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This paper provides an example of micro-planning which involves community, government and non-government organisations both in the context of immigrants' source and host countries. The community in question is the Hungarian diaspora in Australia. The language planning activities are aimed at maintaining an immigrant heritage language and identity. The paper first gives a theoretical discussion on the definition of language policy and planning, with specific focus on micro-planning, and then describes the Hungarian linguistic minorities in the Carpathian basin and in Australia. Then, the paper presents the micro-level language planning activities initiated by the Hungarian non-government organisations in Australia with specific focus on the interaction between Australian non-government organisations, Hungary-based non-government organisations and with government bodies in Hungary and Australia. The paper argues that micro-planning is initiated in the community, but can only be interpreted within the wider scope of macro-level planning. The paper also argues that micro-planning initiatives are essential complementary elements of language planning: neither macro- nor micro level planning is sufficient on its own.
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Introduction

Theories of language policy and planning (LPP)

The role of overt macro-level language policies on the maintenance of minority languages cannot be overemphasised. Still, contemporary minority communities find themselves in situations where the connections between governmentally backed and institutionalised policies on the one hand and their implementation and the utilisation of the potential benefits by the ethnolinguistic communities on the other hand need to be initiated from the communities themselves. Communities are, therefore, seen today as active agents and advocates for the maintenance of their cultural and linguistic heritage, rather than passive recipients of government support. This paper defines micro-planning as language policy originating from the micro not the macro (see Baldat in this volume), therefore micro-planning in this paper is not a mere interpretation of macro-policy upon the ethnolinguistic community in question. Still, from the case presented it is clear that micro-level
initiatives taken on the community level are not isolated from government and non-government organisations, both in the source country as well as the host country. On the contrary, the intense interaction between government and community organisations plays the crucial role in the maintenance of the cultural and linguistic heritage in the community in question.

On the other hand it is necessary to define some concepts used throughout the paper. Since the emergence of the field of language policy and planning in the late 1950s and early 1960s, the terms language policy and planning have been interpreted and defined in a number of ways in the literature (see e.g. Cooper (1989), Haarmann (1990), Haugon (1996), Hornberger (1996), Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) and Tollefsen, (1991)). Current paradigms make a sharp distinction between language policy as referring to the policy of a society in the area of linguistic communication, which is usually formulated in an official document and language planning, referring to a set of concrete measures taken within language policy to act on linguistic communication in a community (Bogarsi, 1992 cited in Schiffman, 1996: 8). In a recent approach to language policy development and evaluation that draws upon the laws and theories of economics, François Grim gives the following definition of language policy:

Language policy is a systematic, rational, theory-based effort at the societal level to modify the linguistic environment with a view to increasing aggregate welfare. It is typically conducted by official bodies or their surrogates and aimed at part or all of the population living under their jurisdiction (Grim, 2003: 30).

While language policies are usually associated with the state and with political decision-making (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997), language policies and language planning initiatives also happen at the community level. These initiatives are often referred to as grassroots language policies (Hornberger, 1996) or micro-planning (Baldauf, 1994; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). Non-governmental organisations and various institutions can be important actors in language planning and play a crucial role in the initiation and implementation of such policies. An example for such micro-planning is Clyde’s (2001) account of university level language planning in Australia.

This paper argues that the role local communities play in language planning is not only a necessary gap-filling exercise which aims to satisfy the planning needs that official policies cannot achieve. Micro-planning is an essential and a necessary complement to the overt official macro-level language policy and planning for obvious reasons. Firstly, if language planning is about influencing the language behaviour of local communities, then it is the local communities who are in the best position to fulfill this role. Secondly, as Canagarajah (2005) and others have argued, language education policies of the 21st century need to grapple with the challenge that language communities are ‘local and global at the same time’ (Canagarajah, 2005: 17). Therefore, in order to respond to the multiple challenges that small languages are facing due to the ever-increasing forces of globalisation, [. . .] ‘localised planning, supported by national policy and ideology, seems essential’ (King, 2004: 344).

Thirdly, as Fishman has argued in numerous writings, immigrant language communities’ language behaviour can only be influenced to the benefit of the
minority language if the community itself is motivated to do so. This paper aims to contribute to this debate and present an argument in support of combining macro- and micro-level planning activities. The attention on the local community responds to the need for scholars to go beyond the County Council’s ‘adequately selected to the everyday strategies of linguistic negotiation of the local people’ (Canagarajah, 2003: 123).

While the term ‘micro-planning’ is relatively new (Baldauf, 1994; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997), examples of micro-planning initiatives are numerous and incorporate a wide range of geolinguistic contexts. In the context of language planning directions in the Republic of Ireland Má-Ciolla Chriosi argued for ‘exploring the complexity of relationships between state, community and individual in relation to their various roles, expectations and rights’ (Mac Ciolla Chriosi, 2001: 297). In the context of Quechua, von Gleicht (1994) reports on the significant impact of the cultural consciousness raising movements promoted by the Indian organisations in Ecuador, Bolivia and Peru (also see numerous examples presented by Richard Baldauf in this volume). This paper aims to contribute to the understanding of similar micro-planning activism in the context of Hungarian language in Australia. Such micro-planning is even more important when the goal of planning is to maintain the identity of an immigrant community, to enhance its ethnolinguistic vitality and to reverse the intergenerational shift to English only. This is not a new idea and has been emphasised by Fishman’s seminal work (1991). As Fishman argues:

RLS efforts must initially be primarily based on the self-reliance of pro-RLSers and on the community of Yish users and advocates whom pro-RLSers seek to mobilise and activate. (Fishman, 1991: 111)

The role of communities in making language planning decisions is also recognised and emphasised in several international policy documents (including the 1992 Declaration of the United Nations, the 1992 European ‘Charter for Regional or Minority Languages’ and the 1995 Framework Convention of the Council of Europe) and various Recommendations of the OSCE’s High Commissioner on National Minorities 1996, 1998, 1999) (Kromlicka, 2002: 3). For example, the Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights (UDLR, 1996) makes the following statement:

All language communities have the right to organise and manage their own resources so as to ensure the use of their language in all functions within society, (and) all language communities are entitled to have at their disposal whatever means are necessary to ensure the transmission and continuity of their language. (Universal Declaration of Linguistic Human Rights, 1996, Article 8)

This Declaration is based on the principle that the rights of all language communities are equal and independent of the legal or political status of their languages as official, regional or minority languages. However, language planners should take care, as without supportive and effective national policies such declarations remain rather powerless and utopian. In fact, linguist and human rights, as declared by several international documents highlight the important role sociopolitical factors play in determining the fate of minority languages in individual nation states (May, 2000). In addition, as May argues,
etnic minorities and national minorities have different types of language rights; only national minorities can claim the automatic right to formal representation of their language in the public domain, and to state-supported minority-language education—a promotion-oriented right, while ethnic minority groups have, at the very least, the right to preserve their language in the private, non-governmental sphere of national life; these latter are referred to as tolerance-oriented rights (Nay, 2001: 13). Universal language rights, therefore, are hard to protect. In addition to the complexity of promotion vs. tolerance-oriented rights, there is a further controversy created by the Western attempt of internationalising minority rights issues and exporting Western models to "newly democratising countries" (Kymlicka, 2002: 1). As Kymlicka argues, this tendency is present in Eastern Europe and since this paper deals with an "eastern-European" minority group with strong traditions of language right movement in the European context this tendency is worth mentioning, even though this paper will not discuss this in detail.

What is language planning then and who does language planning to what effect? The fundamental framework of language planning as proposed by Kaplan and Baldau (1997) aims to seek responses to the question "Who Does What to Whom?". While these questions seem relatively easy to answer, the impact of language planning is more uncertain. Several authors have questioned the effects of language policies on the linguistic outcomes they provision and raised the question of whether planning should follow a bottom-up or top-down pattern. Kaplan sees a reversal of role for government institutions: rather than imposing top-down policies (which rarely work), he has emphasised that bottom-up movements from the community are more likely to lead to success.

In many cases, the stimulus for revitalisation arises among the population of speakers or of the descendants of a population of speakers. It rarely arises in the Ministry of Education; rather, the Ministry of Education responds, to varying degrees, to grass-roots pressure from the community (i.e. policy development is not actually a policy matter; rather it is a matter of assisting implementation. (Kaplan, 2005: 79)

Kaplan and Baldau (1997) discuss micro-, meso- and macro-level planning and note that most language planning is described as a large-scale activity. Language planning occurs, however, on many different levels, and often the micro-level planning is what makes a difference to a community's life and linguistic ecology. Community organisations, therefore, have a crucial role in the language maintenance process and their positions and roles.

Although this paper does not aim to evaluate the micro-level implementation of macro-level policies, as stated above, it adopts the proposition that societal attitudes and practices with regard to language use, acquisition and status are strongly influenced by macro-factors, such as the political, historical and cultural events and processes (Ricento, 2000: 23). This paper presents three macro-level sociopolitical and cultural factors that impact upon the micro-level language planning activities of the Hungarian community in Australia. The first factor is attributable to the strong historical traditions of minority language maintenance in the context of European and ethnic minorities in Europe, and the shift from a post-communist era to a European democracy in the 1990s. The second factor
The Case of Hungarian in Australia

The Status of Hungarian Language in the European Context

Factor 1: Hungarian as a minority language in Europe

The current paper is concerned with the community-level language planning initiatives of the Hungarian diaspora in Australia. In the context of an immigrant minority (using Agee's term 'powerlessness language community'), the motivation for language planning is strongly associated with correcting social inequality, injustice or inequality and these factors play a crucial role in their attempt to actively defend their identity (Agee, 2001: 160). While such inequality was present in the past, in the context of contemporary Australian multiculturalism, the main motivation for the Hungarian community is to maintain a unique identity and to prevent a complete assimilation into mainstream Australia.

The term diaspora in this paper refers to the communities of Hungarian-born or of Hungarian origin persons residing outside Hungary. It is important to make a distinction on the one hand, between the Hungarians outside Hungary living in minority status in the Carpathian Basin in Hungary's surrounding countries, including Romania, Slovakia, Croatia, Ukraine and Austria; and on the other hand, the Hungarian diaspora living in other parts of the world as a result of emigration or immigration. While the first group can be considered national minorities, the second group belongs to ethnic minorities (Mav 2001: 13).
The relationships between state, national language and national culture and identity have never been straightforward in the context of Hungary. This Central European country inherited the French nationalist ideology, which prevailed until the end of World War I and was later replaced by the German model of Kollaboration. Hungarian language has always been a core cultural icon and has been regarded as an important means to express and keep Hungarian identity.

While Hungarian language has been the official language of Hungary since the 1849 declaration of independence, Hungarian has been spoken by a large number of ethnic Hungarians outside the current political borders of the country. There are approximately 400,000 indigenous Hungarians in Slovakia, 160,000 in Subcarpathia, Ukraine, 1.6 million in Romania, approximately 350,000 in Slovakia, 8000 in Slovenia, and perhaps 5000 in Austria (Kritta, 2001: 164). These ethnic Hungarians have lived in minority status as a result of the drastic realignment of political borders as ratified by the Trianon Treaty after World War I. Since Hungary lost two-thirds of its territory and one-third of its population due to the border changes, mother tongue maintenance has had long traditions in Hungarian culture. The language maintenance efforts of Hungarians have been discussed by a number of authors (see e.g. Gal, 1979, 1999; Kritta, 1999; Lantág, 1999; Sóke, 1999; Szepfülfüli, 1999).

With the recent enlargement of the European Union, Hungary has undergone significant social and economic changes. These changes brought new opportunities and challenges with regards to the status of Hungarian language both inside Hungary and in its neighbouring countries. Hungary introduced the Status Law which intended to create stronger connections with Hungarians across the border under the banner of one Hungarian "cultural nation", but this Status Law has been subject to heated political debate and has had mixed impact on these ethnic minorities and Hungary's relations with its neighboring countries.

In brief, the strong historical tradition of promoting and protecting the Hungarian language creates a strong supportive environment for the microplanning in the Australian community.

**Factor 2: Hungarian linguistic culture and core value**

The second main impact upon the language planning initiatives in the Hungarian community derives from the strong intrinsic cultural aspect of the Hungarian community. Hungarians in Australia are a core group and all those efforts to be a language-centred, considering their ethnic language to be among their core values (Smolícz, 1999). For such group members, the value of their first language transcends any instrumental consideration, and represents a strive for self-fulfillment that makes the language a symbol of survival, and hence of aesthetic significance (Smolícz, 1999: 29). This paper investigates how political changes in Australia can affect the patterns of acculturation and language maintenance in an essentially language conscious community.

As Schiffrin argues, language policy is "ultimately grounded in linguistic culture, that is, the set of beliefs, assumptions, cultural norms, prejudices found in belief systems, attitudes, stereotypes, ways of thinking about language and religious-historical circumstances associated with a particular language" (Schiffrin, 1996: 3). Hungarians have always attached a strong value to their language. In fact, it is the language itself which created a unique identity for
Although Hungarian gained the status of official language only after the revolution of 1848-49, since 1986 it has been a compulsory subject in every secondary school, college, and university which, in addition to providing literacy education to native Hungarians, was a "paranoid urge to spread Hungarian" among the multi-ethnic population, of the Hungarian Kingdom (Medgyes & Miklozy, 2000: 170).

Due to its strong nation-building role, Hungarian language has always been strongly attached to Hungarianness and can safely be considered as a core value in Hungarian culture. Smolicz (1999: 28) defines 'language-centred communities' as the ones which regard their 'ethnic tongues as their cores'. Hungarian is one of these communities along with the Greek, Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, Polish, and Spanish (Smolicz, 1999: 28). For Hungarian language becomes 'equated with affiliation to the group'. For them, as for other language-centred cultures, the loss of the native tongue usually heralds a cultural shift to the periphery and weakens the 'cultural transmission chain' (Smolicz, 1999: 38).

Factor 3: Macro-level language planning in the Australian context

The third factor impacting upon the micro-level planning of the community was to the shift to multicultural policies and the development of a society more tolerant of ethnic and linguistic diversity in the host country: Australia. This section will highlight the impact of multicultural policies upon language maintenance activities of Hungarians.

The development of multiculturalism in Australia has a long history going back to 1972, when the term multiculturalism was first introduced. Prior to multicultural policies Australia had a strong assimilationist ideology which required immigrants to conform to the Australian lifestyle and forget about their traditions and languages. This assimilationist period has a devastating impact upon the immigrant languages. The majority of immigrant ethno-cultural communities shifted to English only and did not transmit their language to their next generation. Kipp and Cyne (2003) report the highest rates of shift among the Dutch, Germans and Austrians, while Hungarians occupied a middle ground in terms of language shift. In contrast with the assimilationist ideology prevalent until the 1970s, current multicultural policies overtly support the maintenance of community language. The fundamental principles of multiculturalism are formulated in the policy document. The National Agenda for Multicultural Australia (Department of Immigration & Multi-cultural and Indigenous Affairs, 1999). The report defines three main rights and three main obligations that immigrants should have. The rights are:

- cultural identity: the right of all Australians to express and share their individual cultural heritage, including their language and religion;
- social justice: the right of all Australians to equality of treatment and opportunity, and the removal of barriers of sex, ethnicity, culture, religion, language, gender or place of birth;
- economic efficiency: the need to maintain, develop and utilise effectively the skills and talents of all Australians, regardless of background.
Among the obligations, it is stated that multicultural policies require all Australians to accept the basic structures and principles of Australian society - the Constitution and the rule of law, acceptance and equality, and English as the national language. In the early 1990s, the concept of multiculturalism underwent significant changes which are best manifested in the latest report issued by the National Multicultural Advisory Council (1999). The Council recommends the adoption of the following definition of multiculturalism:

Australian multiculturalism is a term, which recognises and celebrates Australia's cultural diversity. It accepts and respects the right of all Australians to express and share their individual cultural heritage within an overriding commitment to Australia and the basic structures and values of Australian democracy. (National Multicultural Advisory Council, 1999)

The report reflects and reinforces the shift from seeing migrants as people in need of assistance, for example in helping them learn English to seeing them as an 'asset' to society. The new slogan of 'inclusiveness' reflects this change. The policy emphasises the 'economic benefits' that can be gained by capitalising on Australia's wealth of cultural and linguistic skills and on the social and business networks of migrants in the Australian community (National Multicultural Advisory Council, 1999). The report continues to promote the economic benefits that can be derived from Australia's cultural diversity in both the domestic and international markets. It was not the first time, however, that language was seen as a resource, as this concept was also included in the Senate Standing Committee's recommendation report in 1984 (Senate Standing Committee on Education and Arts, 1984).

Such multicultural policies and corresponding language policies 'claim to provide a favourable environment for the maintenance of intelligible languages' (Hatoss, 2004: 18). However, Australian multiculturalism does not go hand in hand with widespread societal multilingualism (Clyne, 1991, 1997; Smolcic, 1980, 1981, 1999). Although superficially Australia is highly multilingual, due to the immigrant languages present, this multilingualism is subject to shift to the use of English only (Clyne & Eipp, 1997, 2000). This confirms that macro-policies or planning are not successful in their attempt to influence language use and language spread in the wider society. Also, as many have argued, these macro-policies are characterised by a 'inspect-fine' approach where migrants' rights to their language is provided, but opportunities of doing so have to be created within the smaller microcosms of the community.

Hungarians in Australia

In the 200 years of Australia's history Hungarians have immigrated to this country in the last 150 years. Although the first Hungarian-born migrant arrived in Australia as early as 1829 (Kütt: 1997: 19), the first arrivals were only sporadic and spasmodic. Apart from these arrivals, Hungarians came in three main waves that corresponded to and reflected Hungarian history. These included the migration after the 1948-49 revolution, after World War II and after the revolution of 1956. At the end of 1948 the first 'contract
immigrants arrived and in the following three years most of the Hungarian migrants arrived as 'displaced persons', or so called 'dips' (Kunz, 1997). Their travel cost was covered by the International Refugee Organisation (IRO) and the Australian Commonwealth contributed £10 to the travel cost in case the journey was longer than the distance between America and Australia. Migrants leaving Hungary in 1956 were supported by Australia and some international organisations. These immigrants were treated under a humanitarian programme and were not subject to the same selection criteria as other migrants in general (Kunz, 1997).

While Hungarians contributed tremendously to the development of Australian industry and economy (Kunz, 1997), they only influenced the demographic growth of the country to a limited degree. Even during the times when the Hungarian migration was at its peak from 1941 to 1961, the Hungarian migrants accounted for only 2% of the total migrant population in Australia (Kunz, 1997). Still, Hungarians were the seventh biggest ethnic group after the British, Italian, Dutch, German, Greek and Yugoslavian migrants. According to the 2001 Census (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2001) a total of 62,859 people reported having Hungarian ancestry, 24,485 people spoke Hungarian in their homes and this figure was 25,846 in 1996. See Table 1 for a summary of demographics of the community and Table 2 for the summary of Hungarian spoken in Australian homes according to states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Hungarians in Australia according to the 1996 and 2001 census results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Census 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Australian population</td>
<td>17,892,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Australian residents born in Hungary</td>
<td>25,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Australian residents who speak Hungarian at home</td>
<td>25,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Australian residents with Hungarian ancestry</td>
<td>(no data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Hungarian language spoken in Australian homes according to the 2001 census in states and territories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States and territories of Australia</td>
<td>Number of persons speaking Hungarian at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>8,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>4,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>3,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>1,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>1,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section describes some of the main organisations as ‘actors’ and some of the main activities as micro-planning initiatives.

The central micro-level language planning actor of the Hungarian community in Australia is the Hungarian Association of Australia and New Zealand (Ausztrália és Új-Zéland Magyar Szövetség (AUGZMSZ)). This association is composed of the state-level Hungarian organisations and fulfills the function of the National Council of Australia (NCA or in Hungarian Országos Tanács, OT) in the World Association of Hungarians (in Hungarian Magyarok Világszövetség). In the following sections, the paper will highlight some of the activities of the state level Hungarian NGOs in three states of Australia: New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria. Traditionally these states hosted most European migrations and they have the largest population of Hungarians.

In New South Wales the most significant actor of micro-planning is the Hungarian Council of New South Wales (HCNSW) which was established in 1952. The Council is a voluntary non-profit organisation which coordinates the work of the various Hungarian associations operating in NSW. These activities include cultural, social, benevolent, charitable, fraternity, church, pensioners and various youth organisations such as the Hungarian schools, scout movement and dance groups. The crucial role the Council plays is the representation of the Hungarian communities’ interest at all official levels especially in Australian and Hungarian governmental departments and institutions. In Australia the Council keeps contact with the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigeneous Affairs (DIMIA) and the Hungarian Embassy in Canberra (in Australia); the Community Relations Commission and the Consulate-General of Hungary in Sydney (in New South Wales). In Hungary it keeps contact with the Ministry of Education; the Ministry of National Culture and Heritage; the Government Office for Hungarian Minorities Abroad; and several educational institutions and foundations such as the Balassi Institute for Hungarian Studies, the Illyés Foundation for Hungarians Abroad, and the Apáczai Foundation for Hungarian Education Abroad. Through these contacts the Council seeks for opportunities to fund Hungarian cultural events, with the event aim to promote the maintenance of Hungarian language among the second and third generation Hungarian Australians. Some of these events are described in the following section.

**Hungarian Identity Conferences**

The main forum for micro-planning

Perhaps the most important language planning event in the diaspora is the Hungarian Identity Conference. This conference is organised annually by the Hungarian Council of New South Wales jointly with the Hungarian Centre in Melbourne. The aim of the event is to support the maintenance of Hungarian cultural and linguistic heritage in the diaspora and to sustain the quality of cultural life in the community. The proactive role the Council plays in the maintenance of Hungarian language and culture is reflected in the words of the President:
It is our responsibility and our moral obligation to be aware of the assistance and opportunities our adopted country extends to us through the Act of Multiculturalism. It is indeed our privilege to retain our identity and thereby ensure the valued presence of Hungarian in Australia. (Kardos, 2004)

The conference provides a forum for various actors of micro-planning, such as scouts and youth group leaders, leaders of old-age community organizations, Hungarian media representatives and coordinators and teachers of the Hungarian schools to discuss relevant issues and identify areas where government monies could be allocated to assist programmes. The conference also hosts representatives of various cultural organizations and government departments from Hungary and from Australia, therefore it creates the crucial links across micro- and macro-level planners. The conference topics lie under the wider theme of maintaining Hungarian identity, as the conference title Megnaradásunk (Hungarian for ‘Remiming Hungarian’) suggests, and usually embrace issues such as the preparation of the syllabus for the weekend schools, the method of teaching, the selection and order of the suitable textbooks and teaching aids for the schools from Hungary. Community members also discuss the various opportunities offered to students by Hungarian institutions for further education in language and culture. An initiative is to arrange refresher courses for teachers either in Hungarian Teachers’ Colleges and Universities, or in Australia by inviting lecturers from Hungary. Through the conference, the community also aims to find sponsors for exchange student programmes in Hungary and Australia.

One of the examples of the achievements of the Identity Conference is the Kavocs Cultural Manager Training Course which is organised by the Hungarian Cultural Foundation in Budapest for those Hungarian Australians who wish to take an active role in the issues of the Hungarian community. It builds upon the knowledge represented in this community. The course is designed on the basis of the needs articulated in the Hungarian-Australian community during the Identity Conference. The aim of the programme is to assist and support the activities which aim to strengthen the Hungarian identity including the support of education and management activities’ (Newsletter to the Hungarian Community, 8 October 2005).

At the first Identity Conference the Council of Australian Hungarian Schools was established. The council is an example of acquisition planning as it monitors the issues related to the Hungarian schools’ needs, assists in the development of curricula, and the selection of suitable textbooks. The majority of the members are teachers of Hungarian in various schools. The Association keeps in contact with the Ministry of Education in Hungary and the National Textbook Publishing House (Hungary). The council directly contacts the Ministry for textbook needs. The working language of the conference is Hungarian, but some sections are presented in English in order to engage some second generation Hungarians who do not speak Hungarian.

Some of the planning activities are targeted at building strong rapport with the government offices of multiculturalism in Australia. An example of a micro-planning activity was the Hungarian Presentation Day at the Parliament of NSW.
organised in 2001 to mark the Centenary of the Australian Federation and the contribution of the Hungarian Community over the past 50 years to enriching and developing multicultural Australia. On this occasion the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs recognised the role the Hungarian Council has played in "contributing to the success of multiculturalism in Australia" (Ruddock, 2001).

**Government and Non-government Institutions in the Source Country (Hungary)**

Micro-level planning initiatives also involve building a close cooperation with several government bodies and non-government organisations in Hungary. One of these key government organisations is the Office of Hungarian Minorities Abroad (HTMH) which makes decisions on the micro-level about the support provided for Hungarian minorities across the border of Hungary, but mainly in the Carpathian Basin. This office was established in 1992 as a national public institution and operates under the Hungarian government, under the supervision of the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Its main responsibilities include:

- maintaining and fostering Hungarian-Hungarian relationships, especially with Hungarian political and social organisations, associations and churches;
- fostering bilateral relations with government bodies responsible for minority issues in countries where the Hungarian diaspora is present;
- carrying out analysis and prognosis on processes concerning the Hungarian diaspora;
- bringing the issues of the Hungarian diaspora outside Hungary to international forums (see HTMH website http://www.htmh.hu/en/index.php?menuid=02).

The Hungarian diaspora keeps in contact with this department and has lobbied successfully in order to draw the Hungarian government's attention to the needs of the Australian Hungarian community. In 2004 and 2005 several government representatives visited the Australian community and informed the members about various grant programmes.

Micro-planning also involves building contacts with non-government organisations in Hungary. Such organisations include the Illyés Foundation for Hungarians Abroad established in 1990. Some of the main activities of the foundation are aimed at 'supporting the maintenance, development and strengthening of Hungarian identity in the diaspora outside Hungary, supporting initiatives which are aimed at the maintenance and development of Hungarian language, supporting the academic work concerning Hungarians outside Hungary, improving the material and human resource conditions necessary for practising religion in Hungarian cultural exhibitions of Hungarians Outside Hungary in the motherland. While most activities are limited to the Carpathian basin and the funds are offered only to the minority groups in Hungary's neighbouring countries, the foundation was the main sponsor for the first Hungarian Identity Conference in Australia in 2001. Another example
is the Teleki László Foundation\footnote{which is a research focused organisation with a strong emphasis on Hungary's international relations, the European integration and the situation of ethnic and linguistic minorities. Through these contexts the dispora creates significant cultural exchange opportunities and opportunities for the use of Hungarian in Australia and in Hungary by second generation Hungarian.} which is a research focused organisation with a strong emphasis on Hungary's international relations, the European integration and the situation of ethnic and linguistic minorities. Through these contexts the dispora creates significant cultural exchange opportunities and opportunities for the use of Hungarian in Australia and in Hungary by second generation Hungarian.

**Acquisition Planning**

**Hungarian schools in Australia**

Micro-level language planning, particularly acquisition planning plays a crucial role in ensuring that second and third generation Hungarian children have access to Hungarian courses in Australia. Australian children have three options to study a LOTE (Languages Other Than English). These include (1) regular day schools including government, Catholic and independent schools, (2) the School of Languages, which is a government funded Saturday school to allow children to learn a LOTE when there is no other opportunity for them to do so during normal schooling, and (3) after-school ethnic schools run by communities, many of which are also supported financially from Federal or State government funds (Clyne et al., 2004: 6).

Hungarian schools in Australia fit under the second and third categories: those run by State governments and ethnic schools run by the Hungarian community. These ethnic schools are run as a result of an ongoing micro-level acquisition planning activity and are located in Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide and Perth. The instruction in these schools is focused mainly on basic Hungarian language, history and culture, but the courses also aim to prepare students for the more advanced classes provided in government schools.

The continuity of these schools is largely dependent on the number of Hungarian-background children in the local community and their level of motivation to maintain or learn Hungarian. The number of children attending these schools in Sydney is approximately 80, in Melbourne 100, in Brisbane 60, Adelaide 30, and in Perth 20. Recruiting new students to these classes is one of the main micro-planning activities that the community undertakes.

Classes run by government schools – mainly on Saturday mornings – take place in the states of NSW (The Saturday School of Community Languages in Sydney), Victoria (The Victorian School of Languages in Melbourne) and South Australia. (The School of Languages in Adelaide). The main focus is to prepare Year 11 and 12 students for the final (matriculation) examination in the Hungarian language. Annually, 40-50 students sit for this examination.

In September 1999, the Hungarian Cultural and Welfare Association (a Magyar Ház) – supported by the CHAGQ – successfully applied for grant from the Ápolácsi Foundation (Ápolácsi Kultúrkapcsolat) to support a Hungarian school for the purpose of maintaining the Hungarian language for people of the second and third generation. The foundation sponsors a Hungarian teacher for a period of one year. Unfortunately, the programme allows only two lessons per week for each group, due to the limited funds and teaching staff. The lessons are held on weekday evenings as well as on Saturday mornings. Choosing the best location for the courses was one of the most difficult tasks, since the Hungarian
community is widely spread in all the suburbs of Brisbane and its surroundings. The Hungarian House hosts three of the classes, situated in one of the southern suburbs of Brisbane, while one class is held in the north of Brisbane, one on the Gold Coast and one in Ipswich, about 50 kilometres west from Brisbane. The school is sponsored by the foundation for only one year, and the community has to apply for further funds on a yearly basis to maintain the programme.

In addition to the issue of numerical strength, that is, the difficulty of getting enough students together in various districts to fill the necessary quota for government-funded Hungarian classes, the main issue that Hungarian schools face is the lack of teaching materials. In response to this need, the National Textbook Publishing Corporation (Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó) in Budapest donated a number of textbooks titled A huna magyarság specifically written for learners of Hungarian outside Hungary. The book is intended for all those 10,000 Hungarian children who study Hungarian language outside Hungary, in the western diasporas. The authors describe the aim of the book with the following words:

Our aim is to make children who are Hungarian-by-birth and Hungarian-by-upbringing realise that they belong to a community of 15 million people. The book orientates the learner to examine his/her place in the world with the knowledge of also belonging to 'Hungarianness', and to raise their interest in the nation's culture, history and present, which in time may develop into a duty. (Original Hungarian: Elnézést kérünk, hogy a magyar, illetve magyarság is a névtelen dák nátyrás az ara, hogy egy tizenöt millió közösséghez tartozik. A tanulság arra orientálja és a kényt, hogy a magyarsághoz (s) történés tudatával mért fő helyt a világban, és érdeklődést kezünk benne e nemzet kultúrájára, múltjára és jelenre indít, amely szerencséit viszont az idők folyamán élettevézetével alkothat benne.) (On WWW at http://www.hotkey.net.au/~aussiemagyar/Haza_A_Magaszaban.htm. Accessed 25.10.05.)

The book is another example of the successful matching of community needs and government support. The book was sponsored by the Ministry of Education and it was the achievement of the First Hungarian Identity Conference that the book was sent to a number of Hungarian schools in Australia.

Discussion

From the various organisations and activities described in the previous section it is clear that Hungarian micro-planning activities are diverse and involve government and non-government organisations both in Australia and in Hungary.

The activities of micro-planning with the actors of these micro-planning activities are presented in Table 3.

From Table 3 it is clear that micro-planning in the Hungarian community is a unique case of language planning which operates on multiple levels: involving government and non-government organisations both in the source country, Hungary and in Australia. The main goals of the micro-planning activities are to maintain a Hungarian identity in Australia and avoid total 'assimilation'. The community's concerns of being assimilated into mainstream Australian culture are justified by the demographic figures which show that the Hungary-born Australian population is in sharp decrease and Hungarian is used in Austral-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-planning organisations based on location and status</th>
<th>Australia-based non-government organisations</th>
<th>Hungary-based non-government organisations</th>
<th>International-level non-government organisations</th>
<th>Hungary-based government organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actors in micro-planning</td>
<td>• Hungarian Association of NSW</td>
<td>• Hungarian Cultural Foundation</td>
<td>• World Association of Hungarians</td>
<td>• Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hungarian Cultural Centre in Melbourne</td>
<td>• Blyész Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Office of Hungarian minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Magyar Ház)</td>
<td>• Apollo Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>(HTMHI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council of Hungarian Association in QLD</td>
<td>• Teleki Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Flex University – International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gold Coast Hungarian Association</td>
<td>• Hungarian Textbook Publishing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Study Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-level planning activities:</td>
<td>• organise identity conferences yearly</td>
<td>• Hungarian Textbook Publishing</td>
<td>• inform Hungarian</td>
<td>• attend Hungarian identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• acquisition planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>community organisations in all</td>
<td>conferences in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• status planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>countries about key events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• corpus planning (textbooks)</td>
<td></td>
<td>impacting upon the Hungarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diaspora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• lobby in relation to various</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>political events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• sponsor cultural manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• sponsor identity conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• supply textbook and CD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>materials to Hungarian schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• offer scholarships for learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungarian culture and language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in Hungary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
an homes to a lesser and lesser degree. This decline in the use of Hungarian is only partially attributable to the population decline. Partially, the reduction in the use of Hungarian is a clear sign of two types of language shift: (1) an intergenerational shift which means that the children born in Australia do not speak Hungarian any more and (2) an intragenerational shift means that the first-generation Hungarians have shifted to the sole use of English in their homes. This typically occurs in mixed marriages, where the spouse is a monolingual English speaking Australian.

As the examples of language planning activities have demonstrated, the language planning needs and opportunities of the community are not met by the governmentally controlled official language planning programmes. The official school system offers LOTE programmes, but Hungarian children are not able to have access to these programmes, due to the dispersed location of the community and the small numbers they represent. From the networking activities that the community has initiated it is clear that there is a strong motivation to transmit Hungarian culture and language to the next generations. Still, attracting young members of the community to the various community events has proven to be the most challenging task for language planners.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Australian-Hungarians have a number of organisations which help them maintain contact with their culture and language. Despite the diaspora's relative demographic weaknesses — such as numerical weakness as well as the geographic dispersion of the community — the community is maintaining a number of activities through various government and non-government organisations. Language policies do not necessarily bring the desired effects on the linguistic environment of migrant communities. For contemporary language communities, such as Hungarian, it is essential that they take initiatives for the maintenance and development of the cultural and linguistic heritage. In the context of Australian multiculturalism it is evident that macro-planning and government level language policies need to be supported by such micro-planning in order to maximise their effect.

From the case study of the micro-planning activities in the Hungarian community in Australia it is clear that it is also crucial that the community has access to and fosters links with expert support for both content and methodology. In this regard, the Hungarian Identity Conference held annually has been exemplary. It addresses the need to articulate the desired future of the Hungarian language and culture, the need for shared thinking, planning, and action in order to pave the future of the Hungarian community's identity in Australia. Some initiatives have come to fruition in forging links and opportunities for personal enrichment and further education.

While the community is successful in addressing various language needs, the planning activities seem somewhat ad hoc. There is no overt and consistent policy which describes language planning goals. Still, the numerous initiatives on the micro-level are to some extent steered by the national and state level networking, mainly through the annual Hungarian Identity Conferences and the various non-government organisations.
As the case of the Hungarian diaspora has shown, both the source country and the host country organisations play an essential part of micro-planning activities. They need to take responsibility for their share in creating opportunities for members of the diaspora to use their language. In this process, as we have seen, nongovernmental organisations play a crucial role. Clearly, the Hungarian initiatives can provide a useful example for other communities.

Australia’s dynamically growing and ever-changing communities need to be active agents in their language outcomes. Macro-planning can only be successful if supported by conscious and strategic micro-planning, such as the one presented in this paper. From a theoretical perspective, theories of language planning need to respond to the dynamics of changing communities, the complexities of their interactions on various levels, it is not sufficient to treat language communities as local, restricted by space and having limited mobility. Contemporary diasporas are in constant change and in dynamic interaction with other communities. This dynamism calls for a paradigm shift and the need to examine language planning in ethnolinguistic communities within the new framework of cosmopolitanism. This new framework allows theories to move away from the rigid concepts of nation-state, diaspora, majorities and minorities.
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Notes
1. LLS stands for language shifting.
2. For a detailed discussion on the Charter see Grim (2003).
4. This paper does not aim to review the linguistic rights situation in the Hungarian minority context in the Carpathian basin. For a review of the language situation in the Carpathian basin see Medgyes and Milosky (2003), also in the broader context of EU enlargement in Central European countries see Vymendi (2002).
5. For a detailed discussion on the development of multilingual policies and the history of immigration in Australia, see Jupp (2002).
7. The most significant language policy document in Australia was the report (Lo Franco, 1987) published in 1987. This policy put a strong emphasis on the value of multilingualism in Australian communities and the value of maintaining minority languages. Currently, there is no overt policy in place and in general language matters are not on the agenda of the current government.
8. For a detailed overview of Hungarian migration to Australia see Katz (1997).
9. In the census survey people were asked to consider the accuracy with which they identified. Multiple responses could be provided. Of more than two responses were provided, the first two were recorded. Comparative figures are not available for this item as the question was rephrased in the 1996 or 1996 censuses.
10. The English language version of the official website of this government depart-
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