Review of Beyza Nur Gürses' Phd-thesis,

'Language Ideologies, Language Practices, and Identity Construction among Turkish People Living in Hungary'

Dr. habil. János Imre Heltai

Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary

Overall, I feel that the dissertation successfully presents a series of sound research questions, with the findings being substantiated by careful data collection and in-depth analysis. The text is well structured and follows a clear line of reasoning based on the interview data. It is also precise in its wording. With the exception of topics relating to family language policies, the literature review presents few contemporary debates, instead providing an overview of classical concepts (e.g. Fishman's LMLS-framework, or acculturation theory). Following the revision, the presentation of these concepts is thorough. The dissertation also reviews how the discussed concepts have been received throughout their history, paying particular attention to their relevance to the author's own research. Personally, I believe it is important to establish links with contemporary critical concepts, such as linguistic repertoire, heteroglossia, translanguaging, superdiversity, linguistic citizenship, Southern theories etc. These enable us to examine the complex linguistic repertoires of individuals and the linguistic diversity of communities without necessarily and only focusing on relationships between named (national) languages or language varieties. At the same time, I consider the starting point chosen by the author of this thesis to be understandable and acceptable. I will therefore examine what the author undertook within the chosen framework below, and the extent to which these undertakings were fulfilled.

In this respect, the author deserves praise for creating a three-dimensional literary overview that examines the everyday lives of the interviewees within the triangle formed by 1. Language maintenance and shift; 2. Language policy and management; 3. Linguistic ideologies. The overview is both historically grounded and reflective in nature. By the latter, I mean that even in the chapter on the literature review, Beyza consistently considers how the theoretical issues under discussion are relevant to her. I am happy to see that Beyza has taken my earlier feedback on consideration, clarifying and refining the presentation of the theoretical foundations of the thesis by adding new chapters and supplementing and refining existing ones.

In general, the changes Beyza made to the theoretical parts of her text have clearly improved the thesis. Its structure is now clearer and more straightforward. The content and titles

of the chapters are now consistent with one another. Beyza has done an excellent job in this respect as. However, I would still like to bring one point on this matter to attention, based on an example in Chapter 2.1, 'Language maintenance and shift'. The chapter opens by distinguishing between 'language shift' (at the community level) and 'language loss' (at the individual level). Beyza then sets out to do nothing less than shed light on how language shift unfolds across generations, and makes the following observations (pp. 5–6):

"First-generation migrants are generally more likely to maintain their mother tongue, whereas subsequent generations tend to shift toward the dominant language, particularly through formal education and increased societal integration (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). At the same time, extensive exposure to the dominant language, combined with limited opportunities to use the heritage language, leads to a gradual reduction in both use and proficiency (Allard & Landry, 1992). These changes occur not only in interactions with the wider society but also within migrant communities themselves, where shifting norms, intermarriage, and reduced group cohesion can weaken intergenerational transmission of the minority language (Fase, Jaspaert, & Kroon, 1992)."

These are broad statements. The following questions came to mind as I read them. In what respect, from what point of view, why does Beyza quote Portes and Rumbaut in particular? This is a book (Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. 2001. Legacies: *The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press). There is so much in a book – how exactly does this book relate to this sentence? Similarly, how does the second sentence relate to Allard and Landry's article entitled 'Ethnolinguistic vitality beliefs and language maintenance and loss'? The third reference, meanwhile, refers to a compilation volume (which also includes the paper by Allard and Landry). So what exactly is Beyza referring to here? Either page numbers should be provided for these references, or a sentence should be included to summarise what Beyza read in these texts and explain exactly how they relate to her own statements.

These are not isolated instances in the thesis, as I pointed out during the mock exam. Many amendments have been made in this regard, and I can see that problematic elements I highlighted in the first review have been corrected or removed from the text. However, I would encourage Beyza to adopt a different approach in this regard in future and pay more attention to establishing a connection between what she has read and her own text. In terms of content, though, this chapter, like the others, not only stands up to scrutiny when this methodological

issue is set aside but also provides excellent support for the empirical part of the thesis. Once again, the revised version responds well to my substantive criticism by connecting theory and analysis.

The description of the participants and the data collection method is sufficient. The interviews with the 50 participants do allow important conclusions to be drawn. Nevertheless, there are some minor inconsistencies. Although Beyza intends to discuss the Turkish community in Hungary, the text reveals that the majority of her interviewees are from Budapest (it is unclear exactly how many), and that there are significantly more men than women. She explains this by stating that it was easier to reach men in community settings, while she primarily reached women through gender-specific online channels. This is also why, in my previous review, I suggested including a positionality statement. This would have provided an opportunity to reflect on why the participants are primarily from Budapest and the potential gender-specific difficulties in recruiting informants. I did not see that such a statement had been included. If it simply escaped my attention, I apologise. I would therefore ask Beyza to address this issue in her reply. Perhaps there are considerations that I have not taken into account.

The thesis is therefore conservative in terms of both its theoretical framework and its methodology. Accordingly, conservative research questions have come to the fore: what are the linguistic ideologies of first-generation Turkish immigrants; what shapes these; how do they relate to family status (for example, marital status) and family language policy; how do speakers navigate the relationship between the community and the host society; and what acculturation strategies do they adopt. I believe this fundamentally conservative approach helped Beyza produce a solid and thorough piece of work of a high standard overall, but perhaps hindered her somewhat when it came to approaching social tensions and questions arising from them in an innovative way. The key statements in the central paragraphs of the summary are as follows:1. „Turkish remains a strong marker of cultural continuity, emotional belonging, and identity among first-generation migrants in Hungary" (p. 100); 2. marital configuration was relevant to language maintenance and shift (p.100); 3. "language and identity do not necessarily change at the same rate" (p. 101); 4. "Acculturation among participants was multidimensional and domain-specific, with integration as the dominant orientation" (p. 101). Beyza highlights the novelty of these findings in that the situation of the Turkish community in Hungary becomes comparable to that in Western Europe. I was not surprised by these revelations. The differences may be due to the varying histories and scales of migration, as well as the differing political structures present in the host communities. On the other hand, Beyza emphasises that the

approach based on the three dimensions of language shift, language policy, and linguistic ideologies is novel and valuable in itself. I agree.

The revised sections of the Conclusion are much appreciated, particularly the recommendations regarding language policy. Beyza notes that it would be useful to have some sort of Turkish language course or school in the afternoon or at the weekend, and that it would be important to establish a cultural centre. However, she does not discuss the numerous contradictions and dilemmas surrounding these issues in greater detail, either based on her data or her own experiences. Ideally, these ideas would have received more attention than just two paragraphs.

I also appreciate Beyza for responding to my additional comments during the revision process. She provided some insight into her translation of the excerpts and the challenges she encountered. She also separated the chapters dealing with code-switching and language loss. The confusing references that equate translanguaging with code-switching have been removed. The role and public perception of the Turkish Maarif Foundation Hungarian-English Bilingual Primary School have, however, become much clearer.

In my first review for mock exam preparation, I highlighted questions that could improve the thesis's already high quality if addressed. I believe the revision was thorough and successful overall, and alongside the thesis's existing strengths (excellent data analysis sections and relevant interview excerpts), the thesis now also demonstrates theoretical rigour and sufficient conceptual development. I lend my countenance to the proposal of the dissertation being subjected to a public disputation.

Dr. habil. János Imre Heltai
associate professor
Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary