

УДК 81'27:378

DOI 10.58423/2786-6726/2024-2-53-69

*Anita Kiss, Zita Somfalvi*

## **Language awareness survey among university students**

### **1. Introduction**

Research in sociolinguistics has drawn attention to the crucial point that all language varieties can be considered as linguistic systems of equal value. Sociolinguistics takes into account the communal nature of language and examines the social meanings associated with the language use. How a linguistic form is used by whom and in what situation is called its associative meaning. Each linguistic form has a social meaning, some more clearly, others less noticeably, indicating the identity of their users. The choice can be influenced by the individual's verbal repertoire and which of the language varieties the speaker has in his or her possession is considered appropriate to the communicative intention in a given communicative situation (Sándor, 2016, p. 18).

Language is an important factor in signalling identity. The perception of certain languages or language varieties has a role in signalling community identity. How others perceive the speaker's own variety of language plays an important role in how the speaker perceives that variety. If a person is criticised or looked down upon because of his or her language use, the offended individual may develop a negative view not only of his or her own language use but also of his or her community (Sándor, 1999, pp. 165-168).

Education plays a crucial role in developing language use and attitudes. For this reason, it is important to examine the ways in which teachers in schools and higher education teach students about linguistic diversity, language varieties and language awareness.

In the last decades, there have been efforts to focus attention on a pluricentric approach to language, which means that by striving for an additive or functional-situational bilingualism, speakers with a dialect background could be educated to become more conscious language users, which includes switching between language varieties depending on the speech partner and the language use context (Parapatics, 2022, p. 85). The terms 'monocentric' and 'polycentric', used to describe national

multilingualism, were introduced by William Stewart (cf. Stewart, 1968). These two concepts represent different ways of describing the process of standardisation. The monocentric view states that there is a common standard and does not pay attention to linguistic diversity. In the case of pluricentric languages, there is no single central norm that determines the 'correct' use of the language, but rather several national or regional varieties coexist and are of equal status (cf. Clyne, 1992).

In our study, we investigated the dialect attitudes and linguistic awareness of students studying at the University of Nyíregyháza. We wanted to find out what knowledge the respondents had about the spatial variation of language, about the conscious use of language and how they view dialect speech.

## **2. The definition of language attitude**

Attitude means a feeling or opinion about something or someone. It can be a positive or negative attitude towards people, situations, ideas, an established tendency to consistently classify something as good or bad (Fishbein–Ajzen, 1975, p. 6).

The knowledge and beliefs in connection with language is called language attitude, in which a particular person's or group's terms and judgements are expressed in connection with certain languages, language variants, pronunciation variants and any linguistic phenomena. Attitude can be located on a scale from very positive to complete rejection, which appears in judgements about the 'correctness' and value of a language as well as the speakers' personal characteristics (Trudgill, 1997, p. 58; Grin, 2013, p. 682).

Language attitudes originate in societies, not in languages; consequently, they express social habits, behavioural rules and prejudice instead of linguistic or aesthetic values. Sociolinguistic research brought to light that language attitudes are formed as the confirmation and validation of an earlier, not language-related stereotype (Kiss, 2002, p. 136). Therefore, language attitudes can have an influence on the changes of the language, behaviour, and can cause insecurity in language use, which means that the users of the language show antipathy towards their language variant, in other words they question its 'correctness'. They try to acquire a speaking style which is in a higher status, and it can lead the individuals to overcorrection and the groups to overachievement of norms (Trudgill, 1997, p. 58). Peter Trudgill's research on language use in Norwich shows that, in addition to the high social prestige of the standard variety, the communities studied also attach prestige to their own non-standard varieties of the language and are attached to their own variety, even if they have been negatively discriminated against for it (cf. Trudgill, 1974).

### **3. Language attitude surveys among teachers and university students**

Knowledge and value judgements about the territorial diversity of language play a very important role in preserving Hungarian national identity. In minority Hungarian areas, the communities living there must have a positive attitude towards their mother tongue variety, as this is essential for the preservation of the mother tongue and the survival of the minority group. In Hungary, by promoting linguistic diversity, we can do much to make young people more accepting of linguistic diversity on a territorial basis, thus avoiding stereotypes about dialects, which can cause serious problems for the psyche and personality of dialect speakers. For these reasons, linguistic attitude studies are an important part of sociolinguistic and dialectological research.

The language awareness and attitudes of Hungarian language teaching students in Transcarpathia were examined. In the course of mother tongue education, the teacher does a lot to form the students' sense of identity, so it was considered important to find out what knowledge the beginning teachers have about the mother tongue, its varieties and functions. The results showed that more than a third of the respondents were aware of situational language use and knew that in certain speech situations the use of the standard was appropriate. It was also found that the students in the teaching programme were familiar with the additive approach to mother tongue teaching, which gave reason for confidence in their teaching (T. Károlyi, 2002, pp. 329–333).

Attitudes towards linguistic variations, especially dialect phenomena, were also assessed among Hungarian teachers in Transcarpathia. The survey was carried out between 2007 and 2008 and involved 150 teachers from different subject areas (Lakatos, 2010, pp. 146–170). Ten years later, in 2018, the survey was repeated to find out whether there had been any noticeable changes in the linguistic value judgements of Hungarian teachers in Transcarpathia compared to the results of the previous survey. The repeated survey was motivated by the 2005 reform of mother tongue education, which provides an additive approach to the curriculum in Hungarian schools for grades 5–12. The results of the 2007–2008 survey showed that the teachers interviewed see dialects as a tradition and an expression of identity, which is important to preserve. However, the responses also showed that, although teachers recognised that the people around them spoke in dialect, they showed a distancing attitude towards dialect phenomena. The results ten years later, after a change in attitude towards mother tongue education had already been promoted, showed a positive change. The data showed that teachers were much more accepting of non-traditional speakers, more of them responded that they would be sorry if dialects disappeared, but sometimes there was still an uncertain and contradictory attitude towards dialect phenomena (Dudics Lakatos, 2019, pp. 123–134).

An attitude survey on dialects was conducted among first-year Hungarian students in Nitra, Slovakia. First-year students were chosen because they do not yet have any dialectological or sociolinguistic knowledge, so the respondents could rely mainly on the experiences they had acquired during their secondary school education and on the experiences they had acquired from their immediate environment. 81.2% of the respondents admitted to speaking a dialect, and the results also showed that Hungarians in Slovakia perceived dialects as being specific not only to villages but also to towns. The majority of the respondents had not had any negative experiences with the use of the dialect and believed that dialects are necessary (Sándor, 2009, pp. 231–239).

Similarly to the previous research, Károly Presinszky's study was based on the assumption that it is the teacher's task to take into account the students' primary language variation and to familiarise them with the concept of linguistic variability. Consequently, he also surveyed first-year students' subjective views on Hungarian language variation. Results showed that one-third of the respondents were mostly corrected by their teachers when they used a non-standard form. The proportion of respondents who corrected or did not correct the speech of others was similar. Regarding language varieties, the majority of respondents had a negative opinion of the use of the language in Budapest and the use of the language in rural Hungary, and a neutral opinion of the use of Hungarian beyond the borders (Presinszky, 2009, pp. 241–248).

In István Jánk's research, prospective and in-service teachers were asked to evaluate students' oral responses. In the study, respondents listened to different language versions from different speakers. The research aimed to find out which aspects played a more dominant role in the teacher's evaluation, the student's subject knowledge or his/her language use, which in Jánk's research included standard and non-standard versions as well as limited and elaborated language use codes. The survey began with a pilot study among students of kindergarten teachers and Hungarian language teachers at the University of Constantine the Philosopher in Nitra, involving a total of 50 respondents. Its conclusions showed that teachers' evaluation of students was strongly influenced by the students' underlying beliefs. This implies that teacher candidates gave students one full merit mark worse for answering in a non-standard language variant and a non-developed language code, despite their perfect knowledge of the current subject matter. Furthermore, students whose subject knowledge was more deficient but who used a standardised language version when answering were rated more positively (Jánk, 2017, pp. 27–47; Jánk, 2018, pp. 150–169). Jánk later extended the same research to four countries in the Carpathian Basin. He conducted a study in Hungary, Slovakia, Romania and Ukraine, with a total of 502 prospective and practising Hungarian teachers. The results showed that, for all the groups studied,

teachers rated most positively the answers given in the standard and elaborated code among the different language varieties and language use patterns, while the answers given in the dialect and restricted code received less positive ratings, even though the student's subject knowledge was flawless (Jánk, 2019, pp. 31–46).

Noémi Fazakas investigated the attitude of Hungarian students from Szeklerland in Romania towards their mother tongue. Her results showed that the majority of respondents said that they spoke the best version of the Hungarian language in Transylvania, and therefore they had a positive attitude towards their mother tongue (Fazakas, 2016, pp. 55–64).

Anikó Csincsik studied the language attitudes of students from Vojvodina studying in Hungary and Serbia. The research was comparative, involving thirty students from Serbia and thirty students from Hungary. The results showed positive attitudes towards the Hungarian language. Differences between the two groups were observed in the use of the language at school and in the office. In terms of group identity, the majority of respondents were associated with Vojvodina and had a positive view of the language variety there. Both groups were characterized by a more positive attitude towards the Vojvodina language variety compared to the Hungarian one (Csincsik, 2011, pp. 44–58).

In Hungary, Árpád Zimányi studied the dialect attitudes of students at the Eszterházy Károly Catholic University (predecessor of the college) and the Károli Gáspár Reformed University, and compared them with the data of Jenő Kiss (cf. 2009). Based on his results, two thirds of Hungarian students studying in Eger and almost half of Budapest students said that they had no direct contact with a dialect, while three quarters of non-Hungarian students answered 'yes' to this question (Zimányi, 2015, p. 234). He compared his data with the results of Jenő Kiss (2009), which showed that 92% of Budapest undergraduates had no dialect background (Kiss, 2009, p. 3). Zimányi's research also revealed that the majority of students at Eszterházy Károly Catholic University are accepting of dialects and consider dialect and vernacular to be equivalent. However, there were also several students in Budapest who held negative views on dialect phenomena (Zimányi, 2015, p. 237).

Edina Kovács wrote about the language attitudes of students participating in teacher education at the University of Debrecen. The results on the perception of dialect speech showed that the respondents considered the use of the standard dialect at school to be appropriate while they also considered it acceptable for the teacher to speak in dialect during lectures (cf. Kovács, 2014).

Andrea Parapatics investigated the linguistic dialect awareness of students studying at different universities in Hungary. She analysed her data based on a national sample and on the basis of responses from the University of Pannonia. Based on her conclusions, the mentality of university students is mostly standard-oriented, they are less accepting of regional-based language variations, and she

sees the reason for this in their lack of native language awareness and knowledge (cf. Parapatics, 2021). Parapatics (cf. 2016) also assessed the attitudes of teachers through a questionnaire survey, which also confirmed that the standard has a higher prestige compared to dialects.

Zoltán Nagy also surveyed teachers in Hungary on the perception of the standard and dialects and the use of these language varieties in schools. His research found that for the majority of teachers, dialect speech sounds natural. They consider it acceptable for teachers to use dialects in lessons and disagree that young people who speak in dialect should be separated from dialect speech. It was also found that the majority of respondents believed that only the standard should be taught in schools, and that linguists decide what is right and wrong in the language (Nagy, 2015, pp. 252–254).

In summary, the results of the research in minority language areas show that stereotypes against dialects are mostly present, while all communities have a positive perception of their language variety and strong group cohesion. It was also found that school education does not always help to dispel stereotypes about language varieties. Studies carried out in Hungary show that a multi-norm approach to language has not yet been integrated into the practice of public education, which means that the vernacular is not taught to pupils alongside dialects (additive mother tongue education) but instead of them (subtractive education). Regarding the students' attitudes towards dialects, the results show a very varied picture, with some who are accepting and others who are less accepting of dialect speech.

#### **4. Research method and participants**

In connection with the research just described, we examined the linguistic awareness and dialect attitudes of students studying at the University of Nyíregyháza during the last academic year. The aim of the research was to find out what knowledge the respondents had about the spatial variation of the language and how they judged dialect speech. The survey was conducted using an online questionnaire, which consisted of mostly closed questions and one or two open questions. The online form contained a variety of questions that covered the sociological characteristics of the students, the definition of dialect, attitudes towards dialect speech, and knowledge of situational language use. The data were also analysed to compare the extent to which responses differed by type of residence. To answer the latter question, two-sample t-tests were conducted.

A total of 70 students studying at the University of Nyíregyháza completed the questionnaire. The respondents were enrolled in an undergraduate degree programme in teaching. The participants in the study were first-year students who had not yet studied dialectology and sociolinguistics at the time of the research.

Thus, their knowledge and attitudes towards linguistic diversity were influenced by what they had learned in high school and by their experiences in their immediate environment. The majority of the respondents were between 19 (32.9%) and 20 (24.3%) years old at the time of completion. By gender, 51% of the respondents were female and 49% were male. In terms of current place of residence, the majority of respondents (61%) lived in a town and a smaller proportion (39%) in a village. As the respondents lived in different municipalities, we grouped them by counties, which showed that the majority of respondents (80%) lived in Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg county.

## 5. Research hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated when designing the research:

1. The results of research on both Hungarian linguistics and the methodology of mother tongue teaching show that the multi-norm approach to language has not yet been integrated into the practice of mother tongue education in schools, and that teachers' attitudes often convey uncertain and contradictory value judgements about non-standard varieties (cf. Parapatics, 2016; Jánk, 2017, 2018, 2019; Dudics Lakatos, 2019; Dudics, 2020). On this basis, we assumed that the dialect attitudes and linguistic consciousness of the students we studied would be determined by their experiences at school, and that negative attitudes towards dialect speech would be observed in their value judgments.

2. The results of several studies in Hungary and abroad (cf. Csernicskó, 2008; Parapatics, 2022) have shown that members of different communities can distinguish the language use of people living in their locality from the speech of people living in the surrounding locality and judge their own more positively. Furthermore, language users tend to perceive the speech of people living in their own municipality as more colloquial than that of people living in other municipalities. On this basis, we assumed that the respondents included in the study would be less likely to acknowledge the occurrence of dialect phenomena in their own language use and in the speech patterns of people in their municipality.

## 6. Results

The majority of respondents (64%) answered 'yes' to the question whether they think there are differences between the language use of people living in their own and neighbouring municipalities. In a comparison by place of residence, the opinions of those living in towns and villages differed, with 44% of those living in towns answering 'yes', compared to only 20% of those living in villages, and a higher proportion of those living in villages (25%) thought that there were no differences between the Hungarian spoken in their own settlement and in other

settlements. The results of the t-test also showed that there was a significant difference between the opinions of those living in towns and those living in villages:  $t(57) = -3.06$   $p > 0.05$  ( $p = 0.003$ ).

We then asked respondents in an open-ended question what they think we call a dialect. Our aim with the open question was to allow respondents to formulate their answers based on their own opinions and knowledge, without being influenced by any predetermined answer choices. This question played an important role in the questionnaire, as it is necessary for the study of attitudes that respondents are able to formulate the attitude itself. All respondents wrote some kind of response to what we call dialect. Usually, for open-ended questions, the answers given can be diverse, and this was the case here, so we categorised them according to their common characteristics. Some of the most typical answers pointed to a specific feature of the dialect, and most of the answers highlighted the variety and geographical boundedness of the dialect. In addition, several respondents referred to pronunciation differences under dialects. One respondent emphasised the identity function of dialects, and there were also respondents who considered dialects as a tradition. There were also a few responses that indicated a more limited knowledge of the meta-language, but in most cases the answers partially covered the concept of dialect to some extent. This suggests that the majority of the students had no misconceptions and negative value judgements about dialect usage.

In the questionnaire, respondents were asked whether they thought dialect speech was typical of their own locality. The majority of respondents said 'yes' (63%), 20% said 'no' and 17% could not say. By place of residence, 33% of those living in a city said 'yes', 7% said 'no' and 16% could not say. For respondents living in a village, the proportion of 'yes' answers was 30%, the proportion of 'no' answers was 10% and 4% of respondents living in a village could not say whether there was a specific dialect in their locality. Although the data show that a slightly higher proportion of urban respondents answered 'yes' than village respondents, the t-test results show that there is no significant difference between the opinions of the two groups:  $t(68) = 1.45$   $p > 0.05$  ( $p = 0.14$ ).

Respondents, on the other hand, recognised a lower proportion of dialect phenomena in their own language use. 39% answered 'yes', 37% 'no', and 24% of respondents could not say. When grouped by place of residence, a higher proportion of those living in towns answered 'no', while a higher proportion of those living in villages answered 'yes'. Thus, more respondents living in villages than in cities acknowledged the presence of dialect phenomena in their language use, but the two groups' opinions did not differ significantly according to the t-test result:  $t(61) = 0.47$   $p > 0.63$  ( $p = 0.24$ ).



**Table 1.** Do you speak a dialect?

	Yes	No	I do not know
Town	19%	24%	13%
Village	20%	13%	11%

We also wanted to find out in which situations respondents speak in dialect. The majority of respondents (53%) said that they mostly used dialect only with family and friends, 38% could not say, and only 9% of respondents said that they spoke dialect everywhere.

It was also found that 57% of respondents considered it acceptable to speak in dialect always and everywhere, 23% considered it good and 20% did not think it was correct. However, respondents were more favourable to people who speak in dialect in family and friends' surroundings, but use the vernacular or a regional version of it in official or more formal settings. The data thus show that 64% of respondents considered the effort to use the language consciously to be good, 36% considered it to be acceptable and none of them ticked the option that they did not consider it to be good. The responses also showed that 62% of respondents did not tend to correct others for their dialect speech.

Asked what dialect speech means to them, the majority of respondents (86%) selected the answer option that dialect is a means of expressing identity. 62% of respondents thought it was a means of communication, 30% thought that only elderly people spoke in dialect, and only one or two respondents had a negative opinion and thought that dialect speech was inappropriate and should be abandoned altogether.

The informants had to indicate on a scale from one to five how much they agreed with various statements. In the questionnaire, only the meanings of the two most extreme values were given: 1 = I do not agree at all, 5 = I completely agree.

The majority of respondents (40.8%) indicated in the middle of the Likert scale that few people speak in dialect today. This means that they could not form an opinion on this statement. According to the following statement, the task of teachers is to teach the students the common language instead of speaking in dialect. Regarding this statement, the opinions were very diverse: 28% of the respondents were indifferent, 24% disagreed less, and 23% agreed more. On the other hand, the majority of respondents (47%) fully agreed with the statement, which was formulated as follows: "The teacher's task is to draw students' attention to the values of dialects in addition to teaching the common language." 42% of the respondents fully agreed with the statement that nowadays it is essential to learn the common language. According to 42% of the informants, it is also good to speak a dialect and use colloquial language. The majority of the students (64.8%) did not agree at all with the statement that a person who speaks dialect is uneducated.

Furthermore, according to the majority of respondents (43.7%), dialect is a value, which is why it is important to preserve it.

## 7. Summary

In our research, we examined the dialect awareness and dialect attitudes of prospective language teachers at the University of Nyíregyháza. Our aim was to find out how the surveyed respondents thought about dialect speech and conscious language use. When planning the research, we assumed that a negative attitude towards dialect speech would be observed in the answers of the respondents (hypothesis 1). The results did not support this hypothesis, as the majority of the students surveyed here did not have a negative opinion of dialect phenomena, they were roughly aware of its meaning and the conscious use of language adapted to the situation. Furthermore, according to the majority of the informants, the standard language variant should be taught to the students at school not instead of the dialects, but alongside them, and this result indicates the awareness of the conscious use of the language on the part of the respondents and the attitudes that accept the language variants. The second hypothesis was partially confirmed, as far fewer of the respondents recognized the occurrence of dialect phenomena in their language use than in the speech of the people living in their settlement. According to the majority of students, differences can be observed in the language use of people living in their settlement and in neighbouring settlements, although when grouped according to residence, the opinion of those living in the city and the village showed a difference, since according to the majority of the people living in the village, no differences can be observed.

Overall, the results show that the respondents involved in the research do not have negative opinions about dialect phenomena. Encouragingly, the majority of respondents show an accepting attitude towards linguistic diversity and consider it right to strive for language awareness. Furthermore, the majority of respondents see dialect speech as a means of expressing identity, which also indicates a positive attitude. From these results, it is hoped that the students who participated in the research will adopt an appropriate (additive) approach to teaching linguistic diversity in their teaching practice, thus influencing students' evaluations of dialects and linguistic diversity in a positive direction.

## Література

1. AkH.<sup>12</sup> 2015. = *A magyar helyesírás szabályai. Tizenkettedik kiadás.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
2. Clyne, Michael. 1992. Introduction. In: Clyne, M. ed. *Pluricentric Languages. Different Norms in Different Countries.* Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 1–9.

3. Cserniczkó István 2008. Nyelv és azonosságtudat összefüggései a kárpátaljai magyar közösségben. In: Fedinec Csilla szerk. *Értékek, dimenziók a magyarságtudatban*. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Magyar Tudományosság Külföldön Elnöki Bizottság. 153–170. o.
4. Csincsik Anikó 2011. Vajdasági magyar nyelvhasználat egyetemisták körében. *Iskolakultúra* 2–3: 45–58. o.
5. Dudics Lakatos Katalin 2019. Kárpátaljai magyar pedagógusok nyelvjárási attitűdjének alakulása két felmérés eredményei alapján (2008–2018). *Magyar Nyelvjárások* 57: 123–134. o.
6. Dudics Lakatos Katalin 2020. Kárpátaljai magyar pedagógusok és tanítványaik metanyelvi ismereteiről. *Magyar Nyelvjárások* 58: 165–173. <https://doi.org/10.30790/mnyj/2020/08>
7. Fazakas Noémi 2016. Erdélyi magyar egyetemisták nyelvi és nyelvhasználati attitűdjei. In: Kozmács István – Vančo Ildikó szerk. *Sztenderd – nem sztenderd. Variációk egy nyelv változataira*. Lakitelek: Antológia Kiadó. 55–64. o.
8. Fishbein, Martin – Ajzen, Icek 1975. *Belief, attitude, intention and behaviour. An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley [ebből magyarul olvasható: 222–244, 253–255, Az attitűd információs alapjai. In: Hunyady György szerk., 1984. *Szociálpszichológia*. Budapest: Gondolat. 175–210. o.]
9. Grin, François 2013. Language Policy, Ideology, and Attitudes. In: Robert Bayley – Richard Cameron – Ceil Lucas eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: University Press. pp. 629–650.
10. Jánk István 2017. Nyelvi hátrány és diszkrimináció az iskolában: A nyelvi szocializáció jelentősége a tanuló értékelésében. *Szociológiai Szemle* 27/3: 27–47. o.
11. Jánk István 2018. A nyelvi alapú diszkrimináció vizsgálatának módszertani korlátai és lehetőségei. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 142/2: 150–169. o.
12. Jánk István 2019. Lingvicizmus a Kárpát-medence négy országának gyakorló és leendő magyartanárainál. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 143/1: 31–46. o.
13. Kiss Jenő 2002. *Társadalom és nyelvhasználat*. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.
14. Kiss Jenő 2009. A nyelvjárások és a dialektológiaoktatás Kárpát-medencei magyar szakos hallgatók szemével. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 133: 1–14. o.
15. Kovács Edina 2014. A tanár szakos hallgatók nyelvi attitűdjeinek társadalmi nemi sajátosságai. *Anyanyelv-pedagógia* 7/2. <https://www.anyanyelv-pedagogia.hu/cikkek.php?id=514> (Letöltés dátuma: 2023. 12. 12.)
16. Lakatos Katalin 2010. *Kárpátaljai magyar iskolások nyelvi tudata és attitűdje*. Kézirat. *Doktori értekezés*. Budapest: ELTE BTK.
17. Nagy Zoltán 2015. Pályán lévő pedagógusok anyanyelvi attitűdjei. In: Puztai Gabriella – Morvai Laura szerk. *Pálya-modell. Igények és lehetőségek a pedagógus-továbbképzés változó rendszerében*. Nagyvárad – Budapest: Partium – P.P.S. – Ú.M.K. 246–247. o.
18. NMTsz.=Kiss Gábor szerk. 2019. *Nagy magyar tájszótár. 55 000 népies, tájnyelvi és archaikus szó magyarázata*. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.
19. Parapatics Andrea 2016. Tények és tapasztalatok a dialektológiai ismeretek tanításáról. In: Czetter Ibolya – Hajba Renáta – Tóth Péter szerk. *VI. Dialektológiai szimpozion*. Szombathely – Nyitra: Nyugat-magyarországi Egyetem Savaria Egyetemi Központ – Nyitrai Konstantin Filozófus Egyetem Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kar. 509–517. o.

20. Parapatics Andrea 2021. Pannon Egyetemen tanuló hallgatók nyelvi-nyelvjárási tudata. In: *Humán tudományok: pedagógusképzés és tananyagfejlesztés*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
21. Parapatics Andrea 2022. Nyugat-magyarországi beszélők nyelvi-nyelvjárási attitűdjei. Részeredmények. *Acta Academiae Beregsasiensis, Philologica* 1/1: 85–105. <https://doi.org/10.58423/2786-6726/2022-1-85-105>
22. Presinszky Károly 2009. Nyelvi attitűdök vizsgálata a nyitrai magyar egyetemisták körében. In: Borbély Anna – Vančóné Kremmer Ildikó – Hattyár Helga szerk. *Nyelvideológiai, attitűdök és sztereotípiák*. Budapest – Dunaszerdahely – Nyitra: Tinta Könyvkiadó. 241–248. o.
23. Sándor Anna 2009. A nyelvjárási attitűd vizsgálata a nyitrai magyar szakos egyetemisták körében. In: Borbély Anna – Vančóné Kremmer Ildikó – Hattyár Helga szerk. *Nyelvideológiai, attitűdök és sztereotípiák*. Budapest – Dunaszerdahely – Nyitra: Tinta Könyvkiadó. 231–239. o.
24. Sándor Klára 1999. Szociolingvisztikai alapismeretek. In: Galgóczi László szerk. *Nyelvtan, nyelvhasználat, kommunikáció*. Szeged: JGYF Kiadó. 133–171. o.
25. Sándor Klára 2016. *Nyelv és társadalom*. Budapest: Krónika Nova.
26. Stewart, William. 1968. A sociolinguistic typology for describing national multilingualism. In: Fishman, J. A. ed. *Readings in the sociology of language*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 530–545.
27. T. Károlyi Margit 2002. A nyelvi tudatosság és attitűd vizsgálata a beregszászi főiskola hallgatóinak különböző csoportjaiban. In: Hoffmann István – Juhász Dezső – Péntek János szerk. *Hungarológia és dimenzionális nyelvszemlélet*. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék. 329–338. o.
28. Trudgill, Peter 1974. *The social differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
29. Trudgill, Peter 1997. *Bevezetés a nyelv és társadalom tanulmányozásába*. Szeged: JGYTF.
30. Zimányi Árpád 2015. A nyelvjárások és a nyelvjárásiasság megítélése egyetemisták és főiskolások körében. *Acta Academiae Paedagogicae Agriensis Nova Series: Sectio Linguistica Hungarica* 42: 233–244. o.

## References

1. AkH.<sup>12</sup> 2015. = *A magyar helyesírás szabályai. Tizenkettedik kiadás* [The rules of Hungarian spelling. Twelfth edition]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. (In Hungarian)
2. Clyne, Michael. 1992. Introduction. In: Clyne, M. ed.. *Pluricentric Languages. Different Norms in Different Countries*. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 1–9.
3. Cserniczkó, István 2008. Nyelv és azonosságtudat összefüggései a kárpátaljai magyar közösségben [Relationships between language and sense of identity in the Transcarpathian Hungarian community]. In: Fedinec Csilla ed. *Értékek, dimenziók a magyarságkutatásban*. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Magyar Tudományosság Külföldön Elnöki Bizottság. 153–170. o. (In Hungarian)
4. Csincsik, Anikó 2011. Vajdasági magyar nyelvhasználat egyetemisták körében [Hungarian language use among university students in Vojvodina]. *Iskolakultúra* 2–3: 45–58. o. (In Hungarian)

5. Dudics Lakatos, Katalin 2019. Kárpátaljai magyar pedagógusok nyelvjárási attitűdjének alakulása két felmérés eredményei alapján (2008–2018) [Development of the dialect attitude of Transcarpathian Hungarian teachers based on the results of two surveys (2008–2018)]. *Magyar Nyelvjárások* 57: 123–134. o. (In Hungarian)
6. Dudics Lakatos, Katalin 2020. Kárpátaljai magyar pedagógusok és tanítványaik metanyelvi ismereteiről [On the meta-linguistic knowledge of Transcarpathian Hungarian teachers and their students]. *Magyar Nyelvjárások* 58: 165–173. o. <https://doi.org/10.30790/mnyj/2020/08> (In Hungarian)
7. Fazakas, Noémi 2016. Erdélyi magyar egyetemisták nyelvi és nyelvhasználati attitűdjei [Language and language use attitudes of Transylvanian Hungarian university students]. In: Kozmács István – Vančo Ildikó eds. *Sztenderd – nem sztenderd. Variációk egy nyelv változataira*. Lakitelek: Antológia Kiadó. 55–64. o. (In Hungarian)
8. Fishbein, Martin – Ajzen, Icek 1975. *Belief, attitude, intention and behaviour. An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley [available in Hungarian: pp. 222–244, 253–255, Az attitűd információs alapjai [The informational basis of attitude]. In: Hunyady György ed., 1984. *Szociálpszichológia*. Budapest: Gondolat. 175–210. o.].
9. Grin, François 2013. Language Policy, Ideology, and Attitudes. In: Robert Bayley – Richard Cameron – Ceil Lucas eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: University Press. pp. 629–650.
10. Jánk, István 2017. Nyelvi hátrány és diszkrimináció az iskolában: A nyelvi szocializáció jelentősége a tanuló értékelésében [Linguistic disadvantage and discrimination at school: The importance of language socialization in learner evaluation]. *Szociológiai Szemle* 27/3: 27–47. o. (In Hungarian)
11. Jánk, István 2018. A nyelvi alapú diszkrimináció vizsgálatának módszertani korlátai és lehetőségei [Methodological limitations and possibilities of the investigation of language-based discrimination]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 142/2: 150–169. o. (In Hungarian)
12. Jánk, István 2019. Lingvicitizmus a Kárpát-medence négy országának gyakorló és leendő magyartanárainál [Linguistics among practicing and prospective Hungarian teachers from the four countries of the Carpathian Basin]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 143/1: 31–46. o. (In Hungarian)
13. Kiss, Jenő 2002. *Társadalom és nyelvhasználat* [Society and language use]. Budapest, Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó. (In Hungarian)
14. Kiss, Jenő 2009. A nyelvjárások és a dialektológiaoktatás Kárpát-medencei magyar szakos hallgatók szemével [Dialects and dialectology education through the eyes of Hungarian students from the Carpathian Basin]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 133: 1–14. o. (In Hungarian)
15. Kovács, Edina 2014. A tanár szakos hallgatók nyelvi attitűdjeinek társadalmi nemi sajátosságai [The social gender characteristics of the language attitudes of students from teacher training courses]. *Anyanyelv-pedagógia* 7/2. <https://www.anyanyelv-pedagogia.hu/cikkek.php?id=514> (Accessed: 12. 12. 2023). (In Hungarian)
16. Lakatos, Katalin 2010. *Kárpátaljai magyar iskolások nyelvi tudata és attitűdje. Kézirat. Doktori értekezés* [Language awareness and attitudes of Hungarian schoolchildren in Transcarpathia. Manuscript. Doctoral Dissertation]. Budapest, ELTE BTK. (In Hungarian)
17. Nagy, Zoltán 2015. Pályán lévő pedagógusok anyanyelvi attitűdjei [Mother tongue attitudes of practicing teachers]. In: Pusztai Gabriella – Morvai Laura eds. *Pályá-*

- modell. Igények és lehetőségek a pedagógus-továbbképzés változó rendszerében.* Nagyvárad – Budapest: Partium – P.P.S. – Ú.M.K. 246–247. o. (In Hungarian)
18. NMTsz.=Kiss, Gábor ed. 2019. *Nagy magyar tájszótár. 55 000 népies, tájnyelvi és archaikus szó magyarázata* [A large Hungarian landscape dictionary. Explanation of 55,000 folk, regional and archaic words]. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó. (In Hungarian)
  19. Parapatics, Andrea 2016. Tények és tapasztalatok a dialektológiai ismeretek tanításáról [Facts and experiences about teaching dialectological knowledge]. In: Czetter Ibolya – Hajba Renáta – Tóth Péter eds. *VI. Dialektológiai szimpozion.* Szombathely – Nyitra: Nyugat-magyarországi Egyetem Savaria Egyetemi Központ – Nyitrai Konstantin Filozófus Egyetem Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kar. 509–517. o. (In Hungarian)
  20. Parapatics, Andrea 2021. Pannon Egyetemen tanuló hallgatók nyelvi-nyelvjárási tudata [Language and dialect awareness of students studying at the University of Pannonia]. In: *Humán tudományok: pedagógusképzés és tananyagfejlesztés.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. (In Hungarian)
  21. Parapatics, Andrea 2022. Nyugat-magyarországi beszélők nyelvi-nyelvjárási attitűdjei. Részeredmények [Language and dialect attitudes of Western Hungarian speakers. Partial results]. *Acta Academiae Beregsasiensis, Philologica* 1/1: 85–105. o. <https://doi.org/10.58423/2786-6726/2022-1-85-105> (In Hungarian)
  22. Presinszky Károly 2009. Nyelvi attitűdök vizsgálata a nyitrai magyar egyetemisták körében [Examination of language attitudes among Hungarian university students in Nitra]. In: Borbély Anna – Vančóné Kremmer Ildikó – Hattyár Helga eds. *Nyelvideológiák, attitűdök és sztereotípiák.* Budapest – Dunaszerdahely – Nyitra: Tinta Könyvkiadó. 241–248. o. (In Hungarian)
  23. Sándor, Anna 2009. A nyelvjárási attitűd vizsgálata a nyitrai magyar szakos egyetemisták körében [Examination of dialect attitudes among university students majoring in Hungarian in Nitra]. In: Borbély Anna – Vančóné Kremmer Ildikó – Hattyár Helga eds. *Nyelvideológiák, attitűdök és sztereotípiák.* Budapest – Dunaszerdahely – Nyitra: Tinta Könyvkiadó. 231–239. o. (In Hungarian)
  24. Sándor Klára 1999. Szociolingvisztikai alapismeretek [Basic knowledge of sociolinguistics]. In: Galgóczi László ed. *Nyelvtan, nyelvhasználat, kommunikáció.* Szeged: JGYF Kiadó. 133–171. o.
  25. Sándor, Klára 2016. *Nyelv és társadalom* [Language and society]. Budapest: Krónika Nova. (In Hungarian)
  26. Stewart, William. 1968. A sociolinguistic typology for describing national multilingualism. In: Fishman, J. A. ed. *Readings in the sociology of language.* The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 530–545.
  27. T. Károlyi, Margit 2002. A nyelvi tudatosság és attitűd vizsgálata a beregszászi főiskola hallgatóinak különböző csoportjaiban [Examination of language awareness and attitude in different groups of college students in Berehove]. In: Hoffmann István – Juhász Dezső – Péntek János eds. *Hungarológia és dimenzionális nyelvszemlélet.* Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék. 329–338. o. (In Hungarian)
  28. Trudgill, Peter 1974. *The social differentiation of English in Norwich.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

29. Trudgill, Peter 1997. *Bevezetés a nyelv és társadalom tanulmányozásába* [An introduction to the study of language and society]. Szeged, JGYTF. (In Hungarian)
30. Zimányi, Árpád 2015. A nyelvjárások és a nyelvjárásiasság megítélése egyetemisták és főiskolások körében [Perceptions of dialects and dialecticity among university and college students]. *Acta Academiae Paedagogicae Agriensis Nova Series: Sectio Linguistica Hungarica* 42: 233–244. o.

### Language awareness survey among university students

**Anita Kiss**, PhD. University of Nyíregyháza, Institute of Languages and Literature, senior lecturer. anita.kiss@nye.hu, ORCID: 0000-0002-5087-3294.

**Zita Somfalvi**, PhD. University of Nyíregyháza, Institute of Languages and Literature, senior lecturer. zita.somfalvi@nye.hu, ORCID: 0000-0002-9734-0719.

In this study we examined the linguistic awareness and dialect attitudes of university students studying at the University of Nyíregyháza. It is particularly important that the future teachers have a positive attitude towards the varieties of the Hungarian language and share their knowledge with their learners in an effective way. However, the results of various research studies show that in many cases, mother tongue education in schools does not build on a multi-standard approach to language varieties, and as a consequence, non-standard varieties are perceived more negatively than standard ones. The aim of this research is to find out what the university students in the research study know about the regional variation of language, conscious language use and how they view dialect speech. The study was conducted through an online questionnaire survey involving 70 respondents. As a starting point for the research, it was assumed that the respondents' dialect attitudes and language awareness would be determined by their experiences at school, and thus negative attitudes towards dialect speech would be observed in their value judgments. It was also assumed that respondents would be less accepting of the occurrence of dialect phenomena in their own language use and in the speech habits of others in their locality.

The results showed that the majority of the students surveyed did not have a negative opinion of dialect phenomena, so the first hypothesis was not confirmed. However, the second hypothesis was partially confirmed, as far fewer respondents acknowledged the occurrence of dialect phenomena in their own language use than in the speech of the people in their locality. Overall, the majority of respondents to the survey have a positive attitude towards linguistic diversity and strive to use the language consciously. It is hoped that the students surveyed here will adopt the right approach to teaching about linguistic diversity in their teaching practice, thus positively influencing learners' attitudes towards dialects and linguistic diversity.

**Keywords:** *language use, dialects, language attitudes, linguistic diversity, language varieties.*

### Дослідження мовної свідомості в середовищі студентів Ніредьгазького університету

**Кіш Аніта**, доктор філософії. Ніредьгазький університет, Інститут мовознавства та літературознавства, старший викладач. anita.kiss@nye.hu, ORCID: 0000-0002-5087-3294.

**Шомфалві Зіта**, доктор філософії. Ніредьгазький університет, Інститут мовознавства та літературознавства, старший викладач. zita.somfalvi@nye.hu, ORCID: 0000-0002-9734-0719.

У статті запропоновано результати дослідження, проведеного серед здобувачів педагогічних спеціальностей Ніредьгазького університету (Угорщина) щодо їх мовної свідомості та ставлення (атітюд) до діалектів. Важливо, щоби молодь, яка в майбутньому стане педагогами, позитивно ставилася до варіантів угорської мови, а свої знання передавала учням, правильно розставляючи акценти. Проте результати різних досліджень свідчать, що часто на уроках угорської мови в закладах загальної середньої освіти не формується світогляд, який позитивно б сприймав різноманітні норми та мовні варіанти. Унаслідок цього виникає більш упереджене ставлення до тих мовних варіантів, що відрізняються від стандартизованої літературної мови. Метою дослідження було з'ясувати, які знання мають залучені до опитування студенти університету про територіальні діалекти, про свідоме мововживання та як вони ставляться до діалектного мовлення. Опитування проводилося у форматі онлайн анкетування, до якого було залучено 70 респондентів. Вихідною точкою дослідження є припущення, що атітюд респондентів стосовно діалектів та їх мовну свідомість визначає отриманий у школі досвід, тобто в їх судженнях буде спостерігатися негативна атітюда стосовно діалектного мовлення. Також ми припустили, що опитані особи менше будуть визнавати використання діалектних елементів у власному мововживанні та у мовленні осіб, які проживають в їхньому населеному пункті.

Результати дослідження показали, що більша частина опитаних здобувачів не висловлювалася негативно про діалектні явища, тож перша гіпотеза не підтвердилася. Натомість друга гіпотеза частково підтвердилася, оскільки серед респондентів значно менша частка визнала використання діалектизмів у власному мовленні, ніж у мовленні мешканців свого населеного пункту. Загалом можна підсумувати, що більшість залучених до дослідження респондентів позитивно ставляться до мовного різноманіття і прагнуть свідомого мововживання. Сподіваємося, що опитані здобувачі, працюючи в майбутньому педагогами, будуть належним чином висвітлювати учням поняття мовного різноманіття та мовних варіантів, спрямовуючи у позитивному напрямку ставлення школярів до діалектів та мовних варіантів.

**Ключові слова:** мововживання, мовні діалекти, мовна атітюда, мовна різноманітність, мовні варіанти.



### Nyelvi tudatosság vizsgálata egyetemi hallgatók körében

**Kiss Anita**, PhD. Nyíregyházi Egyetem, Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Intézet, adjunktus. anita.kiss@nye.hu, ORCID: 0000-0002-5087-3294.

**Somfalvi Zita**, PhD. Nyíregyházi Egyetem, Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Intézet, adjunktus. zita.somfalvi@nye.hu, ORCID: 0000-0002-9734-0719.

Az itt bemutatott tanulmányban a Nyíregyházi Egyetemen tanuló tanárszakos hallgatók nyelvi tudatosságát és nyelvjárási attitűdjeit vizsgáltuk. Különösen fontos, hogy a pedagógusi pályára készülő fiatalok pozitívan viszonyuljanak a magyar nyelv változataihoz, és tudásukat megfelelő szemléletmódban továbbítsák majd a tanítványaik felé. A különböző kutatások eredményei azonban azt mutatják, hogy sok esetben az iskolai anyanyelvi oktatás nem épít a többenormájú, nyelvváltozatokat elfogadó szemléletmódra, és ebből kifolyólag a sztenderd nyelvváltozathoz képest a nemsztenderd változatoknak negatívabb a megítélése. A kutatás célja kideríteni, hogy a vizsgálatban részt vevő egyetemi hallgatóknak milyen ismereteik vannak a nyelv területi alapú változatosságáról, a tudatos nyelvhasználatról, és hogyan ítélik meg a nyelvjárási beszédet. A vizsgálatot online kérdőíves felméréssel végeztük 70 adatközlő bevonásával. A kutatás kiindulópontjaként feltételeztük, hogy az adatközlők nyelvjárási attitűdjeit és nyelvi tudatosságát meghatározzák az iskolában szerzett tapasztalatok, tehát értékítéleteikben megfigyelhetők lesznek a nyelvjárási beszéddel szembeni negatív attitűdök. Feltételeztük továbbá, hogy a megkérdezettek kevésbé fogják elismerni a nyelvjárási jelenségek előfordulását a saját nyelvhasználatukban és a településükön élők beszédmódjában.

Az eredmények azt mutatták, hogy megkérdezett hallgatók nagyobb része nem vélekedett negatívan a nyelvjárási jelenségekről, így az első hipotézis nem igazolódott be. A második hipotézis viszont részben beigazolódott, mivel a válaszadók közül jóval kevesebben ismerték el a nyelvjárási jelenségek előfordulását a saját nyelvhasználatukban, mint a településükön élők beszédében. Összességében viszont elmondható, hogy a kutatásba bevont adatközlők többsége pozitívan viszonyul a nyelvi változatossághoz, és törekednek a tudatos nyelvhasználatra. Remélhetőleg az itt megkérdezett hallgatók majd a pedagógusi pályán is megfelelő szemléletmódban fogják tanítani a nyelvi változatosság tényét, pozitív irányba terelve ezzel a diákok nyelvjárásokkal és nyelvi változatokkal kapcsolatos értékítéleteit.

**Kulcsszavak:** nyelvhasználat, nyelvjárások, nyelvi attitűdök, nyelvi változatosság, nyelvváltozatok.