AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ

The "we" vs. "they" distinction in Slovakia Hungarians' discourse

Ildikó Vančo [*]

Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Drážovská 4, 949 74 Nitra, Slovakia

ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Check for updates

ABSTRACT

Linguistic differentiation is a basic component of sociocultural differentiation: social processes create the social and linguistic meanings of variants, sometimes also contributing to language change through discourse processes. In addition to being continuously constructed, discourse is in a dialectic relationship with extra-discursive factors and can therefore be studied only when embedded in its social and linguistic contexts (cf. Fairclough 2010: 3–5, Laihonen 2009). In this article I investigate how the notion of "we" occurs in the metalinguistic discourse of Hungarian speakers in Slovakia (with reference to Slovakia Hungarians and their Hungarian language use) (cf. Kontra 2006) in contrast with the notion of "they" (with reference to Hungary Hungarians and their Hungarian language use) in lay speakers' utterances referring to language. The study reported on in this article uses directed interviews and employs discourse analysis to provide insight into the use of "we" vs. "they" and their meanings in the Slovakia Hungarian variety. It also seeks to show how certain expressions become indexical in conceptualizations of identity and how the distinction of "we" vs. "they" is created by language.

The present analysis focuses on the opinions of Hungarian bilingual minority speakers in Slovakia about their own variety and other Hungarian varieties. Judgments regarding the varieties used by minorities and regarding various social groups and their languages is more about the relationship of these groups and their acceptance of each other (see Vančo, 2020). The value

[*] Corresponding author. E-mail: ivanco@ukf.sk

AKJournals

of differences between minorities and their languages are demarcated by the varying degrees of the societal acceptance of diversity (cf. Kontra, 2006).

The Hungarian language is, in our interpretation, using the theoretical basis and typology established by Clyne (1992) and Muhr (2012), a pluricentric language.[1] The criteria of pluricentricity, as defined by Muhr (2012), hold for Hungarian. I want to single out two of those criteria here:

1. Linguistic distance (*Abstand*): The variety must have enough linguistic (and/or pragmatic) characteristics to distinguish it from other; these characteristics can serve as a symbol for expressing identity and social uniqueness.
2. Acceptance of pluricentricity: The language community must accept the status of its language as a pluricentric variety and consider that pluricentricity as part of its social/national identity (Muhr, 2012).

In the past 100 years, the varieties of Hungarian in countries neighboring Hungary have developed in language situations that are asymmetrical to a greater or lesser degree, depending on the country in question. The features that differentiate the Hungarian language use of Slovakia Hungarians from that of Hungary Hungarian are the following:

- The Slovakia Hungarian variety is a bilingual variety, whereas the Hungary Hungarian variety is a monolingual one;
- A greater number of regionalisms is used in the Slovakia variety – since the regional dialect is used in more communicative situations than the Hungary Hungarian variety;
- The speakers of Slovakia Hungarian often do not know a Hungary Hungarian variant and experience this as a linguistic gap from the point of view of the Hungarian standard. They tend to use hypernyms, loanwords or codeswitching in such cases;
- Contact phenomena are found in every linguistic subsystem;
- From the point of view of the societal and language policy perspectives, the Slovakia Hungarian variety lacks an appropriate formal status: it only has the status of a minority language in Slovakia.

In this framework, the relationship between speakers and their own variety gains special importance, as does the way in which the use of the variety shapes individual and group identities. The investigation of Slovakia Hungarian uses the theoretical framework of pluricentric languages as its point of departure and has been carried out at the Department of Hungarian at the University of Nitra.[2]

A next step taken is an investigation into the interrelation of language and individual structures of identity in order to better understand identity structures, including examining utterances as a means of creating social reality.

---

[1] See Muhr (2012); for more on Hungarian as a pluricentric language, see, for instance, Lanstyák (1995a, 1995b, 1996, 2008), Kontra and Saly (1998), Szilágyi (2008), Kozmács and Vančo (2016), Huber (2020), and Vančo et al. (2020).

[2] Some of our research has an educational focus, investigating issues surrounding the teaching of Hungarian grammar and of varieties of Hungarian in both minority and majority educational settings. We have also studied the effect of varieties used by students on the evaluation of students' school work (Jánk, 2020), as well as the characteristics of the vocabulary and language use of the Slovakia Hungarian 14- to 18-year-old student population (Gál, 2020) and the characteristics of the community identity associated with the variety and the region. In 2020 we edited (Vančo et al.) a volume of studies addressing issues of the pluricentricity of the Hungarian language.

Individual identity is determined by factors such as knowledge and attitudes acquired during socialization, the experience of belonging to a group or community, and the emotional relation to the native land, culture and language (both the standard and the vernacular) and languages (including the majority language, in a minority situation). 'Language' in the sense of what a particular person says or writes, considered from the point of view of both form and content, is central to individual identity. It inscribes the person within national and other corporate identities, including establishing the person's 'rank' within the identity (Joseph, 2004, p. 225) Joseph, John E. 2004: *Language and identity: national, ethnic, religious*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan). In this sense, language is an identity-forming entity with the help of which one places oneself and others within the given community via discursive utterances.

Numerous studies have examined the role of varieties used by linguistic minority groups in shaping group identity. A case in point is Csernicskó's work from 2008, in which he convincingly demonstrates that "[l]anguage as an identity-forming factor works not only in opposition with other languages in Subcarpathia. [...] Most small communities [in Subcarpathia] distinguish their own language and language use from both that of Hungarians in Hungary and the dialects of the surrounding villages. The local varieties often become valuable markers of self-identification, the source of pride, and important indicator of regional, Subcarpathian identity, defined in opposition to Hungary Hungarians" (Csernicskó, 2008, p. 161).[3]

This research perspective and method regards the construction of discourse as a reality-constructing practice. It is a basic tenet of discourse analysis that the subjectivity of the individual is constructed and expressed through language, and it is also through language that we are able to carry out social action and form power relations (Carver, 2004, p. 144.) Our study focuses on the reality-constructing process created by language, how the notions of "we" [minority Hungarian speakers] and "they" serve to other Hungarian speakers who are not "us", and how these notions occur in discourses about language by lay (non-linguist) speakers (cf. Bartha and Hámori, 2010). This approach originates in postmodern paradigms according to which identities are constructed partly in the course of language use, by accepting or rejecting explicit or implicit interpretations of meanings (cf. Edwards and Potter, 2001; Fairclough, 2010; Laihonen, 2009a, 2009b; Puchta and Potter, 2002).

During discourse, the variability of and change in the rules of language choice may lead to the reorganization of the repertoire, which can change societal meanings associated with individual languages as well as social identities expressed through language (Gal, 1979, p. 171). In such changes it is crucial to examine how speaker groups perceive and interpret their own boundaries subjectively and by using differences of language use and language proficiency in order to decide whether somebody is from the group or not. In this situation the we-code and the they-code can be assigned different meanings in different social groups and, especially, in different age groups (Bartha, 2003, p. 73).

In this framework, linguistic texts are reflections of reality constructed via language. Through these texts not only social relations become empirically analyzable but also the language-related identity constructions of the individual.

---

[3]See Péntek (2008).

METHODOLOGY

The first phase of the investigation involved the collection of empirical data. The context of the investigation was that the Slovakia Hungarian students used as subjects for this study participated in a study-abroad period at a university in Hungary (and one in an ethnically Hungarian town in Subcarpathia, Ukraine). A total of four Slovakia Hungarian students, all majoring in Hungarian, participated in the investigation as subjects, three females and one male.

I conducted a structured interview, recorded with prior knowledge and consent of the interviewees. The topic of the conversation was whether during their stay in Hungary they noticed a difference between the way of speaking used there and the way of speaking Hungarian in Slovakia. The participants completed a one semester course called "Fundamentals of Sociolinguistics and Dialectology", during which they learned about the connections between language and society, including the existence of the Slovakia Hungarian variety and various regional dialects. The conversation was informal, and my conversation partners had a lot to say, interrupting each other talking about their opinions. The interview was about 60 minutes long and was transcribed.

THE DIFFERENTIATION OF THE AXIS "WE" VS. "THEY"

The aim of the investigation was to demonstrate an axis of differentiation on the basis of metalinguistic comments about the Hungarian language as used in Hungary and in Slovakia with the help of which we can differentiate between the "we" code and the "they" codes and can contrast their respective characteristics.

We can gain insight into the process of enregisterment through observing the metasemiotic process by which a cultural model works while speakers identify indexical associations of a speaker type or a variety (Gal, 2018, p. 109). In the analyzed statements I examine the metapragmatic classifications of linguistic forms and their associated properties, that is, the process in which language activity, or some aspect of it, becomes the subject of reflection by average language users.

By contrasting their own speech with that of others, speakers typify the latter, thereby creating and using models, pointing out speakers' attitudes and commitments through their word choices.

Such designations appear in groups of opposites. A characteristic of metapragmatic qualifications in these communications is that they can be placed on an axis of differentiation, thus demonstrating the difference between "us" and "them".

Below, I quote the sentences that were said about speakers or utterances in the course of the conversations. I present the data as follows: I first provide the utterance in Hungarian, followed by its English translation. In the texts (both in the Hungarian and English versions) I highlight (in boldface) the elements that contain the metapragmatic qualifications in the given utterance. S1 denotes the first subject and the other subjects are numbered accordingly.

Connecting linguistic forms and characteristics

The interview participants connected the intonations and pronunciation features of the utterances heard in Hungary with the characteristics of the subjects.

"They":

S1: *Magyarországi magyarok sokkal **jobban artikulálnak**,*

*az már olyan **túlságosan** olyan **erőltetett** (nevetés)*

nem is tudnám magamat elképzelni tiszta vicces lennék.

Mondjuk nekik az vicces ahogy én beszélek.

Jaj még vannak olyan beszólások hogy ez **parasztos beszéd, elmaradott**.

S1: "Hungary Hungarians **articulate** much **better**,

it's like overly, **forced** [laughs]

I could not imagine myself, I would be too funny.

Well I guess they find the way I talk funny.

Oh and there are those comments like this is **peasant speak, backward**."

"They"

S2: *Hát nem érzékeltük azt a . . . **nyávogást**? Érti, hogy mire gondolok. . . . .*

*mert Budapesten ez volt amíg várakoztunk a vonatra, jobbról balról a összevissza **nyávogós hanghordozás.***

S2: "We didn't perceive that. . . **miaowing**? You know what I mean . . . .

because that's what it was while we were waiting for the train, from the left and from the right, all those **miaowing** intonations."

S3: *És magyarországi magyarok ugye, nem tudom, olyanok mintha kicsit **büszkék lennéne**k, és a nyelvhasználatuk pedig például **jobban hangsúlyoznak**, nem is hangsúlyoznak, **másképp** ejtik a szavakat.*

S3: "And Hungary Hungarians, well, I don't know, it's as if they are **somewhat proud**, and their language use, for instance, they **intonate better**, not intonate, they pronounce words **differently**."

My subjects designated speech of Hungary Hungarian speakers with such intonation as a general sign of "affectation", and speakers using it as "affected", and as "miaowers" which they link to another general trait, 'proud'. In the excerpts above, the "they" vs. "us" axis of differentiation appears in two different ways. First, Slovakia Hungarian speakers regard Hungary Hungarians' speech as "affected", and, second, Hungary Hungarians, in contrast with affectation, disdainfully regard contemptuously the speech of Slovakia Hungarians as "peasant-like",

and, thus, backward, as if legitimating the Slovakia Hungarians' opinion about the Hungary Hungarians' affectation.

Another differentiation can be described with the **simple** vs. **colorful,** and **easy** vs. **hard** opposition.

"They"	"We"
S3: *Ahogy tanultuk is hogy Magyarországon egy* **csomó nyelvjárás** *van,* **nem venni észre.**	S4: *szerintem a miénk* **színesebb.** *Ott mindenki próbálja a köznyelvet beszélni.*
S4: *Nem, ott* **olyan egységesnek** *tűnik.* **Egyszerűbb.**	S3: *Itt eljöttünk, akkor elég* **sok nyelvváltozat** *megtalálható már csak az osztályunkban is.*
S3: "As we have learned, that there are **lots of dialects** in Hungary, **you wouldn't notice that.**"	S4: "I think ours is more **colorful.** There everybody tries to speak the standard."
S4: "No, it seems **very unified. Simpler.**"	S3: "Here we came, and there are **many varieties** to be found, even in our classroom."
S3: *Hát ő nekik mindenképp* **könnyebb** *a helyzetük, mint nekünk, de viszont* **nem** *mondom hogy* **jobb.** *Mert* **mi** *annyival vagyunk* **többek,** *amivel* **ők kevesebbek.**	S4: *két nyelven beszélünk...nem két nyelven beszélünk de* **két nyelven beszélünk** *legtöbbet, amit* **ők** *nem.*
S3: "Well their situation is definitely **easier** than ours, but I **wouldn't** say it's **better.** Because **we** have that much **more,** and **they** have that much **less.**"	S4: *Alapból ez a viszonyunk, ami itt van Szlovákiában, ez a magyarok és a szlovákok közötti együttélés, itt is* **alkalmazkodnunk kellett** *egymáshoz.* **Őnekik nincs** *mihez alkalmazkodni,* **ők** *ilyen* **egységben** *élnek. Attól is* **többek vagyunk,** *hogy* **megtanultunk** *alkalmazkodni a másikhoz és* **megtanultunk** *együttélni.*
	S4: "we speak two languages... we don't speak two languages, but **we speak two languages mostly,** which **they don't.**"
	S4: "Basically, the way we relate, what we have here in Slovakia, this coexistence of Hungarians and Slovaks, **we had to adapt** to each other here too. **They don't** have to adapt to anything, **they** live like in **unity. We have more** because we **learned** to adapt to others and **learned** to coexist."

The use of the "easy" vs. "hard" opposition also involves the assignment of social values. Difficulty and complexity connected to "we" is a value and knowledge, whereas easiness connected to "they" is assigned the meaning of "lack of knowledge". "They" do not have to do anything; knowledge is connected to the "we" code; and bilingualism – its existence and formation, as well as its ongoing adaptation – appear as values within it.

The opposition between "correctly in Hungarian" and "not properly" in Hungarian, and the feelings connected to this opposition, are demonstrated in the following excerpts:

S4: *Például amikor Beregszászon* (Ukrajna) *voltam, ott teljesen más volt mint amikor elmentünk Kecskemétre. Volt bennem egy kicsit ilyen* **féltségérzet** (sic)*, hogy mi van akkor, ha én jövevényszavakat fogok használni és nem fogják érteni. Mindig el kell gondolkodnom azon, hogy az a* **szó** *hogy van* **másképpen.** *Hogy van* **rendesen** *magyarul. És ö. . . Beregszászon például ez* **nem volt meg** *bennem, nem volt bennem meg az, hogy most* **féltem** *volna jövevényszavakat használni, mert náluk is voltak olyan szavak, amiket ők megértettek. Hogy hiába azt mondtam hogy horcsica megértették. Vagy ők is rengeteg jövevényszót használnak, ami az ukránból jön még a tanárok is, szóval ilyen mindenki által elfogadott jövevényszavak, például nem azt mondják, hogy: lesz órád, hanem: lesz még parád. És a tanárok is így kérdezik meg, csak nem tudom ott valahogy kicsit közvetlenebb volt az egész.* **Így érzem.**

S4: "For instance, when I was in Beregove [Ukraine], it was very different than when we went to Kecskemét [Hungary]. I did have a slight **feeling of fear** about what would happen if I used loanwords and they didn't understand them. I always have to think about how that **word** can be said **differently**. How it is in **proper** Hungarian. And umm. . . in Beregove I **didn't have** this in me, I wasn't **afraid** to use loanwords, because they also had words that only they understood. It was no problem if I said *horcsica* ["mustard"], they understood. And they use a lot of loanwords that come from Ukrainian, even the teachers do, all sorts of loanwords accepted by everyone, for instance, they don't say *lesz órád* ["you'll have a class"] but *lesz még parád* ["you'll have a class"]. And the teachers also ask like that, and I don't know, there the whole thing was a little more intimate. **That's what I feel.**"

In this sequence, the category of "they" is further stratified, and non-Hungarian "they" partly overlap with the "we" group. In Hungary, people belonging to the "we" group have to look for words, because "they" speak differently: the words of the "we" language are not proper Hungarian and their use may cause stigmatization. In Berehove/Beregszász, Ukraine, there was no need to be afraid to use "non-proper" words: although "they" (the Hungarian speakers from the Ukraine) speak differently than the Hungarians in Slovakia do (the respondent supplies an example), they do so in essentially the same way as the "we" group does. (From the point of view of "them", the people of Subcarpathia do not speak Hungarian properly; rather, they use a contact variety.)[4] "We" carries a narrower and broader meaning at the same time. The indicated sense of fear, which can be linked to talking differently, disappears with the recognition of a similar situation in life and the inclusion of "them" in the "we" group.

The axis of differentiation can also be described by the notion of **spatiality**, with the spatial placement of the high and low: the high is related to the meaning with the higher prestige, the low with the lesser prestige. "They" is expressed through "the high", the superior, and "we" through the contempt, which represents the point of view of the "they" group.

S1: *nem azt mondom hogy* **fentebb** *hordanák az orrukat, de olyannak tűnt.*

---

[4]In order to protect the "proper Hungarian language", some linguists also create the "we" vs. "they" differentiation, cf.: "But let us not forget that the Hungarian language is not spoken only inside Hungary's borders but also by more and more people in diaspora, while lacking any connection to the Hungarian language area. We can experience very strange forms of language use. Language use is truly being debased there" (Balázs, 2005, p. 65).

S2: *ott is a főnök, vagy a kisfőnök aki volt ott nagyon **lenézően**, mintha magasabbrendűnek képzelte volna magát, úgy beszélt velünk.*

S2: *Vannak előnyei meg hátrányai is. Na a plusz nyelv az előnye ugye. De a negativuma az hogy hogy egy kicsit **le is vagyunk nézve**.*

S1: "I'm not saying they **turn up** their noses, but it seemed like that."

S2: "there, the boss, the vice boss there, he spoke to us very **disdainfully**, as if he imagined himself to be higher."

S2: "There are advantages and disadvantages. The extra language is a plus of course. But the down side is that we are somewhat **looked down on**."

The dual allegiance is also expressed by the mitigating expressions *but it seemed like that* and *somewhat [looked down on]*.

While in the first sequence presented, the different pitch associated with the "they" code is connected to the negatively interpreted characteristic *proud*, in the case of the "we" code, *pride* is associated with the expression of the positive value of belonging to Slovakia Hungarians. Belonging to the group is expressed as a mission:

S1: *Mert….bennem is **van** egy kis **büszkeség** hogy az **nem** pusztán **azért** mert **szlovákiai magyar vagyok** és ide születtem, hanem azért mert az én . . . . én **hozzáállásom** a dolgokhoz meg az **értékrendszerem**. . . . . . . Azért ad egy kis büszkeséget mert az maga **egy ilyen**, nagyon sokan eztet egy ilyen **küldetéstudatnak** veszi. Szlovákiai magyarnak lenni az **küldetés**, ezt a küldetést inkább azt mondanám hogy ez a küldetés az úgymond a **megmaradásnak a fontossága**, és ez az ami motivál engem meg minden.*

S1: "Because… there **is** some **pride** in me that **not** just **because** I **am a Slovakia Hungarian** and I was born here, but because my. . . . . the way I **relate** to things and my **system of values**. . . . . . They give me some pride because this is, many people would call it like a **sense of mission**. Being a Slovakia Hungarian is a **mission**, and this mission, I would rather say this mission is the **importance of survival**, and this is what motivates me, these kind of things."

The "we" vs. "they" differentiation, however, is not manifested only in the Hungary vs. Slovakia Hungarian differentiation, but the same axis can be used again to make differentiations within the "we" group. "We" is further divided, and a "they" group appears within the "we" group.

S3: *Most a himnusztörvény kapcsán ugye volt tegnap a himnuszéneklés stb. . . . . . . Volt egy facebook csoport ahova valami 30 ezer ember becsatlakozott abból kb. 15 ezer kommentelt posztot stb, és végül ezren megjelentek a parlament előtt énekelni és előkerült a vissza mindent, Trianon stb. na ez a **nagymagyar** aki azt se tudja hogy mit **fröcsög de fröcsög** mert az jó. Meg az a **nagymagyar** aki odaposztolt egy képet egy felhőről, és megkérdezte, ti is látjátok a turult a felhőben?*

S3: *És én azért nem mentem el himnuszt énekelni mert **én ezekkel nem akarok sorsközösséget vállalni.***

S4: ***Köztünk** is van ellentét igen. A **szlovákiai magyarság se egységes***

S3: *. . .. volt az a felvonulás és* **énekelték a magyar himnuszt** *és* **énekeltek magyar daloka**t*, és utána amikor* **elkezdtek ria-ria hungáriázni** *az már valamikor kicsit* **sok***.*

S3: "Now, in connection with the anthem law,[5] there was the anthem singing yesterday, etc. . . . . . . There was a Facebook group that something like 30 thousand people joined, and about 15 thousand of them left comments, and then in the end one thousand people were there in front of the parliament to sing, and everything came up again, return everything to us, Trianon, etc. Well, these **great Hungarians**[6] who do not know what they are **spewing, but they spew it anyway**, because that's great. And those people are the great Hungarians like the person who posted a picture of a cloud and asked 'Do you also see the *turul* bird in the cloud?'[7]

S3: "And I didn't go to sing the anthem because **I don't want to express a community of fate with these people**."

S4: There are disagreements **among us**, too, yes. **Slovakia Hungarians are not unified either**."

S3: ". . . there was that march, and people were **singing the Hungarian national anthem** and **singing Hungarian songs**, and then when they **started to shout 'ria, ria, Hungária'**, now that a little **too much**."

The differentiation of "we" vs. "they" also appears within Slovakia Hungarians expressed with the "we" code. Those who can be linked to the characteristics of "them" in Hungary form a new side of the axis of differentiation. Speakers recreate cultural frames when they interpret events that are topical and often contradictory in the current interaction. A certain feature perceived by the speaker to be a characteristic of some Slovakia Hungarians, "the great Hungarianness", is magnified and becomes significant in relation to their identities, serving as an explanation of the speaker's activity and the new frame thus created. Speakers create the frame in which they place their group identities by developing complex categories of certainty and uncertainty. Within Hungarians, a smaller group is designated, that of Slovakia Hungarians, which, however, also carries an element of uncertainty. By including a different point of view, this frame is erased and creates two other, opposite frames, the frame of Slovakness from the Hungarian point of view and the frame of Hungarianness from the Slovak point of view.

S1: *Magyaroknak tartjuk magunkat, de* **nem úgy szoktuk mondani** *hogy* **magyarok**nak *tartjuk magunknak,* **hanem szlovákiai magyarok vagyunk***.*

S2: *Is-is amúgy. Mert ha* **Szlovákiában** *vagyunk azt mondják ránk hogy* **magyarok***, de ha elmegyünk* **Magyarország**ra *azt mondják hogy* **szlovák**o*k. Úgyhogy mintha* **beazonosíthatatlanok** *lennénk.*

---

[5]The Slovak parliament passed a law in March 2019 which prohibited the singing of other nations' national anthems at community events if no official delegation representing that nation is present at the event. In the discussion of the law in parliament, one argument for the law was to prohibit the singing of the Hungarian national anthem. The law was modified by decree in May of this year.

[6]"Great Hungarian" is used by the speaker in reference to current day proponents of the historical (pre-Trianon) Hungary.

[7]The *turul* bird is a mythological bird of early pagan Hungarians.

S2: *A magyarországit lehet megkülönböztetni, és mi szlovákiai magyarok különbözőek vagyunk, de sokkal eltérőbb mint a magyarországi magyar.* **Őket egyértelműen lehet** *azonosítani és* **tudni lehet** *hogy* **ők magyarországi magyarok***.*

S1: "We consider ourselves Hungarians, but **we do not say** that we consider ourselves **Hungarian**, **but that we are Slovakia Hungarians**."

S2: "It's both really. Because when we are in **Slovakia**, people say that we are **Hungarians**, but when we go to **Hungary**, people say we are **Slovaks**. So it looks like we are **unidentifiable**."

S2: "Hungary Hungarians can be differentiated, and we Slovakia Hungarians are different, but much more different than Hungary Hungarians are. **The latter can be clearly** identified and one **knows** that **they are Hungary Hungarians**."

Certainty is given to the "they" group, who can be interpreted in the same way from all points of view.

CONCLUSION

Using the analysis of the codes "we" vs. "they", I have attempted to demonstrate how the values of social existence are configured and shaped through linguistic practices, how speakers create complex patterns of identification in a given social situation, and how the components of individual identity are expressed in these patterns. The characteristic features of the distinction of "we" vs. "they" and the characteristics of their construction can be described along an axis of differentiation.

Speakers assign values and qualities to linguistic utterances, with the help of which they express their local and regional identities, designate their own and others' place within the community, and express their solidarity with their own group.

It is safe to conclude that their attitudes to the Slovakia Hungarian variety is positive and the community recognizes the differences between its variety and the Hungary standard. They look at the Slovakia Hungarian linguistic variety as their own, as a part of their identity and as the expression of this identity.

However, other types of identification also appear, such as identification with Hungarians living outside of Hungary in general, or the ambivalent relationship with Hungary Hungarian speakers.

By analyzing utterances and speech in general, we can gain insight into the process of shaping elements of ideologies about language and of personal identity and can uncover explicit, symbolic connections constructed in discourse about language — connections that constitute components of the conceptualization of identity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Balázs, G. (2005). Romlásnak indult... ? In: *Könyv és Nevelés – VII*, 2005/1, pp. 59–65.

Bartha, C. (2003). A kisebbségi nyelvek megőrzésének lehetőségei és az oktatás [Education and opportunities for the preservation of minority languages]. In: Nádor, O. and Szarka, L. (Eds.), *Nyelvi jogok, kisebbségek, nyelvpolitika Kelet-közép-Európában [Language rights, minorities, language policy in East Central Europe]. Magyar Kisebbségi Könyvtár*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, pp. 56–75.

Bartha, C. and Hámori, Á. (2010). Stílus a szociolingvisztikában, stílus a diskurzusban: Nyelvi variabilitás és társas jelentések konstruálása a szociolingvisztika "harmadik hullámában" [Style in sociolinguistics and in discourse: Linguistic variability and the construction of social meanings in the "third wave" of sociolinguistics]. *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 134(3): 298–321.

Carver, T. (2004). Diskurzuselemzés és a "nyelvi fordulat" [Discourse analysis and the "linguistic turn"]. *Politikatudományi Szemle*, 13(4): 143–148.

Clyne, M. (Ed.) (1992). *Pluricentric languages: differing norms in different nations*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin and New York.

Csernicskó, I. (2008). Nyelv és azonosságtudat összefüggései a kárpátaljai magyar közösségben [The interrelatedness of language and identity in the Hungarian community of Subcarpathia]. In: Fedinec, C. (Ed.), *Értékek és dimenziók a magyarságkutatásban [Values and dimensions in research into Hungarianness]*. Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Magyar Tudományosság Külföldön Elnöki Bizottság, Budapest, pp. 153–173.

Edwards, D. and Potter, J. (2001). Discursive psychology. In: McHoul, A.W. and Rapley, M. (Eds.), *How to analyse talk in institutional settings: a casebook of methods*. Continuum International, London, pp. 12–24.

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*, 2nd ed. Longman Publishing, London–New York.

Gál, A. (2020). *A szlovákiai magyarok nyelvhasználata vizsgálata középiskolákban [Research on Hungarian language use in Slovakia in secondary schools]*. Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, PhD dissertation, Nitra.

Gal, S. (1979). *Language shift: social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. Academic Press, New York.

Gal, S. (2018). *A nyelv politikája: Nyelvi antropológiai tanulmányok. Susan Gal válogatott tanulmányai magyar nyelven [The politics of language: studies in linguistic anthropology. Selected papers by Susan Gal, in Hungarian]*. Konstantin Filozófus Egyetem Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kara, Nyitra.

Huber, M. (2020). Hungarian as a pluricentric language: from the debates of the past to the challenges of the future. In: Vančo, I., Muhr, R., Kozmács, I., and Huber, M. (Eds.), *Hungarian as a pluricentric language in languages and literature*. Peter Lang, Berlin, pp. 11–25.

Jánk, I. (2020). Linguistic discrimination and linguistic bias in pedagogical evaluations of Hungarian teachers. In: Vančo, I., Muhr, R., Kozmács, I., and Huber, M. (Eds.), *Hungarian as a pluricentric language in languages and literature*. Peter Lang, Berlin, pp. 49–64.

Joseph, J.E. (2004). *Language and identity: National, ethnic, religious*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Kontra, M. (2006). Hungarian in- and outside Hungary. In: Ammon, U., Dittmar, N., Mattheier, K.J., and Trudgill, P. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics/Sociolinguistik, 2nd completely revised and extended edition*, Vol. 3. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York, pp. 1811–1818.

Kontra, M. and Saly, N. (Eds.), (1998). *Nyelvmentés vagy nyelvárulás? Vita a határon túli magyar nyelvhasználatról [Language saving or language betreaying? Debate on the use of the Hungarian language beyond the border of Hungary]*. Osiris, Budapest.

Kozmács, I. and Vančo, I. (2016). The use of the dominant standard in education in Slovakian Hungarian schools and the effects on education and training. In: Muhr, R. (Ed.), *Pluricentric languages and nondominant varieties worldwide. Volume 1, pluricentric languages across continents: Features and usage*. Peter Lang, Wien–Frankfurt am Main, pp. 315–336.

Laihonen, P. (2009a). *Language ideologies in the Romanian Banat: Analysis of interviews and academic writings among the Hungarians and Germans*. University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä.

Laihonen, P. (2009b). A magyar nyelvi standardhoz kapcsolódó nyelvi ideológiák a romániai Bánságban [Linguistic ideologies related to standard Hungarian in the Banat region of Romania]. In: Lanstyák, I., Menyhárt, J., and Szabómihály, G. (Eds.), *Tanulmányok a kétnyelvűségről IV [Studies on bilingualism, 4]*. Gramma, Dunaszerdahely, pp. 44–77.

Lanstyák, I. (1995a). A nyelvek többközpontúságának néhány kérdéséről (különös tekintettel a Trianon utáni magyar nyelvre) [Some issues of the pluricentricity of languages, with special attention to the post-Trianon situation of the Hungarian language]. *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 119(3): 213–236.

Lanstyák, I. (1995b). A magyar nyelv központjai [The centers of the Hungarian language]. *Magyar Tudomány*, 40(10): 1170–1185.

Lanstyák, I. (1996). A magyar nyelv állami változatainak kodifikálásáról [The codification of the state varieties of the Hungarian language]. *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 120(2): 125–151.

Lanstyák, I. (2008). A magyar szókészlet szétfejlődése 1918 után [The divergent development of the Hungarian vocabulary after 1918]. In: Fedinec, C. (Ed.), *Értékek, dimenziók a magyarságkutatásban [Values and dimensions in Hungarian research]*. MTA Magyar Tudományosság Külföldön Elnöki Bizottság, Budapest, Magyarország, pp. 118–135.

Muhr, R. (2012). Linguistic dominance and non-dominance in pluricentric languages: A typology. In: Muhr, R. (Ed.), *Non-dominant varieties of pluricentric languages: getting the picture. In memory of Michael Clyne*. Peter Lang, Wien, pp. 23–48.

Péntek, J. (2008). A magyar nyelv erdélyi helyzete és perspektívái [The situation and perspectives of the Hungarian language in Transylvania]. In: Fedinec, C. (Ed.), *Értékek és dimenziók a magyarságkutatásban [Values and dimensions in research into Hungarianness]*. Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Magyar Tudományosság Külföldön Elnöki Bizottság, Budapest, pp. 136–153.

Puchta, C. and Potter, J. (2002). Manufacturing individual opinions: Market research focus groups and the discursive psychology of evaluation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 41(3): 345–363.

Szilágyi, S.N. (2008). A magyar nyelv a Magyarországgal szomszédos országokban [The Hungarian language in countries neighboring Hungary]. In: Fedinec, C. (Ed.), *Értékek, dimenziók a magyarságkutatásban [Values and dimensions in research into Hungarianness]*. MTA Magyar Tudományosság Külföldön Elnöki Bizottság, Budapest, pp. 105–117.

Vančo, I. (2020). Investigating the Slovakia Hungarian variety as a fact of identity. In: Vančo, I., Muhr, R., Kozmács, I., and Huber, M. (Eds.), *Hungarian as a pluricentric language in languages and literature*. Peter Lang, Berlin, pp. 49–64.

Vančo, I., Muhr, R., Kozmács, I., and Huber, M. (Eds.), (2020). *Hungarian as a pluricentric language in languages and literature*. Peter Lang, Berlin.