

### **3.4 Teachers' talk in the translanguaging classroom: monolingual teachers in bi- and multilingual classrooms**

**János Imre Heltai, Tünde Demeter-Berencsi, Bernadett Jani-Demetriou, Ábel Flumbort, Zita Tündik**

This chapter explores changes in teachers' talk due to the adoption of practices related to translanguaging in their pedagogical activities. In the research settings discussed in this volume, Hungarian monolingual (or Hungarian-Slovak bilingual) educators teach learners, whose linguistic practices are fundamentally Romani-Hungarian bilingual, defined by spontaneous translanguaging; that is, by the presence of several languages in everyday communication. Prior to the project, these students were taught in schools through Hungarian-only as the language of instruction. They do not always have the competences in Hungarian required by the curriculum. As teachers began to make space for students' home language practices, they encountered ways of speaking which were either unknown to them or only partially known. Since the beginning of the translanguaging project, all participants have experienced changes in the entirety of complex classroom routines and discourses. This chapter explores the changes in teachers' own interactional practices which impact the complex web of classroom interactions and practices and the way teachers experience and reflect on these changes. Teachers' talk is here considered as one factor in the complex system of classroom interactions. Based on concepts of Bakhtins' dialogic discourse (1984) and Vigotsky's social constructivism (1978), teachers' talk is understood in this chapter in a broad sense, as a set of behavioural patterns in the processes of dialogic teaching (Alexander 2005, 2020), embedded in special social contexts (Tharp and Gallimore 1988).

Translanguaging in school can refer to students' spontaneous linguistic practices in everyday learning activities (even in classes conducted in a monolingual way), or to a planned and teacher-guided bi- or multilingual way of learning, or a mix of both. Cenoz and Gorter, framing 'pedagogical translanguaging', argue that translanguaging in the United States has "more of a social justice focus and is seen as empowering minority students" (2021: 5, referencing García and Lin 2017). They highlight that in the Welsh context (Williams 1995), the aim is different inasmuch as it is to extend competences in the minority language (see also Baker 2003). Translanguaging is, thus, a pre-planned and teacher-guided activity, and a policy which introduced the use of several named languages in the same class (Williams 2002, 2012).

The approach based on William's work questions the tradition of the strict separation of languages in particular classes, but it serves mainly to support and promote successful minority language policies in education (Cenoz and Gorter 2017). The focus is not so much on the development of learners' unitary repertoire as on the development of their minority language competences in order to strengthen minority language practices in a community. Cenoz and Gorter remind us that Williams (2012) differentiated official and natural translanguaging (2021: 8), where the former is planned and systematic, while the latter occurs at school when the students' competences in the majority language are not yet sufficient. Jakonen Szabó and Laihonen (2018) investigate similar practices in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classrooms. Cenoz and Gorter, referring to their earlier works (2017 and 2020), differentiate pedagogical and spontaneous translanguaging as follows: "Pedagogical translanguaging is a pedagogic theory and practice that refers to instructional strategies which integrate two or more languages. Spontaneous translanguaging refers to the



reality of bilingual usage in naturally occurring contexts where boundaries between languages are fluid and constantly shifting. A continuum can represent these two types of translanguaging rather than a dichotomy because there can be intermediate situations” (2021: 18).

García and her colleagues consider it a key feature of translanguaging that it rejects abyssal thinking based on raciolinguistic ideologies (García et al 2021: 203); thus, for them, translanguaging has a strong political and social commitment (García and Kleyn 2016: 24–25) and it is dedicated to those who are not among the winners of nation-building and global capitalism (García and Otheguy 2020: 28). This reframed interpretation of translanguaging (García 2009, García and Li 2014, Li 2018) shifts the focus from the minority language to learners’ repertoires. Cenoz and Gorter contrast both approaches, labelling them also in geographic terms such as ‘Welsh’ and ‘US-concepts’. They highlight that proponents of translanguaging in the US (contrasted to the ‘Welsh’ concept) “observe natural unplanned bilingual communicative practices in different contexts, define the characteristics of these practices, label them as translanguaging and propose the legitimization of these practices by accepting them at school” (2021: 9, table 1). Subsequently, they discuss the US-based translanguaging proponents’ standpoints about the unitary linguistic repertoire and languages as socially constructed entities. They consider this standpoint as controversial (2021: 10) and refer to Cummins’s (2017) mid-way solution, which contends that languages are socially constructed entities but with the caveat that people always identify the languages they are speaking.

In addition to the differences between Williams’ original approach and García’s reframed one, the difference in their respective foci and purpose is also striking: extending competences in a minority language through new classroom policies vs. “leveraging students’ bilingualism for learning”, as formulated in the sub-title of García’s, Ibarra Johnson’s and Seltzer’s volume (2017). This difference overlaps with differentiations between teacher-guided and student-centred approaches. Our volume considers both teacher-guided and student-centred approaches as interdependent parts of translanguaging in the classroom.

In a multilingual classroom, translanguaging is always part of students’ thinking, García and colleagues argue, even in cases when the instruction is monolingual and participants’ multilingualism remains hidden. They illustrate this with the metaphor “translanguaging corriente” (García, Ibarra Johnson & Seltzer 2017: xi–xii); similar to an underground river, learners’ fluid multilingualism emerges in an explicit way at points where teachers deliberately include students’ linguistic practices in the learning process. The rest of the time, its traces can be seen and felt, but it is not visible. Teacher-student communication, and within it, teachers’ talk, changes both in situations when students’ spontaneous translanguaging practices occur in the classroom (the corriente becomes visible), and when teachers organise a learning event which includes more than one language (teachers render the corriente visible). Cenoz and Gorter (2021) also note that the spontaneous and guided practices form a continuum rather than a dichotomy, and there are intermediate situations. This chapter argues that teachers’ talk in translanguaging classrooms is always characterized by situations which would be marked by Cenoz and Gorter as “intermediate”.

García and Kleyn list three components of translanguaging as a pedagogical orientation: translanguaging stance, translanguaging shift, and translanguaging design (García and Kleyn 2016: 20–24). Teachers’ talk in a translanguaging classroom can be described in relation to each of these. Translanguaging stance is a pedagogical attitude that recognises that the inclusion of learners’ entire linguistic repertoire in school activities is, in fact, an acceptance of children’s entire personality. Teachers with a translanguaging stance organise everyday activities with this starting point in mind, even if they consider themselves monolingual



Hungarian speakers. Translanguaging design refers to the methodological possibilities for making languages spoken in the classroom part of school activities alongside the language of instruction. The ability to undergo translanguaging shift, once mastered, enables teachers to organise and manage multilingual classroom activities while bringing changes in the prestige relations of the languages. In this chapter we show how both teacher-guided and student-centred translanguaging are present in classrooms. Through the analysis of teacher talk in translanguaging classroom moments we explore the ways in which teachers' stance and teaching design change, and the way teachers become capable of translanguaging shifts, even if they consider themselves monolingual majority-language speakers and/or do not speak (all) the students' language(s).

### 3.4.1 Translanguaging stance and teachers' talk

Translanguaging stance defines teachers' talk in translanguaging classrooms so far as it rewrites teacher's ideologies about languages and speakers. Teachers participating in our project in Tiszavasvári, who deliberately exploit the opportunities offered by translanguaging in their classes, report that they acquired some knowledge of Romani after their attitudes changed. For instance Zita, a teacher in the lower years of primary school who has worked in Magiszter for over fifteen years, reported in a conversation in 2019 the changes in her attitude as follows (excerpt 1, also quoted in Heltai 2020: 148):

- (1) *Egyre bátrabbak a gyerekek. Most már van úgy, hogy kérdés nélkül is, egy-egy válaszba, nem is úgy, hogy téma, kép kapcsán megjelenik a cigány nyelvi kifejezés. Ami a legnagyobb előrelépés, az talán én vagyok, merthogy egyre több mindent én is megérték, amit mondanak, néha nincs is szükség a fordításra.*

'Children are becoming increasingly confident. Sometimes it happens that Romani expressions pop up, even without the children being prompted, in their answers, if Romani is somehow related to a topic or picture. The greatest step forward is perhaps me [sic!], because I understand more and more of what they say. Often, they do not even need to translate for me.'

This is one from a number of accounts that illustrate what Li Wei refers to as the transformative power of translanguaging, which can create new identities and practices (Li 2018: 23). The transformation of teachers' stance is part of these broader transformations, and, as is shown in (1), it is inseparable from other processes. Zita's translanguaging classes transformed the student's language practices in the classroom: *kérdés nélkül is, egy-egy válaszba [...] megjelenik a cigány nyelvi kifejezés* 'Romani expressions pop up, even without the children being prompted, in their answer'. But Zita also reports that her own practices are changing: *egyre több mindent én is megérték* 'I understand more and more of what they say'.

Changes in the learning process and in students' level of engagement were widely reported in discussions with the teachers. All teachers' accounts of the changes include comments which pinpoint students' increased willingness to participate in the learning processes. Teachers' comments also highlight among the changes a more dialogic approach to teaching, and a transformation in students' willingness to participate in dialogues. Dialogue reflects, and is shaped by, social and cultural values (Alexander 2020: 49). The transformation of values (the transformation of teachers' ideologies and stance) leads to the transformation of classroom dialogues, or, quite possibly, paves the way for dialogic teaching



which enable students to find their own voice. Students' language practices are acknowledged and appreciated, and through a holistic view of their language practices, their personalities become more readily accessible and appreciated by the teachers. Instead of quotes from discussions held with teachers, this chapter contains a shorter comment on this topic written by Zita Tündik, and a more detailed report by another colleague, a teacher in the upper years of primary school, Tünde Demeter-Berencsik, also participating in the project.

Zita summarized transformations both of her stance and students' practices as follows: What touched me most in translanguaging as a pedagogical stance is that it enabled me to turn my pupils' Romani utterances, treated earlier as undesirable factors, to advantage while I assisted learners in their progress. One of my first steps was to start encouraging learners in Year 1 to speak in Romani. To my surprise, I found out that this was not as easy as I expected. Having experienced many years of prohibitions at school, parents advised their children to speak only Hungarian in classes. Pupils originally laughed at the learners who asked questions or answered in Romani and they translated for me into Hungarian what was said even when I did not ask them to do so. As a result of constant encouragement and praise, this situation started to change. Learners started speaking in their mother tongue more and more willingly and frequently. When someone was unable to say something in Hungarian or they did not understand something, they could now rely on help in Romani or on other students' interpretation in Hungarian of what they were trying to say. It was at this stage that I realised to what extent the possibility of using Romani and the promotion of fluid linguistic practices liberated the learners. They became increasingly motivated, active, and confident. They knew that their answers will be valued whether they are formulated in Romani or Hungarian. It is also worthy of note that students' translations into Hungarian enhance the comprehension skills of those who know Hungarian less well, and expand learners' Hungarian vocabulary.

Tünde started her twelfth year of employment at Magiszter. She teaches history, ethics and French in the upper years of primary school. Below, her observations and reflections give an overview of children's language practices in- and outside of the classroom, the way she reacts to them and adapts her own language practices to her learners', and, as a result, the ways in which her own language ideologies are transformed.

It is part of my professional practice as a teacher to constantly pay attention to children's behaviour, their reactions, ways of speaking, and habits. I follow closely their ways of speaking with each other, with their parents, grandparents, and teachers. The vehemence with which they speak, their gesticulation, their rapid pace of speech is captivating. But I noticed that this was in sharp contrast with the way they spoke during classes. I teach history, ethics, and French. However, I never heard the children speak at the same pace in Hungarian as they did during breaks in the school's courtyard or corridor, or even just walking down the street, when they speak Romani. I observed that those learners whom I, and most of my colleagues, considered to be of outstanding, good, or average ability spoke both languages quickly. Their use of Hungarian was usually context appropriate. But those learners whom we considered less able spoke Hungarian more slowly, they paused to think while speaking, the flow of their speech was disrupted in Hungarian, they were often looking for the right words. I realised that, when speaking in Romani, they become more animated, their speaking becomes faster, and they look more confident. This is an interesting dichotomy, which reminds us that linguistic competences always have to be separated from learning abilities. There is a little girl in my class who speaks very slowly, she needs a lot of help with her work. During classes, she needs constant encouragement and help, also from her peers. In pair work, she always lets herself to be led by the other learner. But during the breaks, when they speak Romani, the roles are effectively reversed. She becomes a confident, chatty, feisty



Erasmus+

Erasmus+ Programme

little girl. In my mind, that's when she comes to life. She is not the only one. Many children would fit this description.

The difference I noticed when I heard my learners speak Hungarian as opposed to their home language made me think. I started noticing that when speaking in ways familiar from home, we become more open to the world outside. We instinctively get immersed in the atmosphere and the environment in which we are present as speakers. Almost without thinking, we just do our job; that is, we speak, whether we are adults or children. Conversely, when we speak in a language we learned, a familiar inhibition comes into play. We become conscious of precision, clarity, correctness. We focus on our goal to be understood, so that our listeners understand our utterances the way we intended them, to avoid misunderstandings. I recalled having experienced similar feelings as a language learner.

Then, several years ago, it suddenly occurred to me that there was something I could do to make the children's work in class easier. I observed their speaking practices during classes, too. Lessons teaching a particular discipline, especially in the upper years of primary school, are becoming increasingly challenging. Even in the fifth grade, the units in the textbook are several pages long, full of words and phrases that monolingual Hungarian children don't know either. These Hungarian-language texts are difficult for children to understand and summarise in Hungarian. A typical scenario in class was that we watched a short film about, for instance, the building of pyramids or medieval knights, and some of the pupils could not recall and explain what they had seen. The reason for this was not that they were not watching or failed to understand it, but that they were unable to collect their thoughts as fluently as others when speaking Hungarian. Those who are even a little less fluent in Hungarian prefer not to come forward in such situations. Those who can express themselves better in the "language of the school" speak up sooner.

I tried to experiment with tasks which required group work or pair work. I was watching how children reacted while working together. When a task proved to be easy, and did not lead to ambiguous results, conversation in pairs and groups typically occurred in Hungarian. The children agreed on the solution without having a difference in opinion; therefore, there was no debate. In situations when it was challenging to come up with a solution, however, and there were several ways to arrive at a conclusion, as soon as there was the slightest difference in views, a heated debate started – always in Romani. Opinions were contrasted, verbal battles were fought, and I stood, smiling, in the midst of the stream of Romani speech. I understood almost nothing of what was being said, but I could sense that the children were talking about the task they had in hand. Suddenly, it hit me: I saw a sign of relief on the children's faces. Long last, they could break out of the usual constraints and, while remaining focused on the subject learned, formulated freely what they wanted to say. Even learners who were normally in the background and waited quietly for the class to end now came forth and fought for their right to contribute to the solution of the task.

In the storm of Romani words and sentences I could hear the odd Hungarian word emerge. They were Hungarian words – or almost Hungarian. Hungarian words and word stems with suffixes unknown to me, lending the words a Romani appearance. By that time, I knew that children used Hungarian words in their Romani speech when they did not have a matching Romani word. That was the moment when the decision was born in me: I need to let it happen; if I want to give everyone a chance to speak, if I want all those who are challenged by Hungarian to come forth in my classes, I have to open up the possibility for learners to choose the language in which they want to formulate their answers in class. Initially, there was a great deal of confusion. But eventually my pupils realised that I was determined. They grew increasingly confident. In the meantime, we stumbled upon a problem – although it was *my* problem alone – namely, that I did not understand, or not always, what

Project funded by the European Commission. The information in this publication does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union.



the children said. So, I myself had to become a language learner. Learning a new language as an adult is no easy task, especially without dictionaries, grammars, notes. The tables have turned. Now, *I* became shy, thoughtful, slow... I often paused. I had to repeat particular words, phrases, questions, sentences several times.

Our classes were transformed, too. The children instinctively switched to bilingual mode. They used use freely whichever language they wanted because they knew I would accept their answers either way. They translated the Romani utterances for me, or I asked them to translate. I realised that we may cover less ground in terms of the volume of the material taught but what we cover is better ingrained in children's memory: they can recall it better and more confidently. This is practised knowledge. I do not have a permanent interpreter. Anyone who feels like it can translate, or I ask someone, or it is just someone taking part in a particular activity. The learners love being in the centre of attention. I feel that they also like the fact that admitting Romani in the classroom has made me more human. More vulnerable. After all, language learners have to navigate a path full of pitfalls. The pupils laugh a lot but not *at* me. Not anymore... They laugh *with* me because my pronunciation, the way I form the sounds, is often wrong. I have to rely on my ears because I do not have written learning materials. Everyone is now a language learner in my classes. The children have learned that there is nothing wrong with speaking several languages. I often reinforce the idea that being bilingual or multilingual is a joy. They have experienced in the translanguaging classes that anyone can learn a language, and that adults, too, can be language learners. That they, too, can teach me and others. This understanding contributes to developing the learners' personality. I see them become more confident as they let go of their tension, and their relationship with teachers is also transformed. I think that in the classes where we make room for the use of Romani, the children are more active and more involved. After all, they understand a great deal – or at least way more than in classes where they have to rely only on Hungarian.

### **3.4.2 Translanguaging shift, translanguaging design and teachers' talk**

While a translanguaging stance concerns transformations of participants' language ideologies, a translanguaging design is linked mostly to everyday planning, and translanguaging shift is tied to the moment, to teachers' each and every spontaneous or planned decision in the classroom. Translanguaging design fits with cooperative classroom activities. In Tiszavasvári and Szímő (Zemné), the combination of cooperative learning organisation and translanguaging are successful for a number of reasons. The languages (Hungarian and Romani) used in group work are chosen freely by group members. Students who are proficient in both languages can act as facilitators during the joint activity. Students, who otherwise have difficulties with the language of instruction, can take action and ask their partner for help more courageously. The principles of constructive interdependence, individual responsibility, and equal participation are also reflected; social and interpersonal skills are developing. The teachers' controlling role is taken over by the pupils: teachers only have to control the planning and the final outcome, which minimalises problems resulting from the teachers' lacking of, or low, competence levels in Romani. When needed, the teachers can ask for interpreting at any time. Overall, the importance of the teacher's language skills is minimal in cooperative learning organisation.

In tasks involving Romani in group work or frontal class work, as Tünde reported above (cf. 3.4.1), the teacher may find herself in a situation where her language competence is less suitable to lead, or participate in, the work. The school is an institution with a hierarchical structure in which the teachers' powerful position is determined (Fairclough 1989): the teachers' superiority is a consequence of their role to control the classroom (van Dijk 1993).



However, the teacher's position of power is formed in everyday communication and discourse (Fairclough 1989); hence, translanguaging pedagogical practices also have an impact on the change of hierarchical relations between teachers and learners. Translanguaging not only leads to a better understanding of what is said in the classroom, but also balances the hierarchy between the languages (Mazzaferro 2018: 2; Paulsrud and Straszer 2018: 65, citing Otheguy et al. 2015: 283).

While Chapter 3.9 looks at learning organisation in detail, this chapter concerns itself with the issue of translanguaging shift. Its presence and functioning in everyday school life is illustrated by Video 1 (*Translanguaging as cultural mediation*) in the following paragraphs (for a discussion of Video 1 from the angle of mediation of knowledge practices, see Chapter 3.3). In the school year prior to the film making, some members of the class learned poems for a recitation competition both in Romani and Hungarian. One of the students learned a poem written by a Roma poet, Leksa Manush, a native of Riga (Latvia). The poem is about a little fowl which would be cared for and loved by the persona talking in the poem. As the video reveals, alongside the learner who presented it at the competition, many other learners were also familiar with the Romani version because they had heard it several times in the class.

The culturally relevant content (cf. the tradition of horse-keeping and horse-trading in Roma communities, see in more detail in Chapters 3.3., 3.10 and video 21 [*Imitating Romani "adult speech" at school*], [video 21: 1.22–2.22](#)) is adapted to the students' home languages. The original Romani text was rewritten by Zita's colleague in local Romani. (This colleague has Romani competences for family reasons). By presenting a version of the Romani poem adapted to local linguistic practices, Zita challenges standard language ideology in order to support local ways of speaking. Zita repeatedly praises and encourages the children when they contribute to the lesson by following their home practices. In this way, her encouragement reinforces, indirectly, the values associated with these ways of speaking, which works against the language ideologies that stigmatise local practices.

In the first scene in Video 1 ([video 1: 0.49–2.06](#)), Zita asks the pupil who learned the poem the previous year whether he remembers it, and if so, which version: the Romani or the Hungarian. The student can recall the Romani version, but not the Hungarian one, as he indicates in response to Zita's question. This is the first instance where translanguaging shift occurs: the moment in which the teacher decides to shift the language dynamics in the classroom and give way to Romani. The student starts reciting the poem in Romani but after a while he stops.

It's worth observing the teacher's questions in Hungarian after the Romani recitation: “now that we've recalled it in Romani, can you remember a little more in Hungarian?”. Here we see a teacher's attempt to get the children to shift back from Romani to Hungarian. Although it is implicit in the question that the task this time is to recall the poem in Hungarian, the primary purpose of the teacher's questions is to activate existing knowledge. This question is about how much information the students retain a year and a half after learning the poem, what they remember, and whether they remember anything at all. The children try to recall the Hungarian version while repeating the Romanian lines, with varying degrees of success ([video 1: 3:05–3:39](#)). Finally, one of the students claims that he is able to recite the poem in Hungarian, but he ends up reciting it in Romani, not realising for quite a few seconds that he is speaking Romani instead of Hungarian. He finally realizes that he accidentally performed in the language different from what he intended to ([video 1: 3.40–3.53](#)):

(2) Learner [bosszankodva tapsol és zavartan mosolyog] *Áj, ez cigány!*



[snaps his hands annoyedly and smiles in embarrassment] ‘Oh no, this is in Gypsy!’

Teacher [mosolyog] *Na, de ez cigány! Te végig cigányul mondtad el, amikor magyarul akartad.*

[smiling] ‘But this is in Gypsy! You spoke in Gypsy throughout, although you wanted to say it in Hungarian.’

The teacher in her comment reminds the student that he originally intended to speak in Hungarian, but makes no other comment. This moment is a translanguaging shift initiated (accidentally) by the learner, to which the teacher responds positively. The teacher's affirming stance signals the possibility of a flexible treatment of languages to the learners, who are reassured that they cannot get into trouble with their contributions. This allows them to maintain the dynamism of their bilingual language practices.

The children find it easier to recall the text in Romani, and then try to reconstruct the Hungarian text together. At one point, the teacher performs a translanguaging shift by asking the children to translate a line ([video 1: 4:07](#)), as she was unable to link certain Romani parts of the poem to the corresponding Hungarian parts. One of the little girls gets up from her chair and stands in front of the teacher to help her learn and pronounce the words correctly in Romani ([video 1: 4:08–4:32](#)):

- (3) Teacher *Mit csinálunk, még? Ezt nem értettem.*  
‘What are we doing? I don’t understand.’
- Boy *Bevisszük az ólba.*  
‘We take it to the sty.’
- Teacher *Bevisszük az ólba?*  
‘We take it to the sty?’
- Boy *Igen. Kikötöm. Az is volt, kikötöm!*  
‘Yes... tether it. There was also, I will tether it!’
- Teacher *Várjál! Kikötöm? Az hogy van romaniul? ... Kikötöm.*  
‘Wait! I tether it? How is that in Romani? ...I will tether it.’
- Learners *Avripangyam lesz.*  
‘TETHER IT, I WILL TETHER IT.’
- Teacher *Avripangyam lesz?*  
‘TETHER IT?’
- Girl [utánozva mondja] *Avripangyam lesz. Kikötöm.*  
[miming and saying it] ‘I WILL TETHER IT. I tether it.’

In such translation tasks, the students give the information to the teacher, a situation that goes against convention. A single translanguaging shift can change the roles and/or the dynamics between teacher and students. For example, a shift in the moment under discussion implies mutual trust between teachers and students. By asking for a translation, the teacher trusts that the students will respond in a meaningful way, they come up with the necessary information and the lesson will not get bogged down. In a translanguaging teaching situation, teaching is less an autocratic process and more a facilitative one (cf. Grasha 1994: 143; Nahalka 2002: 65). In the collaborative work seen in the video, the teacher is not directly in control of the learning process, but indirectly facilitates the learners' thinking by creating the conditions, despite the fact that all of this takes place in a frontal teaching situation. The role of the facilitating teacher focuses on the learners' work rather than on the teacher's persona. After recalling the text of the poem in Hungarian, the learner has the opportunity to recite it in



front of the class. The learner who participated in the recitation competition does not want to do this alone; he chooses to do the recital in collaboration with others. It is worth noting, however, that they perform only in Romani ([video 1: 5:28–6:05](#)). Shifting the language of the class back to Romani, learners become the initiators of another translanguaging shift – again, it is the learners, not the teacher, who are the change-makers.

There are several translanguaging shifts in the scene, but the main aim of the tasks, facilitated by the teacher, is to recall the text in the language of instruction, based on the Romani spoken by the students. The purpose of the teacher-led translanguaging and the shifts in this process are therefore twofold: on the one hand, to recall the content of the poem, and on the other hand, to be able to formulate it in Hungarian, too, alongside Romani. The students are excited and fully engaged in summarising the content of the text also in Hungarian. The teacher's communication plays a significant role in making the lesson dynamic, the children active and free. Consciously integrating the two languages into the activity, she builds on the home language of the students and thus contributes to a relaxed classroom atmosphere, to the students' participation in the lesson without inhibitions, and to building their self-confidence. It is worth looking at the students' faces during and after the final successful recitation of the poem: one can read the joy and pride they feel at the experience of success.

Video 3 (*Going beyond languages*) is a further example of positive reinforcement and of the crucial role teachers' questions play in facilitating learning. In video 3, the children had to predict the content of a fairy tale based on the title and illustrations in the textbook. One by one, the students try to guess what the story might be about. One of the students answered in Romani, and the teacher, not understanding the answer exactly, asked another student if she understood. The teacher, however, refrained from pointing out that she failed to understand what the student said because it was in Romani. Instead, she embedded her reflection on her own (lack of) understanding in a word of praise, claiming that the students said so much that it was hard for her to follow. She asked if the problematic utterance was about luck, suggesting to the learner who said it that his contribution was correct. Then the same learner repeated what was said before, now in Hungarian ([video 3: 2.30–3.06](#)). The teacher's deliberately leaves out of focus the language students speak while developing their ideas and tries to involve everyone in the class as much as possible. To this end, she opens the floor for the children to shift the conversation to Romani. The teacher makes sure that the students do not experience Romani contributions as something that causes the class to be disrupted, but as contributing factor to the success of the lesson.

In a scene filmed during a fifth-grade Hungarian class taught by a third teacher, Erika, (Video 10, *Enhancing the prestige of Romani within the group*), the students were asked to summarise in Hungarian the Roma folk tale read in Hungarian in the previous session. Not everyone was able to complete the task in Hungarian and, as the teacher's reflection ([video 10: 0.36–1.20](#)) indicates, the task was difficult. Therefore, the teacher introduced a translanguaging shift, modifying the task ([video 10: 1.21–2.26](#)):

- (4) Teacher *Aki úgy érzi, hogy cigányul jobban megy, az úgy mondja.*  
'Those who feel it would be easier in Gypsy, they can say it in Gypsy.'
- Learner *Cigányul?*  
'In Gypsy?'
- Teacher *Persze. Lehet cigányul is*  
'Sure. You can say it in Gypsy.'
- Learner *Én nem szeretném.*  
'I wouldn't like to.'



Erasmus+

Erasmus+ Programme

Teacher *Na, akkor mondjad gyorsan!*  
'Go on, say it then.'

Not everyone takes up the opportunity to say it in Romani as offered by the teacher. The first student, in (3) above, is surprised, and chooses to give his summary in Hungarian. However, the next student, who is among those who could not answer the question in Hungarian in the first round, answers this time in Romani. He seems confused again, but the teacher comes to his rescue, confirming that this time he can choose the language he wants. Then, after some hesitation, the boy makes use of the opportunity ([video 10: 1.56–2.16](#)) and completes the task in Romani, thus shifting the course of the lesson. This was the first Romani utterance during the completion of the task and it provided a pattern for the other students: the majority of the students who followed carried on using Romani. The teacher's instruction which allowed Romani to appear in the students' outputs brought about a change in learners' language practices. The most obvious sign of the change in the hierarchy between languages is that the pupil who was the first one to speak and who, despite being offered the chance to speak in Romani chose Hungarian, told the teacher after his peers finished their summaries that he wanted to summarise the plot a third time, but this time in Romani. The teacher first did not hear what he said, but the others passed on the request, and the opportunity was granted ([video 10: 3.46–4.16](#)).

The student described in the above analysis presented successfully in Hungarian. However, when he saw that most of the students who came after him answered in Romani, it suddenly became important for him to say the same thing this time in Romani. The teacher's reaction shows that she considers the opportunity to speak in Romani important. García and Vogel also note that during translanguaging, the teacher builds on the learners' diverse linguistic practices, and in doing so, among other things, she develops a socio-emotional bond with the learners, in addition to contributing to reshuffling the hierarchy between languages (2017: 10). A good example of this change in hierarchy can be seen in the scene analysed above. Teachers' talk in this lesson only creates the possibility of a translanguaging shift, which learners can take advantage of, and it is down to the learners to embrace or reject it. The teacher remains in "monolingual mode" throughout.

This is not the case in Video 12 (*Translanguaging corriente*), recorded in one of Tünde's history classes, where a teacher-initiated translanguaging shift is implemented. Pupils in Year 7 are learning about the social history of ancient Rome. In a group activity, students learn about the lifestyles of the rich and the poor. The task is as follows: each group is given statements in writing (in Hungarian) about the way of life of the Romans; group members have to decide whether a statement refers to the rich or the poor. The task is checked by the teacher ([video 12: 1.39–2.58](#)), at which point she introduces the Romani opposition *csóro* 'poor' and *barvalo* 'rich'. The groups have to assign their sentences to the categories labelled with these Romani words. In this case, the teacher deliberately performs a translanguaging shift, only symbolically, but in a way that linguistic resources associated with Romani appear in her communication. At first, the learners are reluctant to use Romani resources instead of Hungarian when solving the task, but given that the teacher insists on it and does not allow the children to switch to Hungarian, they accept the Romani solutions and keep using it.

In another lesson of Tünde's, shown in Video 11 dedicated to teacher talk (*Translanguaging in teachers' interactional practices*), the translanguaging shift transforms teacher talk itself (see also Chapters 3.3.3 and 3.10.3). Here, at certain moments, Romani language resources appear in the teacher's communication as Tünde speaks Romani in her class. Her Romani utterances include general classroom-related verbal performances, such as greeting the children. At other times, she gives short instructions in Romani, but Romani

Project funded by the European Commission. The information in this publication does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union.



elements appear in the feedback and evaluation given to students. In Scene 2 ([video 11: 1.30–1.38](#)), she uses the Romani expression *lácso* ('well') to confirm to a student that he has done well in the task, and in Scene 4 ([video 11: 1.52–2.07](#)) she gives a student *duj loulo* points, i.e. 'two red' points, a form of reward in the Hungarian school system. In scenes 3 ([video 11: 1.40–1.50](#)) and 5 ([video 11: 2.12–2.37](#)), she tells the class to be quiet in Romani: *csiütten!* ('be quiet!'). In other instances, using Romani language elements (*loulo* 'red'), she instructs the class to work with a red pencil: *LOULO ceruza a kézben!* ('RED pencil in hand!'). In Scene 5, she counts down in Romani before the time given for the task is up: *jekh, duj, trin* ('one, two, three'). These examples taken from Tünde's class illustrate that all the teacher needs to do is learn a few phrases and instructions in Romani. However, the use of these is not only a friendly gesture towards the learners (which is also important, as it contributes to increasing the prestige of Romani for the learners), but also a sign that there is a place for Romani communication in the classroom.

Unlike the other two teachers, Zita and Erika, Tünde weaves Romani resources into her utterances. As she reported (Chapter 3.4.1), she sees the advantages of this strategy in the balancing of interpersonal relationships with her students. In this way, she (who happens to be a teacher of French, too) becomes a (language) learner, and she is placed in situations in which she feels linguistically insecure. This allows her to develop a better understanding of the learners' position. Because of the low social prestige of Romani and its speakers in Hungary and Slovakia, teachers of children whose repertoires include Romani alongside their other languages rarely think of learning the language. At the start of our project, a common objection from teachers, who generally feel overburdened, was that they do not have the time and energy to learn the children's language, or even to make themselves familiar to some extent with students' home language practices. They argued that translanguaging is impossible, or at least severely hindered, if teachers do not know the students' language. However, those teachers who did try to develop a translanguaging stance, reported positive experiences.

As we have seen in the above analyses, a translanguaging stance allows for a wide range of possibilities in learning organisation by including more than one language. One way is for the teacher to become a language learner, like Tünde, through symbolic gestures, through the use of short utterances, even single Romani words. In this case, teachers make use of planned translanguaging shifts: they invite students to speak Romani or to work with Romani at particular points in the class. They set aside time for translanguaging in this way within the class (Li 2011). Another strategy, illustrated by Zita's and Erika's practices, is to remain simply open towards students and their ways of speaking, not only accepting but also supporting Romani and translingual practices in the classroom. These teachers remain in a monolingual instructional mode (they themselves do not use Romani resources), but create the possibilities for translanguaging shifts. They do it mainly in two ways, according to our analysis above. The first one of these entails explicit statements concerning the points at which they expect Romani to be spoken instead of, or in addition to, Hungarian. The second technique requires some experience and practice on the part of the teacher, and it involves getting the students used to the idea of, and building their confidence for, making the translanguaging shifts themselves in moments when they feel the need to do so. All of these strategies lead to similar results. An emergent translanguaging stance not only changes the characteristics of teacher talk, but also rewrites classroom dialogues and the interpersonal relations and prestige relations underlying them. The adoption of a translanguaging stance has triggered a partial transformation in the ways in which teachers participating in the project speak in their daily work activities and a fundamental rethinking of the ways in which they



organise learning (mentioned in both Zita' and Tünde' contributions to this chapter) to facilitate shifts of one kind or other.

## References

- Alexander, Robin J. 2020. *A Dialogic Teaching Companion*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Alexander, Robin. J. 2005. *Teaching Through Dialogue: The First Year*. London: Barking and Dagenham Council.
- Baker, Colin. 2003. Bilingual and transliteracy in Wales: Language planning and the Welsh national curriculum. In Nancy Hornberger (ed.), *Continua of Bilingualism*, 71–90. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. (Eds. Caryl Emerson). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cenoz, Jason & Durk Gorter. 2017. Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 38(10). 901–912.
- Cenoz, Jasone & Durk Gorter. 2020. Pedagogical translanguaging: An introduction. *System* 92. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2020.102269
- Cenoz, Jasone & Durk Gorter. 2021. *Pedagogical Translanguaging (Elements in Language Teaching)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, Jim. 2017. Teaching for transfer in multilingual school contexts. In Ofelia García, Angel Lin & Stephen May (eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education: Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (3rd ed.), 103–115. Berlin: Springer.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Gal, Susan 2016: Sociolinguistic differentiation. In: Coupland, Nikolas (ed.) *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical Debates*, 113–138. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- García, Ofelia & Angel Lin. 2017. Translanguaging and bilingual education. In Ofelia García, Angel Lin & Stephen May (eds.), *Bilingual Education: Encyclopedia of Language and Education* 5, 117–130. Berlin: Springer.
- García, Ofelia & Li Wei 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, Ofelia & Ricardo Otheguy 2020. Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 23(1). 17–35.
- García, Ofelia & Tatyana Kleyn 2016. Translanguaging theory in education. In Ofelia García & Tatyana Kleyn (eds.), *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments*, 9–33. New York: Routledge.
- García, Ofelia, Nelson Flores, Kate Seltzer, Li Wei, Ricardo Otheguy & Jonathan Rosa. 2021. Rejecting abyssal thinking in the language and education of racialized bilinguals: A manifesto. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 18(3). 203–228.
- García, Ofelia, Susana Ibarra Johnson & Kate Seltzer. 2017. *The Translanguaging Classroom. Leveraging Students' Bilingualism for Learning*. Caslon: Philadelphia.
- 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.



- Grasha, Anthony F. 1994. A matter of style: The teacher as expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. *College Teaching* 42(4). 142–149.
- Heltai, János Imre. 2020. *Transzlingválás. Elmélet és gyakorlat*. Gondolat. Budapest.
- Jakonen, Teppo, Tamás Péter Szabó & Petteri Laihonon. 2018. Translanguaging as playful subversion of a monolingual norm in the classroom. In Gerardo Mazzaferro (ed.), *Translanguaging as Everyday Practice*, 31–48. Springer.
- Li, Wei. 2011. Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(5). 1222–1235.
- Li, Wei. 2018. Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics* 39. 9–30.
- MacSwan, Jeff. 2017. A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal* 54. 167–201.
- Mazzaferro, Gerardo. 2018. Translanguaging as everyday practice. An introduction. In Mazzaferro, Gerardo (ed.), 1–12. *Translanguaging as Everyday Practice*. Springer.
- Nahalka, István. 2002. *Hogyan alakul ki a tudás a gyerekekben?* Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.
- Otheguy, Ricardo, Ofelia García & Wallis Reid. 2015. Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review* 6(3). 281–307.
- Paulsrud, BethAnne & Boglárka Straszer. 2018. “We Know the same languages and then we can mix them”: A child’s perspectives on everyday translanguaging in the family. In Mazzaferro, Gerardo (ed.), *Translanguaging as Everyday Practice*, 49–68. Springer.
- Tharp, Roland. G. & Gallimore, Roland. 1988. *Rousing Minds to Life: Teaching, Learning, and Schooling in Social Context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tusting, Karin. 2020. General introduction. In Tusting, Karin (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Linguistic Ethnography*, 1–10. London: Routledge.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 1993. Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society* 4/2: 249–283.
- Vogel, Sarah & Ofelia García 2017. Translanguaging. In George Noblit & Luis Moll (eds.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–22. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vygotsky, Lev S. 1978. *Mind and Society. The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Williams, Cen. 1994. *Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyd destun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwylieithog* [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]. Bangor: University of Wales Dissertation.
- Williams, Cen. 2002. *A Language Gained: A Study of Language Immersion at 11–16 Years of Age*. Bangor: School of Education.
- Williams, Cen. 2012. *The National Immersion Scheme Guidance for Teachers on Subject Language Threshold: Accelerating the Process of Reaching the Threshold*. Bangor: The Welsh Language Board.