

Review of *Toward Translingual Realities in Composition: (Re)Working Local Language Representations and Practices*, by Nancy Bou Ayash

Review by Yasmine Romero

Kairos 28.2 Spring 24

Welina mai!

Welcome to my book review of Nancy Bou Ayash's (2019) *Toward Translingual Realities in Composition: (Re)Working Local Language Representations and Practices*. The navigation bar for this page is at the top, and you can navigate up to five different sections. These sections include Overview (current), Textual-Visual, Podcast, Narrative, Resources, and About Me.

This overview page presents the thesis, structure, and stakes of the book review (note: This is the page you are on now). The Textual-Visual, Podcast, and Narrative pages include the review itself in three different formats. The Resources page pools the supporting materials together and includes any other related materials or sources for the book review. The About Me page provides information not only on the author, me, but also on the research and assessment projects that I reference throughout the review.

Overview

Taking a traditional approach to reviewing Bou Ayash's (2019) *Toward Translingual Realities in Composition* does not align with her advocacy for translingual activism. As a result, I take a critically reflective multimodal approach when reviewing her book. I explore three major threads criss-crossing throughout the book:

- reimagining how we, teachers and students of writing, view languaging;
- researching language negotiation at micro and macro levels; and
- translating the complex and nuanced ideas of translingualism into actual practice and policy.

These threads twist, turn, and knot around the question of whether translingual activism is possible in our classrooms and beyond. Based on a synthesized reading of Bou Ayash's text with my teaching, learning and research experiences, I explore the possibilities while keeping Bou Ayash's definition of a translingual stance at the center:

A translingual stance toward language and decisions on its actual and observable use [...] is meant to acknowledge and bring out the very fluid, emergent, and unpredictable character of language itself and all communicative practices involving language. (p. 12)

Bou Ayash builds upon, complicates, and nuances this stance throughout each chapter of *Toward Translingual Realities*. In the first half, she focuses on theory and analysis; in the second half, she focuses on practice. What is key to her discussions is evident in her definition of a translingual stance: decisions are made about languaging "on its actual and observable use" across multiple spaces, pedagogical and beyond. In other words, her conclusions are drawn based upon her own experiences, the data that she has collected, and her reflections on this data with students and colleagues.

While she does not have an easy, copy-and-paste answer for teachers and students of writing, these three threads provide starting points for having discussions and creating change that reflects the translingual turn in writing studies. To explore the three threads above, I draw on Paulo Freire's (2005 [1970]) concept of action-reflection/praxis, Kimberle Crenshaw's (1991) intersectionality as a crossroad metaphor, and work on critical pedagogy and reflection in writing and language studies (Burke, 1947; Crookes, 2021; Driscoll, 2000; Enoch, 2004). I developed the following set of questions to guide my summary, critique, synthesis, and reflection—or book review—of *Toward Translingual Realities*:

- What is being said/done? How do I know?
- How do I interpret what is being said/done? Why?
- In what ways can what is being said/done map itself onto my own classrooms? What about other classrooms? Other institutions?
- What are the impacts of mapping what is being said/done in my classroom? What about other classrooms/teaching situations?
- After thinking through the previous questions and my answers to them, why does what is being said/done matter?

Please use the navigation bar above to observe how I work through the three threads—views of languaging, researching language negotiation, and translating translingualism into praxis. I engage with each thread differently: [Textual-Visual](#), [Podcast](#), and [Narrative formats](#).

Rethinking and Reconceptualizing How We View Languaging

Chapters 1 and 2 of Nancy Bou Ayash's (2019) *Toward Translingual Realities in Composition* tackle how languaging is viewed in three ways (mono, multi, and trans), the ideologies and attitudes attributed to these views, and how translingualism can lead to rethinking and reconceptualizing writing as an agentive, semiotic, and socially complex act. In what follows, I combine textual and visual cues to present my understanding, reflection, and critique of the first two chapters.

Language Ideologies

A Summary of Bou Ayash's (2019) Discussion of Language Ideologies

Approach	Connections	Goals	Models/Images
Monolingual	Unidirectional	Single, standardized language	Linear arrow/black box
Multilingual	Multidirectional with limitations	Switching from one language to another to communicate	Islands/switches
Translingual	Multidirectional without limitations	Drawing upon multiple meaning-making sources to communicate	Banyan trees/road traffic/cables

Overview

In Chapter 1, monolingual models, as Bou Ayash (2019) states, are "unidirectional" and perpetuate idealistic views of language. Unidirectional means one movement, such as the black box theory of language learning in Chomskyan linguistics where speakers or listeners receive input, it goes into a little black box, and then it comes out as output for that speaker or listener. The question in these kinds of models is: What happens in that little black box?

For generative linguists, it's the language acquisition device (LAD) that creates connections with our "innate" universal grammar, which is what generative linguists are still figuring out. For rhetoric and compositions folks who use monolingual ideologies and models, standard language does the LAD's job in that it sets a precedent for writers, and that precedent is worked towards, engaged, and practiced. It may even be shown as a linear arrow, progression going upwards if and only if a student takes feedback, improves habits, and conforms to said expectations and structures. There is also an emphasis on languages being separated by difference, and that this difference cannot be interfered with by other languages, situations, and more.

In this way, other languages are sacrificed for a single, standardized language, which is usually in the hands of those in power. A single, standardized language is an ideal; it can be an ideal that speaker-writers in power can force upon others; it can also be an ideal that speaker-writers must conform to to pass classes, to be considered a good student, to be considered a speaker of English (and I should add that race, gender, and socioeconomic status among other factors shape these ideals as well). This idealism leads to problematic steps in the writing classroom and beyond, and Bou Ayash shows how multilingual models do the same thing:

The focus should not be on the degree of adherence to or deviation from a fixed set of abstract language standards and conventional forms in student writing as much as on the rhetorical, material character of their practices, their chosen meanings, and complex decisions while negotiating, like all the rest of us, varied affordances and constraints in local writing ecologies. (p. 55)

Multilingual models see multiple languages as resources, but as separate resources that must be switched on and off depending on time, place, and other speaker-writers present. Bou Ayash compares the multilingual model to an archipelago, where different islands are languages, and you jump from one to another to respond to diverse rhetorical situations.

Such models privilege the concept of code-switching and condemn code-meshing or code-mixing; these models also reproduce notions that non-English languages cannot be academic, and specifically non-Western varieties of English (Canagarajah, 1999).

Translingual models, on the other hand, resolve some of these issues, according to Bou Ayash. They focus on interaction and negotiation. These models also bring attention to the multiple semiotic or meaning-making resources that are drawn upon throughout language use. Further, they embrace that experience is part and parcel of language interaction, and that as we interact with one another, we accomplish goals through language. Our ability to adapt, change, and understand our languaging situations is highlighted more than what is "innate" or what is "turned off and on." We do not have a switch, things are much blurrier than they seem; they are much more interconnected.

To further illustrate her point, Bou Ayash shares three models: the Banyan Tree Model, the Moving Traffic Model, and the Chaotic Arrangement of Overhead Electricity Cables

Model. I actually find that these models resonate with me more, especially the Banyan Tree Model, since I have lived in Saipan and currently reside in Hawai'i.

The Banyan Model emphasizes the organic and interconnected ways that language emerges. Language is not bounded because it sprawls out, with the main trunk supporting the ever-growing roots. This description resonates with me because I think it shows not only the dynamic nature of language, but also that the history of a language gives it growth, and that growth is changing and constantly trying to fit itself into everyday practices, or spaces in the earth or up in the canopy of leaves.

The Traffic Model is less organic than the Banyan Model, and it is a model that pops up throughout Bou Ayash's text. I also find myself using this model when conceptualizing languaging because I feel it accounts for the expectations across multiple lanes of traffic, and that each vehicle waits, passes, or pulls off to the side depending on what is happening to the flow: Are people crossing? Is there an accident? Is there construction? I do feel that this model is much easier to visualize, too, because there are clearer boundaries, but decisions and negotiations for space, for moving are constant.

The Cables Model attempts to capture the organic, interconnecting nature of the Banyan Model, yet the model shows how power dynamics can impact who gets what cable and why. To contest these dynamics, this model also accounts for the agency of individuals arranging cables in certain ways, omitting other cables, avoiding dangerous cables (or not), and/or borrowing cables to support their own (electrical) needs. Borrowing here is not in a negative sense, but in a shared resources sense, which makes the Cables Model incredibly focused on speaker-writers' agency in comparison to the Traffic Model and the Banyan Model.

While all three models have their strengths and weaknesses, it is important to address that by innovating and building other ways of conceptualizing languaging; then we can start breaking down and resisting the ideologies presented in Chapter 1 that continue to persist in our classrooms, profession, and everyday lives.

Critique

My interpretations of Bou Ayash's arguments are twofold: I find her reconceptualizing of translingualism compelling and her critiques of the other models matching my own as a teacher-scholar. I do think that this kind of approach puts the onus on teacher-scholars to facilitate change. I am not saying that teacher-scholars should not be pushing for changes to how language is viewed at their institutions and within their

classrooms, but the question of labor when many writing teachers are overworked and generally serving in adjunct roles makes the question of labor far more complicated.

Being in a tenure-track position, I can certainly vouch for this kind of approach and push for these kinds of changes to happen at the programmatic level, but there is always pushback because of financial concerns or standardization or language ideologies that are a result of colonialism and imperialism.

Bou Ayash does not, at least in these opening paragraphs, give me an idea of what I can do as a teacher–scholar within the bigger picture of the institution. She does touch on that later, but combating ideologies that are problematic can most certainly start in the classroom, or local spaces, but they do need to be carried through to global spaces, that is, institutional and administrative spaces. Further, those in positions of power can and should support these changes, but, again, that takes labor, funding, and time.

I am also always thinking about the question of "what happens beyond the classroom" in the back of my mind. These kinds of models are helpful in showing students how else they can think through languaging and what it accomplishes. For instance, one of my students responds to the alternative way of thinking through errors or problems in Bou Ayash's text (p. 37):

These "mistakes" that may be viewed by a person's own local language ideologies should be viewed as assets in your individual understanding. So maybe we should be focusing on intent? Maybe think about why the author chose to write a sentence in a certain way? Does it mean something else according to the writer's language ideologies? These are types of questions we should maybe be aware of when looking at different pieces of writing. (Anthony)

As Anthony shows, students in my course who are teachers step back and reevaluate their assumptions, how those assumptions came to be, and what to do about those assumptions with this new knowledge and/or new perspective. While some of my students have gone on to accomplish amazing things like asking students to translate between Pidgin and English in their classrooms and reflect on their steps for these translations, I wonder about other students who are not in the education sector? I wonder how these kinds of ideas could be put into action in other sectors—business, health sciences, aloha 'āina communities, technology, and more. How can we secure funding that treats languaging as something agentive rather than just a standard to compare and contrast students to? In the face of affirmative action falling apart (as well as its critiques from before), how can we ensure that there is a way to support changes like these?

Reflection

How to get students and administrators invested seems to be the touchstone I keep returning to, that is, how to make translanguaging matter beyond the theoretical. How to

present another perspective on language that allows other speaker–writers to make their own decisions? How to present translanguaging in such a way that is accessible to the public and not just academics?

Perhaps: having a talk about definitions of languaging rather than this is the right or wrong language definition, which is what I think Bou Ayash accomplishes in naming the strengths and weaknesses of the mono- and multi- approaches to language. However, she does not provide any critiques of the translanguaging model, which was documented by Paul K. Matsuda (2013), as well as by other rhetoric and composition scholars. Why is a bigger question.

When thinking through these two chapters as a teacher of writing, I see that building discussions of languaging—including having students take ownership of knowing what these different perspectives on languaging are and encouraging them to make language decisions for themselves—is a pathway that supports critical pedagogy. Translanguaging is slowly becoming what is considered the norm; however, the critiques of its catch-all-ness catch up quickly (Gilyard, 2016).

For me, then, I think presenting this information in my courses has been successful, and students' investment in learning how each other positions themselves towards languaging supports them in making decisions as they move beyond the classroom. What is missing, for me, is data from students who are not English or education majors. What do they think? How might they use this knowledge in other sectors?

For administrators, creating opportunities to have these kinds of discussions can emerge in talks of assessment and course design and in building opportunities for underrepresented students and languages and voices. In my own experience, with the help of colleagues, we are building a scholarly journal for undergraduate students who come from Indigenous and mixed-race backgrounds. In this way, we're drafting a language statement, and the process in and of itself involves multiple drafts, feedbacking stages, and approval.

Notes

Chapter 1 Notes

- Quotations
 - "Language representation practices, I argue, need to be fully integrated into and taken seriously for a rigorous understanding of and productive intervention in the nature and workings of local language ideologies in the teaching and learning university-level writing (p. 22): we need to address language representation in our curricula.
 - "Teaching writing from a monolingual ideological orientation to language eschews alternative language and literacy practices that emerge in the writing classroom as arguably interfering with and hindering a presumably tension-free, unidirectional flow of knowledge and linear progression toward a static, unquestioned endpoint, that is, an ideal state of (near)

native-like command" (p. 28): my students engaged this idea of "unidirectional flow"; what are alternative language and literacy practices (Bou Ayash, 2019, answers in later chapters)

- "Teacher—scholars who wish to refine intellectual engagements and labor with translanguaging need to resist the urge and popular demand to rush into postulating a specific set of identifiable, unified, and stabilized, prescribed teaching practices and activities" (pp. 39–40): translanguaging orientations open up more paths than foreclose
- Key Points
 - Language Representations (p. 21)
 - Ecological approach (p. 21)
 - Table 1.1: Distinctions among mono-, multi-, and translanguaging in writing instruction (p. 25)
 - Meso-political action (p.36)
- Major Takeaways
 - 1. clearly delineates between mono-, multi-, and translanguaging orientations;
 - 2. establishes working definitions that Bou Ayash (2019) will use to interrogate data;
 - 3. and tackles the debate between multi- and translanguaging orientations.
- Quotations
 - o. "We need to resist the temptation to continue to represent ourselves (hence our disciplinary labor) as invested with an institutional responsibility to rescue the language of the academy from all the assaults it is being and has been subjected to. Instead, it is our professional responsibility to participate in helping current and future generations of college/university writing students recognize and experience the fact that their actual labor of putting language into active use in writing is 'always taking place translanguagingly' or that, as Trimbur (2016, 226) further explains, 'we are all—students, teachers, literary writers—constantly negotiating [with varying degrees of effectiveness] multiple languages, conventions of writing, and linguistic loyalties'" (p. 58)
- Key Points
 - o. Metaphors for translanguaging
 - Banyan Tree Model (p. 44)
 - Moving Traffic Model (pp. 45–47)
 - Overhead Electricity Cables Model (pp. 47–50)
 - 1. Transdirectionality (p. 49), this concept moves beyond unidirectional, towards up, in, and around directionality
 - 2. Key reconceptualizations
 - (1) Language Competence in Writing as Performative (pp. 51–53)
 - (2) Language Standards and Conventions as Regulated, Sedimented Practices (pp. 53–55)
 - (3) The Logic of Language Errors in Writing as Collaborative Social Achievement (pp. 55–58)
 - (4) Writerly Agency and Reader Engagement as Dynamic Co-Writer-Reader-ship (pp. 58–60)
 - (5) "Involves a series of co's: cooperation, collaboration, co-contribution, and coparticipation, co-construction," that is, "overcoming probable hurdles and

breakdowns together to establish meaningful and consequential literate transactions" (p. 60)

- Major Takeaways
 - New, innovative models of language learning that encourage writers to innovate their own,
 - Actively reconceptualizes agency, performativity, error, and standard to account for collaborations,
 - Forefronts nonhegemonic ways of knowing translingualism (linguaging and writing for that matter too).

Wrapping Up

While wrapping up the recording for my podcast, I start to browse through my notecards on the final two chapters of Nancy Bou Ayash's (2019) book as well as my highlights of sections of the texts, my post-it notes, and any marginal comments. As I thumb through, I see emails pop up in my inbox alerting me to student questions and concerns. One stands out: "What do you mean by student incomes?" I consider the term and realize that it may not be used explicitly by any of the texts we cover in our K–12 Expository English course. I prepare an announcement for the course where I define the term as

a student's background, that is, their history, their socioeconomic status, their languages, their identities, their work experiences, their interests; it also means that with these income aspects speak to techniques, processes, templates, and strategies that students rely on to complete writing assignments.

I provide an example as well:

For example, the 5-paragraph template you are taught in High School is what you rely on to accomplish an essay at the college-level. This template is one student income, even if many of us dislike it (and our mentors as well). However, this template can help us, according to some teacher-scholars, understand college writing if we are given the tools, opportunities and discussions to translate, revise, and adapt it to each rhetorical situation.

I hit send, and return to broadly summarizing Bou Ayash's last two chapters. My typing is slow, as I keep the author's words at my level using the clips of a book stand. I also have multiple tabs open with my notes, pictures of my marginal comments, and memos that I jotted down while reading her book.

In the final two chapters, Bou Ayash not only provides clear examples of how to integrate translation into first-year writing assignments but also makes a broader argument for writing classrooms and their institutions. Her assignments were piloted in two different sections of first-year writing: mainstream and multilingual (or L2). While the first half of her class was dedicated to becoming familiar with multiple kinds of literacies and semiotic resources, the second half revisits the writing assignments from the first in the form of critical translations.

I stare at my summary, knowing that what I have learned from these two chapters is nowhere present in this short blurb. There is nothing about translingual activism. I have no critique present or ready. I also have no examples to work through, but the student incomes announcement eats at my brain.

I search the chapters for a way to guide my thought process and the present review. I find her reconnection to her student Ruijia interesting, especially since Bou Ayash has been transparent about her scaffolding of assignment sequences and how students respond to them. Ruijia asks readers to do the work, rather than the writer. This demand is similar to what Bou Ayash asks at the beginning of *Towards Translingual Realities in Composition*.

I know that most conventional academic American readers expect me to explain my main argument at the beginning of my essay. However, as a writer who was educated in an eastern culture and whose writing is inspired by the work of an established Chinese writer Xun Lu, I choose to write this essay following a Chinese writing style that keeps the main argument at the end of a writing piece. Due to the complexity and richness of my experiences [with language], readers of my essay need to be a patient because my deep feelings [about language] that have changed over time cannot be captured by a single statement or two. I hope this decision would encourage my readers to focus more on my personal experiences and collaborate with me in order to grasp my conclusion about the power of language in expressing ones feelings and emotions and bringing different writing styles and cultures together. (Ruijia, freshman English student Fall 2013, as quoted in Bou Ayash, 2019, p. 3)

I push back from my desk, staring up through the jalousie windows. Two mynah birds perch themselves on the glass. I pause. I think. I ask myself, "But can I make this matter?" I search the final chapter for an answer, and I compile a list from Bou Ayash's (pp. 174–185) suggestions:

- Translingual-oriented in-class practices and assignment scaffold sequences. She shares her own set of an assignment sequence on pages 151–153.
- Reworking and revising policy documents, such as documents on language use and program's stances towards languaging, through professional development opportunities
- Creating awareness of translingualism through working with campus partners and/or establishing spaces for students to experiment, mesh, and innovate
- Revisiting assessment so that it is more in line with translingualism goals and values
- Continuing to conduct research that supports translingual activism

Lessons Learned

I find myself gravitating towards item four, that is, revisiting assessment. I read through assessment data that I have collected since starting my position at my home institution. I comb through the student writing samples, our process sheets, and the memorandums

my colleagues and I have created. I reflect on how we implemented these changes. More importantly, I consider Bou Ayash's assertion:

Translingualism from an activist perspective [...] necessitates a serious engagement from the outset with meaningful writing–*translation* connections in the FYW classroom not as another discussion topic tackled through a simple curricular arrangement of chairs but, most important, as an alternative way of thinking, doing, and learning academic English literacies in which our students continue to invest their linguistically and ethnically imprinted, nationalized, raced, classed, gendered, sexualized, and abled selves and desires. (pp. 170–171)

These intersectional factors or axes—or students' "selves and desires" (p. 171)—are one of the many reasons why my current institution invested in authentic assessment or assessment that creates authentic writing situations where students have support throughout the writing process from mentorship to brainstorming to editing and revision. This approach has been translated in multiple ways, but taking a translingual stance aligns with authentic assessment's commitment to transparency and holistic evaluations of students' writing abilities.

I decide to make connections to my assessment project by providing some historical context and then forge connections as to why this situation makes for a strong research site to take a translingual stance. I begin typing:

When COMPASS (Computer-adaptive Placement Assessment and Support System) became defunct, we had to have a way for students to enroll in first-year writing (FYW) courses. We have a full one-year FYW program at my home institution, which supports our demographic of nontraditional, Indigenous, and first generation students. In addition, we have a tutorial section that supports students who need more one-on-one support; this course is not remedial, although many students and non-English colleagues perceive it in that way. This perception was something we wanted to combat through clarification that the tutorial section was not for students "who do not write well" (i.e., have errors in their writing). It is for students who need extra support in becoming familiar with college structures, requiring more time for assignments, and needing one-on-one consultations. I should add that most students in the tutorial sections have extenuating circumstances that impact their lives like first generation students or veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder.

As such, we—my colleagues and I—researched multiple methods and are now on our way towards implementing directed self-placement. However, we started with in-person, timed testing sessions, which we called authentic assessment. These sessions gave us an opportunity to meet one-on-one with incoming students, share the process, and explain each of the courses and the rationale behind these courses. Students' buy-in was incredibly high. But when the pandemic hit, we had to change gears: We had to think of ways to make testing accessible to students off campus. We came up with an e-portfolio approach that mirrors our authentic assessment process. Students watched a vidcast, completed a Google Form, and submitted two examples of their work as well as a critically reflective letter. In their letter, they are asked to rate their examples and argue for what course they should be placed within.

We decided to shift towards directed self-placement because we saw the value in the e-portfolio approach, but also because we wanted to focus more on students critically reflecting on where they should be, what their writerly goals are, and more. While the language ideologies do emerge in some of the responses, practical and fiscal concerns take precedence for many students. For example, veteran students have to pay out of pocket for our tutorial version of the course because the G.I. Bill does not cover it. As such, coming up with other ways to support students from these demographics is necessary. We are now in talks of building writing studios for students who cannot pay for these courses and need the extra tutorial support.

Taking the stance that Bou Ayash has in her work, reflecting on the assessment data, and following up with students and staff, we have been able to create a testing platform that attempts to capture the complexity of first-year writing, with attention to language ideologies as well as issues of socioeconomic status, race, gender, and other backgrounds coming together. Bou Ayash considers these issues; however, it feels language ideology remains the biggest factor in translanguaging, when it might be more than just language difference; systemic racism and other forms of oppression also play a central role in what matters (Gilyard, 2016; Rhodes, 1996; Ruiz, 2021).

Takeaways

I wonder about other readers. I wonder how they—from graduate school students to scholars to administrators—might use this text more clearly. What kinds of work is made possible with a translanguaging stance? I add a page break, and then consider and reconsider the theoretical, practical and methodological takeaways of *Toward Translingual Realities in Composition*.

I think out of all of the options above, Bou Ayash clearly has some actionable ways to create change. While I have focused on assessment in this review, I also find myself gravitating towards policy change because I have found, alongside other antiracist pedagogies, that policy change is central to making other voices matter like Malika's and Nathalie's. Bou Ayash's work could inform the establishment of policies and procedures that open up languaging to be inclusive, rather than exclusive; to mesh not switch; to see each speaker–writer as having multiple resources that they can draw on rather than being limited to what is so-called "appropriate" or "correct" for said writing situation.

Scholars and leaders in our associations and fields can and should consider how Bou Ayash complicates translanguaging; however, they need to consider accessible ways to do so. Translanguaging can appear as a catch-all for languaging differences, yet it can also provide a strong working foundation for research and policy that strives to be better to the speaker–writers we interview, the speaker–writers we represent, the speaker–writers we should speak with, not for.

Undergraduate students, graduate students, and teachers alike can make local, in-class changes happen, such as course design, which includes sequences and assignments focused around translation. However, what is missing from Bou Ayash's text is the exigency for mentorship and safer spaces to discuss the resistance they may face or grapple with themselves.

Thus, I think Bou Ayash's suggestions are necessary, yet we as teachers, undergraduate students, and graduate students need to also know how to deal with the backlash, challenges, and accreditation expectations, and enrollment pressures. We need to know how to negotiate with administrators, parents (for K–12), and other campus partners. This "needing" could be addressed in professional development venues and/or through policy changes that lead to foundations to cite and create arguments for why we should do it this way and not that way.

Another thing that I feel is missing from Bou Ayash's suggestions is how to address supporting teachers in making curriculum and/or programmatic change. For some teacher-scholars, professional development opportunities, campus partnerships, and course design support are readily available, whereas for others, these resources are limited because of funding or politics. As such, teacher-scholars face disparities in how much agency they have in creating change in a curriculum or program. My question for Bou Ayash, then, is how can we address these issues at the institutional or association level?

Overall, I find myself coming back to Bou Ayash's book as I teach and research. I find myself enthralled by her languaging metaphors, the way she engages the student data she collected, and her passion and commitment to a kind of activism that any of us who are invested in languaging and writing can learn from.

I type these last thoughts, watching the cursor blink as I contemplate adding more or letting it sit, unsettled.

Chapter 5 Notes

- Quotations
 - Attention to translation "can provide a condition of possibility for opening up much-needed explorations with students of the opacity of written English as constantly leaking into and out of all other language resources at their disposal for each occasion of reading and writing" (p. 166).
 - "Translingualism from an activist perspective [...] necessitates a serious engagement from the outset with meaningful writing-translation connections in the FYW classroom not as another discussion topic tackled through a simple curricular arrangement of chairs but, most important, as an alternative way of thinking, doing, and learning academic English literacies in which our students continue to invest their linguistically and ethnically imprinted, nationalized, raced, classed, gendered, sexualized, and abled selves and desires." (pp. 170–171)
- Key Points
 - "Heart of translingualism": translation, "labor of translation," "translation in its full complexities" (p. 141)
 - Trans definition as critical translation (p. 143)
 - Dissonance between what happens in everyday situations compared to academic spaces (p. 145)

- Writing-translation sequence p. 147
- Explains sequence in pp. 151–153
- Explores students' translations
- Translation 1, Ryan: pp. 153–156 (write in my voice rather than a voice)
- Translation 2, Mateo: pp. 157–162 (my mind, my life, is neither entirely in Spanish nor in English)
- Translation 3, Ruijia: pp. 162–164 (might be most relatable for me and my data)
- Discusses complaints from students in her courses that found her course to be "not English composition" (p. 167)
- Critical theorizations about translation (p. 170)
- How to strengthen writing-translation connections (p. 171)
- Critical writers-translations (p. 173)
- Major Takeaways: (1) translation rather than process or genre as a model for FYW course design; (2) provides actual examples (Which is often missing in academic prose); (3) dissonance

Chapter 6 Notes

- Quotations
 - "It would be more fruitful to turn our ethnographic gaze toward local language representations and practices in diverse writing program and institutional ecologies as a central analytic pairing that could potentially move our ongoing disciplinary dialogue and labor over correcting the real, detrimental consequences of institutionally sponsored English-only monolingualism further forward" (p. 184)
 - "Taking up a project of translingual activism in composition can prove to be consequential in nuancing the field's level of preparedness for its necessary and perpetual questioning of the lack of continuity between the sociolinguistically relevant co-constructions of English and its academic performances through the constant work we do, in concert with writers and writing communities we are meant to serve, both locally and in different parts of the world." (p. 185)
- Key Points
 - Louis-Jean Calvet (2006)
 - In-class practices focus, pp. 175–177
 - Professional development and working through/revising documents, pp. 177–180
 - Critical translation pedagogies and assessments, pp. 180–183
 - Third spaces, campus partnerships working alongside FYW (p. 183)
 - Meso-spaces (p. 183)
 - Key Takeaways: (1) make changes locally and globally (she actually provides some suggestions); (2) reinforces that praxis is a form of activism