarians (828 settlements in 1977 and 786 settlements in 1992). In another 25 settlements their proportion did not reach 50 percent, but they were the largest ethnic group (In villages with a Hungarian majority, a considerable number of people belonging to several other ethnic groups could be found.) According to the 1992 census, only 38.4% of the Hungarians lived in towns and cities where they were in absolute majority (compared to 79% of the rural Hungarian population).

In 1992, out of a total of 462,650 "Hungarian" marriages (including both the homogeneous and mixed Hungarian marriages) mixed marriages formed 22.8 percent. In 89.2% of these cases the other spouse was Romanian.

Varga (1999) as well as Benő and Szilágyi (2005: 138 ff.) point out the Romanian state’s severe discrimination policies towards its minorities in the area of education as a direct cause of Hungarians being underrepresented in professional and administrative occupations and their overrepresentation among blue collar workers and handicraftsmen.

On average, between the years 1991 and 1994, approximately three-quarters of Hungarian students in primary and secondary education pursued their studies in Hungarian. However, in 1992 only 49,592 (i.e. 3.6%) of the Hungarians had higher education degrees (as compared to 5.3% among Romanians); at the same time, Hungarians were overrepresented in the humanities (Benő & Szilágyi, 2005: 140; Varga 1999: table 35). Employment is always tied to education and, as Benő and Szilágyi point out (2005: 138 ff.), for Transylvanian Hungarians the relation seems to be especially tied to the limited education opportunities in their mother tongue, Hungarian.

In the SHOH project (see section 3.1 above), respondents were asked specific questions concerning language use in certain domains. Benő and Szilágyi’s (2005: 149) results reveal that in the beginning of the 1990s, Hungarian was used in all domains (both public and informal); however, a clear dominance of Romanian language use is related to official affairs conducted in administrative offices (71.6%), at the police station (80.6%) and in courts of law (61%). In private, informal situations 99.5% declared that they use Hungarian with their parents,

---

73 The proportion of the elected representatives of Hungarians in the leadership of state administration approximately followed political arithmetic. In other fields of administration, however, where officials are not elected but appointed, the proportion of Hungarians does not even reach half of their national proportion in terms of active workers.

74 This is mainly true for schools training teachers, theologians and art students, but, in terms of attendance levels, secondary schools with high academic standards can also be regarded as especially important in Hungarian education. These institutions are often chosen because, in the absence of adequate Hungarian vocational training, they represent nearly the only opportunity for Hungarian students to learn in their mother tongue at secondary-school level.
99.7% with their grandparents, 97.9% with their children, 97.4% with their spouses, and 99.5% with their friends (61.1% also spoke Romanian with friends).

Similar results were shown in the area of reading, writing, verbal activities in the mental sphere (thinking, counting, etc.), and also the self-reported data on language proficiency strengthened the picture of a Hungarian dominant community (Benő & Szilágyi, 2005: 150). Following Fishman’s categorisation device on different societies with regard to bilingualism and diglossia that was presented earlier (see section 2.1.1), we can thus conclude that for the Hungarian minorities involved, the above described situation is a case of bilingualism with diglossia.

As for contact phenomena, Benő and Szilágyi (2005: 153-160) found some typical lexical borrowings but only a few cases of structural borrowings in the material; at the same time, they maintain that this only applies to informal speech, whereas in the mass media and formal situations, standard Hungarian variants are used. Finally, Benő and Szilágyi (2005: 161) conclude that the social prestige of Romanian among respondents was high; on the other hand, they found that the cultural prestige of the Transylvanian variety of Hungarian was even higher. It is noteworthy that the overall results of the seven investigated countries in the SHOH project show that the Transylvanian variety was given the highest rating, higher even than the variety spoken in Budapest. According to Benő and Szilágyi’s findings, attachment to the community and to the region is highest among Transylvanian Hungarians as compared to the Hungarians living in the whole Carpathian Basin. This might be due to “the tradition of literature and folklore in Transylvania as well as the myth about expressivity and poetic character of the Szekler dialect”, claim Benő & Szilágyi (2005: 146).

Transylvanian-Hungarians also have a good reputation among Hungarian sociologists and anthropologists, who usually refer to their “strong national consciousness” and “the great tradition of their Transylvanian-Hungarian culture” (Borsody, 1988: 341, see also Szabó, 1997: 216). Many well-known Hungarian scientists, writers, musicians, painters, politicians and also one of the greatest Hungarian kings (Mátyás király) were of Transylvanian origin (e.g. Bartók Béla, Apáczai Csere János, Bolyai János and Farkas, Tamási Áron, Sütő András, Wass Albert just to mention a few), which also heightens the group’s status among Hungarians in general.

However, Transylvania has previously been relatively unknown in the West other than for Bram Stoker’s Dracula. Only recently has the region been recognised in the Western media for its cultural heritage; this happened to be in

---

75 The lexical borrowings are mainly from the administrative language, loanwords connected to commercial activities, and items very often seen in the linguistic landscape of Romanian localities.

76 Structural borrowing could be traced as a slightly greater acceptance of analytical constructions (as compared to standard Hungarian speakers), whereas Hungarian is characterised by a preference of synthetic constructions.
connection to the book The White King by the Romanian-born Hungarian writer György Dragomán; the book has been translated into more than 16 languages within a couple of months after its publication in Hungarian. Even more recently, the name of Transylvania came up in the media when the Transylvanian-born German writer Herta Müller won the 2009 Nobel prize in literature. Interestingly, both of these writers have lived as minorities in Romania and write about the oppression during the communist era of the country – and they do this in their respective mother tongues.

3.3 Sweden

3.3.1 A short history of migration trends in Sweden

Sweden has a great number of immigrants today, but this has not always been the case. Before World War II the country hardly had any other minorities than its autochthonous minorities (see below), and the country was generally characterised by emigration (especially to the USA) rather than by immigration. After WW II, economic development caused a strong labor shortage, and during the second half of the 1940s as well as the 1950s, there was immigration from Finland, Norway, Denmark, Poland, and from the Baltic countries (mainly refugees). The revolution in Hungary in 1956 led to several thousand Hungarian refugees coming to Sweden. As a group of young ‘freedom-fighters’, they were very positively received in Sweden, and as they came in a period of economic development, they had no problems finding jobs. During the 1950s, there were several labor recruitment campaigns, especially in southern Europe, to find workers for the Swedish export industry. During the 1960s, there was immigration (both labor immigration and refugees) from Yugoslavia, Turkey, Vietnam, Greece, Poland and the Nordic countries. A continuous stream of immigrants during the post-war period came from Finland, and the Finnish minority is still one of the largest and most influential minority groups in Sweden. Despite a policy that encouraged labor immigrants to return to their homeland when they were not needed anymore in the industries, the majority of them ended up staying in Sweden (SOU 2004/73: 30).

In the early 1970s, labor immigration decreased as a result of recession, and this was paired with an increase in negative attitudes from the Swedish unions and employers’ organizations towards employing immigrants; at the same time, refugee immigration increased. During the 1970s, most refugees arrived from South America (especially Chile), Turkey and Lebanon (Assyrians, Syrians and

77 http://entertainment.timesonline.co.uk/tol/arts_and_entertainment/books/fiction/article3209772.ece (retrieved 2009-09-25)
79 According to some sources, more than 7,000 refugees arrived at that time from Hungary (cf. Svensson, 1992: 16); other sources mention around 5,000 people (cf. Lundquist 1966: 34). The difference is probably due to a remigration or further migration from Sweden to other Western countries.
Kurds) (SOU 2004/73: 31). Up until 1975, almost 90% of the immigrants came from European countries. More than 400,000 persons immigrated to Sweden in the 1980s, among them also the first wave of Transylvanian-Hungarian refugees. In the 1980s, there was a change in the currents of immigration, with 50% of the immigrants coming from non-European countries, mainly refugees from Iran and Iraq as well as from countries in eastern Africa (SOU 2004/73: 31).

Immigration to Sweden during the 1990s and 2000s has mainly involved political refugees and cases of family reunion. The war in former Yugoslavia had as a consequence a large number of refugees culminating in 1994. The number of refugees from the Balkan meant that the share of immigrants from European countries once again exceeded 50% (SOU 2004/73: 31).

3.3.2 The many languages of Sweden

In the earlier mentioned Special Eurobarometer 243 (2006), a survey conducted by the European Commission allowing multiple choice answers, 95% of the population in Sweden declared having Swedish as a mother tongue, 5% another official language of the EU, and 2% some other language(s). Swedish is spoken by almost all residents of Sweden and operates in practice as an official language (see below). Furthermore, according to the same survey, as many as 89% of the population in Sweden declared knowing English reasonably well, and only 10% declared being monolingual (as opposed to 58% monolinguals in Hungary, see 3.1).

In 2002, i.e. at the time I started this project, 15 percent of the pupils in Swedish schools were foreign born or had immigrant parents (SOU, 2002/27: 197), and these numbers have been constantly rising. The linguistic diversity is huge: According to Statistics Sweden, more than 150 languages are spoken in the country. At the same time, the distribution over the different language groups is very uneven. 60 percent of the pupils entitled to heritage language instruction (henceforth HLI) in Swedish compulsory schools (grade 1-9) are speakers of the ten largest minority languages, each of them having more than 4,000 eligible pupils yearly. The remaining 140 “small” languages make up 40 percent of the immigrant pupils’ mother tongues, and the number of eligible pupils lies between 3,000 and a few in each of these languages. According to the latest statistics, 18

---

80 Note that children of the five national minorities are just partly included in this figure. The Finnish group in Sweden has been recognised as an autochthonous group; still there are many first- and second-generation immigrants in the group. These children are of course included in the above mentioned 15 percent, but not the third or fourth generation. The other autochthonous groups have had their roots in Sweden for many centuries, and just a few of their group members are immigrants (cf. Hyltenstam, 1999; Huss, 2001).

81 The terminology referring to the instruction of minority children in their mother tongue/first language is not consistent in the literature. Here, I will use the term heritage language instruction in accordance with the terminology used in English-speaking countries (Canada and the United States).
percent of all pupils in primary school are entitled to HLI, which implies that they actively use some other language than Swedish at home (SOS 2008/09, table 8A).

As of July 2009 Swedish counts officially as Sweden’s “main language” (SFS 2009/600). This statement is the fruit of a relatively recently started language debate that culminated in a series of language-related policy documents in Sweden at the beginning of the new millennium. In 2000, the Swedish Government decided to officially recognise five “national minority groups” and allocate special resources “to the protection of and support for these communities and their long-established language varieties.” Two years later, a state committee published a report Mål i mun (SOU, 2002/27) stressing the importance of the Swedish language. The report also dealt with the use of English and the national and regional minority languages, as well as with the immigrant languages; however, the latter was mentioned last and only briefly.³³ (For more details on these issues, see Milani, 2007.)

### 3.3.3 Language policies and ideologies in Sweden

Traditionally, Swedish language policies concerning minorities have been nationalist, reluctant, and directed towards assimilation (c.f. Wingstedt, 1998; Winsa, 1999). The history of modern Swedish language policies began in the late 1960s, when a State Commission on Immigrants was set up and guidelines for a structured immigration policy were developed. Its motto, ‘Equality, Freedom of Choice and Co-operation’ (SOU 1974/69), came to play a central role in political decision-making for a couple of decades. Among other changes in public life, pupils with mother tongues other than Swedish could receive ‘mother tongue instruction’ (in the following, referred to as heritage language instruction, HLI) at least two hours a week as part of the regular educational system. The intention of policy-makers was to provide supplemental instruction in all immigrant languages as part of regular schooling, irrespective of the number of pupils in a certain language or of the size of the municipality where the pupils lived (cf. Tingbjörn, 1988). Sweden has to be considered as revolutionary in many respects, but especially because of the explicit ‘home language’ criterion applied for eligibility in the program, rather than a problem-oriented view in form of socio-economic status or generation criterion most common in the countries focused upon in Broeder & Extra (1998).

³² The five recognised national minorities in Sweden are Jews, Roma, Sami (indigenous people), Swedish-Finns and Tornedalians, all with more than 100 years of presence in Sweden. The protected minority languages include Yiddish, Romany Chib (all varieties), Sami (all varieties), Finnish and Meänkieli (Tornedal Finnish). For more information on these languages and their respective level of protection, see also www.sprakradet.se/minoritetssprak; see also http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/2188/a/19444. (last visited 2009-01-30)

³³ The Swedish Language Bill (SOU 2008:26 Värna språken - förslag till språklag) was sent out for consultation in May 2008. The reason for its initiation was said to be to raise the status of the Swedish language to an official level, similar to the earlier acknowledged “national minority languages.” http://www.sprakradet.se/5055#item100000.
Unfortunately, this progressive educational policy turned out to be hard to implement at the local level (Munici, 1987). Instead of developing the system, toughened criteria for participation were introduced in combination with decentralization of decision making and budget cuts. As a result, the earlier HLI-system rapidly depleted (cf. Hyltenstam & Tuomela, 1996; Lainio, 1997, 2001a; Boyd, 2001). Pupils in larger cities tend to attend HLI in compulsory school to a greater degree than others, but since 1991 the numbers have been falling, both relatively and absolutely. The situation is similar in secondary school, and a great variation in participation according to language is clearly visible in current statistics.

Another cause for concern among those advocating pluralism is the last decade of public debate concerning immigrants, culminating prior to the parliamentary elections in September 2002. The main lines of argumentation have been in favour of integration contra segregation, often on a pseudolinguistic basis. Folkpartiet, one of the liberal parties, stressed for example immigrant’s obligations and suggested that Swedish language tests be mandatory for Swedish citizenship. The proposal was heavily contested by many linguists and even experts in other sciences. However, the general opinion was convinced: the Folkpartiet reached an unexpected popularity peak in the 2002 elections. Of course, the mastering of the majority language is an important tool of integration. Still, few parties discuss the question of how to enable immigrants to integrate. All parties agree that segregation is undesirable, but no discussions are conducted on how other alternatives of settling, language acquisition and occupation could be made attractive for immigrant groups that wish to maintain their cultural and linguistic heritage. The how-to-do-it part of the integration is, rather, left to the immigrants. Unfortunately, this kind of political-ideological discourse has very few common points with pluralism, in terms of cultural and linguistic diversity, but shows still more tendencies towards assimilationism (see also the discussions conducted in Boyd, 2001; Milani, 2007, 2008).

3.3.4 Research on minority languages in Sweden

Although there is a growing research interest in immigrant minorities and their language use in Sweden, most of the research still focuses on L2 aspects (Hyltenstam, 2005). Since the late 1990s, there has also been a growing interest in the status and use of minority languages; funds are, however, particularly tied to the so-called national minority languages. Hitherto only two large-scale research projects have been published dealing with the language use among immigrant youth in Sweden: the thesis of Sally Boyd (1985), and a more recent study by Nygren-Junkin and Extra (2003), which is, however, limited to Göteborg.

84 An overview of these protests has been published in the daily newspaper Dagens Nyheter 2003-02-22, where Andreas Bergh from Lund University, Kenneth Hyltenstam and Olle Josephson from Stockholm University, and Mats Myrberg from the Teacher Training College in Stockholm are cited.
With regard to the status and/or use of specific immigrant languages in Sweden there are only a few small-scale studies, and they deal with Greek (Kostoulas-Makrakis, 1995); Persian (Namei, 1993 and 2008; Jahani, 2004); Turkish (Kuyumcu, 1995); Finnish (Janulf, 1998; Nesser, 1996); Korean (Park, 2000) and Chilean Spanish (King & Ganaúa, 2005). As part of a larger project (NISU), Boyd et al. (e.g. 1996 and 1999) has also published a series of papers on language maintenance and shift in four immigrant languages in the Nordic region (For more details on Boyd et al.’s studies, see section 2.2.3).

Scientific studies focusing on the education of particular language groups are rare and cover only three of the five ‘national minority languages’ (Lainio, 1997 and 2001b; Virta, 1994; Tuomela, 1993 and 2001; Wingstedt, 1996, 1998; Svonni, 2001). For an international comparison on the state of the art, see section 2.1.1.4.

There are, nevertheless, some promising lines in this area. University-based research projects on the revitalisation of Tornedal Finnish/Meänkieli and Sami have been initiated since 2005 and onwards, mainly based at the Centre for Multi-ethnic Research at Uppsala University and funded by large nation-wide agencies such as The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation (Riksbankens Jubileumsfond).

### 3.4 Hungarian immigrants and their children in Sweden

As indicated above, Hungarians coming after the defeated revolution of 1956 were one of the first largest refugee groups in Sweden. The group consisted of about 6,000 young people, many of them students and intellectuals (Svensson, 1992). Later on, even more Hungarians chose Sweden as their host country, mostly for socio-economic and political reasons (Szabó, 1988 and 1997). Presently, there are around 15,000 Hungarians recorded in the databank of Statistics Sweden, excluding the Hungarian-speaking immigrants coming from neighbouring countries, such as Romania and the former Yugoslavia. Taking these later refugees into consideration, the Hungarian group in Sweden numbers between 25,000–30,000 immigrants, according to the National Foundation of Hungarians in Sweden (in Hungarian: SMOSZ - Svédországi Magyarok Országos Szövetsége; in Swedish: Ungerska riksförbundet).

---

85 Further information on ongoing research projects concerning national minority languages can be found at the Centre for Multiethnic Research at Uppsala University, www.multietn.uu.se.
86 Similarly to other Western European countries, Sweden does not include any language- or ethnicity-related data in their census questionnaires. Usually, all statistics concerning immigrants coming to Sweden and emigrants leaving Sweden are registered by country of birth.
87 This figure includes only people born outside Sweden, in official documents often referred to as first-generation immigrants. I avoid this terminology mainly because of the questionable character of the terms second- and third-generation immigrants.
3.4.1 Demography

According to the Swedish-Hungarian ethnologist Mátyás Szabó (1988, 1997), and confirmed by my own observations, Hungarians in Sweden are geographically widespread (cf. figure 3.2 below) and physically integrated in the majority society. Many of them are urban citizens and have high-status jobs (especially those who came prior to 1970), and marriages to Swedes are quite common. Although there is a slight concentration in Sweden’s largest cities, Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö, and in certain rural areas (according to the Swedish Immigrant Institute\footnote{The Immigrant Institute is a research and documentation center focusing on immigrants, refugees and racism. For further information, see www.immi.se (last visited 2008-08-24).}), my data collection revealed that, at least within the two cities of Stockholm and Göteborg, Hungarian speakers tend to live incorporated in Swedish-speaking neighbourhoods, so that one does not happen to meet another member of the group accidentally.

The educational level of Hungarians in Sweden is considerably higher compared to the total population in Hungary but also in comparison to the population in Sweden (Svensson, 1992: 198; Szabó, 1997: 204; Hamberg, 1995 and 2000: 25). Szabó (1997: 216) furthermore asserts that among Hungarians coming from Transylvania in the late 1980s and early 1990s, well-educated middle-class intellectuals were overrepresented. These descriptions correspond also to my personal experiences during fieldwork in connection to earlier studies within the group (cf. György-Ullholm, 1998, 2002/2010 2004). Moreover, many of the adult informants in the present thesis who had a secondary-level education in their home country, but also some people who held higher degrees, have completed their original education with additional degrees in Sweden (see section 5.4).

3.4.2 Research on Swedish Hungarians

Earlier accounts on language-related issues in Western diaspora have largely ignored the heterogeneity of Hungarian communities. Swedish-Hungarian ethnologist Mátyás Szabó (1988, 1997) was among the first to draw attention to the Transylvanian immigrants in Sweden. This observation has, nevertheless, not received much attention in scientific circles (cf. Hamberg, 1995, 2000; Straszer, 2005, 2006a, b).

In a recent ethnological study investigating the construction of ethnic and national identities of Hungarians in territorial (Slovakia) and non-territorial minority settings (Sweden), Tünde Puskás (2009) acknowledges this diversity amongst Swedish Hungarians by including both former majority as well as former minority members amongst her interviewees in Sweden. What is of special interest for this study is that by comparing ‘narratives of belonging’ between these two groups of Hungarian immigrants, she found that experiences connected to the informants’ different origins also had a clearly discernable impact on their frames of reasoning in Sweden.
As pointed out earlier, research interest for Hungarian emigrants in Western countries has increased during the last decade, both in Hungary and abroad. Several studies have been carried out also in Sweden concerning different groups of Hungarian immigrants and their children. Besides Puskás’ (2009) and the present study, one further thesis is under way. Boglárka Strasse has conducted investigations concerning the role of language in identity formation among two groups of second-generation Hungarians (the grown-up children of the 1956 refugees from Hungary), living in Sweden and Finland, respectively (Straszer, 2005, 2006a, b). Katalin Henriksson has also written some papers commenting on the relation between identity and language use among Hungarians living in Sweden (cf. Henriksson, undated paper and 2002).

3.4.3 Hungarian migration waves and groupings in Sweden

The first organised immigration from Hungary to Sweden consisted of the Hungarian Jews saved from German labor and extermination camps by Bernadotte-actions in 1945. The only organised labor migration from Hungary to Sweden took place at the end of 1946-47; at the time Sweden had a shortage of labor, while in Hungary there was unemployment. This latter group, however, only comprised a few hundred people who very quickly became ‘Swedenised’ (cf. Szabó, 1988).

The five or six thousand refugees of the 1956 revolution, on the other hand, arrived in larger groups, and although they became very well integrated in the Swedish society,89 they were also the founders of the first Swedish-Hungarian immigrant organisation. Many of them were young men who married Swedish women and raised children in Sweden – these children are in their forties today and have their own families. However, my experience is that most of the second-generation Hungarians, although they might be proud of their origin, raise their children in Swedish and only a few of them are actually able to carry on a conversation in Hungarian (see also Straszer, 2005 and 2006a, b).

During the 1970s and 1980s, there was a continuous minor immigration from Hungary to Sweden, with around 300 persons yearly, and in somewhat lesser numbers also from Yugoslavia.90 As indicated above, at the end of the 1980s, a larger group of Hungarian immigrants originating from Transylvania turned up in Sweden.

During the 1970s and 1980s, the National Federation of Hungarians in Sweden included fifteen member organisations with 2,000 members. When the Transylvanians arrived, they brought long traditions from their home country of

---

89 It must, however, be noted that there has hardly been any other group of refugees - before or after - treated so benevolently in Sweden as the Hungarian refugees in the 1950s.

90 Earlier Hungarian-speaking immigrants from Vojvodina (in Yugoslavia) have been present in Sweden since the 1970s, although in smaller numbers. Most of them came out of economic reasons rather than because of ethnic persecution, which is the more primary reason for recent migration from the area.
building and upholding ethnic associations; as a consequence, they literally revitalised the local Swedish-Hungarian associations.91

Hungarian-born Henriksson, nevertheless, describes the effect of the Transylvanian group on the existing Swedish-Hungarian community in less positive terms:

This last group has changed the migration pattern, both linguistically and ethnically. They did not spring off from the core nation in Hungary, but a peripheral linguistic situation in Transylvania, Romania. (Henriksson, undated paper, my emphasis)

This excerpt exemplifies the huge lack of information among many exile Hungarians concerning the conditions of Hungarians living in minority settings in the Carpathian Basin. This misinformation must, however, be seen in relation to the general neglect of minority issues among politicians during the communist era in Hungary (cf. David, 1988; Bugajszki, 1995; Szarka, 2004). Ordinary people in Hungary (i.e. non-politicians) have simply never heard about the situation of Hungarian minorities outside the borders before the late 1980s. At the time the first Transylvanian refugees turned up in Sweden, the initial reception was, nevertheless, overwhelmingly positive, especially on the part of the Swedish-Hungarian association leaders. However, within a short period of time, the two groups came into conflict about the aims of activities conducted within the associations, which in turn led to a large number of former majority members (i.e. Hungarians from Hungary) to cede from the associations, which they perceived to have been “taken over” by Transylvanians (personal communication with the head of SMOSZ, 2002-03-16).

Puskás (2009: 139 f.) similarly comments on “a progressive deterioration in the beginning of the 1990s when it became evident that the category Hungarian can be understood in different ways”. The reason for this collision has its roots in the way Hungarianness has been narrated in Sweden by the members of the two groups. Puskás explains:

The collective story of those who migrated to Sweden from Hungary between 1956 and 1980 was constructed around narratives about a freedom-loving, hard-working and well-integrated Hungarian, who was forced to leave Hungary because of his/her ideological convictions. On the other hand, the public migration narrative of Hungarians who migrated to Sweden from the territories beyond Hungary’s borders is built around the narrative of ethnic persecution, i.e. that Hungarians in Transylvania and Vojvodina were forced to leave their homes in Romania and Yugoslavia because they identified themselves as Hungarians. (Puskás, 2009: 139)

---

91 The new wave of immigrants coming during the late 1980s and early 1990s initiated new associations (e.g. the Transylvanian book society); they built up a Hungarian Protestant church in Sweden; they organised summer camps for children and youth; they started new periodicals and began to produce and publish literature in their own mother tongue by launching independent publishing companies in Sweden (see also Puskás 2009: 19).
3.4.4 Civic organisations

As indicated above, Hungarians in Sweden are, despite their dispersedness and their low numbers, relatively well organised.\(^{92}\) Today’s countrywide immigrant association (SMOSZ) includes 32 local branches and around 5000 active members.\(^{93}\) Furthermore, since the early 1990s, a large number of civic associations and initiatives have been started, mainly by the wave of Transylvanian immigrants, but lately also in association with more linguistically conscious groups of Hungarian immigrants from the ‘motherland.’ The organisations promoting group cohesion and Hungarian language use that I am referring to are

- an independent Protestant church providing monthly Hungarian-speaking services all over the country,
- several periodicals and monthly newspapers (Kéve, Árghely, Magyar Líchet, Hiáradó),
- a book society publishing a yearly volume on Hungarian-related issues (Erdélyi könyvesgyesület -EKE),
- an association of young Hungarian researchers (Peregrinus Klub) offering monthly activities for interested people residing in Sweden,
- a youth organisation (Svédországi Magyar Ifjak Társasága – SOMIT),
- several professional associations (Association of Hungarian doctors, engineers, etc.),
- a consecutive establishment of a system of Sunday schools in several different localities under the protection of the SMOSZ (see section 3.4.5)
- a so-called mother tongue foundation (Örszavak Anyanyelvi Alapítvány)\(^{94}\) promoting language-maintenance activities in Sweden,
- and several informal groupings.

The number of fiction writers, translators and cultural workers with Hungarian backgrounds in Sweden is also high; according to the Swedish Immigration Institute, it is actually higher than for many other immigrant groups. Most authors publish either in Hungarian or Swedish only.\(^{95}\)

---

\(^{92}\) The homepages of several civil organisations are listed in the references at the end of the thesis.


\(^{94}\) The so-called Custos -Mother Tongue Foundation (Örszavak - Anyanyelvi Alapítvány) was formed in 1997 within the National Federation of Hungarians in Sweden (SMOSZ). The founders explicit aim was to enhance Hungarian language maintenance among the children raised in different parts of Sweden by organising joint summer camps and other activities for Hungarian children, by organising workshops on issues related to child raising in order to improve parental awareness in language use, and by providing additional teacher-training opportunities for interested Hungarian HLI teachers through conferences and workshops in Hungary.

3.4.5 Hungarian heritage language instruction in Sweden

One of the most crucial conditions of language maintenance is access to education in the mother tongue (see section 2.1.1.3 and 2.2.3.5). However, as there are no Hungarian schools in Sweden, children of Hungarian origin usually attend majority schools with Swedish as the medium of instruction. Their only opportunity to use Hungarian at school is by applying for HLI.

In an earlier study (György-Ullholm, 2002/2010), the effects of the last decades’ Swedish language policy and its implementation on a micro-level have been examined using Hungarian as an example for the country’s minor immigrant languages (i.e. with less than 5,000 eligible pupils yearly). The study pointed to a general decay of the HLI system, which hit particularly hard against the “small” immigrant groups, especially since the 1990s, i.e. at the time the families left behind by the Transylvanian refugees arrived to Sweden. Those most affected by the cutbacks in the HLI were speakers living scattered and integrated in the majority society, for example, Hungarians. Since the 1990s, HLI meets for one lesson per week, for one hour at most, and is mainly offered outside the ordinary school schedule (early in the morning before school or late in the afternoon after school). Children speaking small dispersed languages (such as Hungarian) are often also expected to walk to another school in order to make up a group of five pupils, and only by doing so they might be eligible for HLI. Despite these restrictions, everyone is given the right to apply for HLI for his/her children, as long as the language is used in the home on a daily basis.

As a consequence of the restrictions applied in the state-funded system of HLI, from the 1990s and onwards more and more immigrant groups started to develop community-based programs to ensure that their children receive instruction in the ancestral language. In Sweden, this tendency resulted in the presence of two language planning approaches that are parallel to each other: (1) the old system,

Active literary translators from Hungarian to Swedish: Maria Ortman, *1939; Ervin Rosenberg, *1935; Ferenc/Frans Svéd, * 1923; Gabi Gleichmann, * 1954 (Source: www.immi.se/kultur/authors/).

96 The financial resources of HLI were originally determined as earmarked, i.e. direct state-funding for HLI and were directly distributed to the concerned schools. However, in 1991 the municipalities were given greater liberty to distribute funding from the government as they saw fit. Since 1993, the government distributes a single grant to every municipality for education, without marking funds for special purposes. This fact has in turn often led to a change in priority by headmasters who choose to use the funds for other educational improvements in their schools.

97 Since 1991 the municipalities are no longer obliged to offer HLI in languages, which cannot make up a group of at least five pupils within the municipality or the school district (Hyltenstam & Tuomela, 1996: 98). Looking at the statistics of the Hungarian group, it is quite clear how the five-pupil rule affects speakers of minor immigrant languages. According to Sweden Statistics, before 1990, Hungarian ranked as the eleventh largest HL group in the Swedish school, with about 2,000 pupils eligible in compulsory school and 500 pupils at the upper secondary school level yearly. Since 1995, the number of ‘eligible’ Hungarian pupils has been halved along with the participation rates.

98 The study examined the two systems in detail on the basis of Kaplan & Baldauf’s language-in-education policy model (1997: 124), presented in their work Language Planning - From Practice
founded and promoted from the top of the society by majority-group members, in our case, the different state committees and organisations consulted by the Swedish government, and (2) a new system, initiated and run by minority parents directly interested in language transmission.

Even though the community-run program for Hungarian HLI is still in its initial phases, it has to be considered a huge leap in the language maintenance efforts of the Hungarian community (cf. Fishman’s GID-scale, presented in section 2.1.1.3). In the study conducted in 2002 mentioned earlier (György-Ullholm, 2002/2010), besides the apparent differences in funding and scale, the most intriguing difference I found between the two programs was in the content of education. Teachers involved in Hungarian HLI at schools reported focusing on the communicative use of the language, cultural comparisons, and to a lesser degree, special features of Hungarian grammar. Teachers working in community-based education (Sunday schools and summer camps), on the other hand, were engaged in teaching other subjects, such as literature, history, geography, folk music, drama, etc., through the Hungarian language. We might say that in a limited way community teachers are practicing an approach known as “teaching across the curriculum” (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997: 133).

In a subsequent paper (György-Ullholm, 2004), I reviewed the findings with a new goal in mind: the children’s opportunities to reach active bilingualism, the officially expressed goal of Swedish minority education (cf. Tingbjörn, 1988). However, the results of the latter study indicate that under the given circumstances only a combination of the two programs would provide the precondition for Hungarian children in Sweden to achieve active bilingualism. The conclusion of this particular paper was that as long as the current language-in-education policy in Sweden belongs (with an absence of interest from behalf of the state for an enlargement of HL promoting activities), monolingualism in Swedish (or, in the best case, passive bilingualism) is the most probable outcomes for children of Hungarian origin.

On an academic level, Hungarian is taught today in Uppsala and Lund, however, mainly as a foreign language.

Figure 3.2 shows the geographical distribution of available HLI programs for Hungarian-speaking pupils in Sweden in 2002, at the time of my data collection for the educational study. The map might give us some idea of the distribution of Hungarians having school-aged children in Sweden.

Note that the map is restricted to southern Sweden, as the majority of Hungarians live in these areas. The circles (both the filled and unfilled ones) represent municipalities where HL programs are actually offered for Hungarian-speaking pupils in Sweden. The unfilled circles represent municipalities where

---

to Theory. Kaplan and Baldauf’s terms ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up language planning’ (1997: 197 ff.) were used in order to illustrate the different perspectives of the actors in the language-planning process and their differing possibilities for implementing ideas and realising their goals.
only HLI at school is available. The filled circles represent municipalities where pupils have access to both kinds of programs, school-run and community-based. According to the arguments discussed above, we can conclude that the unfilled circles equal passive bilingualism or monolingualism, while filled circles represent good opportunities for active bilingualism. Looking at this map, it becomes obvious that without their parents conscious efforts, most of pupils of Hungarian descent would end up as monolinguals or as passive bilinguals in Sweden.

Map 3.2. Hungarian HL promoting programs provided in 2002 at school (by the Swedish authorities) and by the Hungarian associations in Sweden.
especially since only 35 out of the 92 municipalities\textsuperscript{99} hosting Hungarian-speaking pupils provided Hungarian HLI at school at the time of the investigation (year 2002). In comparison, community-based programs only worked in seven municipalities. While the number participating may have increased somewhat in community-driven HLI, their numbers in the state-funded HLI at schools have dropped considerably. This means that most Hungarian pupils do not get any HLI at all – neither at school nor from the community.

3.4.6 Attitudes towards Hungarian and Swedish

Henriksson (undated paper and 2002) does, unfortunately, not give any description of the criteria applied for recruiting informants for her study. In my investigation concerning Hungarian HLI in Sweden presented earlier (György-Ullholm, 2002/2010), I chose to speak to students whose Hungarian language skills were satisfactory enough to conduct an interview with them in that language (besides doing secondary-source research and speaking to other actors involved in HLI). This in turn implied that my informants also had parents who had made conscious efforts to maintain Hungarian as a family language. As we arrived at quite different conclusions, I assume that we had informants from different groupings within the Swedish-Hungarian community. This in turn makes Henriksson’s investigation, despite its shortcomings, still worth considering as a source of information. As for the language ideologies among her informants, Henriksson observes:

The pragmatic and practical aspects of language use are not weighed and considered by the general, often defensive (purist) Hungarian opinion. The language attrition (or shift) accepted by many Hungarian speakers in Sweden should be seen in the mirror of pragmatic identifications and expectations of the speakers. [...] The way bilingual Hungarian speakers use the Hungarian language in Sweden is often subject to criticism from other Hungarian speakers, especially from purists, and from linguists. The same reaction can be observed in diaspora conditions in other countries. The norms, that the bilingual production is compared with, are monolingual. (Henriksson, undated paper)

This irresolvable conflict between the purist ideologies of native speakers (which is mainly a characteristic of a certain grouping within the community) as opposed to the parents’ (i.e. laypeople’s) ‘pragmatic view’ is held responsible by Henriksson for the language shift in the community:

People have voluntarily accepted the majority language - Swedish - as norm of communication while there is no doubt that in their mind their ethnic identification is nearly always Hungarian. (Henriksson, undated paper)

Henriksson continues:

According to the answers given to my questions in connection with my study, but even during private conversations, the question of the mother tongue is said to be the key to ethnic (Hungarian) identity. When it comes to down-to-earth proofs, the pragmatic attitude

\textsuperscript{99} The total number of municipalities in Sweden is 289.
takes over. The fact that one lives in Sweden where the society requires integration (since 1998 a new integration policy has been launched for immigrants in Sweden) the Hungarian minority has no second thoughts about adjusting. The ethnic boundary is drawn at the front door. (Henriksson, undated paper)

Whether these statements apply to the majority or only a few isolated groups of Swedish Hungarians is in my opinion an empirical question. The methods of exploring this and other related questions are presented in the next chapter of the thesis.
Chapter Four

Research Questions, Data and Methods

For the present investigation, a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods were used, including interviews, participant observation, field notes, and renewed contact with some of the participant families. This chapter describes and analyses the research process undertaken in the work.

However, before proceeding to the presentation of research design, data collection, and other related issues, I would like to return to the aim of the thesis (see section 1.1) and give a better informed description of the research questions in the first section of this chapter.

4.1 Research questions

As briefly mentioned in the introductory chapter, the aim of the present study is to investigate the long-term effects of two thus far unexamined factors for inter-generational language transmission in a migrational context. Both of these factors are related to parent’s (i.e. the immigrant generation’s) childhood and youth experiences, more precisely their

- social identity (=SI), i.e. whether the family in which they were raised belonged to the majority or to an ethnolinguistically vital (or non-vital) minority group of the society, and
- linguistic environment (=LE), i.e. whether the community in which they grew up was multilingual or monolingual.

Throughout this thesis the combination of these two factors will be referred to as the parents’ SILE background (which is an abbreviation of Social Identity and Linguistic Environment during childhood). As for their background, there are three larger groups of Hungarian immigrants represented in the sample:

- former majority members descending from monolingual areas of Hungary (SI=majority, LE=monolingual)
• former majority members from bilingual or multilingual areas of Hungary (SI=majority, LE=bilingual), and
• former minority members from multilingual parts of Transylvania (SI=minority, LE=multilingual).

The research questions of the thesis are discussed from the point of view of these three groups of immigrants and can be summarised as follows:

1. Do the preconditions for language transmission differ between Hungarian immigrants with regard to their SILE background? And if so, in what way?

2. Does the actual language behaviour of parents and children differ as well? If yes, in what way?

3. Is there a division within the Swedish-Hungarian community depending on the first generation’s origins? If yes, what are the consequences for the individual children growing up in these families and the language maintenance chances of the group(s) in Sweden?

Question 1

The intergenerational language transmission process is always related to psychosocial factors, some of which - such as marriage patterns, social network, social identity and language attitudes - have been revealed as being of special importance for language maintenance in threatened communities (for details see chapter 2). By means of earlier mentioned studies concerning Swedish Hungarians (see chapter 3) and my personal experiences as a group member, it was hypothesised that the different groups of Hungarian immigrants would differ on several points with respect to the preconditions of language maintenance, namely:

• marriage pattern (exogamy vs. endogamy) (Szabó, 1997, Dávid & Veress, 1995),
• contact to other Swedish Hungarians (Dávid & Veress, 1995),
• contact to friends and relatives in Hungary and/or Transylvania,
• awareness about and use of language maintenance strategies such as HLI (György-Ullholm, 2002/2010, 2004),
• the core value of language for ethnic identity (Szabó, 1988 and 1997)
• whether bilingualism in general and bilingualism in Swedish and Hungarian in particular is considered an advantage for the individual,
• attitudes and reactions towards code-switching and other language contact phenomena.
**Question 2**

Arguably, a bilingual environment during childhood should be a facilitating factor when trying to raise bilingual children of your own, and the same would apply to people growing up in ethnolinguistically vital minority groups. Although language use amongst Swedish Hungarians has not yet been investigated systematically, there are some studies that foreshadow different linguistic behaviour for different groups of Hungarian immigrants (Dávid & Veress, 1995; György-Ullholm, 1998; Hamberg, 2000; and most recently, Puskás, 2009). Consequently, it was hypothesized that

- **former majority members** growing up in a **monolingual environment** would be least prepared for the linguistically and socially demanding migrant situation, and consequently, also least effective in their language transmission efforts;
- **former majority members from bilingual or multilingual areas of Hungary** would be more tolerant towards CS and more interested in their children’s bilingualism, implying better language maintenance chances in Sweden;
- **former minority members** coming from an **ethnolinguistically vital community**, especially those with a **multilingual experience**, would make use of their mother tongue more widely also in Sweden, in both informal and formal settings; in which case they would have fairly good chances to pass their mother tongue on to the next generation even in a more demanding migrant situation.

**Question 3**

It has been shown that people’s values and attitudes may change as a consequence of major changes in the environment, personal crises and/or other changes, e.g. migration (cf. Liebkind, 2001; Hamberg, 1995, 2000). Taking into consideration that migration dramatically changes both the external and the internal conditions of a group, including its legal status, demography and plausibility structure, we cannot be sure that childhood experiences **actually** facilitate language maintenance in a migrant situation. One major issue in this respect is how individual speakers perceive their relation to other group members in Sweden (i.e. Swedish Hungarians) and also their relation to Hungarians living in other parts of the world. The main question is if the new country (Sweden) reunites Hungarian speakers or conserves their dividedness based on their different origins. In this regard, it was hypothesised that the division largely remains for the first generation, but that this circumstance becomes less accentuated for the next generation.
4.2 Research design

4.2.1 Participants

The sampling criteria implied families with at least one school-aged child, born and raised in Sweden and with one or both parents having Hungarian as his/her first language. In order to include former minority and majority members in comparable numbers, and considering the immigration trends of the last decades to Sweden from Eastern Europe, it was decided that the parents’ country of origin would comprise Hungary and its neighboring country, Romania. To make sure that the Hungarian parents’ first-language acquisition was complete, an additional criterion of having migrated after the age of 20 years was set up for them. The time elapsed between the parents’ year of immigration and the birth of their first child in Sweden was between 0 and 35 years with a median of 5 years.

When looking for suitable families, representativity was not considered as a realistic aim, at least not in the sense that the respondents’ rate should be typical for the Swedish-Hungarian community as a whole. Instead, I intended to reach a range of families as wide as possible within the given frames. One of the main aspects in this regard was to include families that had maintained Hungarian at least within the family, as well as families that do not use Hungarian anymore, an intention that was explicitly made clear already during the recruitment process. Another aspect was to include all interested families irrespective of the parents’ level of education or the families’ current socioeconomic status.

For reasons of personal integrity, Sweden Statistics does not include any population data on ethnicity nor on language use. For this reason, other sources of information were needed to establish contact with potential participants. To reduce positive language bias, I decided to avoid the most convenient channels, i.e. the Association of Hungarian Immigrants in Sweden, the Hungarian Protestant Church in Sweden and the Hungarian mother tongue teachers’ list of participating children. Participants were instead recruited through advertisements on Swedish family sites on the Internet (www.familjeliv.se), my personal mailing lists, in local newspapers (Mitt i, Göteborgsposten, and Metro) and on billboards at youth clubs.

On the whole, the recruitment has to be considered as successful. Within 6 months, 27 families contacted me on phone or e-mail to show their interest. During the first contact, I outlined the project to each parent, giving them time to consult with the rest of the family on whether they would agree to be involved in the study. Follow-up phone calls were made and formal letters introducing myself as a university researcher and the nature and aims of the research were sent by e-mail. After reading the more detailed descriptions, two families withdrew their interest to be interviewed. Also, three more families who originally showed interest in participating could regretfully not find the time to commit themselves. Later on, the original sample of 27 families was enlarged by asking earlier participants to introduce me to other suitable families in their network. This latter snowball sample (Dahmström, 2000: 196) was limited to 3 snowballs per family.
Interestingly, only a few of the former majority members had any Hungarian acquaintances with school-aged children, whereas former minority members appeared to have much more extended networks in this regard.

There were apparent advantages of using advertisements for recruiting purposes: it enabled me to reach interested respondents with different backgrounds and migration motives and to save time by minimising attrition. Nonetheless, advertisements also have their shortcomings: it can involve lost opportunities through slow replies and exclusion of those who feel that their contributions would be irrelevant to the inquiry (Dahmström, 2000; Briggs, 1986). In this case, a regrettable effect was that only a few families that had abandoned Hungarian as a family language showed interest in participating in the study. Nevertheless, taking the issue of inquiry into consideration, a similar distribution of participants may have occurred even by using other ways of establishing contact.

All in all, 144 individuals were interviewed, representing 61 families. 77 of the 144 respondents were parents with an age range of 30-69 years, a length of stay ranging from 8-48 years and an education no less than senior high-school; the rest, i.e. 67 respondents, were children and adolescents with an age range of 7-18 years (m=11.9 years, md=12 years), born and raised in Sweden. The reason for addressing both parents and children was that both perspectives were considered equally important. The relatively high number of participant families was to ensure that statistical analysis could be applied to the material even after dividing them into smaller groups according to the parents’ background data.

As seen in figure 4.1, in regard to the parents’ mother tongue, the largest group in the sample consists of those 35 families (i.e. 58%) where both parents were Hungarian immigrants (=HH families). Hungarian was the mother tongue of both parents in an additional five families, although these families differ from the earlier ones in that one of the parents was born and/or raised in Sweden by
Hungarian parents (=HHs families). Although most of these second-generation Hungarians speak Hungarian reasonably well, they usually prefer talking Swedish to their children. In another 21 families, the parents had different mother tongues, only one of them being Hungarian. In 15 out of these families the other parent (often the father) was Swedish (=SH families). The smallest group in the sample consists of those six families where the non-Hungarian parent belongs to another immigrant group with a different mother tongue (=OH families).

As pointed out earlier, these rates do not reflect the actual proportion of exogamic vs. endogamic marriages of Hungarians in Sweden and should not be interpreted as such. Furthermore, it is important to note that this chart only takes account of the biological parents’ mother tongue. In reality, there are often considerably more complex social and linguistic circumstances surrounding the children. As discussed earlier (section 2.2.3.2), different family constellations, divorces and new partnerships with monolingual speakers, as well as the presence of adult siblings and/or monolingual grandparents in the household may have a major impact on children’s language use, at times also contradicting the effect of other factors in their environment. In section 6.2 and 7.2 I will return to this issue and analyze the possible family constellations in the sample families in more detail.

4.2.2 Three focus groups and “the rest”

Using the family as a point of reference required the individual data to be linked to family membership. In order to reach a comparable amount of families with certain background variables (for the criteria applied, see section 4.2.1.), I started to register data in an SPSS database already at an early stage in the research process, i.e. when around 20 families had been interviewed. Although many spouses in the sample turned out to share each others’ childhood experiences, there were also families in which the parents’ differed in this respect, thereby giving rise to a large number of SILE combinations (see sections 5.1-5.3). Trying to find a common ground for grouping the families therefore turned out to be a quite elaborate task. To make the data manageable, several SILE pair combinations were collapsed into four groups, three of them being comparable in size, thus serving as the focus groups of the study (see e.g. table 4.3).

The first focus group consists of 24 families, in which one or both parents had grown up in Hungary in a monolingual area, as majority members of the society, having Hungarian as his/her mother tongue (henceforward labelled as H maj-mono families).

The second focus group consists of 16 families, where at least one of the parents shared the earlier mentioned majority background, but with a slight, though substantial/intrinsical difference: Growing up in a bilingual area of

---

100 The families were divided into focus groups following a strict line of rules. A detailed description of the process undertaken is to be found in sections 5.1-5.3.
Hungary, these people have at least heard other languages being spoken by others in their presence already during childhood (henceforward H maj-bil families).

The third focus group consists of another 16 families, where one or, in most cases, both parents originate from a multilingual or bilingual area outside the borders of Hungary, sharing the two earlier mentioned groups’ mother tongue, but differing in their social identity during childhood: Prior to immigration, these latter respondents had belonged to an ethnically vital minority group - an experience that was supposed to provide them with at least some advantage on becoming minority parents in Sweden (henceforward H min-multi families).

Five families belong to the so-called non-focus group, falling outside the scope of this study. Included in this group are four families, where the Hungarian speaking parent turned out to be a former linguistically assimilated minority member from Hungary, i.e. a Hungarian speaker of Slovak, German or Jewish descent (in tables and descriptions labelled as “H ass-min”), whereas the other partner was either a non-Hungarian speaker (labelled as “S” or “O”) or totally absent from the family (no contact to the child); in a fifth family, one of the parents had moved back to Hungary, and their child had spent several months a year living with his father in Hungary, for which reason I decided that it would be inappropriate to compare their results to the rest of the sample. Despite their exclusion from certain parts of the statistical analysis, responses and observation notes connected to these latter families made a significant contribution to the qualitative body of data gathered and analysed.

4.2.3 Two sites of investigation: Göteborg and Stockholm

Several studies on language maintenance and shift have shown that not only family efforts but also external circumstances affect intergenerational language transmission (e.g. Boyd, 1985; Borland, 2006; for further references, see chapter 2). For this reason, it has been considered to be necessary to have more than one site of investigation for the study in question.

There were mainly two reasons for choosing Stockholm and Göteborg as the two sites of the present investigation. According to Sweden Statistics and the approximations of the Association of Hungarian Immigrants in Sweden, there is a slight concentration of Hungarians in some larger cities, such as Stockholm, Göteborg, Malmö, Helsingborg, Västerås and Eskilstuna. Amongst these, Stockholm and Göteborg are the two main cities, comparable not only in their size but also in being port towns and with regard to their urban structure (e.g. Näsmann & Thedéen, 1990; Bevelander, Carlson & Rojas 1997). At the same time, they also differ in several social ways. Stockholm, being the capital of the country, is seen as the stronghold of the Swedish bourgeoisie with a long history of contact with Hansa cities on the Baltic Sea. Göteborg, on the other hand, is situated on the Atlantic coast and, having a large industrial port area with contacts all over the world, as well as a concentrated car industry (Volvo), is rather seen as the stronghold of the Swedish working-class movement. Rather than contact with the Hansa
cities, Göteborg has a long history of contacts with Britain. As a consequence of these differences, I found it possible that the cohesion and plausibility structure of immigrant communities in the two cities might be affected as well, which in turn would affect also the language maintenance efforts of these groups.

However, the decision to conduct the investigation at two sites had some serious implications on the research design. When seeking participants for the study, it was necessary to reach a comparable and relatively even distribution of families in the two cities with regard to children’s age and gender as well as with regard to the parent’s social identity and linguistic experiences during childhood. As shown in tables 4.1., 4.2. and 4.3, this intention was fairly met.

4.2.4 An insider’s perspective

Who is capable of describing a group’s practices and/or views of a specific issue, and who has the right to do it? Insider research has its advantages and disadvantages and has been devoted many pages by methodology books.

Local or prior knowledge affects many parts of a study, i.e. how the respondents are accessed, formulation of questions, the process of interviewing and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1. The distribution of different age groups of children at the two sites of investigation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children’s age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.2. Proportion of boys and girls among the focus children interviewed at the two sites of investigation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children’s age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3. Proportion of families belonging to different focus groups of the study at the two sites of investigation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H maj-mono families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H maj-bil families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H min-multi families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-focus families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
eventually interpreting the collected data. Being a Hungarian immigrant myself, and mother of two children born and raised in Stockholm without a doubt shaped the methodology of the study. Some of the respondents knew me previously and others had heard my name in connection to earlier conducted research in the community. I mixed socially with some of them, and we could recall how long we had known each other, when and where we met.

Insider research may have its shortcomings: prior experiences can also lead to preconceived ideas; particular pockets of information may not be elaborated upon, or conversely, may be overemphasised. An ‘outsider’ may be made privy to a differing interpretation and provided with another perspective (Smith, 1999: 66).

However, being an insider can also facilitate research, especially in a multilingual setting. As Briggs (1996: 745) points out: “Practitioners often fail to comprehend the way that interviewing forms part of the contact phenomena in question. Even when interviewers share a predominant language with respondents, important dissimilarities are often apparent in the degree and type of bilingualism or multilingualism that accrue to the two parties.” Being fluent in both languages enabled me to let the respondents choose the language of interaction, a gesture that had at least two positive effects: assuring the best possible communication channel, and giving the respondents a feeling of control over the situation. The respondents’ actual language choice in this real-life situation also proved afterwards to be useful as a comparison with the respondents’ reported language preference in similar settings (towards an adult bilingual group member outside the family).

Another important aspect to be considered is the pragmatic competence of the interviewer (cf. Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Kasper, 1997). Being familiar with the correct ‘cultural’ protocol may be of great advantage when approaching potential participants with different backgrounds. In the Swedish-Hungarian community, the use of formal personal address (niande) is, for example, not in use anymore, whereas it is still the most appropriate way of approaching unknown people in Hungary and in Transylvania. The use of formal address when establishing contact with the participants of the present study would thus have been perceived as a sign of “outsidership”, creating unnecessary distance between researcher and respondents. As an insider, I was aware of the norms requiring that elderly and educated people have to be shown due respect by using other forms of honor and politeness, something that facilitated the establishment of trust already during the first contact.

Most parents showed great confidentiality towards me also during the interview; although they were aware of their possibilities to interrupt the data collection or withdraw their data afterwards, nobody used this option. I believe that my own sociolinguistic background played a crucial role in this respect. Born and raised until the age of 13 in a multilingual Transylvanian city, I am familiar with the dialects spoken in the area. During my youth, I spent another 11 years in Hungary, completing my studies and working as a schoolteacher. This combina-
tion of experiences was of great help when interviewing people with different origins, talking different varieties of Hungarian and using different discursive modes (see Gumperz, 1982), as it made it possible for me to adjust my talk to the respondents’ needs. Revealing that I myself was a long-time resident in Sweden and a mother of Swedish-born children was surely also an advantage. Our similar life situation and the fact that we had to deal with similar concerns made the parents feel that we had much in common. Their sympathy was often also expressed by an eloquent request to be contacted when the work was finished and the results were clear.

Children and adolescents on the other hand were much less familiar with me as an interviewer. Some children commented that they had never been interviewed before, (especially not by a bilingual speaker, I suppose), and many of them wanted to know more about me as a person (not necessarily as a researcher though) before they felt confident enough to answer any questions. References to my own children and interests they shared with the child in question made the children more interested and more open. Adolescents, on the other hand, raised questions about the purpose of the study, some of them explicitly distancing themselves from the research by stating they would only participate for their parents’ sake. However, almost all children and adolescents became engaged during the interview, and afterwards many of them wanted to know more about language use in other families and the investigation as a whole.

Nevertheless, there were also some cases when a relaxed atmosphere could not be attained. Also worth noting is that I was unable to adjust my Stockholm variety to the Swedish used in the Göteborg region, which surely affected children’s perception of me as a person “from the capital”. Similar concerns but also good practices were noted for later analysis in a field book reserved for interview sessions.

4.2.5 The pilot study

The investigation was originally planned to consist of two different phases: the first one being a large-scale written survey, the second one an ethnographic study of a few selected families. As the survey concerned primary data, a pilot study was initiated during fall 2002. Attached in both Hungarian and Swedish, and accompanied with a bilingual cover letter, two sets of structured questionnaires were distributed via internal post to all personnel with a Hungarian name at Stockholm University, the College of Södertörn and some additionally at the Karolinska Institute. The extremely low number of responses (3 out of 32 addressees) as well as the comments of the few respondents in the pilot study made it clear: Families with school-aged children have a difficult schedule, which does not allow time for non-emergency cases such as filling in language surveys. I had to realise that, irrespectively of any changes in question formulations, a written survey was not the right research instrument for my target group. Even though interviews are considered to be more time-consuming and demanding for the investigator, it
seemed to be the only way of conducting a quantitative investigation within a reasonable time limit.

4.2.6 Qualitative interviewing as a method of data gathering

According to Briggs (1986), interviewing is a widespread method within sociolinguistics mostly due to economic reasons and/or because of the lack of trained personnel able to conduct ethnographic observations. However, in this specific case, it was a consciously chosen method in order to get both quantitative and qualitatively analysable data.

The initial literature review as well as my personal experiences and earlier research findings assisted construction of the structure and scope of interview questions. The few but detailed responses of the pilot study were used to decide the range of questions eventually pursued, which tightened the research focus. The responses were also useful in that they pointed out questions that had to be reformulated or needed contextualisation and/or an explanation to be more easily accessible. But most of all, the surveys had to be adapted to face-to-face interaction.

Handbooks concerning statistical analysis often stress the importance of standard interview techniques (e.g. Fowler & Mangione, 1990; Dahmström, 2000; Körner 1987), which means asking a set number of questions in a fixed order. The intention of doing so is then described as minimising any “effects” that the interview process may have on research outcomes, i.e. to obtain high reliability and validity. Nevertheless, many sociologists and ethnographers are sceptical of the validity of positivist approaches to interviewing and criticise them for being hierarchical and reluctant to address issues of strategy and power (see Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983; Cicourel, 1986; Briggs, 1986; Nathan, 1986; Kvale, 1996). Moreover, standardised survey interviews admittedly result in answers that fit into the researchers’ frame, but they miss the respondents’ perspectives and, consequently, they most often fail to reveal new insights into the field of inquiry (see Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2000).

Thanks to research conducted earlier within the group (György, 1998; György-Ullholm 2002/2010; György-Ullholm, 2004), I had the opportunity to meet people of various backgrounds and to talk to them in different social contexts, something that was of a great advantage as a preparation for the interview settings to come.

The decision of changing methodology from standardised to a more creative interview procedure was taken after serious consideration, following three family interviews. Trying to stick to the original questionnaire formulations by ignoring the feelings and thoughts of the respondents simply felt wrong and unnatural and to continue in the same manner was considered meaningless. During these initial interviews, I had the impression that something essential was being...
lost in our conversations and that that something was exactly what I was searching for. Therefore, in an early phase of data collection, a more appropriate combination of interview techniques was chosen. Background questions were continuously asked in the same manner and order as earlier. But questions concerning language use, parents’ more-or-less explicit language transmission efforts as well as questions concerning attitudes and ethnic identity were not asked in any particular order, and extended answers were not discouraged. Usually it turned out that they had relevance to later topics of inquiry.

Interviewing is never an easy task. Respondents seldom answer questions directly and briefly; sometimes they even get into paradoxes, or hesitate in their answers, before they arrive at an answer that suits them. Although sequences of this kind may seem confusing at first glance, they have to be accepted as natural occurrences of vivid discussions. In fact, one can argue, that in contrary to standardised techniques, open questions generate answers or, in more ethnographic terms, “accounts” that better represent the respondents’ beliefs and views about the area of investigation, thus also enhancing reliability. However, these answers have to be interpreted and examined in a reflexive manner, “as social phenomena occurring in, and shaped by, particular contexts” (Hammersley & Atkinson 1983: 126), which means by examining location and time, as well as the investigator’s own status and identity in relation to the respondents’ and other people present during the conversation. In order to facilitate a reflexive interpretation of data, certain measures had been taken during all stages of work. Some of them will be described in more detail in the following chapters.

Taking a creative approach to interviewing does not mean that there are no prepared questions. During the interviews, I had a written questionnaire to rely on, which was filled in by me at least partly during the ongoing interview, fully visible to the respondents (for comments on note-taking during interviews, see Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983: 162). Also, at the end of the interview the respondents were asked to check some of the answers that I felt unsure about. Nevertheless, during the course of interviewing, it also happened that prepared questions went unasked because the context of the discussion had covered the issues sufficiently. An example could be the case of a 16-year-old girl whom I asked to think of different settings when she was talking to her Hungarian father. My role in the conversation was to remind her of the focus of our discussion: “Which language would you use in this particular case? Why? And which language would your father use towards you?” Amongst other settings, the girl commented on a telephone-mediated conversation, which was conducted in the presence of her Swedish mates. The girl claimed that in this case she would always use Hungarian towards her father, as “they [her friends] are not part of the conversation anyway”. This utterance was quite interesting as she had earlier claimed that other people’s presence would trigger her to talk Swedish with her father. In this case, the creative interviewing approach helped me to understand the importance of the channel (in person vs. through the telephone) for this particular family, as well as
their reasoning rhetoric (Who’s considered to be a part of a conversation?), both of which I would have missed if I had followed a standardised interviewing method.

The relaxed atmosphere put respondents at ease, giving them a sense of security and control. Most often, our conversations ended in free-flow discussions, which uncovered information that structured questions could not have revealed. However, it is important to note that despite many similarities, this interview approach cannot be labelled as being reflexive in the ethnographic sense (see Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983: 112-113). Firstly, in order to gain data that were quantitatively analysable, all topics had to be pursued with each family. Secondly, the written procedures weakened somewhat the continuity and the horizontal character of the interviews, although it was a useful way of reminding the respondents of the purpose of our discussions.

The advantage of this interview approach was twofold: it made it possible to analyse the respondents’ answers qualitatively and at the same time gather quantitative data for the statistical analysis. The procedure added to the total knowledge of the inquiry, and by analysing sequences of our conversations, it allowed me to subsequently identify underlying rhetoric and embedded language views of participant families.

Despite the positive outcomes, the decision to change interview methodology had some undesired consequences as well. Because of the high number and the exhausting character of the interviews, very little time was left to pure ethnographic work. The research questions required a quantitative study; at the same time this meant that – at least within the frame of this study - longitudinal observations of individual families were excluded. What was left was complementary participant observation during home visits, community activities, and other outside home activities (for more details see section 4.3.5). Renewed contact with some of the participants added also to the knowledge of inquiry.

4.2.7 Ethical considerations

Before the recorder was turned on, a verbal explanation of the parameters of the research was given. As the parents agreed to be a part of the study, they signed a consent form. During the introduction to the interview, all family members were informed that they were granted anonymity and that their data could be withdrawn from the project at their discretion anytime they wished.

Consequently, in the qualitative analysis, each respondent who is mentioned is referred to by a pseudonym. A masking of descriptive data, which might identify individual families, has also been undertaken.

Another question of ethical interest was how to embody the accounts of the respondents, especially those that were given in a weaker language of the respondents. Most children and adolescents in the study reported Swedish being their dominant language; still many of them chose to speak Hungarian during the course of the interview. In some of the cases, their accounts contained small grammatical and/or idiomatic mistakes; some of the thoughts they expressed were also
expressed in a quite simplistic manner. The choice of Hungarian in an interview situation under the given circumstances has to be recognised as a brave action with a high symbolic value. Therefore, when translating sequences from these interviews, I have chosen to ignore minor deviations from the standard language.

4.3 Data collection

4.3.1 The questionnaires

As mentioned earlier, the content of the surveys was adapted to the target group on the basis of previous ethnographic work concerning Swedish Hungarians (Szabó, 1988, 1997) and my personal experiences as a group member and as an investigator of two linguistic studies conducted earlier (György, 1998; György-Ullholm, 2004). However, to make the interview procedure more respondent friendly, the questionnaires had to be revised and reorganised.

The parents’ questionnaire was divided into four parts according to the interview’s different stages. The first part concerned basic data on the family’s living conditions, such as number and age of family members in the household, their understanding of each other’s languages, the family’s involvement in Swedish vs. Hungarian associations, as well as data on the linguistic composition of the family’s neighbourhood at the time of the interview.

The second part of the questionnaire concerned the parents’ sociolinguistic background, such as birth data, migration dates, level of education, parents’ and grandparents’ mother tongue, and language environment prior to migration including language of education.

The questions in the first two parts of the questionnaire concerned background/factor variables. To assure that they were properly coded, this part of the interview was structured, i.e. all questions were asked in the same pace and manner from all parents, with follow-up questions when needed.

The third part of the questionnaire covered all kinds of questions related to language use within and outside the family, including language choice, codeswitching, interaction patterns, accessible printed, audio and video material in different languages in the home, children’s free-time activities, their participation in heritage language (mother tongue) instruction, and visits to Hungarian-speaking areas. This part of the interview was devoted the most time. The approach was semi-structured with predominantly open-ended questions and much space was given to the participants to give their own views and explanations to the topics pursued.

The fourth part of the questionnaire concerned parental attitudes, including attitudes towards language contact phenomena, naming of (name choice for) their children, explicit efforts made for strengthening their children’s language skills in either language, parents’ language preference, attitudes towards language contact phenomena and questions related to ethnic identity. This part of the interview became more and more individualised for each family that was interviewed. There
were several reasons for that. Some of the questions included were quite private and to ask them straightforwardly, without considering the actual family’s conditions would have been perceived as extremely rude. Another point of consideration was that a more structured approach in this part of the interview would have resulted in a high number of missing - or at least unvalid - answers. Certainly, one-dimensional data would have been enough for the purpose of quantitative analysis, but what I sought was answers that could reveal the multidimensionality of that area. Fortunately, at this point of the interview, the conversations conducted earlier enabled me to accommodate to the respondents’ reasoning and frames of reference.

However, there are apparent dangers associated with an accommodating approach. In the worst case, the investigator gets familiarised with the subject of investigation and misses the point of collecting “raw”, “unbiased” data. In order to minimise this risk, I had to constantly remind myself of the keen balance between complete acceptance and constant questioning of the respondents’ views. Kvale (1996) notes in connection to this dilemma that “good” interviewing is an art rather than a research method that can be learned from books. It involves a complex human interaction, at the same time being dependent on the aims of the investigation. Therefore, he argues, the only way of learning to ask the “right” questions is by training.

The children’s questionnaire is not divided into several parts, although there were several stages in these interviews as well. The reason for ignoring a pre-conceptualised division was the unpredictable character of the child interviews. The interview procedures had to be adapted to the child’s age, interests and linguistic abilities in each individual case. As a result, there were considerable differences in the structure of these interviews. More details on this will follow in the next sections.

4.3.2 Interviewing procedures

After a short introduction to the interview procedures, and obtaining the participants’ consent, an MD recorder was used to avoid the loss of important details. Some methodological handbooks state that recording interviews can have a self-censoring effect on respondents and can influence the degree of frankness and disclosure in their responses. However, due to technical malfunctions, the recorder could not be used with all families involved in the study, and according to my experiences, there did not appear to be any noticeable differences in the nature and level of disclosure between recorded and unrecorded interviews.

The language of the interview was individually chosen by each respondent, an option they were presented in advance, as it was mentioned in the advertisement. In almost all cases, the parents’ initial choice was Hungarian, whereas only half of the interviewed children preferred to be interviewed in that language. Approximately one-third of the children chose Swedish from the start, while the remaining alternated between Swedish and Hungarian during the course of the interview. As
language choice is tightly connected to children’s bilingualism, we will return to this issue in section 9.4, as part of the results.

Most of the respondents, both parents and children, let the tape run freely and did not request it to be turned off, except possibly when we were interrupted by some unexpected incident, e.g. a neighbour ringing the door bell. In case these unrecorded conversations turned out to have relevance for the investigation, the observations were noted in a field book, in direct connection to the interview.

The respondents were presented with the option of being interviewed in their own homes for privacy, convenience, comfort and security, and the majority of the respondents preferred to do so. On the special request of one mother, the interviews with her and her son were conducted at her workplace; in another case, because of the family being in the process of moving. I met one parent and a son over a cup of tea in a café near their home. In a third case, the interview took place in a public building in connection to a Hungarian community activity. In addition to its empowering function (Thompson, 2007), talking to people at places of their own choice also had the advantage that it enabled me to observe the language use of my respondents in a “real-life” situation, interacting at home with family members and me, as an outsider, and, in the latter cases, outside the home and in the presence of non-Hungarian speakers.

To have as many family members’ insights as possible was considered to be of importance for the investigation as a whole, but especially for the qualitative analysis of the material. Unfortunately, it was not always possible to interview all family members. In these cases, I preferred to interview the Hungarian-speaking parent, or, if both parents were Hungarian-speaking, I requested to speak with the parent who spent the most time with the children.

All children were welcome to share their thoughts with me, but at the same time, they were never pressed to do so. In families with more than one child, the main interview was conducted with the oldest child born and raised in Sweden who was still under the age of 18. Most often this meant the first-born child of the family, but in some families it was the youngest child out of two or three, because the older siblings were grown up or because they were born outside Sweden. Some of the participants proved also to be valuable sources for later interviews and observations. However, the statistical analysis is built upon the first-time answers of only one parent and one child per family.

Most often, all family members were interviewed on the same day; however, in some cases the children were engaged in other activities, and we had to arrange another meeting for them. The children interviews lasted half-an-hour to two hours, excluding the time spent on initial play and/or informal conversations prior to the actual interview. The parent interviews usually took approximately two to three hours, but as they often ended in informal discussion, the time spent in the families’ homes was considerably longer.
4.3.3 Interviewing parents

Interviewing parents is not the same as interviewing adult people about themselves or about other issues of interest. In every single interview conducted with a parent, one can find reflections that are due to their role as caregivers of their children. This circumstance adds a new dimension to the interviewing technique, a factor that has been discussed only in psychological research (e.g. Andersson, 1977; Kihlblom, 1979; Kälvesten & Meldahl, 1982).

Most concerns can be summarised as being related to the parents’ wish to be recognised as being “good” parents. However, being a good parent depends on the beliefs and attitudes prevalent in the society and the social network of the family. Moreover, perceived expectations on behalf of the researcher can also lead to biased answers. All these circumstances imply that parental answers have to be interpreted even more carefully than “usual” interview data.

As a solution to this problem, Kihlblom (1979: 27 ff.) suggests an interviewing technique based on reconstruction of regularly occurring events in family life (e.g. meal or bedtime), so that the investigator can ask the parents for explanations of particular actions in connection to these events instead of requiring generalisation.

This latter technique was especially useful in the third and the fourth stage of the parental interviews, when dealing with language use and attitudinal data. Usually, a new area was approached with a vague open question, e.g. “Do you have any rules for language use in your family?” The reason for doing so was to detect the degree of awareness about these questions for each individual respondent. In the next step, the question was narrowed to ask, for example, for language choice towards a defined interlocutor: “What languages do you use when talking to your daughter?” Most answers to these questions were hesitant but simple, with responds stating either Hungarian or Swedish. However, connected to a concrete situation, for example, “In what language are you saying to her to hurry up and put her jacket on when you are picking her up at school?”, the parents would usually answer in more detail and recall other situations they felt related to the one I had mentioned. Reconstructing a set of situations together with the parent provided me in turn with a frame that could reveal insights into governing factors of language choice for the particular family.

4.3.4 Interviewing children and adolescents

Conducting interviews with children and adolescents was, unexpectedly, the most demanding task of the data collection. Talking to the young respondents made me rethink all my earlier assumptions and readings concerning interview techniques. After only the first few times, I had to realise: Simplifying the questions when talking to an eight-year-old will not do it. Without contextualisation, you will probably end up with no answers at all. In the case of adolescents, another problem arose: How to hide my thoughts from them so that they would not try to impress me or, for that matter, to shock me, by choosing their answers depending
on my perceived expectations. Some of these problems apply to adults as well, although to a much lesser degree, as described by Kvale (1996) and Briggs (1986, 1996).

In sociolinguistic research, a fundamental issue of debate has been the nature of language use and how it should be assessed. Within the field of bilingualism, an array of methods and perspectives has been used including qualitative and quantitative approaches. Concerning adults, interviews have been a widely used method within sociolinguistics (cf. Briggs, 1986). There are also some examples of a more questionable kind: interviewing adults about their language use patterns during childhood (e.g. Flodell, 1986). It is still quite rare, however, that sociolinguists ask children about their own or others’ linguistic behaviour. In most studies touching on the topic, also during the late 1990s, observations have been preferred (e.g. De Houwer, 1990; Huss, 1991; Aniansson, 1996) and this method is advocated also in methodological overviews (see Huss, 1989; De Houwer, 1987, 1998; Lanza 2007). In some studies, interviews were conducted in addition to the observations, but even in these cases, the investigators preferred trusting the parents, teachers or other adults around the child(ren) than asking the child(ren) directly (e.g. Aniansson, 1996; Narrowe, 1998; Okita, 2002; Barron-Hauwaert, 2004). It seems that it is only after puberty that children are trusted in questions of language use (e.g. Boyd, 1985; Kostoulas-Makrakis, 1995; Nordenstam & Wallin, 2002; Haglund, 2005a, b).

This self-imposed methodological restriction may be difficult to understand. Child interviews have been used by several practitioners in psychological and pedagogical settings and the investigators agree: interviews are a highly useful, tough and demanding tool of assessing children’s thoughts (cf. Yarrow, 1960; Lindsjö & Rosén, 1979; Alskog, 1986; Doverborg & Pramling, 1993 and 2000).

In the present study, in many cases children’s answers corresponded with their parent’s answers on the same issues, but there were several cases when the child narratives complemented the earlier, considerably shorter answers of their parents. Last but not least, there were also some families with considerable discrepancies between the parent’s and the children’s views on the same questions. Usually these concerned language choice within the family, a highly private matter in bilingual settings. I am firmly convinced that children could contribute a great deal to our understanding of bilingual settings and the context that triggered their own and other’s language choice - supposing that their voice would be allocated more space and strength. However, in order to make use of their statements, we need to improve our awareness of children’s thinking pattern and talking styles, and we have to learn how to apply that knowledge efficiently in the interview situation.

102 There are also some exceptions in a few sociolinguistic studies that actually make use of surveys with children (Virta, 1994; Extra & Verhoeven 1993a; Avoird, Broeder & Extra, 2001; Parszyk, 1999); remarkably, none of them discusses the eventual difficulties associated with assessing children’s thoughts.
and for elicitation purposes (see also Garbarino & Stot, 1989; Lindh-Munther, 1999; Aldridge & Wood, 1998).

Trying to locate some help for my interviews with children in earlier studies and methodology books, several difficulties came to the fore:

(1) Most handbooks on interviewing are restricted to adult communication; they do not even mention child interviews, as if they were nonexistent in the practice (e.g. Briggs, 1986, 1996; Lantz, 1993; Kvale, 1996).

(2) Child research today is not a unified field of study, but a dispersed one: childhood-related studies can be found in a wide range of research disciplines including psychology, pedagogy, ethnology, anthropology, medicine, linguistics, cultural and arts studies. Nevertheless, only few of these studies have children’s thinking, perception or the development of their mental capacities as their main aim. What’s worse, it is rarely mentioned how to actually apply the existing childhood theories in real-life communication with children. To make use of the practices developed in all these fields of research interdisciplinarity is inevitable.

(3) There are numerous studies, thousands of pages written about children, a minority of them also aiming to enhance children’s conditions. However, children are seldom actively involved in the research process. Until the late 1990s, in most disciplines, children were usually treated as unreliable sources. Consequently, most researchers have preferred to observe them during (ordinary or experimental) activities rather than trying to elaborate techniques for accessing their thoughts. As mentioned above, in sociolinguistic research the absence of child interviews is even more apparent.

(4) Adolescents are, on the other hand, as Montemayor, Adams & Gullotta (1990) point out, often treated in survey studies as if they were adults; as if no special treatment or elicitation method would be needed towards them (e.g. Boyd, 1985; Nordenstam & Wallin, 2000)

The few guidelines on this topic are written for social workers and/or medical staff that need support in their everyday work with children. Nevertheless, most of the suggestions given are vague and thus inadequate, age-appropriate language use being the most often advice given (a point made also by Aldridge and Wood, 1998: 19 ff.). After several weeks of troubled search, I found two guidelines that were concrete enough to enhance the investigation: (1) Interviewing children, a guide written by two linguists, Aldridge and Wood (1998), concerning video interviews conducted for evidentiary purposes; and (2) To understand children’s thinking, a more general guide developed by Dowerborg and Pramling (2000) to assess children’s cognitive development. Some overlapping advice mentioned in both guides that I have found useful is:
Give the child time and your full attention;
- If you don’t get an answer, try to reformulate the question;
- Avoid yes/no questions, start instead by asking “Tell me …”;
- Concretise by simple follow-up questions;
- Younger children and children interviewed in their weaker language may need more specific questions;
- Use pictures or other equipment to help the child to remember;
- Be an active conversation partner.

Following the recommendations of Aldridge and Wood (1998) concerning privacy, the children interviews were carried out in the child’s own room or in the kitchen, but more importantly, in the absence of their parents. An exception was made in three cases, independently of each other. The cases concerned two shy seven-year-old boys who seemed worried about being left alone with an unknown adult, and a considerably older boy who was interviewed together with his father in a café as their family was in the process of moving. The reason for interviewing the children separately from the parents was to assure that they did not have to worry about their parents’ opinion and/or feelings when formulating their answers. This reason was made clear previously during the introduction to the parents’ interview with all family members present.

In addition to the advice mentioned earlier, an informal opening was considered as a necessity in all child interviews, the main aim being to diminish the feeling of a rehearsal and to create a friendly atmosphere. Small presents I brought to them (chocolate, candy, a rubber ball or a little car) cheered them up and made them more cooperative. Showing interest in the child’s games, books, posters and other belongings, enabled me to map his/her interests to his/her language preference, and at the same time change perspective from adult conversation to the actual child’s age-level.

Before proceeding with the interview, it was stated that there were no “wrong” or “right” answers and that they would be the only persons capable of judging what would apply for them in each situation.

Instead of asking direct questions out of the questionnaire, children under the age of 12 years were asked to depict an ordinary day of their lives in detail, from the moment they woke up in the morning till the moment they fell to sleep. In case the child needed support, I provided non-leading questions to facilitate their narratives, for example, “Okay, and what are you doing after the school lessons are finished? Are you staying at school or going somewhere else?” Following a natural conversations’ turn-taking rules, I also asked questions related to language use, their best friends, the frequency and type of free-time activities, etc. when it naturally occurred in their stories. Language use with the mother, for example, was asked for when the child mentioned that her mother usually wakes her up. “What is she doing or saying to you to wake you up? And what are you answering?” would be related questions posed to a seven- or eight-year-old. Usually, the
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children would cite the mother in her own words, thus enabling me to make an initial guess regarding the language of interaction in the given setting, a guess that could be followed up in the next question. Best friends, what mother tongue they have and the language use during their interactions came into the picture when the child was telling about free-time activities or breaks at school. Questions concerning book reading and/or media use were asked if the child mentioned some of the activities on her own. Otherwise, further questions were asked after the child had ended the story of her day, often embedded in conversations related to our earlier discussions or properties in her room. Questions related to reading in Hungarian could be asked for by referring to Hungarian-written books she/he had on her shelf: “What nice books you have here! Where do they come from?” “Are you reading them for yourself or is somebody reading for you?” “What have you read last?”, etc. In some cases, these questions generated detailed answers including a retelling of a book’s original story, or in another case leading to a showing of a child’s photo album of her last summer vacation. Despite being time-consuming, these sessions were highly rewarding as they revealed a very accurate picture of the child’s linguistic abilities at the time of the interview.

4.3.5 Participant observation and field notes

During winter/spring 2004 and spring 2006, I spent two exhaustive periods, approximately nine months altogether, intensively interviewing, searching for more respondents, and attending community activities; for the latter, I assumed the role of a participant-observer, recording my experiences in field notes. During this period, I was granted full access to different community activities, including board meetings, enabling me to build a personal opinion and lasting relations with many group members. In the time between different appointments and for several months afterwards, I was engaged with writing up preliminary findings and follow-up questions.

Another set of field notes originated from the interview settings. In connection to the home visits, I would take a walk in the neighbourhood to get a picture of what surroundings the children were growing up in. During the interview sessions it was also easier to relate to the informants everyday reality when they were referring to ‘the nearby shop’, ‘the playground’, ‘the neighbours’, ‘the nearest school’, ‘the bus station’, etc. As for the interview sessions, the respondents’ actual language choice did not always match their explicitly given answers on language choice questions posed during the interview. It happened, for example, that the parent stated everybody in the family would use Hungarian and nothing else at home, although I could clearly hear when a child was addressing his mother in Swedish when asking for dinner. In similar cases I had to decide how to manage discrepancies in the material. I decided to ask for clarification at once when the actual behaviour was contradicting the respondents’ earlier statements. However, if they didn’t change their minds, I did not insist but registered the respondents’ answers according to their own views. Eventually, conflicting observations in
connection to the interviews were instead noted in a field book assigned for the interview sessions. Observations of furniture, handicrafts, music or other artefacts strongly connected to Hungarian or Swedish culture were also noted as additional background information to the individual family notes in the same notebook. The aim of these notes was to provide as much information to the family cases as possible, thereby enriching the sparse survey data.

The aim of participant observations and field notes during community activities was threefold: (1) To check the reliability of my respondents’ answers, monitoring their linguistic awareness, (2) to check the actual language use of different generations in connection to the community activities, and (3) to build an opinion about the social groupings within and between the observed associations. The first aim could only partly be fulfilled because not all respondents were attending community activities and only a minority of these activities were dedicated to children. The latter two aims were especially important as they were addressing the third research question concerning the unity or dividedness of the Swedish-Hungarian community and its consequences for the children’s language use.

4.4 Data analysis

4.4.1 Quantitative data analysis

Each case in the dataset is made up by a whole family defined as a focus child and his or her family members, i.e. including all adults and children involved in the household(s) the child lives in. The statistical analysis is based on the first-time answers of only one parent (always Hungarian) and one child per family, i.e. the oldest child born and raised in Sweden. The answers of other family members were used for qualitative analysis purposes only. Also, as noted earlier, five of the interviewed families were excluded from the statistical analysis because they were considered as falling outside the focus of the study (see section 4.2.2 above). Thus, the remaining number of families included in the focus groups of the study is 56.

In the quantitative analysis, mostly simple descriptive tools such as frequency tables, crosstabulations, charts and display of means and standard deviations were used.

4.4.2 The necessity of a qualitative angle

The statistical data analysis addresses the two first research questions. It does, however, not cover all collected data, and it certainly does not address the third research question. As is the case with all interview studies, the results of the statistical analysis solely are insufficient for the understanding of the phenomena in question, partly due to the fact that the respondents’ answers do not necessarily reflect their actual social and linguistic behaviour, but mainly because of the simplification a statistical analysis necessarily involves.

Due to events beyond my control, considerable time has elapsed between the collecting of data and the actual analysis of data. This circumstance has mostly
been an advantage for the work undertaken, as it gave me the necessary time to disconnect from the material. As Hammersley and Atkinson point out (1983: 212-213):

As the fieldwork progresses, however, the researcher becomes inescapably familiar with the setting, and the accumulated field notes and transcripts represent a physical record of that familiarity. Before embarking on any major writing up, therefore, one has to undertake a further task of estrangement. If one does not distance oneself from them, then there is a danger of being unable to dismantle the data, select from them and re-order the material.

Thus, to enhance the reliability of the study, the rough results of the statistical analysis have been continuously refined by means of qualitative data. Also, in chapters 6, 7, 8 and 9, some data are presented that could not be captured in quantitative terms, using citations from interviews and examples from participant observations.

However, it is important not to overestimate the significance of the individual utterances of respondents. Isolating an individual response from an institutional setting raises problems of both validity and representativeness (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983: 10-11, 44-45). Consequently, detecting patterns of rhetoric and policy priorities among the focus groups was given a higher priority than isolating individual nuances.
Chapter Five

Pre-Contact Factors, SILE Background and the Formation of Focus Groups

The aim of this chapter is twofold. Firstly, it presents the pre-contact factors, including the immigrant generation's social identity and linguistic experiences during childhood (i.e. their SILE background). Secondly, it presents the procedure that led to the formation of focus groups of the study.

Section 5.1 introduces the biological parent’s mother tongue in the sample families, while section 5.2 presents the parents’ SILE background with special attention devoted to the six subgroups of Hungarian immigrants found in the sample.

Section 5.3 presents the process that led to the formation of focus groups in the study. Section 5.4 presents the marriage patterns of the Hungarian immigrants in the sample. Marriage pattern in this thesis is, however, not only analyzed in the more conventional terms of exogamy vs. endogamy but primarily according to the governing principle of the study, namely the parent’s SILE background.

As mentioned in the introduction to the thesis, there is another important feature that distinguishes the present study from previous investigations, namely that it advocates for a family perspective on bilingualism-related issues instead of the more usual individual perspective. In concrete terms this means that from section 5.5 and onwards, individual parents (and, in subsequent chapters also their children) are treated as parts of family units and all data are analyzed accordingly. Furthermore, the formation of the three focus groups and an additional non-focus group is introduced here.

Sections 5.5 and 5.6 investigate some additional pre-contact factors of possible relevance for the families’ post-migratory language behaviour, such as the level of the Hungarian immigrants’ education and the medium of instruction at school.

5.1 Parents’ mother tongue

The initial linguistic composition of the sample families has already been presented in section 4.2.1. Figure 5.1 shows the parents’ mother tongue based on the informants’ self-reports concerning language use with their parents during
childhood back in their country of origin. Among the 122 biological parents, 101 were Hungarian and 21 non-Hungarians.

It should first be noted that there are fewer fathers than mothers in the sample with Hungarian as a mother tongue. This skewed distribution between the genders confirms the observation of Szabó (1997) as well as my own experiences within the Swedish-Hungarian community. It seems that Hungarian women are generally more prepared to move to Sweden because of marriage than men are. When asked about the circumstances for their move to Sweden, considerably more men reported other reasons, like asylum or job opportunities. Furthermore, also in contrast to the women in the sample, several men reported that they took their earlier partners with them, or, if they did not have one at the time of their arrival, they tried to find Hungarian partners via other channels first. However, as mentioned earlier, the proportion of exogamic marriages among Hungarians living in Sweden is probably considerably higher than is apparent in this sample (see section 4.2.1).

5.2 Parents’ SILE background

As mentioned earlier (see 1.3 and 3.4), Hungarian immigrants in Sweden cover a wide range of social and linguistic backgrounds, which is why they are especially suited for this type of investigation. Table 5.1 presents the six types of SILE background found among the 101 Hungarian parents in the sample and demonstrates the abbreviations used subsequently to identify these subgroups. The columns in the table represent the social identity of the parents during childhood, whereas the rows represent the linguistic environment they grew up in. The number of female immigrants with their respective background is followed by the number of male immigrants for the same category. The total numbers include both male and

Furthermore, it might be noted that there are three second-generation Hungarian parents among the fathers and two among the mothers in the sample (five parents in total).
female immigrants; however, note that the table only includes Hungarian parents in the sample.

Essentially, there are three larger groups of backgrounds represented in the sample:

- **H maj-mono** with 18 female and 17 male Hungarian immigrants originating from monolingual areas in Hungary;
- **H maj-bil** with 13 female and 5 male Hungarian immigrants originating from bilingual or, in a few cases, trilingual areas of Hungary; and
- **H min-multi** with 14 female and 10 male immigrants, that is, ethnic Hungarians originating from multilingual, or in a few cases, bilingual environments in Transylvania.

The remaining categories in table 5.1, that is, H min-mono, H min-ass and H min-2gen, comprise considerably fewer informants; furthermore, as it will become clear in the following, most of them are married to representants of one of the larger subgroups of Hungarian immigrants presented above. Details on the different subcategories of Hungarian immigrants and their original surroundings have been presented in earlier chapters; a few of these issues will also be highlighted in the following section (5.3).

Similar diversity in SILE backgrounds can be found among the parents with other immigrant languages as their mother tongue, whereas Swedish parents are only represented by majority members in this sample (corresponding the categories S maj-mono and S maj-bil). The non-Hungarian spouses’ SILE background is, nevertheless, only considered here within a larger explanatory frame, namely as part of the Hungarian immigrants’ marriage pattern.

According to the framework of the study, as mentioned above, the parents in the sample have been treated as parts of a family unit, assuming that language use is a

---

104 An Azerbaijani immigrant from Iran would, for example, correspond to the abbreviation A min-multi, whereas a Turkish immigrant originating from Turkey would correspond T maj-mono; in my database, both of them are nevertheless marked with an O for other, i.e. O min-multi and O maj-mono, respectively.
result of family dynamics and not a result of the will or behaviour of individual parents (or even children) in the family.

For this reason, it might be important to discuss the marriage pattern of the immigrants in this chapter, among the pre-contact factors, even though some of the marriages were established later on, at the initial stages of contact. A more detailed analysis of the six types of Hungarian immigrants (listed in table 5.1.) will follow in section 5.4. However, as the families have been divided into focus groups according to the hypothesis of the study, it is more essential to present them first.

5.3. The formation of focus groups

Table 5.2 shows the marriage patterns found in the sample sorted after the focus groups. Note, however, that marriage pattern is here used in a rather unusual manner referring to the spouses’ SILE combination rather than their mother tongue or ethnicity. Nevertheless, the results of the compilation are striking. As seen in the table, many immigrants in the sample married somebody who shares their childhood experiences, most often their former social identity SI (i.e. maj/min), but in many cases, especially in focus group 1 and 3, the spouses match each other exactly in their SILE background (see also the individual level analysis that follows in section 5.4.)

In table 5.2, the four groups are separated from each other by a horizontal line. Note that each case in the table includes two individuals; however, in some of the cases only one of the spouses is Hungarian. Different marriage patterns are based on the frequency of their occurrence and are listed separately for each of the focus groups in descending order. The frequency of exogamic marriages for the given type of marriage pattern is presented in the last column of the table.

The most common SILE constellation (>50 percent) for each group is highlighted with a grey background in the table. Some constellations, i.e. [min-multi & maj-mono], [maj-bil & maj-mono], [maj-mono & min-ass] and [maj-bil & min-ass], appear two times on the list because of their relevance for two different focus groups. In the two cases marked with an asterisk (*), only one part had Hungarian as a mother tongue, namely the one with a monolingual majority background (=H maj-mono), and this is the reason why these families have been included in the first focus group.

There were three subsequent guiding principles for dividing the sample families into focus groups. Firstly, exogamic families entered a group according to the Hungarian parent’s SILE background. This principle helped to sort out 21 out of 61 cases (=family units). For the remaining 40 endogamic cases, the principle was to identify the parent with the more frequent SILE background (i.e. H maj-mono, H maj-bil or H min-multi). In most cases (31 out of the remaining 40) this second principle was sufficient for deciding which focus group the family fits into and no further steps had to be taken. In cases where parents’ shared not only their ethnicity but also their SILE background, it was easy to decide which group they
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fit into. Nor was it a problem if one of the parents was a representant of the more frequent subgroups of immigrants, whereas the other was a representant of the non-frequent subgroups (H min-mono, H ass-min or H min-2gen). However, there were 9 cases left in which both Hungarian parents had a frequent but different SILE background. This included 8 [H maj-mono & H maj-bil] cases and one [H maj-mono & H min-multi] case. In these remaining cases, the decision was based on my hypothesis, which predicts that the more similar the childhood experience of a parent is to the situation the children face in the new contact situation, the better the family’s chances are for a successful minority language transmission (For more details on the hypothesis, see section 4.1). Thus, in these latter cases I chose the parent who had the more similar SI and/or LI to the situation their children face in Sweden, which I consider to be a possible H min-multi setting. As a consequence, I decided that [H maj-mono & H maj-bil] cases should form part of focus group 2 (i.e. H maj-bil families), while the [H maj-mono & H min-multi] case was added to focus group 3.

Table 5.2. Initial marriage pattern in the sample with regard to the spouses’ SILE background (family level analysis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>Combination of spouses’ SILE background</th>
<th>Number of families per group (out of total)</th>
<th>Percent per group</th>
<th>Frequency of exogamic marriages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>both maj-mono</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=24</td>
<td>maj-mono &amp; min-ass</td>
<td>5 (out of 8)</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maj-mono &amp; maj-mono</td>
<td>2 (out of 3)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maj-mono &amp; min-2gen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maj-bil &amp; maj-mono*</td>
<td>1 (out of 9)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>min-multi &amp; maj-mono*</td>
<td>1 (out of 3)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>maj-bil &amp; maj-mono</td>
<td>8 (out of 9)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=16</td>
<td>maj-bil &amp; min-2gen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>both maj-bil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maj-bil &amp; min-ass</td>
<td>1 (out of 2)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>both min-multi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=16</td>
<td>min-multi &amp; maj-mono</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>min-multi &amp; maj-mono</td>
<td>2 (out of 3)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-focus families</td>
<td>maj-mono &amp; min-ass</td>
<td>3 (out of 8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maj-bil &amp; min-ass</td>
<td>1 (out of 2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maj-mono &amp; min-mono</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This grouping procedure resulted, as previously mentioned, in four groups: three focus groups\textsuperscript{105} that were comparable in size (subsequently matched for children’s age and gender, as well as for city of residence; see section 4.2.3 and 4.4.1) and a fourth category of non-focus families.

As seen in table 5.2, the first and largest group in the sample consists of 24 families in which one or both of the Hungarian parents grew up as majority members in a monolingual environment. These families will henceforward be called H maj-mono families or group 1. The core of this group consists of 17 (out of 18) females and 11 (out of 17) males with the SILE set up H maj-mono.

The second group consists of 16 families in which one or both of the Hungarian parents grew up as majority members in a bilingual (or, in a few cases, trilingual) environment. These families will henceforward be called H maj-bil families or group 2. The labelling of this group is motivated by the fact that it includes all immigrants with the SILE set up H maj-bil, which is 13 females and 5 males. Note, however, that included here are also 4 males and one female with a H maj-mono background, as they are married to H maj-bil immigrants.

The third focus group in the sample consists of 16 families, in which at least one or both of the Hungarian parents grew up as members of a vital minority in a multilingual (or, in a few cases, bilingual) environment. These families will henceforward be called H min-multi families or group 3. The labelling of this group is motivated by the fact that its core consists of the 14 females and the 10 males with a H min-multi background.

Two separate Pearson Chi square tests were performed comparing the three largest subgroups’ marriage patterns to each other. The tests revealed no significant differences between the groups in this sample, neither for SILE match nor for ethnicity match. We may nevertheless note that there was a strong tendency for more exogamic marriages in group 1 (H maj-mono families) as compared to group 3 (H min-multi families) already in the initial stages of family establishment [$\chi^2=3.462$, df=1, n=40, p=0.06].\textsuperscript{106} At the same time, the marriage patterns found in focus group 1 and 2 (H maj-bil families) were similar [$\chi^2=1.000$, df=1, n=40, p=0.32].

One may of course wonder if this pattern is not caused by differences in the conditions of immigration for the former majority vs. the former minority members; for example, that the former majority members immigrated by means of marriage, whereas the minority members immigrated by right of asylum, thereby being free to marry within their own ethnic group to a higher degree. However, I could not find any significant differences between the groups in their conditions of immigration.

\textsuperscript{105} As indicated earlier, the three largest subcategories of Hungarian parents in the sample (i.e. H maj-mono, H maj-bil and H min-multi) comprise the basis of the focus groups.

\textsuperscript{106} Value counted with Yate’s correction for continuity, which compensates for the overestimates of the chi-square value in 2 by 2 tables (cf. Pallant 2007: 216).
5.4. Individual level analysis of marriage patterns

This section is an attempt to present the above-mentioned data in a more traditional way, i.e. based on an individual level analysis. Each subgroup of Hungarian immigrants is treated under a different heading, and their marriage patterns analyzed accordingly. This change in perspective necessarily also implies a slight complication in that each family unit discussed above may be mentioned once or twice, depending on the type of marriage they refer to. Hungarian immigrants who have married their exact match with respect to SILE background will only be mentioned under one of the following headings, and the same applies for all exogamic marriages. Other families, in which the spouses are Hungarian but do not share each others’ SILE set up, will be mentioned twice, as to include each of the parts’ SILE set up as an individual perspective. Note also that this presentation has been included to strengthen reliability of the study and is not necessary for understanding the forthcoming chapters.

5.4.1 H maj-mono immigrants - strong tendency for SILE match and for exogamic marriages

As seen in table 5.1, there were 18 mothers and 17 fathers in the sample who grew up in a monolingual environment as members of the Hungarian-speaking majority in Hungary (H maj-mono parents). All of them, with the exception of one (i.e. 34 out of 35 H maj-mono immigrants), have married other majority members, resulting in a marriage pattern that can be described as [H maj-mono & X maj-x]. Furthermore, it turned out that 24 of their spouses’ also shared the experience of growing up in a monolingual environment, resulting in 14 cases of [H maj-mono & X maj-mono] constellations. These families form the core of focus group 1 (i.e. H maj-mono families, see above). This implies that in 14 families (out of 24) in group 1, both parents grew up in an environment where their own mother tongue was both the national language of the country and the sole language of communication in their local networks.

There is, however, a great difference between the marriage pattern of males and females among these immigrants. H maj-mono males in the sample tended to marry other Hungarians irrespective of their partner’s SILE background. In contrast to this pattern, females were rather consistent in marrying somebody who matched their own SILE background, while the ethnicity of their spouses was of less importance. The divergent SILE background of the spouses in the first focus group (H maj-mono families) is thus mainly due to the H maj-mono males’

---

107 As seen in table 5.2., nine out of the 35 H maj-mono informants married another former majority member who grew up in a bilingual setting (SILE set up of their spouse = X maj-bil). In eight of these cases, the other part was Hungarian as well; these families have been included in focus group 2, counting as parts of H-maj-bil families in further analysis. For the marriage pattern of the remaining H maj-mono informants, see table 5.2 below.
marriages, while the large rate of exogamic marriages (especially to Swedes) is due to the H maj-mono females.  

Interestingly, the majority of the Swedish spouses (seven out of eight Swedish husbands as well as the only Swedish wife in this group) match exactly their spouses’ SILE background (i.e. maj-mono background). This means that 9 out of 11 exogamic marriages included in focus group 1 were of the type [H maj-mono & S maj-mono]. In these cases, i.e. when both parents lack experience in fostering bilingual children as well as experiences on bilingual settings, an exogamic marriage is expected to highly diminish the probability that their children will become bilingual.

5.4.2 H maj-bil immigrants - diverse SILE background among the spouses

There are 13 mothers and 5 fathers in the sample who grew up in a bilingual environment as members of the Hungarian-speaking majority in Hungary (hence-forward H maj-bil parents). The rate of exogamic marriages is lower among these immigrants (5 out of 20) compared to immigrants with monolingual majority background (see above). Nevertheless, their spouses’ SILE background is much more diverse compared to other immigrants in the sample. Most interestingly, this is true not only for males but also for females in this subgroup, a feature that contrasts both to the behaviour of H maj-mono as well as those of H min-multi background (see sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.3, respectively).

H maj-bil immigrants represent the core of focus group 2. As it will become clear in the following chapters, these immigrants’ openness and tolerant attitude towards otherness is not restricted to their partner choice but is also characteristic of their families’ networks (see section 7.4 and 7.7) and often also of their reactions towards their children’s and others’ linguistic behaviour (see section 8.4.1).

5.4.3 H min-multi immigrants – strong tendency for SILE match and for endogamy

The third-largest category of immigrants in the sample comprises 14 mothers and 10 fathers who grew up in bilingual or multilingual parts of Transylvania as members of a Hungarian-speaking vital minority (see map 1 in section 3.2). Similarly to the first category of immigrants (i.e. H maj-mono), H min-multi immigrants also stick together with their similar SILE counterparts; their choices are, nevertheless, also restricted with ethnic properties. This means that the most usual marriage pattern among them is [H min-multi & H min-multi]. In this kind of family constellation, the parents share both the advantage of endogamic marriages, having the same mother tongue, and, by sharing the experience of growing up in an ethnolinguistically vital minority, they are also supposed to boast some prerequisites of fostering bilingual children, e.g. positive attitudes towards

108 Half of the H maj-mono females have married outside their ethnic group, but only two out of the H maj-mono males did so.
bilingualism, awareness of the importance of a cohesive group for childrearing in a minority setting, etc. In these marriages, I therefore expected a higher rate of bilingual children, even in diaspora.

As it will be clear in the following, these couples represent the core of focus group 3 (see table 5.2. below). However, there are similar differences between the genders also among H min-multi immigrants, as it has been shown that among H maj-mono immigrants, males are more conservative in their partner choice than females. Each of the H min-multi males in this sample chose a Hungarian partner sharing his former minority identity; furthermore, 8 of the 10 wives included in focus group 3 also share the experience of having grown up in a multilingual setting. Females with a multilingual minority background, on the other hand, seem somewhat more open to other options in their partner choice. Similarly to H maj-mono immigrants, the two exogamic marriages found among former H min-multi members are due to females’ marriages (one of them concerns a Swedish husband and one with another mother tongue).

5.4.4 H min-mono immigrants

There are 5 mothers and 4 fathers in the sample who grew up in a monolingual environment as members of a Hungarian-speaking vital minority, originating from the border areas of Transylvania or from Szeklerland (see map 1 in section 3.2). In this sample, they are married either to other Transylvanians from multilingual areas (H min-multi) or to former majority members originating from Hungary with a monolingual experience (H maj-mono), thus matching either their former social identity (SI-background) or their former linguistic experiences (LE-background). H min-mono immigrants show a strong tendency for endogamy – actually the strongest among all Hungarian immigrants found in the sample. However, the sample size of this category of immigrants is very small; thus, statistically reliable conclusions cannot be drawn from their marriage pattern. The same restriction applies also to the following two subcategories of immigrants.

5.4.5 H ass-min immigrants

In this sample, there are 5 mothers and 5 fathers who grew up in a monolingual environment as members of an ethnic minority in Hungary; they identified themselves as Hungarian-speaking Jews, Slovaks and Germans. None of them have been addressed in the native language of their parents and were instead raised in Hungarian. These informants count here as former members of non-vital, assimilated minorities. Even if some of them took the opportunity to study the language of their ancestors at school or later on in university courses, this could not be compared to the function of a family discourse conducted in a minority language. These immigrants are usually married to former majority members, with monolingual or bilingual experience. For this reason, they were entered into one of the three focus groups. One women included in this category has a Swedish husband,
and two men have married an immigrant with a mother tongue other than Hungarian. These latter three families are therefore found among the non-focus families throughout the thesis.

5.4.6 H min-2gen parents

Additionally, there are also 2 mothers and 3 fathers in the sample who grew up as children of earlier waves of Hungarian immigrants, thus growing up in a bilingual (strongly diglossic, see 2.1.1) environment as members of an emerging Hungarian-speaking minority in Sweden. Although I usually prefer to avoid marking people by their ancestry, in this context the connection is highly relevant. These parents are present in the sample because they married somebody with similar ethnic affiliation as their parents; furthermore, due to their bilingualism in Swedish and Hungarian, they have similar language choice options as their Hungarian spouses. In this thesis, they are therefore marked as second-generation Hungarians. These parents are, as can be seen in table 5.2., married to former majority members: in four out of five cases, to former majority Hungarians from bilingual environments (H maj-bil), and in the fifth case, to a former majority member with monolingual experience (H maj-mono). Therefore, all of these parents are included in the focus groups.

5.5 The Hungarian parents’ education

As described earlier (3.4.1), Hungarians in Sweden constitute a positively selected immigrant group, which implies that they have a higher educational standard compared to the average population in Sweden as well as compared to Hungarian speakers in their original settings. As shown in table 5.3, there is little difference between the three focus groups with regard to the parents’ highest level of education. Not even the frequency of parents having completed an education with Hungarian language and literature as a major differs between the focus groups. There are, instead, notable differences between the genders, females having generally attained a higher education compared to male immigrants in all focus groups.

5.6 Medium of instruction at school

In group 1 (H maj-mono families), 14 out of 15 Hungarian fathers and all 22 Hungarian mothers (or 99 percent of the H maj-mono families) reported having received education solely in their mother tongue prior to their migration. The same has been reported by 10 out of 13 Hungarian fathers and 14 out of 15 Hungarian mothers in group 2, i.e. 86 percent of the H maj-bil families. Group 3 differed in this respect from the rest of the sample, as only 7 out of 14 fathers and 6 out of 16 mothers (or 43 percent of the H min-multi families) received their original education solely in Hungarian. The rest of the parents in group 3 (i.e. 7 fathers and 10 mothers, or 57 percent of all Hungarian parents in group 3) also had Hungarian as
the medium of instruction during a major part of their education, but besides studying in their mother tongue, they had also studied some years at secondary or tertiary level in Romanian language before moving to Sweden. This experience of having studied in a language different from one’s own mother tongue, in a school governed and administrated by majority members promoting majority values and the majority language, is considered as especially important in the current context, as it might resemble many of the everyday experiences of immigrant children enrolled in Swedish mainstream schools (cf. Fishman’s GID scale presented in section 2.1.1.3, figure 2.1).

5.7 Summary

In this chapter, the pre-contact factors of Hungarian immigrants in the sample have been analysed. Based on their original social identity (SI) and linguistic environment (LE), we may distinguish between six different categories of Hungarian-speaking immigrants in the sample. Three of these subgroups turned out to be represented to a higher degree than others in the sample. These three types of immigrants are

- ethnic Hungarians originating from monolingual settings in Hungary (henceforward H maj-mono)
- ethnic Hungarians originating from bilingual settings in Hungary (henceforward H maj-bil), and
- ethnic Hungarians originating from multilingual settings in Transylvania (henceforward H min-multi)

These three largest subgroups of immigrants have subsequently been compared to each other with regard to their marriage patterns. The result of the comparison

Table 5.3. Hungarian parents’ highest level of education in the sample families. The frequencies indicate number of fathers vs. mothers in each of the groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>Primary education (= 8 years)</th>
<th>Upper secondary education (=12 years)</th>
<th>Post-secondary education (≥14 years)</th>
<th>Tertiary education (≥16 years)</th>
<th>Hungarian as a major at tertiary level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fathers</td>
<td>mothers</td>
<td>fathers</td>
<td>mothers</td>
<td>fathers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-focus families</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
showed no significant differences between the subgroups, but the following tendencies were noted:

- a strong tendency for SILE match and exogamy among former majority members with a monolingual background (H maj-mono), resulting in a high number of [H-maj-mono & S maj-mono] constellations in group 1,
- a diversity in SILE backgrounds among the spouses of former majority members with a bilingual experience (H maj-bil immigrants), i.e. group 2, and
- a tendency for endogamy combined with an exact SILE match among immigrants with a multilingual minority background (H min-multi), resulting in a high number of [H min-multi & H min-multi] constellations in group 3.109

In the next step of investigation, the sample families were divided into focus groups according to the SILE set up of one of the parents. There were three main principles for deciding which parent’s background should count as decisive for the family’s adherence to a certain focus group, namely: 1) the Hungarian parent; 2) the Hungarian parent with the more common SILE set up; and 3) the Hungarian parent whose childhood experiences were more similar to their children’s experiences in Sweden (in accordance with the hypothesis of the study). This procedure resulted in three focus groups and one group comprising five families that did not fit into any of the focus groups; for this reason they are labelled non-focus families.

Subsequent analysis showed little difference between the three focus groups with respect to the parents’ highest level of education. There was nevertheless a slight difference in the medium of instruction at school between former majority members (groups 1 and 2) and former minority members (group 3). Around half of the parents with a minority background (group 3) turned out to have had some experience of being taught in a language other than the mother tongue at school in their homeland. The difference applied, however, mainly to education at the tertiary level, thus only partly being comparable to their children’s experiences of being taught in Swedish right from the start of primary school.

---

109 This subgroup of immigrants stands for the largest amount of exogamic marriages in the sample (11 out of a total of 21) and also for the largest amount of marriages to Swedish majority members (9 out of a total of 15).

110 To be more exact, 9 out of 16 spouses in this group correspond to this constellation (see table 5.2).
Chapter Six

Initial Stages of Contact Factors

There are certain decisions that immigrants have to take at a stage in the migration process while they still lack a deeper understanding of the surrounding society. Many of these initial decisions may, however, shape the language use of the family several years later, including the future prospects of their children. The aim of this section is to examine if my informants’ initial decisions following their first contact to Swedes and the Swedish language can be related to their previous linguistic experiences, and if so, in what way. However, instead of an individual perspective based on parents’ SILE background, the analysis is, as earlier announced, based on a family perspective, using the three focus groups as a basis of comparison.

What I specifically focus attention to in this chapter is

- the type of family unit established in Sweden,
- type and length of parents’ complementary education in Sweden,
- initial language concerns in childrearing, and
- type and length of childcare chosen for their pre-school children.

The first two themes are dealt with in sections 6.1 and 6.2 and mainly comprise quantitative examinations of relevant data from the parental interview sessions. Sections 6.3 and 6.4 comprise both quantitative and qualitative data. Differences in frames of reasoning among the informants are exemplified by excerpts from interview sessions and discussions conducted in other, less formal settings.

6.1 The established family units

As discussed earlier (see section 2.2.3.2), different family constellations, i.e. the presence of adult siblings and/or monolingual grandparents in the household may have a major impact on children’s language use, at times also contradicting the effect of other factors in their environment. Divorces and new partnerships may also cause major changes in children’s linguistic environment, but as they relate to later stages of family life, they will only be dealt with in section 7.1 below.
Some families in the sample have already been formed prior to migration. In many of these cases, the parents have taken one or two young children with them; in other cases, one of the parents or their children have arrived first as refugees, and family reunion was only possible in Sweden after a few years. Some other informants reported that they felt the need for advice and help from the older generation only after they became parents in Sweden. In these latter cases, grandparents have been invited to join the family at a later stage, and in some cases only periodically, three months or half a year at a time. Important to note in this context is that parents, grandparents and siblings might have been at different stages of bilingualism, especially during initial stages of the migration process. To investigate this very important factor, at the beginning of the interview I made an inventory of family members that formed part of the household since the focus child’s pre-school years. Included in these numbers were, however, only persons who spent at least half of the year with the family, thus having a major impact on the children under investigation.

As displayed in table 6.1, at the time of the interview, in 12 of the 61 participant families grown-up children formed part of the household, implying an additional linguistic input for the younger children of the families. Last but not least, the sample also includes five families living in three generational units, (periodically or constantly) enjoying an apprenticeship with the older generation. Unfortunately, only two families with additional adults concerned split families. This means that the negative effect on children’s linguistic input caused by the disappearance of one parent due to divorce could not been counterbalanced this way.

A Pearson chi-square test performed on the data showed no significant difference between the focus groups with regard to additional adults in the household (p=0.73).

### Table 6.1. Additional adults in the sample families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>Adult sibling(s)</th>
<th>Grandparent(s)</th>
<th>Grandparents &amp; adult siblings</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-focus families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Parents’ complementary education in Sweden

Many parents in the sample have completed the education they held from their home country with additional degrees in Sweden – most often at the tertiary level (see section 5.3). There were no significant differences between the focus groups in this respect. There was, however, a slightly higher tendency among parents in
group 1 than parents in the other two focus groups to complete their original education with further courses in Sweden.

To be more exact, the majority of Hungarian parents in group 1 (19 out of the 22 Hungarian mothers and 11 out of 15 Hungarian fathers) have reported some type of additional education in Sweden. In group 2, this was reported by somewhat more than half of the Hungarian parents (eight out of 15 Hungarian mothers and seven out of 13 Hungarian fathers), similarly to group 3, in which it applied to 12 out of the 16 Hungarian mothers and 8 out of the 14 Hungarian fathers.

Additionally it might be noted that many parents in group 1 reported longer periods of additional education in Sweden (>3 years), whereas few parents did so in the two other focus groups.

6.3 Initial language concerns in childrearing

The first-born child often arrives in a setting where certain language use practices are already established, such as the language use of the young couple in between themselves and the language use of their extended network of relatives and friends. Another important issue is the parents’ thoughts concerning language choice towards their newborn child. Both of these questions are dealt with in this section. A third issue, which might be of equal importance for children’s linguistic development, namely at what age they become involved in an institutional setting with Swedish (i.e. the majority language) as the medium of instruction, will be dealt in section 6.4.

It is noteworthy that all data presented here are based on parents’ retrospection in time, which means that one might be cautious of the accuracy of their objective content. We may, nevertheless, pay attention to their frames of reasoning about these issues because they often uncover what de Houwer has called parents’ impact language beliefs (see section 2.2.3.3).

6.3.1 Parents’ initial language use between themselves

All endogamous couples in my sample stated that they initially spoke exclusively Hungarian to each other, and, as we will see further on, many of them continued to do so even after their children were born, at least in private settings (see section 8.1.5).

Many exogamous couples in the sample reported that they spoke a mixture of English and Swedish to each other at the beginning of their relationship. Swedish, however, often became the main tool of communication between these couples, and this was true irrespective of whether Swedish was the mother tongue of the non-Hungarian part or not. There was one exception from this rule, family G22 (included in focus group 2), where the mother reported that her Swedish husband initially spoke Hungarian to her as well as to their newborn son, which he continued to do for the first three years of the child’s life. According to the mother, this was a conscious strategy on behalf of the parents to ensure that their
son had a solid basis in Hungarian before he was exposed to Swedish in the home. It is worth noting that this specific mother held a university degree in linguistics, which might explain her unusual awareness about these issues.

We can conclude that the initial language use of parents in the sample was largely dependent on the mother tongue of the parts involved in the marriage. Which language to use towards their children was, nevertheless, far from being as given as the language use between the spouses.

6.3.2 Parents’ initial thoughts about language choice towards their child(ren)

As mentioned earlier, this investigation is based mainly on families in which the Hungarian part(s) had at least a slight interest for Swedish-Hungarian bilingualism (see 4.2.1). How to go ahead to raise bilingual children was nevertheless not equally clear to all of them. In many families, this was not even a topic of discussion prior to the child’s birth. Sometimes it became apparent that there was a hidden disagreement between the parents regarding language choice towards the child. One of the fathers, for example, explained:

*Example 6.1. Father in family G5.*

Nem, ez nem volt téma közöttünk. J születése előtt semmiképp sem. Mi persze svédül beszéltünk egymással, de azt hittem, mindenki a saját nyelvén beszél majd a gyerekkel. De nem szerette, ha magyarul szöltam hozzá [to the child]. "*Jag förstår inte. Vad sa du?*"

Mindig így. Azt akarta, hogy mindketten svédül beszéljünk vele. [Interjúvoltó: De P-nek lengyel az anyanyelve, nem?]. De, de őt nem érdekelte. Azt mondta, Svédországban élünk, hát a gyereknek először svédül kell megtanulnia. […] Aztán én is megszoktam.

No, this was not an issue between us. Not until J [daughter] was born. We were of course talking Swedish to each other, but I imagined everyone would speak his/her language to the child. But P [the former wife] did not like when I spoke Hungarian to her [to the child]. “*I don’t understand.*” Always like this. She wanted both of us to speak Swedish to her. [Interviewer: But P has Polish as a mother tongue, doesn’t she?] Yes, but she didn’t bother. She said we are living in Sweden so the child has to learn Swedish first. […] And then I also got used to it.

One of the questions I explicitly asked the parents was whether they had thought about in which language to address their children prior to their first child’s birth in Sweden. Despite their immediate reaction stating “yes” or “no”, there was wide variation in the parents’ responses. The answers differed not only in their actual content, i.e. with regard to the parents’ emphasis on one language or the other, but also with regard to parents’ frames of reasoning.

That there were no discussions concerning language choice prior to the child’s birth could be for very different reasons, as the following examples show. Some parents’ argumentation provide evidence for almost non-existent initial language awareness among the parents (see examples 6.1 and 6.2). There were also a few parents who clearly opted for the priority of Swedish already at the beginning (see
example 6.3). Many parents claimed that Hungarian was the only natural (see example 6.4), or, in other cases, the only possible (example 6.5) language choice option from the start. There was also a large group of parents expressing a slight wish or hope for their children to learn/speak Hungarian.

**Example 6.2.** Mother in family S27.

Nem, … nem így előre. Nevekről beszélünk, tudod, hogy milyen nevet adjunk a gyereknek, meg hogy jó volna villába költözni, igen, ezekre emléksem. De a nyelv az csak később lett aktuális, mikor elkezdtek oviba járnii, tudod.

No, … not in advance. We talked about names, you know, what name to choose for the child, and that it would be nice to move to a house. Yes, I can recall these conversations. But the language issue was not at stake, not until they started pre-school, you know.

**Example 6.3.** Father in family S3.

Nem, hát ez szóba se került. Természetes volt, hogy svédül beszélünk.

No, it didn’t even occur to us. It was obvious that we would talk Swedish.

**Example 6.4.** Father in family G10.


No, this wasn’t an issue. We were certain to talk Hungarian, what else? It felt natural for both of us. They would learn Swedish at kindergarten and school anyway.

**Example 6.5.** Mother in family G25.

Nem, nem is volt kérdéses. Egyszerűen nem volt választásom, még nem tudtam svédül.

No, this wasn’t an issue. I simply had no choice, I couldn’t speak Swedish at that time.

Note the contrast between examples 6.3 and 6.4. They mark the two ends of a continuum of a great variety of responses. Similarly, answers starting with yes sometimes, but not always, marked language awareness. As seen in example 6.6, a yes could indicate an emphasis on the priority of Swedish, or, as shown in examples 6.7 and 6.8, could express a slight, rather uncertain wish of parents for their children to “know Hungarian”, which actually, in many cases, resulted in a Swedish dominant family discourse within a few years (for more details, see section 6.5).

**Example 6.6.** Father in family S26.

Igen, hát mindketten fontosnak tartottuk, hogy rendesen megtanuljon svédül. Fontos a szép beszéd, ez alapján ítélük meg az

Yes, we both felt strongly for him to learn proper Swedish. A rich language and a proper speech style is important, because
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embert. you become judged that way.

*Example 6.7. Father in family S7.*

Ja, vi var överens om att det skulle vara bra om barnen kunde ungerska.

Yes, we agreed that it would be nice if the children knew Hungarian.

*Example 6.8. Mother in family S6.*

Ja, jag har funderat men sedan så blev det svenska.

Yes, I did think about it, but then it became Swedish.

*Example 6.9 Father in family G17.*

Igen, beszéltünk erről. Megegyeztünk, hogy a családban mindig magyarul beszélünk.

Yes, we did talk about it. We agreed that we should always talk Hungarian in the family.

Given this large variety of viewpoints it seemed more reasonable to use the informants’ commitment for one language or the other as a categorization device instead of the binary distinction between yes/no answers. The qualitative analysis resulted in five categories displayed in table 6.2. No thoughts concerning language use prior to the child’s birth (= no language awareness) was treated as a category on its own; disagreement between the parents (example 6.1) and other comments (see example 6.5) was treated as a further category. Answers indicating an initial agreement between parents for the priority of Hungarian in family conversations (examples 6.4 and 6.9) comprised the largest category among the focus families and the second largest in the whole sample (19 out of 56 focus families and 20 out of 61 sample families). A slight wish for children to know Hungarian (examples 6.7 and 6.8) was analyzed as a separate category, comprising a similar number of focus families (22 out of 56); at the same time, this was clearly the largest category taking the whole sample into account (26 out of 61 families). Additionally, there were also two families in the sample who opted for Swedish primacy already at the initial stages of family life (see example 6.3 and 6.6.).

Grey shades in table 6.2 indicate the most usual answers among the parents for each focus group. Subsequent chi-square tests revealed that there were indeed significant differences between the focus groups already at the initial stages of childrearing with regard to their commitment for Hungarian. The majority of

---

111 As mentioned in the introduction to the thesis, italics mark Swedish language choice.

112 Included in these figures are also two parents who stated that they were searching for scientific advice on raising bilingual children (cases S23 and G9). Although this action might be seen as a more conscious way to deal with the issue, it appears to have had no essential effect on the two families’ language use in practice. These two answers were thus treated as a slight rather than strong commitment for language transmission and were added to the category “slight wish for children to speak Hungarian.”
Parents in group 3 (H min-multi families) were confident right from the beginning in using Hungarian towards their children, whereas the answers of parents in groups 1 and 2 varied from no initial thoughts to emphasising the primacy of Swedish. Parents’ answers in group 3 differed on the level of \( p=0.02 \) from group 1 \( [\chi^2=11,429, n=40, df=4] \) and on the level of \( p=0.001 \) from group 2 \( [\chi^2=17,641, n=32, df=4] \), indicating clearly the strongest dedication to Hungarian transmission as compared to the other two groups.

Interesting to note in this context is also that surprisingly few, only two out of my 76 adult informants\(^\text{113}\), reported having tried to find scientific information on how to raise bilingual children. The rest of the parents reported instead that they were using examples in their wider networks as a starting point of discussion between themselves. Those who turned to someone outside the family for advice did so within their close networks and often consulted other immigrant parents having older children whose language use they were impressed with. The ideal could, of course, differ a great deal between individual couples (see below). Many parents said that they have never even thought about consulting experts on this issue and that they didn’t even consider there would be books written on how to raise children bilingually. These results are in line with King’s and Fogle’s earlier presented results on the issue (section 2.2.3.3) but are even more striking as this sample includes mainly well-informed and highly educated people.

### 6.4 Pre-school childcare

In Sweden, unlike in other western countries, childcare services are available for all children as early as the age of one year.\(^\text{114}\) Swedish childcare is also distin-

---

\(^{113}\) Here I am referring to those persons I have talked to in person. The number of biological parents in the sample is considerably higher, namely 122. I did nevertheless not meet all of them. The two families in which the parents mentioned to have sought for scientific information were S23 and G9.

\(^{114}\) Fees are proportionate to income with a maximum of approx. 85 euro/child/month.
guished by a high standard of quality and by a “whole-day” concept that enables mothers to continue working even after having children. During the hours spent at the daycare centre, children play and learn, supervised by a team of pre-school teachers, and they are fed several times a day. The conditions are often very home-like, and the activities are also coordinated by a national curriculum elaborated in 1998 (LpFö 98).

Despite this well-established childcare system, parents in Sweden are free to choose other options to care for their infant children, and immigrants may have several good reasons for doing so. Firstly, immigrants run a higher risk of being unemployed. Under such circumstances, it seems reasonable to use the time to care for their young children. Secondly, immigrants may, as several of my informants expressed, be sceptical towards leaving their children in the hands of institutions too soon, especially if they lack experience from their home countries of public childcare at this young age. Several parents in my sample also explained their decision being a conscious effort to ensure that their children learn Hungarian before entering a Swedish institutional context. Interestingly, I found this type of reasoning to be far more common among former minority parents (focus group 3), while parents with a majority background (focus groups 1 and 2) tended to instead emphasise other, more practical reasons for keeping their children at home for a longer period of time, for example, temporary unemployment, lack of ‘proper’ Swedish language skills necessary for seeking an adequate job, the family’s change of residence in Sweden or a second child’s birth.

However, no matter what differences in reasoning frames, I found no significant difference between the three focus groups with regard to their actual choices on the children’s placement rate in Swedish childcare. In all three groups, around half of the children started at a Swedish childcare centre or a family daycare home (Swedish dagmamma) around the age of one year, which corresponds to the most usual age for children in Sweden to start. Around 20 percent of the children in the sample started at the age of two, while the rest, i.e. around 30 percent, spent their early childhood (up till the age of three, four or five) at home, taken care of by a Hungarian parent, or in a few cases, by a Hungarian-speaking nanny.

---

115 Most daycare centers are open from 0630 until 1830 and parents may leave their children at these centers for 12 hours if needed.
116 More exactly, this implies 11 out of 24 children in group 1 (i.e. 45.8 percent), 9 out of 16 children in group 2 (i.e. 56.2 percent), and 8 out of 16 children in group 3 (i.e. 50 percent).
117 The exact numbers comprise 8 children in group 1 (33.3 percent), 3 children in group 2 (18.8 percent), and 5 children in group 3 (31 percent).
118 Employing a Hungarian-speaking au-pair, nanny or babysitter is also an option that clearly enhances the child’s minority language development. Nevertheless, there were only 3 out of 61 families in the whole sample that had chosen this option of pre-school child care.
In most cases in the present sample, the parent staying at home turned out to be the minority language speaking mother. In 15 cases this could have been a reasonable solution as the mother was newly arrived in Sweden at the time of the child’s birth (see table 6.3). This fact also meant that initially there was no real language choice question at stake between the mother and the child, Hungarian being the only possible option. In another 8 cases the mother had lived less than five years in Sweden prior to the focus child’s birth. Some of these mothers also mentioned that they had no employment to return to, which also contributed to their decision to stay at home longer with their children. Interestingly, there was only one mother in group 3 that mentioned this reason. At the same time, she also added that it was good for her daughter to hear Hungarian first and that she could learn Swedish later on anyway (case S21).

As can be seen in table 6.3, there is no significant difference between the three focus groups in the time elapsed between mother’s immigration and the focus child’s birth. There is, nevertheless, a tendency for mothers in group 3 (H min-multi families) to have spent less time in Sweden compared to the mothers in the other two focus groups comprising former majority members. The greatest difference as compared to groups 1 and 2 is that no mothers in group 3 had been living longer than 9 years in Sweden prior to the focus child’s birth. This is important because time spent in the country of immigration not only tends to affect immigrants’ language skills but also the amount and quality of contact established with majority members, in turn also affecting the families’ formal and informal networks.

---

Table 6.3. Time elapsed between the Hungarian mother’s immigration and the focus child’s birth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1 (H maj-mono families)</th>
<th>Group 2 (H maj-bil families)</th>
<th>Group 3 (H min-multi families)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-35 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>born in Sweden</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

119 Out of 27 cases in which children were older than one year when they started at a daycare centre, in 25 cases it was the mother who stayed at home taking care of her child for several years.

120 A Pearson chi-square test conducted to compare the three focus groups to each other showed no significant difference between the mothers in the sample in this request: $\chi^2=10.627$, df=10, p=0.39.
6.5 Early language shift between parents and children

There were no families (neither parents nor children) in group 3 who reported an early language shift among family members. At the same time, there were 6 families out of 16 in group 2 (H maj-bil families) and 8 families out of 24 in group 1 (H maj-mono families) in which one or both parents had shifted from Hungarian to Swedish towards their children very early, before their children turned two or three years old. A narrow examination of these data revealed two differing stand- ing points among the parents: some parents saw the language shift as a natural consequence of their integration in Sweden (see examples 6.10 and 6.11), while others expressed frustration and/or shame about them being forced to give up their intentions (see examples 6.12 and 6.13).

Example 6.10. H-maj bil mother in family S17 married to a H maj-mono father.

[Az apa] tenisz kezdett oktatni gyerekeknek, így a svéd lett természetes. [The father] started to teach tennis for kids, so Swedish became natural.

Example 6.11. Mother in family G30.

De amikor B elkezdett iskolába járni, mikor megszületett K is, B egyre többet beszélt svédül, egyre több svéd barátunk lett, munkát kaptam svéd helyen. Ja, egyre több lett a svéd. A végén a magyar elmaradt. … az én részemről. Meg a gyerekek részéről.

B starting school, and K being born, B more and more spoke Swedish, got more and more Swedish friends, and I got a job in a Swedish place. Well, Swedish got increasingly common. In the end, Hungarian disappeared … for me. And for the children.

Examples 6.10 and 6.11 were typical for parents in group 2 and often involved parents who had not discussed the issue of language choice prior to their child’s birth, but let outer circumstances guide their language behaviour. Example 6.10 is of special interest here, as it refers to a family with two older children following their parents to Sweden at the age of 8 and 10, respectively. The reason for having them in this study was that they had a third child born and raised in Sweden. A complete shift in language use between father and children under these premises is even more marked. Still the mother did not seem especially upset about the shift; she commented it only as a natural result of the family becoming integrated in the host society. (For the public discourse in Sweden concerning these issues, see sections 3.3.2 and 2.2.3.4)

Example 6.12. Mother in family G3 with a Swedish husband. The couple had split up, and the son was changing residence every other week.

Szerettem volna, ha magyarul beszél velem. De nem ment. Mikor elkezdite az óvodát, mikor hazajött, csak svédül beszélt. Megpróbáltam, de nem ment. A férjem nem értett semmit, az anyósom se.

I really wanted him to speak Hungarian with me. But it didn’t work out. When he started pre-school, he came home and spoke only Swedish. I tried, but it didn’t work out. My husband didn’t understand.

anything, my mother-in-law wouldn’t let me be either. What are you saying? What are you saying? Always like this. […] It simply didn’t work out.

Example 6.13. Mother in family G14 married to a Swedish majority member.

Well, they cannot speak Hungarian. Although I tried to speak it, actually. I had decided to teach him [referring to her first-born son]. And I really did. One and a half years, as long as I was at home with him. […] Yes, when we were by ourselves. And grandpa used to talk to him in Hungarian as well. Three times a week! Often. He started going to pre-school when he was one and a half. At the age of two, he didn’t want anymore. “I don’t wanna talk Hungarian! I don’t want to!” He didn’t have the time. “I don’t have time!” It was him who refused [to learn]. He didn’t even want to hear it.

Other parents, especially those in group 1 (H maj-mono families), expressed quite a bit of frustration, a feeling of despair as they explained to me how they were trying to teach their children Hungarian but were not able to stop the negative effects of outer circumstances. Most commonly these testimonies involved a reference to other person’s implicit or explicit preference for Swedish rather than Hungarian in family conversations. In example 6.12., the mother mentions several sources of frustration: her son’s unwillingness to reply in Hungarian, her Swedish husband’s presence (and underlying expectations) as well as her mother-in-law’s constant questioning and need for translation. Similarly, the mother in example 6.13 expresses frustration about her son refusing to use or even understand any Hungarian. Notably, all parents complaining about their children’s unwillingness to use Hungarian were referring to children at the age of one to two (at most three years). I find this to be remarkable as I did not found similar references to such young children in studies on early childhood bilingualism.

6.6. Summary

In this chapter, I have examined some initial decisions taken by the parents in the sample of possible relevance for their own and their children’s linguistic behaviour later on. The results of the analysis indicate no significant difference between the focus groups with regard to:
• established family type and the rate of additional adults in the household (i.e. older siblings and grandparents),
• parents’ complementary education in Sweden (despite a higher tendency for parents in H-maj-mono families to be enrolled for a longer period of time in further education in Sweden), and
• the pace and rate of children’s placement in Swedish medium pre-school institutions.

More narrow, qualitative analysis of parents’ reasoning around these issues revealed, nevertheless, that there were apparent differences in language awareness between the focus groups already at the initial stages of childrearing, especially in

• the strength of parents’ initial commitment for Hungarian,
• parents’ confidence in their role as minority language transmitters,
• the motives which guided the parents in their decision to place their children later than usual in Swedish pre-school institutions.

Difference in frames of reasoning between the groups could be found both in regard to what language(s) the parents expected their children to learn and also why they should prioritise one language or the other in family discourse. It turned out that the great majority of parents in group 3 (H min-multi families) were confident in their role as Hungarian speakers, and they were also consistent in using Hungarian with their children right from the beginning. Parents in groups 1 and 2 on the other hand were considerably more varied in their responses, and there were several cases in both group 1 and 2, in which parents reported a language shift from Hungarian to Swedish already during the first few years of their children’s life. In all the latter cases, the parents referred to external circumstances favoring Swedish language use in family relations. We might thus conclude that environmental factors seem to be of greater importance for former majority parents’ decisions as compared to former minority parents.
Chapter Seven

In-Contact Factors

The aim of this chapter is to examine in what way parents’ SILE background (i.e. their social identity and linguistic experiences during childhood) relates to some in-contact factors that might influence their own and their children’s language use behavior in Sweden. What I am specifically examining here is the significance of the focus group on

- type (endogamic vs. exogamic) and rate of divorces and the establishment of new partnerships in Sweden (section 7.1),
- the premises of language choice within the family, i.e. Hungarian vs. Swedish language comprehension of individual family members (section 7.2),
- the linguistic composition of family’s neighborhood (7.3),
- the family’s cultural orientation (7.4),
- the family’s religious engagement (7.5),
- language resources found in the home (7.6),
- contacts to other Hungarians in Sweden (7.7) and to Hungarians in the immigrants’ former homelands (7.8),
- children’s medium of instruction at school and their enrolment in Hungarian Heritage Language Instruction (7.9),
- children’s after-school activities (7.10), and
- the ethnicity of children’s best friends (7.11).

7.1 Divorces and new partnerships in Sweden

At the time of the interview, 15 of the 61 families were split. As can be seen in table 7.1, these divorces concerned 6 earlier endogamic marriages (out of 40 in the whole sample) and 9 earlier exogamic marriages (out of 21 in the whole sample). As 4 of the 15 divorces ended up in new partnerships with Swedish majority
members (2 of them were originally HH families,\footnote{These two cases comprise a former majority member with bilingual experience (H maj-bil mother in family G30) and the other a former minority member with a multilingual experience (H min-multi mother in family G13).} 2 other started as OH families\footnote{Both cases (S22 and S28) concerned former assimilated minorities from Hungary (H ass-min), and thus, they are not included among the focus groups of the study.}), the overall tendency for exogamy, combined with a preference for Swedish majority members as spouses, has been strengthened in the whole sample. Notably, all four cases involving new partnerships with Swedish majority members were established by female immigrants, whereas no new partnerships were reported by Hungarian males in the sample. This in turn further strengthens the earlier indicated gender differences in marriage patterns among Hungarian immigrants (see section 5.3).

However, as the change from endogamic to exogamic partnership only concerned two focus families (G30 and G13), the newly established partnerships did not change the proportions of endogamic vs. exogamic partnerships considerably; thus, there were no significant differences between the focus groups in the rate of exogamy after a recount of the new family units either.

As shown in table 7.2, these divorces and new partnerships had different consequences for the children involved. In 2 newly formed families (as well as in 3 additional single-parent families), the children’s residence changed periodically between the divorced parents, implying a regular change of their linguistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>Single-parent family</th>
<th>New partner: S</th>
<th>Family intact</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS or HO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO or OH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children living periodically in two families</th>
<th>Stepparent after parents’ divorce</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good contact with the other parent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact with the other parent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1. Split and intact families and new partnerships in the sample.

Table 7.2. Continuity of contact between children and parents in split families.
environment. Furthermore, 2 out of the 4 split-family cases involving a new partnership with a Swedish majority member additionally also meant an increase of the household with monolingual stepsiblings.

In the case that one parent left the family, the contact towards this parent was in the majority of cases (7 out of 10 cases) kept alive irrespective of the presence of a Swedish stepparent. In 3 other cases, the contact to the fathers had been broken several years ago. A disruption in contact with one of the parents can certainly have negative effects on the language input of the children and has consequently been taken into account when analysing language use between family members (see section 8.1).

### 7.2 Hungarian vs. Swedish comprehension of family members

In order to investigate the linguistic premises of language choice in the participant families I asked the parents as part of the interview whether there was anybody in the household who was not able to understand Swedish or Hungarian.

As displayed in table 7.3, 21 out of the 61 sample families cannot be said to be entirely bilingual. In 9 families (out of 24) in group 1 (H maj-mono families), several family members were reported to lack either Hungarian or Swedish comprehension, whereas there were only 4 such cases reported in group 2 (i.e. H maj-bil families), similarly to group 3 (H min-multi families). The differences between the focus groups was, nevertheless, not high enough to reach a statistically significant level (p=0.6).

A closer examination of the data revealed, however, a clear difference between the rate of majority vs. minority language comprehension in the sample. This was especially true for group 1, in which 8 out of 9 families with non-bilingual members reported that this was due to lack of Hungarian comprehension, often of several members in the same family. This is a clear difference compared to groups 2 and 3 in both of which only 2 families (out of 4 non-bilingual families in

---

123 Interestingly, all three cases concerned families in which parents shared a maj-mono SILE background, i.e. the experience of having grown up as a majority member in a monolingual environment. In two of the cases (G5, G20), the parents’ mother tongue was different, and in a third case (G29) both parents were Hungarian.

124 In contrast, there were only two families in this group (1: H maj-mono) in which the parents reported that the grandparents had limited knowledge of Swedish.
both groups) have reported that somebody in the family does not understand Hungarian. It seems thus that many families in group 1 (H maj-mono families) were more limited in their opportunities to use Hungarian in family conversations. Although the difference in Hungarian comprehension between the focus groups might seem apparent, the tendency was not strong enough to reach a statistically significant level (p=0.17).

It is also important to note that whereas in groups 2 and 3, lack of Hungarian comprehension was mainly associated to the non-Hungarian parent or stepparent, in group 1 all kinds of family members were mentioned as lacking knowledge in Hungarian, i.e. not just parents/stepparents, but also children and grandparents (with a mother tongue other than Hungarian). For more details on this issue, especially concerning children’s self-reported Hungarian skills, see chapter 9.

With regard to family members’ Swedish knowledge, there were almost no differences between the focus groups. 2 families in each of the focus groups reported that grandparents staying with the family only had limited knowledge of Swedish. In all of these cases, the explanation was that the grandparents only periodically formed part of the household, and a basic vocabulary in Swedish was therefore sufficient for shopping and taking short walks in the neighborhood. When the older people came into the city centre, or non-Hungarian visitors of the family were invited to the home, usually the bilingual members of the family (parents and/or children) acted as translators for the grandparents. Such situations reinforce children’s (active and/or passive) use of Hungarian, and grandparents lacking Swedish knowledge are – in contrast to family members lacking Hungarian comprehension - seen as an enhancing factor for children’s bilingual development.

### 7.3 Linguistic composition of the families’ neighbourhood

As can be seen in table 7.4, the majority of families in the sample, i.e. 42 out of 61, reported living in a Swedish-dominant neighborhood. Furthermore, as investigated by a Pearson chi-square test, there is no significant difference between the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish dominant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-focus families</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
focus groups with regard to the linguistic composition of the families’ neighbourhoods (p=0.2).

As described in section 4.3.5, in connection to the family visits I used to take a walk in the neighborhood to map the terrain. During these walks, I went through the name lists displayed in the doorways and listened to people’s language use on the street, the local playground and the nearby shop. In most cases, parents’ reports concerning the linguistic composition of their neighborhood were identical to my personal observations during these walks. There were, nevertheless, a few families in each of the groups in which the parents stated that they lived in a Swedish-dominant neighbourhood, although my observations pointed instead to a mixed linguistic composition that included Swedish but also several other languages. Such skewed reports, combined with the high rate of families actually living in Swedish-dominant neighborhoods, point to the fact that most informants have internalised the high status of Swedish-dominant neighborhoods irrespective of their previous experiences (SILE background). For group 3, i.e. former minority members from multilingual environments, this tendency can only be explained as a result of adaptation to the new context, i.e. the strong influence of ideologies and public discourses conducted in the Swedish media and the family’s majority-oriented networks (see also section 3.3.2).

7.4 Cultural orientation

The families’ cultural orientation was operationalised as their members’ active membership in Swedish versus Hungarian associations. This method was chosen because associations are a very common form of social organisation in Sweden, and many social activities are organised by associations formed around common interests. For this reason I expected that all families would be actively involved in several Swedish associations, e.g. the local neighbourhood association or some kind of interest association, like the local football supporter club, children’s sports club, car owners’ club, etc.

All in all, 55 out of 61 families reported to be active members of several Swedish associations. However, contrary to my expectations, there were also 6 families in which the parents stated that their family was not involved in any type of Swedish association. Four out of these families were at least active in Hungarian associations. As can be seen in table 7.5, around half of the families (29 out of 61) in the sample were active in both Swedish and Hungarian associations. There were, however, nearly as many families, namely 25, in which the parents reported that they were members only in Swedish associations. In contrast, there were only 4 families who reported that they were members exclusively in Hungarian associations.

As can be seen in table 7.5, around half of the families (29 out of 61) in the sample were active in both Swedish and Hungarian associations. There were, however, nearly as many families, namely 25, in which the parents reported that they were members only in Swedish associations. In contrast, there were only 4 families who reported that they were members exclusively in Hungarian associations.

In contrast to the high activity rate in Swedish associations, only 34 families reported to be members in one or several Hungarian associations in Sweden, which makes up around half of the sample. As can be seen in table 7.5, there were
nevertheless great differences between the focus groups. Considerably more former minority members (2+13=15 out of 16 in group 3) reported to be members in Hungarian associations compared to former majority members (1+9=10 out of 24 in group 1, and 1+6=7 out of 16 in group 2). This difference in families’ active involvement in Hungarian vs. Swedish associations was also detected by the Pearson chi-square test conducted on the data. The results of the test showed significant differences at the level of p=0.01 between focus group 3 and focus group 1 \[n=40, \chi^2=11.217, df=3\] as well as focus group 2 \[n=32, \chi^2=9.312, df=2\].

Lastly, it should be noted that in 2 families (S10 and S12) the parents stated that none of the family members were active in any kind of association. Given the fact that most leisure-time activities are organised in the form of associations in Sweden, this means that not even the children were engaged in any usual sports or other regular leisure-time activities.

### 7.5 Religious engagement

Religious engagement among the families has been operationalised as the family’s active membership in certain congregations. Note, however, that similarly to the activity in associations reported above, all numbers refer to the whole family unit without distinctions made for individual family members. A few families mentioned both the Hungarian Protestant church and some other congregation. These families have been counted only once, among the members of the Hungarian Protestant church.

As displayed in table 7.6, the vast majority of former majority members (i.e. parents included in groups 1 and 2) did not confess to belonging to any religious faith or congregation. At the same time, 11 families out of 16 in focus group 3 (former minority members with a multilingual background) were members of the Hungarian Protestant church in Sweden, which is the only congregation with regular Hungarian-speaking services in Sweden (see 3.4.4). These differences have to be viewed taking into consideration the scattered living pattern of Hungarians (see 3.4.1 and 3.4.5) and their active engagement in majority-oriented networks (see section 7.4 and 7.3 above). All these factors imply that they very seldom meet other Hungarians by chance. The engagement of the family in a

### Table 7.6. Active membership in association among the sample families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>Active membership in associations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>only H</td>
<td>H + S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-focus families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hungarian congregation, therefore, has a major importance for the opportunities of both adults and children to meet other Hungarians in Sweden and widen their minority-oriented networks.

The Pearson chi-square test conducted on the data detected significant differences between groups 3 and the other two focus groups in this respect. Groups 1 and 2 in turn showed similar patterns. The difference between focus group 3 and 1 was significant at the level of $p=0.002$ [$n=40$, $\chi^2=16.535$, df=4] and between group 3 and 2 at the level of $p=0.001$ [$n=32$, $\chi^2=17.000$, df=3].

7.6 Language resources found in the home

The parental interviews included a wide range of questions concerning different kinds of language resources, i.e. printed, visual and audio media, that were to be found in most family homes at the time of the investigation. The questions were posed separately for each language during the interview, resulting in a subset of 11 items for Hungarian and Swedish. (For certain questions, additional information on language resources in English and/or other language(s) the respondents reported to be important has been collected as well). The answers were coded on a three-step ordinal scale as follows:

0 = no items,  
1 = few items, and  
2 = many items available in the given language.

For parents’ television watching and radio listening in children’s presence, the scale consisted of the following steps: 0=not at all, 1=sometimes, 2=daily. Respondents were instructed to follow certain criteria when responding for each type of language resource.\footnote{When defining these criteria, I was greatly inspired by the methods applied by István Szépfalussy (1980), a former Protestant priest in Wien, who has carried out extensive investiga-}

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Religious engagement in the sample families.}
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\hline
Focus group & Non-religious & Hungarian protestant Church & Roman Catholic Church & Jewish congregation & Swedish Church & Total \\
\hline
1. H maj-mono families & 17 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 23 \\
2. H maj-bil families & 12 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 16 \\
3. H min-multi families & 4 & 11 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 16 \\
Non-focus families & 3 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 4 \\
Total & 36 & 13 & 7 & 1 & 2 & 59\textsuperscript{a} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{a} There were two missing answers in the data, one in group 1 and one among the non-focus families. Grey shade in the table marks the most common answer for each of the focus groups.
Afterwards, a new variable was computed from each pair of questions concerning Hungarian and Swedish resources, the main aim being to detect differing proportions of language resources in Swedish and Hungarian as compared to each other. The result of this procedure was a six-step ordinal scale as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of language resource (in Hungarian and Swedish)</th>
<th>Group 1 Mean ranks</th>
<th>Group 2 Mean ranks</th>
<th>Group 3 Mean ranks</th>
<th>Chi-Square value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult fiction literature* (novels, poetry, etc.)</td>
<td>25.42</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>36.88</td>
<td>8,041*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and youth literature*</td>
<td>24.21</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>39.63</td>
<td>14,009*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-fiction literature (Atlas, lexicons, recipe books, scientific and/or work connected publications etc.)</td>
<td>27.21</td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td>35.03</td>
<td>4,721</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>25.10</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>35.34</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>27.13</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>0,403</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films for adults (DVD, VHS)</td>
<td>25.21</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>35.44</td>
<td>4,305</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films for children/youth*</td>
<td>25.22</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>37.75</td>
<td>10,031*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer games</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td>32.81</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music (CD, MP3, etc.)*</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>25.09</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>10,535*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV on</td>
<td>24.88</td>
<td>27.66</td>
<td>34.78</td>
<td>4,138</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio on</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>28.97</td>
<td>34.13</td>
<td>4,544</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* statistically significant differences between the groups at the level of p< 0.05.

Afterwards, a new variable was computed from each pair of questions concerning Hungarian and Swedish resources, the main aim being to detect differing proportions of language resources in Swedish and Hungarian as compared to each other. The result of this procedure was a six-step ordinal scale as follows:

Table 7.7. Statistics from separate Kruskal-Wallis tests concerning differences in the proportion of Hungarian vs. Swedish language resources in the home.

The procedure had an undesired effect as well, in that certain kind of information got lost: 2=Swedish only covers “many items in Swedish and no items in Hungarian”, but also “few items in Swedish and no items in Hungarian.” 3 = Similar proportions includes similarly two different
Table 7.7 displays the results of separate Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted to explore the effect of focus group on language for each type of language resource investigated. The mean ranks displayed show similar tendencies, although only four of the listed resource types show statistical significance. Mean ranks higher than 33.00 indicate more Hungarian-oriented answers (3-5), whereas mean ranks under 25.00 indicate more Swedish-oriented answers (1-3) and/or a large variation within the group, including several 0 answers, i.e. neither H nor S items. As seen in the table, group 3 reported having more Hungarian resources in all areas investigated.

7.7 Minority-oriented networks

All families in the sample reported to know other Hungarians living in Sweden. However, as earlier investigations have shown, in order to uncover their language use patterns, it is important to distinguish between different type of relations in immigrants’ networks (cf. the works of Li and Gal described in section 2.1.3).

A Pearson chi-square test performed on the data showed significant differences across the focus groups in this respect [$\chi^2=14.535$, n=56, df=6, p=0.024]. As displayed in table 7.8, all parents in group 3 (H-min-multi families) reported to have (often several) Swedish Hungarians in their close networks\(^{127}\) (either friends or both friends and relatives); families in groups 1 and 2 showed, in contrast, greater variation in the type of relations they reported having with their Hungarian contacts in Sweden.

---

\(^{127}\) Li (e.g. 1994) refers to this type of relations as exchange networks (see section 2.1.3).
As for the frequency of their face-to-face interactions, there was a tendency for parents in group 3 to meet their Swedish-Hungarian contacts more frequently, with “at least once a week” or “almost daily” being the most common answers among them. The difference was, however, not significant across the groups \[\chi^2=11.447, n=56, df=6, p=0.076\], “at least once a month” being the most common answer for group 1 (H maj-mono), whereas the answers of group 2 (H maj-bil) were more dispersed, ranging from “never or very rarely” to “at least once a week.”

However, by shifting our focus to children’s participation in these networks, a more complex picture evolves. When asking the parents how often they actually took their children with them to these Swedish-Hungarian gatherings, it turned out that there were great differences between their answers, indicating that in fact the children have access in very different degrees to a bilingual community. As can be seen in figure 7.1, some of the children in groups 1 and 2 lack these contacts completely, and thus, are forced into ‘monolingual language mode’ (see Grosjean, 1982, referred to in section 2.3.1) whenever they communicate with somebody outside the family. As one of the respondents put it when asked for his language preference: “Swedish in Sweden, Hungarian in Hungary.” (For more details on this issue, see chapter 9.) A Kruskal-Wallis test revealed statistically significant differences across the groups in this respect \[\chi^2=6.054, n=56, df=2, p=0.045\], also displayed in figure 7.1. A subsequent median test revealed that group 3 recorded a
higher median score (md=4) than groups 1 and 2, which both recorded median values of 3, indicating a significantly higher frequency of contact to Swedish Hungarians for children in group 3 compared to children in both group 1 and 2.

A Spearman’s rank order correlation test has further been performed on the data to explore if there is a relationship between children’s age and the frequency of their attendance at Swedish-Hungarian gatherings. The test showed only a small\textsuperscript{128} effect for children’s age (n=56, r=0.28, p=0.04). A grouped scatter plot, nevertheless, indicated that in groups 1 and 2 (former majority members) parents with younger children (7-9 years) reported higher frequency rates (“for the most” or “always”) of children’s attendance compared to parents with older children, who gave more varied responses on the same question.

In contrast, children’s age was not decisive for group 3, where only 2 (out of 16) children, a ten-year-old (G13) and a fifteen-year old (S 21) girl were reported to have lower attendance at the time of the interview compared to the rest of the group (in which children were otherwise reported to attend to a very high degree, i.e. “for the most” or “always”). In line with earlier presented arguments among former minority members (see section 6.3, 6.4 and 6.5), in the latter families, the parents seemed unworried but viewed the change in their children’s behaviour as a temporary disturbance, using expressions like “for now,” (mostanában van ez így) or “right now” (hát most éppen) in their responses. Former majority parents whose children initially were involved but stopped following them to Hungarian gatherings, in contrast, were either worried by or totally neutral to their children’s change of behaviour. Those who were worried often told me that it was of no use to push the children. Essentially it seemed to me that no matter their emotional involvement, former majority parents tended to accept the new situation, excusing their children by saying that they “naturally” (in Hungarian: természetesen) preferred the company of their Swedish friends, often using expressions like “this is the way it is and we cannot do anything to change our children’s minds.” I see this latter type of reasoning as yet another sign of what de Houwer calls ‘low impact belief’ among former majority parents.

7.8 Contact with Hungarian speakers in Hungary and/or Transylvania

In regard to the families’ visits to their former homelands, I did not find any significant differences between the focus groups, either in respect to the frequencies of the journeys, their length, or their children’s peer relations (see below). As can be seen in table 7.9, half of the parents in the sample reported (32 out of 59 valid answers) that their children visited Hungarian-speaking areas once a year, usually during the summer holiday. More frequent visits were reported by 8

\textsuperscript{128} Cohen (1988: 79-81) suggests the following guidelines for the interpretation of Spearman’s rho: r=0.10 to 0.29 small, r=0.30 to 0.49 medium, and r=0.50 to 1.00 large correlation (also referred to by Pallant, 2007: 139).
families in the sample, while 19 families reported rather irregular visits during the last five years.

Interestingly, many of the Transylvanian immigrants reported that they, especially during the last ten years, visit Hungary rather than Transylvania. The explanation seems to be a subsequent migration wave from Romania to Hungary (and the rest of the world) indicated earlier in chapter 3. Many former minority immigrants (i.e. group 3 parents) reported that they still meet the same friends and relatives, but many of them had moved to Hungary from Transylvania. During less informal sessions, I have also come to know that many of these immigrants also have friends living in other Western countries whom they often meet in more organized friendship reunions. This happens often during holidays in Budapest (Hungary), where many of them hold a flat, or at some touristic sight in Transylvania. These testimonies are a vivid reminder of the ever-changing ethnic map of the world and how these flows of migration affect our subjects’ transnational networks and language use.

In connection to the interviews, I also asked the parents how long their children usually spent on site during these visits. This factor is of interest because children whose minority language use is restricted to a few domains and/or to a few interlocutors (usually parents and possibly siblings) have been shown to need at least two weeks of exposure in a native language environment in order to feel comfortable and actively use (and thus also develop) their weaker language in contact with locals (c.f. Leopold, 1947; Yukawa, 1997; Caldas, 2006).

Additionally, I asked the children if they had any relation to same-age peers living in Hungarian-speaking areas, and if so, what type of relation they had to them. This second factor is of interest because closer relations usually also imply that the children share common interests and might have contact through the internet also during the rest of the year, when physically apart. As indicated earlier (section 2.2.3.2), having close friendship ties to same-age peers in Hungarian-speaking areas would be a clearly enhancing factor for the motivation for children to keep up their linguistic development in Hungarian.

### Table 7.9. Frequency of journeys to Hungarian-speaking areas among the sample families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>Sporadically</th>
<th>Every second year</th>
<th>Once a year</th>
<th>Twice a year or more often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-focus families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There are two missing answers for this question, one in group 2 and another among the non-focus families.
Before analyzing length of stay and children’s relation to same-age peers in Hungarian-speaking areas, I divided the material in two larger groups depending on the reported regularity of children’s visits (cf. table 7.9 above).

First I will present data in which families reported that their children have visited Hungary/Transylvania only sporadically or at most every second year since their birth. It turned out that these children tended to spend a rather short time in Hungarian-speaking areas one week to ten days (5 out of 19) and two to three weeks (9 out of 19) being the most usual length of stay among the children. As detected by a Kruskal-Wallis test with subsequent median tests, there were no significant differences between the focus groups (n_{gr1}=9, n_{gr2}=3, n_{gr3}=7, p=0.24). With regard to children’s relations to native same-age peers there were even less differences across the focus groups (p=0.69), temporary acquaintances being by far the most common answer among them (12 out of 19 children).

Moreover, I did not find any significant differences among children who have reported more regular visits to Hungarian-speaking areas either, at least not with regard to focus group (n_1=15, n_2=12, n_3=9, p=0.89). Children’s length of stay among these families was, nevertheless, usually longer (than for those with irregular visits), three to four weeks (14 out of 36 answers) and five to six weeks at a time (13 out of 36 answers) being the most common length of stay among the children in all three focus groups. Similarly, there were no significant differences between the focus groups with regard to children’s relations to same-age peers in Hungarian-speaking areas either (p=0.27). The difference was rather apparent for children with irregular visits, as most children regularly visiting Hungary and/or Transylvania mentioned one or several friends among their same-age peers in those areas (27 out of 36 children).

7.9 Children’s medium of instruction at school and their enrolment in Hungarian HLI

At the time of the interview, all the children in the sample but one attended Swedish medium schools. There were a few children in Göteborg who attended a school with a German language profile. This profile meant, however, only additional language lessons and the medium of instruction in other subjects was Swedish. The only opportunity for the children to be taught in Hungarian, therefore, was if they were enrolled in Hungarian HLI at school and/or in the community.

In issues concerning Hungarian Heritage Language Instruction, I found great differences between the focus groups in parents’ argumentation for or against this activity (see below). However, no significant differences could be found between the groups with regard to the actual outcome, i.e. children’s enrolment rate as

---

129 “Regular” here means visiting Hungarian-speaking areas once a year or more.
130 One boy in the sample attended an English medium school. He was the one with a linguist mother as commented on in section 6.3.1, i.e. case G22.
detected by a Pearson Chi Square test. This result, then, resembles the issue of children’s placement in pre-school institutions presented in section 6.4. The only statistically detectable difference was a strong tendency (p=0.06) for group 3 children to start HLI at an early age and continue their enrolment (7 out of 16 children) as opposed to group 2 in which 6 out of 7 children had no chance to try out the language program.

As seen in table 7.10, around half of the children in the sample (25 out of 60) had started HLI already at pre-school or in the first years of school but had consecutively dropped out. The majority of these children, i.e. 13 out of 25, were from group 1. As indicated in section 3.4.5, dropping out of HLI could occur for several reasons. In some cases, parents explained that the HLI group their children used to attend was moved to another school or eliminated because of the implementation of the so-called five pupil rule; others reported that the HLI lessons were held at inconvenient times for their children’s schedule; some other parents decided to withdraw their children from HLI because they judged the lessons to be of low quality or the group to be too heterogeneous with regard to the attained level of Hungarian. Symptomatically, parents complaining of the low quality were from group 3 (i.e. former minority parents), but there were also a few former majority parents with a monolingual background among them (i.e. group 1). Most majority parents, however, mentioned practical reasons for dropping out, while none of the parents in group 3 did so.

There were also 10 children in the sample whose parents did not consider HLI as important or of any use (see ex. 7.1-7.3). Symptomatically, all of these parents were from groups 1 and 2, i.e. former majority members. In contrast, 7 out of the 13 children in the sample, who had attended HLI all the time since pre-school, were from group 3 (i.e. H min-multi families).

\textit{Example 7.1.} Mother in family G30.

\begin{quote}
Nem akartuk. Úgy vagyok vele, van elég dolguk az iskolában. \\
We didn’t want to. I mean, they have enough to do at school already as it is.
\end{quote}

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Children’s enrolment in Hungarian Heritage Language Instruction since pre-school.}
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\hline
Focus group &  \multicolumn{2}{c}{No, not important} &  \multicolumn{2}{c}{Would be nice, but not available} &  \multicolumn{2}{c}{Has dropped out} &  \multicolumn{2}{c}{Yes for now, no opportunity earlier} &  \multicolumn{2}{c}{Yes, since pre-school} &  \multicolumn{2}{c}{Total} \\
\hline
1. H maj-mono families & 3 & 2 & 13 & 3 & 3 & 24 \\
2. H maj-bil families & 6 & 2 & 5 & 1 & 2 & 16 \\
3. H min-multi families & 0 & 3 & 5 & 1 & 7 & 16 \\
Non-focus families & 1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 4 \\
Total & 10 & 7 & 25 & 5 & 13 & 60\textsuperscript{a} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{a} One missing answer among non-focus families.
Example 7.2. Father in S26.

Nem írtattuk be anyanyelvőrőrre, mert legyen a svédre koncentrálva. A tökéletes svédet beszélje. We did not apply for heritage language instruction because we wanted him to be concentrated on Swedish. He should talk perfect Swedish.

Example 7.3. Mother in family G5.

Nem írtattuk be. Ez volt az elvünk: Egy nyelvet mindeneképpen tanuljon meg nagyon-nagyon jól. Akkor mást is meg tud tanulni. Magyarul is, ha akar. No, we didn’t apply for it. This was our principle: He should learn one language very, very well. If he does, he can learn whatever language he wants. Even Hungarian, if he wants.

Example 7.4. Mother in family G31.

Minek? L [az apa] is magtanult, pedig itt nőtt fel Svédországban.

For what purpose? L [the father] has also learnt Hungarian, even if he grew up in Sweden.

These latter examples clearly state the priority of Swedish being the main factor enhancing children’s future prospects. Other parents - especially those with a multilingual minority background (i.e. group 3 parents) - even if they acknowledged the high status of Swedish (see example 7.5), showed considerably higher language awareness, also emphasising the function of Hungarian as a ‘we-code’ (see examples 7.5-7.7).

Example 7.5. Mother in family S30.

Jó érzés volt M-nek [a gyereknek]. A magyar gyerekek között. És azért is írattuk be, mert hittük, hogy segíthet neki megtanulni svédül.

It was nice for M [their child]. With all these Hungarian children. And we applied also because we thought it would help her to learn Swedish.

Example 7.6. Father in G17.

Szerettük volna, hogy ne billenjen át az iskolában a svédre. ... Hogy megmaradjon a magyar az iskolában is.

We didn’t want him to switch over to Swedish at school. … So that Hungarian should be maintained also at school.

Example 7.7. Father in G10.

Szerettük volna, hogy legyen az iskolában is egy magyar közösség.

We wanted them to have a Hungarian community also at school.

In comparison, the few parents with a majority background (groups 1 and 2) who showed interest for external support for their language transmission efforts often had expectations that were too high for what could be accomplished within the program (see examples 7.8 and 7.9); the expectations were not unrealistic per se,
except for the extremely limited premises under which HLI usually operates. Unrealistic expectations can possibly also be a part of the explanation for the high dropout rate among group 1 children.

Example 7.8. Mother in family G11.

Úgy éreztem, önmagam kevés impulzust tudok adni. Meg a nyelvtan miatt. Hogy tanuljon egy kis nyelvtant. I felt I myself can give him too few impulses. And because of the grammar. So he learns some grammar there.

Example 7.9. Mother in family G25.

Igen, jártak, persze. Hogy tanuljanak meg írni, olvasni szakavatott vezetéssel. Yes, of course. So that they learn to read and write with an experts’ guidance.

7.10 Children’s activities after school

A Pearson chi-square test was conducted to explore possible differences in children’s activities after school across the focus groups. It turned out that the parental reports were quite similarly distributed over the sample, and the test showed no significant differences between the focus groups in this respect. It seems thus that group 3 families have also adapted their way of life to the new context in this respect also, and not only in their cultural orientation (7.4) and settlement pattern (7.3).

As it can be seen in table 7.11, a great majority of the parents (41 out of 60 families), reported that their children had a regular schedule including several cultural and/or sports activities outside home. Some others (12 out of 60) claimed that their children spent their time mostly with friends and/or at “fritids.”

### Table 7.11. Children’s after-school activities as reported by their parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>Cultural or sports activity, then at home</th>
<th>At “fritids” or with friends, then at home</th>
<th>At home</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-focus families</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One missing answer among non-focus families.

---

**131** Fritids is the Swedish name of the day-care centre that most school children are engaged in after school up to at least grade three, or, in some other schools, up to grade five. Here they are supervised by pedagogical staff members who provide them with guided activities, e.g. handicrafts. During school holidays, these day-care centres provide whole-day supervision with engaging activities for all children involved, e.g. visiting museums, outdoor activities.
Contact Factors

Ining at home after 5 pm at the earliest. Only seven parents in the whole sample reported that their children directly returned at home after school.

7.11 Children’s best friends

During the interview sessions, children often came to talk about their friends, and I used these occasions to ask them whose company they especially enjoyed or with whom they would share their secrets. The upper limit for the list of best friends was defined to be five, but some of the children only came up with two or three names. As we had the names of their best friends, I asked them to describe these children for me, especially with regard to what languages they spoke and whether their parents were immigrants or not. The answers were summarized afterwards and sorted into the categories displayed in table 7.12. However, because of the great variety of friends’ backgrounds displayed in the table, no significant differences could be detected between the focus groups by the Pearson chi-square test performed on the data.

First of all, it turned out that many children had both majority as well as other minority children among their friends (31 out of 60). All in all, 19 children in the sample mentioned children of Hungarian origin among their best friends. More striking, however, is that as many as 20 children mentioned only Swedish majority members as their best friends. 6 children mentioned only immigrants of another origin than Hungarian, whereas only 2 children mentioned exclusively Hungarian peers as their best friends. As we will see in section 8.4.2, language choice is highly dependent on these friendship relations.

In order to find out if there was a difference between the groups in the rate of children who mentioned peers of Hungarian origin among their best friends, I needed a slight transformation of the data. The result of the recount is displayed in table 7.13. Through this more focused investigation, it turned out that there were indeed significant differences between the groups. As seen in table 7.13, 10 out of 16 children in group 3 (i.e. H min-multi families) mentioned (often several) Hungarian friends, while in group 1, only 4 out of 24 did so, and in group 2 only 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>H only</th>
<th>H &amp; O</th>
<th>H &amp; S &amp; O</th>
<th>H &amp; S</th>
<th>O only</th>
<th>S &amp; O</th>
<th>S only</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gr 1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-focus families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One missing answer among non-focus families.

Table 7.12. Children’s best friends (referring to 2-5 persons per child).

132 Including children of Hungarian origin.
same mother tongue – different origins

162

out of 16. The difference between group 3 and 1 was significant at the level of \( p=0.008 \) \([\chi^2=6.964, n=40, df=1]\) while between group 3 and 2 it was at the level of \( p=0.03 \) \([\chi^2=4.664, n=32, df=1]\).

7.12 Summary

To sum up in-contact factors, the investigation revealed both differences and similarities between the focus groups of the study. However, while the similarities were largely tied to majority-related institutions and settings, the differences concerned Hungarian-related issues.

More precisely, there were no significant differences between the focus groups with regard to

- Swedish knowledge of family members (high rate in all three groups)
- the linguistic composition of the families’ neighbourhoods (which was largely Swedish dominant)
- active membership in Swedish associations (very high for all three groups)
- the proportion of several types of language resources available in Hungarian vs. Swedish in the home (non-fiction literature, magazines, newsletters, films for adults, computer games, TV watching and radio listening)
- the frequency of parents’ contact to other Hungarians in Sweden
- contacts to Hungarian speakers in Hungary and/or Transylvania
- children’s after-school activities (as reported by their parents), and
- the rate of children’s enrolment in Hungarian HLI.

The statistical analysis performed on the data, nevertheless, revealed significant differences between focus group 3 and focus groups 1 and 2 in the following areas:

---

133 Computed with Yates’ continuity correction for 2x2 tables.
134 Computed with Yates’ continuity correction for 2x2 tables.
• active membership in Hungarian associations (higher rate of group 3 families involved in Hungarian associations compared to the other two groups),
• religious engagement (with higher rate of group 3 families being active members of the Hungarian Protestant church in Sweden),
• the proportion of certain type of Hungarian vs. Swedish language resources found in the home (adult fiction literature, children’s and youth literature and music),
• the type of relation to other Swedish Hungarians (group 3 having more exchange network ties rather than just interactive),
• children’s opportunities for meeting other Hungarians in Sweden, and
• the rate of children mentioning peers of Hungarian origin among their best friends (more among group 3 children).

Notably, a narrow analysis of parents’ statements in connection to these issues once again detected great differences between parents’ frames of reasoning, this time with regard to the functions of HLI at school and in the community.
This chapter addresses the question of language use among two generations of Swedish Hungarians with special attention devoted to minority language use. However, before proceeding to the analysis, a caution should be given towards an overinterpretation of the results. First of all, the reported language use of individual informants represents only a cross-section in time. People, especially children, might, as a consequence of changes in outer circumstances, also change their language preference several times during their life (cf. section 9.3), thus also affecting their actual language choice. Secondly, my analysis is limited to a few aspects of language use, the main purpose being to explore certain differences between subgroups and find possible common traits in the informants’ patterns of speaking and other forms of language use. The question of common rules of language use, i.e. what is judged as appropriate and/or expected in certain situations and what is perceived as inappropriate and/or surprising, is especially important from a maintenance perspective, as everyday experiences represent people’s frames of reference towards which individual language choice can be understood/interpreted (cf. Hymes, 1968 and 1972a; Gumperz, 1982; Myers-Scotton, 1993b and 1998).

As early as in 1968, in his Ethnography of Speaking, Dell Hymes sketched the basis of a new research area in the intersection between anthropology and linguistics. Many of Hymes’ thoughts were revolutionary at that time, and they are a rich source of inspiration for researchers even today. One of his most important notions concerns the fundamental character of speaking in all human activity. Speaking involves cognitive as well as expressive behaviour; hence, he argues, speech (as well as other forms of language use) must be analysed in its behavioural context:

We must know what patterns are available in what context, and how, where, and when they come into play. [...] In sum, description of semantic habits depends upon contexts of use to define relevant frames, sets of items, and dimensions of contrast. (Hymes, 1968: 105)

Furthermore, Hymes also underlines the priority of inductive discovery (ibid, 107), based on the viewpoint of participants and comparison between groups (ibid, 109). Although the present study is based on sociolinguistic methods in the first
place, and does not aim to provide an explicit description of the group’s language economy, Hymes’ recommendations concerning studies of language usage have served as a guideline during the interview process as well as in the analysis stage concerning language usage. Most importantly, I have tried to highlight the social context in which language use is embedded, always keeping in mind that the informants’ answers relate to a social reality that they share but might interpret differently according to their personal presuppositions.

Table 8.1 outlines the language use-related questions that served as the basis of the interview sessions. In the following sections, I will analyse the informants’ answers and thoughts in connection to these questions, starting from the narrow perspective of family interactions, and subsequently widening it to a more holistic view, including not just speaking but also other type of language-related activities.

In section 8.1, results concerning parents and children’s self-reported language use with individual family members are presented. In section 8.2, the perspective is broadened to the ethnic community level by reporting on the informants’ personal experiences concerning language use in their own networks of Swedish Hungarians (and, in some cases, the lack thereof). Section 8.3 presents children’s language use during leisure time activities, i.e. their use of printed, audio, and visual media. In section 8.4, there will be a change in perspective: by introducing different types of language use patterns found in the sample and comparing them to each other, I will attempt to draw a more holistic picture of the language use of my informants. Finally, section 8.5 summarises the findings presented throughout the chapter.

**8.1 Language choice between family members**

In this section, self-reported data on language choice between individual family members will be presented. Note, however, that all of these data refer to oral conversations only (i.e. speaking). It does not include written notes, sms or other means of communication between family members, some of which will be dealt with in section 8.3.

As for the statistical analysis of the data, for each of the subsequent issues, a mixed between-within subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to explore the combined impact of (a) focus group and (b) social context; in cases in which there were any significant differences between the groups, the results were followed up by separate one-way between groups of ANOVA tests.

Following Hymes’ recommendations,135 I found it necessary to approach each question from a narrow perspective, at least within the family domain. First of all, all language choice questions were specified with respect to speaker (sender) and interlocutor (addressee). Evidence calling for this kind of distinction comes from

---

135 Hymes names three aspects of a community’s speech economy that are useful to consider separately, namely speech events, constituent factors of speech events and the functions of speech. As an elaboration of this idea he suggests an accurate analysis to be based on 1. Sender, 2. Addressee, 3. Message Form, 4. Channel, 5. Code, 6. Topic, and 7. Setting (Scene/Situation).
observations in bilingual families (e.g. Huss, 1991; Sirén, 1991; Döpke, 1992; Lanza, 1997; de Houwer, 2007) showing that parents’ and children’s language choice do not necessarily coincide with each other. While some parents seem to accept that their children use the majority language or a mixture of both in their conversations, despite that they themselves more or less maintain the minority language, this “bilingual discourse strategy” (coined by Lanza, 1997) might be totally unacceptable for others. As pointed out earlier, consensus in language choice behaviour between parents and children is important also from a maintenance perspective.

Secondly, the operationalisation of social context builds upon informants’ own descriptions of relevant contextual cues calling for different language choice. In
her classical study on language choice in Paraguay, Joan Rubin (1968) employed a sort of domain analysis, using a long and elaborated list of language choice questions comprising a combination of different interlocutors, topics, location, and grade of formality in order to detect the factors responsible for expected language choice. In the present study, I tried instead to assess the informants’ subjective perceptions of relevant social context by initiating discussion around these issues and by asking informants to clarify and exemplify what factors they themselves would take into account in a given interaction. During the first ten or so interviews, some recurring situations in everyday family life were presented to the informants, asking them which language they would judge as appropriate in the specific context. A subsequent analysis of these conversations resulted in a differentiation between “conversations in private” contra “conversations in non-Hungarian speakers’ presence”. The main aim of this procedure was, as pointed out earlier, to uncover the contextual cues calling for different social behaviour, including different language choice. Afterwards, this opposition served as a productive instrument in subsequent interviews. Before proceeding to specific language choice questions, I asked the informants whether they found the opposition relevant, and if so, to specify how they themselves would interpret the contexts in question.

The two contexts had, of course, a slightly different meaning for different families. In the course of the interviews, it turned out that the interpretation of the contextual frames was highly linked to the parents’ former experiences. For many parents who had grown up as majority members in a monolingual environment (group 1), “in private” had a very narrow meaning, referring to conversations conducted within the home and without the presence of any person other than the Hungarian parent(s) and their children, whereas parents belonging to groups 2 (H maj-bil) and 3 (H min-multi) applied a rather broad definition of the term, at most also including situations when several other people were present but at a distance and without any relation to the informants’ family (e.g. father and child travelling on a bus or shopping in a mall). In sum, parents belonging to group 1 (H maj-mono) used a more narrow definition of private, whereas parents belonging to group 2 (H maj-bil) and group 3 (H min-multi) gave a broader description of the private context.

Conversations in the presence of non-Hungarian speakers, on the other hand, refers to the other end of the spectrum, i.e. cases in which outsiders of the family are perceived as potential participants in a conversation. Some informants (typically parents with a majority background, i.e. groups 1 and 2) were sensitive to the actual presence of people they were known to (e.g. when picking up the child at school, they referred to other pupils’ and/or parents’ presence in the cloak-

---

136 In case of exogamic marriages this often included restrictions towards the non-H parent’s or stepparent’s presence; hence, at its extreme, “in private” has been interpreted as dyadic conversations between the Hungarian mother and her child(ren) in the Swedish-speaking parent’s/partner’s absence.
room), whereas others (typically parents with a multilingual minority background, group 3) focused on cases when non-Hungarian speakers were actually playing a part in the same communicative context (e.g. conversations conducted during an excursion or dinner with several people involved). Typically, parents belonging to group 3 used a more narrow definition of ”non-Hungarian presence”, mainly referring to the active presence of majority speakers (“Swedish people”), whereas many parents belonging to groups 1 and 2 included other immigrants as well when referring to non-private context. Interestingly, children usually agreed on their parents’ description of social contexts; at the same time, their perception of appropriate language use could still differ from their parents’ views (see section 8.1.8). For more details on interpreting situations differently and the consequences thereof for language use, see section 8.4 below.

The parametric measures and tests reported in the following included a scale ranging from 1 to 7, where values were attached as follows:

- **1 = H** Hungarian only,
- **2 = H+** predominantly Hungarian with occasional (intrasententential) CS to Swedish,
- **3 = Hs** mostly Hungarian, but longer stretches of Swedish utterances also occur,
- **4 = HS** similar amount of Hungarian and Swedish utterances,
- **5 = Sh** mostly Swedish, but longer stretches of Hungarian utterances also occur,
- **6 = S+** predominantly Swedish with a few Hungarian words or expressions occasionally used (mostly tag-switching, only a few cases of inter-sentential CS to Hungarian were observed)
- **7 = S** exclusively Swedish.

Although the language choice scale found in the questionnaire originally consisted of five steps only, it was very early replaced by another, more adequate seven-step rank scale. Out of my respondents’ answers (also confirmed by my own observations), I soon realised that the original scale wasn’t sufficient but had to be broadened with two additional steps comprising occasional intersentential CS, tag-switching and borrowings from the other language, which are here marked as steps 2 and 6. This change was possible because the informants were asked open questions about their language use as part of an ongoing conversation and did not look at the questionnaire during the interview. I did all the notations without giving them options for the type of answers I expected. Language use-related questions were treated especially thoroughly, and short responses were followed up through more narrow, clarifying questions. (For further details concerning the interview procedure, see also section 4.3). This interviewing technique resulted at last in a smoother categorisation of answers than originally planned.
Reports concerning language choice between siblings (and with friends, to be discussed in section 8.3.3) included in some cases reference to languages other than Swedish and Hungarian, i.e. Se=mostly Swedish, with some English utterances; He=mostly Hungarian with CS to English; O=mostly another language, usually the mother tongue of the other immigrant parent (not English, not Hungarian); and SO=Swedish and a third language. In conversations between parents, some couples additionally reported Hrs=mostly Hungarian with occasional CS to Rumanian and Swedish. In the parametric tests that follow, O and SO answers have been treated as missing data, whereas answers referring to mostly Swedish (Se) or mostly Hungarian (He, Hr and Hrs) have been recoded as S+ and H+ with assigned values of 2 and 6, respectively.

8.1.1 Mothers’ language choice towards their children

As indicated above, a mixed between-within subjects ANOVA was conducted to explore the combined impact of (a) focus group and (b) social context on mothers’ language choice towards their children. Mothers with a mother tongue other than Hungarian (i.e. Swedish or another language) were excluded from this analysis to avoid language bias, resulting in n=53 instead of the initial 56 cases included in the focus groups.

The mean scores and standard deviations representing the mothers’ self-reported language choice are presented in table 8.2. The test showed a highly significant effect for social context [Wilks’ Lambda=0.25, F(1, 50)=145.96, p<0.0005] with an effect size of multivariate partial eta squared 0.75, which is to be considered as very large. Additionally, there was also a statistically signifi-

137 This type of answer, however, had a very low frequency, including not more than one or two cases at a time, thus not affecting the results significantly.

138 According to Cohen (1988: 22), eta square value 0.01 has to be considered as a small effect, 0.06 as medium effect and 0.138 as large effect (also referred to by Pallant 2007: 208).
cant difference in language choice between the mothers belonging to different focus groups \[ F(2, 50)=3.43; \ p=0.04 \] with a medium effect \[ \text{eta squared } =0.12 \]. The interaction effect between social context and focus group was insignificant \( p=0.18 \), which indicates that the main effects can be regarded as reliable.

Separate one-way between groups ANOVA tests with post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated, however, that the difference was significant only in private \[ F(2, 50)=4.74, \ p=0.01 \]. The mean score for group 1 \( (m=3.18, \ sd=1.82) \) was significantly different from group 3 \( (m=1.63, \ sd=0.89) \), whereas group 2 \( (m=3.0, \ sd=1.89) \) was similar to group 1 but did not differ significantly from group 3.

Figure 8.1 (derived from the mixed between-within ANOVA test) displays this tendency, showing that most mothers, irrespective of their focus group, are sensitive to social context: non-Hungarian speakers’ presence triggers an accommodation towards perceived majority norms, which is reflected in a higher degree of Swedish use towards their children. Note, however, that the variance within groups 1 and 2 is relatively high in private settings \( (sd=1.82 \text{ resp. } 1.89) \), whereas the majority of mothers belonging to group 3 reported exclusively Hungarian towards their children in private (only a few cases of occasional intrasentential CS to Swedish); moreover, the answers of mothers in group 3 were also more consistent/cohesive \( (sd=0.88) \) as compared to those in groups 1 and 2 (see above).
8.1.2 Fathers’ language choice towards their children

The mean scores and standard deviations representing the Hungarian fathers’ reported language choice derived from the mixed between-within subjects ANOVA are presented in Table 8.3. Similarly to the test concerning mothers’ language choice towards their children, fathers with a mother tongue other than Hungarian were excluded from the analysis, resulting in only 41 cases instead of the original 56 focus families. The test showed a highly significant effect for social context also in fathers’ answers [Wilks’ Lambda=0.28, F(1,38)=98.69, p<0.0005] with a large effect [eta squared=0.72]. Additionally, there was also a statistically significant difference in language choice between different focus groups [F(2,38)=4.56, p=0.02] with a large effect [eta squared=0.19]. The interaction effect between social context and focus group was insignificant (p=0.39) also in this case, which indicates that the main effects are reliable.

Separate one-way between groups ANOVA tests with post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the difference between fathers’ belonging to the three groups was significant in private only (F(2,38)=3.81, p=0.03), similarly to the results of the analysis of mothers’ responses presented earlier.

The difference in private was significant between group 2 (m=3.31, sd=1.49) and group 3 (m=1.79, sd=1.19), at the p=0.04 level, but not for group 1. In non-H speakers’ presence, on the other hand, fathers’ belonging to group 3 (m=4.64, sd=1.22) did not differ significantly either from those belonging to group 1 (m=5.93, sd=1.33) or group 2 (m=5.38, sd=1.47).

Figure 8.2 displays this tendency, showing that most Hungarian fathers, similarly to the mothers, are sensitive to social context irrespective of their focus group: non-Hungarian speakers’ presence triggers an accommodation towards perceived majority norms, which is reflected in a higher degree of Swedish use towards their children. Note also that fathers belonging to group 3 (H min-multi families) report that they use only or nearly only Hungarian towards their children.

### Table 8.3. Descriptive statistics of Hungarian fathers’ language choice towards their children in two different social contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers → children in private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers → children in non-H speakers’ presence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parents in this group (mothers as well as fathers) reported that they use Swedish words or expressions mostly to highlight the Swedish connotation of the word, to create a linguistic joke or because no equivalent expression exists in Hungarian. My field notes from observations during home visits and community activities strongly confirm these reports.

8.1.3 Children's language choice towards their Hungarian mothers

The mixed between-within subjects ANOVA test conducted to explore the combined impact of (a) focus group and (b) social context (conversations in private contra conversations in the presence of non-Hungarian speakers) on children’s language choice towards their Hungarian mothers\textsuperscript{139} showed a highly significant effect for social context [Wilks’ Lambda=0.40, F(1,50)=75.58, p<0.0005] with a large effect [eta squared=0.60]. Additionally, there was also a statistically significant difference in language choice between the children

\textsuperscript{139} Similar to the procedure described in 8.1.1, children with mothers having another mother tongue (i.e. Swedish or an immigrant language other than Hungarian) were also excluded from this analysis to avoid the confounding effect of language bias. The analysis is thus based on N=53 instead of the original number of 56 focus families.

*Figure 8.2. Plots of Hungarian fathers’ mean scores on reported language choice towards their children in two different social contexts (only significant value differences are displayed).*
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belonging to different focus groups \([F(2, 50)=4.18, \ p=0.02]\) with a large effect \([\text{eta squared}=0.14]\). The interaction effect between social context and focus group was insignificant \((p=0.12)\), which indicates that the main effects can be regarded as reliable. The mean scores and standard deviations representing the children’s self-reported language choice towards their mothers are presented in table 8.4.

Separate one-way between groups ANOVA tests with post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the difference in language choice towards the mother was significant only in private \([F(2, 50)=5.63, \ p<0.01]\) and primarily concerned children belonging to group 3 as opposed to children in groups 2 and 1. The mean score for group 3 (H min-multi families \(m=2.00, \ sd=1.59\)) was significantly different than both group 1 (H maj-mono families \(m=3.93, \ sd=1.87\)) and group 2 (H maj-bil families \(m=3.86, \ sd=2.07\)) at the \(p=0.006\) level, whereas children belonging to groups 1 and 2 showed highly similar patterns \((p=0.99)\).

Figure 8.3 (derived from the mixed between-within ANOVA test) displays this tendency, showing that all children, irrespective of their focus group, are sensitive to social context: the presence non-Hungarian speakers triggers an accommodation towards perceived majority norms, which is reflected in a higher degree of Swedish use towards their mothers. Notably, the children’s mean scores are higher in all three group’s compared to their mothers’ scores; moreover, there is also a greater individual variation among the children as compared to that of the mothers of all three groups. Note also that, only a few children in group 3 (i.e. H min-multi families) report exclusive use of Hungarian towards their mothers in private, while quite a high number of them report (for the most part, occasional intrasentential) CS to Swedish.

8.1.4 Children’s language choice towards their Hungarian fathers

The mixed between-within subjects ANOVA test conducted to explore the impact of (a) focus group and (b) social context (conversations in private contra conversations in non-Hungarian speakers presence) on children’s language choice

Table 8.4. Descriptive statistics for children’s self-reported language choice towards their Hungarian mothers in two different social contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children → mothers in private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>2.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children → mothers in non-H presence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
towards their Hungarian fathers showed a highly significant effect for social context [Wilks’ Lambda=0.43, F(1,37)=49.76, p<0.0005] with a large effect [eta squared=0.57]. Additionally, there was also a statistically significant difference in language choice between the children belonging to different focus groups [F(2,37)= 5.56, p<0.01] with a large effect [eta squared =0.23]. The interaction effect between social context and focus group was insignificant (p=0.20), which indicates that the main effects can be regarded as reliable. The mean scores and standard deviations representing the children’s self-reported language choice towards their Hungarian fathers are presented in table 8.5.

Separate one-way between groups ANOVA tests with post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the difference was significant only in private [F(2, 39)=7.81, p=0.001]. The mean score for group 3 (H min-multi families m=2.00, sd=1.71) was significantly different from group 1 (H maj-mono families m=3.60, sd=2.10) at the level of p=0.05 and group 2 (H maj-bil families

Similarly to the procedure noted in section 8.1.2, children with fathers having another mother tongue (i.e. Swedish or an immigrant language other than Hungarian) were excluded from this analysis, as well as two additional cases in which the children claimed having no contact with their fathers outside the home. This exclusion resulted in N= 39 as opposed to the original number of focus families, which was 56.
Figure 8.4 (derived from the mixed between-within ANOVA test) displays this tendency, showing that all children, irrespective of their focus group, are sensitive to social context: non-Hungarian speakers’ presence triggers an accommodation towards perceived majority norms, which is reflected in a higher degree of Swedish use towards their fathers. Notably, the children’s mean scores are higher in all three groups compared to their fathers’ scores, however, only in private; moreover, there is also a greater individual variation among the children as compared to that among the fathers within all three groups. Note also that only a few children belonging to group 3 (H min-multi families) report exclusive use of Hungarian towards their fathers in private; the number of those reporting occasional CS to Swedish is considerably higher, with a few outliers reporting longer stretches of Swedish utterances (intersentential CS) as well.

### Table 8.5. Descriptive statistics for children’s self-reported language choice towards their Hungarian fathers in two different social contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children → H fathers in private</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children → H fathers in non-H presence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.777</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

m=4.69, sd=1.75) at the p=0.001 level, whereas there was no significant difference between children belonging to groups 1 and 2.

8.1.5 Parents’ conversations among themselves

The mixed between-within subjects ANOVA test conducted to explore the combined impact of (a) focus group and (b) social context on parents’ language choice towards each other showed a highly significant effect for social context [Wilks’ Lambda=0.35, F(1,46)=87.25, p<0.0005] with a large effect [eta squared=0.66]. Additionally, there was also a statistically significant difference in

---

141 This analysis is built upon all focus families, including those where one of the parents had another mother tongue (i.e. Swedish or an immigrant language other than Hungarian). Seven out of the 56 focus families’ data are, however, missing from the table (four from group 1 and three from group 3) as these parents only reported language use in private towards each other (often as a consequence of divorce). The missing answers affect the mean of group 1, which (given that the answers of these couples would have been included) should be M=4.21, with a SD= 2.55 (i.e. somewhat higher than indicated in table 8.6) and those of group 3, which should be M=2.06 with an SD=1.43 (i.e. lower than indicated in the table above).
language choice between parents belonging to different focus groups [F(2,46)=5.26, p=0.01] with a large effect [eta squared=0.19]. The interaction effect between social context and focus group was insignificant (p=0.35), which indicates that the main effects can be regarded as reliable. The mean scores and standard deviations representing the parents’ reported language choice towards each other are presented in table 8.6.

Separate one-way between groups ANOVA tests with post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the difference in parents’ language choice towards each other was significant in both contexts. The difference in private [F(2,53)=5.09, p=0.01] was significant between group 3 (m=2.15, sd=1.57) and group 1 (m=4.25, sd=2.45) at the level of p=0.007. In non-Hungarian speakers’ presence, the difference in mean scores was significant between group 3 (m=4.92, sd=1.19) and group 1 (m=6.20, sd=1.15) at the p<0.03 level, whereas couples belonging to groups 1 and 2 showed highly similar patterns (p=0.89) in this context.

Figure 8.5 (derived from the mixed between-within ANOVA test) displays this tendency, showing that all parents adjust their language use to outsiders’ presence, irrespective of their focus group. As this figure includes all focus families, i.e. also mixed couples, it also displays the great effect of exogamic marriages on language
use between parents. Note also that although parents belonging to group 3 report the lowest proportion of Swedish use, most of them actually report CS also in private. This is, however, not necessarily CS towards Swedish, but in several cases towards other languages the couples share, including e.g. Rumanian and/or English.\footnote{According to my observations, the amount of Hungarian in such conversations is still overwhelming; thus, this kind of answer has been recorded as H+, that is, as step 2 on the seven-step scale of language choice.}
Language use in conversations with older siblings and younger siblings was originally registered separately, but as only 13 out of the 56 children had older siblings, and 34 had younger siblings (with only three families overlapping), the sample sizes would have been too small to allow for comparisons between groups. In order to solve this problem, the scores of older and younger siblings have been counted together, resulting in 44 possible cases to be compared.

The mixed between-within subjects ANOVA test conducted to explore the impact of (a) focus group and (b) social context on children’s language choice towards their siblings showed a highly significant effect for social context \([\text{Wilks’ Lambda}=0.54, F(1, 40)= 33.89, p<0.0005]\) with a large effect \([\text{eta squared}=0.46]\). Additionally, there was also a statistically significant difference in language choice between the children belonging to different focus groups \([F(2,40)=7.86, p=0.001]\) with a large effect \([\text{eta squared}=0.28]\). The interaction effect between social context and focus group was nevertheless also significant \([\text{Wilks’ Lambda}=0.79, F(2,40)=5.15, p=0.01]\). The mean scores and standard deviations representing the children’s self-reported language use towards their siblings are presented in table 8.7.

8.1.6 Siblings’ conversations among themselves

Language use in conversations with older siblings and younger siblings was originally registered separately, but as only 13 out of the 56 children had older siblings, and 34 had younger siblings (with only three families overlapping), the sample sizes would have been too small to allow for comparisons between groups. In order to solve this problem, the scores of older and younger siblings have been counted together, resulting in 44 possible cases to be compared.

The mixed between-within subjects ANOVA test conducted to explore the impact of (a) focus group and (b) social context on children’s language choice towards their siblings showed a highly significant effect for social context \([\text{Wilks’ Lambda}=0.54, F(1, 40)= 33.89, p<0.0005]\) with a large effect \([\text{eta squared}=0.46]\). Additionally, there was also a statistically significant difference in language choice between the children belonging to different focus groups \([F(2,40)=7.86, p=0.001]\) with a large effect \([\text{eta squared}=0.28]\). The interaction effect between social context and focus group was nevertheless also significant \([\text{Wilks’ Lambda}=0.79, F(2,40)=5.15, p=0.01]\). The mean scores and standard deviations representing the children’s self-reported language use towards their siblings are presented in table 8.7.

143 There was, however, no significant difference between the number of children having older and younger siblings in the three focus groups.
Separate one-way between groups ANOVA tests with post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the difference was significant in both contexts. The difference between the means scores in private settings was significant at the p=0.003 level between group 3 (m=2.65, sd=1.99) and group 1 (m=3.60, sd=2.10), and between group 3 and group 2 (m=4.69, sd=1.75) at the p=0.001 level. Additionally, there was a significant difference in mean scores for conversations in non-H speakers’ presence between children belonging to group 3 (m=5.00, sd=1.83) and group 2 (m=6.58, sd=1.44) at the p=0.04 level.

Figure 8.6 displays the same tendency as earlier figures, showing that all children, irrespective of their focus group, are sensitive to social context: non-Hungarian speakers’ presence triggers an accommodation towards perceived majority norms, which is reflected in a higher degree of Swedish use towards siblings as compared to conversations in private. There are, however, children in all three groups who report intrasentential as well as intersentential CS in conversations with their siblings. There are two major differences that distinguishes group 3 from the two other groups. First of all, the mean scores for private conversations indicate that only children belonging to group 3 use predominantly Hungarian towards their siblings, whereas children belonging to groups 1 and 2 use predominantly Swedish also in private. Secondly, the difference in language choice is significant also in non-Hungarian speakers’ presence. Note, however,
that the variance of group 3 in non-Hungarian presence is considerably higher in the case of siblings’ conversations (sd=1.99 in private and sd=1.83 in non-Hungarian presence) compared to earlier presented family constellations.

### 8.1.7 Children’s language input by family members in private and non-private settings

In order to summarise children’s language exposure within the family unit, a mean score for different family members’ reported language use towards and in the presence of the focus child have been computed, including all members of the household, e.g. also grandparents, adult siblings, stepparents and stepsiblings living within the family unit.144

The mixed between-within subjects ANOVA test that was conducted to explore the combined impact of (a) focus group and (b) social context on children’s input from family members showed a highly significant effect for social context [Wilks’ Lambda=0.281, F(1,53)=135.73, p<0.001] with a large effect [eta squared=0.72], as well as for focus group [F (2, 53)=7.92, p=0.001] with a large effect [eta squared=0.23]. The interaction effect between social context and focus group was insignificant (p=0.06), which indicates that the main effects can be regarded as reliable. Mean scores and standard deviations representing the children’s input provided by family members is presented in table 8.8.

Separate one-way between groups ANOVA tests with post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated a significant difference between group 3 and the other two groups in both contexts. The difference in private settings was significant at the p=0.001 level between group 3 (m=2.20, sd=1.30) and group 1 (m=4.24, sd=1.75), and at the p=0.01 level towards group 2 (m=3.88, sd=1.67). In

---

144 In this analysis, all 56 families were included, i.e. even families where one of the parents had a mother tongue besides Hungarian or Swedish. In order to suit the investigation, reports concerning the use of languages other than Swedish and Hungarian were excluded from the analysis. This data trimming, however, concerns only two families (9G and 11G).
The scale ranges from 1=Hungarian only to 7=Swedish only, with 4=Hungarian and Swedish in approx. equal proportions

Figure 8.7. Boxplots for children’s input by family members in private settings.

non-Hungarian speakers’ presence the mean scores of group 3 (m=4.76, sd= 0.93) were significantly lower compared to those of group 1 (m=5.82, sd=1.17) at the p=0.02 level, and also compared to those of group 2 (m=5.79, sd=1.35) at the p=0.04 level.

These tendencies are also shown in figures 8.7 and 8.8, displaying the distribution of mean scores for the three focus groups and signalling the proportion of Swedish vs. Hungarian exposure of children by their family members in two different social settings. As shown in figure 8.7, the median of groups 1 and 2 in private settings is slightly above 4.00, indicating that for most of these families, Swedish is used in the family domain as much as Hungarian is used. There is, however, a large variance in both groups (1 and 2), with some children being exposed to more Hungarian and others to more Swedish than the mean. In contrast, the language exposure of children belonging to group 3 is less varied, and the median is around 1.5, indicating the imperative status of Hungarian within the family domain.

Notably, there is some overlapping between the three groups; this overlap, however, concerns outliers rather than the main bulk of the group. Figure 8.8, on the other hand, shows that although the median of group 3 is lower also in this context compared to the two other groups, children in all three groups are faced with a model of language use that emphasises the superiority of Swedish towards Hungarian usage in non-Hungarian speakers’ presence. There is one outlier...
belonging to group 2, where the family reported mainly Hungarian usage between family members irrespective of social context. Otherwise, groups 1 and 2 highly overlap, with certain overlapping between the lower bound of group 1 and the upper bound of group 3.

8.1.8 Correlations between children’s input and output in private

The relation between children’s input by family members (as measured by means calculated from parental reports on subsequent questions) and children’s output in private (i.e. their language choice towards family members, as measured by means calculated from children’s self-reports on subsequent questions) was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. As expected, there was a strong positive correlation between the two variables \([r=0.92, n=56, p<0.0005]\), showing that the more Swedish-oriented the input provided within the family is, the higher the proportion of Swedish is in the child’s language choice towards family members.

Figure 8.8. Boxplots for children’s input by family members in non-Hungarian speakers’ presence.

The scale ranges from 1=Hungarian only to 7=Swedish only, with 4= Hungarian and Swedish in equal proportions.

---

145 The explanation for the unusual linguistic behaviour of this family might be, as the mother explicitly claimed during the interview, the family’s aristocratic ancestry, which she referred to as a heritage to be proud of, but also entailing certain obligations, high aspirations with respect to family members’ proficiency in Hungarian being one of them.
Additionally, Figure 8.9 displays that most children report a somewhat higher use of Swedish than the input provided by family members. There are a few children who report more Hungarian as compared to the reported input; however, most of them belong to groups 1 and 2 (i.e. they are children of former majority members). There are also a few outliers who report considerably more Swedish use compared to the reported input within family. Most of these children belong similarly to groups 1 and 2, having parents with a majority background. From these figures we can conclude that differences in children’s input and output is more usual in families with a majority background. Another important finding is that most of the plots for group 3 are to be found at the lowest end of the figure, whereas the plots of the two other groups are more scattered over the whole range of the scale. This indicates that children as well as adults in group 3 are more Hungarian-oriented in their language usage in private as compared to the other two groups, where the variation is considerably higher.

8.1.9 Family language

In order to address the question of language use in the family domain from a more holistic view, the parental interview additionally included a more general question on ‘family language,’ defined as “the language(s) applied during family routines
involving many-part conversations of family members, for example, conversations conducted at the dinner table” (cf. Blum-Kulka, 1997).

Separate chi-square tests confirmed the earlier results, showing significant differences for group 3 as opposed to group 1 \( \chi^2 = 10.92, n=40, df=2, p=0.004 \) as well as group 2 \( \chi^2 = 10.92, n=32, df=2, p=0.018 \). Groups 1 and 2, in turn, showed similar patterns to each other. This difference is also displayed in figure 8.10.

8.2 Language use in the informants’ minority-oriented networks

This section presents parents’ and children’s language use in conversations with other Swedish Hungarians as reflected by the informants’ personal experiences. (For a presentation of the families contacts with Hungarians in Sweden, see section 7.7.) A distinction concerning the direction of speech has been applied also in this respect, i.e. language choice has been treated separately for conversations between adults, adults towards children, children towards adults and children in between. As it will become clear in the following, in some families only some of these constellations turned out to be relevant.

For the statistical analysis, mostly ANOVA tests were conducted based on the same seven-item scale presented in section 8.1. In those cases in which the sample size or the data level did not admit parametric measures, non-parametric tests have been used, such as Pearson chi-square test, Kruskal-Wallis H test, Mann-Whitney U test and Spearman’s rank order correlation test.

Figure 8.10. Distribution of reported family language in the three focus groups.
8.2.1 Parents’ reports on language use with other Swedish Hungarians

As described in section 7.7, there was no significant difference between the focus groups with respect to parents’ frequency of contact with other Hungarians in Sweden. There was, nevertheless, a significant difference between group 3 and the other two focus groups in the frequency of children’s contacts with Swedish Hungarians, group 3 children having access to larger and more vivid minority networks compared to children in groups 1 and 2.

Table 8.9 displays descriptive statistics derived from subsequent one-way ANOVA tests conducted to explore the impact of focus group on language use patterns in the families’ minority-oriented networks. Three general tendencies might be noted at first:

(1) Parents belonging to group 2 (H maj-bil families) have the highest scores (indicating that there were several families who reported regular Swedish usage within their minority networks) and also often the greatest variation for each of the questions compared to the results of the other two groups.
(2) Group 3 (H min-multi families) consistently has the highest answer rate (N), the lowest scores (indicating more Hungarian-oriented language usage) and the lowest variation (indicating a more uniform speech pattern) across the three focus groups.

(3) Generation also seems important in this respect, as conversations with children involved as senders (see C. and D. in table 8.9) generate greater variation and higher scores in the parental reports (i.e. it is more usual that children use a higher amount of Swedish than adults do).

Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test furthermore revealed:

A. The difference between the focus groups in reported language choice between adults was least significant if compared to other constellations of conversational partners. The difference between group 3 (m=1.69, sd=0.70) and group 2 (m=2.69, sd=1.44) was still found to be statistically significant at the level of p=0.04, whereas group 1 did not differ significantly from either group 2 or group 3.

B. The difference in adults’ language choice towards children was similarly significant between group 3 (m=1.5, sd=0.97) and group 2 (m=3.0, sd=1.35) at the level of p=0.02, whereas group 1 did not differ significantly from either group 2 or group 3.

C. The scores of children belonging to group 3 (m=2.13, sd=1.15) in conversation towards adults was significantly different from group 2 (m=4.0, sd=1.76) at the level of p=0.011 and from group 1 (m=4.0, sd=1.83) at the level of p=0.003.

D. Children’s language use among themselves as reflected by the parental reports\textsuperscript{146} indicates that group 3 (m=3.4, sd=1.12) differs significantly from group 1 (m=5.09, sd=1.57) at the level of p=0.003 and from group 2 (m=4.83, sd=1.75) at the level of p=0.036. Groups 1 and 2, in turn, showed similar patterns to each other (p=0.87).

8.2.2 Children’s self-reported language use

Children’s reports on how often they actually used Hungarian in conversations with adult Hungarian speakers in Sweden (excl. family members) confirmed the parental reports, although there were some slight differences, mainly due to the

\textsuperscript{146} A caution must be made for the parental reports concerning children’s language use among themselves: several parents claimed that they were uncertain of which language the children used in the absence of adults (lack of control), which is a legitimate concern. For this reason, there are far too few answers in group 2, which is why a non-parametric test would have been more appropriate for these results. Also, the remaining answers of parents who did answer the question must be interpreted only as an indication of the actual situation. The results of the conducted ANOVA test are displayed here only as a basis of comparison to the three other constellations (A,B and C).
A Kruskal-Wallis test conducted to explore the impact of focus group on the results showed a highly significant difference between the groups \[ \chi^2 = 13.732, \ n=56, \ df=2, \ p=0.001 \].

Figure 8.11 shows that children belonging to group 3 (H min-multi families) use Hungarian on a regular basis towards adults, whereas there are many children in the other two groups who rarely ever use Hungarian towards adults outside their family.

Table 8.10 displays the mean scores for children’s self-reported language choice in conversations with other children of Hungarian origin (excluding their siblings). First of all, we may note that the answers of two children from group 1 and four from group 2 are missing. This is due to the fact that they reported that they never or very rarely meet any children of Hungarian origin in Sweden. All

---

[147] Some children (typically those who did lack contact to bilingual networks) included their Heritage language teacher in the category of Swedish-Hungarian adults in their reports on Hungarian usage outside the family, leading to a slight increase in numbers as well as a decrease in language use scores compared to parental reports. Furthermore, in certain networks, it turned out that adult speakers use Swedish instead of Hungarian with children who are judged as being poor in Hungarian. This latter factor might explain why some children, who, despite being reported as accompanying their parents to these gatherings, did not report any Hungarian usage with adults.
children belonging to group 3 (H min-multi families) are included, i.e. all of them reported to have regular contact to other Hungarian children in Sweden (at least once a month, often considerably more).

Furthermore, in this context it is important to note that the answers presented in the table are very generalised: children who regularly meet other Hungarian peers in Sweden had to summarise their language use towards several interlocutors in several different settings, whereas others only referred to their interactions with a single person and were often also limited in respect of social context. As pointed out in section 2.3, language choice is always dependent on a large number of factors, not least on language dominance, language preference, etc., of the other participants in the conversation, and, as shown in the previous section (8.1), also on the social context in which the conversation takes place. These factors should preferably all be taken into consideration when we examine what language choice the respondent children have reported using with their Hungarian peers; e.g. if two children are classmates, and they only meet at school, where minority language use is restricted (cf. Parszyk, 1999; Sjögren, 2003; Haglund, 2005), we might expect a higher degree of Swedish in their conversations, whereas in a conversation conducted in a closed network of Swedish-Hungarian families, the language use between the children is regulated by the network’s internal language use patterns.

Apart from these cautions, the one-way ANOVA test conducted to explore the impact of focus group on language use with Hungarian peers showed a highly significant difference at the level of p=0.002 for the three groups [F(2,47)=6.926], a result indicated also by the sometimes less reliable reports of their parents that were presented earlier (see section 8.2.1 above). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test revealed that the scores of group 3 (m=3.38, sd=0.96) were significantly lower and less varied than those of group 1 (m=5.09, sd=1.57) at the level of p=0.002. Moreover, group 3 means also differed significantly from those of group 2 (m=4.83, sd=1.75) at the level of p=0.03. Groups 1 and 2, in turn, showed similar patterns to each other (p=0.87).

Additionally, a two-way ANOVA test was conducted to control for the possible impact of age and gender on children’s reported language choice towards their Swedish-Hungarian peers. Before performing the test, the cases were divided into

---

**Table 8.10.** Descriptive statistics for children’s self-reported language use in conversations with their Hungarian peers in Sweden.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. dev.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.749</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.619</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
three groups reflecting the respondent children’s age (7-10 years, 11-14 years and 15-18 years). The interaction effect between gender and age group was not significant [F(2,44)=0.88, p=0.42], which means that the main effects can be regarded as reliable. The main effects did not reach statistical significance neither for gender [F(2,44)=0.61, p=0.44] nor for age [F(2,44)=0.99, p=0.38].

8.2.3 Correlation between parents’ and children’s reports on group internal language usage

As children’s interviews had to be held shorter, they comprised fewer questions than the parental interviews. With regard to language use with ethnic peers, it is thus only possible to compare children’s and parents’ reports concerning children’s language use among themselves. Interestingly, as shown by separate Spearman’s rho correlation tests, \(^{148}\) there was a strong \(^{149}\) positive correlation between parents’ and children’s reports for group 3 (n=15, r=0.70, p=0.003), as well as for group 2 (n=9, r=0.68, p=0.04), but only medium for group 1 (n=18, r=0.40, p=0.096). Despite similar rho results, group 3s and 2 differed, however, in the amount of valid parental vs. children’s responses (15 out of 16 for group 3, and only 9 out of 12 for group 2 with a sample size of 16), suggesting a lower confidence level among parents in group 2 than indicated by the statistical results. Taken altogether, this suggests that parents belonging to group 3 have a greater insight into their children’s language behaviour and/or greater confidence for their children to make appropriate language choices, which, additionally seems to opt for the priority of Hungarian for group internal affairs not only for the immigrant generation but also among their children raised in Sweden.

8.3 Children’s language use during leisure time

School-aged children in Sweden spend considerable time at school, from 8:00 or 9:00 o’clock in the morning to at least 3:00 o’clock in the afternoon, implying Swedish language usage for all children but the few who attend English medium schools (one child in this sample) or some other schools with an ethnic profile (Finnish, German, etc., no children in this sample). In this study, I have thus limited my investigations to children’s language use outside school.

This section examines (children’s leisure time activities and) the language use connected to these activities. As most data in this section are derived from nominal or rank ordered scales, non-parametric tests have been used for analyzing them. An exception is made for a third, related question concerning children’s language

\(^{148}\) The language use data to be correlated concerned an interval scale that usually calls for parametric tests. However, as pointed out earlier (section 8.2.2), the very low sample size of group 2 for this question made non-parametric tests more appropriate.
\(^{149}\) Cohen (1988: 79-81) suggests the following guidelines for the interpretation of Spearman’s rho: r=0.10 to 0.29 small, r=0.30 to 0.49 medium, and r=0.50 to 1.0 large correlation (also referred to by Pallant, 2007: 139).
use towards their best friends, which has been analyzed using ANOVA test of variance.

Parental reports concerning children’s language use after school serves as an introduction into the matter (8.3.1) and is followed by a more detailed analysis of children’s self-reports regarding their habits of television and/or film watching, music and/or radio listening, and diverse literacy practices, as well as other regular leisure time activities (section 8.3.2). Children’s reports are investigated from mainly two angles here, (a) by comparing the results of the three focus groups with respect to the rate of Hungarian and Swedish language use in connection to these activities, and (b) by examining the correlations between different types of activities of each focus group separately, also considering the impact of age, sex and city of residence. Later, in section 8.4.3, I will reexamine children’s language use in connection to their leisure time activities from a more holistic perspective, by sketching different language use patterns throughout the whole sample. In contrast, the emphasis in this section 8.3 is on the differences and similarities between the three focus groups, treating each of the above mentioned activities separately.

8.3.1 Parental reports on children’s language use after school

As described in section 7.10, there were no significant differences in parental reports between the three focus groups with regard to children’s leisure time activities. The Kruskal-Wallis test conducted to explore differences between children’s language use after school (as reported by their parents) indicated, nevertheless, highly significant differences across the groups \( \chi^2 = 11.32, n=56, \text{df}=2, p=0.003 \). The test was based on a five step rank order scale including

1 = H only/mainly Hungarian,
2 = Hs Hungarian for most of the time, Swedish for certain activities,
3 = HS Hungarian and Swedish, approximately to the same extent,
4 = Sh Swedish for most of the time, Hungarian for certain activities,
5 = S only Swedish language use.

In a subsequent median test group 3 recorded a lower median score (md=4) than both group 1 and group 2, which both recorded median values of 5. This indicates that most children in groups 1 and 2 also have Swedish dominant language use during their leisure time activities, whereas children belonging to group 3 are exposed to a more balanced linguistic environment after school. These results might of course be colored by parental hopes and expectations and can thus only be interpreted as indications for children’s language use outside school.
8.3.2 Children’s self-reported leisure time activities and the language use connected to these activities

The interviews conducted with the children included a wide range of questions aiming to assess their patterns of television and film watching, music and radio listening, regular sports and/or cultural activities conducted during the week, as well as some of their literacy practices outside school and, most importantly, the languages connected to these activities. Note that the questions concerned the (passive and active) use of printed, audio and visual media during leisure time only. Evidently, when children report low scores on reading habits in Swedish this is largely compensated by the fact that Swedish is the medium of instruction at school, implying daily reading (and writing) activities in Swedish. With Hungarian this is certainly not the case, not even for children attending heritage language instruction, as this activity is very limited both in time and scope (ten minutes to one hour a week, see also section 3.3.2 and 3.4.5).

The questions were posed separately for each language during the interview, resulting in a subset of seven items for Hungarian and seven for Swedish. The informants’ answers were coded on a five-step ordinal scale including

0 = never/ very rarely
1 = a few times a year
2 = a few times a month
3 = once to four times a week
4 = every day

Firstly, two separate Kruskal-Wallis tests were performed to explore the impact of focus group on children’s Swedish vs. Hungarian language use during leisure time activities. The test revealed no significant differences between the focus groups in Swedish language usage, except for playing computer and/or video games, where a significant number of children in groups 2 and 3 reported relatively higher frequency usage (md=2 resp. 1.5) of Swedish PC games as opposed to children in group 1 (md=0). This difference was, however, due to a few younger children (<10 years; for explanations, see below).

150 It has been observed that –if allowed- bilingual children often use their whole linguistic repertoire to solve a problem, not restricting themselves to just one language (cf. Swain & Lapkin, 2000); thus, although the questions were posed separately for each language investigated, informants’ answers referring to activities for which both languages were used, have been included in their reports for both Swedish as well as Hungarian usage.

151 In the cases children referred to activities conducted exclusively during holidays in Hungary/Hungarian-speaking areas, ‘a few times a year’ was recorded in connection to their Hungarian usage. For Swedish, the same frequency was recorded if the respondent mentioned an activity usually conducted under a limited period of the year, e.g. skiing in North Sweden. Thus, although ‘a few times a year’ does not imply any regularity, it cannot be bunched together with the response ‘never/very rarely’.
The Kruskal-Wallis test conducted for Hungarian language usage in connection to different leisure time activities showed, nevertheless, rather clear differences between the three focus groups of the study, displaying similar tendencies out of which four turned out to be statistically significant. Table 8.11 displays the results of the subtests conducted for Hungarian.

The results of the performed tests indicate that more children belonging to group 3 use Hungarian regularly during their leisure time as opposed to children belonging to the other two groups; furthermore, they also indicate that children in group 3 use Hungarian significantly more often for writing, music/radio listening and in connection to additional (regular) leisure time activities as compared to the majority of children in groups 1 and 2.

Figures 8.12 - 8.14 display children’s self-reported frequency of different type of leisure time activities connected to Hungarian vs. Swedish usage in the form of bar charts.

Another way of examining the language use practices of the children’s three focus groups is to investigate possible correlations among the informants’ answers for each group separately and compare their results to each other afterwards. A set of Spearman’s rank order correlation tests were conducted for each of the groups, resulting in a large number of statistically significant positive correlations between different types of activities conducted in the two languages, and also a few negative correlations. As it will become clear in the following, there were differences between the groups regarding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity</th>
<th>Group 1 Mean ranks</th>
<th>Group 2 Mean ranks</th>
<th>Group 3 Mean ranks</th>
<th>Chi-Square value</th>
<th>df.</th>
<th>Asymp. sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Hungarian (all kinds of printed media)</td>
<td>24.37</td>
<td>24.53</td>
<td>34.78</td>
<td>5,276</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching Hungarian TV programs/films</td>
<td>27.19</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>35.47</td>
<td>4,832</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing (notes, sms, mail, chat, diary, narratives etc.) in H</td>
<td>25.13</td>
<td>24.72</td>
<td>37.34</td>
<td>7,193*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to H radio/music with H lyrics/radio</td>
<td>22.13</td>
<td>24.37</td>
<td>38.16</td>
<td>11,278**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Hungarian webpages for information gathering</td>
<td>27.23</td>
<td>26.31</td>
<td>32.59</td>
<td>2,187</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing computer/video games in H</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>35.34</td>
<td>12,358**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional leisure time activities connected to Hungarian usage</td>
<td>24.54</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>37.31</td>
<td>8,276*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* the difference between the groups is significant at the p<0.05 level.
** the difference between the groups is significant at the p<0.01 level.

Table 8.11. Statistics of Kruskal-Wallis tests showing the effect of focus group on the frequency of children’s Hungarian usage connected to different types of leisure time activities.
Figure 8.12. Children’s self-reported frequency of different type of leisure time activities connected to Hungarian vs. Swedish language usage (1).

(a) the type of activities between which statistically significant correlations have been found,
(b) the strength of these correlations, and, most importantly,
(c) the basis of the identified correlations, i.e. the frequency they referred to.
In the following, the results of these tests will be reported separately for each focus group with an additional analysis concerning age, sex and city of residence.

Figure 8.13. Children’s self-reported frequency of different type of leisure time activities connected to Hungarian vs. Swedish language usage (2).
8.3.2.1 Correlations for group 1

The Spearman’s rank order correlation test conducted for group 1 (H maj-mono families) found eleven positive correlations with a large or, in some cases, medium effect\(^{152}\) between children’s

- reading activities in Hungarian and watching Hungarian TV programs/films (n=23, r=0.55, p=0.007),
- reading and writing activities in Hungarian (n=23, r=0.517, p=0.012),
- writing activities in Hungarian and listening to Hungarian music/radio (n=24, r=0.424, p=0.044),
- writing activities in Hungarian and writing activities in Swedish (n=24, r=0.669, p<0.001),
- listening to Hungarian music/radio and visiting Hungarian webpages (n=24, r=0.619, p=0.002),
- writing activities in Hungarian and visiting Hungarian webpages (n=24, r=0.435, p=0.034),
- writing activities in Hungarian and visiting Swedish (!) webpages (n=24, r=0.416, p=0.043),
- writing activities in Swedish and visiting Swedish webpages (n=24, r=0.637, p=0.001),
- visiting Swedish webpages and listening to Hungarian (!) music/radio (n=23, r=0.586 p=0.003),
- visiting Swedish webpages and visiting Hungarian webpages (n=24, r=0.645, p=0.001), and

\(^{152}\) Cohen (1988: 79-81) suggests the following guidelines for the interpretation of Spearman’s rho: r=.10 to .29 small, r=0.30 to 0.49 medium, and r=0.50 to 1.00 large correlation (also referred to by Pallant, 2007: 139).
• watching Hungarian TV programs/films and playing Swedish (!) computer games (n=24, r=0.438, p=0.032).

Notably, most of the correlations concern different type of activities conducted in Hungarian. A closer look at children’s answers concerning the two languages (cf. the earlier presented figures 8.12-8.14) reveals, however, that most of these correlations are due to a similarly high amount of low frequency answers for activities conducted in Hungarian, more than half of the group reporting ‘never’ or ‘a few times a year’ for each of the questions displayed on the list. This might also explain some otherwise surprising positive correlations between e.g. watching Hungarian TV programs/films and playing Swedish computer games (notably, most children reported to play computer/video games regularly in English rather than in any other language).

Additionally, there were also four negative correlations with a medium effect detected for group 1 between children’s

• writing activities in Hungarian and additional leisure time activities in Swedish (n=24, r=-0.419, p=0.041),
• visiting Hungarian webpages and additional leisure time activities in Swedish (n=24, r=-0.483, p=0.017),
• visiting Hungarian webpages and watching Swedish TV programs/films (n=24, r=-0.489, p=0.015), and
• visiting Swedish webpages and additional leisure time activities in Swedish (n=24, r=-0.410, p=0.047).

All of these negative correlations are, however, due to the high amount of answers indicating high frequency of additional leisure time activities conducted in Swedish as opposed to low frequency of several types of activities conducted in Hungarian among group 1 children.

The age effect has been examined by using Spearman’s rank order correlation test, and resulted in the following statistically significant correlations for group 1:

• A positive correlation with a large effect between children’s age and the frequency with which they visited Swedish webpages (n=24, r=0.597, p=0.002) as well as Hungarian webpages (n=24, r=0.493, p=0.014), showing that older children use the Internet more often for information gathering. This correlation was expected for Swedish, but less so for Hungarian.
• A negative correlation with a large effect was found between age and playing video/computer games in Swedish (n=24, r=-0.536, p=0.007), indicating a decrease in interest and/or limited access to Swedish computer/video games for older children.
A negative correlation with a large effect was found between age and watching television and/or films in Swedish (n=24, r=-0.596, p=0.002), indicating a decrease in interest for watching television programs and/or films in Swedish with increasing age, possibly explainable by an increase in English medium films and TV programs, easily accessible in Sweden.

The Mann-Whitney U test conducted to explore the impact of gender on Hungarian vs. Swedish language usage during leisure time activities revealed two significant differences between girls and boys in group 1:

- Girls in group 1 reported significantly higher frequency in reading printed materials in Hungarian compared to boys [n=23, z=-2.624, p=0.009]; this result is noteworthy, as there was no gender effect for the other two groups in this regard.
- Furthermore girls belonging to group 1 reported significantly higher frequency in playing Swedish computer games compared to boys in the same group [n=24, z=-2.244, p=0.025].

8.3.2.2 Correlations for group 2

For group 2, the number of positive correlations was only eight, comprising correlations between children’s

- reading activities in Hungarian and watching Hungarian TV programs/films (n=15, r=0.814, p<0.001),
- reading activities in Hungarian and listening to Hungarian music/radio (n=15, r=0.605, p=0.017),
- watching Hungarian TV programs/films and listening to Hungarian music/radio (n=15, r=0.588, p=0.021),
- writing activities in Hungarian and visiting Hungarian webpages for information gathering (n=16, r=0.732, p=0.001),
- writing activities in Swedish and visiting Swedish webpages for information gathering (n=16, r=0.670, p=0.005),
- writing activities in Swedish and playing computer games in Swedish (n=16, r=0.593, p=0.016),
- playing computer games in Hungarian and visiting Hungarian webpages for information gathering (n=16, r=0.516, p=0.041), and
- playing computer games in Swedish and visiting Swedish webpages for information gathering (n=16, r=0.798, p<0.001).

Similar to the results of group 1, the positive correlations that were found concern different type of activities conducted in Hungarian. Although the tendency is somewhat more moderate than it was for group 1, the basis of the correlations is a similar high amount of low frequency answers connected to Hungarian usage, at
least half of the group reporting ‘never’ or ‘a few times a year’ for each of the questions displayed on the list (see figures 8.12-8.14). The main difference with group 1 is that group 2 children show higher frequencies of Swedish usage for certain activities (e.g. using the Internet for information gathering and playing computer games). This slight difference results in some seemingly parallel correlations for Swedish and Hungarian in this group, whereas these correlations for group 1 are restricted to correlations concerning low frequency answers for Hungarian.

Additionally, there were also three negative correlations detected for group 2 between children’s

- reading activities in Hungarian and additional regular leisure time activities connected to Swedish usage (n=15, r= -0.521, p=0.047)
- listening to Hungarian music/radio and regular leisure time activities connected to Swedish usage (n=15, r= -0.770, p=0.001), and
- regular leisure time activities connected to Hungarian usage and watching Swedish TV programs/films (n=16, r= -0.650, p=0.006).

Interestingly, all negative correlations involve an opposition between Hungarian and Swedish usage. Although it concerns different type of leisure time activities, it is important to note that they all show a strong effect on this group (r>0.50), indicating an opposition between Swedish and Hungarian usage for certain activities.

The age effect turned out to be statistically significant for group 2 in two of the three areas mentioned for group 1, but to an even larger effect:

- Visiting Swedish webpages (n=16, r=0.805, p<0.001), which has a positive correlation with a large effect for Swedish, indicating that children in this group use Swedish webpages for information gathering more often as they get older;
- Playing video/computer games in Swedish (n=16, r=-0.864, p<0.001), which has a negative correlation with a large effect, indicating a decrease in playing Swedish medium computer/video games as children get older;
- Additionally, there was also a positive correlation with a large effect between children’s age and their writing activities conducted in Swedish (n=16, r=0.603, p=0.013), indicating a significant increase in productive literacy in Swedish as children get older.

Notably, there is no increase in Hungarian usage over the years in any of the investigated areas for this group; on the other hand, there is no significant decrease for Hungarian either.

A Mann-Whitney U test conducted to explore the impact of gender on Hungarian vs. Swedish language usage during leisure time activities revealed no significant differences between girls and boys in group 2.
8.3.2.3 Correlations of group 3

For group 3, nine statistically significant positive correlations have been found between

- reading activities in Hungarian and watching Hungarian TV programs/films (n=16, r=0.621, p=0.010),
- reading activities and computer games in Hungarian (n=16, r=0.517, p=0.040),
- reading activities in Swedish and watching TV programs/films in Swedish (n=16, r=0.514, p=0.042),
- reading activities in Swedish and listening to Swedish music/radio (n=16, r=0.530, p=0.035),
- watching Hungarian TV programs/films and playing Hungarian computer games (r=0.583, p=0.018),
- watching Swedish TV programs/films and additional leisure time activities in Hungarian (n=16, r=0.512, p=0.043),
- listening to Swedish music/radio and visiting Swedish webpages (n=16, r=0.570, p=0.021),
- visiting Swedish webpages and visiting Hungarian webpages (n=16, r=0.616, p=0.011), and
- visiting Swedish webpages and playing computer games in Swedish (n=16, r=0.627, p=0.009).

There is a great difference between these results compared to the results of the two earlier presented groups. Notably, most of the correlations found in this list refer to a similar amount of high frequency answers, more than half of the group reporting regular (‘a few times a month’ to every day’) use for each of the questions displayed (see also figures 8.12.-8.14.). Furthermore, the list of significant correlations indicates regular usage of both Hungarian and Swedish.

There was one single negative correlation detected for this group, namely between watching Hungarian TV programs/films and visiting Swedish webpages (n=16, r= -0.611, p=0.012). This negative correlation was quite surprising, but on the other hand, it might reflect a tendency of using Hungarian for entertainment purposes as opposed to gathering practical information from local Swedish sources (e.g. looking for concert schemes or using the time table of the local commuter train).

The age effect turned out to be statistically significant for group 3 in several areas:

- Visiting Swedish webpages (n=16, r=0.662, p=0.005), showing a positive correlation with a large effect, indicating an expected increase in the use of Swedish Internet resources for information gathering as children get older;
• Listening to Swedish music/radio (n=16, r=0.519, p=0.039), showing a positive correlation with a large effect, indicating an increase in majority-oriented music listening habits as children get older;
• Writing activities conducted in Swedish (n=16, r=0.767, p=0.001), as well as in Hungarian (n=16, r=0.519, p=0.040), showing a positive correlation with a large effect in both languages, indicating an increase in the frequency of writing activities conducted in both languages (!) as children get older; and for
• Watching Hungarian television programs and/or films (n=16, r=-0.566, p=0.022), showing a negative (!) correlation with a large effect, indicating a decreasing tendency of watching Hungarian programs/films as children get older.

Interestingly, there is no similar increase for Internet usage in Hungarian, nor for listening music with Hungarian lyrics among older children, which might have been expected in this group. The only positive age-effect for this group is an increased tendency over the years to use Hungarian productively in its written form. This is, however, an important difference compared to the other two groups, in which more than half of the children reported no or very irregular use of Hungarian usage in writing. An increased use of writing activities in the minority language is a promising indicator of relatively balanced language use, which also promotes long-term language maintenance. This is especially true in the late modern, globalised world, where literacy skills have become more important than ever, especially when it comes to job opportunities and for maintaining transnational bounds through communication via the Internet (cf. section 2.2.3.2 and 2.4.).

The Mann-Whitney U test conducted to explore the impact of gender on Hungarian vs. Swedish language usage during leisure time activities revealed no significant differences between girls and boys in group 3.

8.3.2.4 Correlation between children’s home town and their language use during different leisure time activities

The Mann-Whitney U test conducted to explore the effect of children’s home town (=city of residence) on their language use in connection to different types of leisure time activities showed two significant differences between the cities:

• higher frequency among children living in Stockholm to have regular leisure time activities connected to Swedish usage as compared to those living in Göteborg [z=-0.292, n=56, p< 0.001 ], and
• higher frequency among children living in Göteborg to visit Hungarian webpages [z=-1.978, n=56, p<0.05 ] as compared to children living in the Stockholm area.
Unfortunately, I did not find any reasonable explanation for these correlations.

8.3.3 Children's language use towards their best friends

In section 7.11, I investigated children’s reports concerning the ethnicity of their best friends. Table 8.12 displays the mean scores for children’s self-reported language use in conversations with these friends. In this context, it is important to note that the answers presented in the table are very generalised: children were asked to recall at least three and at most five of their best friends; thus, the language use data include a summary for several people, which might have the same or very different linguistic backgrounds. The scale used to investigate children’s language use is the same as presented in section 8.1, i.e. ranging from 1, to indicate Hungarian usage only, to 7, to indicate Swedish usage only.

Despite these cautions, the one-way ANOVA test conducted to explore the impact of focus group on children’s language use with their best friends showed a highly significant difference on the level of \( p=0.007^{153} \) across the groups \([F(2,53)=11.363]\). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test revealed that the scores of group 3 (\( m=4.88, sd=1.93 \)) were significantly lower than those of group 1 (\( m=6.63, sd=0.77 \)) at the level of \( p<0.001 \). Moreover, group 3 means also differed significantly from those of group 2 (\( m=6.50, sd=0.82 \)) at the level of \( p=0.001 \). Groups 1 and 2 showed, in turn, similar patterns with each other (\( p=0.95 \)), indicating strongly Swedish-oriented language usage also in these close relations towards age mates. Group 3, on the other hand, displays a much larger variance in this question compared to earlier presented language use data. This is because group 3 comprises several children who reported Hungarian dominant usage, as well as children who reported Swedish dominant usage.

In this section, I have explored children’s reported language use practices outside school in connection to different leisure time activities. The results indicate that group 3 children (H min-multi families) have more balanced literacy practices and language use compared to groups 1 and 2, in both of which more than half of the children reported strongly Swedish-oriented language use during their leisure time.

8.4 Parental strategies and children’s language use patterns

This section aims to provide a more holistic picture of the informants’ language use by presenting overall language use patterns in the sample. This process included reviewing data presented in earlier sections (8.1-8.3), adding other relevant information to them, and lastly, summarising all data on an individual and a family level in order to be able to generalise to a few language use patterns. The main intention here is to draw an overall picture of the language use patterns in the whole sample and also to uncover the most usual patterns. In a second step, I will also attempt to find out whether the Hungarian parents’ childhood experiences (i.e.

\(^{153}\) Using Welch correction to adjust for homogeneity of variances.)
their SILE background) have any predictive value for the communicative strategies applied by them and in what way it is related to their children’s language use.

Section 8.4.1 is devoted to parental strategies, while section 8.4.2 summarises children’s speaking patterns. Section 8.4.3 presents children’s patterns of language use in connection to leisure time activities at the time of the interview. In each of the subsections, the distribution of various types of patterns will be compared over the focus groups as well as to other relevant factors, such as the parent’s educational background, the initial linguistic composition of the family and their neighborhood, parent’s thoughts about leaving Sweden, and children’s age and gender.

Finally, in section 8.4.4, children’s language use patterns will be compared with the parental strategies applied and the type of language resources found in the home (already presented in section 7.6).

### 8.4.1 Parental conversational strategies, the minority parent as language use model

In this section, a new typology of parental conversational strategies will be introduced that makes it possible to analyse parents’ language use from the perspective of the child; instead of focusing on parental characteristics such as mixed or endogamic marriage pattern, this typology focuses on the model(s) of language use the child is exposed to by the minority parent. Similarly to the analysis presented in earlier sections, I have taken my departure in the informants’ own views and thoughts concerning language usage and the principles that regulate their choices; the reports were then analysed in light of my field notes and the theoretical frameworks available in the literature.

As pointed out earlier (see section 2.2.3.1. of the thesis), out of the six parental strategies Romaine (1995: 183-185) describes in bilingual contact situations, only four are found in my sample. However, during the course of data collection, I found great differences between individual families in the extent of the rigorousness to which they applied these strategies in their everyday communication. Endogamic couples that I met could, for example, apply a more or less strict compartmentalisation of languages with respect to interlocutors, domain, place of

### Table 8.12. Descriptive statistics for children’s self-reported language use with their best friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. dev.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.928</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>1.418</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
conversation, and topics pursued and/or presence of outsiders; although many of them might fit into Romainé’s category of ‘non-dominant language at home without societal support’, it seemed unfair to treat all these different conversational styles as one and the same parental strategy. Most importantly, I judged Romainé’s typology as insufficient for my analysis, as it does not provide us with any cues concerning the younger family members’ linguistic behaviour. Instead, this latter aspect is rather central in the discourse-oriented studies of parent-child conversations as represented by Lanza’s work (e.g. 1992, 1997, 2007).

It was mainly due to these reasons that I felt the need to construct a new typology of parental strategies that takes into account several diverse factors based on the principles of language choice (see section 2.3) - rather than emphasising the differences between exogamic and endogamic marriages. The typology I have arrived at is presented in table 8.13. It comprises five types of parental strategies and two additional categories. Based on a combination of Grosjean’s (cf. 1992, 1998) ideas of monolingual and bilingual language mode in bilingual conversations and Elisabeth Lanza’s (1997) framework of a monolingual-bilingual continuum that parents may provide for the growing child, I have strived to identify patterns of language use in which the minority parents (in this case Hungarian parents) apply similar strategies in conversations with their children, irrespective of the spouse’s mother tongue combination. The reason for emphasizing the minority parent’s linguistic behaviour rather than the linguistic composition of the family is that it is the minority parent who provides a role model for minority language usage for minority language usage for at least the first few years in children’s life (cf. de Houwer, 1990; Huss, 1991; Döpke, 1992; Lanza, 1997; Rontu, 2005), and is thus primarily responsible for creating a context calling for monolingual or bilingual language use towards other speakers of the minority language. Once established, patterns of language use between two interlocutors have been said to remain more or less the same over the years (cf. Clyne, 1998: 303).

The rows in table 8.13 represent seven types of parental strategies found in the sample (n=61), whereas the columns represent a summary of the factors taken into account:

- the Hungarian parents’ reported language choice towards their children and with their spouses,
- the explicitly mentioned factors governing their language choice,
- their reported CS behavior, and
- their reported reactions to their children’s CS.

154 For a more detailed description of Grosjean’s ideas on monolingual vs. bilingual language mode and Lanza’s framework, see section 2.3.1 and 2.3.4, respectively.
Table 8.13. Categories of parental strategies in the sample (categorization based on the principles of language choice, see section 2.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental strategy</th>
<th>Hung. parent(s) towards children</th>
<th>Endogamic couples among themselves</th>
<th>Exogamic couples among themselves</th>
<th>Reported factors of importance</th>
<th>Parental CS</th>
<th>Parents’ reported reaction to children’s CS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Strictly interlocutor based</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H (n=2)</td>
<td>HS or S (n=3)</td>
<td>Interlocutor &amp; others’ presence</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>Request for clarification, and correction/help in Hungarian (=Lanza’s strategy 1-2-3)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Combined interlocutor and social context based</td>
<td>H ► HS</td>
<td>H ► HS (n=10)</td>
<td>S (n=3)</td>
<td>Interlocutor &amp; others’ presence</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Request for clarification, and correction/help in Hungarian (=Lanza’s strategy 1-2-3)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Strictly social context based</td>
<td>H ► S</td>
<td>H ► S (n=7)</td>
<td>S (n=1)</td>
<td>Place &amp; others’ presence</td>
<td>- (?)</td>
<td>Request for clarification, and/or repetition in the appropriate language (H or S) (=Lanza’s strategy 1-2-3)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Mixed language</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>HS ► HS/S (n=7)</td>
<td>S (n=5)</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Move on strategy or adult CS (=Lanza’s strategy 4-5)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Combined mixed lg. and soc. context</td>
<td>HS ► S</td>
<td>HS ► S (n=6)</td>
<td>S (n=5)</td>
<td>Topic &amp; others’ presence</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Move on strategy or adult CS (=Lanza’s strategy 4-5)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Different between the parents</td>
<td>Different</td>
<td>H/HS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Different</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Different (= Lanza’s strategy 1-2-3 by one part, 4-5 by the other, or 3-4-5 by both)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) No apparent bilingual strategy</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In all cases, parents’ reports were also checked against my field notes and adjusted accordingly (actually there were only a few cases in which an adjustment was necessary).

The most important abbreviations used in the table are the following:

H stands for Hungarian usage (possibly with some occasional intrasentential or tag-switching to Swedish, i.e. steps 1 and 2 on the seven-step language use scale presented in section 8.1) towards the given interlocutor both in private as well as in non-Hungarian speakers’ presence; HS means bilingual usage (including steps 3, 4 and 5 in the earlier presented seven-step language use scales), while S refers to Swedish usage (possibly with some occasional tag-switching to Hungarian, i.e. steps 6 and 7 on the seven-step language use scale).

The sign ► between two letters refers to the fact that language choice is dependent on social context. ‘H►S’ for example means that in the actual speaker-interlocutor constellation Hungarian is preferred in the case of a private/dyadic setting (without outsiders’ presence) and Swedish in non-Hungarian speakers’ presence.

When two similar language choice options are included in one pattern, it is indicated by a / (slash sign) in the table; the different options included in the category are set in order of frequency, i.e. the most common answer comes first, followed by less common answers.

Parental CS (based mainly on self-reports) has been included in the table in spite the fact that it is a feature present in all categories but strategy 3 (parents reporting monolingual language mode with language choice based strictly on social context). The main point of including this factor was to highlight its relation to parents’ reported reaction to their children’s CS. Obviously, few parents would react negatively to CS features that correspond to their own intuition of what is acceptable language choice. Thus, parents’ actual CS behaviour can only be understood as a combination of both columns. Details concerning differences in CS behaviour will also be highlighted when describing each of the strategies further on.

(1) The first type of strategy, called the interlocutor based strategy, is relatively unusual in the sample and refers to a type of highly conscious language use behaviour a minority-speaking parent may apply, using the minority language in all conversations towards certain interlocutors, most often towards family members and friends, including their own children and those of others. Most importantly, this strategy implies a refusal to take account of social context (i.e. the presence of others and/or the place) in a conversation, including cases in which the interlocutors are dominant in the majority language. A parent applying this conversational strategy might be highly bilingual but has consciously chosen to restrict his or her use of the majority language (in this case Swedish) towards majority members and representants of other minorities; Swedish might only be
used in exceptional cases towards other Hungarians in Sweden, and even then only for a certain purpose, namely to create social distance. Some parents in this category have reported that they are eager to avoid every form of CS and that they await the same from their children. Others claimed that they may use certain Swedish expressions but only if there is no Hungarian equivalent for a word.\textsuperscript{155} No parents in this pattern have reported CS from Swedish to Hungarian, however. All parents included here have reported strong reactions against children’s “unnecessary”\textsuperscript{156} use of Swedish words and expressions in Hungarian conversations. Parents’ reported reactions included requiring immediate clarification from the child by asking a direct question (=Lanza’s conversational strategy 1), or by offering them an appropriate word in Hungarian (expressed guess or correction=Lanza’s strategy 2-3). At the same time, most parents were also keen to explain that their children do not code-switch especially often. Parents using this type of parental strategy are three mixed couples strictly following the OPOL rule, but also two couples sharing the same minority language (in this case Hungarian),\textsuperscript{157} using exclusively Hungarian in communication with family members both at home and in public (on a bus, in a shopping mall, at school, at workplace, etc.).

(2) The combined strategy of interlocutor and social context means that the minority parent(s) use(s) exclusively the minority language, at least in private settings; Hungarian is also the main language of communication towards their children in non-Hungarians’ presence (as well as other group members), but in contrast to strategy 1, parents applying this strategy may casually adapt to the presence of others and switch to Swedish if they judge it as necessary for the course of communication (e.g. in a three-part conversation on a student developmental conference, where the Swedish-speaking teacher, the parent and the child need to discuss the school progress of the child). Adult CS is reported more often among parents in this category. These reports comprise certain lexical borrowings, such as those mentioned above (Swedish authorities and special Swedish food), possibly with a wider range of items included. However, the greatest

\textsuperscript{155} The type of CS these parents reported (and applied - at least in my presence) seems to be a clear case of occasional lexical borrowing, restricted to a limited number of culture specific words (typically, the name of different Swedish authorities, e.g. Försäkringskassan, BVC, and Swedish food, e.g. knäckebröd, falukorv).

\textsuperscript{156} “Unnecessary” is a wording that was used by several parents in this category when referring to some of their acquaintances’ and their children’s CS to Swedish in connection to our discussions concerning language use within the community.

\textsuperscript{157} Romaine is rather vague in pointing out what language might characterise endogamic couple’s language use in public (see the description of ‘non-dominant language use without societal support’ in Romaine, 1995: 184); thus, it is hard to say whether she is referring to this type of strict minority language use. However, according to my data, this type of strategy appears to be rather unusual among endogamic couples.
difference compared to strategy 1 is that parents applying strategy 2 may use CS from Hungarian to other languages (Swedish and/or Rumanian) for a wider range of purposes, such as marking direction of speech (inclu- sion/exclusion), citation, comment, etc.; thus, not only intrasentential but also intersentential CS might occur in their speech, although still to a very limited extent. Also, parents included in this category reported strong reactions against children’s inappropriate use of Swedish words and expressions (=Lanza’s strategy 1-2-3, see above) in Hungarian utterances. Several parents in this category commented on the fact that their children lack certain Hungarian expressions, especially in connection to more serious matters, e.g. political, philosophical and environmental issues. Many of these parents also claimed that the best solution to overcome this problem is not to accept this lack in their children’s vocabulary but to give them opportunities to hear and use the appropriate expressions as often as possible. “[You have to] help your child out. With the right word. Again and again. … You know, it’s because of the [Swedish] school. We cannot expect them to know everything right from the beginning if they never hear these words. We ought to help them out” (father in family G10). This strategy is applied by ten (originally) endogamic couples in the sample and three minority parents living in exogamic marriages (S25, S28 and G9). Interestingly, one of the ten initially endogamic couples who split up several years ago (G13) have continued to apply this strategy despite the fact that one of them has since then been in a relationship with a Swedish- speaking majority member.

(3) There is a third type of parental strategy, which seems to be solely based on social context. Interlocutor or topic are less important in this case; rather, the governing principle is adjustment to place and the presence of non-Hungarian speakers. This strategy implies a consequent use of Hungarian in private, paired with a consequent use of Swedish in public, but also in informal settings where non-Hungarians might be present. (Notably for mixed couples this includes family conversations.) Adult CS is nearly taboo for these parents, and this applies to both Hungarian and Swedish contexts. Certain lexical borrowings may occur (besides those mentioned earlier, also certain expressions connected to Swedish institutional contexts, such as fritids – ‘day care center after school’, vårdcentralen – ‘medical center’, as well as some technical innovations, e.g. printer); however, there is a great difference in awareness towards the parents applying the two previously mentioned strategies: many (though not all) parents included in this category seemed rather unaware of their use of Swedish words and expressions in their Hungarian speech. When I asked them to comment on some of the Swedish items they used during our interview, many of them were surprised. Parents included in this cate-
category reported (similarly to parents applying strategy 1 and 2) that they would request for clarification or repeat the right expression if the child would not use the appropriate language (=Lanza’s strategy 1-2-3); at the same time, most of them also claimed that their children did not need to be reminded especially often. Interestingly, several parents applying this strategy reasoned about where and when one should use Swedish rather than Hungarian, and also, when Hungarian should be used in the first place. Some parents included here were – irrespective of their own CS - very strict in their principles concerning language choice, opting for monolingual mode in all conversations (see example 8.7 below). Seven out of eight couples applying this strategy were endogamic couples.\textsuperscript{158} Additionally, there was also one minority parent living together with a minority member who had a mother tongue other than Hungarian (=OH couple) who reported a pattern indicating this parental strategy (G11). This latter case represents then the only OH case (out of six) in the sample, which resembles Romaine’s description of ‘double non-dominant language without societal support.

(4) Quite a few minority parents in the sample seem to apply a strategy of mixed language use, which means using the two languages interchangeably in conversation with other bilinguals,\textsuperscript{159} including their own children. The presence of others, even if they are monolingual (Swedish or Hungarian) speakers, does not make a great difference for these parents; they reported to choose language mainly with respect to the topic and, to a lesser degree, also to the place of the conversation. Adult CS is customary for these parents, both intersentential and intrasentential. This does, however, not mean that their language use is uniform. For some of them, a wide range of lexical borrowings from Swedish might characterise their Hungarian conversations;\textsuperscript{160} at the same time, there is considerably less borrowing from Hungarian to Swedish.\textsuperscript{161} Other parents included in this category switch over completely to Swedish mainly because of a change in the topic of their conversations, when talking about their jobs or some

\textsuperscript{158} If we look at the distribution of families in the sample, this strategy might possibly represent a more usual case of Romaine’s category ‘non-dominant language at home without societal support’ compared to strategy 1, which is rather unusual among endogamic couples.

\textsuperscript{159} This type of language use is largely reminiscent of the one described by Zentella (1997); however, in contrast to the Puerto Rican girls featured in her study, the Swedish-Hungarian families applying this language usage in this sample most often lack regular contact with other bilingual families (see also the discussion in section 7.7).

\textsuperscript{160} These borrowings are mainly nouns (e.g. bulle- bun, keso – cottage cheese, saft-lemonade) and verbs (fika – ‘taking a coffee break’, träna – ‘working out’), but also include adjectives (mysig-cosy, slysst-awsome, lagom-just right).

\textsuperscript{161} I have in fact only managed to observe the use of a few culture-specific Hungarian words in their Swedish conversations, which referred to Hungarian food and drinks, such as gulyásleves, pälina.
local news, and also when discussing home work with their children. Most
of these parents are highly aware of their mixed language use; some of
them claimed that they have sometimes tried to “get rid of this bad habit”
but also that they soon realised that “this is the way we use Hungarian.”
(Citation from mother in family S27). Some parents explained that this
kind of alternation between the two languages has become more and more
usual as the children got older and they needed help with homework. “You
need to talk Swedish in school matters, because this is the way they are
expected to discuss it at school.” (father in family G27). Parents included
in this category reported that they would not interrupt their children what-
ever language they use, “the main thing is they get it out, whatever they
want to say” (mother in G15). This parental conversational style corre-
Asson with Lanza’s strategies 4 and 5. There were seven endogamic couples
in the sample who reported a language use indicating this type of mixed
language use. For the five Swedish-Hungarian couples included in this
category, this strategy seems to correspond to a weakened form of OPOL,
while no mixed couples with differing minority languages (OH families)
seemed to apply this strategy.

(5) The combined strategy of mixed language use and social context implies
that the minority parent(s) use(s) both languages in private but turns to a
completely monolingual Swedish language usage in non-Hungarians’
presence even when talking to his or her own children. Many of these
parents are clearly aware of their mixed language use at home, but as most
of them lack contact to other Swedish Hungarians, they don’t bother about
what other Hungarians might think. “Our children can at least talk a little
bit of Hungarian,” explained one of my informants (mother in family
S19). Parents included in this category often claimed that their children
did not need to be reminded especially often about the appropriate
language choice. “She doesn’t use Hungarian outside home, although we
have never talked about it” – as one of the parents expressed it (father in
G31). So also in this case - similarly to strategy 3 - the focus is rather on
when and where to avoid the use of Hungarian, rather than an expectation
to stick to it in certain situations. All in all, eleven couples (six endogamic
and five exogamic couples) apply this strategy in the sample. For an
outsider, this strategy might appear very similar to strategy 3 (see discus-
sion below); there is, nevertheless, a great deal of difference between the
two: in contrast to strategy 3, strategy 5 provides the children with a
minimal input in the minority language, affecting not only their style
register, but also their basic vocabulary and grammar. As this rule of
language choice is also applied in the presence of non-Hungarian speaking
parents, this strategy hits especially hard against children of mixed couples
(5 out of 11). This category of parental strategies differs, therefore, from
the earlier mentioned ones, in that there is a difference between its outcome in endogamic and exogamic marriages.

(6) Eight families in the sample differ from the earlier mentioned cases in that the parents apply different conversational strategies towards their children. As the classification is based on the minority parents’ speaking patterns, this category comprises per definition endogamic couples only. In four out of these eight cases, one of the parents used only (or at least mainly) Swedish in communication with his/her children, while the other parent provided minority language input to differing extents. In three families, this parental role distribution is partly explainable by the fact that one of the Hungarian-speaking parents had grown up in Sweden (second generation), and being dominant in Swedish, the parents claimed that this strategy appeared to be the best solution “to provide the best possible circumstances for the children to learn proper Swedish. Hungarian will hopefully not be lost if we speak it at least at home” (citation from mother in G12). In the remaining fourth case, as well as in the other four cases included in this category, the parents apparently disagree on the norms of language use in spite of the fact that they share the same mother tongue and also the experience of having migrated as adults to Sweden. Interestingly, this parental disagreement in norms of bilingual language usage is, according to my observations, also reflected in their actual language choice towards their children.

(7) Finally, there were also four cases in the sample, in which the parents use mainly or exclusively Swedish towards their children, as well as towards each other, in all domains, irrespective of social context or other factors. CS to Hungarian may occur but mainly in the form of lexicalised tag-switches, e.g. saying good night and sweet dreams to each other (Jó éjszakát! Szép álmokat!), expressing love and affection (Szeretlek! Puszi!), etc. Notably, only one of the four couples included here declared that they had decided to prioritise Swedish from the very beginning (S3); the other three parents claimed that they had a wish for transmitting their language (Hungarian), but felt that the language shift became inevitable as the children got older and entered majority-dominated scenes (kindergarten/school/the yard). Some of these parents expressed sorrow about their children not being able to speak Hungarian (see example 6.12 and 6.13 in chapter 6), while others (see example 8.13 below) were less troubled.

Notably, the first three parental strategies (1, 2, and 3) share the norms of private language use: an expressed ambition of monolingual Hungarian usage within private domains, i.e. with a minimum of CS to Swedish. The dimension in which
parental strategies 1, 2 and 3 differ from each other is, as the following examples show, the way the language is used in non-Hungarian speakers’ presence, with an ascending proportion of Swedish usage.

**Example 8.1.** Mother in case S31 (applying strategy 2). I=interviewer, R=respondent

I: S ha boltban vagytok vagy buszon, ahol mások is vannak?
R: Családon belül mindig magyarul beszélünk, nem is tudnék mást elképzelni.
I: S mi van akkor, ha magyarul nem értő barátok vannak nálak?
R: Mondjuk, hogy ha olyasmiről van szó, ami mindenkit érint, s itt vannak nálunk vacsorán, akkor az asztalnál svédül beszélünk. Persze attól is függ, miről. Szóval azt, hogy ‘lennyújtánad a sót?’ azt magyarul mondják B-nek [férfi]. De a beszélgetés, ami közös, az svédül megy.

I: And what if you are in a store or on the bus, when there are other people around you?
R: Within the family, we always speak Hungarian, I couldn’t even imagine otherwise.
I: And what happens if you have some friends visiting you and they don’t understand any Hungarian?
R: Well, when it comes to matters that affect everybody, and they are here for dinner, we talk Swedish ‘round the table. But it depends also on what we are talking about. Like, ‘Could you lend me some salt?’ I still say in Hungarian to B [husband]. But the conversation as such usually goes on in Swedish.

**Example 8.2.** Mother in family S4 (applying strategy 3).

Ha nincs itthon senki, evidens, hogy magyarul beszélünk. […] És akkor abban a pillanatban, hogy egy svéd beteszi a lábát, akkor svédül beszélünk egymással is.

If there’s no one at home, evidently, we speak Hungarian. […] And then, at the moment a Swedish turns up, we speak Swedish also to one another.

Parental strategies 3 and 5, in turn, share the norms of language use in non-Hungarian speakers’ presence, both of them requiring monolingual Swedish usage outside the home. Because of this rule, families applying this strategy (and of course, strategy 7) might by outsiders easily be taken for majority members (or “wannabees”), which in some cases might be one of the explicit aims of the parents:

**Example 8.3.** Father in case G31 (applying strategy 5).

För att inte bli utpekad kan det vara bra att hålla sig till svenskan när man är ute bland folk.

If you don’t want to be singled out, it’s better to stick to Swedish when you’re out in public.

Most of these parents emphasise the obliging principle of politeness, as it has been expressed by the following informants:
Example 8.4. Mother in family S4 (applying strategy 3). I=interviewer, R=respondent

R: Ha itt van nálunk egy barátja? … Akkor svédül beszélünk, ez evidens.
I: Egytársal is, te meg a fiad?
R: Igen, persze.
I: Akkor is, ha nem érinti a barátját? Mondjuk meg akarod kérdezni, hogy megszínálta-e a leckéjét. Vagy hogy szejd fel a holmiját a földről.
R: Hát nem tehetsz úgy, mintha itt se lenne a másik gyerek! Ez udvariasság kérdése.

R: You mean when his friends are here for a visit? … Of course we are talking Swedish. It’s evident.
I: Even you and your son, in between yourselves?
R: Sure.
I: Even if the matter does not concern his friend? Like, if you want to ask your son if he’s done with his lessons. Or if you want to ask him to pick up his stuff from the floor.
R: Well, you can’t pretend the other kid is not there! It’s a question of politeness.

Example 8.5. Father in family S26 (strategy 5).

Végül is Svédországban élünk. Mi jöttünk ide. Elvárható, hogy alkalmazkodjunk hozzájuk

After all, we are living in Sweden. We came here. It seems pretty reasonable that we adapt to them.

At the same time, parental strategies 3 and 5 are incompatible in the norms of language use in private, strategy 3 requiring Hungarian usage without CS, while CS is rather custom in the case of strategy 5.

Example 8.6. Father in family S26 (applying strategy 3, the case is nevertheless listed as strategy 6, because of the mother applying a different strategy).

Fontos a szép beszéd! Bármilyen nyelven beszél, legyen az magyar vagy svéd. Aki sokat olvas az szebben tudja kifejezni magát, s az alapján ítélik majd meg.

Whatever language you speak, it might be Hungarian or Swedish, it’s important to speak it properly. Those who read a lot can express themselves more adequately, and you become judged by that. The way you speak.

Example 8.7. Father in family S21 (strategy 3).162

Nem blandázunk! Ha erre vagy kiváncsi. We don’t mix! If this is what you wanted to know.

That there is a hidden, or, in some cases also open, conflict between parents applying different conversational strategies might be discerned from several inter-

---

162 The expression ‘blandázunk’ is based on the Swedish verb BLANDA (=mix) and by attaching a Hungarian verbalizing suffix (-z) and the conjugation for 1st person plural (-unk) a mixed Swedish-Hungarian word is created on the analogy of other similar constructions especially used by those using strategy 4 and 5. The ironic intonation makes it clear that the respondent uses CS to emphasise his negative affection towards similar expressions.
view sessions in which parents explicitly commented on other people’s “unacceptable” linguistic behaviour or, in some cases, on their experiences being harassed by certain Hungarian speakers because of differing expectations. In order to avoid confrontation, one of my informants, a Hungarian mother who mainly speaks Swedish with her children declared, for example, that she is especially cautious of people speaking Hungarian in public, calling them “great” Hungarians (see example 8.8).

Example 8.8. Mother in family G30 (strategy 7, but family case listed as strategy 6 because of the father applying a different conversational strategy).

Ja, mondjuk a boltban. Mikor hallom, hogy magyarul beszélnek, már megyünk is omnan. Nem akarom hallani a szöveget, hogy én meg miért svédül beszélek a gyerekekkel. Ez a mi életünk, semmi közük hozzá.

Like in the mall. When I hear them speaking Hungarian, I leave the place immediately. I don’t want to hear their comments about me speaking Swedish to the children. This is our life, nobody has to do with it/it is nobody else’s business.

Table 8.13 (see above) shows the distribution of each type of parental strategy over the whole sample (n=61). The Chi-Square test conducted to explore the impact of focus group (n_{gr1}=24, n_{gr2}=16, n_{gr3}= 16) on parental strategies showed highly significant differences across the groups \[\chi^2=28.354, \ n=56, \ df=12, \ p=0.005\]. Separate chi-square tests revealed, however, that the difference was only significant between groups 2 and 3 \[\chi^2=14.438, \ n=32, \ df=5, \ p=0.013\], and between groups 1 and 3 \[\chi^2=13.611, \ n=40, \ df=6, \ p=0.034\], but not between groups 1 and 2. Considering that the combined strategy of mixed language use and social context (=strategy 5) turned out to be most usual among group 1 parents (H maj-mono families), mixed language strategy (=strategy 4) among group 2 parents (H maj-bil families), and combined interlocutor and social context based strategy (=2) among group 3 parents (H min-multi families), the indicated differences between the groups are in effect even higher than it is possible to show by means of non-parametric measures.

Most importantly, the parental strategies differ not only in the amount of Hungarian provided by the Hungarian parent(s), but also in the type of linguistic context (monolingual vs. bilingual) they offer for the children. In order to reach a more easily comprehensible design, I collapsed the seven parental strategies to five categories according to these two (above mentioned) aspects: parental strategies 1 and 2 are regarded as providing Hungarian dominant models for the children, strategy 3 and 4 as providing different kinds of bilingual models, while strategy 5 is seen as a Swedish dominant model, and strategy 7 as a monolingual Swedish model. Parental strategy 6 is included here, although it cannot be said to provide children a certain language use model but two different models at the same time, including cases in which parents apply different conversational strategies towards the children. If we look at the distribution of these models over the
four groups in the sample, the differences between them appear more clearly (see figure 8.15).

First of all, we can note that parents belonging to group 3 (i.e. with a multi-lingual minority experience) most often apply a Hungarian dominant or at least some type of bilingual parental strategy towards their children, while the linguistic behaviour of parents belonging to groups 1 (i.e. with a monolingual majority experience) and 2 (i.e. parents with a bilingual majority experience) is harder to predict. Interestingly, about half of group 1 parents provide Swedish dominant or Swedish monolingual models of language use for their children; this is also the main difference towards group 2, in which most parents have adopted some kind of bilingual strategy towards their children.

There are of course differences between the options a family might have depending on the couple’s linguistic background (i.e. their mother tongues). The chi-square test conducted to explore the impact of the family’s initial language composition \( (n_{HH}=35, n_{HHs}=5, n_{SH}=15 \text{ and } n_{OH}=6) \)\(^{163}\) on the parental strategies applied (the seven categories shown in table 8.13.) showed accordingly highly significant differences across the groups \( [\chi^2=41.530, n=61, \text{df}=18, p=0.001] \). This

\(^{163}\) The abbreviation HH refers to endogamic couples. HHs refers to couples in which both have Hungarian as their mother tongue, but one of them has grown up in Sweden as a child of Hungarian immigrants. SH refers to Swedish-Hungarian marriages, while OH refers to exogamic marriages in which only one of the spouses is Hungarian and the other has another mother tongue.
difference between the couples with differing linguistic backgrounds \((n_{HH}=35, n_{HHs}=5, n_{SH}=15\) and \(n_{OH}=6\)) remains significant also after collapsing the seven parental strategies to the five language use models presented in figure 8.15 \(\chi^2=30.051, n=61, df=12, p=0.003\). Because of the low sample size in two of the four groups, it was only possible to compute a subsequent chi-square test between the language use models provided by endogamic couples \((n_{HH}=35)\) as compared to Swedish-Hungarian couples \((n_{SH}=15)\). The test, nevertheless, revealed significant differences between these two types of families \(\chi^2=11.716, n=50, df=4, p=0.020\); however, this difference was mainly because 26.7% (that is 4 out of 15) SH couples provided Swedish monolingual models of language use for their children, while none of the HH families did so. On the other hand, 14.3% (that is 5 out of 35) HH couples applied different conversational strategies towards their children, which was impossible for SH couples per definition. In all other aspects, there were only slight differences between the distribution of language use models provided by SH vs. HH families in the sample, around 26-34% in both groups providing Hungarian dominant models, around 33-37% some type of bilingual model and further 13-14% Swedish dominant models of language use.

Table 8.14 shows the distribution of the four generalised language use models provided by the parents and the additional category of parents applying different conversational strategies across the four types of family constellations. As we can see, there is a strong tendency for endogamic couples to provide Hungarian dominant or bilingual models for their children, whereas exogamic couples are found in most of the categories listed; however, as the number of endogamic couples was considerably higher in the sample as compared to exogamic couples of different types, one needs to be cautious before generalising these results to the whole population of Swedish Hungarians.

Additional chi-square test conducted to explore the impact of parents’ educational background, the linguistic composition of their neighborhood, their children’s age and gender showed no significant differences between the groups neither with regard to parental strategies applied, nor to the language use models they provided. Thus, we may conclude with some certainty that the differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial language composition of the family</th>
<th>Language use model provided by the Hungarian parent(s)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H dominant</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between the minority parents in the sample who adopt different kinds of conversational strategies towards their children seem to a large degree to be based on their childhood experiences and probably further strengthened by the (ethno)linguistic affiliation of their spouses.

8.4.2 Children’s speaking patterns

In the following, seven types of speaking patterns will be introduced, reflecting different kinds of language usage among the children in the sample. The identification of the seven patterns is the result of an overall analysis of children’s self-reports (and partly, also my own observations) concerning language use under differing conditions and towards different types of interlocutors. Children’s speaking patterns are presented in table 8.15, representing a scale ranging from more Hungarian-oriented towards more Swedish-oriented language usage and including the number of cases in each of the patterns found in the sample (n=61).

Although this table has much in common with the implicational scales commonly found in sociolinguistic work, it has to be noted that this one has some limitations because of its child-centred approach. First of all, the list of interlocutors is limited to family members and some significant age-mates in the child’s exchange network, resulting in a scale that includes grandparents and parents with a mother tongue other than Hungarian, but excludes all other adults outside family, irrespective of their ethnicity, and/or bilinguality. Moreover, as compared to more sophisticated implicational scales found in the literature, this one lacks several other features that were not possible to collect without further (ethnographical) observations (such as e.g. the gender of interlocutors; for more “classical” implicational scales cf. Gal, 1979; Li, 1994).

Before proceeding with the analysis, another important remark has to be made: in order to reach a more intelligible design, some details have been highly compressed. In table 8.15, a single letter or a combination of two letters thus represent a summary of four (sometimes quite different) responses to related questions: children’s self-reported language choice (1) towards a given interlocutor type during conversations in private (i.e. without outsiders’ presence) and (2) in non-Hungarian presence; additionally, (3 and 4) children’s responses to these questions have also been checked with their parent’s reports, both under different social contexts.164

The abbreviations found in the table should be interpreted as follows:

H stands for Hungarian usage towards the given interlocutor irrespective of social context, referring to the fact that both child and parents have reported that the child in question uses only Hungarian (possibly with some occasional intra-

---

164 As mentioned in section 8.2.4, children’s and parents’ views on the same questions did not always coincide, and although some children reported bilingual usage, parents may not have been aware of what happened in conversations they were not present at. In other cases, it happened that parents were greatly aware of their young child’s CS behaviour, whereas the child reported Hungarian usage only.
sentential or tag-switching to Swedish, i.e. steps 1 and 2 on the seven-step language use scale presented in section 8.1) towards the given interlocutor both in private as well as in non-Hungarian speakers’ presence; HS means bilingual usage (including steps 3, 4 and 5 presented earlier in the seven-step language use scales), while He and Se indicates Hungarian vs. Swedish usage with occasional switches to English. S, in turn, refers to Swedish usage (possibly with occasional intrasentential or tag-switching to Hungarian, i.e. steps 6 and 7 on the seven-step scale).

The sign ▶ between two letters refers to the fact that language choice is dependent on social context. ‘H►S’ for example means that in the actual speaker-interlocutor constellation Hungarian is preferred in private (without outsiders’ presence) and Swedish in non-Hungarian speakers’ presence.

When two similar language choice options are included in one pattern, it is indicated by a slash sign (/) in the table. A minus sign indicates that the given interlocutor type has not been relevant in some of the cases included in the pattern (only some of the children have a grandparent included in their household, for example). Language indicated in brackets means interchangeability within the line, i.e. the given language choice option is applied only towards one of the bracketed interlocutor types.

The category of Hungarian parent refers to parents whose mother tongue is Hungarian. Primarily, this means Hungarian immigrants from the Carpathian Basin, but also includes the five parents who grew up bilingually in Sweden, descending from earlier Hungarian immigration waves (i.e. children of refugees after the 1956 year’s revolution in Hungary).

Pattern 1: Language choice appears to be governed solely by the (perceived) ethnicity of the interlocutor, irrespective of social context. Hungarian serves as the ‘we-code’, Swedish as the ‘they-code’ (cf. Gumperz, 1982). Monolingual Hungarian usage is preferred towards family members as well as ethnic peers (including those considered as their best friends), while Swedish is used towards people with another ethnic background (including peers and best friends). Although only two children have reported this type of speaking pattern, an 11-year-old boy (G22) and a 15-year-old girl (S21), I wanted to highlight it separately, as it represents the strictest compartmentalisation of languages according to interlocutor. One of the two cases here (case G22) features a Swedish father, towards whom bilingual usage is preferred by the child, probably as a sign of inclusion in the family membership. At the same time, this specific child has no siblings and uses Hungarian most often towards adult speakers.

165 One of the two children included in this category has, nevertheless, mentioned occasional CS to English. I was, however, not able to observe such a switch during my stay with the family and the siblings did not take part in any community activities either.
Table 8.15. Children’s speaking patterns based on their self-reported language use towards different type of interlocutors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children’s speaking pattern</th>
<th>Grandparents*</th>
<th>Hungarian parent(s)</th>
<th>Siblings</th>
<th>Ethnic peers</th>
<th>Best friends</th>
<th>Girl- or boyfriend</th>
<th>S/O parent and/or stepparent</th>
<th>N (out of 61)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pattern 1</td>
<td>H/-</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H/-</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S/-</td>
<td>H and S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern 2</td>
<td>H/-</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H/-</td>
<td>H/HS</td>
<td>H and S / HS and S</td>
<td>HS/S/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern 3</td>
<td>H/-</td>
<td>H/ H► HS</td>
<td>HS/ H► HS/-</td>
<td>HS/HS/Se</td>
<td>H and S / HS and S</td>
<td>S/-</td>
<td>S/-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>HS/ H► HS/ S</td>
<td>HS/ H► S/-</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S/-</td>
<td>S/-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern 5</td>
<td>H/O/-</td>
<td>HS/ H► S</td>
<td>S/- (HS► S)</td>
<td>S/- (HS► S)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S/-</td>
<td>S/-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern 6</td>
<td>HS/-</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S/- (HS)</td>
<td>S/- (HS)</td>
<td>S/Se</td>
<td>S/-</td>
<td>S/-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern 7</td>
<td>S/-</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S/-</td>
<td>S/-</td>
<td>S/Se</td>
<td>S/-</td>
<td>S/-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pattern 2: For five children in the sample, Hungarian clearly serves as the exclusive family language. Hungarian is used towards all family members by these children, irrespective of social context. Bilingual language use and sensitivity to social context characterises peer relations with ethnic peers, including best friends and/or girl/boyfriends. Swedish is used towards peers with an ethnic background other than Hungarian, including best friends and girl/boyfriends.

Pattern 3: Monolingual Hungarian usage has been reported by ten children in the sample as being preferred towards the Hungarian parent(s) and grandparents, in some cases with slight accommodation to the presence of non-Hungarian speakers (H►HS, marking sensitivity to social context). Bilingual language usage is usually reported towards age mates, i.e. ethnic peers, best friends, and, in most of the cases also towards siblings. Also included here is one case (S31) in which a fifteen-year-old boy reported monolingual Hungarian usage towards his considerably younger sister but slight accommodation to social context in interaction with his parents and his brother (who was similar in age).

Pattern 4: Twelve children in the sample reported a language use that implies bilingual language use, and – in most of the cases - great sensitivity to social context towards all interlocutors of Hungarian origin, while monolingual Swedish usage is the custom towards girl/boyfriend and with parent/stepparent with a mother tongue other than Hungarian. Swedish is also preferred towards best friends, who are usually of Swedish origin or, in a few cases, have a different ethnic background than the children themselves. In most cases, this speaking pattern resembles parental strategy 5 (i.e. combined mixed lang. and soc. context). Included in this group is also one girl (G4) who reported monolingual Swedish usage towards all friends except her ethnic friend, with whom she reported bilingual language usage for most of the time. This girl has been included here because she reported bilingual language usage towards all interlocutors and no monolingual Hungarian language use towards anyone.

Pattern 5: An even more Swedish dominant pattern has been found among eleven children in the sample. Swedish is used towards all but two interlocutors on the list towards whom the child applies bilingual language usage, with frequent CS between the languages. However, half of the informants included here reported accommodation to social context (HS►S) towards the interlocutors with whom they use Hungarian. The two interlocutors towards whom the child uses both languages always include one (or both) of the Hungarian parents and either sibling(s) or ethnic peers, who the child meets regularly (once a month or more often). With the exception of case G31 (a nine year old girl), this seems to be a typical pattern for adolescents in the sample (between 12 and 17 years). On the other hand, this is the only speaking pattern that seems to be related to age group.
Pattern 6: For ten children in the sample, Swedish is the language used towards all but one single interlocutor on the list, i.e. the grandparent(s), the Hungarian parent(s), siblings or ethnic peers. Notably, the main part of these exchanges is also conducted in Swedish, and Hungarian is only used by the child in a few CS turns, for example, for expressing gratitude for the served meal, saying good night to each other or featuring culture-specific words for referential purposes. The interlocutor towards whom Hungarian sequences can occur is usually one or both parents, but in a few cases it is a young sibling (<3 years) or an ethnic peer, who the child meets regularly (at least once a month). In most cases, the children in these families are very young (ranging from 7 to 13 years, M=8.62 years; Md=8 years), which indicates that this pattern might be a forestage of pattern 7, i.e. monolingual Swedish language usage. One of the cases (G5) included in this pattern nevertheless indicates the results of a single parent’s revitalisation efforts, following a split up from the parent who initially was against the use of Hungarian.

Pattern 7: Eleven children in the sample reported completely monolingual Swedish language use towards all interlocutors. This category also includes a few cases in which occasional CS to English was reported towards friends. There seems to be no correlation to either age or gender in this pattern, the children’s age ranges from 8 to 17 years in this group.

Notably, all patterns have been reported by children who live in three generational units as well as in nuclear families. Thus, we may conclude that the pure presence of a Hungarian-speaking grandparent does not necessarily make any difference for the children’s language use towards other interlocutors. Speaking Hungarian with one’s beloved grandfather or grandmother does, of course, enhance the child’s development in terms of vocabulary growth and grammar development in the minority language but does not necessarily trigger his or her possibilities and/or will to apply that competence in other domains and towards other interlocutors, which would be needed to further develop his or her communicative competence in that language (cf. Hymes, 1972b and 1987; Bachman and Palmer, 1996; David & Li, 2008).

Furthermore, it may be noted that several children who lack contact to ethnic peers have a Swedish-dominant speaking pattern (5, 6 and 7), whereas all children with pattern 1, 2, 3 and 4 reported having regular contact (once a month or more often) to other children of Hungarian origin. Thus, we may conclude that the ethnicity of, and even more importantly, the language use towards age mates appears to be very important cues of children’s language use patterns; consequently, this factor might be an even more useful indicator of language maintenance or shift over generations than it has been recognised as earlier (see, however, Winter & Pauwells’ study from 2006 as one of few exceptions in the literature, see also David & Li, 2008).
A Pearson chi-square test revealed significant differences across the focus groups \(n_1=24, n_2=16, n_3=16, n_{\text{total}}=56\) with regard to the distribution of children’s seven speaking patterns \(\chi^2=30.119, n=56, \text{df}=12, p=0.003\). In order to visualise the differences between the focus groups, I have also this time collapsed the seven patterns to four more easily comprehensible profiles according to the relative amount of minority vs. majority language usage they imply: Patterns 1-2 are regarded as Hungarian dominant speaking profiles, patterns 3-4 as bilingual profiles, 5-6 as Swedish-dominant speaking profiles and pattern 7 as the only Swedish monolingual speaking profile. Figure 8.16 shows the distribution of children’s four general speaking profiles in the sample.

First of all, it should be noted that very few children seem to have a Hungarian-dominant speaking pattern \(n=7\), although several children have bilingual patterns \(n=22\), but the majority use Swedish, exclusively or mainly \(n=21+11=32\), towards the significant people in their environment. These numbers indicate that there is a tendency to language shift already in the second generation. Note, however, that that there are differences in children’s speaking profiles over the three focus groups; thus, a general tendency to language shift cannot be said to apply for the whole population of Swedish Hungarians. Taking the group’s poor demographic conditions and the low status of the Hungarian language in Sweden into account (see 3.3., 3.4.1 and 3.4.6), even the few cases representing active Hungarian usage among the children should be regarded as indicators of active language maintenance efforts within the group.

Secondly, if we compare the distribution of children’s speaking patterns across the three focus groups \(n=56\), it becomes clear that children in group 3 (H min
multi families, \(n_{gr3}=16\) stand out from the other two groups in that they make up the majority of those reporting Hungarian-dominant (\(n=4\) out of \(7\)) and bilingual speaking patterns (\(n=11\) out of \(21\)). Children in group 1 (H maj-mono families \(n_{gr1}=24\)) are instead equally distributed among the categories bilingual (\(n=9\)), Swedish-dominant (\(n=7\)) and Swedish monolingual speaking patterns (\(n=7\)) with only one child reporting Hungarian dominant language use (G22). Among group 2 children (H maj-bil families, \(n_{gr2}=16\)), most children have a Swedish-dominant speaking pattern (\(n=10\)), while there is only one child with a bilingual speaking pattern, 2 with a Hungarian-dominant pattern, but also 3 with Swedish monolingual usage. It seems thus, that Hungarian maintenance might be secured through children of groups 3 and 1, whereas growing up as a child in group 2 families seems to result in rapid language shift.

It is, nevertheless, important to keep in mind that these differences between individual children mainly apply to their time outside school, which is about half of an average schoolchild’s waking time during an ordinary school week. At the same time it might represent their whole time language use during school holidays.

Subsequent chi-square tests were conducted on the whole sample (\(n=61\)) to explore the impact of children’s gender, age group, as well as the linguistic composition of their neighborhood on children’s speaking patterns, but no significant differences were found related to these factors. The initial linguistic composition of their families, i.e. the biological parents’ mother tongue, was the only factor found to have some overall\(^{166}\) significance \([\chi^2=20.348, \text{df}=9, p=0.016]\) for children’s oral language use. A closer analysis of the distribution of the four speaking profiles revealed that

- most children of endogamic couples had bilingual (45,7% or 16 out of 35 HH families) or Swedish-dominant speaking profiles (28,6% or 10 out of 35 HH families);
- the majority of children with one Hungarian and one Sweden-born Hungarian parent (4 out of 5 HHs families) as well as children of minority parents with differing mother tongues (4 out of 6 OH families) had Swedish-dominant profiles;
- nearly half of the children from Hungarian-Swedish marriages had a monolingual Swedish pattern (46,7% or 7 out of 15 SH families), while the rest represented all other profiles.

The results of this analysis are also displayed in table 8.16.

Thus, we may conclude that the family’s linguistic composition seems to be more important indicator for children’s speaking profiles in exogamic marriages

\(^{166}\) Age has been shown to be significant only in case of speaking pattern 5, whereas no significant age-related difference could be traced between the children with respect to the overall distribution of speaking patterns.
(SH and OH families), while it is of less predictive value for children’s oral language use in endogamic marriages (HH families). Because of the low sample size in two of the four groups (HH, HHs, SH and OH), it was only possible to compute a subsequent chi-square test between families consisting of endogamic couples (N_{HH}=35) as compared to Swedish-Hungarian couples (N_{SH}=15). The test revealed expected significant differences between these two types of families [$\chi^2=9.691$, n=50, df=3, p=0.021].

8.4.3 Children’s language use pattern in connection to leisure time activities

This section summarises two aspects of children’s language use connected to their leisure time activities:

1. children’s use of different languages (mainly Swedish, Hungarian and English) in connection to leisure time activities as compared to each other, and

2. the number/amount of leisure time activities connected to regular Hungarian usage, comparable in frequency of using other languages in connection to the same activities.

As a first step of analysis, I reviewed the children’s reports on their language use in connection to different type of leisure time activities (seven subsequent questions, see section 8.3) on an individual level, making notations on the (type and number of) languages used on a regular\textsuperscript{167} basis in connection to the activities found on the list. In the next step, by comparing these individual results to each other, the following four language use patterns could be identified among the children in the sample:

- **Trilingual pattern** = Similar frequency of regular Hungarian, Swedish and English usage with each of the languages mentioned in connection to at least three different types of leisure time activities;

\textsuperscript{167} Regular means “once a month” or more often.
**HS bilingual pattern** = Similar frequency of regular Hungarian and Swedish usage with each of the languages mentioned in connection to at least three different types of leisure time activities;

**SE bilingual pattern** = Similar frequency of regular Swedish and English usage with each of the languages mentioned in connection to at least three different types of leisure time activities;

**S dominant language use pattern** = Mainly Swedish usage in connection to all seven types of leisure time activities.

Figure 8.17 shows children’s language use patterns connected to several leisure time activities and the distribution of these patterns over the focus groups. Even here we can conclude that (similar to children’s general speaking patterns) most children have either a Swedish-dominant (n=27) or a bilingual Swedish and English language use pattern (n=17), further strengthening the picture of a language-shifting community. Notably, although there were seven children who reported Hungarian-dominant speaking patterns in the sample (see section 8.4.2), none of them reported Hungarian-dominant language use in connection to leisure time activities. Two of the categories (the Hungarian-Swedish bilingual pattern with n=8, and the Trilingual pattern with n=9) indicate, nevertheless, a regular usage of Hungarian, similar in frequency to the use of other languages.

The chi-square test that was conducted to examine the impact of focus group on type of language use pattern connected to leisure time activities did not show any significant difference between the groups, only a tendency for groups 1 and 2 for SE bilingual and S dominant patterns \[\chi^2=12.109, n=56, \text{df}=6, p=0.06\].

In order to highlight Hungarian usage towards the usage of other languages (in most cases Swedish and English) in connection to the children’s individual interests, a further computation was made for children’s language use in connection to leisure time activities. This computation resulted in a new variable (see figure 8.18), revealing the total number of activities (out of seven possible) in which Hungarian usage has been reported to be regular (i.e. once a month or more often) and comparable in frequency to the use of other languages for that certain activity.\(^{168}\)

The chi-square test conducted on this latter variable revealed significant differences between the focus groups \[\chi^2=13.321, n=56, \text{df}=4, p=0.01\]. Based on the informed reports of children, figure 8.18 shows the differences between the focus groups with regard to the amount of leisure time activities for which Hungarian

\(^{168}\) What I was mainly interested in here was to count the number of activities in which the child had a balanced language use, including similar and regular frequency of Hungarian usage as compared to Swedish and/or English usage. Thus, if a child mentioned, for example, reading some printed material in Hungarian once a month but reported to read the daily newspapers in Swedish every day, Hungarian usage in connection to reading was not taken into account for this variable.
usage was found to be regular and comparable to the use of other languages. Most obviously, group 3 appears to be distinctive from the other two groups, in that the majority of children have been found to have balanced language use for three or more aspects of leisure time activities, whereas groups 1 and 2 show similar (Swedish-dominant) patterns.

Further chi-square tests were conducted on the whole sample (n=61) to explore the possible impact of children’s gender, age group, their parents’ mother tongue, education and the linguistic composition of their neighborhood on children’s speaking patterns. Essentially, none of these factors showed any significance for children’s language use in connection to leisure time activities, not even parents’ mother tongue \( \chi^2=2.668, \text{ df}=6, p=0.85 \). When tested for the first variable, i.e. language use patterns connected to leisure time activities, the statistical analysis revealed children’s gender to be of high significance \( \chi^2=20.120, \text{ df}=3, p<0.001 \), with significantly more boys reporting trilingual (seven boys out of nine children in total) and Swedish-English bilingual patterns (15 boys out of 17 children) as compared to girls, who tended to report Hungarian Swedish (seven girls out of eight children) and S dominant patterns (18 out of 27 children in total). However, keeping in mind that the results are based on reported data, this difference might
be due to more boys tending to emphasise their use of English than girls apparently did. Accordingly, when compared with regard to the second variable, i.e. the amount of activities connected to regular Hungarian usage as compared to the use of other language(s) for the same activities, no significant differences could be found between boys and girls in the sample [$\chi^2=6.553$, df=4, p=0.16].

### 8.4.4. Correlations between different patterns of language use

In this section, children’s speaking patterns are compared with the parental strategies, the type of language resources found in the home, and also to children’s language use patterns connected to leisure time activities. The relation between these variables was investigated by a series of Spearman’s rank order correlation tests and, in case the data level didn’t admit correlation tests, Pearson chi-square tests were performed. The results of these tests can be seen in table 8.17.

Firstly, there was a strong positive correlation with a high significance between children’s speaking patterns (ranging from 1=strictly interlocutor based language choice to 7=Swedish monolingual pattern) and the conversational strategies applied by their parents (ranging from 1=strictly interlocutor based strategy to 7=no strategy), r=0.629, n=61, p<0.0005, with more Hungarian-oriented language
use of parents associated with more Hungarian-oriented language use by children and vice versa.

The relation between children’s speaking patterns (ranging from 1=strictly interlocutor based speaking pattern to 7=S monolingual pattern) and their reported language use in connection to leisure time activities (ranging from 1=trilingual pattern to 4=S dominant pattern) has been investigated with a Pearson chi-square test. The results show highly significant differences between children having different speaking patterns \( \chi^2 = 49.759, n=61, df=18, p<0.0001 \], with Swedish-oriented speaking patterns (5-7) being associated with Swedish-dominant or Swedish-English bilingual language usage also in connection to leisure time activities, while Hungarian-dominant and bilingual speaking patterns (1-4) tended to be associated with more frequent Hungarian usage also in connection to leisure time activities. This result has also been confirmed by a Spearman’s rank order correlation test showing a highly significant strong positive correlation between children’s speaking patterns (ranging from 1=‘strictly interlocutor based strategy’ to 7=’no strategy’) and children’s regular Hungarian usage in connection to different type of leisure time activities (1=three or more activities out of seven, 2=one to two activities, 3=no activities) \( r=0.654, n=61, p<0.0001 \], with more Swedish-oriented speaking patterns being associated with less Hungarian usage in connection to leisure time activities, and more Hungarian-oriented speaking patterns associated with more frequent Hungarian usage also in connection to leisure time activities.

Additionally, there was also a highly significant medium strong positive correlation between the conversational strategies applied by the parents (ranging from 1=‘strictly interlocutor based strategy to 7=’no strategy’) and the children’s regular Hungarian usage in connection to different type of leisure time activities (1=three or more activities out of seven, 2=one to two activities, 3=no activities)

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
1. Children’s speaking patterns & - & r=0.629*** & \chi^2=49.76*** & r=0.654*** & \chi^2=38.93* \\
2. Parental conversational strategies & - & \chi^2=29.53* & r=0.487*** & \chi^2=45.32** \\
3. Children’s ling. use / LT activities & - & \chi^2=57.02** & \chi^2=25.51* \\
4. Hungarian use / LT activities & - & \chi^2=18.63* \\
5. Ling. resources in the home & - & \\
\end{array}
\]

*significant at the p<0.05 level
** significant at the p<0.01 level
*** significant at the p<0.001 level
[r=0.487, n=61, p<0.0001]. This result is also in line with the results of the chi-square test performed to explore the relation between parental strategies (ranging from 1=‘strictly interlocutor based strategy to 7=‘no strategy’) and children’s reported language use in connection to leisure time activities (ranging from 1=trilingual pattern to 4=S dominant pattern), $\chi^2=29.53$, n=61, df=18, p=0.042. Although there is a rather indirect relation between the above mentioned patterns, the results of the two tests confirm that children with parents using more Hungarian-oriented conversational strategies tend to use more Hungarian among themselves as well and also for other purposes than speaking to family members and friends.

The chi-square test that was conducted to explore the relation between children’s speaking patterns and the language resources found in the home showed high significance [$\chi^2=38.928$, n=61, df=24, p=0.028], but the significance of the relation between parental conversational strategy and language resources found in the home was far more higher [$\chi^2=45.321$, n=61, df=24, p=0.005]. These results indicate that despite the dialogic nature of socialisation, parents may still be more in charge over the “linguistic landscape” at home as compared to their children than we might be aware of.

An additional Pearson chi-square test revealed significant differences between children having reported different language use in connection to leisure time activities (ranging from 1=trilingual pattern to 4=S dominant pattern) and with respect to the language resources found in the home (ranging from 1=Hungarian dominant to 5=Swedish dominant), [$\chi^2= 25.505$, n=61, df=12, p=0.013]. The subsequent chi-square test between children’s regular Hungarian usage in connection to leisure time activities and the language resources found in the home showed similar significance [$\chi^2= 18.626$, n=61, df=8, p=0.017]. These latter two results reveal that even though parents may feel in charge at home, children might choose as they like from the language resources provided at home and will also use their own networks to widen their horizons (in this sample, mostly through activities connected to Swedish and English use).

8.5. Summary

The results of the quantitative as well as the qualitative analysis indicate that there is only one common point in the language use norms of the sample families, namely the rule that non-Hungarian speakers’ presence triggers an accommodation towards perceived majority norms. This common point is reflected in a significantly higher amount of Swedish language usage between family members and friends in settings where non-Hungarian speakers’ are present as compared to language use in private. However, while some parents prefer to avoid CS, and

169 The relation between the two variables is indirect because parents’ minority-oriented conversational strategies are a necessary but far from sufficient condition for children’s minority language usage during leisure time.
require the same from their children, others put more emphasis on the communicative functions of language use, and use the two languages interchangeably, adapting the extent of Hungarian vs. Swedish language usage to a number of different factors.

The quantitative measures concerning language use between family members have revealed that although the proportion of Swedish is often higher in children’s output than the input provided by family members, it is only in families providing Hungarian-dominant or a relatively balanced bilingual input that we find children actively using Hungarian. Further analyses of language use patterns have shown that this is often true not only within the family domain but also towards other bilinguals, adults as well as ethnic peers.

Another major factor for children’s linguistic behaviour seems to be the frequency and intensity of contact to Hungarian-speaking age mates. Children who had ethnic peers among their best friends (in Sweden or elsewhere in the world) were found among all speaking patterns. In contrast, all of those who lacked regular contact to ethnic peers had Swedish-dominant or Swedish monolingual speaking patterns.

In connection to children’s speaking patterns, it has also been noted that despite their parents’ explicit wishes for minority language transmission, more than half of the children in the sample (32 out of 61) had Swedish-dominant or monolingual Swedish speaking patterns. Furthermore, it turned out that an even larger proportion of children (44 out of 61) had either a Swedish-dominant or a Swedish-English bilingual language usage also in connection to leisure time activities. These results indicate that a language shift is going on in the second generation of Swedish Hungarians. However, this tendency does not apply to the whole sample and cannot be said to be a characteristic of the whole population, but rather of a special segment of it.

Notably, several differences between the focus groups were found in all examined areas of language use. Two of the focus groups (groups 1 and 2, originating from different majority settings in Hungary) make up 66% of the sample, and were found to be heavily represented in the Swedish-dominant figures above. Group 3 (originating from multilingual areas in former Romania, i.e. with a multilingual minority background), on the other hand, comprises only 26% of the sample. This distribution might explain some of the Swedish-dominant figures presented above.

Both quantitative and qualitative analysis point to the fact that group 3 stands out from the rest of the sample in that both parents and children are significantly more Hungarian-oriented in their language usage as compared to the other two groups, where the variation is considerably higher, especially in private settings. Also, it seems that parents belonging to group 3 have a greater control/insight on their children’s language behaviour and/or greater confidence in their children’s language choice (as indicated by correlations between parents’ and children’s reports on similar questions). Despite sometimes having similar results, groups 3 and 2 often differed in the proportion of Hungarian they used in private, whereas
group 1 often showed the greatest variance of all. These initial findings have been further strengthened by the results of qualitative analysis of the interview data and the field notes.

Interestingly, whereas parents in group 1 are equally represented in all types of parental strategies (ranging from Hungarian-dominant to Swedish monolingual models), the great majority of group 2 parents apply some kind of bilingual strategy, and most parents belonging to group 3 apply Hungarian dominant strategies (see figure 8.14). The distribution of language use patterns over the focus groups was even more striking among the children in the sample. More than half of the children in group 1 and the majority of children in group 2 turned out to have Swedish-dominant or Swedish monolingual speaking patterns (see figure 8.15). Moreover, an even larger proportion of these children (groups 1 and 2, i.e. children with parents sharing a majority background) turned out to have Swedish-dominant language usage also in connection to their leisure time activities. In contrast, most children in group 3 had bilingual or Hungarian-dominant speaking patterns, and many of them had also bilingual or trilingual language usage in connection to leisure time activities (see figure 8.17).

Altogether, this suggests that Hungarian language maintenance may be attributed to mainly two groups of children among the examined Swedish-Hungarian families: most of the children of former minority members with a bilingual or multilingual background (=group 3), and, to a lesser extent, to some children of former majority members with a monolingual background (= 30-40% of group 1). Furthermore, it is also clear that, due to the poor demographic predispositions of the Hungarian group and the low status of the language in Sweden (see 3.4), Hungarian might be preserved only in private settings (without the interference of majority members). At the same time, it is important to note that for those involved in wider minority networks (parents as well as children), this must not imply a limitation to private domains (see section 3.4.4 on the large variety of Hungarian media and cultural events on a local, national and international level accessible from Sweden). As we have seen, this group comprises parents as well as children in the sample, the latter especially from focus groups 3 and 1.
Chapter Eight addressed parents’ and children’s bilingualism in the sample based on a functional view of the matter. This chapter presents some additional data on children’s bilingualism, addressing further criteria mentioned in the literature, such as competence, attitude and chronological order. Additionally, I have also saved a concrete example of children’s language choice until this section, namely their language choice during the interview, to represent the functional perspective. The main aim of assembling these different kinds of data in a separate chapter is to investigate possible connections between the four – often separately treated – aspects of bilingualism.

The chapter starts with two competency-related issues, children’s self-rated proficiency in Hungarian vs. Swedish (9.1), followed by a section on children’s language dominance (9.2).

Section 9.3 presents an overview of children’s language preference, an issue that touches upon the attitudinal criterion of bilingualism.

Section 9.4 presents children’s language choice during the interview, including a discussion of possible reasons for it.

Section 9.5 discusses the question of acquisition order, presenting an overview of children’s (retrospectively) reported first language(s). Besides the linguistic composition of the family accounting for differences between consecutive and simultaneous bilinguals in the sample, focus group will be investigated as a possible complement to this factor.

Tightly related to the functional criterion but also to attitudinal aspects are children’s frames of reference. This latter issue will be investigated in section 9.6, by means of citations from the interviews conducted with the children concerning two issues, namely their motives for improving their Hungarian vs. Swedish skills, and children’s reactions to parents talking to them in Hungarian in public.

Section 9.7 presents correlations between the above mentioned aspects, and 9.8 sums up the results of the chapter.

For more details concerning different criteria applied in the literature on bilingual acquisition, see section 2.2.1.
9.1 Children’s self-reported language proficiency

During the interview, I asked the children to give an estimation of their language proficiency in Hungarian and Swedish. However, what I mainly intended to capture was not children’s proficiency per se but their own *perception* of their proficiency.\(^{171}\)

In connection to these questions, I also took the opportunity to go further and asked the children whether they were pleased with their level of proficiency or not, and why. This was to initiate a discussion about what it means for them to be proficient in Hungarian vs. Swedish and to get closer to their frames of reference. We will return to these rather complicated questions further on in this chapter (see section 9.4 and 9.6). For now I will restrict myself to a quantitative presentation of children’s answers to the four subsequent questions of language proficiency.

The proficiency questions covered four language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Children who had started school the same year as the interview was conducted (all 7-year-old children and some of the 8-year-olds) were only asked questions concerning their oral skills; this decision led to six missing answers on two of the four questions in both languages (two children in group 1, one in group 2 and three in group 3). The ordinal scale applied to measure children’s answers to the subsequent questions consisted of the following five steps:

0 = no skills
1 = very limited
2 = rather bad
3 = good
4 = very good (age appropriate)

Usually, when people learn a language, they listen first, then they start to comprehend what others say and try to produce new language by speaking; reading and writing come later, with children usually starting to develop these skills at school age. In a native environment, these language skills are developed naturally in collaboration (see Hymes, 1972b and 1987). However, in a minority context, especially when the opportunities for formal education in the minority language are restricted and the majority language is the sole medium of instruction and the main tool of informal communication between children at school, children’s paths to language development might be quite different, and variation between individual children is to be expected.

As figures 9.1a and 9.1b show, my expectations seem to have been confirmed on most points. Generally there were only slight differences in children’s Swedish language proficiency in the sample; at the same time, there was a relatively large

---

\(^{171}\) Self-assessments of language proficiency are seldom accurate, especially by children (cf. Hyltenstam & Svonni, 1990).
variation in their Hungarian language skills. This difference between the two languages was further strengthened by the fact that children who reported less than age adequate proficiency in Swedish were often very young (≤8 years) consecutive bilinguals (see section 9.6), while age and their parents’ mother tongue did not seem to be of the same importance for children’s self-reported Hungarian proficiency.

When it comes to Hungarian, children in group 3 clearly stand out from the sample, as they reported relatively high proficiency on all four skills in Hungarian; additionally, there is also the least variation within this group. From the competency criterion perspective, these children can be regarded as what is referred to in the literature as nearly balanced bilinguals. This applies only to a minority of children in the two other focus groups; at the same time, most of them are active bilinguals. The most apparent difference between the children lies not in the

Figure 9.1a. Boxplots of children’s oralcy skills in Hungarian and Swedish based on children’s self-reports. Note: only children from the three focus groups are included in this chart.
distinction between active or passive bilinguals but rather between bilingual speakers with and without reading and writing skills in Hungarian.

The separate Kruskal-Wallis tests conducted on the data revealed, however, only one statistically significant difference across the focus groups (see table 9.1.), namely on Hungarian speaking skills \( \chi^2 = 13.109, \text{ df}=2, \text{ n}=55, \text{ p}=0.001 \). A consecutive median test confirmed the earlier results, showing higher median scores in Hungarian speaking skills for group 3 (md=4) than for groups 1 and 2 (md=3).

The fact that no other skills showed to be significantly different between the focus groups might seem surprising at first but in the end is explainable by children’s greater experience with oral language use than with written genres. For the same reason, I generally consider children’s self-assessment being more accurate on oral skills than on written skills (see also the discussions conducted in sections 9.5 and 9.6).
Children’s Bilingualism

9.2 Language dominance

This section addresses children’s language dominance, which gives a more general picture of their bilingual competency. During the interview, I asked the children to compare their proficiency in the two languages and to give an estimation of which of them they felt they were best at during the last couple of weeks. Children’s reports on their language dominance is here analysed in relation to

- focus group,
- the linguistic composition of the family,
- city of residence,
- children’s gender and age-group, and
- parents’ reported language dominance.

9.2.1 Focus group vs. linguistic composition of the family

As indicated in table 9.2, the majority of children in the sample (44 out of 58 valid answers) reported Swedish as their dominant language. There were, nevertheless, significant differences between the focus groups in this respect. The difference was most apparent between groups 1 and 3.

Several children in group 3 claimed that Hungarian was their dominant language (4 out of 14 valid answers) or that they had similar proficiency in both languages (further 4 children), as opposed to group 1, where the majority of children (22 out of 24) reported Swedish dominance. The Kruskal-Wallis test conducted to explore the impact of focus group on children’s language dominance indicated accordingly highly significant differences across the groups $[\chi^2=15.060, n=54, df=2, p=0.001]$. In a subsequent median test, group 3 recorded a lower median score ($md_{gr3}=2$) than both groups 1 and 2, which both recorded median values of 4; this in turn confirms earlier results, namely that most children in groups 1 and 2 are Swedish dominant, whereas children belonging to group 3 are more balanced in their bilingualism. Similarities and differences between the groups are also displayed in figure 9.2.

Table 9.1. Statistics of Kruskal-Wallis tests showing the effect of focus group on children’s self-reported Hungarian language skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language skill</th>
<th>Group 1 Mean ranks</th>
<th>Group 2 Mean ranks</th>
<th>Group 3 Mean ranks</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral comprehension (listening)</td>
<td>23.98</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>35.33</td>
<td>5.811</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>23.48</td>
<td>23.53</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>13.109*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>31.46</td>
<td>3.466</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>32.69</td>
<td>4.876</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant differences between the groups at the p=0.001 level.
Notably, there were no differences in language dominance between the children in the sample depending on the language composition of the family (p=0.72 as of \( n_{HH}=33, n_{HH}=5, n_{SH}=14, \) and \( n_{OH}=6 \) families). The differences were far from noticeable even after collapsing the families into two groups comprising exogamic vs. endogamic families (p=0.51).

### 9.2.2. Differences related to city of residence

The Pearson chi-square test conducted on the data did not reveal any significant differences between the language dominance of children living in Göteborg and Stockholm (p=0.27).

### 9.2.3 Gender and age-related differences

The Pearson chi-square test conducted on the data did not reveal any gender differences in self-reported language dominance among the children (p=0.81).

As seen in table 9.3, most children were dominant in Swedish irrespective of age group; at the same time, there were several children among the youngest (age group 7-11 years) who stated that they were dominant in Hungarian (3 out of 21) or equally good in both languages (5 out of 21), while the tendency for Swedish dominance seems to be stronger among the older children. According to the Spearman’s rang order correlation test performed on the data, there was a signifi-
significant but small\textsuperscript{172} positive correlation between age group and children’s language dominance [$r=0.263$, $n=58$, $p=0.046$].

9.2.4 Correlation with parents’ language dominance

In contrast to children’s strong tendency for Swedish dominance, about half of the parents stated that they were Hungarian dominant (34 out of 61). Sixteen others claimed that their dominance differed depending on the topic of the conversation and/or the setting in which the conversation took place. Notably, 4 parents in group 1 stated that they were Swedish dominant irrespective of context, while no parents in the other groups did so. Although there were some differences between the three focus groups in the rate of parents’ answers on this question, the differences between the focus groups were not significant ($p=0.15$).

The Spearman’s correlation test conducted on the data revealed accordingly small and non-significant positive correlations between parents’ and children’s language dominance [$r=0.240$, $n=57$, $p=0.072$]. These results remind us of the fact that although parents are important interaction partners at the start, later on, as the children grow older, parents alone are not able to provide all the input that is needed for children’s age-appropriate language development in the minority language.

\textsuperscript{172}Cohen (1988: 79-81) suggests the following guidelines for the interpretation of Spearman’s rho: $r=0.10$ to 0.29 small, $r=0.30$ to 0.49 medium, and $r=0.50$ to 1.0 large correlation (also referred to by Pallant, 2007: 139).
9.3 Children’s language preference

Similarly to language dominance, children’s language preference will also be compared to different factors that could have affected differences in the sample.

9.3.1 Focus group vs. linguistic composition of the family as indicators for children’s language preference

As seen in table 9.4, almost half of the children in the sample (25 out of 60 valid answers) reported preferring using Swedish with bilingual interlocutors. Twelve children stated they had no preferences but that they adapt to the interlocutor’s needs during the interaction. Seven children gave more detailed answers and explained that their choice would differ depending on the topic, the location of the conversation or on their intimacy with the interlocutor. Most surprisingly, there were also 16 children who claimed that they prefer Hungarian irrespective of other factors.

The Kruskal-Wallis test conducted to explore the impact of focus group on children’s language preference nevertheless indicated highly significant differences across the groups \[\chi^2=12.516, n=55, df=2, p=0.002\]. In a subsequent median test group 3 recorded lower median score \(\text{md}_{\text{gr}3}=1\) than both group 1 and group 2, which recorded median values of \(\text{md}_{\text{gr}1}=3\), and \(\text{md}_{\text{gr}2}=4\), respectively. These results confirm that most children in groups 1 and 2 have opted for Swedish language use, whereas children belonging to group 3 are Hungarian-oriented in conversations towards bilinguals (i.e. given a language-choice option). Similarities and differences between the groups are also displayed in figure 9.3.

In contrast to focus group, the linguistic composition of the family (HH/HHs/SH/OH) was not significant for children’s language preference \(p=0.34\) and was even less so after collapsing the families into two groups (exogamic vs. endogamic families, \(p=0.51\)).

9.3.2 Differences related to city of residence

City of residence turned out to be highly significant for children’s language preference \[\chi^2=12.120, n=60, df=3, p=0.007\]. This result was quite surprising, and there

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Focus group & H & No & It depends & S & Total \\
\hline
1. H maj-mono families & 5 & 6 & 2 & 11 & 24 \\
2. H maj-bil families & 2 & 1 & 3 & 10 & 16 \\
3. H min-multi families & 8 & 4 & 2 & 1 & 15 \\
Non-focus families & 1 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 5 \\
Total & 16 & 12 & 7 & 25 & 60 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Children’s answers to the question “Which language do you prefer when talking to a Swedish-Hungarian bilingual speaker?”}
\end{table}
is no apparent reason why this should be the case. A possible explanation could be a more relaxed attitude among Swedish speakers’ in Göteborg compared to Stockholm with respect to divergent language use. To my knowledge, however, no sociolinguistic comparative study in the two cities has been conducted to date, and thus, one cannot be sure if this is indeed the case.

9.3.3 Gender and age-related differences

The Pearson chi-square test conducted on the data did not reveal any gender differences in self-reported language preference among the children (p=0.94).

Furthermore, the Spearman’s rang order correlation test performed on the data, in contrast to language dominance, did not show any significant correlation between age group and children’s language preference [r=0.047, n=60, p=0.723].

9.3.4 Correlation with parents’ reported language preference

With regard to language preference, in contrast to children’s reports there were only slight differences between parents belonging to different focus groups (p=0.67) with half of them reporting Hungarian preference (25 out of 61) and nearly as many (19 out of 61) reporting that it was dependent on the topic, the location of the conversation or the level of intimacy with the interlocutor.

A subsequent Spearman’s rang order correlation test showed a positive but small and non-significant correlation between parents’ and children’s language preference.

Figure 9.3. Children’s self-reported language preference in the three focus groups towards a fictive bilingual interlocutor.
preference \([r=0.249, \ n=60, \ p=0.06]\), once again reminding us of the limits of parental impact.

### 9.4 Children’s language choice during the interview

Although I had pointed out to all informants several weeks before interviewing them that I was interested in getting as deep an understanding of their family’s language use as possible by interviewing, and that I was more interested in the content of the conversation rather than the language use during the interview, most parents preferred using Hungarian as the means of communication (47 out of 61 cases). Their children, however, seemed to have their own thoughts about appropriate language use in the actual context.

#### 9.4.1 Focus group vs. linguistic composition of the family as indicators for children’s language choice during the interview

In addition to what I said to their parents, I also assured the children that there were no wrong answers and that it would be okay to start in one language and then switch to the other language if they felt that something was easier to explain that way. Despite all these premises, the children belonging to the three focus groups apparently reacted quite differently, as if they had projected their expectations of an unknown Hungarian adult on me as an interviewer.

The results of the statistical analysis are displayed in table 9.5. Given the opportunity to choose the language of the interaction during the interview, 36 out of 61 children, i.e. more than half of the sample, opted for Hungarian and maintained it throughout the entire interview, with the exception of a few tag-switches or marked intrasentential switches. There were also 20 children who chose to speak exclusively in Swedish with me right from the beginning; some of them for obvious reasons, i.e. because they could not speak Hungarian, but for most of them it turned out that there were rather attitudinal reasons for it (see sections 9.3 and 9.6). Those children, who did not mark their intrasentential code-switches (either by pronunciation or verbally, e.g. “Sorry, I don’t know the word for …”), used intersentential switches nearly as frequently and were thus categorised in a middle category in the statistical analysis (H+S).

As seen in table 9.5, all the children but one in group 3 chose to speak Hungarian during the interview, thus manifesting/proving their earlier presented oral skills in Hungarian. This is also reflected in the statistical analysis of the data, showing highly significant differences between group 3 and group 1 \([\chi^2=12.222, \ n=40, \ df=2, \ p=0.002]\), as well as group 2 \([\chi^2=11.657, \ n=32, \ p=0.003]\). So far this result is pointing in the same direction as earlier ones, confirming the positive attitudes of group 3 with respect to Hungarian (see section 9.3) and earlier presented reports concerning children’s active everyday use of Hungarian (see chapter 8).
However, in contrast to earlier figures indicating the similar tendencies of groups 1 and 2, this time I found significant differences between the children in these two groups \( \chi^2=6.667, n=40, df=2, p=0.036 \). As seen in figure 9.4, this difference is due to a more relaxed code-switching behaviour among the children in group 2, which contrasts not only to group 3 but also to group 1, in both of which children chose to stick to either Swedish or Hungarian during the entire interview.

Children who chose Swedish had no problems expressing themselves no matter the topic we were discussing. However, there are several examples of interviews conducted in Hungarian – later on, it turned out that this particularly concerned children in group 1 - when I felt that there were unexpressed thoughts or feelings behind the restricted answers; still, some children, once they had started in Hungarian, refused to switch to Swedish, even though I repeatedly encouraged them to express themselves in whichever language they felt more comfortable doing so. In hindsight, it seems to me that children of former majority members with a monolingual experience (group 1) assumed that if they started the interview in one language, they had to stick to it, otherwise they would be judged as not “good enough.”

In contrast, most children in group 3 had no problem explaining their thoughts in Hungarian, or at least not that was obvious to me as an interviewer. Also, children in groups 2 and 3 who felt insecure answering certain questions in Hungarian used code-switching as a resource in our conversations; sometimes they answered in the same language as the question was raised, other times they answered completely in Swedish, or partly in Hungarian and partly in Swedish. I have not had the time yet to analyse these conversations in detail, but it is obvious that these children did not expect me to judge them negatively because of their code-switching behaviour. As we can see in figure 9.4, most of the code-switching children turned out to have one or two Hungarian parents with bilingual majority experience (group 2). In one of the cases, the bilingual mode was performed by a child with two Hungarian parents with a multilingual minority experience (group 3). Nevertheless, we can clearly see a difference between the two groups in the rates of those who chose Hungarian vs. Swedish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>H + S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-focus families</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All children in group 3 but one chose Hungarian and maintained it during the entire interview. Surprisingly, even the one boy in this group who usually speaks Swedish to his parents started the interview in Hungarian. His switches to Swedish were, however, both shorter and more marked than the code-switching behaviour of children belonging to group 2. At the end of the interview, he declared:

Example 9.1. 13 y old boy in family S30. (R=respondent, I=interviewer)

R: Furcsa volt. Így beszélni, ilyen komoly dolgokról, közbe meg …
I: Hogy érted, hogy “furcsa volt”? Mi volt furcsa?
R: It felt weird. To talk like this, on serious matters, and then …
I: What do you mean by “weird”? What exactly felt weird?
R: Like this: Hungarian once and then Swedish, back and forth. I have never talked like this to an adult.

The thoughts of this boy support my earlier observations during community activities, namely that children belonging to focus group 3 are expected to talk Hungarian to all Hungarian-speaking adults, no matter whether the interlocutor is bilingual or not, whereas this is not that obvious for children in the other two groups.

In contrast to focus group, the linguistic composition of the family (HH/HHs/SH/OH) was not significant for children’s language choice during the interview (p=0.2). However, after collapsing the families into two groups (exogamic vs. endogamic families), the Pearson chi-square test actually revealed a slight significant difference between them [$\chi^2=6.410$, n=61, df=2, p=0.04].
9.4.2 Differences related to city of residence

The Pearson chi square-test conducted on the data did not reveal any significant differences between Göteborg and Stockholm in children’s language choice during the interview (p=0.23).

9.4.3 Gender and age-related differences

The two Pearson chi-square tests conducted on the data revealed neither gender (p=0.83) nor age-related (p=0.71) differences among the children in language choice during the interview.

9.4.4 Correlation with parents’ language choice during the interview

With regard to language choice, in contrast to children’s language choice there were only slight differences between parents belonging to different focus groups (p=0.2), the majority of them (47 out of 61) choosing Hungarian as the language of interaction.

A subsequent Spearman’s rang order correlation test accordingly showed a highly significant medium strong positive correlation between parents’ and children’s language choice [r=0.412, n=61, p=0.001].

9.5 Children’s first language(s)

In much of the bilingual acquisition literature, it has been assumed that children in endogamic families usually start their linguistic development as monolinguals in their parents’ mother tongue and become bilingual at a later age (=consecutive bilingualism); at the same time, children of mixed couples are assumed to start as bilinguals (=simultaneous bilingualism). However, as shown in chapter 8, language use is a rather intricate issue and children’s developmental paths cannot be determined on the basis of this specific factor.

During the interview, I asked all children to recall what language or languages they had started to speak when they were very young. As they must have been around the age of one or two when this happened, I did not actually expect them to give accurate answers to this question. What I was rather interested in was to assess children’s perceptions in this matter, i.e. what importance they ascribed the two languages in question for their personal development at those young ages.

Although most children took their time in answering questions, they nevertheless came up with fairly straightforward statements. Afterwards, it also turned out that only a few of these statements (5 out of 61) were contested by the parents. The analysis is, nevertheless, based on children’s self-reports.

173 Out of these 5 cases, 3 concerned children’s reports indicating a monolingual start in Swedish and 2 further indicated a bilingual start. One of the latter cases was in a group 3 family, the rest in group 1. In all five cases, the parents were keen to explain that the children actually started to speak Hungarian but that Swedish came up very early in their children’s lives.
The Kruskal-Wallis test conducted to explore the impact of focus group on children’s first language indicated significant differences across the groups \(\chi^2=7.928, n=56, df=2, p=0.02\). In a subsequent median test, group 3 recorded a lower median score (md\(_{gr3}=1\)) than both group 1 and group 2, which recorded median values of md\(_{gr1}=4\), and md\(_{gr2}=2.5\), respectively. These results reveal that most parents in groups 1 and 2 have accepted Swedish language use from the start, whereas parents belonging to group 3 were more rigorous in using Hungarian in conversations with their children.

Additionally, the initial linguistic composition of the family (HH/HHs/SH/OH) turned also out to be significant for children’s first language \(\chi^2=34.614, n=61, df=9, p<0.001\), and remained significant also after collapsing the families into two groups comprising exogamic vs. endogamic families \(\chi^2=22.376, n=61, df=3, p<0.001\).

The Pearson chi-square test conducted on the data did not reveal any significant differences between Göteborg and Stockholm in children’s first language (p=0.66).

### 9.6 Children’s frames of reference

As indicated earlier (section 9.1), children’s self-assessment becomes valuable only if we combine them with their frames of reasoning, which is what I attempt to do in this section. However, before turning to some concrete examples, I start the presentation with an overview of children’s opinions concerning their level of proficiency in the two languages investigated.

#### 9.6.1 Children’s satisfaction with their Hungarian vs. Swedish proficiency

Most children in the sample (49 out of 59 valid answers) reported that they were pleased with their level of Swedish proficiency irrespective of their reported language skills (see table 9.7). A subsequent chi-square test showed no significant differences between the focus groups in this respect (p=0.22).

Table 9.8 shows that despite great variation in Hungarian language skills (see figure 9.1), most children (40 out of 59 valid answers) were pleased with their level of Hungarian proficiency as well. There were even fewer differences
between the focus groups in this respect (p=0.66) compared to children’s satisfaction with their Swedish proficiency (see above). This might seem surprising at first but can be explained by children’s more similar frames of reference of Swedish language usage as compared to their differing frames of reference concerning Hungarian (see chapter 8 and the following sections).

### 9.6.2. Adult expectations vis-à-vis children’s age

Children base judgments of their proficiency (see section 9.1) as well as their satisfaction with it (see 9.6.1) on their everyday experiences of what is expected from them, in other words, what they need to use the two languages for. If the domains and/or genres they encounter are largely restricted in one of the languages (in this sample, this applies most often to the minority language), children will base their judgments on that restricted context. As a consequence, they will perceive even a low proficiency as completely satisfying for their needs. As I repeatedly have observed in different settings (and repeatedly noted in my field notes), their satisfaction does not have to coincide with their actual level of proficiency in that language, nor with their own judgment of their proficiency. In contrast, children who have been exposed to both formal and informal contexts in the minority language are more aware of their proficiency in both languages and are also more capable of comparing their competency between them (see example 9.2). Possible future plans may also motivate children to desire higher levels of proficiency (see examples 9.10 and 9.12).
As seen in section 9.2.3, older children in the sample reported to be Swedish dominant irrespective of focus group. Although this led to significant differences between different age groups, this result must also be seen in relation to higher expectations towards children who interact in larger networks and are thus confronted with (and also expected to adapt to) more diverse domains. As one of my respondents pointed out when trying to figure out his dominant language:

**Example 9.2.** 14 y old boy in family S20 (HH family, group 3).

Beszédben kb. ugyanolyan, de mondjuk, hogy beszédet kell tartsak. Jobban találm a szavakat svédül. A magyarok, ... olyan gazdag az emberek szókincse! Persze akkor gondolják, hogy én is olyan jól ki kell tudjam fejezni magam. ... Svédül tuds úgy is tartani egy nagyon jó (beszéde)ü. Anélkül, h olyan nagyon bonyolult szókat használnál.

In a casual conversation, it’s the same, but let’s say I have to give a speech. I find the words more easily in Swedish. Hungarians are … people have such a wide vocabulary! And then of course they think I have to express myself accordingly. … In Swedish, you can give a very good speech also without using any complicated words.

9.6.3 Children’s motives for improving their Hungarian vs. Swedish

Although I asked all children to comment on their answers for both of the languages, those who were pleased with their level of proficiency often did not have more to say on the issue (see example 9.3 as an exception).

**Example 9.3.** 12 y old S-dominant boy in family S29 (SH family, group 2).

Ja, [jag är nöjd] att jag överhuvudtaget kan. Yes, [I am pleased] that I know any at all.

Children who were not pleased with their proficiency (in either language) were, in contrast, more explicit in their explanations. The reasons they mentioned had to do with feelings of inferiority in the past (see examples 9.7, 9.8 and 9.11); others were future-oriented, explaining what specific aspect they would like to improve and why this would benefit them (see examples 9.10, 9.12, 9.13 and 9.14).

After a fine-grained analysis of these statements, I realised that children’s motives could be categorised as either competency-related (see examples 9.3 - 9.6 for Hungarian and examples 9.15 and 9.16 for Swedish) or rather function-oriented (see examples 9.7 - 9.11 for Hungarian and examples 9.13-9.14 for Swedish). An exception to this trend is the more detailed explanation of the young man in example 9.12 combining the two aspects.

**Example 9.4.** 7 y old boy in family G21 (OH, non-focus family).

Nej, jag skulle vilja kunna bättre. För att göra mamma glad. ... Saknar ord. No, I would like to know more. To make mom happy. ... I lack words.
Example 9.5. 7 y old girl in family G17 (HH family, group 3).
Szeretném, hogy több szavat tudjak.  
I would like to know more words.

Example 9.6. 13 y old boy in family G15 (HH family, group 1).
Jobban szeretnék beszélni és írni.  
I would like to be better in speaking and writing.

Example 9.7. 12 y old girl in family G18 (SH family, group 1).
Szeretném megérteni a vicceket.  
I would like to understand the jokes.

Example 9.8. 14 y old boy in family G30 (HH family, group 2).
Skulle kanske vilja tala bättre. [Det är]  
jobbigt med pappa och hans [ungerska]  
kompisar.  
I would like to speak better. [It’s ] tedious with dad and his [Hungarian] friends.

Example 9.9. 16 y old girl in family S6 (SH family, group 1).
Det skulle va`roligt att kunna  
kommunicera mera med släktingar [i  
Ungern].”  
It would be nice to be able to communicate more with relatives [in Hungary].

Example 9.10. 14 y old boy in family G27, (HHs, group 2) – function.
Ha magyarba megyek egyedül, tudjak újságot olvasni.  
So that, when I go to Hungary alone, I can read the newspapers.

Example 9.11. 16 y old girl in family G20 (SH family, group 1).
Magyar fiatalokkal, felnőttekkel hülyének érzem magam.  
In the company of Hungarian youths and adults I feel awkward.

Example 9.12. 18 y old in family S4, (HH, non-focus family).
No, I would like it to be better. Because I am interested in languages, I have great … good opportunities to actually get better. I am especially annoyed with writing, my spelling is not okay. I would like to live in Budapest, I mean in Hungary, I think it will be Budapest. I have serious plans of moving there, to live there for a couple of years. In that case I really want to be better.

A subsequent analysis of children’s motives for improving their Hungarian revealed that competency-based motives were more common among children up to age 12-13 years, while children above that age had more concrete goals on their mind and related their desires to that specific (functional) goal. The analysis
showed furthermore that although there was a tendency for group 1 children to emphasise competency, the differences between the focus groups was less apparent than the age factor.

Interestingly, children’s desire to get better in Hungarian was more usual at the two extreme ends of the proficiency scale, i.e. among those who could barely utter a few words in Hungarian (see examples 9.4, 9.8, and 9.9) and those who were highly competent speakers of Hungarian with surprising adequacy in their expression and often also nativelike pronunciation (see examples 9.2, 9.10, 9.11 and 9.12).

Children’s motives for improving their Swedish skills were much harder to categorise (see examples 9.13-9.16). This is just partly explainable by the low numbers of statements I had access to. From what I could see, there seemed to be no age-related factors for children’s competency vs. functional orientation (as it was the case with Hungarian), nor were there any apparent differences in children’s reasonings according to focus group.

*Example 9.13.* 7 y old girl in family G17 (HH family, group 3).

> Jobban szeretnék tudni, hogy jobban megértsem, amit az emberek mondanak.  
> I would like to be better, so that I can understand what people are saying.

*Example 9.14.* 8 y old girl in family G24 (HH family, group 2).

> Mindent meg szeretnék érteni a könyvekben.  
> I would like to understand everything in the books.

*Example 9.15.* 16 y old girl in family G20 (SH family, group 1).

> Az utóbbi időben inkább magyarul beszélünk itthon. Úgy érzem, kicsit töröm a svédet.  
> We have been talking mainly Hungarian lately. It feels like I am talking Swedish with an accent.

*Example 9.16.* 11 y old boy in family G22 (SH family, group 2).

> Szeretnék mindkét nyelven ugyanolyan jól tudni.  
> I would like to know both languages equally well.

If we want to categorise these statements in terms of motivation (see section 2.2.3.3), only those of the functional type are of use. Noel’s (2001) distinction between intrinsic, extrinsic motivation and amotivation seems more appropriate for this material, while Gardner’s (1985) distinction between instrumental and integrative motivation, even though it largely affects the children, is not made explicit by the children in the sample. Instead, we find examples of intrinsic motivation for improving Hungarian among the above statements (9.7 and 9.10) as well as for improving Swedish (9.14). There are also examples of extrinsic motivation for improving Hungarian (9.4, 9.8, 9.11, 9.12) and Swedish (9.13), as well as explicitly made amotivation (9.2).
9.6.3 Hungarian usage in public (in non-Hungarian presence)

During the parental interview, I asked the parents to describe their children’s reactions on occasions when they have been talking Hungarian to them in public (i.e. on the bus, in a shop, on the street, at school and/or at workplace). Additionally, in a separate interview, I also asked the children directly if they ever felt ashamed by their parents talking Hungarian instead of Swedish in certain situations. The aim of asking these questions was to investigate if the setting (in private vs. in non-Hungarians presence, see chapter 8) was similarly important to both parents and children and if there was a difference in what exactly they perceived to be of importance in a given situation.

A quantitative compilation of parents’ answers is displayed in table 9.9. These answers represent a state of the art at the time of the interview and might have changed for the individual families since then. However, we see that most children (40 out of 48 valid answers) were reported as giving no special response by their parents; this indicates that they perceive Hungarian use in public to be normal (which does not necessarily mean that they would also answer in Hungarian), i.e. nothing worthy of comment. 4 children in the sample were said to have reacted negatively to their parents’ use of Hungarian in public, which indicates feelings of shame and/or internalised negative attitudes against deviant language use in a majority setting. 2 other children were reported to react positively at the time of the interview (e.g. talking louder/more vividly than usual). This compilation reveals that children’s reactions actually do not differ between the focus groups (p=0.84), which, in turn, indicates that children might undergo periods of shame or pride in connection to their families’ otherness irrespective of parents’ previous experiences, current language attitudes and/or linguistic behaviour.

What is important to note in this context, however, is the differing number of valid answers for each of the groups. Excluded from this analysis were namely those families in which the parents stated that they never speak Hungarian in public. This applies to as many as 9 out of 24 families in group 1 and to 4 out of 16 families in group 2, while no families claimed this in group 3 nor the non-focus families. This indicates that – especially with regard to minority usage in different

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Negative response</th>
<th>Positive response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. H maj-mono families</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H maj-bil families</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H min-multi families</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-focus families</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
domains – there is a major difference in parental behaviour; this in turn means that children’s frames of reference differs more than was indicated in chapter 8.

Notably, there was, nevertheless, a significant difference between children’s reactions depending on the linguistic composition of the family [χ²=13.733, df=6, n=48, p=0.033]. The difference was due to 5 parents (out of 30 HH families) reporting negative reactions from behalf of their children, whereas there was only one such case among the exogamic families (in this case it concerned an SH family); furthermore, one child among HHs families and another one among SH families reported positive reactions.

No gender differences in children’s reported reactions on parents’ Hungarian usage in public were found (p=0.38).

Furthermore, there were no significant age-related differences between the children in the reported reactions either [χ²=9.355, df=4, n=48, p=0.05]. However, as seen in table 9.10, the negative responses that were reported concern younger children, i.e. two children in the age span 7-11 years and four in the age span 11-14 years, whereas no negative reactions were noted for children older than 14 years.

Despite these parental reports, there were several children in the older age group who could recall feelings of shame. All of them were, however, children of former majority members, i.e. group 1 or 2. The last example shows how complex this issue can be for a young man who has been socialised according to pattern 3, i.e. social context-based strategy (see section 8.4.1). The question he is responding to is whether he ever felt ashamed of his parents talking Hungarian in the presence of a non-Hungarian. Note that in a separate interview, his mother stated that she seldom uses Hungarian in the presence of non-Hungarian speakers, possibly if she knows them very well. As it becomes clear from the citation, the son has learned his lesson: he is clearly aware of the high status of Swedish in society, and not only of Swedish per se but of native like, accent-free Swedish. This in turn makes language choice even more important for him in public.

Table 9.10. Children’s reaction to their parents’ talking to them in public (parental reports) in different age groups in the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Negative response</th>
<th>Positive response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-10 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 9.17. 17 y old boy in family 25G (HH family, group 1).

Possibly on the bus … There are many jerks living in this area, […] and some of them who I don’t really get along with. I don’t want to attract their attention, I don’t want mom to speak Hungarian. Or I am at the market with mom and she starts speaking Hungarian. … I would like her to stop speaking Hungarian. … Or at a development conference, with the teacher. It’s not nice of her to speak Hungarian, the teacher does not understand. He tells us how things are going for me in different subjects at school, and … absence. Mom’s Swedish is actually quite good, but Hungarians have this special accent, well, mom speaks also with this accent, sometimes she replaces one word with another [mixes them up?]. […] But …how should I put it? … sometimes I don’t want her to speak Swedish at all, because often … how do you say I’m ashamed … yes, I am ashamed, because she speaks badly, dad as well, often really badly. It would be better if they would speak Hungarian … in Swedish company. Or we better don’t speak at all. When I was younger I didn’t care. Now this is the teenager “Oh, no, my mom!”

9.7 Correlations between different aspects of children’s bilingualism

Several subsequent Spearman’s rang order correlation tests were performed on the above presented data to investigate possible connections between them. As shown in table 9.11, the tests revealed highly significant medium strong or strong positive correlations between all of the variables listed. I will comment on these correlations in their order of strength.

The correlation between children’s first language and their language preference at the time of the interview was significant but only slightly \( r=0.269, n=, p<0.0 \). Similarly, children’s first language showed only a small correlation towards their language dominance as well \( r=0.331, n=, p<0.0 \). These results confirm the fact that people can start their linguistic development in one or two languages but might change both their language dominance and their language preference over the years.
In contrast there was a much stronger relation, detected as a medium strong and highly significant correlation, between children’s language dominance and children’s language choice during the interview \(r=0.444, n=58, \ p<0.001\), and also between their language dominance and their language preference \(r=0.452, n=58, \ p<0.001\).

One may of course wonder how it is that not all children who prefer using Hungarian with bilingual speakers actually also have a more balanced bilingualism. A reasonable explanation could be that there is much less opportunity for meeting bilingual speakers in Sweden than there is meeting monolingual Swedish speakers, not to mention encountering other channels of language input (media, books, etc.). In other words, it is the limitation in opportunities for using Hungarian that can explain children’s Swedish dominance. Another possible explanation (or a combination of the two) may be that my own (=the linguist’s) and some of these children’s (=the respondent’s) frames of reference differ in terms of code (see also Auer, 1998: 13 on this issue), i.e. when they say they prefer ‘Hungarian’ some of them mean ‘Hungarian as the base language with frequent code-switching to Swedish’ (see example 9.16 above).

However, the strongest correlation found in the data was that between children’s language choice during the interview and their language preference, which was also highly significant \(r=0.634, n=60, \ p<0.001\). These results confirm that children’s language use is not necessarily determined by their proficiency in the two languages but also by other factors, not least of all, their attitudes towards the languages and the speakers involved.

### 9.8 Summary

Only slight differences between the focus groups could be detected in children’s self-rated proficiency in both languages. However, as subsequent analysis showed, this was mainly because of children’s differing frames of reference.

From a competency perspective, most children in group 3 can be regarded as nearly balanced bilinguals, while only a few in the other two groups can be

---

**Table 9.11. Correlations between different aspects of children’s bilingualism.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language dominance (competence)</th>
<th>Language preference (attitude)</th>
<th>Lg choice during the interview (function)</th>
<th>Children’s first language acquisition order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lg dominance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.452***</td>
<td>0.455***</td>
<td>0.331*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lg preference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.634***</td>
<td>0.269*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lg choice during interview</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.543***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at the level of \(p<0.0577\)
*** significant at the level of \(p<0.001\)
regarded as such. At the same time, it is apparent that the distinction between active and passive bilinguals is not applicable to this sample; the major differences are instead to be found in children’s competency in Hungarian with regard to reading and writing skills, and the variation is especially great in groups 1 and 2.

Group 3 children’s dedication to Hungarian has also been confirmed by subsequent analysis of functional (assessed by children’s language choice during the interview) and attitudinal aspects (assessed by self-reported language preference) of bilingualism, showing significant differences towards both group 1 and group 2. Furthermore, it also turned out that all but one of the children in group 3 had started their linguistic development as Hungarian speakers, while the variation was much greater in the other two groups.

Children in group 2 stand out in the sample due to their more relaxed attitude towards code-switching, which became apparent in their language choice during the interview. This was also the only significant difference between group 1 and group 2 in children’s bilingualism. Children in group 1 tended instead to separate the languages and chose either Swedish or Hungarian right from the beginning. Moreover, although all correlations between the four aspects of children’s bilingualism were significant, the strongest of them turned out to be with respect to children’s language preference and their language choice during the interview. This correlation further strengthens the above mentioned differences between the three groups’ relation to Hungarian.

In contrast to these differences between the groups, there were almost no differences between children’s relation to Swedish, most of them being highly proficient and satisfied with their level of proficiency in the majority language and also aware of its high status in society.

Differences related to the families’ linguistic composition were not found other than for children’s first language. On the other hand, there were also significant differences in this respect between the focus groups, so it seems that the order of acquisition of the two languages is a result of a combination of these two factors.

As expected, there were no gender-related differences in the sample in any of the aspects investigated. City of residence turned out to be of importance in one single respect, namely for children’s language preference. The reasons for that are, however, not easy to speculate on. Significant age-related differences were detected in one respect, namely for children’s language dominance; this result makes sense if set in relation to heightened expectations towards older children in language competency on the part of native speakers. This expectation concerns both languages but is harder to fulfill in Hungarian, which explains older children’s Swedish dominance. The reasons for this imbalance have already been addressed in earlier chapters (3, 6 and 7); some of these factors (restricted access to native speakers, formal education, etc.) are here addressed from the perspective of the children, in the form of citations from the interview sessions.

Correlations towards parents’ language dominance and preference were positive but small and non-significant in all but one aspect, namely their language choice
during the interview. These results reminds us that, although parents are important interaction partners and role models at the start, as children grow older, they are only *one* of several sources of input for children’s linguistic development.
This study started as a sociolinguistic investigation of language maintenance and shift among Swedish Hungarians and evolved to incorporate broader issues of bilingual language acquisition in migrant settings. The aim of the study was defined accordingly as twofold:

- to describe what difference it makes to raise bilingual children in a 21st century urban western society depending on one’s social identity (SI) and linguistic experiences (LE) prior to migration, and
- to investigate what a small group’s heterogeneity and a few of its members conscious efforts mean for the whole group’s language maintenance prospects in the future.

The first aim was specified in two separate research questions, addressing (1) the preconditions for intergenerational language transmission and (2) the actual language behaviour of family members included in the study. The second aim was specified as a research question directly pointing to the heart of the matter, namely group cohesion contra division. (For more details, see section 4.1.)

Building on a double-sided perspective the study combines parents’ and children’s views on the matter. According to the research questions and the hypothesis of the study, the families in the sample were divided into three focus groups on the basis of the Hungarian parents’ SILE background (i.e. their social identity and linguistic environment during childhood, see section 5.3). The results are largely related to these three focus groups, comprising mainly three groups of immigrants:

- Group 1 or H-maj-mono families: 24 families with one or both parents descending from a monolingual majority setting in Hungary
- Group 2 or H maj-bil: 16 families with one (or both) parents descending from a bilingual majority setting in Hungary, and
• Group 3 or H min-multi: 16 families with (one or) both parents with a multilingual background descending from a vital minority setting in Transylvania

The main results of the study are displayed separately for each of the groups in figures 10.1-10.3, modelled after the framework presented in figure 2.4 (at the end of chapter 2). In the following, these figures will serve as a basis for comparisons between the groups as well as for further discussions.

This last chapter of the thesis is a summary of the main results and thoughts conducted throughout the thesis and also a pathfinder pointing forward. A discussion of the methods applied bridges the gap between these two topics. Section 10.1 includes an overview of the main results. Section 10.2 draws some conclusion with regard to children’s bilingualism on an individual and language maintenance on a group level. Section 10.3 examines whether the hypothesis have been confirmed. Section 10.4 suggests some implications for parental advisory books. Section 10.5 evaluates the research methods, and section 10.6 gives some directions for further research.

10.1 Summary of findings

So, what are the results telling us? First, we may conclude that there are many similarities between the investigated subgroups of Hungarian immigrants concerning the preconditions of intergenerational language transmission. By comparing figures 10.1-10.3 to each other, we can see that there are also a few, important differences between the groups; in the figures these differences are highlighted by underlining.

With regard to pre-contact factors, we have seen that (apart from the immigrants’ social identity and linguistic environment during childhood) there are two important differences between the focus groups, namely the immigrants’ marriage patterns and their impact belief. At the same time, they have very similar educational backgrounds, with a slight difference in medium of instruction at the tertiary level.

With regard to initial stages of contact factors and in-contact factors, the investigation revealed a large number of similarities but also several significant differences between the focus groups. However, while the similarities were largely tied to majority-related institutions and settings (Swedish and Hungarian), the differences concerned minority (Hungarian) related issues in Sweden.

The largest differences between the focus groups are, however, found in the actual language behaviour of the Hungarian parents and their children. As we have seen, the differences were to be found not only in the respondents’ language use patterns, but also in children’s first language and their language preference at the time of the interview, which was also demonstrated by their language choice during interview and on community activities.
To highlight this apparent difference between majority- and minority-related contexts, similarities and differences will be presented in two different sub-sections.

10.1.1 Similarities among the focus groups

There were no differences between the focus groups with regard to their ‘highest level of education,’ all of them having finished at least secondary school in their home country. Around half of the parents with a minority background (group 3) turned out to have some experience of being taught in a language other than the mother tongue at school in their homeland. The difference applied, however, mainly to education at the tertiary level, thus only being partly comparable to their children’s experiences of being taught in Swedish right from the start of primary school.

Irrespective of focus group most families in the sample reported that

- the Hungarian immigrants’ highest level of education was secondary or tertiary education from the home country, with Hungarian as the medium of instruction during most of their education
- many parents had undergone complementary education in Sweden (most often on a tertiary level) with Swedish as the medium of instruction,
- two generation families was the most frequent family type, and additional adults in the household (older siblings and grandparents) were relatively infrequent,
- most children started in Swedish medium pre-school institutions around the age of 1.5 year.

Moreover, at the time of the interview, in the majority of families

- all members of the family knew Swedish well,
- they lived in a Swedish-dominant neighbourhood,
- they were active members of several Swedish associations,
- most of the children reported being Swedish dominant,
- all but a few of the youngest children reported age-appropriate levels in all four language skills in Swedish (listening, speaking, reading and writing).
Figure 10.1. Intergenerational language transmission in focus group 1.
Figure 10.2. Intergenerational language transmission in focus group 2.
Figure 10.3. Intergenerational language transmission in focus group 3.
10.1.2 Differences between the focus groups

Focus group turned out to be of significance for the following aspects of family life:

- marriage patterns,
- parents’ impact belief (see below),
- parents’ initial language choice towards their children,
- cultural ties to Swedish Hungarians (assessed by reported activity in Hungarian vs. Swedish associations and membership in the Hungarian Protestant church in Sweden),
- proportion of certain types of language resources (adult fiction literature, children’s and youth literature and music CDs) in Hungarian vs. Swedish in their home,
- parents’ type of relationship and frequency of contact to other Swedish Hungarians, especially their children’s attendance at these gatherings, and
- children’s type and frequency of relation to age mates with Hungarian background in Sweden.
- parents’ Hungarian language usage in public (group 1 parents being most restrictive),
- parents’ and children’s speaking patterns within as well as outside family
- children’s Hungarian language use in connection to leisure time activities
- children’s self-reported Hungarian-speaking skills.

As displayed in figures 10.1-10.3, there were differences in immigrants’ behaviour already at the initial stages of contact, which resulted in different type of marriage patterns in the three focus groups. The following constellations turned out to be the most frequent (50%-58%) in

- group 1: [H-maj-mono & S maj-mono], i.e. mixed marriages to Swedes who shared the Hungarian immigrants’ experience of having grown up as a majority member in a monolingual environment;
- group 2: [H-maj-mono & H maj-bil], i.e. endogamic marriages between former majority members from Hungary, one of them having grown up in a bilingual environment, the other one in a monolingual environment; and
- group 3: [H min-multi & H min-multi], i.e. endogamic marriages in which the spouses share both their mother tongue and their experience of having grown up in a multilingual setting as members of a vital minority in Transylvania.

The results of the investigation furthermore show that the great majority of parents in group 3 (H min-multi families) were confident in their role as Hungarian speakers, and they were also consistent in using Hungarian towards their children right from the beginning. Parents in groups 1 and 2, on the other hand, were consi-
derably more varied in their responses and there were several cases in both group 1 and group 2 in which parents reported a language shift from Hungarian to Swedish already during the first few years of their children’s lives. In all these latter cases, the parents referred to outer circumstances favoring Swedish language use in family relations. We might thus conclude that environmental factors in the host country were of greater importance for former majority parents’ initial decisions than for former minority parents.

As for the in-contact factors, it turned out that in contrast to focus groups 1 and 2, most families in group 3

- were active members of (often several) Hungarian associations,
- were active members of the Hungarian Protestant church in Sweden,
- had similar proportions of certain types of language resources in Hungarian vs. Swedish in their home (adult fiction literature, children’s and youth literature and music) or more Hungarian than Swedish,
- had both close friends and relatives among Swedish Hungarians, whom they met regularly (once a week or almost daily)
- their children most often joined Swedish-Hungarian gatherings irrespective of their age,
- had the lowest drop-out rate from Hungarian HLI, many children had attained HLI since pre-school,
- several children mentioned peers of Hungarian origin among their best friends with whom they most often spoke Hungarian with occasional CS to Swedish (depending on the context).

Additionally, in contrast to group 1 and group 2, there were several children in group 3 who reported Hungarian dominance or equal proficiency in both languages; however, with increasing age the number of these children decreases significantly also in this group. Older children (>14 y) reported that they were dominant in Swedish irrespective of other factors, including focus group.

There were, as seen in chapter 7, no differences between the focus groups with regard to children’s visits to Hungarian-speaking areas, neither were there any differences in children’s peer relations to native speakers in those areas. There was a variation in the sample in this respect, but this was not attributed to differences in focus group. Instead, there were major differences between the focus groups in children’s networks in the frequency as well as the intensity of their contacts to bilingual speakers in Sweden. While most children in group 3 always or nearly always followed their parents to social gatherings with other Swedish Hungarians, only a minority of children in groups 1 and 2 did so. This was a major difference between the groups, especially since parents in group 3 tended to meet other Swedish Hungarians more frequently than parents in the other two groups did. Additionally, children in group 3 were also those who attended Heritage Language
Instruction to the highest degree in the sample; the difference was highly significantly towards groups 1 and 2.

Interestingly, whereas parents in group 1 were equally represented in all types of parental strategies (ranging from Hungarian dominant to Swedish monolingual models), the great majority of group 2 parents applied some kind of bilingual strategy, and most parents belonging to group 3 applied Hungarian-dominant strategies (see figure 8.14). The distribution of language use patterns over the focus groups was even more striking among the children in the sample. More than half of the children in group 1 and the majority of children in group 2 had Swedish dominant or Swedish monolingual speaking patterns and were even more Swedish dominant in their language use in connection to leisure time activities. In contrast, most children in group 3 had bilingual or Hungarian-dominant speaking patterns, and many of them had bilingual or trilingual language usage in connection to leisure time activities (see chapter 8).

Additionally, as shown by narrow, qualitative analysis of the interview records and field notes, there were also apparent differences between the focus groups in parents’ and, to a lesser extent, also in children’s reasoning frames. The difference was most evident between former majority members (groups 1 and 2) as compared to former minority members (group 3).

At the initial stages of childrearing the differences were mostly related to language awareness, especially in

- the strength of parents’ initial commitment for Hungarian (weak vs. strong),
- parents’ confidence in their role as minority language transmitters (low vs. high impact belief),
- the motives that guided the parents in their decision to place their children later than usual in Swedish pre-school institutions (external vs. internal).
- which language(s) the parents expected their children to learn at a native level in the first place and also why they should prioritise one language or the other in family discourse (see chapter 6)

Later on, after several years spent in Sweden when the contact situation had been going on for a while and the immigrants had found their place in the host society, the differences between focus groups 1 and 2 as opposed to group 3 were still apparent in

- parents’ frames of reasoning with regard to the functions of HLI (former majority parents emphasising competency, while former minority parents were focusing on community aspects) (see section 7.9), and
- children’s motives for improving their Hungarian skills (emphasising competency vs. functional motives, see section 9.7)
10.2 Individual bilingualism vs. language maintenance on a group level

Despite a combination of methods and theories from several research traditions, when it comes to issues surrounding intergenerational language transmission, it is important to make a distinction between two sides of the matter: on one hand, children’s opportunities to become bilingual, and on the other, the group’s language maintenance chances. Paradoxically, the two issues do not go hand in hand. In the following discussion, I will therefore try to highlight some substantial differences between them.

As we have seen evidence for in this investigation, individual bilingualism can be attained by frequent and/or long visits to the native environment (where it is the medium of all conversations, formal and informal events and also of the public media); we also know that individual bilingualism can be upheld later on for professional reasons (e.g. employment by a company with Hungarian ties) or because of a marriage to a “fresh” Hungarian immigrant. This type of individual bilingualism does, however, not facilitate group cohesion in Sweden, unless the family at a certain point decides to join community activities (which is quite unlikely from what I have seen). There were several families in group 1 whose children reported good oral language skills in Hungarian at the same time as they reported that they only use these skills in Hungary or towards monolingual visitors to the family.\textsuperscript{174} As a consequence, these people are not visible to others as Hungarian speakers in Sweden and do not in any way contribute to the Swedish-Hungarian group’s cohesion and language maintenance.

10.2.1 Children’s chances for becoming bilingual in the three focus groups

From a competency perspective, most children in group 3 can be regarded as only slightly Swedish dominant bilinguals with high competency in Hungarian; at the same time, this description can only apply to a few children in the other two focus groups.

At the same time, it is apparent that the distinction between active and passive bilinguals is not applicable to this sample; the major differences are instead to be found in children’s competency in Hungarian with regard to literacy skills, and the variation is especially great in groups 1 and 2. At the same time, while there were several children in group 2 who reported relatively good oral skills in Hungarian, because of their frequent use of CS to Swedish, they often have a highly restricted vocabulary in Hungarian.

Apparently, at the age of 13-14 years school and peer relations are affecting children’s linguistic development to a much higher degree than what parents’ minority language use, positive attitudes and explicit efforts can counterbalance. At the same time, most children in the sample irrespective of focus group have to

\textsuperscript{174} Additionally, there were also several children in group 2 who never or only occasionally met other Hungarian families in Sweden.
be regarded as functional bilinguals as they seem satisfied with their competency in the two languages, i.e. it corresponds their needs.

When it comes to comparisons between children’s everyday language usage, their actual competence in Hungarian and their satisfaction with the acquired level of competency, it is hard to distinguish between cause and effect. According to my observations in connection to the interview sessions and community activities, there were children in all three focus groups who had a relatively good mastery of spoken Hungarian. However, there is a major difference in where and under what circumstances these children have acquired this level of Hungarian proficiency, and also, what attitudes they have towards Hungarian as a minority language. If we take a new look at figures 10.1-10.3 and the list of differences presented above, we can see that only children in group 3 are actually exposed to Hungarian on an everyday basis and in a variety of contexts that enables them to develop a high level of bilingualism, i.e. a communicative competence that is suitable for a maintenance of linguistic minority identity in Sweden (cf. György-Ullholm, in print).

All but one of the children in group 3 had a wide repertoire of vocabulary and style register and most of them also a near native pronunciation in Hungarian (as well as Swedish). The same amount and quality of minority (Hungarian) language exposure and communicative competence can only be said to apply to a small minority of children in groups 1 and 2. Children’s Swedish language exposure, on the other hand, is very strong, which also explains why all children, irrespective of focus group tend to become Swedish dominant around the age of 13-14 years.

The quantitative analysis has also shown that as a consequence of their parents’ integration/assimilation-oriented lifestyle, many children in groups 1 and 2 lack bilingual mates or even older role models who match their own linguistic profile. For many of these children, Hungarian usage is restricted to monolingual contexts, mainly connected to relatives coming from or their family going to Hungary on visits; thus, when actually using Hungarian, they are often confronted with unrealistic expectations descending from a puristic language ideology characteristic of today’s Hungarian society (for concrete examples, see György-Ullholm, in print). All these circumstances lead to an unavoidable separation of the children’s two languages: Swedish being the language used in most settings in Sweden, and Hungarian in a much more restricted range of contexts, mostly during visits to Hungary and/or with parents at home. Also, these conversations are mainly restricted to informal (often short) conversations with relatives in Hungary and/or their parents at home. As reported by several parents, these conversations are also characterised by a limited set of topics, such as food/meals, family schedules, and simple instructions.

Group 3 children’s dedication to Hungarian has also been confirmed by subsequent analysis of functional (assessed by children’s self-reports on language use

175 Of course, this is not comparable to children’s even wider exposure to Swedish.
within and outside family and by their actual language choice during the interview) and attitudinal aspects (assessed by self-reported language preference) of bilingualism, showing significant differences towards both group 1 and group 2. Furthermore, it also turned out that all but one of the children in group 3 started their linguistic development as Hungarian speakers, while the variation was much greater in the other two groups.

Children in group 2 stand out in the sample by their more relaxed attitude towards code-switching, which became apparent in their language choice during the interview. This was also the only significant difference between group 1 and group 2 in children’s bilingualism. Children in group 1 tended instead to separate the languages and chose either Swedish or Hungarian right from the beginning of the interview session. Moreover, although all correlations between the four aspects of children’s bilingualism were significant, the strongest of them all turned out to be that between children’s language preference and their language choice during the interview. This correlation further strengthens the above-mentioned differences between the three groups in attitudes towards and the associated functions of the minority language.

In contrast to these differences between the groups, there were almost no differences between children’s relation to Swedish, most of them being highly proficient and satisfied with their level of proficiency in the majority language and also aware of its high status in society. This result confirms earlier research in that it shows that there is not an either-or relation between the languages but, given positive circumstances, e.g. encouragement from family and friends, and opportunities to use the minority language on an everyday basis, there is a real chance for additive bilingualism for the children.

The quantitative measures concerning language use between family members revealed that although the proportion of Swedish is often higher in children’s output than the input provided by family members, it is only in families providing Hungarian dominant or a relatively balanced bilingual input that we find children actively using Hungarian. Further analyses of language use patterns have shown that this is often true not only within the family domain but also towards other bilinguals, adults as well as ethnic peers.

Another major factor affecting children’s linguistic behaviour seems to be the frequency and intensity of contact to Hungarian-speaking age mates. Children who had peers with Hungarian backgrounds among their best friends (in Sweden or elsewhere in the world) were found among all speaking patterns. In contrast, all of those who lacked regular contact with ethnic peers had Swedish dominant or Swedish monolingual-speaking patterns.

The quantitative results must also be placed in relation to the structure of the families included in the sample. Given the fact that only a few families with monolingual Swedish language use between family members could be reached and even fewer were interested in being included in this study, the results of the study concerning the proportion of bilingual children are not representative for the
Swedish-Hungarian group as a whole. According to my notes, there are considerable differences between the focus groups also in this respect, further strengthening the differences between the focus groups described above. Families who I had been recommended as being non-transmitters of Hungarian, but who, for the most part, turned down my invitation, primarily had a former majority background. There was only one of twenty cases noted in my field notes where a former minority parent with multilingual experience whom I heard to be mentioned as a “deterrent” example by some parents during a community activity, but I never actually met one. These hidden numbers of non-transmitters among former majority members could, unfortunately, not be revealed in this study. In this context, it is nevertheless of importance why children in groups 1 and 2 are not able to reach the same proficiency that group 3 apparently can. By comparing the three figures for the focus groups to each other, we can conclude that these differences can be attributed to neither group vitality factors nor to societal factors in the host country, but rather, to certain differences in the parents’ initial decisions (such as initial language use towards the children) and to in-contact factors such as the families’ social networks (including children’s peer groups) and the available language resources found at home.

10.2.2 Children’s chances for becoming bilingual depending on the linguistic composition of the family

Differences in children’s reports concerning their linguistic behaviour were not found in the sample related to the families’ linguistic composition other than for children’s first language, which was expected. On the other hand, there were also significant differences in this respect between the focus groups, so it seems that the order of acquisition of the two languages is a result of a combination of these two factors.

As my data did not show any significant differences in children’s language behaviour in other respects that could be related to the family’s linguistic composition, we can conclude that both additive and subtractive bilingualism are fully possible outcomes of language socialisation in minority language families as well as in mixed language families where one of the parents is a majority member (here, a Swedish speaker).

10.2.3 Language maintenance or shift? Outcome on a group level

Following earlier accounts in the area of language maintenance and shift (cf. Gal, 1979; Gumperz, 1982; Li, 1994), I will address issues of group cohesion and closeness of network and let these data guide my conclusions regarding language maintenance among Swedish Hungarians.

The qualitative analysis of interview responses and field notes revealed major difference between the focus groups in parental behaviour and attitudes. Former majority parents (groups 1 and 2) had a low impact belief and were apparently less
aware of the consequences of their choices as compared to former minority parents (group 3). Minority parents who have chosen to speak both Swedish and Hungarian with their children from birth reported that they did so because they were convinced that this would benefit children’s future prospects in Sweden. Parents who could not maintain Hungarian as a family language and shifted towards Swedish while their children were still very young, explained their behaviour by referring to external factors, such as the children’s unwillingness to answer in Hungarian and/or non-Hungarian speakers’ presence and/or Swedish speakers’ negative attitudes towards divergent language use in their closed networks (see chapter 6). This type of reasoning was only found among group 1 and 2 parents, but was especially frequent in group 1. At the same time, it was among group 1 parents that we also found very assertive language transmitters, who put real effort into teaching their children Hungarian. The problem is, though, that they often did this by visits to Hungary and/or by providing their children with films and books in Hungarian rather than by frequency of contact to Swedish Hungarians. As these children grow older and spend more and more time outside home, there is a great risk that the significance of Hungarian will decrease in their everyday relations, and in that case the motivation to sustain and further develop their Hungarian skills will decrease as well.

The quantitative as well as the qualitative analysis of language use data indicates that there is one common point in the norms of language use among the sample families, namely that non-Hungarian speakers’ presence requires a switch towards Swedish. However, as we have seen, this applies not only to settings outside the family, but especially in groups 1 and 2, the same rule is applied also in the presence of the non-Hungarian parent, thus strongly decreasing the amount of Hungarian conversations within family. Furthermore, while some parents try to avoid CS, and require the same from their children, others put more emphasis on the communicative functions of language use and use the two languages interchangeably, adapting the extent of Hungarian vs. Swedish language usage to a number of different factors (see chapter 8).

As described in chapter 7, associations and other informal gatherings where Hungarian speakers with different backgrounds meet and exchange ideas and thoughts may have a balancing effect on these discrepancies between the groups. Also, former majority members with a bilingual experience (H maj-bil) and assimilated minorities from Hungary (H min-ass) have slightly better opportunities for being accepted by both Transylvanians and Hungarians descending from monolingual settings in Hungary.

It is apparent that a difference in reasoning between the parents may contribute to tensions between former majority and minority members on the community level. Many local associations in Stockholm as well as Göteborg are dominated by either former minority or majority Hungarians. Saturday schools (HLI in community) and family-related activities are most often organised by former minority
members and all Hungarian-speaking families are welcome to join irrespective
their SIIE background or the linguistic composition of the family.

However, I have observed that in community activities, families with a majority
background can sometimes be overlooked or marginalised by Hungarians
descending from Transylvania (i.e. with a minority background), not on purpose
but rather because of their inferiority in numbers. An example from my field notes
is from a family camp with around fifteen families. Gathered for evening
activities, it turned out that on the singing repertoire to be guessed out of partici-
pants’ pantomime performances there were mainly Transylvanian folk songs and
proverbs, hardly any of those more known in Hungary. Some of the reactions I
have noticed among former majority members on this evening were frustration, a
few rather unsure efforts to contribute with own suggestions, but there were also
parents who expressed admiration for such a vivid expression of cultural main-
tenance. At times, I have also witnessed certain families suddenly leaving
community activities because of apparent misconceptions concerning “the others”
aims. In concrete terms, former minority members pursue/strive for language and
cultural maintenance, and active minority networking can be perceived as a sign of
national arrogance and/or segregation by Hungarians descending from majority
settings. Former majority members’ references to Swedish language norms and
cultural values are, on the other hand, looked upon with mistrust by many former
minority members. These differences apply, as we have seen, mainly to the
parental generation. It affects, however, heavily their children’s participation rates
on community activities. If the parents don’t feel welcome, they won’t take their
children to activities organised by former minority members, Saturday schools and
family camps included. The sad thing is that former minority members are too few
and cannot sustain an institutional support for their children unless they can com-
promise with other subgroups of Hungarians living in Sweden. For stronger group
vitality, former minority members do need to involve children of former majority
members as well, even if this means tolerating more CS between the children.

In connection to children’s speaking patterns, it has also been noted that despite
their parents’ explicit wishes for minority language transmission, more than half of
the children in the sample (32 out of 61) had Swedish dominant or monolingual
Swedish speaking patterns. Furthermore, it turned out that an even larger propor-
tion of children (44 out of 61) had either a Swedish dominant or a Swedish-
English bilingual language usage also in connection to leisure time activities.
These results indicate that there is already a tendency to language shift among
the second generation of Swedish Hungarians. However, this tendency does not apply
to the whole sample and cannot be said to be a characteristic of the whole popula-
tion, but rather of a special segment of it.

Group 3 stands out from the rest of the sample in that both parents and children
are significantly more Hungarian-oriented in their language usage as compared to
the other two groups where the variation is considerably higher, especially in
private settings (without non-Hungarians’presence). Also, it seems that parents
belonging to group 3 have a greater control/insight on their children’s language usage and/or greater confidence for their children’s appropriate176 language choice (as indicated by correlations between parents’ and children’s reports on similar questions). Despite sometimes similar results, group 3 and group 2 often differed in the proportion of Hungarian usage in private, whereas group 1 often showed the greatest variance of all. These findings have been further strengthened by the results of the qualitative analysis of the interview data and the field notes.

In conclusion, I consider that under current circumstances, due to the poor demographic predispositions of the Hungarian group (especially their dispersion) and the low status of the language in Sweden (see section 3.4), Hungarian might only be preserved in private settings (i.e. without the interference of majority members). At the same time, it is important to note that for those involved in wider minority networks (parents as well as children), this must not imply a limitation to private domains (see section 3.4.4 on the large variety of Hungarian media and cultural events on a local, national and international level accessible from Sweden). As we have seen, this group comprises parents as well as children in the sample, the latter especially from focus group 3.

Since I started this project eight years ago, there have been a few developments that hold promise for Hungarian language maintenance in Sweden. For the first, a few dedicated people within the Hungarian community (former minority members) have started a conscious program for the popularisation of Hungarian culture in Sweden with the explicit aim of raising the status of the group in Sweden. One of these initiatives is the Hungarian week in Göteborg (held for the 6th time in 2010),177 featuring performances of Hungarian artists, writers and researchers at different parts of the city and in both languages. Another one is the newly established cultural magazine Hungarofans,178 written in Swedish about Hungarian matters in Sweden and explicitly targeting an interested Swedish majority. These initiatives strengthen group cohesion and network closeness by enabling Hungarian speakers with common interests to meet and discuss irrespective of their backgrounds and their residence in Sweden. Apparently, former minority members possess strength in that they realise what has to be done to make their children continue to use Hungarian. At the same time, they need to involve other subgroups of Hungarian immigrants in their networks to strengthen the group demographically.

Another promising development for increasing children’s motivation to further develop their Hungarian skills are Internet resources and the transnational ties that can be activated that way (see also directions for further research).179

176 Appropriate refers here to their parents’ views.
177 www.ungerskaveckan.se (last visited 2010-03-20).
178 www.hungarofans.se (last visited 2010-03-20).
179 A colloquium on this theme has been organised by Eva Lam as part of the AAAL conference in march 2010 in Atlanta: TECHNOLOGY AND LANGUAGE IN GLOBALIZED CONTEXTS: CRITICAL APPROACHES The abstracts of the colloquium are available at http://www.aaal.org/aaal2010/index.php?ID=29 (retrieved 2009-12-01).
10.3 Have the hypotheses been confirmed?

The hypotheses presented in section 4.1 could only partly be confirmed in the thesis. The first two hypotheses have been confirmed in that families of Transylvanian descent have a greater Hungarian network to rely on in Sweden, mostly due to a larger number of relatives and friends from the old homeland, but often also enlarged by new acquaintances acquired in Sweden. Most of the children and youngsters in this group also show an openness for establishing contact with other Hungarian speakers they meet in Sweden, monolingual as well as bilingual. As a consequence, the use of Hungarian in everyday conversations as well as some formal settings is considerably higher than for children raised by parents originating from a majority setting (= focus groups 1 and 2). Families with a monolingual majority background seem to be most prone to language shift, but there are several families with a bilingual majority background who experience the same tendency. The most problematic for these children is the limited access to contexts where they could use their minority language skills and develop them further.

As for question three, it has been hypothesised that the division between Hungarian speakers in Sweden largely remains for the first generation, but that this circumstance becomes less accentuated for the next generation. Unfortunately this does not appear to be the case. Even though children in group 3 are open for new acquaintances among age-mates with other types of Hungarian background, according to their reports, the language use in these settings tends to be Swedish dominant because of the other children’s language preference and/or strong Swedish dominance. However, before any final conclusions can be drawn on this matter, more qualitative, preferably ethnographical, observations of children’s face-to-face interactions in different settings may be needed.

10.4 Implications for parental advisory books

Most parental books on raising children bilingually emphasise the role of caretakers, especially their language use towards the child (cf. Arnberg, 1987; Cunningham-Andersson & Andersson, 1999; Caldas, 2006). The principle of maximal engagement with the minority language\(^\text{180}\) (coined by Yamamoto, 2001: 128) is definitely to be acknowledged as important for all children irrespective of age. However, while caretakers may be the most important source of children’s linguistic input in infancy, and the home the most likely arena for its use, as we have seen in this sample, other factors gain in importance as the children get older. From the age they enter majority institutions (pre-school and school), they are exposed to the majority language for at least half of the day. This limitation in time, parallel to a gradual widening of their competency in new domains through

\(^{180}\) Yamamoto assumes that more input in the minority language and the familial expectation that it is to be used in the home leads to its use by children: “the more engagement the child has with the minority language, the greater her or his likelihood of using it” (ibid., 128).
the majority language, also necessarily affects children’s dominance. In this sample, this can clearly be seen in the strong Swedish dominance of the children. Issues discussed at school but not at home may lead to a lack of fluency and deficiencies in their minority language vocabulary and morphosyntactic development. This is an issue that has been known for some time within educational research (cf. Baker, 1988 and 1996; Glenn & De Jong, 1996; Garcia, 1997) but has nonetheless yet to make its breakthrough in parental books (an exception from this rule is Baker’s guide published 2000).

As seen in this study, the decreasing impact of parental behaviour on school-aged children is also measurable in quantitative terms. Correlations between parents’ and children’s language dominance and preference in this sample were positive but small and insignificant. The only correlation between parents and children’s behaviour that has been found to be significant is in their language choice during the interview. These results remind us that parents are not more than just one of several sources of input for children’s linguistic development. This confirms the results of previous studies of school-aged children showing that children’s bilingual development and language choice is dependent on the interaction of many interrelated factors (cf. Tuomela, 2001; Haglund, 2005a). Moreover, in some recent studies (cf. Bolonyai, 2005; Luykx, 2005), it is also argued that even young children act as rational social actors who actively make strategic and meaningful linguistic choices with the overall aim of achieving optimal outcomes in a given interaction. This means that situational aspects may play a more important role for young children’s language choice than recognised earlier.

For this reason, an update of parental advice in the literature for raising children bilingually would be in place. The importance of parents as role models and interaction partners is still to be acknowledged; at the same time, it is essential to mention that this only concerns the first few years of children’s lives. In order to help parents to continue their efforts and feel proud of their children’s active use of both languages, we need to broaden their horizons. The significance of other factors for school-aged children’s bilingual development increases, especially in the early teens, and should therefore be highlighted to a much greater extent in parental books than is the case today. What I am specifically referring to is raising parents’ awareness on the following issues:

- to consciously widen the family’s minority network when the children are still very young, especially with families who have similar language use norms and children of similar age;
- to encourage every opportunity to meet age-mates with the same minority background, for example, by attendance in HLI-programs and other activities organised by local minority associations;
- to take considerate decisions concerning pre-school placement and school choice with special reference to the medium of instruction;
• to be attentive to the effect of children’s age-mates (in life and virtual friends, i.e. through contacts on the Internet); and
• to be attentive to the proportions of language resources available in different languages at friends and at school, and provide qualitative additional resources to the home library in the minority language if necessary.

10.5 Research Methods

The results presented above reveal the complexity of the language transmission process and also show that in many cases it is hard to distinguish between dependent and independent variables. Besides a few given characteristics at the start of their migrational carrier, such as mother tongue and their linguistic experiences during childhood (here labelled as immigrants’ SILE background), immigrants’ decisions taken in the host country (here Sweden) are a result of chain events that have a cumulative effect on their children’s linguistic development.

Each variable connected to the lives of immigrants in Sweden, such as their marriage pattern, the family unit established, the family’s chosen place of residence (city and neighbourhood), their religious engagement, group cohesion, language resources at home, parents and children’s language use, etc., all investigated factors, are tightly interwoven. It is for this reason that I have preferred to call them factors rather than variables throughout the thesis, even though my conclusions heavily rely on a quantitative analysis of the collected data.

The family-based framework proposed in the theoretical chapter of the thesis (chapter 2) has been proven to be a valuable tool for summing up data from both parents’ and children’s point of view. It has also been fruitful for the investigation, as it allowed for a group specific analysis departing from a family level and taking account of a large variety of possible factors. However, in order to make this framework applicable to other contact situations, certain language and group-specific adaptations might be needed.

As for the methods for data collection and analysis, the ideal case would have been collaboration between two sociolinguists, one of them applying a purely quantitative approach and the other one an ethnographic approach in a few families, including a detailed analysis of different family members’ code-switching behaviour. This thesis reflects what has been possible for a single investigator to achieve through a combined quantitative-qualitative approach. Its limitations lie in the fact that many of the data are self-reported and could not always be confirmed and/or contested even by thorough observation.

The decision to divide the sample families into focus groups according to one of the parents’ SILE set-ups was a difficult, but nevertheless necessary, decision to make, and as it turned out later on, also a fruitful one. Some subsequent principles for deciding which parent’s background should count as decisive for the family’s adherence to a certain focus group helped at last to form groups in which the majority of parents’ background reflected the label of the group.
The most central issues of the thesis, i.e. those connected to language use and language attitudes have been analysed from both parents’ and children’s perspectives, and in some vital questions, these two views were also compared to each other. One of the main conclusions from this experience is that the children’s views and concerns may be even more important in a migrant setting than has been earlier recognised. For example, when asking for different family member’s language use towards each other, several children (above the age of 9 years) gave more adequate answers than their parents (compared to observations); moreover, many of them were recalling situations when one or another factor triggered them (or other people in their networks) to use mainly one language or to code-switch. The detailed examples these children gave highly outnumbered the examples their parents could (or were willing to) provide.

10.6 Directions for further research

An inevitable consequence of thesis writing is that a number of very interesting data remain unanalysed because they fall outside the scope of the study. This is certainly the case with much of the recorded interview data. Moreover, the attained results may generate issues for further research. In the following, I will mention a few aspects that might be interesting to investigate in the future.

First of all, it would be of great interest to conduct ethnographically based longitudinal investigations of certain families included in the sample in order to gain deeper understanding for the internal relationship of factors of intergenerational language transmission addressed in this study. An ethnographic method would also enable us to uncover mechanisms and functions of language choice and code-switching on a micro-level, in more natural face-to-face interactions.

The second aspect involves an investigation of Hungarian families in Sweden’s rural areas. During fieldwork, I came to hear about a rather large group of Hungarians descending from monolingual parts of Transylvania who are settled in the area of Huskvarna-Jönköping-Ljungby (southern Sweden). In this study, this group of Hungarian immigrants (H min-mono), i.e. representants of the “Székely” group mentioned in chapter 3, have only been mentioned as spouses of other Hungarian immigrants, with whom they share either SI (H min-multi) or their LE background (H maj-mono). Their children were, therefore, included in groups 1 or 3 or among non-focus families. It would be interesting to conduct a comparative study on these immigrants to see in what way their preconditions and language use differ from the groups described in this thesis.

A third, completely different, type of research would include a follow-up of the language use and social networks of a few of the children included in this study. The original interviews have been conducted six respectively four years ago.

---

181 Several children were, for example, referring to situations where the channel of the conversation in combination with other factors such as location made a great difference in their language choice, i.e. telephone at home vs. on a cell phone on the bus, a Swedish or international internet forum vs. a Hungarian site, etc.
Several years have elapsed since the data was collected; some of the children who were in their late teens at the time of the interviews have since become young adults and have started university studies or work at part-time jobs. Interestingly, those who reported Swedish-dominant language use patterns have to a large extent remained in Sweden, while many of the children who reported bilingual or trilingual language use have chosen to spend a few years abroad. As I have continued to have contact with some of them, I can see that they are very active on different internet forums and some have also started own blogs. It would be interesting to investigate the use of new media among these young people, and how they make use of their multiple linguistic resources (including literacy in several languages) for sustaining these transnational and international ties. Additionally, by taking into account the transnational dimensions and geographical locations of these communication networks, we might gain new insights into the commons and differences of individual bilingualism vs. language maintenance prospects of scattered minority groups.
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Sweden related (last visited 2007-09-05)

HLI related links of the National Education Board in Sweden:
  http://modersmal.skolutveckling.se/projekt/
National Education Board: www.skolverket.se
SIOS- The Cooperation Group for Ethnical Associations in Sweden: www.sios.org
Statistics Sweden: www.scb.se
Swedish Immigrant Institute: www.immi.se
Swedish Integration Board: www.integrationsverket.se
Punkthusbloggen http://punkthus.wordpress.com/2008/05/29/goteborg-vs-stockholm/ - a blogg written by Dan Hallemar, a Swedish journalist writing for two well established daily newspapers, Expressen and Sydsvenskan.

Hungarian and Transylvanian sites (last visited 2009-10-25)

Balassi Bálint Institute (Balassi Intézet) for the promotion of Hungarian language and culture beyond the borders of Hungary: www.bbi.hu/
Corvinus Library: provides free access to books, reports and articles on Hungarian History in English: www.hungarian-history.hu/lib/index.htm
Ethnic maps of Romania and Transylvania from the map collection of Sebők László (only accessible in Hungarian):
Foundation Elemér Jakabffy (main scope: to document the history of Hungarians in Romania (in particular the post-1989 political history, and to make accessible for the wider public): http://www.jakabffy.ro/ Jakabffy Elemér Alapítvány
Hungarian Minorities Monitor: human right watch specialized for the Hungarians living in the Carpathian Basin since 1990: www.hhrf.org/monitor/mont.htm
Pro Minoritate Foundation (A kissebségekért – Pro Minoritate Alapítvány):
  http://www.prominoritate.hu/
Transylvanian Hungarian Databank (Erdélyi Magyar Adatbázis):
  http://adatbank.transindex.ro/

Swedish-Hungarian netbased newspapers, organizations and sites of informal groupings (last visited 2009-03-20)

Hungarian Protestant Church in Sweden: http://www.keve.se
National Foundation of Hungarians in Sweden www.smosz.org
Youth organization of the National Foundation: www.somit.net
Southern Sweden’s Hungarian Family Magazine (Lund):
   www.hhrf.org/magyarliget -
Peregrinus Club, association of Hungarian-speaking researchers in Sweden:
   http://www.peregrinusklub.freeurl.com
www.geocities.com/hunsor/ - A trilingual information resource centre
   monitoring the Carpathian Basin and Scandinavia from Sweden
www.geocities.com/istjan/ - An interactive information cite (private initiative)
www.geocities.com/moraklub/ - The local branch of the Hungarian Association in
   Solna
   promoting Art and Literature
## Appendices

### Appendix A

*Basic data on the sample families.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>Mother’s background</th>
<th>Father’s background</th>
<th>Additional adults in the household</th>
<th>Total n of children (incl. adults)</th>
<th>Gender of the focus child</th>
<th>Age of the focus child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H min-ass</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>S-maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>S maj-mono</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H min-ass</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5S</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>H min-mono</td>
<td>H min-mono</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>grandchildren and adult siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6S</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>S maj-mono</td>
<td>H grandmother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7S</td>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>S maj-bil</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8S</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H min-mono</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9S</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10S</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>H min-ass</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11S</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12S</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>H min-ass</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13S</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>S maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14S</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>H min-ass</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15S</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H min-ass</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>adult sibling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16S</td>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>adult siblings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17S</td>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18S</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H 2nd-gen</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>adult sibling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19S</td>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>adult siblings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20S</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21S</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>H min-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>O maj-mono</td>
<td>S stepfather</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23S</td>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>S maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24S</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>S maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25S</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>S maj-mono</td>
<td>adult sibling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26S</td>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27S</td>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>adult siblings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>O maj-bil</td>
<td>H min-ass</td>
<td>S stepfather</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29S</td>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>S maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30S</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-mono</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31S</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>adult siblings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1G</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>H min-mono</td>
<td>H grandparents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2G</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3G</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>S maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4G</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-mono</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5G</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>O maj-mono</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6G</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7G</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>adult siblings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8G</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>H ass-min</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9G</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>O min-multi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10G</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>adult siblings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11G</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>O min-multi</td>
<td>O grandmother and adult sibling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12G</td>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>H 2nd-gen</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13G</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>S stepfather</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14G</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>S maj-bil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15G</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17G</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18G</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>S maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19G</td>
<td></td>
<td>H min-ss</td>
<td>S maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20G</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>S maj-mono</td>
<td>H grandparents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22G</td>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>S maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23G</td>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>2-gen H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24G</td>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25G</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>adult siblings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26G</td>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>H min-multi</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27G</td>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>2-gen H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28G</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>H min-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29G</td>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30G</td>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>H maj-mono</td>
<td>S stepfather</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31G</td>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>H maj-bil</td>
<td>2-gen H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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