

3.10 Stylization, voice and crossing in the classroom

Bernadett Jani-Demetriou, Csanád Bodó, Réka Boros Petra

Translanguaging education brings home language practices to school. These school practices become more heterogeneous and stratified not only because of the transposition of home practices into a new context, but also because both home and school practices are in themselves heterogeneous and stratified. In this complex web of different semiotic resources, practices and ideologies, teachers, students, and their supportive parents make social meaning through constantly reflecting on their own and others' situation in the world. This reflection is linked to sociolinguistic practices that focus on the representation of one's own and others' languages, styles or voices to which speakers want to draw each other's attention. In this chapter, we introduce the notions of stylization, individual and social voice, and crossing ethnic boundaries through the analysis of three classroom videos, in order to argue for their strategic potential in translanguaging teaching practices. In the first video, children stylize, i.e., imitate adult speech in a literacy lesson applying drama pedagogy. The second video demonstrates how parents' individual and social voices may bring social issues into the school and how these are reflected by teachers and students. By analysing teachers' translanguaging communication in the third video, we point out the potential of crossing ethnic boundaries as a translanguaging way of building strengthened cooperation between teachers and students.

3.10.1 Stylization of romani adult speech in school

Stylization, according to Rampton (2014: 276), is a reflexive communicative activity where speakers represent voices, dialects or languages and styles – often exaggerated – that do not belong to their habitual linguistic practices. Apart from this act's ironic or parodistic nature (ironic and parodistic by the exaggeration of certain ways and elements of speech), stylization is a potential way of discovering differences, similarities, and further relations between the stylizing party and the stylized one. As Jaspers and Van Hoof point out, when speakers stylize, they “interrupt the routine and turn others into spectators of a brief performance” (2018: 110). Stylization does not come out of the blue; it reflects the stylizer's interpretation of the given situation and its wider contexts. It is precisely this reflexivity of stylization that becomes significant in institutional settings where new sociolinguistic practices are being developed, such as the introduction of translanguaging into a monolingual school. As we will see, the characters represented in the classroom are stylized according to the presenters' language ideologies, beliefs, values, and attitudes towards each other. The analysis of the stylized figures gives an insight into the characteristic elements that are important for them in the representation of the other.

Stylization is well connectable to the drama pedagogical theory that highlights the sketching aspect of drama, defining acting as an outline of a character's most outstanding features. Dramatic outlining happens in interaction, through language, and also includes non-linguistic elements as well, such as gestures, facial mimics and bodily movements. In drama pedagogy role-play is a widely employed activity that engages students actively, that is why it is often used as a form of drama pedagogy as “a strategy for teachers to help students become more active in learning” (Gascon 2019: 10). Drama has the potential to actively involve students physically, emotionally, and intellectually. As a result, it is often used to embody conflicts through acting out tensional events aiming to find a solution to tackle a given issue, thus having the ability to affect intra- or interpersonal relations (see for example Malm and

Löfgren 2007). For example, children actively participate in the activities: they act out different roles, sing and dance, and take part in discussions as well. Drama pedagogy is built on the theory of constructivism; drama is an active process that constructs ideas, beliefs, and meaningful interactions (Smith and Herring 2001). This way, role-play activities are forms of constructive learning: the role-play participants rely on their already existing knowledge and experiences, while they grasp new information and construct new knowledge components. By doing so, during this process of learning the new elements build in, re-shape or overwrite the existing knowledge constructions (Glaserfeld 1990).

In the following, we analyse video 21 [*Imitating Romani “adult speech” in school*] through the two concepts introduced above, stylization and drama pedagogy. The classroom scene ([video 21: 1.02–2.27](#)) in discussion is the continuation of a previous task: the students read pieces of the Romani community storybook made by project members and then had to choose a scene from the book to perform in pairs. The chosen scene turned out to be a horse fair scene which they were allowed to perform both in Romani and/or Hungarian. They did not have to stick to the concrete scene read in the book, their task was just to get inspired by it and demonstrate what a horse fair actually looks like according to their own experience. A common perception of Roma across Central and Eastern Europe is that they are keen to go to the fair, do a lot of business and bargain successfully. There are Roma communities, even in Hungary, with a long tradition of horse keeping and horse trading (Stewart 1998), and in Tiszavasvári, some families have horses till today. Many Roma families often buy and sell also cars and Roma are often seen in city fairs selling various sorts of items. One can always bargain with them, and they are hard bargainers themselves. This observation causes many non-Roma to associate this cultural practice with the Roma, to the extent that it has grown into a stereotype concerning them.

It is also important to note that minority related practices usually do not get represented or discussed in institutional environments such as schools, in the same way as bi- and multilingual linguistic practices are usually not part of most official school settings and happenings. Therefore, it is unusual to see that a Roma related practice gets discussed in the classroom. The video only shows footage of one pairs’ performance whose members chose to perform in Romani. The following extract (1) is a dialogue between a seller and a buyer bargaining over a horse ([video 21: 1.22–2.22](#), the names are pseudonyms):

- (1) Aladár *Minek avjan muro phral?*
‘WHY DID YOU COME, BROTHER?’
- Tihamér *Hat, dikhlem tyo graszt, teccil mange.*
‘I’VE SEEN YOUR HORSE, I LIKE IT.’
- Aladár *Táj...táj so kamelej te keren?*
‘AND, AND WHAT DO YOU WANT TO DO WITH IT?’
- Tihamér *Hát te kinen kádále graszt.*
‘WELL, I WANT TO BUY THE HORSE.’
- Aladár *Hat figyelin, barátom, atanav lesz tük táj dikh lesz!*
‘WELL, LISTEN MY FRIEND, I’LL BRING IT HERE SO YOU CAN HAVE A LOOK AT IT!’
- Tihamér *Hat ado náj lásó, túl sukoj, leszko jek ják othe dikel e káver meg othefe.*
‘THIS ONE’S NOT GOOD, IT’S TOO LEAN. ONE OF ITS EYES LOOKS THIS WAY AND THE OTHER LOOKS THAT WAY.’
- Aladár *Figyelin barátom, more grasztesz ná dik téle! Des mán vás leszke*



- hatvanezret vagy na?*
'LISTEN FRIEND, DO NOT LOOK DOWN ON MY HORSE! WILL YOU GIVE 60.000 FOR IT OR NOT?'
- Tihamér *Így, így na! Ennyiért nem kell!*
'For this much I won't take it!'
- Aladár *40-ért lingresz tuke!*
'HAVE IT FOR 40 000!'
- Tihamér *Na! Nem viszem!*
'I won't take it!'
- Aladár *Ajj! Jaj már, hogy az a!!*
'Oh, come on now!'
- Tihamér *Na! Nem kell annyiért!!!*
'I won't buy it for this much!'
- Aladár *Akkor figyelj moro phral!.. Figyelj, dav tu... des man.. vás ketezerötöt, táj ando káver cson othe des len.*
'LISTEN TO ME THEN BROTHER... I'LL GIVE YOU... YOU GIVE ME 2500 AND YOU'LL GIVE THE REST NEXT MONTH.'
- Tihamér *Ajj, dilino han? Na! Áááá, ki van zárva, megbolondultál? Nem!!!*
'OH NO, Out of question, have you gone mad? No!!!'
- Aladár *Ajjj!!! Szo te kerav tuhá?! Akkor kacsi kamesz te mange te den?*
'AHH, WHAT SHOULD I DO WITH YOU?! HOW MUCH DO YOU INTED TO GIVE ME THEN?'
- Tihamér *Ketszázat!*
'TWOHUNDRED!'
- Aladár *ááá, me na kheláv vasztenca. ákánák phenáv mégegyszer, de utoljára: káccsi kámesz te kinánla?*
'AHH, I WON'T BARGAIN WITH YOU! I'LL ASK YOU ONE MORE TIME, THE VERY LAST TIME THOUGH; FOR HOW MUCH WILL YOU BUY THE HORSE?'
- Tihamér *200! Kétszáz forintért!*
'for 200 forints!'
- Aladár *Akkor me na foglalozinav vásztencá!*
'THEN I STOP BARGAINING WITH YOU!'

The opportunity to activate their whole linguistic repertoire and the fact that the teacher didn't expect a literal reproduction of the original scene from the book gave the students room to improvise, therefore they had the opportunity to outline the most emblematic characteristics that they see as such of Roma adult speech, also to stylize adults' speech. The semiotic resources they are employing are not absent from their linguistic repertoire in the sense of these elements being foreign but in the sense that bargaining as a genre is potentially not part of children's everyday linguistic practices. They associate these speech units with adults and that is what they outline through their choice of words, emphasis, their facial mimics and gestures. It is important though that this dramatic scene does not portray Romani adult speech in general, but in a specific communicative situation: in our case, in the situation of horse trading and bargaining. Bargaining has a specific pattern and dynamic that the two acting students seem to know and reproduce. They stylize Romani adult speech within the bargaining situation incorporating the vocabulary and patterns of bargaining in stylized speech. This is an illustrative demonstration of the fact that translanguaging does not only

concern language and speech but brings cultural patterns to the surface as well. These patterns are parts of the two pupils' linguistic repertoire.

This short drama scene is also a way of self-reflection from various aspects. By this performance they reflect on how they see adults and their ways of interacting in certain situations. They might also reflect on the way they assume others see Roma people. In this way their outline can be both a self-presentation and a well-intended parody of how they assume non-Roma see them and the cultural practice they display (in this case the parodistic/ironic aspect of stylization comes to the fore). The other self-reflexive aspect we highlight is the reflection on the standards they connect to the character of the buyer and the seller, how they portray routine figures of both participants.

Besides the self-reflective aspect of the performance, there are some practical benefits to it that the pupils might have good use out of in other situations. Involving them in such performative situations helps the students bring more awareness to their presence when it comes to focusing an audience's attention, they learn being in the role of the performer. This skill helps them to be more confident and focused in situations like presentations, oral exams, or any kinds of school-related happenings where they need to speak for a longer amount of time giving account of their knowledge or sharing information.

3.10.2 Individual voices and the social meanings brought into the school

By introducing translanguaging into the school, children's home linguistic practices become sensibly present. This change, per se, gives more prestige to children's home linguistic practices (for example in video 10 [*Enhancing the prestige of Romani within the group*]), we can see how speaking in Romani becomes a source of pride when the good pupil wants to answer again to the same question he did before in Hungarian, but at this time in Romani. He finds it important to show his teacher and classmates that he can answer just as well in Romani too). As referred to in interviews with teachers at the Magiszter school, they have noticed that due to teaching with a translanguaging stance, those pupils become more active during lessons who had not spoken much beforehand. However, different ways of speaking manifest various voices that carry social meanings. People have opinions, beliefs and attitudes about certain ways of speaking. In the Bakhtinian sense, language is not neutral (Bakhtin 1981), but it involves the intentions of others too. When children bring their home linguistic practices into the classroom, their ways of speaking represent such intentions as well.

In video no. 20 [*Parental engagement at school*], we witness quite unusual classroom scenes. Beside the students, their parents are also present, and what is more, they are the main participants of the activities, which are part of a session of the regularly organised Parents Club. In the beginning of the video ([video 20: 0.00–1.48](#)). Erika Puskás, an upper grade teacher at the Tiszavasvári School emphasises the importance of involving parents into the school life. As Erika mentions in the video, a Parents Club has become a tradition of the school as it has been organised since the very beginning. One of the ways of building connections between parents and teachers is the afternoon parents-teacher meeting organised by Erika. In this event, parents come to the school and spend an afternoon with her and Erika Kerekes-Lévai, the principal of the school. They discuss school events and issues, and it is also an opportunity to become more familiar with each other, sometimes by taking part in role-plays, just like the ones we see in video 20. As Erika mentions in the video, parents were introduced to drama play in the previous session. They liked it so much that parents requested more drama plays for the teacher-parents sessions. This shows not only their preference for certain activities in the Parents Club but also their trust towards the teachers. As Erika admits,

“they brought in religion, music and everything that was crucial for them” ([video 20: 0.19–2.24](#)).

In addition to the above described characteristics of drama activity, it also creates a fictional reality by playfully imitating the real world: in a role-play, participants take up a role. This empowers the participant players to act according to their roles but at the same time, it gives them security, because they act in a fictional, not in the real world.

It is important to point out that language is predominant in drama activities, because these drama activities are mostly carried out through interactions of the player participants. The social approach of constructivist pedagogy also emphasises the importance of language in learning. Vygotsky (1964) pointed out that the construction of knowledge takes place through interactions with others. As the role-play activities are carried out in a group of participants, the fictional reality of their role-play is also discursively produced: during the play, participants create together the roles, the storyline, conditions, and relations. Consequently, drama has the power to open up dialogues of various matters, even sensitive ones (Donelan 2002). For example – as in the case of the Tiszavasvári school as well – intercultural or interethnic dialogues. Thus, drama activities provide opportunity for exchanging the experiences participants have of each other, by using the classroom as a safe space in which embodied but fictional cultural characters and narratives can be shared and shaped (Donelan 2002: 39).

In the first scene ([video 20: 3.06–4.29](#)), we see the first drama activity in which the teacher offers an issue to display: a good student’s academic achievement started to deteriorate. The teacher and the parents take up each other’s characters; the teacher appears in the role of a Roma student, while a parent acts out the character of a teacher. It is shown in excerpt (2.) how the teacher plays the character of a mother, and how a parent takes up the role of a student:

- (2) Anna *Édesanyám, bepakoltál mindent a hátizsákomba?*
‘Mom, did you pack everything in my backpack?’
- Erika *jajj, kislányom, megnézem, nehogy elfelejtsek valamit. A hajadat megigazíthatom?*
‘Oh, my girl, let me see so I don’t forget something ... Can I adjust your hair?’
- Anna *Igen, egy kicsit.*
‘Yes, a little bit.’
- Erika *Óvatosan, nehogy összekócoljam. Tudom, hogy neked van a világon a legszebb hajad. Ó, még a tiszórai is benne van.*
‘Carefully, so as not to tangle it. I know you have the most beautiful hair in the world. Oh, even the snack is in it.’
- Anna *Uzsonna!*
‘Snack!’
- Erika *Igen, hogy...*
‘Yes, so...’
- Anna *Pénzt tettél bele? Tudod, az iskolai büfébe szoktam járni.*
‘Did you pack some money? You know, I go to the school buffet sometimes.’
- Erika *Ja, várjál! Van is nálam. Egy húszezres elég lesz? Jajj, bizony, hát sok pénzembe került.*
‘Oh wait! I have some with me. Will twenty thousand be enough?’

Well, yes, it cost me a lot.’
Anna *Na, szia, anyukám!*
‘Well, goodbye, mum!’
Erika *Szervusz!*
‘Bye!’

As they play the role of the other, they give a reflection about and their own interpretation of the characters. The way the teacher’s play stylizes the Roma figure is through a choice of a set of attributes found important by the teacher, for example she emphasises the long hair and the abundance of money as characteristic features of a Roma students ([video 20: 8.16–9.49](#)). The teacher’s choice of representing the Roma student by these attributes implies that these are the most characteristic features of the figure of a Roma student that had been perceived and experienced by the teacher. The other character of the excerpt, a student, is played by one of the parents and her performance depicts a student who is rather neglectful and ungrateful in that she demands the mom to pack her bag and give her money. Both, the teacher and the parent as playing their roles, create an identity to their characters.

In Bakhtin’s theoretical approach, voice is a perspective of the individual, with personal and social characteristics. A voice is someone’s “consciousness expressed in discourse” (Bakhtin 1984: 88). In drama plays, identities are created through playing roles of various characters. These identities are – as Dufva and Pietikäinen (2006: 207) phrased it – “socially constructed but individually experienced”. Drawing on Bakhtin’s (1981) dialogicality, these identities are related to one another; they are represented through different voices of individuals that carry social meanings. Bakhtin identified social voices and described them as speech forms that index widely recognized registers and at the same time, highlight the uniqueness of individual voices (Bakhtin 1981). Persona is a voiced social character that carries socio-ideological meanings.

According to Bakhtin, speakers can employ different voices in their speech, even voices other than their own. By the employment of various voices, speakers position themselves according to the social meanings of such voices. We can see such positioning between the parent and the teacher as well in the process of creating the relationship between mother and student while playing their roles: first, the parent outlines the relationship by asking the teacher whether she packed her bag. The teacher then answers, depicting the picture of a very helpful and willing mother. This continues and unfolds further when the parent asks for pocket money: here, the teacher gives voice to the mother as being very generous. The relationship between them is developing through their positioning according to the role they play. They stylize the characters of the mother and the student by outlining a figure to these roles as they highlight characteristic features of various social or individual voices.

It is not clear, though, which of these voices are social or individual in nature. Does the voice of the student come from the mother’s own voice, is it about her own personal experience or is it rather a social figure of teachers in general? Agha (2005: 38) emphasises the active role speakers play in creating such social voices due to the fact that they “establish forms of footing and alignment with voices indexed by speech and thus with social types of persons, real or imagined, whose voices they take them to be”. Susan Gal (2016) also argues that linguistic variations not only index social differences, but speakers take an active role in the reconstruction of them. Bodó et al. (2019) emphasise the co-determination between individual and social voices, and they suggest that individual voices also take a vital part in the construction of social meaning. This also implies that voice is not a constant and static

attribute of a person; speakers can actively take up different voices indexing various social meanings.

The teacher, in the role of the mother, offers her “daughter” an unrealistically huge amount of pocket money for school and obeys her without questioning her demands. She shows a very attentive mother who serves out her daughter: it is the mother who fixes the child’s hair, she is the one who checks if the bag is ready, and the daughter has everything in it. With this behaviour, she portrays a picture of a submissive and humble mother. The same way, the mother also creates the character of a child: that is, being ungrateful and demanding. She expects the teacher playing the role of the mother to pack her school bag and she is the one who asks for money without it being offered by the mother. It remains unclear whether these voices of a mother and of a child are individual or social voices, however, it is these attributes they can imagine being this particular mother and her daughter from the Roma community they are familiar with.

Stylization often grasps a person’s characteristics that are different or „strange” for the other. These emphasised traits then become the base of the act of stylization. This happens in the next scene ([video 20: 4.30–5.59](#)) as well, when the parents perform the characters of the non-religious people who mock the congregation:

- (3) Anna *Legyen egy olyan, hogy van egy csoport keresztény és van egy csoport, akik nincsenek megtérve. Mondjuk, bent vagyunk a gyülekezetbe és bejönnek a kívülállók, akik nincsenek megtérve. Mi fogadjuk őket szeretettel, de ők gúnyoskodni jönnek be.*
 ‘There is a group of Christians and there is a group of those who are not converted. Let’s say we’re in the church and outsiders come in who aren’t converted. We welcome them with love, but they come to make fun of us.’
- Éva *Cigányul legyen, hogy ...*
 ‘In Romani...’
- Erika *Szerintem az lenne jó, hogy...*
 ‘I think it would be good to...’
- (...)
- Parents *[énekelnek] Te vagy a királyunk! Téged áldlak szívemben. Te vagy mindenem; Az életem.*
 [singing] ‘You are our king! There is a flame in my heart. You are everything; my life.’
- Other parents *Mit csinálnak? Bolondok ezek? Mit csinálnak?*
 ‘What are they doing? Are they crazy? What are they doing?’
- Parents and teachers *[Együtt énekelnek] Téged vár a szívem szüntelen...*
 [Singing together] ‘My heart is waiting for you all the time...’

The topic of the role-play is introduced by a parent. As she outlines the issue, we hear her individual voice: It is she and the other members of the congregation who are in the service, it is them who welcome the outsiders. Then, we see two of the parents in the role of the mocking non-religious people. The posture, the movements (standing carelessly, gesticulating vividly), and the rising tone of their voices aim to depict the figure of the mocking person.

However, drama play in video 20 is a setting not merely to depict characters, but it also generates a space for the players “to create, explore, develop and invent cultures and identities” (Brahmachari 1998: 24, cited by Donelan 2002: 36). Besides depicting characters of others, role-play is also an opportunity for self-reflection, for example in the moment, when the parents take up the role of themselves. When parents sing ([video 20: 4.30–5.59](#)), they are in a role in which they play the character of themselves: members of the congregation. In Rampton’s (2014) ethnolinguistic research with teenagers, students often stylized various voices in instances of sensitive moments of interactions, for example when they felt humiliated, or insulted by a teacher or other peers. This fact led Rampton to draw the conclusion that in some instances of interactions, stylization is not only a form of performance, but a means of communication to indicate or cease tensions (Rampton 2014). Thus, stylization refers to the relationships among speakers, their beliefs, attitudes, ideologies, as speakers employ their own or foreign voices to position themselves according to these values and social meanings. The parents’ role-play in this scene does not only serve as a performance, but as Rampton (2014) described the phenomenon of stylization; parents brought in various voices to display, discuss and tackle issues of social tension. In the fictional reality of the role-play, the parents act in a safe space in which the sensitive issue of religion and its reception in the community could be raised.

Thus, in the role-play in Scene 3, the displayed characters bring the parents’ and others’ voices and the social meanings assigned to them into the role-play. Then, these voices are becoming dialogically related. During the role-play, player participants had the opportunity to raise a sensitive issue, and the power to change on the settings, as during role-play, they “can transcend socially defined identities and imagine themselves differently; they can explore alternative values and different roles and circumstances” (Donelan 2002: 36). The present analysis of the parents’ role-play in video 20 is a good example of how the various roles in a role-play are interrelated. Rampton’s (2014) interpretation of stylization draws on Bakhtin’s notion of voice and dialogicality as Rampton emphasises the dialogical nature of stylization. This means that the speakers’ experiences of and the relations among the stylized figures are taken into account. The parents, apart from playing the role of the religious members of the community, also bring in the social voice of this persona. In their role-play, it is important that this voice is confronted by the voice of the mocking people. It is this dialogical opposition of the voices of the religious and the mocking people that helps parents to position themselves as they attach values to these voices. By two of the parents stylizing the mocking characters, they set up a relationship in which they stand on the negative side, opposing the others who appear in their own roles: the religious members of the congregation. Through their play, they not only perform themselves, but they bring their voices into the play through stylization and creating the dialogicality with the mocking characters. By doing so, a social issue can be played out: the congregation present in the community faces some problems caused by the people who are not religious and not part of this congregation. They have the opportunity to deal with an issue that causes tension for them and to „find a solution” for this issue and cease the tension, as in the end the mocking people join the religious group and all sing together as a sign for their peace.

In the end of the scene, the principal and the teacher are also part of the role-play acting as religious Roma members of the community, standing in the same line as the parents ([video 20: 3.06–4.29](#)). They all sing together, and one of the teachers starts dancing. Her dance brings in characteristics of Roma dances: the arms kept open wide, and she is clicking her fingers while she is stepping with her feet to the rhythm of the song. This performance is the stylization of the dancing of a Roma person and by this stylization, the teachers’ participation

legitimises the played character of the religious members of the congregation, together with its positive value that was displayed in the role-play. As the role-play unfolds, the individual voice of the parents from the beginning dissolves in the joint voices of all participants when the children, parents – from and outside of the congregation – along with the principal and the teacher sing the worship song together.

By bringing this social issue to the classroom through role-play, parents had the opportunity to make their social voices being heard by school academic members and to find an alternative solution, as in the end they found a way to cease tension between the religious and non-religious groups. Religious and non-religious members of the Roma community all stood with the principal and the teacher together. Although the act of testimony can be performed only in a personal way, in an individual voice which did not happen in this role-play, this moment is still very important because through the teacher-participation, parents' social voices are listened to and made legitimate by the teachers.

3.10.3 Crossing the boundaries: Teachers' stylization

Stylization is not constrained to dramatized situations, as in the videos 20 and 21. Outside of the world of drama activities, there are also performances that are stylized; in order to distinguish them from the former, it is useful to refer to Coupland's (2007) distinction between "high" and "mundane" performance. Coupland reminds us that any act of speaking *performs* the persona that the speaker intends to represent, consciously or not, in the interaction. There is, however, a scale running between two opposite formats of performance, depending on the focusing of the communicative event: high performance is predefined, regulated, bounded and planned in space and time, mostly public, and, in addition to these even in its intensity, it is different from the routine communicative practices of mundane performance (Coupland 2007: 147; cf. Bauman 1992). If we turn our attention on this scale from the instances of high performance previously represented by the horse fair and the adult debate to the routine flow of communicative practices in the classroom, we can also encounter stylization in its mundane performance.

Video 11 [*Translanguaging in teachers' interactional practices*] is a telling example (cf. also chapter 3.4.2). It represents class activities in which Tünde, the teacher, uses Romani language resources in addition to the default Hungarian ones. The lesson begins with a bilingual welcome, as seen in Extract 4. It starts with the pupils' joint greeting of their teacher, which is a common ritual at the beginning of the lesson in Hungarian schools.

- | | | |
|-----|--------|--|
| (4) | Pupils | <i>Jó reggelt kívánok!</i>
'I wish you a good morning!' |
| | Tünde | <i>Lácso gyész kívánok!</i>
'I wish you a GOOD MORNING!' |
| | Pupils | [laughing: <i>Lácso gyész</i>] <i>kívánok!</i>
'I wish you a GOOD MORNING!' |
| | Tünde | <i>Lácso gyész kívánok! Hogy vagytok?</i>
'I wish you a GOOD MORNING! How are you?' |
| | Pupils | <i>Jól.</i>
'Well.' |

Here, the focus of our analysis is on the moment when the children repeat the teacher's Romani greeting with laughter. Why the laughter? Why does it not accompany the teacher's translanguaging greeting and only appear in the children's utterance? In order to answer these

questions, we interpret the interaction in terms of stylization and its related concept of crossing.

The teacher uses Romani language resources in a way that evokes the persona of the Romani speaker who is different from her. If speakers stylize their utterances, that is, produce representations of linguistic resources that do not belong to their routinely used repertoire, stylization can often be funny or entertaining. But, as Rampton (2009) points out, there are times and places when and where stylization goes further than this. It raises in the audience not only the question "why that now?" but also "by what right?" does the speaker who is stylizing evoke the language or style that is associated with them. In other words, pupils may ask "by what right is she speaking for us"? This latter form of stylization is what Rampton (1995, 2017) calls "crossing".

In the hierarchical order of the classroom, children are not allowed to ask the Romani-speaking teacher "by what right?", a question that is perfectly reasonable, since, despite the school's translanguaging project, Hungarian is the dominant language of the majority of their lessons. They can express their reservations about the teacher's crossing at most by laughing, not even by laughing at her, but by laughing in their own voices. When the teacher repeats the greeting without noticing the children's non-verbal reaction, she provides a framework for the class in which the linguistic crossing of ethnic boundaries is supported by the authority of the teacher and accepted by the pupils (as they do not laugh either during the teacher's utterance or in their response).

In the commentary accompanying the classroom interaction, Tünde describes bilingual interactional episodes as a pedagogical strategy, as seen in Extract 5 ([video 11: 0.56–1.26](#))

- (5) Tünde *A kétnyelvű köszönéssel igyekszem arra bátorítani a gyerekeket, hogy bátran, gátlások nélkül használják a romanit. A gyerekek ilyenkor már kötetlenebbül, nyitottabban várják a tanítási órát, és sokkal érdeklődőbbé válnak, együttműködőbbek lesznek. Igyekszem az egyszerűbb kifejezéseket, "üljetek le, álljatok föl, vegyetek elő piros, kék vagy éppen zöld ceruzát!", illetve az értékelést is igyekszem romani nyelven elmondani.*
'By greeting each other in both languages I would like to encourage the children to use Romani without feeling intimidated. The pupils look forward to our sessions feeling more relaxed, more open, more curious. They are more willing to collaborate. I try to use simple expressions such as "stand up, sit down, pick up a red, blue or green pencil", in Romani and I also evaluate their work in Romani.'

The pedagogical and language policy objectives reflected in this extract are closely interlinked; the children should speak Romani, just as they should participate in class – freely, confidently, with an open and curious mind. The practice of linking teacher instruction and assessment both to Hungarian and Romani language resources, facilitates the achievement of these goals. To put it another way, it is the teacher's linguistic crossing of ethnic boundaries that anticipates the change. Similarly, Rampton states that "a clever or funny interactional design could capitalize on ethnic difference and neutralize the political sensitivities, potentially leading to new solidarities" (2009: 153). This is how the translanguaging practice of crossing, strategically used in teachers' interactions, is linked to the goals of a social constructivist pedagogy.

Despite the strategic potential of crossing, it does not necessarily lead to success in the educational process. As Stroud and Lee warn us, “there is always the risk that crossing (on the part of either the teacher or the students) could lead to rejection and ridicule” (2007: 51). These risks can be realized not only in crossing, but also in other cases of classroom translanguaging. As ethnographic data from a multilingual and highly diverse Greek-Cypriot primary school show, language ideologies and conflict histories affect Turkish-speaking students’ resistance to their teacher’s attempt to include translanguaging practices into the mostly Greek-speaking classroom (Charalambous et al. 2018). Even if interethnic conflicts are scarce or moderate, teachers take risks in transforming their own language practices at the expense of the authority of their own voice. The analysed video gives several examples that this risk is worth taking, as the students themselves change their language practices in the classroom as a result of the teacher’s initiative and they use Romani linguistic resources. The following excerpt is an example of how Romani language expertise is negotiated in the classroom interaction.

- (6) Tünde *Na, ha készen vagy, akkor csütten! Számolok háromig. Jekh. Duj.*
‘If you are ready, be QUIET please. I am counting to three. ONE.
TWO.’
Gábor Trin.
‘THREE.’
Tünde *Sss! Jekh. Jekh, duj, trin! Készen van mindenki?*
‘Shush! ONE. ONE, TWO, THREE! Are you all ready?’

The teacher’s counting indicates the time remaining until the task is completed. When she starts counting in Romani, before she reaches the number *trin* ‘three’ that marks the end of the task, one of the children cuts in before her. After gently silencing the child, she starts again and then successfully completes the counting, confirming her authority both in the role of the classroom instructor and of the language expert in Romani. Note also that, unlike in Extract 4, here the teacher’s use of Romani linguistic resources is not accompanied by laughter, neither following the imperative *csütten* ‘be quiet’, nor during the counting.

If we interpret the emergence or absence of laughter in terms of the distinction between crossing and stylization, then it is worth understanding these two as a temporal shift on a scale that indicates a change in the meaning of ethnic boundaries between the participants. Drawing on Bakhtin (1984: 199), Rampton and his associates state that “circumstances can lead to the blurring and weakening of inter-ethnic boundaries, and this can mean that crossing becomes stylisation, which can in turn become (habitual) style” (2019: 650). For the students in the classroom, the teacher’s language crossing of ethnic boundaries becomes a habitual style through a series of stylized everyday performances without the external circumstances changing. What is changing is the introduction of the translanguaging practice into the classroom, though.

The extracts analysed also raise the question of where the limits of the teachers’ translanguaging practices lie. The teacher creates an environment in which the use of Romani linguistic resources is supported for all participants in the classroom. Its transformative effect is hard to deny. Teachers’ crossing contributes to building strengthened cooperation between teachers and students. It creates space for students’ bilingualism and removes the barriers that have been created by monolingual ideologies of the school. In the extracts, there are only a few examples of pupils taking the initiative to translanguaging in their mundane classroom activities, however. Their use of Romani linguistic resources is mostly a reaction to the

teacher's translanguaging utterances. But the teacher's commitment to shared learning is evident in her closing words of Video 11: "They can see that I make mistakes, too, that I have to learn their language, just as they have to learn to use my language. We are learning together each other's languages and we come to rely on each other in this process" (3, [video 11: 6.05–6.21](#)). An ongoing question that accompanies the risk taken with crossing is whether its gradual transition into a common translanguaging style can lead beyond the mutual use of interaction rituals.

3.10.4 Conclusions

In this chapter, we discussed how translanguaging is reflected in the linguistic practices and their representations among speakers linked to the school, whether they are students, teachers, or parents. We looked at translanguaging moments which involve stylisation of the other, such as students imitating adults' speech, parents impersonating teachers and *vice versa*. Teachers' translanguaging voices were analysed from a crossing perspective, mapping them against ethnic boundaries that correspond to the classroom hierarchy. When different voices, styles and languages are put on display, the participants draw on their strategic potential in the actual interaction. This potential, we argued, can be channeled into translanguaging teaching practices through different means that bring together pedagogy and translanguaging. Drama pedagogy and role-play have a central place in helping students or parents to bring the language of the home into the school through the linguistic stylization of their own or other's voice. The crossing of ethnic boundaries might contribute toward the prospect of the creative reinterpretation of sociolinguistic differentiation. School activities in which stylization and crossing occur provide the opportunity for practising teachers, learners, and parents to adopt a reflexive approach to their own roles and positionality within their social world.

References

- Agha, Asif. 2005. Voice, footing, enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1). 38–59.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays*. USA: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bauman, Richard. 1992. Performance. In Richard Bauman (ed.), *Folklore, Cultural Performances, and Popular Entertainments*, 41–49. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bodó, Csanád, Gergely Szabó & Katalin Ráhel Turai. 2019. Voices of masculinity: Men's talk in Hungarian university dormitories. *Discourse & Society* 30(4). 339–358.
- Brahmachari, Samir. 1998. Stages of the world. In Hornbrook, David (ed.), *On the Subject Of Drama*, 18–35. London: Routledge.
- Charalambous, Panayiota, Constadina Charalambous & Michalinos Zembylas. 2018. Inarticulate voices: Translanguaging in an ecology of conflict. In Jürgen Jaspers & Lian Malai Madsen (eds.), *Critical Perspectives on Linguistic Fixity and Fluidity: Languagised Lives*, 167–191. London: Routledge.
- Coupland, Nikolas. 2007. *Style: Language Variation and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Donelan, Kate. 2002. Embodied Practices: Ethnography and Intercultural Drama in the Classroom, *NJ* 26(2). 35-44.

- Gal, Susan. 2016. Sociolinguistic differentiation. In Nikolas Coupland (ed.), *Sociolinguistics. Theoretical debates*, 113–135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gascon, Deborah, J. 2019. The Impact of drama pedagogy on student achievement, attitude, and empathy: An action research study. University of South Carolina dissertation. <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/5197> (accessed 11 November 2021)
- Glaserfeld, Ernst von 1990. An exposition of constructivism: Why some like it radical? In: Robert B Davis, Carolyn A. Maher & Nel Noddings (eds.), *Monographs of the Journal for Research in Mathematics Education* 4., 19–29. Reston: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Jaspers, Jürgen & Sarah Van Hoof. 2018. Style and stylisation. In Karin Tusting (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Linguistic Ethnography*, 110–124. London & New York: Routledge.
- Malm, Birgitte & Horst Löfgren. 2007. Empowering students to handle conflicts through the use of drama. *Journal of Peace Education* 4(1). 1–20.
- Pietikäinen, Sari & Hannele Dufva. 2006. Voices in discourses: Dialogism, critical discourse analysis and ethnic identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 10(2). 205–224.
- Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rampton, Ben. 2009. Interaction ritual and not just artful performance in crossing and stylization. *Language in Society* 38(2). 149–176.
- Rampton, Ben. 2014. Dissecting heteroglossia: Interaction ritual or performance in crossing and stylization? In Adrian Blackledge & Angela Creese (eds.), *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy*, 275–300. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Rampton, Ben. 2017. *Crossing 30 years later. Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, 210. Kings' College: London.
- Rampton, Ben, Costandina Charalambous & Panayiota Charalambous. 2019. Crossing of a different kind. *Language in Society* 48(5). 629–655.
- Smith, Lea J. & Daniel Herring. 2001. *Dramatic Literacy: Using Drama and Literature to Teach Middle-level Content*. New Hampshire: Heinemann
- Stewart, Michael. 1998. *The Time of the Gypsies. Studies in the Ethnographic Imagination*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Stroud, Christopher & Lionel Wee. 2007. A pedagogical application of liminalities in social positioning: Identity and literacy in Singapore. *TESOL Quarterly* 41(1). 33–54.
- Vogel, Sara & Ofelia García. 2017. Translanguaging. In George Noblit & Luis Moll (eds.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*, 1–22. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vygotsky, Lev S. 1964. *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.