3.5 Translanguaging shift and institutional settings: impact beyond the classroom

János Imre Heltai, Krisztina Czumpft, Georgina Lilla Falb, Erika Kerekes-Lévai, Gabriella Köves, Zsuzsa Molnár, Richárd Vágner

In Hungary, schools with a language of instruction other than Hungarian belong mostly to institutions of elite education. Bilingual institutions are scarce, and, besides elite education, they focus on the needs of (German, Serbian, Romanian, Croatian etc.) national minorities (on the topic of bilingual education in Hungary cf. Vámos 2016). Otherwise, public education on a broad scale is available only in Hungarian monolingual schools. Hungarian speakers in Hungary are also known as the population with the weakest foreign language skills in the European Union. In addition to a sense of relative linguistic isolation (Hungarian is classified as a Non-Indo-European language and Hungarians do not understand without targeted learning activities any other European language) and organisational problems of foreign language teaching, a historically-founded monolingual ideological orientation is the reasons for this situation. Hungarian speakers, at least inside the borders of Hungary, are characterised by attitudes which gravitate towards the standard, and non-standard ways of speaking are clearly marked and stigmatized.

In the states neighbouring Hungary, there are several million speakers who use Hungarian as their home language, of which a few hundred thousand live in Southern Slovakia. Over the last century, approximately since the end of World War I, these Hungarian speakers have been largely isolated from sociolinguistic processes in Hungary. As a result, Hungarian has developed into a pluricentric language in its Central European context. After an intense scholarly debate at the end of the 1990s (cf. Kontra and Saly 1998; Tarsoly 2016: 228), this orientation gained also ideological support. Speakers of Hungarian in the neighbouring Central European states are in a minority position, usually intertwined with a strong Hungarian national identity. Most live in Hungarian monolingual areas, towns or villages and encounters the national language of the respective states only in school. In and around Szímő (Zemné), for example, ethnic Hungarians learn Slovak only at school as a second or environmental language and often to medium levels of attainment.

As a result of the above tendencies, the schools in Tiszavasvári and Szímő (Zemné) were strongly oriented toward monolingualism in the past, regarding both the curricula and teachers' own language ideologies. In situations like this, students' multilingualism remains often hidden or unnoticed (Gogolin 2004: 55). However, this is not an Eastern-European issue; schools have mostly monolingual policies across the western world and teachers usually do not acknowledge or value students' multilingualism as a learning resource. Multilingual learning approaches often have no role in learning activities, whether codified in school curricula or not, nor practiced in schools in the everydays (Shohamy 2006, Gkaintartzi, Kiliari, and Tsokalidou 2015; Pulinx, Van Avermaet, and Agirdag 2017). This is largely independent from teachers' personal attitudes towards multilingualism. Positive attitudes do not necessarily result in promoting multilingual learning approaches, but training in language awareness can bring about changes in this regard (Alisaari et al. 2019). This is in line with our pilot projects: workshops for teachers about principles and practices linked to a translanguaging pedagogical stance resulted in changes in teachers' attitudes toward the home language practices of their pupils and regarding their own teaching habits, too. The teachers' new beliefs and attitudes had an impact on extra-curricular activities, which meant that the

institutional environment also began to change. This chapter discusses how this happens and what consequences it has for the educational environment as a whole.

3.5.1. Innovative pedagogical strategies in a monolingual environment

For more than a decade, the school in Tiszavasvári has been attended almost exclusively by Romani-speaking emergent bilingual children (see chapter 1.3.1). Most learners consider themselves Roma also in Szímő (Zemné). However, due to the low prestige of Romani, its non-standardized status, and the local circumstances (cf. chapter 1.3), Hungarian monolingualism remained the dominant approach to instruction in Tiszavasvári until the start of the translanguaging project. The school in Szímő (Zemné) undertook language-related projects in which the home language practices of Roma learners were valued, in particular as part of their cultural tradition. The learning difficulties of Roma children can be traced back to a number of factors, from characteristics of early socialisation and marginalized status to ideological distance, based on local traditions, from school etc. (Gerganov, Varbanova, and Kyuchukov 2005; Flecha and Soler 2013; Tóth 2020, Csikósné Maczó and Rajcsányi-Molnár 2020). In line with Jaspers (2019), we think that education is an open and dynamic system, and the consequences of introducing a translanguaging stance alone do not solve complex and tenacious problems. But language issues are an important component in reducing these difficulties, as the acceptance of the students' personality and family background is not conceivable without accepting their language practices and understanding their language ideologies.

In 2009, the school in Tiszavasvári was taken over from the municipality by a foundation, and in 2019 by the Hungarian Pentecostal Church. (The share of church schools in primary education in Hungary is over 15%, in secondary education over 21% and growing – Pusztai, Bacskai, and Morvai 2021: 2). Since 2009 the dominant trend was that Roma families sent their children to school in Magiszter, and, according to local views, in the next few years the school came to be associated exclusively with the Roma, irreversibly. This is why the governing body of the school launched their complex integration programme, which operates with the tools of prevention through education and learning. The aim is to develop a life-long career model, which provides opportunities and solutions to the problems of families living around the school, mostly under the poverty line. This programme focuses on laying the foundations for basic literacy through physical-mental, emotional and intellectual development. The teachers and professionals involved in this programme aim to develop in their pupils the skills and competences that will lay the foundations for lifelong learning, in which the emphasis is on practical, hands-on skills. The first results of the programme include the fact that an increasing number of children continue their education at secondary level (although they often drop out) that education and schooling are regarded increasingly favourably by members of the community. The expected breakthrough, however, which would have triggered radical changes in the lives of Roma children have yet to be accomplished.

At the same time, language-related barriers to successful learning were noticed by the teaching staff. Parents were teaching their children to communicate only in Hungarian outside the community, saying that "Hungarians" did not like or understand Romani. The pressure from outside to become monolingual thus became internal, and local Roma adapted in this way. The pressure to erase the differences related to the Roma, to make them invisible, is not only a feature of Tiszavasvári, but of the whole of Europe (cf. Richardson 2020). The result of this pressure locally was that Romani became almost a secret language for the community. For years even after the arrival of the research team in the school, many teachers believed that

Romani had little or no presence in most children's families. At the same time, the children were noticeably quiet at school, often unable to express their thoughts in Hungarian in a way that they did at home. This was not taken into account by either the urban community or the school's teaching staff. The children, who already had difficulty in learning because of their social disadvantages, carried the burden of this ignorance, too. One can imagine the extent to which members of the Romani-speaking community endeavored to conceal their practices, considering that many non-Roma living in the town were unaware that Romani was a living language there. Most of the children's time and energy was spent concentrating on not speaking their home language at school and trying to understand instead what the teacher was saying in Hungarian.

The school in the municipality of Színő (Zemné) has also made several attempts to optimise the organisation of activities which reach beyond everyday education and enhance children's success in life. A project launched in 2009 focused on differentiated skills development for pupils in lower secondary education, while the project launched a year later focused specifically on developing the skills and competences of Roma pupils. The school was then able to employ 'teaching assistants' of local origin (without qualifications) who also spoke Romani. In addition, a Roma studies expert was involved in the project's activities. The children took part in Roma poem recital competitions, for which they learned and presented poems, some of them in Romani, by a Hungarian Roma poet, György Rostás-Farkas. Typically, these were adapted by the children, parents and the experts involved to local ways of speaking in order to ensure they were intelligible to local speakers. In the course of teachers' their daily work, however, it was clear that all this was not enough: as teachers and pupils struggled side-by-side to complete certain tasks, with each helping the other linguistically, teachers realised time and again that teaching and educating children who spoke Romani at home was not feasible without the use of Romani in schools.

3.5.2 Introducing a translanguaging stance in a monolingual environment

The introduction of translanguaging as a pedagogical stance in the schools relied on this openness towards pedagogical innovation in both schools, which served as a counter-point to the strong monolingual ideologies promulgated by the state and the school. Translanguaging is and was in both schools an innovation supported by the head teacher. In Tiszavasvári, after reading the first journal article written about the experience gathered at the school (Heltai 2016), the head teacher showed considerable interest toward translanguaging and started to develop a translanguaging stance in her own teaching. In Színő (Zemné), the head teacher and some other colleagues joined the Erasmus+ project at the end of 2019.

Based on her first positive impressions, the head teacher in Tiszavasvári invited members of the research group for a joint workshop with the teaching staff. Researchers and student researchers presented some findings of their ethnographic fieldwork (cf. chapter 3.1.1) and a "translanguaging catechism", based on García and Kleyn eds. 2016 and García, Ibarra Johnson, and Seltzer 2017. The catechism entails, in ten questions and answers presented on four pages, information about the concept of translanguaging, the linguistic repertoire of the local children, and the possibilities of translanguaging in everyday school activities. The participants of the workshop discussed this material in a 120-minute session in August 2017. During the next two academic years, monthly 90-minute workshops were organised. Researchers and students spent on average three days a month in the school. They attended classes taught by the teachers who were interested in trying out translanguaging. As teachers' participation remained voluntary, about 30% of the teachers invited the visitors to one or more of their classes. During these visits, researchers and student researchers collected their

impressions of the teachers' developing translanguaging stance. Teachers also observed in other's classes and engaged in peer dialogue about their experience. Good practices were shared in the workshops (cf. Chapter 2.1.1). The discussions were recorded. Below, we provide extracts in (1), (2), (3), and (4) from the workshop in January 2018, which took place a full semester after the introduction of the translanguaging catechism. (The names in the extracts below are pseudonyms, except for Erika Puskás's who is one of the authors of the present volume).

(1) Alma *Én például azt figyeltem meg […], hogy a gyerekek sokkal szívesebben, bátrabban, tehát meg mernek eleve szólalni cigányul. Nem szólunk rájuk, hogy ne beszélj így, hanem bátran. Tehát- gát nincs bennük. […] És mi is használjuk a színek megnevezésénél, vagy egyszerűbb kifejezéseknél. és úgy élvezik a gyerekek. Tehát bátran el tudják mondani az érzéseiket* (also cited in Heltai: 146).
'For example, I have noticed […] that children are much more willing, more courageous, and therefore dare to speak Gypsy. We don't tell them not to speak like that, but to speak bravely. So, there is no barrier. […] And we also use it when naming colours, or in simpler expressions. And the children enjoy it. So, they can express their feelings.'

(2a) Virág *Ki is állt négy gyerek, és elkezdték a mesét mondani, és ami meggyőzött most is, tehát (név), aki a hal volt, ugye próbálta- válaszolni, és akkor mondtam neki, hogy nyugodtan mondjad, mintha anyukádnak mondanád otthon. Úgy beszélt cigány nyelven, hogy még én is meglepődtem, és ő nagyon gyenge képességű gyerek, viszont nagyon szépen elmondta. Hát az egy mondat- több mondat volt, amit ott válaszolt a halásznak. Ő ennek utána, mikor vége volt az óra-, ő nagyon büszke volt magára, tehát nagyon motiválja a gyerekeket, jó volt* (also cited in Heltai 2020: 146).
'In the end, four kids came forward and started telling the story, and what convinced me was that [learner's name], who was the fish, he was trying to answer, and then I told him: "Go ahead and say it, as if you were talking to your mum". He spoke in Gypsy so fluently that even I was surprised, and he is a child of less than average ability, but he told his part very nicely. Well, the one sentence became several sentences as he answered the fisherman. At the end of the class, he was very proud of himself, so, this [technique] is very motivating for the children, it was good.'

(2b) Virág *A másik dolog, amit akartam mondani, hogy nem élnek vissza. Nem élnek vissza vele. Tehát ez is úgy jött- tehát mi elkezdjük magyarul, és amikor adódik a helyzet, akkor mondja. Tehát nem kötelezem, ha észreveszem, hogy nem tudja kifejezni, akkor mondom, hogy mondhatod, ha anyu- mi- nálunk ezt úgy hívjuk, hogy ha anyukádnak mondanád, hogy ő is megértené. De nem élnek vele vissza* (also cited in Heltai 2020: 149).
'The other thing I wanted to say is that they don't abuse it. They don't abuse this possibility. This also just happened, so, we start in Hungarian, and when the situation arises, they say it. I don't impose it on them. When I notice that they can't express themselves, I say you can say it as if your mummy (that's how we say it here) as if to your mother so that she would understand. But it's

never abused.'

(3)   Lívia   *Hát mint nálam (név), mert ő papíros. És ahhoz képest úgy beszél cigányul, hogyha neki lehet, akkor folyékonyan. És csak mondja, mondja, mondja. (...) Volt olyan gyerek, aki egyáltalán nem is értette, hogy én mit akarok tőle, elmagyarázták neki cigányul. Tehát én ebből sose csinálok nagy ügyet vagy problémát. (...) De amúgy élvezik, mert engem tanítanak* (also cited in Heltai 2020: 147).
'Well, in my class, there is [name], he's got a paper [for a disability check]. Considering that, he speaks Gypsy fluently when he is given the chance. And he just talks and talks and talks. (...) There were children who didn't even understand what I wanted from them, so, others explained it to them in Gypsy. I never make a big deal out can of it. (...) But they enjoy it anyway, because they teach me.'

In the excerpts, teachers discuss the benefits of allowing the students to speak their home language variety in everyday school activities in an early phase of the project. Teachers generally speak of the benefits on learner's linguistic behaviour: they speak Romani more fluently and more willingly, they communicate more freely, and they are given a better chance to achieve their full potential; as shown in (1) and (2a).

In the workshops held during the two academic years, teachers discussed their worries and reservations; they took the opportunity to convince each other that feeling concerned was inevitable yet unfounded. One of their main concerns was that students might take advantage of teachers' monolingualism and poor understanding of Romani and disrupt the class with Romani language taunts that mock teachers and hinder their learning. The first pilot classes showed that these fears unfounded in the case of teachers who otherwise have a good relationship with students, as stated in Excerpt (2b).

Teachers also discover new and unexpected qualities in their students as in (2a): "He spoke in Gypsy so fluently that even I was surprised, and he is a child of less than average ability, but he told his part very nicely" and (3) "…he's got a paper [for a disability check]. Considering that, he speaks Gypsy fluently when he is given the chance**.** The expression *papíros* 'having a piece of paper' means in teachers' jargon that the class teacher has the permission, with parental consent, to initiate a developmental review process on behalf of the learner (EMMI 2013). The outcomes of the review are documented, stating the child's potential limitations, where necessary, in general and cognitive ability; hence, these children will be "covered by a piece of paper" or "documented" (Hu., informal, *papíros*). The areas of development and the date of the next review are proposed at the end of the consultation. However, parents can choose not to follow the teachers' advice and not to bring their children for the review. In the Magiszter school in Tiszavasvári, 42 learners were "documented" in the academic year 2021/2022, but teachers say that the number could be considerably higher if parents followed teachers' proposals for an examination.

These opinions exemplify that students' weak language competences in Hungarian, on the one hand, and, on the other, their general linguistic and even cognitive abilities are not necessarily separated in teachers' minds. Although we have always stressed the importance of this distinction in our workshops, we must stress that this distinction has to be understood in the context of Roma learners' multiple difficulties, stemming from a variety of sources alongside their bilingualism, at the start of school. Pedagogically challenging situations, however, are always complex, and they must be viewed in the broad perspective of their

social, emotional, and cognitive implications; therefore, solutions cannot rely on a single factor, such as language alone (cf. Jaspers 2019). Roma students often face difficulties of a social nature which manifest themselves in the form of learning disabilities at the moment they enter school. For example, according to the results of a school readiness test (SRT) used countrywide in Hungary (Diagnostic Development Screening System, DIFER, cf. Nagy et al. 2016 [2004]), approximately at the same time when our project started (2017), 2 out of 56 students entering the first grade reached the required school readiness level in the Tiszavasvári school (Baloghné Birgán 2017). There is no data on how much these results are affected by real setbacks in physical and/or cognitive development, or to what extent they are a reflection of the Hungarian monolingual testing system (instructions are given in Hungarian, and language-based tasks are linked to Hungarian – about 30 percent of the testing system is language-based in addition to the instructions).

Assuming that students would perform better in a test which is aligned to their home language practices, at the beginning of the 2017/2018 school year, the members of the translanguaging workshop measured first grade students' ability to understand and produce texts in Hungarian and in local Romani ways of speaking. Workshop participants created a test based on the language-related tasks of the DIFER (Nagy et al. 2016 [2004]) screening system. This test was produced in two ways: based on Hungarian and on local Romani (cf. Heltai and Jani-Demetriou 2017). The Romani version (hereafter: the translingual test) allowed students to mobilise their Romani resources. When designing the new test, the developers assumed that the DIFER test gives an unrealistic picture of Roma children's readiness for school in Tiszavasvári because it assumes Hungarian-language home socialisation and measures the presence or absence of skills that are largely language-related (cf. Heltai and Jani-Demetriou 2018; Heltai 2020: 166–178).

The students (N=45) had two tasks in both the translingual and the Hungarian test. In the first task students saw 3 pictures and they had to describe them. In both tests, the pictures were drawings or paintings. In the translingual test they depicted real-life situations (families, houses, events, environments etc.), which we assumed children would be familiar with, whereas the pictures in the standardised test were selected because we assumed they would be more abstract for the children, depicting similar situations but less related to the children's life experience. In the second task, students were asked to listen to a story (a tale) both in local Romani and in Hungarian; in Romani the recording was made with the contribution of a local Roma woman, and in Hungarian with the contribution of one of the Budapest-based students. The pupils had to summarise the story by telling it. The staff conducting the examination consisted of a local teacher, a researcher, and a bilingual local participant. During the translingual test, the Romani-speaking examiner initiated a conversation in Romani, the local teacher in Hungarian, and the children had the possibility to speak as they wished. They spoke mostly in Romani, but some students spoke both in Romani and in Hungarian in different tasks or different phases of the test, others mostly or practically only in Hungarian. Therefore, the examiners decided to design three categories to evaluate the results (Fig. 1.):

Learners' language choice	mostly Romani (n = 27)	both Hungarian and Romani (n = 10)	mostly Hungarian (n = 8)
Results in the translingual test	68,2%	58,1%	43%
Results in the Hungarian test	58,1%	58,8%	57%

Figure 1. Impact of learners' language choice on test outcomes

Heltai and Jani-Demetriou's (2018: 10–12) interpretation of these results leads to three important findings. These are, in ascending order of importance: 1) the hypothesis that students will perform significantly better on the translingual test than on the standard test has been partially confirmed. Those who mobilised mostly Romani resources were able to achieve better results in the translingual test. This group includes 60% of the children. However, the hypothesis cannot be confirmed either for those who spoke mostly Hungarian or for those who used resources from both languages. 2) Some students rejected entirely Romani-based communication, while others strived to speak Hungarian, too, alongside Romani. This phenomenon can be explained by speakers' perceptions according to which there are a few families in the community which prioritise Hungarian in language socialisation. Another possible, and perhaps more plausible explanation is that there are families which prepare their children for education by proscribing the use of Romani in school. 3) The results of the Hungarian test are not adversely affected by the presumed bilingual socialisation. A very important result is that the presence of Romani in the children's lives has no negative impact on their performance in the Hungarian language test. On the contrary, children who spoke both languages or mainly Romani, performed better, if only slightly, on the standard test. This result is of central importance because it contradicts the widespread ideology that minority-language and bilingual socialisation is a factor that hinders school success in a monolingual (majority-language) school, while majority-language socialisation is a factor that supports school success.

In recent years, teachers in the schools of Tiszavasvári and Szímő (Zemné) have developed a variety of pedagogical approaches to help pupils overcome their assumed "language deficit". Language deficit is a concept that is very much alive in Hungarian (language) educational scholarship, in which it made advances in the 1980's (e.g. Bíró 1984). Some studies build in Bernstein's work (1971) and assume the coexistence of social disadvantage and language deficit (Oláh Örsi 2005; Nemes 2016). A different, cultural anthropological approach is concerned with the correlation between non-majority cultural heritage and school failure (Réger 1984, 1995; Derdák and Varga 1996; Bartha 2015). Critique on language deficit approaches appeared in Hungarian by members of the research team (Heltai 2017, Jani-Demetriou 2020).

In order to overcome the "language deficit", one of the school's previous pedagogical efforts was to focus on intensive Hungarian vocabulary building and on increasing students' courage to speak. In the practice of some teachers this was combined with a ban on the use of Romani, on the grounds that this would help improve the Hungarian language competences of the pupils more quickly. This practice was implemented by the teachers in the classroom in some respects, but, as expected, it was impossible to fully control the students' conversations with each other. One of the first grade classes in the academic year 2017-2018, taught by Zita Tündik, was chosen to pilot translanguaging. In order to measure the impact of translanguaging education, workshop members agreed that Zita would actively include Romani in the classroom from the beginning of the year, while the teacher of the other Year 1 class would do the same only from the second semester. At the end of this experimental semester, workshop members arranged a second progress test among the first-grade learners.

Similar to the school readiness test a semester before, the second test had a Hungarian and a translingual version, but team members also included written tasks (reading comprehension). The class which had started the school year with a translanguaging approach, performed significantly better on both tests. Regarding the written tests for example, Zita's class achieved an average result of 51% in the translingual test and 57% in the

standard one, while the other class achieved 27% and 28%, respectively. However, other variables (e.g. methodological differences in the practice of the two teachers, social differences between the families of the children attending the two classes, etc.) may also have contributed to these differences, which calls for caution in the interpretation of the results (cf. Heltai and Jani-Demetriou 2018: 13–16).

In addition to the measurable outcomes, Zita also felt that her experiment was a success. Her comments are cited in Chapter 3.4.1. Furthermore, she felt that alongside the changes discernible in learners' quantifiable results, qualitative transformations were starting to take place, too. Transformations in teacher-learner relationships and classroom hierarchies are summarised in Chapter 3.2, while Chapter 3.4 explores translanguaging shifts in teachers' talk. The remaining part of this chapter is dedicated to school-level and institutional-level policies triggered by the workshops piloting translanguaging, including the transformations concerning the kindergarten attached to Magiszter, as well as the subject-specific applications of a translanguaging stance.

3.5.3 Transformation of school-level policies based on teachers' individual practice

When certain teachers are committed to translanguaging, their activities can become inspiring for others (teachers, students, and staff) in the school. In Magiszter, Romani language practices reach an increasing number of domains compared to the purely monolingual Hungarian school environment prior to the project, and translanguaging impacts linguistic practices outside the classroom environment, extending it to the entire school.

The Hungarian class in video 1 (*Translanguaging as cultural mediation*) is centred around the recitation of a poem (see also Chapters 3.3 and 3.4.2). The teacher (Zita Tündik) revises with the students a poem they learnt for a recital competition a year and a half before, where a student recited a poem by the Roma poet Leksa Manush in both Hungarian and Romani (video 1: 0.15–0.39). One of the school's teaching assistants, who is familiar with local Romani, adapted the original Romani text of the poem to local ways of speaking in order to make it easier for the students to learn it. The possibility for children to recite in languages other than Hungarian (not only within the classroom but also at the competition) is not a wide-spread practice in the education system and is a shift away from the monolingual curriculum beyond the level of school classes.

In this class, Zita, the teacher deliberately focuses on the learner who participated in the recital competition and who won a prize for his performance (video 1: 0.50–1.00). The boy who stands in front of the class activates his classmates' prior knowledge by reciting the poem in Romani, so that they can put together the text of the whole poem, first in Romani and then in Hungarian, with the guidance of the teacher.

When asked by the teacher whether he remembers the Romani or the Hungarian version better, the boy gives a clear answer: the Romani. In fact, he claims that he does not remember the Hungarian version of the poem at all (video 1: 1.00–1.10). Later, students put the text together, first in Romani, then, after having been given a foundation which activated their entire repertoire, also in Hungarian. This suggests that Romani-related practices dominate the children's repertoire. The important lesson Zita draws from this at the end of the video is that the Romani version seems to be more effectively integrated into the children's long-term memory than the Hungarian. The classroom practice witnessed here has implications for school contexts beyond the classroom. The learner was enabled to enter the school recital competition with a Romani poem; teachers other than the class teacher and learners from other classes were taking part in this recital, witnessing the learners' performance. In addition

to this, he won first place, which gave an important symbolic endorsement to Romani and to translanguaging classroom practices outside the classroom at the institutional level.

Video 16 (*Translanguaging in a fixed school practice*) shows a fixed school practice, the act of reporting, which takes place at the beginning of classes, and whose purpose is to inform the teacher about the number of missing students, and create a symbolic break between leisure time and learning. Two students in weekly rotation are assigned to perform this task. They have an overall responsibility to ensure that the material conditions for teaching and learning are in place in the classroom (e.g. they wipe the blackboard, they help the teacher carry realia into the classroom, they air the room during breaks, etc.). They present the reports based on a formulaic text. These same sentences have been repeated at the beginning of every class taught in Hungary for decades. But these students speak, in their perception, Romani – although speakers of Hungarian will notice that they add Romani endings to a total of four words, thus creating what they believe to be a Romani text (video 16: 00.55–01.20). A detailed analysis of the text and the students' performance as a mimetic act is provided in Chapter 3.3. What is important from the perspective of the cross-institutional presence of translanguaging is that this Romani report is a typical daily routine task of institutional life in school, and by starting the lesson in this way the students also render the classroom a translanguaing space. This modified practice shows that for the duration of the class, within this community, translanguaging has a place. In this case, it is not a classroom practice which is institutionalised, but an institutional practice is transformed in the classroom, creating new opportunities, even for the whole institution.

Video 26 (*Reflecting on constructions of Roma identity*) shows a scene in which students had to work in groups. During the class in which the video was made, the class discussed Roma culture and identity. The groups made posters which were later displayed in the school corridors. The task was for students to select a few images, which they would like to see displayed in their classroom, from a larger bunch provided by their teacher, Erika. The images included symbols (flags) associated with Roma national aspirations and the Hungarian tricolour, stock photos of people in both Roma and Hungarian folk costume, paintings romanticising the Roma, etc. Some of the images were considered by the teacher more Roma and others more Hungarian. The teacher, who is also the headmaster of the school, has contributed to the prestige of the Romani by encouraging the creation of the posters. As the head of the school, she set an example to her colleagues, encouraging them to be bold and engage with learners' home languages and identities. The posters had been integrated into the linguistic landscape of the school, where they attracted the attention of students from other classes, as illustrated in Video 27.

In Video 27 (*Representations: Translanguaging as a concept and linguistic landscape*), the teacher addresses her own language policy in the classroom, which is encouraged and supported by the school administration, but not in the curricular framework, as the language policy of the school. She declares: "we do translanguaging here at school". In the video, she draws students' attention to the fact that there are visible signs of this in the school (for more on linguistic landscape, see Chapter 3.6). She identifies the school as a translanguaging space (video 27: 3.32–4.06). Children are clearly familiar even with the term translanguaging. One of the pupils incorporated it into his Romani answer (video 27: 2.55–3.05 – excerpt [5]).

(5)   pupil   *Ande káver iskola ámencá szembe, hi egy- egy- otej o fojosovo, oprej irimi: transzlingválási.*
          'IN THE SCHOOL BUILDING OPPOSITE US, THERE IS A CORRIDOR WITH A POSTER SAYING: TRANSLANGUAGING.'

The term references bilingualism and the emancipation of Romani ways of speaking in the school. Children are not aware of its exact meaning, but they know that it has to do with the possibility of speaking Romani. The conversation between the teacher and the learners reflects not only Zita's standpoint but also the school's language policy. Translanguaging, thus, reaches outside the classroom, the school embraces it in the design of the learning environment, too, thus validating the use of Romani in the institution.

The video recordings surveyed above illustrate that teachers' attitudes can bring about gradual change in the normative trends of school language policy. The monolingual norm, which mandates that only Hungarian should be used in the school, is being transformed. Some of the school's teachers have become open to a translanguaging approach, giving students the freedom to choose the language of their school. The way learners speak at home is appreciated; in some ways it is becoming equally valued as monolingual Hungarian utterances. The curriculum itself has not changed (there are no written amendments in official documents), but a progressive shift is taking place in educators' life as a result of the change in perspective on language and the practical activities that follow from it. The norms of the existing school language policy have changed: the use of Romani has been added to Hungarian in class (even during tests and exams), outside the classroom (recitation competitions), and the linguistic landscape of the school has changed, too. This change is also felt by parents. The relationship between school and parents is strong, with regular programmes involving parents, often focusing on Romani and other social practices in the learners' homes (for details on community-based learning and culturally transformative pedagogies, see Chapter 3.7). The gradual change in attitudes resulting from the adoption of a translanguaging stance, therefore, is beginning to be felt across the institution and beyond, in the families the school services.

3.5.4 The impact of translanguaging on subject-specific learning and teaching: case study on a mathematics class

Video 5 (*Translanguaging in maths class*) is made in a third-grade class. The aim of the video is to show that translanguaging not only helps students to better express themselves in the humanities, but also supports them effectively in learning science subjects. The teaching of mathematics and languages can have a number of common objectives, such as supporting and strengthening the development of cognitive abilities and language operations; enhancing the understanding of ideas conveyed by texts; learning how to pick up on essential information and unpack meaning, enabling learners to express thoughts and formulate arguments based on learners' own linguistic means, and, last but not least, the understanding and use of technical language. Accordingly, video 5 is explored here from two perspectives. On the one hand, the comprehension of the types of texts which occur in text-based mathematical tasks, i.e. when the mathematical question is embedded in a story, and, on the other hand, the understanding of complex sentence structure.

The video shows a session whose aim is to get students to practice the four basic mathematical operations (addition, subtraction, multiplication, division), through a written task. The teacher told a story to motivate students to solve the problems, which led to the basic instruction being replaced by a problem-solving question: "Which four gifts did the little mouse receive?" instead of "Complete the following calculations". As the task is embedded in a story, this is a text-based mathematical task. In such tasks, a mathematical model is needed to solve the problem or answer the question which is embedded in the text of the task.

The first step in solving a text-based task is to analyse the text and understand the problem. The text can be either read out or presented by the teacher, as if telling a story, as in the classroom scene analysed. Alternatively, learners can read the task independently, in which case a pupil who is confident in reading can read it out loud for the whole class or learners can read it for themselves. The ultimate aim is to enable learners to understand the task-based problem to be solved based on their own, independent reading. In all cases, the teacher must ensure that the pupils understand the text of the task, i.e. that a lack of understanding of the text does not prevent them from solving the problem. One way to check the understanding of the text is to ask the pupils to explain it in their own words. This eliminates problems arising from a partial understanding of the task, and improves learners' analytical and comprehension skills. This is shown in the video: a learner explains the task in his own words in Romani (video 5: 1.43–2.10).

Paraphrasing is just one way of checking learners' understanding of the task in text-based mathematical exercises. From the point of view of mathematical operations, texts can be divided into two broad categories based on their complexity: single-operation (simple) tasks and multi-operation (complex) tasks. Simple text-based problems can be further divided into two broad groups, depending on linguistic formulation. The first group consists of tasks which refer clearly to the operation through which the solution is arrived at; for example: "I have 5 coins in one pocket and 3 more than that in my other pocket. How much money do I have in my other pocket?". The text elicits the operation suggested by the word *more* and *and*. So, the mathematical model is $5 + 3 =$ and the solution is 8. In the other group of simple text-based problems the text does not refer clearly to the operation. For example: "I have 5 coins in one pocket, 3 more than that in the other pocket. How much money do I have in my other pocket?" The mathematical model in this case is $5 - 3 =$ and the solution is 2. For both problems, it is useful to ask the question "Which pocket has more money?". The formulation of a question concerning the solution to the mathematical problem can also check the comprehension of the task. Realia or drawings to illustrate the task can serve as models in finding the solution and they can also be used to check comprehension.

Complex text-based problems require several operations to be solved. For example: "I have 5 coins in one pocket and 3 more than that in the other. How much money do I have in these two pockets?" In this case, too, we can check learners' understanding of the text by using a model: object manipulation, drawing, or an equation $5 + (5 + 3) =$. To make the solution somewhat easier, the same problem can be formulated as follows: "I have 5 coins in one pocket and 3 more than that in the other. How much money do I have in my two pockets in total?"

The data appearing in the tasks can be grouped according to their importance: there are necessary data and unnecessary data. Based on this, we can create four groups. There are texts containing (1) only necessary data, (2) necessary and some redundant data, (3) too little necessary data, and (4) too little necessary data alongside redundant data. In these cases, we can check understanding by identifying the necessary data. The separation of relevant and irrelevant data for problem solving is also related to text comprehension, and it is an important second step in problem solving, which follows the identification of the problem. The next steps in problem solving are: making a plan; implementing and checking the plan; looking for alternate solutions; checking the solution, and, finally, responding to the problem (Pólya 2014 [1945]; Conway 2014). The verification can be done from two points of view. First, whether the operations have been carried out correctly; second, whether the result corresponds to the text of the task. The importance of understanding the text is paramount, here, too, just like in the answer.

Understanding the text of the problem is therefore a necessary but not a sufficient condition for solving it. At this elementary level of mathematical knowledge, the planning stage of the solution of text-based problems is embedded in language. Conversely, in the text-based response, language is built on mathematical thinking. In these cases, linguistic and mathematical thinking are inseparable, mutually interdependent, and interacting with each other.

Sentence-level understanding is a precondition for comprehension. The comprehension of sentences in Hungarian is influenced to a greater extent by clause and sentence construction, and whether the sentences in question are well formed, than by semantic choices (the use of words with the most precise meaning) (Szegfű 2017). This means that a word with a meaning which is unknown or uncertain to the learners is less of an obstacle to sentence interpretation than a grammatical construction which is not yet known as part of applications. Nonetheless, when formulating the text of a task, one must try to make the lexical choices which are age appropriate to the learners. In teachers' talk, it is particularly important to be conscious of sentence structure when working with children who are learning a language other than their home language. These phenomena have received little attention so far; it seems to be taken for granted that children of pre-school age have all the potential to understand and practice the language of instruction (Köves and Szegfű 2015; Szegfű 2017).

When formulating the mathematical content, the sentence structure must serve the purpose of explaining and expressing the mathematical content in a manner which is technically appropriate but at the same time clear and meaningful for the learners. The linguistic formulation and the mathematical content should overlap. It is also important that there is a clear sequence of tasks. In Video 5, for example, the interpretation of the structure with the infinitive (*meglepni* 'to surprise') and its adjunct (*csomagokkal* 'with parcels') in *csomagokkal készülnek meglepni a kisegeret* 'they are preparing to surprise the little mouse with packages' may be difficult even for monolingual Hungarian children aged 9-10, because the noun *csomagokkal* 'with parcels' can be the extension of either the infinitive or the finite verb (*készülnek* 'they are preparing'); so, the two possible understandings are 'they are preparing with parcels (to surprise the little mouse)' or '(they are preparing) to surprise (the little mouse) with parcels'. The structure is clearer when expanded into a complex sentence consisting of two clauses and a verb form in the subjunctive in the purposive subclause *Arra készülnek, hogy csomagokkal lepjék meg a kisegeret*.

(5) *Arra készülnek, hogy csomagokkal lepjék meg a kisegeret.*

Ar-ra	készül-nek	hogy	csomag-ok-kal	lep-j-ék	meg
that-SUBL	prepare-3PL	that	parcel-PL-INS	surprise-SUBJ-3PL	PFV

A	kis-eger-et
the	little-mouse-ACC

'They are preparing [for that] they should surprise the little mouse with parcels.'

SUBL: sublative, PL: plural, ACC: accusative, SUBJ: subjunctive, 3PL: third person plural person marker, PFV: perfective verbal particle

The analytic structuring of the information renders this sentence easier to understand. The two actions (preparing, surprise) are clearly formulated in the two clauses with two finite

verbs: 1. they are preparing to do something, 2. they will surprise the mouse with packages. In the next sentence, the instruction is imbedded in the text of the story: "You can find out what the little mouse's friends prepared for her birthday by [looking at] the gift cards I will give every team…" (video 5: 1.00–1.16). If the instruction ("to find out, you will have to look at the cards") is wedged into the texts of the problem-solving exercise ("the little mouse's friends prepared something for his birthday"), it is more challenging for students to understand. It would be easier to follow and understand the text if the story and the instruction were separated into shorter sentences; e.g. "I give gift cards to everyone, to all the teams". With the latter sentence the teacher attempts precisely this kind of simplification. Not all students are given gift cards but each team receives a bunch. In questions such as "How many of these will you stick on the paper?", it is usually helpful for students if the noun is repeated together with the demonstrative pronoun: "How many of these 12 cards will you stick on the paper?"

Texts in mathematics classes, whether oral or written, should be as simple as possible, with a clear grammatical structure. This does not necessarily mean that teachers should use only the shortest possible sentences. It is perfectly acceptable, and even necessary, to repeat a concept, a word, in cases where this is useful for understanding. It is important, from both a linguistic and a mathematical point of view that texts, whether oral or written, are accurate and adequate. This is of particular importance for students for whom translanguaging is almost a prerequisite for progress in their studies. For students whose home language is not the same as the school's language, unambiguous sentence structure is of particular importance. One of the prerequisites for the success of translanguaging is that learners can build on sentences in the language of instruction that are clearly structured and meaningful to them. In everyday practice, it is unrealistic to expect the teacher to bear the minutiae of all factors brought into this analysis, nor would it be life-like to speak in these elaborate yet concise ways. However, it is worth rethinking our pedagogical possibilities in this direction, especially if we teach children whose language practices outside school are not aligned with the language of instruction.

3.5.5 Translanguaging in the local education programme, multilingual ideologies in practice: a kindergarten in Tiszavasvári

The kindergarten, which is located in the building next to the school, is in shared management with the school. The two institutions are united not only by financial management and professional supervision, they also cooperate on practical matters. The children from the nursery regularly visit pupils in the first grade, and sometimes the schoolchildren in the higher grades also visit the kindergarten. The kindergarten, similar to the school, is avoided by non-Roma families. Children enrolled in both institutions are connected by extended family ties and networks. Simultaneously with the translanguaging workshops in the school, the head teacher of the kindergarten was involved in similar activities. The board of kindergarten educators consciously reflected on language-related issues even prior to the start of the project. As early as in 2010, the kindergarten deviated from the national kindergarten education programme and created its own bilingual education programme (Sándor-Kulcsár and Fekete-Balogh 2010).

One of the results of the two institutions collaborative work, which since 2017 has also included our research team, is that the kindergarten's teaching staff have developed the 2010 programme further, combining their prior experience with the newly encountered principles

of translanguaging. The outcome was a new pedagogical programme for the kindergarten (Sándor-Kulcsár ed. 2018). The programme designed in 2010 uses Romani elements of the children's linguistic repertoire as a means to an end, primarily for learning about majority customs and acquiring Hungarian language resources. In contrast, the new programme builds on the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and abilities based on the children's entire linguistic repertoire.

The chapters of the document concerning language educational issues (Sándor-Kulcsár ed. 2018: 17–18) follow the principles of a pedagogy based on a translanguaging stance. The authors state that "the children coming to our kindergarten are characterised by the fact that their families speak both Romani and Hungarian at home. The children's primary language socialisation is mainly in Romani. The development of the children's communication skills can be achieved if we keep this in mind and adapt the language of education in the kindergarten accordingly" (Sándor-Kulcsár 2018: 17, translated by Heltai). The document refers to a joint publication by the outgoing head of the kindergarten and Heltai (Sándor-Kulcsár and Heltai 2017) when describing the principles of language education in the kindergarten. As a criterion for success, the document mentions that "children's linguistic repertoires are made up of resources belonging to both languages" (Sándor-Kulcsár 2018: 18) and that it is necessary to "develop the repertoire rather than individual languages, distinguishing between general language competences (not tied to specific languages) and language competences tied to specific languages (such as Hungarian)" (Sándor-Kulcsár 2018: 18). Thus, while local documents in the school were not affected by the introduction of translanguaging, the documents summarising the programme were adapted according to the new principles in the kindergarten.

Three-year-old children who can barely understand Hungarian are often admitted to kindergarten from families where Romani resources dominate communication and language socialisation. Hungarian monolingual kindergarten teachers find it difficult to communicate with these children. The difficulties are somewhat mitigated by the fact that two pedagogical assistants from the bilingual local community have been employed in the kindergarten in recent years. In a conversation with Krisztina Czumpft (Excerpt 6), they stressed the importance of translation as one of their tasks:

(6) Mária *Én úgy dolgozom az óvodában, mint roma anyanyelvi dajka és- ahol segíteni kell lefordítani a cigányt magyarra, én abban a csoportba szoktam menni. Ha megkérnek rá, segítek lefordítani roma nyelről magyarra […] én mozgok az összes csoportban, igen, igen.*
'I work in the kindergarten as a Romani-speaking assistant and – I go to groups where I have to help translate Gypsy into Hungarian. If they ask me, I help them to translate from Romani into Hungarian […] I move around in all the groups, yes, yes.'

Valéria *Van gyerek, aki csak cigányul beszélni* [sic!]*, és odahívnak, hogy fordítsanak.* […] *Értik ezt a cigányt is, de ha valamit nem értenek, akkor megyek én. Amikor a gyerek nem érti a magyart, és elmondom cigányul és egyre többet használják a magyart, amikor már megértik.*
'There are children who to speak [sic!] Gypsy and they call me to translate. […] They understand this Gypsy [language] also, but if they don't understand something, I go. When a child doesn't understand something in Hungarian, I say it in Gypsy and they [children] use Hungarian more and more, when they understand it.'

The main aim of our project was to explore and showcase school activities concerning translanguaging. There is, however, one film (Video 8, *Children's home language in the kindergarten*) which illustrates practices in the kindergarten on an occasion when a group of pupils from school visits the nursery. In this film, the activities presented break down hierarchical teaching and learning roles and incorporate educator-initiated translanguaging practices into a day in the kindergarten. This requires practices that transcend institutional boundaries: school teachers and their pupils work alongside kindergarten teachers, pedagogical assistants, and nursery-aged children. Children in the nursery room sit around the table, and they are joined by a group of pupils from the primary school. The school teacher, Erika Puskás, and her learners in the upper years of primary school prepared with a short recital for the occasion. At the beginning of the session, Erika explains what the session will be like. She then presents the nursery children with a riddle whose solution is "a cat", which will be the main topic of the session. Erika then asks one of the pupils to recite a poem in Romani about cats (the Romani translation of a Hungarian children's rhyme). Some of the kindergarten children look shy or embarrassed in the moments of the recital, as if a well-kept secret was given away, a taboo broken, although this is likely to be due to the presence of the cameras and the visitors, rather than just the language of the recital.

Later, during the crafts session, the tension in the children eased (video 8: 4.13–4.39), and in several cases they spoke in Romani. There are also examples where short dialogues are structured in such a way that the children draw primarily on Romani resources and the teachers on Hungarian ones. The fact that all children, regardless of age, feel confident to communicate in their home language is due to the informality of the pedagogical situation. Children do not speak in this way because of external pressure, not even as a result of encouragement, but because they choose to do so (video 8: 5.15–5.57). This is facilitated by the fact that older pupils, the visitors from school, bring the language of their home into the session, legitimising these utterances, and marking out the time of the session as a translanguaging space (video 8: 3.55–4.12). Thus, unlike the pedagogical assistants, they are present in the sessions not as translators but as local speakers, making Romani language resources an integral part of the session.

While the principles set out in local documents can be of great importance, the crucial question is how and to what extent they are implemented in everyday educational practice. In this respect, the school and the kindergarten, which are under shared management, follow different paths. Local school documents have not changed, but practices have, in the ways described above. The kindergarten's documents have changed, but this has not necessarily led to a significant change in practices. The bilingual assistants employed by the nursery focus mostly on the use of translation and the ways in which it enables children to use Hungarian better.

References

Alisaari, Jenni, Leena Maria Heikkola, Nancy Commins & Emmanuel O.Acquah. 2019. Monolingual ideologies confronting multilingual realities. Finnish teachers' beliefs about linguistic diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 80. 48–58.

Baloghné Birgán, Anita 2017. *DIFER Alapkészségek Vizsgálata* [DIFER Basic Skills Assesment]. Tiszavasvári: Magiszter Elementary School. Manuscript.

Bartha, Csilla. 2015. *Nyelvi hátrány, avagy a cigány gyermekek oktatásának elmulasztott lehetőségei* [Linguistic disadvantage or missed opportunities for Roma children's education] In Ágnes Antalné Szabó, Krisztina Laczkó & Raátz Judit (eds.),

Szakpedagógiai körkép I. Anyanyelv- és irodalompedagógiai tanulmányok [Pedagogical overview I. Studies in mother tongue and literary pedagogy], 28–45. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University.

Bernstein, Basil. 1971. *Class, Codes and Control: Theoretical Studies Towards a Sociology of Language*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bíró, Zoltán. 1984. Beszéd és környezet [Speech and environment]. In Zoltán Bíró (ed.), A környezet fogságában [Caught by the environment]. 8–85. Bucharest: Kriterion.

Conway, John H. 2014. Foreword. In Gyorgy Polya, *How to Solve It: A New Aspect of Mathematical Method*, xix–xxiv. Princeton University Press.

Csikósné Maczó, Edit & Mónika Rajcsányi-Molnár. 2020. The situation and chances of Roma students in secondary and tertiary education in Hungary. *Central European Journal of Educational Research* 2(1). 26–35.

Derdák, Tibor & Aranka Varga. 1996. Az iskola nyelvezete idegen nyelv [The language of the school is a foreign language]. *Regio – Kisebbség, politika, társadalom* 7(2). 150–176.

EMMI. 2013. Emberi Erőforrások Minisztériuma: *Rendelet a pedagógiai szakszolgálati intézmények működéséről* [Ministry of Human Resources: Decree on the operation of pedagogical services]. https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a1300015.emm (accessed 26. 02. 2013)

Encho Gerganov, Silvia Varbanova & Hristo Kyuchukov. 2005. School adaptation of Roma children. *Intercultural Education* 16(5). 495–511.

Flecha, Ramón & Marta Soler. 2013. Turning difficulties into possibilities: Engaging Roma families and students in school through dialogic learning. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 43(4). 451–465.

García, Ofelia & Tatyana Kleyn (eds.). 2016. *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments*. New York: Routledge.

García, Ofelia, Susana Ibarra Johnson & Kate Seltzer. 2017. *The translanguaging Classroom. Leveraging Students Bilingualism for Learning*. Philadelphia: Caslon.

Gkaintartzi, Anastasia, Angeliki Kiliari, & Roula Tsokalidou. 2015 'Invisible' bilingualism – 'invisible' language ideologies: Greek teachers' attitudes towards immigrant pupils' heritage languages. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 18(1): 60–72

Gogolin, Ingrid. 2004. Lebensweltliche Mehrsprachigkeit. In Karl-Richard Bausch, Frank G. Königs & Hans-Jürgen Krumm (eds.), *Mehrsprachigkeit im Fokus*, 55–61. Tübingen: Gunther Narr.

Heltai János Imre & Gabriella Sándor-Kulcsár: A romani beszéd és az óvoda [Romani and Kindergarten]. 2017. *Anyanyelv-pedagógia* 10(4). 47–59.

Heltai, János Imre & Bernadett Jani-Demetriou. 2017. Romák nyelvi gyakorlatai és az iskolaérettség [Linguistic practices of Roma students and school readiness]. In Tibor Cserti Csapó & Mátyás Rosenberg (eds.), *Horizontok és Dialógusok 2017. VI. Romológus Konferencia* [Horizons and dialogues 2017. Romani Studies Conferences 6], 9–26. Pécs: University of Pécs.

Heltai, János Imre & Bernadett Jani-Demetriou. 2018. A transzlingváló pedagógiai orientáció hatása az iskolai sikerességre [The impact of a translingual pedagogical orientation on school success]. *Anyanyelv-pedagógia* 12(1). 5–18.

Heltai, János Imre 2016. Az egységes nyelvi repertoár pedagógiája [Pedagogy of the unitary linguistic repertoire]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 140(4). 407–427.

Heltai, János Imre. 2017. A nyelvi hátrányos helyzet paradigmájának kritikája: zombik az iskolában [A critique of the linguistic disadvantage paradigm: zombies at school] In Attila Benő & Noémi Fazakas (eds.), *Élőnyelvi kutatások és a dialektológia: Válogatás a 19. Élőnyelvi Konferencia – Marosvásárhely, 2016. szeptember 7-9. – előadásaiból.* [Sociolinguistics and dialectology: a selection of papers presented at the 19th Conference on Sociolinguistic – Marosvásárhely/Târgu Mures, 7-9 September 2016], 110–121. Kolozsvár/Cluj Napoca: Erdélyi Múzeum Egyesület.

Jani-Demetriou, Bernadett. 2020. Az iskolai eredményesség nyelvi tényezői és a heteroglosszia [Linguistic determinants of school performance and heteroglossia]. In János Imre Heltai & Beatrix Oszkó (eds.), *Nyelvi repertoárok a Kárpát-medencében és azon kívül. A 20. Élőnyelvi Konferencia előadásai* [Linguistic repertoires in the Carpathian Basin and beyond. Papers presented at the 20th Conference on Sociolinguistic], 490–503. Budapest: Nyelvtudományi Intézet.

Jaspers, Jürgen. 2019. Authority and morality in advocating heteroglossia. *Language, Culture and Society* 1. 83–105.

Kontra, Miklós & Saly Noémi (eds.). 1998. *Nyelvmentés vagy nyelvárulás? Vita a határon túli magyar nyelvhasználatról* [Language rescue or language betrayal? Debate on the use of the Hungarian language beyond the borders]. Budapest: Osiris.

Köves, Gabriella & Mária Szegfű. 2015. Anyanyelvet a matematikához (is)! [Vernacular for Mathematics, (too)! In Erzsébet Erdélyi & Attila Szabó (eds.), *A hit erejével. Pedagógiai tanulmányok* [By the power of faith. Pedagogical studies]. Budapest: Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary/L'Harmattan Kiadó.

Nagy, József, Krisztián Józsa, Tibor Vidákovich & Margit Fazekasné Fenyvesi (eds.). 2016 (2004). *DIFER Programcsomag. Diagnosztikus Fejlődésvizsgáló Rendszer 4-8 évesek számára* [DIFER Programme Package. Diagnostic Developmental Screening System for 4-8 year olds]. Budapest: Mozaik.

Nemes, Gyöngyi. 2016. A nyelvi hátrányos helyzet és az anyanyelvi olvasás diagnosztikus értékelése – elméletek, módszerek [Diagnostic assessment of language disadvantage and mother tongue reading – theories, methods]. *Iskolakultúra*, *26*(7–8). 47–53.

Oláh Örsi, Tibor. 2005. Az iskolai sikertelenség szociolingvisztikai megközelítése [A sociolinguistic approach of school failure]. *Új Pedagógiai Szemle* 55(7–8). 45–58.

Pólya, György. 2014 [1945]. *How to Solve It. A New Aspect of Mathematical Method*. Princeton University Press.

Pulinx, Reinhilde, Piet Van Avermaet & Orhan Agirdag. 2017. Silencing linguistic diversity: the extent, the determinants and consequences of the monolingual beliefs of Flemish teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 20(5). 542–556.

Pusztai, Gabriella, Katinka Bacskai & Laura Morvai. 2021. Religious values and educational norms among catholic and protestant teachers in Hungary. *Religions* 12(10). 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12100805

Réger, Zita. 1984. A cigányság helyzetének nyelvi és iskolai vonatkozásai. Álláspontok és viták [Linguistic and educational aspects of the situation of the Roma. Positions and debates]. *Szociálpolitikai Értekezések* 2. 140–173.

Réger, Zita. 1995. Cigány gyerekek nyelvi problémái és iskolai esélyei [Language problems and school chances of Roma children]. *Iskolakultúra* 5(24). 102–106.

Richardson, Kristina L. 2020. Invisible strangers, or Romani history reconsidered. *History of the Present* 10(2): 187–207.

Sándor-Kulcsár, Gabriella & Erika Fekete-Balogh (eds.). 2010. *Szó-Beszéd.Kom nyelvi-kommunikációs program* [Szó-Beszéd.Kom language communication programme]. Tiszavasvári: Magiszter Óvoda. Manuscript.

Sándor-Kulcsár, Gabriella (ed.). 2018. *Helyi óvodai nevelési program* [Local kindergarten education programme] Tiszavasvári: Magiszter Óvoda. Manuscript.

Shohamy, Elana. 2006. *Language Policy. Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. New York: Routledge.

Szegfű, Mária. 2017. A mondat megértése a grammatikai megoldások függvényében [Understanding a sentence in dependence of grammatical solutions] I–II.. *Tanító* 55(8). 9–12 and 55(9). 11–13.

Tarsoly, Eszter. 2016. *Pedantry, preoccupation, and the presentation of self: An interdisciplinary study of attitudes towards language.* London: University College London dissertation.

Tóth, Norbert. 2020. The Issue of Failure of Roma Students at School. *Különleges Bánásmód* 6(1). 95–102.

Vámos, Ágnes. 2016. Bilingual education and language-of-education policy in Hungary in the 20th Century (1918–2008). *History of Education and Children's Literature* 11(1). 135–152.