2.3 Concept and analysis: translanguaging as connectivity and non-hierarchical multiplicity

János Imre Heltai

What we label as a "project", is, as the previous chapters have shown, made up of different activities by different actors, embedded both in Tiszavasvári and in Szímő (Zemné) in special sociocultural environments and surrounded by different ideologies circulating at local, national and supranational levels. The TRANSLANGEDUROM project is, at the time of writing, nearing its end, but most of the participants continue their local activities, just as they did prior to the project. Over the years, many of the activities have changed, and the range of participants has expanded. The activities are linguistic ethnographic in nature, but with language pedagogical implications, and relating to minority language practices and to issues of language planning. The consequences of the work carried out so far shape reality in the project sites.

The key concept of our project is Translanguaging, characterised as a practical theory (Li 2018) for both describing human linguistic practices and pedagogies built around them. The present volume, based on various project activities and participants, concentrates on the connectivity of this concept, approaching translanguaging from different angles and highlighting its different features. The first chapters introduced the topic in a concentric way, leading the reader closer and closer to the locality, its implications, and the project activities. This chapter defines the conceptual framework according to which data of a translanguaging-based project in the context of such a wide range of activities can be produced, sorted and interpreted in an interdisciplinary but coherent way.

2.3.1 Concepts of interconnectivity

Our team includes, apart from applied linguists, teachers and teacher education specialists with no specific linguistic or sociolinguistic training. The project is based on ethnographic research methods and on participatory approaches. Academic (e.g. linguistic, pedagogical, etc.) and local knowledge has become symbiotic during project activities. The perspectives of all participants influenced the way we understand translanguaging. Rather than defining the pedagogy of translanguaging and possibilities of its application among local Roma students, non-linguist academic members of our project were more concerned with pointing out how translanguaging complements contemporary pedagogical approaches. As a result, project members see translanguaging at the schools as a stance that can work as an inclusive part of contemporary pedagogical approaches and concepts, and which redefines teachers' work and the ways they think (cf. Chapter 3.9 on adaptive schooling). The activities with non-academic participants, such as local Roma parents, have increasingly encouraged all participants to think of translanguaging not only as a pedagogical concept for schools, but as a possibility for organising cultural and social life as a whole (cf. Chapter 3.7 on community-based knowledge and culturally transformative education).

Models and concepts aimed to capture such complex and diverse realities necessarily exhibit interdisciplinary characteristics. They reveal the fading relationship between the various disciplines and remind us that individual research is always part of complex systems (cf. Larsen-Freeman and Cameron 2008). A position paper of the Douglas Fir Group (2016), made up mainly of SLA practitioners, presents such a holistic model of applied linguistics research in the field of language learning and teaching. The authors map the factors that influence language teaching and learning and map them to three levels (a micro level of social

activity, a meso level of sociocultural institutions and community, and a macro level of ideological structures) in a highly complex and chiselled way. Hult (2019), recognising the virtues of this model, proposes an approach based on nexus analysis (Scollon and Scollon 2004). It not only emphasises the embeddedness of applied linguistic research in complex realities, but also highlights how elements of reality interrelate, with dynamic interactions and relationships within a single complexity. Social actions are at the heart of the proposed model. Social actions are embedded in the history of a person's experience (historical body), in the normative systems of the person's conversations with other persons (interaction order) and in the spaces and localities where these interactions take place (discourse in place). With this model, inter- and transdisciplinary research can not only take all these dimensions into account, but can treat them in their interconnectedness, as parts of a single integrated system. Hult argues that this nexus analysis approach can be extended, beyond ethnographic description, to the analysis of any social action and its context, in any field of applied linguistics (2019: 142).

The same logic and way of thinking prevails in the metaphor we have chosen in this volume to present our diverse activities as parts of translanguaging, which we view as an integrated, but multiple system. However, there is also some difference between the approaches discussed above and the metaphor we propose. The proposed metaphor is that of the rhizome, which was brought into social science thinking by Deleuze and Guattari (1987). With its use, we do not capture the elements of reality, but their interconnectedness, and we rather focus on the transitions than on the dimensions of reality.

Rhizome, a term in biology, describes a type of root system, which lacks a central stem and consists of several multiple interconnected small roots, as seen in various types of grasses. These root systems have no boundaries, they have an extent, but no beginning and no end. Regarding their internal structure, they can't be traced back to a single unit: there is no trunk and main root as for some other plants. Rhizomatic root systems cannot be divided into clearly separable parts. When detaching a part of any size, a new rhizome is created. The rhizome is open in all possible directions due to the complex system of the small roots. As a result, it can come into contact with its environment in many ways.

In the introduction of their work *A Thousand Plateaus* Deleuze and Guattari (1987) claim that facts and phenomena of the world, instead of being structured into hierarchical order, are arranged in a rhizomatic way, with multiple and variable connections. This claim is ambitious yet simple, which is both its strength and its weakness. It aspires to explain how practically everything in the social world operates, and focuses on easy-to-understand characteristics: everything is connected, nothing is central, nothing is hierarchical, and there is no traceable ultimate unity. (Compare this to the term heterarchy, "where due to homologous dynamics, influence extends in both/many directions among the components of a complex system, rather than top-down or bottom-up" Larsen-Freeman 2019: 68).

Certain aspects of this conceptual metaphor have became popular in the last decades of sociolinguistic thinking. The image of the rhizome was used to describe the organisation of discourses (Pietikäinen 2015, Leppänen and Kytölä 2017), classroom practices (Prinsloo & Krause 2019) linguistic landscape (Milani and Levon 2016), the language performance of individuals (Canagarajah 2018), research methods (Heller, Pietikäinen, and Pujolar 2018), and translanguaging and translingual practices (Heltai 2021).

The rhizome-metaphor helps to highlight that translanguaging is a concept in constant development, having both theoretical and practiceoriented aspects interconnected with each other, and connected with pedagogical issues and questions of language policy in multiple ways. It is also a tool to understand the relationship between the chapters in this volume. The complexity of the connections and the diversity of voices and activities that characterise the

project, which we intended to make an important feature of this book, can be both captured and understood by the metaphor of the rhizome.

2.3.2 Translanguaging as a rhizomatic multiplicity

Translanguaging describes language as a "multisensory and multimodal system interconnected with other (…) cognitive systems" (Li, 2018: 20) and embraces different communicative and learning practices (cf. Heltai 2021: 13). The term described originally a concept of teacher-guided multilingual learning organisation (Williams 1994), promoting the use of two languages in a complementary way. The reshaped (García 2009, García and Li 2014, Blackledge and Creese 2010) concept has seen in the last decade a blooming history and shaped thinking about both multilingualism and multilingual pedagogies.

The core idea of translanguaging is the unity of the linguistic repertoire (Vogel and García 2017). One must note that the linguistic repertoire is not a human organ, but a concept, an idea which helps to imagine how a person operates all resources and skills needed to speak, always collaborating with other speakers. This means that the repertoire is not only psychologically embedded, but also strongly linked to intercorporeality (Busch 2012a, 2012b) and interpersonal relationships. Translanguaging scholars assume that bi- and multilingual speakers do not have double, triple etc. repertoires according to the number of languages they speak. That is, the languages spoken by a person do not divide the repertoire into separate units. Instead, every single speaker has only one repertoire, independent from the number of the languages she or he speaks. The unitary repertoire consists of many different linguistic resources (words, syntactic structures, stress patterns etc. – cf. Blommaert and Backus 2013: 6), and, more broadly, semiotic resources. The latter term includes also non-verbal resources such gestures, facial expressions, etc. These resources are in our thinking assigned to one or more languages, but also to situations, interaction partners etc. This assignment defines when and how to combine repertoire components. But the repertoire itself is unitary. This is a point matching the picture of the rhizome, which is also a single unity consisting of different, multiply connected components, both unitary and diverse at the same time.

People speak in diverse ways. They all make use of different linguistic and semiotic resources. When speaking, we mostly do not care whether we are using resources assigned to one, two or more units (languages or varieties), but select them in a way best suited to be understood by our conversation partners. It does not mean that boundaries between languages and varieties do not exist; on the contrary, these boundaries are very real. This is, however, a social and cultural reality: the boundaries are formed due to social and cultural processes. That is why they are in constant change, not fully exact to define, and interpreted differently in different communities. Languages and varieties are seen as social inventions, resulting from social and cultural traditions (Makoni and Pennycook eds. 2006; Blommaert and Rampton 2011; Kleyn and García 2019; Otheguy, García, and Reid 2015). Translanguaging scholars argue that the boundaries between them are social in nature, they do not have mental representations: our cognitive system is structured, but not in the way as languages structure social reality (Otheguy, García, and Reid 2019: 626–627). Languages do not have a psycholinguistic reality.

This argument has far-reaching pedagogical consequences. Translanguaging scholars propose to acknowledge and to make use of learners' entire repertoire in education, not only because it is socially just (García and Kleyn 2016: 24–25) but also helpful in learning. They recommend developing the whole repertoire in a holistic way (Blackledge and Creese 2010), instead of supporting only one or the other language exclusively. Translanguaging in pedagogy is the conscious utilization of all linguistic resources that make up students' repertoires. It can be implemented by students and/or initiated by teachers and often results in

new language policy solutions in classrooms and schools (Cenoz and Gorter 2017; Prinsloo and Krause 2019).

In this volume, we consider translanguaging not as pedagogy per se, but as a pedagogical stance, an insight of the fact that acknowledging students' unitary repertoire means to acknowledge students' full personality. Translanguaging as a pedagogy is in our opinion based on a magic moment of recognition and change, a turn in behaviour and thinking, connecting entrepreneurial teachers with new pedagogical possibilities. These possibilities occur in many different areas of a teacher's work. In the ten main chapters of this volume such areas will be explored. This volume introduces translanguaging as a rhizomatic multiplicity, constantly changing in nature.

References

Blackledge, Adrian & Angela Creese. 2010. *Multilingualism. A Critical Perspective*. London: Continuum.

Blommaert, Jan & Ad Backus. 2013. Repertoires revisited: 'Knowing language' in superdiversity. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies 67*. London: Kings' College.

Blommaert, Jan & Ben Rampton. 2011. Language and superdiversity. In Jan Blommaert & Ben Rampton & Massimiliano Spotti (eds.) *Diversities*. 13(2). 1–22.

Busch, Brigitta.2012a. Linguistic repertoire revisited. *Applied Linguistics* 33(5). 503–523.

Busch, Brigitta. 2012b. *Das sprachliche Repertoire oder niemand ist einsprachig*. Klagenfurt/Wien/Celovec/Dunaj: Drava.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2018. Translingual practice as spatial repertoires: Expanding the paradigm beyond structuralist orientations. *Applied Linguistics* 39(1). 31–54.

Cenoz, Jasone & Durk Gorter. 2017. Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 38(10). 901–912.

Deleuze, Gilles & Félix Guattari. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus. (Introduction: Rhizome)*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Douglas Fir Group. 2016. A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. Modern Language Journal 100(S1). 19–47.

García, Ofelia & Tatyana Klein 2016. Translanguaging theory in education. In Ofelia García & Tatyana Kleyn (eds.), *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments*. New York: Routledge. 9–33.

García, Ofelia. 2009. Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21. Century. In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Robert Phillipson, Ajit K. Mohanty & Minati Panda (eds.), *Social Justice Through Multilingual Education*, 140–158. Cromwell: Multilingual Matters.

García, Ofelia & Li Wei. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Heller, Monica, Sari Pietikäinen & Joan Pujolar. 2018. *Critical Sociolinguistic Research Methods: Studying Language Issues that Matter*. New York/London: Routledge.

Heltai, János Imre. 2021. Translanguaging as a rhizomatic multiplicity. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. Ahead of print. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2021.1926465

Hult, Francis M. 2019. Toward a unified theory of language development: The transdisciplinary nexus of cognitive and sociocultural perspectives on social activity. *The Modern Language Journal* 103(S1). 136–144.

Kleyn, Tatyana & Ofelia García. 2019. Translanguaging as an act of transformation: Restructuring teaching and learning for emergent bilingual students. In Luciana C. de Oliveira (ed.), *Handbook of TESOL in K-12*, 69–82. Malden: Wiley.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane & Lynne Cameron. 2008. *Complex Systems and Applied Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 2019. On language learner Agency: A complex dynamic systems theory perspective. *The Modern Language Journal* 103(S1). 61–79.

Leppänen, Sirpa & Samu Kytölä. 2017. Investigating multilingualism and multisemioticity as communicative resources in social media. In Marilyn Martin-Jones & Deirdre Martin (eds.), *Researching Multilingualism. Critical and Ethnographic Perspectives*, 155–171. New York/London: Routledge.

Li Wei. 2018. Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics* 39(1). 9–30.

Makoni, Sinfree & Alastair Pennycook eds. 2006. *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Milani, Tommaso & Erez Levon. 2016. Sexing diversity: Linguistic landscapes of homonationalism. *Language & Communication* 51. 69–86.

Otheguy, Ricardo, Ofelia García & Wallis Reid. 2015. Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review* 6(3). 281–307.

Otheguy, Ricardo, Ofelia García & Wallis Reid. 2019. A Translanguaging view of the linguistic system of bilinguals. *Applied Linguistics Review* 10(4). 625–652.

Pietikäinen, Sari. 2015. Multilingual dynamics in Sámiland: Rhizomatic discourses on changing language. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 19(2). 206–225.

Prinsloo, Mastin & Lara-Stephanie Krause. 2019. Translanguaging, place and complexity. *Language and Education* 33(2). 159–173.

Scollon, Ron & Susie Wong Scollon. 2004. *Nexus Analysis*. New York: Routledge.

Vogel, Sara & Ofelia García. 2017. Translanguaging. In George Noblit & Luis Moll (eds.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, Cen. 1994. *Arfarniad o ddulliau ddysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog* [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]. Bangor: University of Wales dissertation.