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Abstract: This paper reports on a phenomenological study that examined Hungarian American parents’ perceptions and practices related to translanguaging—a systematic scaffolding strategy that utilizes multiple linguistic repertoires to facilitate competence and performance in two or more language—in family communication. We used semistructured interviews with questions related to language use, parents’ reactions to translanguaging, and their perceptions of why and how translanguaging occurs in oral and written family communications. The participants included twelve Hungarian American families with adolescent children who used the Hungarian language in family communication. The findings indicated that most families found translanguaging natural and positive, and these families used supportive and constructive behaviors when translanguaging happened. A few parents rejected the practice of translanguaging when the communication took place in Hungarian, which indicated monoglossic language ideologies. These divergent views of family language policy were often explained by the familial, social, and cultural contexts of the families. Because parents are the main stakeholders in language maintenance, their perspectives and practices are essential. This paper contributes to our understanding of family language policies regarding translanguaging and offer recommendations for a minority language community, the Hungarian American immigrant community, for which translanguaging is not well researched. jszilagy@brockport.edu
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To address language shift and language loss among minority language groups, researchers have examined the process of heritage language maintenance. Studies that documented parents’ quest to preserve the minority language have indicated several reasons why parents would want their children to acquire the heritage language (Liang and Shin 2021; Sok and Schwarz 2021: 6–8;
Valdés et al. 2008). These reasons include communicating with family members who speak the heritage language; developing an ethnocultural identity; becoming able to study or work in the heritage language; having professional and personal opportunities; and, maintaining emotional ties with parents who feel more comfortable and authentic when speaking the heritage language (Authors 2020; Valdés 2017). Although such goals seem to be common regardless of parents’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds, parents have used a wide variety of strategies and practices that facilitate heritage language maintenance. Such strategies include the consistent use of the heritage language; attending heritage language schools or community groups (e.g., scout groups); traveling to the home country; reading books in the heritage language; watching TV programs in the heritage language; and, using media technologies such as Skype or Facebook (Curdt-Christiansen and Lanza 2018; Kang 2015; Schwartz 2020). Although a wide variety of strategies exist, their effectiveness is still under examination.

Parents’ perspectives on the consistent use of the heritage language in family communication vary. Some parents believe that the heritage language can be developed and maintained only with strict language policing to exclusively use the heritage language at home (Authors 2020; Barron-Hauwaert 2004; Pintz 2011b). Such relatively firm use of the heritage language has been reinforced by views and theories of language immersion as an effective language learning strategy (Oliver & Azkarai, 2017). With good intentions, parents want to expand their children’s exposure to the heritage language; therefore, they often require and enforce its exclusive use. However, other parents may have concerns about enforcing an heritage language-only policy at home for different reasons, such as avoiding pressure and stress (Hashimoto and Lee 2011: 178–180; Liang 2018: pp. 73–76). This divide between the one-parent-one-language approach and other more flexible language practices represents the current debate among linguists and teachers about effectively contributing to emergent bilingual children’s language development. One-parent-one-language was popular twenty to thirty years ago, especially among families with young children who had not been exposed to the majority language before entering school. It is important to note that there is little evidence for the effectiveness of one-parent-one-language for school-age and adolescent children, for whom the language of school becomes a dominant component of their linguistic repertoire (Montrul 2010; Wilson 2021: pp. 69–72). To enrich communication, Garcia and Li (2014) proposed a more flexible language approach by embracing the use of both the majority language and the heritage language. Such flexible language use is aligned with translanguaging (Garcia and Li 2014), which is a systematic scaffolding strategy that utilizes multiple linguistic repertoires to facilitate competence and performance in two or more languages. Because parents are the main contributors to their children’s language development in the heritage language (Authors 2020; Liang 2018; Guardado 2018), it is meaningful and important to understand the beliefs, approaches, and strategies parents implement to foster young adolescents’ language performance in the heritage language.

The purpose of our study is to explore family language policy with a focus on translanguaging through the lens of Hungarian American parents. Although more than 1.3 million people living
in the United States self-identify as Hungarian or as having Hungarian ancestry (United States Census Bureau 2017), only 6.6% of this group indicate that the Hungarian language is spoken in their home. Most of these people are fluent in both English and Hungarian, and only 7.3% note that they do not speak English well (United Stated Census Bureau 2013).

Studies on the Hungarian diaspora in the US have indicated changes in the characteristics of immigrants during the past thirty years. Most recent immigrants from Hungary tend to be professionals with higher education degrees, and many of them live geographically isolated from other Hungarian families (Pintz 2011a: 266–268). In Australia, Hatoss (2004, 2018a, 2018b, 2020) documented the diversity of the Hungarian language community, which impacted their ideologies about languages and family language policies. Because of the existence of such diverse, dynamic, and often individual and intergenerational language practices in Australia, it can be assumed that the US is similar in this respect. Because of the changing demographic makeup of recent Hungarian American immigrants, it is important to investigate current immigrants’ family language policies (Spolsky 2004) with a focus on translanguaging.

Research on Hungarian immigrants in the US has explored diverse facets of the immigrant experience. For example, researchers have documented the cultural, political, and educational efforts of Hungarian diaspora communities in the US (Kovács 2018; Ludányi 2014; Niessen 2013; Palotai et al. 2019; Pintz 2011a). In addition, scholars examined the Hungarian language as a heritage language (Bartha 1995; Fenyvesi 1995, 2005; Hoot 2019; Kovács 2009), and also explored language use patterns and parents’ practices and perceptions related to Hungarian language maintenance (Authors 2012, 2020; Bolonyai 1998; Fenyvesi 1995; Kontra and Nehler 1981; Kovács 2009, 2011; Pintz 2011b; Polgar 2001). Although literature on Hungarian language maintenance in the US exists, we were not able to find studies that examine Hungarian American families’ language policies and practices with a focus on translanguaging. Therefore, in this paper, we explored Hungarian American parents’ perceptions of language use in family communications, and their views about language strategies related to translanguaging, to understand how Hungarian American adolescents and their parents use two or more languages to support multilingual youth’s linguistic development. We used the concept of translanguaging as a process of meaning-making in which speakers draw upon various linguistic and cognitive resources. While code-switching is an alternation between languages in certain communicative scenarios, translanguaging, as Wei (2011) noted, “creates a social space for the multilingual language user by bringing together different dimensions of their personal history, experience and environment, their attitude, belief and ideology, their cognitive and physical capacity into one coordinated and meaningful performance and making it into a lived experience” (Wei 2011: 1223).

**Literature Review with Theoretical Framework**

In this study, we used Spolsky’s family language policy theory (2004), and the concept of translanguaging (Garcia and Wei 2014) to inform our theoretical lens. Family language policy is
Translanguaging was first proposed for school settings as an optimal way for bilingual teachers to tap into emergent bilingual children’s full linguistic repertoires to develop their bilingual skills (Garcia and Li 2014). Studies and scholarly reports have widely examined the practices of translanguaging in the classroom, and its effects on students’ bilingual skills and academic performance (Lee and Garcia 2020; Daniel and Pacheco 2015; Noguerón-Liu 2020). For example, Golubeva and Csillik (2018) examined student- and teacher-led translanguaging practices in a Hungarian school in New York City, pointing out that teachers’ intentional creation of translanguaging spaces supports comprehension in the classroom.

Recently, the space for translanguaging has expanded beyond the walls of regular classrooms to include community centers, after-school programs, and families (Kim et al. 2021: 294–299) conceptualized it as community translanguaging, with a focus on the collaborative nature of translanguaging and the changing notion of communities in which individuals communicate. For example, Abraham et al. (2021) reported on an initiative in which a community literacy program encouraged bilingual Latinx children to become writers by creating a translanguaging space in which both the heritage language and English were encouraged. In these activities, they found that children moved fluidly between languages and identities. Other studies have also documented successful attempts to include parents and the heritage language through translanguaging in literacy activities in community-based projects and offered suggestions for creating such spaces (Kim et al. 2021; Kim and Song 2019).
Researchers further expanded the translanguaging space by examining family language policies and language practices, focusing on the extent and purposes of languages in family communications. These studies have been conducted over the past ten years; therefore, they provided insight into the most current family language policies and practices in the US and in other countries. Because families’ language policies and practices are affected by the micro and macro contexts of the minority language and the minority group, including historical, social, and cultural specifics of the contexts (Curdt-Christiansen 2009: 352–356), it is meaningful to consider the participants’ ethnic, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds. The literature on translanguaging in families offers insights into family language policy in Korean, Chinese, Russian families in different countries; however, no studies were found on translanguaging in Hungarian American families.

Studies that have examined Korean American families’ practices regarding translanguaging show an overall flexible and strategically selected language use for creating and negotiating meaning (Song 2016: 94–100). According to Kwon (2019), young immigrant Korean American children and their families used translanguaging for meaning-making during museum visits, which allowed “further discovering the specifics of their language and literacy practices” (Kwon 2019: 13). Similarly, Kim (2018) found that a thirteen-year-old Korean American youth used all her linguistic repertoire through expanding her translanguaging scope in multimodal communications with diverse audiences, to achieve effective discourse that also impacted her bicultural and bilingual identity. In addition, Korean families in the US on short-term stays, for whom both the Korean language maintenance and the acquisition of English was essential, used translanguaging in family communications when it was substantiated by the context, topic, or desired goal (Lee et al. 2021: 6–12). Furthermore, Song (2019) emphasized how cultural and ideological factors related to the Korean language and culture, and the English language seemed to influence language choice in Korean youth and family communication. Similarly, Chinese immigrant families with young children also used translanguaging in family literacy practices. As Yang et al. (2021) argued, a mother and two young children utilized translanguaging during shared book reading with specific goals, such as providing a bridge to comprehension, or a window to imagination. In addition, a case study on a Chinese-Portuguese family in London gave insights into young children’s emergent translanguaging practices via the online WeChat platform, where young boys used transmodal (image-based semiotic resources) and translinguistic repertoire to negotiate complex interactions (Zhao and Flewitt 2020).

An examination of Russian-speaking families in Cyprus, Estonia, and Sweden showed that most parents frequently chose the one-parent-one-language approach; however, some families opted for the more flexible use of both languages, which, according to Karpava et al. (2019), can support and foster bilingualism. In a more recent study, although Karpava et al. (2021) acknowledged the benefits of translanguaging, highlighting the impact on language attitudes of the sociolinguistic situation of the new country. They also noted, “parents should also be aware of the fact that a language shift can happen more quickly than they expect, and thus it is
important for parents to provide numerous opportunities for practicing Russian as the L1” (Karpava et al. 2021: 951). Ultimately, in this study Karpava et al. (2021) suggest the separation of languages in early childhood. This ambivalent approach was present in parents’ beliefs about translanguaging and their practices in a large sample mixed methods study by Wilson (2020). Although most parents supported translanguaging and the flexible use of languages, case studies revealed relatively strict language separation and some dilemmas for the parents. Wilson (2020) suggested further investigation of the emotional impact of parents’ language practices on both parents and children.

This review of literature indicates a gap in research on Hungarian American families’ family language policy with a focus on translanguaging. It is important to examine a specific cultural-ethnic group, such as recent Hungarian immigrants in the US, separately from others, because their family language policy has been impacted by the micro- and macro context of the minority culture (Curdt-Christiansen 2009: 372). In addition, our study offers a unique insight into adolescents’ language practices through their parents’ perspectives. Therefore, the following research questions, which were guided by the theoretical framework of translanguaging (Garcia and Wei 2014) and family language policy (Spolsky 2004), as discussed above, were pursued in this study:

What is the Hungarian American parents’ family language policy regarding translanguaging?
1. What are parents’ beliefs related to translanguaging in the family?
2. What are parents’ perceptions of the reasons for the translanguaging patterns of their children?
3. What are parents’ reactions to translanguaging in family communication?

**Methods**

**Research Design**

We used the qualitative phenomenology approach (Moustakas 1994) to explore Hungarian American parents’ perceptions and language practices related to translanguaging. The phenomenological approach is an appropriate research methodology, because we were interested in the lived experiences of families related to everyday language practices. This approach is useful in understanding the meaning individuals make of their experiences (Denzin and Lincoln 2005; Merriam 2016). This approach allows the researcher to carry on an in-depth exploration of phenomena that were rooted in the perspectives and the experiences of the participants (Neuman 2000). Therefore, to understand the families’ experiences with translanguaging, including language use and management, we developed an in-depth, semi-structured interview protocol with open-ended questions.

**Participants and Sampling**

We used purposeful snowball sampling to recruit participants for our study. Upon Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, we contacted the participants of a previous study (Authors 2020)
who had indicated interest in future studies. We invited them to participate and asked them to forward our invitation email to families they thought might be interested. We had several criteria for inclusion in our study: (1) the family has a child who is 12–17 years old with at least a low intermediate level of Hungarian language proficiency; (2) the Hungarian language is used for family communication at least to some extent; and (3) the family has been living in the US for at least two years either as long-term residents or US citizens. We specifically targeted families with adolescent children, because although many studies have focused on young children’s language development (Danjo 2021; Lee and Garcia 2020; Zhao and Flewitt 2020), very few studies have focused on the later stage of language development. In addition, we wanted to focus on the developmental period of early and late adolescence, when children experience numerous contexts (school, friends, hobbies) in which the English language often becomes dominant, and the status and level of the heritage language significantly decreases.

A total of twelve families participated in our study. In a qualitative study, this number of participants is satisfactory, because the purpose is to gain an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon of translanguaging rather than to have generalizable findings. The names and identifying characteristics of the participants were removed from the data, and each participant was assigned a code to ensure confidentiality. In the interviews, nine families were represented by the mother, one family by the father, and two families by both parents. However, this imbalance was acceptable, because we were not interested in examining gender-based differences in the data. The average age of the participating parents was forty-seven. Their educational background was relatively high, with all parents having a college degree, most of them at the graduate level. All families but Family 11 have lived in the US for more than ten years. Table 1 details the demographics of the twelve families.

Table 1. Demographics of participants and their families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Hungarian proficiency of parent</th>
<th>Child (age)</th>
<th>Child’s country of birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family 1</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>fluent speaker</td>
<td>Daughters (12 and 10)</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>native speaker</td>
<td>Sons (7 and 5)</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 2</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>native speaker</td>
<td>Son (16)</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>native speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 3</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>native speaker</td>
<td>Son (17)</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>native speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 4</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>native speaker</td>
<td>Daughter (12)</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>native speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 5</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>native speaker</td>
<td>Sons (14 and 12)</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>not proficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 6</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>native speaker</td>
<td>Daughter (9)</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sons (13 and 10)</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 7</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>native speaker</td>
<td>Sons (14 and 8)</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>native speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection and Data Analysis

Data for our study included a survey that collected demographic information, interviews, and language samples provided by the families. Families interested in our study first completed the informed consent form. Then we sent a link to the demographic survey, which they completed before the interviews. The interviews were conducted from October through December 2021. We used individual, semistructured interviews that included twenty to twenty-five open-ended inductive questions to receive pertinent information regarding parents’ perceptions of translanguaging. All interviews occurred on Zoom, and they lasted no longer than one hour each. The interviews were audiotaped, and the researchers took field notes. The participants could select the language of the interview, as they felt comfortable. Five interviews were conducted in English, seven in Hungarian. We offered this option so participants would use the language in which they could give more detailed answers. At the end of the interviews, we asked parents to send us any additional written or oral language samples for translanguaging if they recalled or observed any more. A month after the interviews, we sent a reminder email with this request, and four parents provided written samples for translanguaging.

All audio recordings of the interviews were transcribed verbatim for data analysis. Because we are bilingual in Hungarian and English, we did not translate the interviews, but used the transcripts in the original language. We each completed a chart using the interview responses as they related to the research questions. This process assisted us in creating coding categories such as beliefs and views, reasons, and strategies/reactions. In addition, we were able to determine the interconnectedness of these in the data (Denzin and Lincoln 2005). To ensure trustworthiness, the researchers addressed the issues of credibility and transferability (Creswell and Poth 2018). Utilizing multiple data sources—including face-to-face interviews, field notes, and in-depth analysis techniques—was vital. In this way, the data sources were centered on the participants’ sharing of their own stories and using their own voices, which is an essential component to understanding their lived experiences. To address transferability, the researchers provided rich, thick descriptions of the participants and their experiences to indicate the context in which the findings could be applicable.
Findings

The analysis of the data related to translanguaging in family communication resulted in three themes: (1) parents’ beliefs about language use related to translanguaging; (2) parents’ perceptions on reasons for translanguaging; and, (3) parents’ reactions to translanguaging. These three themes are aligned with Spolsky’s family language policy theory (2004), specifically language ideology, practice, and management regarding the use of two languages in the families.

1. Parents’ beliefs about language use related to translanguaging

Expressing their beliefs about the use of languages in the family, participating parents represented two different viewpoints. Parents in five families (Families 1, 4, 5, 10, and 11) supported the “Hungarian only” approach for family communication, while the remaining families indicated their acceptance of translanguaging.

Hungarian Only: No Translanguaging

Parents in five families claimed that family communication must be carried out in Hungarian only to achieve the goal of children maintaining proficiency in Hungarian. They felt that using Hungarian exclusively, without any English in family communications, would ensure the children’s high proficiency in Hungarian and their identity as Hungarians. The in-depth analysis of the interviews with these families indicated different reasons for this language rule and for the rejection of translanguaging. For example, in Family 4, the father was born in the Hungarian diaspora in Romania, and he felt that only the consistent use of Hungarian can guarantee the preservation of a minority language. He recalled his experiences as a child in Transylvania, where the use of the “tiszta magyar nyelv” [pure Hungarian language] was considered the most important way to preserve their Hungarian heritage in the dominant Romanian culture. In Family 11, the Hungarian-only approach was explained by the mother’s lack of strong English skills and the family’s relatively recent immigration to the US. Finally, because Family 10 plans to relocate to Hungary in the future, the father insisted on the one-language approach, rejecting translanguaging at home, to prepare the children for Hungarian schools. According to these parents, translanguaging was either completely rejected, or, as the father in Family 11 noted, “not desirable.” Although the familial, social, and cultural contexts that probably impacted their language ideology were different, each of the parents in these families expected native speaker–like Hungarian proficiency from their children. They shared the view that using the Hungarian-only approach will ensure the achievement of this goal.

Translanguaging is Accepted

Parents in eight families found the use of both languages acceptable, and even necessary and beneficial for effective communication at home. For example, one mother (Family 8) separated two different goals that determine her language ideology, and said, “If our goal is improving their Hungarian, switching between two languages is not a good thing. If our goal is to
communicate, I do not think switching is a problem.” In addition, these participants also had different reasons for their beliefs regarding translanguaging. In linguistically mixed households, translanguaging is a “normal part of the bilingual reality,” as the mother in Family 8 noted. A single mother (Family 6) felt that she was able to maintain the Hungarian language in everyday conversations and evening prayers, but all other conversations, including those had in the context of homeschooling, needed to be done in English. Similarly, the mother in Family 2 found it acceptable to switch to English for a few sentences in everyday Hungarian conversations to discuss complex ideas or events at school. Likewise, the mother in Family 7 stated, “General things around the house, chores, behavior, general conversations are always going to be in Hungarian. If they become a little bit more complex, a little bit more complicated, we switch to English.” These parents felt that switching to English made communication in certain contexts possible and often richer, because children are allowed to use the linguistic background to allow them to carry on a conversation in the specific context. Ultimately parents who embraced translanguaging seemed to focus on the flow of the communication rather than focusing on the use of Hungarian only.

2. Parents’ perception on reasons for translanguaging

Although parents represented two different ideologies regarding translanguaging, some rejecting it and others accepting it, all parents shared examples of translanguaging happening in the family and discussed their perceived reasons for translanguaging. The occurrence of translanguaging in all families indicated that even with a strong intention to exclude English in Hungarian communication, families were not able to maintain a completely monoglossic context.

Lack of vocabulary or language structure

Most parents claimed that translanguaging happened when the child was unfamiliar with a word, expression, or language structure in their Hungarian utterance, and instead of remaining silent, the child infused English words or completely switched to English. Sometimes this happened in everyday conversations, such as “add ide a pear-tő” [give me the pear] (Family 6), because the child could not recall the Hungarian word for pear. The mother in Family 8 mentioned that her daughter will switch to English when she is stumped by a word and will continue in English after that. “I remember my daughter was talking about her day in school, she was saying something in Hungarian, ‘És akkor ebédeltünk a többiekkel, és’ [‘And then we were having lunch with the others, and’], she did not know how to say ‘recess’ in Hungarian, and then she changed to English: ‘after lunch we go to recess.’”

Most examples indicated that when children switched to English due to lack of Hungarian vocabulary, they continued to use the grammatical structure and feature of the Hungarian language and added Hungarian suffixes to the English word, such as “Scootingölj odébb” ['scotch over'] and “A soloist-ek olyan bénák” ['The soloists are so clumsy'] (Family 10). Several examples showed the lack of vocabulary in school-related academic conversations, such
as “Any! Ma a pea és a nyál DNS-t izoláltuk kémiaórán” ['Mom! Today in chemistry class we isolated DNA from peas and saliva'] (Family 1). The mother in Family 9 also noted that this kind of word switching happened “especially when it’s a word related to technology or school.” In addition, while discussing high school social studies assignments in Hungarian, the mother in Family 2 specifically used terms in English, such as “constitution,” because she knew her son was unfamiliar with the word alkotmány (constitution). Because her son had a good understanding of the word “constitution,” she felt this way he was able to access his background knowledge, although all other explanations and discussions of the English-language assignment were done in Hungarian.

Translanguaging can also happen during conversations in English. The mother in Family 12 shared an example of her son, who, when asking his brother a question in English, substituted Hungarian words: “Mom is asking if you want to take gyömbér szörp [ginger syrup] in your water bottle to school.” She explained that she and her sons regularly brew ginger syrup at home. Although her sons always speak in English with each other, they learned to express the ginger brew prepared at home in Hungarian, as it comes up in the home context in Hungarian, not in English. Therefore, the son substituted what he knew well in Hungarian in his English sentence. Similarly, the mother in Family 7 noted:

My son was with friends, American friends, and could not remember the word for papucs [slippers]. So, he kept saying papucs [slippers], and his friends didn’t know what that was. He knew the word was slippers, but for some reason it just wouldn’t come … and it drove home how certain words and certain items, if we never said them in English to him, he really never had the reason to learn [them].

These examples indicate that the speakers relied on the linguistic background that offered a more fluent response in the conversation to avoid silence or a break in communication.

**Meaning-making with elaboration**

All participants, regardless of their language ideologies being monoglossic or translingual, claimed that translanguaging happens for meaning-making, elaboration, and clarification of complex ideas and concepts. Both in everyday conversations and discussions over homework and academic topics, translanguaging was found to be essential for ensuring correct meaning. For example, the mother in Family 8 described a joint reading experience: “She [her daughter] didn’t understand the story. The older one tried to explain it in Hungarian, [and] she still didn’t get it, so I stepped in, and I summarized it in English.” In addition, translanguaging also happened when parents and/or children wanted to make sure that there was no misunderstanding about important messages. For example, if a text message was very important, the mother in Family 2 would write in English, although she usually texted her son in Hungarian. Furthermore, the father in Family 4, who was very insistent on his daughter not using English, mentioned that his daughter will switch to English with her Hungarian scout friends only when she is unsure about her friends’ Hungarian proficiency and wants to ensure comprehension. Similarly, this is
how the mother in Family 7 explained the importance of the audience in her son’s use of translanguaging: “Those who speak Hungarian will understand what he’s trying to say if he gets to mix it and … it’s much easier to understand somebody if they can just do it smoothly than for them to stop and think about what they’re saying in a language, so just translanguaging makes it easy.”

During homework assistance, translanguaging was common, and happened for different reasons. Sometimes parents felt more comfortable and skilled to explain concepts in Hungarian (e.g., Family 11), while other parents switched to English from Hungarian conversation. The mother in Family 8 explained that during homework they switched to English because “I think it’s just an unnecessary extra step to do it in Hungarian and then in their head translate it back to English and then write it down.” Similarly, the mother in Family 9 explained that when her daughter asks for help preparing for a test, “I am the one saying, ‘Just do it in English, you’ll have the test in English, let’s keep the conversation in English’ … because we want to focus on the results.”

Several examples from Families 2, 10, 11, and 12 showed the following process for translanguaging while completing homework: first, they read the text or math problem in English; then, they discussed it in Hungarian, clarifying and elaborating on new concepts. Finally, the child completed the written section in English; e.g., a word problem or a short essay. Usually, the parents provided scaffolding and explanation in Hungarian while tackling the English homework. The mother in Family 7 even noticed that the older her children grew, the more they used translanguaging to express complex thoughts, because their thinking became more multifaceted and intricate. Overall, they all agreed that translanguaging was vital for meaning-making and flawless comprehension.

**Emotional-affective relatedness**

Several parents discussed emotion-related reasons for translanguaging and shared some examples. Some mentioned that switching to another language allowed them to have a “secret language.” For example, one mother (Family 6), who had separated from her American husband, noticed that the children often switched to Hungarian when calling her from the father’s house to keep the dialogue confidential. To explain the value of a shared language, one mother (Family 8) stated, “As soon as the language has a use, like a special use, it becomes treasured, I guess.” On the other hand, translanguaging frequently happened to include those who are unable to speak Hungarian. In addition, some mothers argued that they were more flexible with language use and accepted translanguating because they did not want their children to stop speaking to them or to be frustrated due to an inability to express their thoughts in Hungarian. These mothers noted that to maintain their close relationships with their teenagers sometimes they needed to switch to English to maintain the flow of the conversation.

At the same time, parents also noticed that their children utilized translanguaging for pleasing someone or achieving something. Both mothers in Families 6 and 12 mentioned that their
children make attempts to text them in Hungarian “to make me happy.” Often the underlying reason for switching to Hungarian is to achieve something, like asking to go out for dinner or to avoid the consequences for a bad grade or for forgetting to do something. One Mother (Family 7) had to encourage her son to switch to English instead of staying silent; because the son thought that if he spoke in English, it would have upset his mom. According to some parents, their children were proud of being bilingual. Therefore, even when speaking in English to a friend, they switched to Hungarian when turning to their mother to impress their friends.

Some parents noticed that certain emotional situations would result in translanguaging. For example, the mother in Family 7 noted, “My older one will often switch to Hungarian if he is like totally annoyed by his little brother.” Alternatively, one parent (Family 8) noticed that her daughter will switch to English when she is excited “and wants to say something fast, quickly, she says it in English rather than figuring it out in Hungarian. Because she must think more in Hungarian” Overall, parents concluded that children switch to another language to try to influence others’ emotions or to respond to their own emotions, recognizing the connection between languages and emotions. In addition, these examples showed that children strategically use both languages for filling gaps in communication and for responding to emotional and affective states of mind.

3. Parental reactions to translanguaging

Although all participants acknowledged that translanguaging happened in family communications, two distinctively different reaction patterns to translanguaging surfaced from parents’ discourses. These reactions and strategies for language use, which Spolsky (2004) referred to as language management, seemed to be aligned with their language ideology. Parents in four families (Families 1, 4, 5 and 10) completely excluded the English language in Hungarian communication. On the other hand, parents in the remaining families utilized a relaxed and flexible approach, which allowed and encouraged the use of both Hungarian and English as the situation required.

Complete exclusion of the English language

Parents who firmly believed that the exclusive use of one language benefitted children’s Hungarian proficiency discussed the following strategies to maintain Hungarian as the language of the conversation: firmly correcting children’s utterances without translation into English and using expressions like “Nem értem, mondjad magyarul” [‘I don’t understand, say it in Hungarian’] (Family 1). As the father in Family 4 mentioned, when his daughter stayed silent because of the lack of Hungarian expressions and words, he pushed her and encouraged her, without switching to English. A scout leader, he immersed his daughter in Hungarian literature and used only Hungarian explanations when trying to explain the meaning of poems by Sándor Petőfi, a famous Hungarian poet. Similarly, the mother in Family 5 noted, “I did not accept him [her son] speaking any English to me. I just told him, ‘If you want me to understand you, you are
going to speak Hungarian”. She reinforced her language management while expressing her ideology, saying, “We don’t like to mix languages, we really like to keep English, English; and Hungarian, Hungarian.”

**Relaxed and flexible approach to using both languages**

Many parents (Families 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12) described their reactions to translanguaging through examples that showed a relaxed and flexible approach to events when children switched to English. In most cases, the family’s specific microcontext explained their language management strategies for keeping both languages in family communications, including: (1) mixed-language households where the father did not speak Hungarian (Family 12) and, (2) living in a linguistically diverse neighborhood (Family 8). When translanguaging happened, some parents listened and gently reminded the child, “Így is lehet mondani” [‘You can say it this way as well’] modeling the correct use of the Hungarian language (Family 2). Further, the mother in Family 6 said that she wanted her children to use Hungarian with joy: “Azt akarom, hogy szívből csinálják, ezért nem javítgatom őket” [‘I want them to use Hungarian from the heart; therefore, I do not correct them directly’]. In addition, mother (Family 7) recalled her experiences growing up in the US and feeling ashamed when using the Hungarian language incorrectly. Therefore she applied a different approach. She noted:

Growing up as a child I was always admonished for mixing the languages. So, I would really try to stick to a language if I was using it. But what I found was that as time has passed, people in general have gotten a lot more flexible. I think Hungarians in general who are here in the United States are a lot more forgiving; if somebody misuses the Hungarian language there’s a lot less people saying what a shame that you don’t speak Hungarian properly or I’m not gonna speak to you in Hungarian if you can’t speak to me properly. I heard a lot of that as a child. My children; I can’t get angry or upset with them. I’m excited that they’re trying. And so I encourage them to switch as much as they need to, to get a thought through.

Although these two distinctively different language management approaches were aligned with families’ language ideologies, we noticed some divergence within the families. The mother in Family 2 emphasized her gentle and patient approach to her son’s occasional switch to English, although she also noted that the stepfather was more critical about it, and sometimes even laughed at their son’s “mixed” Hungarian. In addition, Families 1 and 11, where both parents were interviewed, showed differing perceptions when describing the other family members’ reactions to translanguaging. The father in Family 1, who used Slovak for everyday communication and Hungarian for everyday and academic conversations with the children, seemed to consistently not allow English in conversations. However, his wife, who had grown up in the US in a mixed Hungarian American family, seemed to be more relaxed, allowing the children to switch to English when it made communication easier.
Discussion

The issue of translanguaging in family communication is an emerging topic of interest among linguists and educators. This study aimed to explore parents’ family language policy including language ideology, language use, and language management (Spolsky 2004) with a focus on translanguaging in Hungarian American families with their adolescent children. Overall, the findings of our study were aligned with results of recent studies (Karpava et al. 2019; Song 2019; Yang et al. 2021; Wilson 2021), which also indicated support for the flexible and strategically determined use of two languages. In this study, most families used a flexible approach to language use, relying on their full linguistic repertoire, as previous research also documented in Russia, Korean and Chinese families (Karpava, et al. 2019; Song 2016; Wilson 2021). The families that had a positive and accepting approach to translanguaging found translanguaging to be a natural part of their linguistic journey in their efforts to maintain the Hungarian language. Such families had a flexible approach to language use and maintained a heteroglossic understanding of language for communicative purposes (Cummins 2019; Garcia and Wei 2014; MacSwam 2019). Families that embraced translanguaging perceived it to be a helpful tool for meaning-making, including both affective and practical aspects. Translanguaging thus enriched the depth of conversations when a lack of vocabulary was in the way of meaning-making, and it gave comfort and ultimately decreased stress in conversations by using the language that was easier to access. Families that appreciate the meaning-making function of translanguaging also emerged in studies with parents from diverse cultures (Danjo 2021; Kwon 2019; Yang et al. 2021). In addition, the meaning-making process is important for adolescents who tend to be interested in increasingly complex issues, and translanguaging allows them to discuss ideas using two languages, as they find appropriate. Ultimately, using vocabulary that is easier to access and switching languages based on other factors like affect and comfort enhance the communicative experience and support meaning-making (Hatoss 2016; Song 2019; Lee et al. 2021).

On the other hand, several families followed strict rules to use the Hungarian language exclusively for family communications and opposed translanguaging to develop and preserve the Hungarian language. These families expressed various reasons for believing in the one-parent-one-language approach. Importantly, the microcontext of the family seemed to affect their perceptions, practices, and language management policies. For example, families who planned to return to Hungary wanted their children to maintain proficiency in Hungarian at a level that allows them to seamlessly join the Hungarian school system. Furthermore, two fathers who grew up in the Hungarian diasporas in Romania and Slovakia, experienced that developing and maintaining a Hungarian identity in a minority community required high proficiency in the Hungarian language. In addition, some parents for whom the Hungarian language was the dominant language felt that only in the Hungarian language could they express themselves and maintain strong emotional ties with their children. These results supported Hatoss’s (2018a; 2018b) arguments related to the careful consideration of the historical, political, and individual sociocultural backgrounds of families, which affect their language ideologies and practices.
Finally, we noticed some divergence within those families that had both parents present during the interview to discuss their beliefs and practices. Although at least one parent in those families held a firm belief of the Hungarian-only approach, in some cases it seemed that the person who spent more time with the children acknowledged that translanguaging often happened, regardless of their stated ideology. Therefore, within the same family, one parent sacrificed efficient meaning-making for the correct and consistent use of Hungarian, while the other parent gave up on the flawless use of Hungarian to keep comprehension and communication as priorities. Such a discrepancy within a family might indicate that language ideology and practice is not always agreed upon by all family members, and children in the family might experience different and even conflicting expectations. Similarly, Wilson (2020) also found that families’ language ideology and language management strategies were in conflict.

Families in this study indicated that translanguaging was especially observed and appreciated when the parents helped their children with homework. In these families, translanguaging was an intentional practice to expand and contribute to their children’s academic and intellectual development. All adolescents in our study attended middle or high school, where the schoolwork and homework required the use of discipline-specific vocabulary, an in-depth comprehension of complex concepts, and critical thinking. Because academic learning happened in English, translanguaging included either some explanations in Hungarian for an English text, or the use of English vocabulary in Hungarian explanations to enhance efficiency and meaning making. Therefore, these families recognized the benefits of using two languages strategically to enhance cognition (Bialystok, 2016). Similarly, Alvarez (2014) documented translanguaging during homework assistance within families of young emerging bilingual children. She proposed that these practices were scaffolded by community agencies to increase trust between school, community, and families. However, the parents of the adolescents in our study justified their strategic use of two languages by the increased level of academic content.

Conclusion

This study contributes to the debate of one-parent-one-language versus translanguaging in family communications among Hungarian American families with adolescents and provides insights into the family language policies of Hungarian American families. Although the findings are not generalizable, due to the limited number of families and the use of self-reported interviews without observations, minority families’ translanguaging perceptions and practices are important to be considered without generalization.

Because the participating families in our study were the main source of exposure to the Hungarian language, the responsibility of language maintenance lies exclusively with the families. According to Wilson (2020), family practices may reflect a preference for language separation strategies such as one-parent-one-language due to the pressure of families being the main source of heritage language, regardless of their flexible views of bilingualism. Therefore, minority families that intend to preserve the language and culture of the native country would
need resources and support in their efforts, while adopting flexible language management strategies. They might also need help with harmonizing such flexible practices with the goal of developing the heritage language, and to achieve flexible bilingualism and successful heritage language maintenance for both parents and children.

In the future, it would be important to conduct case studies with extensive observation to validate this study’s self-reported language ideologies and practices. In addition, studies that include children’s and adolescents’ perceptions and voices would provide another perspective on how they experience their parents’ language policies and how that impacts their willingness, efforts, and goals to maintain the heritage language. Finally, due to the diverging views that surfaced within some families, studies that include both parents, and even grandparents and children, could shed light on the diverse and complex intricacies of family language policies.

**Works Cited**


Authors (2012).

Authors (2020).


Kim, Sujin. “It was kind of a given that we were all multilingual”: Transnational youth identity work in digital translanguaging.” *Linguistics and Education* 43, 2018, pp. 39–52.


Song, Kwangok. ““Okay, I will say in Korean and then in American”: Translanguaging practices in bilingual homes.” Journal of Early Childhood Literacy 16, no. 1, 2016, pp. 84–106.


