

Translingual Pedagogical Perspectives: Engaging Domestic and International Students in the Composition Classroom, edited by Julia Kiernan, Alanna Frost, and Suzanne Blum Malley. Utah State University Press, 2021. 316 pp.

Reviewed by Andres Altamirano, Texas Tech University

Theorizing translingual writing considerations, tenets, and practices has gained significant traction over the last decade. Composition scholars like Horner, Lu, Canagarajah, Pennycook, and García have helped define translingualism as a methodology by which to deconstruct the perceptions entailed by language supremacy. This deconstruction happens by leveraging difference within linguistic codes, modes, and structures towards authentic communication between speakers and audiences, regardless of the interlocutors' native tongues. Other scholars—like Matsuda, Trimbur, and Inoue—continue to invigorate translingual theorizing by examining the way translingual literacies may decolonize the academy and undo the hegemonic legacies of language instruction in the United States. Because of the topic's complexity, however, moving discussions about translingualism into concrete pedagogical practices proves difficult. For instance, according to the University of Connecticut's Department of English, challenges to students and instructors operating under the umbrella of translingualism include varying levels in temporal-cultural fluency, textual and lexical abilities, and *de facto* student segregation where students seeking comfort in sameness curtail the likelihood of heterogeneous collaboration with others different from themselves. Yet, while “many discussions on translingual orientation remain largely philosophical rather than pedagogical,” the editors of *Translingual Pedagogical Perspectives: Engaging Domestic and International Students in the Composition Classroom* take strides towards concretizing instructional design that is translingually diverse, equitable, and inclusive (59).

Bookended by a foreword by Ellen Cushman and afterword by Thomas Lavalley, the chapters are organized into two parts. The first, comprising six chapters, centers on the needs of multilingual writers in first-year writing (FYW) courses across varying U.S. universities. The student populations studied in these chapters range from self-identifying monolinguals with proficiency in academic English to multilingual writers with emerging command of English grammars. The second part of the book, comprising five chapters, focuses on the interdisciplinary professionals teaching writing in the academy and wrestles with divisions between traditional and translingual perceptions of writing. Many of the pedagogies begin with classroom-building before introducing practitioners to translingual approaches for avoiding the alienation that privileging of standardized writing practices can have on students. Contributors to the

collection provide detailed rationale, processes, and outcomes of assignments that bolster the “encouragement of rhetorical dexterity by inviting students into the literacy practices of reading or writing nonstandard forms of English or non-English texts” (75). Steeped in qualitative research, the collection furthers the call for equitable academic instruction by offering practical and adaptable assignments for students with multiple fluencies and literacies for language, texts, modalities, and spaces.

Starting the collection, Ghanashyam Sharma’s “Addressing Monolingual Dispositions with Translingual Pedagogy” asks teachers to invert the traditional perception of multilingual writers as marginalized populations in order to establish the knowledge bases of multilingual learners as valuable sites from which authentic writing occurs. Following Sharma, Daniel V. Bommarito and Emily Cooney’s “Criteria-Mapping Activities and the Transformation of Student-Teacher Relations” urges facilitators in FYW classrooms to collaborate on success metrics for courses intended to foster cultural identities and literacies both in and outside of the academy. The authors offer ways to increase student writers’ investment in their own learning outcomes by having students develop course rubrics along with instructors. Next, Ming Fang and Tania Cepero Lopez’s “Unity in Diversity: Practicing Translingualism in First-Year Writing Courses” contributes to discussions about translingual writing by searching for answers to the question: “If we don’t teach Standard English, what do we teach?” in first year writing courses (63). Their answers build from the understanding that most people, regardless their degree of multilingualism, “negotiate multiple linguistic resources, making use of any and all assets available to them” in an attempt to gain membership to the discourse communities of interest to them (61).

Chapter four, “Keeping It Real: Developing Authentic Translingual Experiences for Multilingual Students” by Norah Fahim, Bonnie Viderine-Isbell, and Dan Zhu, examines the translation assignments of two multilingual students focusing on the tensions within student liminalities through personal narratives. The assignments found within this chapter provide a logical connection to the following chapter, “An Integrative Translingual Pedagogy of Affirmation and Resource Sharing” by Gregg Fields. Fields introduces to students a process of skill and fluency integration—that is self-evaluation and re-evaluation—by appropriating the racialization of linguo-cultural identities that helps students decompartmentalize competing registers of language. Lastly, Esther Milu and Mathew Gomes’s “*Hay un Tiempo Y Un Lugar Para Todo*,” (the Spanish title is left intentionally untranslated) establish the reasons behind specific translingual rhetorical moves in student writing. Their accounts of student work trace how student writers identify the experiences with which they wish to cross borders and which will invite multidirectional border crossing.

In the second part of the book, Mark Brantner's "Writing on the Wall: Teaching Translingualism through Linguistic Landscapes" furthers the effort to decolonize the academy by considering students' lived experiences through the lens of socio-historical materialism. Through this lens, colonization triggers the availability of linguistic contact. This approach allows Brantner to qualify student recognition of literacy sponsorship, a concept borrowed from Deborah Brandt, within marketplaces outside the United States; the analysis carries significant implications for students' linguistic negotiations in capitalistic societies. "Following Labors of Recontextualization: Towards a Pedagogy of Translingual Mapping" by Brice Nordquist reimagines the traditional text-based classroom by asking students to consider themselves as texts with spatial-temporal limitations (and to imagine their teachers similarly), thus closing cleavages between literacy events and establishing relevancies not traditionally fostered in the academy.

Nordquist is followed by "Writing-Theory Cartoon" by Xiqiao Wang, which positions students as composition theorists. Wang introduces metaphor analysis as an activity that affords students the opportunity to theorize their writing practices in the context of motivations, ambitions, and tensions. The idea of tension is further explored in Naomi Silver's chapter, "Translingualism as Pedagogical Methodology for Preservice Teachers and Peer Writing Consultants in Training," which grapples with the conflicts over translingualism and the perceptions of writing outside of composition scholarship. The tensions within the specific context of this chapter—training peer consultants in the writing center—are indicative of the broader conflicts facing multilingual students and teachers of translingual perspectives more generally. Rounding out the collection, Julia Kiernan's "A Framework for Linguistically Inclusive Course Design" examines the liminality of student language practices when considering audience and establishes a framework for acknowledging innate student agencies within their linguistic choices.

In curating these works, editors Kiernan, Frost, and Blum-Malley move discussions of translingualism out of the salon and into the hands of practitioners in writing classrooms across the academy. The assignments champion writing pedagogies as "most meaningful when they use languages as a means of inquiry into different value systems, as catalysts for intellectual inquiry with an openness of mind" (31). By implication, the volume critiques traditional, monolingual perceptions of writing as reifications of power structures responsible for perpetuating ideo-linguistic supremacy in academic, as well as spatial-cultural, settings. Yet, while such a deduction is ostensibly the editors' intention, readers must pay attention to the cleavages in the collection's understanding of translingualism as a pedagogical praxis. Specifically, the collection implies that the process of turning theory into (replicable) pedagogical practice is a singular

one. In presenting assignments as loose iterations of translanguaging, the book suggests there are but two steps involved in constructing pedagogical practices to meet evolving academic exigences. To me, this is severe over-simplification. We must ensure that, in moving beyond theoretical exigences, we do not forget to address “the cross-linguistic differences multilinguals experience due to their fluency and sociocultural histories” (111). Because writing studies, as a discipline, has yet to define concisely the constitutive components of translanguaging writing, the discipline necessarily presents an underdeveloped case for translanguaging practices as legitimate academic methods and pedagogies. Missing from the discussion, both generally and in this edited collection, are clearly demarcated parameters that organize translanguaging’s limitations (especially against critiques that claim it to be linguistic entropy at best, a catchall neologism at worst). To echo Laval’s afterword, translanguaging is too important a disciplinary concern to begin building its shelter upon shaky ground. The structures delineating the pedagogical practices of teachers of translanguaging writing need careful planning and clear definitions to represent multiple facets entailed by the term. Before “we can seek better understandings of how literacies produce, maintain and transform material places and social relations across lines of race, gender, class, language, ethnicity, nationality, and more,” we must first uncover the linguistic structures those phenomena hinge upon. That way, we can engage in hyper-focused attempts at removing those rhetorical lynchpins (193). Hyper-focus on the problematizing of linguistic supremacy can only be accomplished by defining and honing the specific processes of translanguaging that actively subvert dominant discourses.

That said, experiential knowledge is as valuable as any other; the need to know what something is and how to define it is predicated upon the knowing of what something is not. *Translingual Pedagogical Perspectives*, then, moves us forward by allowing composition scholars insight into which perceptions of translanguaging lend themselves to pedagogical experience and which do not. In the future, scholars and teachers in this area should undergird their pedagogical attempts with cohesive definitions of *translingualism*, continue to investigate the hyper-focused problematizing that works toward translanguaging aims, and discard the teaching practices that do not remove oppressive, monolingual lynchpins. Otherwise, we run the risk of celebrating ourselves in loose iterations of change.

Brownsville, Texas

Works Cited

Brandt, Deborah. “Sponsors of Literacy.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 49, no. 2, 1998, pp. 165–85. <https://doi.org/10.2307/358929>

- Canagarajah, Suresh. "Toward a Writing Pedagogy of Shuttling between Languages: Learning from Multilingual Writers." *College English*, vol. 68, no. 6, 2006, pp. 589–604. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25472177>
- García, Ofelia, and Hugo Baetens Beardsmore. *Bilingual Education in the 21st century: A Global Perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell Publications, 2009.
- Horner, Bruce, et al. "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach." *College English*, vol. 73, no. 3, 2011, pp. 303–21.
- Inoue, Asao B. "How Do We Language So People Stop Killing Each Other, or What Do We Do about White Language Supremacy?" *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 71, no. 2, 2019, pp. 352–69.
- Lu, Min-Zhan, and Bruce Horner. "Translingual Literacy, Language Difference, and Matters of Agency." *College English*, vol. 75, no. 6, 2013, pp. 582–607.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei. "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition." *College English*, vol. 68, no. 6, 2006, pp. 637–51. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25472180>
- Pennycook, Alastair. *Language as a Local Practice* (1st ed.). Routledge, 2010.
- Trimbur, John. "Linguistic Memory and the Politics of U.S. English." *College English*, vol. 68, no. 6, 2006, pp. 575–88. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25472176>
- University of Connecticut. "Challenges for Students and Instructors." fyw.uconn.edu/resources-for-instructors/challenges-for-students-and-instructors/