JOGLTEP

Exploring Nontraditional Rhetoric: Voicing the Voiceless through Nativization of Traditional Rhetoric

Shuv Raj Rana Bhat[1]

The University of Texas at El Paso, USA

Abstract: In this paper, I draw on a number of scholars—Kachru, Anzaldúa, Canagarajah, Young, Horner et al., Mangelsdorf, Rao, Matsuda, Royster, and Lyons—to formulate and analyze nontraditional rhetoric. Building on these scholars' conceptualizations of rhetoric, I argue that nontraditional rhetoric refers to the rhetorically nativized use of language that significantly departs from standard English in order to give voices to many historically marginalized people. I use the terms "rhetoric" and "nativization" to respectively refer to the way language is used to achieve an intended goal and to the process of mingling and meshing Indian and Spanish linguistic and cultural idioms and expressions with the traditional English language. Through the analysis of Raja Rao's first novel *Kanthapura* and Gloria Anzaldúa's "How to Tame a Wild Tongue," I illustrate how the authors deliberately make use of a wide range of nontraditional rhetorical strategies to nativize English. I present different strategies such as nativizing language, code switching, code meshing, syntactic fusion, reduplication, and cultural artifacts that nontraditional rhetoricians deploy in their writings to represent native voice, identity, and spirit of their own culture, people, and language.

Keywords: nontraditional rhetoric, nativization, code switching, code meshing, hybrid rhetoric

---

[1] Shuv Raj Rana Bhat is a PhD student at The University of Texas at El Paso.
Email: shuvaranabhat0@gmail.com

Introduction

In the first semester of my doctoral program in Rhetoric and Composition at The University of Texas at El Paso, I had an opportunity to study a course entitled "Introduction to Rhetoric and Writing Studies" in a multicultural setting in which there were students from Asia, Africa, Europe, and North America. Like the composition of the class, its syllabus was constituted by diverse thematic titles such as civil discourse, contemporary rhetoric, composition studies, nontraditional rhetoric, writing instruction, research, book review, and the like. While all of these topics were interesting enough for me to study, it was in the domain of nontraditional rhetoric that I found myself most interested. The expression "nontraditional rhetoric" particularly drew my attention, encouraging me to further explore what it really meant in the discipline of rhetoric. Under this rubric "nontraditional rhetoric," there were readings by Sri Lankan writer Suresh Canagarajah, American writer Gloria Anzaldúa, a writer of color Jacqueline Jones Royster, native American Scott Richard Lyons, and James P. Zappen et al. In my pursuit of meaning of nontraditional rhetoric, I paid a close attention to all the articles prescribed. However, I found myself challenged when I discovered that none of the articles explicitly referred to the terminology "nontraditional rhetoric." In my attempt to search for meaning, I not only reread the articles but also explored databases and digital libraries such as JSTOR, EBSCOhost, ProQuest, and Google Scholar even though my search did not turn out to be fruitful. Failure to find meaning of the term prompted me to further my research and it intrigued my curiosity to know why writers ranging from America to Sri Lanka were classified under one rubric called nontraditional rhetoric.

Communicating with culturally diverse cohort in the doctoral program was equally intriguing because our classroom as a *contact zone*, to use Pratt's term, provided us with an opportunity to converse and share our cultural experiences from different parts of the globe. Whereas, borrowing the term from linguistics, Pratt (1991) deploys the term *contact zone* to allude to "social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out in many parts of the world today" (p. 34), I would not consider my class to be a space where the colonizer and the colonized clashed with each other as in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when colonization was at its height. This does not mean that communication among us—a diverse cohort—was smooth, easy, and fluent as the term *contact* itself connotes. Our classroom was certainly a space in which world Englishes—Nepali English, Ukrainian English, Spanglish, Ghanaian English, Cameroonian English, and American English—met and

sometimes clashed with each other due to differing linguistic and cultural heritages all of us embraced. While all of my classmates seemed to be similar in terms of the ways we used syntactic patterns in English, mostly following standard academic written English, we were unique in the way we used Englishes orally. Owing to our unique or different pronunciation, stress, intonation, idiomatic expressions, and other paralinguistic features, communication breakdown on different occasions was a common phenomenon that we experienced (although not in equal ways) both inside and outside the classroom. I am deliberately using the pronoun "we" because understanding intercultural communication was problematic not only to international and second language learners like me but also to native speakers of English.

In addition to my experiences in the classroom, understanding communication outside the university, particularly in restaurants, shopping centers, and over the phone was considerably more difficult for me than inside the university for a number of reasons: accent, lack of audience recognition, metallic voice, specially speaking over the phone, unfamiliarity with location and food items, use of conversational or colloquial language, and American measurement system. Commonly understood as a distinctive way of pronouncing a language, accent was arguably the hardest thing for both interlocutors—native and nonnative speakers of English—to comprehend. As a native speaker of a non-stressed Nepali language and as a second language learner of English who had begun to learn the English language through textbooks, translation, teaching and deductive grammatical rules in my late teens without any English environment or direct exposure—native and nonnative—, it was quite natural for me to get baffled when I encountered the stressed Southwestern American English language variety in a discourse community I had never been exposed to. Even more interesting was the scene in which I could see my interlocutors' (both native and nonnative speakers of English) perplexed faces when they did not understand what I was talking about. Another reason that hindered our communication was the lack of audience recognition on the part of interlocutors. My several communicative experiences in different parts of the US suggest that conversations often start, continue, and end with the assumption that interlocutors know what they are talking about without really considering audiences' educational, social, geographical, and linguistic backgrounds. For example, educated in the tradition of British English as the textbooks in my schools and colleges were mostly Anglo-centric, my English was directly or vicariously influenced by British English, particularly vocabularies such as pavement for sidewalk, city centre for downtown, lift for elevator, petrol for gasoline, full stop for period, pronunciation such as dance /da:ns/ for /dæns/, now /nau/ for /næu/, can't /ka:nt/ for /kænt/ and measurement systems such as kilogram for pound, kilometres for miles, to name a few. My lack of familiarity with Southwestern American varieties of English and many American speakers' lack of acquaintance

with British and Nepali varieties of English often resulted in the failure of communication in supermarkets, food stores, pharmacies and other public arenas. Taking too much for granted often led to communication misfire, inducing us to devise new communication and negotiation strategies: repeating ourselves multiple times, rephrasing the terms when they were not comprehensible to us, spelling out the words, and pretending to understand when nothing worked. While our conversation in the public areas often showed that we—both native and nonnative speakers of English—were not well acquainted with each others' accents, it was we nonnative speakers who were branded as having "accents" as though native speakers do not have any accents.

Experiences such as these, as well as the syllabus and the prescribed readings in the course stimulated my interests into researching nontraditional rhetoric, triggering several questions in my mind: What does the prefix "non" in the word "nontraditional" refer to? Does it posit resistance to long-established traditions, rules, and norms? Does it mean to be opposed to western white normativity? Does it suggest a deviation from standard English? Does the word nontraditional include world Englishes? Is it so expansive or pluralistic as to encompass code switching, code meshing, translanguaging, native idioms, synecdoche, untranslated words, neologism, syntactic fusion, reduplication, symbols, images, and cultural artifacts such as music, art, rituals, and dances? Does it involve an insider's perspective or outsider's perspective or none? In short, does nontraditional rhetoric adopt unidirectional or multidirectional approach to writing, research, and scholarship?

Defining nontraditional rhetoric

Prior to defining what nontraditional rhetoric is, it seems to be advisable to discuss what traditional rhetoric is. The term "traditional" is generally defined as something that has been long established or existing in the world for a long period of time. Likewise, the term "rhetoric" is generally used to refer to the art of effective communication. Even though many scholars treat language and rhetoric as two different entities, I am using them somewhat interchangeably like Victor Villanueva (1993) who argues that rhetoric "becomes for me the complete study of language" (p. 77). To me, rhetoric is the way language is used to achieve a certain goal. What I mean by this is that not everything in language is rhetorically significant. There are certain aspects of language such as rhetorical and cohesive devices—parallelism, symbol, image, reiteration, assonance, alliteration, diction, pun, metaphor, and simile—that rhetors or rhetoricians use to produce certain effects on their intended or real audiences. Viewed along this line, traditional rhetoric, generally speaking, is the language that has been dominantly used as a medium of instruction in

academic institutions such as schools, colleges, and universities, and other places in order to achieve intended goals or persuade audiences. Alternatively and more specifically, traditional rhetoric might also refer to the Western way of using language as the ability "to see the available means of persuasion" (Aristotle, 2007, p. 37), "the powerful lord" (as cited in Plato, 2008, p. 79), and the like. However, in this paper, I am not dealing with Aristotelian classification of traditional Greek rhetoric into judiciary, epideictic and deliberative. Whatever might be its semantic connotations, traditional rhetoric or language follows certain conventions or "terministic screen" to use Burke's term, that have been practiced for ages, and anything that does not conform to the tradition is considered to be deviant or inferior. In this sense, standard American English or British English that has influenced the world since long could be considered to be traditional as it strictly claims to follow some monolithic structural rules when it comes to the use of sounds, words, phrases, meanings, sentences, and discourses. The traditional language has a tendency to marginalize any other rhetorics that do not conform to standard language ideology. According to Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur (2011), "traditional approaches to writing . . . take as the norm a linguistically homogeneous situation: one where writers . . . are expected to use Standard English . . . imagined ideally as uniform—to the exclusion of other languages and language variations" (p. 303). Traditionalists hold that language variations or differences do not contribute to effective communication; they hinder the communication practices instead. Therefore, "the long-standing aim of traditional writing instruction has been to reduce "interference," excising what appears to show difference" (Horner et al., 2011, p. 303). The standard language ideology is based on the assumption that there is linguistic homogeneity, "the tacit and widespread acceptance of the dominant image of composition students as native speakers of a privileged variety of English" (Matsuda, 2006, p. 638). By producing evidences from history, Matsuda in fact defies the very notion of linguistic uniformity as claimed by the followers of standard American English. That there is linguistic homogeneity in the US is merely a myth that "is seriously out of sync with the sociolinguistic reality of today's U.S. higher education as well as of U.S. society at large" (Matsuda, 2006, p. 641). The notion of standard American English is so deeply rooted in the society that writing teachers and researchers continue teaching standard American English to their students because they assume that "so-called standard language can help students succeed in the mainstream culture. But by not challenging the notion of a standard language, we are passing along a naïve and even damaging view of language to our students" (Mangelsdorf, 2010, p. 113).

Contrary to the traditional orientation to rhetoric, I argue that nontraditional rhetoric refers to the rhetorical use of language that primarily aims at creating a voice to many historically marginalized people through the strategy of nativizing

traditional language: standard English. Nativization is the "process by which a transplanted language becomes native to a people or place, either in addition to or in place of any language or languages already in use, as with English in Ireland and both English and French in West Africa" (McArthur, 1992, p. 682). The process of nativization "takes place at every level of language, local users of that language developing, among other things, distinctive accents, grammatical usages, and items of vocabulary, such developments generally linked with their other or former languages" (McArthur, 1992, p. 682). This concept of nativization resonates with the definition of Indian linguist Kachru (1996) who deploys the term "nativization" to refer to "the linguistic processes—conscious or unconscious—by which a transplanted language, in this case English, is localized" (p. 154). In his discussion of world Englishes and distinctiveness of South Asian English literatures, Kachru (2005) mentions three important issues pertaining to nativization, cohesiveness of a text, and rhetorical strategies. He specifically talks about the "contextual nativization of a text" which embeds "the text within its South Asian sociocultural and historical contexts" (p. 60). As to the cohesion or cohesiveness of a text, Kachru contends that the "organization of textual structure may not necessarily be the canonical structure associated with English. It may be, and often is, a transfer from another underlying dominant language, and may involve a lexical shift: direct lexical transfer, hybridization, code-switching, etc." (p. 61). Similarly, rhetorical strategies do not conform to standard American English or British English. According to him, "the devices used for nativizing rhetorical strategies include similes and metaphors from local languages that may result in 'unusual' collocations, combinations of lexical items, for the native speakers" (Kachru, p. 61).

As aforementioned by McArthur and Kachru, nativization of English manifests in many different forms: code switching, code meshing, translanguaging, native idioms, synecdoche, untranslated words, neologism, syntactic fusion, reduplication, symbols, and images. Nontraditional rhetoricians go to such an extent as to include cultural artifacts such as music, art, rituals, dances, and visuals in their writings. Nontraditional rhetoric has more pluralistic and expansive view of the world—the world is constituted by diverse people, geography, culture, language, race, ethnicity, religion, and that the voices and identities of all people should be respected and recognized in different spheres of human activities—academic, cultural, linguistic, social, political, and religious in the world. By radically departing from the western white norms and traditions, nontraditional rhetoricians question the longstanding, monolingual, unidirectional and hegemonic approach to literacy due to its exclusionary nature. They deliberately denaturalize the standard rules and the norms of English for basically two reasons: one to resist or decanonize the canonical, hegemonic, white-centric power and the other to give a voice and identity to the people on the fringe, those whose voices have been subdued for ages for

being nontraditional, nonwhite, noncanonical, nonwestern, women, and subaltern. Given the nature, time, scope, and space of the article, I am going to delimit my essay to the discussion of Indian and Spanish rhetorics as developed by Raja Rao and Gloria Anzaldua in addition to drawing on many other scholars such as Vershawn Ashanti Young, Suresh Canagarajah, Braj B. Kachru, Jacqueline Jones Royster, Scott Richard Lyons, and so on. In particular, I will zero in on the strategies used to non-traditionalize rhetoric: violating grammatical rules, deviating from the standard syntactic patterns, making stylistic innovations, nativizing English, employing Indian and Spanish vocabularies, onomatopoetic words, and cultural artifacts in addition to code switching and code meshing.

Because of its nature of looking at the world from the perspective of the marginalized, the victimized, the voiceless, and the colonized, nontraditional rhetoric resonates with postcolonial writing. Three of the authorities on postcolonial writing, Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin (2002) argue that "the crucial function of language as a medium of power demands that post-colonial writing define itself by seizing the language of the centre and replacing it in a discourse fully adapted to the colonized place" (p. 37). Raja Rao, an Indian novelist, makes use of nontraditional rhetoric abundantly in his first novel *Kanthapura* by going beyond the standard norms to nativize English. In what follows is an analysis of nontraditional rhetoric in Rao's text based mostly on the features of Indian variety of English as devised by Braj B. Kachru.

Nativizing standard English: nontraditional rhetoric from India

Raja Rao is a nonwestern nonwhite bilingual writer who hails from India. In *Kanthapura*, he brilliantly nativizes English, which, however, cannot be generalized as the capitalized uniform Indian English owing to the existence of much linguistic diversity in India. Rao's nativizing strategies encompass direct translation of Indian expressions into English, deviation from the standard syntactic structure, stylistic innovations, employment of Indian vocabulary and onomatopoetic words, and what Chakladar (2003) calls "ventriloquizing the voices" (p. 143). Rao's (2001) own proposition as to the mode of writing in the foreword to *Kanthapura*, "Our method of expression . . . has to be a dialect which will some day prove to be a distinctive and colourful as the Irish or the American" (vii) substantiates his location linguistically as a non-western English writer. While *Kanthapura* is a veritable mine for the exploration of cultural artifacts, given the time and space constraints within which I am bound to work, my investigation of nontraditional rhetoric will be limited to grammar—question formation, question tags, pluralization, reduplication, tense switching—vocabulary, and rhetorical devices such as metaphors and similes from

the local languages. *Kanthapura* has also drawn attention from various scholars and critics since its publication. Again, owing to space constraint, I will be engaging in conversation with a very few critics. Viewing the novel from the postcolonial perspective, Shelly Bhoil (2015) argues that "Rao has whetted the colonizing master's own tools such as the English language to dismantle the master's "euro-centric" house and to renovate it so as to have space for the "natives" who are "othered" to the margins" (p. 82).

Indianization through flouting of monolithic grammatical rules

In order to foreground the Indianness, Raja Rao significantly departs from the normal use of the grammar of standard English in *Kanthapura.* The grammatical violations occur mostly in question formation, question tags, reduplication, pluralisation, and tense switching. According to Kachru, (1996) South Asians, particularly Indians, formulate interrogative sentences without inverting the position of the subject and the verb. This tendency is evident in the beginning of the novel: "And it was on one of those evenings that they had invited Jayaramachar—you know Jayaramachar, the famous Harikatha-man?" (p. 16). Likewise, having got to the Skeffington Coffee Estate, Bade Khan, who is in search of a house, asks, "Your Excellency, a house to live in?" (p. 22). Unlike British English or American English in which "tag questions form a set, out of which an appropriate choice has to be made according to the context," in Indian English generally, "that choice is restricted to 'isn't it?'" (Kachru, 2005, p. 49). The following instance bears witness to this fact: "What we ask is that your daughter will have enough to eat, and be blessed with many children, and perform all the rites, isn't it?" (p. 84).

Kanthapura is replete with reduplicated expressions such as "hot, very hot" (very hot), "sacks and sacks of rice" (many sacks of rice), "these bonds and bonds and bonds to sing" (many bonds), and "so many, many interesting things" (many interesting things). According to Kachru (1996), reduplication "is used both in spoken and written educated varieties of South Asian English and includes various word classes" (p. 21). Likewise, pluralization, instead of using hyphen, in certain compound expressions is unique to Indian variety of English. Raja Rao makes use of pluralization in his novel such as, "And a real seven-days marriage" (p. 29) (a real seven-day marriage) and "her two-months old brat in her arms" (p. 78) (her two-month old brat). Discussing the differences between Nepali English and standard English in terms of plural formation, Verma (1996) asserts, [pluralization of mass nouns] "is shared by many varieties of South Asian English as the result of transfer from indigenous languages of the area. It can also be seen in the phrase "a 14 years old girl" (p. 86). The switching of tense from past to present and vice

versa, which is usually marked as an inconsistent use of tense in standard English, seems to be a common phenomenon in Indian English. The following excerpt from the novel demonstrates that tense switching occurs both in a single sentence and a paragraph:

> But hardly had he finished the Harikatha and was just about to light the camphor to the god; than the Sankur Police Jamadar is there. Moorthy goes to him and they talk between themselves, and then they talk to Jayaramchar, and Jayaramchar looks just as though he were going to spit out, and we never saw him again . . . (p. 18).

By breaking with the grammar of the colonizers' language, Rao has given a new direction to Indian variety of English. In this context, Sidhwa's proposition is worth quoting:

> We the colonized have subjugated the language, beaten on its head and made it ours! Let the English chafe and fret and fume. The fact remains that in adapting English to our use, in hammering it sometimes on its head, and in sometimes twisting its tail, we have given it a new shape, substance, and dimension. (1996, p. 231-32)

Nativized similes and metaphors

Rao as an Indian creative writer employs certain rhetorical strategies, which do not conform to those, used either by the Americans or the British. "The devices," states Kachru (1996), "used for nativizing rhetorical strategies include similes and metaphors from local languages that may result in 'unusual' collocations, combinations of lexical items, for the native speakers" (p. 33). Some of the devices employed in the novel entail "son of a widow," "you donkey's husband" (p. 65), "And yet he was as honest as an elephant" (p. 15), "Narsamma was growing thin as a bamboo and shriveled like banana bark" (p. 48), and "He wanted me to be his dog's tail" (p. 74). According to Kachru, (2005), "the speech acts and culture-specific interactional markers are translated from South Asian languages" (p. 61). Raja Rao makes extensive use of this device in *Kanthapura,* written under the influence of Gandhi's philosophy of nonviolence. The expressions such as "I swear upon my holy thread I shall keep pure and noble and will bring no evil to my ancestors" (p. 41), "No, no, you cannot straighten a dog's tail but you can straighten a man's heart" (p. 140), "I cannot imagine our Moorthy saying these things, Rama-Rama . . ." (p. 48), "He Narsamma" (p. 43), and "He, there! What are you waiting for? Nobody's marriage procession is passing. Do you hear?" (p. 53) are Indian interactional markers. The following sentence " . . . and many a child in Kanthapura *sits* [my italicization] late into the night to see the crown of this god" is a literal

translation of Indianness, most probably intervened by the first language. Another interesting example of literal translation occurs in the use of the word 'marry', which creates ambiguity in the following sentence: "And I have daughters to marry" (p. 43). Despite the absence of the causative verbs—get or have—in the following sentence, "I am not marrying my daughter to Advocate Seenappa for nothing" (p. 86), it, in the context of the text, means 'I am not getting my daughter married to' or 'I am not marrying her off'.

Vocabulary

Basically three distinctive classes of words—single lexical items majority of which have not been assimilated into the native varieties of English, hybridized lexical items, and English lexical items used with extended or restricted semantic connotations—constitute the reservoir of South Asian English vocabulary (Kachru, 1996, p. 53-54). The single Indian lexical items used in the text involve "charkha," "dhoti," "anas," "coolies," "kumkum," "bungalow," "ahimsa," "mahout," and "khadi" among others. Kachru's second type of vocabulary known as the hybridized lexical items are constituted by two different and distinct languages. Instances of these types as evidenced in *Kanthapura* are "lathi-ring," "sage-loved Himalayas," "brahminic," "carcass-eating Pariahs," "Harikatha-man," "Ghandi-man," and the like. The third category of lexical items used with extended or restricted semantic connotations encompasses "eating-leaves" in " . . . and they were seated at their eating-leaves, and when . . ." (p. 38) and "salt-givers" in "So you are a traitor to your salt-givers!" (p. 21). In order to capture the Indian spirit and rhythm, Rao has also nativized onomatopoetic words such as "tap-tap" in " . . . through the bathroom came a soft tap-tap like a lizard spitting"(p. 150), "flap-flap" in " . . . the cattle began to moo and moan, and the flap-flap of the whips is still heard from the mango grove beyond the Promontory . . ." (p. 153), and so on.

As the analysis shows, Raja Rao, a bilingual South Asian writer, has nativized English by directly translating Indian expressions into English, deviating from British sentence structure, making stylistic experimentation, and deploying Indian vocabulary and onomatopoetic words in addition to using nativized rhetorical strategies such as metaphors and similes. The profuse use of Indian terminologies and imageries employed in the novel bears witness to his attempt to give voices to the marginalized Indians who have not been heard. Raja Rao's credo for Indian English creativity is articulated by Anita Desai when she says, "If a writer is Indian . . . his work will naturally be Indian in quality, in flavour, in its characteristics . . . it can hardly be anything else, even if he is writing in English. The English spoken

and written in India has in any case become an Indian language" (as cited in Kachru, 1996, p. 17).

Nativization Through hybrid rhetoric in Anzaldúa's "How to Tame a Wild Tongue"

In the previous section, I demonstrated how the Indian writer Raja Rao deployed nontraditional rhetoric to give voices to the British colonized people with an illustration from the Indigenized variety of Indian English used in his novel. In particular, Rao nativized or Indianized English by violating the grammatical rules of the standard language and using indigenized vocabularies, onomatopoetic words, and local varieties of Indian English in addition to using rhetorical strategies profusely. In this section, I investigate Gloria Anzaldúa's essay entitled "How to Tame a Wild Tongue" to demonstrate how she non-traditionalizes English through the use of hybrid rhetoric, which consists of code switching, code meshing, cultural artifacts such as music, films, and foods, and Mexican proverbs and vocabulary to create her own identity and critique the linguistic and patriarchal hegemonies.

Critiquing unidirectional approach to literacy

Right from the outset of the chapter, Anzaldúa expresses her bitter experience of being punished and humiliated by the school simply for not speaking the English language and talking back to her Anglo teacher. That she is infuriated with the school authority is reflected in the expressions "talk[ing] back" and "answer back" which repeat at least five times on the very first page of the essay, reminding the readers of how the writer is silenced both at school and at home. She also narrates how Spanish students are compelled to attend classes on speech to keep their accents at bay. The way school tries to annihilate the Spanish accent of students leads her to form a vehement expression: "Attacks on one's form of expression with the intent to censor are a violation of the First Amendment" (p. 2947). By devising the very title of the essay from the perspective of the colonizer, "How to Tame a Wild Tongue," the author shows a rigid dichotomy between the colonizer and the colonized which is represented by the hegemonic English speakers and the Spanish speakers respectively. The perspective here is very powerful because it allows the readers to examine the colonizer's attitude to the colonized on the one hand, and the plight of the Spanish students on the other hand. The ventriloquizing of the colonial voice in the title suggested by the phrase "wild tongue" is Anzaldúa's strategic move to show how the imperialists represent the Others as uncivilized or

wild, necessitating their intervention as a tamer or civilizer who is not only capable of pronouncing words correctly but also capable of teaching the wild. By positioning the tamer at a point from which to educate the non-English speakers, Anzaldúa is actually critiquing the linguistic terrorism perpetrated by the hegemonic power. In the following excerpt, the author shows how language is inextricably intertwined with identity and voice:

> So if you want to really hurt me, talk badly about my language. Ethnic identity is twin skin to linguistic identity? I am my language. Until I can take pride in my language, I cannot take pride in myself. Until I can accept as legitimate Chicano Texas Spanish, Tex-Mex and all the other languages I speak, I cannot accept the legitimacy of myself. Until I am free to write bilingually and to switch codes without having to always translate, while I still have to speak English or Spanish when I would rather speak Spanglish, and as long as I have to accommodate the English speakers rather than them accommodate me, my tongue will be illegitimate.
>
> I will no longer be made to feel ashamed of existing. I will have my voice: Indian, Spanish, white. I will have my serpent's tongue-my woman's voice, my sexual voice, my poet's voice. I will overcome the tradition of silence. (p. 2951)

As the extract conveys, the author equates language with one's pride and voice. She demands that instead of succumbing to the English language, all other multiple ways of expressions—Chicano Texas Spanish, Tex-Mex, Indian, Spanish, Spanglish, and code switching—should be legitimized. From this short extract and description, it is clear that Anzaldúa resists the unidirectional approach to literacy and expression held by the dominant language ideology. She advocates a multilingual, multicultural approach to literacy, writing, and education to give voice to the linguistically colonized and to what postcolonial writers call "write back to a centre" (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 2002, p. 6).

Code switching/meshing

Writers or speakers often switch from one language to another or from one code to another freely at different levels of discourse and communication. A closer examination of available scholarship pertaining to code switching shows that scholars vary from each other in the way they define and write the term. Scholars such as Carol Myers-Scotton and Suresh Canagarajah prefer to write

"codeswitching" as one word whereas scholars like Vershawn Ashanti Young and Anastasia Lakhtikova write "code switching" as a two-word word and "code-switching" as a hyphenated one respectively. In *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism,* Myers-Scotton (2006) defines code switching as "the use of two language varieties in the same conversation. It can occur between speakers, or between sentences in the same speaker's turn, or within a sentence" (p.161). Suresh Canagarajah's definition resonates with that of Carol Myers-Scotton's to a great extent. In his attempt to distinguish code switching from code meshing, Canagarajah (2011) asserts, "Whereas codeswitching treats language alternation as involving bilingual competence and switches between two different systems, codemeshing treats the languages as part of a single integrated system" (p. 403). Unlike Suresh Canagarajah and Carol Myers-Scotton, Young (2014) presents a negative construction of code switching, which is "a racialized teaching method that manufactures linguistic segregation in classrooms and unwittingly supports it in society" (p. 58). For the same reason, he "call[s] for teachers to embrace code-meshing on the merits that it represents linguistic integration" (p. 58). Young displays his weariness and distrust toward the prevailing notion of code switching promoted by most educators as "language substitution, the linguistic translation of Spanglish or AAE into standard English" (p. 50). He further laments, "This unfortunate definition of code switching is not about accommodating two language varieties in one speech act. It's not about the practice of language blending. Rather it characterizes the teaching of language conversion" (p. 50). As the best solution to the racialized practice of code switching, Young (2014) presents code meshing as "an alternative vision of language to teachers, one that offers the "disempowered" a more egalitarian path into standard English, a route that integrates academic English with their own dialects and that simultaneously seeks to end discrimination" (p. 56).

Lack of consensus among the scholars on the definition of code switching suggests that the use of code switching in oral and written communication situations is not a neutral intellectual project; it is instead imbued with intentions, interests, beliefs, and ideologies. Myers-Scotton (2006) talks about the social motivations for language use such as to assert multilingual persona, to lower oneself, and to show code switching as a neutral choice. Whereas Myers-Scotton considers code switching to be a "neutral choice," many would debate it, as no language use including code switching is a transparent carrier of meaning, reality, and knowledge. People code switch on many occasions in order to show solidarity, to win favor, to assert identity in the face of crisis, to create their voices, and to discard oppression or dominance of other people. Like code switching, code meshing is driven by motivations and intentions. While code meshing refers to the blending of two different varieties of language such as mingling of African American

English with that of standard variety of American English as exemplified by Ashanti Young in his article "Should Writers Use They Own English?" the terminology, particularly "mesh" also posits negative rhetoric such as enmeshment or entrapment or entanglement. Depending upon what the rhetorical situations are— purpose, location, audience, context, modality and medium—, code meshing is chosen as a medium of expression to achieve the intended goals. For instance, postcolonial writers use unfamiliar words and nativized expressions in order to "write back to a centre" (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 2002, p. 6). The way Anzaldúa makes use of nativized language or hybrid language makes me contend that her purpose is twofold: one to assert her own identity and the other to talk back or write back to linguistic hegemony and patriarchy.

Differing perceptions of code switching and code meshing as mentioned earlier make it more difficult for me to exactly pinpoint Gloria Anzaldúa's use of language as code switching or code meshing, for her text "How to Tame a Wild Tongue" is so rich and diverse in its use of language that it does not fit one specific standard. For the same reason, I have entitled this section "Nativization Through Hybrid Rhetoric in Anzaldúa's "How to Tame a Wild Tongue." Moreover, my own lack of acquaintance with the Spanish language puts me at a disadvantaged position as it hinders me from examining code meshing "as part of a single integrated system" as suggested by Canagarajah. Gloria Anzaldua's own assertion about her facility for using her own language—"TexMex, or Spanglish, comes most naturally to me. I may switch back and forth from English to Spanish in the same sentence or in the same word" (p. 2949) resonates with Carol Myers-Scotton's definition of code switching as "the use of two language varieties in the same conversation" even though Young despises such "language substitution." Despite her claim to be a spontaneous or natural code switcher, Anastasia Lakhtikova objects to her statement. Commenting on two texts *La Frontera/Borderlands* and *Omeros,* Lakhtikova (2017) writes, "the code-switching as it is constructed in the two texts in question is not as it naturally occurs in bilingual exchanges confined to specific geographic localities. The code-switching here is constructed to look natural . . ." (p. 6). The following expression occurring in one discourse as "I want you to speak English. *Pa'hallar buen trabajo tienes que saber hablar el ingles bien. Que vale toda tu educaci6n si todavia hablas ingles con un'accent*,' " (p. 2947) sounds more like code switching as it occurs "between sentences in the same speaker's turn, or within a sentence" as argued by Carol Myers-Scotton. Nonetheless, the language uses such as these "*Es una falta de respeto* to talk back to one's mother or father" (p. 2947) and "Even our own people, other Spanish speakers *nos quieren poner candados en la boca*. They would hold us back with their bag of *reglas de academia*" (p. 2948) sound more like code meshing as language here is treated more "as part of a single integrated system" (Canagarajah,

2011, p. 403).

Cultural artifacts, proverbs and archaisms

In her attempt to affirm her identity and critique the linguistic terrorism, Gloria Anzaldúa uses various types of cultural artifacts such as music, film, food, Mexican sayings, archaic use of language, and native vocabularies. The author uses sayings such as "*Oye coma ladra: el lenguaje de la frontera Quien tiene boca se equivoca*" (p. 2948) (Hey coma bark: the language of the border. Whoever has a mouth is wrong.) (*Google translation*) and "*Dime con quien andas y te dire quien eres*" (p. 2954) (Tell me with whom you are and I'll tell you who you are.) (*Google translation*). Likewise, referring to archaisms, she says, "Chicanos use "archaisms," words that are no longer in the Spanish language, words that have been evolved out. We say *semos , truje, haiga, ansina, and naiden*" (p. 2950). The references to movies such as *Nosotros los pohres* and *Cuando los hijos se van,* music, "*conjuntos*, three- or four-piece bands made up of folk musicians playing guitar, *bajo sexto*, drums and button accordion, which Chicanos had borrowed from the German immigrants" and food, "homemade white cheese sizzling in a pan, melting inside a folded *tortilla*, spicy *menudo chile colorado*, pieces of *panza* and hominy floating on top, *fajita*s in the backyard," and "steaming *tamales"* attest to her love for her own cultural artifact, "tied to" [her] "identity, to" [her] homeland" (p. 2953). As argued in the beginning of the essay, nontraditional rhetoric aims at creating voices to those people whose wild tongues were thought to be tamed. Toward the end of the essay, Anzaldúa justifies her abundant use of nontraditional rhetoric in the text:

> For a people who are neither Spanish nor live in a country in which Spanish is the first language; for a people who live in a country in which English is the reigning tongue but who are not Anglo; for a people who cannot entirely identify with either standard (formal, Castillian) Spanish nor standard English, what recourse is left to them but to create their own language? A language which they can connect their identity to, one capable of communicating the realities and values true to themselves-a language with terms that are neither *espanol ni ingles*, but both. We speak a patois, a forked tongue, a variation of two languages. (p. 2948)

Anzaldúa's emphasis on creating language that people "can connect their identity to, one capable of communicating the realities and values true to themselves" reminds me of Kate Mangelsdorf, who siding with Gloria Anzaldúa's use of language, writes, "I refer to Spanglish as a language in the sense that Anzaldua

referred to it as a language—as "*un lenguaje que corresponde a un modo de vivir*" (55), a language in harmony with a way of living" (p.115). Jacqueline Jones Royster expresses a similar idea in her article "When the First Voice You Hear Is Not Your Own." Her focus is on the "subject" position, which "really is everything." She feels that "when the subject matter is me and the voice is not mine, my sense of order and rightness is disrupted" (Royster, 1996, p. 31). She highlights the way "we have been forever content to let voices other than our own speak authoritatively about our areas of expertise and about us" (p. 39) and awakens expression within us, "It is time to speak for ourselves, in our own interests, in the interest of our work, and in the interest of our students" (p. 39).

Like Anzaldúa who freely code switches and/or code meshes from English to Spanish in her book, Canagarajah (2006) in "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued," "presents code meshing as a strategy for merging local varieties with Standard Written English in a move toward gradually pluralizing academic writing and developing multilingual competence for transnational relationships" (p. 586). Canagarajah explains the rationale behind "pluralizing composition from the specific angle of emergent World Englishes" (p. 587). Through his research, he shows that because the number of non-native speakers of English is gradually outnumbering the number of native speakers of English, "English should be treated as a multinational language, one that belongs to diverse communities and not owned only by the metropolitan communities" (p. 589). Furthermore, the current pedagogical approach used in the classroom setting is against translingual communities in the world. He illustrates this through a student named Almon who "is frustrated by the negative identities provided for his "broken English" in school" (p. 591). But when it comes to using his own English with multilingual speakers of that language, he is loquacious.

While Suresh Canagarajah has been able to diagnose what is wrong with the unidirectional and monolingual approach to literacy, he does not specifically prescribe pedagogical remedy in this article (although he does in his later works) to practice in the multilingual classroom. His announcement at the very outset of the article that he is going to use code meshing as a way of mixing local varieties with standard English frustrates the readers toward the close of the essay: "Still, I must confess that I am myself unsure how to practice what I preach (other than the few instances where I shamelessly copy Smitherman's strategies above)" (p. 613). Even when he uses Asian variety of language, he puts that within quotation marks, segregating it from the standard variety of English: "I can hear my South Asian colleagues saying: "But your approach is looking like the very same one as Elbow's, no?" I agree. "However," I would reply, "there are small, small differences that make big, big significance"" (p. 599). When seen from the perspective of Kachru, Canagarajah clearly employs Asian variety of English here, particularly

reduplication and question form. But instead of meshing the Asian variety of codes with standard English, or in his own words, instead of treating "the languages as part of a single integrated system", he actually separates it within inverted commas, which, in turn, deconstructs his own mission of pluralizing English into Englishes (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 403). Despite this, Canagarajah certainly makes some space for what he calls "pedagogical rethinking and textual experimentation on the place of WE in composition" (p. 613). For detailed study of translingual strategies, his article "Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging" (2011, p. 404) and book *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations* (2013, p. 79) are really useful, especially for negotiation strategies such as envoicing, recontextualization, interactional, and entextualization and code meshing strategies such as recontextualization, voice, interactional, and textualization strategies. The author contends that World Englishes are as important and valid as any dominant English language—standard American or British or Canadian, and that they deserve the same recognition as does American or British English.

Lyons (2000) highlights a similar idea, the need to recognize nontraditional rhetoric used by the American Indians in "Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want from Writing?" The question "what do American Indians want from writing?" is actually a rhetorical question as the answer is embedded in the very title: rhetorical sovereignty. Referring to the story of assigning white men's names to native Indian children, he makes it clear that Indians do not want any types of white names, "stereotypes, cultural appropriation, exclusion, ignorance, irrelevance, rhetorical imperialism" (2000, p. 462). Instead, they pine for rhetorical sovereignty, which, according to Lyons, is:

> the inherent right and ability of *peoples* to determine their own communicative needs and desires in this pursuit, to decide for themselves the goals, modes, styles, and languages of public discourse. Placing the scene of writing squarely back into the particular contingency of the Indian rhetorical situation, rhetorical sovereignty requires of writing teachers more than a renewed commitment to listening and learning; it also requires a radical rethinking of how and what we teach as the written word at all levels of schooling, from preschool to graduate curricula and beyond. (p. 449-50)

The author further adds, "rhetorical sovereignty requires above all the presence of an Indian voice, speaking or writing in an ongoing context of colonization and setting at least some of the terms of debate. Ideally, that voice would often employ a Native language" (p. 462), clearly calling for nativization in order to preserve the Indian voice.

As the analysis of Indian rhetoric as used in *Kanthapura*, Spanish rhetoric as in "How to Tame a Wild Tongue", and articles discussed so far posit, the authors advocate for a new conception of rhetoric i.e. nontraditional rhetoric (even though they do not use this terminology) that has been historically marginalized. At the center of their discussion are terminologies such as voice, language, identity, code switching, code meshing, colonization, marginalization, Englishes, subject position, multiculturalism, rhetorical sovereignty, nativization, alternative rhetoric, and the like. Anzaldúa, referring to herself and her community, asserts that since they are heterogeneous people speaking many different languages, their tongues must be respected and recognized instead of being tamed or cut, and use of nativized language should be accepted as a way of expressing their authentic voice. Canagarajah argues for a "multilingual and polyliterate orientation to writing" and lays stress on code meshing as a strategy for embracing varieties of expressions and creating a space for them in the rhetoric and composition classroom along with standard English. Rao speaks for the indigenized variety of Indian English and Young advocates for the use of code meshing as a pedagogical approach to end racism in America. Likewise, Lyons speaks for the rhetoric of Native American and Royster for rhetorical agency. In the similar vein, Mangelsdorf proposes that "we study and honor students' lived languages, such as Spanglish, in order to examine our own assumptions about language demarcation and containment" (2010, p. 124).

Some scholars might argue that if nontraditional rhetoric is a nativized rhetoric that departs from the norms of standard language ideology as developed both by western and nonwestern writers, are writers such as James Joyce and e. e. cummings, too, nontraditional rhetoricians? I certainly agree that both Joyce and cummings have made extensive linguistic experimentation in novels and poems respectively. Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*, in which he invested more than fifteen years of his life, is noted for its experimental style, particularly neologism. But his purpose of coining new words is significantly different from the purpose of nontraditional rhetoricians. Unlike nontraditional rhetoricians, Joyce was a follower of stream of consciousness technique, a defining characteristic of modern fiction. As the follower of this technique, he believed that human mind is essentially illogical and incoherent and literature should represent the mind at work. So the literary writings such as *Finnegans Wake* are direct reflections of the workings of the mind, not a departure intended to represent the voices of the marginalized. Likewise, almost all of cummings' poems flout lexical, and syntactic rules of English. Like Joyce and unlike nontraditional rhetoricians, he is more concerned with the presentation of the visual because form or visual presentation, not content, is the primary purpose or overall meaning of his poetry.

Conclusion: Implications for rhetoric and writing studies

My own experience as an international student at The University of Texas at El Paso, the readings prescribed for graduate students, particularly those relating to nontraditional rhetorics and translingualism, student population consisting of domestic and international students, communication breakdown among students due to linguistic varieties, and professors, researchers, and scholars' heavy emphasis on inclusion of demographic, cultural, and linguistic diversities and differences in academia clearly suggest that US universities are being expanded and transformed every year into more international, inclusive, and multicultural universities. Located on the border between Juárez, Mexico and El Paso, Texas (the US), The University of Texas at El Paso is truly an international university, inviting students from all around the globe. My own doctoral cohort that comprises seven students has five international students. As evidenced in the communication breakdown both native and nonnative speakers of English experienced in our cohort and outside the university, prescription of one particular language such as standard American English no longer works as rhetorical situations are changing day by day. Nontraditional rhetoricians have already begun to show what Lyotard (1984) calls "incredulity toward metanarratives" (xxiv). Standard American or British English is in fact a grand narrative just like Marxism and the Enlightenment Philosophy that respectively envision a classless society and perpetual progress. Standard language ideology is always in favor of promoting conformity and homogeneity in a heterogeneous culture, community, and society. The belief that mandating the monolithic rules of standard American English will result in standardization no longer holds in the postmodern world. The readings prescribed in rhetoric and composition courses such as those Gloria Anzaldúa and Ashanti Young respectively wrote "How to Tame a Wild Tongue" and "Should Writers Use They Own English?" defy the metanarratives of standard language ideology. Likewise, US student demographics demonstrate that majority of students come from Asian countries such as China, India, Bangladesh, Nepal and Bhutan among others. A closer look at the undergraduate level classrooms demonstrates that majority of classes are taught by teaching assistants, assistant instructors, and adjuncts; many of them may not meet the objectives as envisaged in standard language ideology. The rapid flow of international students into US universities is beginning to indicate that native speakers of English will be in crisis if they do not familiarize themselves with the world Englishes and nontraditional rhetorics.

At a time when we have accepted international students and teachers whose Englishes differ significantly from each other, in a context in which we have

accepted diversity and multilingualism, at a time when universities have prescribed nontraditional texts and rhetoric, at a time when even the white middle class teachers and scholars are overtly advocating for nontraditional rhetoric, translingualism, and translanguaging, it is high time we changed our teaching method, assessment system, and our thought about language. The syllabus has changed, the textbooks have changed, and even teachers and students have changed, but our teaching and evaluation system have not changed yet. Teaching based on the assumption without catering to the needs of the students coming from different geographical, economic, educational, academic, and cultural backgrounds and without considering students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors that directly affect students' performance may lead not to standardization but to a big fiasco. Likewise, current assessment system based on rubrics such as accuracy, academic voice, third person point of view, grammatical sentences, clarity, and tense consistency promotes homogeneity and conformity to traditional forms of writing which, in turn, promotes racism in academic arenas. Therefore, in order to ameliorate the current situation, I propose that schools and universities introduce nontraditional rhetorics into curricula and assess students' writings on the basis of process, not product, intelligibility, not accuracy, description, not prescription (Young), labor, not quality, "a valuing of labor over so-called quality" (Inoue, p. 80), and cloud pedagogy in which regardless of linguistic orientation and backgrounds students feel happy when they find their opinions "validated in the writing classes. Cloud pedagogy also creates environments where students can explore how rhetorical traditions, cultural materials, and geopolitical conditions are changing, and how such epistemic shifts are influencing their roles as local as well as global citizens" (Marohang, 2012, p.16). Moreover, Bhusal's recommendation to combat inequality and racism in America by bringing the "stories" and "*voices*" of minorities into academic world, "increasing exposure to multicultural education and incorporating the study of all minorities in critical race theory" is worth mentioning (2017, p. 88). In fact, treatment of all those historically marginalized languages on equal footing will allow the voiceless to express their voices.

References

Anzaldúa, G. (1987). How to tame a wild tongue. *Borderlands/la frontera: The new mestizo*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Aristotle. (2007). *On rhetoric*: *A theory of civil discourse.* (G. A. Kennedy, Trans.). (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2002). *The empire writes back: Theory and*

practice in post-colonial literatures. (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Bhoil, S. (2015). The politics of language and theme in Raja Rao's *Kanthapura*. *Todas as Letras-Revista de Língua e Literatura*. *17*(2), 82-92.

Bhusal, A. (2017). The rhetoric of racism and anti-miscegenation laws in the United States. *IAFOR Journal of Arts & Humanities*, *4*(2), 83-89.

Canagarajah, S. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*. *57*(4), 586-619.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), Special issue: Toward a multilingual approach in the study of multilingualism in school contexts, 401-417.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations.* London: Routledge.

Chakladar, A. (2003). *At home in the world: Indian literature in the postcolonial academy*. Diss. University of Southern California. Ann Arbor: UMI, 3116674.

Horner, B., Lu, M. Z., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Opinion: Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English*, *73*(3), 303-21.

Inoue, A. B. (2015). *Antiracist writing assessment ecologies: Teaching and assessing writing for a socially just future*. Fort Collins, Colorado: WAC Clearinghouse.

Joyce, J. (2012). *Finnegans wake*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions.

Kachru, B. B. (1996). South Asian English: Toward an identity in diaspora. *South Asian English: Structure, use and users.* R. J. Baumgarder (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 9-28.

Kachru, B. B. (1996). World Englishes: Agony and ecstasy. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, *30(*2), Special Issue: Distinguished Humanities Lectures II, 135-155.

Kachru, B. B. (2005). *Asian Englishes: Beyond the canon.* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Lakhtikova, A. (2017). Code-switching in Anzaldúa's *borderlands/la frontera* and Walcott's *omeros*: A literary device for "new readability." *Poroi*, *13*(1), 1-31.

Limbu, M. (2012). Teaching writing in the cloud: Networked writing communities in the culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. *Journal of Global Literacies, Technologies, and Emerging Pedagogies*, *1*(1), 1-20.

Lyons, S. R. (2000). Rhetorical sovereignty: What do American Indians want from writing?" *College Composition and Communication*. *51*(3), 447-468.

Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

McArthur, T. (Ed.). (1992). *The Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mangelsdorf, K. (2010). Spanglish as alternative discourse: Working against Language demarcation. In B. Horner, M. Z. Lu, & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UÇ, 113-127.

Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. *College English*, *68*(6), 637-651.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism*. MA: Blackwell.

Plato. (2008)*. Gorgias*. (R. Waterfield, Trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pratt, M. L. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. *Profession*, 33-40.

Rao, R. (2001). *Kanthapura.* New Delhi: Orient Paperbacks.

Royster, J. J. (1996). When the first voice you hear is not your own. *College Composition and Communication*. *47*(1), 29-40.

Sidhwa, B. (1996). Creative processes in Pakistani English fiction. *South Asian English: Structure, use and users.* R. J. Baumgarder (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 231-40.

Sridhar, S. N. (1996). Toward a syntax of South Asian English: Defining the lectal range. *South Asian English: Structure, use and users.* R. J. Baumgarder (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 55-69.

Verma, Y. P. (1996). Some features of Nepali newspaper English. *South Asian English: Structure, use and users.* R. J. Baumgarder (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 82-87.

Villanueva Jr, V. (1993). *Bootstraps: From an American academic of color*. National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 W. Kenyon Rd., Urbana, IL 61801-1096.

Young, V. A. (2009). "Nah, we straight": An argument against code switching. *JAC, 29*(1), 49-76.

Young, V. A. (2010). Should writers use they own English? *Iowa Journal of Cultural Studies*, *12*(1), 110-117.

Young, V. A., Barrett, R., Young-Rivera, Y., & Lovejoy, K. B. (2014). *Other people's English: Code-meshing, code-switching, and African American literacy.* New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.