

“GETTING THINGS ‘ALT’ ENOUGH”: A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF
COMPOSITION SCHOLARS’ USE OF HYBRID
ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

Except where reference is made to the work of others, the work described in this thesis is my own or was done in collaboration with my advisory committee. This thesis does not include proprietary or classified information.

Caroline Grace Wilkinson

Certificate of Approval:

Michelle A. Sidler
Associate Professor
English

Kevin R. Roozen, Chair
Assistant Professor
English

Thomas E. Nunnally
Associate Professor
English

George T. Flowers
Dean
Graduate School

“GETTING THINGS ‘ALT’ ENOUGH”: A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF
COMPOSITION SCHOLARS’ USE OF HYBRID
ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

Caroline Grace Wilkinson

A Thesis

Submitted to

the Graduate Faculty of

Auburn University

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the

Degree of

Master of Arts

Auburn, AL
May 9, 2009

“GETTING THINGS ‘ALT’ ENOUGH”: A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF
COMPOSITION SCHOLARS’ USE OF HYBRID
ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

Caroline Grace Wilkinson

Permission is granted to Auburn University to make copies of this thesis at its discretion,
upon request of individuals or institutions and at their expense. The author reserves all
publication rights.

Signature of Author

Date of Graduation

VITA

Caroline Grace Wilkinson, daughter of Jeffrey Byrd and Susan (Williamson) Wilkinson, was born December 8, 1984, in Opelika, Alabama. She graduated from Auburn High School in 2003. She attended Auburn University and graduated summa cum laude with a Bachelor of Arts degree in English in May, 2007. She entered Graduate School at Auburn University in August 2007.

THESIS ABSTRACT

“GETTING THINGS ‘ALT’ ENOUGH”: A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF
COMPOSITION SCHOLARS’ USE OF HYBRID
ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

Caroline Wilkinson

Master of Arts, May 9, 2009
(B.A., Auburn University, 2007)

82 Typed Pages

Directed by Kevin R. Roozen

Much writing studies research addresses the benefits of undergraduates’ application of hybrid academic discourse in the composition classroom, but there has not been research on scholars’ use of it. This thesis analyzed two composition scholars’ use of hybrid academic discourse in their publications by a rhetorical analysis through the lens of Mikhail Bakhtin and James Paul Gee, and text-based interviews with the scholars themselves.

Hybrid academic discourse is utilized by these scholars to attract a more diverse audience, incite audience awareness, and also allow individuals to self-reflect more in academic work. Implications for this use in research and teaching are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank Dr. Kevin Roozen for his continual encouragement and assistance throughout the drafting and revising process and Dr. Michelle Sidler and Dr. Thomas Nunnally for their helpful revisions. Thanks also due to family members Mom and Dad for their support during this work.

MLA used

Microsoft Office 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Definition.....	2
Literature Review.....	4
Research Questions.....	12
CHAPTER II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	14
Mikhail Bakhtin.....	14
James Paul Gee.....	19
Relationship Between Bakhtin and Gee.....	23
CHAPTER III. DONALD MCCRARY.....	25
Restatement.....	26
Embedded Hybridity.....	34
Conclusion.....	40
CHAPTER IV. MICHAEL SPOONER.....	42
Reported Speech.....	44
Humor.....	50
Conclusion.....	56
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....	59
Research Implications.....	63

Chapter One: Introduction

“To study the word as such, ignoring the impulse that reaches out beyond it, is just as senseless as to study psychological experience outside the context of that real life toward which it was directed and by which it was determined.”-Mikhail Bakhtin¹

In the last thirty years, composition scholars have begun to approach the discord between a growing diverse academic population in American universities and the “conception of English writing in the United States as a unidirectional and monolingual acquisition of literate competence” (Canagarajah 586).² The academic community had begun to diversify its identity with more minorities, women, and economically marginalized individuals not only attending college, but becoming scholars at the university level. While the population of composition scholars was changing, the discourse privileged in composition classrooms and utilized in published journals remained the same. Like the diverse student population, these “new academics”³

¹ “Discourse in the Novel,” 292.

² In April 1974, the CCCC adopted a resolution to address the variety of student dialects in composition classrooms, owing to more diversity at the university level in the United States. CCCC published this resolution in Fall 1974 in a special issue stating, “We affirm the students’ right to their own patterns and varieties of language—the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own identity and style...The claim that any one dialect is unacceptable amounts to an attempt of one social group to exert its dominance over another” (“Students’ Right” 2-3).

³ When she states “new academic,” Bizzell refers to the increase in diversity of post-secondary education teachers and scholars (“Hybrid” 11).

⁴ Traditional academic discourse, according to Bizzell, “enforces a typical worldview, such that personal speaking through academic writing projects the following characteristics” (“Hybrid” 10). For these characteristics, read Bizzell’s “Hybrid Academic Discourses: What, Why, How.”

encountered tension as the stringent standards of traditional academic discourse⁴ did not parallel the pluralization which had occurred in the academy (“Hybrid” 11).

Hybrid academic discourse is a form by which scholars can express this ever changing diversity in the academy. Patricia Bizzell coined this term in 1999, defining it as a new form of academic writing that “borrows from both [parent discourses] and is greater than the sum of its parts, accomplishing intellectual work that could not be done in either of the parent discourses alone” (“Hybrid” 13). To delve more into what this term means, hybrid academic discourse involves two different discourses, standard written English and a discourse frequently not accepted by the academy, whether that be a dialect such as Black English⁵ or Southern dialect, or textual features like jokes in quote bubbles or sketches and drawings. Also named “experimental,” “mixed,” “alternative,” or “constructed” discourse, hybrid discourse includes traits such as writing in a variant form of English, using a non-traditional range of cultural references including words and concepts from cultures other than upper-class male European, using personal experience, employing “offhand refutation” where an opponent is indirectly or gently questioned, using humor, employing “appropriate history,” and coming at one’s main point through meandering (“Hybrid” 16).

This thesis project conducts a rhetorical analysis of published work by two composition scholars who utilize hybrid academic discourse in different ways. This

⁵ I choose to capitalize “Black English” following the convention of many individuals who have written about it, such as Geneva Smitherman and Keith Gilyard.

analysis is heavily informed by text-based interviews with both scholars on the subject of alternative discourses and how these function within the academy. These scholars are very different from one another—one is primarily a professor while the other is a director of a university press. Although they are distinct from one another, both have published in respected composition journals and books. The first scholar I discuss is Dr. Donald McCrary, an Associate Professor of English at Long Island University in Brooklyn, New York, who has published in the *Journal of Basic Writing* and *College Composition and Communication*. McCrary's research interests are most prominently in sociolinguistics, womanist theology, and developmental writing. In his 2005 work "Represent, Representin', Representation: The Efficacy of Hybrid Texts in the Writing Classroom," McCrary utilizes hybrid discourse dialectically through code meshing standard written English and Black English, and the combination of these language varieties leads him to self-reflect about his multiple discourses and experiences, broadens the audience for this work, and challenges this audience to be aware of the limitations in traditional academic discourse.

The second scholar is Michael Spooner, the Director of Utah State University Press, a scholarly publisher and division of Utah State University. Spooner utilizes hybrid discourse in a multimodal model through combining textual features like sketches and quote bubbles with standard English. However, I concentrate on his use of standard written English and more informal uses of languages. He has published work in texts such as *ALT DIS: Alternative Discourses and the Academy*, employing this multimodal

model for audience awareness. Spooner is also a creative writer who has published such works for children and young adults as *Last Child*, *Daniel's Walk*, and *A Moon in Your Lunchbox*. Additionally, Spooner has collaborated with Kathleen Yancey⁶ in many works, including *Electronic Collaboration in the Humanities: Issues and Options*, *Works and Days*, and in scholarly publications like *College Composition and Communication*. Spooner has also taught composition courses at Utah State, including technical writing classes in the writing program. In the text-based interview conducted with him, Spooner states that self-reflection is understood in any expression, so he focuses more on audience reflection about hybridity, and in some parts creates such extreme hybridity that it confuses the audience. Although he states this, there is still a connection of Spooner's different literate selves in this work. In doing a rhetorical analysis using Mikhail Bakhtin's and James Paul Gee's ideas, one can see that both McCrary and Spooner conduct unique ways of reflecting which work to have the same overall goal of redefining academic discourse by pluralizing it to demonstrate that multiplicity can be possible in scholarly writing. However, Spooner's discourse also excludes when it is attempting to include, which goes against the purpose of his own hybridity.

In her 1999 article "Hybrid Academic Discourses: What, Why, How," Patricia Bizzell writes how traditional academic discourse, with its focus on skepticism and precision, has been the only privileged language variety in the academic community.

⁶ Yancey is the Kellogg W. Hunt Professor of English and Director of the graduate program in Rhetoric and Composition at Florida State University. Her research focuses on composition studies generally with interests in writing assessment, especially print and electronic portfolios, and on the intersections of culture, literacy, and technology.

Relating directly to this language variety is how the “traditional academic discourse community enforces a typical world view” (“Hybrid” 10). Bizzell explains how this world view is created by the individuals in power at the university, who are frequently white middle-to upper-class males. The writing that reflects this world view leads to monologia in the academy, which contrasts specifically with the diversity of students and scholars at the university.

Bruce Horner and John Trimbur, two scholars who agree with Bizzell’s depiction of the privileging in academia, explore this further by studying the history of how monolingualism developed in the U.S. first year writing course in their 2002 “English Only and U.S. College Composition.” Horner and Trimbur call for an internationalist perspective on writing in the classroom in relation to globalization, discussing how monolingualism is a problem and limitation of U.S. culture, and arguing for an actively multilingual language policy, which would allow for “students and teachers both to rethink what academic work might mean and be—who is and should be involved, the forms that work might take, the ends it might pursue, the practices that define it and which might be redefined” (621). Vershawn Ashanti Young in his recent book *Your Average Nigga: Performing Race, Literacy, and Masculinity* discusses how forcing African American students to give up Black English for standard written English leaves many in an identity crisis. Scholars such as these recognize the predicament of privileging one form of writing and one world view at the university.

To combat the hegemony in composition programs, Bizzell explores hybrid academic discourse in the “Hybrid Academic Discourses” work discussed earlier, and showcases how scholars such as Victor Villanueva and his blending of standard English and “newyorican” English are enabling “new kinds of intellectual work” that focus on individuals expressing themselves through different modes of writing, and not reflecting the dominant community’s world views (“Hybrid” 11). Bizzell’s account of how Villanueva mixes these two languages portrays the rising awareness that hybridity allows individuals to do intellectual work in ways that they could not before if confined to traditional academic discourse. She also explains that utilizing hybrid discourse is beneficial because human beings “are usually acquainted with more than one discourse, without being essentially defined by any—which helps give rise to hybrid discursive forms in which the language using practices of more than one discourse are blended, sometimes not smoothly” (“Hybrid” 10). These meldings of multiple discourses contrast with the dichotomy established in the academy community of standard English as “correct” and other forms as “error,” and begin to redefine what academic discourse means.

Although scholars like Bizzell, Horner and Trimbur, and Young support the use of hybrid discourse, there are many in the field who find this type of work problematic. In “The Silenced Dialogue: Power and Pedagogy in Educating Other People’s Children,” Lisa Delpit eloquently argues that teaching traditional academic discourse is needed so that “if you are not already a participant in the culture of power, being told explicitly the

rules of that culture makes acquiring power easier” (282). Delpit views teaching hybrid academic discourse as limiting to many minorities because it keeps them from knowing the language variety to succeed at the university. She thinks educators need to understand the socio-economic and cultural backgrounds of their students and also understand that gatekeeping does exist, and to act that it does not ensures “that many students will not pass” through the gates (292). Delpit also discusses how numerous parents desire their children to learn standard academic discourse so that they can succeed within larger society, and that such parents are not necessarily as worried about self-actualization like “many liberal educators” (285). Richard Rodriguez is similar to Delpit in disfavoring hybrid discourse at the academy. In his autobiography, *Hunger for Memory*, Rodriguez writes that learning standard written English is the reason he has succeeded as a writer. Additionally, in the first chapter of this book, “Aria: A Memoir of a Bilingual Childhood,” Rodriguez writes that there is a difference in a private and public language variety, and that one’s home languages do not need to be spoken or written at school. He states, “while one suffers a diminished sense of *private* individuality by being assimilated into public society, such assimilation makes possible the achievement of a *public* individuality” (231). Like Delpit, Rodriguez thinks that the way for individuals to achieve is to be part of the dominant community, which means mastering this community’s discourse.

While Bizzell and others rally for it, and Delpit and Rodriguez possess a strong stance against it, many scholars are not as absolute in their views of hybrid academic

discourse. An example of this is Peter Elbow in “Vernacular Englishes in the Writing Classroom? Probing the Culture of Literacy,” where Elbow displays reservations about employing hybrid discourse in the composition classroom. He believes that it is appropriate to use this way of writing in informal writing tasks and at the beginning stages of academic work: “We can ask students to revise some of their freewrites and low stakes pieces and personal essays into final corrected drafts in their comfortable or vernacular dialect” (131). However, Elbow does not think that most final products of academic discourse should be written in a language variety other than standard English, and understandably so, because this is the language variety that is assessed by the university, and what most students need to know for their careers. Keith Gilyard in *Voices of the Self* writes in hybrid discourse, but discusses how there are many different degrees of it in academic writing. He terms them by explaining monolingualism, pluralism, and bidialectalism, demonstrating that hybrid academic discourse is usually not an either/or situation, but more of a complex issue for many scholars. Although Gilyard describes these different categories, he is obviously a proponent of hybrid discourse, utilizing it in *Voices of the Self*. In her work *English with an Accent*, Rosina Lippi-Green states like Gilyard that language variety is important to self expression: “Language...is more than a tool for communication of facts between two or more persons. It is the most salient way we have of establishing and advertising our social identities...[T]he way we use language is more complex and meaningful than any single fact about our bodies” (5). Allan Bell, in “Style and the Linguistic Repertoire,” agrees

with this point as he writes, “On different occasions we talk in different ways. These different ways of speaking carry different social meanings” (95). These scholars establish in their works that languages are intertwined with social context and identity.

Focus has tended to be on students’ use of hybrid discourse in relation to their social context and identities (Bizzell, 1999; Lu, 2000; Campbell, 1997; Gilyard and Richardson, 2001). This research is especially noted in works by composition scholars such as Judith Hebb, Mike Rose, and David Bartholomae. Hebb writes in her work from 2002 that basic writing students who struggle with standard written English “will revolutionize the academy and create new and interesting intellectual possibilities” (25).⁷ In this work, Hebb explains how multiple discourses allow students to express their cultural identities in the classroom. This view on the advantages of multiple discourses is also demonstrated in Rose’s 2006 note for “The Language of Exclusion: Writing Instruction at the University,” where he restates that his premise from the 1985 essay is still the same in creating for students a “demanding curriculum that encourages the full play of language activity and that opens out onto the academic community rather than sequestering students from it” (199). Delving even more into this view of students’

⁷ Hebb discusses in “Mixed Forms of Academic Discourse: A Continuum of Language Possibility” that basic writers’ “discourse is measured for correctness against “‘traditional’ academic discourse, whatever that may be” (22). Relating with Bizzell, Hebb writes how these students have valuable personal experiences and linguistic resources that allow them to better express themselves in mixed forms rather than standard academic writing.

⁸ Bartholomae also writes in his 1993 “The Tidy House: Basic Writing in the American Curriculum” that “We have constructed a course to teach and enact a rhetoric of exclusion and made it the center of a curriculum designed to hide or erase cultural difference, all the while carving out and preserving an ‘area’ in English within which we can do our work. Goodness” (18). He reflects the view that Bizzell, Rose, Hebb, and other scholars possess that university level English is hegemonic, only privileging individuals who have a background in standard academic discourse.

writing in multiple discourses is Bartholomae's *Writing on the Margins* where he writes, "Some error, in other words, can be seen as a sign of growth, as a sign of students' implicit faith in writing and their willingness to take risks and experiment" (39).⁸ These scholars' views of students' multiple discourses illustrate the focus there has been in the field on analyzing students' use of hybrid academic discourse.

Moving away from the focus on students is how many scholars employ hybrid academic discourse in their own work (Smitherman; Anzaldúa; Rose; McCrary; Villanueva; Lu; Monroe; Campbell; Gilyard; hooks; Fox). Smitherman especially has "paved the way for scholarly hybrid discourse," writing texts such as 1977's *Talkin and Testifyin: The Language of Black America* and 2000's *Talkin that Talk: Language, Culture, and Education in African America* (McCrary 76). While there are a number of academics who write in hybrid discourse for scholarly journals and books, there are far less studies on writing scholars' publications compared to students' academic essays, exhibiting that scholars are not studying their own and their peers' multi-discourses enough. There have been some exceptions to this, such as Andrea Lunsford in "Toward a Mestiza Rhetoric: Gloria Anzaldúa on Composition and Postcoloniality," which is an analysis of a composition scholar's use of hybrid discourse by analyzing Gloria Anzaldúa's work and then conducting an in depth interview with the author. This article establishes context to the mestiza rhetoric that Anzaldúa creates in her writing, especially

in Lunsford's discussion of code switching, where Anzaldúa switches back and forth in multiple dialects.

Suresh Canagarajah discusses more about the significance of codes in "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued." Canagarajah proposes the model of code meshing, writing that "while Elbow and the other scholars...propose a model of *code switching* I propose a model of *code meshing*. While they separate the codes and prioritize ME [Metropolitan Englishes, which Canagarajah defines as spoken by communities who traditionally claimed ownership over the language in English, the United States, etc.] for formal purposes, I consider merging the codes" (598). He studies both students and Smitherman in this work, discussing how both writers make textual space for hybrid academic discourse that influences academic writing to be multidialectical and multimodal. Canagarajah views these multiple discourses as leading to the pluralization of composition that will connect more to the globalization of American universities. Both Lunsford and Canagarajah contribute greatly to how hybrid academic discourse works for certain scholars, but both also study only one scholar. In my research project, I study two scholars, McCrary and Spooner, and through analyzing their work by means of the theories of Mikhail Bakhtin and James Paul Gee and conducting text-based interviews with both of them, I argue that some of hybrid academic discourse's major purposes are to broaden the field to a more diverse audience, express self-reflection, and invite more audience awareness about academic writing, all which

work to redefine academic discourse to connect more to the pluralization which has occurred at the university in the past thirty years and continues to develop.

I expand this argument over the next four chapters. In Chapter Two, I articulate the theoretical and methodological approaches used in this project. Mikhail Bakhtin's notions of dialogic conversation, monologia, heteroglossia, and authoritative and internally persuasive discourses, and reported speech are especially important in this work. This situates the examination of the texts in Bakhtin's reflections on heterogeneity. James Gee's definitions of Discourses, social languages, intertextuality, and transfer and conflict are also a part of the theoretical framework for this thesis.

In Chapter Three, I analyze how Donald McCrary utilizes hybrid academic discourse dialectically by code meshing standard written English and Black English. In this examination, I look at two specific examples of this hybridity: restatement and embedded hybridity. In studying these examples, I discuss how they relate to Bakhtin's monologia, heteroglossia, and authoritative and internally persuasive discourses. I also discuss them through the theoretical lens of Gee's Discourses, social languages, and intertextuality. Included in the inquiry are text-based interviews. By analyzing the work through these theoretical frameworks and interviews, I argue that the specific purposes for McCrary in writing in hybrid academic discourse is self-reflection and audience reflection, and that the overall purpose is pluralizing the field by redefining academic discourse to correlate with the diversity of the academy.

In Chapter Four, I analyze how Michael Spooner employs hybrid academic discourse by investigating two specific modes of this hybridity: reported speech and humor. By examining these models, I discuss how they are analyzed through a Bakhtinian lens, especially concentrating on reported speech and dialogic conversation. I also relate these examples to Gee's notions of Discourses and transfer and conflict. In investigating the text through these theories and text-based interviews, I argue that the specific purposes of Spooner writing in hybrid discourse is audience awareness and understanding the intermixing of his different literate experiences, and that the overall purpose is to pluralize the field by redefining this writing. I also argue that Spooner is not self-reflective enough about his own work because he is not disengaged from the identity of a copy editor.

Finally in Chapter Five, I outline what my analysis of McCrary and Spooner's use of hybridity suggests for future research, particularly in terms of how hybridity is understood theoretically and studied methodologically. I also explain what my analysis suggests for writing pedagogy.

Chapter Two: Theoretical Framework of Mikhail Bakhtin and James Paul Gee

This chapter details the theoretical framework used to analyze the composition scholars in Chapters 3 and 4. The theory begins with an explanation of Mikhail Bakhtin's notions of speech genres, heteroglossia, and authoritative and internally persuasive discourses which he explains in "The Problem of Speech Genres" and "Discourse in the Novel." In these texts, Bakhtin concentrates on how every individual speaks many languages derived from the different social communities in which they are involved. Focusing more on the relation of language varieties in social context is work by James Paul Gee in his "Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction and What is Literacy?" and *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. This chapter clarifies Gee's notions of Discourses, social languages, intertextuality, and transfer and conflict.

Bakhtinian Concepts of Speech Genres, Heteroglossia, and Authoritative/Internally Persuasive Discourses

Along with the great amount of research on hybrid academic discourse, there has been much work analyzing Mikhail Bakhtin's influence on rhetoric and composition. Prominent Bakhtinian scholars (Holquist Brandist, Shephard, Tihanov, Nolan) focus on Bakhtin's influence in literary criticism, but other research can be found on his effects in

rhetoric and composition such as James P. Zappen's 2004 *The Rebirth of Dialogue: Bakhtin, Socrates, and the Rhetorical Tradition* and Carol D. Lee's 2004 "Double Voiced Discourse: African American Vernacular English as Resource in Cultural Modeling Classrooms." Both works analyze Bakhtin's notions of heteroglossia and authoritative and internally persuasive discourses. In his work, Zappen states how "Bakhtin's comments about rhetoric suggest that he seeks not to reject but to dialogize rhetoric by recapturing the multiplicity of voices that he believes is always inherent in it" (40). While Zappen does not directly discuss hybrid discourse in relation to Bakhtin, this quote demonstrates the joining of the theorist to alternative types of work. Lee is more explicit than Zappen in relating hybrid discourse to Bakhtinian theory, especially in how she writes that the "idea of hybrid language practices resonates very much with Bakhtin" (131). She employs this relationship in her article, connecting hybrid academic discourse and Bakhtinian concepts effectively.

To understand why scholars have begun to connect Bakhtin with hybrid academic discourse, it is important to understand his notions of speech genres, heteroglossia and authoritative and internally persuasive discourses. Bakhtin thinks to use a language variety significantly is to appropriate it and make it one's own. In "Discourse in the Novel," Bakhtin argues that languages are not neutral mediums, but inherently social, "populated—overpopulated—with the intentions of others" (294). He reiterates this view in "The Problem of Speech Genres," disagreeing with Saussure's concept that language is only an abstract system, and instead views it as a living dialogue of utterances, stating

that “language is not an abstract system of normative forms but rather a concrete heteroglot of the world” (“Discourse” 293).⁹ Bakhtin suggests languages construct meaning through these utterances that constitute speech genres, and explicates how every single possible community is a speech genre: “the wealth and diversity of speech genres are boundless because the various possibilities of human activity are inexhaustible” (“Speech” 1227).¹⁰ This “diversity of speech genres” illustrates how each individual participates in multiple languages, and that these languages are always in dialogue with one another. This is especially noted in Bakhtin’s notion of reported speech, where one speaker directly or indirectly quotes another.

Although numerous, Bakhtin classifies speech genres into two types: primary speech genres, which are everyday uses of languages, and secondary speech genres, which Bakhtin terms as more institutional, like novels, dramas, scientific research, and academic discourse (“Speech” 1228). Both primary and secondary speech genres are always changing, with centripetal and centrifugal forces simultaneously cohering and yet

⁹ Bakhtin refutes Saussure’s view, describing that there are potential meanings of language instead of a fixed meaning implied by the word “sentence.” He explains that utterances are both oral and written, stating that “Language is realized in the form of individual concrete utterances...These utterances reflect the specific conditions and goals of each such area not only through their content (thematic) and linguistic style” (“Speech” 1227). Bakhtin also discusses that there is “no generally recognized classification of language styles” (“Speech” 1230). Therefore, the meaning of an utterance perpetually differs in complex ways according to context and conditions used.

¹⁰ Speech genres are “*relatively stable types*” of utterances in “each sphere in which language is used” (“Speech” 1227). They include the conventions of a casual conversation or the formulas for business documents.

¹¹ Eileen Landay in “Performance as the Foundation for a Secondary School Literacy Program: A Bakhtinian Perspective,” writes “Alive and always active, language moves in multiple dimensions simultaneously: in perpetual tension between centripetal and centrifugal forces—the tendency to unify, centralize, fix, formalize, privilege, and create norms—and the tendency to invent, innovate, vary, expand, and specialize” (108).

also breaking them free, displaying the evolution of language varieties. Bakhtin writes about the ideological notions behind primary and secondary discourses when he states, “The very interrelations between primary and secondary genres and the process of the historical formation of the latter shed light on the nature of the utterance (and above all on the complex problem of the interrelations, among language, ideology, and world view)” (“Speech” 1229). Here, Bakhtin displays that languages are not overall structures or hierarchies of words, but constant dialogue of utterances where social context, ideology, and world view are all important. Bakhtin also explains that language variety is not separated from ideology and world view, but that they are connected to one another.

Relating to Bakhtin’s idea of speech genres are “authoritative” and “internally persuasive” discourses. Authoritative discourses are never one’s own but the voices of authority such as in religious, moral, political, and educational situations. These voices characterize themselves to be privileged speech which demands attention, as in the language variety of standard written English. Internally persuasive discourses are discursive languages such as Black English or textual features in multimodal discourse, usually “denied all privilege, backed up by no authority at all, and...frequently not even acknowledged in society” (“Discourse” 342). They customarily represent our personal beliefs, the stories that shape and create our identities. Bakhtin examines the unitary kind of language variety in authoritative discourse, declaring the singularity to be

monologia.¹¹ Monologia controls the “unity of the reigning conversational (everyday) and literary language, ‘correct language’” (“Discourse” 270). Bakhtin contrasts monologia with internally persuasive discourses, which interact with each other and authoritative discourses. In doing so, he illustrates that languages are an unending dialogic web of utterances and responses.

Much of Bakhtin’s work scrutinizes rhetoric for being far too authoritative or monologic in its limitation to few genres. To contest this monologia, Bakhtin presents that languages are essentially heteroglossic,¹² with individuals utilizing different speech genres depending on the audience and setting. Bakhtin employs the term heteroglossia to explain how speech genres are always blending with no pure discourse. He defines heteroglossia by the awareness of how languages operate over time:

Thus at any given moment of its historical existence, language is heteroglot from top to bottom: it represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between different epochs of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles, and so forth, all given a bodily form. These “languages” of heteroglossia intersect each other in a variety of ways, forming new socially typifying languages. (“Discourse” 291)

¹¹ When Bakhtin writes about monologia, he means a unitary language that “at every moment of its linguistic life it is opposed to the realities of heteroglossia. But at the same time it makes its real presence felt as a force for overcoming this heteroglossia, imposing specific limits to it” (“Discourse” 270).

¹² He discusses that in this heteroglossia, “words of others carry with them their own expression, their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework, and reaccentuate” (“Speech” 1245).

Due to all these multiple “languages,” at every given moment, a person must choose which language variety to employ. Also, Bakhtin utilizes languages in quotes here to show the heteroglossia is not actually separate tongues, but that the heteroglossic tension does give rise to languages historically speaking. When one communicates, she or he could choose to communicate in a variety of authoritative discourses, but also internally persuasive discourses. These modes of languages exemplify Bakhtin’s argument that languages are social and founded on human experience, not privileged norms: “All the diverse areas of human activity involve the use of language” (“Speech” 1227). Therefore, Bakhtin expresses how languages are not one singular or “correct” form distant from one’s identity, but a blending of utterances from one’s social context.

Gee’s Notions of Discourses, Social Languages, and Intertextuality

James Paul Gee’s theory on Discourses connects to Bakhtin’s notions of utterances because Gee understands how languages and discourses are derived from social context. He writes that in one social context, one specific language variety is used that might not be employed in another context because it is possible for a person “to use a language perfectly and *still* not make sense. It is not just *how* you say it, but what you *are* and *do* when you say it” (“Literacy” 525). In his “Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction and What is Literacy?” Gee writes that “the focus of literacy studies or applied linguistics should *not* be language or literacy, but *social practices*” (“Literacy” 525). To discuss literacy, Gee first explains his notions of discourses and

Discourses. He states that “discourse” with a little “d” means connected stretches of languages, so “discourse” is a part of “Discourse.” In the 1999 *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*, Gee discusses that to study languages in use, one must study more than just the languages, but also study the Discourses. He then defines Discourses as “ways with words, deeds, and interactions, thoughts and feelings, objects and tools, times and places that allow us to enact and recognize different socially situated identities” (*Analysis* 526). Not only is Gee stating that context is significant, but also an individual’s identity which derives from that context. This is where Gee begins to establish his own theory separate from Bakhtin because he explicitly explores identity more. Gee even writes of Discourses becoming “identity kits” that have costumes and instructions on how to talk, act, and write so one takes on certain roles at different times (“Literacy” 526). These multiple Discourses then do not just involve languages, but are also evident of multiple selves of the communicator.

Explaining these Discourses further, Gee believes that one cannot be taught by formal schooling to be in a Discourse. They are learned by “apprenticeship” into social practices through scaffolding and interaction with people who have already mastered the discourse. Clarifying this further, Gee writes,

Discourses (and therefore literacies) are not like languages in one very important regard. Someone can speak English, but not fluently. However, someone cannot engage in a Discourse in a less than fully fluent manner. You are either in it or you’re not. Discourses are connected with displays of an identity; failing to fully

display an identity is tantamount to announcing you don't have that identity, that at best you're a pretender or a beginner. ("Literacy" 529)

With this statement, Gee explains the difference in Discourses and languages so that to know a Discourse, one must be fully in it. Gee also recognizes that there is often tension between various discourses and Discourses that people represent. He describes the initial Discourse to be the primary Discourse, the one that we first use to make sense of the world and interact with others. After initial socialization in the home community, there are secondary Discourses, which are non-home based social institutions in the public sphere like churches, schools, agencies and organizations, community groups, and so forth. There are also dominant and nondominant Discourses. Dominant Discourses are secondary Discourses that bring with them the acquisition of social "goods" like money, prestige, and status. Nondominant Discourses are secondary Discourses that bring solidarity with a specific social network, but not wider status and social goods in the society at large. Gee describes how these Discourses can transfer and also conflict with one another, which "otherwise influence each other to form the linguistic texture of whole societies and to interrelate various groups in society" ("Literacy" 532).

Frequently, these relations between Discourses do not occur smoothly, which can cause tension.

Another component of Gee's theory is his description of social languages, which are "different varieties of language that allows us to express different socially significant identities...and enact different socially meaningful activities" (*Analysis* 35). Social

languages identify the whos and whats—they are what we learn and what we speak. Social languages and Discourses have different meanings since social languages are defined as the role of languages in Discourses. One might think that she or he only possesses one social language, but in actuality there are multiple social languages in every individual. As discussed earlier, this is because one changes the way she or he speaks depending on the context and conversational partner. When one communicates differently with different people, this represents various versions on the identity of this person.

Social languages possess their own distinctive grammars, and there are two different sorts of grammars important to social languages. The first grammar is the traditional one we think of with nouns, verbs, inflections, and phrases. The second grammar is the patterns in oral and written utterances of the speaker or writer that the interpreter attributes to situated identities of and specific activities by the communicator. Related to this discussion of social languages is another term by Gee referred to as intertextuality, which is a process where a “text spoken or written in one variety of language (one social language) will accomplish a sort of switching by incorporating (‘borrowing’) words from another text spoken or written in the same or a different variety of language” (*Analysis* 46). This incorporation can occur in a great variety of ways, from directly quoting to indirectly quoting to just alluding to what hearers and readers know was taken from another source. Gee’s social languages compare to Bakhtin’s speech genres because both concentrate on the fluidity of languages in how they change in

relation to specific social contexts. Therefore, both also combat Saussure's idea of language as a fixed and abstract system. However, Gee's social languages explore the identity behind the communicator more in depth than Bakhtin's speech genres. In this way, social languages are more explicitly related to identity compared with speech genres.

How Bakhtin and Gee Are Beneficial to this Work

In the next two chapters, I analyze Donald McCrary and Michael Spooner's writing through Bakhtin's notion of dialogism, where "there is a constant interaction between meanings, all of which have the potential of conditioning others" ("Glossary" 426). This allows me to discuss that when McCrary code meshes standard written English and Black English, and when Spooner utilizes jokes, they are both representing how there is a continual conversation in academic discourse, and how this conversation should be changing. I also utilize Bakhtin's notions of authoritative and internally persuasive discourses, which are beneficial in displaying how standard written English is privileged as the authoritative discourse, and there are other internally persuasive discourses in both McCrary's and Spooner's work which are just as valuable and powerful as standard English. Lastly, I examine McCrary's text through heteroglossia, which provides the reader with a greater understanding of the multiple languages at work in his article, which connects to the continually diversified academic population.

I also investigate McCrary and Spooner's work through Gee's theory on Discourses, especially in relation to how their written publications are part of the authors' Discourses, representing the roles they play both professionally and personally. This discussion of Discourses is especially significant to McCrary and his expression of self-reflection through hybridity. Gee's Discourses are also imperative for understanding the roles of author and editor in Spooner's work, and how this facilitates audience awareness and understanding of his own literate experiences. Additionally, Gee's ideas on transfer and conflict are imperative to study in Spooner's work on his extreme use of hybridity in certain parts of the essay which works to mitigate the inclusion that frequently is a part of hybridity.

Chapter Three: Donald McCrary's Use of Hybrid Academic Discourse for Both Self-Reflection and Audience Awareness

This chapter analyzes Donald McCrary's use of hybrid academic discourse in his 2005 article "Represent, Representin', Representation: The Efficacy of Hybrid Texts in the Writing Classroom" which was published in the *Journal of Basic Writing*. It is examined through Bakhtin's notions of speech genres, heteroglossia and authoritative and internally persuasive discourses and also by Gee's ideas on social languages, intertextuality and Discourses. Also discussed are text-based interviews conducted with McCrary on his work. By analyzing McCrary's article and interviews, this chapter argues that the author's blending of standard written English and Black English allows him to merge his multiple experiences and identities as a scholar and minority. This chapter also argues that writing in this discourse broadens the article's audience and allows the readers to reflect on what they define as academic discourse. Finally, this chapter argues that as McCrary utilizes these two social languages for both self-reflection and audience awareness, he redefines academic discourse, demonstrating that there can be pluralization of languages at the university level.

When reading "Represent, Representin', Representation," it is obvious to the audience that this article is marked hybrid academic discourse. Marcia Z. Buell defines "marked" in her work "Code-Switching and Second Language Writing: How Multiple

Codes Are Combined in a Text,” as when more than one discourse is used in a text, and an individual changes the discourse when she/he “perceives a need for a new set of rights and obligations” (Buell 100). This change in markedness is recognized in McCrary’s work, where the two languages of standard written English and Black English are interwoven together throughout. McCrary demonstrates this hybridity in two main ways: restatement and embedded hybridity.

Restatement

The first way is restatement, which is when there are two different languages utilized simultaneously to express the same idea. In McCrary’s work, restatement occurs when he writes an idea in Black English and then states the same idea following in standard written English. This can also be accomplished in reverse, where McCrary composes an idea in standard English and then in Black English. One example of restatement is on page two, when McCrary discusses the view of Black English to be a private language variety instead of public by many individuals: “And that’s what I want the academy to understand. My students don’t speak no broken English. They speak a legitimate dialect that conveys legitimate meanings” (73-74). In this quote, McCrary begins with standard written English, conveying his feelings about Americans’ use of Black English in their everyday life by using diction like “academy” and “understand.” Then, he begins to code mesh more to Black English by using the contraction “don’t” and double negative “no broken.” In the immediate sentence following this one, McCrary

writes the same idea about speaking “no broken English” in standard written English. This time, he utilizes words known in the academic community, such as “legitimate” and “conveys.”

By analyzing this specific example of restatement through a Bakhtinian lens, we see that McCrary begins by writing this passage in standard written English because it is the authoritative discourse many identify as the only valid way to communicate at the university level. Standard written English is employed at the beginning of the quote to establish McCrary’s credibility as an academic writer before he brings in atypical codes to the audience of this academic journal. This view of standard English as the only way to communicate that McCrary combats is what Bakhtin terms as monologia. Bakhtin explains monologia as mandating linguistic and also ideological norms. Therefore, this metalanguage or monologia does not affect just the language variety itself, but also the language user, as Bakhtin writes, “Thus a unitary language gives expression to forces working toward concrete verbal and ideological unification and centralization” (“Discourse” 271). Many in the academy think monologically about languages in academic discourse. By writing in restatement, McCrary combats the monologia, displaying how he is not attempting to totally dismantle standard academic discourse, but the supremacy of it as the only authoritative discourse at the university.

Also by writing in this way, McCrary displays what Bakhtin argued that an authoritative discourse is not a “purely poetic formulation,” but only a dominant language (“Discourse” 260). He demonstrates that in contrast to the authoritative discourse of

standard written English is Black English, which is an internally persuasive discourse in Bakhtin's terms because it is usually not privileged by authors in academic journals. By employing restatement in the example above, McCrary establishes Black English to be just as intellectually valuable as the authoritative discourse of standard English because they are both being employed to convey the same meaning. When I write the word intellectually valuable here, I mean that Black English is being valued for its utilization in academic prose. This medium also demonstrates that because Black English is as valuable as standard written English, it can also be as powerful because the two are not only spatially right next to one another, they are also responding to one another through heteroglossia.

This passage in "Represent, Representin', Representation" also relates to Bakhtin's notion of heteroglossia by the use of both standard written English and Black English in reiterating the significance of all types of communication in academic discourse. Bakhtin describes heteroglossia as "these 'languages' of heteroglossia intersect each other in a variety of ways, forming new socially typifying languages" ("Discourse" 291). The combination of standard English and Black English in restatement illustrates a form of heteroglossia that functions to incorporate a more diverse audience of people than only scholars as the intended audience. Individuals in the audience bring different ideologies to what they are reading and have "specific points of view on the world, forms for conceptualizing the world in words, specific world views, each characterized by its own objects, meanings and values" ("Discourse" 291-292).

Thus, hybrid academic discourse simultaneously offers a linguistic and ideological connection for distinct communities as they read the same text. One advantage of using this hybridity is that it could potentially appeal to a broader audience and readership. It could create a new and more diverse audience to McCrary's work and also Writing Studies as a field. This is important because a broader audience would also connect more to the pluralization which has occurred at universities in the past thirty years. However, McCrary's use of hybrid academic discourse can also problematize the audience because it could be so marked that it repels certain people who are unfamiliar with hybrid discourse from even beginning to read it. Also, the space in which McCrary published is the *Journal of Basic Writing*, which is a prominent journal in composition studies. It is most likely read by people in the field, and although McCrary might attract some scholars to hybrid discourse, he might not broaden the audience unless he published in a periodical that is more mainstream.

The second example of restatement is on the last page of the article, where McCrary writes about how hybrid academic discourse can help students to feel more liberated in their languages and possess more self confidence of home experiences:

It is counterproductive to our notion of critical literacy and multiculturalism to have students believe that any aspect of their language or culture is inferior and unintelligent. Hybrid discourse may help students to feel more empowered about their own experience and competence with language. And that ain't nothin' to shake a stick at. Ya heard? (90)

Like the last passage, this one begins in standard written English, and this time even more evident with words such as “counterproductive,” “critical literacy,” “multiculturalism,” and “empowered.” Then, there is a marked rural Southern dialect with inclusion of “ain’t” and “nothin’.” Connected with these is the term “Ya heard,” a common Black English phrase that is not only part of Southern speech, but has been reappropriated by many in American society. It is interesting to note in both of these pieces chosen so far that McCrary never puts the Black English words in quotes to make them seem distinct or different. In doing this, it is similar to what Suresh Canagarajah identifies about Geneva Smitherman’s work when he writes: “Consequently, most readers would now produce these switches without pausing to consider them unusual” (604). Also, McCrary does not explain “Ya heard” to the audience in case they do not know. He does not make these words seem out of place, but like they are supposed to be in this article on equal terms with standard written English. By writing without the quotations and utilizing terms that have been reappropriated into mainstream society, McCrary enacts the heteroglossia that Bakhtin describes.

This example of hybrid discourse represents heteroglossia additionally because of the blending of both standard English and Black English so tightly. Through restating the idea that his students communicate in a valid language variety with sentences right next to each other, McCrary is able to display a central aspect of Bakhtinian theory that utterances are in dialogue with one another. Bakhtin discusses this when he writes, “The word in living conversation is directly, blatantly, oriented toward a future answer-word:

it provokes an answer, anticipates it and structures itself in the answer's direction" ("Discourse" 280). McCrary's restatement is a model for what Bakhtin declares as both the authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse talking back to one another in constant conversation.

For McCrary, heteroglossia also becomes personal because he is able to reflect on his "multiple linguistic selves," suggesting that just as there is no pure language variety, there is no pure self (McCrary 81). Writing this article allows McCrary to self-reflect about not only his plurality in language use, but also in identity. James Paul Gee writes about this connection of languages and identity in *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* when he analyzes the social context of the communicator: "When we do so, we are looking at how people communicate *who* they are and *what* they are doing by the ways in which they put language to use" (35). Gee names the combination of these *who*'s and *what*'s Discourses, and defines them as identity kits which come "complete with the appropriate costume and instructions on how to act, talk, and often write, so as to take on a particular role" ("Literacy" 527). By using Black English and standard English so explicitly, McCrary acknowledges the significance of these languages as Discourses which represent his work and identity. Learning more about the *who* that Gee identifies, we see that McCrary is an Associate Professor of English at Long Island University in Brooklyn, New York who has published in the *Journal of Basic Writing* and *College Composition and Communication*. He has been at LIU

Brooklyn since 1993, and has taught many courses, from developmental writing to graduate courses in rhetoric and writing.

To understand more about his use of hybrid academic discourse, I conducted a text-based interview with McCrary which took place in February 2008. In this interview, there is a definite connection of languages to identity, where McCrary describes hybrid discourse and what it allows him to do that standard written English does not. In one interview, I asked him “What were your influences for beginning to write in hybrid discourse?” He explained that his personal life influenced his professional in becoming more interested in alternative discourses:

There were many influences for my own hybridity, including a slow reclaiming of my primary language, interest in the many hybrid forms I found in the popular culture marketplace, and frustration with writing pedagogy that neither recognized nor respected students’ primary languages. (“Interest”)

Here, McCrary demonstrates how his interest in hybrid academic discourse came from his home language variety of Black English and popular culture discourses. Since languages come from social context in communities according to Bakhtin and Gee, then McCrary writing in Black English is a way for him to express his cultural identity. By writing in both standard written English and Black English, McCrary can reflect on the pluralization of not only the languages he possesses, but the multiple Discourses that he embodies as a minority and scholar. This use of academic discourse for self-actualization

is relatively rare, so for McCrary to actively become personal in his professional writing works to redefine academic discourse to be more expressive.

McCrary continues to redefine academic discourse by his use of restatement in the last example where he discusses specific scholarly and cultural figures. In the same paragraph, the scholar introduces two individuals who do not seem to relate—Bakhtin and the rapper Ludacris. McCrary briefly mentions the theorist at the beginning of the paragraph, referring to him as “my man, Mikhail Bakhtin” (74). He acknowledges Bakhtin in specific Black English diction in order to integrate the theorist into another community besides only the scholarly one, where standard English is predominantly utilized. When McCrary begins to explain Bakhtinian theory, he continues to meld both standard English and Black English: “Contribution is somethin’ we need to dig on because that is what is denied to many other literate students in the academy” (75). Absent from this discussion of Bakhtin’s theory is any in depth analysis of it in standard academic discourse. This is because if Bakhtin was only discussed in standard English, it would mitigate McCrary’s argument of the plurality of languages and identities.

The presence of Ludacris is another cultural connection that occurs in the same paragraph with Bakhtin. McCrary quotes Ludacris as he writes, “Take that and rewind it back, as the rapper Ludacris might say” (75).¹³ McCrary explains both Ludacris and Bakhtin in how they function as individuals who coin linguistic terms, marking them both

¹³ This quote of Ludacris is from the song “Yeah,” where he collaborated with hip hop artists Usher and Lil’ John. Ludacris is a rapper with such hit songs like “Act a Fool,” “Stand Up,” “Pimpin’ All Over the World,” “Runaway Love,” and “Money Maker” (“Def Jam”).

as intellectual and powerful. Reflecting the way there is an absence of Bakhtinian theory explained in standard written English in this article, there is also an absence of other quotes in Black English from Ludacris besides the one cited earlier. This allows the article to be centered on hybrid academic discourse instead of a singular cultural figure or language. The diversity here in cultural figures again is an example of broadening the audience and the field of Writing Studies with this discourse. However, yet again there are drawbacks to comparing two figures such as these. One is the rapper Ludacris has written and sung certain songs that are much more sexual and violent than when McCrary quoted him. To compare Ludacris to Bakhtin in a way does not seem to work because McCrary has not given the whole context to Ludacris. Therefore, readers who know Ludacris' songs might be shocked that he is being privileged in a scholarly source. This could repel certain members of the audience.

Embedded Hybridity

Another mechanism which McCrary employs is embedded hybridity, where marked items like Black English words code mesh with standard written English in a phrase or sentence, and become embedded in one another. One case in particular of embedded hybridity is at the beginning of "Represent, Representin', Representation" when McCrary writes, "When my students 'represent,' they see themselves as embracing their identities and cultures in the midst of academia, as playas in the college game rather

than the game of college playin' them" (72).¹⁴ In this section, McCrary code meshes back and forth between standard written English and Black English seamlessly so that the reader does not feel jarred by a different discourse. He uses the words from both social languages right next to one another, implying that in his work, neither one is privileged. Also, by writing words like "playas" and "playin'" continually next to the word "college," McCrary establishes that these are intellectually weighty terms that have a right to be used at the university.

"Represent" and "playa"¹⁵ are commonly used words in popular rap and hip hop songs such as Joe's "Don't Wanna Be a Player" and Nas' "Represent."¹⁶ McCrary states that some perceive these words as merely for entertainment's sake, implying how many recognize Black English as a social language more focused on amusement than being intellectually valuable. However, by McCrary's use of hybrid discourse with code meshing "represent" and "playa" with phrases like "embracing their identities" and "midst of academia," the author establishes that these speech genres intermix with one another in how they are "dialogically implicated *in* each other and begin to exist *for* each other" (Bakhtin "Discourse" 400). Composing in this heteroglossic nature, McCrary

¹⁴ Smitherman defines the term "represent" in *Black Talk: Words and Phrases from the Hood to the Amen Corner* as "to exemplify a group, position, cultural style; to reflect what Hip Hoppers call the 'flava' of something or someone; a model example of the group or thing being represented...A DJ hosting a party on the club scene asks one of the party people: 'What side of town you representin' tonight?' She answers, 'I'm representin' the South Side'" (245).

¹⁵ Smitherman does not define "playa" in *Black Talk*, but outlines "play" in four definitions. For these descriptions, see page 230.

¹⁶ Joe is an R&B artist celebrated for songs like "Stutter" and "Ride Wit U" ("Joe"). Nas is a rapper, famous for music like "I Can," "Thief's Theme," and "Hate Me Now" ("Nas"). Both incorporate Black English into their song lyrics.

illustrates that Black English as an internally persuasive discourse is just as valuable at the university as standard written English and the “dominant community” identity (Bizzell “Hybrid” 11). When McCrary code meshes in this way, he argues that academic discourse is not a pure language variety, but one full of different languages that represent different ideologies and worldviews, and one does not have to be privileged over the other.

By having these languages intermix together, McCrary also demonstrates Gee’s concept of transfer in Discourses, where different Discourses augment one another as they are linked together. Since Black English and standard written English are languages which are part of Discourses, they could either work together or clash with one another. Judging from the privileging of standard English in the academy, it appears that much of the time these two languages clash. However, McCrary mediates these two languages, which could have tension, with his use of embedded hybridity in the above example. Employing embedded hybridity, McCrary redefines the idea that academic discourse must privilege one language variety, which causes his audience to then rethink how they define academic discourse. This also makes the audience reflect more on what they think academic discourse should accomplish as they realize that there are implications for enfranchising only one language variety at the university.

Another example of embedded hybridity occurs when McCrary explains his view of what academic discourse should be to the audience, again allowing them to reflect on this issue. McCrary writes how he does not desire Black English or any other non-

standard English language variety to be the only one employed at the university because that negates his point about multiplicity. As he writes, “Instead I’m preachin’ hybrid discourse, and one of the languages students use should be standard English because that is the language the academy knows best, and successful communication is an important concern” (74). In this quotation, McCrary once more code meshes standard written English and Black English, but it is different than the last example. It is obvious that this sentence utilizes more standard English words such as “academy,” “successful communication,” and “important concern.” The only two words in this work of informality are the contraction “I’m” and the Black English spelling of “preaching.” This code meshing of the authoritative and internally persuasive discourses is not only an illustration of heteroglossia, but also defines Gee’s similar notion of intertextuality. When Gee writes about intertextuality, he describes where one text incorporates words from another. In McCrary’s case, he borrows in this mostly standard written English essay from the internally persuasive discourse of Black English to construct its sentences. This intertextuality which combines the social languages together is similar to Bakhtin’s view of language: “The word in language is half someone else’s. It becomes ‘one’s own’ only when the speaker populates it with his intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting to his own semantic and expressive intention” (“Discourse” 293). McCrary causes academic discourse to be *his own* in this article by reappropriating it to create a mixture of languages. This blending of social languages

again makes the audience reflect on what they think academic discourse could accomplish by exhibiting the pluralization of discourses possible at the academy.

The last example of embedded hybridity also enacts this plurality of discourses, and also represents the multiple Discourses reflected by McCrary in his work. Near the conclusion of this article, he writes in an especially marked way,

Nonetheless, I contend that exposing students to hybrid discourse and encouraging dem to play around wif it, might help them to see that standard English isn't the only game in town, that they know more about language than the schools give them credit for, that they can do a little somethin' somethin' with language, too. (89)

In this one sentence, McCrary combines standard written English and Black English like the other examples utilized before. However, he adds more Black English into this section than the other instances. Additionally, the Black English used is more extreme, such as words like “dem,” “wif,” and “somethin.” Not only is the diction strong here, but there are also more phrases associated with Black English like “only game in town” and “somethin' somethin.” This quotation is an example of Bakhtin's notion that languages exemplify worldview: “We are taking language not as a system of abstract grammatical categories, but rather language conceived as ideologically saturated, language as a world view, even as a concrete opinion, insuring a maximum of mutual understanding in all spheres of ideological life” (“Discourse” 271). Constructing this discourse denotes McCrary's worldview and allows him to express both an academic and

cultural identity in this work. This idea on worldview also relates to Gee's concept of Discourses, demonstrating how as these languages interconnect with one another, so does McCrary's once disparate selves. This allows McCrary to reflect about his culture and himself, showing that personal expression can be part of professional writing.

This connection of languages to identity through Discourses is explained more in the interview when I asked McCrary, "What does hybrid discourse allow students and scholars to do that standard academic discourse does not? I think a lot has to do with it being that one can understand her or his own identity better and also merge between their home and academia. But I did not know if that was right or not so what do you think?" and he responded,

You are certainly right about the merging of home and school identities as an advantage to hybrid discourse. Additionally, it allows students to express a wider range of their language knowledge, which I believe helps them to be more confident as language users and more aware of language itself. ("Interest")

When McCrary responded about identities, he also discussed the significance of being "more aware of language itself." This displays that he is not only being self-reflective through hybrid academic discourse, but he is also making the audience more aware and reflective about how languages are used in different contexts. He actively makes the audience aware by explicitly displaying this marked discourse, which asks the readers to think about what academic discourse is, and whether they are comfortable with this redefinition through dialect. Making the audience aware and reflect themselves is

another way that through hybrid discourse, McCrary redefines what academic discourse means and what it can do.

Conclusion

By writing in hybrid academic discourse through two mechanisms of restatement and embedded hybridity, Donald McCrary's makes academic writing connect more with the continual pluralization of the academy that has occurred because of the diversity in population at universities. When Suresh Canagarajah writes about this pluralization in relation to postmodern globalization, he states how "the intensified globalization of English in postmodern society further challenges this unequal and hierarchical relationship between English varieties" (588). In this multilingual world, Canagarajah expresses how it is imperative for composition teachers and students in the United States to become more open to multiple discourses. In writing "Represent, Representin', Representation: The Efficacy of Hybrid Texts in the Writing Classroom," McCrary succeeds in enacting Canagarajah's view by code meshing standard written English and Black English. Writing in this way demonstrates the issue in academic discourse of monologia or purity in languages, where standard written English is supreme. Employing hybrid writing combats this monologia and also enacts Bakhtin's theory on heteroglossia and Gee's notion of intertextuality of social languages. Heteroglossia and intertextuality are especially seen in the combination of an internally persuasive discourse with an authoritative discourse. The melding which occurs is beneficial because it opens up a

broader audience to academic discourse and also exhibits that Black English is not merely for entertainment, but is a language just as valuable as standard English.¹⁷ However, McCrary's use of code meshing in a scholarly journal that is circulated mostly to scholars might be keeping the same audience. Additionally, his use of Ludacris is controversial because the rapper employs sexual and violent diction which McCrary chooses not to discuss. Therefore, this opening of the audience becomes problematized.

Not only does McCrary redefine academic discourse, he additionally redefines the expression of academic identity within the university. In terms of Gee's ideas of Discourses as "identity kits," McCrary's language use represents his world view and his own self. In the interview conducted, the audience can see how this allows him to self-reflect about his academic and cultural identity, embodying both through code meshing languages. Additionally by expressing himself through hybrid discourse, McCrary incites the audience to contemplate what they think academic discourse means, and whether this work is "alt enough" or too alternative. Through all these means, McCrary redefines academic discourse at the university level, connecting more to the diversity at the university.

¹⁷ bell hooks mentions this explicitly in her piece "Teaching New Worlds/New Words."

Chapter Four: Michael Spooner's Use of Hybrid Academic Discourse for Audience Awareness

This chapter examines Michael Spooner's use of hybrid academic discourse in "An Essay We're Learning to Read: Responding to Alt.Style," which was published in *ALT DIS: Alternative Discourses and the Academy* in 2002. This work is examined through Bakhtin's concept of reported speech and Gee's analysis of how Discourses possess relationships of transfer and conflict. Transfer and conflict are similar to Bakhtin's notions of centripetal and centrifugal forces, which simultaneously connect and divide speech genres. Additionally, there is discussion of the text-based interviews conducted with Spooner on the subject of alternative discourses and how he views them at the university. In employing this theory, Chapter Four argues that Spooner experiments with scholarly discourse in order to broaden the audience and facilitate audience awareness about academic language, and also display the many experiences that affect his own literate life. In doing so, Spooner, like McCrary, redefines academic discourse to demonstrate that there can be pluralization in this discourse at the university level. However, this chapter also argues how Spooner is not able to self-reflect in his work, caught in a monologic and academic prose that works to combat hybrid discourse.¹⁸

¹⁸ I credit this idea to Thomas E. Nunnally, Associate Professor of English at Auburn University.

Spooner's essay is part of *ALT DIS*, a collection of works edited by Christopher Schroeder, Helen Fox, and Patricia Bizzell. This book includes scholarly work from individuals such as Peter Elbow, Malea Powell, Jacqueline Jones Royster, Paul Kei Matsuda, and LuMing Mao. Some of these writers work to investigate the definition of hybridity, and others enact alternative discourses in their articles. *ALT DIS* especially concentrates on this enactment: "many academics and students have been developing new discourse forms that accomplish intellectual work while combining traditional academic discourse traits with traits from other discourse communities" (viii). This text displays to its audience an understanding of the development of many alternative forms in academic discourse and also discusses in what ways these forms are evolving in the academy.

In "An Essay We're Learning to Read," Spooner utilizes a marked form of hybrid academic discourse evident as soon as the audience reads the first page. He composes in standard written English for much of the article, displaying to his readers that he is well aware of formal academic writing and can accomplish this task effectively. Spooner also employs a hybrid discourse that is both multimodal through quote balloons, sketches, and boxes full of editorial notes, and linguistic through reported speech and humorous language. There are many multimodal examples in his work, such as the sketch of the Utah State University office floor plan, the advertisement for an editor, and the multiple quote bubbles with jokes housed in each one. Although multimodal features of hybridity

abound in “An Essay We’re Learning to Read,” this chapter focuses on two linguistic types: reported speech and humor.

Reported Speech

Reported speech is a term discussed by Voloshinov and Bakhtin, where “one participant in dialogue directly or indirectly restates what another participant has said or might say” (Dorval and Gomberg 131). Reported speech can be accomplished through directly quoting from an individual, but it can also occur when one indirectly quotes, not necessarily utilizing the speaker or writer’s exact words. Bakhtin viewed reported speech as portraying the continual dialogue that occurs between utterances. He states that “the speech of another, once enclosed in a context, is—no matter how accurately transmitted—always subject to certain semantic changes. The context embracing another’s word is responsible for its dialogizing background, whose influence can be very great” (“Discourse” 340). This quotation demonstrates the considerable influence that context can have in reported speech. The first example of reported speech in “An Essay We’re Learning to Read” occurs when Spooner describes how other scholars contemplate academic discourse: “But then, on the listserv that was set up for contributors to this book, Chris Thaiss asked what really is convention, anyway? And Pat Bizzell answered well here are fourteen things that are common as dirt in conventional academic writing”

(156). Here, Spooner does not cite Christopher Thaiss¹⁹ or Patricia Bizzell in the traditional academic sense by utilizing their full names that are well known in Writing Studies. Additionally, he does not cite them traditionally by introducing them as scholars, such as stating, “Scholars Christopher Thaiss and Patricia Bizzell write...” Instead, Spooner refers to both casually by shortening their names to “Chris” and “Pat,” representing them more informally than standard academic discourse would.

Correlating with this alternative use of academic discourse is Spooner’s decisions not to directly quote what either scholar actually stated about alternative modes for writing. He does not utilize quotation marks nor Thaiss or Bizzell’s exact words, making their language varieties casual in terms like “what really is” and “common as dirt.” This use of reported speech aligns with both of Gee’s notions of transfer and conflict. When Gee writes about transfer, he describes that “aspects of one Discourse can be transferred to another Discourse, as one can transfer a grammatical feature from one language to another” (“Literacy” 528). In transfer, there can be cooperative action, also known as synergy, between multiple Discourses. This is seen in Spooner’s reported speech example by his reference to both scholars as “Chris Thaiss asked” and “Pat Bizzell answered” because it represents how the work of other individuals can be part of Spooner’s own text. The reported speech is hybrid because it combines multiple authors in one work, which creates a merging of Discourses from one scholar and audience to

¹⁹ Thaiss is Professor of English at George Mason University, where he has directed the composition and writing-across-the curriculum programs and served as chair of the English Department. Since 2000, colleague Terry Myers Zawacki and Thaiss have been engaged in a study of the ways by which learners become proficient in the discourses of disciplines. The first phase of this research was published as a chapter, “Questioning Alternative Discourse: Reports from across the Disciplines” in *ALT DIS*.

another. The use of informal language variety in this reported speech also broadens the audience outside of academia because more people can understand the conversation terms “what really is” and “common as dirt.” This is synergetic because Spooner demonstrates that informal language variety can be a part of academic discourse, which opens up this way of writing to a more diverse audience at the university.

Although there is transfer in the reported speech example, other parts of this example demonstrate Gee’s notion of conflict. Gee describes conflict as in opposition to the cooperation of how Discourses can interact with one another:

The various Discourses which constitute each of us as persons are changing and often are not fully consistent with each other; there is often conflict and tension between the values, beliefs, attitudes, interactional styles, uses of language, and ways of being in the world which two or more Discourses represent. Thus, there is no real sense in which we humans are consistent or well-integrated creatures from a cognitive or social viewpoint, though, in fact, most Discourses assume that we are (and thus we do too, while we are in them). (“Literacy” 527)

Gee explains that conflict is between at least two Discourses constantly because human beings are not synergetic all the time. Individuals change, developing tension in different circumstances where their multiple Discourses contrast. The conflict in Spooner’s reported speech example is how he refers to Thaiss and Bizzell. A reader not familiar with either scholar could think that they are actually called Chris and Pat frequently in academic work. This reference to both Thaiss and Bizzell in such casual terms can be

gatekeeping because it can confuse readers who are not aware of the shorthand. This effect could function to take away from one of Spooner's purposes in writing alternative discourses, which is audience awareness about hybridity. By referencing the scholars in a conversational language variety and never explaining their full names, Spooner does too much with hybrid discourse here, experimenting to the point where it does not function to make the reader contemplate more about academic discourse, but is just confusing. Additionally, by writing "Pat and Chris," Spooner is not self reflecting on his own gatekeeping. He is blind to what his choice has done in terms of creating a wider audience. The spelling that is obviously different to Spooner himself does not seem different to an audience who has no knowledge of Bizzell or Thaiss. Therefore, Spooner is only thinking about what he knows in academic discourse, and expecting that of his readers, which leads to confusion. Spooner is also excluding others when he means to be including them because he does not think enough about explaining these terms. This goes against Spooner's point of demonstrating the pluralization in academia when he writes to exclude.

The audience as confused would be detrimental to Spooner's work because one of his main reasons for utilizing hybrid discourse is to promote audience awareness about alternative discourses. In my interview conducted with him in December 2008, the significance of audience reflection to Spooner is explicit:

It's clear enough that subjectivities are involved in all we write, and in the last ten years, it's even becoming acceptable to reveal and acknowledge (even to claim)

them in academic writing...Couldn't a discursal subversion like this be motivated by another sort of consciousness--politics or aesthetics or even just by the writer's sense of audience or moment/kairos? "To express identity" isn't a big part of it, at least for me; like it's on about page 50 of my priorities. ("Questions")

Without interviewing Spooner about what he thought his use of alternative discourses does, I would have assumed he was interested in expressing aspects of identity similar to McCrary. I think that my assumption derived from the parts of his article which concentrated on his personal experiences and the frequent use of personal pronouns. However, judging from the interview, one can see how wrong I was in assuming that Spooner's discourse was only about identity. As he states about expressing himself through alternative discourses, "it's on about page 50 of my priorities." This is because Spooner believes that there are personal expressions in everyone's writing, and he also refers to the last decade in the acceptance of alternative writing. In his work, Spooner does not negate identity as a part of hybrid academic discourse, but he sees there are other purposes, such as audience awareness, in his hybridity. Self reflection is not important to him in this work to the extent that he does not reflect enough in "An Essay We're Learning to Read." If he had more, then his relationship with his audience would also be more fluid because Spooner would not be gatekeeping.

The importance of audience awareness is discussed even more explicitly in another part of the interview where I asked, "What does hybrid discourse allow you to do that standard academic discourse does not?" Spooner responded with how alternative

discourses create an environment for the reader to reflect more on what is expected in academic writing:

What I do enjoy about alt styles is that I can use them to create a less directed experience for the reader. For example, in the “Essay We’re Learning to Read,” I think the jokes and the fictional comments from a fictional editor tend to push the reader away. Their incongruity makes space in which the reader becomes more aware of the constructedness of the writing. (“Questions”)

Spooner views an effect of how writing alternatively can make the reader question the implications of different modes of academic writing. The created stance can work to force an audience to be more actively involved in their reading and also contemplate the definition of academic discourse. It can make one wonder if Spooner’s article is academic discourse, then how far can one go with this hybridity? By asking the reader to think about these ideas through his hybridity in a published scholarly article, Spooner redefines that academic discourse can only be accomplished one way.

Although Spooner states that expressing identity is not his main objective in this work compared to audience awareness, one sees that his literate lives are being expressed in “An Essay We’re Learning to Read.” Even though this work does not relate to cultural identity in the same way as McCrary’s “Represent, Representin’, Representation,” Spooner expresses his professional identity in this scholarly work. When he writes, he uses the notes from the editor as an expression of his own profession, since he is the Director of the Utah State University Press, and has been for the past 16 years since 1993.

He also writes in standard written English as a scholar, since he has published many articles in composition journals like *College Composition and Communication* and knows the conventions of this field. Additionally, Spooner uses humor as a creative writer, since he composes children and young adult literature such as *Last Child*, *Daniel's Walk*, and *A Moon in Your Lunchbox*. By employing reported speech in this essay, Spooner demonstrates his different Discourses weaving together multiple professional identities with one another.

Humor

Gee's terms of transfer and conflict are also part of Spooner's second use of hybridity through humor. Bizzell states in "Hybrid Academic Discourses: What, Why, How" how humor is one of the fourteen components that can make a text hybrid. She writes that it is a stylistic, cultural, and cognitive element from "different discourse communities" which allows more alternative ways of developing academic discourse besides just utilizing a marginalized cultural language ("Preface" ix). The first example of humor in "An Essay We're Learning to Read" begins on the first page, when Spooner writes in one quote balloon, "How many copyeditors does it take to screw in a light bulb?" and in the next quote balloon, "Not sure whether you mean 'change a light bulb' or 'have sex in a light bulb.' Consider revising for clarity?" (155). Such structures are colloquial, with diction such as "screw" and "have sex." Not only is this language variety informal, but it explicitly articulates sexuality, which is frequently not discussed

in academic publications in a joking manner. Therefore, because of the colloquial language variety and unconventionality of the humor, Spooner highlights these jokes as internally persuasive discourses because they have the possibility of shocking the audience from what they are accustomed to in academic writing. Not only do they shock the audience, but the mock seriousness of the created editor's query is also a way that Spooner bursts the bubble of his own importance. Spooner recognizes how serious editors can seem to be to outside viewers, and satirizes them with his own words. His self-mocking is humorous to himself, but it is more difficult for people outside of an academic or copy editor community to understand why this is so funny.

Spooner's employment of the sexually charged jokes as internally persuasive discourses is similar to the section on "Pat and Chris," where Spooner never really explains these people. In both examples, he is excluding others from the academic community while not even realizing it. This is because he never explains the benefits or even the significance of stating these sexual jokes. In other parts of this essay, Spooner discusses why utilizing humor and other unconventional modes of writing are helpful because they make for a more interesting reading experience. However, the use of sexuality in these jokes is overlooked in being clarified. This demonstrates Gee's conflict that occurs between different Discourses, and how the effectiveness of one Discourse is influenced by the other. Gee writes about this tension,

We can always ask about how much *tension or conflict* is present between any two of a person's Discourses...We have argued above that some degree of

conflict and tension (if only because of the discrete historical origins of particular Discourses) will almost always be present. However, some people experience more overt and direct conflicts between two or more of their Discourses than do others...I argue that when such conflict or tension exists, it can deter acquisition of one or the other or both of the conflicting Discourses, or, at least, affect the fluency of a mastered Discourse on certain occasions of use" ("Literacy" 528).

This idea that there can be much conflict with certain Discourses is especially representative in Spooner's case of utilizing the sexual jokes in academic discourse. The humor that could broaden more of an audience if it is explained instead becomes more of self-mockery that only appeals to people who are copy editors or understand how copy editors work. For others who do not have experience with copy editors, the myopic view of one does not have individuals as engaged. It seems that many readers would wonder why Spooner even included the joke, and why he would make it the first text the audience reads after the title. The joke is an illustration of how academic prose is inhibited by monologic editing. However, since the sexuality goes unexplained, the joke can become misconstrued, and is an example of where there can be too much hybridity in a work. It feels like the internally persuasive discourses of the humor and the standard written English of other parts of the article clash with each other to the point that they break down. This is especially true in how Spooner's purpose of audience awareness about understanding hybrid discourse becomes complicated when the readers might be confused in the sexuality section. In this section, Spooner is caught in his monologic

academic prose mindset too much and is not able to demonstrate hybridity because he does not explain what the joke means. This is an example where his discourse excludes when it is trying to include.

One reason that Spooner might have taken this hybridity to the extreme is because he felt apprehensive about how much to use in his essay. This issue of how much hybridity to use arose in the interview when I asked Spooner, “What challenges have you had with weaving together standard English and different discourses in your work?” He responded, “Maybe the most vexing moments are those when I judge that I'm not getting things “alt” enough. Conventional academic discourse is like a first language to me, and it takes an extra discipline to compose in another language” (“Questions”). It appears from this interview that Spooner struggles with how much hybrid discourse to use. Therefore, by being anxious about the amount of alternativeness to include and making sure the point of audience awareness is attained, Spooner went to an extreme in his employment of humor which lost the audience. Here, instead of inviting the audience into his reading, he may have repelled many because they did not understand the joke because they are not engaged with copy editors. This conflicts with one point of hybridity which is broadening academic discourse.

The second example of Spooner’s employment of humor is one of the imagined editor’s notes, which does not contain as much conflict as the sexual jokes. In this note, the imagined editor writes about adding the real editors of *ALT DIS* into Spooner’s literature review section:

And Helen Fox's *Listening to the World*, in case you haven't seen it, is equally attuned to the "alternative" discourse of her international students. And one of Bizzell's purposes is to highlight the contingent nature of what is accepted in the U.S. as definitive convention[...]In addition, not to put too fine a point on it, S, F, & B are the volume editors here; it would be politic to give them a plug (159).

This note seems serious by the consistent use of standard written English for most of it and the topic discussed. However, it is humorous to the audience because of the context of this essay being included in *ALT DIS*, which "S (Schroeder), F (Fox), & B (Bizzell)" all published. Therefore, it is most likely that Spooner himself has not only seen, but has read Helen Fox's work. Additionally, by obviously stating how it would be "politic" to give these editors a plug, Spooner mocks the politics which many times govern standard academic discourse, where a writer may include their editor's name or work to do a favor to the editor. Again, he is self-mocking and mocking the community that he participates in. Yet, if one is not a part of this community, they may feel lost on why this note is so funny.

In this use of humor, Spooner broadens the readership to his article by mocking the politics in academia. He writes in a way so that a diverse amount of readers would understand what he means, and many would probably think the joke is funny. This demonstrates Gee's transfer, where the languages "influence each other to form the linguistic texture of whole societies and to interrelate various groups in society" ("Literacy" 533). The use of transfer is another example where Spooner attempts to

broaden his readership and also asks his audience to reflect on whether this type of humor is appropriate in academic discourse. Making his audience reflect on their notion of academic discourse is similar to what McCrary does in “Represent,” when he writes in Black English to make the audience challenge their notions of only seeing this dialect as entertainment. Spooner wants people to recognize that humor can be intellectually weighty in academic discourse, just as McCrary desires individuals to realize Black English is as valuable as standard written English.

Considering the joke about plugging in one’s editors for exposure from Gee’s point of view on Discourses, the audience can recognize how this joke represents the ideology and identities of many in the academy. Spooner is humorous by writing about the editors so as to make a favorable recommendation, but this humor demonstrates what many in the academy do in their publications. Therefore, this use of discourse is not just languages being used, but the role of the author and editor within those languages. Gee writes about how “‘little d’ discourse (language-in-use) is melded integrally with non-language ‘stuff’ to enact specific identities and activities” or Discourses (*Analysis* 7). The language-in-use in Spooner’s work melds with the identities of author and editor and the activities of these identities. Not only does this joke represent many in the academy, but also represents Spooner’s identity. He is making fun of what authors do for editors, and yet he is simultaneously both, a full member of these discourse communities. The joke allows him to implicitly express his multiple professional identities, and this expression works to redefine academic writing as it becomes more personal. However,

just like the use of “Pat and Chris” and the sexual joke humor, it seems that one must be a part of Spooner’s audience to really understand his jokes. In this way, he continually limits individuals because he is caught in his monologic, academic prose mindset.

Conclusion

Similar to Donald McCrary’s purpose, Michael Spooner’s purpose in his use of hybrid discourse is to portray a redefinition of academic writing that concentrates on more audience awareness. Spooner’s use of Bakhtin’s concept of reported speech works to involve a broader audience into academic work by his use of informal languages, which corresponds with the diversity of the academy. This opening of a diverse audience also correlates with Gee’s concept of transfer because the informal languages in the reported speech is working fluently in the academic article. Yet, through these same words, the reported speech example can also work to act as a gatekeeper because it seems that one needs to be fully part of the academic discourse community to understand Spooner’s shorthand. This demonstrates Gee’s concept of conflict because there is tension with the exclusionary nature of the reported speech and what Spooner desires to accomplish with the audience awareness on the languages utilized. It seems that Spooner is too stuck in monologic academic prose to realize that he is excluding others from the academic community. If he had explained more, then his use of hybridity would have been more effective.

The employment of humor by Spooner also fits Gee's ideas on transfer and conflict, where Spooner broadens his readership by mocking academia. Yet, there is the most conflict in the humor section because of the potentially misunderstood sexual joke which begins "An Essay We're Learning to Read." This is a noted example where there is too much hybridity because the joke which could be misconstrued is never explained and it has the potential to repel many in the audience. When Spooner acted in this way, it took away from the audience being aware of hybrid discourse, and instead becoming confused by the abundance of hybridity. These jokes represent how sometimes texts work so hard to be "alt" enough that they lose their purpose in the process. Additionally, the hybrid examples convey that Spooner is not reflective enough about his own gatekeeping. He does not realize that he is leaving many in the audience out by not explaining the jokes or the copy editor community.

Even though his use of hybrid discourse can be overwhelming at times, Spooner does invite the readers to reflect on how they define academic discourse and what they think it should be or how they think it should function. His interviews especially indicate these purposes as he continually responds on the significance of audience awareness compared to self-reflection. Nevertheless, Spooner's hybrid work viewed through Gee's Discourses, and his answers to some of my interview questions, indicate that this way of writing links many different aspects of his identity together, especially in the roles of editor, author, and scholar. Overall, by viewing Spooner's use of hybridity in "An Essay We're Learning to Read: Responding to Alt.Style" through the Bakhtinian concept of

reported speech and Gee's perspective of Discourses and synergy and conflict, one sees how this hybridity works to redefine academic discourse by creating a conversation with the reader that provokes audience awareness. One can also see though that this work proves to be too limited and exclusionary in ways, and for that reason, it might not be "alt enough."

Chapter Five: What We As Scholars and Educators Can Learn from McCrary and Spooner's Use of Hybrid Academic Discourse

In their article, "English Only and U.S. College Composition," Bruce Horner and John Trimbur detail the degree to which English composition programs have become monologic in the United States. Donald McCrary's "Represent, Representin', Representation: The Efficacy of Hybrid Texts in the Writing Classroom" and Michael Spooner's "An Essay We're Learning to Read: Responding to Alt.Style" directly relates to what Horner and Trimbur discussed when they wrote, "The task, as we see it, is to develop an internationalist perspective capable of understanding the study and teaching of written English in relation to other languages and to the dynamics of globalization" (624). Although many would argue that Black English through restatement and embedded hybridity, and informal languages through reported speech and humor is not an "internationalist perspective," I see the code meshing of these internally persuasive discourses with standard written English as an internationalist perspective because both McCrary and Spooner illuminate the significance of pluralization in scholarly work.

By writing in hybrid academic discourse, McCrary is able to redefine what academic discourse is and what it should do. To McCrary, hybrid academic discourse is defined by his writing in both standard written English and Black English. Additionally, hybrid academic discourse is defined by McCrary in the purposes of this medium, one

purpose being that this way of writing allows internally persuasive discourses to be not only accepted, but enacted by the academy as an intellectually weighty mode of communication. When I write the word intellectually weighty, I mean that this language variety is being valued academically to express thoughts, arguments, etc. The acceptance of Black English works to bridge the gap that has traditionally been constructed between academia and popular culture. The purpose of accepting an internally persuasive discourse like Black English as valuable also works to broaden the audience who reads these articles, and introduces more people to the field of Writing Studies. Not only that, but “Represent, Representin’, Representation” makes the audience contemplate their definition of academic discourse and what they think it should become, which makes the reader more actively involved in academic writing and how it is developing.

Another purpose to McCrary’s use of hybrid academic discourse is that it allows both self-reflection on his cultural and scholarly identity. The third purpose is it makes McCrary’s audience question how academic discourse is written and whether it is privileging a certain language variety and community. In terms of research into the relationship of languages and identity, McCrary’s essay conveys the sacrificing of whole selves that individuals suffer to be a part of higher education. This predicament relates to the ideas on public and private, and how many individuals view these as disparate arenas, but through his use of hybrid academic discourse, McCrary demonstrates that these are inextricably-linked to one another in the academy. For this purpose, hybrid academic discourse allows McCrary to be more of himself in academia in a way that traditional

academic discourse cannot accomplish because there is such singularity in standard written English. Understanding James Gee's notions of Discourses as "identity kits," one understands how the way McCrary is writing is a part of him and represents his home communities. This would not be as evident if McCrary wrote only in standard written English.

The last purpose of McCrary's work is that it pluralizes academic writing, displaying that composition as a field should not be stagnant, but ever changing along with the diversity of the academy. I believe that McCrary and other composition scholars' work with dialectical hybrid discourse exhibits how much there is to learn about the connections of languages and literacy within and outside the academy. Ultimately, there should be continued expansion of research on scholars' application of this type of hybrid discourse in academic articles along two key fronts: considering how mainstream higher education in the U.S. has served to marginalize non-mainstream languages as well as the cultural identities connected with them, and suggesting that we can learn from this composition scholar's discourse to be more self-reflective of the many facets of our writing and identities. Researching further on the topic would establish more about how individuals' cultural identities are significant to their intellectual work. McCrary writes, "Either our students' lives and cultures—and language is a central aspect of both—have meaning, or they don't" (75). It is crucial to delve more into how both scholars and students use their home languages in academia. Not only can we research how learning from these multiple languages functions in the academy, but also how it affects ourselves

in social interaction and personal growth in multiple communities. It is also imperative to study more about the development of scholarly identity along with this use of hybrid academic discourse.

Although not exactly the same as McCrary's medium, Michael Spooner's "An Essay We're Learning to Read: Responding to Alt.Style" is much the same in purposes, beginning with seeing internally persuasive discourses, such as conversational languages and humor as intellectually weighty like standard written English. In demonstrating this, Spooner also opens up his article and the field of Writing Studies to a broader audience. However, by being caught in a monologic and academic mindset, Spooner also mitigates his use of hybridity because he excludes others who are not in academia and have not had interactions with copy editors. Spooner's hybrid discourse, though, makes the audience more aware of the constructedness of writing. Spooner concentrates on audience awareness so that readers understand how writing is an active process between different Discourses that work in transfer and conflict. The transfer and conflict make the audience think about academic discourse, and why it should have to be in a singular form. Spooner makes the audience ask questions like "Why is this unacceptable to the editor?" "Is there an ideology behind this way of writing?" "Are there ideologies behind every way of writing?"

I conclude from much of the text-based interviews conducted with him that Spooner is not interested in self-reflection or expression of cultural identity through his work like McCrary. However, by looking at this work through Gee's notions of

Discourses, the reader recognizes that Spooner in fact is expressing many sides of his literate life in his work, from his experiences of being an editor, author, and scholar. Therefore, there is a connection between Spooner's identity and his work similar to McCrary's. However, he is also not self-reflective enough in his work because he is blind to explaining aspects of copy editing that he understands and that others do not. Another purpose of using hybrid academic discourse for Spooner that is also similar to McCrary is the pluralizing of academic discourse in response to the diversity of American universities. Although his use of languages is not as explicit as McCrary's, the concentration on language use is still extremely important in Spooner's article. However, Spooner, unlike McCrary, does not restate ideas in multiple languages, so that if his audience does not understand one word in another language variety, then they are left confused. He is not reflective enough about how his hybridity is gatekeeping people. More research should be done on Spooner's uses of languages to answer why he is gatekeeping, and if he even knows that he is.

Deriving from my analysis of both of these scholars, it is my belief that continued research should focus on the methodology of text-based interviews with scholars. It would be beneficial for a researcher to interview a greater amount of scholars than I have done in this work so as to view more reasons that scholars choose to write in alternative discourses. Marcia Buell discusses the importance of interviews in research, stating, "Interviews in particular allow for confirmations or refutations of the analyst's interpretations and for participants to introduce alternative readings of the texts, codes,

and contexts” (105). Interviews have been concentrated on with students many times in relation to their own essays, and now it is time to concentrate on scholars as well. In my interviews with McCrary and Spooner, I learned much about why they write in hybrid academic discourse and more about each scholar’s context. This was especially significant in understanding Spooner more, who I thought would be interested in self-reflection primarily by using hybrid discourse. After the interview, though, I discovered that this was not the case at all. By conducting interviews with the participants, one can learn more about their work as a whole and also more about the academic environment as well. Overall, I think that the exploration of hybridity could benefit from more fully coupling rhetorical analysis with text-based interviews.

Other suggestions for researching hybridity methodologically are to do longitudinal case studies of certain scholars, following their use of alternative discourses for at least five years to see if their medium changes and also if the reasoning behind writing in this way evolves. Additionally, interviews or case studies with both scholars and students could be valuable in comparing and contrasting how these different communities utilize hybridity, focusing on whether self-reflection or audience reflection occurs in both. I would also suggest that future researchers interested in hybrid discourse use the theoretical framework that I outlined here, but make it narrower. I concentrated on many subjects within Bakhtin and Gee’s theories, and I think it would be clearer in further research to focus on a couple, like Bakhtin’s notion of heteroglossia and Gee’s idea on intertextuality together in one research paper. Additionally, I think focusing

solely on Gee's Discourses could be extremely helpful in doing an in-depth analysis of scholar's writing in relation to their academic identities.

Research could also be done more on the effects of hybrid discourse in scholar's success at the university, so whether individuals who write in this way obtain tenure at their universities and publish a great amount, or whether they are relegated to smaller universities and not as much job security because of this medium. I also think it is significant to further study the complexities of hybrid discourse with a more skeptical stance, so that the positive and negative attributes of such work are explicated. While most of my thesis concentrates on the positive aspects of this discourse, I realize there are drawbacks as well. I attempted to bring up some of these drawbacks in Chapter Four when Spooner utilizes unneeded hybridity in relation to the reported speech and sexual joke examples. More research on the negative implications of hybrid discourse could help to answer questions like "Are some alternative discourses more acceptable or useful than others?" "Is there any such thing as being 'alt' enough?" If a scholar studied these questions, she or he could incorporate more concerning why many people do not desire hybridity at the university and attempt to construct guidelines for creating an effective balance between traditional discourse and alternative discourses that can be utilized in academia.

Furthermore, in my research I concentrated on two scholars who demonstrate marked hybrid academic discourse in their writing. I think it would be incredibly interesting to study a discourse which is not as marked, such as students' papers for their

composition class or scholars' papers for publication which they believe are only written in standard written English. By interviewing these individuals and asking why they use certain words or phrases, I am sure that this implicit hybridity would come forth. This study would allow academia to realize that all writing is hybrid in ways even if it does appear unmarked, which encourages individuals to look at hybrid discourse in all works to discover how even if a text looks homogenous, it can be heterogeneous. Even if an article is unmarked, this does not mean it is not heterogeneous; it just means that its hybridity is not as obvious as marked hybridity. It is important in this further research to encourage more innovativeness and demonstrate the hybridity in all works, especially scholarly works, as they are at the intersection of internally persuasive discourses and authoritative discourses, which Paul Prior discusses in his work *Writing/Disciplinarity*.

Relating to teaching, McCrary's and Spooner's hybrid discourse foregrounds that composition educators need to examine their reasons for teaching, or at least requiring, standard written English and the political implications behind teaching this language variety. In place of employing a dichotomy between speech genres like standard written English and Black English, or standard written English and colloquially humorous language, students can develop a multiplicity of discourses through hybrid academic discourse. The multiplicity allows critical thinking because students experiment with many different discourses instead of regurgitating the same one continuously without ever questioning it. In the interview, McCrary wrote how this would "allow students to express a wider range of their language knowledge, which I believe helps them to be

more confident as language users and more aware of language itself” (“Interest”). Students could feel more confident in questioning conventions of academic discourse, such as what Spooner does in “An Essay We’re Learning to Read.” They could be more reflective about how different discourses in the university but also outside of it affect them and would also understand that standard written English is not the only language variety that should be privileged in the academy.

There are complications in using hybrid discourse in the classroom, and I am still unsure myself of how many papers could be written in it for grading. It seems as though it would be a difficult product to evaluate, but Jody Shipka in her 2005 article, “A Multi-Modal Task-based Framework for Composing” lays out a detailed way to grade her students’ work that was multimodal. Therefore, I believe that grading such work effectively can be done, especially concentrating on students’ critical thinking skills. I will say that I do not think every single composition project should be in hybrid discourse because as teachers, we are preparing our students for professional schools, graduate schools, and occupations where standard written English dominates. Since that is the case, I think most final products should be done in standard written English so that students can be confident users of this language variety. However, I still think that hybrid discourse can be a part of multiple assignments, including the final product. This is actually similar to McCrary’s view in “Represent, Representin’, Representation.” He does not think his students should know only hybrid discourse, but it is important for them to know that it does exist, and that it is valuable.

Also by using hybrid academic discourse in the classroom, students would not have to leave their home identities “at the door,” but can take them inside the university (McCrary 72). This would allow students, especially basic writing students, to not feel marginalized from academic discourse and English education in general and be able to weave together their many literate practices. It would also allow students to self-reflect on being members of many different communities, and what that all entails in this increasingly globalized society. In doing so, students could think not only about their individual writing and life, thus creating a relation to both to the outside world. The use of hybrid discourse could create an open minded environment about different cultures and identities at the academy because students could be reading and writing varietal and multimodal essays that would facilitate their understanding more about diversity at the university.

This understanding of how we desire students to self-reflect through hybrid academic discourse should also demonstrate that we as scholars need to do it ourselves. Scholars define their field through their work in published journals, conferences, and pedagogy, and they ultimately display what is acceptable in the academy. What scholars accept from students differs from what they accept from peers and what they promote in their field. Studying McCrary’s work evokes the notion that if we desire for our students to subjectify and personalize standard discourse, then why do individuals feel uncomfortable when academics express their multiple selves through multiple discourses? Writing as a scholar is the highest level of academia, and the fact that

composition scholars like McCrary are even choosing to write in hybrid discourse to self-reflect displays how it could also function for more academics. I think if more academics at least attempted to write in hybrid academic discourse, it would be interesting to view how many struggled with it compared to traditional academic discourse. Spooner discusses this in the interview, writing, “Conventional academic discourse is like a first language to me, and it takes an extra discipline to compose in another language” (“Questions”). If more scholars locked into monologic academic discourse attempted hybrid academic discourse, then many of them would view how much energy and discipline it takes, similar to the task of students mastering traditional academic discourse. Practicing hybrid academic discourse would be a beneficial exercise for both students and scholars in experimenting with different language varieties and modes. Also, if more scholars practiced hybrid discourse, they would see how the process is much like composing in standard written English, aligning hybrid discourse to be more equal with traditional academic discourse.

By studying scholars’ use of hybrid academic discourse more, we can begin to redefine academic discourse. Presently, academic discourse works through the stringent guidelines of standard written English as a gatekeeping tool. McCrary and Spooner both display how hybridizing academic discourse could work to help students and scholars alike acknowledge the multiple facets of their languages, communities, and identities. Not only that, but both exhibit how it can open up Writing Studies to a different audience and challenge readers to question their assumptions in writing. However, Spooner does

not self-reflect enough, and ends up excluding much of his audience, which goes against one of the major purposes of hybridity. Although both of these scholars use different media for their own specific purposes in hybrid academic discourse, they possess the same overall reason behind their works—to pluralize academic writing and open up the field of composition studies to more individuals. One seems to be more successful than the other in this endeavor. However, in doing so, both work to connect the field of Writing Studies more to the pluralization of individuals at American universities.

Works Cited

- Anzaldúa, Gloria. "Speaking in Tongues: A Letter to Third World Women Writers." *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*. Eds. Cherríe Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa. New York: Kitchen Table, Women of Color Press, 1983. 165-173.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Discourse in the Novel." *The Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1981. 259-422.
- . "The Problem of Speech Genres." *The Rhetorical Tradition*. Eds. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 1227-1245.
- Bartholomae, David. "Released into Language: Errors, Expectations, and the Legacy of Mina Shaughnessy." *Writing on the Margins: Essays on Composition and Teaching*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005. 36-59.
- . "The Tidy House: Basic Writing in the American Curriculum." *Journal of Basic Writing* 12.1 (1993): 4-21.
- Bell, Allan. "Style and the Linguistic Repertoire." *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*. Eds. Carman Llamas, Peter Stockwell, and Louise Mullany. London: Taylor and Francis, 2006. 93-105.
- Bizzell, Patricia. "Basic Writing and the Issue of Correctness, or, What to Do with 'Mixed' Forms of Academic Discourse." *Journal of Basic Writing* 19.1 (2000): 4-12.
- . "Hybrid Academic Discourses: What, Why, and How." *Composition Studies* 27.2 (1998-1999): 8-23.
- . "Preface." *ALT DIS: Alternative Discourses and the Academy*. Eds. Christopher Schroeder, Patricia Bizzell, and Helen Fox. Heinemann, 2002. vi-xv.

- Buell, Marcia Z. "Code-Switching and Second Language Writing: How Multiple Codes Are Combined in a Text." *What Writing Does and How It Does It: An Introduction to Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices*. Ed. Charles Bazerman and Paul Prior. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2003. 97-122.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued." *College Composition and Communication*, 57.4 (2006): 586-619.
- Clark, William G. "Responses to 'The Students' Right to Their Own Language.'" *College Composition and Communication* 26.2 (1975): 216-217.
- Delpit, Lisa. "The Silenced Dialogue: Power and Pedagogy in Educating Other People's Children." *Harvard Educational Review*. 58.3 (1988): 280-298.
- Dorval, Bruce and David Gomberg. "Psychotherapy as the Construction of Interpenetrating Consciousnesses." *Bakhtin, Carnival, and Other Subjects*. Ed. David Shepherd. Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 1993. 125-144.
- Elbow, Peter. "Vernacular Englishes in the Writing Classroom? Probing the Culture of Literacy." *ALT DIS: Alternative Discourses and the Academy*. Eds. Christopher Schroeder, Patricia Bizzell, and Helen Fox. Heinemann, 2002. 126-38.
- Gee, James Paul. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- . "Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction and What is Literacy?" *Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Ellen Cushman, Eugene R. Kintgen, Barry Kroll, and Mike Rose. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 523-546.
- Hebb, Judith. "Mixed Forms of Academic Discourse: A Continuum of Language Possibility." *Journal of Basic Writing* 21.2 (2002): 21-36.
- Horner, Bruce and John Trimbur. "English Only and U.S. College Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 53 (2002): 594-630.
- "Joe." Zomba Recording. 2007. Zomba Recording. 9 April 2008
<<http://www.joescrib.com>>.
- Jones, Stephanie. "Language with an Attitude: White Girls Performing Class." *Language Arts* 84.2 (2006): 114-124.

- Landay, Eileen. "Performance as the Foundation for a Secondary School Literacy Program: A Bakhtinian Perspective." *Bakhtinian Perspectives on Language, Literacy, and Learning*. Eds. Arnetha F. Ball and Sarah Warshauer Freedman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 107-128.
- Lee, Carol D. "Double Voiced Discourse: African American Vernacular English as Resource in Cultural Modeling Classrooms." *Bakhtinian Perspectives on Language, Literacy, and Learning*. Eds. Arnetha F. Ball and Sarah Warshauer Freedman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 129-149.
- Lippi-Green, Rosina. *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- "Ludacris." Def Jam Recordings. 2006. 9 April 2008 <<http://www.defjam.com/site/artist>>.
- McCrary, Donald. "Represent, Representin', Representation: The Efficacy of Hybrid Texts in the Writing Classroom." *Journal of Basic Writing* 24.2 (2005): 72-91.
- "Nas." Def Jam Recordings. 2006. 9 April 2008 <<http://www.defjam.com>>.
- Rodriguez, Richard. *Hunger for Memory: The Education of Richard Rodriguez*. New York: Bantam, 1983.
- Rose, Mike. "The Language of Exclusion: Writing Instruction at the University." *An Open Language: Selected Writing on Literacy, Learning, and Opportunity*. Ed. Mike Rose. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2006. 182-202.
- Smitherman, Geneva. *Black Talk: Words and Phrases from the Hood to the Amen Corner*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2000.
- Spooner, Michael. "An Essay We're Learning to Read: Responding to Alt.Style." *ALT DIS: Alternative Discourses and the Academy*. Eds. Christopher Schroeder, Patricia Bizzell, and Helen Fox. Heinemann, 2002. 155-177.
- . "Comments on Geneva Napoleon Smitherman's 'Dat Teacher Be Hollin' at Us—What is Ebonics?' A Reader Reads and the Author Responds." *TESOL Quarterly* 33.7 (1999): 136-139.
- "Students' Right to Their Own Language." *College Composition and Communication* 25 (1974): 1-32.

Wilkinson, Caroline. "Interest in 'Represent, Representin', Representation: The Efficacy of Hybrid Discourse in the Classroom." E-mail to Donald McCrary. 16 Feb. 2008.

---. "Questions about 'An Essay We're Learning to Read: Responding to Alt.Style.'" Email to Michael Spooner. 07 Jan 2009.

Zappen, James P. *The Rebirth of Dialogue: Bakhtin, Socrates, and the Rhetorical Tradition*. New York: SUNY Press, 2004.