I'm Callin You Out!: Spoken Word as Social (Inter)Action

Tiffany Marquise Jones
University of South Carolina

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Study

Where Jane Hill (2008) analyzes public discourse as spaces dictated by dominant ideologies and Whiteness, minorities often find themselves positioned as unauthorized to participate in societal negotiations of racist, sexist, and other forms of prejudiced/discriminatory language[1]. In these conversations, especially those in direct discussion of minority identity, offensive behaviors are justified as 'gaffes,' excused in light of a speaker's intentionality and/or portrayed as the result of a hearer's oversensitivity. This silencing works to deny minority groups, such as the African American community, the power to challenge the hegemonic structures at play. However, with the artistic and cultural practices constituted within Spoken Word, artists utilize a speech act known as the 'callout.' This act can be manifested as its own separate speech act as well as within the final confrontation of the He-Said-She-Said (H-S-S-S) participant framework (Goodwin, 1990) – the latter of these is described by this study; nevertheless, in either capacity it is used to publicly highlight offenses of a specific individual, group, or ideology.

This analysis will show how the Callout effectively works to disrupt the disenfranchising or 'business-as-usual' practices of public White space. Within the context of social action and advocacy, and particularly in the verbal art of Spoken Word poetry, this speech act empowers marginalized communities by authorizing its representatives – via the positionality granted by this art form – to challenge the prevalent micro-

[1] Minorities should not be interpreted as solely based on one's race or ethnicity, but instead includes gender, language, sexual orientation, and national identity.

Texas Linguistics Forum 59: 60-70
Proceedings of the 24th Annual Symposium about Language and Society-Austin
April 15-16, 2016
© Jones 2016

aggressions infringed upon them. This is most salient when artists, particularly highly skilled poets known as 'features,' will characterize (i.e., embody and 'voice') dominant ideologies and place them in direct contact with minority voices and stances also evoked within a given performance. Through this medium, poets can interject their stance into a diachronic and continuous public dialogue and specifically 'call out' or highlight offenses of the dominant group, situating the characterized representatives of these dominant ideologies for interrogation and possible indictment of their offenses.

In order to assess the principles discussed above, this study will examine the Callout as utilized within 'The Period Poem'— a feminism-inspired work by Spoken Word artist and Slam poet Dominque Christina, who was the 2011 National Poetry Slam Champion as well as the 2012 and 2014 Women of the World Slam Champion. Christina's recent titles and extensive resume categorizes her as the epitome of virtuosity – meaning her performances exemplifies the expected competence of a veteran Spoken Word artist. Furthermore, as a 'feature' artist, she is given long, uninterrupted stretches of time to both narrate and setup each poem. This commentary offers the perfect opportunity to assess the genre's proclivity for dialogicity via the extextualization of multiple characters and voices, where artists reach across time to insert absent or imagined figures – a feature that is pertinent to the performed confrontation or 'the Callout.'

1.2 Background of Spoken Word

During the 19th century, American poetry flourished under a theme of romanticism. Well-known poets like Ralph Waldo Emerson, Walt Whitman, and Emily Dickinson often are regarded as literary geniuses, having established the standards that influenced later generations of formalized poetry. However, in many ways, they also symbolize the core argument of Bakhtinian criticism: that poetry "does not artistically put to use word's natural dialogicity" (Eskin, 2000). Defining such work as 'monologic', Bakhtin juxtaposes poetry against the novel, described as an inherently dialogic form, to argue for the need to represent language realistically (i.e., the social diversity of speech or 'social heteroglossia') (Bakhtin, 1982; Wesling 1993; Eskin, 2000)[2].

In actuality, when looking across Bakhtin's lifetime and entire collection of treatises, one can see an emerging reformed perspective of poetry. Instead of dismissing all poetry, he defines a clear dichotomy where monologicity begins and ends within the genre. Eskin brilliantly summarizes this point with the following representation:

> While the poet may be on the side of state power and official discourses, he or she may equally—precisely because he or she enacts not simply the diversity of speech and languages but an *emphatically* singular answerable, and invested position within this diversity—criticize and reprehend those who are in power by ways of his or her poetry. [Eskin, 2000, p. 388]

In other words, poetic prose utilized as 'social intentionality' (Wesling, 1993) – as seen with many border or diaspora cultures – is fundamentally dialogic. Spoken Word, a genre that is innately subversive, is a genre that follows in such traditions.

[2] Note that this term *dialogic* refers to the 'contact' between texts – a relationship that gives 'life' or meaning to each utterance (Bauman, 2004).

© Jones 2016

In terms of defining this genre, the appellation 'Spoken Word' itself is very revealing, as it marks the combination of orality and written language. In fact, this art form—a conscious blend of music, poetry, narrative, and conversation—is best described as "poetry that is written on a page but performed for an audience" (The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, 2008). Where this genre has many similarities with other poetry traditions, including its ability to reach forward or backward in time (Irvine, 1996), this art form stands out in the expectation that artists will stimulate their audience with their vocal stylizations and visual aesthetics as well as participate in illocutionary acts of social commentary. These visual elements can range from enacting the artist's developed persona (i.e., a crafted identity) to an actual characterization of someone mentioned in the content, while the audible aesthetics includes rhyme, alliteration, and metaphor as well as shifts in speed, volume, and pitch. In fact, the virtuous performers can use these elements to mark shifts in characterizations (e.g., when enacting dominant ideologies versus other dissenting voices), aligning certain figures and voices with a particular moral framing that essentially critiques targeted ideologies (Hill, 1995).

When observing Spoken Word as a live performance, what emerges are two layers of participation that allow for members of disenfranchised groups to participate in the public sphere: 1) the micro-level context of the live audience and performer interaction (grounded in African American discourse modes like call and response) and 2) the macro level of the entextualized/decontextualized voices and sentiments of the third-party offenders, which are then placed in dialogue with the performer producing these voices. At the micro level, it becomes clear that audience members are not merely onlookers, or 'listeners', but they are participants in an emerging conversation. This is best displayed by the call and response rituals and overtly expressed audible cues like snapping – an equivalent to the 'amen' in church traditions (Rickford and Rickford, 2000). An artist will often embed elements that will elicit this type of back-channeling, situating a clear stance that then prompts audiences to judge the accusation put forth by the artist. Simultaneously, at the macro level—and as discussed previously—virtuous performers can place the 'voices' of disenfranchised communities in dialogue with hegemonic ideologies. Both levels of this live performance are very much dialogic in nature; however, this study focuses mostly on the latter of the two, highlighting the polyphonic practices within the exceptional linguistic and non-linguistic skills required of the performer.

While Spoken Word poetry is analyzed as a discursive practice positioned along the African American Language continuum, in certain aspects the distinctive customs of the art form establishes its own community of practice, where members of the culture authenticate themselves through competent performances of expected norms and rituals – including the 'Callout' analyzed in this study (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004). The characterizations evoked within these speech act not only provide a moral framing that essentially critiques these dominant ideologies (Hill, 1995) and address the ostracism of minority communities, but they also prompt an informed reaction by audiences who can then judge offenses or validate the poets' claims. Thus, the dialogic practices instituted within Spoken Word performances authorize disenfranchised speakers with the opportunity to invoke the practice of the Callout by inserting a once silenced community into public conversation with the 'powers-that-be' – a practice that is described in detail below.

2. Analysis

© Jones 2016

2.1 Introducing the 'Callout"

The act of 'calling someone out' is a common trope within African American speech events and language. In everyday practices, it is best described as a challenge, where the challenger makes it blatantly obvious who is being confronted and why. During the 'Callout' as represented in the final confrontation of Goodwin's (1990) H-S-S-S framework, a victim of 'behind-the-back' talk or injustices is able to publicly accuse and, often, indict the accused of serious moral offenses. As an extension of African American Language (AAL) traditions, Spoken Word performances extend this practice by entextualizing absent figures or 'voices' deemed responsible or relevant to a confrontation: the accused and the informant(s) – the latter is represented as the 'instigator' in the H-S-S-S framework. Both are positioned as 'present' within an emerging and enacted conversation. This enactment allows marginalized communities to mark representatives of dominant and hegemonic ideologies as offenders, making them susceptible to overt critique.

2.2 The Call Out: The Participant Roles and Enacted Voices

The offender:

To map the Callout as a chain reaction of speech events that leads to a final indictment of dominant ideologies or its representatives, it becomes necessary to first identify the initiating act. In the H-S-S-S participant structure, the initial offense is identified as 'behind-the-back' talk where some interlocutor commits the offensive deed of speaking ill of a friend (i.e., the assaulted or 'victim' of the attack) in a context where the target is not present to defend him or herself (Goodwin, 1995). For the purpose of this study, the offender represents the hegemonic forces that work to silence certain groups[3]. In other words, what is essential in marking the speech act as an 'offense' is that it serves to infringe on the value and liberties of another group—often one that is positioned as subordinate and thus unratified to participate in the conversation (i.e., the one controlled by dominant culture). While the original conversation can happen publicly, it works in the same 'behind-the-back' manner as it treats the 'victim' as absent or unauthorized to respond.

In the manner described by Goodwin (1995), the offense is particularly problematic because the offender and the assaulted are friends; therefore, there is a violation that presupposes an act of betrayal – where a mutual loyalty becomes nullified by the offensive act. However, it should be noted that in the Callout as mapped in Spoken Word culture, especially as depicted in the example utilized in subsequent sections, a previous establishment of affiliation or mutual respect is not mandated. As with any given offensive act, wrongdoing can be committed against a complete stranger or one who is positioned as inferior. Particularly, in the latter instance, a marginalized community member can reframe his or her positioning just by taking up the aims of calling out the offender. In this case, where the Callout is used as a tool of empowerment, the accuser positions the offender (i.e., dominant culture or its representatives) as indictable. That said, what is

[3] Hegemonic forces could be represented as the media, monoglot ideology, public White discourse, neoliberalism, or the patriarchy. See van Dijk, 1995; Silverstein, 1992; Hill, 2008; Craven and Davis, 2013 for discussions of these ideologies.

© Jones 2016

constant across contexts is that the offender is positioned in the Callout as being targeted for de-legitimation.

The accuser:

As indicated within the H-S-S-S framework (i.e., in everyday talk), the accuser represents the person who is positioned as a stakeholder and often an indirect target of the personal attack (i.e., behind-the-back talk). Once the instigator notifies the offended party of the offense, if that person takes up the notion to address the offender, he or she shifts from being an immobilized outsider in terms of the original speech act to one who takes control of the narrative via confrontation. In Spoken Word, the performing artist positions him or herself as the accuser simply by opting to publicly address the offenses of the dominant culture or its ideologies. Thus, this character functions to publicize these offenses by first establishing certain acts as immoral or erroneous in some way.

In this sense, the artist functions similarly to the role of the District Attorney, or one who brings charges to court for impending judgment[4]. Hence, the artist who also is positioned as the principle interlocutor in this conversation – as evidenced by iconic emblems of authority (i.e., being situated on stage and at the microphone) (Agha, 2005) – is able to reinsert themselves in the conversation that he or she was deemed unratified to participate. Instead of seeking permission to interject his or her stances, the accuser forgoes consent and instead uses the confrontation to institute and assert inalienable rights to engage in public discourse. In terms of performativity, the very nature of speaking and taking to the premise of calling out the now accused is an inaugural act – one that formally establishes the speaker's voice as authorized and the dominant representative as indicted.

The instigator:

What brings these two forces, the offender and the accuser, together in one climactic confrontation is due in large part to the mediating acts of the 'instigator' (Goodwin, 1990; Goodwin and Goodwin, 2004). This character is the one constant figure in both the original offense, the transmission of information, and then the final confrontation and public indictment. In the context of this paper, 'constant' does not always indicate a literal 'presence' but can appear in reference only and still be considered part of an interaction between figures. That said, the instigator *is* physically in attendance as the ratified addressee in the original 'behind-the-back' offense. Thus, this is one participant or medium that makes the victim (i.e., the target of the original offense) privy to the conversation responsible for his or her disenfranchisement. The instigator, then, completely ignores this exclusion and shares the full intimate details of the talk. Goodwin (1990) explores the moral positioning of this act by constructing the instigator as someone who supplants blame and constructs a persona of loyalty to the victim. This, however, is not always the case with the instigating figure in the Callout. What is most important about this role is how it serves to bridge the two estranged parties without which the offense would remain imperceptible for critique and indictment.

Considering the mediation that is characteristic of this role, it deserves mentioning that the instigator is not always an 'interlocutor' per se, but is any medium of transmission

[4] This analysis draws on similar uses of metaphor and allusion to courtroom speech as discussed in Keller-Cohen and Gordon (2003).

© Jones 2016

that has the capacity to inform the 'victims' of the offense. Thus, media – including print, televised, or digital news sources – can assume the same function[5]. Nevertheless, in either capacity – as an interlocutor or a digital form, this role acts as the required informant / material witness used to build a case against the incrimination of the accused. That said, while this participant(s) may be absent, the transmission of information may be referenced during the indictment. Thus, this role shifts from being a primary addressee in the original conversation (or behind-the-back talk) to becoming a supplementary figure to the final (performed) confrontation. Furthermore, it is at this point that he, she or it is positioned as a part of the overhearing audience as described below.

The audience:

While all of the aforementioned roles are in some way crucial to the execution of the Callout, the audience bears an essential function that changes the pragmatic implications of the final confrontation. When observed, Spoken Word performances reveal a participant structure that is collaborative in nature; thus, the audience members are not merely passive 'listeners' but ratified addressees and, at times, are positioned as 'interlocutors' in the emergent conversation. When an artist makes a statement that is particularly effective, the audience is expected to participate (and interject) with audible or verbal cues (e.g., the 'call and response' style of snapping) that indicate the participants' approval and/or agreement.

These culturally situated stance-taking cues function similarly to what Du Bois (2007) posits with the Stance Triangle. He argues that "stance has the power to assign value to objects of interest, to position social actors with respect to those objects, to calibrate alignment between stance-takers, and to invoke presupposed systems of sociocultural value" (p. 139). Considering this argument, then, artists will invoke their stance on issues (e.g., politics, discrimination, education, cultural genocide)—aligning with or disaligning from the ideologies being assessed. Simultaneously, the audience acknowledges, evaluates, and responds via the aforementioned stance-taking participation cues as moments of 'alignments' with the speaker.

Accordingly, for the performed Callout, not only is the audience (both those that are present and projected – i.e., future addressees and overhearers reached when performances circulate over social media) are invited to witness the public confrontation, including the accusation and assessment of offenses. But, more importantly, the participation framework of Spoken Word places them in direct collaboration with the indictment process. For example, in everyday practices, the accuser could always opt to address the accused in private and thus allow this person the chance to 'save face' (i.e., to maintain dignity and a sense of morality). However, such privacy bears different results that do not allow for the public incrimination of the offense. In short, what makes the confrontation a 'Callout' specifically is the public nature of the interaction, for the audience is positioned as judge and jury; to be precise, they are bestowed with the ability to evaluate dominant culture as culpable of the disenfranchisement experienced or witness the judgment if not part of the target community. It is the evaluative function of the performed Callout that makes Spoken Word a potential tool for social activism and empowerment.

[5] Discussion of material culture goes beyond the scope of this analysis; nevertheless, the Callout participant framework provides a unique opportunity to include and thus analyze technology, including social media and other material culture, as being an agentive participant.

© Jones 2016

2.3 The Callout in Practice

Transcript Key

° °	Speech delivered in lower volumes
bold	Speech delivered in higher volumes
:	Lengthening of preceding sounds
italics	Quoted or reported speech
underlined	Speech that is delivered with stress or emphasis
!	Rising volume at the end of a phrase (like an exclamation)
?	Rising pitch at the end of a phrase (like a question intonation)
.	Falling pitch at the end of a phrase (like a period intonation)
,	Rising to middle pitch at the end of a phrase (like for an incomplete phrase)
**	Description of visual or other audible cues (e.g., clapping or shrugging)
~	Rapid speech (i.e., performed without pauses or breath of any kind)
(0.0)	Duration of pauses in tenths of seconds

Excerpt of "The Period Poem" by Dominique Christina

1. When she started her period.
2. We all knew because when she walked out of the bathroom and she looked stricken.
3. *long pause / audience laughter*
4. A::nd I have 4 children,
5. She's my only daughter.
6. 3 boys,
7. My god **so.**
8. She's walks out of the bathroom looking stricken
9. Her brothers are confused,
10. You know and I'm like *Naja, what's up?*
11. Told me she started her period,
12. She was devastated,
13. Lip tremble,
14. Whole thing.
15. So her brothers are immediately like °*O:::h*° *face cringing in disgust*
16. **audience laughter**
17. *laughs* and she had this
18. She was grieving!
19. And I needed to undermine what to me looked like shame
20. Right away
21. Um:::
22. And it was familiar shame
23. °Cuz~I~remember~being~in~middle~school having~started~my~period and~the boys~found~out and~then~you~know there~was~some~shit.°

---

24. When I was in Austin, Texas for the Women of the World Poetry Slam this year.
25. I got a screen shot from her.
26. There was a guy on Twitter. *sucks*
27. And in a 140 character he: (1.2) *squinting and pointing to the rhythm of each word* °almost undermined all that work°.[6]
28. So this is my message to him. *stepping back from the mic*
29. *audience applause and cheering*

(Begin Poem)

[6] The line break denoted elided content removed for the sake of space. This elision discusses more of the 'work' that is referenced in line 27. See the full performance (noted in the following footnote) for a complete rendition.

© Jones 2016

30. *exhales loudly, rolling eyes, and stepping back to the mic*
31. So dude on Twitter says.
32. Quote. *sucks teeth*
33. °*I was having sex with my girlfriend when she started her period*°
34. ° *I dumped that bitch immediately*°
35. End quote.
36. **Dear nameless dummy on Twitter**
37. You're the reason (1.5) why my daughter cried funeral tears when she started her period.
38. The sudden induction into a reality that she would have to negotiate people like you.
39. And your disdain for what a woman's body can do
40. Herein~begins~an~anatomy~lesson~infused~with~feminist~politics
41. Because I hate you. *steps back from the mic*
42. *audience cheering and snapping*

As someone who has demonstrated virtuosity in the genre of Spoken Word, and as a feminist, activist, and proponent of education and civil rights, Dominique Christina is no stranger to challenging the 'powers-that-be' in any and all forms. Nevertheless, her capabilities are particularly salient in the performance of "The Period Poem," which is a direct attack on male dominance and the tendency to shame the female body – particularly a menstruating body. In order to directly confront the shame surrounding menstruation and those dominant voices responsible for such ideology, she utilizes Spoken Word's performative manifestation of the Callout to achieve this feat. In order to see the Callout in practice, I have transcribed one version[7] of this performance with conversation analysis conventions (adapted from various sources)[8] to visually map and thus illustrate Spoken Word's emphasis of performance to execute this linguistic tradition.

As shown in the excerpt above, during the setup of the poem, Christina narrates her daughter Naja's first experience with menstruation. This encounter was particularly marked by Christina's sons' disgust upon seeing Naja exiting the bathroom—an action utilized to situate a persistent narrative of male hegemony: the shaming of the female body and its biological functions. Through this narration, Christina links the shaming that Naja encounters to her own experiences with middle school boys (line 22 and 23) and ultimately to the offensive act committed by Dummy on Twitter (DoT). In the latter instance, Naja witnesses the offense via an anonymous male's post to Twitter – a post used to publicly shame his girlfriend and the general female experience of menstruation. In lines 33 and 34, the offender expresses abhorrence to the fact that his girlfriend starts her period during sex. As part of the general Twitter public, Naja is not the target of the conversation but is positioned as an addressee. Furthermore, as part of the female populace who menstruates, it is clear that she sees this in dialogue with her own shame. Thus, she shares the tweet with her mother (line 25), and, in doing so, takes on the role of Goodwin's instigator or what this study situates as the informant.

Once Naja has completed the task of transmission or 'bearing witness' to the original offense, Christina assumes her role as the accuser, or the figure who seeks to interrupt this dominant narrative. In line 28, she cues the audience to this shift in speech roles, showing that she is now positioned to confront the offense and the offender. It is at this moment in the performance that she literally 'takes the stage' to call out the "nameless Dummy on Twitter" and the male hegemony he represents. Notably, it is her ability to narrate these

[7] The version used is available on Youtube at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FZDYy47l4MQ.
[8] Conventions as developed by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) and utilized by Britt (2011).

© Jones 2016

experiences, voice each character, and shift in and out of each role—as well as Spoken Word's authorizing of such characterizations – that allows entextualization of all prominent absent figures. Because Christina switches from talking about DoT indirectly (i.e., in the 3rd person) to positioning him into the scene as a direct addressee (line 34), the audience is able to clearly understand that the offender is recontextualized as an actual addressee in the conversation.

In terms of the instigator's presence, in Goodwin's (1990) H-S-S-S participant framework, the instigator – while absent physically – is treated as a constant figure or participant in the final confrontation. What is clear from Goodwin's analysis is that he, she, or it (i.e., in the case of technology, social media, or some other news medium that can fulfill the role) is still involved in the exchange either because a current participant references their words in the conversation or is assessed as having been the sole reason for the encounter. Illustrated in the full performance is the idea that Naja (the informant) remains 'present' throughout the speech event but is recontextualized as an audience member or overhearer that can then witness the ensuing climactic Callout. It is through these entextualizations that Christina's performance is positioned to call out the original offense of DoT and, more importantly, address persistent iterations of period shaming.

In terms of a Du Boisean analysis, the performance eventually situates DoT and his allegiances to male hegemony as the object to be presented to the audience for assessment. While Christina uses the entire setup and performance (particularly lines 37-42) to craft her case against him, at line 41 she expresses an explicit stance to DoT and the ideology he represents. Audiences can then decide to either align with Christina or with DoT. Through the stance-taking action of the Callout and then via the call and response model embedded within Spoken Word culture (i.e., snapping to showcase one's acceptance, agreement, or alignment with a poet's performance or the actual arguments referenced at a given point), the audience can relay their judgment. In this case, the snaps executed (in line 42) are acknowledged as being in agreement with Christina.

3. Conclusion

Analysis of Spoken Word reveals that it is a branch of performance poetry that embeds many of AAL's linguistic and cultural traditions, including the practice of calling out an adversary and his/her offenses, within the art form. To this end, this genre moves beyond 'entertainment' and prompts its participants for social action – hence, the entextualized speech act known as the Callout, where dominant culture and its representatives are publicly indicted for their offenses against the disenfranchised. Particularly, the logistics and discourse practices of the art form, as shown in the following salient attributes of Spoken Word, reveal its effectiveness in disrupting dominant narratives in public White space:

1) Performers are physically situated in a position of authority (i.e., on a stage and at the microphone)
2) Performers operate as the principal speaker in a performed dialogue
3) Performers are able to embody and insert disenfranchising institutions and persons into the performance for confrontation and critique.

Furthermore, by bearing witness to these indictments, including the speech acts performed during the confrontation, audiences are empowered to critique hegemonic ideologies. In

© Jones 2016

short, marginalized group's identities and their voices become legitimized by the artist and art, which serves as a medium for social justice.

As an intersection of narration, conversation, performance, and culture, Spoken Word deserves insightful study, particularly within linguistics and anthropology. Given the discipline-specific conversations developed from both spectrums, there is much that these two fields can offer, especially where these subjects converge. For example, the participant framework described in this study prompts interactional linguistics to account for those participants that are not just ratified simply because they are in attendance – just as Goodwin's (1995) work challenged linguists and anthropologists to explore conversation beyond the dyad exchange. Overall, this work seeks to answer Goodwin's call for more activity- and talk-specific analyses as well as to address those interactions that entextualize 'absent' figures as 'present' participants.

References

Agha, A. (2005). Voice, footing, enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 15*(1), 38–59.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1982). "Discourse in the Novel" in *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M.M. Bakhtin*. (pp. 288-366). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bauman, R. (2004). "Introduction: Genre, performance, and the production of intertextuality." *A World of Others' words: Cross-cultural perspectives on intertextuality*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Britt. E. "Can the church say amen": Strategic uses of black preaching styles at the State of the Black Union. *Language in Society, 55,* 211-213.

Butler, J. 1988. "Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory." *Theatre Journal, 40*(4), 519-531.

Craven, C. and Davis, D. *Feminist activist ethnography: Counterpoints to neoliberalism in North America*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Du Bois, J, (2007). The stance triangle. In Robert Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*. (pp. 139-182). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Eskin, M. (2000). Bakhtin on poetry. *Poetics today*, 21(2), 138-151.

Goodwin, M (1990). He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among Black children. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Goodwin, C. and Goodwin, M. H. (2004). Participation. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology*. (pp. 222-244). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hill, J. (1995). The voices of Don Gabriel: Responsibility and self in modern Mexicano narrative" in *The dialogic emergence of culture*. Eds. Dennis Tedlock and Bruce Mannheim. (97-147). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Hill, J. (2008). *The everyday language of White racism*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Irvine, J. T. (1996). "Shadow conversations: The indeterminacy of participant roles". *In natural histories of discourse*. Eds. Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban. (pp. 131-159). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Keller-Cohen, D. and Gordon C. "On trial": Metaphor in telling the life story. *Narrative inquiry, 13*(1), 1–40.

Rickford, J. R. and R. J. Rickford. (2000). *Spoken soul: The story of Black English*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Silverstein, M. "Monoglot 'Standard' in America: Standardization and metaphors of

© Jones 2016

linguistic hegemony." *The matrix of language—Contemporary linguistic anthropology*. Ed. Donald Brennis and Ronald K.S. Macaulay. (pp. 284-306). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art. (2008). What is Spoken Word poetry? Retrieved from: https://porterewhs.pbworks.com/w/file/fetch/86320318/SpokenWord.pdf

Van Dijk, T.A. 1995. Discourse, power and access. In *Critical discourse analysis*, eds. M. Coulthard and C. R. Caldas-Coulthard. (pp. 84-104). London: Routledge.

Wesling, D. (1993). Mikhail Bakhtin and the social Poetics of dialect. *Papers on language & literature, 29*(3): 303-323.

Wortham, S. (2001). *Narratives in action: A strategy for research analyses*. New York: Teachers College Press.

© Jones 2016