This chapter explores the changes in teachers’ classroom talk which emerge as a result 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 Romani-Hungarian bilingual, defined by spontaneous translanguaging; that is, by the presence of several languages in everyday communication. Prior to the project, these pupils 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 pupils’ 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 the way teachers experience and reflect on these changes. We see teachers’ talk as one of the many factors in the complex system of classroom interactions. Based on concepts of Bakhtins’ dialogic discourse (1984) and Vygotsky’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).

In a multilingual classroom, translanguaging is always part of learners’ thinking. García and colleagues (2017) 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, and Seltzer 2017: xi–xii); similar to an underground river, learners’ fluid multilingualism emerges in an explicit way at points where teachers deliberately include learners’ linguistic practices in the learning process. The rest of the time, it remains invisible, yet it is present in learners’ thinking, attitudes, and relationship to each other, the teacher, and the world that surrounds them. Teacher-student communication, and within it teachers’ talk, changes both in situations when learners’ spontaneous translingual practices occur in the classroom (the corriente becomes visible), and when teachers organise a learning event which includes more than one language (teachers render
Cenoz and Gorter (2021) also note that the spontaneous and guided practices form a continuum rather than a dichotomy, and there are intermediate situations (cf. Chapter 3). This chapter argues that teachers’ talk in translanguaging classrooms is always characterised 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 design, and translanguaging shift (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 which recognises that the inclusion of learners’ entire linguistic repertoire in school activities is essentially the 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 of 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’ attitude towards learners and their translanguaging changes due to their translanguaging stance, and the way this brings about new approaches in their everyday teaching design, too. The chapter traces the way teachers become capable of translanguaging shifts, even if they consider themselves monolingual majority-language speakers and/or do not speak (all) the learners’ language(s).

10.1 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 towards learners’ translingual practices changed. Before the project, teachers were often unaware or ignored pupils’ multilingualism: it did not occur to them that by bringing the translanguaging corriente to the surface they could support their learners. In the early phase of our activities, researchers and teachers had several discussions about teachers’ experiences, where teachers
reflected on their previous ideologies and practices and on their impact on classroom talk. For instance, Zita, a teacher in the earlier years of primary school, who has worked in Magiszter for over fifteen years, reported in a conversation in 2019 that she began to learn Romani words and this affected her classroom communication: (excerpt 1, also quoted in Heltai 2020: 148):

(1) Egyre bátrabbak a gyerekek. Most már van úgy, hogy kérés 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 megértek, 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.’

The transformation of teachers’ stance is inseparable from other processes. Zita’s translanguaging classes transformed the learners’ language practices in the classroom: kérés 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 megértek ‘I understand more and more of what they say’.

Changes in the learning process and in learners’ level of engagement were widely reported in discussions with the teachers. Teachers have found that by changing their own stance, they have discovered new skills and competences their pupils had, and this impacted on their teaching, encouraging, for instance, increased collaboration with the pupils in different ways. All teachers’ accounts of the changes include comments which pinpoint learners’ increased willingness to participate in the learning processes. Teachers’ comments also highlight among the changes a more dialogic approach to teaching, and learners’ increased willingness to engage in dialogue. 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 interaction, and, possibly, paves the way for dialogic teaching which enables learners to find their own voice. Learners’ 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, the following part of this chapter contains a shorter comment on this topic written by Zita Tündik, and a more detailed report by another teacher who works in the upper years of primary school, Tünde Demeter-
Berencsik, also participating in the project. These reflections are the results of the authors’ joint working process. We interpret and present them as knowledge crystallised through conversations and workshops held with the participation of researchers, student researchers, and practicing teachers.

Zita summarised transformations both of her stance and the pupils’ 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 pupils’ 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 pupils’ 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 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 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, and sentences several times.

Our classes were transformed, too. The children instinctively switched to bilingual mode. They used 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 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.

10.2 Translanguaging shift, translanguaging design and teachers’ talk

While a translanguaging stance, as Zita’s and Tünde’s accounts (cf. 10.1) state, concerns transformations of participants’ (language) ideologies and general attitudes, 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. Pupils who are proficient in both languages can act as facilitators during the joint activity. Pupils, 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. 10.1), 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, translingual 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 cite Otheguy et al. 2015: 283).

While Chapter 15 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, cf. Chapter 9). 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 pupils learned a poem written by a Roma poet, Leksa Manush, a native of Riga (Latvia). The poem is about a little foul 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 9, 16 and video 21 [Imitating Romani “adult speech” at school], video 21: 1.22–2.22) is adapted to the pupils’ 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 pupil 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 pupil 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 learners 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 pupils 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 realises that he accidentally performed in the language different from what he intended to (video 1: 3.40–3.53):

(2) pupil [bosszankodva tapsol és zavartan mosolyog] Áj, ez cigány!
[snaps his hands annoyedly and smiles in embarrassment] ’Oh no, this is in Gypsy!

Zita [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.’

In her comment, Zita reminds the pupil that he originally intended to speak in Hungarian, but makes no other comment. This moment is a translinguaging 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 because of their contributions. This allows them to maintain the dynamism of their bilingual language practices. Translanguaging shifts like this are everyday occurrences in Zita’s classes, and this is a result of Zita’s new, translanguaging stance: as she mentioned above, in 10.1, pupils’ answers are valued whether they are formulated in Romani or Hungarian, and pupils’ previous anxieties begin to disappear when they sense this acceptance.

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 girls (pupil 2) 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) Zita *Mit csinálunk, még? Ezt nem értettem.*
‘What are we doing? I don’t understand.’

pupil 1 *Bevisszük az ólba.*
‘We take it to the sty.’

Zita *Bevisszük az ólba?*
‘We take it to the sty?’

pupil 1 *Igen. Kikötöm. Az is volt, kikötöm!*
‘Yes . . . tether it. There was also, I will tether it!’

‘Wait! I tether it? How is that in Romani? . . . I will tether it.’

pupils *Avripangyam lész.*
‘TETHER IT, I WILL TETHER IT.’

Zita *Avripangyam lész?*
‘TETHER IT?’

pupil 2 [utánozva mondja] *Avripangyam lész. Kikötöm.*
[miming and saying it] ‘I WILL TETHER IT. I tether it.’

In such translation tasks, the learners give the information to the teacher: a situation that goes against convention. A single translinguaging shift can change the roles and/or the dynamics between teacher and learners. For example, a shift in the moment under discussion implies mutual trust between teachers and learners. By asking for a translation, the teacher trusts that the learners will respond in a meaningful way, they come up with the necessary information and the lesson will not get bogged down. In a translinguaging 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 pupils. 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 pupils 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 pupils and thus contributes to a relaxed classroom atmosphere, to the pupils' participation in the lesson without inhibitions, and to building their self-confidence. It is worth looking at the pupils’ 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 pupils try to guess what the story might be about. One of the pupils answered in Romani, and the teacher, not understanding the answer exactly, asked another pupil if she understood. The teacher, however, refrained from pointing out that she failed to understand what the pupil 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 pupil 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 deliberately leaves out of focus the language learners 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 pupils 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 pupils 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):
Not everyone takes up the opportunity to say it in Romani as offered by the teacher. The first pupil, in (4) above, is surprised, and chooses to give his summary in Hungarian. However, the next pupil, 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 pupils: the majority of the learners who followed carried on using Romani. The teacher’s instruction which allowed Romani to appear in the pupils’ outputs brought about a change in the 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 pupil described in the above analysis presented successfully in Hungarian. However, when he saw that most of the pupils 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. Vogel and García 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, pupils 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 (cf. also Chapters 9.3 and 16.3). 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 elements appear in the feedback and evaluation given to learners. 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: csütten! (‘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, she sees the advantages of this strategy in the balancing of interpersonal relationships with her pupils (cf. Chapter 10.1: “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”). 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.

### 10.3 Summary: An emergent translanguaging stance and learning design

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 learners’ home language practices. They argued that translanguaging is impossible, or at least severely hindered, if teachers do not know the learners’ 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 learners 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 learners 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 learners 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’s and Tünde’s contributions to this chapter) to facilitate shifts of one kind or other.
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