Zsófia Fülöp
University of Pannonia, Hungary
Zahia Flih
University of Pannonia, Hungary
Beyza Nur Gürses
University of Pannonia, Hungary
Szilvia Bátyi
University of Pannonia, Hungary

THE APPLICABILITY OF SPOLSKY'S TRIPARTITE MODEL IN THREE CONTEXTS

Abstract. This study evaluates the applicability of Spolsky's tripartite model of language policy, consisting of language beliefs, practices, and management across three different minority contexts in Europe. The research respectively targets Algerians in France, Hungarians in the UK, and Turks in Hungary. The first study centres around the national and community level, while the second and third studies focus on the family domain. For the case of Algerians in France, the study investigates language management by analysing governmental top-down language policies and probes language beliefs and practices among first-generation immigrants using a questionnaire. The second study shifts to the familial domain, using a questionnaire based on Spolsky's tripartite model to explore bilingualism efforts among Hungarian-speaking mothers in the UK. Meanwhile, the Turkish context in Hungary utilizes both semi-structured in-depth interviews as well as a short questionnaire to examine Turkish families' language management, beliefs and practices. The studies present varying results, with Algerians strongly upholding Arabic against the weight of French monolingual policies and the societal demands for using French. Moreover, Hungarian families' efforts to meticulously cultivate bilingualism among their children are undermined by external pressures in education, leading to a more fluid bilingual experience. By contrast, the results showcase the shift of Turkish immigrants towards Hungarian due to intermarriages and the lack of institutional support. Although the findings underscore Spolsky's model adaptability in depicting language policy dimensions across different contexts, it falls short of accounting for layers of complexity pertaining to the impact and role of external socio-political and economic factors. Furthermore, the model partially grasps the dynamic nature of multilingual identity construction. As such, these insights call for a rigorous investigation of these complexities in order to arrive at a better understanding of the fluid and ever-evolving nature of language policy as well as producing more context-sensitive policies.

Keywords: bilingualism; language beliefs; language management; language policy; language practices; Spolsky's tripartite model.

Introduction

When examining language policy (LP), whether at the macro level (e.g., nations, minority groups, education) or at the micro level (e.g., family settings), Spolsky's (2004) framework is frequently used. This framework outlines language policy as a multifaceted concept consisting of three distinct yet interconnected elements: language beliefs, practices, and management. In his later works, Spolsky also added different levels or domains where these elements can be applied, such as the individual, family, national and supranational levels (Spolsky, 2009; 2012; 2021). Language practices are understood as the actual language use of a speech community or family, also labelled as language repertoire at the individual level (Spolsky, 2021). Beliefs and ideologies are formed by the speakers about language(s) and language choices. The third component is language management which refers to any deliberate efforts of individuals or institutions to modify the language practices or beliefs of a community. Van Oss et al. (2021) note that none of these components can be investigated without the other two as they are interconnected and indispensable elements of language policy.

In this paper, we would like to describe the applicability of the model in three different research designs. The goal of this study is to present how language management, practices and beliefs are manifested in three minority contexts in Europe, where individuals and communities navigate their multilingualism in different language political environments. Different methodologies are used in the studies, as several factors (such as size and composition of the minority) require qualitative and/or quantitative approaches. The first study focuses on the national and community level, while the second and third studies concern the family domain approaching it from a quantitative and a qualitative perspective. Study 1 reports on the findings of a research that was conducted among Algerians in France. It is a special case as the target community includes post-colonial migrants already having a good proficiency in French pre-migration. Language management is described at the national level (i.e., France), while language practices and ideologies at the immigrant community level. Study 2 is a large questionnaire survey-based study using Spolsky's tripartite model as a framework and targets different

types of Hungarian families living in the UK. Study 3 employs in-depth interviews to explore Turkish families' language ideologies, management and practices in Hungary. The article will discuss the most relevant concepts and studies followed by the description of the three studies; the results part will concentrate on how the components in Spolsky's framework can be used to explain the results.

Literature Review

The majority of the world's languages are minority languages which are either undergoing the shifting process to the dominant language in the hope of better opportunities or fighting against the homogenizing effect of globalization and focusing on language maintenance (Hogan-Brun O' & Rourke, 2019). Cross-border migrants are no exception. Globalization is a major factor affecting the mobility of people and at the same time urges scholars to revisit approaches to studying migrant speaker communities. Pauwels (2016) notes that the triggers and the nature of migration have changed considerably because of globalization. The economic, religious, demographic and political reasons are complemented with educational opportunities, tourism and employment practices. Furthermore, migration or mobility can also take different forms: short-term mobility, long-term (re)settlement or being 'on the move' as a desire or a must. This creates a new context to approach and interpret the language choices and practices in these communities. The language policy model developed by Spolsky (2004) and its later modifications offers such a framework. The model can be understood as a reaction to the limited scope of previous conceptualizations of language policy. Initially, the concept of language policy was developed jointly with *language planning*; however, with the expansion of the field, the planning part became inapplicable in many contexts. Now language planning is mainly used in situations when the state or authority determines what languages or varieties can be used in different domains, i.e., how languages should be managed (Jernudd & Nekvapil, 2012). As a result of the intertwined history of the two terms, language policy is still often understood as a top-down process (Liddicoat, 2020). However, taking into account all the domains where

language policy research is conducted (e.g., families, workplaces, schools, public spaces, military, etc.), it becomes apparent that bottom-up processes are also important. The wide scope of language policy is also evidenced by its interrelation with multiple factors. As Spolsky (2004: ix) notes: "Language policy exists within a complex set of social, political, economic, religious, demographic, educational and cultural factors that make up the full ecology of human life."

Spolsky's tripartite model of language policy is comprehensive, composed of language management, language practices and beliefs or ideologies. Besides the top-down language managing activities, it includes not intentional and not planned activities (Johnson, 2013) as well. The introduction of domains, following Fishman (1972), was a useful addition to the model, as it makes the framework applicable to the context of individual, family, education, nation, and above (Spolsky, 2007; 2021). **Language management** originates from the idea that language use can be managed. The language manager can be the *state* managing language use via the constitution and/or language laws, *institutions*, making decisions about the official working language or medium of instruction in schools, *parents* making efforts to persuade their children to use the heritage language. The Language Management Theory (Neustupný & Nekvapil, 2003; Nekvapil & Sherman, 2015) makes a distinction between *simple managemen*t and *organised management*, the latter referring to activities undertaken by institutions, while the former means language decisions made by individuals (also referred to as individual self-management by Spolsky, 2021). **Language practices** are the observable behaviors and choices of people, and these practices may be influenced by external and internal forces (social, psychological, religious, etc.) and the outcome can be maintenance or shift depending on the strength of these factors. Language practices are not necessarily in line with language management efforts; for example, regardless of the government's recommendations to use the state language at home, migrant families can still use their mother tongues with their children. **Language beliefs and ideologies** are values assigned to languages and varieties. Ideologies do not always translate into practices, e.g., minority groups may have very positive attitudes towards their languages, but their

language use in the family and community is low (Flih, 2024). The model has served as a framework in different contexts (e.g., education (Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Van Oss et al., 2021); however, in this paper only the community and family context will be discussed.

Language Policy at the State and Community Level

Early research on LP started at the level of the state, focusing on how languages are managed across different nations as well as addressing the challenges and the issues that may arise from adopting certain policies. Lambert (1999) believed that the language policy of a country is highly influenced by the composition of its society, as it reflects the complex relationship between the state and its linguistic communities. This foundational understanding of state level language policy aligns with Spolsky's aforementioned tripartite model, which offers a nuanced perspective when applied at the macro level (Spolsky, 2004). At a national scale, language management usually denotes the state's legislative and administrative efforts to direct the use of language by either bolstering or contrasting prevailing language practices in the community. Language practices themselves are both a reflection of and response to such language management strategies that manifest in the linguistic behavior of the community. Moreover, language beliefs and ideologies held by the community could incline towards a singular national identity and language or opt for linguistic diversity, informing as well as yielding to national policies. In an application of Spolsky's model to Iceland, Albury (2015) highlights how language management, language practices, and language beliefs materialize at a macro level. As a response to the global influence of English, the Icelandic government enacted a policy of linguistic purism and monolingualism, perceiving Icelandic as a global minority language in need of preservation. Supported by a community that embraces a monoglot ideology and belief, language purism was implemented by reinforcing Icelandic in daily life (media and education), scrutinizing loanwords from other languages, promoting a cultural identity, and influencing digital contexts (Friðriksson, 2009; Svavarsdóttir, 2008; Hilmarsson-Dunn, 2009). Concurrently, the policies acknowledge the necessity of English in certain

academic and professional domains, fostering a form of pragmatic bilingualism whereby English is used without replacing Icelandic's central role in the language practices of the community (Hilmarsson-Dunn & Kristinsson, 2010). Moreover, in reviewing Malaysia's national language policy, Habuan (2018) displays how language management, shaped by the language practices of the community, attempts to balance the national ideology which is firmly tied to the Malay language and identity, the global influence of English as well as the plight of minority languages in the country. Although the national policy recognises Malay as the official language of the country, it also allows for a degree of flexibility in trying to meet the demands for global communication in English (MBMMBI policy to strengthen both Malay and English proficiency; Ahmed et al., 2012). Furthermore, the policies sanction national-type schools and elective language subjects to accommodate the languages of minority (Chinese and Indian) as well as indigenous (Iban, Kadazan-Dusun, and Semai) groups (Habuan, 2018). The previous examples showcase the interplay of Spolsky's three elements in forging national language policies at the macro level whereby language management both influences as well as adheres to language practices and national ideology in the community.

Language Policy at the Family Level

Recent studies have highlighted both the strengths and limitations of Spolsky's tripartite model in explaining Family Language Policy (FLP). Curdt-Christiansen and Sun (2022), after reviewing past research that applied Spolsky's model, note that studies have predominantly focused on internal factors such as parental beliefs, emotions, and identity and how these influence language practices and management efforts, and they argue that future inquiries should broaden their scope to include diverse socioeconomic contexts and apply quantitative methods to better understand multilingual families.

Among others, Stavans (2012) has implemented Spolsky's model in her study, which involved 60 Ethiopian families in Israel. The findings highlight how internal (home and family) and external (school and institutions) factors shape parent-child interactions. Stavans emphasizes the complex interplay between parental attitudes towards child-rearing and educational

responsibilities, which are influenced by both home culture and the desire to adapt to a new society.

On the other hand, quantitative research has also made valuable contributions to the field, as presented in studies by Hirsch and Kayam (2020) and Hollebeke et al. (2022). Hirsch and Kayam explored the interrelation between different immigrant and trans-settler transnationalism types using Spolsky's model in Israel. In contrast, Hollebeke et al. questioned the complexity of Spolsky's three components, creating and testing scales to measure the relationships between beliefs, practices, and management within the Flemish community in Belgium. A successive study by Hollebeke (2024) provided an even deeper analysis of these scales, allowing for statistically validated assessments of the dynamic nature of Family Language Policy both at the population level and within individual families. Based on the meticulous research on Spolsky's tripartite system the results of Hollebeke's analyses also confirm that language policy in the family sphere is not a unitary construct, and she notes that its components can be accurately described independently of each other and, therefore, draws attention to the importance of exploring the varied dynamics between components in both formal institutionalized domains and in the family sphere.

The most recent study by Hatoss (2024) further expands the application of Spolsky's model by examining FLP among Hungarian families in Australia. This study focuses closely on the emotive-relational dimensions, testing a semi-comprehensive model that highlights the challenges and conflicts from the parental perspective. Despite these advancements, Hatoss notes that questions about parental beliefs regarding their impact on and control over children's language practices and development remain unanswered.

Aims and Research Questions

The three studies in this paper aim to illustrate how Spolsky's tripartite framework can be applied flexibly to examine language policy across different contexts at both macro and micro levels. The studies required the use of diverse methodologies and instruments to accommodate contextual

differences. Each study investigates the language practices, ideologies, and management of a particular minority, which allows for a more focused examination of how the model's components manifest in various settings. The study is guided by two main research questions:

1. How are language beliefs, practices, and management reflected in the experiences of Algerians in France, Hungarians in the UK, and Turks in Hungary?

2. To what extent does Spolsky's model explain the influence of outside factors—such as schools, government policies, or mixed marriages—on language use and practices?

Research Contexts and Methodologies

Study 1: Algerians in France

The Algerian presence in France dates back to the late 19th century, following the French colonisation of Algeria in 1830 and as a result of several historical events it continued until today. As of recent statistics[1], there are approximately 2.6 million Algerians living in France including both immigrants and their descendants. To date, there has been little research conducted on the linguistic profile of the Algerian community despite being the largest immigrant minority in France and one of the largest immigrant minorities in Europe (Vassoille, 2024). Furthermore, none of the studies have analysed all aspects of language policy as it is manifested in the given community. Nonetheless, it is possible to derive insights from available research on the Algerian immigrant community in France. For instance, Arfi (2008) argues that prior knowledge of French plays a significant role in pushing Algerians towards the dominant language, which can serve to inform national language management decisions towards increasing language proficiency requirements for future immigrants. Medjdoub's (2015) observation of the gradual generational shift towards French among Algerian immigrants highlights the impact of strict monolingual policies on language practices over time, while

---

[1] See https://observatoire-immigration.fr/limmigration-des-algeriens/

Zemmour and Alghazo (2023) results about Kabyle speakers' positive attitude towards their native language illustrate how established language beliefs resist robust language policies. The aim of this study is to explore how language practices and beliefs/ideologies are negotiated by the Algerian community given the assimilatory policy of France.

Participants

The study involved 221 participants, with 113 females and 108 males. All participants were first-generation immigrants recruited using the snowballing technique; however, an important aspect of the study was to aim for diversity and representativeness in terms of settlement, education, age, age at immigration, occupation, marriage type, etc. Most participants are currently residing in major French cities including Paris, Marseille, and Grenoble. Among the group of married respondents (40.27%), 50.6 percent were married to Algerian spouses, 30.4 percent to Franco-Algerian spouses, and 16.5 percent to French spouses. The remaining 2.5 percent were married to immigrants of other nationalities (Tunisian and Egyptian). As for participants' level of education, 57.9 percent have a university level education (bachelor, master, or PhD degrees) while 42.1 percent have a non-university level education (vocational certificate or below). Table 1. shows participants' characteristics in terms of their age, age at immigration, and length of residence (LOR).

Table 1

Participants' Characteristics (N=221)

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max
Age (years)	35.8	13.8	14	82
Age at immigration (years)	25.3	8.3	7	61
LOR (years)	10.5	11.4	.33	57

The Research Instrument

To get a full picture about the language management, language practices and beliefs in this community, different approaches were used. In this context, language management is conceptualized as the top-down activity of the state through the constitution, language laws, and regulations. Language practices and beliefs were explored using a questionnaire developed for this study. Besides demographic information, participants were asked about their language use habits in different domains and with different interlocutors. They were also asked to rate, on a five-point Likert scale, their agreement with statements in order to assess their attitudes and beliefs towards French and Arabic.

Procedure and Analysis

Participants were recruited using the snowballing technique, which allowed the sample to grow through referrals. They were asked to complete the questionnaire that was available both online (Google Forms) and in person (paper-based format) in the language of their choice since it was developed in Arabic and French. Participants' responses were then analysed. The analysis involved conducting basic statistical techniques (e.g., mean, std. deviations, etc.) to investigate participants' language use as well as their attitudes towards Arabic and French languages.

Study 2: Hungarians in the UK

Emigration waves from Hungary to the UK have occurred during various historical periods starting after World War I (Gazsó, 2016). Migration in the last 50 years or so differs from previous waves as the triggers are not historical but economic, social, educational, etc. According to the latest census, data from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) from 2021, there are 118,000 Hungarian-born people residing in the UK, most of them moved there after Hungary joined the EU in 2004.

One of the most relevant features of the migration for this current wave is that Hungarians living in the UK have turned from young, single emigrants into blossoming families, from which thousands of children are born into Hungarian families in the UK. Due to their significant number, the Hungarian community has become increasingly visible, particularly through the Hungarian Sunday School system (Papp, Kovács, & Kováts, 2019). However, little is known about the Hungarian community's language practices, ideologies and language management, a gap this study aims to fill by focusing on families.

Participants

The study involved 93 participants with a mean age of 38.18 years, consisting entirely of women. These participants, who have resided in the UK for an average of 11.35 years, are all Hungarian-speaking mothers (see Table 2). The majority of them live in Hungarian-English dominant speaking families, whereas 3 families use Hungarian and other languages, but not English. This indicates multilingualism without the inclusion of English. One family uses only English at home that suggests that English-only households are very rare in this context. Households that predominantly use Hungarian show strong native-language preservation, as indicated by their high numbers.

Table 2

Participants' Characteristics (N=93)

	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Age (years)	38.18	5.3	28	50
Age at immigration (years)	26.75	4.9	15	43
LOR (years)	11.35	4.3	4	26

The majority are currently living in London, while many others are based in the East and West Midlands. In terms of education, 63.2 percent have attained a university degree (bachelor's, master's, or PhD), while the rest have

a non-university level education, such as a vocational certificate or informal learning.

The Research Instrument

The research employed a macro-level investigation using a questionnaire that is based on Spolsky's tripartite model (2004, 2008). The questionnaire included questions about language management, practices and beliefs besides demographic and other relevant data. Factors affecting the three pillars of FLP have also been explored by the survey; however, it is not the goal of the present paper to discuss these relationships. The instrument was composed relying on previous studies (Curdt-Christiansen et al., 2023; González et al., 2024), The different scales of the questionnaire were reliable as measured by Cronbach alpha (child-directed speech (6 items): α = .751, child(ren)-initiated conversations (5 items): α = .894; positive language ideologies (18 items): α = .804; negative language ideologies (6 items): α =.723

Procedure and Analysis

Only the Hungarian members of the couples were invited via online platforms to complete a questionnaire in Hungarian. Following this, additional participants were encouraged by snowball sampling to participate, allowing the sample expand through referrals. The collected responses were then analysed using basic statistical methods (such as means and standard deviations) to explore various aspects of Spolsky's tripartite model and their interconnectedness. This analysis aimed to examine participants' language practices and their attitudes towards both Hungarian and English.

Study 3: Turkish in Hungary

The historical connection between Hungary and Turkey dates back to the Turkish occupation from 1526 to 1686, which provides context for

contemporary Turkish migration to Hungary, particularly after 1989 (Egeresi & Szigetvári, 2017). Currently, around 5,700 Turkish citizens reside in Hungary, though the number of permanent settlers is lower, as per the 2011 census. While Hungary officially recognizes 13 minorities under Act CLXXIX of 2011, Turks are classified as an immigrant community (Kováts, 2010). A 2009 sociological study of 223 participants found that most Turks migrated for economic reasons, with an average stay of nine years, and 29% spoke Hungarian fluently, especially those aged 35–49, while one-third neither spoke nor planned to learn Hungarian (Örkény & Székelyi, 2010). This community is different in many ways from the Turkish diaspora in Western Europe which has grown significantly since labor migration agreements in the 1960s, with 5.5 million Turks currently residing there (Akgünüdüz, 2008). Language maintenance is key in these communities, with Turkish as a core identity marker with high language vitality perception (Extra, Yağmur, & Van der Avoird, 2004). In France, bilingualism is common, and in-group marriages reinforce Turkish language use (Yağmur & Akıncı, 2003). Linguistic changes, such as new dialects, are seen in Germany due to bilingualism (Schroeder, Şimşek, & Küpper, 2015), while in the Netherlands, Turkish remains dominant within families, though language attitudes differ by education (Yağmur, 2015). Conversely, in Hungary the Turkish population is small facing challenges with limited institutional support, weak community networks, and high out-group marriage rates, affecting language maintenance and identity. A small-scale study by Gürses & Bátyi (2022) highlights these issues, revealing distinctive dual identity negotiation, and calls for further research into how these factors affect the Turkish diaspora's long-term linguistic practices.

Participants

A total of 20 male first-generation Turkish immigrants in Hungary participated in this study, with an age range of 33–71 (mean: 51.65 years) (Table 3). Participants were recruited from diverse educational, marital, and occupational backgrounds to ensure representativeness. Most participants were recruited in Budapest, specifically in teahouses, restaurants, and businesses where the Turkish community gathers.

Table 3

Participants' Characteristics (N=20)

	Mean	**Std. Deviation**	**Min**	**Max**
Age (years)	51.65	7.9	33	71
Age at immigration (years)	28.5	6.3	18	49
LOR (years)	22.9	2.5	11	36

In terms of marital patterns, out-group marriages were predominant: 12 participants were married to Hungarian partners, while only two endogamous marriages were documented. Additionally, three participants were unmarried, and three reported divorces involving Hungarian or Turkish spouses.

The Research Instrument

A short questionnaire was used to explore personal and demographic data, and as the main instrument, semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted to examine language management, use, and ideology within the Turkish immigrant community, based on Spolsky' s model. The interview questions explore experiences, integration strategies, and community connections, focusing on how language management influences language use. It also investigates beliefs about Turkish and Hungarian languages, ideological stances, and the societal impact on language ideologies. Additionally, the study addresses social language use, media multiliteracy, bilingual and multilingual practices, and the negotiation of multiple identities, all within the framework of language policy's influence on linguistic behavior and self-perception.

Procedure and Analysis

The study employed qualitative methods, using semi-structured in-depth interviews at locations convenient to participants, not limited to their

homes. Interviews followed grounded theory principles (Charmaz, 2006), were conducted in Turkish, and allowed language switching for natural expression. Each lasted 45–60 minutes, was audio-recorded with consent, and supplemented by observational notes for contextual insight. Transcripts were analyzed using initial and focused coding, with constant comparison. Data were organized via Spolsky's tripartite model; language practices, management, and ideologies. Demographic questionnaires further contextualized the findings.

Ethical considerations were carefully observed for each of the three studies included in this paper. Prior to data collection, participants were asked for their consent to take part in the study. They received ample explanation regarding the nature and aims of the research. They were informed that their participation is voluntary and that withdrawing is optional at any time. Participants were also informed that their responses will remain anonymous and confidential and will only be used for academic research purposes.

Results

Study 1

This section will examine the language policy of France and investigate whether it has an effect on the linguistic choices and ideologies of the Algerian community residing in the French territory. By considering language management at the state level and ideology and practices at the community level, the analysis will offer a comprehensive understanding of how Spolsky's model is applied in the French context.

Language Management

France is one of the most linguistically varied countries in Europe, yet, it adopts a strict monolingual French language policy. This policy is based on the "one nation, one language" principle where the use of any other language on its territory is officially rejected. Article 2 of the French constitution explicitly states: *"la langue de la République est le français"*, which emphasizes the central role of the French language in France and reflects its linguistic unity.

According to a 2022 report by the French Ministry of Culture, Arabic is approximately spoken by 4 million people, mainly of North African origin (around 6% of the population). However, France insists on implementing policies that seek to limit and control the teaching, learning and use of Arabic within the society. In 2016, Najat Valluad-Belkacem, a former Minister of Education, suggested a project that aimed at improving the teaching of Arabic to all Arab communities living in France (Durand, 2016). Her initiative was unfortunately denied by members of the right-wing party who said the decision would fuel sectarianism and threaten the French national unity. Figures show that Arabic is only taught in 3% of the country's schools, especially in areas that are mostly inhabited by Arab immigrants (Wakim, 2020). On the community-level, however, Arabic classes are usually delivered by mosques and in private institutions where children have the opportunity to learn their heritage language each Sunday. Such efforts have been critical in ensuring that the younger generation remains connected to their identity, language and culture, despite the challenges posed by the French government.

Language Practices

Table 4 presents the results (mean scores and standard deviations) of language use of the Algerian community living in France across five domains: family, friends, mosque, work, clubs and organizations. Within the family domain, participants reported using mostly Arabic when communicating with their parents, siblings, spouses, and children (M = 2.27, SD = 0.95). This is not surprising since 'home' is the least subjected domain to the language policies and regulations of the host country and, therefore, the most crucial in terms of language maintenance. By speaking Arabic at home, Algerians encourage intergenerational transmission of their heritage language and create a linguistic space that balances between the pressure of integration and the preservation of their identity in a predominantly French-speaking environment. Furthermore, the data suggests that participants use Arabic and French equally with their Algerian friends (M = 2.99, SD = 0.84). Note that participants' linguistic choices in the friendship domain may vary depending on the interlocutors' Arabic proficiency level (especially if they are second or third

generation), topic of conversation, and personal preferences. In the mosque, Arabic is commonly used for prayers as it is the language of Quran, but also for delivering the Friday's sermon (M = 2.21, SD = 0.73). We conclude that the religious domain is also important since it has a critical role in helping the Algerian community maintain ties to its heritage language in the French context. Conversely, French emerges as the dominant language in the workplace (M = 4.30, SD = 0.96), reflecting its role as the official and administrative medium of communication. Finally, the results show that participants use both Arabic and French in clubs and organizations (M = 3.10, SD = 0.98) considering the type of activities they are involved in.

Table 4

Self-Reported Language Use

	Mean (M)	Std. Deviation (SD)
Family	2.27	0.95
Friends	2.99	0.84
Mosque	2.21	0.73
Work	4.30	0.96
Clubs/organizations	3.10	0.98

Note. (1) only Arabic, (2) mostly Arabic, (3) Arabic and French, (4) mostly French, (5) only French.

Language Ideologies

Participants were asked to report about their ideologies and attitude towards their home language (Arabic) and the majority language of the dominant group (French). The results, provided in Table 5, show that participants have very positive attitudes regarding both languages. The positive attitude of participants towards Arabic is reflected not only in their frequent use of the language with people that share the same linguistic

background, but also in their strong desire to maintain it and pass it on to future generations, considering it is an integral part of their heritage. However, the positive attitude towards the French language is a matter of necessity in the first place. Despite the shared colonial history between Algeria and France that may influence the linguistic attitudes of the Algerian minority group in France, they are surely aware of the great role French plays since it is the primary means of communication and integration into the French society and key to higher academic and professional achievement. The mean scores and standard deviations of participants' self-reported attitude are presented below.

Table 5

Participant's Attitude Towards Arabic and French Languages

	Mean (M)	Std. Deviation (SD)
Attitude towards the Arabic language	4.21	0.60
Attitude towards the French language	4.07	0.60

Note. (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) Not sure, (4) agree (5) strongly agree.

Study 2

Language Management

Following Curdt-Christiansen et al. (2023) language management was operationalised as different actions that parents can take to manage and/or develop their home languages.

Table 6

Actions Parents Would Take for Their Child's/Children's Language Development

Actions	%
Hire a bi/multilingual nanny/child-carer	15
Sign up my child for Hungarian tuition	35

Actions	%
Register my child for summer camp to learn English	15
Register my child for summer camp to learn Hungarian	60
Organise frequent visits for my child to stay with relatives in my home country for language purposes	68
I learn my partner's language	13
Involve my child's grandparents in child-caring	34
Maintain virtual contacts with family members through mobile devices	78
Other	12

The analysis discovered (Table 6) reveals a strong preference for both virtual communication and physical immersion: 78% of the parents marked mobile devices as the most prioritised way to keep in touch with family members abroad, thus highlighting the ever-growing reliance on technology to preserve linguistic and cultural bonds. On the other hand, 68% of the participants emphasized the importance of frequent visits to the home country that points towards physical immersion in a native-speaking environment as a complementary method for language learning. Cultural programs, such as Hungarian summer camps was chosen by 60% of the parents while 34% of the participants would opt for grandparental involvement in child-rearing. The choices reflect a strong commitment towards maintaining the children's Hungarian language skills and cultural identity through real-world experiences.

Language Practices

The questions related to language practices incorporated the following domains: (1) the parents' own language practices, (2) child directed speech (3) child(ren)-initiated conversations. A clear bilingual trend became visible across most of the observed activities.

When it comes to parents' own language practices, they use both Hungarian and English for reading books and online news, watching TV, listening to music, writing shopping lists, while with their partners they either use Hungarian or English exclusively, depending on the partner's language. After examining the child-directed speech, it becomes clear that Hungarian is most likely to be chosen as the dominant language across most of the family interactions—especially in culturally significant contexts such as mealtime conversations and grandparent interactions—confirming its central role in intimate family life. Most of the parents use both Hungarian and English in various contexts, such as homework assistance, that again shows a great impact of the schooling system. English is more present in child-partner interactions, presumably influenced by the partner's linguistic background. Different types of family dynamics are shown by the relatively high number of 'not relevant' answers, the reasons of which could be the absence of a partner, the age of the child, or role-specific parental engagement. Overall, in child-directed speech context Hungarian remains central in intimate family communication, together with the features of bilingualism and English that both play context-dependent roles.

Table 7

Language of Child-Directed Speech (%)

	Dominantly Hungarian (> 75%)	Hungarian and English	Dominantly English (> 75%)	Other	Not relevant
Help your child do homework	19	42	16	0	23
During mealtime	68	12	19	1	0
You to children	72	23	5	0	0
Your partner to child(ren)	35	9	24	4	28
Paternal grandparents to child(ren)	55	0	15	6	24
Maternal grandparents to child(ren)	88	4	0	0	8

When it comes to conversation initiated by the child(ren), the data shows Hungarian as the dominant language in close family interactions, particularly between children, parents, and grandparents (Table 8). Bilingual communication among family members is also significant, indicating a flexible and dynamic language environment within the family. On the other hand, interactions with grandparents show a solid attachment to Hungarian, that points towards the endeavours of involving the grandparents and other non-English speaker family members into the children's lives. Sibling interactions, however, present a more balanced distribution of the languages, that reflects varying degrees of language influence across family relationships and indicates a strong impact of the dominant schooling system.

Table 8

Language of Child(ren)-Initiated Conversations (%)

	Dominantly Hungarian (> 75%)	Hungarian and English	Dominantly English (> 75%)	Other	Not relevant
Children to you	44	24	25	0	8
Children to you partner	32	16	34	2	15
Child to siblings	16	12	22	1	49
Children to paternal grandparents	46	2	20	5	26
Children to maternal grandparents	73	9	9	0	10

Language Ideologies

Language ideologies were explored via Likert-scale statements—both positive and negative—regarding the perception of bilingualism, the use of Hungarian in a predominantly English-speaking environment, the use of English in Hungarian households in the United Kingdom, and grandparental involvement in the upbringing of children in transnational families.

This section of the questionnaire included 20 items; therefore, the Exploratory Factor Analyses (EFA) was conducted using the Principal

Component Analyses (PCA) for factor extraction. The analyses identified 5 factors:

> (1) Factors contributing to child's (language) development (5 items, e.g.: "*It is beneficial for a child to attend a Hungarian complementary school to learn the non-English home language(s)*"; "*It is important for me to follow websites/pages where language related advice is shared*");
>
> (2) Positive statements about bi/multilingualism (2 items, e.g.: "*Being bi/multilingual benefits a child's academic performance*");
>
> (3) Negative statements about bi/multilingualism and Hungarian (5 items, e.g.: "*It is disadvantageous for a child if only Hungarian is used at home*"; "*Speaking two or more languages confuses a child*".);
>
> (4) Literacy (3 items, e.g.: "*It is important for my child(ren) to read in Hungarian*"; "*A child's ability to read and write in two or more languages plays a positive role in his/her academic development*");
>
> (5) Contact with family members (two items, e.g.: "*Keeping in regular contact with members of our family who do not speak Hungarian is important to me*").

As Table 9 shows, parents usually are positive towards maintaining Hungarian and raise their children bi- and multilingual. Participants are positive about the contribution of grandparents, complementary schools and recommendations of language-related websites to help their children language development. They also disagree with negative statements about the maintenance of the heritage language and the benefits of bi- and multilingualism; however, there are some negative opinions about the contribution of bi- and multilingualism to the children's success as indicated by the dispersion of the data ($M = 1.5$, $SD = 1.05$). Literacy in Hungarian as well as bilingual literacy is valued by the parents, and they particularly value the maintenance of regular contact with the non-English speaking family members, emphasizing the decisive role of family in the preservation of heritage languages.

Table 9

Descriptive Data of Parents' Language Ideologies

	Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Factors contributing to (language) development	2.78	0.83	1	5
Positive statements about bi/multilingualism	1.5	1.05	1	5
Negative statements about bi/multilingualism and Hungarian	4.41	0.61	2.8	5
Literacy	1.68	0.69	1	3.67
Contact with family	1.4	0.69	1	5

Note. 1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree

Study 3

Language Management

Individuals as language managers often make decisions about language use, especially in bi- and multilingual contexts. As it becomes clear from the analyses of the interviews with first-generation Turkish immigrants in Hungary, language management exhibits a dynamic interplay with personal ideologies, language practices and external sociolinguistic influences. A significant sociolinguistic factor within the domestic sphere is the marital context. Participants in exogamous marriages predominantly use Hungarian with their spouses, whereas those in endogamous marriages demonstrate stronger efforts to maintain Turkish at home (see Excerpt 1). Father interviewees adhering to an "only Turkish" ideology emphasized the exclusive use of Turkish with their children, often reinforcing it with books, media, and cartoons. Conversely, language practices can also affect language management as some parents reported abandoning Turkish in child rearing

due to resistance from children or the dominance of Hungarian in the surrounding environment. This also highlights the prominent role of familial language policies in shaping intergenerational transmission of the heritage language (Spolsky, 2012).

Participants with higher educational attainment were found to engage more deliberately in preserving and transmitting Turkish to the next generation, However, these individuals also reported more frequent use of Hungarian in daily interactions (see Excerpt 2), highlighting their heightened experience of language shift. These individuals reported more frequent use of Hungarian in daily interactions (see Excerpt 3), reflecting the language shift that often accompanies integration.

Excerpt (1)

> ... The most important thing is to understand each other. I speak in solely Hungarian to my wife. It is easier so I do not switch with her. I don't feel the need.

Excerpt (2)

> Because of those children, well, we built the house completely in Turkish.

Excerpt (3)

> Now we deliberately keep the social media, TV, and radio in Turkish at home just for the kids. However, in the car, my radio has always been Hungarian. I use Hungarian seventy to eighty percent of the time in my daily life. It is very important. I've invested all my effort in Hungarian. Am I satisfied? So far, yes. But with the kids, I speak only Turkish.

Language Practices

Patterns of language use within the Turkish immigrant community in Hungary reflects practical considerations and sociolinguistic dynamics. Turkish is primarily used with the parents of the participants, serving as a medium for emotional connection and cultural heritage. However, interactions with children, particularly in exogamous families, are dominated by Hungarian (see Excerpt 4), reflecting the societal dominance of the majority language and interethnic language shift.

Excerpt (4)

> We speak Turkish with my parents, but with my children, it's all Hungarian. I try sometimes, but when I speak Turkish to my kids, they respond in Hungarian.

Examples such as this illustrate the gradual shift towards Hungarian within both family and social contexts. Multilingual practices are prevalent in social interactions, with language choice determined by context. Turkish is used with other Turks, Hungarian with Hungarians, and English or other international languages in intercultural settings (see Excerpt 5). Code-switching is common, reflecting the community's linguistic adaptability (see Excerpt 6).

Excerpt (5)

> In general, I use Hungarian with Hungarians, Turkish with Turks, and English with others, depending on the situation. It's all about what's needed at the moment.

Excerpt (6)

> We switch between languages even with our Turkish friends, sometimes just for fun. For example, we might say, 'Boldog szülinapot, barátom!' [Happy birthday, my friend!] in Hungarian, then add a smiley face to show we're not serious.

Participants also reported context-dependent literacy practices. Turkish and English are preferred for leisure reading, while Hungarian dominates professional and instructional contexts due to its utility in technical fields. Similarly, writing in Hungarian is common in work-related settings, even when communicating informally with Turkish friends.

Language Ideologies

Language ideologies significantly shape the practices of Turkish immigrants in Hungary, reflecting a tension between cultural preservation and integration. Hungarian is prioritized pragmatically for societal integration, while Turkish remains a key marker of identity with emotional and cultural significance (see Excerpt 7, Excerpt 8, Excerpt 9). This duality highlights

the complex relationship participants have with language: Hungarian is necessary for engagement with broader society, while Turkish serves as a vital marker of personal and cultural identity (see Excerpt 8).

Excerpt (7)

> Hungarian comes first for me. Why? Because I live here. I meet these people every day. At home, in family meetings, or during trips, we're mostly with Hungarians. You need to know the language. Without it, you feel incomplete and alienated.

Excerpt (8)

> Of course, Turkish has a special place for me, as it is my mother tongue.

To navigate this tension, participants emphasize multilingualism, advocating for the balanced use of Turkish, Hungarian, and even English (see Excerpt 10). However, they recognize the Turkish language decline as an inevitable consequence of integration.

Excerpt (9)

> Turkish is more important because it is our mother tongue... If you live here, speaking Hungarian is essential.

Excerpt (10)

> Children should use all languages—Hungarian, Turkish, and English. But Hungarian and Turkish are a must.

Despite Hungarian's dominance, participants express concern about the lack of institutional support for Turkish, which threatens its intergenerational transmission. They all see a weak future for the Turkish language (see Excerpt 11, Excerpt 12, Excerpt 13) Many call for the Turkish state's involvement, noting stronger heritage language programs in other European countries (Excerpt 13).

Excerpt (11)

> Turkish will be lost... Will I be sad? Yes, because I am Turkish. But will they (the kids) lose much in life? No.

Excerpt (12)

> Hungarian will be sufficient... There will be a loss of Turkish, but it's not a problem.

Excerpt (13)

> In Hungary, there's no system for teaching Turkish. The Turkish state should do more other countries like Germany or France do.

Discussion

Subsequent review studies have already ventured into the applicability of Spolsky's tripartite model (language beliefs, practices, and management) (Hollebeke et al. 2022; Lomeu Gomes 2018; Tamleh, Rezaei, & Boivin, 2022) providing a solid framework for an analytical lens, yet each study analyses the model from distinct perspectives that highlight both its usefulness and its limitations. Hollebeke et al. (2022) and Tamleh, Rezaei, and Boivin (2022) particularly emphasize the disconnectedness between parental ideologies and actual language use, revealing how easily strong heritage language beliefs fail to result in consistent practices due to children's preferences, societal norms, or institutional barriers. Lomeu Gomes (2019), in contrast, questions the frequent application of the Spolsky's model without sufficient reflection, calling attention to the uncritical adoption that overlooks power relations and Western-centric assumptions. These perspectives ultimately highlight that while Spolsky's framework is structurally sound, its practical application requires a much deeper exploration of the socio-political contexts that influences families' language choices.

Following these previous studies, this theoretical disparity becomes even more pronounced when the model is applied to the empirical cases illustrated in this paper, such as Algerian, Hungarian, and Turkish diasporas in Europe.

In France, the Algerian diaspora keeps maintaining the Arabic language in the private and religious spheres despite the high demands of monolingual policies. This persistence of autonomy confirms the disunion between the official language management endeavours and real-life linguistic practices,

highlighting the community's resilience against the pressure of assimilation. As Curdt-Christiansen and Lanza (2018) emphasize, family language policy is shaped by dynamic and situational factors including children's agency and everyday interactions which are particularly evident in the Algerian case. In contrast, Hollebeke et al. (2022) show that in the Flemish context, the maintenance of heritage languages often relies more on conscious, structured family management, such as setting explicit rules about language use, than on oppositional or identity-driven strategies. These cases illustrate how varying sociopolitical environments and the role of family agency can shape divergent trajectories in heritage language practices.

Hungarian families in the UK work out meticulous strategies to support bilingualism among their children. Nonetheless, these efforts are often undermined by external factors such as peer interactions and educational environments, pointing towards a more fluid bilingual experience than initially intended by parental language management, echoing Hollebeke et al.'s findings on the gap between beliefs and practices. This is further supported by King and Fogle (2013), who highlight how parental aspirations for bilingualism are frequently reshaped by external social pressures. Bezcioglu-Goktolga and Yagmur (2022) reinforce the argument about the disconnect between parental ideologies and language practices, demonstrating that, despite strong ideologies (e.g., the desire to maintain Turkish), actual language use is significantly influenced by external factors such as children's language practices and societal expectations.

Turkish immigrants in Hungary face a pronounced language shift towards Hungarian due to the limited institutional support and prevalent intermarriage. These families illustrate how individual language management endeavours can be overshadowed, therefore setting an example as the most striking case of language shift, where external forces like limited institutional support and intermarriage override familial language intentions, as Tamleh, Rezaei, and Boivin (2022) observed. This observation aligns with Pauwels' (2016) analysis, which highlights how similar external pressures contribute to the decline of heritage language use. In contrast, in the Netherlands, institutional support, such as Turkish-language schools and community organizations, plays a significant role in preserving linguistic ties (Yağmur, de

Bot, & Korzilius, 1999), helping counteract the effects of language shift. Intermarriage also significantly influences language practices, often leading households to prioritize the dominant language of the wider society over heritage languages (De Klerk, 2001). These studies highlight the strengths of Spolsky's model and the limitations of its use but also stress the importance of including identity negotiation and broader social forces in family language policy research to get a clearer, more comprehensive picture.

Conclusions

This current study set out to examine the applicability of Spolsky's tripartite model across three distinct migratory contexts—Algerians in France, Hungarians in the UK, and Turks in Hungary—by exploring how language ideologies, practices, and management interact within diverse socio-political environments. The findings confirm that while the model offers a flexible and valuable structure for analysing family and community language policy, it does not fully capture the impact of external factors such as state-level monolingual policies, institutional support, educational pressures, or intermarriage. These variables proved to be decisive in shaping language behaviour and in either supporting or undermining efforts at language maintenance.

Across the three studies, different patterns of resilience, adaptation, and language shift were identified. Algerians in France maintain Arabic in private and religious domains despite state-imposed monolingualism, reflecting a disconnection between language management and community practice. Hungarian families in the UK demonstrate active language management strategies but face challenges from peer influence and education systems, resulting in fluid bilingualism. Meanwhile, Turkish families in Hungary experience a significant shift towards Hungarian, driven by societal integration pressures, lack of institutional support, and intermarriage illustrating the model's limitations in contexts of high external influence.

These findings underscore the need to revise or expand Spolsky's model to account for broader socio-political dynamics and the negotiation of multilingual identities. Language policy is shown here not as a static construct, but as a fluid, evolving process shaped by individual agency, family dynamics,

institutional environments, and societal expectations. Future research should aim to develop a more nuanced, context-sensitive framework that integrates these external dimensions, offering a more comprehensive tool for analysing language policy in complex, real-world multilingual settings.

Acknowledgements

References

Ahmad, R. R., Majid, N., Mamat, N. J. Z., Rambely, A. S., Muda, N., Jaaman, S. H. H., Suradi, N. R. M., Ismail, W. R., Shahabuddin, F. A., Nazar, R. M., Samsudin, H. B., Zin, W. Z. W., Zahari, M., & Rafee, N. M. (2012). Transformation of language in teaching and learning policy. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 59*, 685–691. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.331

Akgündüz, A. (2008). *Labour migration from Turkey to Western Europe, 1960–1974: A multidisciplinary analysis.* Routledge.

Albury, N. J. (2015). National language policy theory: Exploring Spolsky's model in the case of Iceland. *Language Policy, 15*(4), 355–372. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-015-9357-z

Arfi, K. (2008). *Languages of Algerian diaspora in the United States of America: Comparative study with Algerian diaspora in France* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida].

Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology, 46*(1), 5–34. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1997.tb01087.x

Berry, J. W. (2006). Acculturation: A model for cross-cultural psychology. In D. Matsumoto (Ed.), *The handbook of culture and psychology* (pp. 61–93). Oxford University Press.

Bezcioglu-Goktolga, I., & Yagmur, K. (2022). Intergenerational differences in

family language policy of Turkish families in the Netherlands. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 43*(9), 891–906. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2036746

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Curdt-Christiansen, X., & Lanza, E. (2018). Language management in multilingual families: Efforts, measures and challenges. *Multilingua, 37*(2), 123–130. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2017-0132

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L., & Sun, B. (2022). Establishing and maintaining a multilingual family language policy. In A. Stavans & U. Jessner (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Childhood Multilingualism* (pp. 257–277). Cambridge University Press.

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L., Wei, L., & Hua, Z. (2023). Pride, prejudice, and pragmatism: Family language policies in the UK. *Language Policy, 22*(4), 391–411. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-023-09669-0

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 182–204. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000092

De Klerk, V. (2001). The cross-marriage language dilemma: His language or hers? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 4*(3), 197–216. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050108667728

DEPS, Ministry of Culture. (2022). *Cultural practices surveys in metropolitan France (2018) and in the overseas territories (2019–2020).* Author.

Durand, A.-A. (2016, May 27). L'arabe, une langue « communautaire » ? C'est surtout une matière oubliée de l'école. *Le Monde*. https://www.lemonde.fr/les-decodeurs/article/2016/05/27/l-arabe-une-langue-communautaire-c-est-surtout-une-matiere-oubliee-de-l-ecole_4927967_4355770.html

Egeresi, Z., & Szigetvári, T. (2017). *FEUTURE EU 28 country report: Hungary.* FEUTURE Project. https://feuture.unikoeln.de/sites/feuture/pdf/Hungaryc_28_Country_Report.pdf

Extra, G., van der Avoird, T., & Yagmur, K. (2004). *Communiceren in Kleurrijk Tilburg: Een pilotstudie naar communicatiepatronen en informatiebehoeften bij verschillende bevolkingsgroepen.* Babylon.

Fishman, J. A. (1972). Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry: Revisited. In A. S. Dil (Ed.), *Language in sociocultural change: Essays by Joshua A. Fishman* (pp. 76–134). Stanford University Press.

Flih, Z. (2024). Patterns of language maintenance among Algerian-Arabic speakers in France. *Sustainable Multilingualism, 25*, 35–64. https://doi.org/10.2478/sm-2024-0012

Friðriksson, F. (2009). *Language change vs. stability in conservative language communities: A case study of Icelandic.* Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag.

García González, E., Liu, L., & Lanza, E. (2024). Language in multilingual families during the COVID-19 pandemic in Norway: A survey of challenges and opportunities. *Multilingua, 43*(2), 163–190. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2023-0011

Gazsó, D. (2016). A magyar diaszpóra fejlődéstörténete ['The development of the Hungarian diaspora']. *Kisebbségi Szemle, 1*, 9–35.

Gurses, B. N., & Bátyi, S. (2022). A törökök anyanyelv-megőrzése: európai és magyarországi kitekintés. *Anyanyelv-Pedagógia, 15*(4), 135–145. https://doi.org/10.21030/anyp.2022.4.8

Habuan, D. A. (2018). Awang Habuan, D. A. (2018). Using Spolsky' Model in Examining Malaysia's National Language Policy. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, 1*(3), 321–327. https://doi.org/10.34050/els-jish.v1i3.5078

Hatoss, A. (2024). Towards an emotive-relational model of FLP: Mapping the connections between family language policy and parental well-being. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *45*(1). 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2024.2311722

Hilmarsson-Dunn, A. (2009). The impact of English on language education policy in Iceland. *European Journal of Language Policy, 1*(1), 39–59. https://doi.org/10.3828/ejlp.1.1.5

Hilmarsson-Dunn, A., & Kristinsson, A. P. (2010). The language situation in Iceland. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *11*(3), 207–276. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2010.538008

Hirsch, T., & Kayam, O. (2020). "We speak Pidgin!" – Family language policy as the telling case for translanguaging spaces and monolingual ideologies. *Open Linguistics, 6*(1), 642–650.

https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2020-0037

Hogan-Brun, G., & O'Rourke, B. (2019). Introduction: Minority languages and communities in a changing world. In G. Hogan-Brun & B. O'Rourke (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of minority languages and communities* (pp. 1–16). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-54066-9_1

Hollebeke, I., Struys, E., & Agirdag, O. (2020). Can family language policy predict linguistic, socio-emotional, and cognitive child and family outcomes? A systematic review. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 44*(10), 1044–1075. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1858302

Hollebeke, I., Van Oss, V., Struys, E., Van Avermaet, P., & Agirdag, O. (2022). An empirical investigation of Spolsky's framework applied to family language policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 25*(9), 3228–3241. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2022.2039894

Hollebeke, I. (2024). How stable is a family's language policy? Multilingual families' beliefs, practices, and management across time. Language Policy, *23*, 279–304. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-023-09679-y

Hungary. (2011). *Act CLXXIX of 2011 on the rights of national minorities (as in force on 21 December 2017).* Hungarian Official Gazette. https://njt.hu/jogszabaly/en/2011-179-00-00

Hungarian Central Statistical Office. (2013). *2011 Population Census: Preliminary Data*. Hungarian Central Statistical Office. https://www.ksh.hu/docs/eng/xftp/idoszaki/nepsz2011/enepszelo2011.pdf

Jernudd, B. H., & Nekvapil, J. (2012). History of the field: A sketch. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy* (pp. 16–36). Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, D. C. (2013). What is language policy? In *Language Policy. Research and Practice in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 3-25). Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137316202_1

King, K. A., & Fogle, L. W. (2013). Family language policy and bilingual parenting. *Language Teaching, 46*(2), 172–194.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000493

Kováts, A. (2010). *Magyarországi adatok, európai indikátorok. Bevándorlás és integráció.* MTA Kisebbségkutató Intézet.

Küppers, A., Şimşek, Y., & Schroeder, C. (2015). Turkish as a minority language in Germany: Aspects of language development and language instruction. *Zeitschrift für Fremdsprachenforschung, 26*(1), 29–51.

Lambert, R. (1999). A scaffolding for language policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 137,* 3–26. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1999.137.3

Liddicoat, A. (2020). Language policy and planning for language maintenance: The macro and meso levels. In A. Schalley & S. Eisenchlas (Eds.), *Handbook of Home Language Maintenance and Development: Social and Affective Factors* (pp. 337–356). De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501510175-017

Lomeu Gomes, R. (2019). Family language policy ten years on: A critical approach to family multilingualism. *Multilingual Margins, 5*(2), 50–63. http://dx.doi.org/10.14426/mm.v5i2.98

Medjedoub, R. (2015). Language shift and maintenance: The case of Algerian immigrants in France. *Milev Journal of Research and Studies, 1*(1), 19–38. http://dx.doi.org/10.58205/mjrs.v1i1.786

Nekvapil, J., & Sherman, T. (2015). An introduction: Language Management Theory in language policy and planning. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 232*, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2014-0039

Neustupný, J. V., & Nekvapil, J. (2003). Language Management in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *4*(3–4), 181–366. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664200308668057

Örkény, A., & Székelyi, M. (2010). Hat migráns csoport összehasonlító elemzése. In A. Örkény & M. Székelyi (Eds.), *Az idegen Magyarország. Bevándorlók társadalmi integrációja* (pp. 123–167). ELTE Eötvös Kiadó.

Papp, Z. A., Kovács, E., & Kováts, A. (2019). Az új magyar diaszpóra intézményesülése: Hétvégi magyar iskolák az Egyesült Királyságban. *Regio: Kisebbség KultúraPolitika Társadalom, 27*(3), 209–248.

Pauwels, A. (2016*). Language maintenance and shift.* Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy*. Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2007). Language policy. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 17*(2), 268–270. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2007.154_2.x

Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language Management*. Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (Ed.). (2012). *The Cambridge handbook of language policy.* Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2021). *Rethinking Language Policy*. Edinburgh University Press.

Stavans, A. (2012). Language policy and literacy practices in the family: The case of Ethiopian parental narrative input. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 33*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2011.638073

Svavarsdóttir, A. (2008). Icelandic. In U. Ammon & H. Haarman (Eds.), *Sprachen des Europäischen Westens/Western European Languages* (pp. 441–457). Klagenfurt: Wieser Verlag.

Tamleh, H., Rezaei, S., & Boivin, N. (2022). Family language policy among Kurdish–Persian speaking families in Kermanshah, Iran. *Multilingua*, *41*(6), 743–767. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2021-0130

Van Oss, V., Van Avermaet, P., Struys, E., & Vantieghem, W. (2021). An empirical validation study of Spolsky's language policy model. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 23*(1), 77–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2021.1907060

Vassoille, A. L. (2024, June 4). A brief history of Algerians in France. *Lingoda Blog*. https://www.lingoda.com/blog/en/algerians-in-france/

Wakim, N. (2020). *L'arabe pour tous: Pourquoi ma langue est taboue en France.* Seuil.

Yağmur, K., & Akıncı, M.-A. (2003). Language use, choice, maintenance, and ethnolinguistic vitality of Turkish speakers in France: Intergenerational differences. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 164*, 107–128. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2003.050

Yağmur, K. (2015). Language maintenance and shift patterns of the Turkish speakers in the Netherlands. *bilig, 74*, 259–286.

Yagmur, K., De Bot, K., & Korzilius, H. (1999). Language attrition, language shift and ethnolinguistic vitality of Turkish in Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 20*(1), 51–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434639908666369

Zemmour, S., & Alghazo, S. (2023). The role of language attitudes in language maintenance: The case of Kabyle immigrants in France. *Dirasat; Human and Social Sciences, 50*(4), 387–398. https://doi.org/10.35516/hum.v50i4.5649

Fülöp Zsófia
Pannon Egyetem, Veszprém, Magyarország
sophie.fulop@gmail.com
Flih Zahia
Pannon Egyetem, Veszprém, Magyarország
zahia.flih@gmail.com
Gürses Beyza Nur
Pannon Egyetem, Veszprém, Magyarország
b.nurgurses@gmail.com
Bátyi Szilvia
Pannon Egyetem, Veszprém, Magyarország
batyi.szilvia@htk.uni-pannon.hu

SPOLSKY HÁROMPILLÉRŰ NYELVPOLITIKAI MODELLJÉNEK ALKALMAZHATÓSÁGA HÁROM KONTEXTUSBAN

Absztrakt. Jelen tanulmány Spolsky hárompillérű nyelvpolitikai modelljének alkalmazhatóságát értékeli, amely a nyelvi döntések, nyelvi gyakorlatok és nyelvi ideológiák hármasából áll, három különböző európai kisebbségi kontextusban. A kutatás a franciaországi algériaiakat, az Egyesült Királyságban élő magyarokat, illetve a magyarországi törököket vizsgálja. Az első tanulmány a tágabb, társadalmi szintre összpontosít, míg a második és harmadik tanulmány a családi színteret helyezi előtérbe. A franciaországi algériaiak esetében a tanulmány a nyelvi döntések meghozatalának folyamatát vizsgálja a kormányzat felülről lefelé irányuló nyelvpolitikájának elemzésével, valamint kérdőív segítségével elemzi az első generációs bevándorlók nyelvi meggyőződését és gyakorlatát. A második tanulmány a család szintjére helyezi át a hangsúlyt, és Spolsky hárompillérű modelljén alapuló kérdőív segítségével vizsgálja az Egyesült Királyságban élő magyar anyák kétnyelvűségi törekvéseit. Eközben a magyarországi török kontextusban félig strukturált mélyinterjúkat, valamint egy rövid kérdőívet használnak a török családok nyelvi döntései, nyelvi gyakorlatai és nyelvi ideológiáinak vizsgálatára. A tanulmányok eltérő eredményeket mutatnak be: az algériaiak erősen kitartanak az arab nyelv mellett, még a francia egynyelvűségi politika súlyának és a francia nyelv használatára vonatkozó társadalmi igények ellenére. Továbbá, a magyar családok arra irányuló erőfeszítéseit, hogy gondosan ápolják gyermekeik kétnyelvűségét, aláássa az oktatásban tapasztalható külső nyomás, ami a kétnyelvűség folyékonyabb megéléséhez vezet. Ezzel szemben az eredmények a török bevándorlók magyar nyelv felé történő elmozdulását mutatják, amit a tömeges vegyesházasságok létrejötte és az intézményi támogatás hiánya indokol. Bár az eredmények hangsúlyozzák Spolsky modelljének alkalmazhatóságát a nyelvpolitika dimenzióinak bemutatására különböző kontextusokban, a modell nem veszi figyelembe a külső társadalmi-politikai és gazdasági tényezők hatásának és szerepének összetett rétegeit. Ezen kívül a modell csak részben magyarázza a többnyelvű identitás kialakulásának dinamikus jellegét. Ennek eredményeként ezen összetett tényezők alapos vizsgálata szükséges ahhoz, hogy jobban megértsük a nyelvpolitika folyékony és folyamatosan fejlődő természetét annak érdekében, hogy kontextus-érzékeny nyelvpolitika kerüljön kidolgozásra.

Kulcsszavak: kétnyelvűség; nyelvi meggyőződések; nyelvi döntések; nyelvpolitika; nyelvi gyakorlatok; Spolsky hármas modellje.

Zsófia Fülöp
Panonijos universitetas, Vengrija
sophie.fulop@gmail.com
Zahia Flih
Panonijos universitetas, Vengrija
zahia.flih@gmail.com
Beyza Nur Gürses
Panonijos universitetas, Vengrija
b.nurgurses@gmail.com
Szilvia Batyi
Panonijos universitetas, Vengrija
batyi.szilvia@htk.uni-pannon.hu

SPOLSKIO TRIJŲ DALIŲ MODELIO TAIKYMAS TRIJUOSE KONTEKSTUOSE

Anotacija. Šiame tyrime vertinamas Spolskio trijų dalių kalbos politikos modelio, susidedančio iš kalbos įsitikinimų, praktikos ir valdymo, taikymas trijose skirtingose mažumų aplinkose Europoje: Prancūzijoje gyvenantys alžyriečiai, Jungtinėje Karalystėje gyvenantys vengrai ir Vengrijoje gyvenantys turkai. Pirmoji tyrimo dalis dėmesį sutelkė į nacionalinį ir bendruomenės lygmenis, kitos dvi – į šeimos sritį. Prancūzijoje gyvenančių alžyriečių atvejo tyrimas nagrinėja kalbos valdymą atsižvelgdamas į vyriausybės nustatytą kalbos politiką ir apklausos būdu tiria pirmosios kartos imigrantų kalbinius įsitikinimus ir praktiką. Antrojo tyrimo dėmesio centre – šeima. Taikant Spolskio trijų dalių modelio pagrindu parengtą klausimyną, tirtos Jungtinėje Karalystėje gyvenančių vengriškai kalbančių motinų dvikalbystės ugdymo pastangos. Trečiajame tyrime nagrinėtas turkiškas kontekstas Vengrijoje: taikant pusiau struktūruotą giluminį interviu bei trumpą klausimyną, siekta ištirti turkų šeimų kalbos valdymą, įsitikinimus ir praktiką. Tyrimai pateikia skirtingus rezultatus. Alžyriečiai tvirtai gina arabų kalbą, nepaisydami prancūzų kalbos vienkalbystės politikos ir visuomenės reikalavimo vartoti prancūzų kalbą. Vengrų šeimų pastangas kruopščiai ugdyti vaikų dvikalbystę silpnina išoriniai švietimo sistemos veiksniai, todėl dvikalbystė labiau kinta. Turkų imigrantai pereina prie vengrų kalbos dėl mišrių santuokų ir institucinės paramos trūkumo. Šie rezultatai atskleidžia, kad Spolskio modelis pritaikomas aprašant kalbos politikos aspektus skirtingomis aplinkybėmis, vis dėlto jis nepakankamai atsižvelgia į išorinių socialinių, politinių ir ekonominių veiksnių poveikio ir vaidmens sudėtingumą. Be to, tik iš dalies atspindi dinamišką daugiakalbės tapatybės formavimąsi. Todėl įžvalgos reikalauja nuodugniai ištirti sudėtingus aspektus, siekiant geriau suprasti kintamą ir nuolat besikeičiantį kalbos politikos pobūdį, bei sukurti kalbų politiką, labiau atitinkančią kontekstą.

Pagrindinės sąvokos: dvikalbystė; kalbos įsitikinimai; kalbos valdymas; kalbos politika; kalbos praktika; Spolskio trijų dalių modelis.