



**Doctoral School
of Sociology and
Communication
Science**

COLLECTION OF THESES

to the Ph.D. thesis
of

Hanga András

titled

National Identity in Székelyland

Changes in the minority identity of young adults in Székelyland

Scientific coordinator:

Dr. Márton Demeter, PhD
Associate Professor

Budapest, 2021

Institute of Communication Science and Sociology

COLLECTION OF THESES

to the Ph.D. thesis
of

Hanga András

titled

National Identity in Székelyland

Changes in the minority identity of young adults in Székelyland

Scientific coordinator:

Dr. Márton Demeter, PhD

Associate Professor

© Hanga András

Content

Content	Hiba! A könyvjelző nem létezik.
1. Reason for choosing the topic	4
2. Methods used.....	6
2.1. Methodology of second analysis and selection of research	7
2.2. Methodology of individual, semi-structured interviews	8
2.3. Methodology of focus group interviews	8
3. Results of the research.....	9
4. Summary of conclusions	12
5. Main references	17
5.1. Printed source list.....	17
5.2. Other source list	20
6. Own publications on this topic and co-authored publications	20
6.1. Conference volume	20
6.2. Online journal	21
6.3. Book chapter	21
6.4. Book editing.....	22
6.5. Co-authored studies	22
6.6. Lectures on the subject.....	22
7. Appendix	23

1. Reason for choosing the topic

Among the Hungarians in Székelyland, a tangible social change seems to have started, which I assume can most be captured in the change of identity: within the very diverse Hungarian population, the part of the Hungarian community forced to live in Romania of nearly one and a half million people living in a block (Székelyland) seeks to show up a Hungarian-language “national” identity, distinguished by the term Székely, due to its historical past and collective memory, which exists as an ethnic, cultural and linguistic island. In particular, the various forms of public expression of politics, the political language renewal, the organised political demonstrations, the replacement of former worn-out symbols with new “national” symbols, the discovery and public holding of “national” holidays, and the establishment of institutions operating on the “national” principle are particularly suitable for achieving and legitimising this.

In the case of Hungarians living in the Carpathian Basin, due to their specific situation, three communities and the relationship between them are mostly mentioned: the totality of Hungarians, the Hungarians in the mainland (the remaining country after Trianon) and the Hungarians beyond the border, which are national minorities in the surrounding countries. In this system, the Hungarians of Székelyland appear as a separate social group as a “conceivable community” (Anderson 1983). This forced community, separated from the motherland, has an undertaken and shared experience of being a minority and has a strong vision of minority nation-building and becoming a minority nation (Bárdi –Szarka 2007). However, in order to create an imagined community, it is essential to transform memory into a history, which requires an institutional system by which the recollection of the legacy of the reinterpreted past can be made a program in the form of holidays and anniversaries, ceremonies and rites, monuments embodying historical memory, cultural works – through them, the conception of the nation is institutionalized and national identity is formed. In the formation of modern nations, people had to accept and identify with national identity, which was possible because they had already become aware of some kind of “national character”. This consciousness is the discovery of the national feeling that made it possible for the society to exist as a nation. The three indispensable factors in this process are the “fate” treated as a remembrance of the common past, the cultural and linguistic relationships that form the constitutive basis of social communication, and the equality of the members of the group that defines itself as a nation – the creation of civil society (Hroch 2000). In the case of Székelyness, all three factors exist palpably, but at the same time we cannot consider them to have developed once and for all, due to their specific situation they are constantly looking for – and find – signs of separation and identification of themselves, let us just think of the

inherited Székely gate (Gagyi 2004) or the Real Csíki Beer, which made beer consumption “national”.

Although the history of Székelys is not an unprecedented case, it is worth approaching it from the formation of modern nations and recalling Hroch's (2000) thoughts for this again. In the long 19th century, Hungarians lived in their own country under the rule of a German-speaking elite, so during the capitalist transformation of society, the leading class was of a different ethnicity than the majority of society. As a consequence of the First World War, a significant part of the Hungarians became a national minority with a state-forming majority national consciousness trapped outside the border of the “motherland”, which was only strengthened by the territorial revisions of the Second World War. Romania has sought to eliminate the Székelys living in one block. It did so by countless means, by reorganizing the public administration (countyization – nivelul NUTS III), by forced appointing of housing and jobs (“placement”) to graduates, by destroying villages, by swelling the Hungarian-majority cities with Romanian-speaking people, by means of secret service. During this period of the János Kádár’s politics, which pursued a “prudish” national policy, practically left Hungarians beyond the border to their fate, which could only be changed by the revolutions and free elections of 1989-1990. Meanwhile, two generations grew up more or less isolated from the motherland. After 1990, the threads that bind the two parts of the nation were interwoven again, some Hungarians discovered the “true Hungarian(s) in Székelyness” and Hungarians living in Székelyland were finally able to reach the nation's capital, Budapest, where they were degraded and called “Romanians” due to their citizenship and the territorial location of their place of residence. Where the Hungarian “crop rotation” government either felt obliged to embrace Hungarians beyond the border (Act 2001 LXII. tv. about Hungarians living in neighbouring states), or it attuned the mainlanders against them (national referendum of 5th December 2004). The referendum was fruitless, with 37.49% of those eligible to vote going to vote and the number of “yes” votes was only 3.14% higher than the number of “no” votes. It was then that many individual experiences of the inhabitants of Székelyland became a collective experience, at which time they became aware that they did not belong to the people of the “motherland”, they were different from them. According to Deutsch, we can say that the birth of national consciousness requires something that is collectively conscious in its ethnic group members (Deutsch 1966). In the case of the Székely people, the feeling of being left to their own devices due to the lack of interest in the referendum (Papp Z. 2011) may have strengthened the development of an increasingly assertive Székely “national” identity. The Székely flag, widely known and used today, was adopted by the Székely National Council in January 2004, and its explosive spread and its becoming a symbol of Székely autonomy could

also be brought by the 5th December 2004 referendum¹. The actions presenting Székelyland as an independent geographical unit have multiplied, but they have also been given a prominent role and political support after 2010, owing to the change of government and the consequently changing national policy. The observed social changes also point in the direction that the young Hungarians in Székelyland increasingly regard Transylvania as their homeland, declare themselves to be Székely and consider the political, geographical, ethnic (and national) autonomy of Székelyland acceptable – “the national body [...] requires space for itself” (Hroch 2000, 18). We can also see other preconditions for the “becoming a nation” of the Székely people: a system of common language and customs, an ethnically homogeneous population living in a delimited “own” historical area, a common historical consciousness, national consumption, effective social communication channels, independent and young intellectuals.

Among the young people of Székelyland, the Székely national minority identity is palpable and appears as a competing identity of the Hungarians in the mainland and of the Romanian national identity. Where is this “nation-building” taking, can we even call it nation-building, what is going on within the Székely ethnic group?

From the PTC perspective, the basic question of the dissertation is how a solitary agent can become part of the Székely (national) community, and what additional preparedness (knowledge, preferences, regulators) it needs to have for this. How is a non-inherent community (the nation) constituted (and regulated) by the agents, what kind of presentation, spectation, construction and legitimacy is needed for the Székely agents to see and make see themselves as a non-inherent national community on the basis of their extra preparedness? Where is now the formation of the Székely agents into non-inherent (national) communities, collective agents, is the Székely people legitimate as a national community, can we even talk about some kind of communicative thing in this regard?

2. Methods used

The research is a systematic observation of the views of young Hungarians in Székelyland regarding their identity, seeking answers to questions concerning behaviour, discourse, the use of symbols and identity. In order to create a more accurate and comprehensive picture, several methods were justified (triangulation), the research methods used were 1) the second analysis of representative, large-sample questionnaire youth research after the change of regime through the screening of responses from young adults in Székelyland; 2) individual,

¹ The scientific exploration of this is beyond the scope of the present dissertation, but in the focus group interviews conducted during the research, interviewees are constantly told that the confrontation of the Székely people with the mother nation is linked to the failed national referendum in 2004, and this helped the new Székely flag to become a symbol of Székely autonomy.

semi-structured interviews, and 3) focus group interviews. Processes that can be traced back from secondary analyses can be verified by focus group research. The interview is a particularly suitable method for exploring and symbolically examining the reports held by the society, during focus group interviews, it is possible to map behaviour, and through the behaviour it suggests the processes of the individual and, through it, of the society. By applying these methods together, I try to understand the social processes from the point of view of individuals.

Due to the PTC perspective, I consider communication to be a state, so I consider the readiness available for problem solving to be a state either. And the state can change, so communities can also change. In this sense, individual communities can fall apart or rearrange, creating new ones from/instead of them. So, a change in status can mean that the previous state is preserved, while something in the community changes, something new appears in it besides or instead of the older one. The fact that what the group of young adults in Székelyland think about their own identity and how they relate to the other groups around them can only be examined within that given group. The result shows the current state, it can only be determined, since the attitudes characteristic for a given (ethnic, national) group and the content displayed within the scope of attitudes are not general and can change. All this is a dynamically changing reality, this is why it is not even useful to be generalized.

As a first step of the research, the second analyses were carried out, followed by the organization of individual, semi-structured interviews, during which the topics and questions that are essential for the examination of the Székely identity became apparent. Subsequently, the obtained results were discussed with mini-groups. This gave an accurate picture of the grassroots initiative of identity (Feischmidt 2005), the exploration of the epicentre of important topics, the reactions of young adults to political events, and the confirmation of research interpretation.

2.1. Methodology of second analysis and selection of research

From the large sample, representative questionnaire youth research surveys conducted after the change of regime, those surveys were selected that deal with the national identity of young Hungarian adults in Székelyland in sufficient detail for the purpose of the research. On this basis, seven researches (Kárpát Projekt 1997, Mozaik 2001, Kárpát Panel 2007, Erdélyi Magyar Fiatalok 2008, Kárpát Panel 2010, Erdélyi Magyar Fiatalok 2013, Kincses Kolozsvár 2015) were selected, in which two screenings were applied: 1) Respondents from Maros, Hargita and Kovászna counties, 2) Respondents who were 18-35 year old at the time of the filling out of the questionnaire. In all cases, the examined unit of large-scale youth research is young people, whose national identities, everyday life and future plans were assessed by the researchers. Due to the screenings concerning the settlement and age, the databases are

suitable for the purposes of this thesis. Only the same questions and their corresponding answers were compared during the review, thus avoiding that the different character of the questions may be contributing to the results. The data were collected between 1997 and 2015, and although not all can be considered current, they are excellent databases for detecting changes in national identity. The aim of the current analysis was to examine the national identity of Hungarian-speaking young adults (18-35 years old) in Székelyland, in which the definitions originally used in previous data collections correspond to the purpose of the current analysis, but at the same time it was difficult to unify the variables in some cases, this was indicated separately in the comparisons. I did the second analysis of the databases using SPSS version 21.

2.2. Methodology of individual, semi-structured interviews

Fifteen individual, semi-structured interviews were conducted during the review period. I recorded two interviews in the area along the river Nyárad of the Maros county, where the Hungarian-speaking community identifies itself as Hungarian, Transylvanian Hungarian rather than Székely, although their national symbol system is predominantly the same as that of the Székelys. The region borders directly with Romanian-majority settlements, but also with the definitely Székely-conscious regions. I don't see it as a frontier area, but the phenomenon of "overlapping" is already being felt. The third interview was conducted in Kézdivásárhely, Kovászna county, the easternmost Hungarian-majority town in the Carpathian Basin, where about 85% of the population is Native Hungarian and their mother tongue is Hungarian. I did the other interviews online using several platforms (Skype, Google Meet, Messenger). When recording the interviews, most of the subjects (8 persons) were staying in Székelyland, one person in Kolozsvár (born in Székelyudvarhely) and two were in Budapest (one was born in Marosvásárhely and the other was born in Sepsiszentgyörgy). The discussions took place on the following topics: national identity criteria and affiliations, ethnocentrism, relations with the majority Romanian and the mainland Hungarian society, national symbols and symbols, autonomy efforts and citizenship. During the interviews, data on specific issues were collected with ad hoc analysis, on the one hand, and the identity, intentions and social embeddedness of the subject's actions were explored on the other.

2.3. Methodology of focus group interviews

The third applied qualitative method is one of the most widely used forms of social science research, the focus group interview. A total of 8 focus group interviews were conducted in 7 locations (one online) between 2013 and 2016: Marosvásárhely, Sepsiszentgyörgy, Gyergyószentmiklós, Csíkfalva, Székelyudvarhely and Csíkszereda. When forming focus groups, I took into account sex, age, marital status, occupation, place of residence and type of

settlement. Each time, 3-7 people participated in the conversation (mini-group), which lasted an average of 90-110 minutes. The focus group was organized in cooperation with the teachers of the Sapientia Hungarian University of Transylvania (Sapientia EMTE) and in consultation with local community creators, local companies and Sapientia EMTE students. In the course of the surveys, we have taken into account topics that have been highlighted in previous surveys, such as self-classification, boundary delimitings allowing self-classification, intergroup relationships and coping strategies related to everyday life, which can cause changes in identity. The current policy topics and aspects discussed in the interviews are only presented in so far as they have survived their daily actuality and have been widely integrated into the collective memory in general. I analyzed focus group interviews with Atlas.ti 5.0.

3. Results of the research

In the course of the *second analyses*, I mapped the national identity and the change of the Székelylanders living in one block along the following seven categories:

- national identity criteria: degree of state national or cultural national identity,
- forms and statements of national ethnocentrism and citizenship centrism,
- emotional experience of the feeling of being Hungarian,
- national origin (affiliation),
- living as a Hungarian national in Romania,
- national policy aspects: the Hungarian status law and the dual citizenship,
- the idea of emigration.

The changes that started within the society of Székelyland are witnessed by the fact that in 2007 the question and the possibility of answering it concerning the Székely self-classification already appeared in the research used for second analyses. Among the examined group, cultural national identity is more typical than state national identity. Respondents considered it extremely important that those who are Hungarian should feel the Hungarian culture as their own, that is, knowledge of Hungarian culture and the positive relationship to it are one of the most important pillars of Hungarian identity for them. They regard Hungarian identity as an advantage rather than a disadvantage, and there are more and more people who do not consider it absolutely necessary to live among Hungarians for most of their lives. In the context of their identity, respondents considered Hungarian citizenship to be of little importance and the proportion of those who agreed to the condition to some extent also showed a decreasing degree. The Hungarian mother tongue was considered a condition that is necessary for feeling Hungarian, being accepted as Hungarian and the proportion of those who considered it an absolutely necessary criterion showed a strong increase. The study of ethnocentrism showed that the respondents are generally strongly but not extremely

dismissive of the Romanian state, although more than two thirds explicitly rejected identification with the Romanian ethnic. The decline in critical attitudes towards one's own nation is indicative of an increase in ethnocentrism. If national self-classification turned up as a group membership, two thirds of the respondents preferred to declare themselves Hungarians from Transylvania/Székelyland/Romania and one third just Hungarians (without additional attribute). However, if the researcher forced the respondent to answer yes or no, the proportion of respondents claiming to belong to the Hungarian nation is over 90%. If the Székely ethnicity was included in the list of answers, the Transylvanian and the Hungarian from Transylvania retained two thirds of the votes, but the Hungarian category fell back to 20% and nearly 16% of the respondents consciously chose Székely. Székely was also elected as a secondary group membership by a 16% share, but the number of people marking the Hungarian category also increased, which shows that the Hungarian consciousness of the group examined is not in line with the Hungarian "mother country's" national consciousness. The surveys show little change in culturally hereditary issues – these are inherited through socialization – and until 2010 there was a decrease in Hungarian consciousness and then a slight increase, upon the judgment based on daily experience. The Székely self-consciousness and with it the Székely self-classification show an increase, the meaning of the word also changes, in some cases and in some qualities it is a means of separation and delimitation. Extreme ethnocentrism is not typical among the target group studied, and their attitude is typically more of a cultural nation than of a state-forming nation. In the case of the people of Székelyland, the concept of homeland does not play a prominent role in self-determination. If it yet does, it is increasingly related to Transylvania and Székelyland, so the concept of "beyond the border" in the discourses is increasingly separate from its meaning in Hungary.

One of the most important experiences of the *individual, semi-structured interviews* is that the minority life earmarks the lives of subjects. Identity is a framework that the agent fills with his personal life story and interprets the world around him through a set of knowledge possessed by his community. The linguistic form of ethnic repression represents a grievance for some people, others adapt to the circumstances. The ethnocentrism of the local majority is like the settled occupying aliens, the larger-scale analogue of which is represented by the Hungarians living in a block within the Romanians of nearly twenty million people. Nevertheless, the Hungarians living in local majority call for dialogue with the majority nation, and consider its local numerical majority as a sufficient negotiating position, because for them the local community is more important than the "imagined" national community. Therefore, the functioning of the majority national state is represented as a fight against minorities, although they often do not consider themselves a minority, even being in minority, if they classify themselves as belonging to the block Hungarian nation. Knowledge of the

Romanian language, even if some people speak the “kitchen language” of it incompletely, is considered a cultural surplus, thus indicating openness, willingness to cooperate and cultural superiority. National auto- and hetero-stereotypes greatly shape national identity, and the hetero-stereotypes are opinions about the other group (Romanians and Hungarians in Hungary), which, to varying degrees, contain both positive and negative elements, are greatly influenced by entrenched clichés, relationships and jointly experienced events. Reviews of your own group mostly contain positive elements (auto-stereotypes). A certain degree of rapprochement to the Romanian society can be observed, the coexistence, the cooperation and the everyday events provide them with a constitutive basis, as opposed to the Hungarian society that is increasingly moving away physically and mentally. Individuals are striving to develop a positive social identity (Tajfel 1978), which is the cornerstone of the survival of the community, one of its possible forms is the getting in “majority” based on the history, customs and norms of the community, which is feasible due to their numerical majority in Székelyland. Another form is the social integration, i.e. reducing the differences with the members of the majority Romanian state, it seems to be implemented along the everyday coexistence, way of life, lines of economic coping strategies, and its final form is assimilation, which is a less dangerous process due to their majority position in Székelyland.

As earlier, the participants of the *focus group interview* were characterized by the characteristics of cultural national identity, and the basics of ethnic self-classification were interpreted along the lines of kinship, preservation of traditions, religion, language, history and stigmatization. The characterful codes of otherness and exclusivity are embodied in the so-called “góbé-specifics” [“góbé” is a positive-humorous nickname of the Székelys], the interviewees named the ingenuity, the quirkiness, the stubbornness, the determination and the sense of mission as the most characteristic Székely qualities. Among the group appeared the proud self-awareness, the pride connected with the origin, the autonomy, which reinforced auto-stereotypes. One of the pillars of the formation of uniqueness and character is the relationship to the objects of ethnic culture, which creates the possibility of differentiation (but does not always constitute sharp differences), the Székely anthem, the Székely flag and the sport were the three most important elements determined among the group examined. It is important to note that about half of the interviewees treated the mainlanders as “they”, so the auto-stereotypy could be interpreted as hetero-stereotypy. The minority situation can also manifest itself as a compulsion to prove itself, two types of which were distinguished by the interviewees: the “big vest” and the quietly lingering, tradition-following Székely. I tried to form identity ideal types from the data of the focus group interviews, I compared the data providers with the help of eight variables, and although I cannot say that I could have recognized independent types as an intersection of self-classification and variables, two larger

groups were outlined: 1) Székely, Transylvanian Hungarian and Székely-Hungarian, and 2) Hungarian self-classification groups. At the same time, it is important to note that in the case of the two most distant groups of each other – “Székely” and “Hungarian” – there is more in common than with what they differ.

4. Summary of conclusions

Showing up as an independent nation is most likely to occur in situations where there is an essentially monolingual and monocultural ethnic group living in large numbers and in a block, which can separate itself linguistically and culturally sharply from those around them, and it is not an obstacle if there is an ethnicity or nation of similar culture or language separately in space. In such a case, ethnic self-identification shows the triadic relations of Brubaker (Brubaker 1996), in this case concerning the relationship between the Romanian and Hungarian states and the people of Székelyland. The national ideology of the nation-strengthening nationalism characteristic of the Romanian state is ethnocultural, and due to their majority consciousness, the pressure on the minority is an everyday practice, which is most often manifested in the use of languages (the Romanian state reclaims the necessity to know the state language from its citizens) and in the denial of the existence of the Székely people (if they do not exist, they do not have collective rights). The reason for not knowing, rejecting or even refusing a foreign language is in some cases the rejection of the foreign language and culture of the “occupier” (Szabó 2006; 2016). For the examined age group, the resulting conflicts are determining memories, since the questioning of their existence (Székelyland does not exist, those who claim to be Székelys are actually Hungarized Romanians) is often a recurrent grievance, as is also the stigmatization (calling the Hungarians mockingly “Bozgors”, which allegedly means “a person without a homeland”), which, through categorization, enhances the strengthening of the Székely national minority identity. Consequently, young people in Székelyland are more dismissive than accepting (although the proportions are varied at the local level), and the stereotypes and prejudices are interpreted along the lines of various interethnic relationships, stigmatisation and aggression. The “mother country” nationalism characteristic of the Hungarian state considers its mission and right to monitor the fate of the minority. On the part of Hungarian society, however, young people in Székelyland experience discrimination, resulting in the loss of the homeland and the strengthening of the minority national identity. The failure of the referendum of 5 December 2004, identified by the people of Székelyland with a sense of oppression and of being abandoned, was also added to this (Papp Z. 2011). According to young people, the attitude of the Hungarian and Romanian society to the minority community is hardly different. During the second analyses and individual interviews a largely accepting attitude

could be experienced, but during the focus group interviews the Hungarian identity was marginalized and the Székely national identity came to the fore, the terms of separation were constantly present. According to my understanding, the reason for the difference lies in the research methodology, because the group dynamics of the focus group interviews and the interaction of interviewees created, through thematization, an opportunity to overshadow the expected responses. The third component of the Brubaker Triad is the nationalism of minorities, which makes it “natural” to make demands on the majority state, such as recognition, legitimacy and autonomy. In order to achieve all this, the keeping together and closedness are considered the most important virtues of the people of Székelyland, the source of which is pride connected with origin and territorial identity.

The subjects of the research mostly defined their national identity as birth-related rights, naming their ancestors as a reference. For them, the “own” national group exists as a continuous self-justification on a dual field, the ambivalence of contempt and appreciation, mixed emotions and unexplained misconceptions characterize the relationship between the Székely minority and the Hungarians in the mainland. A group of young people did not sharply separate the Székelys from the Hungarians, but for others the “Hungarians” increasingly carried the dissension and the feeling of constant humiliation recognizable behind the “shop window keeping together”, but the number of people feeling ashamed was low.

As a result of the slow change in national consciousness measured by a series of large sample researches among the study group, a significant number of subjects began to amplify elements of Székely ethnic identity. Small differences in common identity elements have been noticed and magnified to the extent that they correspond to the new “national” identity. The components of the Hungarian cultural national identity have begun to be replaced by the characteristics, behaviours and symbols of the term “Székely”, by which the Hungarian national identity gradually becomes a Székely national identity with the fading of the term “Hungarian”. The period of separation spans several generations, driven by the common experience of the generations (being called a “Romanian” by fellow Hungarians, traditions, way of life), collective memory (referendum, feeling left to themselves), auto- and hetero-stereotypes (being a proud “góbé”, “Székely” language and way of life) and cultural memory (historical past, “Transylvanianism”). Their identity is basically shown in two directions, they distance themselves from both the majority Romanian and the majority Hungarian society, but in many cases the collective experience of coexistence has shown a greater rapprochement towards Romanians than towards Hungarians in Hungary. Nevertheless, categorizing them as Romanians is a gross violation of their identity, a measure of ignorance, but it points to a strange dichotomy: what on the part of Romanians, together with the “Bozgoring” (see

above), is a nationalist manifestation, while on the part of Hungarians it is a measure of lack of national attitude. According to them, the lack of national attitude is one of the most important dividing lines between Székelys and Hungarians, but they also form a border along the “tápos” (nourishment-fed people) and “nyávogó” (meowing) stereotypes, while also ethnicizing the Hungarians from Hungary (Papp Z. 2012), one of the means of which is the two adjectives mentioned above and the other differentiating categories. This phenomenon was palpable throughout the research.

The Romanian majority society is divided into Transylvanian and trans-Carpathian parts, the latter is clearly rejected by stereotypes and prejudices, and the Romanians in Transylvania are more accepted, especially locally, by those who live with them. This is because, in the safety of their home, people are more likely to notice the positive and constructive behaviour of Romanian nationals. The phenomenon is based on the long-lasting integrant emotions modified by positive episodic feelings (Forgács 2003), but a stereotypical, prejudiced behaviour is “expected” against those beyond the Carpathians. Neither the Hungarian nor the Romanian national identity can be matched with the Székely “national” identity, but we are not part of the birth of a new nation, but a change in the national consciousness affecting a part of the totality of Hungarians – essentially the Hungarians in Székelyland. This process can be influenced by the current (national) policy in Hungary and Romania, but the real danger is the economy-motivated exodus of young people and the emptying of the age tree from the bottom.

From the PTC perspective, the basic question of the dissertation was how can and will become an individual agent in the Székely (national) community, what additional preparedness (knowledge, preferences, regulators, etc.) it needs to have for this. How is a non-inherent community (the nation) constituted (and regulated) by the agents, what presentation, spectation, construction and legitimacy is needed for the Székely agents to see and make themselves seen as a non-inherent national community in the possession of their extra preparedness? Where is the process of formation of the Székely agents into non-inherent (national) communities, into collective agents, are the Székelys legitimate as a national community, can we even talk about some kind of communicative in this regard? The answer will not, of course, be yes or no, because although I regard communication as a state, becoming a nation, the formation of a nation can (also) be interpreted as a process in which “milestones” are presented as a state. Milestones can be described as communicative states, and I will attempt to describe one of these states below.

Identity is a framework that the agent fills with his personal life story and its attributes. I have attempted to explore the own world of individual agents through interviews, in which identity is the result of specific integration. I have no reason to question the descriptive

content of the integration of identity, and the scope of action emerging from the identity of those in the target group of the research – as a reminder: young people aged 18-35 in Székelyland – allows them to speak legitimately about the Székely national identity in connection with their Székely identity. The essential descriptive content of national identity is the main national identity criteria (preparedness): the self-classification, the own (and specific) language, the symbols, the homeland, the history, the “góbé-specifics”, the holidays, the relation to others (stigmatization, language conflicts, autonomy, pride, etc.), the preservation of traditions and religiosity. The emergence of identity as a national feature is possible through national identity criteria, through the preparedness that constitutes the nation, through the institutions that the agents have interiorized, that is, in order to present themselves as an independent Székely nation, as a non-inherent community and collective agent, they must be sharing common and mutual preparedness from the nation as a collective agent. This share was not palpable in the showing up of the agents’ own world. The space, possibilities for action and actions of individual agents do not extend further than the conflict-free presentation of certain attributes of the nation (e.g. flag, anthem, preservation of traditions, keeping together), which also sets the boundary of the sphere of action. The specific scene of being an independent nation is much narrower and thus more conflicting than that of the collective agents presenting themselves as a legitimate nation. The categorical space of action of the individual agents with Székely identity cannot be called an independent national scene *in vitro*, because it is only partially discussed and presented, its boundary is conflicting, its language is under formation and the agents are not factually prepared to use the sphere of action and to (re)define its boundaries. Their competence *in vivo* does not extend further than the possibility of establishing a negotiating horizon, although some individual agents wished to present themselves as legitimate Székely national identities in such a sphere that is not currently legitimate as a nation – without a common constitutive basis, they cannot enter into a communicative state with other agents. Thus, the individual agents of Székely national identity constituted a scene for their appearance, but at the same time their space of action, which they can legitimately use, is much narrower – a group of individual agents with Székely national identity. Will they be able to show up themselves as a collective agent with a Székely national identity?

Anderson describes the nation as an imagined community (Anderson 1983), whose members mostly don’t know each other, but believe that there are many other individual agents who consider themselves part of that national collective agent. Their common (surplus) preparedness allows them to manifest themselves as a nation, and belonging to the nation is an integral part of their own world, supported by the nation as a collective agent with its preparednesses. Its communication scene is created by the arrangement of the individual

agents' own world. The assembly of the agents' own world concerns the part of their own world which is associated with the preparednesses of national identity criteria and constitutes the collective agent's own world. "The arrangement is permanent if mutual knowledge does not require continuous reflection." (Domschitz – Hamp 2007, 142) A lasting organization also means permanent scenes in which the resulting collectives have a collective own world. X The collective agent thus constituted exists separately from the individual agents, but not independently of them, and possesses some kind of autonomy and institutions. In the course of the researches, the independent institution linked to the collective agent of the independent Székely nation was not palpable, the own world of individual agents with Székely identity was predominantly organized along the lines of ethnic/cultural preparedness, therefore it did not require continuous (self-)reflection and regulation. However, this does not mean that the agents with Székely ethnicity, or some of them, would not attempt to establish the communicative basis of a Székely nation as a collective agent, as confirmed by the focus group interviews. Their related attitudes and attitude objects converge, and the integration of agents has been strengthened during the period covered by the research. It should be borne in mind that the adaptive creation and stability (sometimes crisis and dissolution) of the collective agent, including the nation, reflects the availability of the (accessible) surplus preparedness of the individual agents who make it up. Its scope of action and consequently its room for manoeuvre (→ scene) are characterized by its degree of stability. The stability of the Székely ethnically based collective agent is high and does not require constant self-reflection. The collective agent of the Székely nation already has a demonstrable dynamic and little stability (in change), but the themes of his internal publicity are expanding (e.g. the relationship to Hungarian national symbols vs. Székely "national" symbols, the relationship to the motherland and Romania), i.e. through thematicization his available surplus preparedness is enhanced. The thematicization not only means that the discourse about the Székely ethnic group as a nation has recently become legitimate, but also the way it was communicated in the past has changed: the possibility of separation from the Hungarian nation has gained ground in the target group, and not through focus group interviews.

The preparedness of the Székely ethnically based collective agent, like all collective agents, is rooted in the preparedness of the individual agents who make up him, and if individual agents are forced to adapt, they are forced to change their preparedness – the change is obviously related to the recognition of the problem to some extent. If the preparedness that forms the national identity is affected by the need for adaptation, then changes in national identity also cause changes in the collective agent's preparedness – in its own world. Assuming, but not considering proved, if the failure of the December 2004 referendum caused a compulsion of adaptation for hundreds of thousands of Székely

ethnically identified individual agents with Hungarian national identities, then the recognized problem and its resolution, through the feeling of disappointment and self-abandonment, could lead to the recognition of the independent Székely nation as an accessible desirable state meaning the solving the problem.

Summarizing the results of my research as a closing sentence, it can be stated that the Székely as a nation has no collective agent constituency base, its publicity is very limited, but in the publicity of the collective agent with Székely ethnic identity it is already possible to present and discuss in a legitimate way about the collective agent constitutive basis of the Székely nation, the surplus preparedness of its own world.

5. Main references

5.1. Printed source list

- ANDERSON, BENEDICT (2006) [1983] *Elképzelt közösségek. Gondolatok a nacionalizmus eredetéről és elterjedéséről.* (ford. Sonkoly Gábor) Atelier füzetek, 8., L'Harmattan – Atelier, Budapest. 44-51., 138-170.
- BIRÓ A. ZOLTÁN – BODÓ JULIANNA (2011) *A „hargitaiság”. Egy régió kultúraépítési gyakorlatáról.* In: Szimbolikus térhasználat: ünnepek, jelképek. Szerk.: Bodó Julianna. Alutus Kiadó, 66-72.
- BODÓ BARNÁ (2013) *Kisebbségi magyar fiatalok identitásváltozatai.* In: Szabó A., Bauer B., Pillók P. (szerk.): MOZAIK2011 – Magyar fiatalok a Kárpát-medencében. Kutatási jelentés. Belvedere. Szeged-Budapest.
- BODÓ JULIANNA – BIRÓ A. ZOLTÁN (2000) *Szimbolikus térfoglalási eljárások.* In: Miénk a tér? Szimbolikus térhasználat a székelyföldi régióban. (szerk. Bodó Julianna). Pro-Print Kiadó, Csíkszereda, 9-42.
- BOURDIEU, PIERRE (1985) *Az identitás és a reprezentáció. A régió fogalmának kritikai elemzése.* Szociológiai Figyelő (1): 7–22.
- BRUBAKER R., FEISCHMIDT M., FOX J., GRANCEA L. (2006) *Nationalist Politics and Everyday Ethnicity in a Transylvanian Town,* Princeton: University Press.
- BRUBAKER, ROGERS (1996) *Ártalmas állítások.* (ford. Neményi László) In: Beszélő (1. évf.) 7. sz. 26. <http://beszelo.c3.hu/cikkek/artalmas-allitasok> [2013. 03. 18. 21:35]
- BRUBAKER, ROGERS (2007) *Nacionalizmus új keretek között.* (ford. Erdősi Péter) L'Harmattan Kiadó, Budapest.
- CASTELLS, MANUEL (2006) [1996] *Az identitás hatalma.* (ford. Berényi Gábor, Rohonyi András) Gondolat – Infonia, Budapest.
- CSATA ZSOMBOR – KISS DÉNES – VERES VALÉR (2007) *Kárpát Panel – Erdély. Gyorsjelentés 2007.* In: Papp Z. Attila, Veres Valér (szerk.): Kárpát Panel 2007. A

- Kárpát-medencei magyarok társadalmi helyzete és perspektívái. Gyorsjelentés. MTA Etnikai-Nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet. Budapest.
- CSEPELI GYÖRGY (1992) *Nemzet által homályosan*. Századvég, Budapest.
- CSEPELI GYÖRGY – ÖRKÉNY ANTAL – SZÉKELYI MÁRIA – CSERE GÁBOR (1998): *Jelentés a Tündérkertből. Romániai magyarok és románok nemzeti identitásmintái Erdélyben*. In: Társadalmi riport, Kolosi Tamás – Tóth István György – Vukovich György (szerk.). Budapest, TÁRKI, 527-548.
- DE CILLIA, R.; REISIGL, M.; WODAK, R. (1999) *The Discursive Construction of National Identities*. In: Discourse Society, 1999, 10. sz. 149.
- DOMSCHITZ MÁTYÁS – HAMP GÁBOR (2007) *A kommunikáció színtereiről*. In: Horányi Özséb (szerk.) *A kommunikáció mint participáció*. Budapest, AKTI-Typotex, 101-174.
- ELEKES TIBOR (2011) *Székelyföld közigazgatás-földrajzi változásai a 13. századtól napjainkig*. Földrajzi Közlemények 135. 4., 415–429.
- ERCSEI KÁLMÁN (2017) *Ifjúságkutatás Romániában 1989-et követően*. In: Változó kisebbség. Kárpát-medencei magyar fiatalok. A GeneZYS 2015 kutatás eredményei. (2017) Papp Z. Attila (szerk.) Mathias Corvinus Collegium – Tihanyi Alapítvány – MTA Társadalomtudományi Kutatóközpont Kisebbségkutató Intézet, Budapest, 91-133.
- GEERTZ, CLIFFORD (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books, New York.
- HORÁNYI ÖZSÉB (2007) *A kommunikáció participációra alapozott felfogásáról*. In: Horányi Özséb (szerk.) *A kommunikáció mint participáció*. AKTI–Typotex, Budapest, 246-264.
- HORÁNYI ÖZSÉB – SZABÓ LEVENTE (2007) *A kommunikáció ágenséről*. In: Horányi Özséb (szerk.) *A kommunikáció mint participáció*. AKTI – Typotex, Budapest, 175-236.
- KARL DEUTSCH (1966) *Nationalism and Social Communication*. 2nd. ed. M. I. T. Press, New York.
- KÁNTOR ZOLTÁN (2000) *Kisebbségi nemzetépítés – a romániai magyarság, mint nemzetépítő kisebbség*. In: Regio (11. évf.) 3. sz. 219-241.
- Kárpát Panel 2007. A Kárpát-medencei magyarok társadalmi helyzete és perspektívái. Gyorsjelentés*. (2007) PAPP Z. ATTILA, VERES VALÉR (szerk.) MTA Etnikai-Nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet, Budapest.
- KISS TAMÁS – BARNA GERGŐ – SÓLYOM ZSUZSA (2008) *Erdélyi magyar fiatalok 2008. Közvélemény-kutatás az erdélyi magyar fiatalok társadalmi helyzetéről és elvárásairól. Összehasonlító gyorsjelentés*. Institutul pentru studierea problemei minorităților naționale (ISPMN), Kolozsvár.

- KISS TAMÁS (2015) *Increasing Marginality, Ethnic Parallelism and Asymmetric Accommodation. Social and Political Processes Concerning the Hungarian Community of Transylvania*. *Minority Studies* 18.
- Measuring Identity. A Guide for Social Scientists*. (2009) ABDELAL, HERRERA; JOHNSTON, MCDERMOTT (eds.). Cambridge University Press.
- MERTON, ROBERT K., FISKE, MARJORIE ÉS KENDALL, PATRICIA L. (1956): *The Focused Interview. A Manual Of Problems And Procedures*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press. Megjelent a Tömegkommunikációs Kutatóközpont Módszertani Sorozatában, VIII. évfolyam, 35. szám
- MOZAIK2001. *Gyorsjelentés. Magyar fiatalok a Kárpát-medencében*. (2002) In: SZABÓ ANDREA, BAUER BÉLA, LAKI LÁSZLÓ, NEMESKÉRI ISTVÁN (szerk.) Nemzeti Ifjúságkutató Intézet. Budapest.
- MOZAIK2011 – *Magyar fiatalok a Kárpát-medencében. Kutatási jelentés*. (2013) In: BAUER BÉLA, PILLÓK PÉTER, SZABÓ ANDREA (szerk.) Belvedere. Szeged-Budapest.
- PETE KRISZTIÁN – P. SZILCZL DÓRA (2007) A kommunikáció intézményeiről. In: Horányi Özséb (szerk.) *A kommunikáció mint participáció*. Budapest, AKTI – Typotex, 17-100.
- SÍKLAKI ISTVÁN (2006) *Vélemények mélyén. A fókuszcsoporthoz tartozó módszer, a kvalitatív közvélemény-kutatás alapszere*. Kossuth Kiadó, Budapest.
- SMITH, ANTHONY D. (2001) [1991] *National Identity*. Penguin Books, London
- SZABÓ MIKLÓS (1989) Program és állapotideológiák. In: Tallár Ferenc (szerk.): *Politikai kultúra Magyarországon. 1896-1986. Medvetánc könyvek, Atlantis Program*. 93-108.
- TÖNNIES, F. (1983) *Közösség és társadalom*. (ford. Berényi Gábor, Tatár György) Gondolat Kiadó, Budapest.
- VERES VALÉR (2005a) *Nemzeti identitás Erdélyben – szociológiai olvasatban*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- VERES VALÉR (2005b) *Az erdélyi magyar fiatalok nemzeti identitását meghatározó tényezők*. In: Csata István – Csata Zsombor – Erdei Itala – Gábor Kálmán – Nagy (Bernáth) Julianna Krisztina, Papp Z. Attila – Veres Valér (szerk.) *A perifériáról a centrumba*. Belvedere Meridionale, Szeged.
- VERES VALÉR – PAPP Z. ATTILA – GEAMBAŞU RÉKA – KISS DÉNES – MÁRTON JÁNOS – KISS ZITA (2012) *Szociológiai mintázatok. Erdélyi magyarok a Kárpát Panel vizsgálatai alapján*. Nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet (ISPMN) Kiadó, Kolozsvár.
- WEBER, MAX (1998) *A társadalomtudományi és társadalompolitikai megismerés „objektivitása”*. In Wessely Anna (szerk.): *Tanulmányok*. Osiris: Budapest. 7-69.

5.2. Other source list

BAKK MIKLÓS ÉS MTSAI: *Kerettörvény a régiókról (Az autonómia-csomagterv része, 2003)*. http://adatbank.transindex.ro/html/cim_pdf501.pdf [letöltés dátuma: 2018. 10. 12. 14:50]

Lege pentru modificarea legii Nr. 2/1968 privind organizarea administrativă a teritoriului Republicii Socialiste România. (1968) Buletinul Oficial, București.

Manualul personalului de recensamint [Népszámlálási útmutató] (1991)

http://colectaredate.insse.ro/phc/metadata/RO_Manual1992_RO.pdf, 95-96. p. [letöltés dátuma 2018. 11. 10., 19:40]

Recensământul general al populației și al locuințelor din anul 1992 (1994) Vol. I.-IV. București, Comisia Națională de Statistică

Recensământul general al populației și al locuințelor din anul 2002 (2003) Rezultate parțiale. București, Institutul Național de Statistică

Recensământul general al populației și al locuințelor din anul 2011. Vol. I.-II. <http://www.recensamantromania.ro/noutati/volumul-ii-populatia-stabila-rezidenta-structura-etnica-si-confesionala/> [2018. 06. 21. 10:08]

SZÉKELYFÖLD AUTONÓMIA STATÚTUMA.

http://sznt.sic.hu/hu-sic/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=15%3Aszekelyfoeld-autonomia-statutum&catid=10%3Astatutum&Itemid=14&lang=fa [letöltés dátuma 2018. 10. 12., 15:49]

A székely székek közigazgatási változásait összegző térképgyűjtemény elérhetősége: Az erdélyi megyék közigazgatási határainak változása a középkortól napjainkig. Erdélyi Magyar Adatbank, Kolozsvár. (<http://elekes.adatbank.transindex.ro>)

6. Own publications on this topic and co-authored publications

6.1. Conference book

András Hanga (2017): *Többségi tudattal, kisebbségiként élni Székelyföldön – esettanulmány*.

In: Bakó, Rozália Klára; Lajos, Katalin; Hubbes, László Attila; Tapodi, Zsuzsa (szerk.) *Idegen - Strainul - Stranger : Kivonatok - Interdiszciplináris konferencia Csíkszereda, Románia : Sapientia Erdélyi Magyar Tudományegyetem, Csíkszeredai Műszaki- és Társadalomtudományi Kar, Társadalomtudományi Tanszék*, pp. 16-17., 2 p.

András Hanga (2017): *A székely identitás szerepe a Székelyföldről elvándoroltak hazatérésében*. In: Keresztes, Gábor; Kohus, Zsolt; Szabó, P. Katalin; Tokody, Dániel

(szerk.) Tavaszi Szél Konferencia 2017: Nemzetközi Multidiszciplináris Konferencia:
Absztraktkötet

Budapest, Magyarország: Doktoranduszok Országos Szövetsége (DOSZ) (2017) 477 p. p.
207, 1 p.

András Hanga (2015): *A várpalotai Trianon Múzeum nemzeti mitológiai kollázsa*. In: *Új magyar mitológia: a szakralizált őstörténet médiaprezentációi és rítusai*: II. SZEMEISZTOSZ Konferencia a magyar alternatív történettudat diskurzusairól. Sepsiszentgyörgy, Románia: Sapientia Erdélyi Magyar Tudományegyetem, Csíkszeredai Műszaki- és Társadalomtudományi Kar, Társadalomtudományi Tanszék, 19 p. pp. 5-5., 1 p.

András Hanga (2015): *Többségi tudattal, kisebbségi románként élni Székelyföldön: esettanulmány*. In: Csiszár, Imre (szerk.) Tavaszi szél: absztraktkötet 2015. Budapest, Magyarország: Publio Kiadó, Doktoranduszok Országos Szövetsége (DOSZ) (2015) 485 p. p. 31

András Hanga (2014): *Erdélyi magyar kisebbségi nemzeti identitás a Nemzeti Összetartozás Napjának tükrében*. In: Csiszár, Imre; Kőmíves, Péter Miklós (szerk.) Tavaszi Szél 2014 / Spring Wind 2014: II. kötet Állam- és jogtudomány, közigazgatás tudomány, had- és rendészettudomány, Debrecen, Magyarország: Doktoranduszok Országos Szövetsége (DOSZ) (2014) p. 28

6.2. Online journal

András Hanga (2021): *A 2019-es romániai elnökválasztás második fordulója a székelyföldi megyékben*. SZÉKELYFÖLD - TERRA SICULORUM 25: 3 pp. 73-91., 19 p.

András Hanga (2020): *A székely identitás szerepe a Székelyföldről elvándoroltak hazatérésében – egy hiányzó stratégia*. KISEBBSÉGI SZEMLE 5: 1 pp. 63-93., 30 p.

András Hanga (2020): *Változó székely identitás. A nemzettudat sajátosságai a székelyföldi fiatalok körében*. HONISMERET 48: 3 pp. 42-49., 8 p.

András Hanga (2020): *A székelyföldi románság mint kisebbség: Esettanulmány*. KULTÚRA ÉS KÖZÖSSÉG 11: III pp. 21-28., 8 p.

András Hanga (2015): *Csikfalva község identitásformáló székely motívumai*. JEL-KÉP: KOMMUNIKÁCIÓ KÖZVÉLEMÉNY MÉDIA 2015/4 pp. 3-8., 6 p.

6.3. Book chapter

András Hanga (2019): *A nemzeti identitás megőrzésének közösségi módszerei*. In: Gasparics, Judit; Ruda, Gábor; Székely, András Bertalan; Szabó, Palócz Attila; Kovács, András; Dupka, György; András, Hanga; Nick, Ferenc; Radvánszky, Ferenc Kárpátalja -

Oktatás, kultúra, hitélet és nyelvi folyamatok. Pilisvörösvár, Magyarország: Muravidék Baráti Kör Kulturális Egyesület, 116 p. pp. 43-59., 16 p.

András Hanga (2017): *Az identitás kulturális szimbólumai. Stílusorientált közösségek relacionális konstrukciója*. In: András, Hanga (szerk.) *Kommunikációs terek 2017*. Budapest, Magyarország, Sepsiszentgyörgy, Románia: T3 Kiadó, Doktoranduszok Országos Szövetsége (DOSZ) pp. 134-146., 12 p.

András Hanga (2015): *Erdélyi magyar kisebbségi nemzeti identitás a Nemzeti Összetartozás Napjának tükrében – Sajtóelemzés*. In: András, Hanga (szerk.) *Kommunikációs terek*. Budapest, Magyarország, Nagyvárad, Románia: Új Mandátum Könyvkiadó, 176 p. pp. 48-58., 10 p.

6.4. Book editing

Kommunikációs terek 2018. András Hanga - Lips, Adrián (szerk.) Budapest, Magyarország, Sepsiszentgyörgy, Románia: T3 Kiadó, Doktoranduszok Országos Szövetsége (DOSZ), 206 p. (ISBN: 9789731962726)

Kommunikációs terek 2017. András Hanga (szerk.) Budapest, Magyarország, Sepsiszentgyörgy, Románia: T3 Kiadó, Doktoranduszok Országos Szövetsége (DOSZ), 217 p. (ISBN: 9789731962658)

Kommunikációs terek 2016. András Hanga (szerk.) Budapest, Magyarország, Sepsiszentgyörgy, Románia: T3 Kiadó, Doktoranduszok Országos Szövetsége (DOSZ), 198 p. (ISBN: 9786155586026 ISBN: 9789731962597)

Kommunikációs terek. András Hanga (szerk.) (2015) Budapest, Magyarország, Nagyvárad, Románia: Új Mandátum Könyvkiadó, 176 p. (ISBN: 9786158004473)

6.5. Co-authored studies

András Hanga - Szakács István (2018): *Egy városi identitáskutatás módszertani dilemmái*. In: András, Hanga; Lips, Adrián (szerk.) *Kommunikációs terek 2018*. Budapest, Magyarország, Sepsiszentgyörgy, Románia: T3 Kiadó, Doktoranduszok Országos Szövetsége (DOSZ), 206 p. pp. 105-115., 11 p.

András, Hanga - Szakács István (2016): *"Osztt a Heinekentől loptuk vóna?": a nemzeti identitás mint márkatényező - az igazi Csíki Sör*. In: András, Hanga (szerk.) *Kommunikációs terek 2016*. Budapest, Magyarország, Sepsiszentgyörgy, Románia: T3 Kiadó, Doktoranduszok Országos Szövetsége (DOSZ), 198 p. pp. 105-117., 13 p.

6.6. Lectures on the subject

András Hanga (2019): *A székely nemzet épülése*. I. Interdiszciplináris konferencia a Kárpát-medencei magyarság társadalmi és gazdasági helyzetéről (Miskolc, 2019. november 8-9.)

- András Hanga (2017): *Nemzeti elemek a marketingkommunikációban - egy székelyföldi sör esete*. XXII. Bolyai Konferencia (Budapest, 2017. március 18.)
- András Hanga (2017): *A székely identitás szerepe a Székelyföldről elvándoroltak hazatérésében*. XX. Tavaszi Szél konferencia (Miskolc, 2017. március 31-április 2.)
- András Hanga (2017): *Az emlékezet kanonizálása - csíkfalviak történeteiből*. Szimbiózis - Kulturális Antropológiai Fesztivál (Budapest, 2017. május 12-13.)
- András Hanga (2016): *Az Igazi Csíki Sör mint identitásformáló székely brand*. Fiatal Kommunikációkutatók Fóruma (Csíkszereda, 2016. május 30.)
- András Hanga (2015): *Emléknap, gyásznap, győzelmi ünnep?: A Nemzeti Összetartozás Napjának értelmezései*. Megmaradni, de hogyan? Adalékok a közösségi identitás szempontjainak interdiszciplináris megközelítéséhez című nemzetközi konferencia (Csíkszereda, 2015. november 7.)
- András Hanga - Szakács, István (2015): *"Oszt a Heinekentől loptunk vóna?": A nemzeti identitás mint márkatényező - az igazi Csíki Sör*. Tudományos Hét - Vezetés- és vállalkozástudományi és Közgazdaságtudományi szekció, (Dunaújváros, 2015. november 10.)
- András Hanga (2015): *Kisebbségi sors saját országban: az ember és tragédiája részeként*. In: Szimbiózis Kulturális Antropológiai Fesztivál (Budapest, 2015. április 24.)
- András Hanga (2014): *Versengő identitáspolitikák az erdélyi magyar kisebbségi nemzeti identitás alakításában*. BCE Társadalmi Kommunikáció Doktori Iskola zárókonferencia, (Budapest, 2014. június 20.)
- András Hanga (2014): *Nyárádménte identitásformáló székely motívumai*. Magyar Kommunikációtudományi Társaság: Kommunikáció, kreativitás, kultúra 2014 konferencia, (Budapest, 2014. november 28.)
- Szakács István - András Hanga (2013): *Historizmus és identitásformálás*. Tudományos Hét - Egyhetes konferenciasorozat a Dunaújvárosi Főiskolán a TÁMOP-4.2.3-12/1/KONV-2012-0051 számú, "Tudományos eredmények elismerése és disszeminációja a Dunaújvárosi Főiskolán" c. pályázat támogatásával, Dunaújvárosi Főiskola (2013. november 11-15.)

7. Appendix

The thesis contains a 44-page appendix with diagrams, graphs, tables and textual elements that, although not included in the main text, are an important part of the thesis.