Acta Beregsasiensis

A II. Rákóczi Ferenc Kárpátaljai Magyar Főiskola tudományos évkönyve

Науковий вісник Закарпатського угорського інституту ім. Ф. Ракоці II

> A Scholarly Annual of Ferenc Rákóczi II. Hungarian College of Transcarpathia

> > 2009 VIII. évfolyam, 2. kötet Том VIII, № 2 Volume VIII, № 2

Acta Beregsasiensis

A II. Rákóczi Ferenc Kárpátaljai Magyar Főiskola tudományos évkönyve

Науковий вісник Закарпатського угорського інституту ім. Ф. Ракоці II

2009/2 VIII. évfolyam, 2. kötet / Том VIII, № 2

SZERKESZTŐBIZOTTSÁG: Soós Kálmán, Orosz Ildikó, Csernicskó István, Barkáts Jenő A kötetet szerkesztette: Penckófer János, Kohut Attila

Редакційна колегія: Шовш К., Орос І., Черничко С., Боркач Є. За редакцією: Пенцкофер І., Когут А.

Korrektúra: G. Varcaba Ildikó / Коректура: Г. Варцаба I. Tördelés: Garanyi Béla / Верстка: Гороній А.

A kiadvány megjelenését a



támogatta

A kiadásért felel: Orosz Ildikó és Soós Kálmán/Відповідальні за випуск: Орос I., Шовш К. ISBN: 978-966-7966-78-2 Készült: PoliPrint Kft. Ungvár, Turgenyev u. 2. Felelős vezető: Kovács Dezső

Tartalom

Történelem

Orbán László: Nemzet- és nacionalizmuselméletek	7
BOCSKOR MEDVECZ ANDREA: Nacionalizmus és történetírás. Az ukrán történelemformálás	
hatása a nemzetté válás folyamatában	17
Lukács Attila: Kárpátalja magyar–magyar kapcsolatainak alakulása. 1989–1994	35
Szakál Imre: Magyar ellenzékiség Podkarpatszka Ruszban 1919 és 1938 között.	
Pártprogramok és érdekérvényesítés	49
Molnár Ferenc: A máramarosi határvidék hadászati problémái az 1849. évben	61
Székely Gusztáv: Ugocsa vármegye kialakulása az új kutatások tükrében	73
Номокі Dianna: Rákóczi hadseregének társadalmi helyzete	91

Pedagógia

Черничко Степан: Напрямки мовної освіти України і угорськомовна освіта	
на Закарпатті	.97
BERECZKY GYÖRGY: A nemzetiségek helye és szerepe a szovjet iskolai	
történelemoktatásban a Szovjetunió története című tankönyvek alapján	107
HEVESI TIBOR: Dinamikus geometriai szerkesztések mértanórán	115
LECHNER ILONA: Altersspezifische Merkmale des Fremdsprachenerwerbs	
und Fremdsprachunterrichts	125
Ádám Erzsébet: A zenei nevelés helye és szerepe a pedagógusi munkában	137

Nyelvészet. Irodalom. Művelődés

Márku Anita: Nyelvválasztási stratégiák a kétnyelvű kárpátaljai fiatalok körében145
SZILÁGYI LÁSZLÓ: Language Learning Strategies used by Monolingual and Bilingual
Students in Transcarpathian Secondary Schools163
DR. ILONA HUSZTI: How can a language learner be successful in second or third
language acquisition?
AGNES G. HAVRIL: The past and present periods of English for Special Purposes
teaching and testing in Hungary187
GAZDAG VILMOS: Nyelvi attitűdök és az interferencia kérdései Vadastanya
ukrán/ruszin nyelvű lakossága körében199
Ва́га́му Béla: Традиции «Войны и мира» Л. Н. Толстого в романе
В. Гроссмана «Жизнь и судьба»
CSEH GIZELLA: A magyar népszínmű XIX. századi művelődéstörténetének vázlata229

Egyház(történet)

Orbán Marianna: Ébredési mozgalom a Kárpátaljai Református Egyházban (1936–1947) 239
GERENDELY BÉLA: Egyházi felekezetek Tiszakeresztúrban

Epidémia. Vízvizsgálat. Régészet. Logisztika

DANCS György: Az 1831-es kolerajárvány és Perényi szerepe az ellene folyó harcban253
CSOMA ZOLTÁN-HADNAGY ISTVÁN: A felszíni és a felszín alatti vizek nitrátterhelése
Makkosjánosi községben és környékén265
Рац А.Й.: Закарпатські обсидіани: міфи та реальність
PATAKI GABOR: Kárpátalja logisztikai szerepköre és fejlődési stratégiái

nénynaptár

AGNES G. HAVRIL*

The past and present periods of English for Special Purposes teaching and testing in Hungary

Rezümé A jelen tanulmány része egy nagyobb, többéves kutatásnak, amelynek célkitűzése a magyarországi angol - mint idegen nyelv - kommunikatív szaknyelvi kompetencia fejlesztésének és vizsgáztatásának vizsgálata a nem nyelvszakos felsőoktatási képzésekben. A kutatás egyik szignifikáns része a folyamat főbb korszakainak és jellegzetességeinek feltárása. Az ötvenes évektől egészen a 2000-ben lezajló nyelvoktatási és nyelvvizsgáztatási reformig az idegen nyelvek oktatása, vizsgáztatása, valamint a szakmai nyelvoktatás és nyelvvizsgáztatás - mely bevett gyakorlat volt és a szűk körű szakmai, munkaerő-piaci igényeknek hosszú ideig megfelelt - egymással karöltve két színtéren folyt: a politikai döntések, kormány- és minisztériumi határozatok végrehajtását működtető, országos hatáskörű ELTE Idegennyelvi Továbbképző Központban (ITK), és a tradíciókra épülő felsőoktatási intézményekben. A cikk a dokumentumelemzés módszerével az ELTE ITK angol szakmai, szakmai anyaggal bővített vizsgáztatásának, valamint a nem nyelvszakos egyetemi hallgatók szaknyelvi képzésének történetét tekinti át a kutatási eredmények alapján, a kezdetektől napjaink gyakorlatáig.

Pesiome This article is part of a bigger and several years' research project which aims to discover the improvement of English for Special Purposes (ESP) communicative competence in teaching and testing among university students in the foreign language demanding specializations. One of the significant parts of the research is to investigate the main periods and general characteristics of ESP teaching and testing in Hungary. From the beginnings until the language examination reform in 2000 there had been two scenes of this process: Eötvös Loránd University Centre for Foreign Languages Examinations (ELTE ITK) - heavily and frequently regulated by governmental or ministerial decrees - where General English (GE) and ESP had been taught and tested together with other foreign languages, and the higher educational language institutes built on traditions. To reveal the changes the most effective research method was the *documentary* analysis by which this paper reviews the historical periods of ESP teaching and testing in ELTE ITK and university language institutes from the fifties up to the recent changes.

Introduction

This research article focuses on English for Special Purposes (ESP) – as a Second Language (SE) – teaching and testing, and aims to discover the main periods and general characteristics of ESP teaching and testing in Hungary from the fifties up to the recent changes.

There had been two scenes for teaching and testing of General foreign Languages (GL) and Languages for Special Purposes (LSP) in Hungary from the late fifties up to the language examination reform in 2000: the countrywide authority of ELTE ITK (Eötvös Loránd University Centre for Foreign Languages) which was controlled and operated by governmental and ministerial decrees, and the higher educational institutions built on traditions.

1. English for Special Purposes examinations in the period of state language examination system: a historical review of ELTE ITK foreign Languages for Special Purposesexaminations

One of the longest periods of the above mentioned process was the history of ELTE ITK Language Examination Centre where General English (GE) and ESP had

^{*} Egyetemi adjunktus, a Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem, Szociológia és Társadalompolitikai Intézet, Idegen Nyelvű Oktatási és Társadalomtudományi Szaknyelvi Központjának vezetője.

been tested, together with other foreign languages from the beginnings until 2000.

To reveal the changes – throughout our whole investigation – the most effective research method was the *documentary analysis* as ELTE ITK was heavily and frequently regulated by governmental or ministerial decrees. Since ELTE ITK could not provide us any empirical data – all the language examination records from the fifties are going to be statistically analysed in the ELTE Archives – we turned to use the *qualitative method of the interviews*. We made interviews with Jenő Bárdos who had been the vice-president of the English language section of ELTE ITK from 1979 to 1990, and with István Görgényi who used to be an examiner of ESP examinations. They both remember the popular ESP examiners– Andor Katalin, Brüll Adél, Czobor Zsuzsa, Hámori Balázs, Horlay György, Papp Nándor, Radványi Tamás, Rapcsák János, Székács Györgyné etc. – , and gave us useful information about the formal and informal relations and traditions of the examination centre.

ELTE ITK had been the only foreign language examination centre in Hungary in the last forty years. It was established by the Group of Foreign Language Courses and Examinations and had always been under the supervision of ELTE University.

1.1. The beginnings

The first ministerial decree [4/1958. (VIII. 3.] regulating the foreign language exams in Hungary was issued at the end of the fifties, and was operative until late sixties. At that time there were only professional language examinations, and there were no chances for individual applications. Only the workplaces could send their professionals for a language exam. According to Bárdos there was not a clear distinction between the oral and written parts of the exam, and most of the written and oral tasks were based on translations. The evaluation was pretty subjective, and on the basis of the candidate's performances the examiners decided whether the examinee receives an intermediate or an advanced level examination certificate. Every candidate had to signal his/her professional background and the exams were planned to the applicants' professional needs. As Görgényi said, 'This professional English language testing system was driven by the credential aspect of wage supplement, which could have been 30% of the monthly salary in case of an advanced foreign language examination'. This professional English language examination did not resemble to ESP testing of the western world at all.

This closed and strongly centralised system was loosened and modified by the ministerial decree [6/1965. (VII. 16.] in the late sixties. From that time individuals could apply for general language exams but for professional exams the workplaces kept on appointing the candidates. As Bárdos said, the importance of oral communication became dominant but on the written exams the translation tasks were unchanged in both categories. The structure of *professional English language examination* remained but in opposition to the GE exam its name became *English language examination with supplemented professional materials*. According to Bárdos these supplemented professional materials were transported to the examinations by ministerial officers in a sealed envelope.

1.2. The period of public State Foreign Languages Examination system

Officially the State Foreign Languages Examination Board, operating within ITK Centre, was set up in 1967 under ELTE University control as an institution for teaching and testing of foreign languages. It was established according to a ministerial regulation [3/1967. (XII. 3.)] on state language examination system.

- In the early years our primary field of activity was language teaching, with courses
- offered to high school graduates in five languages. Later on our state exams received
- more and more attention whereas only 5591 candidates registered in 6 languages in
- 1967,...¹

The state Foreign Languages Examinations Board issued language certificates in two categories: general foreign languages and foreign *languages with supplemented professional materials*. Both categories had intermediate and advanced modules in five different languages: English, German, French, Italian and Russian. Minor changes were implemented by the [2/1971. (VII. 14.)] ministerial order.

This was the first period when the number of English examinees started to increase in both fields.

1.3. The reform of the seventies: "the new foreign language exam"

In the second half of the seventies a decree of the Ministry of Education [9/1978. (VIII. 25.)] further modified the foreign language examination system. The small professional team of ELTE ITK had a chance to introduce the aspect of testing communicative competence which testing theory had already been widely accepted especially in the field of English language examinations. Due to Bárdos these changes resulted in the reform of the "new foreign language exam".

This modernisation brought in a lot of different innovations. The candidates could apply individually for intermediate or advanced levels in GE or English with supplemented professional material language exams. If an advanced level candidate failed on the advanced exam but his/her performances reached the average points of the intermediate exam, the applicant could receive an intermediate language certificate. Every examinee had to appear on the oral and the written parts of the exams. The oral exams became more dominant and the ratio of the oral and written exams was 5:2. As a result of the technological development listening tasks became part of the oral exam. All the traditional language skills (speaking, listening, reading, writing, mediation) were measured and evaluated. This was the time when ELTE ITK introduced the multiple choice tests on the written part of the examination.

Unfortunately, the reform meant only the modernisation of GE examinations. Due to the strong control and supervision of the ministries and political, economic organizations the *English language examination with supplemented professional materials* was not improved. Though, the structural, technical and testing

¹Source: ITK webpage (http://www.itk.hu/origo/alt_info/tortenet.htm) (September, 2008)

innovative variations of GE exam appeared on the professional English language examinations.

The weak point of the new foreign language system was the English language examination with supplemented professional materials. The materials and one of the examiners of the oral examination board was continued to be provided by the ministries. Neither the materials nor the examiners reached the expected level of English standard and knowledge, so it often happened that the vice-presidents sent the examiners away. There was a lot at stake on these exams. Wage supplements, appointments and high positions depended on the result of the language examination certificates. Within ELTE ITK the examiners used the expression of English language examinations "cut back" with professional materials, instead of "supplemented" materials (Bárdos, 2002:249-250).

1.4. The decentralisation period of ELTE ITK foreign language exams

In the years of the 1980s the number of the candidates significantly increased, especially in the field of English language exams. It was the result of several political, social and economic changes. A ministerial decree [3/1980. (X. 25)] brought down the age limit of the applicants from 18 to 15. The ITK introduced the Basic level exams and started the professional trainings of the examiners. Exams were already offered in more than 6 languages, and Hungarian as a foreign language also appeared on the list. The institute became regionally decentralised along with the significant increase in the numbers of exam candidates, and ORIGO language exams – this became the officially registered name of the foreign language examination system – could be taken in a number of different locations in the country from the 1980's. These local examination places were available at the biggest university towns where the infrastructure of teaching and testing foreign languages were offered by the foreign language institutes of state universities: Debrecen, Miskolc, Pécs, Szeged, Veszprém.

These changes followed the social need of the citizens which appeared together with the opening of the country and the increased tourism. "Between 1975 and 1978 the total number of the ORIGO exams was 11 800, in 1978 it was 9 560, in 1987 this number was 29 6000." (Bárdos, 2002:251) These numbers include all the foreign language examinations and unfortunately, they reflect neither the ratio of every foreign language nor the ratio of general or professional exams. There were hardly any statistical analyses at that time. Only a few (Terestényi, 1980) indicate the dominance of English language exams but none of them show the number of professional language exams.

According to Görgényi the communicative testing approach was applied on the professional oral exam but radical innovations were not introduced. The supervision of the ministries, the procedure of the exam and the supplemented materials were all unchanged. The *English language examination with supplemented professional materials* remained a strange mixture of communicative GE and the western type ESP testing elements. Due to the increased number of the young exam candidates, the ministerial decree [4/1982. (III.12)] issued in 1982 declared that in certain higher educational institutions the foreign language comprehension examinations are equal with the State Foreign Languages Examination certificates. Most of these certificates were professional language certificates. This was the time when the number of the professional language exams started to decrease in ELTE ITK, and started to increase in the higher education.

A dynamic increase in general language exams in numbers was followed by a new ministerial decree [11/1990. (X. 4.)] in the beginning of the 1990's. As foreign language knowledge was highly appraised in the society, the advantages of youngsters and workers having a foreign language certificate further increased: secondary school students were exempted from the foreign language part of GCSE, and candidates with successful exams could hope for extra university entrance scores, or professional continued having a raise at the workplaces. *Table 1*² proves the significant changes and data of the above analysed period.

Foreign languages	1985	1990	1995
English	9 454	30 858	49 208
German	5 713	18 434	33 205
French	1 036	2 259	3 259
Russian	2 972	3 215	2 777
Italian	225	1 175	1 636
Spanish	291	459	627
Total	19 691	56 400	90 712

Table 1 The number of exam candidates in relation of foreign languages

2. The history of ESP teaching and testing in the higher educational institutions

The teaching foreign languages in Hungarian higher education, has always been important and significant in its scope. In Hungary most of the universities and colleges – beside the foreign language teacher trainings – offered a high level foreign language teaching to their students especially in the fields of medical, technical, legal, commercial, economic and social scientific fields.

In 1949 Russian language learning became mandatory in the universities as well. At first the Russian Language Institutes (Lektorátus) became responsible for language teaching "where the purpose of Russian language learning was that the students could read, understand and translate their professional background knowledge and scientific information without the help of a dictionary" (Sós-Sturcz, 1986:8). Even then the primary goal of language teaching was a content-based professional knowledge oriented foreign language teaching.

 $Very \, early, already \, in \, 1957 \, the \, 70^{th} \, Ministerial \, Decree \, let \, the \, language \, institutes \\ of \, universities \, introduce \, teaching \, different \, foreign \, languages. This educational \, form$

²Source: <u>http://www.oki.hu/oldal.php?tipus=cikk&kod=Tartalmi-valtozasok-06-Vago</u> (September, 2008)

concentrated on a small number of the students who were selected, thus foreign language teaching was said to be highly effective.

Due to the autonomy of the universities there was not a countrywide accepted foreign language core curriculum, and every language department within the same university used its own foreign language related syllabus and applied its own testing system on the relatively closed language comprehensive examinations. There had been some governmental and ministerial decrees but they did not heavily influence and regulate foreign language teaching and testing at the universities. The common elements followed the traditional content-based trends of the eastern European countries where the emphasis was on the improvement of reading and translation.

The significant changes appeared at first in 1982 [4/1982. (III.12.)] when the higher educational institutions' foreign language comprehension examinations became equal with the State Foreign Languages Examination certificates. Soon after another decree [11/1990. (X.4.)] – including several changes – together with the Higher Education Act (1993) regulated the criteria of final university degrees. According to these orders without at least one foreign language certificate on intermediate level, graduate students could not receive their final university degrees.

Since then the number of the students learning foreign languages – especially English – at universities has definitely been growing. As a result in the late 80s and 90s most of the higher educational institutions modernised their foreign language policy. In their teaching and testing methods the language institutions applied the communicative approach and definitely focused on Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP) education.

The basic idea of foreign language policy was the following. As future professionals, the students in higher education need to acquire good communicative competence to prepare not only for the local but the global market as well. Communicative language competence became a prerequisite for successful communication among professionals for general and specific purposes. This concept comprised both linguistic (phonological, grammatical, lexical, discourse) and pragmatic (functional, sociolinguistic, interactional, cultural) aspects of communicative competence.

In view of the above-mentioned need for developing the future professionals' communicative language competence, when preparing Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) course designs language instructors gave more and more attention to the acquisition of universal communication skills, and language in subject-specific contexts. As a result these LSP language training courses became characterised as a mixture of communicative general language (GL) teaching and LSP teaching. The teaching of LSP focused on the acquisition of proper grammar and LSP vocabulary, and the development of the five language skills, especially speaking. In LSP testing practice, achievement tests were administered as end-of-year or end-of-term tests at the language departments. In the past there was no common testing policy or co-operation in test design among the departments in the institution. The main characteristics of these earlier LSP tests were the following: testing of grammar, mediation skill and LSP vocabulary (written exam), and testing of listening skill, communicative speaking skill (oral exams). The texts

and tasks were, with very few exceptions, non-authentic and non-contextualised. Although the earlier LSP testing emphasised the communicative function of language, the tests missed the lifelike situations.

This was the revival period of the traditional LSP elements and early researches, and the starting point of a new tendency which became familiar with the western type communicative LSP teaching and testing techniques. Teaching and testing General foreign languages and LSP had been parallel at most universities though the big ones (Corvinus university of Budapest, Budapest Business School, Pannon University, Technical University of Budapest, University of Szeged, Pécs and Debrecen) specialised in ESP education. These ESP teachers and experts started to work out new curricula of ESP teaching and were involved in new research projects. As a consequence they founded the *Countrywide Association of ESP Educators and Researchers* (SZOKOE) in 2003. This association keeps together the professionals, holds a scientific conference and publishes its periodical in every year.

There are only a few data about foreign language education in the nonlanguage teacher training universities. *Table* 2^3 shows some recent information which tends to indicate that English language learning including ESP learning has been far more popular among the university students than any other foreign languages.

Table 2 The ratio of foreign languages learnt at the universities among the non-language teacher training students

Year	English	French	Latin	German	Italian	Russian	Spanish	Other	Total
1999- 2001	36 480	3 828	5 432	19 946	2 121	1 569	1 464	No data	70 840
2000- 2001	41 582	3 942	6 176	23 110	2 505	1 351	2 032	2 121	82 819

*One student can have more than one foreign language certificate

3. Reform of foreign language teaching and assessment in Hungary in 2000

Foreign language teaching and foreign language examinations became a subject of debate in the years of 2000 in Hungary. The tendency – and the long-term aim of the Ministry of Education as well – was that the public education curriculum, in the primary and secondary schools, should include foreign languages for general purposes and should be designed to provide the foreign language learner with basic or intermediate language competence in the five skills: speaking, listening, reading, writing and mediation. At this stage of the foreign language learning process the students should pass a language examination at

any of the foreign language centres accredited in Hungary. According to this concept, undergraduate college/university students – with their good general language competence – can focus on mastering foreign languages for their specific purposes during their studies at any higher education institution.

These changes originated in the preparatory period of the introduction of the Bologna Reform in the Hungarian higher education and the appearance of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment (Council of Europe, 2001). In the late 90s two important orders were released which were in line with the European Union foreign language policy as well. Concerning the permeability of the foreign language certificates in Europe a governmental decree [71/1998 (IV. 8.)] became operative which was rapidly followed by the decree of the Ministry of Education [30/1999 (VII. 21.)] providing the standardised criteria of the accreditation process of foreign language examination systems.

As a result, the Hungarian Accreditation Board for Foreign Language Examinations (HABFLE) was established by the Ministry of Education as an independent body in Hungary.

This highly professional board published the Manual of the Hungarian Accreditation Board for Foreign Language Examinations (Lengyel, 1999) which contained the basic principles and guidelines of the operation of any accredited foreign language examination centres.

The 40-year-old monopoly of the so-called public State Foreign Language Examination Centre (popularly named as Rigó Street) was challenged both politically and professionally. The old pattern was transformed into a marketoriented but state-controlled system of state-accredited language examination centres and systems all over in Hungary.

The accreditation process was carried out in harmony with some decrees and orders (see above), and followed the requirements of the Accreditation Manual and partly of the CEFR. The process was checked and controlled by the HABFLE.

Many GL examination centres appeared in the first round of the accreditation process, but only a few LSP examination centres were accredited. These LSP examination centres were established at the biggest Hungarian universities in the fields of economics, military affairs, agricultural and medical science. It was at this time that the earlier autonomous foreign language institutes and departments had to harmonise their old respective testing policies with respect to other different foreign languages, and follow the principles of the Accreditation Manual which was a strange Hungarian adaptation of the CEFR. Since 2000 the number of the newly accredited exam centres started to mushroom in Hungary.

Since 2005 we can speak about a "new reform". The growing acceptance of the standards presented by the CEFR created a situation in which public bodies, examination institutions, language schools and university departments concerned with the teaching and testing of languages are increasingly interested in relating their curricula and examinations to the Common Reference Levels. Immediately after the official Hungarian publication of the CEFR (2002) there were

³ Source: Country Report: To make Hungary's Foreign Language Policy. Ministry of Education, Budapest. 2002-2003: 87. Appendix 39

questions posed to the language-testing community in effect requesting advice on how various language testing systems around Europe could be validated and linked to the Framework. In Hungary this was once again brought about by state regulations. According to the orders of the Hungarian Accreditation Board for Foreign Language Examinations, exam-providers who are unable or unwilling to abide by the required standards will lose their state accreditation; those who are able and willing partners will obviously agree to follow the processes described in the CEFR.

From the above it follows that this was the latest challenge for most of the LSP Examination Centres (as well as for the Accreditation Board): i.e. to relate the examination systems and the examinations to the standards of the CEFR. A considerable amount of work had to be done again concerning standardisation. The process involved specification, empirical validation, a piloting system and the participation of teacher-examiners and trained item- writers who have been fully conversant with the required standards.

The biggest problem is that, although the CEFR provides theoretical and practical principles for GL testing and assessment, it has not been so forthcoming in extending its recommendations to LSP testing. A number of questions arise from this situation. What is the reason for this apparent deficit? How does professional background knowledge influence the identification of proficiency levels? What kinds of procedure for validating these LSP exam-levels can be used in this special situation?

It is these questions that have inspired most of the Hungarian LSP/ESP researchers and university language teachers do more detailed researches in the field of LSP/ESP testing.

Present situation as a conclusions

Only testing centres and their locations accredited by the Hungarian Accreditation Board for Foreign Language Examinations have been eligible to offer language exams as of January 2000 in Hungary. Since then the foreign language examination systems have been competitive and market-oriented. In spite of the positive changes in the last ten years' professionalism and work most of the LSP/ESP Language Examination Centres of our universities are disappointed. The contradiction lies in the paradox decisions of the Hungarian Accreditation Committee (HAC) which is responsible for the accreditation of the newly founded BA and MA university specializations and the accredited LSP/ESP language examination centres at the universities.

The Higher Education Act (2005.CXXXIX) on the basis of the HAC decisions determined general foreign language examination certificates instead of LSP/ESP examination certificates as the final foreign language output criteria for most BA and even for most MA degrees. According to Sturcz researches (2009, conference presentation) neither the BA nor the MA educational forms demand a high level LSP exam certificate. It means that a Hungarian university student can finish his/ her studies without acquiring competitive LSP/ESP communicative competence in their special background knowledge. For better understanding see *Table 3*.

Table 3 Final foreign language output criteria for BA and MA degrees(Sturcz, 2009)

142 BSc/BA FO	REIGN LANGUAGE OUTPUT CRITERIA
128 BSc/BA	1 intermediate level general foreign language exam
12 BSc/BA	1 intermediate level LSP exam
2 BSc/BA	2 intermediate level LSP exams
137 MSc/MA FO	REIGN LANGUAGE OUTPUT CRITERIA 1 intermediate
8 MSc/MA	1 intermediate level general foreign language exam + 1 basic level general foreign language exam
9 MSc/MA	2 intermediate level general foreign language exams
7 MSc/MA	1 advanced level general foreign language exam

On the basis of the statistical database of the Hungarian Accreditation Board for Foreign Language Examinations *Table 4* provides further worries in the field of ESP examination centres. As we can see General English language centres (mono- or bilingual, Hungarian- or foreign-owned) and ESP (mono- or bilingual) examination centres are available for the candidates. Altogether there are 42 accredited language testing centres out of which 25 ESP centres have been operating (blue colour). 18 (blue colour stars) out of the 25 ESP centres are functioning at a higher educational institution. We can say that almost half of the language examination centres are owned by the universities which invested heavily in the accreditation process in the previous years. According to the promises of the Ministry of Education in 2000 – public education provides GE knowledge and exams, and the universities become the dominant areas of improving ESP competence – all these universities could hope for an increasing number of ESP/LSP university language learners and examinees in the new BA and MA educational forms.

Unfortunately, dreams and promises were not realised. The present ESP/ LSP teaching and testing systems at the Hungarian universities have to face with financial problems and further difficulties which can slow down the enthusiasm, the motivation and innovative intensions of the teachers and experts.

Table 4 also proves the constant need for English language knowledge and certificates. Between 2000 and 2008 altogether the number of the examinees was 1 189 142 (HC database) out of which 731 434 candidates were taking English exams. If we compare these numbers with the data of *Table 1* we can say that the English exam candidates' number shows a 15 fold growth.

This analysis definitely proves the dominance of English teaching and testing in Hungary.

 Table 4 The number of GE and ESP examinees in the accredited language

 examination centres between 2000 and 2008

	basic	intermediate	advanced	total
AF, GE	0	0	0	0
BC, GE	162	1.404	2.269	3.835
BGF, English for Economics (EE) (tourism-catering trade) *	193	10.180	455	10.828
BGF, EE, (financial) *	3	2.252	171	2.426

BGF, EE (business)*41124.5161.54326.470BCE, EE*17019.1103.91323.193BME, GE8.41066.5892.87577.874BME, Eghth for Technical32331157CH,GE1.4446.8169719.231CH,GE0000EURO, Eg2.30141.3183.44447.063EURO, Eglish for Tude (foreign trade)109.602143.86012.615266.077KIT. English for Trade (foreign trade)109.60214.844301.541KIT. English for Trade (catering trade)271.444301.541KJF, GE1.4303.4083815.219KIT. English for Trade (foreign trade)271.484301.541KJF, EE (burism)*041904190KJF, EE (tourism)*0419000ORZES, GE00000ORZES, GE00000ORZES, English for Tabe2.6272.8626956.183PROPEX, CGE00000PROPEX, CGE3.15526.6624.3393.3756SZIE, English for Law*1116243360ORZES, English for Law*1116243360ORZES, CGE00000ORZES, English for Law*1116243360SZIE, Eng	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
BME, GE 8.410 66.589 2.875 77.874 BME, EE* 7 846 34 887 Communication* 3 23 31 57 CH,GE 1.444 6.816 971 9.231 GI, GE 0 0 0 0 0 EURO, Eg 2.301 41.318 3.444 47.063 EURO, Eg 109.602 143.860 12.615 2660.07 KIT, English for Trade (foreign trade) 157 10.477 41 10.675 KIT, English for Trade (foreign trade) 23 1.042 5 1.022 KIT, English for Trade (foreign trade) 27 1.487 30 1.541 KJF, EE (busines)* 0 14130 3.408 381 5.219 KJF, EE (tourism)* 0 419 0 419 0 KUM, English for Bible* 0 0 0 0 0 ORZSE, English for Bible* 0 0 0 0 <td< th=""><th>i</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></td<>	i				
BME, EE* 7 846 34 887 BME, English for Technical Communication* 3 23 31 57 CH,GE 1.444 6.816 971 9.231 GI, GE 0 0 0 0 EURO, GE 2.301 41.318 3.444 47.063 EURO, GE 2.301 41.318 3.444 47.063 EURO, GE 109.602 143.860 12.615 266.077 HIT, English for Trade foreign trade 5 1.012 5 1.025 KIT, English for Trade foreign trade 2 1.067 5 1.025 1.022 KIT, English for Trade foreign trade 2 1.042 5 1.022 5 1.022 KIT, English for Trade foreign trade 2 1.042 5 1.022 5 0 KJF, EE (business)* 0 1.55 0 1.55 0 1.55 KJF, EE (business)* 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	· ·	-			
BME, English for Technical 3 23 31 57 Communication* 1.444 6.816 971 9.231 GI, GE 0 0 0 0 BURO, GE 2.301 41.318 3.444 47.063 BURO, English for Business 29 4.251 174 4.454 ITK, GE 109.602 143.860 12.615 266.077 KIT, English for Trade (atering trade) 57 10.477 41 10.675 KIT, English for Trade [catering trade) 23 1.667 0 1.690 KIT, English for Trade [foreign trade) 23 1.667 0 1.690 KJF, EE (business)* 0 155 0 1.55 0 1.55 KJF, EE (business)* 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 RUM, English for Diplomacy 54 76 130 260 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 </th <th>BME, GE</th> <th>8.410</th> <th>66.589</th> <th>2.875</th> <th>77.874</th>	BME, GE	8.410	66.589	2.875	77.874
Communication* 3 23 31 57 CH,GE 1.444 6.816 971 9.231 GI, GE 0 0 0 0 EURO, GE 2.301 41.318 3.444 47.063 EURO, English for Business 29 4.251 1.74 4.454 ITK, GE 109.602 143.860 12.615 266.077 KIT, English for Trade (catering trade) 5 1.012 5 1.022 KIT, English for Trade (catering trade) 27 1.484 30 1.541 KJF, GE 1.430 3.408 381 5.219 KJF, Eglish for Trade (nome trade) 27 1.484 30 1.551 KJF, EE (business)* 0 1155 0 155 KJF, EE (business)* 0 0 0 0 0 KUM, English for Diplomacy 54 76 130 2600 OL,GE 0 0 0 0 0 PANNON, GE <		7	846	34	887
CH,GE1.4446.8169719.231GI, GE0000EURO, GE2.30141.3183.44447.063EURO, English for Business294.2511744.454ITK, GE109.602143.86012.615266.077KIT, English for Trade (foreign trade)15710.4774110.675KIT, English for Trade (actering trade)231.66701.690KIT, English for Trade (loreign trade)231.66701.690KJF, EE (business) *01.53101.5310KJF, EE (tourism) *01.4303.4083815.219KJF, EE (tourism) *00000ORZSE, English for Diplomacy547761302600ORZSE, English for Bible*00000PANNON, GE5.44919.6732.07727.199PITMAN, GE16.72519.4812.27638.482PROFEX, English for Law*1116243360PROFEX, English for Medical Science*2.6272.8626956.184PROFEX, English for Farming1206.4273.933.3756SZIE, English for Farming *698482731.190SZIE, English for Farming *698482731.190SZIE, English for Farming *698482.0371.2744THEO, English for Churches*3801.11 <th></th> <th>3</th> <th>23</th> <th>31</th> <th>57</th>		3	23	31	57
GI, GE 0 0 0 0 0 EURO, GE 2.301 41.318 3.444 47.063 EURO, English for Business 29 4.251 1.74 4.454 ITK, GE 109.602 143.860 12.615 266.077 KIT, English for Trade (catering trade) 5 1.012 5 1.022 KIT, English for Trade (catering trade) 27 1.483 30 1.841 KUT, English for Trade (coreign trade) 27 1.483 30 1.921 KJF, GE float trade (coreign trade) 27 1.483 30 1.931 KJF, EE (tourism) * 0 1.1430 3.408 381 5.219 KJF, EE (tourism) * 0 0 0 0 0 OI, GE 0 0 0 0 0 0 ORZSE, GE 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PANON, GE 5.449 19.673 2.077 27.199 116 <td< th=""><th></th><th>1 444</th><th>6.816</th><th>971</th><th>9 231</th></td<>		1 444	6.816	971	9 231
EURO, GE 2.301 41.318 3.444 47.063 EURO, English for Business 29 4.251 174 4.454 ITK, GE 109.602 143.860 12.615 266.077 KIT, English for Trade (foreign trade) 157 10.477 41 10.675 KIT, English for Trade (catering trade) 23 1.667 0 1.690 KIT, English for Trade (foreign trade) 27 1.484 30 1.541 KJF, GE 1.430 3.408 381 5.219 KJF, EE (business)* 0 155 0 155 KJF, EE (tourism)* 0 419 0 419 KUM, English for Diplomacy 54 76 130 260 ORZSE, GE 0 0 0 0 0 ORZSE, English for Bible* 0 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, English for Law* 1 116 243 360 PROFEX, English for Bible* 0 0 0 0					
EURO, English for Business 29 4.251 174 4.454 ITK, GE 109.602 143.860 12.615 266.077 KIT, English for Trade (foreign trade) 157 10.477 41 10.675 KIT, English for Trade (catering trade) 23 1.667 0 1.692 KIT, English for Trade (oreign trade) 23 1.667 0 1.690 KIT, English for Trade (oreign trade) 27 1.484 30 1.541 KJF, GE 1.430 3.408 381 5.219 KJF, EE (business) * 0 155 0 155 KUM, English for Diplomacy 54 76 130 260 Ol,GE 0 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, Eglish for Bible* 0 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, GE 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, English for Law* 1 116 243 360 135 149 135.5 26.262<	·	÷	-	~	-
ITK, GE 109.602 143.860 12.615 266.077 KIT, English for Trade (foreign trade) 157 10.477 41 10.675 KIT, English for Trade (catering trade) 23 1.667 0 1.692 KIT, English for Trade (nome trade) 23 1.667 0 1.690 KIT, English for Trade (nome trade) 27 1.484 30 1.541 KJF, EE (business) * 0 155 0 155 KJF, EE (tourism) * 0 419 0 419 KUM, English for Diplomacy 54 76 130 260 ORZSE, GE 0 0 0 0 0 0 ORZSE, GE 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, GE 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, English for Law* 1 116 243 360 33.756 1.622 4.339 33.756 PROFEX, English for Farming 120					
KIT, English for Trade (foreign trade) 157 10.477 41 10.675 KIT, English for Trade (catering trade) 5 1.012 5 1.022 KIT, English for Trade (bore trade) 23 1.667 0 1.690 KIF, English for Trade (bore trade) 27 1.484 30 1.540 KJF, EE (business) * 0 1.155 0 1.55 KJF, EE (tourism) * 0 419 0 419 KUM, English for Diplomacy 54 76 130 260 OI,GE 0 0 0 0 0 ROFEX, Eglish for Bible* 0 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, GE 0 0 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, GE 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, English for Law* 1 1116 243 360 135 PROFEX, English for Farming 120 6.427 349 6.896 SZIE, Englis	· •				
KIT, English for Trade (home trade) 23 1.667 0 1.690 KIT, English for Trade (foreign trade) 27 1.484 30 1.541 KJF, GE 1.430 3.408 381 5.219 KJF, EE (business) * 0 1155 0 1155 KJF, EE (business) * 0 419 0 419 KUM, English for Diplomacy 54 76 130 260 OI,GE 0 0 0 0 0 ORZSE, GE 0 0 0 0 0 0 ORZSE, English for Bible* 0 0 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, GE 0 0 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, English for Law* 1 116 243 360 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 695 6.184 PROFEX, English for Farming 120 6.427 349 6.896 SZIE, English for Farming * 69	KIT, English for Trade (foreign trade)				
KJF, GE1.4303.4083815.219KJF, EE (business) *01550155KJF, EE (tourism) *04190419KUM, English for Diplomacy5476130260OI, GE00000ORZSE, GE00000ORZSE, English for Bible*00000PTMAN, GE5.44919.6732.07727.199PTMAN, GE16.72519.4812.27638.482PROFEX, GE00000PROFEX, English for Law*11116243360PROFEX, English for Law*1116624333.756SZIE, English for Farming16965135PTE, GE3.15526.2624.33933.756SZIE, English for Farming *698482731.190SZIE, English for Technical Sciences*233338TIT, GE30.41871.9853.874106.277ZMNE, English for Technical Sciences*233338TIT, GE30.41871.9853.874106.277SIIE, English for Military*4.0866.4152.24712.748THEO, English for Suiness602.3771442.581DE, GE581.126501.234GDF, English for Informatics*38257411967	KIT, English for Trade (catering trade)	5		5	
KJF, GE1.4303.4083815.219KJF, EE (business) *01550155KJF, EE (tourism) *04190419KUM, English for Diplomacy5476130260OI, GE00000ORZSE, GE00000ORZSE, English for Bible*00000PTMAN, GE5.44919.6732.07727.199PITMAN, GE16.72519.4812.27638.482PROFEX, GE00000PROFEX, English for Law*11116243360PROFEX, English for Law*1116624333.756SZIE, English for Farming1206.4273496.896SZIE, English for Farming *698482731.190SZIE, English for Technical Sciences*233338TIT, GE30.41871.9853.874106.277ZMNE, English for Military*4.0866.4152.24712.748THEO, English for Churches*38011BFI, GE00000GB, English for Informatics*38257411967	KIT, English for Trade (foreign trade)	27	1.484	30	1.541
KJF, EE (tourism)* 0 419 0 419 KUM, English for Diplomacy 54 76 130 260 OI,GE 0 0 0 0 0 ORZSE, GE 0 0 0 0 0 0 ORZSE, English for Bible* 0 0 0 0 0 0 PANNON, GE 5.449 19.673 2.077 27.199 PITMAN, GE 16.725 19.481 2.276 38.482 PROFEX, English for Law* 1 116 243 360 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 695 6.184 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 4.339 33.756 SZIE, English for Farming 120 6.427 349 6.896 SZIE, English for Farming * 69 848 273 1.190 SZIE, English for Technical Sciences* 2 33 3 38 TI, GE 30.418 71.985					
KUM, English for Diplomacy 54 76 130 260 OI,GE 0	KJF, EE (business) *	0	155	0	155
OI,GE O O O O O ORZSE, GE 0 0 0 0 0 0 ORZSE, English for Bible* 0 0 0 0 0 0 PANNON, GE 5.449 19.673 2.077 27.199 PITMAN, GE 16.725 19.481 2.276 38.482 PROFEX, GE 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, English for Law* 1 116 243 360 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 695 6.184 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 4.339 33.756 SZIE, English for Farming 1 69 65 135 PTE, GE 3.155 26.262 4.339 33.756 SZIE, English for Farming * 69 848 273 1.190 SZIE, English for Technical Sciences* 2 33 38 38 TIT, GE 30.418 71.985 3.874	KJF, EE (tourism) *	0	419	0	419
ORZSE, GE 0 0 0 0 ORZSE, English for Bible* 0 0 0 0 0 PANNON, GE 5.449 19.673 2.077 27.199 PITMAN, GE 16.725 19.481 2.276 38.482 PROFEX, GE 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, English for Law* 1 116 243 360 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 695 6.184 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 4.339 33.756 SZIE, English for Farming 1 69 65 135 PTE, GE 3.155 26.262 4.339 33.756 SZIE, English for Farming 120 6.427 349 6.896 Management * 2 33 3 38 33 38 TIT, GE 30.418 71.985 3.874 106.277 12.748 THEO, English for Military* 4.086 6.415 2.247	KUM, English for Diplomacy	54	76	130	260
ORZSE, English for Bible* 0 0 0 0 PANNON, GE 5.449 19.673 2.077 27.199 PITMAN, GE 16.725 19.481 2.276 38.482 PROFEX, GE 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, English for Law* 1 116 243 360 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 695 6.184 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 4.339 33.756 SZIE, English for Farming 120 6.427 349 6.896 Management * 2 33 3 38 TIT, GE 30.418 71.985 3.874 106.277 ZMNE, English for Military* 4.086 6.415 2.247 12.748 THEO, English for Churches* 3 8 0 11 BFI, GE 0 0 0 0 GB, English for Business 60 2.377 144 2.581 DE, GE	OI,GE	0	0	0	0
PANNON, GE 5.449 19.673 2.077 27.199 PITMAN, GE 16.725 19.481 2.276 38.482 PROFEX, GE 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, English for Law* 1 116 243 360 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 695 6.184 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 4.339 33.756 SZIE, English for Farming 120 6.427 349 6.896 Management * 69 848 273 1.190 SZIE, English for Farming * 69 848 273 1.190 SZIE, English for Technical Sciences* 2 33 3 38 TIT, GE 30.418 71.985 3.874 106.277 ZMNE, English for Military* 4.086 6.415 2.247 12.748 THEO, English for Churches* 3 8 0 11 BFI, GE 0 0 0 0 GB	ORZSE, GE	0	0	0	0
PITMAN, GE 16.725 19.481 2.276 38.482 PROFEX, GE 0 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, English for Law* 1 116 243 360 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 695 6.184 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 4.339 33.756 SZIE, English for Farming 120 6.427 349 6.896 SZIE, English for Farming* 69 848 273 1.190 SZIE, English for Technical Sciences* 2 33 38 38 TIT, GE 30.418 71.985 3.874 106.277 ZMNE, English for Military* 4.086 6.415 2.247 12.748 THEO, English for Churches* 3 8 0 11 BFI, GE 0 0 0 0 GE, English for Business 60 2.377 144 2.581 DE, GE 58 1.126 50 1.234	ORZSE, English for Bible*	0	0	0	0
PROFEX, GE 0 0 0 0 PROFEX, English for Law* 1 116 243 360 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 695 6.184 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 695 6.184 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 1 69 65 135 PTE, GE 3.155 26.262 4.339 33.756 SZIE, English for Farming 120 6.427 349 6.896 Management * 69 848 273 1.190 SZIE, English for Farming * 69 848 273 1.190 SZIE, English for Technical Sciences* 2 33 3 38 TIT, GE 30.418 71.985 3.874 106.277 ZMNE, English for Military* 4.086 6.415 2.247 12.748 THEO, English for Churches* 3 8 0 11 BFI, GE 0 0 0 0 0 <	PANNON, GE	5.449	19.673	2.077	27.199
PROFEX, English for Law* 1 116 243 360 PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 695 6.184 PROFEX, English for telecommunication* 1 69 65 135 PTE, GE 3.155 26.262 4.339 33.756 SZIE, English for Farming Management * 120 6.427 349 6.896 SZIE, English for Farming * 69 848 273 1.190 SZIE, English for Technical Sciences* 2 33 3 38 TIT, GE 30.418 71.985 3.874 106.277 ZMNE, English for Military* 4.086 6.415 2.247 12.748 THEO, English for Churches* 3 8 0 11 BFI, GE 0 0 0 0 0 GE, English for Business 60 2.377 144 2.581 DE, GE 58 1.126 50 1.234	PITMAN, GE	16.725	19.481	2.276	38.482
PROFEX, English for Medical Science* 2.627 2.862 695 6.184 PROFEX, English for telecommunication* 1 69 65 135 PTE, GE 3.155 26.262 4.339 33.756 SZIE, English for Farming 120 6.427 349 6.896 SZIE, English for Farming * 69 848 273 1.190 SZIE, English for Technical Sciences* 2 33 3 38 TIT, GE 30.418 71.985 3.874 106.277 ZMNE, English for Churches* 3 8 0 11 BFI, GE 0 0 0 0 GB, English for Business 60 2.377 144 2.581 DE, GE 58 1.126 50 1.234	PROFEX, GE	0	0	0	0
PROFEX, English for telecommunication* 1 69 65 135 PTE, GE 3.155 26.262 4.339 33.756 SZIE, English for Farming Management * 120 6.427 349 6.896 SZIE, English for Farming * 69 848 273 1.190 SZIE, English for Technical Sciences* 2 33 3 38 TIT, GE 30.418 71.985 3.874 106.277 ZMNE, English for Military* 4.086 6.415 2.247 12.748 THEO, English for Churches* 3 8 0 11 BFI, GE 0 0 0 0 GB, English for Business 60 2.377 144 2.581 DE, GE 58 1.126 50 1.234	PROFEX, English for Law*	1	116	243	360
telecommunication* 1 69 65 135 PTE, GE 3.155 26.262 4.339 33.756 SZIE, English for Farming Management * 120 6.427 349 6.896 SZIE, English for Farming * 69 848 273 1.190 SZIE, English for Technical Sciences* 2 33 3 38 TIT, GE 30.418 71.985 3.874 106.277 ZMNE, English for Military* 4.086 6.415 2.247 12.748 THEO, English for Churches* 3 8 0 11 BFI, GE 0 0 0 0 GB, English for Business 60 2.377 144 2.581 DE, GE 58 1.126 50 1.234		2.627	2.862	695	6.184
Telecommunication* 1		1	69	65	135
SZIÉ, English for Farming Management * 120 6.427 349 6.896 SZIE, English for Farming * 69 848 273 1.190 SZIE, English for Technical Sciences* 2 33 3 38 TIT, GE 30.418 71.985 3.874 106.277 ZMNE, English for Military* 4.086 6.415 2.247 12.748 THEO, English for Churches* 3 8 0 111 BFI, GE 0 0 0 0 GB, English for Business 60 2.377 144 2.581 DE, GE 58 1.126 50 1.234 GDF, English for Informatics* 382 574 11 967		2 155		4 220	
Management * 120 6.427 349 6.896 SZIE, English for Farming * 69 848 273 1.190 SZIE, English for Technical Sciences* 2 33 3 38 TIT, GE 30.418 71.985 3.874 106.277 ZMNE, English for Military* 4.086 6.415 2.247 12.748 THEO, English for Churches* 3 8 0 11 BFI, GE 0 0 0 0 GB, English for Business 60 2.377 144 2.581 DE, GE 58 1.126 50 1.234 GDF, English for Informatics* 382 574 11 967					
SZIE, English for Technical Sciences* 2 33 3 38 TIT, GE 30.418 71.985 3.874 106.277 ZMNE, English for Military* 4.086 6.415 2.247 12.748 THEO, English for Churches* 3 8 0 11 BFI, GE 0 0 0 0 GB, English for Business 60 2.377 144 2.581 DE, GE 58 1.126 50 1.234 GDF, English for Informatics* 382 574 11 967	Management *	120	6.427	349	6.896
TIT, GE 30.418 71.985 3.874 106.277 ZMNE, English for Military* 4.086 6.415 2.247 12.748 THEO, English for Churches* 3 8 0 111 BFI, GE 0 0 0 0 GB, English for Business 60 2.377 144 2.581 DE, GE 58 1.126 50 1.234 GDF, English for Informatics* 382 574 11 967	SZIE, English for Farming *	69	848	273	1.190
ZMNE, English for Military* 4.086 6.415 2.247 12.748 THEO, English for Churches* 3 8 0 11 BFI, GE 0 0 0 0 GB, English for Business 60 2.377 144 2.581 DE, GE 58 1.126 50 1.234 GDF, English for Informatics* 382 574 11 967	SZIE, English for Technical Sciences*	2	33	3	38
THEO, English for Churches* 3 8 0 11 BFI, GE 0 0 0 0 0 GB, English for Business 60 2.377 144 2.581 DE, GE 58 1.126 50 1.234 GDF, English for Informatics* 382 574 11 967	TIT, GE	30.418	71.985	3.874	106.277
BFI, GE 0 0 0 0 GB, English for Business 60 2.377 144 2.581 DE, GE 58 1.126 50 1.234 GDF, English for Informatics* 382 574 11 967		4.086	6.415	2.247	12.748
GB, English for Business 60 2.377 144 2.581 DE, GE 58 1.126 50 1.234 GDF, English for Informatics* 382 574 11 967	THEO, English for Churches*	3	8	0	11
DE, GE 58 1.126 50 1.234 GDF, English for Informatics* 382 574 11 967	BFI, GE	0	0	0	0
GDF, English for Informatics* 382 574 11 967	GB, English for Business	60	2.377	144	2.581
	DE, GE	58	1.126	50	1.234
Total 187.587 498.119 45.728 731.434	GDF, English for Informatics*	382	574	11	967
	Total	187.587	498.119	45.728	731.434

* For further information go on to http//www.nyak.hu

REFERENCES

BÁRDOS, J. (2002): Az idegen nyelvi mérés és értékelés elmélete és gyakorlata. Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó. Budapest.

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment. (2001) Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Közös Európai Referenciakeret. Nyelvtanulás, nyelvtanítás, értékelés (2002): Európa Tanács

Közoktatási Bizottság Élő Nyelvek Osztálya. Strassbourg, Kiadja az Öktatási Minisztérium megbízásából a Pedagógiai Továbbképzési Módszertani és Információs Központ Kht. Budapest.

LENGYEL, ZS. (ed.) (1999): Államilag elismert nyelvvizsgák (központok, rendszerek) akkreditációjának kézikönyve. Professzorok Háza, NYAK. Budapest.

SÓS, P.-STURCZ, Z. (1986): Nyelvoktatás – nyelvoktatási rendelet – nyelvtudás. Folia Practico-Linguistica. XVI. 2. 7-26.

TERESTÉNYI, T. (1980): Idegen-nyelvtudás a magyar lakosság körében. Tömegkommunikációs Kutatóközpont, XII. évf. 13.

List of documents

1.	70 th Ministerial Decree
2.	4/1958. (VIII. 3.) Ministerial Decree
3.	6/1965. (VII. 16.) Ministerial Decree
4.	3/1967. (XII. 3.) Ministerial Decree
5.	2/1971. (VII. 14.) Ministerial Decree
6.	9/1978. (VIII. 25.) Governmental Decree
7.	3/1980. (X. 25.) Ministerial Decree
8.	4/1982. (III. 12.) Ministerial Decree
9.	11/1990. (X. 4.) Governmental Decree
10.	Higher Education Act (1993)
11.	71/1998 (IV. 8.) Governmental Decree
12.	30/1999 (VII. 21.) Governmental Decree
13.	Higher Education Act (2005.CXXXIX))