James Kwapisz

A Call For The Hybridization Of Composition And Creative Writing

I find it fundamentally conflicting when directors of composition programs advise instructors to avoid studying literary works in their classes. The mentality is that, since many of the students are not English majors, we should focus on teaching them how to write across and within various disciplines. Douglas Hesse, in his essay "The Place of Creative Writing in Composition Studies," states, "Content with growing on its own terms, creative writing in all but rare cases performs no service role, aspires to no 'across the curriculum' infiltration of chemistry or sociology, and worries little about assessment" (32). On the contrary, I believe writing creatively can shape students' attitudes and intentions, which ultimately render the work they produce in whatever field. I take issue with the trend in academia of students identifying themselves as either "good in math/science" or "artsy." How many times have you heard someone in the English department make some humorous, self-deprecating comment about their poor math skills? The problem with this pattern of identification is that it is seemingly monolithic: "Oh, I can't analyze that poem because I'm a physics major." And so, I repeat my central question: Why not both? Why not strive to better ourselves to be well-rounded instead of accepting ourselves as half? In his psychology dissertation, Donald K. Parlow states,

> I found evidence and rationales to contend that creative writing exercises do serve to foster students' creative growth while also fostering, more importantly, their development of practical-writing abilities . . . Creative writing pedagogy can

> empower students who are often marginalized and silenced by the traditional composition curriculum. (v)

Instead of assigning our students exclusively non-fiction readings, I believe we should have them analyze and synthesize both non-fiction and fiction works in order to provide them with a wider scope of genres and a greater understanding of the use of certain genres in particular situations. Exposure to different writing forms will endow students with a greater variety of expression through writing.

I propose that students of the composition program would greatly benefit from learning both academic *and* creative writing. To divide one form of writing from the other and, moreover, to give more priority to one over the other is a faulty approach that is misleading to students. I would like to distinguish my proposition for the inclusion of creative writing in composition courses from creative writing workshops. My purpose here is to offer students a more well-rounded perspective of writing in order that we may empower them to employ effective strategies and recognize when language acts as a guise or a disguise. While I believe the composition program should prioritize academic writing, instructors should teach ways creative writing could improve writing in general across different disciplines. I do not mean to imply that one form of writing is necessarily better than the other; rather, creative writing should supplement, not supplant, academic writing.

I find the supposed rift between academic writing and creative writing to be more problematic than if we were to embrace the advantages of fusing these "binaries" together. Douglass Hesse asserts, "When creative writing and composition studies have little to do with one another, the division truncates not only what we teach and research but how writing gets understood (or misunderstood) by our students, our colleagues, and the

spheres beyond" (34). The most powerful and influential pieces of writing I have studied include both academic and creative elements.

My endeavor here is to expand on Hesse's argument that "creative writing and composition studies would do better by keeping more open borders, if not sharing a departmental house then at least being friendly neighbors with fenceless backyards" (34). The main points I wish to express are that the hybridization of academic and creative writing could 1. empower students with capabilities to employ literary devices in their arguments; 2. encourage them to join conversations and, furthermore, view source material as catalysts for generating ideas; and 3. deepen their understanding of genres and when and how to use them.

Addressing the "Impracticality" Argument

Those who oppose the inclusion of creative writing in composition often claim that such an undertaking would be impractical. The main reason students go to college is to eventually land a job in the workplace. Pardlow remarks,

> There is currently a bias in American academia against creative writing . . . The department [is] dead-set on training students to become teachers of English literature, teachers who taught literature in the way the department wanted literature to be taught, from a strictly historical perspective. (iv-vi)

Are our studies reserved solely for the social sphere? I argue that a comprehensive course that consists of both composition studies and creative writing can teach students practical skills in social spheres as well as private ones. I think of writing as thinking, so by practicing writing in various situations, social or private, writers can more efficiently organize their

thoughts so as to act in a manner that is appropriate in whatever given circumstance. Hesse states, "The purpose of teaching creative writing is not to produce professional writers, 'but satisfy a human need to speak in a variety of ways . . . Writing [is] 'an indispensible tool for shaping personal and professional identities'" (38). The impracticality argument does not hold much weight because writers can attune their consciousness and, respectively, their sense of self and purpose through writing; by writing creatively, students can challenge the hegemony of academic institutions and standardized English.

Continual creative rethinking is required in order to become an individual as opposed to an academic automaton. Nietzsche, in his "On Truth and Lying in a Non-Moral Sense," proposes that we make a necessary shift from "the man of reason" to "the man of intuition" (883). The former live in cowardice, abiding by already established "knowledge"; whereas the latter continually criticize all that they are told and rebuild anew only to criticize what they have built in order to strengthen their intuition through experience. In this vein, I am more in favor of descriptive teaching rather than prescriptive, as far as composition studies are concerned. While, yes, instructors should spend some time going over the mechanical rules of grammar, I strongly advise against teaching the majority of their classes in such a manner; the method becomes stale quickly as it does not effectively engage students for long. I have found that students (myself included) learn best through the use of examples. Instead of expecting students to automatically absorb the rules and guidelines of writing from our teaching *at* them, we should teach *with* them in order that they can understand how such parameters work in various contexts.

Inspired by Junot Diaz's "The Money," I developed a visual analogy to help students conceptualize how our perceptions of the same act change completely when put in different contexts: the essay/narrative details Diaz's account of the money his mother would send to his grandparents in Santo Domingo; the money is stolen by thieves and then Diaz decides to steal it back; I represented the act of thievery by one prime color (red) and the contexts in which the acts took place by the others (blue for the former act and yellow for the latter); after mixing the act with the contexts, we were left with purple, representing immoral thievery, and orange, representing moral vengeance. Simply put, composition is not like other disciplines; unlike math and science, for instance, there are hardly ever absolute answers, as everything is subject to criticism.

Within the first few weeks of my first semester teaching composition, I realized that, in order to align my teaching methods with the situational nature of composition, I would have to make the necessary shift from a lecture-based model to a discussion-based one. Rather than entertaining the unrealistic expectation that my students would just miraculously absorb what I attempted to teach them, I would compile a list of questions pertaining to the reading(s) for the day and have them generate answers on their own. Paulo Freire, in his article "Banking vs. Problem Posing," contends, "Knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry men pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other" (58). In order to respond to Nietzsche's call, we must reject the banking method as it gives the faulty impression that knowledge is fixed and unchanging, and that we must bend ourselves in order to abide by such "truths," which were, in reality, created by some imposing authoritative source; instead, I believe it would be more beneficial to students if we were to

teach them that knowledge is evolutionary and that, moreover, they have the power to bend it to *their* will—the power to become masters, rather than victims, of language. In relation to this sentiment, bell hooks asserts, "The engaged voice must never be fixed and absolute but always changing, always evolving in a dialogue with a world beyond itself" (11). To conflate Nietzsche and Freire's ideas, the shift they are asking us to make is from passive to active learning. If the ultimate goal in writing courses is to guide students to become free, independent (creative) thinkers, it is important that they develop the persistent habit of questioning authoritative ideologies.

The problem with standardized academic English is that it is often perceived as the "right" language, so as a result, other dialects are seen as deviant. While I concede that standardized academic English is an efficient dialect as it establishes a common ground for communication, I think we should also embrace the diversity of dialects because languages, and the cultures they are derived from, play a major role in shaping individuals' identities. In her essay "How to Tame a Wild Tongue," Gloria Anzaldúa makes a strong claim that one's language and one's identity are indivisible: "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" (36). In sum, to dismiss certain dialects is to dismiss voices of certain demographics.

Hegemony is the enemy of creativity. In order to generate new, and more constructive, lenses through which to see the world, standardized academic English must be persistently challenged by marginalized dialects. This statement by hooks exemplifies how to put this theory into practice:

> When I need to say words that do more than simply mirror or address the dominant reality, I speak black vernacular. We take the oppressor's language and turn it against itself. We make our words a counter-hegemonic speech, liberating ourselves in language. (175)

Put in other terms, Kenneth Bruffee describes this constructive phenomenon of intersectionality between spheres of discourse as "normal discourse" being critiqued by "abnormal discourse": "Abnormal discourse sniffs out stale, unproductive knowledge and challenges its authority, that is, the authority of the community which that knowledge constitutes" (556-57). Bruffee's idea of normal and abnormal discourses relates to Stanley Fish's concept of "interpretive communities." Within a certain interpretive community, like an English class, for example, the inhabitants share similar interpretations/thought patterns with one another; those outside this particular interpretive community, however, will think differently, as they are influenced by whatever community/communities they belong to.

In the next section, I will argue that creativity is a matter of making connections between different spheres of culture. By comparing and contrasting spheres of dialects, students can write creative, and informative, works about how different voices/identities comment on one another. Further, to amend the toxic notion that people are simply products of their cultures, I suggest that the agglomeration of whatever interpretive communities an individual is shaped by, and the diversity of discourses he/she uses for various social purposes, constitute his/her unique identity. I will explore how the practice of crossing different genres of different cultural spheres can promote creative thinking and thus produce creative works.

Can Creativity Be Taught?

One major argument against the inclusion of creative writing in composition courses is that creativity cannot be taught. Wendy Bishop and David Starkey assert, "While the qualities that make a master carpenter . . . may be as elusive as those that make a master writer, the assumption is that just about anyone can become functional in their craft" (198). I agree that some writers will be more creative than others, but, with that said, I refuse to believe there are wholly uncreative people; rather, everyone's creativity wavers in degrees when applied in different contexts, so I think it is important to provide students with various scenarios in which they can invent and support different arguments. In our classes, we should "provide . . . context[s] in which students can practice and master the normal discourse exercised in established knowledge communities in the academic world and in business, government, and the other professions" and, further, challenge normal discourses by comparing and contrasting them with abnormal ones (Bruffee 553). As I have said earlier, there are rarely ever any definitive answers in composition, and so students' success is determined by their ability to adapt to certain situations and create and support arguments appropriate to the given contexts. Exposure to a wider variety of social situations will equip students with the knowledge of various genres and how to use them in order to intellectually join the conversations therein.

While peer reviews are helpful in that they provide students with perspective on their classmates' writing advantages and flaws, they are problematic as they are most often inconsistent: some students put more effort into their reviews than their partners and the outcome is usually that the former are left without helpful insight and feeling discouraged,

while the latter are usually indifferent to the process and their progress as writers. The issue with creative writing workshops is that instructors often spend too much time dwelling on and nitpicking student writing when they should be placing more emphasis on studying established authors. Having been in many workshops myself, I can say that I often took such classes less seriously than others because their grading policies were loose, and I could tune out on days that my pieces were not being discussed. Not only is student laziness a detrimental byproduct of workshops, but also instructor laziness:

> Ostrom sees instructor laziness, as much as anything else, as the reason for the workshop's popularity: "Most probably, those who retreat from theory and pedagogy are likely to fall back on the workshop in its simplest form: 'Going over' poems and stories in a big circle, holding forth from time to time, pretending to have read the material carefully, breaking up squabbles like a hall monitor, marking time." (Bishop 199)

Seen in this light, workshops seem to be illusions of classes in which students do not retain much and instructors entertain the pantomime and get paid all the same. However, in order to employ peer reviews effectively, instructors should, in my own view, only schedule a few sessions throughout the semester, and, on the few dates that they occur, they should actively engage the class rather than act as a puppet figure of authority who only *reacts* to student writing. Creative writing can either strengthen or weaken one's ethos, so it is of utmost importance that instructors of either creative writing workshops or my proposed creative composition courses are aware and conduct their classes responsibly in order that the quality of their characters are up to par.

Let us turn the conversation from the quality of instructors to that of students. Since many students in composition are not English majors or aspiring fiction writers/poets, why is it important that they should be creative? Well, simply, so they hone their abilities to create. Without such abilities, they will most likely end up as solely passive consumers rather than active producers in their societies. The common conception of the word "creative" is often perceived in its negative connotation: If you are "creative"/"artsy," you're a dreamer who probably won't get a good job; and if you're "good with numbers," you're destined for success. Instead, I think of being "creative" as being a source of generation and invention in any field. In any writing class, there is the anxiety of being unoriginal—I attempt to remedy this issue by encouraging students to analyze various combinations of works and through their synthesis of the amalgamation they can produce something authentic. An ideal student paper would display careful curations of texts and both informative and creative interpretations and synthesizes of them. Steve Jobs once said,

> Creativity is just connecting things. When you ask creative people how they did something, they feel a little guilty because they didn't' really do it, they just saw something. It seemed obvious to them after a while. That's because they were able to connect experiences they've had and synthesize new things. (Farnam Street)

To express this idea in my own words, I use an analogy of sandcastles: First, analyze the castles that are already there, breaking down their structures and content, and then, guided by what does and does not work in the creations that came before yours, build anew. It is important that we teach students the importance of being producers so that they appreciate the effort other authors put into their works, and, more importantly, put in a sufficient

degree of effort into their own works to the point that they take pride in what they have created.

The reason I use so many visual analogies is to help students (and myself) comprehend complex concepts through simplistic images. In other words, by marrying abstract ideas with concrete representations, the concepts become more accessible to the mind. For example, to clarify the importance that students use reputable sources to support their arguments, I thought of an (admittedly strange) analogy of novice writers as small children swimming in a pool representing the realm of academia; I suggested that they think of their source texts as inflatable armbands, or "swimmies," that will help them swim across the pool without drowning in critique. The most common writing issues that plague student papers are vagueness and the use of clichés. One would think that since American culture is becoming increasingly more visual, that members of newer generations would have little trouble creating their own images; however, the opposite seems to be true: the more we are bombarded by images, the less likely we are to create our own since we have so many relevant visual representations available to us. Italo Calvino ruminates, "What will the future of the individual imagination be in what is often called the 'image civilization'? Will humanity's power to evoke images in absentia continue to develop as it is increasingly swamped by the flood of ready-made images?" (112). While it is my hope that students will adopt my habit of conceptualizing concepts through visual analogies so that they may create their own imagistic conceptualizations and ultimately use them to communicate with more clarity, precision, and concision, I reinforce this value by having students analyze the strategies that established, critically acclaimed authors employ in their writing.

My go-to example of a great work by a great author that I encourage my students to analyze carefully is Martin Luther King Jr.'s "Letter from Birmingham Jail." This semester I had each student analyze 3 specific paragraphs of the essay, noting King's rhetorical strategies, namely his use of metaphors, similes, and allusions. The essay is loaded with figurative language that simplifies and clarifies abstract ideas. I believe the power and success of this piece are attributed to its hybridization of academic and creative writing.

Given that he was a black man living in the 1960s American South, it was crucial that he articulated his sentiments in an intellectual manner so as to strengthen his ethos in order to be taken seriously by his audience. Not only does King exhibit creative strategies through his use of literary devices, he also fictionalizes his audience to a degree, painting them in a more favorable light than the reality of their ignorant, prejudiced character: "My Dear Fellow Clergymen" (328). In Walter J. Ong's article "The Writer's Audience is Always a Fiction," he argues, "First . . . the writer must construct in his imagination, clearly or vaguely, an audience cast in some sort of role. . . Second . . . the audience must correspondingly fictionalize itself" (12). As King articulates his sentiments with clarity, concision, and precision, the audience would not want to find themselves in the foolish position of misunderstanding messages put into such easily understandable terms. I encourage my students to adopt this method of fictionalizing audience. What better way to persuade/inspire your audience than to illustrate them with qualities they would aspire to possess? For instance, King states, "I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that law and order exist for the purpose of establishing justice and that when they fail in this purpose they become the dangerously structured dams that block the flow of progress"

(335). The audience, I would hope, would prefer to be in alignment with law and order and not a "dam that blocks the flow of progress."

During this class session, we contrasted King's approach with that of a Black Lives Matter leader, who, after the alt-right white nationalist rally in Charlottesville this year, wrote, "White people, if any of the people you intend to leave your property to are racist assholes, change the will, and will your property to a black or brown family. Preferably a family from generational poverty" (Helm). We agreed that referring to your audience as "white people" and their descendants as potentially "racist assholes" is not a great strategy, and moreover, an inadvertent one. Arguing against ignorance from a standpoint of ignorance is ineffective. King's audience most likely consisted of "white, racist assholes," but his strategy of addressing them as his "fellow clergymen" and communicating with them in an intellectual and polite tone is more powerful than the latter letter, which is characterized by impulsive aggression. So, in the words of Emily Dickinson, "Tell all the truth but tell it slant."

The main idea he seeks to clarify in his essay/letter is that, contrary to the white moderates' misconception, his organization's nonviolent protest in Birmingham was not a cause but an effect of the cause of racial prejudice: "Actually, we who engage in nonviolent direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to surface the hidden tension that is already alive" (335). The argument to which King is responding is the clergymen's statement that the protest was "unwise and untimely." The clergymen thought that King was just causing problems needlessly, but he contends that he is, on the contrary, trying to fix a problem.

One of the most powerful messages that King delivers in this piece is that, in a climate that has become murky due to injustice, authoritative figures will demonize those who attempt to enact justice so as to maintain their power. King employs allusions to communicate this message more eloquently than I have in my long-winded attempt:

> Isn't this like condemning Socrates because his unswerving commitment to truth and his philosophical inquiries precipitated populace in which they made him drink hemlock? Isn't this like condemning Jesus because his unique God-consciousness and never-ceasing devotion to God's will precipitated the evil act of crucifixion? . . . Society must protect the robbed and punish the robber. (335-36).

By comparing his purpose to those of Socrates and Jesus, he simultaneously elevates his ethos and makes his message more accessible by mentioning similar themes in well-known texts. To further support his claim, he mentions other famous historical figures, such as Martin Luther, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln, who were labeled "extremists," but were, in actuality, leaders of revolutions that ultimately benefitted humanity.

King's final metaphor is efficient because of its visual clarity:

> Let us all hope that the dark clouds of racial prejudice will soon pass away and the deep fog of misunderstanding will be lifted from our fear-drenched communities, and in some not too distant tomorrow the radiant stars of love and brother-hood will shine over our great nation with all their scintillating beauty. (343)

By marrying the concepts of racial prejudice, misunderstanding, and, finally, love and brotherhood, with images of dark clouds, deep fog, and, at last, radiant stars, King makes his sentiment clear and accessible to the mind. Without this element of visibility, all we would have are the words on the page detailing abstract ideas; but since King employs such

clear metaphors, he has taken control of his words, and, because of his precision, readers are more likely to understand his meaning.

Mixing Genres/Multi-Modal Writing

Not only is King's work a letter, it is also a fusion of different academic essay genres: Cause & Effect; Definition; Proposal. King's agglomeration of genres exhibits Steve Jobs's idea of "connecting things." Those who feel that they are not "creative types" may rejoice in the fact that they are not confined to one particular genre or normal discourse, but are free to mix genres and discourses so as to produce new ideas.

It is problematic to define the genres of non-fiction and fiction as true or untrue, or "made up." Considering that speakers are approaching the issues they discuss from their subjective angles, and, furthermore, that they, consciously or unconsciously, fictionalize their audiences, I believe these genres should be skeptically conceptualized. Think of the controversial genre classification of "historical fiction." Since history is written by those in power, is it so outlandish to suggest that perhaps all of our historical accounts are fictitious? I worry about how students perceive the genre of non-fiction, as it purports to be read as objective truth due to the design of its title of classification: non-fiction, which can be (mis)understood as "not untrue." Provided the appearance of being a source of truth, writers of non-fiction pieces have more power to persuade their readers by sneaking in their hidden agendas. As I have stated earlier, indirect writing can be a more efficient means of communication than direct writing—since works of fiction do not claim to be true, they can provide insightful observations of the human condition without imposing upon the reader. But with this said, it is difficult to think of a work that could be classified as just one

genre. Novels, short stories, and poems, for example, are often derived from real-life experiences; and the ostensible objectivity of essays, articles, and textbooks is compromised by the subjectivity of their authors. I think both genres can work in together: by teaching non-fiction works in class, students can learn individually through communal discourse; and by teaching fiction works, they can learn communally through individual discourse.

So what is genre? The Oxford English Dictionary defines it simply as "a type of work characterized by a particular form, style, or purpose." Carolyn Miller expands on the definition: "A rhetorically sound definition of genre must be centered not on the substance or the form of discourse but on the action it is used to accomplish" (151). So, instead of classifying a work solely by its structure or content, Miller suggests we define its genre by how form and substance work together to accomplish the work's purpose. In other words, the genre of a work is determined by its exigence. On exigence, Miller relates Kenneth Burke's and Lloyd Bitzer's opposing views:

> Burke's emphasis is on human action, whereas Bitzer's appears to be on *reaction* . . . What is particularly important about situations for a theory of genres is that they recur . . . But in order to understand recurrence, it is necessary to reject the materialist tendencies in situational theory. (155-56)

Miller's qualm with Bitzer is that he is focused on responding aptly to situations that have already happened in the material world rather than concerned with placing necessary emphasis on the motivations of the agents who carry out the acts. In other words, instead of passively waiting for events to occur so that we may then respond, a more constructive approach would be to target the thought patterns that motivated the agent to carry out the acts so that we may cultivate new lenses that are informed by similar past accounts. Miller

claims, "A genre is a rhetorical means for mediating private intentions and social exigence; it motivates by connecting the private with the public, the singular with the recurrent" (163). The focus of Miller's argument is on how works respond to and impact social situations. But to understand genre more comprehensively, it is necessary to consider both how works function beyond the page and within.

Laura Aull, in her article "Linguistic Attention in Rhetorical Genre Studies and First Year Writing," suggests that we consider both macro and micro-levels when we think about genre. She writes,

> In its attention to context and macro-level features . . . RGS [Rhetorical Genre Studies] has focused less on recurring linguistic patterns in written genres, which has contributed to two gaps in genre-based approaches to FYW [First Year Writing]: few large-scale analyses of first-year written genres, and little attention to language patterns in genre-based FYW pedagogy and research. This article aims to interrogate these gaps and offer a way beyond them.

In her experiment, Aull analyzed the writing patterns of expert and novice writers. When contrasting academic essays written by FYW and by experts (sourced by The Corpus of Contemporary American English), the results were that the former tended to refer to their own experience—using the "I" pronoun—more frequently than the latter, whom were more likely to predominantly root their arguments in evidence/scholarly sources. Whether a piece is one genre or another can be influenced by minute details such as what particular words writers use: "If the author had used 'view' rather than 'opinion,' the various statements might appear more like expert academic argumentation, insofar as this wording (or form) is one that recurs more in expert genre performances of academic

argumentation." The solution Aull offers is that instructors should be more cautious in their prompt designs. We should teach our students that the academic essay is a genre in which one's argument will more effectively affect the audience if it is supported more so by scholarly sources than personal experiences.

So, similar to my call for the hybridization of academic and creative writing, Aull asks us to consider both context and in-text elements of writing: "Linguistic attention should supplement, not supplant, attention to macro-level details." She is arguing for more "contextually aware but also linguistically-attentive approaches to FYW." It is important that students learn to recognize both what to do and what not to do; by comparing and contrasting novice and expert writing, their understanding of how to write strongly and avoid common pitfalls will be sharpened. I exemplify how source texts can be used as catalysts to generate ideas through my borrowing of Aull's wording when I say, "creative writing should supplement, not supplant, academic writing"; while I believe that "storytelling could be used as an effective means of argumentation and of exposition" (Pardlow vii), I concede that personal anecdotes should be utilized with concision and brevity in academic papers, so that students focus on joining the conversation rather than dominating it. Put simply, novice writers will drown in expressivism without their swimmies.

Conclusion

My proposition relies on careful and conscious moderation of creative and academic elements in writing: the degrees to which these elements are employed are determined by the genre of the piece. On the one hand, I worry that students in composition courses will

write overly personal pieces that more so resemble diary entries than academic essays; on the other hand, I fear that indoctrinating students with such rigid, academic standards will rob them of their creativity. In Ken Robinson's TED Talks presentation "Do Schools Kill Creativity?" he explains that the problem with academic institutions is how they instill in students the fear of being wrong. The pass/fail model of evaluating intelligence is flawed. "Intelligence is diverse, dynamic, and distinct" (Robinson). The binary model of assessment is not compatible with the ambiguity and complexity of humans' various intellect. I, for one, as I have demonstrated, am a visual learner. Everyone has different ways of expressing themselves, and so, as instructors, we should embrace our students' intellectual diversity instead of stifling it with uniformity. I agree with Pardlow when he argues, "The use of creative writing techniques will encourage more creative risk-taking by students in their writings" (vii). The generation of new ideas depends on such risk-taking. It is my hope that the hybridization of academic and creative writing will, in effect, free students' minds of the dominant normal discourse and genre of the conventional academic essay by inviting and encouraging them to persistently challenge hegemony by creatively comparing and contrasting normal academic discourse with abnormal discourses and by mixing and implementing different genres carefully and consciously so as to communicate in ways that are both informative and engaging.

Works Cited

Anzaldúa, Gloria. "How to Tame a Wild Tongue." *One Hundred Great Essays,* Pearson Education, 2011, pp. 30-41.

Aull, Laura. "Linguistic Attention in Rhetorical Genre Studies and First Year Writing." Composition *Forum,* 2015.

Bishop, Wendy, and David Starkey. "Workshop." *Keywords in Creative Writing,* University Press of Colorado, Urban Institute, 2006, pp. 197-200.

Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind.'" *The Norton Book of Composition Studies,* W.W. Norton, 2009, pp. 545-562.

Calvino, Italo. "Visibility." *Six Memos for the Next Millenium,* Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1988, pp. 99-122.

Diaz, Junot. "The Money." *Everyone is an Author,* 2nd ed., W.W. Norton, 2016.

Fish, Stanley. "How to Recognize a Poem When You See One." *Is There a Text in This Class?: The Authority of Interpretive Communities,* Harvard University Press, 1980, pp. 322-37.

Freire, Paulo. "Banking vs. Problem Posing." *Pedagogy of the Oppressed,* NY Continuum, 1970, pp. 57-74.

"Genre." *OED Online,* Oxford University Press, 2017.

Helm, Chanelle. "White people, here are 10 requests from a Black Lives Matter leader." Leoweekly.com.

Hesse, Douglas. "The Place of Creative Writing in Composition Studies." *College Composition and Communication,* Vol. 62, No. 1, The Future of Rhetoric and Composition, 2010, pp. 31-52.

hooks, bell. "Introduction: Teaching to Transgress." *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom,* Routledge, 1994, pp. 1-13.

Jobs, Steve. "On Creativity." Farnamstreetblog.org.

King Jr., Martin Luther. "Letter from Birmingham Jail." *One Hundred Great Essays,* 4th ed., Pearson Education, 2011, pp. 328-43.

Miller, Carolyn. "Genre as Social Action." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 1984, pp. 151-65.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. "On Truth and Lying in a Non-Moral Sense." *The Birth of Tragedy and Other Writings,* Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 139-53.

Ong, Walter J. "The Writer's Audience is Always a Fiction." *PMLA,* Vol. 90, No. 1, 1975, pp. 9-21.

Pardlow, Kenneth D. "Flight to Flatland: A Descriptive Study of Using Creative-Writing Pedagogy

to Improve the Teaching of First-Year English Composition." Dissertation Abstracts Internation, Section A: The Humanities and Social Sciences, 2004, pp. iv-viii.

Robinson, Ken. "Do Schools Kill Creativity?" TED Talks, 2011.