

**Intergenerational transmission of Hungarian as a heritage
language in Canada: The macrosociolinguistics of the
Hungarian community in Hamilton, Ontario**

Jelige: Quercus92

Abstract

The present paper is based on 37 interviews carried out with the help of a questionnaire among Hungarians in Hamilton, Ontario, in Canada. The intergenerational transmission of Hungarian, as well as the entire macrosociolinguistic situation of the community, is described from a two-fold perspective that combines the approach of language contact with that of heritage languages, highlighting a general – although not absolute – tendency towards three-generational heritage language shift. The most important findings concern heritage language use in private vs. public domains, where the former can be characterized by more frequent use of Hungarian, whereas the latter provide the most obvious evidence to three-generational heritage language shift, since the use of Hungarian seems to be much less frequent in these domains. Other findings shed light on the fact that religion and the church, as well as the heritage language school, play an essential role in the maintenance of ethnicity and culture among Hamilton Hungarians, but also that Hungarian is now doubtlessly present in telecommunications and the multimedia in the life of the community in question. Furthermore, data regarding the Hungarian language acquisition of the participants are also analysed. Wherever meaningful, a distinction is made between data provided by first-generation immigrants and second-generation speakers, mostly in order to illustrate the gradual nature of heritage language shift that is in progress in the community.

Kivonat

Jelen tanulmány 37 interjún alapul, melyek egy kérdőív segítségével készültek a kanadai, Ontario tartománybeli Hamiltonban élő magyarokkal. A magyar nyelv generációk közötti továbbadását – csakúgy, mint a közösség makroszociolingvisztikai helyzetét – kettős megközelítésből vizsgálom, igyekezve összehangolni a nyelvkontaktus-elemzés, valamint az örökségnyelv perspektíváját. Megfigyelhető egy általános – bár nem abszolút – tendencia a háromgenerációs nyelvcsere irányába. Emellett a legfontosabb megállapítások a magán-, ill. a közösségi szférában történő örökségnyelv-használatra vonatkoznak, melyek közül előbbi a magyar nyelv gyakoribb használatával jellemezhető, míg utóbbi esetében a háromgenerációs nyelvcsere jelei egyértelműbbek, mivel a magyar nyelv használata itt sokkal kevésbé gyakori. Más megállapításokból fény derül arra, hogy a vallás és az egyház – csakúgy, mint az örökségnyelvi iskola – kulcsfontosságú szerepet játszik a nemzetiségi hovatartozás és a kultúra megtartásában a hamiltoni magyarok körében, valamint, hogy a magyar nyelv ma már kétségkívül jelen van a szóban forgó közösség életében a telekommunikáció és a multimédia területein is. A magyar nyelv elsajátításával kapcsolatos adatok szintén elemzésre kerülnek. Az elsőgenerációs bevándorlóktól, ill. a másodikgenerációs adatközlőktől származó adatok elkülönülnek egymástól, ahol ennek jelentősége van – elsősorban a közösségben zajló nyelvcsere fokozatosságát illusztrálандó.

Table of contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Literature review	3
2.1. The perspective of language contact and bilingualism.....	3
2.2. The heritage language (HL) perspective	5
2.3. Sources on Hungarian in North-America	9
3. Methodology	14
3.1. Participants	14
3.2. Data collection.....	14
3.3. Data analysis.....	16
4. Discussion	17
4.1. The maintenance of ethnicity and culture.....	17
4.2. Language use in private domains	19
4.3 Language use in public domains	23
4.4. Hungarian language acquisition	25
4.5. Telecommunications and the multimedia.....	26
5. Conclusion.....	29
Bibliography.....	31
Appendix 1	34
Appendix 2	35
Appendix 3	48

1. Introduction

The present paper aims at describing the language use and sociolinguistic makeup of a Hungarian community living in Hamilton, Ontario, in Canada. The topic is approached from a macrosociolinguistic point of view, concentrating more on the social characteristics of the group than the strictly speaking linguistic features. In other words, it is the social data that are interpreted from a linguistic perspective.

At this point, let some figures illustrate the geographical location and the size of the community that is looked at in this paper. Hamilton is a city with a population of around 500,000 on the western shore of Lake Ontario, about 36 miles south-west of Toronto. According to the 2006 census data (Statistics Canada, 2006), there are 15,155 people in Hamilton who reported to be of Hungarian origin, with 5,080 of these being single responses, indicating Hungarian alone and not in parallel with some other nationality or nationalities.

Throughout this paper, the Hungarian language community of Hamilton will be described from the perspective of language contact. To be more exact, what will be looked at is whether the situation of Hungarian in contact with English in this particular case can be characterised by language maintenance or language shift.

Furthermore, it is also essential to note that this study considers the variety of Hungarian spoken in Hamilton as a heritage language (HL) variety, and concentrates on what is commonly referred to as its “intergenerational transmission” (Campbell and Christian 2003, 1), i.e. whether the knowledge of Hungarian is passed down from generation to generation in its entirety or gradually diminishes with time.

By combining the above two approaches (i.e. those of language contact and of intergenerational HL transmission), a more comprehensive understanding of the ongoing processes can be arrived at, since this way it becomes possible to interpret empirical findings through a kind of a double lens, whereby the two perspectives can successfully complement each other.

After a brief review of the literature relevant to the present study, with all the important notions and concepts defined and drawn into a framework, a section on methodology will ensue, providing a description of the participants as well as the data collection and analysis, always with the research question in mind. The methodology section will be followed by presenting the data and then a discussion of these. Finally, conclusions will also be provided, restating the most relevant findings, explaining the significance of the

study, as well as shedding light on the possible future directions and avenues for research, along the lines of which the study can be taken a step further.

2. Literature review

2.1. The perspective of language contact and bilingualism

What follows is a discussion of the most relevant sources of this paper, starting with the more general items and proceeding towards the more specific ones, thus narrowing the scope after gaining a general picture about the topic of language contact and bilingualism.

As far as the most rudimentary and general concepts in connection with this topic are concerned, two basic introductory volumes should be mentioned, which provide a comprehensive overview of the field and introduce the background information necessary to understand any study concentrating on language contact or bilingualism. These two books are Thomason (2001) and Grosjean (1982), both of them having contributed a lot to the theoretical basis of the present paper.

Thomason (2001) introduces the essential notion of language contact, which she defines as “the use of more than one language in the same place at the same time” (Thomason 2001, 1). However, she also adds that this definition might be a bit oversimplified as a number of exceptions can be thought of, in the case of which the languages are not necessarily used in the same place or at the same time (e.g. contact with learned or sacred, at times also dead languages).

Apart from the problem of the definition, Thomason (2001) also elaborates on questions such as how contact situations arise (contact onsets), what typical settings they usually occur in, what happens to languages and their speakers in contact situations, what kind of mechanism and results contact-induced language change has, what characterises contact languages, and so on.

Out of these numerous topics discussed by Thomason (2001), let us examine that of contact onsets somewhat more in detail, assigning the case of Hungarian immigrants in Hamilton to one of the categories suggested by her. The most basic ways of contact onset that Thomason (2001) describes include the prolonged, peaceful coexistence of neighbouring groups; colonisation and conquests; immigration; various trade situations; intermarriage between communities; etc.

The case of Hungarian in Hamilton definitely belongs to the category of language contact due to immigration, which presupposes an unstable contact situation, meaning that language shift to the majority language is likely to happen sooner or later. According to Thomason (2001), shift usually takes place in what she calls migrant subordinate communities rather rapidly, and the Hungarian speakers in Hamilton doubtlessly constitute such a

community. Their situation of language contact can be characterised by “an asymmetrical dominant-subordinate intergroup relationship with pressure toward shift” (Thomason 2001, 23), since the power relations between the two languages taking part in the contact situation are obvious, with English apparently being the dominant language and Hungarian the subordinate one.

Grosjean (1982), on the other hand, considers language maintenance and shift as possible outcomes of bilingualism, also playing an instrumental role in constructing the theoretical framework of the present study. He formulates that bilingualism can either be prolonged for a relatively long time, or it might just be a temporary state, followed by a return to monolingualism. In the latter case, this return either happens by reverting to monolingualism in the original language (i.e. maintenance), or by the disappearance of the original (first) language of the group, resulting in monolingualism in the second language (i.e. shift). Furthermore, Grosjean (1982) also adds pidginization and creolization as possible outcomes of bilingualism, where new contact languages arise, but this option does not belong to the scope of this paper.

Besides investigating the possible outcomes of bilingualism, Grosjean (1982) also discusses other fundamental topics, such as bilingualism being the global norm rather than the exception, attitudes to bilingualism, the distinction between individual vs. state bilingualism, language choice, bilingual language acquisition, symmetrical vs. asymmetrical bilingualism, the origins of bilingualism; etc.

At this point, I would like to examine the latter two topics more in detail as those are especially relevant for our present discussion. It is important to see first that bilingualism in the case of the Hungarian-speaking community in Hamilton is asymmetrical, meaning that it is usually only the minority group (i.e. that of the Hungarian immigrants) that learns the other language, while the majority group (i.e. that of Canadians) very rarely does so.

Furthermore, as far as the origins of bilingualism are concerned, Grosjean (1982) identifies the movement of groups, political federalism, education, intermarriage, urbanisation and globalisation as some of the essential reasons that can lead to communities becoming bilingual. Out of these, it is mainly movement (and, more specifically, immigration) that plays a role in the Hamilton Hungarian case, although none of the other factors can be completely excluded since, as in most cases, it is an interplay of all these components that leads to bilingualism and language contact in this particular instance as well.

To move away from the very general and introductory sources, somewhat more specific than the previous two volumes is Paulston (1981), who introduces the notion of three

generational language shift, meaning that, most typically in the case of immigrant languages in the USA, the first generation shows a strong preference for their mother tongue, whereas the second generation usually becomes bilingual, and the third one is typically monolingual in English.

Such a pattern can be expected to manifest itself in the case of the Hungarian community in Hamilton as well, since Hungarian is an immigrant language there. And, although Hamilton is apparently not in the United States but in Canada, this is not likely to make too much difference here, since the cultural makeup and the situation of immigrants is rather similar (although by no means completely the same) in these two countries.

Besides Paulston (1981), several other authors describing three-generational language shift can also be mentioned, such as Fishman (1966, 1991), or Veltman (1983). What is more, Chevalier (2004) complements this model with a gradual narrowing of registers in parallel with the shift in language, resulting – at least in part – from bilinguals’ access to more than one language, as a result of which bilingual speakers will tend to code-switch where monolinguals only switch registers or speech styles in discourse (Chevalier 2004, 3). Consequently, a gradual loss of high and formal registers, styles, and/or domains is to be expected from generation to generation (with respect to Hungarian) if language shift turns out to be really in progress in the Hamilton Hungarian community.

2.2. The heritage language (HL) perspective

Before moving on to sources dealing more specifically with Hungarian in North America, it is important to introduce the basic framework of heritage languages (HLs) as well, to complement that of language contact, which has been briefly described above. As Wiley (2001) points out, it is rather problematic to provide a comprehensive definition for HLs, as is always the case when attempting “to apply a single label to a complex situation” (Wiley 2001, 29).

A rather broad and widely accepted definition is offered by Kelleher (2008), in which she formulates that “[t]he term heritage language is used to identify languages other than the dominant language (or languages) in a given social context” (Kelleher 2008, 3). She also contrasts the term with that of foreign languages, arguing that HLs are not *foreign* to their users, but “they are *familiar* in a variety of ways. Some people may be able to speak, read, and write the language; others may only speak or understand when spoken to. Some may not understand the language but are part of a family or community where the language is spoken”

(Kelleher 2008, 3). Thus, as she suggests, any of these outsets can be described as HL situations, and adds that the term can regard persons, families, and communities alike.

Furthermore, Kelleher (2008) also proposes that the term *minority language* should be replaced with that of *heritage language* as well, on the one hand because of the strong cultural and social stigma that has been attached to the former, and on the other hand because there may well be situations where, as she argues, the HL community constitutes the numerical majority. As a result, even though the Hamilton Hungarian community is a minority in terms of demography, I also consider it reasonable to describe its language as a HL rather than an immigrant or minority language, to remain as neutral as possible and to avoid any possible connotations that the word usage may inadvertently imply.

Based on a view similar to the one represented by Kelleher's definition, Fishman (2001) points out that there are three basic types of HLs (with respect to the United States), namely, indigenous, colonial and immigrant ones. First, for indigenous HL situations, he cites the example of the Amerindians, whose languages are in instant danger of extinction (if not extinct already). Thus, he stresses the importance of educational and institutional efforts towards "heritage language revitalization, acquisition and maintenance" (Fishman 2001, 83) in their case.

Second, as examples of colonial HLs he names the languages of the European colonizers who arrived in North-America before the United States was established. Such non-indigenous languages include (among others) Dutch, German, Spanish, and French. He asserts that the overwhelming majority of these communities have lost their colonial roots, and now owe their present existence in the US to what he calls "immigrant reinforcement" (Fishman 2001, 83), with the single exception of Pennsylvania German, which is the only colonial heritage variety that "can claim significant intergenerational mother tongue transmission" (Fishman 2001, 84).

Third, he lists French, German, Spanish, Italian, Polish, and Yiddish as the major immigrant HLs in the United States. In connection with these, he remarks that despite what he refers to as "the sad experiences of indigenous and colonial heritage language maintenance" (Fishman 2001, 85), immigrant HL communities exhibited great determination and struggled intensely to establish HL schools and maintain their HLs. Besides emphasizing the importance of HL education, he also touches upon the topic of how changes in national interests, ideology, propaganda, even foreign policy or legislation can affect HL maintenance and education.

Although Fishman (2001) refers his arguments to the USA only, the scope of his ideas definitely applied to Canada as well, since the sociohistorical and sociocultural backgrounds of the two countries are rather similar, with the indigenous, colonial and immigrant HL communities being generally analogous, although definitely not completely identical.

An obvious reason why this work by Fishman is of considerable interest for the aims of the present paper is that it makes it possible to classify the Hamilton Hungarian variety as an immigrant HL. Furthermore, it can also be presupposed based on Fishman (2001)'s observations that the role of HL education, national ideology, legislation, etc. will be essential in this case as well, highlighting potential directions for further investigations.

To narrow down the focus of the attention within the HL perspective to the intergenerational transmission of HLs, the next source to mention is Campbell and Christian (2003). The significance of this study is that it provides an opportunity to connect the HL perspective to the language contact approach, by observing the correlation between intergenerational HL transmission (or rather its absence in the long run) and the typical North-American three generational language shift that has been pointed out by Paulston (1981), Fishman (1966, 1991) and Veltman (1983) as well.

Campbell and Christian (2003) identify two possible vehicles through which heritage languages can be sustained. One is through the arrival of ever newer immigrants who keep the community (and its heritage language) alive, while the other is “through transfer of language knowledge from one generation to the next within communities and families”, which is what they call the “intergenerational transmission of HLs” (Campbell and Christian 2003, 1). If this intergenerational transmission is effective enough, the heritage language will be maintained (HL maintenance), although – as they point out – this is not very typical in the United States (nor is it in Canada), where the HL usually gradually diminishes, resulting in HL shift – mostly, as described above, throughout three generations. Thus, it can be stated that it is – at least partly – because of the decreasing efficiency of intergenerational transmission that HL shift takes place in these three generations.

The reasons for and the mechanisms of this shift, as Campbell and Christian (2003) assume, are still to be researched, making this investigation one of the main aims of the present paper – obviously only with respect to the Hamilton Hungarian community.

Another important topic addressed by Campbell and Christian (2003, 3) is that of language ecology. As they point out, “the rubric of the *ecology of languages*” encompasses such issues as the following:

“the role of the school system and other institutions, the historical experiences of particular language communities, [...] the infrastructures within specific communities that are entrusted with HL revitalization or preservation and their relation with the institutions of mainstream society (e.g. the schools)[, etc.]”

They add to these topics a brief list of what they call “[r]esearchable features of a broad language ecology pattern [..., including] residential settlement patterns; concentration of speakers and the proportion of youth; community institutional density; frequency of encounters with naturalistic use of the HL; and community control of children’s socialization” (Campbell and Christian 2003, 4).

Of all these topics and researchable features that they name, they stress the importance of schools (HL education) and the parental use of the heritage language the most, maintaining that these two function as the most essential sources of HL input in the case of immigrant children (Campbell and Christian 2003, 17). They argue that parents need to have sufficient and true knowledge about bilingualism to be confident enough to discredit the wide-spread myths surrounding it (such as the ones about a bilingual being two monolinguals in one person, or true bilinguals having to be equally fluent in both of the languages they speak, etc.).

As a result, it is not only children but also parents who need to be sufficiently informed about the importance and value of bilingualism as well as HL transmission, since parents’ knowledge about these matters plays a crucial role in their children’s HL development.

Further studies that provide evidence demonstrating the importance of HL education based on the empirical findings of their own research include Chinen and Tucker (2005), Otcu (2010) and Oriyama (2010). Chinen and Tucker (2005) claim in their study on 31 Japanese-American teenagers attending a Japanese HL school in Los Angeles that “the participants’ sense of ethnic identity, attitudes toward the JHL school [Japanese heritage language school] and self-assessed proficiency of Japanese [...] were significantly related” (Chinen and Tucker 2005, 27), in a way that more positive attitudes to the JHL school generally meant more intensive Japanese identification and higher levels of self-assessed proficiency.

Otcu (2010), in her study about a Turkish Saturday school in New York City, also emphasizes the role of the HL school “in maintaining the Turkish language and forming a Turkish cultural identity” (Otcu 2010, 131). Oriyama (2010), who conducted her study on

“three groups of Japanese-English bilingual youths and their parents in Sydney, Australia” (Oriyama 2010, 76) also has similar findings, proving the role of HL schools in identity-construction and HL development, “especially when they are supported by community, peers, and home” (Oriyama 2010, 95).

What we can infer from these studies with regard to the present paper is that, as has been suggested based on Fishman (2001) and Campbell and Christian (2003) as well, HL education and the Hungarian school in Hamilton, ON can be expected to play a crucial role in maintaining the Hungarian language and identity in the community.

2.3. Sources on Hungarian in North-America

Fenyvesi (2005) provides a comprehensive description of the historical, demographical and socio-economic background of Hungarians in the United States, and also describes domains of their Hungarian language use and various linguistic aspects of it (phonetic, phonological, morphological, syntactic and pragmatic features alike). Although the present study is not about an American Hungarian community, the information provided by this paper is still valuable, since such a comprehensive work has not been written on Canadian Hungarian to date.

However, there also are sources that concentrate specifically on Hungarians in Canada, although less comprehensive than the ones mentioned above. Perhaps the most general of these is Dreisziger (1982), which is based to a certain extent on Dreisziger (1981). Dreisziger (1981) deals with the life of Hungarian immigrants in Canada between 1924 and 1939, which is then completed by Dreisziger (1982), broadening its scope so that it does not just concentrate on the 15 years indicated above, but incorporates literally the whole history of Canadian-Hungarians between the 1880s and the 1980s.

Dreisziger (1981) talks about four waves in which Hungarians entered Canada. The first wave he mentions is that of the “pioneers”, who immigrated at the end of the 19th and in the first two decades of the 20th century. Secondly, he also talks about interwar immigrants entering between 1924 and 1939, followed – thirdly – by post-war émigrés in the 1940s and 50s. Finally, the fourth group he introduces is that of the 1956-57 refugees.

In connection with this latter group, it has to be remarked that the number of Hungarian refugees entering Canada was extremely high in 1956 and '57 as a result of the suppression of the Hungarian revolution against the communist regime in November 1956. In a later work of his, Dreisziger (2004) formulates that nearly 40,000 Hungarians fled to Canada in these two years. If we take into consideration that, according to Antalóczy (2006),

altogether some 200,000 refugees fled Hungary directly after the revolution to 54 different countries, we can draw the conclusion that one fifth of all the Hungarian 56'er emigrants opted for Canada as their destination.

What is also essential to see in connection with this fourth wave of Hungarian immigrants to Canada (i.e. the '56-ers) is that whereas all the previous waves consisted mostly of working-class immigrants and peasants, this one included a considerable number of intellectuals as well, with 958 Hungarian college students entering Canada in 1957, according to Hidas (1998).

To go back to Dreisziger (1981), it can be stated that, apart from stressing the importance of the émigrés of 1956-57, he also indicates that it was the second wave (i.e. the interwar immigrants) that constituted the most important group of Hungarian immigrants in Canada. The reason why this can be claimed is not only numerical (with this wave being the second biggest of all four), but, as Dreisziger (1981, 61-62) puts it:

“[T]he importance of this stream went beyond the realm of demographic growth: the post-1924 immigrants greatly promoted the dispersal of Canada's Hungarian population throughout much of the country, and they were mainly responsible for the establishment of Magyar colonies in many of Canada's large cities, especially Montreal and Toronto.”

It is also important to note, though, that Dreisziger (1981) only mentions these four waves of Hungarian immigration to Canada, and it is only the interwar group that he analyses in detail. In contrast, Dreisziger (1982) deals with all of the waves comprehensively, although with a slightly modified division. What is more, Dreisziger (1982) also investigates the period after 1956 (an era not even mentioned in his previous work), which, as he suggests, can be characterised by an intensive decline in Hungarian immigration.

Another similar publication is Dreisziger (1986), which is quite a detailed account of the history of Hungarian immigrants in Canada between 1886 and 1986, indicating a clear trend about how the urban vs. rural distribution of Hungarian immigrants in Canada changed throughout the hundred years he discusses. He illustrates this trend by stating that in the initial decades the overwhelming majority of Hungarian settlers in Canada were rural, then in 1921 the urban-rural distribution was already just about equal, whereas in 1981, 82% of Hungarian Canadians already lived in urban districts.

Apart from showing this shift from rural regions to urban ones, Dreisziger (1986) also provides several reasons that could account for it, with the reasons ranging from socio-

historical to political and economic in nature. He also describes the geographical distribution of the Hungarian population within Canada, coming to the conclusion that their centre gradually shifted from mainly agricultural Saskatchewan and Alberta to largely industrial Ontario and also Quebec.

Papp (1979) is even more specifically connected to the topic of this paper, dealing with the history and culture of Hungarians in Ontario, the province where Hamilton is located as well. Papp maintains that the first Hungarian communities in Ontario were founded in the early 1900s, namely, for instance, in Niagara Falls, Welland and Brantford, but also in Hamilton. She adds that “by 1931 the cities of Hamilton, Toronto, Welland and Windsor had Hungarian populations of over one thousand” (Papp 1979, 8), with Hamilton then being home to the largest Hungarian population in Ontario, attracting immigrants with the great number of jobs available in its iron foundries and steel mills. This shows how important Hamilton’s role has been in the life of Hungarian immigrants in Ontario, and it still continues to be home to the second-largest Hungarian community in Eastern Canada, which makes it an ideal setting for conducting research like this.

As far as cultural life and social gatherings are concerned, the first Hungarian associations were, as Papp indicates, sick benefit societies, such as *The First Hungarian Workers Sick Benefit Society* organised in Hamilton in 1907. These were the associations that first started to organise meetings and social events for Hungarians in these communities, and it was only in the interwar period that Hungarian community centres, Hungarian houses, clubs or even congregations were established for this aim.

Let it be mentioned in passing that, as Ruzsa (1940) reveals, the first Hungarian Presbyterian Congregation in Eastern Canada was founded in Hamilton in 1926, while the Hungarian Lutheran Congregation of the city was established in 1930, and the Hungarian Greek Catholic Parish in 1935. The Roman Catholic Parish was not founded until 1944, but has played an extremely significant role in the life of the Hungarian community since then, just like the other congregations, which are all very important scenes of the community’s cultural gatherings and virtually any kinds of social activities involving Hungarians in Hamilton.

Papp also mentions some secular organisations such as the Toronto monthly newspaper *Magyarság (Magyar-Canadians)* or the *Kanadai Magyar Munkás* started in 1929 in Hamilton to publicize left-wing ideology, the Hungarian language schools in Toronto, Hamilton, St. Catharines, Kitchener, London and Oshawa (coordinated by the Hungarian School Board, founded in 1971) or the radio station *Hungarian Voice in Niagara Falls*

launched in 1952 along with the several scout troops all over Ontario, which have all played a key role in maintaining the Hungarian identity and language in the region.

Dreisziger (2004) has already been briefly mentioned above, in connection with the number of '56-ers emigrating to Canada. However, this article does not only examine this single period, but also defines a number of more general trends in connection with the demographics and the language use of Hungarians in Canada. These trends can be inferred based on various census data under a number of different headings that have been changing from time to time during the past decades. Among these are such figures as “Canadian residents born in Hungary, or Canadians with Magyar as mother-tongue, or Canadians speaking Hungarian in the home” (Dreisziger 2004, 58), etc.

As Dreisziger (2004) indicates, all of these figures were continuously growing throughout most of the 20th century. However, from 1986 onwards, it was only the number of those claiming Hungarian as their ancestry that increased (namely from 210,000 to 270,000 nation-wide), while all the other data concerning the demographics and the language use of Hungarians in Canada decreased.

As far as language use is concerned, Dreisziger (2004) reveals that the highest number of respondents claiming Hungarian as their mother tongue among all the provinces is to be found in Ontario. To be more exact, 44,060 respondents claimed exclusively Hungarian as their mother tongue in Ontario in 1996, and this figure slightly increased to 45,275 to 2001, whereas the nation-wide figures in this respect are 76,995 and 75,350, respectively (see Table 1).

	1996	2001
Ontario	44,060	45,275
Canada (total) ¹	76,995	75,350

Table 1. The number of respondents claiming Hungarian as their exclusive mother tongue (based on Canadian census data as cited in Dreisziger 2004)

This can show us that, even though there is a minor increase within the province of Ontario, the nation-wide figures are actually declining.

Concerning the data about Hungarian as a language of the home, Dreisziger (2004, 59) emphasises how useful and contrastive these statistics are as follows:

¹ The nation-wide figures are my calculations.

“One of the best indicators of language maintenance by a linguistic cultural group is the category known as “language spoken at home.” In fact, this category is a better measure of cultural persistence than “language spoken” or “mother tongue,” because language spoken at home indicates a long-term commitment to culture maintenance. Further, it is a predictor of language transmission to the next generation.”

According to the 2001 census data as discussed in Dreisziger (2004), Hungarian was used at home by 44,590 people nation-wide, out of which 11,575 respondents reported to use it as the only language of their home. Here again, it was Ontario that showed the highest ratio on the province level, with 7,885 of the nation-wide 11,575 claiming Hungarian as the exclusive language they used at home in 2001.

To illustrate how steeply these data about the language spoken at home are decreasing, Dreisziger (2004) gives the example of the Western provinces, out of which Saskatchewan provides the most striking decline, with 1,945 responses in 1971 and only 120 in 2001, showing an undisputed sign of language shift.

The final source to mention here is Polgár (2001), a paper about the sociolinguistic analysis of a Hungarian American community in Toledo, Ohio, USA. The present study relies on this source to a great extent since the topics of the two papers are quite similar, which might prove to be useful when it comes to comparing the findings.

3. Methodology

The data collection was carried out by applying a combination of two methods, namely, using a questionnaire and doing a sociolinguistic interview. The way these two methods were combined was the following. I read out the questionnaire for the participants, who, in turn, answered the questions orally, which I recorded both in writing (by filling out the questionnaire myself) and with the help of a sound recording device. At times the subjects also felt free to tell stories and anecdotes throughout the interview, in which case it was really useful for me to have their voice recorded so that no data was lost. Understandably, these recordings are not necessarily useful for this paper, but perhaps they will be for another one sometime in the future.

3.1. Participants

I conducted the interviews with 38 participants, one of whom turned out not to have the appropriate proficiency in Hungarian to perform the tasks involved, so in the end I ended up with 37 usable interviews. Out of these 37 participants, 21 were female and 16 male, while there were 26 first-generation immigrants and 11 second-generation speakers.

As far as their age is concerned, two of them were between 20 and 30, twelve between 31 and 60, twenty-one between 61 and 80 and two above 80 (see Table 2).

Age-group		Number of participants
Young adults	20 - 30	2
Middle-aged speakers	31 - 60	12
Elderly speakers	61-80	21
Old speakers	above 80	2

Table 2. The number of participants by age-group

I gave codes to the speakers based on the chronological order in which the interviews were conducted, thus getting speakers 1-38, but as already mentioned above, I had to exclude one speaker (namely, speaker 9) due to his lack of proper proficiency in Hungarian.

For a comprehensive table (Table 2) on the personal data of speakers, see Appendix 1.

3.2. Data collection

As for the location of the interviews, most of them were conducted at the parish building where I was staying, as it was a location known by most of the participants. However, in some cases I visited the subjects at their homes and the interviews were carried

out there. I always let the participants choose – whichever option they felt more comfortable about.

Although I stayed in the Roman Catholic parish building of the community and initially started contacting subjects in this setting, I soon managed to conduct interviews also with speakers who were not members of this religious community. This way I could collect data that are not biased in this regard, largely reflecting the whole community's religious division², with 26 out of the 37 speakers being connected to the Roman Catholic parish in one way or another, while the remaining 11 being either members of one of the two other Hungarian parishes in Hamilton or do not belong to any religious group whatsoever.

In order for my results to be comparable to previous research findings, I used a slightly modified version of the questionnaire of the SHOH (Sociolinguistics of Hungarian Outside Hungary) project. This questionnaire had previously been used by a number of researchers, among others Csernicskó (1998), Göncz (1999), Lanstyák (2000) and Polgár (2001) in a number of different places, such as in Subcarpathia (Ukraine), Vojvodina (Serbia), Slovakia and Toledo, Ohio, respectively.

The goal of using the questionnaire was in all of these cases “to study the social context of language use and the contact phenomena in the Hungarian spoken by the minorities in the neighboring countries” (Kontra, 2005:34). (Of course, the case of Toledo is an exception here as it does not belong to a neighbouring country of Hungary, but Polgár 2001 does look at the social context of language use and does investigate contact phenomena in the Hungarian spoken by the immigrant group there.)

It has to be remarked, however, that as compared to the first three studies mentioned above (i.e. Csernicskó 1998, Göncz 1999 and Lanstyák 2000), the sample of my work is considerably smaller, but in spite of this, as Polgár (2001, 12) formulates in connection with her own study as well, “the sociolinguistic situation of these speakers [might show] tendencies similar to the ones described by the linguists mentioned above”, so I hope to reveal findings that are at least to some extent comparable to theirs.

As stated above, the questionnaire I used (see Appendices 2 and 3) was not completely the same as the original questionnaire of the SHOH project, but I modified it at some points

² Since no calculations are available on the number of people affiliated with the Roman Catholic, Presbyterian and Greek Catholic parishes in the community, I base my arguments here on my own ethnographic observations, which suggest that the overwhelming majority of the community's members are connected to St Stephen's Roman Catholic Church in some way even if their church affiliation is not Roman Catholic, probably because this parish provides the most vivid cultural and social life in the community.

by leaving out some questions irrelevant for the present case and adding some new (mostly linguistic) ones that concentrate on contact phenomena unique for Hungarian in an English environment. These minor changes in the questionnaire were instituted based on Fenyvesi (2005).

The questionnaire contains both language task and non-language task type questions, out of which this study only discusses answers given to the non-language task type ones, i.e. those that are rather sociolinguistic in nature. These include questions about personal data (e.g. age, gender, marital status, mother tongue, level of education, occupation, etc.); private and public domains of Hungarian language use; ways of acquiring Hungarian; watching television or using the internet in any of the given languages and so on, enabling me to receive a usable amount of information in connection with various topics that belong to the sociolinguistic situation of the community in question.

3.3. Data analysis

I entered the data from the 37 questionnaires into several Excel charts; one chart per question, always showing which answer was given by how many respondents. When it made sense, I also calculated percentages³ in order to better illustrate the proportions of the various answers. Naturally, in the case of those questions that involved longer answers in sentences instead of just choosing from a number of possible options, no chart was prepared, but the answers were collected one under the other to make comparison easier.

³ The percentages that are shown in the tables throughout the present paper are mostly rounded to integers, but sometimes (if rounding to integers would distort the figures too much) halves are also indicated.

4. Discussion

This section concentrates specifically on my own findings that have been collected with the help of the questionnaire mentioned above. Within these findings, the first topic to be described will be the maintenance of ethnicity and culture among Hungarians in Hamilton, with particular attention paid to the domains that play the most considerable role in this maintenance. After that, data on the community's language use in private vs. public domains will also be discussed and commented on, followed by a section on the language acquisition of the speakers. Finally, having also taken a brief look at what roles modern technology, telecommunications and the multimedia play in the subjects' Hungarian language use, the speakers' attachment to Hungary will be discussed as well.

4.1. The maintenance of ethnicity and culture

The role of religion and the church in preserving ethnicity, culture, and even language is extremely crucial, as highlighted by Grosjean (1982) concerning multilingual communities in general, and by Polgár (2001) and Fenyvesi (2005) as well, regarding Hungarian communities in the United States, but also by Harney (1979), in connection with Hungarians in Ontario in particular.

The reason why religion is especially important in the case of Hungarian immigrant communities in the United States can be connected to what Campbell and Christian (2003) refer to as "residential settlement patterns" (Campbell and Christian 2003, 4) and is elaborated on by Fenyvesi (2005: 276) as follows:

"Hungarian language use tends to be absent with neighbors since by the end of the 20th century the once fairly homogeneous Hungarian-American communities have become mixed, and most of the Hungarian-Americans themselves have moved out to other places and are now tied together solely by ethnic institutions like Hungarian churches and clubs rather than a shared neighborhood."

As has already been claimed in the Literature Review section of the present paper, the social situation of Hungarian immigrants in Canada is rather similar to that of Hungarians in the United States. This remark applies to this particular context as well, since this scattered nature of Hungarian communities described by Fenyvesi (2005) is also characteristic of Hamilton, as far as their place of residence within the city is concerned.

This, as Fenyvesi (2005) suggests, assigns a particularly important role to the church and religion (along with Hungarian clubs), with these forming one of the only remaining bonds among members of the ethnic community. This is exactly the case in Hamilton, too, where the Hungarian Roman Catholic parish, St. Stephen's, has occupied a central position of Hungarian community life since it was established in 1944.

As far as my own findings in this respect are concerned, all of my respondents reported (when asked in Question 55 of the questionnaire) to use Hungarian in church regularly, whereas the corresponding percentage in the case of other domains (such as education, employment, shops, and restaurants) was considerably lower (11%; 16%; 46% and 51%, respectively). This claim is further strengthened by the fact that not all of my subjects are weekly churchgoers, which implies that the church is an important domain of Hungarian language use even for those who do not practice their religion on a weekly basis.

As far as the Hungarian club in Hamilton is concerned, the situation is somewhat different from what is suggested by both Polgár (2001) and Fenyvesi (2005). While they both report about considerable community life and frequent celebrations, dinners, balls, etc. taking place in these clubs in the United States, I found that, in the case of my Hamilton respondents, the Hungarian club (or "Hungarian house", as it was referred to by some of them) was mostly only listed by the elderly as a place where they used Hungarian and a place they attended at all (mentioned by 49% of the subjects, that is 18 people, nearly all of them above 60).

Those celebrations, balls, dinners and other get-togethers that are mentioned by Polgár (2001) and Fenyvesi (2005) as important functions of Hungarian clubs in the United States (e.g. "[the] traditional *disznótoros*, pig-killing celebration dinners, and *szüreti bál*, grape harvest dances" Polgár 2001:19) tend to be organized in the church basement in Hamilton, either by the civil representative body of the parish, or by scout-troop members.

It has to be mentioned, though, that Polgár (2001) also describes a similar process going on in Toledo, Ohio. She argues that the Hungarian club is gradually losing its importance there, and identifies two possible reasons why it is so, which are perfectly applicable to the situation of the Hungarian club in Hamilton as well (Polgár 2001:20):

"On the one hand, it is situated in the Birmingham area⁴, but most of the Hungarians live in the suburbs by now. On the other hand, the festivities

⁴ "Toledo's Hungarian neighborhood, [...] located in the East side of Toledo" (Polgár 2001:8), eventually deserted by most of its Hungarian population as they have moved to the suburbs

mentioned above are seasonal, so the Hungarian club does not provide activities on a regular, i.e. weekly or monthly, basis.”

Similarly to the situation in Toledo, it is also true in the case of Hungarians in Hamilton that, on the one hand, most members have moved to various different suburban districts – contributing a lot to what has been described above as the scattered nature of the Hungarian community – and, on the other hand, that the programs provided by the Hungarian club are rather seasonal in nature.

In connection with domains other than the church (and the Hungarian clubs), there is one more essential phenomenon to be remarked about the results of Question 55. Although, as has been suggested above, the proportion of those claiming to use the Hungarian language in education is rather low (11%) in total, it needs to be added that all of my second-generation respondents reported to use (or have used) Hungarian in the Hungarian HL school of the community, which, however, few of them mentioned when asked about their language use in education. Instead, they only added it when they were asked if they used (or had used before) Hungarian in any other settings or domains that were not listed in the questionnaire but they considered important. What can be inferred based on this observation is that (in accordance with the presuppositions formulated in the Literature Review section based on Fishman 2001, Campbell and Christian 2003, Chinen and Tucker 2005, Otcu 2010, and Oriyama 2010), the Hungarian HL school⁵ does play an important role in HL maintenance in the community, although few regard it to be a part of the institutionalized educational system.

4.2. Language use in private domains

After the issue of ethnicity and culture maintenance, the next topic to consider is language use in private domains in the case of the Hamilton Hungarian community. These domains can be characterised by relatively frequent use of Hungarian, since these are the areas of language use that are affected by HL shift the least. Of the five classic domains of language use proposed by Fishman (1972) – i.e. family, friends, religion, education, and employment – I consider the first two to belong to this category, so accordingly, it is these two private domains (i.e. family and friends) that are investigated in the present section.

⁵ The Hungarian HL school (officially called Arany János Hungarian School) has operated in Hamilton, ON since 1980, and has 33 students at preschool, primary and secondary levels, as of 2010. Furthermore, there are three Hungarian 1-8 grade schools in nearby Toronto as well.

In addition, these two domains are complemented by five different situations belonging to a person's private sphere, namely, praying, counting, swearing, thinking and talking to animals. The reason for choosing these five situations is that, on the one hand, they really constitute private and intimate activities; and on the other hand that they were the ones included in the original SHOH questionnaire, and I did not want to change them in order to be able to obtain comparable findings.

I begin with language use – or, to be more precise, language choice – with different family members (namely parents, grandparents, children and spouse). Regarding this domain, it can be stated based on the answers I got to Question 46 of the questionnaire that the most Hungarian is used with parents and grandparents (with 56 and 62 percent of the respondents claiming to use exclusively Hungarian when interacting with their parents and grandparents, respectively). The proportion of the exclusive choice of Hungarian is much lower when it comes to interacting with one's spouse (32%) and even lower when it comes to language choice with one's children (14%). This is a clear sign of intergenerational transmission fading away, thus HL shift being in progress, since if the second generation already tends to speak to the first generation either only in the second language or in both the first and the second one (but not in the first language alone), then it is fairly unlikely for the third generation to learn the immigrant community's first language (i.e. the HL) at all, let alone passing it down to further generations. This way, three-generational HL shift (which was the suggestion of Paulston (1981), Fishman (1966, 1991), and Veltman (1983), as described in the Literature Review) seems to be really taking place.

It is also important, however, to differentiate between data provided by first-generation immigrants and second-generation (i.e. Canadian-born) speakers in connection with some of the answers, since the differences that arise are meaningful in those cases. Thus, for instance, there is only one out of the 11 second-generation speakers (i.e. 9%) that reported to use exclusively Hungarian with their parents, whereas 21 of the 26 first-generation immigrants (i.e. 81%) reported to do so. Similarly, concerning language choice with one's children, none of the second-generation speakers reported to use Hungarian only, whereas the corresponding proportion in the case of first-generation immigrants was 5 speakers out of the 26 (i.e. 19%). These proportions are illustrated in Table 3 below.

	Language choice with children: Hungarian only	Language choice with parents: Hungarian only
First-generation immigrants	5 (19%)	21 (81%)
Second-generation speakers	0 (0%)	1 (9%)

Table 3. Language choice with children and parents, in numbers (and percentages)

This differentiation that can be seen between first-generation immigrants and second-generation speakers further supports the suggestion that HL shift is taking place, because if the number (and proportion) of second-generation speakers talking only in Hungarian to their parents and children is considerably lower than that of first-generation speakers doing so, then the likelihood for the third generation to acquire the HL is rather low, since intergenerational HL transmission does not seem to be effective enough. This is yet another support for the suggestion of Paulston (1981), Fishman (1966, 1991), and Veltman (1983), mentioned above.

A final remark in connection with the language choice of Canadian-born second-generation speakers with their parents and children is that, although they opt for using Hungarian exclusively only in very few cases, it does not mean that they automatically use only English in the rest of the cases. What my findings reveal in this respect is that there was only one second-generation speaker claiming to use exclusively English both with their parents and with their children, while the remaining 10 claimed to use both English and Hungarian with their parents and all of those who had children also claimed to use both languages with them. As a result, it cannot be argued at any point that third-generation speakers are never exposed to the HL, even though this might not correspond to the tendency of three-generational HL shift suggested above.

Within private domains, the next topic to include is language choice with friends. Here, what my findings reveal is a much simpler picture than the one we saw concerning language choice with family members. It is again the answers I got to Question 46 of the questionnaire that I base my findings on in this case as well.

What can be seen based on these data regarding language choice with friends is that in most cases both English and Hungarian are used, which is because the participants tend to have friends who speak English but not Hungarian, but also ones who speak Hungarian but do not speak English, and, what is more, they also reported that with those friends who speak both of their languages, they usually speak both, with occasional switches due to various factors like the topic, the situation they are in, etc.

As for the exact numerical data in this respect, it is 32 of the total 37 speakers who reported to use both Hungarian and English with friends, whereas 2 speakers each reported to use only Hungarian and only English and there was one speaker who claimed to use English, Hungarian and French.

After having gained some insight into speakers' language choice in private domains, let us take a look now at the 5 aforementioned situations belonging to a person's private sphere that were included in the questionnaire, namely praying, counting, swearing, thinking and talking to animals. As far as these 5 private situations are concerned, the findings to be revealed are based on Question 56 of the questionnaire, the answers to which are to be seen in Table 4 below.

N=37	Hungarian	English	Hungarian & English	none	no answer
when praying	24 (65%)	3 (8%)	9 (24%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
when counting	11 (30%)	8 (22%)	18 (49%)	-	-
when talking to animals	11 (30%)	10 (27%)	13 (35%)	3 (8%)	-
when thinking	9 (24%)	7 (19%)	21 (57%)	-	-
when swearing	5 (14%)	8 (22%)	16 (43%)	8 (22%)	-

Table 4. Language choice in private situations

What we can conclude based on these data is that praying seems to be the most deeply rooted activity out of all the 5, as that is the one linked to Hungarian the most tightly. However, if we investigate the situation a bit more closely and differentiate between first-generation immigrants and second-generation speakers, we can find a great difference, where 22 out of the 26 first-generation immigrants pray exclusively in Hungarian (85%), while only 2 second-generation speakers out of the 11 do so (18%), with 6 of the remaining 9 praying in both languages, 2 only in English, and 1 not praying at all.

Then, moving downwards in the table, we find that the use of Hungarian decreases step by step, which gives the interesting result that, based on this limited sample, swearing and thinking seem to be much less strongly connected to Hungarian than praying and counting.

To sum up, it could be seen that in the case of private domains the use of Hungarian by the Hamilton Hungarian community is relatively frequent, and even though there are doubtless signs of three-generational HL shift, it cannot be applied to all speakers and situations.

4.3 Language use in public domains

As for language use in public domains, the situation is somewhat different from what was described in the case of private ones. Here, the use of Hungarian is much less frequent than that of English, which shows that HL shift takes (or has taken) place in these domains much faster than in private settings. This actually corresponds to the pattern suggested by Chevalier (2004), since it is usually in these public domains that more formal language is used – with more formal registers and styles –, and if the use of Hungarian is less frequent here than in informal situations, it proves Chevalier (2004)'s claim about a gradual narrowing of registers parallel to HL shift. Accordingly, second-generation speakers tend to code-switch instead of simply switching registers or speech styles due to the formality of the situation (or domain) they are in (Chevalier 2004, 3).

Consequently, we can now state that the presupposition formulated in the Literature Review section of the present paper, based on Chevalier (2004)'s suggestion mentioned above, seems to be proved by my actual findings, with the much less intensive presence of Hungarian in public domains suggesting a gradual loss of high and formal registers and styles throughout the generations. (Data concerning language use in public domains are based on Question 55 of the questionnaire and shown in Table 5.)

	Church	Restaurant	Hungarian club	Shop	Work	School
Total	37 (100%)	19 (51%)	18 (49%)	17 (46%)	6 (16%)	4 (11%)
First generation	26 (100%)	14 (52%)	14 (52%)	10 (37%)	4 (15%)	4 (15%)
Second generation	11 (100%)	5 (45%)	4 (36%)	7 (64%)	2 (18%)	-

Table 5. The number (and percentage) of those who use Hungarian in the given public domains

As can be seen in Table 5, and as has already been established in connection with the maintenance of ethnicity and culture, it is the church where the use of Hungarian is the most frequent among all public domains, since all of my participants reported to use Hungarian in church settings. However, as we move to the right within the table, we can see that the frequency of the use of Hungarian gradually decreases, suggesting that the role of school and work as domains of Hungarian language use is negligible, whereas Hungarian is still present

to a certain extent in shops, in the Hungarian club or in restaurants, but the role of these domains is definitely much less substantial than that of the church.

The fact that the category “school” was mentioned by so few participants in the case of this question indicates that the role of the Hungarian HL school in Hamilton is not so much that it functions as a domain where most members of the community actually *use* their HL in the present, but rather as a domain for *acquiring* it. Hence, we can argue that it is this role it plays in HL acquisition that makes this HL school so essential in the maintenance of the Hungarian language in the community, by contributing a great deal to its intergenerational transmission (thus adding considerably to the role of parents), as has been postulated by Chinen and Tucker (2005), Otcu (2010) and Oriyama (2010) as well, with respect to the various different HL communities studied by them, as described briefly in the Literature Review section above.

In addition, a further important factor also included in Question 55 of the questionnaire is whether Hungarian was used in these public domains earlier on. Basically, in all cases but for church, there is a decrease to be seen if we compare the number of those who claimed to have used Hungarian in the given domain earlier on with the number of those who claimed to use it now, with the most considerable decrease to be observed in the case of restaurants (from 78% to 51%). As a possible explanation for this, it can be stated that a number of Hungarian restaurants have been closed down throughout Ontario in the past decades, as revealed by many of my interviewees.

Apart from the data provided by Question 55, Question 46 of the questionnaire also contains information that can belong to the topic of language use in public domains, since it asks about the language the participants use with their neighbours. The answers to this question show that altogether 95% of the speakers (i.e. 35 people) use only English with them, while the remaining 5% (i.e. 2 participants) claim to use both Hungarian and English. This provides further evidence to the scattered nature of the Hungarian community in Hamilton, which developed throughout the second half of the 20th century due to excessive suburbanisation, when the Hungarian families left the traditionally Hungarian neighbourhoods that they used to live in for decades before. This is a process that a number of Hungarian communities in the United States share as well, as implied by Polgár (2001) and Fenyvesi (2005) alike, and as has already been suggested in the present paper above.

4.4. Hungarian language acquisition

As far as the speakers' Hungarian language acquisition is concerned, the data I base my findings on are provided by Question 28 of the questionnaire, the answers to which are summarized in Table 6 below.

	Hungarian learnt...			
	...from parents	...while scouting	...at school	...at university
Total	37 (100%)	17 (46%)	36 (97%)	6 (16%)
First generation	26 (100%)	8 (30%)	26 (100%)	4 (15%)
Second generation	11 (100%)	9 (82%)	10 (91%)	2 (18%)

Table 6. Hungarian language acquisition of speakers

First and foremost, the most spectacular finding based on these data is that all of the speakers reported to have learnt Hungarian from their parents, which shows that it is connected to the family domain rather closely in the case of first-generation immigrants (i.e. those born in Hungary) and second-generation speakers (i.e. those born already in Canada) alike. However, it does not mean that they had no further source of acquisition besides their parents, since it was possible to give multiple answers in the questionnaire.

As a result, meaningful data were obtained in the case of school, university and scouting as possible sources of acquisition as well, out of which school proved to be present in most of the cases, with all but one speakers claiming to have learnt the HL at school. In the case of second-generation speakers, this further illustrates the importance of the Hungarian HL school in maintaining the Hungarian language (via enhancing its intergenerational transmission) in the Hamilton Hungarian community, since most second-generation speakers commented orally throughout the interviews that it was in this Hungarian HL school and not in their official Canadian primary or secondary school that they learnt Hungarian.

As for the role of scouting, a rather telling difference can be observed between first-generation immigrants and second-generation speakers, where only 30% of the former group (i.e. 8 speakers out of the 26) claimed to have acquired Hungarian while scouting, whereas the corresponding proportion among second-generation speakers was 82% (i.e. 9 out of 11). This in turn sheds light on the fact that scouting (similarly to, and often even in cooperation with the Hungarian school) also plays a crucial role in maintaining language and ethnicity among Hungarians in Hamilton, meaning far more than a merely religious movement.

4.5. Telecommunications and the multimedia

The presence of the Hungarian language in telecommunications and the multimedia in the life of the Hamilton Hungarian community was looked at through seven questions, all of which (except for the one regarding television and radio) were prepared by me, since the researchers who had previously conducted studies with the help of the original SHOH questionnaire (or similar, slightly modified ones) had not included questions concerning this topic in their research, apart from a single one on the role of television and radio. However, I considered it to be an important field to investigate, given the omnipresence of telecommunications and multimedia in people's everyday lives nowadays.

As I have already mentioned, there was a question in the original SHOH questionnaire regarding the presence of Hungarian in telecommunications, namely Question 51, asking about what language(s) the participants watched television and listened to radio programmes in. My findings based on this question show that none of the speakers reported watching or listening to only Hungarian programmes, but the proportion of those opting for both English and Hungarian ones was 25 out of 37 in the case of television and 7 of 37 for radio.

The reason why Hungarian programmes can be listened to and watched at all in Hamilton is that there are some Hungarian radio stations in the neighbouring cities and towns (e.g. Toronto or Tilsonburg), and the local television broadcasts a Hungarian variety programme on Saturday afternoons each week. Apart from this, satellite television channels are also possible to receive, and many Hungarian radio stations can be listened to online as well. As has been shown by the proportion of those who listen to or watch these programmes in Hungarian (apart from listening to and watching English-language ones as well), the role of radio and television cannot be disregarded when it comes to maintaining ethnicity, language and culture.

The first two of the six questions regarding telecommunications and the multimedia that were added to the questionnaire by me (namely Questions 90 and 91) concerned the presence of Hungarian in the cell-phone usage of the community. While answers to Question 91 showed that none of the speakers had Hungarian as the language of their cell phones, Question 90 revealed that 9 out of the total 37 respondents used Hungarian when writing text messages. This shows that Hungarian is not totally absent in this context either, but it clearly only plays a marginal role as compared to English in the case of both generations.

Question 92 asked about whether the participants surfed Hungarian Internet pages. The results showed that 26 out of the total 37 (with 10 out of the 11 second-generation speakers) claimed to do so, with the most commonly mentioned topics ranging from

Hungarian history, politics and news to Hungarian recipes. What these findings suggest is that the Internet can be regarded as a relatively new domain in which the Hungarian language is used by Hungarians in Hamilton. In addition, as is also exemplified by the most common topics of the pages that the speakers reported to visit, the Internet can also play an important role in preserving ethnicity, culture and identity in the community.

Finally, as far as the remaining 3 questions about Hungarian and the multimedia are concerned, answers to Question 94 have revealed that 17 out of the 37 respondents used some kind of forum to chat on-line in Hungarian, while, as can be seen from answers to Questions 95 and 96, 8 out of 37 reported to use the Hungarian social networking site *iWiW*, and 14 out of the total 37 claimed to use Hungarian via the similar, but international site *Facebook*. In the case of the latter, the proportion of second-generation speakers using Hungarian on that page was 10 out of 11.

To conclude, telecommunications and the multimedia have turned out to be doubtlessly playing a more and more crucial role in the Hungarian language use of the community in question, probably with the Internet being the most considerable nowadays of all the fields that were briefly elaborated on above. Apart from the great variety of Internet pages (but mostly pages about Hungarian history, news, politics and cuisine) that members of the community tend to visit, the role of chat-rooms and social networking sites is also of paramount importance, to the extent that this virtual domain of the Internet could even be added to the five basic classic domains of language use described in the initial subsections of the present Discussion (i.e. family, friends, religion, education, and employment, as proposed by Fishman 1972), since it has become equal in importance to most of them, to say the least.

At this point, it should be mentioned in passing that the presence of Hungarian in these new spheres could also be studied from the perspective of globalization, which could provide an opportunity for continuing research in this aspect, but this is not part of the present study.

To conclude the Discussion, I want to mention that some questions of the questionnaire were left out of this paper even though they could have been included in a macrosociolinguistic analysis. The reason for this is obvious: the discussion has turned out to be rather lengthy for the purposes of the present paper even without these additional topics, so it was out of length-considerations that I decided to exclude some questions from the analysis.

Nevertheless, the five subsections of the Discussion have lead us through the most important findings of the study based on the data collected with the help of the questionnaire. We have seen in topics ranging from the maintenance of ethnicity and culture, language use in private vs. public domains, and language acquisition to the presence of Hungarian in the

multimedia that, although HL shift is taking place without doubt, its pace is relatively slow and at times there even are signs that might talk against three-generational shift to be happening.

5. Conclusion

In this section, I am going to restate and evaluate the most important findings and try to summarize what might be regarded as the answer to my research question. After that, I am going to highlight some possible directions in which the present research can be continued and taken somewhat further. At the end, a brief section about the significance of this study will also be provided.

Basically what can be regarded as the most essential finding of the present study is that HL shift is doubtlessly taking place in the Hamilton Hungarian community, although it might not be as rapid as could be expected before the detailed analysis, with some signs even challenging the presupposition that the typical North-American three-generational HL shift is happening in the community, although in most cases this is exactly what can be concluded based on the findings. Evidence for shift (mostly due to the lack of effective intergenerational HL transmission) has been found in a number of different topics, ranging from preserving ethnicity and culture to language use and acquisition.

In connection with the possible future avenues of research, along the lines of which the scope of my investigations can be broadened and taken a step further, conducting a comparative study based on this paper and any of the four ones described at the beginning of the section on data collection (i.e. Csernicskó 1998, Göncz 1999, Lanstyák 2000, and Polgár 2001) might be a reasonable step to take, since exactly this was the reason why I wanted to obtain data comparable to theirs, using a questionnaire rather similar to the ones used by them.

Furthermore, I am also planning to analyze the more strictly speaking linguistic data that I have collected, since this paper only looks at the sociolinguistic findings, and it would be reasonable to broaden the scope of my investigations by including the language task type questions as well.

Another avenue for continuing this research could be a study focusing on the instances of code-switching produced by my participants in the course of the interviews. Since my interviews have all been recorded, it is perfectly possible to collect and transcribe the instances of switches produced by the speakers, and look at either the environments or the possible social motivations underlying them.

As far as the significance of this paper is concerned, it can be stated that no similar macrosociolinguistic survey has been carried out in connection with Hungarians living in Canada to date, and given Canada's well-established and widely advertised multicultural and

immigrant-friendly policies, it is reasonable to compare and contrast the findings of this study to those of previous studies on Hungarian in the USA and in countries neighbouring Hungary, the latter of which are often referred to as having different (sometimes even opposing) attitudes towards minorities.

Although this study is rather innovative in nature (dealing with a topic not systematically researched before), its innovation serves to broaden the scope of several previous investigations by a number of different authors about Hungarian speech communities in various language contact situations, by providing data comparable to theirs. As a result, the present paper can be claimed to be innovative and conservative at the same time, with its innovation relying to a great extent on the already existing work of various authors.

Bibliography

- Antalóczy, Scarlett Deva. 2006. *Freedom '56: Personal accounts of the 1956 Hungarian revolution and its aftermath*. Charleston, SC: Book Surge Publishing.
- Campbell, Russ and Donna Christian, eds. 2003. Directions in research: Intergenerational transmission of heritage languages. *Heritage Language Journal*, 1:1-44.
- Chevalier, Joan F. 2004. Heritage language literacy: Theory and practice. *Heritage Language Journal*, 2:1-19.
- Chinen, Kiyomi and Tucker, G. Richard. 2005. Heritage language development: Understanding the roles of ethnic identity and Saturday school participation. *Heritage Language Journal*, 3.1:27-59.
- Csernicskó, István. 1998. *A magyar nyelv Ukrajnában (Kárpátalján)* [The Hungarian language in the Ukraine (Subcarpathia)]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó and MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely.
- Dreisziger, Nándor F. 1980. Immigrant lives and lifestyles in Canada, 1924-1939. *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies*, 8: 61-83.
- Dreisziger, Nándor F. 1986. Immigration and re-migration: The changing urban-rural distribution of Hungarian Canadians, 1886-1986. *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies*, 13: 20-41.
- Dreisziger, Nándor F. 2004. The erosion of the Hungarian linguistic presence in Canada, 1991-2001. In: Ludanyi, Andras, ed. *Yearbook of the Hungarian Community of Friends*. Portland, OR: Hungarian Communion of Friends, 58-62.
- Dreisziger, Nándor F., M. L. Kovacs, Paul Bódy and Bennett Kovrig. 1982. *Struggle and hope: The Hungarian-Canadian experience*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Fenyvesi, Anna. 2005. Hungarian in the United States. In: Fenyvesi, Anna, ed. *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: Studies on Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 265-318.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1966. *Language loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1972. Domains and the relationship between micro- and macrosociolinguistics. In: Gumperz, John J. and Dell Hymes, eds. *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of speaking*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 407-434.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1991. *Reversing language shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Fishman, Joshua A. 2001. 300-plus years of heritage language education in the United States. In: Peyton, Joy Kreeft, Donald A. Ranard and Scott McGinnis, eds. *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource*. Washington, DC and McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems, 81-97.
- Göncz, Lajos. 1999. *A magyar nyelv Jugoszláviában (Vajdaságban)* [The Hungarian language in Yugoslavia (Vojvodina)]. Budapest and Újvidék: Osiris Kiadó, Forum Könyvkiadó and MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely.
- Grosjean, Francois. 1982. *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hidas, Peter I. 1998. The Hungarian Refugee Student Movement of 1956-57 and Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies Journal*, 30: 19-49.
- Kelleher, Ann. 2008. What is a heritage language? In: Peyton, Joy Kreeft, ed. *Frequently asked questions about heritage languages in the United States, Volume 1*. Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 3-4.
- Kontra, Miklós. 2005. Contextualizing the Sociolinguistics of Hungarian Outside Hungary project. In: Fenyvesi, Anna, ed. *Hungarian language contact outside Hungary: Studies on Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 29-46.
- Lanstyák, István. 2000. *A magyar nyelv Szlovákiában* [The Hungarian language in Slovakia]. Budapest and Bratislava: Osiris Kiadó, Kalligram Könyvkiadó and MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely.
- Otcu, Bahar. 2010. Heritage language maintenance and cultural identity formation: The case of a Turkish Saturday school in New York City. *Heritage Language Journal*, 7.2:112-137.
- Oriyama, Kaya. 2010. Heritage language maintenance and Japanese identity formation: What role can schooling and ethnic community contact play? *Heritage Language Journal*, 7.2:76-111.
- Papp, Susan M., ed. 1979. *Hungarians in Ontario*. Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario.
- Paulston, Christina Bratt. 1981. Bilingualism and education. In: Ferguson, Charles and Shirley Brice Heath, eds. *Language in the USA*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 469-485.
- Polgár, Etelka. 2001. *Language maintenance and language shift: A sociolinguistic analysis of a Hungarian-American community*. Szeged: University of Szeged, MA thesis.

- Ruzsa, Jenő. 1940. *A kanadai magyarság története* [The history of Hungarians in Canada]. Toronto: Jenő Ruzsa.
- Statistics Canada. 2006. *Ethnocultural Portrait of Canada Highlight Tables, 2006 Census*.
<http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/hlt/97-562/pages/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo=CMA&Code=537&Data=Count&Table=2&StartRec=1&Sort=3&Display=All&CSDFilter=5000> (Date of access: 30/04/12)
- Thomason, Sarah Grey. 2001. *Language contact: An introduction*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Veltman, Calvin. 1983. *Language shift in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Wiley, Terrence G. 2001. On defining heritage languages and their speakers. In: Peyton, Joy Kreeft, Donald A. Ranard and Scott McGinnis, eds. *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource*. Washington, DC and McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems, 29-36.

Appendix 1

Table 11. Personal data of speakers (1-38)

speaker number	date of the interview	sex	year of birth	place of birth	year of		place of residence	years of education		occupation	
					emigration	immigration, Canada		outside Canada	in Canada	original	present
1	06.07.2011.	M	1958	Hamilton, ON	-	-	Stoney Creek, Hamilton, ON	-	15	body-mechanic	dish ed. retirement
2	06.07.2011.	M	1952	Ribickethy (today part of Szeged) (Hungary)	1956	1956	Dundas, Hamilton, ON	9,5	1	butcher	retired
3	08.07.2011.	M	1931	Scorbalaky	1955	1956	Hamilton, ON	15	3	school-inspector	retired
4	08.07.2011.	M	1927	Mykisszati	1956	1957	Hamilton, ON	14	-	conductor, singer	retired
5	10.07.2011.	F	1947	Budapest	1971	1971	Dundas, Hamilton, ON	15	-	shop assistant	housewife
6	11.07.2011.	F	1955	Csaszaja	2001	2001	Oakville, ON	15	-	kindergarten teacher	housewife, housekeeper
7	11.07.2011.	M	1930	Budapest	1956	1957	Dundas, Hamilton, ON	12	-	technician	retired
8	11.07.2011.	F	1937	Kolozsar (RO)	1956	1957	Dundas, Hamilton, ON	8	1	nurse	retired
9	12.07.2011.	M	1949	Stockholm (S)	1951	1951	Stoney Creek, Hamilton, ON	-	15	instrumentation technician	retired
10	14.07.2011.	F	1969	Turerecs (RO)	1998	1998	Hamilton, ON	12	-	dressmaker	cleaner
11	14.07.2011.	F	1936	Koniamon	1957	1957	Burlington, ON	12	2	book-keeper	retired
12	14.07.2011.	M	1933	Lami	1957	1957	Burlington, ON	13	-	transportation contractor	retired
13	16.07.2011.	F	1973	Hamilton, ON	-	-	Hamilton, ON	-	17	graphic designer	customer service coordinator
14	17.07.2011.	M	1947	Oreglak	1970	1970	Hamilton, ON	12	-	plumber	retired
15	17.07.2011.	F	1948	Hidas	1970	1970	Hamilton, ON	13	-	machine operator	retired
16	19.07.2011.	F	1932	Szolnok	1955	1960	Hamilton, ON	13	3	singer, administrative manager	retired
17	19.07.2011.	F	1943	Budapest	1945	1950	Hamilton, ON	1	17	teacher	retired
18	19.07.2011.	M	1934	Budapest	1956	1957	Hamilton, ON	13	7	teacher	retired
19	20.07.2011.	F	1970	Hamilton, ON	-	-	Mississauga, ON	-	15	teacher	teacher
20	20.07.2011.	F	1963	Hamilton, ON	-	-	Toronto, ON	-	17	laboratory technician	infection prevention coordinator
21	22.07.2011.	M	1935	Ujfeherto	1955	1956	Hamilton, ON	12	-	tool and die maker	retired
22	23.07.2011.	M	1953	Szathmarnevel (RO)	1990	1995	Oakville, ON	17	-	mechanical engineer	production supervisor
23	23.07.2011.	M	1935	Budapest	1955	1956	Mississauga, ON	13	1	tool and die maker	tool and die maker
24	24.07.2011.	F	1974	Hamilton, ON	-	-	Hamilton, ON	-	18	massage therapist	massage therapist, X-ray technologist
25	26.07.2011.	M	1932	Aggocszereny	1952	1953	Hamilton, ON	8	3	construction worker	retired
26	26.07.2011.	F	1936	Őrszempeker	1957	1957	Stoney Creek, Hamilton, ON	14	-	factory worker	retired
27	28.07.2011.	F	1961	Hamilton, ON	-	-	Hamilton, ON	-	15	office administrator	office administrator
28	28.07.2011.	F	1988	Hamilton, ON	-	-	Hamilton, ON	-	15	pharmacy technician	unemployed
29	28.07.2011.	F	1940	Aggocszereny	1969	1969	Hamilton, ON	13	-	post-office employee	retired
30	29.07.2011.	M	1946	Fefenitz (A)	1957	1957	Hamilton, ON	4	15	teacher	retired
31	30.07.2011.	M	1950	Nereszabdyar	1980	1980	Caledon, ON	15	-	millwright	machine fitter
32	02.08.2011.	F	1971	Hamilton, ON	-	-	Hamilton, ON	-	20	medical laboratory technologist	medical laboratory technologist
33	03.08.2011.	M	1980	Hamilton, ON	-	-	Aurora, ON	-	15	library technician	library technician
34	06.08.2011.	F	1933	Sakitia	1955	1957	Hamilton, ON	12	-	primary school teacher	retired
35	07.08.2011.	F	1945	Eschwege (D)	1979	1979	Oakville, ON	15	-	physiotherapist	retired
36	08.08.2011.	F	1960	Belleville, ON	-	-	Ancaster, Hamilton, ON	-	16	fire safety inspector	financial services adviser
37	10.08.2011.	M	1937	Kislacs (today part of Lúcs) (Hungary, SK)	1957	1957	Oakville, ON	12	3	millwright	retired
38	10.08.2011.	F	1987	Hamilton, ON	-	-	Stoney Creek, Hamilton, ON	-	17	teacher	activities director in a nursing home

Appendix 2

Nyelvhasználati kérdőív

Az itt következő adatokra a magyar nyelv mai helyzetének tudományos vizsgálata céljából van szükségünk: ehhez hasonló kérdőívet sok magyar anyanyelvű személy kitöltött Magyarországon, Kárpátalján, Vajdaságban, Erdélyben, Szlovákiában, Szlovéniában, Ausztriában és az USA-ban. Most a kanadai magyarokat is szeretnénk megkérdezni. Az adatokat bizalmasan kezeljük. Öszinte válaszaival nagy segítségünkre lehet. Ha valamelyik kérdésre nem kíván válaszolni, ne válaszoljon. Köszönjük segítségét.

0. A kitöltés időpontja:

00. Hogyan viszonyulnak a kanadaiak ahhoz, ha magyarul hallják Önt beszélni? Adódott-e már valaha ebből problémája?

000. Tudják-e Önről nem magyar szomszédai, munkatársai, ismerősei, hogy Ön magyar származású?

28. Hol tanult meg magyarul? (Karikázza be mindet, ami Önre vonatkozik.)

1. szüleimtől
2. cserkészletben
3. iskolában
4. egyetemen
5. nyelvtanfolyamon

29. Van-e házastársa vagy élettársa?

1. van
2. nincs, de volt
3. soha nem volt

30. Házastársa/(élettársa) milyen iskolákat végzett?

1. általános iskola
2. középiskola
3. főiskola, egyetem
4. posztgraduális képzés

31. Házastársa/(élettársa) foglalkozása:

32. Ön szerint milyen nemzetiségűnek tartja magát az Ön házastársa/élettársa?

1. magyarnak
2. kanadainak
9. másnak:

33. Házastársa/élettársa anyanyelve:

1. magyar
2. angol
9. más:

AZ ALÁBBI MONDATOK KÖZÜL KARIKÁZZA BE AZ EGYIKET, AZT, AMELYIKET TERMÉSZETESEBBNEK ÉRZI.

501. (1) A találkozást Péterrel jó jelnek tartotta.
(2) A Péterrel való találkozást jó jelnek tartotta.

502. (1) Valószínűleg fogok késni egy kicsit, várjanak meg!
(2) Valószínűleg késni fogok egy kicsit, várjanak meg!

503. (1) Befizetted már az idei tagsági díjat?
(2) Befizetted már az idei tagdíjat?
504. (1) Éhes vagy, kis bogaram? Adjak egy kis kenyérkét?
(2) Éhes vagy, kis bogaram? Adjak egy kis kenyeret?
505. (1) Nézd, milyen szép banánokat árulnak az üzletben!
(2) Nézd, milyen szép banánt árulnak az üzletben!
506. (1) A mai gyerekek attól válnak önzökké, hogy mindent megkapnak.
(2) A mai gyerekek attól válnak önzővé, hogy mindent megkapnak.
507. (1) Unom már ezt a sok utazást busszal.
(2) Unom már ezt a sok buszozást.
508. (1) Ezzel az eshetőséggel is kell számolni.
(2) Ezzel az eshetőséggel is számolni kell.
509. (1) A bejárat az épületbe a másik oldalon van.
(2) Az épület bejárata a másik oldalon van.
510. (1) Hahó, itt vagyok! Látsz?
(2) Hahó, itt vagyok! Látsz engem?
511. (1) Ebben az üzletben nemcsak függönyt, hanem szőnyeget is lehet vásárolni.
(2) Ebben az üzletben nemcsak függönyöket, hanem szőnyegeket is lehet vásárolni.
512. (1) Koszovóban folytatódnak a tárgyalások az albánok és a szerbek között.
(2) Koszovón folytatódnak a tárgyalások az albánok és a szerbek között.
513. (1) Valószínűleg külföldre fognak költözni.
(2) Valószínűleg, hogy külföldre fognak költözni.
514. (1) Tanító néni, fáj a fejem. Kimehetek?
(2) Tanító néni, fáj a fejem. Ki tudok menni?
515. (1) Tegnap láttalak a tévében.
(2) Tegnap láttalak téged a tévében.

JÓNAK TARTJA-E A KÖVETKEZŐ MONDATOKAT?

531. Ott van a szék a szoba sarkába.
(a) jónak tartom
(b) rossznak tartom, jobb így:
532. Nem tudom, a banki számláján mennyi pénz van.
(a) jónak tartom
(b) rossznak tartom, jobb így:
533. Ha megírta volna is a levelet, nem ment volna semmire.

- (a) jónak tartom
 (b) rossznak tartom, jobb így:

535. A szerződő felek a megállapodást közjegyző előtt írásban foglalták.

- (a) jónak tartom
 (b) rossznak tartom, jobb így:

536. Ha szellőztetni akarok, így kérek engedélyt: Ki tudom nyitni az ablakot?

- (a) jónak tartom
 (b) rossznak tartom, jobb így:

537. Már dél lesz, mire megérkezünk a szülővárosomban a családomhoz.

- (a) jónak tartom
 (b) rossznak tartom, jobb így:

43. (1) Gyermekének keresztnéve:
 (2) Nincs gyermekem.

46. Általában milyen nyelven vagy nyelveken szokott Ön beszélni az alábbi táblázatban feltüntetett személyekkel? A megfelelő rubrikába tegyen egy X-et. Egy sorba több X-et is tehet, ha szükséges. Például ha gyerekeivel magyarul és angolul is szokott beszélni, akkor tegyen két X-et a "Gyerekeivel" sorba.

	magyar	angol	egyéb
szüleivel			
nagyszüleivel			
gyerekeivel			
házastársával			
barátaival			
szomszédaival			

47. Milyen szinten beszéli ön a következő nyelveket? A megfelelő rubrikákba tegyen egy X-et!

	magyart	angolt	egyéb nyelvet
6. anyanyelvi szinten			
5. nagyon jól			
4. jól			
3. nem nagyon jól			
2. alig néhány szót			
1. nem beszélek, csak értek			
0. sehogy			

ÍRJON A PONTOK HELYÉRE (HA SZÜKSÉGESNEK ÉRZI!) EGY ODAILLŐ VÉGZŐDÉST VAGY SZÓT!

801. Még nem tudjuk, hogy hányan jönnek el a találkozóra. Majd meglá....., ha odaérünk.

802. Pista jobban beszél magyar....., mint angol..... .

803. A kutya vonyított, amikor a farká..... léptem.

804. Egyik ház..... a másik..... jártak, és mindenhova becsöngettek.

805. A férjem..... Sanyi..... hívják.
 806. Soha nem találkozott az ap....., mert meghalt, mielőtt ő megszületett.
 807. Megjavítottam mind a két bicikli..... .
 808. Sok legye..... beengedett a nyitott ablakon.
 809. Minden nap sétálok a kutyáim..... a parkban.
 810. Majd amikor megérkezünk Budapest....., mindenki pihenhet egy kicsit.

48. Tud-e írni-olvasni az alábbi nyelveken?

	írok és olvasok	csak olvasok	nem írok, nem olvasok
magyarul			
angolul			
egyéb nyelven			

49. Ha szokott írni magyarul, mit?

.....

50. Rendszerint milyen nyelven olvas...? Egy sorba több X-et is tehet, ha szükséges.

	magyar	angol	egyéb	sehogy
újságot, folyóiratot				
imakönyvet, Bibliát				
verset, regényt				
szakirodalmat				

51. Milyen nyelvű tévé- és rádióműsorokat néz illetve hallgat?

	magyar	angol	egyéb nyelv
tévé			
rádió			

55. Ön használta-e régebben és használja-e most a magyart az alábbi helyzetekben?

	régebben	most
templomban		
boltban		
étteremben		
munkahelyen		
iskolában		
magyar klubban, Magyar Házban, magyar egyesületben		
egyéb helyen:		

56. Ön rendszerint milyen nyelvet használ ...?

	magyart	angolt	egyéb nyelvet	semmilyet
imádkozás közben				

számolás közben				
káromkodás közben				
gondolkozás közben				
állatokhoz szólva				

KARIKÁZZA BE AZ (1)-T VAGY A (2)-T ASZERINT, HOGY MELYIK ILLIK BELE JOBBAN A MONDATBA!

601. A képviselők az okokat tartották.

(1) komolyaknak (2) komolynak

602. Miért sírsz, kis bogaram? Megütötted a?

(1) kezecskédet? (2) kis kezedet?

603. A repülőgépek megsértették Svájc

(1) légi terét (2) légterét

604. Az autós moziban az utasok ülve nézhetik a filmet.

(1) autókban (2) autóban

605. Fáj a fejem, mert a szomszéd egész délután

(1) hegedűn játszott (2) hegedült

606. Fiúk, nem attól váltok, hogy elvégzitek az iskolát, hanem attól, ha tüzet oltotok.

(1) tűzoltókká (2) tűzoltóvá

607. Mindjárt kész az ebéd,

(1) ne légy türelmetlen! (2) ne türelmetlenkedj!

608. Itt van még Péter? – Itt, de már

(1) készül menni (2) menni készül

609. Az egyik ismerősöm fia volt katona.

(1) Craiován (2) Craiovában

610. Az osztályban senki sem

(1) magasabb, mint ő (2) magasabb nála

611. A fiúk még tavaly jelentkeztek

(1) tűzoltóknak (2) tűzoltónak

612. Azt hiszem, ebéd után mindenkinek jól esik egy – mondta a háziasszony kedves mosollyal.

(1) kávécska (2) kávé

613. A tükör előtt hosszan

(1) szépítette magát (2) szépítkezett

615. Találkoztam Hedviggel, s, hogy vegyen nekem egy kiflit.
 (1) megkértem (2) megkértem őt

57. A megfelelő szám bekarikázásával határozza meg 1-től 5-ig terjedő skálán,
 a) hogy mennyire kötődik Ön az alábbi helyekhez!

1=egyáltalán nem kötődöm hozzá, 5=nagyon erősen kötődöm hozzá

- | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) saját városához | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b) saját tartományához | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c) Kanadához | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d) Magyarországhoz | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e) sehová | | | | | |

b) hogy mennyire érzi Ön magát (1=egyáltalán nem; 5=nagyon erősen)

- | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) a kanadai magyarsághoz tartozónak | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b) a magyar nemzethez tartozónak | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c) a kanadai nemzethez tartozónak | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d) sehova sem tartozónak | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

58. Melyik sportolónak vagy csapatnak szokott Ön szurkolni, ha...

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| a) magyar játszik kanadaival | |
| 1) a magyarnak | 2) a kanadainak |
| b) magyar játszik mással (nem kanadaival) | |
| 1) a magyarnak | 2) a másiknak |
| c) kanadai játszik mással (nem magyarral) | |
| 1) a kanadainak | 2) a másiknak |

62. Ön szerint hol beszélnek a legszebben magyarul? Karikázza be a megfelelő választ!

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1) Budapesten | 6) a Felvidéken (Szlovákia) |
| 2) Magyarországon, vidéki városban | 7) a Vajdaságban (Jugoszlávia) |
| 3) Magyarországon, falvakban | 8) Burgenlandban (Ausztria) |
| 4) Kárpátalján (Ukrajna) | 9) a Muravidéken (Szlovénia) |
| 5) Erdélyben (Románia) | 10) Kanadában |

63. Ha valaki csak magyarul tud Kanadában

- | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| (1) könnyen boldogul | (2) lehetnek nehézségei | (3) nehezen boldogul |
|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|

67. Milyen gyakran utazik Ön Magyarországra? Karikázza be a választ!

- | | |
|----------------|------------------|
| 0 Soha | 3 Kb. 2-3 évente |
| 1 Ritkán | 4 Évente |
| 2 Kb. 5 évente | 5 Félévente |

68. Mikor volt utoljára Magyarországon? évben.

ÍRJON A PONTOK HELYÉRE (HA SZÜKSÉGESNEK ÉRZI!) EGY ODAILLŐ
 VÉGZÖDÉST VAGY SZÓT!

621. Patrícia magasabb Klaudiá....., pedig egy évvel fiatalabb.

622. Azt akarom, hogy ő nyi..... ki az ajtót.

623. Középiskolánk..... sok szakképzetlen pedagógus tanít.

624. Jó napot kívánok, a főnök..... jöttem, panaszt szeretnék tenni.

625. Kovács János azt kérte, hogy a jelölő bizottság tekintsen el attól, hogy őt titkárrá jelölje és (megválasztani).

626. Erzszi néninek fáj..... a szív....., Kati néninek meg a láb..... is fáj.....

628. Ha Péter rosszul válogat..... meg a barátait, pórul jár.

629. Minek ez a halogatás?! Nem szeretem, ha valaki elhala..... a döntéseket.

69. Vannak-e olyan rokonai, barátai Magyarországon, akikkel szoros kapcsolatot tartanak fenn (pl. látogatják egymást, leveleznek)? (1) igen (2) nem

72. Előfordult-e Önnel, hogy Magyarországon nyelvi nehézségei támadtak? (Például félreértették vagy nem értették meg, amit Ön mondott, vagy Ön nem értette meg pontosan, amit ők mondtak, nem tudta, hogy kérjen valamit a boltban, megjegyzést tettek az Ön beszédére stb.)

(1) igen (2) nem

73. Ha igen, mi történt?

.....

ÖN SZERINT HELYESEK-E MAGYARUL AZ ALÁBBI MONDATOK?

701. A magyar nyelv szép, de csak akkor, ha szépen van beszélve.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

702. János 14 év ezelőtt érkezett Kanadába.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

703. "Hogy hívnak téged?" "Én vagyok Tóth Béla."

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

704. Tudod azt a férfit ott? Olyan ismerősnek tűnik.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

705. Pénteken délből mindig ráteszem a magyar zenét, mert azt nagyon szeretem hallgatni.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

706. A férjem és én sokat jártunk táncolni, amikor fiatalabb voltunk.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

707. A mi családjunkban a magyar még sokat van használva.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

708. Mindig én nyitom ki a leveleket, ami jönnek.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

709. Képzeld, az apámnak van egy új autó.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

80. Szokott-e Ön vagy bármely hozzátartozója magyar ételeket készíteni? Ha igen, mit?

.....

81. Tartja-e Ön a kapcsolatot más Kanadában élő magyarokkal?

82. Ha igen, milyen alkalmakkor találkoznak?

.....

83. Ilyenkor milyen nyelven beszélnek egymás között? (Válaszát X-szel jelölje!)

magyarul	angolul	egyéb nyelven

84. Szokott-e Ön magyar zenét hallgatni? Ha igen, milyen forrásból? (lemezről, rádióban, interneten, stb.)

.....

85. Szokott-e Ön magyar filmeket nézni? Ha igen, milyen forrásból? (lemezről, televízióban, interneten, stb.)

.....

ÖN SZERINT HELYESEK-E MAGYARUL AZ ALÁBBI MONDATOK?

811. Tegnap délután kimostam az autót, mert nagyon sáros lett a hosszú úton.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

812. Mari nem csinálta meg a munka, mert már fáradt volt.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

813. Minden este megnézek a kedvenc műsoromat a tévében.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

814. Mikor jártál utoljára Magyarországra?

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

815. Az iskolában hívtak engem István, otthon Pisti.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

816. A múlt héten nem csináltad a feladatot, tehát most kell csinálnod, hogy kész legyen.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

818. Tizennyolc éves voltam, mikor kijöttem az iskolából.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

819. A múltkor találkoztam egy régi barátom, és nagyon jól beszélgettünk.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

820. Először nem ismert, de aztán bemutatkoztam, és akkor már tudta, ki vagyok.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

821. Sanyinak most nincs munkája, mert letették a kórházból.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

822. Egyszer egy év visszautazunk Magyarországra.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

823. A döntésem azon függ, hogy mennyi pénzt kapok.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

824. Figyelj oda, nehogy megütöd magad!

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

825. Majd meglássák ők is, hogy ez hogy megy.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

826. A fiaim 18 éves voltak, amikor elköltöztek itthonról.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

827. Ők azok, aki mindig segítenek.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

828. Jobban szoktam beszélni magyarul, de most már csak rosszul tudok, sokat felejtettem.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

829. A feladatban sok hibák voltak.

1) helyes

2) nem helyes, jobb így:

.....

90. Szokott-e Ön magyarul SMS-ezni?

91. Milyen nyelvűre van állítva a mobiltelefonja?

92. Szokott-e Ön az interneten magyar oldalakat böngészni? Ha igen, milyen témájú oldalakat?

.....

93. Olvas-e az interneten magyar sajtótermékeket? Ha igen, melyek ezek?

.....

94. Milyen nyelven szokott Ön chat-elni (virtuális hálózatok segítségével csevegni)?

(Válaszát X-szel jelölje!)

magyarul	angolul	egyéb nyelven	sehogymag

95. Regisztrálva van-e Ön az Iwiw nevű magyar közösségi oldalon? Ha igen, mire használja?

.....

96. Látogat-e Ön más közösségi oldalakat? (pl. Facebook, Twitter, stb.)

97. Ha igen, használja-e valakivel a magyar nyelvet ezeken keresztül?

AZ ALÁBBI MONDATOK KÖZÜL KARIKÁZZA BE AZ EGYIKET, AZT, AMELYIKET TERMÉSZETESEBBNEK ÉRZI.

901. (1) Mi dolgoztunk akkor sokat együtt.

(2) Sokat dolgoztunk akkor együtt.

902. (1) Marinak a férje volt nagyon gazdag.

(2) Marinak nagyon gazdag volt a férje.

903. (1) Megkértem, hogy segítsen.

(2) Megkértem őt, hogy segítsen.

904. (1) A két testvére nem tud magyarul.

(2) A két testvérei nem tudnak magyarul.

905. (1) Azért van az ablaktörlő, hogy esőben is lássuk az utat.

(2) Azért van az ablaktörlő, hogy esőben is látjuk az utat.

906. (1) Akkor már tavasz volt, zöld voltak a fák.

(2) Akkor már tavasz volt, zöldek voltak a fák.

907. (1) Fiatal koromban sokat szoktam úszni, de már öreg vagyok hozzá.

(2) Fiatal koromban sokat úsztam, de már öreg vagyok hozzá.

908. (1) Azok a legszebb lányok, aki elbűvölik az embert.

(2) Azok a legszebb lányok, akik elbűvölik az embert.

909. (1) A feleségem neve Szabó Ilona volt.

(2) A feleségem neve volt Szabó Ilona.

910. (1) Az autómat gyártották 2008-ban.

(2) Az autómat 2008-ban gyártották.

1. Lakhely: 2. Tartomány:

3. Neme: 1) férfi 2) nő

4. Neve:

5. Születési éve:

6. Születési helye:

7. Ha nem Kanadában született, mikor érkezett ide:

8. Milyen iskolákat végzett Kanadán kívül és hol:

1. általános iskola,
2. szakközépiskola,
3. gimnázium,
4. főiskola, egyetem,

Mikor végezte el az utolsót?

9. Milyen iskolákat végzett Kanadában:

1. általános iskola
2. középiskola
3. főiskola, egyetem
4. posztgraduális képzés

Mikor végezte el az utolsót?

10. Eredeti foglalkozása:

11. Jelenlegi foglalkozása, magyarul:
angolul:

12. Munkahelyének neve:

17. Milyen nemzetiségűnek tartja magát?

1. magyarnak 2. kanadainak
9. másnak:

18. Ha Ön nem Kanadában született, amerikaiasította-e a nevét? (Pl. Kovács Istvánról Stephen Kovácsra vagy Stephen Smith-re)

1. nem
2. igen, (a) csak a keresztnévemet, (b) csak a vezetéknévemet, (c) mindkettőt

19. Ha az előző kérdésre igennel válaszolt, mi volt a változtatás oka, célja, és mikor történt?

20. Ha Ön Észak-Amerikában született, milyen keresztnéve van?

1. olyan, ami magyarul és angolul is van (pl. Andrew - András)
2. olyan, ami angolul nincs, csak magyarul (pl. Árpád)
3. olyan, ami magyarul nincs, csak angolul (pl. Brian)

21. Anyanyelve:

1. magyar 2. angol 9. más:

22. Anyja anyanyelve:

1. magyar 2. angol 9. más:

23. Anyja milyen iskolákat végzett:

1. általános iskola
2. középiskola
3. főiskola, egyetem
4. posztgraduális képzés

24. Anyja foglalkozása:

25. Apja anyanyelve:

1. magyar 2. angol 9. más:

26. Apja milyen iskolákat végzett:

1. általános iskola
2. középiskola
3. főiskola, egyetem
4. posztgraduális képzés

27. Apja foglalkozása:

Appendix 3
Questionnaire on language use
(The English translation of the questionnaire)

The following data is needed in order to support research on the present situation of the Hungarian language. Similar questionnaires have been filled out by many people in Hungary, Subcarpathia, Vojvodina, Transylvania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Austria and the USA. We would like to ask Canadian Hungarians now. All data is treated confidentially. You can be a great help for us if you fill out the questionnaire seriously. If there is a question you do not want to answer, please skip it and go on.

0. Date of filling out the questionnaire:

00. How do Canadians react when they hear you speak Hungarian? Have you ever had any problems because of doing so?

000. Do your non-Hungarian neighbours, colleagues, acquaintances know that you are of Hungarian origins?

28. Where did you learn Hungarian? (Circle everything that applies to you.)

1. from parents
2. when scouting
3. at school
4. at university
5. at a language course

29. Are you married?

- | | | |
|--------|-----------------|----------------|
| 1. yes | 2. I used to be | 3. I never was |
|--------|-----------------|----------------|

30. What schools did your spouse attend?

1. primary school
2. secondary school
3. higher education
4. postgraduate studies

31. Your spouse's occupation:

32. What nationality do you think your spouse considers themselves to be?

- | | | |
|--------------|-------------|-----------------|
| 1. Hungarian | 2. Canadian | 3. other: |
|--------------|-------------|-----------------|

33. Your spouse's mother tongue:

- | | | |
|--------------|------------|-----------------|
| 1. Hungarian | 2. English | 3. other: |
|--------------|------------|-----------------|

**CIRCLE THE SENTENCE YOU FEEL MORE NATURAL OUT OF THE SENTENCE
 PAIRS BELOW**

501. (1) A találkozást Péterrel jó jelnek tartotta.
 (2) A Péterrel való találkozást jó jelnek tartotta.

502. (1) Valószínűleg fogok késni egy kicsit, várjanak meg!

- (2) Valószínűleg késni fogok egy kicsit, várjanak meg!
503. (1) Befizetted már az idei tagsági díjat?
(2) Befizetted már az idei tagdíjat?
504. (1) Éhes vagy, kis bogaram? Adjak egy kis kenyérkét?
(2) Éhes vagy, kis bogaram? Adjak egy kis kenyeret?
505. (1) Nézd, milyen szép banánokat árulnak az üzletben!
(2) Nézd, milyen szép banánt árulnak az üzletben!
506. (1) A mai gyerekek attól válnak önzőkké, hogy mindent megkapnak.
(2) A mai gyerekek attól válnak önzővé, hogy mindent megkapnak.
507. (1) Unom már ezt a sok utazást busszal.
(2) Unom már ezt a sok buszozást.
508. (1) Ezzel az eshetőséggel is kell számolni.
(2) Ezzel az eshetőséggel is számolni kell.
509. (1) A bejárat az épületbe a másik oldalon van.
(2) Az épület bejárata a másik oldalon van.
510. (1) Hahó, itt vagyok! Látsz?
(2) Hahó, itt vagyok! Látsz engem?
511. (1) Ebben az üzletben nemcsak függönyt, hanem szőnyeget is lehet vásárolni.
(2) Ebben az üzletben nemcsak függönyöket, hanem szőnyegek is lehet vásárolni.
512. (1) Koszovóban folytatódnak a tárgyalások az albánok és a szerbek között.
(2) Koszovón folytatódnak a tárgyalások az albánok és a szerbek között.
513. (1) Valószínűleg külföldre fognak költözni.
(2) Valószínűleg, hogy külföldre fognak költözni.
514. (1) Tanító néni, fáj a fejem. Kimehetek?
(2) Tanító néni, fáj a fejem. Ki tudok menni?
515. (1) Tegnap láttalak a tévében.
(2) Tegnap láttalak téged a tévében.

DO YOU REGARD THESE HUNGARIAN SENTENCES AS CORRECT?

531. Ott van a szék a szoba sarkába.
(a) I regard it as correct.
(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:
532. Nem tudom, a banki számláján mennyi pénz van.
(a) I regard it as correct.
(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

533. Ha megírta volna is a levelet, nem ment volna semmire.

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

535. A szerződő felek a megállapodást közjegyző előtt írásban foglalták.

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

536. Ha szellőztetni akarok, így kérek engedélyt: Ki tudom nyitni az ablakot?

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

537. Már dél lesz, mire megérkezünk a szülővárosomban a családomhoz.

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

43. (1) First names of your children:

(2) I do not have children.

46. Usually in what languages do you communicate with the following people? Please look at the chart and put an X in the appropriate places. A line can have more Xs than one if necessary. For instance, if you speak with your children both English and Hungarian, put two Xs in the *children* line.

	Hungarian	English	other
parents			
grandparents			
children			
spouse			
friends			
neighbours			

47. On what level do you speak the following languages? Please put an X in the appropriate places.

	Hungarian	English	other
6) native level			
5) very well			
4) well			
3) not very well			
2) just a few words			
1) only understanding			
0) not at all			

COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING SENTENCES BY WRITING AN APPROPRIATE WORD OR WORD-ENDING ON THE DOTTED LINE IF YOU FEEL IT IS NECESSARY

801. Még nem tudjuk, hogy hányan jönnek el a találkozóra. Majd meglá....., ha odaérünk.

802. Pista jobban beszél magyar....., mint angol..... .

803. A kutya vonyított, amikor a farká..... léptem.

804. Egyik ház..... a másik..... jártak, és mindenhova becsöngettek.

805. A férjem..... Sanyi..... hívják.

806. Soha nem találkozott az ap....., mert meghalt, mielőtt ő megszületett.

807. Megjavítottam mind a két bicikli..... .

808. Sok legye..... beengedett a nyitott ablakon.

809. Minden nap sétálok a kutyáim..... a parkban.

810. Majd amikor megérkezünk Budapest....., mindenki pihenhet egy kicsit.

48. Can you read and write in the following languages?

	read and write	read only	neither
Hungarian			
English			
other language			

49. If you write anything in Hungarian, then what?

.....

50. Usually in what languages do you read...? More Xs can be put in a line if necessary.

	Hungarian	English	other	none
newspapers, magazines				
prayer books, the Bible				
poems, novels				
professional texts				

51. What languages do you usually watch TV and listen to the radio in?

	Hungarian	English	other
TV			
radio			

55. Have you used and do you use Hungarian now in the following situations?

	before	nowadays
at church		
in shops		
in restaurants		
at work		
at school		
in the Hungarian Club		
in other places:		

56. Usually what language do you use...?

	Hungarian	English	other	none
when praying				
when counting				

when swearing				
when thinking				
when talking to animals				

CIRCLE (1) OR (2), WHICHEVER FITS BETTER IN THE SENTENCE

601. A képviselők az okokat tartották.

- (1) komolyaknak (2) komolynak

602. Miért sírsz, kis bogaram? Megütötted a?

- (1) kezecskédet? (2) kis kezedet?

603. A repülőgépek megsértették Svájc

- (1) légi terét (2) légterét

604. Az autós moziban az utasok ülve nézhetik a filmet.

- (1) autókban (2) autóban

605. Fáj a fejem, mert a szomszéd egész délután

- (1) hegedűn játszott (2) hegedült

606. Fiúk, nem attól váltok, hogy elvégeztek az iskolát, hanem attól, ha tüzet oltotok.

- (1) tűzoltókká (2) tűzoltóvá

607. Mindjárt kész az ebéd,

- (1) ne légy türelmetlen! (2) ne türelmetlenkedj!

608. Itt van még Péter? – Itt, de már

- (1) készül menni (2) menni készül

609. Az egyik ismerősöm fia volt katona.

- (1) Craiován (2) Craiovában

610. Az osztályban senki sem

- (1) magasabb, mint ő (2) magasabb nála

611. A fiúk még tavaly jelentkeztek

- (1) tűzoltóknak (2) tűzoltónak

612. Azt hiszem, ebéd után mindenkinek jól esik egy – mondta a háziasszony kedves mosollyal.

- (1) kávécska (2) kávé

613. A tükör előtt hosszan

- (1) szépítette magát (2) szépítkezett

615. Találkoztam Hedviggel, s, hogy vegyen nekem egy kiflit.

- (1) megkértem (2) megkértem őt

57. By circling the appropriate number, rate the following on a 1-5 scale.

a) How much are you attached to these places?

1 = not attached at all

5 = very much attached

- | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) your own town | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b) your own province | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c) Canada | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d) Hungary | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e) nowhere | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

b) How much do you feel you belong to (1 = not at all; 5 = very much)

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) the Canadian Hungarian community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b) the Hungarian nation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c) the Canadian nation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d) nowhere | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

58. Which sportsperson or team do you cheer for when...

- a) a Hungarian plays a Canadian
 1) the Hungarian 2) the Canadian
- b) a Hungarian plays another (non-Canadian)
 1) the Hungarian 2) the other
- c) a Canadian plays another (non-Hungarian)
 1) the Canadian 2) the other

62. Where do you think the most beautiful Hungarian is spoken? Circle the appropriate answer.

- | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1) in Budapest | 6) in Slovakia |
| 2) in a Hungarian country town | 7) in Vojvodina (Serbia) |
| 3) in a Hungarian village | 8) in Burgenland (Austria) |
| 4) in Subcarpathia (Ukraine) | 9) in Slovenia |
| 5) in Transylvania (Romania) | 10) in Canada |

63. If a person speaks only Hungarian in Canada, ...

(1) they can manage easily (2) they can have difficulties (3) they have a difficult time

67. How often do you travel to Hungary? Circle the answer.

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0) never | 3) approx. in every 2-3 years |
| 1) seldom | 4) every year |
| 2) approx. in every five years | 5) twice a year |

68. When did you last go to Hungary? In

COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING SENTENCES BY WRITING AN APPROPRIATE WORD OR WORD-ENDING ON THE DOTTED LINE IF YOU FEEL IT IS NECESSARY

621. Patrícia magasabb Klaudiá....., pedig egy évvel fiatalabb.

622. Azt akarom, hogy ő nyi..... ki az ajtót.

623. Középiskolánk..... sok szakképzetlen pedagógus tanít.

624. Jó napot kívánok, a főnök..... jöttem, panaszt szeretnék tenni.

625. Kovács János azt kérte, hogy a jelölő bizottság tekintsen el attól, hogy őt titkárrá jelölje és (megválasztani).

626. Erzsébet nének fáj..... a szív....., Kati nének meg a láb..... is fáj.....

628. Ha Péter rosszul válogat..... meg a barátait, pórul jár.

629. Minek ez a halogatás?! Nem szeretem, ha valaki elhala..... a döntéseket.

69. Do you have relatives or friends in Hungary who you are in close contact with (e.g. visit each other or exchange letters)? (1) yes (2) no

72. Has it ever happened to you that you had language problems in Hungary? (For instance, you were misunderstood, or not understood at all, or you did not exactly understand what people told you, or you did not know how to ask for something in a shop, or your speech was commented on, etc.)

(1) yes (2) no

73. If so, what happened?

.....

DO YOU REGARD THESE [HUNGARIAN] SENTENCES AS CORRECT?

701. A magyar nyelv szép, de csak akkor, ha szépen van beszélve.

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

702. János 14 év ezelőtt érkezett Kanadába.

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

703. "Hogy hívnak téged?" "Én vagyok Tóth Béla."

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

704. Tudod azt a férfit ott? Olyan ismerősnek tűnik.

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

705. Pénteken délben mindig ráteszem a magyar zenét, mert azt nagyon szeretem hallgatni.

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

706. A férjem és én sokat jártunk táncolni, amikor fiatalabb voltunk.

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

707. A mi családukban a magyar még sokat van használva.

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

708. Mindig én nyitom ki a leveleket, ami jönnek.

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

709. Képzeld, az apámnak van egy új autó.

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

80. Do you or any of your family members ever prepare Hungarian dishes? If so, then what?

.....

81. Do you keep in touch with other Hungarians living in Canada?

82. If so, then on what occasions do you meet?

83. What language do you use among each other on these occasions? (Put an X where appropriate.)

Hungarian	English	other

84. Do you ever listen to Hungarian music? If so, then from what source? (disk, radio, Internet, etc.)

.....

85. Do you ever watch Hungarian movies? If so, then from what source? (disk, TV, Internet, etc.)

.....

DO YOU REGARD THESE HUNGARIAN SENTENCES AS CORRECT?

811. Tegnap délután kimostam az autót, mert nagyon sáros lett a hosszú úton.

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

812. Mari nem csinálta meg a munka, mert már fáradt volt.

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

813. Minden este megnézek a kedvenc műsoromat a tévében.

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

814. Mikor jártál utoljára Magyarország?

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

815. Az iskolában hívtak engem István, otthon Pisti.

(a) I regard it as correct.

(b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

816. A múlt héten nem csináltad a feladatot, tehát most kell csinálnod, hogy kész legyen.

- (a) I regard it as correct.
 (b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:
818. Tizennyolc éves voltam, mikor kijöttem az iskolából.
 (a) I regard it as correct.
 (b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:
819. A múltkor találkoztam egy régi barátom, és nagyon jól beszélgettünk.
 (a) I regard it as correct.
 (b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:
820. Először nem ismert, de aztán bemutatkoztam, és akkor már tudta, ki vagyok.
 (a) I regard it as correct.
 (b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:
821. Sanyinak most nincs munkája, mert letették a kórházból.
 (a) I regard it as correct.
 (b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:
822. Egyszer egy év visszautazunk Magyarországra.
 (a) I regard it as correct.
 (b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:
823. A döntésem azon függ, hogy mennyi pénzt kapok.
 (a) I regard it as correct.
 (b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:
824. Figyelj oda, nehogy megütöd magad!
 (a) I regard it as correct.
 (b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:
825. Majd meglássák ők is, hogy ez hogy megy.
 (a) I regard it as correct.
 (b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:
826. A fiaim 18 éves voltak, amikor elköltöztek itthonról.
 (a) I regard it as correct.
 (b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:
827. Ők azok, aki mindig segítenek.
 (a) I regard it as correct.
 (b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:
828. Jobban szoktam beszélni magyarul, de most már csak rosszul tudok, sokat felejtettem.
 (a) I regard it as correct.
 (b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:
829. A feladatban sok hibák voltak.
 (a) I regard it as correct.
 (b) I regard it as incorrect, rather like this:

90. Do you ever text in Hungarian?

91. What is the language of your cell phone?

92. Do you browse Hungarian websites? If so, then what is the topic of these sites?

.....

93. Do you read Hungarian newspapers or magazines on the Internet? If so, which ones?

.....

94. What language do you use for chatting on-line? (Mark your answer with an X.)

Hungarian	English	other	none

95. Are you registered on the Hungarian social networking site *iWiW*? If so, what do you use it for?

96. Do you visit any other social networking websites? (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, etc.)

.....

97. If so, do you use Hungarian with anyone on these websites?

.....

CIRCLE THE SENTENCE YOU FEEL MORE NATURAL OUT OF THE SENTENCE

PAIRS BELOW

901. (1) Mi dolgoztunk akkor sokat együtt.

(2) Sokat dolgoztunk akkor együtt.

902. (1) Marinak a férje volt nagyon gazdag.

(2) Marinak nagyon gazdag volt a férje.

903. (1) Megkértem, hogy segítsen.

(2) Megkértem őt, hogy segítsen.

904. (1) A két testvére nem tud magyarul.

(2) A két testvérei nem tudnak magyarul.

905. (1) Azért van az ablaktörlő, hogy esőben is lássuk az utat.

(2) Azért van az ablaktörlő, hogy esőben is látjuk az utat.

906. (1) Akkor már tavasz volt, zöld voltak a fák.

(2) Akkor már tavasz volt, zöldek voltak a fák.

907. (1) Fiatal koromban sokat szoktam úszni, de már öreg vagyok hozzá.

(2) Fiatal koromban sokat úsztam, de már öreg vagyok hozzá.

908. (1) Azok a legszebb lányok, aki elbűvölik az embert.

(2) Azok a legszebb lányok, akik elbűvölik az embert.

909. (1) A feleségem neve Szabó Ilona volt.
(2) A feleségem neve volt Szabó Ilona.

910. (1) Az autómat gyártották 2008-ban.
(2) Az autómat 2008-ban gyártották.

1.Home town: 2.Province:

3.Gender: 1) male 2) female

4. Name:

5. Year of birth:

6. Place of birth:

7. If not born in Canada, date of arrival:

8. What schools did you attend outside Canada and where?

1. primary school,
2. secondary technical school,
3. secondary grammar school,
4. university or college,

When did you graduate from the latest one?

9. What schools did you attend in Canada?

1. primary school
2. secondary school
3. university or college
4. postgraduate studies

When did you graduate from the latest one?

10. Your original occupation:

11. Your present occupation, in Hungarian:
in English:

12 The name of your work place:

17. What nationality do you consider yourself?

1. Hungarian 2. Canadian
- 9.other:

18. If you were not born in Canada, have you Americanized your name? (e.g. from Kovács István to Stephen Kovács or Stephen Smith)

- 1.no
2. yes, (a) only my first name, (b) only my second name, (c) both

19. If you answered yes to the previous question, what was the reason and purpose of the change and when did it happen?

.....

20. If you were born in North America, what kind of first name do you have?

1. one that is there both in Hungarian and in English (e.g. Andrew – András)
2. one that is there in Hungarian, but not in English (e.g. Árpád)
3. one that is there in English, but not in Hungarian (e.g. Brian)

21. Your mother tongue:

1. Hungarian 2. English 9. other:

22. Your mother's mother tongue:

1. Hungarian 2. English 9. other:

23. What schools did your mother attend?

1. primary school
2. secondary school
3. university or college
4. postgraduate studies

24. Your mother's occupation:

25. Your father's mother tongue:

1. Hungarian 2. English 9. other:

26. What schools did your father attend?

1. primary school
2. secondary school
3. university or college
4. postgraduate studies

27. Your father's occupation: