

*Dosar:*  
*Plurilingvismul – între deziderat și realitate (IX)*

## Arguments for a Translanguaging Approach to the Case of Romanian Diaspora in Spain

Catalina ILIESCU GHEORGHIU\*

**Keywords:** *Romanian diaspora; cultural diplomacy; translanguaging; language and identity*

### 1. Globalization and Human Mobility

Globalization is often defined as a phenomenon of the 1990s, arising from the fall of the Soviet Empire, and the emergence of new hegemonic power relations, as well as from the evolution of technology and neo-liberalism. In 1997, the OECD published a report acknowledging the arrival of a new global age in which all countries could be active players. It contained an implicit promise of well-being for those trapped in poverty. But while labour is moving from the third to the first world (Horváth, Anghel 2009:13), production capacity moves in the other direction, based on the exclusivist logics of profit maximization, sometimes with a devastating social, environmental and cultural impact.

For the International Monetary Fund, globalization brings economic interdependence and an increased volume of cross-border transactions, while Soros (2002: VII) narrows the definition to a “free movement of capital and the increasing domination of national economies by global financial markets and multinational corporations”. In turn, Cronin (2003: 77) stresses the idea of “global movements and exchanges in global processes”. As has become clear during the latest international crisis, the ‘global village’ type of organization has affected all the spheres of our life: health, education, trade, leisure, employment, environment and obviously governance, both political and individual. Some scholars (Hocking 2000: 31) also remark the coexistence of two dialectic phenomena, globalisation and localisation and this tension between fragmentation and cohesion has been called *glocalisation*. Hocking further observes that traditional diplomacy has given way to a global polyarchy which solves conflicts through games of power, negotiations and alliances of lobbies while the state’s role is often relegated to that of a mere mediator.

As it is argued by Iliescu, Lambert (2014), global thinking (be it from a humanistic perspective – concerned about unlimited growth – or a technocratic/mass media/political/economic one, led by the slogan “one world, one market, one economy”), draws on the idea that our planet is borderless and unlimited in terms of

---

\* University of Alicante, Spain.

time and space, as long as new technologies guarantee communication. Obviously, as Branea (2009: 237) argues, implicit outputs of our recent history, such as fear, also become globalized. In their book *Globalizing God*, Galtung and MacQueen (2008) assume that the gap left by the demise of the communist promise in former Soviet-sphere countries, is being filled by religion, either the main one (Orthodox Christian) or others like the Protestant or several emerging Neo-Protestant faiths.

But perhaps the most visible consequence of globalization and technological development is migration. The main reason for people moving to more developed countries is the hope of economic prosperity and a better life, together with other motives such as political or religious persecution or booming tourist industry, which transform western culture into a “global dream” or what some have called “the global cultural bazaar”.

Global human mobility is reflected in the more than 200 million people on the move, about 3% of the population of the world, who are constantly changing their profile: refugees, citizens from other continents escaping famine, poverty, wars, knocking at the doors of our European *promised-land* or sometimes, *fortress*, as Diminescu pointed out (2009: 50), for those less privileged in search of Holy Lands which are very often lands of exclusion. As Lambert observed,

the term diaspora cannot be disconnected from its biblical origins (the “Holy Land”) nor from pre-European nomadic traditions, but the West-European Nation-State, [...] that has had an enormous impact on the social and political organization of our planet, has refreshed the *diaspora* concept during the 20th Century (Lambert 2012: 9).

Nowadays, the refugee exodus towards safer territories, combines with a constant movement of populations towards wealthier areas than their own.

Some of the Southern European countries that were emigrant exporters (the American dream for Italians, the Swiss dream for Spaniards, the German dream for Turkish) have become immigrant receivers. Other changes include new migration routes, as well as the feminization and regionalization of migration. And the question is: how much do host countries (old and new) recall their own exile? How ready are they to share welfare, rule of law, equality, democracy, achievements they took so long in accomplishing? How empathetic are they with others’ needs and hopes, when we have seen a successful Brexit campaign based on seeing immigration as a problem?

The large segments of population moving round the globe today lead to new relationships, new policies and measures by receiving countries to integrate them, but the provision of equal conditions is not always guaranteed. In this respect, language policies and translation may play an essential role, as mentioned by Maalouf et alii (2008). In his book *Translation and Globalization*<sup>1</sup> Cronin warns (2003: 3) against the vulnerability “which results from aggressively monoglot views of the world” and advocates linguistic plurality. Recent studies have focused on translanguaging pedagogy as a political act, a critical response to the monolingual bias of current education policy in countries like UK, hosting large numbers of

---

<sup>1</sup> In his fifth chapter Cronin (2003) raises the alarm (together with other voices) as to the “fragility of the linguistic ecosystem of the planet and the unprecedented rate of language loss”.

migrants (Otheguy, García, Reid 2015). Similarly, Caramés (2008: 271) shows that recognition of cultural diversity in Western societies must not obey only the principle of immigrant population numbers, but also the evidence of growing interaction with these diverse groups in the context of technological revolutions.

## 2. Romanian Migration to Spain

During the cold war, the iron fist policy exerted in Romania by the communist dictatorship was, to a degree, permissive with migration, allowing Germans and Jews to leave the country in exchange for economic benefits (Ricci, 2006), as well as accepting temporary migration to other Eastern European states, and signing agreements with Libya, Iraq or Syria for contingent workers. The fall of the regime in 1989 unleashed an emigration fever fuelled by a desire to see that mythicized West, forbidden for so many years (Diminescu 2009). One of the factors contributing to the country choice in the case of Romanians is, in Sandu's opinion (2000), the Christian substratum which eases their integration in host societies.

According to Tamames et alii (2008: 120), during the years prior to the crisis in Spain and coinciding with the rise of the Romanian population in this country, 50% of economic growth was due to migrants and 0.3 points in GDP were the result of the positive effect of migration on the Spanish per capita income. They also argue that the presence of migrants, especially women, has improved the Spanish citizens' job perspectives whose children or elderly are catered for by these newcomers. Hence, the double dependency on migration: the need for remittances from emigrants in the departure country and the benefits in the arrival country, which are not only economic but also demographic (such is the Spanish case, with an ever smaller working population, supporting an ever larger ageing one). However, the economic dependency on migrants does not make their integration easier; on the contrary, intolerant, even racist behaviours come to the surface especially in the context of a global crisis – the most patent proof of the extent to which we are globalized. Unemployment affects migrants in a greater measure than host populations and, in Spain, Moroccans and Romanians were the first segments affected by the stagnation in the construction industry, the fund cuts in agriculture or the LIFO rule (last in first out), as argued by Tamames et alii (2008: 66).

Migration is, according to Antohi (2009: 292), a social phenomenon involving all the spheres of our collective existence. Romanians in Spain have acquired new lifestyles, new attitudes, have accessed new values; this re-socialization brings a new collective identity, able to function as a co-culture<sup>2</sup>, to position itself as an ethno-political group within Spanish society. New interactions arise between this identity and narratives from inside Romanian borders.

Another visible effect is perhaps the transformation suffered, home in Romania, by the “pillar village” (symbol of resistance and preservation of a peasant way of life during totalitarian urbanization and over-industrialization, Diminescu 2009: 52) turning it into what Antohi (2009: 297) calls the “phantom village”, in

---

<sup>2</sup> The term gained notoriety with Mark Orbe, autor of Constructing Co-cultural Theory (1998), in which it is suggested that the construction of the identity of a co-cultural group exists within the power structures of a dominant society, in resistance to it. The book explores how people in a co-cultural group communicate with people in the dominant group.

reference to those rural areas in Romania that have been abandoned and are repopulated in summer, when emigrants come to spend their holidays or celebrate a wedding, not in Romanian style, but rather imitating their host country's customs. Family and gender relationships are also affected by migration, especially in those patriarchal contexts (e.g. the Szekelys minority) in which masculine power is upstaged by, for instance, a daughter's grant obtained in the UE sufficient to support the whole family.

Romania is one of the European countries with the greatest number of citizens living abroad, almost 700 000 of whom live in Spain, aged on average between 20 and 44. About half of them are women who, under crisis conditions, provide the main support for their families. Employed in housework or caring for children and the aged, they ensure the continuity of the migration project if men attempt a return plan, as in fact occurred during the Spanish economic crisis and sudden decay of state industry leaving many Romanian men unemployed.

In this paper, I will focus on the Romanian community (approximately 25 000) living in the Spanish province of Alicante, on the Mediterranean Coast with 2 million inhabitants. The region to which it belongs, is the second most populated by Romanians (106 414<sup>3</sup>), after Madrid and its surrounding areas. Romanian migration to Spain started in the nineties but grew massively in the new millennium and is mainly due to economic factors. A phenomenon inherent to migration is *acculturation*. The acculturation models, as seen by social psychologists, involve: *assimilation* (adoption only of customs belonging to the host society), *integration* (adoption of these customs and equal preservation of those brought from home society); *separation* or *segregation* (preservation of the latter without adopting any customs of the host society); and *marginalization* or *exclusion* (neither preservation nor adoption). A study conducted by sociologists Rojas, Jiménez and Navas (2012) shows that Romanian migrants in Spain would rather both preserve and adopt customs in public contexts (political life, education, health, work or consumption), but in private contexts they retain their traditions (which does not always please the host society). Since they opted for an integration model in the public context, Romanians were seen favourably by Spanish society during the first stage of their migration (the nineties), but in the second stage (2007–2013), the Spaniards' perception changed. According to sociologists, this is mainly due to negative media campaigns.

In a survey carried out in 2006<sup>4</sup>, I asked members of the Romanian community living in Alicante if they felt integrated in the Spanish society, and 60.4% (of the 53 interviewees) answered "yes, in great measure, but after a while"; 26.4% said "so so" and 13.2% stated "a hundred per cent since the very beginning". When asked how Spaniards treated them, 37.7% said "in a friendly way from the very beginning"; 58.5% "in a friendly way but after a period of reserved behaviour" and only 3.8% felt "lack of confidence" on behalf of the Spanish society. In 2010, after the first signs of the global economic crisis affecting them, I carried out a new survey<sup>5</sup> (see Iliescu, 2010: 95), this time aimed at inquiring into their intentions of

---

<sup>3</sup> According to the INE (National Statistics Institute), 01/01/2017.

<sup>4</sup> On 53 subjects, members of the Romanian community living in the Province of Alicante.

<sup>5</sup> This new survey was conducted in February 2010, on 41 informants belonging to the Romanian community residing in Alicante.

leaving or remaining in Spain. The conclusion was that most of the informants do not think of leaving Spain except in extreme cases like “intense racism” or “serious hardships”. Two aspects deserve special attention: 22 informants (out of 41) thought that Spaniards had become less tolerant in response to some Romanians’ or immigrants’ behaviour, so our informants tended to hold their peers responsible for conflicts that normally have to do with either the socio-economic conditions, or education of the host society; thus, they seemed to draw a line between “good” and “bad” migrants. Secondly, it was surprising how little they trusted provision for improvement in their home country, subordinating future plans to the Spanish context and not to changes in Romania. Obviously, this was a very small sample and should be seen only as a qualitative probe.

Authors such as Viruela (2008) underline the good image Romanian workers used to have in Spanish entrepreneurs’ eyes, on the grounds of their responsibility, efficiency, discipline, initiative or adaptability. In turn, Ferrero (2008) explains the negative image as a consequence of stereotyping the whole group as prone to organized crime, corruption, violent burglary, begging, children trafficking. For instance, Romanian gypsies were called “a plague” by a leader of the right-wing Popular Party in Catalonia (El País 16/04/2010). Researchers like Gordo (2008: 163) find the attention paid by news reports disproportionate, sometimes encouraging prejudices and generalizations. In 2011, the study “Attitudes towards immigration” conducted by the Spanish Sociological Research Centre on 2838 respondents, showed through its question no. 31 (“Is there any immigrant group you dislike?”) that 16.5% of the Spanish people interviewed considered Romanians to be the most disliked group and when asked why, the three main reasons were: they are involved in crime, they do not integrate, they are aggressive and violent.

In 2008, aware of this change in perceptions, the Romanian Government launched a multimedia campaign in Spain entitled “Hola, soy rumano, juntos hacemos un buen equipo” (Hello, I’m Romanian, we make a great team together), which doesn’t seem to have been particularly successful. Among the Romanian community living abroad, associations or personalities are called upon to counter-balance biased labels based on prejudices and generalizations.

That same year, Aamin Malouf et alii in a report to the European Commission warned that linguistic, cultural, ethnic and religious *diversity* was wonderfully enriching, but also a source of tensions. He and his peers proposed to reverse the old single-direction vector (in which the migrant learns the language and cultural landmarks of the host society) so as to make it reciprocal. He also warned about those second-generation migrants who do not project their identity and may develop dissatisfaction, contempt, even aggressive, fanatic behaviours.

### **3. Diaspora as a Catalyst for Cultural Policies**

In the early 90s, Spanish society knew little about Romania, but perhaps more than they knew about other Central or Eastern European countries at that time. Now, two decades later, Spaniards are used to sharing job environments, cultural events and even bomb attacks (11th March 2003 terrorist actions in Madrid) with Romanians and other migrants. However, Romanian culture is still largely unknown in Spain or at least, this is the impression of a small sample of ten Romanian women

living in the Province of Alicante whom I interviewed in 2015. They believe that only 1 to 20% of Spanish society (mainly intellectuals) know of one Romanian writer, composer or artist. This feeling is shared by Ion-Aurel Pop, Member of the Romanian Academy who said that:

Romanians, located relatively far from West, are perceived by the Western public opinion as a strange people living in a region predominantly Slavic, but with Latin aspirations, about whom few disparate and sensationalistic things are known, between legends and excerpts of reality (Pop 2014: 21).

The study I conducted comprised questions on family history, traditions, religion, migration, motherhood, as well as Romanian language, as the main component of identity. The general idea shared by my interviewees was that self-recognition and identity projection implies, on the one hand, dignifying symbols and values by making them visible and familiar to the host society, and on the other hand, it implies conveying those assets, bequeathing them to their children, the second generation of diaspora.

An important amount of current research in the field of paradiplomacy is devoted to the role of diasporas, not only in the relations established between a certain region and the state hosting many of its citizens living abroad, but the indirect paradiplomatic action carried out by state institutions with regions or NGOs in countries where diaspora have settled. Such is the case of several actions held by Romanian Institutions (Ministry for Romanians Abroad, Romanian Cultural Institute, Romanian Language Institute) in Spain, which I divided into three categories (see Iliescu 2016: 262): (a) culture management activities; (b) language spreading activities; and (c) political-diplomatic activities (or paradiplomatic, if we consider diasporas as lobbies or groups of action).

Since this paper delves into questions related to the linguistic dimension of the migrating phenomenon, several initiatives comprised in the second category (language spreading activities) should be mentioned.

In the first place, the *LCCR Programme* was implemented ten years ago, in the framework of a partnership between the Romanian Ministry of Education and some EU member states where a great number of Romanian citizens lived. Its main objective is to teach Romanian pupils in Belgian, Italian and Spanish schools an optional course in Romanian language and culture. Currently, there are 5 000 pupils registered aged between 3 and 18. The selection of teachers is done by the Romanian Language Institute (ILR) and their fees are also covered by the Romanian public budget.

Secondly, an initiative held by the University of Alicante and supported by the Romanian Ministry of Education (through its Romanian Language Institute), was implemented for first time worldwide, in 2008 at the University of Alicante and has been in place ever since. I refer to the official examination of 6 competence levels (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2) in Romanian language (ACLro), under the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages guidelines. This examination is meant for both Spanish students learning Romanian and second-generation Romanians who cannot prove officially their level of knowledge. This certificate is an opportunity for them to check, improve and show their level of

accuracy needed not only as a requisite in job interviews but also in grant awarding or admittance in further studies programmes abroad.

Apart from state institutions, these cultural diplomacy actions can be carried out by NGOs within diaspora. According to the Romanian Embassy's website, there are about 190 associations with a Romanian profile in Spain, mainly created after EU accession, most of which have ceased activities since the economic crisis, officials reveal. In Alicante, the non-profit, cultural Association ARIPI- Wings (the meaning of the acronym being FRIENDS OF ROMANIA FOR CULTURAL EXCHANGES' INITIATIVE AND PROMOTION) was created in 2005. Several projects focused on making language more visible and transmitting it to younger generations have been developed and implemented in the framework of this association's statutory purposes. I will mention two of them. One was aimed at creating a machine-translation tool from Romanian into Spanish. Its outcome, called TRAUTOROM, was possibly the first machine-translation software developed worldwide on this language pair. Linguist Delia Prodan prepared the set of rules (morpho-syntactic and lexical-semantic to train the system) and IT professor Mikel Forcada from the University of Alicante adapted the open code architecture to the given pair of languages. This pioneering (back in 2006) software<sup>6</sup>, capable of not only translating typed texts or attached files from Romanian into Spanish, but also innovatively browsing automatically into the target language, was regarded as an asset by its users: Spanish journalists (who could now directly access Romanian news), researchers and Romanian diaspora. This project had the support of the Romanian Government and the University of Alicante. For further details on this project, see Iliescu (2009). A complete description of the preliminary research carried out by Prodan, is offered by herself in: <http://www.um.es/lacell/aesla/contenido/pdf/10/ionela.pdf>.

The other project worth mentioning, aimed at preserving identity by conveying Romanian language to young generations, is currently financed by the *Ministry for Romanians Abroad* and it has been, for 10 years now, by its predecessor institution, the Department for Relations with Romanians Abroad (DRRP) within the Foreign Affairs Ministry. The project called ROMANIAN TEACHING FOR SECOND GENERATION MIGRATION is developed by ARIPI in collaboration with the University of Alicante, which cedes infrastructure (classrooms and technology). Children, split into two groups (aged 3 to 6) and (6 to 12), receive classes of Romanian Language, but also some notions of geography, history and arts taught in Romanian once a week, on Saturdays. This schedule is completed by a vast range of complementary activities such as: poetic recitals, performances of fairy tales, folklore music and dance events, organized trips to farms or visits to museums and factories meant to enlarge the children's specialized vocabulary in Romanian referring to homeland cultural realities and concepts. A positive by-effect is the role played by this teaching programme as a catalyst, joining families, ensuring cohesion and encouraging other derived projects meant to strengthen the Romanian community in Alicante.

---

<sup>6</sup> Now integrated on the Apertium platform: <http://www.apertium.org/index.eng.html#translation> (accessed August 23rd 2017).

#### 4. Majority Language, Minority Language and Second Generations

Apart from the media, which plays, as we have seen, a decisive role in constructing or de-constructing the *imaginary collective identity* on its three levels (departure society, arrival society, diaspora self-mirrored), there are two other essential points. One is social networks as spaces for daily, permanent interaction; the other is cultural production and circulation. Diasporic identities are permanently re-constructed through discourse (social, political or literary) originated either in the home or host country. With no doubt, the most powerful instrument for preserving and displaying, (but also for rejecting or concealing) the cultural identity of an ethnic group is *language*. When we talk about ‘majority language’, we refer to a language used by a socially and culturally dominant group, whereas the term ‘minority language’ defines the language used by a subordinate group in a given social and cultural context (Hamers, Blanc 2000). As it has been already proved, a bilingual person finding him/herself in contact settings, usually has a command of both majority language and minority language, regardless of the order of acquisition. As Butcher shows, bilingual competence, following the pattern of monolingual competence, includes reading and writing skills as well as speaking skills. According to Oriyama (2001), literacy plays a vital role in bilingual development, because it guarantees long-term lexical retention and it upgrades general language development and maintenance. In a study on development and maintenance of a minority first language literacy in Japanese–English bilingual children in Sydney, Australia, Oriyama (2001) shows that this issue is one of the major motives of concern for Japanese communities overseas. Hatano (cited in Oriyama) shows that this is because Japanese literacy is considered an important asset for a person ‘to be regarded as an educated member of Japanese society’. Other scholars, who have conducted studies on various linguistic minorities, claim that of all language skills, writing seems to suffer most in the process of language loss since it is the least required skill in their daily lives and it would need constant use or training for its maintenance (Smolicz, Secombe 1985; Butcher 1995; Clyne et alii 1997). Oriyama uses the term “*translanguage*” to define ‘a developing minority language in a bilingual system’, based on the theoretical framework of language transfer and ‘*interlanguage*’ (Selinker 1972) which was applied to second language acquisition. In our case, we deal with two categories of children: later-comers and early-comers. (1) For some of the members of second generation migration (children whose parents migrated when they were studying secondary school in Romania), Spanish is a second language at the very beginning of the integration/acculturation process, but soon competence in it becomes similar to the one in Romanian. (2) For other second-generation members (who were born in Spain or arrived at an earlier stage of their life, such as first school years or previously), Spanish overcomes Romanian in competences. Additionally, in an already bilingual region like the Comunidad Autónoma Valenciana (where both Spanish and Valencian are officially taught and used), Romanian children become equally fluent in both of them. In these cases, teaching them Romanian may have a lot to do with a second language acquisition. Thus, the concept of *interlanguage* or transitional dialect (Corder 1981) might be applied, provided the context is clearly specified as comprising only those cases of

bilingual development in contact settings. An interesting path for analysis would be to check how the three languages (Spanish/ Valencian/ Romanian) develop side by side, albeit unequally, due to the dominance of the majority language(s) of the host society (Spanish/Valencian). Under these conditions, I approached second generation migrants (category 2 or “early-comers”) through their mothers in order to find out how important the preservation of Romanian language competence was in the family and if mothers felt responsible for transference of homeland language and knowledge.

This sample (ten Romanian mothers of children born in Spain) was meant to serve as a probe for a more extensive one, forthcoming, focused on developmental characteristics shared by the children acquiring Romanian monolingually before migration and learning Spanish/Valencian as a second language, in comparison to those who are in fact native speakers of Spanish/ Valencian and also of Romanian but not equally. As I said, my field work consisted of an in-depth interview with 10 Romanian mothers living in Alicante. It was conducted in January 2015 and it comprised questions on family history, traditions, social norms, religion, marriage, migration, motherhood, as well as Romanian language, literature and culture as catalysts in the integration process. The idea of diasporic women as preservers and conveyors of source culture elements and particularly of the mother tongue is clearly confirmed in their own narratives. When asked about language, 7 interviewees told me they used only Romanian with their children, 1 “tried to”, 1 used both Romanian and Spanish and 1, only Spanish. Question 46 in this interview was: do you think a Romanian mother in diaspora has more work ahead to make her child aware of their identity than one living in Romania? The answer was ‘yes’ unanimously because “by living abroad, children lack immersion in home-culture, so parents, especially mothers, must compensate”. Obviously, such a small sample cannot make for extrapolations, but we might detect a behavioural pattern: diasporic mothers are indeed the conveyors of cultural elements, more than men, because they received them from their own mothers, and they are aware of this duty as such and verbalize it; they exert it even when children are not so receptive, perceiving it as a compulsory part of raising their sons and daughters.

Second generation migrants raised in families with such concerns and aware of the need to preserve and develop language skills in Romanian for the future global development and performance in society of their bilingual/ trilingual children might be the adequate sample group for a study based on the recent concept of “translanguaging”. Oriyama (2001) uses the term ‘translanguage’ to label a bilingual’s developing minority first language as distinct from the original concept of ‘interlanguage’ coming from a second language acquisition, explaining that the conceptual bases in two languages are shared and transferable to each other and that significant cross-lingual correlations are found in the literacy competence of bilinguals, so interdependency excludes the cases of unavailable cross-linguistic equivalents due to culturally specific notions and a gap in the development of register in each language. On the other hand, Oriyama argues:

The minority language system would share certain characteristics of both monolingual first language acquisition, and second/foreign language learning, which are intertwined in a complex and dynamic way in the process of bilingual development. In other words, translanguaging consists of both developmental and transference features. This is similar to the characteristics of interlanguage, whose

rules are shared by the first and the second language. Thirdly, bilinguals' minority first languages are unstable in nature, continuously changing in competence and performance as a transitional language, whether it leads to full development or loss of the language. In short, translanguaging is a conceptually transferable and transitional language. It is emphasized, however, that the term is employed in a positive sense, acknowledging its essential role in minority language development as a creative tool of communication to supplement any lack of knowledge and experience (Oriyama 2001: 2).

According to this model, translanguaging would be different from codeswitching, because the latter is a conscious process which does not occur naturally for bilinguals who are early-comers, whereas translanguaging is characterized by the unintentional integration of multiple language systems. It is also different from diglossia, in spite of the fact that we deal with majority and minority languages, because translanguaging does not imply settling a hierarchy of language systems (one is not mandatory over the other, nor does it apply to one function of speech or to a certain domain in the speaker's mind), rather it develops adaptability and cooperation of language systems. García defines translanguaging as "the act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages, in order to maximize communicative potential" (García 2009: 140). Elsewhere, she elaborated on the concept:

The young people are using resources from different languages together, with very little regard for what we might call the 'boundaries' of named languages such as 'Spanish' or 'English'. They are using elements of each language together to communicate more effectively. This is translanguaging: it's about using all your language resources to communicate (García 2016).

In linguistic terms, maybe the most patent aspect may be the influence exerted by Spanish on Romanian, the latter being reduced to a family register and leisure context, since migrants very seldom access jobs based on their bilingualism or biculturalism, whereas Spanish is the language used at work, or at school in the case of second generations. A significant amount of research carried out by linguists such as Brânză (2012), Schulte (2012, 2015), Duță (2012), Buzilă (2015), Biriş (2011), Uță (2011) focused on the influence exerted by Spanish on Romanian language to such extent as to modify its use by diaspora speakers, whereas the degree of alteration (some even argue the emergence of a new variety called 'rumañol') depends on such variables as: age, educational background, the number of years spent in the host country, the speaker's age when migration took place, the professional environment etc. Fewer studies have been conducted on the impact Spanish has on Romanian in the case of the population living in Romania. Due to the exposure to a constant bombardment of news, TV programmes and serials in Spanish, words, idioms and names enter Romanian structures and lexicon, perhaps helped by a certain audience's proclivity towards an idealized land.

The study of translanguaging in the case of second generation Romanian migrants in Spain might cast some light on those dark spots remaining after having measured the impact of Spanish on Romanian in the case of adults. One step further might include a multi-conceptual approach (interlanguage, translanguaging, diglossia, code-switching and 'rumañol') to this reality, and to this very special segment of population.

## References

Antohi 2009: Sorin Antohi, *Perpetuum mobile: note despre emigrația din România postcomunistă*, in Remus Gabriel Anghel, and István Horváth (eds.), “Sociologia Migrației”, Bucharest, Polirom, p. 289–300.

Biriş 2011: Gabriela Biriş, *Sobre la dinámica del préstamo*, in Delia Ionela Prodan, and Catalina Iliescu Gheorghiu (eds.), “El Papel de la Traducción en el Discurso de la Rumanidad desde una Perspectiva Diáspórica”, DVD, Alicante, Aguaclara, p. 63–78.

Branea 2009: Silvia Branea, *Discursurile globalizării*, in Daniela Roventă-Frumușani (ed.), “Ipostaze discursive”, Bucharest, Editura Universității din București, p. 231–272.

Brânza 2012: Mircea Brânza, *Transferencias lingüísticas en el habla de los rumanos residentes en España*, in Catalina Iliescu Gheorghiu (ed.), “Traducción y (a)culturación en la era global–Translation and (Ac)Culturation in the Global Era”, Alicante, Agua Clara, p. 105–118.

Butcher 1995: Lorena Sun Butcher, *Mother Tongue Literacy Maintenance among the Children of Recent Chinese Immigrants in Brisbane*, Adelaide, Helios.

Buzilă 2015: Paul Buzilă, *Rumañol – The Adaptation of Romanian to the Spanish Linguistic Context*, in Rodica Dimitriu, Sara Laviosa, Georgina Lock, and Veronica Popescu (eds.), “The Many Facets of Adaptation”, Iași, Editura Universității ‘Alexandru Ioan Cuza’, p. 101–124.

Caramés 2008: Mayte Caramés, *Gestionando la diversidad en el ámbito sanitario: reflexiones y sugerencias en torno a la incorporación de la perspectiva intercultural en el ámbito de la gestión sanitaria*, in Gerardo Fernández Juárez (ed.), *La diversidad frente al espejo. Salud, interculturalidad y contexto migratorio*, Quito, Abya Yala, p. 271–276.

Clyne et alii 1997: Michael Clyne, Sue Fernandez, Imogen Chen, and Renata Summo-O’Connell, *Background Speakers: Diversity and its Management in LOTE Programs*, Canberra, Language Australia.

Corder 1981: Stephen Pit Corder, *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*, London and New York, Oxford University Press.

Cronin 2003: Michael Cronin, *Translation and Globalization*, London, and New York, Routledge.

Diminescu 2009: Dana Diminescu, *Exercițiul dificil al liberei circulații: o introducere în istoria migrației recente a românilor*, in Remus Gabriel Anghel, and István Horváth (eds.), “Sociologia Migrației”, Bucharest, Polirom, p. 45–62.

Duță 2012: Oana Duță, *Particularidades del lenguaje de los rumanos de España en el estilo periodístico*. In Catalina Iliescu Gheorghiu (Ed.), *Traducción y (a)culturación en la era global–Translation and (Ac)Culturation in the Global Era*, Alicante, Agua Clara, p. 151–158.

Galtung, MacQueen 2008: Johan Galtung, and Graeme MacQueen, *Globalizing God. Religion, Spirituality and Peace*, Oslo, Kolofon Press.

García 2009: Ofelia García, *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*, Malden, MA and Oxford, Blackwell/Wiley.

García 2016: Ofelia García, *What is translanguaging?*, “EAL Journal”. 26.07.2016. Retrieved from <https://ealjournal.org/2016/07/26/what-is-translanguaging/>.

González 2007: Jorge H. González, *Internacionalización de la educación superior, “Universidades”*, 33, p. 3–10, retrieved from <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.ox?id=37303302>.

Gordo 2008: Mercedes Gordo Márquez, *¡Volved a Rumanía, por favor! La política de retorno del gobierno rumano y sus implicaciones en los inmigrantes que se encuentran en España*. “Cuadernos de Geografía”, 84, p. 153–168.

Hamers, Blanc 2000: Josiane F. Hamers, and Michel H. A. Blanc, *Bilingualism and Bilingualism*, 2nd edition, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hocking 2000: Brian Hocking, *Vigilando la 'frontera': globalización, localización y capacidad de actuación de los gobiernos no centrales*, in Francisco Aldecoa, and Michael Keating (eds.), “Paradiplomacia: las relaciones internacionales de las regiones”, Madrid, Marcial Pons, p. 29–54.

István, Remus 2009: Horváth István, and Gabriel Anghel Remus. *Introducere*, in Remus Gabriel Anguel, and István Horváth (eds.), “Sociologia migrației”, Iasi, Polirom, p. 13–44.

Iliescu 2009: Catalina Iliescu Gheorghiu, *Construcción europea y dignificación de la diversidad a través de las TIC. Un ejemplo: TRAUTOROM*. “The Scientific Journal of Humanistic Studies Oradea”, 2009, 1, p. 67–72.

Iliescu 2016: Catalina Iliescu Gheorghiu. *The Role of Language and Translation in the New Configuration of Paradiplomacy and Multi-Layered Governance Featuring our World Society*, in Stoica Alina, Horga Ioan, and Tavares Ribeiro, Maria Manuela (eds.), “Culture and Paradiplomacy Identity. Instruments in Sustaining EU Policies”, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, p. 249–269.

Iliescu, Lambert 2014: Catalina Iliescu Gheorghiu, and José Lambert, *Introduction*, in José Lambert, and Catalina Iliescu Gheorghiu (eds.), “Universe-Cities as Problematic Global Villages. Continuities and shifts in our academic worlds”, Tubarao, Copiart, Florianopolis, PGET/UFSC.

Lambert 2012: José Lambert, *In Place of Foreword...*, in Catalina Iliescu Gheorghiu (ed.), “Traducción y (a)culturación en la era global—Translation and (Ac)Culturation in the Global Era”, Alicante, Agua Clara, p. 9–10.

Maalouf et alii 2008: Amin Maalouf, Jutta Limbach, Sandra Pralong, Simonetta Agnello Hornby, David Green, Eduardo Lourenço, Jacques de Decker, Jan Sokol, Jens Christian Grøndahl, and Tahar Ben Jolloun, *A rewarding challenge. How the multiplicity of languages could strengthen Europe. Proposals from the Group of Intellectuals for Intercultural Dialogue set up at the initiative of the European Commission. Brussels, 2008*, retrieved from European Commission, Multilingualism website:  
[https://ec.europa.eu/education/sites/education/files/rewarding-challenge-report\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/education/sites/education/files/rewarding-challenge-report_en.pdf).

Oriyama 2001: Kaya Oriyama, *Japanese as a Translanguage: A Developing Minority Language in Japanese-English Bilingual Children in Australia*. “Proceeding of the 2001 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society”, p. 1–13  
<http://www.als.asn.au/proceedings/als2001/oriyama.pdf>

Otheguy, García, Reid 2015: Ricardo Otheguy, Ofelia García, and Wallis Reid. *Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics*, “Applied Linguistics Review”, 6, no. 3, p. 281–307.

Pop 2014: Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Eminescu și Transilvania. Locul românilor în Europa. Lecția de românism a românilor de la răsărit*, Cluj-Napoca, Eikon.

Ricci 2006: Antonio Ricci, *Passato e presente dell'emigrazione romena in Europa, “Transylvanian Review”*, XV, no. 1, p. 141–152.

Rojas, Jiménez, Navas 2012: Antonio J. Rojas Tejada, Pablo Jiménez Sayans, and Marisol Navas Luque, *Similitud percibida y actitudes de aculturación en autóctonos e inmigrantes*, “International Journal of Psychological Research”, 5, no. 1, p. 70–78.

Sandu 2000: Dumitru Sandu, *Migrația transnațională a românilor din perspectiva unui recensământ comunitar*, “Sociologie Românească”, 3–4, p. 5–52.

Schulte 2012: Kim Schulte, *La aparición de nuevas variedades romances: el contacto lingüístico entre rumano, castellano y valenciano en Castellón de la Plana*, in

Catalina Iliescu Gheorghiu (ed.), “Traducción y (a)culturación en la era global—Translation and (Ac)Culturation in the Global Era”, Alicante, Agua Clara, p. 119–133.

Schulte 2015: Kim Schulte. *Spontaneous 'Bad' Translation or a New Ibero-Romance Variety? The Case of Rumañol*, in José Jorge Amigo Extremera (ed.), “Traducimos desde el Sur. Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de la Asociación Ibérica de Estudios de Traducción e Interpretación”, DVD, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Servicio de Publicaciones y Difusión Científica de la ULPGC, p. 351–365.

Selinker 1972: Larry Selinker. *Interlanguage. Product Information*. “International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching”, 10, no. 3, p. 209–241.

Smolicz, Secombe 1985: Jerzy Smolicz, and Margaret J. Secombe. *Community Languages, Core Values and Cultural Maintenance*, in Clyne, Michael (Ed.), “Australia, Meeting Places of Languages”, Canberra, Pacific Linguistics, Australian National University, p. 11–38.

Soros 2002: George Soros, *George Soros on Globalization*, New York, Public Affairs.

Tamames et alii 2008: Ramón Tamames, Miguel Pajares, Rogelio Pérez Bustamante, and Felipe Debasa Navalpotro, *Estudio sobre la migración rumana en España*, Retrieved from [http://fedrom.org/statics/uploads/Estudio\\_saatchi.pdf](http://fedrom.org/statics/uploads/Estudio_saatchi.pdf)

Uță 2011: Ofelia Uță Burcea, *El habla de los rumanos. Trazos de español en el rumano escrito. La construcción creativa: El 'rumañol'*, in Delia Ionela Prodan, and Catalina Iliescu Gheorghiu (eds.), “El Papel de la Traducción en el Discurso de la Rumanidad desde una Perspectiva Diásporica”, DVD, Alicante, Aguaclara, p. 95–110.

Viruela 2008: Rafael Viruela Martínez, *De este a oeste: la inmigración desde los nuevos países comunitarios (Rumanía y Bulgaria)*, “Cuadernos de Geografía”, 84, p. 127–134.

## Abstract

Cultural diplomacy actions carried out by state institutions, NGOs or diaspora personalities help linguistic diversity to be preserved and homeland cultural values to be safeguarded and conveyed to second generation migrants.

The aim of this paper is twofold. On the one hand, a short discussion on how phenomena such as globalisation or migration affect the process of integration of Romanian migrating populations in a (recent) host country like Spain will be presented. On the other hand, several arguments will be put forward advocating a translanguaging approach to the relationship second generations establish with their mother tongue (relegated to the family context) and with their own languages (Spanish and Valencian) used by their teachers, by their media idols and by themselves in almost all aspects of everyday life. A translanguaging approach might help experts understand better this relationship and might help teachers find pedagogical tools to maintain and develop these students' linguistic and cultural experience and make them regard it as an asset rather than a hindrance.