International Journal of TESOL Studies (2022)
Vol. 4 (4) 40-62 https://doi.org/10.46451/ijts.2022.04.04

Article

Effects of an L2 Writing Poetry Pedagogy: Tracing Learner Development of Authorial Voice and Agency

Jared Michael Kubokawa
Aichi University, Japan

Received: 14 October, 2021/Accepted: 27 May, 2022/Published: 30 August, 2022

Abstract
This study explored language learning as a transformational event in which success is not measured in terms of cognitive and communicative ability, but rather allows learners to reflect on experiential identity forming moments through writing. The pedagogy attached to the action research portion of this study attempted to access learners' identity and agency through L2 poetry writing that fostered the ability for an individual to create an authentic authorial voice. The creative writing pedagogy acted as the frame in which a qualitative multiple case study was carried out to examine the effects of authorial voice on learners' agency. The case study was conducted at a university in Japan with three EFL learners and traces their development as L2 writers and language learners. Results showed that the presence of authorial voice alone did not necessarily increase a learner's sense of agency; however, if a learner believed they had achieved authorial voice, then an increased level of agentic behaviors was observed. The negative counterpart was also found to be true. Therefore, a relationship of mutual causation was identified between a learner's agency and the learner's personal belief in the achievement of authorial voice. In the authorial voice and agency system (AVAS) of mutual causality, the considerations acted interdependently in which change in one effected change in the other, either positively or negatively. Additional factors such as community of practice, discourse community, the teaching of literary devices, and translingual writing strategies were found to effect authorial voice and thus generate changes in learner agency.

Keywords
L2 creative writing, L2 poetry, authorial voice, learner agency, learner development

1 Introduction

In recent years, there has been a great deal of interest in how to adequately meet the needs of language learners in composition classrooms. A fair number of *how-to* pedagogical strategies and interventions have been brought forward with little concern for the thematic output produced by second language (L2) writers. As Yang (2020) suggests, "a narrow focus on language learning may do disservice to EFL learners' growth as writers. Besides the *how* to write, the *what* to write should also be given due

Email: jaredkubokawa@gmail.com

attention" (p. 2). If L2 writing pedagogies are not providing "due attention" to the content—that is the learner's thematic output—then, essentially, these pedagogies promote an instrumental view of language teaching and learning. Instrumentalism is, by definition, utilitarian and deemphasizes an individual's needs in favor of a pragmatic stance. This dehumanizing of the language classroom places learners at the center of a pedagogy that measures success in terms of structural, cognitive, and linguistic standards. This narrow focus does a "disservice to EFL learner's growth" as individuals (Yang, 2020, p. 2) and essentially ignores a learner's phenomenological traits such as perception, memory, emotion, desire, and imagination.

This study aims to explore language learning as a transformational event in which success is not measured only in terms of cognitive and communicative ability, but rather allows learners to reflect on emotional and experiential identity forming moments in terms of expressive writing. Therefore, this study assumes a poststructuralist stance on accessing learners' identity and agency through a creative writing pedagogy that centers on an individual's written authorial voice. The creative writing pedagogy was developed through classroom-based action research and acts as the frame in which a multiple case study is carried out to examine the effects on learners' agency in an L2 poetry writing course that focuses on harnessing authorial voice.

2 Theoretical Framework

2.1 What is authorial voice?

Authorial voice, or voice, is an enigmatic concept that encompasses ideas of identity, ownership, writing style, linguistic features, rhetorical stance, and personal identity (Hanauer, 2012). In its simplest form, voice is the way in which a writer's individualism transmits onto the page. Voice can be based on any number of written discourse features, e.g., word choice, tone, style, organization, punctuation, grammatical usages, and point of view. The concept of a writer having an authorial voice captures the idea of discernibility. In other words, voice is the concept of knowing who the writer is simply by reading their work—the writer's identifying discourse.

In search of the identifying discourse of authorial voice, Hyland (2008) proposed a text-oriented concept utilizing a framework of *interactional metadiscourse* (Hyland, 2005). Hyland (2008) focused on textual interactional features and suggested that "every successful academic text displays the writer's awareness of both its readers and its consequences" (p. 6). By indicating that writers need to interact effectively with readers through the use of voice, Hyland (2008) proposes a definition for authorial voice which focuses on relationships between *people* and *ideas*. In Hyland's (2008) model, there are two main aspects of voice: (1) *stance*, which is the writer's expression of voice and the writer's point of view; and (2) *engagement*, which is the writer's relationship to the audience and the audiences' point of view. Hyland's conceptions of stance (voice) and engagement (audience awareness) does consider social aspects of authorial voice; however, it is mainly constructed from *texts*. Thus, a closer investigation of *con-text* is imperative to understanding authorial voice.

Voice in a second language (L2) context can be an elusive concept. An L2 writers' voice is an interaction among the individual, the available linguistic resources, and the social/cultural context; L2 authorial voice can be (1) an individualized expression, (2) a social expression, (3) or a mix of the two (Matsuda, 2001; Matsuda & Tardy, 2007; Tardy, 2012). Therefore, an L2 writers' voice can exhibit a plurality of expressions—subsisting in both distinct and hybrid communicative aspects. In sum, L2 voice is a blended construct based on several individual and social factors yet continues to signify a writer's individual expression of self.

For any writer, voice takes time to develop—for L2 writers, it can be an arduous task. However,

Hanauer's (2015) study on measuring authorial voice in an L2 creative writing context concluded that voice was present in students' L2 poetry after only one 15-week writing course. The ramifications of this finding are vast. Hanauer (2010) and others (Maxim, 2006; Spiro, 2014) argue that if learners achieve authorial voice in their L2, then an emotional connection with the additional language could also be achieved, possibly in the form of learner agency and/or ownership. In this conception, a student could essentially transform their entire experience of learning an additional language by accessing their voice—a worthwhile and meaningful inquiry.

2.2 Hanauer's (2012) *meaningful literacy*

Although creative writing pedagogies in L2 teaching and learning remain an underutilized faculty, the act of writing a poem and the need to negotiate the meaning with an interlocutor could create a significant transformative experience. As Hanauer (2012) theorizes in his *meaningful literacy* framework, "the moment when you really express your innermost thoughts and experiences in a second language is a powerful one, and one that can qualitatively change a student's perception of the new language" (pp. 110-111). Arguably, this change of perception is essential to having a transformative language experience. Meaningful literacy aims for the learner to release instrumental views of language as a tool; and instead, to view the L2 as a personal resource (Hanauer, 2012) that evokes emotional and experiential identity formations. When viewed as such the learner begins to take ownership of the additional language. Therefore, an L2 poetry pedagogy can carry out an agentic learning experience that leads to ownership of the L2 through personal expression. In this way, L2 learners can use whatever resources they have available to write about a topic in which they are experts...themselves (Kubokawa, 2021a).

2.3 Spiro's (2014) reading-to-writing cycle

In Spiro's (2014) reading-to-writing cycle, which puts forward a specific L2 creative writing close reading strategy, the L2 novice writer reads experienced L2 writers' texts to search for and understand the nature of poetry and poetry writing. Spiro's cycle follows a four-part pedagogy that asks students to read as writers: (1) *choose*, learners choose influential texts written by peer L2 writers, (2) *articulate*, learners articulate why they have chosen these texts, (3) *apply*, learners apply reading insights into their own expressive writing, and (4) *reflect*, learners reflect on the entire process (p. 29). These four aspects: choose, articulate, apply, and reflect, are often situated in initial stages of creative writing courses; the cycle acts as scaffolding toward the learning and retention of close reading strategies for more complex writing in later stages of a syllabus or curriculum.

2.4 The influence of Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theories of learning

The learner development approach in Spiro's (2014) reading-to-writing cycle contains relatively well-documented concepts in social learning such as sociocultural theory (SCT) (Lantolf, 1994; Vygotsky, 1978) and *community of practice* perspectives (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Within SCT, Vygotsky's concepts of a more knowledgeable other (MKO)—students learning from someone who has a higher ability—and a *zone of proximal development* (ZPD) are at play in the community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) of creative writing workshops and the *discourse community* (Bazerman, 1979; Swales, 1990) of student publications. ZPD is defined as the space that exists between what a learner can do alone and what a learner can do with guidance or in collaboration with peers (Vygotsky, 1978). In Spiro's (2014) reading-to-writing cycle, L2 novice writers are asked to enter the *intercommunication* (Swales, 1990) of the L2 poetry discussion and participate in a group ZPD (Poehner, 2009). Finally, the *reflection* process is also significant to learner engagement and a growing sense of agency as it allows learners to develop autonomous skills for reviewing the effectiveness of their learning by sharing their writing with others

in the community of practice and gauging audience response—a component of self-efficacious agentic behavior as well as Hyland's (2005, 2008) models of authorial voice.

2.5 Multilingual and translingual writing concepts

Kellman (2019) defines *translingual writing* (TLW) as the linguistic phenomenon of "writers who create texts written in more than one language" (p. 337). The practices of TLW "are centuries old" however, as Canagarajah (2020) argues, "theorizing them for modern academic and scholarly communities has just begun" (p. 40). Translingual pedagogies within academic inquiry remain "a work in progress" (Canagarajah, 2020, p. 40); therefore, debates surrounding the relationship between translingualism and L2 writing (Silva & Wang, 2020) are pervasive. However, translingual studies that focus on literacy and language learning implications are useful in understanding how writers, students, and teachers understand relations and conceptions of the L1 in the L2. Taking a TLW, or multilingual writing (MLW), approach to language pedagogy could offer an alternative stance on L2 writers—as Canagarajah (2020) writes—*resourceful rather than deficient* in their linguistic, rhetorical, and cultural breadth. This is certainly a novel take on language learners.

A pedagogy that values TLW orientations advocates for L2 writers accessing all available resources and simultaneously confronts the *monolingual paradigm* (Yildiz, 2011). Moreover, if language teachers value TLW and transnational approaches in their writing classrooms, then learners can begin to reshape literacy beliefs and practices via what Leonard (2014) refers to as *rhetorical attunement*. Rhetorical attunement invites the negotiation of meaning across difference and assumes plurality in contextualized rhetoric. A pedagogical system that values plurality can have larger ideological learning consequences such as *cosmopolitanism* (You, 2016)—the ideal of a global citizen who recognizes that all people are members of a single community despite affiliations such as language or citizenship status. In other words, by designing courses and course content that values reflective practices, emphasizes genre, and invites TLW/MLW approaches, it is possible for language teachers to create efficacious transnational spaces that frustrate the monolingual paradigm and allow for threshold concepts such as writing as social act, rhetorical attunement, and other approaches that are inclusive to heterogeneity and difference.

2.6 Learner agency and Bandura's (2001) human agency theory

The late psychologist Albert Bandura wrote several influential publications (1994, 2001, 2006a, 2006b, 2008, 2018) on agentic theory and defined human agency in four distinct categories: (1) intentionality, (2) forethought, (3) self-reactiveness (self-regulation), and (4) self-reflectiveness (beliefs of self-efficacy) (Bandura, 2001, p. 1). When applied to language learning, Xiao (2014) views learner agency as affecting learners' sense of self-efficacy and metacognition thus altering motivation and identity in both positive and/or negative aspects (p. 5). Agency itself is part of a learner's engagement and "is the process in which students intentionally and somewhat proactively try to personalize and otherwise enrich both what is to be learned and the conditions and circumstances under which it is to be learned" (Reeve & Tseng, 2011, p. 258). Therefore, incorporation of personalization into meaningful and relevant language learning activities and writing tasks is imperative to accessing learners' agency. As students undertake the process of Bandura's (2001) agentic theory, learners' development becomes more independent, self-initiated, and self-efficacious.

Self-efficacy is integral to successful L2 learning. Bandura (1994) places *self-efficacy* as a part of his social cognitive theory of behavioral change and defines it as an individual's belief in their ability to accomplish actions and behaviors needed to generate positive performance outcomes—the confidence to control one's own behavior, motivation, and actions in a social environment. Self-efficacy determines how learners behave, feel, think, and motivate themselves as a perception of self. Furthermore, in Bandura's (1994) model, self-efficacy is cyclical with results feeding back into the original sense of self-

efficacy in a relationship of mutual causation. Thus, to maintain, a high sense of self-efficacy a learners' ability to cope with negative results and utilize positive ones affects the overall system.

3 Methods

3.1 Research domain and design

Undertaking a multiple case study of three Japanese university students, the research domain is the author's own EFL classroom and self-developed L2 creative writing course. The class meets for one semester (15 times), weekly for 90 minutes. The course utilizes the literary journal *Seasons: An EFL Literary Journal* as a "textbook", which is created semesterly from cohorts of the same course. Generally, the students' English levels, in the common European framework (CEFR), is between A2 and B2 (basic to independent users) depending on the semester. The three students in the study are Japanese L1 users with an English level near A2 in the CEFR. The IRB board at the university agreed to the conditions of the study and the students signed consent forms that allowed for full names to be used; however, pseudonyms are utilized to protect participants' privacy.

The research question stems from the discussion section in Hanauer's (2015) study on authorial voice in L2 poetry writing: How does a creative writing pedagogy that promotes the development of authorial voice a/effect learners' agency? The research design consisted of three sets of data, allowing for triangulation of findings, analyzed in an ongoing iterative process. The data collection included the following:

1. *Bilingual Japanese-English Questionnaire*: An initial questionnaire about students' educational and L2 writing background was given at the beginning of the semester (Appendix A)
2. *Students' written production from the L2 creative writing course*:
   a) Original student's poetry
   b) Reflective writing assignments: midterm and final (Appendix B)
3. *Interview Transcriptions*: Transcribed audio-recorded interviews with each of the three students was conducted after the midterm reflection. The interviews were done in English; however, this is a limitation to the study as students were not always able to answer in full. Sometimes, the interviewer clarified the meaning of questions by using Japanese and/or machine translation software. Students were unavailable for a final interview.

In addition, students completed weekly free-writes in a writing journal as well as discussion forum responses, and a reading-to-writing task, which were used as secondary sources in forming the analysis. The researcher also kept field notes with a thick description of the course and reviewed the poetry workshop recordings. Finally, it should be noted that 75% of the course was conducted via videoconferencing with pandemic concerns halting in-person instruction just a quarter of the way into the Spring 2021 semester.

Ultimately, all research has a fundamental ontology and epistemology as well as methodology that directs the inquiry (Duff, 2008). The choice of method is determined by the field of inquiry and the methods that the research questions lend themselves to (Polio & Friedman, 2016). Therefore, this study undergoes a hybrid style of interpretive research: case study action research. This researcher believes that complexities of language research can be studied and presented meaningfully within the fullness of cases (Duff, 2008) and that based on the research question and the classroom research domain, case study action research was the optimal style of inquiry.

3.2 The L2 poetry pedagogy and the Japanese EFL context

The L2 poetry pedagogy that directed this study involves a facilitated writing process in which Japanese EFL writers were required to produce 12 original English poems written from personal experiences and topics of their own choosing (Kubokawa, 2021b, 2021c). The course was divided into three units (*shinhaiku*, short poems, and long poems) with learners required to submit final versions of five shinhaiku, five short free verse poems, and two long free verse poems. The aim of such a course is to give learners the opportunity to develop literacy knowledge, writing and recursive writing skills, to provide strategies for communicating about writing, and to foster the development of a unique authorial voice. The actual process of writing involved several stages: reading and analyzing peer texts; the teaching of literary devices; personal reflection; poetic rendition; peer and instructor reading and responses in workshops (and on discussion boards); editing, revising, and reworking, and finalization of a body of work.

3.2.1 What is shinhaiku?

Shinhaiku, or new *haiku*, poetry was chosen as an entry point into the pedagogy because of its brevity, focus on sensory experiences, relative ease of construction, and cultural responsiveness in the Japanese context. Shinhaiku also activated learner schemata as haiku is taught in Japanese secondary schools. Historically, shinhaiku was a trend in Japanese literature at the turn of the twentieth century led by haiku master Shiki Masaoka (Yamagiwa, 1959). Shinhaiku is a modern take on the traditional form and focuses on meaning rather than meter, thus shinhaiku does not assume the classic 17 syllable structure (5-7-5). Here are three examples of shinhaiku from the participants in the case study:

Beautiful night
Walking with you—
Wearing *yukata*
By Akane

Look up—
cherry blossoms fall
like fluttering *kanji*
By Mai

I wake up
The air is clear...
New Year's Day
By Hana

The TLW strategy of code meshing (also referred to as code switching) is utilized here for linguistic, cultural, and composition purposes. *Code-meshing* is a writing technique that merges standard written English with other languages in a move toward pluralization in written discourse (Canagarajah, 2006). The transliteration of Japanese words in the shinhaiku above—*kanji* (Japanese writing characters) and *yukata* (Japanese traditional summer robes)— offer a cultural, or ethnolinguistic, perspective that would not have been communicated if the English equivalents were used. More on translingual aspects in L2 poetry can be found in Kubokawa (2021c) and Kubokawa (2022).

3.2.2 Identity formations and the writing prompt

To emphasize authorial voice and identity formation in student's L2 poetry, a writing prompt was translated to Japanese and provided in both languages throughout the course. The prompt was created by Hanauer (2012) in his meaningful literacy framework specifically for novice L2 poets to explore and render memories and experiences into image-driven poetry. It was conveyed to students that poetry strives to create a sensory picture in the reader's mind that transports them back to the exact moment of the poem in which the writer perceived the rendered experience (Kubokawa, 2021b, 2021c). Certainly, poetry writing can be understood in other ways; however, rendered experience is a common theme in haiku and thus a culturally relevant teaching model that was suitable for this context and for identity explorations. Hanauer's (2012) original English version is reproduced here:

> Think about the significant moments of your life. In your mind, go over your memories and think of these moments that truly made an impression on you. Think of real moments and try to see them in your mind. Close your eyes and really imagine and relive the moment you are thinking of. Try and see, smell, hear, touch and taste the experience. Now try and show the moment in words—make it possible for someone else to see it too. Just describe the moment itself. Use language to make it come to life for someone else. Make a collection of these written significant moments—what is it that you are telling the world— what is it that is uniquely you? (p.16)

The sensory experience of the moment is at the vanguard of Hanauer's (2012) identity accessing prompt as it aids novice L2 poets in creating a written performance of self, personal history, perception, and experience. The L2 poetry pedagogy in this study utilized this prompt for all three types of poetry writing (shinhaiku, short, and long free verse). Here are examples produced by each of the three case study participants written from the prompt:

Night Only For Two by Akane

You and me are walking
along the coast silently
The wind wraps us
My heart is beating like wave rhythm

Glitter, glitter—
Stars stare at us
Half moon is smiling
Hand to hand touch—

The dim night hid the red cheeks
but I just know faces of each other
illuminated by the moonlight are smiling

Mermaid by Mai

Splash—
A whole blue world
Dolphins are swimming with me
The water surface is sparkling like a diamond

I dive a bit—
A colorful world
Sea anemones greet me
Clownfish are peeking between them
I stick my head out of the water—

A whole red world
The sunset is looking at me
This world is full of countless colors

Dreams by Hana
I am a witch
I am a dwarf
I am Santa Claus
I am the tears of a crying person in a movie theater
I am a fridge
I am a mermaid
I am a curry carrot
I am the clothes the president is wearing

I can be anything
In a dream...

3.2.3 From a community of practice to a discourse community

To revise working texts, a creative writing pedagogy usually aims to provide creative writing workshops as experiential learning opportunities. Student texts are developed, edited, and shared within the community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) of the classroom. The texts can then be distributed in various digital and print publishing capacities both in and outside the classroom, which expands the community of practice into a distinct discourse community (Bazerman, 1979; Swales, 1990) in which literary conversations and intercommunication take place over subsequent semesters/academic years. In the pedagogy of this study, the *Seasons* journals are distributed semesterly by the university on the language institutes' website and shared as exemplary work with students and other stakeholders. The publications aided in developing an undergraduate L2 creative writing community (Kubokawa, 2021b) and provided a venue for learners to explore rhetorical concepts such audience, context, purpose, and genre.

4 Results and Analysis

4.1 Learner profiles: Akane

Akane is an 18-year-old, first-year literature major. In the past, she has never written English poetry nor taken a writing course in English; however, Akane "very much" enjoys both reading and writing in English. Regarding, authorial voice, on the initial questionnaire, Akane answered that she did not "have my own writing style in English" and the only previous English writing had been "notes for class."

Although this *Communication Skills* course was described as a writing course, when questioned why she took this class, Akane responded that she wanted to "improve my English ability so that I could speak English," and to "be able to have daily conversations in English." The workshop process emphasized student-to-student communication and the teacher provided scaffolding and examples before facilitating the student-led workshops. This teaching style afforded a "four-skills" approach to the poetry writing class. Hopefully, this fulfilled Akane's desires to improve her English speaking and oral communication skills. This desire for oral communication improvement can be evidenced in Akane's reflective writing[1]:

> I tried to write shin haiku and short poem from my experiences. Expressing what I want to tell was difficult for me. I also feel difficult to balance writing so that listeners can understand and writing not to be bold expression to make listeners imagine. Still, repeat the number of time, I became fun to write and I got used to write in English than before. I felt workshop is nice because I can hear many advices for my writing. I also could learn good point from poem of other students, so I think *workshop made my poem better and developed my confidence.* In other class, I'm chatting in English and I became able to react to friend's comment. It's a little, but it's the moment when *I feel my communication skills improved*. *I'm really good at attracting people by writing funny and cute poem. But my poem tends to be childish*, it's a good point, so I want to attract people by writing poem that *stirs listeners imagination* and *using technique effectively*. *I will try to write better poem making use of what I have learned*. (Emphasis added)

In this mid-term reflection, it is possible to see the effect of the workshop writing process on Akane's ability to communicate in English in other courses when she "became able to react to friend's comment." Afterall, her goal for the writing course was to improve her oral communication skills; therefore, she may have focused on speaking skills rather than writing. Akane displays some *intentionality*, one of Bandura's (2001) aspects of human agency, by describing how she would like to use "technique effectively" to "stir listeners imagination." It is not entirely clear what technique she would like to utilize; however, she does consider the reader's experience while writing a poem. This intentionality is important to a growing sense of agency.

When asked during the interview if she believed she had a writing style of her own, she answered *positively*; however, when pressed about authorial voice she answered *negatively.* Although Akane could not, or would not, provide a reason why. Here is her response in length:

> **Jared**: In your reflection, you said cute, yes?
>
> **Akane**: Yes.
>
> **Jared**: Akane's style is cute and funny poems, but maybe childish [taken from her reflection]. So do you think this is your style?
>
> **Akane**: Yes.
>
> **Jared**: And do you think you have a voice? […] Do you understand "voice?"
>
> **Akane**: No.
>
> **Jared**: For example...[Shows machine translation explanation of authorial voice]. Does that make sense? If I see Akane's poem and another person's, but I don't know [the writer]. I say, "oh! that's Akane's."
>
> **Akane**: No.
>
> **Jared**: No? Why not?
>
> **Akane**: ...
>
> **Jared**: Like, if another teacher, your English teacher is -----?
>
> **Akane**: Yes.
>
> **Jared**: Yeah, so if ----- is reading Mai's poems, and Hana's poems, and Akane's poems. They

> say, "oh, I know that voice, that writing voice, that writing voice is Akane!" You think, no?
>
> **Akane:** No.

The silence when asked "why not" was more than likely due to an inability to articulate an answer; however, she does make clear her opinion on authorial voice versus style. By the end of the semester, Akane evolves to believe that she has a more mature style; however, she does not comment on the presence of authorial voice:

> Next, I feel that I have developed a style as a poet. My poems are often used nature and moving. I used scenes that I ride a bicycle and car. I often use the word of wind because I feel the wind by moving like this. I also have personification style.

Despite her beliefs, Akane exhibited, what this researcher believes, are clear indications of authorial voice, in both the use of literary techniques, punctuation, and TLW. Further, the "errors" such as missing articles, contribute to her unique voice.

> **To a Comfortable Sleep by Akane**
>
> In the bed
>
> I can hear sound of rain
>
> *para para para...*
>
> The sound invites me to sleep
>
> My eyes gradually close...
>
> Like healing music

The poem "To a Comfortable Sleep," has utilized the ellipsis effectively to indicate a sense of time—a rhetorical strategy—as the sound of the rain gently lulls her to sleep "like healing music." This simile, in the final line, also contributes to growing control over her L2 authorial voice in relation to Hyland's (2005, 2008) theories on stance in L2 writing. Equally so, Akane controls the line length and form by giving this free verse poem a balanced structure of three couplets. The errors, such as the missing article in line two of stanza one, contribute to her unique voice—as Canagarajah argues, "L2 writers can find scope for creativity in grammar and rhetoric in English writing" (p. 49). Although, even if these features are evidence of a unique authorial voice, Akane herself does not believe she has a voice.

This researcher argues that Akane's voice was present; however, her lack of belief in her own authorial voice negatively affected her sense of agency and thus ownership. This may have created a negative feedback loop. In other words, the two considerations acted interdependently in which change in one a/effected change in the other. This relationship of mutual causation both mimics Bandura's (1994) self-efficacy model and exemplifies the importance of self-efficacy in language learning. Regarding the research question, this is evidence of authorial voice being present; however, the negative *belief* thus negatively affected the learner's agency—especially self-regulation. In the cases to follow, there is evidence of similar mutual causality.

4.2 Learner profiles: Mai

Mai is also a first-year university student in the literature program. Although her English level is similar to Akane's—she exudes a certain air of confidence that aids in her sense of self-efficacy. Although Mai enjoys reading in English "very much," she only enjoys writing "a little" and has only ever written "text messages and class notes" in English. In contrast to Akane, Mai strongly felt that she developed an authorial voice, as responded in her interview:

Jared: Do you think you have a voice, or a style?

Mai: Yes, I have style. Natural. About nature.

Jared: Yes, yes, good. So, you are good at using onomatopoeia, hyperbole and alliteration [referencing midterm reflection task, see below] but your style is very natural.

Mai: Oh, yes.

Mai is confident when stating "oh, yes" concerning her authorial voice, or style. Regarding her understanding of voice, the researcher did not use the machine translation for authorial voice in Mai's interview; however, the class spoke about a writer's voice throughout the course and therefore it is assumed that she understood the relative meaning. From her belief in her own voice, her sense of agency increased within a positive feedback cycle of mutual causality.

Mai's sense of self-regulation and self-efficacy (Bandura, 2001) is apparent in her speaking as well as her writing. In her midterm reflection, she embodies Hanauer's (2012, 2015) idea of meaningful literacy, as she writes about her own experience:

> I really enjoyed writing shin-haiku and short poems. Up until now, I had read English such as writing and solved problems with writing and grammar, but by making these [poems], I was *able to use English myself*. At the workshop, I had an important experience of *communicating in my own words*, and I'm glad I was able to get new ideas. Also, I feel that I can *express my view of the world* little by little by making many works. Looking back on my previous works, I felt that I was good at using Onomatopoeia, hyperbole and alliteration. However, when I made a shin-haiku, I *had to have a clear image, but I sometimes couldn't express it well*. I want to *make use of this reflection in the long poem I'm going to finish*. I think this lecture will *help me grow up in many* ways. Anyway, I'll enjoy it without fear of failure. (Emphasis added)

In this reflection, Mai displays all four of the aspects of Bandura's (2001) human agency theory. Firstly, she intends to "make use of this reflection in the long poem I'm going to finish." Mai is confident she is going to finish, which is exemplary of self-efficacy (Xiao, 2014); moreover, intentionality and forethought are apparent in her making use of a reflective piece of writing for creative writing intents. She also exhibits self-regulation when Mai mentions that she "had to have a clear image, but sometimes couldn't express it well." Finally, there is a strong sense of self-efficacy in her statement that this lecture will help her to "grow up in many ways." This displays intentionality of personal growth both *inside* and *outside* of academics (Reeve & Tseng, 2011). Similarly, she brings intrinsically motivated reasoning into her language learning and creative writing (Xiao, 2014). Mai intends to grow as an individual from the act of learning to write creatively in English. She views creative writing as efficacious in that it will enable her to "grow up in many ways." In response to the research question, the characteristics drawn from these statements exude a strong sense of agentic behavior stemming from the L2 poetry pedagogy.

In her poem "Shooting Star," Mai displays authorial voice by utilizing several varied literary devices and effects:

> **Shooting Star by Mai**
> Twinkle, twinkle—
> Sky without a cloud
> Glittering like the sea
>
> I lie down with my brothers
> Like the character for river 川
> We look up at the falling sky
>
> *Kiran—*

We join hands in a hurry
We close our eyes tightly
We mutter three times in our hearts
We smile each other without saying anything

In the first line, Mai immediately plays on the common English nursery rhyme "Twinkle, twinkle little star." Throughout her portfolio, Mai increasingly toyed with cliché and latent pop culture knowledge available to most audiences e.g., "a whole blue world" in her poem Mermaid (see Methods) references the song "A Whole New World" in Disney's "The Little Mermaid" film. This aspect of her writing yields a strong sense of her identity, personality, and voice as a young woman entrenched in pop culture in Japan.

Finally, in "Shooting Star" Mai expresses the closeness of her relationship with her brothers by repeatedly utilizing the first-person plural pronoun "we" as the actions of the characters coincide. However, she does not make apparent the secret that they share in the main text of the poem, only in the title. This withholding of information to the audience adds to her authorial voice, control, and ownership of the language. Equally secretive, Mai does not make apparent that "*kiran*" is the translingual onomatopoeic phrase for a shooting star in Japanese. *Translingual onomatopoeia* (Kubokawa, 2022) is a multilingual literary effect that utilizes an onomatopoeic phrase in a language that differs from the primary language of the text. In a clear representation of authorial voice, Mai leaves the implicit mystery of translingual onomatopoeic phrase up to the reader to decipher. Afterall, the true magic of art and poetry is what is left unsaid.

4.3 Learner profiles: Hana

Hana is a second-year psychology major and has written both Japanese and English poetry before as a junior high school student. Although she enjoys reading and writing in English "very much," she is "not really" motivated to learn English as she is busy with studies in other areas. As a goal for this course, she stated in the initial questionnaire that she hopes to eliminate the "difficult prejudice about English." She is speaking of a common theme with EFL learners in Japan. Oftentimes, learners in this context can revert to learned helplessness as English is "too difficult" a subject to become proficient. Therefore, Hana is aware of cultural bias toward English learning. She is also aware of social and ethnolinguistic considerations, such as untranslatable cultural concepts that exist in the Japanese language. When asked what is most difficult about writing in English, she stated: "expressions in Japanese but not in English." She cited two specific examples in which there is no direct English equivalent, (1) *wabi-sabi* (Japanese minimalist aesthetics) and (2) the functional phrase *yoroshiku onegaishimasu* (meaning I look forward to/thank you in advance for). Arguably, this can be viewed as a move toward global citizenship and ideas of cosmopolitanism (You, 2016) as Hana recognizes ethnolinguistic differences and is aware of language power and prejudices.

It was observed throughout the semester that, although her English level was "lower" than the other students, Hana's thought-process was often of a higher-order. This can be seen in her metaphorical, feminist-take on a humorous personification poem, "Feelings of the Washing Machine."

Feelings of the Washing Machine by Hana

Today is hot and sunny
Such a day is the day
When I play an active part

Round and round
Round and round round and round
Guruguruguruguruguruguruguruguruguruguru

I am turning my eyes
I am getting tired
Let's rest a little

The owner has come
It is sad...
I will do my best

Gyaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
There is a cockroach underneath
I want to run away

Let's run away secretly
The trick is to walk like a Ninja
Sasasasasa

Oh!
The owner has come
It is sad…

Pyrroline
Pyrroline
Laundry is over

In this course, Hana is unique among her peers in addressing the feelings of homemakers in Japanese society. She relates the struggle of being "sad" and the desire to "run away secretly." This poem begs the question—who would ever ask the feelings of the washing machine? This researcher believes this is an allusion to gender dynamics in Japanese society; thus, it becomes possible to replace "washing machine" with homemaker. Allusion and allegory are complex literary techniques that veteran L1 writers can struggle with. However, Hana is a novice L2 poet employing devices that were not explicitly taught in the classroom. Therefore, in response to the research question, the L2 poetry pedagogy has not necessarily provided Hana with the tools for her authorial voice yet the group ZPD of the class has given her a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) to collaborate with and thus voice her unique perspective on society.

From informal conversations, this researcher became aware that Hana is a believer in the classic idea of the writing process. She believes in sitting down quietly with her thoughts and writing them out considerately on a piece of actual paper with an actual pen. In her midterm reflection, when asked about her writing style and authorial voice, she instead commented on this specific writing process: "It was important to write down what came to my mind about my poem on a piece of paper and then shape it into a poem. Because I think it is important to take steps one by one." This may have been a deflection

response; however, throughout the course, Hana was constantly considering best practices for the writing process as well as the drafting, editing, and revision processes. When asked the same question in the interview, about her style and voice, she answered positively, yet somewhat reluctantly, that she had a discernible authorial voice:

> **Jared**: Do you think you have your own style, your own voice, Hana's voice?
> **Hana**: Yes.
> **Jared**: Do you understand "voice"?
> **Hana**: Oh...
> **Jared:** Hana's style? For example...*kore wo yomemasuka*? (Can you read this?) [Shows machine translation explanation of authorial voice]
> **Hana**: *Hai*, y*omemasu*. (Yes, I can read it.) Ahhh...
> **Jared**: Your voice, your style?
> **Hana**: Ahhh?
> **Jared**: Do you think—?
> **Hana:** I think, yes.

Hana's personality is quiet and reserved; however, throughout the semester her writing seemed to grow into her ideas. Little-by-little as she discovered her voice—her poetry began to reflect her deep thought processes. In her final reflection, she states: "I realized that writing a shinhaiku was a free expression of my emotions." It may be that Hana, through the creative writing pedagogy and Hanauer's (2012) identity accessing prompt, began to grasp the concept that creative writing in English (or any language) allows the writer the "free expression" and agency to access a variety of both lived and imagined experiences (Hanauer, 2010; Maxim, 2006; Spiro, 2014). Commenting on her frequent use of the personification literary device, Hana continues: "anthropomorphism [personification] is something that you can't actually do, but there's nothing you can't do in haiku, so you can use your free ideas. Also, I think it's a good thing that readers can feel what they can't usually experience." In this sense, Hana was able to transcend her normal sense of identity and extend her perception into other beings as well as objects (washing machine)—more importantly she brings the reader along for the ride. This is clear evidence of audience awareness as she exhibits both stance and engagement (Hyland, 2005, 2008) as well as a move toward Leonard's (2014) rhetorical attunement.

Hana was able to access self-efficacy and self-regulation agentic behaviors (Bandura, 1994, 2001) in her poetry by considering the reader's point of view as well as what specific literary devices may enhance the reader's experience. She deeply considers her own perceptions during in the writing process, and then makes intentional writing choices to increase the effect and enjoyment of her poems (Reeve & Tseng, 2011; Xiao, 2014). This is exemplified in Hana's final reflection when she comments on the effectiveness of her style as it relates to the reader's experience:

> I think that the imagery has a role to deepen the meaning of the poem and to *attract the imagination and interest of the reader.* I feel that I have developed a style as a poem. My style of poems is using onomatopoeia and repetition a lot. I think *what the reader can imagine in poetry is very important*. Also, I think onomatopoeia and repetition is *the most effective for the reader to imagine*. Therefore, I used them to write poems and express my feelings.

Hana understands and embraces the idea that what the writer puts into the imagination of the reader "in poetry is very important." She then makes the next step by intentionally deciding to use two specific literary devices (onomatopoeia and repetition) to create a desired effect on the reader and the reader's experience of her poetry—clear indication of Hyland's (2005, 2008) engagement and stance as well as knowledge of rhetorical situations such as audience, purpose, genre, and context. Regarding learner

agency, Hana strongly displays Bandura's (2001) human agency theory of intentionality as well as, in certain degrees, self-efficacy, self-regulation, and forethought. Like Mai, her agency and belief in authorial voice are caught in a positive system of mutual causation.

5 Discussion

This section will discuss the results based on three common themes underlying the three case studies. The goal is to observe and compare how relevant these three cases are to each other and explore both linguistic, compositional, cultural, and rhetorical linkages between the L2 poetry.

5.1 Common themes: Translingual and multilingual writing

TLW and MLW strategies have aided the three participants in exhibiting unique discourse features and transnational perspectives. Upon closer examination of how translingualism was poetically rendered reveals differences between the three writers. In Akane's poem "To a Comfortable Sleep" she utilizes both repetition and translingual onomatopoeia (Kubokawa, 2022) in line one of stanza two, "para para para…" In this case, the translingual onomatopoeia is the Japanese phrase for the sound of rainfall; however, the art and mystery of the expression is lost as the meaning is given away in the previous line "I can hear sound of rain." This is an example of not fully taking advantage of a TLW strategy as the writer is offering a translation thus ineffectively rendering the translingual onomatopoeia.

In Hana's poem "Feelings of the Washing Machine," she utilizes several translingual onomatopoeic phrases: (1) "*Guruguruguruguruguruguruguruguruguruguru*" which is the sound of water spinning and sloshing, (2) "*Gyaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa*" an exaggerated equivalent of "Ah!", and (3) *Sasasasasa*, which carries the latent Japanese cultural signification of a ninja's ultra-quiet footsteps moving across a floor. Hana's Japanese translingual onomatopoeic phrases lack the translation that Akane used in her poem. Situated within an English language poem, these Japanese expressions provide a sense of cultural intuition, innovation, and humor. Canagarajah (2020) theorizes that "L2 writers can utilize multi-voiced and genre-bending practices that accommodate narrative, personal, or other rhetorical preferences from the students' backgrounds" (p. 49). Hana's multiple voices indicate ownership and command by utilizing personal rhetorical preferences. Overall, repetitive language features have been common amongst the L2 poets; however, combining repetition with translingual onomatopoeia is relatively unique and exudes a resourcefulness rather than a deficiency in L2 linguistic practices (Canagarajah, 2020); thus, it is believed that TLW orientations can enhance the performance of authorial voice in learners' expressive L2 writing; however, in the case of Akane, the use of a TLW technique did not enhance her authorial voice.

In the case of Mai, in the poem "Shooting Star" she was the first student to utilize the TLW strategy of including a non-transliterated Japanese character within an English poem, e.g., 川 (*kawa*, river). This small but highly effective technique assures the presence of an authorial voice in view of Hyland's (2005, 2008) theories of stance (voice) as well as engagement (audience awareness). Moreover, Mai exhibits authorial voice by interacting among the individual, the available linguistic resources, and the social/cultural context (Matsuda, 2001; Matsuda & Tardy, 2007; Tardy, 2012) by utilizing this character to provide a unique translation (English to Japanese via kanji), a visual representation of the three siblings lying on the ground, and an ethnolinguistic perspective into a cultural insight.

In "Shooting Star" Mai begins to negotiate with her multilingual identity via Leonard's (2014) theory of rhetorical attunement. Employing conceptions of the L1 in the L2 as a communication strategy and the repurposing of the Japanese character reveals the writer existing in a liminal transnational space (Canagarajah, 2018, 2020; You, 2016, 2018)—the east-west transcultural bridge between languages, writing systems, and identity. This is arguably a transformative move as the writer implies Japanese

cultural values in an English language poem by utilizing a TLW approach. To illustrate this point, a brief explanation of the cultural significance of the Japanese river kanji used in this rhetorical context is necessary. In addition to the pictorial quality of the river kanji providing a visual for readers for three siblings lying on the ground, this TLW strategy exudes latent cultural knowledge to Japanese readers—*kawa no ji ni natte neru,* or sleep like the character for river. Traditionally, Japanese families would sleep in one room with *futons* on a *tatami* floor—if there were three members of the family (mother, father, child), they would sleep in a row in the shape of the kanji for river. If one looks closely at the kanji 川, it is clear that the taller father is on the far left, the mother on the far right and the smaller child safely tucked between the two parents. By employing the non-transliterated pictorial Japanese character, Mai is both personally communicating the safety and closeness of her family as well as Japanese familial values. This depth of meaning creates a rich mix of a Japanese poet's phenomenological literary aesthetic thriving in an L2 English language poem that plays on a bildungsroman narrative of cosmic nature. All of this is achieved in 55 words. In response to the research question, here is a poet with an authorial voice present, acting with agency, and possibly transforming her perception of an L2 identity through a TLW writing literary technique in the L2 poetry pedagogy.

5.2 Common themes: Student publications

This study uncovered that mimicking writing for publication had an impact on learners' conceptions of identity as poets as well as possibly contributing to students' growing sense of agency. Publications can provide a sense of authenticity to the L2 writing classroom by expanding the audience to more than simply the teacher and students in the course. In this case, past and future cohorts contributed to the overall community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) The publications not only contributed to summative learning conceptions, but also became an integral part of the formative learning process. Moreover, L2 learners may feel disconnected from or intimidated by texts written by L1 users. To overcome this difficulty, texts written by fellow L2 writers can be chosen as model texts which alleviate any undue stress caused by intimidation or inadequacy produced from reading texts written by L1 authors.

The *Seasons* publications created scaffolding and acted as a static MKO within the individual and the group's ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978) as well as a small but integral discourse community (Bazerman, 1979; Swales, 1990) for learners to participate and work within. This discourse community looked to the past, present, and future simultaneously as students in the course considered what was written before them, and presently strived to create texts of merit so that future L2 poets will consider their poems as influential to the writing process. This chronology adheres to the reading-to-writing cycle (Spiro, 2014) as well as creative spiralization theories (Sullivan, 2015; Taylor, 1976). This study suggests other teachers explore digital and print publications in their writing and language classrooms to aid in improving several aspects of learning. Additionally, publications can be used as data for literary arts, applied linguistic, TESOL and other interdisciplinary research.

5.3 Common themes: Literary devices

The L2 poetry pedagogy taught literary devices[2] throughout the course and they were exhibited in all three of the participants' poetry. The devices were taught by means of providing explanations and examples, by finding examples in other L2 writers' poems, and by practicing these techniques in the writing journals, and in feedback sessions in the workshops. In response to the research question, it is believed that these literary devices aided the L2 poets in expressing themselves in an artful manner and contributed the L2 poet's stance (Hyland, 2005, 2008). However, literary devices alone cannot enhance the effect of the poem within the reader's experience, or engagement; thus, the social/cultural aspect of authorial voice (Matsuda, 2001; Matsuda & Tardy, 2007; Tardy, 2012) could not be attained through the

teaching of literary devices alone. To access these aspects, the student had to make use of the workshop and sociocultural context of the group's ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978) in the classroom itself. Finally, it remains uncertain how the teaching of literary devices a/effected poetic style—and whether style and voice are synonymous—in the realm of L2 creative writing. Unfortunately, this article does not have the scope to uncover these phenomena but may be explored in future studies.

6 Conclusion

6.1 A complex system of mutual causality

This study concluded that the effect of the L2 poetry pedagogy and authorial voice on learners' agency can be viewed in terms of *belief*. In other words, a pedagogy that promotes authorial voice does not directly lead to an increased sense of agency. However, if the pedagogy can support a learner's internal conviction in performing an authorial voice, then an advancement of agency, as well as ownership, was evidenced, e.g., Mai and Hana. The negative counterpart was also found to be true, e.g., Akane. Therefore, a relationship of mutual causation was identified between a learner's agency and the learner's personal *belief* in the achievement of authorial voice. The two considerations acted interdependently in a system where change in one effected change in the other, either positively or negatively, like a feedback loop. Moreover, in some cases, such as Mai and Hana, this assumption of mutual causality was extended beyond L2 writing into other areas of learning, such as overall language learning, higher order thinking skills, and identity formation.

This authorial voice and agency system (AVAS) of mutual causality not only mimics Bandura's (1994) model of self-efficacy but is an example of the importance of self-efficacious behavior in language learning. Xiao (2014) views learner agency as affecting a language learner's sense of self-efficacy; therefore, if the AVAS of mutual causation is true, then authorial voice would also affect learners' self-efficacy. This creates a link between self-efficacy and the performance of authorial voice where self-efficacy could replace *belief* in authorial voice as the x-factor that determines the overall AVAS.

Bandura's (1994) self-efficacy framework is itself a system of mutual causality, thus, it could be argued that the relationships between AVAS and self-efficacy constitute a more interactive complex system with multiple factors of mutual interdependence. It is important to remember that agency is part of learner engagement (Reeve & Tseng, 2011) and metacognition (Xiao, 2014) and thus can alter motivation and identity. Therefore, a complex system of self-efficacy, agency, and authorial voice will in turn a/effect numerous other parts of learning including but not limited to motivation, engagement, identity and ownership. Finally, the relationships in these systems are dynamic and asymmetrical; therefore, the dichotomy of positive and negative is more than likely inadequate for measurement. The scale of such a human learning system would be more effective if measured on a divergent continuum, possibly on multiple planes.

6.2 Translingual orientations

Regarding, the efficacy of TLW practices, if the reader has the latent cultural knowledge being communicated by the TLW technique, then audience participation in the act of reading can be enhanced. The L2 poets naturally included translingual approaches in their texts thus creating a transnational space for various threshold concepts such as cosmopolitanism (You, 2016) and rhetorical attunement (Leonard, 2014). Furthermore, by working within the poetry genre and allowing L2 writers to negotiate with and deconstruct language norms uncovered the linguistic phenomenon of translingual onomatopoeia. The use of translingual onomatopoeia revealed a transcultural perspective to the audience. It can be argued

that L2 writing instructors should enable students to recognize and negotiate the monolingual paradigm (Yildiz, 2011) to transcend linguistic, ethnic, and national boundaries (Canagarajah, 2018; You, 2016, 2018). By encouraging TLW practices in the L2 writing classroom, teachers can reaffirm the value of threshold concepts in writing and foster Leonard's (2014) theory of rhetorical attunement.

Moreover, L2 poetry, as a genre, is ripe for exploring conceptions of translingual orientations as a pedagogical practice because (1) free verse poetry does not follow any specific writing conventions, (2) *poetic license*, L1 in the L2 can be viewed as artistic choices made for various rhetorical, compositional, linguistic, or other reasons, and (3) L2 writers can sometimes lack familiarity with academic English genre expectations, however in poetry L2 writers can utilize culturally relevant L1 poetic conventions i.e., shinhaiku, and thus feel open to express themselves freely using L1 and/or L2 resources (Canagarajah, 2020). In other words, L2 creative writing pedagogies can provide opportunities for L2 writers to make use of their cultural, linguistic, compositional, and rhetorical tools, which are actually always at their disposal (Kubokawa, 2021c). As L2 creative writing is often underutilized in language teaching, there could be scope in this area. For classroom L2 writing practices, teaching poetry can benefit learners in the way that multilingual writing practices benefit learners: building fluency, L2 literacy, and L2 identity. Because of its lack of conventions poetry becomes an excellent venue to showcase translingual orientations and other multilingual writing practices (rhetorical attunement, positive language transfer, and cultural knowledge transfer). L2 poetry writing advocates for multilingual writers to be viewed as resourceful, not deficient, where the L1 acts as support rather than hindrance in L2 learning. These contextually informed and locally generated L2 writing techniques can be added to the toolkit of language strategies that teachers might employ to engage students in comparable situations.

6.3 Literary devices and authorial voice

In response to the research question and the L2 poetry pedagogy aspect of teaching literary devices, it was thought that this could promote authorial voice—and linguistically, at least, this was true. Novice L2 poets and basic English users, such as Hana, found scope for expression by utilizing poetic devices, i.e., personification in *Feelings of the Washing Machine*. It is possible that if Akane had taken these literary devices into stronger consideration, she would have had more agentic purpose in her writing. In Hyland's (2005, 2008) conception of authorial voice, the literary devices can provide some semblance of stance (voice); however, the second aspect, engagement, or audience awareness, is more elusive. As a social expression (Matsuda, 2001; Matsuda & Tardy, 2007; Tardy, 2012) voice is harder to pin down. It is thought that the publications in the pedagogy aided in the social aspect of authorial voice (audience awareness) as all three of the focus students responded positively to the publications.

6.4 Implications

The pedagogical implications in this study are relatively straightforward—by whatever means the teacher chooses—a pedagogy that supports authorial voice should lead to a stronger sense of agency in L2 writing students and in some cases can be extended to language learning in general, specifically identity formation, as is the case with Mai. Anecdotal evidence from this study reveals novice L2 users performing expert rhetorical, cultural, and compositional practices in their L2, e.g., the explicitly taught literary devices, such as simile, personification, and onomatopoeia as well as devices that were not explicitly taught such as allegory, and allusion. As the course instructor, in the future, this researcher hopes to utilize concept-based instruction (CBI) (Ferreira & Lantolf, 2008; Negueruela & Lantolf, 2006) for presenting the literary devices to learners. The L2 poets in this course seemed to latch onto poetic devices that can be easily rendered such as simile, personification, and repetition. Therefore, if learners are finding these techniques efficacious, then presenting these stratagems in a contextual manner that is conducive to learning and writing seems ideal. Negueruela and Lantolf's (2006) ideas of L2 learning and

teaching languages as a creative and transformative developmental process could be essential.

This study revealed the efficacy of translingual practices in an L2 creative pedagogy; however, most L2 teachers would raise questions regarding the practicality of such techniques in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) writing courses. A useful perspective on teaching translingual perspectives alongside EAP writing may be Ruecker and Shapiro's (2020) *critical pragmatism* approach. The concept of critical pragmatism serves as a "conceptual umbrella for approaches that pursue a "both/and" approach to standard written English—both teaching and problematizing the norms" (p. 129). By utilizing a "both/and" approach to teaching L2 writing a balance can be achieved—*both* pragmatic EAP *and* "problematizing the norms" i.e., incorporating L2 creative writing and translingual pedagogies in standard written English instruction. In effect, this balance covers both sides of the standard and peripheral pedagogies coin and views standard and novel approaches on a continuum rather than as dichotomous binaries. L2 poetry brings multilingual writing practices into focus for emerging independent L2 users and therefore by implication other freer writing practices such as language play should push learners toward multicompetence acquisition tendencies.

6.5 Future scope

As with all inquiries, this study has its obvious limitations and further scope is needed to explore conceptions of self-efficacy in relation to authorial voice and the overall effects on learner agency. Moreover, because of the limitations of a non-generalizable case-study such as this, the theories regarding a complex system of mutual causation need to be examined further in quantitative or mixed methods studies with larger sample sizes. Further analysis is also needed regarding the relationships between translingual orientations in L2 creative writing and multicompetence theories in second language acquisition, authorial voice, and learner agency (Widdowson, 1984). Finally, the community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) in the poetry workshops played a significant role in offering peer perspectives that effected the rendering of rhetorical features such as audience, context, purpose, and genre. Further conceptions of group dynamic assessment (Poehner, 2009) within the group's ZPD should be considered for further studies in L2 writing and L2 creative writing—this researcher plans to explore these lines of inquiry in future research.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to sincerely thank Professor Duane Kindt for his insightful formative comments. The author would also like to thank April Eve Day for her support throughout. Finally, the writer would like to thank Professor Matthew Apple and Professor Aaron Olaf Batty as well as the blind reviewers for their formative suggestions.

Notes

1. For this and the following reflective writing tasks, errors in the original were left uncorrected however italic emphasis was added by this researcher.
2. Literary devices taught in the course were: alliteration, assonance, hyperbole, imagery, metaphor, onomatopoeia, personification, repetition, rhyme, and simile. A brief lesson on stanza and line was also provided, specifically endstopping and enjambment were taught.

Appendices

Appendix A: Initial questionnaire (adapted from Ortmeier-Hooper, 2008)
In this class we have begun to use poetry workshops to practice English conversation and improve our writing. I would like to know how you feel about this. Please read the following questions, and circle or write your answer. Please answer completely and honestly.

Your Background

What is your name? What year are you in university? What is your major?

Have you ever written poetry in English before? If yes, when and where?

Have you ever written poetry in another language before? If yes, when and where?

About Reading and Writing (Likert Scale 1-5)

1. I enjoy reading in English.
2. I enjoy writing in English.
3. I am motivated to read in English.
4. I am motivated to write in English.
5. I have my own writing style in English.
6. I have my own writing style in Japanese
7. I make choices and decisions about my own learning—not teachers nor parents nor anyone else.

Other Questions:

1. What do you hope to achieve in this class?
2. What do you usually write in Japanese? (Please describe what you write—i.e., letters, email, articles, poetry, etc.)
3. What do you usually write in English? (Please describe).
4. Have you taken any writing courses in Japanese, or English before? (If yes, please describe the course)
5. What do you think is the most difficult part of composing a piece of writing in English?
6. Other comments, questions, or concerns?

Appendix B: Reflective writing tasks
MID-TERM

Reflect upon your shinhaiku and short poem writing. You may write your rough drafts an email and I will give you advice there. Please submit your final draft to me in the LMS. Here are some questions to help you get started:

1. How did you feel about the writing process?
2. How did you feel about the workshop process?
3. How have you developed confidence in writing? Style? Your own voice? Why or why not?
4. What are you really good at? What can you do better?

FINAL

Reflect upon your poetry writing over the entire semester (shinhaiku, short poems & long poems). Use your poems to help you write this reflection. You may write your rough drafts, email them to me and

I will give you advice, if you want. Please submit your final draft to me in the LMS. Here are some questions to help you get started:

1. After taking this class, how do you understand writing shinhaiku in English? What are you really good at? What can you do better? Use examples from your shinhaiku.
2. After taking this class, how do you understand using poetic devices in English writing? What are you really good at? What can you do better? Use examples from your short and long poems.
3. Do you feel you have developed a style as a poet in English? How? Why or why not? Use examples from your poems.

References

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (pp. 71-81). Academic Press.

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology 52*, 1-26.

Bandura, A. (2006a). Growing primacy of human agency in adaptation and change in the electronic era. *European Psychologist, 7*, 2-16.

Bandura, A. (2006b). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1*, 164-180.

Bandura, A. (2008). The reconstrual of "free will" from the agentic perspective of social cognitive theory. In J. Baer, J. C. Kaufman & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Are we free? Psychology and free will* (pp. 86-127). Oxford University Press.

Bandura, A. (2018). Toward a psychology of human agency: Pathways and reflections. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 13*(2), 130-136.

Bazerman, C. (1979, April). Written language communities. Paper presented at the Convention of College Composition and Communication (CCCC) 1979, Minneapolis, MN.

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

Canagarajah, S. (2011), Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*, 401-417.

Canagarajah, S (2018). Transnationalism and translingualism: How they are connected. In X. You (Ed), *Transnational writing education: Theory, history, and practice* (pp. 41-60). Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (2020). Addressing language statuses in the writing of multilingual students. In T. Silva & Z. Wang (Eds.), *Reconciling translingual writing and second language writing* (pp. 40-50). Routledge.

Duff, P. (2008). *Case study research in applied linguistics* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Ferreira, M. M., & Lantolf, J. P. (2008). A concept-based approach to teaching: Writing through genre analysis. In J. P. Lantolf & M. Poehner (Eds.), *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second languages* (pp. 285-320). Equinox Publishing.

Hanauer, D. (2010). *Poetry as research: Exploring second language poetry writing*. John Benjamins.

Hanauer, D. (2012). Meaningful literacy: Writing poetry in the language classroom. *Language Teaching, 45*(1), 105-115.

Hanauer, D. (2015). Measuring voice in poetry written by second language learners. *Written Communication, 32*(1), 66-86.

Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies 7,* 173-192.

Hyland, K. (2008). Disciplinary voices: Interactions in research writing. *English Text Construction, 1*, 5-22.

Kellman, S. G. (2019). Literary translingualism: What and why? *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices, (16)*3, 337-346.

Kubokawa, J. M. (2021a). An interview with Iain Maloney, author, editor, journalist, and teacher, on the state of literature and creative writing in EFL. *Journal of Literature in Language Teaching, 10*(1), 37-41.

Kubokawa, J. M. (2021b). Show don't tell: Developing a creative writing community in an EFL Context. *Language and Culture: Bulletin of the Institute for Language Education at Aichi University, 44*, 81-94.

Kubokawa, J. M. (2021c). Second language creative writing: Learner development in the shihaiku pedagogy. *Nagoya JALT Journal (2)*1, 71-96.

Kubokawa, J. M. (2022). Translingual onomatopoeia: Literary innovation from the language classroom. *PanSIG 2021 Journal*, 318-328.

Lantolf, J. P. (1994), Sociocultural theory and second language learning: Introduction to the special issue. *The Modern Language Journal 78*, 418-420.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.

Leonard, R. L. (2014). Multilingual writing as rhetorical attunement. *College English, 76*(3), 227-247.

Matsuda, P. K. (2001). Voice in Japanese written discourse: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *1*, 35-53.

Matsuda, P. K., & Tardy, C. (2007). Voice in academic writing: The rhetorical construction of author identity in blind manuscript review. *English for Specific Purposes*, *26*, 235-249.

Matsuda, P. K. (2013). It's the wild west out there: A new linguistic frontier in U.S. college composition. In S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms* (pp. 128-138). Taylor and Francis.

Maxim, H. (2006). Giving beginning adult language learners a voice: A case for poetry in the foreign language classroom. In J. Retallick & J. Spahr (Eds*.), Poetry and pedagogy: The challenge of the contemporary* (pp. 251-259). Palgrave Macmillan.

Negueruela, E., & Lantolf, J.P. (2006). Concept-based instruction and the acquisition of L2 Spanish. In R. Salaberry & B. Lafford (eds), *The art of teaching Spanish: Second language acquisition from research to praxis* (pp. 79-102). Georgetown University Press.

Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2008). "English may be my second language, but I'm not ESL." *College Composition and Communication, 59*(3), 389-419.

Poehner, M. E., (2009). Group dynamic assessment: Mediation for the L2 Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(3), 471-491.

Polio, C., & Friedman, D. (2016). *Understanding, evaluating, and conducting second language writing research* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Reeve, J., & Tseng, C. M. (2011). Agency as a fourth aspect of students' engagement during learning activities. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *36*, 257-267.

Rueker, T. & Shapiro, S. (2020). Critical pragmatism as a middle ground in discussions of linguistic diversity. In T. Silva & Z. Wang (Eds.), *Reconciling translingual writing and second language writing* (pp. 125-134). Routledge.

Silva, T., & Wang, Z. (Eds.). (2020). *Reconciling translingualism and second language writing* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Spiro, J. (2014). Learner and writer voices: Learners as writers and the search for authorial voice. In D. Disney (Ed.), *Exploring second language creative writing: Beyond Babel* (pp. 23-40). John Benjamins.

Sullivan, S. L. (2015) Student autonomy through creativity. *The Journal of Literature in Language Teaching 4*(1), 35-53.

Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications.* Cambridge University Press.

Tardy, C. (2012). Current conceptions of voice. In K. Hyland & C. Sancho-Guinda (Eds.), *Stance and voice in written academic genres* (pp. 34-50). Palgrave Macmillan.

Taylor, B. P. (1976). Teaching composition to low-level ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly, 10*(3), 309-319.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard University Press.

Widdowson, H. G. (1984). Reading and communication. In J. C. Alderson & A. H. Urquhart (Eds.), *Reading in a foreign language*, (pp. 213–230). Longman.

Xiao, J. (2014) Learner agency in language learning: The story of a distance learner of EFL in China. *Distance Education, 44*(4), 4-17.

Yamagiwa, J. K. (1959). *Japanese literature of the Shōwa period: A guide to Japanese reference and research materials.* University of Michigan Press.

Yang, S. (2020) Meaningful literacy and agentive writer identity. *MEXTESOL Journal 44*(4), 1-15.

You, X. (2016). *Cosmopolitan English and transliteracy*. Southern Illinois University Press.

You, X. (2018). Introduction: Making a transnational turn in writing education. In X. You (Ed), *Transnational writing education: Theory, history, and practice* (pp. 1-60). Routledge.

Yildiz, Y. (2011). *Beyond the mother tongue*: *The postmonolingual condition*. Fordham University Press.

Jared Michael Kubokawa was an assistant professor in the department of humanities and social sciences at Aichi University in Japan at the time of writing. He is currently a doctoral student in the Second Language Studies program at Michigan State University (MSU). He is a recipient of the MSU distinguished fellowship and has experience teaching English in both international and domestic contexts. His research interests include second language and multilingual writing, multilingual creativity, translingual pedagogies, learner and teacher identity, and corpus linguistics. More information can be found here: https://jaredkubokawa.wordpress.com.