

## CONTENTS

Introduction: Translingual and Transnational Graduate Education in Rhetoric and Composition

*Nancy Bou Ayash and Carrie Byars Kilfoil* 3

### **PART I. INVISIBLE AND DISLOCATED: GRADUATE STUDENT INSIGHTS IN TRANSLINGUAL AND TRANSNATIONAL CONTEXTS**

1. Doing Translingualism through Panoramic Ethos: Three Transnational Graduate Students' Pathways across Multiliteracies and Implications for Program Practices

*Corina Lerma, Moisés García-Rentería, Patricia Flores, Kate Mangelsdorf, and Lucía Durá* 27

2. (En)countering Monolingualism: A Transnational Sensemaking of Graduate Education

*Joseph Franklin, Emily Yuko Cousins, and Alex Way* 43

3. The Postmonolingual Condition and the Rhetoric and Composition PhD: Norming Language Difference in a Doctoral Program

*Carrie Byars Kilfoil* 58

### **PART II. (TRANS)DISCIPLINARITY AND KNOWLEDGE BUILDING IN GRADUATE CURRICULA AND MENTORSHIP**

4. Transforming Graduate Education in Rhetoric and Composition: Toward a Transnational and Translingual Reevaluation

*Bruce Horner* 83

5. Translation and Translingual Competence in Graduate Training

*Nancy Bou Ayash* 101

6. Comparative Rhetoric and the Translingual Future of Mentorship

*Michelle Zaleski and Xiaoye You* 123

7. The Role of Graduate Education in Building Writing Teachers' Knowledge of Language

*Madelyn Pawlowski and Christine M. Tardy* 140

8. A Translingual Approach to Tutoring International Graduate Students

*Aimee Jones* 159

**PART III. RESPONSES**

9. Shifting the Paradigm of Translingual and Transnational Graduate Education

*Amy J. Wan* 179

10. Translingualism and Transnationalism as Decolonial Recovery

*Anselma Widha Prihandita* 186

11. Distributing the Labor of Translation in the Context of Graduate Education in Writing Studies

*Joe Wilson* 193

12. Translingual and Transnational Graduate Education for the Local Public Good

*Brice Nordquist* 201

*Index* 207

*About the Contributors* 211

## INTRODUCTION

### *Translingual and Transnational Graduate Education in Rhetoric and Composition*

Nancy Bou Ayash and Carrie Byars Kilfoil

Translingual and transnational scholarship have marked a conceptual, epistemological, and ideological milestone in composition studies. By challenging dominant monolingualist approaches to teaching and research, this scholarship has worked to dismantle a disciplinary parochialism that restricts composition's focus to one language (English) and one nation (United States), imagined in static, homogenized, commodified, and mutually dependent terms. Translingual composition theory surfaces the linguistic heterogeneity of all written communication, even that which appears to take place in one language (as conventionally defined), and promotes writers' adeptness working across languages, dialects, genres, and discourses to make meaning in global-local contexts. Transnational composition theory highlights and encourages uptake from these contexts by promoting a view of writing and reading as dynamic material social practices that move across nation-state borders and the current and historical consolidations of capital and resources these borders mark. Further, transnational composition inquiry develops cross-border connections and sustained exchanges of ideas and resources, which introduce alternative ways of understandings and responding to—in teaching, research, and administration—these socially constructed literacy practices as constantly entangled in complex webs of ideologies and power structures.

Translingualism and transnationalism are related concepts often conflated in composition's discourse. This conflation reflects a more general conflation of language and nation advanced by a monolingualist ideology. Monolingualism, Suresh Canagarajah (2013) explains, is based on an "equivalence of language, community, and place," such that each language is "stamped with the essence of the particular community it is associated with" and "the language [is] capable of naturally expressing only the values and thoughts belonging to that community"

(20). Community itself is imagined as homogeneous and bounded by geographical spaces “colonized for one language or another” (21). As Yasemin Yildiz (2012) argues, this one-to-one equation of language, community, and territory leads to the popular (and incorrect) assumption that “individuals and social formations . . . possess one ‘true’ language, their ‘mother tongue,’ and through this possession [are] organically linked to an exclusive, clearly demarcated ethnicity, culture, and nation” (2). These links are inflected by and work to reinforce global hierarchies of symbolic power attached to “official” and “unofficial” languages and their associated regions, cultures, and communities.

Notions of a language’s social prestige in various contexts work to advance racist and colonialist ideologies and the institutional projects through which these ideologies are exercised and reinforced. We join our contributors in recognizing the need to attend to and contest hegemonic ways of thinking about and engaging with standardized national languages, language varieties, identities, and nation-states that might result from past and/or current training and professional acculturation at both the undergraduate and graduate level. We believe it is necessary to confront the dominant monolingualist and nationalist orientation of our field, as it is reproduced through the professionalization that takes place in graduate studies, in order to establish composition as a disciplinary space for linguistically and socially just epistemologies and social practices.

Translingual theory unsettles a monolingualist understanding of languages as discrete, static entities indexing belonging to equally static and hierarchically organized national-cultural collectives. In their 2011 opinion piece, “Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach,” Bruce Horner, Min-Zahn Lu, Jacqueline Jones Royster, and John Trimbur introduce the concept of “translingualism” to refer to a “disposition of openness and inquiry toward language and language differences” that resists the monolingualist reification of language, nation, and sociocultural identity (311). From this perspective, translingualism foregrounds the fluid, changeable, and performative character of language, always part of the fashioning and refashioning of identity but never in any pregiven, bounded, and predictable manner. In the context of writing and writing teaching, a translingual orientation recognizes heterogeneity in all linguistic practices, even those we are conditioned to perceive as taking place in one language and culture (Lu and Horner 2013), and values writers’ creative capacities to work across languages, dialects, genres, and registers to meet communicative exigencies. As Steven Alvarez (2016) argues, emphasis on translingual repertoires and

practices can help dismantle hegemonic language hierarchies and the policing of language standards upon which they rely. In this way, translingualism can inform composition pedagogies that “frame, conceptualize, interpret, and highlight the plurality of local histories and social struggles” (24) in minoritized communities and “create transformative educational experiences that give students theoretical tools for foregrounding social justice” (20).

This sense of translingualism, which our collection adopts, is closely linked to transnationalism insofar as transnational approaches to writing research and education often require engagements in deliberate and visible cross-language work and/or involve analysis of literacy practices easily identifiable as translingual in historically complicated geopolitical networks of dominance and resistance. As Christiane Donahue (2009) argues, transnational writing scholars must “develop rigorous practices and a grounded vocabulary for collaborative literacy research across national contexts” (235) through utilizing the full range of linguistic resources in their repertoires, including knowledge of the speech and writing patterns of other national languages. Moreover, as Rebecca Lorimer Leonard, Kate Vieira, and Morris Young (2015) note, while transnational inquiry in writing “should not be conflated with nor limited to the study of multilingualism,” “including language in analysis can reveal how writers make sense of their own practices or how they position themselves across multiple cultural, linguistic, and political contexts” (x). Analyzing the ways writers work across languages in various global-local contexts is one way to apply a transnational focus to composition, since Lorimer Leonard, Vieira, and Young define the “transnational” as “an optic or analytic that traces how individuals build social fields across real or perceived boundaries” in the context of global change (vi). Though issues of language and language plurality run through transnational composition, its focus is not restricted to them. While translingual composition scholarship has been enhanced by transnational composition research (see the “Selected Bibliography” in Horner et al.’s opinion piece [2011], which cites scholars from across the globe), translingualism is not the sole application of transnational research or the domain of transnational composition more generally.

In keeping with disciplinary trends, translingual and transnational composition scholarship to date has mainly focused on undergraduate writing pedagogy and practices in the United States (US) and abroad (Bou Ayash 2019; Canagarajah 2013; Horner and Tetreault 2017; Martins 2015). Some scholars have acknowledged that the effective implementation of translingual and transnational approaches will require changes to

the teacher-scholar training that takes place in rhetoric and composition graduate programs (Canagarajah 2016; Horner, NeCamp, and Donahue 2011; Tardy 2017; You 2016); however, these and similar engagements with the specific implications of this changing terminological and ideological landscape for graduate students' academic life and work remain dependent on the strong leadership and commitment of individual proactive faculty and their forward-looking course designs and pedagogies and have not yet widely altered existing disciplinary structures and discourses. Given connections among graduate education, disciplinary identity, and (re)production, large-scale, collaborative investigations of the ramifications of emerging translingual and transnational paradigms for the field's graduate programs are necessary if these theories are to shape composition's identity and professional practices in the long term.

Since their emergence in the late 1970s, graduate programs in rhetoric and composition have contributed to the professionalization of the field, mapping its parameters via coursework, reading lists, exams, and other requirements in distinct, sometimes idiosyncratic programmatic ways (Lauer 1984; Phelps 1995). While these curricular structures offer shape to the discipline, it is through graduate students and faculty navigating them that composition as a field of study is reproduced. As David Shumway and Craig Dionne (2002) argue, graduate students become "disciplined" through the completion of coursework and requirements to "internalize the values, norms, and standards the discipline upholds" (3). After graduation, these internalized assumptions structure their academic labor (teaching, administration, and scholarship) in what amounts to a self-policing of disciplinary boundaries (Shumway and Dionne 2002), at least in the traditional sense of the term. As far as composition is concerned, Bruce Horner (2016) forwards a model of academic disciplinary labor and knowledge as practice that crosses and remakes boundaries, borders, and traditions and that is "more true to the experience of those working in composition" (204). Counteracting the discipline's nationalist history and containment by English-only monolingualism, this collection contributes to such ongoing social material practice in its reimagining and rewriting of rhetoric and composition graduate studies.

To understand the role graduate programs play in the disciplinary uptake of translingual and translingual theories in the field, there is a pressing need for more scholarly attention to (1) the design of graduate courses and curricula that aspire to implement translingual and transnational theories of composition; (2) graduate students', faculty's, and administrators' feelings of frustration, (in)security, or (dis)empowerment in the wake of these theories and their implied professional

labor; and (3) what is at stake for graduate programs and their members working toward (and ultimately reworking) the tenets of translingualism and transnationalism in learning, teaching, scholarship, and/or the administration of existing programmatic arrangements.

With a primary focus on graduate studies and professionalization in rhetoric and composition, this collection explores the ways translingual and transnational perspectives can and should shape the labor and experiences of graduate students entering the field and staffing most first-year writing courses. It includes a range of theoretical, empirical, and narrative-based perspectives with examples and analyses from actual graduate-level programs, course designs, and campus initiatives. To maintain coherence amid this rich variety of voices, we encouraged contributors to frame their chapters around the following central questions:

- In what ways do contemporary graduate-level rhetoric and composition coursework, program design, and/or professional-development and mentorship opportunities align with and/or diverge from the tenets of translingual and transnational composition scholarship?
- How are, can, and should graduate students be professionalized to work across (language, social, cultural, and national) differences at various points in their programs ranging from coursework, to teaching, to the production/circulation of scholarship?
- How do graduate faculty and their students negotiate disciplinary traditions of graduate-level education and professionalization with emerging composition theories and pedagogical practices that call for rethinking dominant conceptualizations of language and nation and the material labor involved in researching and teaching them?
- How must twenty-first-century graduate professionalization and education be reworked in light of new understandings of and approaches to language and nation, as well as increasing global mobility and connectivity?
- How do we cultivate different types of scholarly and pedagogical expertise to counter the residual effects of past monolingualist, monocultural training and professionalization practices?
- If we accept that all teaching and mentorship is local and situated practice, how do we connect local institutional/programmatic/departmental expectations with broader disciplinary conversations on the normalcy of and necessity for translingual and transnational competence and labor?
- What can graduate students themselves do en route to take control, either individually or collectively, of their own translingual and transnational positioning and preparation?

The chapters in this collection do not provide definitive answers to these complex questions, nor are they intended to, but they do illustrate

how graduate students, fellow faculty, and administrators alike continually negotiate constraints and possibilities for change and critical innovation. We invite our readers to consider these questions along with us and the ways they have been addressed and interpreted in each chapter as the field continues to reimagine the full scope and structure of its graduate education along translingual and transnational lines. In what follows, we summarize the individual chapters and put them in communication with one another in relation to these central questions. Several currents run through the upcoming chapters, including the importance (and frequent lack) of graduate student agency in program design and assessment, models for assessing the challenges and successes of graduate programs attempting to engage in translingual and transnational work, and viable pathways for destabilizing the racist and colonialist monolingual ethos implicitly built into rhetoric and composition graduate programs and the institutions in which they are situated.

The University of Louisville graduate program in rhetoric and composition, and its current and former members, figures prominently in several chapters. This program, and the biennial Thomas R. Watson Conference it hosts, has long been a locus of translingual and transnational work in the field and was instrumental in the development of the landmark 2011 *College English* opinion statement on translingualism and its key tenets and implications (Horner et al. 2011) and in the creation of the Transnational Composition Standing Group, which has met annually and sponsored a panel at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) since 2015. As such, its faculty and former graduate students are well positioned to participate in the discussion this collection works to engage, and the program itself is a useful site for analysis of the ways translingual and transnational theories influence graduate education as material social practices situated in spatiotemporal contexts. That said, other institutional locations are also represented in this collection—such as the University of Texas at El Paso, the University of Washington, Penn State University, the University of Arizona, and Barry University, illustrating that translingual and transnational concerns are not exclusive to one graduate program but emerge in locally situated ways as graduate students and faculty negotiate the material conditions of writing teaching and research, currently and historically.

Based on perspectives from specific graduate-level programs and courses, this collection presents potential pathways for developing translingual and transnational orientations in such primary sites of disciplinary socialization. Insights from various chapters suggest

rhetoric and composition graduate programs and curricula are caught up in what Yildiz (2012) describes as the “postmonolingual condition” of twenty-first-century Western social and academic life, a complex “field of tension” (5) in which a dominant nationalist-monolingualist ideology continues to assert and sustain itself just as emergent translingual, transnational representations of and practices with language and literacy are increasingly gaining ground. Though such programs and curricula are inflected by the flow of diverse discourses, knowledge constructions, Englishes, languages, and language varieties as a result of transnational patterns of migration and border crossings, these flows remain largely conditioned by the privileging of English-only, US-centric ways of languaging, reading, writing, and knowing. In response to deeply entrenched national and language-ideological allegiances in graduate-level work, the chapters that follow represent small-scale, localized efforts to confront disciplinary blinders imposed by nationalistic views of the world and perspectives on languages as closed systems with clearly demarcated boundaries impervious to foreign influence. Such efforts are not meant to be read as ultimate solutions for all problems pertaining to the current state of graduate education but rather as invitations for further exploration, experimentation, and collaboration among graduate faculty, advisors, administrators, and students. In other words, these invitations bring the rigorous ideological work of translingualism and transnationalism within the scope of various stakeholders’ power, available program and/or campus resources, and funding opportunities (for compensation, hiring, professional development, new course development and design, pedagogical innovation, policy reform, etc.).

Taken together, these chapters identify rhetoric and composition graduate programs as potential sites of transformation to expose and intervene in the dominant ideologies of monolingualism and nationalism that continue to shape compositionists’ belief systems and professional practices as teachers, scholars, and administrators in linguistically and culturally heterogeneous institutions. Such transformation in graduate education, however, can only begin by moving beyond the kind of *ideologiekritik* of nationalist monolingual ideologies that characterizes the field’s contemporary translingual and transnational writing scholarship toward a deeper attention to and examination of their real, damaging effects of linguistic racism and the erasure of difference—intellectual as well as linguistic, racial, and ethnic (Bou Ayash 2019, 165; Gilyard 2016, 287). In fact, pointing toward “models for radical, translingual engagement” in the field, Keith Gilyard (2016) advocates for dedicating time and energy to documenting the negotiation efforts and “stories

of struggle . . . and . . . triumph” (288) of students,<sup>1</sup> especially so-called ethnic minorities, in order to get “a fuller portrait” of their complex life and work amid the productive tensions of working closely and collaboratively with faculty and each other across racial, ethnic, linguistic, and other differences.

Taking up Gilyard’s calls, part 1, “Invisible and Dislocated: Graduate Student Insights in Translingual and Transnational Contexts,” is comprised of graduate student accounts of their experiences negotiating tensions among the monolingual assumptions of US higher education generally, rhetoric and composition graduate education specifically, and the porous national and linguistic borders that define their lives. At every turn in their graduate studies, students are positioned on the front lines of these ideological tensions largely not of their own making and are most burdened with the task of confronting them. Therefore, we open the collection with fresh graduate student perspectives on how the advent of translingual and transnational theories and pedagogies in the field has affected their lived experiences and daily labor in order to set the scene for the chapters that follow in part 2, which offer practical applications of translingual and transnational writing theories and pedagogies to graduate education.

Representing the voices of students socially designated as mainstream and language minoritized, as users of English as a first and additional language, these critical reflections document a significant lack of graduate student agency and autonomy, a lack monolingualism has structured into graduate curricula and programs. We echo our contributors’ conviction that graduate students at various stages of their academic careers are to be seen as agentive language users and active collaborators on program development and revision (Lerma et al., chapter 1; Zaleski and You, chapter 6). Graduate faculty can and should play a significant role in designing student-fronted pedagogies and courses that value their students’ language expertise and cross-border experiences and closely attend to their narratives of meso-level negotiations across spaces, times, knowledges, national languages, language practices, cultures, and (racialized, classed, gendered, sexed, abled) identities.

The chapters by Corina Lerma, Moisés García-Rentería, Patricia Flores, Kate Mangelsdorf, and Lucía Durá, and Joseph Franklin, Emily Yuko Cousins, and Alex Way attest to the fact that new and continuing rhetoric and composition graduate students too have responsibilities in taking more control of their academic and professional careers. They can do so through recognizing the constant interplay between socially dominant ideologies of linguistic nationalism, on one hand,

and counterhegemonic ideologies, on another hand, and how their complex negotiations of these inform their subject positionings in relation to texts, contexts, readers/writers, and conventions. Consequently, graduate students can ultimately participate in the construction and reconstruction of their sociocultural and political realities and futures.

In their contribution, “Doing Translingualism through Panoramic Ethos: Three Transnational Graduate Students’ Pathways across Multiliteracies and Implications for Program Practices,” Lerma, García-Rentería, Flores, Mangelsdorf, and Durá use the concept of “panoramic ethos” to highlight and extend translingual theories of language and subjectivity, as well as their implications for graduate teaching and learning. University of Texas at El Paso graduate students’ testimonios of lived experiences on the US-Mexico border illustrate their facility as sophisticated translingual practitioners working across racial and ethnic lines, negotiating national, sociocultural, and linguistic borders in material and theoretical educational contexts. By contrast, programmatic literature tends to deny student agency, especially around “language,” casting their expertise as “invisible, ignored, or exoticized.” To address the disconnect between graduate program expectations and students’ linguistic practices, histories, and subjectivities, a panoramic ethos extends translingual theory’s assertion that difference is normative and further highlights the “deficits” in student, teacher, and programmatic understanding that normative difference in the classroom implies. The authors suggest possibilities for program designs that engage all stakeholders’—students’, teachers’, and administrators’—multiple subjectivities and languages, focusing not on the unidirectional pursuit of preestablished objectives and standards but rather on renegotiating understandings of and motivations for rhetoric and composition learning in diverse, situated contexts.

Franklin, Cousins, and Way join Lerma, García-Rentería, Flores, Mangelsdorf, and Durá in making visible the often-overlooked challenges graduate students face as they confront the complex ideological entanglements, contradictions, and ruptures that characterize their education and training. In “(En)countering Monolingualism: A Transnational Sensemaking of Graduate Education,” Franklin, Cousins, and Way offer further evidence of graduate-program practices that deny student agency, and add that such practices reproduce “sedentary, monolingualist” assumptions advancing fast-capitalist agendas in higher education across the globe. They begin with narratives of their experiences as international English-language teachers and US rhetoric and composition graduate students, recounting in painful detail the

commodification of their language practices, labor, and professional subjectivities in the context of the neoliberal values driving “English” higher education in the United States and abroad. The authors then reflect on their experiences with translingual and transnational scholarship as graduate students, observing that these theories provided a way to locate themselves as liminal subjects working across national and professional borders, as well as ideological frameworks to resist alienating, unsustainable subjectivities and labor practices.

By virtue of their experiences, Franklin, Cousins, and Way argue that translingual and transnational approaches to rhetoric and composition graduate education can and should accent the valuable experiential knowledge students bring to their programs, disrupt programmatic assumptions about language and identity tied to uncritical perceptions of the demands of “the market,” and summon shifts in ideology and practice to enhance collaboration and community. Their narratives and sensemaking highlight the ways monolingual ideology lays the groundwork for the commodification of language, language users (including teachers and students), and languaging, imagined in terms of decontextualized language “skills” exchanged on academic and professional markets. Translingual ideology—in so much as it offers an alternative to monolingualism—can offer new conceptualizations of disciplinary members and work that resist this commodification, and, by extension, the broader fast-capitalist, monological structures increasingly imposed on composition teaching and learning. Making these changes can position programs to more fruitfully address the changing conditions of teaching, learning, and even the “market” in twenty-first-century contexts of internationalizing higher education.

Our student-centered section concludes with Carrie Kilfoil’s “The Postmonolingual Condition and the Rhetoric and Composition PhD: Norming Language Difference in a Doctoral Program.” In her empirically driven chapter, Kilfoil presents data from a 2013 survey of University of Louisville graduate students’ perceptions of language diversity to illuminate how disciplinary language ideology is being restructured to account for growing awareness of linguistic heterogeneity in writing and writing teaching. Offering a postmonolingual reading of her data, Kilfoil attunes to the presence of multilingual perceptions and practices among graduate students amid the continued forcefulness of the monolingual paradigm. Specifically, she notes how respondents consistently indicate their awareness of and appreciation for language differences in their writing program, as well as desires to engage multiple languages and English dialects in composition teaching and research. However,

she argues the continued dominance of monolingualist ideology is evidenced by the ways respondents tended to imagine these engagements as taking place through curricular add-ons and extracurricular activities that pose practical barriers to their timely progression through the program. Drawing from student comments and recommendations, Kilfoil suggests ways this program, and others like it, can leverage students' positive perceptions of and attitudes toward multilingualism to "norm" language differences in its mainstream rhetoric and composition graduate curriculum, thus lessening the material barriers graduate students perceive to engaging language issues in their professional development.

Shifting from student-centered to departmental, programmatic, and institutional perspectives and the necessary work of revamping curricula, structures, and practices in graduate education, part 2, "(Trans)Disciplinary and Knowledge Building in Graduate Curricula and Mentorship," opens with the theoretically oriented essay "Transforming Graduate Education in Rhetoric and Composition: Toward a Transnational and Translingual Revaluation" by Bruce Horner.

With its central argument that graduate-level rhetoric and composition programs and courses must rethink and revalue what they are already doing so it may be done "differently," Horner's chapter helps bridge the student experiences and perspectives shared in the previous section and the practices and initiatives outlined in this section. Since the graduate student narratives and accounts offered in part 1 articulate how monolingualist, nationalist ideologies negatively impact graduate student experiences and learning processes, it is tempting to read translingualism and transnationalism, as depicted in this section, as stable bodies of knowledge and practices that offer shiny new "solutions" to these "problems." That said, such understandings obscure how translingualism and transnationalism operate as ways of seeing that expose the linguistically and culturally fluid, heterogeneous character of rhetoric and composition, currently and historically, to enable and foreclose particular opportunities for meaning making in its graduate programs. In his chapter, Horner emphasizes the need to acknowledge the ordinariness and normativity of translingual and transnational relations in that "matters of language and nationality" are and have always been part and parcel of rhetoric and composition graduate education. The seeming uniqueness and newness of translingual and transnational relations, as Horner notes, "attests *not* to their actual novelty, but, rather, the new awareness of their presence," hence of their force and significance (emphasis added).

Tracing the trajectory of the graduate seminars he taught at his home institution, the University of Louisville, and offering a reflective analysis

of the place and role of translanguality and transnationality in his course designs and syllabi, Horner stresses the growing tensions of reconciling the desire for pedagogical innovation and creativity, on one hand, and a crucial realization, on another hand, that there is nothing “new” or “special” about the translingual and transnational in composition. In response to such felt tensions, he voices skepticism toward the design of individual graduate-level courses with the explicit goal of transmitting and securing “a stable body” of specialized knowledge on the translingual and/or transnational character of various aspects of composition work. Alternatively, Horner calls for a more integrated approach to curricular changes and revisions, demanding of both graduate faculty and their students a qualitative, not additive, “reevaluation and transformation” of the full set of threshold concepts that have come to shape ways of seeing and doing language and nationality in graduate programs and courses. In his own words, this approach requires endorsing and cultivating “a different understanding of language, language relations, users, contexts of use, and the relations among these, and a different understanding of the transnational location and movement of work in and on composition.” After all, as Horner (2016) points out in earlier work with Min-Zhan Lu, it is the “labor of revision that is always what we, in concert with our students, take up, and take responsibility for (whether or not we acknowledge that responsibility) in our thinking, teaching/learning, writing” and re-envisioning of programmatic structures and designs (216).

Echoing Horner’s call for integrative curricular revisions aimed at normalizing translingual, transnational practices and identities endemic to rhetoric and composition graduate programs, the rest of the chapters that comprise part 2 offer insights on how to more effectively shape the experiences and practices of graduate students through carefully structured curriculum design, mentorship, and teacher/tutor training. We encourage readers to approach the pedagogical and curricular transformations some of these chapters describe not as contradictory to Horner’s suggestions but rather as interconnected and a further indication of the difficult work ahead of us in unveiling the intrinsically translingual and transnational character of graduate rhetoric and composition work that has been *unnoticed* and *unexamined* in theory, policy, and practice for so long under a monolingual nationalist paradigm. In fact, because a monolingual, nationalist mindset is both pervasive and pervasively naturalized, it is often difficult for our graduate students and many of our colleagues to see the ordinariness of translanguality and transnationality in their literate work and life without the aid of sensitizing pedagogical praxis and curricular interventions like the ones Bou Ayash, Michelle

Zaleski and Xiaoye You, and Madelyn Pawlowski and Christine M. Tardy, have designed. Put differently, the translingual and transnational connections this collection strives to promote in rhetoric and composition graduate education are in reality both *not new and new* and, therefore, necessitate closer, louder, and more open engagements among graduate students, mentors, researchers, teachers, and/or administrators.

Detailing concrete ways to work from graduate students' needs and concerns regarding foreign-language learning, Bou Ayash, in her chapter "Translation and Translingual Competence in Graduate Training," presents critical translation as a valuable pedagogical resource for actively promoting their translingual competence and sensibilities. With an eye toward how translation might reorient translingual inquiry and how translingualism might reorient translation practice, Bou Ayash describes a locally sensitive pedagogic initiative at the University of Washington, a large public research university in the Pacific Northwest US region, that prepares graduate students for agentively pursuing cross-language relations in their writing, research, and teaching practices. Reflecting on the affordances and challenges of teaching a graduate seminar on the theoretical and practical approaches to translation from a transdisciplinary perspective, she emphasizes how through centralizing translation in its full complexity, such pedagogical spaces can become key institutional sites for promising discussions among graduate students, faculty, and program administrators surrounding the often-ignored, undisturbed PhD language requirement. As Bou Ayash demonstrates, a strong focus on the complex politics and problematics of translation brings graduate students (even those traditionally labeled as *monolingual speakers* for whom English is a first and dominant language) face to face with the reality of difference in today's translingual and transnational literate world. In this sense, Bou Ayash argues rhetoric and composition graduate curricula must provide opportunities for their students to fully integrate translation practice into their scholarly and pedagogical pursuits.

The chapters by Zaleski and You, and Pawlowski and Tardy, emphasize that the complexities of language and rhetoric in today's local-global contact zones merit strong representation in rhetoric and composition graduate programs. In their chapter entitled "Comparative Rhetoric and the Translingual Future of Mentorship," Zaleski and You share insights on the transformative relationships to "texts, rhetorical traditions [and practices], and authority" emerging out of You's teaching of a comparative rhetoric graduate seminar, on one hand, and, on another hand, Zaleski's active participation and coursework in that seminar. Disrupting the strict binaries of novice versus expert that define

traditional teacher-student/mentor-mentee relationships, Zaleski and You specifically describe forging a translingual-oriented mentoring relationship marked by curiosity, deliberative inquiry, informed risk taking, experimentation, self-reflexivity, and productive dialogue across difference. The “cosmopolitan dispositions” and relations such translingual mentorship affords contribute to leveling the playing field in graduate training in that these demand from graduate faculty not only the willingness to accept the agentive role students play as fellow writers and rewriters of disciplinary knowledge, but also the humility to let go of their positioning as the sole authority figures with the final word on research- and teaching-related matters. In conclusion, Zaleski and You call for cultivating translingual and transnational sensibilities through incorporating comparative rhetorical studies into graduate rhetoric and composition curricula.

In “The Role of Graduate Education in Building Writing Teachers’ Knowledge of Language,” Pawlowski and Tardy also call for changes to rhetoric and composition graduate curricula that decenter graduate-faculty expertise, thereby making space for language-related coursework and concepts that trouble traditional disciplinary boundaries. Pawlowski and Tardy trace the decline of language-related research and scholarship in rhetoric and composition and its graduate programs, noting recent concerns that, as a consequence, many disciplinary professionals lack the formal language-related knowledge to engage in translingual teaching and scholarship responsibly. They then report on a study of graduate student teachers in a US writing program that suggests students need what Pawlowski (2019, 55) has elsewhere termed enhanced “pedagogical language knowledge” (PLK): a knowledge of language and its pedagogical relevance in the writing classroom. Through survey data and interviews with individual graduate students, Pawlowski and Tardy illustrate tensions between students’ critical language awareness, often informed by multilingual experiences outside their graduate work, and low levels of confidence applying pedagogical practices that reflect that awareness. Pawlowski and Tardy conclude that graduate students’ metalinguistic insecurity, lack of confidence designing and facilitating lessons for L2 students, and tendency to consider language instruction solely in terms of grammar correction indicate programs must apply an interdisciplinary approach to graduate students’ development of PLK. They encourage programs to both allow for and require outside coursework, in, for instance, applied linguistics and modern languages, and for rhetoric and composition faculty to apply greater attention to “bridging concepts like genre, transfer, and code” in core coursework to

better prepare graduate students for the mobile, multilingual realities of contemporary composition teaching.

The final chapter, “A Translingual Approach to Tutoring International Graduate Students” by Aimee Jones, presents how the translingual and transnational directions this collection is forwarding can materialize in writing center work. Uniquely situated outside but alongside graduate programs, writing centers as “third spaces” (Reiff et al. 2015, 15) contribute to the language and literacy socialization of graduate students and help build opportunities for them to skillfully network various aspects of their academic and professional lives. More specifically, Jones reports on a case study of international multilingual graduate students’ motivations and expectations for using the writing center at a large R1 public university in Florida. Interviews and tutoring-session transcripts illustrate how the widely accepted binary model of writing center tutoring, which breaks down client needs into higher-order concerns (HOCs) and lower-order concerns (LOCs), risks eclipsing the specific language needs of these students. As a corrective, Jones advocates for a translingual approach to tutor training that eschews the implicit monolingualism of the binary model, instead highlighting the productive labor of writing center clients as language users working across languages. This model for writing center tutor training, according to Jones, would disrupt the HOC and LOC binary and work to replace nondirective, Socratic styles of tutor-client interaction with dialogue and negotiation. In addition, a translingual approach to tutor training would professionalize writing center tutors to see multilingual student writers’ motivations and expectations as dynamic and shifting in relationship to their developing semiotic repertoires and academic identities.

The collection concludes with a collection of short response essays that critically engage with the perspectives, arguments, and recommendations already presented in parts 1 and 2. The individual responses by Amy J. Wan, Anselma Widha Prihandita, Joe Wilson, and Brice Nordquist comprising part 3 highlight the important yet complex work still to be done if we are to pursue translingual and transnational relations in graduate rhetoric and composition studies. In her response, “Shifting the Paradigm of Translingual and Transnational Graduate Education,” Wan reflects on the “messy” and “deliberate” nature of the contributors’ work to centralize translingual and transnational orientations in rhetoric and composition graduate education. For Wan, the contributors’ efforts illustrate that applying such orientations is about much more than simply promoting the “acceptance of people who speak languages other than English or who come to the US to study from other countries”

in individual graduate courses. Indeed, she cautions against seeing the movement this collection seeks to document and advance only in terms of increasing representation of diverse languages, discourses, and people in graduate pedagogy, lest the “the optics of diversity” become a cover for maintaining oppressive institutional structures in which we and our field are deeply enmeshed. In this sense, Wan urges readers to see the chapters in this collection as examples of concerted efforts to go against the grain of dominant institutional ideologies, illustrative of the hard work involved in changing a racist, monolingualist system of higher education from the bottom up through various points of intervention: pedagogical, programmatic, and institutional. Wan emphasizes the important role of institutionally secure tenure-line faculty who can and should bravely and actively engage in this process as she highlights connections between monolingualist sensibilities and “white supremacist dispositions and structures” to clarify what is at stake in making these changes and why we must fight for them.

In “Translingualism and Transnationalism as Decolonial Recovery,” Prihandita demonstrates a similar commitment toward social justice within the academy more broadly and graduate education in particular. Informed by her own struggles negotiating difference in academic writing as a female international graduate student of color, she argues that the field’s translingual and transnational approaches to writing must be researched and taught as a form of what she terms “decolonial recovery” for them to reach their full counterhegemonic potential in graduate-level academic work and life. Such acts of “*recovery from coloniality*” place a strong focus on recognizing, reclaiming, and capitalizing on the diverse meanings, knowledges, language resources, rhetorical traditions, and literacy practices graduate students inevitably bring with them into their writing and learning but that get lost, silenced, and erased under traditional colonized models of graduate training. The difficult task of dismantling such colonial logics in rhetoric and composition graduate education, according to Prihandita, begins by enacting sustained structural critique, developing cosmopolitan dispositions of openness and accommodation, and, most important, constantly questioning how naturalized beliefs and practices continue to maintain—albeit inadvertently—linguistic, racial, and epistemic privilege and institutional power.

Wilson, in “Distributing the Labor of Translation in the Context of Graduate Education in Writing Studies,” takes up the question of labor—and the translingual and transnational orientations it is associated with—and how “we conceive of and locate” its concrete

manifestation in active translations across genres, named languages, and language practices in diverse writing situations. Considering the interplay between rhetorical genre studies, on one hand, and, on the other hand, translingual and transnational scholarship in the field, Wilson prompts us to think more critically about the many genres we purposefully select for our graduate seminars, program policies, curricula, and assessment tools and the ways these genres can further support, leverage, and reward our graduate students' labor of "translating their rhetorical, linguistic, and disciplinary knowledges" while developing deeper translingual and transnational sensibilities.

In his response, "Translingual and Transnational Graduate Education for the Local Public Good," Brice Nordquist reflects upon the goals of this collection in the context of various environmental, sociopolitical, and public health crises that have further contributed to inequality and injustice on a local and global level. He specifically notes that rhetoric and composition's "productions and applications of knowledge . . . are struck in fixed tracks of professional preparation and performance" that seem ill equipped to address the current moment. Following Lerma et al.'s recommendations, he confirms that translingual and transnational attention to the "language practices and mobilities that constitute our classrooms and programs" can offer graduate faculty and their students opportunities to reframe disciplinary knowledge building to be more socially attuned and responsible. In this sense, Nordquist suggests, "attention to local language practice and coconstructions of localities, along with a commitment to the boundary-crossing work of democratic education, can broaden our understandings of graduate and postgraduate success and thus open up more possibilities for conceiving of and enacting graduate education as a public good."

Rhetoric and composition graduate programs and classrooms are useful sites for facilitating intellectual curiosity and risk taking and subsequent ideological clarity about the operation and profound impacts of monolingual nationalism on writing and writers. Just as important, they are also sites of some of the most creative thinking and innovation about what to do differently and how. Therefore, translingual and transnational change in rhetoric and composition must start with graduate education as a critical gap in disciplinary research. As Stephen North (2000) observes of English studies generally, composition "appears to have very little historical sense, shared or otherwise, of its efforts at doctoral education" and, moreover, "no significant tradition of dealing with doctoral education as education" (2). In fact, identifying a paradox in rhetoric and composition graduate studies, Sidney Dobrin (2005) notes

how it works to enculturate students into the field, yet its practices often run counter to, and even tacitly argue against, disciplinary theories and research. Along the same lines, Louise Wetherbee Phelps (1995) argues, “The maturation of Ph.D. programs in composition and rhetoric creates a rhetorical exigency to study and theorize doctoral practices of education as deeply and seriously as we have undergraduate teaching” (117).

As we point out at the beginning of our introduction, compositionists have spent considerable time and energy discussing undergraduate writing teaching and learning and not as much time understanding the complexity of graduate students’ sociocultural positioning, linguistic and cultural practices, and lived experiences as scholars and teachers. Moreover, little attention has been applied to thinking about how our current practices and standards might be inadvertently perpetuating and strengthening, rather than challenging, the marginalization of these positionings, practices, and experiences. To do so, we must begin to see graduate education as education: a set of (meta)pedagogical and epistemic practices that are rich, multilayered, and locally oriented insofar as they involve the socialization of prospective writing teachers and scholars. These practices map out the conditions of possibility in the field and in so doing inculcate the conceptions of language and nation that shape the ways its members see themselves as professionals and conduct disciplinary work.

As Barbara Gleason (2006) reminds us, complex decision-making about the design of graduate curricula must take into consideration the “value a knowledge base may have for improving the opportunities and lives of individuals, families, and entire communities” (267). Collectively, our contributors suggest ways translingual and transnational writing theories and pedagogies can improve the “opportunities and lives” of stakeholders in rhetoric and composition graduate education during a time of unprecedented challenge. As the COVID-19 pandemic amplifies fast-capitalist influences on institutions, humanities-based disciplines like rhetoric and composition (and the new faculty they produce) are increasingly called upon to prove their relevance and worth in internationalizing institutions beset by declining enrollments and ensuing budget cuts. Like the virus, the market and its pressures highlight the illusory quality of national borders, across which neoliberal ideologies and their commodified visions of language, students, faculty, and disciplines (and the reified job-ready “skills”—linguistic and otherwise—they represent) pass as institutions struggle for financial solvency, or growth beyond it. As the graduate student contributions in this collection suggest (Lerma et al., chapter 1; Franklin, Cousins, and Way,

chapter 2), translingualism and transnationalism provide a knowledge base for future faculty to locate themselves within the dynamic ideological landscape of global higher education and resist the damaging subjectivities and labor practices fast-capitalist, monolingualist interpretations of “English” teachers and teaching impose on them, their students, and the wider disciplinary community they are working to join.

At this crucial stage in graduate students’ professional development, it is incumbent on graduate faculty, program directors, and institutions to integrate translingual and transnational sensibilities into curricular planning and pedagogy, as our contributors have demonstrated, in order to ensure graduate students find strong support, modeling, and training for the counterhegemonic teaching and research needed at this critical moment in the field. That said, we are mindful that, for many graduate faculty, administrators, and students, making revisions to graduate programs already underresourced and overextended in terms of their goals and responsibilities is an intimidating prospect. This collection aims to provide inspiration and models for making these curricular and pedagogical changes while illustrating the importance of productive collaboration and transdisciplinarity to make them feasible and sustainable in a dominantly “individualistic,” insular “graduate school culture that prevails in the humanities” and beyond (Cassuto 2015, 2).

A small first step in that direction would be to draw graduate students and their faculty into the kind of collaborative relationships several of our contributors have taken up in the very act of composing their own chapters, namely Lerma et al., Zaleski and You, and Pawlowski and Tardy. By deliberately engaging with the language resources and experiences students and faculty bring into programs, finding ways to reimagine core courses along transdisciplinary lines, and forming partnerships with allied departments and programs in global studies, applied linguistics, translation studies, foreign and second-language studies, and modern languages, graduate programs can integrate translingual and transnational orientations in epistemologically and materially attainable, sustainable ways. As Bruce Horner, Samantha NeCamp, and Christiane Donahue (2011) note, a translingual orientation to language difference and heterogeneity “shifts our focus away from individuals, located on a fixed scale of competence toward ‘mastery’ of a reified ‘target’ language, and toward groups of people working in collaboration to use all available linguistic resources; and it shifts our focus away from disciplinary boundaries separating specific traditions of scholarship on writing and its teaching, and toward putting these diverse traditions in dialogue with one another to the benefit of all those working ‘in’ them” (288).

By working together, dialogically, to deconstruct research silos and create alternative linguistic practices and institutional structures inspired by innovative modes of professionalization, graduate faculty and students can do more than just weather the unprecedented shock of shuttered campuses, faculty layoffs, and historically low tenure-track hiring in the humanities. We can remake rhetoric and composition graduate programs to foster the disciplinary dispositions needed for future faculty to meaningfully address challenges posed by this particular moment of geopolitical crisis and what lies beyond it.

The pandemic has laid bare and amplified the material, existential consequences of stark and persistent inequities among races, ethnicities, cultures, nations, genders, sexualities, and differently abled bodies. At this juncture, expanding access to (and definitions of what counts as) research-based knowledge, the symbolic capital it carries, the material capital for which it can be exchanged, and the sociomaterial resources of academic institutions is critically important for marginalized and underserved individuals across the globe. Antiracist and decolonial projects in composition studies have worked to destabilize widely accepted (and traditionally institutionally transmitted and reinforced) hegemonic assumptions about writing and its teaching to claim space for minoritized people and rhetorics in academic institutions. These projects are bound up in issues of language, nation, and sociocultural identity and share many practical and epistemological concerns with scholarship in translingual and transnational studies, including matters of linguistic justice, epistemological exclusion, and faculty inclusion and representation. As Wan suggests in her response to this collection, scholars of translingualism, transnationalism, decolonialism, and antiracism in composition are potential “accomplices and allies” in a collective struggle to shift dominant disciplinary paradigms regarding “what it means to build knowledge within the institution of higher education” and who is invited to participate in this knowledge building.

Though beyond the scope of this collection, several chapters suggest connections between translingual and transnational theories and antiracist, decolonial work aimed at opening up and redefining academic literacies, rhetorics, and writing program teaching and administration along inclusive and equitable lines. We see these connections as a point of departure for future research in composition studies and urge further consideration of how translingual and transnational scholarship and sensibilities, as conducted and inculcated in rhetoric and composition graduate education, can further support antiracist and decolonial initiatives in the field. Such research would highlight the power of rhetoric

and composition graduate programs to improve the lives and labor of the many people our field touches, thereby revaluing our graduate studies as matters of social responsibility in linguistically and socioculturally diverse institutions and the communities in which they are situated.

#### NOTE

1. Gilyard here addresses college students, but his views hold equally true on the graduate level.

#### REFERENCES

- Alvarez, Steven. 2016. "Literacy." In *Decolonizing Rhetoric and Composition Studies: New Latinx Keywords for Theory and Pedagogy*, edited by Iris Ruiz and Raúl Sánchez, 17–30. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bou Ayash, Nancy. 2019. *Toward Translingual Realities in Composition: (Re)Working Local Language Representations and Practices*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. 2013. *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. London: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. 2016. "Translingual Writing and Teacher Development in Composition." *College English* 78 (3): 264–72.
- Cassuto, Leonardo. 2015. *The Graduate School Mess: What Caused It and How We Can Fix It*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dobrin, Sidney I. 2005. "Introduction: Finding Space for the Composition Practicum." In *Don't Call It That: The Composition Practicum*, edited by Sidney I. Dobrin, 1–37. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Donahue, Christiane. 2009. "'Internationalization' and Composition Studies: Reorienting the Discourse." *College Composition and Communication* 61 (2): 212–43.
- Gilyard, Keith. 2016. "The Rhetoric of Translingualism." *College English* 78 (3): 284–89.
- Gleason, Barbara. 2006. "Reasoning the Need: Graduate Education and Basic Writing." *Journal of Basic Writing* 25 (2): 49–75.
- Horner, Bruce. 2016. *Rewriting Composition: Terms of Exchange*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Horner, Bruce, Min-Zhan Lu, Jacqueline Jones Royster, and John Trimbur. 2011. "Language Difference: Toward a Translingual Approach." *College English* 73 (3): 299–317.
- Horner, Bruce, Samantha NeCamp, and Christiane Donahue. 2011. "Toward a Multilingual Composition Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm." *College Composition and Communication* 63 (2): 269–300.
- Horner, Bruce, and Laura Tetreault, eds. 2017. *Crossing Divides: Exploring Translingual Writing Pedagogies and Programs*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Lauer, Janice. 1984. "Composition Studies: Dappled Discipline." *Rhetoric Review* 3 (1): 20–29.
- Lorimer Leonard, Rebecca, Kate Vieira, and Morris Young. 2015. "Special Editors' Introduction." *Literacy in Composition Studies* 3 (3): vi–xii.
- Lu, Min-Zhan, and Bruce Horner. 2013. "Translingual Literacy, Language Difference, and Matters of Agency." *College English* 75 (6): 586–611.
- Martins, David. 2015. *Transnational Writing Program Administration*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- North, Stephen. 2000. *Refiguring the Ph.D. In English Studies: Writing, Doctoral Education, and the Fusion-Based Curriculum*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

- Pawlowski, Madelyn T. 2019. "Locating and Supporting the Developing Pedagogical Language Knowledge of College Writing Instructors." PhD dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Phelps, Louise Wetherbee. 1995. "Reproducing Composition and Rhetoric: The Intellectual Challenge of Doctoral Education." *Composition Studies* 23 (2): 115–32.
- Reiff, Mary Jo, Anis S. Bawarshi, Michelle Ballif, and Christian R. Weisser. 2015. *Ecologies of Writing Programs: Program Profiles in Context*. Anderson, SC: Parlor.
- Shumway, David, and Craig Dionne, ed. 2002. *Disciplining English: Alternative Histories, Critical Perspectives*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Tardy, Christine. 2017. "Crossing, or Creating, Divides? A Plea for Transdisciplinary Scholarship." In *Crossing Divides*, edited by Bruce Horner and Laura Tetreault, 181–89. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Yildiz, Yasemin. 2012. *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- You, Xiaoye. 2016. *Cosmopolitan English and Transliteracy*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.