

Access to this work was provided by the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) ScholarWorks@UMBC digital repository on the Maryland Shared Open Access (MD-SOAR) platform.

Please provide feedback

Please support the ScholarWorks@UMBC repository by emailing [scholarworks-group@umbc.edu](mailto:scholarworks-group@umbc.edu) and telling us what having access to this work means to you and why it's important to you. Thank you.

# Chapter 11


## Dealing With Language Gap in a Hungarian–English Early Childhood Classroom

**Eva Csillik**

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1256-3332>

*New York City Department of Education, USA*

**Irina Golubeva**

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8505-1047>

*University of Maryland, Baltimore County, USA*

### ABSTRACT

*The term ‘translanguaging’ has been widespread in the field of Applied Linguistics in a short period of time, and just as quickly, it infiltrated in the field of Multilingual Education. Translanguaging is mostly seen as an opportunity to build on multilingual speakers’ full language repertoire in the classroom in order to make sense of the world around them. At the same time, translanguaging might be seen as a threat for heritage language survival because heritage languages are forced to immerse in the mainstream language(s). The authors observed pedagogical translanguaging practices in the AraNY János Hungarian Kindergarten and School (USA) to understand how English was used in teaching the heritage language and to discover how bridging existing language gaps between speakers worked in the practices of bilingual pedagogues. The overarching aim of this study was to reveal some of the pedagogical translanguaging strategies used to deal with occurring language gaps.*

### INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, in the past, schools have followed a monolingual language policy of strict language separation in the school curriculum, by establishing clear boundaries between two or more languages to avoid cross-linguistic influence and code-switching, to protect and develop proficiency in minority languages. These ideologies of language separation have been highly criticised in recent years (Grosjean, 1985;

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-1219-7.ch011

Cook, 1999; Cummins, 2007; García, 2009; Creese and Blackledge, 2010; Li, 2011; Canagarajah, 2011; Gort, 2018) and are outdated in terms of multilingual education. A new paradigm has been taking shape due to today's fast-changing world as a result of globalization, ubiquitous technology use, and world-wide immigration. Instead of separating language systems from one another, there is a trend towards two or more languages to co-exist in the multilingual classroom (García, 2009; Canagarajah, 2011; Cenoz and Gorter, 2011, 2015). Although it is a natural linguistic phenomenon for emergent bilingual speakers to use all their language systems or language repertoires to communicate and make-meaning of the academic content (García & Wei, 2014; Paulsrud et al., 2015; García & Kleyn, 2016; Golubeva & Csillik, 2018), it is still a challenging task for pedagogues working in multilingual classrooms (Csillik, 2019b). The integration of different elements from different languages is not easily accepted neither by the field of Applied Linguistics, nor by the wider society. It is still associated with the incompetency of the language speaker who lacks a linguistic code in one language and borrows this code from another language. Some might see it as a “divergent linguistic phenomenon” that deviates from the “standard academic language” or from the socially accepted norm in language education. In spite of all these, translanguaging (García & Wei, 2014; Cenoz & Gorter, 2015, Paulsrud et al., 2015; García & Kleyn, 2016; García et al., 2017; Gort, 2018; Rabbidge, 2019) is one of the widely used concepts associated with this new trend in multilingual education. The authors previously introduced translanguaging (Csillik & Golubeva, 2019b, p. 170) as “the act of using different languages interchangeably, in order to overcome language constraints, to deliver verbal utterances or written statements effectively, and, to ultimately achieve successful communication”.

Encouraging students to translanguage with their language learning peers and teachers helps multilingual students to claim some ownership in the educational process, show complete understanding of the subject area, and express individuality in shaping their identity to belong to a social minority group (Golubeva & Csillik, 2018; Csillik & Golubeva, 2019a; Csillik, 2019a in press).

Not only language learners can use translanguaging in the classroom, but also the teachers of the multilingual/multicultural setting (García et al., 2017; García & Kleyn, 2016; Paulsrud et al., 2017). By using translanguaging practices in the multilingual/multicultural classroom, teachers make students feel comfortable and welcomed while increasing the students' social-emotional well-being at the same time. Furthermore, it promotes diversity and ensures inclusion in school settings. This is especially beneficial in the case of first-generation immigrant students who are transitioning from one culture to another in a very short period of time, and by providing translanguaging practices they can easily find a close link to “home”, which is extremely comforting at first in an environment where they might experience a ‘cultural shock’ at first (Golubeva & Csillik, 2018; Csillik & Golubeva, 2019a; Csillik, 2019a in press), or sometimes even a sense of identity loss.

The analysis of the recent scholarly papers on this new translanguaging phenomena (Csillik & Golubeva, 2019b) showed that the research in this area has mostly been dedicated to study the social and psycholinguistic aspects of ‘linguaging’ or ‘code-switching’, and less is done in the fields of Foreign/Minority Language Pedagogy or Heritage Language Transmission and Maintenance. The linguistic terms, language “transmission” and “maintenance”, were first used by Fishman (1991) separating passing on the heritage language to young children (language transmission) and maintaining the heritage language among adolescents and young adults after transmitting the heritage language. It is unequivocal that more should be done in investigating the multilingual classroom settings from this aspect as well.

In this chapter, the authors discuss some of the pedagogical translanguaging practices they observed in a Hungarian-English bilingual immersion pre-school classroom in the AraNY János Hungarian Kindergarten and School in New York City (USA) where they previously researched on translanguaging practices in a multilingual classroom to identify student-led and teacher-led translanguaging practices (Golubeva & Csillik, 2018). This time the authors studied the phenomenon of translanguaging in an immersion Hungarian-English bilingual program to understand how bridging existing language gaps between Hungarian (L1) speakers learning English (L2), Hungarian-English fluent bilinguals, and English (L1) speakers learning Hungarian (L2) works in practice.

Furthermore, the authors will discuss that the selection of pedagogical translanguaging strategies depend on the attitude and belief of the Hungarian-English bilingual pedagogues that can further influence the linguistic strength between Hungarian being a weaker (target) language and English being a stronger (mainstream/dominant) language or vice versa in immersion programs.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **The Dynamics of Heritage Languages**

Due to socio-economic and socio-political reasons the status of low-incidence heritage languages (e.g. Hungarian) in the United States is vulnerable and the possibilities for promoting the learning of such minority languages as a foreign language in the public-school systems is less desired compared to other high-incidence heritage languages (e.g. Spanish, Chinese or Arabic). It mostly depends on the speaker or the minority group's effort and motivation how these low-incidence languages can survive. Fishman's publications (1966a, 1966b, 1985b) on ethnic minority language maintenance and language shift before the Millennium have shed light on the ignorance and negligence of the American society and government toward the perseverance of non-English languages of its immigrant and native populations. Until recent years, low-incidence languages have had a peripheral place not only in the American society, but also in its multilingual classrooms. Perhaps, they were exposed to a slow decadence in the number of speakers, or worst, this decline might even have led to an irreversible language loss these low-incidence minority language groups might have suffered over time.

Here are the ten most commonly reported home languages of multilingual learners (MLL) in the United States of America according to the National Center for Education Statistics (2018) <sup>1</sup>: Spanish was the home language of 3.79 million MLLs (76.6%), Arabic of 129,386 MLLs (2.6%), Chinese of 104,147 (2.1%) speakers, and Vietnamese of 78,732 (1.6%) MLLs. English was the fifth most common home language for 70,014 (1.4%) MLLs who live in multilingual households or was adopted from other countries who were raised speaking another language but currently live in households where English is spoken primarily. Somali of 38,440 speakers (0.8%), Russian of 34,843 speakers (0.7%), Hmong of 33,059 speakers (0.7%), Haitian/Haitian Creole of 31,608 speakers (0.6%), and Portuguese of 28,214 speakers (0.6%) were the next most commonly reported home languages of MLLs in the fall of 2016.

In New York City during the 2016-17 school year the following top ten home languages were reported in bilingual and multilingual classrooms by the Division of English Language Learners and Student Support of the Department of Education in New York City<sup>2</sup>: Spanish was the home language of 27,666 MLLs (65.7%), which is four times as many as Chinese, the home language of 4,803 MLLs (11.4%), followed by Arabic of 2,351 MLLs (5.6%), Bengali of 1,679 MLLs (3.9%), Haitian/Haitian Creole of

786 MLLs (1.9%), Urdu of 773 MLLs (1.8%) and Russian of 749 MLLs (1.8%). The next most commonly reported home languages were Uzbek of 499 students (1.2%), French of 429 students (1%) and Punjabi of 213 students (0.5%), meanwhile 112 other languages remained unidentified and counted as one group of 2,124 MLLs (5.05%).

As we can see from the data presented above, the first three most commonly spoken heritage languages nationwide in the U. S. and citywide in the public schools of New York City are: Spanish, Chinese and Arabic. Hungarian is not mentioned as a significant heritage language either nationwide or citywide. So, how can such a low-incidence heritage minority language (e.g. Hungarian) survive in the “jungle” of languages found in multilingual classrooms across the United States?

It is not surprising that transmitting a low-incidence heritage language (e.g. Hungarian) in the United States, precisely in New York City, is challenging and an adventure on its own. The maintenance of a low-incidence heritage language is not just a transfer of language and literacy skills from one generation to the next, but it is rather a matter of transferring and instilling a love and admiration of one’s cultural heritage in the form of the mother tongue. It is an unfamiliar process for the children of immigrants who are trying to make a bond to a low-incidence heritage language belonging to a distant land that some of them have never seen and may not be able to see ever, or any time soon. The secret to the vitality of a low-incidence heritage language through the generations is to learn to appreciate what it means to belong to a particular minority group. It is the transfer of cherished memories and heritage and the hopes of its survival in future generations.

Heritage language transmission and maintenance have been a struggle for many immigrant families, especially for the first and second generations (Nesteruk, 2010). First and second-generation children are growing up in environments that are foreign both to themselves, due to their relatively young age, and to their parents. The severity of the situation is even more intensified when children are born in mixed-marriage families. Ideally, heritage language speakers’ parents reserve using the low-incidence heritage language when communicating with their children in order to feel that they still relate to the “home” through their first language (heritage language), but this is not always the case in these families. It often happens that the usage of the heritage language is not carried over to the offspring due to family dynamics that the parents of the child(ren) prefer the mainstream (dominant) language for communication in the household. Meanwhile, caregivers’ attitudes towards the mainstream and heritage languages vary from household to household, it still considered to be the one of the strongest factors of heritage language transmission and maintenance (Nesteruk, 2010).

Each heritage language family has their own possible alternative to tackle language and cultural learning related questions and issues. One possible alternative that first and second-generation immigrants choose to cope in the host country is a rapid acceptance, adaptation and integration (Shaules, 2007) into the new culture where the dominant language, English, is spoken in the mainstream society. Acculturation involves the learning of the mainstream society’s language and norms as soon as possible leaving behind their native language. Let’s see how language transmission changes over generations. Members of the first generation go through instrumental acculturation; they speak some English but preferring to use their heritage (native) language at home. Members of the second generation speak English in school and with friends, and increasingly answer in English at home, however, they become limited bilinguals whose language of choice is English most of the time. Members of the third generation are most likely to lose the remains’ of the first generation’s native language due to the lack of support for it at home and in the host society (Nesteruk, 2010).

Many times the assimilation “learning process of both generations is embedded in a co-ethnic community of sufficient size and institutional diversity to slow down the cultural shift and promote partial retention of the parents’ home language and norms” (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001, pp. 53-54). Another possible alternative immigrant families might choose is to live in isolation to preserve the heritage language and culture. The denial of the new culture and its influence to push the mainstream language on the heritage language to ultimately defend the minority group’s heritage language and culture (Shaules, 2007) is not rare amongst first generation immigrant families. Combined institutional supports and ethnic social networks increase the probability of balanced bilingualism in the second generation (Chumak-Horbatsch, 1999). Those immigrants in the United States who have an extensive social network, have frequent opportunities to use their heritage language in the minority group, consequently, have a better chance of maintaining their heritage language even though their children tend to use English with each other (Nesteruk, 2010).

### **Heritage Language Schools in the United States**

Heritage language schools are community-based schools, formed voluntarily and work on its own without any governmental funds from the host country to maintain the minority group’s language and culture. In most cases they use compulsory government-prescribed curriculum and government-certified textbooks from the home country (Doerr & Lee, 2009). Their aim is not only to teach language but also to develop the proficiency and use of reading and writing in the heritage language. In these heritage language schools the limitations are countless: limited number of students, limited number of skilled pedagogues, limited time, space, and resources for instruction, and limited financial resources. Their budget depends on low tuition fees, collected donations, raised funds, or funds coming from tenders from the home country. Due to the extreme limitations that heritage language schools face classes are formed by immersing minority students with different language backgrounds, therefore, different language repertoires get in contact with each other.

In low-incidence heritage language immersion programs where the heritage language is the target language, it occurs regularly that L1 speakers are mixed together with L2 speakers based on their age and not their linguistic competence (Hickey, 2001) as a result of low numbers of attendees and their wide dispersal in the host country. However, the mixing of native heritage language speakers (L1) with heritage language learning English speakers (L2) in an immersion program offers both an opportunity and a challenge for all participants. While providing an opportunity for L2 learners to interact with native heritage language speakers (L1), it presents a challenge to pedagogues have to support and enrich the L1 language skills of the native speakers in a situation of language contact. Also, Hickey (2001) found that the linguistic composition of immersion programs significantly affects the frequency of heritage language usage by the L1 speakers and the bilingual speakers. However, it has less effect on the use by English (L2) speakers compared to their L1 speaking counterparts.

Bilingual or two-way immersion programs in the United States are in huge popularity since they provide interaction between L2 and L1 speakers by including both the dominant and heritage languages. Instruction through each of the two languages may be divided up to 90% in the heritage language and 10% in the dominant language. For heritage language speaking children, a speedy acquisition of English is expected compared to the dominant language speaking children whose any attempt of the heritage language is admired. Wong Fillmore (1991) discussed this problem of heritage language speakers L1 being gradually eroded as a consequence of learning English. She suggested to provide the development

of mother tongue skills in early education programs before introducing English to these students. Jones (1991) observed that when primary school L1 speakers of Welsh were mixed with L2 learners, the Welsh speakers tended to accommodate to the interlanguage of the learners, rather than the L2 learners adapting to the norms of the L1 speakers. L1 minority students tended to be more motivated to acquire and switch to the higher status language than the L2 learners (struggling with their low-level competence in the lower status target language) were to learn the target language.

### **New Trends in Multilingual Education<sup>3</sup>: ‘Translanguaging’ as a Pedagogy**

Multilinguals’ ability to use multiple languages in one linguistic context is quite fascinating and only those can understand this phenomenon who can fully relate to it. Meanwhile, bilinguals share this cross-linguistic ability to step ‘in-and-out’ of two languages since they can never shut the L1 out in the brain while learning the L2, the degree of this behaviour depends on the speakers. They choose when and where they want to step in or out of a language and slip into another. However, this individual choice has its own limits in the language learning classroom. Baker (1997) noted that in reality the teacher and the other students influence the choice of the bilingual speakers’ translanguaging practices in the classroom.

Translanguaging as a bilingual pedagogy began in the 1980s in the Welsh education system to empower the Welsh minority language against the coercive power of English. Since then, translanguaging was used as a pedagogy to describe what is happening in different translanguaging settings coming from interviews and observational data rather than detailed analyses of this interactional data (Conteh, 2018).

In a traditional way, translanguaging pedagogy is based on alternating the languages used for input and output in a systematic way (Lewis, Jones, & Baker; 2012a) to provide scaffolding and support for language learners. When language speakers are more advanced in their linguistic competence (Lewis, Jones, & Baker; 2012b) to use their languages together or separately this scaffold can be removed.

Translanguaging is also used in the multilingual classroom to increase comprehension in the context of other heritage languages (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017). Examples are reported by Lowman *et al.* (2007) in the case of English students learning Māori and by Llurda, Cots & Armengol (2013) in the case of Catalan students learning English. In both cases students’ comprehension increased when they were allowed to use their first or heritage language.

The term nowadays is researched from multiple aspects but the focus of this chapter is to highlight its pedagogical translanguaging aspect. Pedagogical translanguaging or classroom translanguaging refers to instructional strategies that integrate two or more languages in the multilingual classroom. Cenoz and Gorter (2017) call it a “bi/multilingual usage in naturally occurring contexts where boundaries between languages are fluid and constantly shifting” (p. 904). They also referred to it as a “planned alternation of the languages for input and output combined with other pedagogical strategies that go across languages” (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017, p. 904).

Translanguaging in a classroom where one or more low-incidence language(s) is/are present can be beneficial since these languages are vulnerable and are constantly fighting for survival. Otheguy, García, and Reid (2015, p. 283) explain it well: “Translanguaging, then, as we shall see, provides a smoother conceptual path than previous approaches to the goal of protecting minoritized communities, their languages, and their learners and schools.”

Translanguaging provides an opportunity to heritage language speakers to speak freely in a society where the dominant language is spoken and even if they insert language codes from a heritage language into the dominant language or vice versa, still, their language is being present, and their voices are be-

ing heard. The idea that the heritage language can be used freely was mentioned by Fishman (1991, p. 59) as a “*breathing space*” and the idea is that the low-incidence heritage language can ‘breathe’ in the school, in a space where only the heritage language is spoken. This way translanguaging stands for a way of language protection and preservation of low-incidence languages in the classroom. In the past it was easy to fulfil the idea of ‘breathing spaces’ because heritage languages mostly stayed in isolation and had no influence of other languages on them. But, in today’s globalized world, isolation is not the case. It is challenging to create these “separate spaces” in which the minority language does not compete with the majority language (García, 2009). García and Wei (2014) posits the idea of “*translanguaging spaces*” since learning does not just take place ‘in the mind’, it is constructed in the spaces afforded by the particular social and cultural practices in which learners and teachers engage. In these safe spaces language learners can thrive (Conteh & Brock, 2010).

In the case of translanguaging in heritage language schools there is a biased pedagogical attitude. Some pedagogues are in favour of spontaneous translanguaging; yet, many of the pedagogues are against it. Those who see it with a negative attitude claim that the quality of the heritage language is jeopardized. As Jørgensen (2005, p. 393) points out “teachers and parents who favour bilingualism often think that children should speak both languages ‘purely’, without traces of the other language they know.” At the same time, translanguaging takes place mostly when the multilingual speaker uses the low-incidence language and brings in the mainstream language in his/her way of communication and not the other way around. Even if it is possible to use primarily the mainstream language for communication, it hardly ever happens that the low-incidence language is brought into the dominant language (Hickey, 2001).

It is also important to mention that the attitudes of pedagogues towards translanguaging also depend on the status of the heritage language in a given mainstream society. For instance, the situation of translanguaging in the case of Spanish-English bilingual speakers in the United States, whereas Spanish is considered a high-incidence heritage language, is different from the situation of translanguaging in the case of Hungarian-English bilingual speakers, whereas Hungarian is seen as a low-incidence heritage language. From this perspective, it is more likely that the Spanish-English speakers in the United States use translanguaging with a more positive attitude, as a form of empowerment, with the hope that Spanish eventually will become the dominant language. Also, it is less likely that the Hungarian-English speaker in the United States use translanguaging with a more positive attitude since in this case the bilingual speaker is aware that Hungarian will never gain such a status that it would become dominant in the United States. Therefore, the authors hypothesis is that it is more likely that pedagogues in a low-incidence heritage language school (e.g. Hungarian heritage school) will opt for a negative attitude towards translanguaging and further towards using pedagogical translanguaging strategies.

## **Bridging the Language Gap**

The authors of this chapter define language gap as a communication gap between L1 monolingual speakers learning L2 and L2 monolingual speakers learning L1. In their conversation they lack an understanding of each other due to a deficit in shared vocabulary or a difference in their intercultural understanding. It is possible that language gaps occur during the communication of multilingual speakers in multilingual settings (e.g. bilingual immersion program) as well where the mutual understanding of the people involved in the communication is missing. Multilingual speakers face these language gaps for two reasons. On one hand, language gaps take place when the multilingual speakers’ linguistic competency and previous experiences with the languages involved in the communication differ from one another (e.g. missing



vocabulary or lexical gap), or, on the other hand, when the cultural identity (values, habits, attitudes, beliefs, etc.) of the speakers are distinct from each other (e.g. missing cultural terms or cultural gap). Meanwhile, language speakers might be able to come up with strategies on their own to remedy lexical gaps during communication, finding solutions for cultural gaps is a more complex and a slow process that often requires help from someone else who is more familiar with the cultural differences behind both languages, from an intercultural mediator.

There are several strategies that language speakers use when they come across a lexical gap during communication (Munday, 2001; Jannsen, 2004; House, 2009; Darwish, 2010; Shabanirad, 2011). For example, the following list of strategies remedy the interrupted flow of communication in the case of a lexical gap: (1) *adaptation* to adjust to the language before it becomes fully intelligible, (2) *lexical borrowing* to adapt a word from one language to use it in another, (3) *calque* (loan translation) to borrow a word or a phrase from another language while translating its components and create a new lexeme in the target language, (4) *compensation* to recreate a similar effect to the one missing in the target language through means that are specific to the target language (e.g. guessing the meaning, using gestures), (5) *omission* to leave out one or more words from a clause that are nevertheless understood in the context of the remaining speech, (6) *description* to describe the missing word or phrase in the other language, (7) *equivalence* to carry the meaning or the idea from one language to another (yet it is difficult to find a corresponding word for every word in two languages), (8) *explication* to unfold or make clear the meaning, (9) *generalization* to translate a word or phrase from one language into a broader and more general term in other language, (10) *literal translation* or word-to-word translation, (11) *modulation* to use a phrase that is different in the source and target language to convey the same idea, (12) *particularization* to translate a word or phrase from one language into a narrower and more particular term in another language, (13) *substitution* to replace from one language to another without changing the meaning of the missing part, (14) *transposition* to change the sequence of words in one language to another since grammatical structures are often different in different languages, and (15) *variation* to vary pronunciation (accent), word choice (lexicon), or morphology and syntax (grammar) from one language to another since the same can be said in various ways.

Language and culture are so intimately related in the sense that the latter is part of the former, which is why “a particular language is the mirror of a particular culture” as Wei (2005, p. 56) stated previously. In this sense, multilingual learners by learning the target language are also learning the culture the target language is associated with (Csillik, 2019b). However, it is a simultaneous, long-lasting process, in which acquiring cultural competence goes beyond reaching language proficiency (Nieto, 2010; Liddicoat *et al.*, 2003; Kramsch, 2006; Byram *et al.*, 2002). In this learning process multilingual learners may find that many cultural terms that exist in one language may not exist in another language. Katan (2012) classifies six categories where language learners can find lexemes that are ambivalent between cultures or are not existing: (1) environment (e.g. physical environment, ideological environment, space, climate, temporal setting, clothing, and food), (2) behaviour (e.g. greeting habits, eye-contact, eating habits), (3) capabilities, strategies and skills used to communicate (e.g. rituals, non-verbal communication, tone of voice, pitch of voice), (4) values, (5) beliefs (e.g. proverbs), and (6) identity.

Finding strategies to bridge cultural differences is not as easy as we might think due to the cultural sensitivity of the speakers. It takes a great amount of open-mindedness to mind-shift; increased cognitive empathy to learn the values, customs, belief, attitudes of other cultures, and overall to adapt the way how people think and behave according to the norms of a new culture. This cultural learning eventually

leads to shifting one's cultural identity and developing multiple cultural identities. The authors strongly believe that it is not only possible to adapt multiple cultural identities, but also to create one comprehensive cultural identity that contains elements from all the cultural identities the language learner has ever encountered. As it is possible to come 'in and out' of multiple languages when multilingual learners translanguage (García & Wei, 2014), the authors believe that it is also possible to come 'in and out' of cultural identities when multilingual learners translanguage. In this sense, multicultural students are shaped like a chameleon who can adapt to their surroundings and switch between their cultural identities to blend into different cultural contexts. Thus, the 'cultural code-switching', as Shaules (2007, p. 220) calls it, often makes multicultural students question their own identity to the point where they need to resolve the conflict of not having a stable sense of the self because of the too many shifting between multiple social and cultural frameworks. When language learners are very young, they are unable to understand these cultural differences and shifts. It is also difficult for them to face the cultural adaptation challenges; therefore, they heavily rely on their parents and teachers to help them bridge the cultural gaps they encounter.

In multilingual classes the role of the pedagogues is key in helping multilingual learners facing the language gaps mentioned above. They are not only two-way interpreters (they insure the accurate and complete flow of communication) and clarifiers (they ensure resolution of any confusion or miscommunication due to the syntax and vocabulary usage of the speaker), but also, they are cultural brokers or mediators between cultures (they share and exchange cultural information to ensure clear communication between speakers). Their role requires extremely high tolerance for differences, understanding for the relativity of values (no culture's values are better or worse than others), and expertise in cultural knowledge and language proficiency.

## **MAIN FOCUS OF THE CHAPTER**

This chapter aims to explore more profoundly the pedagogical translanguaging practices used in a Hungarian-English bilingual immersion pre-school class by three Hungarian-English bilingual pedagogues. The main goal of this research is to understand how teachers can help to bridge existing language gaps between Hungarian (L1) speakers learning English (L2), Hungarian-English fluent bilinguals, and English (L1) speakers learning Hungarian (L2). The authors report on the case of low-incidence heritage language-and-culture teaching in the AraNY János Hungarian Kindergarten and School in New York City (USA).<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, the attitudes and beliefs of the three Hungarian-English bilingual pedagogues possibly influencing the outcome of this research will be under discussion as well.

## **Issues, Controversies, Problems**

As previously introduced in this chapter, low-incidence heritage language schools (e.g. the AraNY János Hungarian Kindergarten and School in New York City) face several limitations as a result of their peripheral status in the mainstream society. Not enough governmental funds are dedicated to the maintenance of such low-incidence heritage language as Hungarian is in the United States, where the socio-economic and socio-political interest of the United States dictates a quick assimilation into the American culture for members of the Hungarian ethnic group.

The Hungarian community's best option to transmit and maintain their heritage language, culture and the Hungarian identity is to survive on its own, either alone in the family, or by their children attending Hungarian heritage language schools on the weekends, or by the two closely working together. However, there is a tendency that Hungarian descendent families move in separate directions from one another, which makes it difficult to find connections to such communities.

Creating translanguaging spaces in heritage language schools can be an opportunity for the Hungarian language to survive, but also a challenge. An opportunity for the Hungarian language to be heard and used, to be vivid, but also, by constantly being exposed to the majority language of the mainstream society, to be taken over.

Due to the peripheral, low-incidence aspect of the Hungarian language; the different efforts and attitudes of the parents towards language transmission and maintenance in the family, Hungarian descendant children come to the Hungarian heritage language school with very different linguistic competence and experiences hoping that the school will teach the Hungarian language and familiarize its culture with the children.

It is common that language gaps (both lexical and cultural) occur in immersion programs between target language native speakers, speakers who learn the target language as their second language, and fluent bilingual speakers. Working with so many children with different educational and language backgrounds prior to enrolling in the heritage language school, the pedagogues working in these settings face a challenging task. They can only deal with these challenges successfully if they implement pedagogical language practices (e.g. pedagogical translanguaging strategies) that equally help fluent bilinguals, heritage first-, and second language learners at the same time.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The method applied to study the pedagogical translanguaging practices in the Hungarian-English bilingual immersion pre-school class in the AraNY János Hungarian Kindergarten and School in New York City (USA) was classroom observation as part of the method of triangulation.

At this time the authors present only a part of their broader longitudinal research that was taken place for two years in the above-mentioned heritage language school. The authors have already reported some of their findings previously (Golubeva & Csillik, 2018), however, this research profoundly added to their previous findings about translanguaging. To ensure the validity and reliability of this study, the authors also conducted a questionnaire with parents to gain background information on the students and the families' attitudes towards their low-incidence heritage language preservation, and interviews with the teachers after each observations to gain an insight and feedback on the pedagogical translanguaging practices they chose to apply in the classroom.

Classroom observations were planned from December 2017 till May 2018. In total, thirteen observation sessions were conducted after obtaining the consents of school administration, teachers and children's parents. The data collected throughout the second half of the school year were later transcribed for further analysis and categorization. Data included the verbal utterances of the participants (students and teachers) in any of the languages spoken (Hungarian, English) in the classroom. Since the authors fluently speak both languages, no problems were encountered during the process of transcription of the spoken interactions. For the purpose of this chapter, the authors only looked at 29,013 words for analysis that came from the first seven classroom observations.

It is important to emphasize that the authors changed the names of the participants in the later transcribed data, they used fictitious names instead of the real names of the participants, this way the participants' identity will stay anonymous and unrevealed.

## **Context of Research**

The AraNY János Hungarian Kindergarten and School is a melting pot for first, second and third generation of Hungarian immigrant families in the New York City urban and suburban areas. Many of the children attending this heritage language school come from mixed-marriage families where English is the dominant home language next to other languages spoken in the family like Spanish, Mandarin, and Vietnamese. Some children also learn a third or fourth language such as Spanish or Russian from extended relatives or from their nannies by the time they arrive at the school. The students have different Hungarian language skills and proficiency levels. Some children were born in the US and some came from various parts of the world including Hungary; however, all children are in the process of forming their Hungarian social and cultural identities (Golubeva & Csillik, 2018).

Students can start as early as from birth to 3 years old in the Bóbita Hungarian Play Group. The aim of this very early group is to develop children's Hungarian language skills. The program requires the active participation of the parents while the children learn Hungarian games, nursery rhymes and children's songs. Students can continue in the Nursery, Preschool, and Kindergarten programs between the ages of 3 to 6 following the Montessori Method that is quite popular in Hungary. In these early childhood years, it is beneficial for students to learn through sensory-motor activities, working with materials that develop their cognitive powers through direct experience: seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, touching, and movement through Hungarian Folk Dance classes. In these groups children spend up to 3 hours weekly with two certified teachers and a teacher helper to develop social and communication skills while learning about the Hungarian culture and traditions (stories, songs, games, arts-and-crafts, etc.) (Golubeva & Csillik, 2018).

Later on, from the age of 6 till the age of 18 students can continue their studies in the Elementary, Middle, and High School as part of the Hungarian Scouts Association in New York City. The primary goal of these schools is to develop students' fluency in reading and writing in Hungarian; as well as to teach basic historical and geographical knowledge of the Republic of Hungary and the Carpathian Basin. The students use a variety of materials that include textbooks and workbooks published for the public schools in Hungary (e.g. Apáczai Kiadó). Other resources are learning materials that were developed by the Balassi Institute for learners of Hungarian as a heritage language and publications on Hungarian Heritage Studies edited and published by the Hungarian Scouts Association in Exteris (Golubeva & Csillik 2018).

The school's goal goes further beyond to just educating Hungarian descendent second and third generation immigrant children in New York City to help them preserve the Hungarian heritage language and culture. In this welcoming environment, students, parents, and teachers make true, lifelong friendships far from the mother land. Thus, the school serves not only as a learning center for young Hungarian speakers but for many as an adopted family where they belong to in the New York City area (Golubeva & Csillik, 2018).

## **Participants**

Participants of the study attended the AraNY János Hungarian Kindergarten and School in New York City (USA) once a week for four hours on Saturday mornings. The participants of the study were pre-schoolers in the “Katica Csoport” (Ladybug Group) between the ages of 2.5 and 4. Ten children were enrolled in the “Katica Csoport” for the 2017-2018 school year. Nine participants attended the school from New York: three from Manhattan, two from Queens, four from in Brooklyn; and one participant commuted from Connecticut. Since only three participants lived in Manhattan where the school is situated, it is undoubtable that due to the long commute in the extreme weather conditions during the wintertime affected the attendance of the children.

Most children came from mixed marriage families where either the father or the mother identified themselves as Hungarian descendent, first or second-generation immigrants, marrying either an English native speaker, an English-Spanish, or English-Russian bilingual speaker. Only one child came from a household where both parents were first generation Hungarian native speakers.

Five participants had English as their dominant language (L1), learning Hungarian as their second language (L2) to preserve their Hungarian family heritage; four participants had no dominant language since they equally were fluent in English and in Hungarian, they are considered true Hungarian-English bilinguals. One of these four participants was confidently using three languages with different speakers, such as Hungarian, English, and Russian. Only one participant had Hungarian (L1) as a dominant language learning English as a second language (L2) since both parents were Hungarians and they only used Hungarian in the home.

All children were born in the USA. Out of the ten participants, three participants had older siblings also enrolled in the AraNY János Hungarian Kindergarten and School, one participant had a younger and a new-born sibling at home, and six participants had no other siblings. All participants attended the AraNY János Hungarian Kindergarten and School for the first time this year. One participant was a newcomer who was enrolled on a trial basis.

Many of students had no early literacy skills in English or in Hungarian. In New York City, universal pre-K is mandatory to attend and only has been established since 2015 for 4-year-olds. However, the children in this group have not yet turned 4-years-old by the beginning of the school year therefore they were not registered in an English-only pre-Kindergarten program at the time. Only three children were able to write their names without mistakes in Hungarian or in English learned from older siblings.

The “Katica Csoport” was run by two Hungarian-English bilingual pre-school teachers. Both teachers were first generation Hungarian immigrants graduated as nursery teachers in Hungary but had been living in New York City over thirteen years, therefore both teachers fluently spoke English. One of the teachers also had some Russian heritage language skills as her third language. Their practices were fundamentally child-centred, which meant that they all sought to use any appropriate means to meet the language needs of the children to support them in their language learning process, they used the translanguaging approach multiple times throughout the observations to comfort students and bridge language gaps during conversations.

## DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Translanguaging was observed between all participants in the following occasions: (1) constructive play: colouring/drawing, arts-and-craft (e.g. making mother's day card, making a porcupine/snowman, making a carnival mask), Play Dough, blocks; (2) games with rules: colour games, animal identification play, instrument game, etc. (3) make-believe play: acting out television/cartoon characters (e.g. The Turk and the Cows), (4) circle time: planting beans, making a bird-feeder, painting a rainbow, learning songs and poems, counting activities, (5) story time (e.g. Eric Carle: The Very Hungry Caterpillar), and (6) snack time.

The data revealed multiple pedagogical translanguaging practice that the three Hungarian-English bilingual pedagogues used in this Hungarian-English immersion pre-school class to help to bridge existing language gaps between Hungarian (L1) speakers learning English (L2), Hungarian-English bilinguals, and English (L1) speakers learning Hungarian (L2) or even amongst themselves. Let's see some of these pedagogical translanguaging practices as examples how they helped the speakers bridge occurring language gaps in their conversations.

In the first example (Table 1) the teacher used the children's background knowledge to come across and tackle the language gap (e.g. "What colour are the stars usually when we look up the sky? How do they shine? In what colour?"). The Hungarian-English bilingual child right away said its Hungarian name "kék" [keik] while the Hungarian (L1) speakers learning English (L2) said its English name "blue" and later repeated it in the L1 "kék". The English (L1) speaker learning Hungarian (L2) used intersentential code-switching and said, "I can say "kík" [ki:k]." with an English accent on the Hungarian word "kék". The teacher also used multiple guided questions (e.g. "Are the stars shining blue on you, Princess?", "What's dad's favourite colour?", "And how do we say that in Hungarian?") to teach the word "kék"/"blue".

The following example (Table 2) shows how teachers help to fill up the cultural gap since the animal children were making is very different in the Hungarian and American culture. The animal in question is referred as "sündisznó"/"hedgehog" in Hungarian, but "porcupine" in English which means "tarajos süll" in Hungarian. The porcupine and hedgehog are prickly mammals. They are often confused because they both have sharp, needle-like quills on their body. However, that's about the only similarity between

Table 1. Free time drawing/coloring (January 20, 2018)

Transcription	Authors' Translation
<p><b>Alma:</b> Mi van Domokos, min gondolkozol, hogy milyen színű legyen a ...? A csillagok milyen színűek általában amikor felnézünk az égre? Hogy ragyognak? Milyen színben?</p> <p><b>Lina:</b> Kék.</p> <p><b>Alma:</b> Kékben ragyognak neked a csillagok, Királykisasszony? Amikor mész haza este, Apával nézzétek meg a csillagokat. Szépen színeztél, Gina, nagyon ügyes vagy. Mi Apának a kedvenc színe?</p> <p><b>Domokos:</b> Blue.</p> <p><b>Alma:</b> És azt hogy mondjuk magyarul?</p> <p><b>Lina:</b> Kék.</p> <p><b>Domokos:</b> Kék.</p> <p><b>Gina:</b> I can say "kík",<sup>5</sup></p> <p><b>Alma:</b> Úgy mondjuk, hogy "kék".</p>	<p><b>Alma:</b> What's up, Domokos, what are you thinking of? What colour should be the ...? What colour are the stars usually when we look up on the sky? How do they shine? In what colour?</p> <p><b>Lina:</b> Blue.</p> <p><b>Alma:</b> Are the stars shining blue on you, Princess? When you go home tonight, look at the stars with your dad. You did colour nicely, Gina, you're very clever. What's dad's favourite colour?</p> <p><b>Domokos:</b> Blue.</p> <p><b>Alma:</b> And how do we say that in Hungarian?</p> <p><b>Lina:</b> Blue.</p> <p><b>Domokos:</b> Blue.</p> <p><b>Gina:</b> I can say "[ki:k]".</p> <p><b>Alma:</b> We say that as "[keik]".</p>

Source: (Own elaboration)

the two animals. The gap between these two occurs due to the differences in their physical features and their habitat that results in a cultural gap. A Hungarian (L1) child might have never seen a porcupine since only hedgehogs live in Hungary but the English (L1) child might have seen both animals but unaware that porcupines do not live in the territory of Hungary. The teachers help the students bridge this cultural gap by using explication of where the animal lives and how it looks like (e.g. “That is a porcupine that has huge quills.”, “This is a porcupine. It’s a kind of American porcupine who has a huge....”). One of the teachers also come across a lexical gap not knowing the English equivalent of “tüske”/“quill”, but the other teacher helped her out bridging this gap by offering linguistic borrowing (e.g. “It has quills.”).

The next example (Table 3) shows how teachers’ belief and attitude alter from one another in relation to identifying a language gap and in the way how they offer different alternatives to tackle it. The difference in the strategy of handling the language gap between the two teachers came from the difference in what each one of them saw as a gap. One teacher offered to use the Hungarian words, “kirakó” (n) and “kirakózni” (v), in the conversation while the other teacher relied on the loanword, “puzzle” (n), and used “puzzle”-ozni (v) as a calque adding the English word a Hungarian suffix. Regardless that the Hungarian word was available for the teacher to use it since the other teacher brought it into the conversation, the teacher kept the loanword and calque due to the fact that the word “puzzle” has become well-known in Hungarian and accepted socially.

*Table 2. Instruction time: Making a porcupine from apples and spaghetti (January 20, 2018)*

Transcription	Authors’ Translation
<b>Lina:</b> Nézd, nézd. Disznó, ez disznó. <b>Evelyn:</b> Az mi? <b>Alma:</b> Hallottad mit mondott? Azt mondta, “Az mi?” <b>Ilona:</b> Az egy sündisznó, aminek nagy a tuskéje. <b>Alma:</b> Ez egy <i>porcupine</i> . Ez egy amerikai fajta sündisznó amelyiknek ilyen nagy a... <b>Ilona:</b> Tuskéje van neki. Nagyon ügyesek vagytok ma. <b>Gina:</b> <i>Spaghetti. Spaghetti.</i> (...)	<b>Lina:</b> Look, look. Pig, it’s a pig. <b>Evelyn:</b> What’s that? <b>Alma:</b> Did you hear what she said? She said, “Az mi?” <b>Ilona:</b> That is a porcupine that has huge quills. <b>Alma:</b> This is a <i>porcupine</i> . It’s a kind of American porcupine who has a huge... <b>Ilona:</b> It has quills. You are so good today. <b>Gina:</b> <i>Spaghetti. Spaghetti.</i> (...)
<b>Gina:</b> <i>Porcupine. Looks like a Christmas tree.</i> <b>Alma:</b> Tényleg úgy néz ki, mint egy karácsonyfa? De klassz! <b>Ilona:</b> Bármit lehet benne látni. <b>Alma:</b> Nagyon szép.	<b>Gina:</b> <i>Porcupine. Looks like a Christmas tree.</i> <b>Alma:</b> It really looks like a Christmas tree? Wow! <b>Ilona:</b> Anything can be seen in it. <b>Alma:</b> So pretty.

Source: (Own elaboration)

*Table 3. Free time. Coloring/playing with puzzles (January 27, 2018)*

Transcription	Authors’ Translation
<b>Alma:</b> Hát szia! Szeretnél <i>puzzle</i> -ozni vagy színezni szeretnél? <b>Edit:</b> Kirakóznál? <b>Alma:</b> Kirakózni vagy színezni szeretnél? Gyere megmutatom, mit színeünk. Békát. Ezt szeretnéd vagy a <i>puzzle</i> -t? <b>Parent:</b> A <i>puzzle</i> -t nagyon szereti. <b>Alma:</b> Melyiket szeretnéd? Mutass az asztalra! <i>Puzzle</i> -t?	<b>Alma:</b> Hi! Do you want to do a <i>puzzle</i> or you rather colour? <b>Edit:</b> Do a puzzle? <b>Alma:</b> Do you want to do a puzzle or colour? Come, I’ll show you what we are colouring. A frog. Do you want to do this or the <i>puzzle</i> ? <b>Parent:</b> She loves the <i>puzzle</i> very much. <b>Alma:</b> Which one do you want? Point to the table! The <i>puzzle</i> ?

Source: (Own elaboration)

The next example (Table 4) shows that the teacher offers co-linguaging as a pedagogical translanguaging practice to help the student understand the language gap. This English (L1) speaker learning Hungarian (L2) did understand the word “menjünk” in Hungarian (probably has heard it many times in the home substituting “Let’s go!”) and associated it right away with ‘going home’. Instead, the teacher asked to go and wash hands after they finished making the children’s bird feeders. Since they finished the task it had more relevant meaning to the child to ‘go home’ in the context. The teacher’s strategy was co-linguaging and translating all that was being said before into English.

The same co-linguaging strategy is used in the next example (Table 5) where the teacher manages student behaviour. Here, it is essential to mention that using co-linguaging often as a strategy to tackle misunderstanding might lead to a mistake on the part of the teacher impacting students’ language learning. English (L1) speakers learning Hungarian (L2) might not make any effort to listen to the Hungarian (L2) language since the teacher repeats the communication in English (L1). They might know already after a while that they will hear the translated English (L1) equivalent of what is being said right after the L2. They might not only lose focus, but also eventually their motivation.

In this next example (Table 6) we can see how rhyming words might possibly cause a language gap. The teacher faces a language gap based on the misunderstanding of what was being said. She believes that the child is making a “train” that rhymes with “crane” in English that the student originally verbalized but the teacher did not hear it properly. The other teacher also faced a lexical gap since she had a missing lexeme in Hungarian and filled it up with modulation (another Hungarian word). “Markoló” is also a type of construction vehicle in Hungarian like “daru” is; however, the child used “crane” on the

Table 4. Instruction time: Making a bird feeder (January 27, 2018)

Transcription	Authors’ Translation
<b>Alma:</b> Na menjünk kezét mosni. <b>Edit:</b> Mit csinálsz? Még nem megyünk haza. <b>Alma:</b> Lina, még nem megyünk haza, tedd vissza a kabátodat. Evelyn, senki nem mondja. <i>We are not going home. Can you put your jacket back on the chair and push it in?</i> Ilona néni asked you to go wash your hand. No, not with the pony. <i>Can I have the pony, please?</i> <b>Edit:</b> Gina, Linda, gyertek, menjünk kezémosni.	<b>Alma:</b> Let’s go and wash hands. <b>Edit:</b> What are you doing? We are not going home yet. <b>Alma:</b> Lina, we are not going home yet, put your jacket back. Emily, no one says it. <i>We are not going home. Can you put your jacket back on the chair and push it in?</i> Ms. Ilona asked you to go wash your hand. No, not with the pony. <i>Can I have the pony, please?</i> <b>Edit:</b> Gina, Linda, come on, let’s go and wash hands.

Source: (Own elaboration)

Table 5. Instruction time: Making a snowman (February 3, 2018)

Transcription	Authors’ Translation
<b>Alma:</b> Gyertek, lecsücsülünk az asztalhoz de nem nyúltok semmihez. Ella, NEM NYÚLUNK SEMMIHEZ! Nem nyúlunk semmihez. Alma azt mondta, hogy lecsücsülünk az asztalhoz. <i>Everybody, sit down, but do not touch anything. Just sit down, ok?</i> <b>Lina:</b> Én nem csináltam. <b>Alma:</b> Nem nyúlunk hozzá. Azt mondta az Alma, hogy nem nyúlunk hozzá. <b>Ella:</b> Nem.	<b>Alma:</b> Come, we sit down at the table, but we don’t touch anything. Ella, DON’T TOUCH ANYTHING! We don’t touch anything. Alma said that we sit down at the table. <i>Everybody, sit down, but do not touch anything. Just sit down, ok?</i> <b>Lina:</b> I did not do. <b>Alma:</b> Don’t touch. Alma said that we don’t touch it. <b>Ella:</b> No.

Source: (Own elaboration)



first place that literally means “daru”. In this same conversation we also see another child asking the meaning of “volcano” and the teacher not only uses literal translation again, but she also uses this opportunity to teach the word in context when she explains what comes out of the volcano.

In the next conversation excerpt (Table 7) teachers use their creative side to invent a new word that does not exist in Hungarian. In the process of making a carnival mask children were using glitters stored in an object that looked identical to a salt and pepper shaker. However, teachers instead of using the Hungarian word “csillámszóró” that would come from the literal translation of “glitter”/“csillám” and “shaker”/“szóró” melted together in one word, they invented a new word coming from the English “Shake ‘N Bake”. They used the cultural relevance of this American cooking product (breadcrumb) referring to the action of “shake it and bake it” meaning something is getting immediately done; since teachers encouraged student to just shake the glitters on the masks and their carnival masks will be ready to be worn.

In the next example (Table 8) the teacher uses the scaffolding strategy to teach the Hungarian language to the English (L1) speakers learning Hungarian (L2). The teacher is bridging the language gap due to the vast number of lexical gaps the child has by using constant repetition, simplified questioning, extended wait-time, background knowledge, and involving other children as example givers in the conversation. The student repeated words and phrases in Hungarian that she caught from the example sentences, but she was unable to grasp the meaning of what she was repeating. It did not make sense to her since there was no context provided with the new vocabulary. The student used “kutya” meaning “dog” in the sentence “I have a kutya at home.” because that was probably one of the few words she knew in Hungarian, but she filled up all the unknown words from her English repertoire. Instead of saying “Van egy kutyám otthon.” she translanguaged and used codes from English and Hungarian in one sentence. In the rest of the

*Table 6. Free constructive play time: Playing with blocks (February 3, 2018)*

Transcription	Authors' Translation
<b>Alma:</b> Zoran, te mit építesz? <b>Zoran:</b> A crane. <b>Alma:</b> Vonatot? <b>Edit:</b> Nem, ő egy markolót. <b>Alma:</b> Ja, egy “crane”-t. Darut. <b>Domokos:</b> Mi magyarul a “volcano”? <b>Alma:</b> “Vulkán.” Mi van a vulkánokkal? <b>Domokos:</b> Nagyon meleg. <b>Alma:</b> Így van. Tudod, hogy mi jön ki belőle, Domokos? Mert az a forró tűz meg tud téged égetni, ami kijön a vulkán pocakjából, a gyomrából, a vulkán mélyéből.	<b>Alma:</b> Zoran, what are you making? <b>Zoran:</b> A crane. <b>Alma:</b> A train? <b>Edit:</b> No, he is making an excavator. <b>Alma:</b> Oh, a crane. A crane. <b>Domokos:</b> What is “volcano” called in Hungarian? <b>Alma:</b> “Vulkán”. What’s with the volcanos? <b>Domokos:</b> Very hot. <b>Alma:</b> That’s right. Do you know what comes out of it, Domokos? Because that boiling fire can burn you that comes out of the volcano’s belly, from its stomach, from the depths of the volcano.

Source: (Own elaboration)

*Table 7. Instruction time: Making a carnival mask (February 10, 2018)*

Transcription	Authors' Translation
<b>Alma:</b> Neki nincsen olyan shakey-bakey-je. Már beragasztottam. <b>Ilona:</b> Itt van a shakey-bakey. Neki is oda lehet adni. Szórjad. <b>Alma:</b> Nézd csak, cserélhetek színt. Itt van, Zoran. <b>Edit:</b> Gina, szórjál mostmár rá, mert meg fog száradni a ragasztód. Szórjad rá még mielőtt megszárad teljesen.	<b>Alma:</b> He does not have that shakey-bakey. I have already glued it. <b>Ilona:</b> Here is the shakey-bakey. Pass it onto him, please. Sprinkle. <b>Alma:</b> Look, you can switch colours. Here you go, Zoran. <b>Edit:</b> Gina, sprinkle now because your glue will dry out. Sprinkle before it dries completely.

Source: (Own elaboration)

Table 8. Circle time conversation (March 10, 2018)

Transcription	Authors' Translation
<p><b>Alma:</b> Evelyn, <i>do you need to go to the bathroom?</i> Nope?  <b>Evelyn:</b> <i>I want to wash hands.</i>  <b>Alma:</b> <i>We are gonna wash hands after the dance, okay?</i>  <b>Evelyn:</b> Okay.  <b>Alma:</b> Megmossuk a kezünket a tánc után.  <b>Evelyn:</b> And then we'll get snack.  <b>Alma:</b> Igen, utána eszünk <i>snack</i>-et. Megpróbálok magyarul, Evelyn? Alma segít neked, jó?  <b>Evelyn:</b> Jó.  <b>Alma:</b> Mondjad akkor. Mondjad magyarul.  <b>Evelyn:</b> Magyarul.  <b>Alma:</b> Mondjad te amit szeretnél mondani magyarul. Nehéz neked mondani magyarul? Álmos vagy?  <b>Evelyn:</b> Álmos vagy.  <b>Alma:</b> Én kérdezlek téged. Mond, hogy "Álmos vagyok".  <b>Evelyn:</b> <i>I have a kutya at home.</i>  <b>Alma:</b> Van kutyád? Mi a neve?  <b>Evelyn:</b> Mi a neve?  <b>Alma:</b> Nem fogom neked most mondani. Mi a neve a kutyádnak? Téged hogy hívnak? Hogy hívnak?  <b>Evelyn:</b> Hogy hívnak?  <b>Alma:</b> Hogy hívnak? <i>What's your name?</i>  <b>Evelyn:</b> Emily.  <b>Alma:</b> And what is your dog's name? Hogy hívják a kutyádat?  <b>Evelyn:</b> Willie.  <b>Alma:</b> Engem Almának hívnak. Hogy hívnak?  <b>Evelyn:</b> <i>You are Alma.</i>  <b>Alma:</b> Hogy hívnak? Mond meg neki téged hogy hívnak. Nem mondod meg a nevedet? Szupertitkos? Téged hogy hívnak?  <b>Domokos:</b> Domokos.  <b>Alma:</b> Téged hogy hívnak?  <b>Zoran:</b> Zoran.  <b>Alma:</b> Téged hogy hívnak?  <b>Evelyn:</b> Evelyn.  <b>Alma:</b> Látod így kell kérdezni, hogy "Téged hogy hívnak?"  <b>Edit:</b> Edit.  <b>Alma:</b> Téged hogy hívnak?  <b>Linda:</b> Linda.  <b>Alma:</b> Engem meg Almának hívnak.</p>	<p><b>Alma:</b> Evelyn, <i>do you need to go to the bathroom?</i> Nope?  <b>Evelyn:</b> <i>I want to wash hands.</i>  <b>Alma:</b> <i>We are gonna wash hands after the dance, okay?</i>  <b>Evelyn:</b> Okay.  <b>Alma:</b> We'll wash our hands after the dance.  <b>Evelyn:</b> And then we'll get snack.  <b>Alma:</b> Yes, we'll eat snack after. Can you try it in Hungarian, Evelyn? Alma will help you, okay?  <b>Evelyn:</b> Okay.  <b>Alma:</b> Say it in Hungarian then. Say it in Hungarian.  <b>Evelyn:</b> In Hungarian.  <b>Alma:</b> Say what you want to say in Hungarian. Is it hard for you to say it in Hungarian? Are you sleepy?  <b>Evelyn:</b> You are sleepy.  <b>Alma:</b> I ask you. Say, "Álmos vagyok".  <b>Evelyn:</b> <i>I have a dog at home.</i>  <b>Alma:</b> Do you have a dog? What's his name?  <b>Evelyn:</b> Mia neve?  <b>Alma:</b> I won't tell you now. What's your dog's name? What's your name?  <b>Evelyn:</b> Hogy hívnak?  <b>Alma:</b> Hogy hívnak? <i>What's your name?</i>  <b>Evelyn:</b> Emily.  <b>Alma:</b> And what is your dog's name? What's your dog's name?  <b>Evelyn:</b> Willie.  <b>Alma:</b> My name is Alma. What's your name?  <b>Evelyn:</b> <i>You are Alma.</i>  <b>Alma:</b> What's your name? Tell her what your name is. Why don't you say your name? Is it top secret? What's your name?  <b>Domokos:</b> Domokos.  <b>Alma:</b> What's your name?  <b>Zoran:</b> Zoran.  <b>Alma:</b> What's your name?  <b>Evelyn:</b> Evelyn.  <b>Alma:</b> Do you see, that's how you ask, "Téged hogy hívnak?"  <b>Edit:</b> Edit.  <b>Alma:</b> What's your name?  <b>Linda:</b> Linda.  <b>Alma:</b> And my name is Alma.</p>

Source: (Own elaboration)

conversation, we can see that this student could only understand what was being said when the teacher co-linguaged or repeated the Hungarian sentences in English. That leads us back to the concept that we previously suggested: Hungarian (L2) learners lacked motivation and effort since they knew they will get the English equivalents of what was being said right after it was said.

The next two example conversations (Table 9 and Table 10) reveal multiple lexical gaps because the English words do not exist in Hungarian (e.g. goodie bag, bagel, muffin) due to the existing cultural differences between these two cultures. Therefore, the bilingual speaker borrows them from English to bridge the cultural gap this way. Nowadays "bagel" and "muffin" are words that are accepted and wildly used in Hungarian, but a "goodie bag" is a very special American treat for those who attend a birthday party and it does not exist in Hungarian. In Hungary this custom does not exist; therefore, no lexeme is found in Hungarian for it. And if we try to translate it, who would even call a "goodie bag" to

a “nyalánkságokkal teli zacskó”? We could call it a “ajándécsomag” (giftbag), but with this word the semantic aspect of “goodies=sweets” would lose its meaning that it contains sweet treats instead of any kind of gift if we consider “goodie=gift”. The best option is to leave it as it is in English.

Other times when the speaker faces lexical gaps (e.g. “jumping caste”, “lollypop”) the teacher reinforces the usage of Hungarian language by constantly asking questions about what was being said and if the speaker comes through a language gap, she provides the literal translation to bridge that gap. In the case of “watermelon” the situation is different. Again, we do not use the literal translation of this word since in Hungarian “watermelon” would be “vizidinnye” that Hungarians do not say, but “watermelon” means “görögdinnye” in Hungarian where “görög” stands for “Greek” and “dinnye” for “melon”.

This data absolutely coincides with previous studies on the field (Jones, 1991; Wong Fillmore (1991); Hickey, 2001; Lowman et al., 2007; Llurda, Cots, and Armengol, 2013). Furthermore, our data supports the previously found data (Golubeva & Csillik, 2018) on the reasons for teacher-led translanguaging in the classroom, such as, (1) convey information and reinforce meaning; (2) create translanguaging spaces when asking for the meaning of the world either in Hungarian or in English; (3) honour and develop multilingual identities through translanguaging in the classroom; (4) comfort a child in order to provide more support; and (5) capture students attention/correct unwanted behaviour when it was urgent (Golubeva & Csillik, 2018, p. 104).

Additionally, the examples have revealed how the attitudes of the three pedagogues sometimes encouraged or other times discouraged language learners translanguaging to tackle occurring language gaps in the classroom. Further, it was also revealed that when teachers used way many occasions to co-language in the classroom and translate from L1 to L2, the English (L1) speakers learning Hungarian (L2) seemed not to make any effort to listen to the Hungarian (L2) language since it became a habit after a while that the teacher repeated the communication in English (L1). They already knew after a while that they will hear the translated English (L1) equivalent of what was being said anyways. They not only lost focus easily.

*Table 9. Snack time conversation (March 10, 2018)*

Transcription	Authors' Translation
<b>Ilona:</b> És mi lesz a születnapodon? Mit fogtok csinálni?	<b>Ilona:</b> And what will be on your birthday? What will you be doing?
<b>Lina:</b> <i>Jumping castle</i> -t.	<b>Lina:</b> <i>Jumping castle</i> .
<b>Ilona:</b> Az magyarul micsoda? Ugrálóvár. Megyek akkor ugrálóvárzni. És mit szeretnél kapni születésnapodra?	<b>Ilona:</b> What's that in Hungarian? “Ugrálóvár”. I'll go to jumping caste. And what will you like to get for your birthday?
<b>Lina:</b> Ö, egy amulett töled. Amulettet. Egy világos amulettet.	<b>Lina:</b> Hm, an amulet from you. An amulet. A light amulet.
<b>Ilona:</b> Amulettet? Az micsoda? Az nem tudom, hogy micsoda.	<b>Ilona:</b> An amulet? What's that? I don't know what that is.
<b>Lina:</b> Nekem már van. Csak egy.	<b>Lina:</b> I have already. But only one.
<b>Ilona:</b> Kell még egy neked?	<b>Ilona:</b> Do you need another one?
<b>Lina:</b> Kettő.	<b>Lina:</b> Two.
<b>Ilona:</b> És még mi lesz a születnapodon?	<b>Ilona:</b> And what else will there be on your birthday?
<b>Lina:</b> Egy, egy...	<b>Lina:</b> A, a...
<b>Ilona:</b> Azt tisztáztuk, hogy lesz ugrálóvár. És még mi lesz a születnapodon?	<b>Ilona:</b> We confirmed that you'll have a jumping castle. What else will you have?
<b>Lina:</b> <i>Goodie-bag. Goodie-bag.</i>	<b>Lina:</b> <i>Goodie-bag. Goodie-bag.</i>
<b>Ilona:</b> Magyarul fogod elmondani.	<b>Ilona:</b> You'll say it in Hungarian.
<b>Lina:</b> Egy, egy... nem tudom.	<b>Lina:</b> A, a... I don't know.
<b>Alma:</b> Csomag.	<b>Alma:</b> Package.
<b>Lina:</b> Csomag.	<b>Lina:</b> Package.
<b>Ilona:</b> A bag az csomag. És mi lesz benne? Meglepetés? Az jó amikor meglepetést kapunk?	<b>Ilona:</b> Bag means package. And what's going to be in it? Surprise? Is it good when we get a surprise?

Source: (Own elaboration)

Table 10. Story time: Eric Carl - *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* (April 7, 2018)

Transcription	Authors' Translation
<p><b>Lina:</b> Ez az Erikaé, nagyon <i>special</i> neki.  <b>Alma:</b> Tényleg? És ezt odaadta neked most? Nagyon szép volt az Erikától, hogy ezt odaadta neked. Na, elolvassuk? Szeretnétek elolvasni "A Telhetetlen Hernyócskát"?  <b>Lujza:</b> És én ezt tudom olvasni egyedül.  <b>Alma:</b> Hát te nagyon ügyes vagy.  <b>Lujza:</b> Én tudom olvasni egyedül.  <b>Lina:</b> De az magyar. És én el tudom olvasni.  <b>Alma:</b> Na, akkor olvasd el nekünk.  <b>Lina:</b> "The Hungry Caterpillar."  <b>Alma:</b> De most magyarul mond, angolul mondtad. Mi a címe?  <b>Edit:</b> "A Telhetetlen Hernyócska."  <b>Lina:</b> Oda kinnt állt egy kis tojás. Abban lakott egy hernyó.  <b>Alma:</b> Egy meleg nyári napon...  <b>Lina:</b> Egy meleg nyári napon kibújt egy éhes, termetis hernyócska.  <b>Alma:</b> Hétfőn megevett... Mit evett meg hétfőn?  <b>Lina:</b> Kettő <i>strawberry</i>-t.  <b>Alma:</b> Epret. Ezt tudod mikor ette?  <b>Lina:</b> Nem.  <b>Alma:</b> Szerintem szombaton.  <b>Lina:</b> Egy csokitortát, egy jégkrémet, egy <i>bagel</i>-olt, meg ezt.  <b>Edit:</b> Savanyúuborkát.  <b>Lina:</b> Savanyúuborkát. Egy sajtot. Egy kolbászt.  <b>Alma:</b> Ú, de jó neki.  <b>Lina:</b> Egy <i>lolly-pop</i>-ot.  <b>Alma:</b> Az mi az a <i>lolly-pop</i> magyarul? "Nyalóka."  <b>Lina:</b> Egy nyalókát. Egy kisebb ilyen.  <b>Alma:</b> Mi ez?  <b>Edit:</b> Egy pite.  <b>Alma:</b> Meggyespitét. Ú, de finom nyáron a meggyespite.  <b>Lina:</b> Te is akarsz sütni ezt?  <b>Alma:</b> Igen, én szoktam sütni.  <b>Edit:</b> És ez? Ez milye?  <b>Lina:</b> Kolbásza.  <b>Alma:</b> Mit evett még? Dinnyét. Milyen dinnye az?  <b>Lina:</b> <i>Muffin</i>.  <b>Alma:</b> <i>Muffin</i> és utána mi jön?  <b>Lina:</b> Egy <i>watermelon</i>-t.  <b>Alma:</b> Mit evett? "Dinnyét".  <b>Lina:</b> Dinnye.  <b>Alma:</b> Görögdinnye.  <b>Lina:</b> Utána nem volt éhes.</p>	<p><b>Lina:</b> This is Erika's, it's very <i>special</i> for her.  <b>Alma:</b> Really? And she gave it to you now? That was very nice of Erika that she gave it to you. So, should we read it? Would you like to read "The Very Hungry Caterpillar"?  <b>Lujza:</b> And I can read this on my own.  <b>Alma:</b> Well, you are so clever.  <b>Lujza:</b> I can read it alone.  <b>Lina:</b> But that is Hungarian. And I can read it.  <b>Alma:</b> Then read it for us.  <b>Lina:</b> "The Hungry Caterpillar."  <b>Alma:</b> But tell us in Hungarian now, you said it in English. What's the title?  <b>Edit:</b> "The Very Hungry Caterpillar."  <b>Lina:</b> A little egg was laying outside. Inside the egg was a tiny caterpillar.  <b>Alma:</b> On a warm summer day...  <b>Lina:</b> On a warm summer day, out of the egg came out a tiny, very hungry caterpillar.  <b>Alma:</b> On Monday he ate... What did he eat on Monday?  <b>Lina:</b> Two <i>strawberries</i>.  <b>Alma:</b> Strawberry. Do you know when he ate that?  <b>Lina:</b> No.  <b>Alma:</b> I believe it was on Saturday.  <b>Lina:</b> A chocolate cake, an ice-cream, a <i>bagel</i> and this.  <b>Edit:</b> A pickle.  <b>Lina:</b> A pickle. A cheese. A sausage.  <b>Alma:</b> Wow, it's so good for him.  <b>Lina:</b> A <i>lolly-pop</i>.  <b>Alma:</b> What's a <i>lolly-pop</i> in Hungarian? "Nyalóka."  <b>Lina:</b> A lolly-pop. A smaller of this.  <b>Alma:</b> What's this?  <b>Edit:</b> A pie.  <b>Alma:</b> A cherry pie. Wow, the cherry pie is so delicious in the summer.  <b>Lina:</b> Do you want to bake this as well?  <b>Alma:</b> Yes, I usually bake that.  <b>Edit:</b> And this? How is that for him?  <b>Lina:</b> His sausage.  <b>Alma:</b> What else did he eat? Melon. What kind of melon is that?  <b>Lina:</b> <i>Muffin</i>.  <b>Alma:</b> <i>Muffin</i> and what comes after?  <b>Lina:</b> A <i>watermelon</i>.  <b>Alma:</b> What did he eat? Melon.  <b>Lina:</b> Melon.  <b>Alma:</b> Watermelon.  <b>Lina:</b> Then he was not hungry.</p>

Source: (Own elaboration)

Overall, teachers and students naturally moved between the English and Hungarian languages to teach and learn due to the numerous opportunities this immersion program offered to translanguage. Through the pedagogical translanguaging practices we discovered, teachers were not only able to familiarize Hungarian as a low-incidence heritage language and acquaint the Hungarian culture with the students, but also, they helped children to construct and constantly alter their socio-cultural identities and values during their conversations.

## **SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The authors' solution in dealing with the above-mentioned issues and problems is to familiarize teachers working in multilingual settings with pedagogical translanguaging strategies through professional developments, continued education in-service courses, conferences, and through discussion panels. More findings of future and current research are necessary from various multilingual settings, so educators can hear about it, learn about it, and eventually follow this new approach filtering in today's classrooms. It is every teacher's responsibility to support multilingual learners when they come across challenges, such as lexical or cultural gaps, to be flexible when using linguistic repertoires available to the learners, to foster collaboration, meaning making, and equity in language learning classrooms to provide the best access possible for all language learners. The authors have no doubt that teachers will rise to the challenges and responsibilities of the future and they expect a positive outcome of the new strategies implemented.

In addition, the authors recommend five goals for low-incidence heritage language schools dealing with students with diverse linguistic competence and previous experiences: 1) promote the strength and value of language(s) and linguistic diversity, 2) emphasize on human rights and respect for those who speak a different language than the mainstream, 3) accept alternative language choices for people, 4) stand by social justice and equality for all people, and 5) emphasize equal distribution of power and income among all languages in the classroom.

## **FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS**

Through translanguaging practices multilingual learners can face language gaps, show their linguistic creativity, their ability to play with language and break the linguistic conventional norms and rules accepted by homogeneous societies, and to select various features or codes from their language repertoire shaped by the knowledge of two or more languages and cultures to let language itself flourish to convey the most accurate meaning of the "here and now".

There are clearly a lot that should be done in the future, academically and in terms of advocacy to promote pedagogical translanguaging strategies, to ensure that there is a mutual understanding between the participants of certain conversations. There is more to be done with supporting bi-, and multilingual speakers of non-standard, non-privileged languages (e.g. Hungarian) and to make sure they often have a voice and they are always being heard. There is a long way to go in this direction of change, which will be only possible to happen if we leave traditional concepts and boundaries behind to develop new perspectives with the holistic understanding of the phenomena in question in mind.

## **CONCLUSION**

In this chapter, the authors have discussed the dynamics of heritage language and the status of heritage language schools in the United States, followed by listing some practical linguistic strategies how to bridge the possibly occurring language gaps in every day conversations. The authors further introduced the pedagogical translanguaging strategies Hungarian-English bilingual pedagogues selected to use in a linguistically diverse Hungarian-English immersion program in New York City to support language learners (Hungarian (L1) speakers learning English (L2), Hungarian-English fluent bilinguals, and

English (L1) speakers learning Hungarian (L2)) coming across language and cultural gaps due to lack of their lexical or cultural knowledge in linguistic contexts.

The authors showed several examples in this chapter how to bridge suddenly occurring language (lexical and culture) gaps during communication with some of the most commonly used linguistic strategies, such as, (1) adaptation, (2) lexical borrowing, (3) calque (loan translation), (4) compensation, (5) omission, (6) description, (7) equivalence, (8) explication, (9) generalization, (10) literal translation or word-to-word translation, (11) modulation, (12) particularization, (13) substitution, (14) transposition, and (15) variation.

The authors' theory of translanguaging posits that bi-, and multilingual learners possess a free will to choose elements from their language repertoires depending on the "here-and-now" when they communicate. The linguistic system that bi-, and multi-lingual speakers have differs person to person the same way as language learners' linguistic experiences and abilities to 'language' and 'linguaging' also differ person to person. The success of the communication between two individual depends partially on the choices that the language users make about what features of their language repertoire (shaped by one's own life experiences of where they have lived before and what languages they have come across prior to the given space and time of their communication) they want to include, partially on the language repertoire of the conversing peer and what features they wish to include as well in the communication based on the linguistic abilities of the language users', and on the given space and time in which the conversation takes place. In this sense, occurring discrepancies between different language users due to a division between the speakers different linguistic or cultural background is a natural phenomenon that any language user meets who engages in meaningful conversations.

Teachers have an exemplary and essential role in the translanguaging process in general and in heritage language schools, such as in the one we introduced in this chapter, to make an impact on our future generation of multilingual and multicultural citizens. They demonstrated that regardless their different belief and attitude towards heritage language preservation, language learning, and translanguaging, their effort to create a risk- and stress-free, safe environment in which they involve the heritage language, they strengthen the children's sense of their heritage, their cultural identity, their connectedness, and ultimately their sense of "being-in-the-world-together".

The analysis of the data revealed in this chapter that translanguaging has a strong pedagogical aspect that can scaffold learning, protect and develop proficiency in heritage languages, and help to construct cultural and social identities.

It is still necessary to research, develop, and spread pedagogical translanguaging strategies in multilingual educational settings around the world. We are just at the beginning of making changes in language practices to create more translanguaging spaces in various social contexts in the future. We need to stay optimistic and hope that more and more pedagogical translanguaging strategies will appear on the field.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. However, the research was supported by AraNY János Hungarian Kindergarten and School, New York.

## REFERENCES

- Baker, C. (1997). Language contact in the classroom. In W. Wölck & A. de Houwer (Eds.), *Recent studies in contact linguistics* (pp. 9–19). Bonn, Germany: Dümmler.
- Byram, M., Gribkova, B., & Starkey, H. (2002). *Developing the Intercultural Dimension in Language Teaching. A practical Introduction for Teachers*. Strasbourg: Language Policy Division, Council of Europe.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 401–417. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on Multilingualism: A Study of Trilingual Writing. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 356–369. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01206.x
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2015). *Multilingual Education. Between language learning and translanguaging*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(10), 901–912. doi:10.1080/01434632.2017.1284855
- Chumak-Horbatsch, R. (1999). Language change in the Ukrainian home: From transmission to maintenance to the beginning of loss. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 31(2), 61–76.
- Conteh, J. (2018). Translanguaging as pedagogy – a critical review. In A. Creese & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Superdiversity* (pp. 473–487). New York, NY: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315696010-33
- Conteh, J., & Brock, A. (2010). Safe Spaces? Sites of Bilingualism for Young Learners in Home, School and Community. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(3), 347–360. doi:10.1080/13670050.2010.486850
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185–209. doi:10.2307/3587717
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching. *Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x
- Csillik, E. (2019a, in press). Effective Practices for Meeting the Learning Needs of ‘Superdiverse’ Multi-Language Learners in Early Childhood Classrooms. *Acta Academiae Beregsasiensis*, 17(1), 23. Available at <http://kmf.uz.ua/kiadvanyaink/>
- Csillik, E. (2019b). Intercultural Challenges of Teaching in Multilingual/Multicultural Classrooms. In P. Romanowski & E. Bandura (Eds.), *Intercultural Foreign Language Teaching and Learning in Higher Education Contexts* (pp. 1–25). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-5225-8128-4.ch001
- Csillik, E., & Golubeva, I. (2019b, forthcoming). The current ‘state of the art’ in researching code-switching in multilingual classroom. In F. Palacios Hidalgo (Ed.), *Educación en Contextos Plurilingües: Metodología e Innovación / Education in Plurilingual Contexts: Methodology and Innovation* (pp. 167–178). Córdoba, Spain: UCOPress, Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Córdoba.

- Csillik, E., & Golubeva, I. (2019a, forthcoming). *Játék a szavakkal: Transzlengvális Nyelvi Gyakorlatok a New York-i Angol-Magyar Kétnyelvű Óvodáskorú Kisgyermek Csoportjában*. Academic Press.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking Monolingual Instructional Strategies in Multilingual Classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 221–240.
- Darwish, A. (2010). *Elements of Translation*. Melbourne, Australia: Writescope.
- Division of English Language Learners and Student Support. (n.d.). *English Language Learner Demographics Report for the 2016-17 School Year*. New York City Department of Education. Retrieved on May 25, 2019 from [https://infohub.nyced.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/2016-17-demographic-report-v10\\_remediated.pdf](https://infohub.nyced.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/2016-17-demographic-report-v10_remediated.pdf)
- Doerr, N. M., & Lee, K. (2009). Contesting heritage: Language, legitimacy, and schooling at a weekend Japanese-language school in the United States. *Language and Education*, 23(5), 425–441. doi:10.1080/09500780802651706
- Fishman, J. (1966a). *Language Loyalty in the United States: The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups*. Mouton.
- Fishman, J. (1966b). *Hungarian Language Maintenance in the United States*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Fishman, J. (1985a). *Ethnicity in Action: The Community Resources of Ethnic Language in the United States*. Binghamton, NY: Bilingual Press.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., Ibarra Johnson, S., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The Translanguaging Classroom. Leveraging Student Bilingualism for Learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon, Inc.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2018). *Educating Emergent Bilinguals. Policies, Programs, and practices for English Learners* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students. Learning from Classroom Moments*. New York, NY: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315695242
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging. Language, Bilingualism & Education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Golubeva, I., & Csillik, E. (2018). Translanguaging Practices in a Hungarian-English Early Childhood Classroom. In E. M. Gómez Parra & C. A. Huertas-Abril (Eds.), *Early Childhood Education from an Intercultural and Bilingual Perspective* (pp. 96–116). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-5225-5167-6.ch007
- Gort, M. (2018). *The Complex and Dynamic Language Practices of Emergent Bilinguals*. New York, NY: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315180052



- Grosjean, F. (1985). The Bilingual as a Competent but Specific Speaker-Hearer. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6(6), 467–477. doi:10.1080/01434632.1985.9994221
- Hickey, T. (2001). Mixing Beginners and Native Speakers in Minority Language Immersion: Who is Immersing Whom? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 443–474. doi:10.3138/cmlr.57.3.443
- House, J. (2009). *Translation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Janssen, M. (2004). Multilingual lexical databases, lexical gaps, and simullda. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 17(2), 137–154. doi:10.1093/ijl/17.2.137
- Jones, G. E. (1991). Aspects of the linguistic competence of Welsh immersion program pupils. In K. Herberts & C. Lauren (Eds.), *Flersprakighet i och utanför Norden/Multilingualism in the Nordic Countries and Beyond* (pp. 202–212). Åbo, Finland: Åbo Akademi.
- Jorgensen, J. N. (2005). Plurilingual Conversations among Bilingual Adolescents. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(3), 391–402. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2004.10.009
- Kang, R. H. (2009). Multicultural Education in Early Childhood: Teacher's attitudes. *Korean Journal of Infant Mental Health*, 2(2), 47–57.
- Katan, D. (2012). *Translating Cultures. An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. Brooklands, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Kramsch, C. (2006). Culture in language teaching. In H. L. Anderson, K. Land, & K. Risager (Eds.), *Culture in language learning* (pp. 11–25). Aarhus University Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctv62hgw3.4
- Lewis, G. W., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012a). Translanguaging: Origins and Development from School to Street and Beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice*, 18(7), 641–654. doi:10.1080/13803611.2012.718488
- Lewis, G. W., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012a). Translanguaging: Developing its Conceptualisation and Contextualization. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice*, 18(7), 655–670. doi:10.1080/13803611.2012.718490
- Li, W. (2011). Multilinguality, Multimodality and Multicompetence: Code- and Mode-Switching by Minority Ethnic Children in Complementary Schools. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 370–384. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01209.x
- Liddicoat, A. J., Papademetre, L., Scarino, A. & Kohler, M. (2003). *Report on intercultural language learning*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Llurda, E., Cots, J. M., & Armengol, L. (2013). Expanding Language Borders in a Bilingual Institution Aiming at Trilingualism. In H. Haberland, D. Lonsman, & B. Preisler (Eds.), *Language Alternation, Language Choice, and Language Encounter in International Tertiary Education* (pp. 203–222). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-6476-7\_10
- Lowman. (2007). First Language Literacy Skill Transfer in a Second Language Learning Environment: Strategies for Biliteracy. *SET*, 2, 24–28.
- Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing translation studies*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Nesteruk, O. (2010). Heritage language maintenance and loss among the children of Eastern European immigrants in the USA. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 31(3), 271–286. doi:10.1080/01434630903582722

Nieto, S. (2010). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Rabidge, M. (2019). *Translanguaging in EFL Contexts. A Call for Change*. New York, NY: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780429439346

Shabanirad, F. (2011). Strategies used in translation of cultural words in literary text. *Translation Studies*, 9(36), 113–128.

Shaules, J. (2007). *Deep Culture*. In *The Hidden Challenges of Global Living. Languages for Intercultural Communication and Education: 16*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters. doi:10.21832/9781847690180

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, English Language Learners in Public Schools. (n.d.). *Digest of Education Statistics 2018, Table 204.27: English language learner (ELL) students enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools, by home language, grade, and selected student characteristics: Selected years, 2008-09 through fall 2016*. Retrieved on May 25, 2019 from [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18\\_204.27.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_204.27.asp)

Wei, Y. (2005). Integrating Chinese culture with TEFL in Chinese classroom. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 2(7), 55–58.

Wong Fillmore, L. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 6(3), 323–346. doi:10.1016/S0885-2006(05)80059-6

## **ADDITIONAL READING**

Agustín Llach, M. P. (2010). Lexical gap-filling mechanisms in foreign language writing. *System*, 38(4), 529–538. doi:10.1016/j.system.2010.09.009

Fairclough, M., & Beaudrie, S. M. (2016). *Innovative Strategies for Heritage Language Teaching. A Practical Guide for the Classroom*. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Fu, D., Hadjioannou, X., & Zhou, X. (2019). *Translanguaging for Emergent Bilinguals. Inclusive Teaching in the Linguistically Diverse Classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

García, O., Zakharia, Z., & Otcu, B. (2013). *Bilingual Community Education and Multilingualism. Beyond Heritage Languages in the Global City*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Gay, G. (2016). *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2007). *Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Montrul, S. (2016). *The Acquisition of Heritage Languages*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139030502

Velázquez, I. (2019). *Household Perspectives on Minority Language Maintenance and Loss. Language in the Small Spaces*. Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Multilingual Matters.

## KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

**Bilingual/Two-Way Immersion Program:** A language learning program, popular in the United States of America, where two languages are used for classroom instruction where L1 is the students' first language and L2 is the students' second language or the target language to be acquired through peer/teacher interaction while integrating both students of the minority language and students from the majority language in the same classroom. The ultimate goal of this program is to reach academic excellence and create successful bilingual/bicultural language speakers.

**Code-Switching:** The practice of alternating or switching between two or more languages in a given communication for various reasons (e.g., missing word in one language, better fitting word in another language, strong cultural attachment, time saving to use shorter word[s], sounding fancier, leaving others out of the conversation, etc.), between interlocutors who belong to the same bilingual culture.

**Heritage Language:** A low- or high-incidence language spoken by an ethnic group in a given population of a social context regardless that this heritage language might be a dominant language of another given population in another social context.

**Language Gap:** A communication gap found in bilingual immersion programs where L1 monolingual and L2 monolingual speakers lack an understanding of each other due to a deficit in shared vocabulary or a difference in their intercultural understanding.

**Mainstream/Dominant Language:** The dominant language spoken by the majority of the population in a given population of a social context.

**Multilingual Education:** The use of two or more languages for learning and teaching in an educational setting to develop content area knowledge and literacy skills in two or more languages.

**Pedagogical Translanguaging Strategies:** A set of language teaching strategies in multilingual classrooms where all language repertoires are presented in order to promote multiple language development and learning simultaneously.

**Translanguaging:** The act of using different languages interchangeably, in order to overcome language constraints, to deliver verbal utterances or written statements effectively, and, to ultimately achieve successful communication.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> See U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, EDFacts file 141, Data Group 678, extracted October 18, 2018; and Common Core of Data (CCD), "State Nonfis-

cal Survey of Public Elementary and Secondary Education,” 2016–17. See Digest of Education Statistics 2018, table 204.27. Retrieved on May 25, 2019 from [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18\\_204.27.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_204.27.asp).

<sup>2</sup> See Division of English Language Learners and Student Support, English Language Learner Demographics Report for the 2016-17 School Year, New York City Department of Education. Retrieved on May 25, 2019 from [https://infohub.nyced.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/2016-17-demographic-report-v10\\_remediated.pdf](https://infohub.nyced.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/2016-17-demographic-report-v10_remediated.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> The authors understand that bilinguals are speakers of two languages exclusively and that multilinguals are speakers of two or more languages. Multilingualism is a broader term for those who speak more than two languages without specifying exactly how many languages are spoken by the speaker. Therefore, in this sense, the authors understand that bilingualism is part of multilingualism, however, due to the research the authors carried out in a bilingual classroom, the authors will be using the term “bilingualism” and “multilingualism” respectfully but not interchangeably.

<sup>4</sup> See more about the structure and context of this heritage language school in Golubeva & Csillik, 2018.

<sup>5</sup> It is important to note that for those who did not speak Hungarian from their birth it is very difficult to make difference between [í] and [é] sounds.