

Why Hungarian? Motivations of Hungarian language learners in Finland

Ildikó Pusztai-Varga*  and Anita Kéri** 

University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Received: March 21, 2024 • Accepted: March 3, 2025

Published online: May 14, 2025

© 2025 The Author(s)



ABSTRACT

Since the end of the 18th century, when knowledge and awareness of the linguistically related Hungarian and Finnish language started to spread in both language speaking communities, several different forms of social, political and cultural relations have encouraged members of the two societies to learn each other's language. Knowing the language of the partner community has meant deeper insight into its cultural, social, and public life, and it has been a key to understanding each other better. This research aims at answering the question of what motivates adult language learners to study Hungarian as a foreign language in present day Finland. The study focusses on adult education and university education as study environments. The research methodology mixes qualitative and quantitative methods and is empirical in nature. The theoretical background is based on research on motivation for language learning, particularly on Zoltán Dörnyei's model about components of foreign language learning motivation, and on the context of the history of social and cultural relations between Finland and Hungary. The results show that elements of the Dörnyei model surface within the answers of the research participants and can be further grouped according to categories related to those of Dörnyei.

KEYWORDS

language learning motivation, Finnish-Hungarian relations, adult education, cross-cultural communication, Zoltán Dörnyei's language motivation model

* Corresponding author. E-mail: ildiko.pusztai.varga@eco.u-szeged.hu

** Corresponding author. E-mail: kerianita@eco.u-szeged.hu

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the end of the 18th century, when knowledge and awareness of the linguistically related Hungarian and Finnish language started to spread in both language speaking communities, several different forms of social, political and cultural relations have encouraged members of the two societies to learn each other's language. Knowing the language of the partner community has meant deeper insight into its cultural, social, and public life, and it has been a key to understanding each other better.

As a learner of the Finnish language, then graduating as a teacher of Finnish language and literature, later working as a translator of Finnish contemporary literature into Hungarian, one of the authors of the research has seen and experienced the enthusiasm in both the Hungarian and the Finnish community to get to know each other, to maintain closer relations in the context of the two cultures, nations, and countries. They have also experienced the high motivation of adult learners in Finland to start and continuously pursue Hungarian language studies regardless of their age as a way of self-development and self-fulfilment, in order to uphold close relations in their family, friendly, choir, church, twin city or education, and work-related connections with Hungarian people.

The present research aims to answer the question of what motivates adult language learners to study Hungarian as a foreign language in today's Finland. It focusses solely on adult education and university education as study environments.

The research methodology mixes qualitative and quantitative methods and is empirical in nature. First, semi-structured interviews were conducted with teachers and learners of Hungarian as a foreign language in Finland. Subsequently, a survey was distributed among adult learners of "Hungarian as a foreign language" in Finland. An online questionnaire in Finnish language was designed based on the results and conclusions of the interviews. The interviews and the online survey were completed with field observations in Finland, this way ensuring triangulation.

The subjects of the research are language learners older than 18 years of age who study Hungarian as a foreign language either in higher education or in non-academic adult education. It is important to make a distinction between Hungarian language learners for whom Hungarian is a foreign or second language (L2) and Hungarian language learners for whom Hungarian is a heritage language, so for them Hungarian is a language related to their ethnic identity and origin, not being their mother tongue, neither a foreign language (Csire and Laakso, 2011).

The theoretical background of the research is two-fold. First, it builds on the theoretical background of language learning motivation research, particularly on the Zoltán Dörnyei model on components of foreign language learning motivation (Dörnyei, 1994). Second, it expands on the context of the history of social and cultural relations between Finland and Hungary.

2. MOTIVATIONS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING – DÖRNYEI'S MODEL

The present research aims to explore the motivational components of Hungarian language learners in Finland. It applies the foreign language learning motivation theory of Zoltán Dörnyei, more precisely, his model categorising the components of foreign language learning motivation.

At the end of the 1980s, research on the motivations in second language acquisition combined the cognitive and social psychological aspects. Exploring the factors that contribute to the language learners in their own understanding was the focus of research interest (Sunj, 2012; Szaszko, 2020). The Dörnyei model sheds light on the fact that motivation in language learning has different factors, such as 1. the learner (different types of learners and personalities), 2. the language (individual features of the given language) and 3. the situation (environment, teacher and time). Consequently, L2 motivation is an eclectic, multifaceted construct, coinciding with the three basic constituents of the L2 learning process, that is, the social dimension, the personal dimension, and the educational subject matter dimension (Dörnyei, 1994; Mathews-Aydinli, 2008).

In this model, the effects of three different psychological trends merge. The language level reflects on the social psychological aspect, referring to the integrative and instrumental subsystems. The level of the learner incorporates motivation psychological aspects explaining to what extent motivation can predict the success of language learning. Finally, the effect of dynamic development theories appears in reflecting on the relations between personality and dynamic motivational forces, at the same time highlighting the influence of the learning situation on the learner's behaviour (Sunj, 2012; Szaszko, 2020).

The most general level of the model is the Language Level, focussing on orientations and motives related to L2, such as the culture it conveys, the community in which it is spoken, and the usefulness of efficiency in it. These general motives determine basic learning goals and explain language choice. This general motivational aspect includes two motivational subsystems, an integrative motivational subsystem and an instrumental motivational subsystem. The integrative motivational subsystem builds on the L2-related affective predispositions, such as social, cultural and ethnolinguistic components, together with a general interest in foreignness and foreign languages. The instrumental motivational subsystem is related to well-internalised extrinsic motives building upon the language learner's future career aims (Table 1).

The second level of the L2 motivation model is the Learner Level, including affects and cognitions that shape personality attributes. Two motivational components can be identified at this level: the need for achievement and self-confidence, the latter involving language anxiety, perceived L2 competence, attributions about past experiences, and self-efficacy.

The third level of the L2 motivation model is the Learning Situation Level, consisting of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations and motivational conditions related to three areas. 1. Course-specific motivational components are related to the syllabus, the teaching materials, the teaching method, and the learning tasks: interest, relevance, expectation, and satisfaction. 2. Teacher-specific motivational components involve the affiliation drive to please/satisfy the teacher, the type of authority, and the direct socialisation of the motivation of the student (modelling, presentation of tasks, and feedback). 3. Group-specific motivational components consist of four main components: goal-orientedness, norm and reward system, group cohesion, and classroom goal structure (Dörnyei, 1994).

The present research intends to reveal the motivational components of learners of Hungarian as a foreign language in Finland identified by the Dörnyei model. The research includes adult language learners, over-18-year-olds currently living in Finland. The research setting involves adult education outside of school context (non-academic adult education) and higher education, i.e., university education in Finland.

Adult education has several different definitions depending on the social-educational context (Pusztai, 2007). In the present research, the adult language learner is defined based on legal terms,

Table 1. Dörnyei’s model on components of foreign language motivation (Dörnyei, 1994, p. 280)

Components of foreign language motivation	
Language Level	Integrative Motivational Subsystem
	Instrumental Motivational Subsystem
Learner Level	Need for Achievement
	Self-Confidence - Language Use Anxiety - Perceived L2 Competence - Causal Attributions - Self-Efficacy
Learning Situational Level	Course-Specific Motivational Components - Interest - Relevance - Expectancy - Satisfaction
	Teacher-Specific Motivational Components - Affiliative Drive - Authority Type - Direct Socialization of Motivation - Modelling - Task Presentation - Feedback
	Group-Specific Motivational Components - Goal-Orientedness - Norm and Reward System - Group Cohesion - Classroom Goal Structure

that is, those people who are regarded as adults by their society, in this case by Finnish laws. Consequently, two different learning groups can be identified in the context of the present research: 1. university students studying Hungarian as a foreign language in the context of higher education, 2. adult learners who study Hungarian as a foreign language on their own expense in a non-academic but formalised/institutionalised context, that is in language courses organised by institutions and associations related to Hungary, or by adult education centres in Finland. Finland’s adult education centres – in Finnish called “kansalaisopisto” or “työväenopisto” – are educational establishments offering opportunities for a wide variety of recreational activities and study. They are available to everyone, regardless of their age or educational background.¹

Language learning goals may differ in the two subject groups in a way that university students may pursue these studies partly as a semi-optional part of their university curriculum, while adult learners of language courses pursue Hungarian language studies for self-

¹Source: Official webpage of adult education in Finland at <https://kansalaisopistot.fi/kansalaisopistojen-historia/>.

development and self-fulfilment. However, in the higher education context, university students in Finland have always had a high level of freedom in choosing their study paths and accumulating study credits by performing different optional courses (Kovács, 2013; Vecsernyés, 2013); this way, we can see university students in Finland as learners highly motivated and conscious of their own choice of courses.

It is important to note that Finnish native speakers may also study Hungarian as a foreign language in Hungary, for example in summer universities, as exchange students at universities or in non-academic formal education, i.e. in language courses. Studying Hungarian with a private language teacher is also an option in both Finland and in Hungary. The present study focusses solely on language learners who study Hungarian as a foreign language in Finland in formal, i.e. organised language education in groups.

3. FINNISH-HUNGARIAN RELATIONS

Motivation in learning a second language is strongly influenced by the learner's attitude towards the culture the language conveys and the community in which it is spoken. An active and positive cultural-political relationship between the two speech communities can affect this attitude and raise the level of motivation and the strength of the integrative motivational components (Dörnyei, 1994). The close and active relations between Finns and Hungarians fostered by different layers of social and community activities have motivated and encouraged Hungarian language learners in Finland in the past centuries.

3.1. Periods of mutual relations

The acceptance of the relationship between the Finnish and Hungarian languages gradually spread among the educated circles of Europe and became generally established in the course of the 18th century. This marked the beginning of a cultural cooperation that has continued almost unbroken until today. At the end of the 18th century, the idea of relatedness and common roots appeared in both communities and served as a scientific proof in the period of the Hungarian enlightenment and reform era (Korhonen, 1985).

The first period of active mutual relations, between the 1840s and the First World War, is marked by vivid personal connections and frequent visits of scholars to both countries. The idea of relatedness penetrated into the wider educated audience. Toward the end of this period, contacts were also made in the fields of music and fine arts (Tervonen, 1985). The foundation of the Finno-Ugric department at the University of Helsinki in 1872 also marks the importance of scholarly and cultural ties. The notion of kinship became deeply rooted in Finns when in 1876 Zacharis Topelius in his work, a compulsory reading for pupils in Finland ever since, entitled *Maamme Kirja* (Our Motherland's Book) included the idea of kinship, generating a sympathy for the southerly relations (Tervonen, 1985; Richly, 2020).

The interwar years 1920–1945 can be regarded as the second period in Finnish-Hungarian relations. By this time, both countries had gained political independence and there was a firmer basis for Finnish and Hungarian people to get to know each other. In 1920, diplomatic relations between the two countries started, and in 1928, a Hungarian Embassy was established in Helsinki. In 1927, the first World Congress of Finno-Ugric Peoples was organised encouraging Estonia, Finland and Hungary to identify and establish organisations that will coordinate the

work of kindred Finno-Ugric states. The period is marked by more organised and canalised connections beyond the field of linguistics, resulting in the signing of the Finnish–Hungarian Cultural Agreement in 1937. A very important event from the period in mutual relations that has a very long memory in Finnish people’s mind is the helping hand that Hungary gave in the time of the Winter War in 1939, when Finnish troops fought a rather hopeless fight against the Soviet Union. Volunteers from Hungary travelled to assist their Finnish friends in the war, and financial and material support was also sent to the Finns by the Hungarian government. It was also during this period that friendship was formed between the Church of Finland and the Hungarian Lutheran Church.

The third period of mutual relations falls between the Second World War and the change of the regime in Hungary in the 1990s. During the 1950s, favourable political conditions opened the way for official relations, and the Finnish–Hungarian Society was established in Finland. Their periodical, *Suomi-Unkari*, has been published four times a year since its launch in 1953. In 1956, the Finnish nation was very supportive of the changes in Hungary. Then, in 1959, the Hungarian–Finnish Agreement on Cultural, Educational, and Scientific Cooperation was signed (renewed in 1995); furthermore, an official agreement between the Scientific Academies supported the exchange of scholars, and an educational agreement ensured the work of university lecturers. In 1969, visa-free travel was allowed between the two countries; and in 1980, the Hungarian Cultural and Scientific Centre in Helsinki was open (Numminen, 1985; Richly, 2021).

As a result of the historically intensive relations between the two nations, the actual political efforts of the two states, and the personal and subjectively motivated endeavours of certain people who acted as catalysts, the opening of the centre may be regarded as a milestone in the relations of the two countries (Richly, 2021). Consequently, since 1980, in addition to the Embassy of Hungary, another institution working under the supervision of the Hungarian government has supported the export of Hungarian culture and language in Finland, as actors in cultural diplomacy. Given the actual world political context of the 1980s, the foundation of the cultural and scientific centre in Finland was strongly supported by left-wing political and social groups within the country. It is also important to note that in Finnish–Hungarian bilateral relations, state participation and financial support was most intensive and extensive on behalf of both partners in the 1980s (Richly, 2021).

In addition to the fruitful relations on the state and institutional levels, this period also features very active twin city relations, the first between Pécs and Lahti launched in 1956 (Dobos, 2005; Mészáros, 2021).

The fourth period of the relations falls between the 1990s and 2004. The change in the regime in Hungary did not significantly alter the political and state level relations between the two countries; there was a natural continuation of fruitful cooperation, also supported by the fact that the cultural institute could continue its work and mission uninterrupted. Even the director of the institute, Dr. István Nyirkos remained in his position, this way also ensuring smooth transition.² In this period, Finland strongly supported Hungary’s efforts toward Western integration; in turn, Hungary guaranteed a reliable partnership for Finland in the fundamentally

²István Nyirkos functioned as director of the Hungarian Cultural Institute in Helsinki between 1987 and 1993 (Richly, 2022).

changing East-Central European region. The Finnish media continued to follow the situation in Hungary with more attention than in the case of other countries of the region. However, due to the economic recessions in the 1990s and at the end of the 2000s, the financial resources supporting cultural relations already started to decrease. It was due to the decrease of state participation, the principal of subsidiarity gaining ground, and the new perspectives offered by the European Union that the renewed Finnish–Hungarian Cultural, Educational, and Scientific Cooperation Agreement signed in 1995 included considerably fewer state funded projects than before. The quota for scholarship grants and study trips also decreased. It was already evident in this period that the significance of mutual sympathy based on linguistic kinship started to fade in the age of globalisation, mostly among younger generations. On a more positive note, it should be mentioned that educational programmes related to Hungarian studies widened in this period, namely in the 1990s (Mészáros, 2021; Richly, 2020).

The beginning of the most recent period of the relations is marked by the date of Hungary's joining the European Union in 2004. The past two decades have featured a more negative attitude in Finnish society toward Hungary due to the actual Hungarian politics and public life. As a result, in 2013, the Finnish–Hungarian Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Agreement was no longer extended, resulting in a rather unfavourable environment for Hungarian cultural export to gain support in Finland. The number of events organised in the cultural institute in cooperation with the Finnish–Hungarian Society has significantly decreased; also, parallel to the decreasing activity of the Society, its network outside of the capital city weakened. Furthermore, the Finnish media has conveyed an exclusively negative picture of Hungary and the Hungarians in the past decade (Kovács, 2013; Richly, 2021).

By 2022, bilateral cultural agreements have expired, dedicated state funded scholarships have been terminated, and the positions of visiting university lecturers based on mutual agreements have been eliminated. The only state-run cultural institution in Finland to promote Finnish–Hungarian relations is currently the now so-called Liszt Institute based in Helsinki. The two civil societies, the Finnish–Hungarian Society and the Association of Hungarians Living in Finland, also play an active role in this mission, mostly in the capital city and its agglomeration (Richly, 2021). Since 2016, when Hungarian cultural institutions were integrated into Hungarian embassies based in the given city, the Hungarian Embassy in Helsinki has gained more and more control over the activity of the Liszt Institute. This resulted in the situation that in May 2022, Endre Szabó, the former deputy head of the Hungarian mission in Helsinki was appointed as director of the Liszt Institute, Hungarian Cultural Centre Helsinki. One of his first acts was to raise the rent of the Finnish–Hungarian Society offices located within the Institute so high that it was unacceptable for the Society to pay. Consequently, they left the building of the Hungarian Cultural Centre, putting an end to decades-long close cooperation.

Since 2017, cultural activities in Helsinki have also been managed by scholarship holders of the Hungarian state-run Kőrösi Csoma Sándor Programme.³ Since August 2023, a new director, Helga Kovács-Sárközi, a former employee of the Embassy of Hungary in Helsinki, a Master's degree holder in history, Finnish language and literature, a diplomat, designer, and illustrator, has been holding the position of director of the Liszt Institute.⁴ In September 2023, a regular

³The official website of the Kőrösi Csoma Sándor Programme is available at <https://www.korosiprogram.hu/>.

⁴<https://culture.hu/hu/helsinki/munkatarsaink>.

newsletter of the institute started to inform the registered audience on programmes organised by the institute.

3.2. Layers of connections

The close and active relations between the two nations can be explained by the fact that, since the beginnings, the ties have been fostered by different layers of social and community activities, with a very strong official support in both countries since 1920.

On the state level, political intentions have supported mutual connections, manifested in signing agreements and providing financial support in many different fields to maintain mutual relations. Furthermore, at the level of cultural institutions, mutual interests have initiated projects and regular cultural exchange. Lastly, universities have hosted departments and training programmes that improve education in the field of Hungarian language and culture in Finland, and in the field of Finnish language and culture in Hungary (Lahdelma, 2013; Mészáros, 2021; Vecsernyés, 2013). The intensity and extent of state-level coordination, as well as the amount of financial resources delegated to foster mutual connections, have varied in the different periods of Finnish–Hungarian relations detailed in the previous section.

Another pillar that promotes knowledge about Hungary and Hungarian culture is the community of Hungarians living in Finland. They have always been the engines of spreading Hungarian culture in Finland, as well as welcoming representatives of Hungary, channelling their visits and cultural endeavours within Finnish society. In 1993, this community formalised their so far scattered activities and endeavours by founding the Association of Hungarians Living in Finland,⁵ with the dedicated aim to maintain the Hungarian identity among Hungarians living in Finland, building on and fostering the most precious values: the role of the family, Hungarian language, culture, and traditions (Dobos, 2005).

As a third layer, the work of enthusiastic civil societies and the twin city movement should be mentioned. They have triggered regular visits, also built personal, long-lasting relationships between Finnish and Hungarian families, everyday people. Relations of this kind operate more on the level of individuals, being less structured and institutional. However, this kind of cultural knowledge and experience is handed over to the following generations more genuinely (Dobos, 2005; Mészáros, 2021).

Today, the Association of Hungarians Living in Finland and the Finnish–Hungarian Society are the two formally registered associations in Finland to promote the Hungarian culture. The Finnish–Hungarian Society has nurtured Finnish–Hungarian friendship for more than 70 years, by organising cultural events and Hungarian language courses. Their quarterly periodical entitled *Suomi-Unkari* contributes to sustain interest in Hungary. They organise on a yearly basis the event *Weeks of Hungarian Culture* in countryside cities, as well as since 1984 every four years *Hungarian Thematic Weeks* in schools throughout Finland. The Society has been a genuine cooperating partner for the Hungarian Cultural Centre since its foundation in 1980 (Richly, 2021). However, in the current political context, there is a sensible tension between the two organisations, with the Society overtly criticising the current governmental policies ongoing in Hungary.

⁵The official webpage of the association is available at <https://magyarutca.org/wordpress/>.

Lastly, active cultural relations in all fields of art have contributed to the two language communities gaining a deeper understanding of each other.

The first main work on Hungarian literature in Finnish language is the volume entitled *Unkarilaisen kirjallisuuden historia* (A History of Hungarian Literature) by Aarni Penttilä, published in 1939. However, the credit for making Hungarian literature known in Finland must go to the Hungarians themselves, among others József Szinnyi, Géza Képes and Dezső Keresztury. Géza Képes, a poet and essayist who played a central role in Finnish–Hungarian literary relations, has been writing about aspects of Hungarian literature in Finnish publications since the early 1940s. Later, in the 1970s and 1980s Hungarian-speaking Finnish literary researchers took over the main responsibility for making Hungarian literature known in Finland. Hungarian scholars have also dealt with Hungarian literature in Finnish publications, among them Lajos Szopori Nagy, who published contrastive studies on the history of Finnish and Hungarian literature. There is also a wealth of material on literary history in the anthologies of Hungarian poetry and small-scale prose that appeared in Finnish translation in the 1970s (Lahdelma, 1985).

In 1970, in the field of poetry, the publication of a comprehensive anthology entitled *Unkarin lyry* (Hungarian Lyric Poetry), translated by Toivo Lyy, marked the beginning of an unprecedented enthusiasm, and the 1970s can be regarded as the decade when Hungarian lyric poetry made its real breakthrough in Finland. When it comes to prose, up until the past few decades, some of the translations of Hungarian literature into Finnish were made via a third language, German or English. In the 19th century, the most popular Hungarian writers in Finland were Mór Jókai and Ferenc Herczeg. Other Hungarian writers who have gained great popularity in Finland are Lajos Zilahy and Sándor Márai. Plays and one-minute stories by István Örkény, as well as children's literature by Éva Janikovszky, have also been translated into Finnish, gaining popularity in the country (Lahdelma, 1985).

Lying within easy reach of the major music centres of Europe, Hungary, a country with an unusually rich and complex folk music tradition, has long held a more established position in the world of music than Finland. In composition and musical education, Finland has in fact mainly been the receiving party in relations between the two countries. Ferenc Liszt's fame as a composer and pianist soon reached Finland at an early date. As Finland was suffering from a shortage of both competent orchestral players and teachers for the music academy, it was necessary to look elsewhere, also in Hungary (Helasvuo, 1985).

The triumph of Hungarian music in Finland was also strong at another level: the folk music of the "puszta", the "Hungarian folksong". This music became well known from the 19th century onwards through the highly popular Hungarian folk plays, and their triumphant progress was later crowned by the equally popular Hungarian operettas in the 20th century. As the gipsy ensembles finding their way to Finland at the end of the nineteenth century played precisely the same or similar melodies, „gipsy music” soon became established as a brand name covering all folk-like music of Hungarian origin. Concepts of what is „genuine” and what is not in Hungarian folk music have subsequently been generally clarified since the 1910s, thanks to Béla Bartók and Zoltán Kodály. In addition, the reforms introduced into music teaching by Zoltán Kodály and his colleagues during the 1960s have greatly enriched music teaching in Finland, too. Many young Finnish teachers went on study trips to Hungary and became familiar with Kodály's music teaching principles, which have been systematically adapted to Finnish conditions (Helasvuo, 1985).

Finnish visual artists first came into contact with Hungarian painting over a hundred years ago while travelling abroad. The Hungarian masters arousing the interest of their northerly

colleagues at this early stage were Mihály Munkácsy and László Paál, who were working in the 1870s first in Düsseldorf and later in Paris. By the end of the century, knowledge of linguistic relations began to set people moving in the field of visual culture, too, and the gap between the two countries in fine arts began to be bridged. During the first decade of the twentieth century, this artistic bridge was only a one-way link: almost all the traffic was from Finland to Hungary. Then, the first exhibition organised in 1922 of Hungarian art in Finland was a representative official showing of contemporary Hungarian art and was supported by the governments of both countries. There were 250 works by about 80 painters and 20 sculptors on display. This was one of the biggest exhibitions of foreign art held in Finland. The exhibition gave a rather conservative view of Hungarian art. By the 1930s, cultural exchange had become an established goal. In 1935, an exhibition of Hungarian medals and fine china opened at the Finnish National Museum. Then, Hungarian applied and folk art was on display at the Museum of Applied Arts in Helsinki in 1936. The exquisite embroidery lace and porcelain elicited the greatest admiration, and the exhibition was said to be splendid (Reitala, 1985).

After the Second World War, contacts could be re-established after the renewal of the cultural agreement in 1959, marking a new era in artistic relations. The next major exhibition of Hungarian painting, sculpture, and graphic art was held in Helsinki in 1974, and this time the whole scale of contemporary art, including the various modern stylistic trends, was represented in addition to the old masters. As a result, the richness and diversity of Hungarian art came as a surprise to both the critics and the public. The 1970s were significant in the history of artistic relations in general, often reaching beyond the formal level of official exhibitions. A cooperation agreement between the Finnish Artists' Society and the Association of Hungarian Artists was also signed in 1978 (Reitala, 1985).

Since 1990, in the representation of Hungarian culture in Finland, in the field of literature, music, and fine arts, a major part has been played by the Hungarian Cultural Centre in Helsinki, by organising and supporting regular literary events, concerts, and exhibitions, in close cooperation with the Finnish-Hungarian Society and the Association of Hungarians Living in Finland (Richly, 2021).

To conclude, the enthusiasm of individuals or groups of people may connect two cultural communities or nations also to the extent that they bind official political, governmental, and cultural relations. On the other hand, already established political-social-cultural frameworks provide a safe and financially supported context for individuals and communities to initiate cultural exchange between the two cultural communities. When Finns and Hungarians stepped over the first, so important idea of linguistic relation, several fields of cultural connections and forms of cultural exchange opened up, and since then it has been encouraged. Different fields of art, let it be literature, music or fine art, beyond their inherent task of passing on aesthetic content and artistic values promote cooperation between nations and communities, and help further understanding and mutual respect.

3.3. Language education

In Finland, the Hungarian language has been taught on four levels: in the context of higher education, in adult learning centres, in summer schools, and in courses organised by the Finnish-Hungarian Society or by the Association of Hungarians Living in Finland.

A very important act in fostering cultural relations between the two nations was when university lectorates were open to support the spread of the Hungarian language and culture of the related community. The first Hungarian lectorate in Finland opened in 1924 at the University of Helsinki. From 1962, an exchange of lectors took place regularly between the Helsinki and Budapest universities. In 1966, the first Hungarian lector started his work at the University of Turku; then, in 1975, a Hungarian lector began to work at the University of Jyväskylä (Numminen, 1985). Besides these three universities, at the University of Tampere and the University of Oulu a specialisation in Hungarian studies was available. After years of fruitful cooperation with exchanging lectors and visiting professors financed by the two governments, due to the introduction of the Bologna educational system and the financial crises, as well as to the ever more deteriorating relations between the two countries, also following international trends, ministries responsible for education, referring to university autonomy – as a way of withdrawing of funding –, do not take responsibility to finance positions of lectors and visiting professors any more. As a result, Hungarian studies closed down in Jyväskylä, Oulu, and Tampere, available only in two universities in Finland, Turku and Helsinki. The number of university students enrolling into Hungarian studies as a major or minor or registering for a Hungarian language course has been largely decreasing. Financing studies of limited-diffusion languages and cultures is not a priority anymore. In addition, in the changing Finnish educational context, learning other languages than Swedish and English, already in high schools, plays less importance than studying mathematics. At the university level, again, students are more and more encouraged to continue with their studies in their actual major, not taking unnecessary additional courses as just a way of self-development (Kovács, 2013). Being members of the European Union, the connections in higher education between Hungary and Finland ceased to continue on a direct bilateral level. Collaborations are now maintained as part of European Union funded multilateral projects, involving other participants besides Finland and Hungary. This form of collaboration proves to be less effective in nurturing the relationships between the two kindred nations.

Regarding the Hungarian language and cultural education, courses have been taught in the context of adult education in Finland for decades. This form of education became relatively popular after the foundation of the Finnish–Hungarian Society in 1950. Furthermore, thanks to the lively exchange activity of the twin city movement, it invites Finnish citizens of all ages interested in Hungarian culture and language.

It is important to note that in Finland there has been a great tradition of attending adult education centres where courses on a wide variety of topics are on offer without any degrees or certificates. Adult learners attend these courses with the aim of self-development or recreation. Course fees are reasonable and are subsidised by the central government and local authorities. There have been two types of adult education centres in Finland, the so-called “työväenopisto” (worker education centre) and “kansalaisopisto” (folk education centre). The former was established in the 19th and early 20th century mainly by labour unions or other left-wing organisations, and they often had a political agenda in their teaching; while “kansalaisopisto” was usually established with more general ideas of promoting education of the less resourceful strata of society. Currently, the difference is only in name and both institutions are supported by the state and municipalities. Today, some adult education centres are named neutrally as “aikuisopisto” (adult college).⁶ The

⁶Source: Official webpage of adult learning centres in Finland at <https://kansalaisopistot.fi/kansalaisopistojen-historia>.

number of Hungarian language courses available in adult educational centres throughout Finland has decreased considerably in the past decades (Richly, 2021).

Summer universities have also been on offer for those who wanted to improve their Hungarian language skills or gain deeper insight into Hungarian culture. These summer courses have been organised by universities or by adult education centres in Finland. Language learners may have also chosen summer universities organised in Hungary by universities, for example in Debrecen, Szeged, or Pécs, or by civil associations, such as the Hungarian–Finnish Society⁷ or the Kalevala Friendship Association.⁸ For university students currently studying Hungarian at universities in Finland, scholarships are offered by the Tempus Public Foundation.⁹ The number of summer universities organised in Finland has also decreased in the past decades (Richly, 2020).

Hungarian language courses have also been organised by the Finnish–Hungarian Society and the Association of Hungarians Living in Finland. With the decreasing number of courses offered by adult educational centres and universities closing their Hungarian language education, these two associations tend to take over the leading role in organising Hungarian language courses for adult learners in Finland. However, their activity is mostly focused on the capital city and its agglomeration, leaving fewer opportunities for adult Hungarian language learners in rural Finland. It is interesting to note that the journal issued by the Finnish–Hungarian Society, entitled *Suomi-Unkari* provides lessons in the Hungarian language both in its paper-based and online editions, taking the language closer to learners in many different and colourful ways. Furthermore, the Society has actively taken part in developing and publishing Hungarian language course books dedicatedly designed for adult language learners studying Hungarian in non-academic adult education, their motivation of language learning being different from that of university students. These course books support individual language learning for those who live in the countryside and have no access to Hungarian language courses. The new course book package received very positive feedback, motivating many to start or continue their Hungarian language studies. Another positive result of this project is that methodological workshops on Hungarian language teaching in Finland have been organised on a regular basis, supporting the work of Hungarian language teachers living in different parts of Finland, sometimes not even having a professional qualification in language teaching. Once a year, this symposium is organised with the financial support of the Hungarian Cultural Centre in Helsinki, in cooperation with the Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest (Vecsernyés, 2013).

An interesting phenomenon of the past decades is that Finnish citizens permanently or temporarily move to Hungary and settle mainly in peaceful countryside villages. In these villages, when they reach a certain percentage, newly settled Finnish dwellers start learning the Hungarian language. They may have the opportunity to take a formal language course, organised by the local government of the actual settlement where they settled. An excellent example of the case is the village of Geresdlak, in Tolna County (Heltai, 2020).

In summary, based on the vivid and different types of mutual connection between Hungary and Finland, motivated by different factors, Finnish people have pursued Hungarian language studies in different educational contexts. The actual forms and the amount of language learning

⁷Official webpage is available at <http://www.magyarfintarsasag.hu>.

⁸Official webpage is available at <https://kalevalabp.wordpress.com>.

⁹Official webpage is available at <https://www.tpf.hu/english>.

opportunities available have varied depending on the actual intensity and types of relations between the two nations. In the present research, we intend to explore the context of Hungarian as a foreign language learning education provided for adult learners in Finland, together with the motivational items of present-day language learners.

4. METHODOLOGY

The methodology of the present research utilises a quantitative method and is empirical in nature. Before designing the questionnaire, semi-structural interviews were conducted in person in Finland with three teachers of the Hungarian language as a foreign language. One of them represents university language teaching context in Turku, the only non-capital city university in Finland where Hungarian language teaching is still on offer. The other university lecturer represents the teaching context of the Hungarian language in the capital city, at the University of Helsinki. The third language teacher has been teaching Hungarian language in non-academic formal education in Helsinki for decades. This way, both adult learning contexts, that is, university education, and non-academic adult education are represented. The aim of the three interviews was to explore the educational context, also retrospectively, of Hungarian as a foreign language in adult education in Finland.

Further interviews were conducted in person with two Hungarian language learners in Hungary and Finland, in order to collect ideas for generating questionnaire items and thus to ensure content validity of the research tool. One of them is a university student studying Hungarian language at the University of Helsinki. He also took part in a summer university in Hungary, at the University of Szeged. The interview was made with him in person in this context in Szeged in July 2022. The other language learner is a retired person who has been studying Hungarian for several decades in non-academic language courses organised by the Finnish–Hungarian Society. She represents the adult language learner outside of the university context.

In addition to the semi-structured interviews, field observations were completed in Finland. First, in June 2022 interviews were conducted in Turku and Helsinki. Second, in September 2022 reviews were recorded while one of the authors was taking part as a guest lecturer in the annual methodology workshop of Hungarian language teachers living in Finland at the Liszt Institute in Helsinki. Moreover, the personal experience as well as the professional knowledge one of the authors has gained in the past 30 years as a graduated teacher and researcher of Finnish language and literature, as a translator of contemporary Finnish poetry, with personal experiences living in Finland for several years, support the conclusions of the present research.

The results of a previously conducted exploratory qualitative research (interviews and field-observations) led to the conclusion that further quantitative research is needed to understand learners' motivations for studying Hungarian deeper. Therefore, the main research tool used in this article is a survey that collects data to identify the motivations of Hungarian language learners in Finland. As a tool to conduct the survey, a self-administered anonymous questionnaire was designed in Finnish. The ease of response provision was the reason behind the language choice of the survey, which contained 26 items (see [Appendix 1](#)).

The first 4 items ask for personal data: 1, age (as closed-ended question with ordinal data); 2, citizenship (as closed-ended question with nominal data, furthermore, an open-ended question

when other than Finnish); 3, mother tongue, and 4, place of residence (as open-ended questions).

The second group of 4 items asks about factual data related to the respondents' Hungarian language learning experience: 1, the duration of their Hungarian language studies (as an open-ended question); 2, the form of previous Hungarian language studies (as multiple choice question with nominal data, plus an open-ended question when marked other); 3, the present form of Hungarian language learning (as multiple choice question with nominal data, plus an open-ended question when marked other); and 4, the mode of delivery of present Hungarian language studies, if online or onsite (multiple choice question with nominal data).

The last group of questions is related to the respondents' motivations to learn Hungarian as a foreign language. First, an open-ended question asks about their most important Hungarian language learning motivations detailed in 2–3 sentences. This question stands alone in the online questionnaire sheet so that the respondents are not influenced by the following question set that hints at motivation components. After answering this question, the respondent can move on to the next set, when they are given 16 statements about possible motivation factors for learning Hungarian language, and they are asked to rank them on a Likert-scale ranging from 1 to 4, with 4 marking total agreement with the statement, with 1 marking total disagreement with the statement (ordinal data asking for level of agreement). Respondents had the possibility to change their responses retrospectively while filling in the questionnaire. The 16 statements have been formulated based on the input of the preliminary interviews made with teachers of the Hungarian language and learners of the Hungarian language as a foreign language in Finland, as well as on the input of participant observation carried out in Finland and on the conclusions of the related secondary literature and primary written sources. The last question was an open-ended question asking respondents to describe a memorable experience of practising the Hungarian language with a native speaker. This latter question utilised the Critical Incident Technique (CIT) to investigate a significant experience in the language learning process (Flanagan, 1954; Hughes, 2008).

The link of the online questionnaire was shared by Hungarian language teachers with their students studying Hungarian in the autumn of 2022, this way motivating students to fill in the questionnaire, ensuring representative research and a sufficient response rate. The target population of this study equals the total number of adult Hungarian language learners living in Finland studying Hungarian as a foreign language in the autumn of 2022 either in a university course or in a non-academic language course.

Prior to the research, all Hungarian language teachers in Finland were asked to provide the exact number of their Hungarian language learning students. In the respective period, there were 10 teachers in Finland teaching Hungarian as a foreign language. Based on the answers received from 8 teachers, the number of potential respondents was 93. Two teachers have not provided the requested data, so we can estimate approximately 100–110 learners of Hungarian in Finland during the period, which equals the population of the present research.

Given that the questionnaire was anonymous and filling it was optional, there may have been overlaps in the number of language learners given by the teachers if they attend more than one language course. The response rate to the survey is considered to be high, as 50 Hungarian language learners filled out the questionnaire. Therefore, this sample can be considered representative, with approximately 50% of the population completing it (Kruskal and Mosteller, 1979; Woodrow, 2014). Although the research mainly used an online survey tool, upon request,

a paper format was provided, thereby contributing to a representative sampling method. All in all, 50 responses were registered, 49 online and 1 paper-based.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the following, answers given to the individual questions are first analysed; then, answers received for the open-ended motivational question and for the motivational Likert-scale items are examined. Finally, the motivational components identified in the answers based on the Dörnyei model are categorised and compared.

5.1. Analysis of the individual questionnaire items

5.1.1. Age. 48% of the respondents are 19–30 years old, 30% are over 60 years old, and 22% of them are between 31 and 59 years old. The fact that 48% (24) of the respondents are under 30 years old shows that younger generations are still interested in studying Hungarian. 20 of them are studying Hungarian at university, with only 4 of them studying Hungarian in non-academic adult education. Thus, in this age group, the university context dominates. 13 of them have studied Hungarian for more than a year, 12 for less than a year. Nine of them have not yet had the opportunity to practice the language with a native speaker. The most important motivating factor for this age group is the motivating personality of the teacher (25) and the cohesion of the group (21). None of them marked choir relations and owning a property in Hungary as important, only 1–1 of the respondents marked church and twin city relations significant.

Fifteen respondents (30%) are over 60 years old, a relatively high number compared to the younger generation of respondents. Only one of them has studied the language for less than a year, while the others have studied Hungarian for several years, even decades, showing their persistent motivation. Only 4 of them have not yet had an opportunity to practice the language with a native speaker. The most important components for this age group are family and friendly relations (15) and the motivating personality of the teacher and the professional level of education (13). Only 1–1 respondent marked choir, church and twin city relations important.

Eleven respondents (22%) are between 31 and 59 years old. Two of them have studied the language for less than a year, 3 of them are university students. Five of them have not yet had the opportunity to practice the language with a native speaker. The most important components of this age group are the motivating personality of the teachers (9), the cohesion of the group (7) and the language being unique and/or of Finno-Ugric origin (7). None of them marked choir, church and twin city relations, and only 1 marked owning a property in Hungary as important.

Comparing the 3 age groups, we can see that 65.7% of the respondents under 59 years are university students. Eighty-eight and a half percent of respondents over 31 years old have studied Hungarian for more than a year. The rate of those who have not yet had the opportunity to practice their Hungarian with native speakers is the highest (45.5%) in the age group 31–59 and lowest (26.7%) in the age group over 60. In all three age groups, the motivating personality of the teacher and professional education scores are very high, being the most important factor in the age group 19–59, and the choir/church/twin city relations and property in Hungary scored the least.

5.1.2. Citizenship and mother tongue. Ninety-two percent of the respondents are Finnish citizens, with 2 Czech, 1 Estonian and 1 Russian citizens among them. When it comes to mother tongue, besides Czech, Russian, and Estonian, Serbian, and Swedish appear with 1–1 respondent answer. This data reveals that currently in Finland there are Hungarian language learners who hold other than Finnish citizenship and mother tongue. This factor is important primarily in the context of university education. The 4 non-Finnish citizen respondents are all university students and may be studying in Finland as short-term mobility or full-degree students. Their motivations are linked to studying Finno-Ugric linguistics, or their personal contact to Hungarian native speakers. Their motivation items are group cohesion (4) and the motivating personality of the teacher (4), together with interest in Hungarian culture (3), society and public life (3), sympathy for Hungarians and Hungary (3), the language being so different from other languages studied (3), and the language learning being a brain teaser for them (3).

5.1.3. Place of residence. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents (19) live in the capital city and its agglomeration, where more opportunities are provided for formal Hungarian language learning, both at university and in non-academic adult education contexts. The respondents who live in the countryside (10) are partly students of the University of Turku or adult language learners studying Hungarian at an adult education centre (“kansalaisopisto”) in Oulu. The main motivation is the motivating personality of the teacher and professional education (9), the cohesion of the group (7) and the opportunity for this particular language course (7). Although capital city language learners rank highest, the fact that Hungarian language is one being so different from other languages studied and of Finno-Ugric origin (26) and language learning being a brain teaser (23) are the most important factors.

5.1.4. Experience learning the Hungarian language. Asking about the *time interval of Hungarian language studies* reveals data on persistent motivation in Hungarian language learning. Seven respondents have studied Hungarian for more than 10 years (2 of them for more than 60 years), 8 respondents have studied it for 5–10 years, and 21 respondents for 1–5 years, 14 respondents for less than a year. Twelve respondents had not learnt Hungarian before taking their actual course in autumn 2022. Data show that the majority of the respondents have studied the language for 1–5 years, and the ratio of those who have just started or have studied Hungarian for less than a year is high (52%), showing that there is a tendency to start Hungarian language studies even nowadays. The ratio of those who studied Hungarian for more than 5 years is 30%, showing that there is a group of language learners who are devoted to continue their studies in the long run.

The data on the *previous Hungarian language learning* form show the different forms of language learning available in Finland in the past decades. Eight respondents studied Hungarian before the actual language course at university, 16 had taken part in Hungarian language courses (may also be university), 1 respondent studied Hungarian with her native speaker husband, and another by living in Hungary. Twenty respondents learnt Hungarian in a private way too, thus in non-formal education, 7 respondents participated in summer universities either in Hungary or in Finland. Forms are diverse, since the question was multiple choice and respondents could mark more than one item; also, there was room for them to add other forms. We received a detailed list of Hungarian language learning forms available in Finland: with private teacher, individually, learning with native speaker relatives/friends, summer university, language course

in adult education centres or organised by the Finnish–Hungarian Society and the Association of Hungarians Living in Finland, university courses.

Data on the *specific form of language learning* explore the availability of Hungarian language learning forms in Finland. Twenty-seven respondents studied the Hungarian language in a language course offered by the Finnish–Hungarian Society, the Association of Hungarians Living in Finland, or by an adult education centre. Twenty-three respondents studied Hungarian at university. Thus, the forms of study listed in the previous item continue to exist and are offered continuously. Since the survey involved respondents who were studying in formal Hungarian language education at that time, private learning forms and summer university are not relevant as answers to this question.

Data on *current delivery modes* reveal to what extent in autumn 2022 language teaching restores back to onsite mode after the COVID19 pandemic. Four respondents were studying solely online, 43 only onsite, while 3 respondents marked both study versions. This shows that as soon as it was possible, Hungarian language courses in Finland went back to onsite delivery modes. This does not come as a surprise, since the personality of the teacher and group cohesion are highly ranked motivational components in the survey, which can be sustained in onsite teaching more efficiently than in online courses.

5.1.5. Open-ended question on the most important motivations for learning Hungarian language. Based on the answers given to the open-ended question *What are your main motivations in studying the Hungarian language? Please, answer at least in two-three sentences*, we could identify 9 different motivational items: 1, Interest in the country and society; 2, Teacher’s personality; 3, Group cohesion; 4, Interest in culture; 5, Interest in languages/Finno-Ugric languages; 6, Useful for studies/work; 7, It is a way of brain teaser/hobby/source of learning/success; 8, Good opportunity on offer for language learning; 9, Communication with relatives or friends, or as a tourist or as a property owner in Hungary (Table 2).

This question was posed on the online sheet individually before the actual motivational Likert-scale items became accessible. In this way, respondents gave their genuine answers on their motivations for learning Hungarian language without being influenced by the researcher’s suggested motivational Likert-scale items provided in the next set of the questionnaire.

Table 2 shows these 9 motivational items identified based on the open-ended motivational question and the number of their occurrences mentioned by the respondents. Altogether 81 mentions are recorded in the answers. If a respondent gave several motivational items in their response, each of the items are counted separately. In addition, all the mentions of an item provided by different respondents are counted separately.

In the open-ended question, respondents listed the importance of communication with relatives, friends, in tourist trips or as property owners in Hungary 32 times, representing 39.5% of all mentions: “Mieheni on unkarilainen, joten perheeni ja myös Unkarin sukulaiset puhuvat unkaria.” [My husband is Hungarian, thus both my family and our relatives in Hungary speak Hungarian around me.]; “Toivon, että joskus vielä voin matkustaa Unkariin ja käyttää siellä oppimaani.” [I hope that one day I will travel to Hungary and be able to use what I have learnt.]; “Että paljon Unkarissa liikkeessa on mukava osata jonkin verran unkaria, koska aina törmää tilanteisiin, joissa ei ole muuta yhteistä kieltä.” [When travelling in Hungary, it is always very useful to speak at least some Hungarian since one gets into situations where there is no other common language.]

Table 2. Motivational items and the number of their occurrence in respondents' answers

Motivational items	Number of listed items by respondents (N = 81)	Ratio of listed items (%) (N = 81 = 100%)
Communication with relatives or friends/as a tourist/as a property owner in Hungary	32	39.5%
Interest in languages general/Finno-Ugric languages	22	27.2%
It is a way of brain teaser/hobby/source of learning success	8	9.9%
Interest in culture	6	7.4%
Useful for studies/work	5	6.2%
Teacher's personality	3	3.7%
Interest in the country and society	2	2.5%
Group cohesion	2	2.5%
Good opportunity on offer for language learning	1	1.2%
Altogether	81	100%

Source: Own study.

The interest in languages general and in Finno-Ugric languages had 22 mentions in the open-ended question, standing for 27.2%: “Kiinnostus suomen sukukieliä kohtaan, kielen eroavuudet ja samankaltaisuudet suomen kanssa, isoin suomalais-ugrilainen kieli.” [My interest in the language related to Finnish, the differences and similarities between the two languages, it is the Finno-Ugric language with the highest number of native speakers.]; “On mielenkiintoista oppia uusi kieli, etenkin kun kyseessä on suomalaisugrilainen kieli, jollaista en ole aikaisemmin vieraana kielenä opiskellut.” [It is always interesting to learn a new language, especially if it is a Finno-Ugric language, a language similar to that I have not studied before.]; “Olen yleisesti ottaen kiinnostunut kielistä ja tykkään opiskella kieliä.” [I am generally interested in languages and learning new languages.].

Hungarian language learning, being a way of a brain teaser, hobby or source of learning and success received 8 mentions in the open-ended question, representing 9.9%: “Unkari on kiehtova ja vaikea kieli. Se on hyvää aivojumbppaa.” [Hungarian is a fascinating and difficult language, it is a good brain teaser.]; “Sopivan haasteellista ja kannustavaa huomata oma edistyminen.” [It is comfortably challenging and it is motivating to see how I improve.]; “Lisäksi saan nautintoa siitä, kun huomaan kielitaitoni kehittyvän.” [I enjoy experiencing how my language skills improve.]

Interest in culture received 6 mentions in the open-ended question, representing 7.4%: “Kiinnostus unkarilaista kulttuuria ja kirjallisuutta kohtaan motivoi opiskelemaan kieltä, sillä sen avulla ymmärrän kulttuuria ja ihmisiä paremmin.” [My interest in Hungarian culture and literature motivated my studies of Hungarian language, since I can understand culture and

the people better through their language.]; “Olen kiinnostunut kielestä ja Unkarin kulttuurista.” [I am interested in the Hungarian language and culture.]; “Kieli on avain kulttuuriin ja maan tuntemukseen.” [Language is a key to getting to know the culture and the country.]

Usefulness for studies and work received 5 mentions in the open-ended question, representing 6.2%: “Opiskelen myös kielitiedettä ja se on minullekin mielenkiintoista tämän takia.” [I am also studying linguistics and it is interesting for me because of this.]; “Opiskelen myös suomen kieltä ja muita suomalais-ugrilaisia kieliä ja olen huomannut, että vahva unkarin kielen taito on näissä opinnoissa erittäin hyödyllinen.” [I am also studying Finnish and other Finno-Ugric languages and have noticed that a strong knowledge of Hungarian language is extremely useful in these study fields.]; “Teen vertailevan tutkimuksen gradua (arkeologia) ja Unkari liittyy tähän vahvasti.” [My thesis research is comparative in its methodology (archaeology) and Hungary is strongly related to the subject.]

The personality received 3 mentions in the open-ended question, standing for 3.7%: “Pidän opettajastani” [I like my teacher.]; “Pääsyynä oli unkarin kielen opettajani [exact name mentioned]” [The main reason is my Hungarian language teacher [exact name mentioned].]

Interest in the country and society received 2 mentions in the open-ended question, representing 2.5%: “Tein kandin sekä gradun unkarilaisesta poliittisesta diskurssista.” [I have written my bachelor and master thesis in Hungarian political discourse.]; “Kieli on avain kulttuuriin ja maan tuntemukseen.” [Language is a key to getting to know the culture and the country.]

Group cohesion received 2 mentions in the open-ended question, which is 2.5%: “Pidän opettajastani ja ryhmästä.” [I like my teacher and my study group.]; “Ryhmä ja opettaja olivat mukavia.” [The study group and the teacher were very friendly.]

The good opportunity on offer for language learning received 1 mention in the open-ended question, standing for 1.2%: “On varsinaisesti hyvä mahdollisuus opiskella unkaria, eli unkarin kielikurssit, kaikenlaisia Unkarin kielen ja kulttuuriin liittyviä tapahtumia jne.” [It is a really good opportunity to learn Hungarian, that is, Hungarian language courses, different kinds of events related to Hungarian language and culture, etc.].

5.1.6. Motivational Likert-scale items. In the next part of the questionnaire, respondents evaluated 16 statements about motivation factors for learning the Hungarian language on a scale ranging from 1 to 4; 1 means “totally disagree” and 4 means “totally agree” with the statement. Respondents had the possibility to change their responses retrospectively while filling in the questionnaire.

Table 3 shows the number of responses for each Likert-scale item. In addition, the mean score and the standard deviation of each statement were also calculated based on the 50 responses received for each statement. The number of responses to the evaluation of each item on the Likert-scale (from 1 to 4) shows how many times the respondents opted for “totally disagree”, “disagree”, “agree” or “totally agree” with the statements at hand. The mean scores for each item were calculated that show the mathematical mean of the scores given for each item by the respondents. This makes comparison between motivational items possible. In order to make a thorough comparison, the standard deviation needs to be computed, which shows the standard deviation of the responses from the mean scores given for each motivational item. In other words, it shows the diversity of responses the respondents gave for each motivational item. The smaller the standard deviation, the more similar responses the respondents gave (Tastle et al., 2008).

Table 3. Motivational Likert-scale items and the number of responses ($N = 50$ respondents), mean score, and standard deviation for each Likert-scale item

Statements	1 - Totally disagree	2 - Disagree	3 - Agree	4 - Totally agree	Mean score of responses	Standard deviation of responses
I am studying Hungarian because the education is professional and the language teacher is motivating.	1	3	19	27	3.44	0.70
I am studying Hungarian since the atmosphere in class is very good, the community in class is motivating.	4	7	20	19	3.08	0.92
I am studying Hungarian since I am interested in Hungarian culture (music, film, literature).	7	10	13	20	2.92	1.08
I am studying Hungarian since language learning is a good brain teaser.	7	9	19	15	2.84	1.02
I am studying Hungarian since the language is unique, different from all the foreign languages I have studied so far.	11	8	12	19	2.78	1.18
I am studying Hungarian since I had the opportunity to study this particular language in an organised language course.	10	9	16	15	2.72	1.11
I am studying Hungarian since I am interested in Hungarian society and public life.	8	10	20	12	2.72	1.01
I am studying Hungarian since I feel sympathy for Hungarians and Hungary.	10	11	16	13	2.64	1.08

(continued)

Table 3. Continued

Statements	1 - Totally disagree	2 - Disagree	3 - Agree	4 - Totally agree	Mean score of responses	Standard deviation of responses
I am studying Hungarian due to family and friendly relations.	21	4	5	20	2.48	1.39
I am studying Hungarian due to tourism trips to Hungary.	17	17	5	11	2.20	1.14
I am studying Hungarian due to work/ professional ambitions related to Hungary.	23	12	6	9	2.02	1.15
I am studying Hungarian due to the activity done by civic organisations/schools operating in Finland.	33	10	4	3	1.54	0.89
I am studying Hungarian due to twin-town relations with Hungary.	42	6	1	1	1.22	0.58
I have a property in Hungary.	46	1	1	2	1.18	0.66
I am studying Hungarian due to church relations with Hungary.	45	3	1	1	1.16	0.55
I am studying Hungarian due to choir relations with Hungary.	47	2	0	1	1.10	0.46

Source: Own study.

The results in Table 3 are displayed in descending order of the mean score. The results show that the respondents agreed with the statement “I am studying Hungarian, since the education is professional and the language teacher is motivating” the most (mean = 3.44; standard deviation = 0.70), which was followed by the motivations of class atmosphere and community (mean = 3.08; standard deviation = 0.92), and interest in Hungarian culture (mean = 2.92; standard deviation = 1.08). On the other hand, the respondents disagreed with the statement “I am studying Hungarian because of choir relations with Hungary” the most (mean = 1.10; standard deviation = 0.46), which was followed by the motivations for church relations (mean = 1.16; standard deviation = 0.55) and the ownership of a property in Hungary (mean = 1.18; standard deviation = 0.66). This shows a relatively large difference between the different motivational types for studying Hungarian, as the mean score of the answers ranged from 1.10 to 3.44 on a 4-point Likert-scale.

If we take a look at the standard deviations, we can conclude that the greatest variation in the answers can be observed in the case of the item “I am studying Hungarian because of family and friendly relationships” (standard deviation = 1.39), where the majority of respondents rated the item with “totally disagree” or “totally agree”. The smallest difference in answers could be observed in the case of the item “I am studying Hungarian because of choir relations with Hungary”, where standard deviation was 0.46, and the majority of respondents answered with “totally disagree”.

5.1.7. Practice with native speakers. To the open-ended question utilising the Critical Incidents Technique (Flanagan, 1954; Hughes, 2008) „Have you ever had the opportunity to practice the Hungarian language with native speakers?” If so, describe a memorable occasion”, 18 respondents answered negatively, 11 of whom are university students. The rest of the respondents’ answers highlight that they are not afraid of using their Hungarian knowledge, since native speakers are very tolerant and patient. In most cases, they recall memories of having fun in their experience of using Hungarian with native speakers, especially in the field of pronunciation. They also state that they use Hungarian when there is no other alternative language usage option, since Hungarians do not speak English or German. They also claim that using Hungarian in the field of their own expertise is more comfortable and fruitful, as well as it is a situation when the native speakers are delighted by the fact that foreigners speak to them in Hungarian. All of these factors contribute to motivating the language learner to use Hungarian, already on a lower level of language acquisition.

5.2. Comparison of the results of the motivational components

Comparing the results of the two different types of questions on the motivational components (Tables 2 and 3), it is interesting to note that in the case of the motivational items related to the importance of communication with relatives, friends, in tourist trips or as property owners in Hungary, the perceived importance of the Likert-scale items is significantly lower than the number of mentions of the relevant categories in the open-ended question of the survey. Furthermore, the importance of the teacher’s personality and professionalism, as well as group cohesion and the motivation of the class atmosphere appear to have a much higher perceived importance in the Likert-scale item questions than in the relevant open-ended question part. This demonstrates that the respondents regarded an item more significant when they gave their genuine motivational reasons without any preliminary hints in the open-ended question than in

the Likert-scale item question, which provided them with several more options. The respondents may have found items that are more relevant for them in the Likert-scale statements, and thus entered their rating accordingly. Both types ask for subjective opinions; consequently, the respondents' answers may vary based on the context of the question setting. Last but not least, the sequence of these questions could also have influenced the respondents.

5.3. Categorisation of motivational components based on the Dörnyei model

5.3.1. Categorisation and ratio of the motivational items identified in the open-ended question. The identified 9 motivational items can be related to the Components of Foreign Language Learning Motivation defined by Dörnyei (1994) as shown in Table 4 together with their ratio in the survey mentions.

Applying the motivational item categories of the Dörnyei model, the following distribution is visible when analysing the distribution of motivational items detected in the open-ended question. It can be seen that of the 9 motivational items, 4 are language level integrative, 1 is language level instrumental, 3 are learning situation related, with 1 course-specific, 1 group specific and 1 teacher specific in nature. 1 item falls in the category of learner level, need for achievement (see Table 4). Numerically, language-level integrative items are the highest in ratio with 62 mentions, standing for 76.5%. Then, the motivation item learner level, need for achievement, is the second highest with 8 mentions, standing for 9.9%. Language-level instrumental item mentions are 5, standing for 6.2%. The learning situation item mentions are altogether 6, standing for 7.4%; with

Table 4. Categorisation of the identified motivational items based on Dörnyei's model (1994)

Identified motivational items	Components of motivation for foreign language learning motivation (Dörnyei)	Ratio of listed components (%)
Useful for studies/work	Language Level – Instrumental	6.2%
Interest in languages general/Finno-Ugric languages	Language Level – Integrative	76.5%
Communication with relatives or friends/as a tourist or as a property owner in Hungary	Language Level – Integrative	
Interest in culture	Language Level – Integrative	
Interest in the country and society	Language Level – Integrative	
It is a way of brain teaser/hobby/source of learning success	Learner Level – Need for Achievement	9.9%
Good opportunity on offer for language learning	Learning Situation – Course Specific	1.2%
Group cohesion	Learning Situation – Group Specific	2.5%
Teacher's personality	Learning Situation – Teacher Specific	3.7%

Source: Own study.

3 mentions for teacher-specific motivation, standing for 3.7%; 2 mentions for group-specific motivation, standing for 2.5%; and 1 mention for course-specific motivation, standing for 1.2%.

To sum up, language level item mentions are altogether 67, standing for 82.7%, suggesting an outstandingly high ratio of this motivational item. The mentions of motivation items at the learning level are 8, standing for 9.9%; and at learning situation level they are 6, standing for 7.4% (see Table 5).

Thus, based on the open-ended motivation question, 82.7% of the mentions given by the respondents are language level motivational items, highlighting the motivational force of L2 to an undoubtable extent.

5.3.2. Categorisation and ratio of the items listed on the motivational Likert-scale. The individual items listed in the motivational Likert-scale can be studied based on how they correspond to the Components of Foreign Language Learning Motivation defined by Dörnyei (1994) as shown in Table 6. This shows that 1 statement was related to Dörnyei’s Language Level Instrumental motivation, 11 statements were in relation to Language Level Integrative motivation, 1 statement to Learner Level’s Need for Achievement motivation, 1 to Learning Situation Course-Specific motivation, 1 to Learning Situation Group-Specific motivation, and 1 to Learning Situation Teacher Specific motivation.

Motivational items could further be studied based on their relation to the Dörnyei model and their calculated group mean scores and standard deviation by group. Table 7 shows that according to the Dörnyei categories and the relevant mean and standard deviation scores, the learners were mostly motivated by the learning situation and course, group, and teacher-specific motivations (mean = 3.08; standard deviation = 0.91). This was followed by Learner Level – Need for Achievement motivations (mean = 2.84; standard deviation = 1.02), Language Level Instrumental motivations (mean = 2.02; standard deviation = 1.15) and Language Level Integrative motivations (mean = 1.99; standard deviation = 0.91).

Summarising the above results, we can state that according to Dörnyei’s categorisation, respondents were mostly motivated by the learning situation (specific to the course, group and teacher) and they were least motivated by Language Level Integrative motivation items.

5.3.3. Comparison of ratio of the motivational items. If we compare the motivational items related to Dörnyei’s model in the two different sets of questions, we see the following results. In the case of the open-ended question set, respondents are motivated to a high extent (82.7%) by

Table 5. Ratio of the components of foreign language learning motivation (Dörnyei, 1994) in the answers to the open-ended question

Components of motivation for foreign language learning motivation (Dörnyei)	Ratio in the answers to the open-ended question
Language Level	82.7%
Learner Level	9.9%
Learning Situation Level	7.4%

Source: Own study.

Table 6. Categorisation of the items listed in the motivational Likert-scale items based on Dörnyei's model (1994)

Statements	Components of motivation for foreign language learning motivation (Dörnyei)
I am studying Hungarian due to work/professional ambitions related to Hungary.	Language Level – Instrumental
I am studying Hungarian since I am interested in Hungarian culture (music, film, literature).	Language Level – Integrative
I am studying Hungarian due to family and friendly relations.	Language Level – Integrative
I am studying Hungarian since the language is unique, different from all the foreign languages I have studied so far.	Language Level – Integrative
I am studying Hungarian since I feel sympathy for Hungarians and Hungary.	Language Level – Integrative
I am studying Hungarian since I am interested in Hungarian society and public life.	Language Level – Integrative
I am studying Hungarian due to tourism trips to Hungary.	Language Level – Integrative
I am studying Hungarian because of the activity done by civic organisations/schools operating in Finland.	Language Level – Integrative
I have a property in Hungary.	Language Level – Integrative
I am studying Hungarian due to choir relations with Hungary.	Language Level – Integrative
I am studying Hungarian due to church relations with Hungary.	Language Level – Integrative
I am studying Hungarian due to twin-town relations with Hungary.	Language Level – Integrative
I am studying Hungarian since language learning is a good brain teaser.	Learner Level – Need for Achievement
I am studying Hungarian since I had the opportunity to study this particular language in an organised language course.	Learning Situation – Course-Specific
I am studying Hungarian since the atmosphere in class is very good, the community in class is motivating.	Learning Situation – Group-Specific
I am studying Hungarian because the education is professional and the language teacher is motivating.	Learning Situation – Teacher-Specific

Source: Own study.

Language Level Components and, more specifically within that category, by Language Level – Integrative Components (76.5%). Thus, they are mostly motivated by elements related to the language community, e.g., their culture, society, and by the urge to communicate in the language, as well as the usefulness of the language in their work or studies. On the other hand, Language Situation Components seem to motivate the respondents to a very low extent (7.4%), that is, they do not consider the role of the language teacher or the community cohesion as important.

Table 7. Categorisation, mean score and standard deviation of the motivational Likert-scale items based on Dörnyei’s model (1994)

Components of motivation for foreign language learning motivation (Dörnyei)	Statements	Overall mean	Overall standard deviation
Language Level – Instrumental	I am studying Hungarian due to work/professional ambitions related to Hungary.	2.02	1.15
Language Level – Integrative	I am studying Hungarian since I am interested in Hungarian culture (music, film, literature).	1.99	0.91
	I am studying Hungarian due to family and friendly relations.		
	I am studying Hungarian since the language is unique, different from all the foreign languages I have studied so far.		
	I am studying Hungarian since I feel sympathy for Hungarians and Hungary.		
	I am studying Hungarian since I am interested in Hungarian society and public life.		
	I am studying Hungarian due to tourism trips to Hungary.		
	I am studying Hungarian due to the activity done by civic organisations/schools operating in Finland.		
	I have a property in Hungary.		
	I am studying Hungarian due to choir relations with Hungary.		
	I am studying Hungarian due to church relations with Hungary.		
	I am studying Hungarian due to twin-town relations with Hungary.		
Learner Level – Need for Achievement	I am studying Hungarian since language learning is a good brain teaser.	2.84	1.02
Learning Situation – Course, group, and teacher -Specific	I am studying Hungarian since I had the opportunity to study this particular language in an organised language course.	3.08	0.91
	I am studying Hungarian since the atmosphere in class is very good, the community in class is motivating.		
	I am studying Hungarian because the education is professional and the language teacher is motivating.		

Source: Own study.

However, in the case of the Likert-scale statement set, respondents are reported to be mostly motivated by the Learning Situation (course, group, and teacher-specific) elements, that is, for them, the personality and professionalism of the language teacher, together with the good class atmosphere and the good opportunity for a language course was most motivating in their Hungarian language learning.

6. CONCLUSIONS

As seen from the results of the empirical investigation, two universities in Finland still offer Hungarian language courses and the intensive activity of associations related to Hungary – the Finnish–Hungarian Society and the Association of Hungarians Living in Finland –, supported by the Embassy of Hungary and the Hungarian Cultural Centre, the Liszt Institute are still fostering Hungarian language learning in Finland. In addition, the motivating personality and professionalism of Hungarian language teachers, together with a positive class atmosphere and group cohesion, further encourage language learners in Finland to start and continue to pursue Hungarian language studies.

The fact that in the autumn of 2023 – one year after the survey of the present research was conducted – the Hungarian Cultural Centre, in cooperation with the Association of Hungarians Living in Finland and the KSL Study Centre¹⁰ offered Hungarian language courses for all levels, ranging from total beginners to advanced learners, shows that there is an ongoing effort on behalf of the Cultural Institute and related organisations to offer, and a wish on behalf of prospective Hungarian language learners to join Hungarian language courses in Helsinki. The courses are mostly held onsite, but some of them are also available online.

In spite of the mostly negative image of Hungary that has been spreading in Finland in the past 20 years, the social and cultural bilateral relations of the two countries are becoming less intensive; the motivational force of Hungarian culture, society, and of feeling sympathy towards the country, together with the wish to communicate with Hungarian people in different fields of life, is still the strongest motivational component in all age groups as reflected in the open-ended question set. However, the high ratio of the learning situation level component reflected in the Likert-scale question set also demonstrates that the motivating personality of the language teacher, the professional quality of language teaching, and motivating class community with good atmosphere, together with the opportunity to study Hungarian in an organised language course keep Hungarian language learners motivated in present day Finland. Although the latter highlights the fact that organised language courses in Hungarian as a foreign language are mostly on offer in two universities, in Helsinki and Turku, and they are offered in organised language courses in non-academic adult education mostly in Helsinki, that is, in the capital city and its agglomeration.

Respondents of the research present all the age groups between 19 to over 60, and all the forms of possible language learning contexts that have been available in Finland for learners of Hungarian language, namely university courses and non-academic adult education are present. However, the fact that the number of respondents currently studying Hungarian in an adult education centre in Finland is much fewer than that of those previously enrolling in such

¹⁰Official website of the KSL Study Centre: <https://www.ksl.fi/in-english/>.

courses shows that Hungarian language courses are not so much on offer anymore in these adult education centres, with one current exception in Oulu. In the capital city and its agglomeration, these courses are now substituted by those organised by the associations related to Hungary, also supported by the Embassy of Hungary and the Hungarian Cultural Centre.

The present research has not aimed at comparing the number of Hungarian language learners retrospectively, that is, by comparing the actual number of learners with data available in different previous decades. The very fact that the number of Hungarian language learners has significantly decreased in the past two decades is based on information gained from secondary literature, primary written sources, and oral interviews. However, detecting accurate data on the number of Hungarian language learners in previous decades would shed more light upon the exact level of changes taken place in the context of Hungarian language learning in Finland.

Another prospect of future research on the topic is to include the motivational items revealed in the answers given to the open-ended question *Have you ever had the opportunity to practice the Hungarian language with native speakers?* The answers to this question bring about new motivational elements not mentioned in the research before. 1. Hungarian native speakers are very tolerant, patient and helpful with language learners, positively motivating them with a relaxed attitude to mistakes. 2. Hungarian native speakers appreciate the efforts of Hungarian language learners to a great extent. 3. Hungarians do not tend to speak foreign languages, thus the only way to communicate with them is to learn their language. All of these factors also contribute to motivating the language learner to use Hungarian, already on a lower level of language acquisition. In Dörnyei's model, these motivational elements fall into the category of the Learner Level, the motivational component of self-confidence that includes language anxiety, perceived L2 competence, attributions about past experiences, and self-efficacy. Further research may reveal to what extent these elements encourage Hungarian language learners in Finland, refining the ratio of the motivational component categories examined in the present research.

REFERENCES

- Csire, M. and Laakso, J. (2011). Teaching the heritage language as a foreign language: on the questions of bilingualism and minority language teaching in Austria. *Eesti ja Soome-Ugri Keeleteaduse Ajakiri*, 2011(1–2): 93–107, <https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2011.2.1.06>.
- Dobos, E. (2005). *A magyar-finn kapcsolatok jelene és főleg jövője*, Lecture delivered in the Hungarian-Finnish Society in Budapest on 26 February 2005. Retrieved 24 January 2022, from <http://www.magyarfinntarsasag.hu/index.php?ugras=hiroldvaso&hirszama=19070>.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(3): 273–284.
- Flanagan, J.C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *The Psychological Bulletin*, 51(4): 327–358.
- Helasvuo, V. (1985). Hungarian music and music teaching in Finland. In: Numminen, J. and Nagy, J. (Eds.), *Friends and relatives: Finnish-Hungarian cultural relations*. Corvina, Budapest, pp. 237–250.
- Heltai, B. (2020). *Többsz nyelvűség geresdlakon*. L'Harmattan Kiadó, Budapest.
- Hughes, H. (2008). Critical incident technique. In: Lipu, S., Lloyd, A., and Williamson, K. (Eds.), *Exploring methods in information literacy research*. Centre for Information Studies, Charles Sturt University, Australia, pp. 49–66.

- Korhonen, M. (1985). Early Finno-Ugric linguistics. In: Numminen, J. and Nagy, J. (Eds.), *Friends and relatives: Finnish-Hungarian cultural relations*. Corvina, Budapest, pp. 29–52.
- Kovács, M. (2013). Magyar nyelv és kultúra a Helsinki egyetemen: múlt, jelen – és a jövő dilemmája a 21. század elején. *Spectrum Hungarologicum*, 7: 57–68.
- Kruskal, W. and Mosteller, F. (1979). Representative sampling, III: the current statistical literature. *International Statistical Review/Revue Internationale de Statistique*, 47(3): 245–265, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1402647>.
- Lahdelma, T. (1985). Hungarian literature in Finland. In: Numminen, J. and Nagy, J. (Eds.), *Friends and relatives: Finnish-Hungarian cultural relations*. Corvina, Budapest, pp. 210–225.
- Lahdelma, T. and Fenyvesi, K. (2013). A jyväs kyläi hungarológia húsz éve. *Spectrum Hungarologicum*, 7: 7–17.
- Mathews-Aydinli, J. (2008). Overlooked and understudied? A survey of current trends in research on adult English language learners. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 58(3): 198–213, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741713608314089>.
- Mészáros, A. (2021). Észak-déli rokonság. *Országút*, 2021(12). Retrieved 24 January 2022, from <https://orszagut.com/kitekinto/eszak-deli-rokonsag-1684>.
- Numminen, J. (1985). The development of cultural relations between Hungary and Finland. In: Numminen, J. and Nagy, J. (Eds.), *Friends and relatives: Finnish-Hungarian cultural relations*. Corvina, Budapest, pp. 9–19.
- Pusztai, I. (2007). Felnőtt-e az egyetemista? In: Silye, M. (Ed.), *Porta Lingua–2007*. Debreceni Egyetem, Debrecen, pp. 185–191.
- Reitala, A. (1985). Hungarian fine arts in Finland. In: Numminen, J. and Nagy, J. (Eds.), *Friends and relatives: Finnish-Hungarian cultural relations*. Corvina, Budapest, pp. 250–255.
- Richly, G. (2020). 100 év a finn–magyar kulturális kapcsolatok történetéből. *Finnugor Világ*, XXV(1): 10–22.
- Richly, G. (2021). *A helsinki Magyar Kulturális és Tudományos Központ története 1980–2020*. Ráció Kiadó, Budapest.
- Suni, M. (2012). The impact of Finno-Ugric languages in second language research: looking back and setting goals. *Lahivordlusi/Lahivertailuja*, 22(22): 407–438, <https://doi.org/10.5128/LV22.14>.
- Szaszkó, R. (2020). A nyelvtanulási motivációk kutatásának evolúciója magyar kontextusban. In: *Partnerstädte Überlegungen über die Pädagogie Vechta – Jászberény*. Eszterházy Károly Egyetem Líceum Kiadó, Eger, pp. 63–75.
- Tastle, W.J., Russell, J., and Wierman, M.J. (2008). A new measure to analyze student performance using the Likert-scale. *Information Systems Education Journal*, 6(35): 1–9.
- Tervonen, V. (1985). 19th-century pioneers of cultural relations. In: Numminen, J. and Nagy, J. (Eds.), *Friends and relatives: Finnish-Hungarian cultural relations*. Corvina, Budapest, pp. 52–99.
- Vecsernyés, I. (2013). Két magyarnyelv-oktatási projekt története. *Spectrum Hungarologicum*, 7: 177–182.
- Woodrow, L. (2014). Writing about participants. In: *Writing about quantitative research in applied linguistics*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230369955_4.

Appendix I

Hyvä Unkarin Kielen Opiskelija!

Olen Dr Ildikó Pusztai-Varga, Szegedin yliopiston tutkija. Tutkin unkarin kielen opiskelijoiden motivaatioita Suomessa. Ole hyvä ja tuke tutkimukseni tällä 10 minuttia kestäväällä kyselyllä. Käsittelen vastauksia anonyymisti, ja yhteenvetona teen johtopäätökset niiden perustella. Jos Sinulla huomautuksia on tutkimuksen yhteydessä, ole hyvä ja kirjoita minulle sähköpostio-soitteeseen ildiko.pusztai.varga@gmail.com. Kiitos!

Ikäsi: 0–18, 19–30, 31–59, 60–

Kansalaisuuteesi: 'suomalainen' vai „muu”, jos muu, sitten mikä?

Äidinkieli:

Asuinpaikasi Suomessa (asutuksen nimi):

Miten kauan olet opiskellut unkarin kieltä?

Ennen kun kirjoittauduit tälle kursille, missä muodossa opiskelit unkaria?

- yksilöllisesti
- yksityisoppitunnilla
- kielikursilla
- kesäyliopistossa Suomessa
- kesäyliopistossa Unkarissa
- muu

Millaisella kursilla opiskelet unkaria tällä hetkellä?

yliopistossa/työväenopistossa/kansalaisopistossa/Suomi-Unkari Seuran kursilla/Suomen Unkarilaisten Yhdistyksen kursilla/Muu

Opiskeletko unkarin kieltä nyt

online kursilla?

paikan päällä kursilla?

Mikä motivoi Sinua opiskelemaan unkarin kieltä? Ole hyvä ja vasta vähintään kahdella tai kolmella virkkeellä.

Kuinka seuraavat väitteet pitävät paikkansa Sinun tapauksessa? (1 = Ei pidä paikkaansa, 4 = Täysin totta.) Opiskelen unkaria perhesiteiden/ystävyyssuhteiden takia.

Opiskelen unkaria turistimatkojen takia.

Opiskelen unkaria työsuhteiden takia/omiin ammatillisiin tarkoituksiin.

Opiskelen unkaria kuorosuhteiden takia.

Opiskelen unkaria kirkkosuhteiden takia.

Opiskelen unkaria ystävyyskaupunki suhteiden takia.

Minulla on kiinteistö Unkarissa.

Opiskelen unkaria Suomessa toimivan Unkariin liittyvien järjestöjen/koulun toimintojen takia.

Opiskelen unkaria, koska kieli on tosi erikoinen, se poikkeaa muista kielistä jotka olen opiskellut.

Opiskelen unkaria, koska se on hyvä aivovoimistelu.

Opiskelen unkaria, koska olen kiinnostunut unkarilaisesta kulttuurista (musiikki, elokuva, kirjallisuus).

Opiskelen unkaria, koska olen kiinnostunut unkarilaisesta yhteiskunnasta ja julkisesta elämästä.

Opiskelen unkaria, koska tunnen sympatiaa unkarilaisia ja Unkaria kohtaan.
Opiskelen unkaria, koska minulla oli mahdollisuus opiskella juuri tämän kielen kielikursilla.
Opiskelen unkaria, koska kielitunnit ovat hyväntuulisia, ja yhteisö on hyvä.
Opiskelen unkaria, koska opetus on ammattilainen ja opettaja on motivoiva.

Oletko koskaan harjoitellut unkaria kielitunnin ulkopuolella unkarin äidinkielen puhujan kassa?
Jos olet, ole hyvä ja kirjoita ikimuistoisin elämyksesi.