

9-2015

THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: POIESIS AND THE EMERGENCE OF THE MULTILINGUAL SUBJECT

Courtney E. Scarborough

California State University - San Bernardino, cscarbo82@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Scarborough, Courtney E., "THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: POIESIS AND THE EMERGENCE OF THE MULTILINGUAL SUBJECT" (2015). *Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations*. Paper 229.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of Graduate Studies at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION:
POIESIS AND THE EMERGENCE OF THE MULTILINGUAL SUBJECT

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
English Composition:
Applied Linguistics and Teaching English as a Second Language and Literature

by
Courtney Elizabeth Scarborough
September 2015

THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION:
POIESIS AND THE EMERGENCE OF THE MULTILINGUAL SUBJECT

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Courtney Elizabeth Scarborough

September 2015

Approved by:

Caroline Vickers, Committee Chair, English

Jessica Lewis Luck, Committee Member, English

© 2015 Courtney Elizabeth Scarborough

ABSTRACT

This study explores relationships between second language acquisition (SLA), poetic language, and embodied cognition and its connection to second language speakers' linguistic self-formation, or their distinct ways of speaking and thinking. In particular, this study examines processes by which second language (L2) learners' subjective realities are constructed and demonstrates that these processes are inherently poetic, emerging from a combination of the constraining structures of the language system and second language speakers' phenomenological experiences. The context of the study is a poetry-making activity the researcher designed and took place in the English Department Writing Center at California State University, San Bernardino. Data was collected from a total of four participants through video and audio recordings of the poetry-making activities. Data analysis incorporated multimodal methods associated with conversation analysis and intertextuality. Findings demonstrate that poetic features the L2 participants deploy are crucial to their sense-making and linguistic self-formation. The author encourages readers to consider the importance of creativity and self-expression in second language learning as it occurs in social activity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Caroline Vickers, my advisor and chair, for sharing her knowledge of linguistics and second language acquisition, and for her generous feedback throughout the development of this project. Also to Jessica Luck, for deepening my interest in the relationships between science and poetry, and for helping me to clarify my ideas as they changed shape. Thanks to my parents Chuck and Becky Scarborough for their emotional support and encouragement. To my sister and brother-in-law Lindsey and Jesse Lyon for locating my files and emailing them to me while I was in Korea. Finally, I am forever grateful to John and Margaret Scarborough for their interest and affection throughout this process and for pushing me more than anyone else to write the best thesis I could.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	
Statement of Problem	1
Linguistics and Poetics.....	3
Epistemology and the Poetic Image.....	5
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
Introduction	7
Approaches to Embodiment in Literary Studies	8
Approaches to Embodiment in Second Language Acquisition.....	11
Intertextuality, Narrative Analysis, and Second Language Poetry	11
Cognition as Social Process	16
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	
Introduction	22
Research Context and Participants.....	22
Data Collection.....	23
Pre-writing Activity	24
Translations: Idea to Image	26
Data Analysis	27
Conversation Analysis	28
Intertextuality	31

Summing Up	33
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS	
Introduction	34
Part 1: Sound Patterning and Word Selection.....	35
Excerpt 1.....	36
Excerpt 2.....	37
Excerpt 3.....	37
Excerpt 4.....	38
Excerpt 5.....	39
Excerpt 6.....	39
Part 2: Word Searching and Story Structure	40
Excerpt 7.....	41
Excerpt 8.....	43
Excerpt 9.....	45
Excerpt 10.....	46
Excerpt 11.....	47
Part 3: Repetition and Intertextuality	48
Excerpt 12.....	49
Excerpt 13.....	50
Excerpt 14.....	51
Coda	52
APPENDIX A: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS.....	56
APPENDIX B: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL	58
APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT	60

APPENDIX D: VIDEO USE INFORMED CONSENT	62
APPENDIX E: DRAFTS OF SOL'S POEMS.....	64
APPENDIX F: DRAFTS OF SEUNG-JAE'S POEMS	67
REFERENCES.....	73

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Participants and Data Collection Schedule	23
--	----

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Statement of Problem

This thesis examines processes by which second language (L2) learners' subjective realities are constructed and argues that these processes are inherently poetic, emerging from a combination of the constraining structures of the language system and second language speakers' phenomenological experiences. In this, my study reflects a paradigm shift in our understanding of mind, language, epistemology, and learning in the humanities and social sciences. This shift stems from research in the cognitive sciences that supports the idea that cognition is embodied and develops through interaction with the social, cultural, and physical environment.¹ Traditional work in linguistics has studied language as an abstract social system, in which speakers are regarded as autonomous, agentic speaking selves; they "choose what to say, how to say it, and what it means" (Johnstone, 2000, p. 405). In this view cognition and the making of meaning reside in the speaker and are internal mental states.

Yet anthropologists, linguists, literary theorists, and even neuroscientists have observed that cognition and meaning making are processes bound within an individual's lived experience in the world (Atkinson, 2002, 2010; Barsalou,

¹ Valera, Thompson, & Rosch's (1991) use the term embodiment to emphasize two points: "first that cognition depends upon the kinds of experience that come from having a body with various sensorimotor capacities, and second, that these individual sensorimotor capacities are themselves embedded in a more encompassing biological, psychological and cultural context" (p. 172-173).

2008; Felski, 2008; Gibbs, 2006; Valera, Thompson, & Rosch, 1991, 2000; Watson-Gegeo, 2004). With this insight, many researchers in SLA (e.g., Atkinson, 2011; Hanauer, 2010; Kramsch, 2009) are developing alternative approaches to studying the complexities of language learning, ways that “look in richer detail at the lived experience of multiple language users (Kramsch, 2009, p. 2) and “place learners in situations where the L2 is necessary for social action” (Atkinson, 2011, p. 144).

Poetic language provides a particularly fertile site to examine subjective, embodied, sense-making processes of L2 learners. Because it hinges on a pre-linguistic awareness, poetry is often linked to perceptual phenomena, exploring the properties and limits of the materiality of language (for example, imagery, sound patterns and textures, and rhythm), which contribute to the sustained affect of the artwork. Marjorie Perloff (2009) notes that poetic language “is language made strange, made somehow extraordinary by the use of verbal and sound repetition, visual configuration, and syntactic deformation. Or again, it is language perhaps quite ordinary but placed in a new and unexpected context” (p. 7). Perloff evokes the artistic technique Russian formalists described as *ostranenie*, making it strange: “The technique of art is to make objects ‘unfamiliar,’ to make forms difficult to increase the difficulty and length of perception because the process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself and must be prolonged” (Shklovsky, 1917, p. 16).

The process of learning additional languages inherently involves this notion of de-familiarization. As Kramersch (2009) reminds us, “the experience of the foreign always implies a reconsideration of the familiar” (p. 5). Poetry and poetic practices, therefore, can provide a research site for examining and understanding phenomenological experiences of L2 learners while also embracing the process of SLA as a creative transformation.²

Linguistics and Poetics

Hymes (2000) uses the term *poetics* (from the classical Greek verb *poein*, “to make”) to refer to “shaping in any or all aspects of cultural life” (p. 191). In considering the “shaping of language,” he defines *poetry* as “relations within and among lines” (ibid). Hymes’ definition echoes Jakobson’s (1960) principle of “equivalence” in the poetic function of language: “the poetic function projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination” (p. 358). Additionally, in his work on grammatical parallelism, Jakobson (1966) notes “on every level of language the essence of poetic artifice consists of recurrent returns” (p. 399). Hymes (1981) characterizes this principle as “the matrix of the meaning and effect of the poem” (cited in Tannen, 2007, p. 48). Hymes and Jakobson, among other linguists, therefore turn their attention away from studying poems as “enduring objects” to studying how poetic processes emerge in everyday conversational interactions. Poetry, therefore, can be understood

² While phenomenology’s roots are in the works of Martin Heidegger and Edmund Husserl, I have limited my discussion of phenomenology to the views of Bachelard (1950/1987) and Felski (2008).

not so much as an “enduring object,” but rather a distinctive way of organizing language.

Using applied linguistics to study poetics is not new. Many linguists have demonstrated that poetic language is not simply a property of texts and aesthetic objects, but foregrounds features that are present in all language (Chafe, 1994; Bauman & Briggs, 1990; Friedrich, 1986; Hymes, 1981; Jakobson, 1960, 1966; Norrick, 2000/2001; Sacks, 1992; Sherzer, 1982; Tannen, 2007). In fact, much of linguistic and anthropological research in poetics is based on the observation that all language has form and that poetic patterning is a basic and essential resource in shaping linguistic structure and creating linguistic systems. Chafe (1994), for example, defines the way that conversation emerges in a spurt-like manner as an intonation unit. Intonation units tend to be about five words long and “verbalize the speaker’s focus of consciousness at that moment” (p. 63), suggesting an aspect of prosody usually associated with poetry. Each intonation unit usually begins with a brief pause and ends with a slight rise or fall in intonation, a prosodic contour. The conversational excerpt below is from Chafe (1994, p. 61) and illustrates how these units unfold in ordinary talk.

- a(A) ... (0.4) Have the..animals,
- b(A) ... (0.1) ever attacked anyone in a car?
- c(B) ... (1.2) Well I
- d(B) well I heard of an elephant,
- e(B) ...that sat down on a VW one time.

Epistemology and the Poetic Image

While many linguists have examined the correspondences between ordinary conversation and poetic language in various cultural contexts (Becker, 1995; Friedrich, 1986; Hymes, 1981; Tannen, 2007), little research exists on poetics in SLA scholarly spaces (for an exception see Hanauer, 2010). In order to see the link I make between SLA, poetry, and linguistic self-formation it is important to understand the idea of poetic imagery from the phenomenological standpoint of Gaston Bachelard.

Bachelard studied the subjectivity of consciousness expressed in poetic imagery. For Bachelard, creative thought comes into being through what he calls an epistemological break. This involves directing attention away from common sense thought (continuities within a system of knowledge) and toward events that interrupt the system, which in turn allows for novel ideas to emerge. According to Bachelard (1950/1987), the imagination, or poetic imagery, emerges through this process. Bachelard argued that poetry uses images that arise from the subjective consciousness that are not subject to the rules of rational thought (or a culture's epistemology). As such, in re-imagining, the poetic image brings forth new perspectives; it is an act of discovery; it is the "forerunner of perception" (p. 13). Bachelard considers the poetic image "referable to a direct ontology" (p. 71). It is "the poet," writes Bachelard, who "speaks on the threshold of being" (p. 72).

Bachelard's idea of the epistemological break intersects with cross-linguistic studies in linguistic anthropology, which have shown that speakers of

different languages rely on linguistic categories that may differ in structure and meaning (Gumperz & Levinson, 1996; Hanks, 1996; Levinson, Kita, Haun, & Rasch, 2002; Sapir, 1949; Whorf, 1956). People who have experienced foreign languages and poetry find that natural languages connect talking, thinking, imaging, and emotions.³ Translation equivalents are not always conceptual equivalents. My study attempts to trace the emergence and reception of the poetic image in the consciousness of L2 learners of English.

Through analyses of video-recorded interactions between second language learners and myself, I show how L2 learners' imaginative, perceptual, and linguistic processes are made available phenomenologically vis-à-vis a poetry-making activity. More specifically, I examine how poetic features that the participants deploy conjure subjective, embodied resonances that contribute to the speakers' process of self-discovery and linguistic self-formation. My study concludes with suggestions about directions for future poetry-in-SLA research and how the term poetry can be placed within a broader process of a bodily living-in-the-world that includes language and participatory engagement.

³ Friedrich (1986) argued, "persons with experience of foreign languages and poetry who feel most acutely that a natural language is a different way not only of talking but of thinking and imaging and of emotional life" (p. 16).

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In this chapter, I review approaches to embodiment and subjectivity in literary studies and SLA that reflect the current paradigm shift. These studies take a phenomenological approach to language, exploring how embodied experience shapes our understanding of ourselves and the world we live in.⁴ I begin by reviewing several approaches to embodiment in literary studies: Felski's (2008) neo-phenomenology, Turner's (1996, 2006) conceptual blending, and Tsur's (2008) cognitive poetics. Then, I look at two alternative approaches to embodiment in SLA. The first approach highlights the process of identity construction from the standpoint of Mikhail Bakhtin (1981, 1986)—its multiple, heterogeneous character and its implications for agency and opportunity in language learning. Within the identity approach I also include research by Hanauer (2002, 2010), who has considered the use of poetry within the SLA context. The second approach I look at in SLA connects social and cognitive theories of language to describe ways that cognition manifests phenomenologically in social activities.

⁴ Phenomenology involves studying phenomena as experienced from the first person perspective.

Approaches to Embodiment in Literary Studies

In recent years, critics and theorists in literary studies have begun to explore more of the affective and cognitive dimensions of aesthetic engagement (Felski, 2008; Turner, 1996, 2006; Tsur, 2008). Interest in the affective and cognitive dimensions of aesthetic engagement stems from a broader turn toward issues of reader response and a desire to build better bridges between theory and embodied experience. By pairing literary texts with research in the cognitive sciences, scholars in literary studies have found innovative ways of addressing issues of textual aesthetics, reader response, and subject formation while also providing insight into the ways cognitive processes are produced and experienced in social life (Felski, 2008; Richardson & Steen, 2002; Turner, 1996, 2006; Tsur, 2008).

Rita Felski's (2008) manifesto on the different "uses of literature" speaks to the phenomenological dimensions of reading literary texts. Her "neo-phenomenological" approach to reading engages with the "sheer thickness of subjectivity" by examining the intricacies of perception, interpretation, and affective orientations that constitute aesthetic response. Her aim is to experiment with ways of placing literary theory into a more productive dialogue with ordinary, everyday motives for reading. Drawing on everyday perceptions, or "distinct structures of thought or feeling," Felski analyzes different modes of textual engagement (the structures of recognition, enchantment, knowledge and shock) that involve "thick descriptions of experiential states" (p. 19). Thick descriptions

consist of tracing the evolution and development of an aesthetic response—what leads up to the response, the contextual and experiential understandings that render the response meaningful. These descriptions allow for a more expansive account of aesthetic experiences as they can capture the experiential density of what it feels like to become absorbed in a book. In sum, her research contributes to questions about the reading experience, as well as how literary texts/literary language help shape and structure selves.

Felski's neo-phenomenological approach connects to another strand of research in literary studies called cognitive literary studies. Critics in this field take Felski's approach to another level by applying theories from the science of embodied cognition to the interpretation of literary texts.⁵ Though research in this field varies widely in approach, what brings them together is their agreement that the science of embodied cognition opens up new venues for investigating the ways that literary texts reflect and enact cognitive processes.

Some of the approaches taken in this field (e.g., Freeman, 2002, 2005; Hiraga, 1999, 2006) have applied Lakoff and Johnson's (1980, 1999) theory of conceptual metaphor and Mark Turner's (1996) theory of conceptual blending. Conceptual metaphor refers to understanding one idea in terms of another and is a pervasive part of language.⁶ Conceptual metaphors are encoded in cultural models and image-schemas (gestalt-like structures) and emerge from embodied

⁵ See Richardson and Spolsky (2002) for an introduction to further approaches scholars in this field take to analyzing the relations between literature, cognition, and culture.

⁶ For example, the American conceptual metaphor, ARGUMENT IS WAR, is reflected in expressions like, "He *attacked* every weak point in my argument," "His criticisms were right on *target*," "I've never *won* an argument with him" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

experience. Conceptual blending is the combining of two different image-schemas to create a new conceptual metaphor. Scholars like Freeman (2002, 2005) and Hiraga (1999, 2006) apply these constructs to show how different literary texts are structured by underlying metaphorical schemas. Freeman (2002, 2005) applies these constructs to trace the different conceptual principles that underlie the poetics of Robert Frost, Emily Dickinson, and Sylvia Plath. By exploring the metaphorical schemas that underlie their poetics, Freeman reveals the different philosophical stances they adopt toward their historical environments. Hiraga's (1999, 2006) work applies Turner's models to analyze metaphorical blending in the haiku. By applying Turner's model, Hiraga explains how the rhetorical effects of the haiku function at both the local (textual) and global (cultural) levels.

A second approach to cognitive literary studies is Reuven Tsur's (2008) theory of cognitive poetics. Tsur's approach analyses cognitive processes involved in poetic form, and in turn how these processes elicit aesthetic responses in readers. For example, Tsur describes how verse line conventions such as iambic tetrameter, pentameter, and hexameter are divided by a caesura into two segments as a reflection of certain perceptual needs specific to the effects of poetry. Another example in Tsur's work is his study of the distinctions between poetic texts perceived as witty as opposed to texts that produce more emotive effects. Here, Tsur draws on work in Gestalt psychology to distinguish

different aspects of literary style, and how those aspects enable more rapid or delayed responses in the reader.

Approaches to Embodiment in Second Language Acquisition

Intertextuality, Narrative Analysis, and Second Language Poetry

Relationships between identity, agency, and embodiment have become an important focus within SLA (Pavlenko, 2001, 2007; Koven, 2002; Norton & McKinney, 2011; Vitanova, 2010). Taking insights from poststructuralist theories of language and subjectivity, Norton and McKinney (2011) note that identity research “highlights the multiple positions from which language learners can speak, and how sometimes marginalized learners can appropriate more desirable identities with respect to the target language community” (p. 73). Scholars like Pavlenko, Norton, and McKinney thus study the dynamics of identity construction by examining “how people experience second language learning and make sense of this experience” (Pavlenko, 2007, p. 164).

The construct of intertextuality and the ideas of Mikhail Bakhtin (1981, 1986) are central to investigating identity and embodiment in SLA.⁷ Tannen (2007) gives us a vision of the overarching concept of intertextuality when she refers to it as “notions of relationality, interconnectedness and interdependence in discourse” (p. 8). Bakhtin (1986) demonstrates how this interconnectedness works in his essay on speech genres:

⁷ While the idea of intertextuality is credited to the work of Bakhtin, the term itself was coined by Kristeva (1974, 1980) when she first introduced Bakhtin’s ideas to Western readers.

When we select words in the process of constructing an utterance, we by no means always take them from the system of language in their neutral, dictionary form. We usually take them from other utterances, and mainly from utterances that are kindred to ours in genre, that is, in theme, composition, or style. (p. 87)

Intertextuality thus points to the heteroglossic, or multi-voiced, nature of every utterance and every written word or text: “Any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another” (Kristeva, 1986, p. 37). All people, artists, and poets appropriate and rework words and ideas—including predispositions and value systems—from previous use. This idea presents a challenge to traditional notions of the individual authoring his or her own voice as an original, creative construct. Instead, the individual voice—which for Bakhtin is the embodiment of consciousness—is actualized by selectively assimilating the voices of others:

Language, for the individual consciousness, lies on the borderline between oneself and the other. The word in language is half someone else’s. It becomes ‘one’s own’ only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention. (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 293)

For Bakhtin, to exist means to engage in open-ended dialogue. Through dialogue, people are transformed by being fused with parts of the other’s discourse. To understand how individuals appropriate the voices of others and

use those voices for their own intention, language needs to be investigated as “situated utterances in which speakers, in dialogue with others, struggle to create meanings” (Norton & McKinney, 2011).

Narratives provide a particularly rich source of information for studying people’s sense-making and identity construction during second language learning. Moreover, from a research perspective narratives “are transformative as they shift the power relationship between researchers and participants, and between teachers and learners, making the object of the inquiry into the subject and granting the subject both agency and voice” (Pavlenko, 2007, p. 180). In applying the concept of intertextuality to narrative studies, Pavlenko notes that Bakhtin’s ideas offer “tools to explore the tension between participants’ beliefs about linguistic self-construction and the actual processes they engage in” (ibid, p. 170).

An example of how Bakhtin’s ideas work in practice is Vitanova’s (2010) study of Eastern European immigrants’ narratives and her analysis of the role that appropriation plays in their constructions of self. Drawing on Bakhtin’s concepts of answerability and emotionally-volitional tones, Vitanova shows how the participants act as agents in contexts and discourses alien to them.⁸ For instance, one Russian woman in her study, Vera, at first believed that the best way to learn English was by immersing herself in formal English grammar and

⁸ Vitanova (2004) writes that Bakhtin’s notion of answerability is akin to agency in that it “entails the necessity for selves to answer each other’s voices in a discursive event” (p. 263). An emotionally-volitional tone, or “complex of one’s desires, feelings, and ethical evaluation,” underlies any act of answerability and is what Koven and Bakhtin consider “the force of one’s act” (p. 264).

vocabulary. Over time, however, Vera discovered that learning the discourse of her newfound profession as a kitchen manager and later owner of a catering business allowed her to establish a more authentic voice so that she could communicate with her clients and colleagues.

Koven (2002) also uses narratives of personal experience to examine the relationship between language and identity from a Bakhtinian lens. In her research, she asks a French-Portuguese bilingual speaker to tell the same narrative story twice, once in French, and then again in Portuguese. Using Bakhtin's concept of double-voicing, Koven shows how the participant inhabits different roles when telling the same story in a different language.⁹ In the Portuguese telling, the speaker uses linguistic features that link the narrated event more to the current 'here-and-now' event of the speaking, thus taking on an authorial perspective. In the French version, the speaker uses linguistic features that suggest she has stepped back into the narrated event and is speaking more from the perspective of quoted characters.

Another method for exploring questions of identity, subjectivity and embodiment in SLA is Hanauer's (2003, 2010) unique work on second language poetry writing. In making his case for adding poetic discourse to SLA research, Hanauer (2003) states that poetry provides "multileveled access to the individual and thus promotes the experience, concept, and understanding of human

⁹ The term 'double-voiced' stems from Bakhtin's discussions of Dostoevsky's poetics (1981), in which he distinguishes between the voice of the author, the narrator, and the characters. The novelist's challenge is to manage the heteroglossia that results from the orchestration of these multiple positions so that the reader is able to see how reality appears to each character.

diversity” (p. 71). Hanauer (2010) pushes this idea forward in his conception of poetic identity as “the working out of the subject position that most closely suits the understanding of the writer at the moment of writing” (p. 74). The analysis of poetic identity is thus “the analysis of the participant’s perspective, their way of being in the world, the way they construct their own autobiographical histories, and self-understanding in their process of development” (ibid).

Hanauer (2010) explores the “working out” of poetic identity by analyzing three categories of information: context, content, and stylistic choice. Analysis of context includes micro-level influences (the L2 learner’s reason for writing, their understanding of the writing task, and the physical setting) and macro-level influences (the historical and ideological discursive setting within which the writer functions). Analysis of content consists of information within the poem that relates to the writer’s autobiographic self, “events, dispositions, presented memories, ideas, experiences, thoughts and feelings” (p. 63). Analysis of stylistic choices includes examination of the specific linguistic and literary choices the writer made. “Poetic identity is the decision concerning how to use linguistic and literary resources in order to focus and direct the reader’s attention to particular ways of experiencing the described events” (p. 64).

In addition to his focus on poetic identity, Hanauer’s (2010) work includes an investigation of the process of poetry writing in which he identifies four stages of the poetry writing process.¹⁰ Hanauer’s examination offers insight into the

¹⁰ I describe Hanauer’s four stages of poetry writing in Chapter 3.

process of constructing a poem (as opposed to analyzing the poem itself). My study attempts to take Hanauer's work a step further by using video and audio recordings to examine the L2 learner's poetry writing process as it emerges in practice.

Cognition as Social Process

Cognition's social, cultural and physical environments form the context for all processes of language acquisition and self-formation (Atkinson, 2002, 2010; Barsalou, 2008; Gibbs, 2006; Valera, Thompson, & Rosch, 1991, 2000; Watson-Gegeo, 2004). What this means is that the potential for neural development depends largely on the body's interaction with the external environment.¹¹ There is empirical evidence that supports this down to the neural level. Mirror neurons fire both when we perform an action and when we perceive the action being performed by others (Rizzolatti & Craighero, 2004). The discovery of mirror neurons and their function has led many researchers to rethink the mainstream view that cognition, perception, and action are separate and instead develop ways of understanding how cognitive processes shape and are shaped by embodied experience (Atkinson, Churchill, Nishino, & Okada, 2007, 2010; C. Goodwin, 2000, 2003; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Maynard, 2006; Mori & Hasegawa, 2009; Mori & Hayashi, 2006).

¹¹ Traditional SLA theories have had a cognitivist orientation, separating language from its use in the world by considering L2 development as a form of cognitive internalization (Boden, 2006; Larson-Freeman, 1991).

An approach to studying the interconnections between the mind, the body, and the environment is Atkinson's (2002, 2010) sociocognitive approach to SLA. Sociocognitive theory conceptualizes SLA as an adaptive process to environmental conditions and views learning as consequential to the adaptive process. This approach thus seeks to describe what goes into learning by studying the process of alignment, "the means by which human actors...flexibly depend on, integrate with, and construct...the ever-changing mind-body-world environment" (Atkinson Churchill, Nishino, & Okada, 2007, p. 171). Atkinson, et al (2007) demonstrate the process of alignment in their analysis of a Japanese teacher and her student engaging in an EFL tutoring session. Their study examines how different semiotic resources such as language, gaze, gesture, and affordances function as part of a larger activity system, "a socially developed, multi-person way of acting, thinking, and being in the world" (Atkinson, 2011, p. 151). Their findings describe a number of phenomena including latching, mirroring, repetition of words, intonation patterns, as well as the adaptation of similar bodily orientations between the tutor and learner. The manifestation of these actions function as a form of extended cognition by establishing a link between the learner's current and past experience with the particular grammatical focus in the tutoring session. Their results provide empirical evidence that such embodied actions are a kind of extended cognition and claim that "alignment is a necessary condition for SLA" (Atkinson, 2010, p. 157).

In another study examining the same EFL tutoring session discussed above, Churchill, Nishino, Okada, & Atkinson (2010) trace a gesture the tutor makes repeatedly across time as a way to show her student the relationship between two different grammatical constructions. Through her “symbiotic gesture,” the tutor demonstrates how learning is publically enabled and enacted through interactional routines, “prepatterned interaction sequences by which two or more interactants perform social action” (Atkinson, 2011, p. 158).

Mori and Hayashi (2006) also bring together the social and the cognitive in their study analyzing embodied phenomena that are brought to bear on the achievement of intersubjectivity between L1 and L2 speakers of Japanese. Using the analytical methods of conversation analysis (CA), Mori and Hayashi (2006) investigate verbal and non-verbal conduct involved in an “embodied completion,” a practice by which a gesture or other embodied action is used to complete a turn at talk.¹² They show how, by way of an embodied completion, the L1 speaker is able to avoid linguistic expressions which may not have been accessible for the L2 speaker. They claim that embodied completions are motivated by “recipient-design” considerations, or “the sensitivity and orientation to some specific features of the co-participants,” which in turn facilitate understanding (p. 199).

Another kind of embodied phenomena that has been investigated within SLA are word searches. In CA, word searches are examined as part of repair

¹² I discuss the theories and methods associated with conversation analysis (CA) more extensively in Chapter 3.

sequences and are a means by which interlocutors deal with problems of speaking, hearing, and understanding (Schegloff, Jefferson, Sacks, 1974). During a word search, a speaker ceases their talk in the midst of a turn and pauses to search for the next unit of speech. There are patterns that have been noted at different phases of a word search: speech perturbations (*uh...*), cut offs, sound stretches, gesture movements, gaze shifts, and a distinct “thinking face” (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986). The end of a word search is often indicated by an acceptance of the sought-for word. An important finding in word search research is the preference for a self-over-other outcome unless the original searcher invites the other’s co-participation. (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986). From a CA perspective, searching for a word “is not simply a cognitive process which occurs inside a speaker’s head” (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986, p. 52). Rather, it is a social activity co-constructed between interlocutors in face-to-face interactions.

In SLA contexts, word searches have been studied with regards to how L2 speakers overcome language barriers while interacting with L1 and/or other L2 speakers (Brouwer, 2003; Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Mori & Hasegawa, 2009). In their analysis of different ways L2 students of Japanese organize word searches during pair work, Mori and Hasegawa (2009) demonstrate how the L2 learners display a variety of semiotic resources (verbal and non-verbal conduct, and objects like textbooks and notebooks) to reveal how they “conduct indigenous assessment of each other’s level of knowledge” (p. 65). Through such assessments, the speakers establish a shared understanding of each other’s

knowledge and are able to carry out the task at hand (constructing sentences using a particular grammatical structure).

Brouwer (2003) also analyses word searches between L1 and L2 speakers of Danish. He demonstrates how the design and organization of a word search (whether the self-initiated repair projects self or other outcome) can help identify what types of interactional moments constitute opportunities for vocabulary learning. Brouwer argues that word searches can be considered language learning opportunities when “(a) the other participant is invited to participate in the search, and (b) the interactants demonstrate an orientation to language expertise, with one participant being a novice and the other being an expert” (p. 542).

To conclude this exploration of how embodiment has been approached in literary studies and SLA, I would emphasize that the thread running through all these varied uses is a focus on the fundamental relationship between embodied experience and how we make meaning in language. Much of the work in Felski’s neo-phenomenology and cognitive literary studies uses the concept of embodiment to address questions of aesthetic response and the underlying cognitive processes that shape these responses. SLA scholars apply embodiment to understand the dynamics of identity construction, and how both cognitive and social processes function integrally in how L2 learners make meaning. In contributing to the role of embodiment in language, my own study,

like that of Hanauer's, situates L2 learning within a poetic context as a way to research and understand L2 embodied experience as a creative transformation.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In this chapter I describe the context for my research, including the participants involved in my project and the procedures I used for analyzing the data. I begin by describing the recruiting process along with a description of the four L2 learners of English who participated in my study. Then I describe the data collection process and the poetry-making activity I designed. I use the term “poetry-making activity” as it refers to not simply the act of writing, but the social context and interactions within which the writing was shaped and influenced by. I also include a summary of Hanauer’s (2010) model of the poetry writing process, which I used as a general guide when developing the poetry-making activity. Finally, I describe the research methods and analytic principles I used to analyze the data: 1) conversation analysis, including video analyses of talk-in-interaction, and 2) research methods associated with intertextuality.

Research Context and Participants

I conducted and video-recorded a total of five poetry-making activities between four different L2 speakers of English and myself (an L1 speaker of English) at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) between May 16, 2011 and May 26, 2011. To recruit participants, I presented my research project to international students at CSUSB’s American Language and Culture

Program. During the presentation I explained that it was not necessary for volunteers to have prior experience writing poetry in any language. However, I did stress that I was looking for volunteers who were interested in experimenting with new ways of expressing themselves in a second language. Any students who were interested in participating in the project were given a recruitment card and asked to write down their contact information and availability, which I collected at the end of the presentation. I then contacted students individually via email to make arrangements to meet. Four students followed through. Table 1 provides details about the participants, including their pseudonym, their place of origin, and the date(s) and duration(s) of each session.

Table 1. Participants and Data Collection Schedule

Pseudonym	Place of Origin	Session Date	Duration of Session
Ji-woo	South Korea	May 16, 2011	50 minutes
Chae-won	South Korea	May 16, 2011	1 hour, 4 minutes
Sol	South Korea	May 20, 2011	1 hour, 39 minutes
Seung-jae	Born in U.S., at age 6 moved to South Korea	May 24, 2011 May 26, 2011	1 hour, 53 minutes 1 hour, 25 minutes

Data Collection

Meetings with the four participants were conducted individually and took place in the English Department Writing Center at CSUSB. Every session I conducted was audio- and video- recorded. To video record I used a hand-sized

digital camera that could be conveniently placed at the front of the table facing the participant and myself without being intrusive. Before the recording started I reviewed the consent forms with the participants. Once the recording started, I asked the participant questions concerning his/her demographics, history of learning English, and experiences living abroad. Additionally, I asked them to explain what poetry is to them. I wanted to get a sense of their subjective understandings of poetry before introducing its purpose for my project. In hindsight, gaining access to their perspectives was interesting in terms of how they approached writing poetry, as their perceptions seemed to influence how they approached much of the task of writing their own poetry.

Following Hanauer (2010), my approach to second language poetry writing was based on the idea of “combining data collection with a process of self-discovery” (p. 83). In order to ensure that the data collection would foster self-realization, I created a writing activity that allowed them to engage in “extended, reflective, deliberative consideration of autobiographical information” (p. 83).

For the participants to gain an understanding of what poetry does, and in turn experience making it for themselves, they needed to learn particular language techniques that exemplified poetic discourse. I led them in the following pre-writing activity:

Pre-writing Activity

First part: a general definition of images in poetry. When speaking of images in poetry, we generally mean *a word or sequence of words that calls up a physical*

sensation (it appeals to us at the level of any our five senses). For example, this sense can be a sight (a beautiful face), sound (the showers beat), a touch (rough or smooth). It can also be a smell or a taste or even a bodily sensation (such as pain, the prickling of gooseflesh, the quenching of thirst).

Second part: an example of poetic imagery. Buson haiku is shown and read aloud. Participants are then asked to respond to the haiku by identifying images/sense impressions that resonate to them.

The piercing chill I feel:
my dead wife's comb, in our bedroom,
under my heel...

Third part: show alternate version of Buson haiku. Participants are asked to describe differences they see between Buson's haiku and the alternate version.

I am very sad
My kind wife died recently
I really miss her¹³

By allowing the participants to see the poem across two forms of discourse, they could grasp how different kinds of words are used to express a certain experience (the former uses literal, concrete words that create the experience for the reader, while the later explains the experience using abstractions). So, following Addonizio and Laux (1997), I encouraged the participants to see poetic images as “the rendering of your bodily experience in the world...[and] by recording images in as much vivid detail as you can, the more likely it is that your poetry will *become* an experience for the reader, rather than simply talk *about* an experience” (p. 91).

For the poetry writing activity, I followed Hanauer's (2010) model of the process of writing poetry to develop an exercise that would facilitate a way of

¹³ I am grateful to Jessica Lewis Luck for these examples of poetic imagery.

doing poetry that participants could apprentice themselves to. Hanauer's model is comprised of four stages: 1) ACTIVATION, whereby "an experiential and/or associative process triggers the writing process," 2) DISCOVERY, in which "the writer finds new underlying meanings and gives new directions to the emerging poem, its subject and communicative and emotional insight," 3) PERMUTATION, in which "the poem develops through a series of rewritings," and 4) FINALIZATION, whereby "the poet produces the last version of the poem" (p. 19). I used the following poetry writing activity from Behn and Twichell's (1992) compilation of poetry writing exercises to trigger the writing process:

Translations: Idea to Image

1. I'd like you to shut your eyes and I'll say a word. Open your eyes and write down what you "saw." This is the mind's "translation" of an idea, and abstract concept into a mental picture,¹⁴ an image. For example:

LOVE hearts, a loved one's face

DEATH coffin, grave, tombstone

Please write down your images. Be honest about what you see. Don't worry if you see a Brussels sprout when I say 'self'—your mind is telling you something. It's making a connection, which may not be noticeable to you. There is no such thing as a non sequitur (a statement which does not seem to be connected in a reasonable or sensible way with what was said before) the mind always has logic; it might not be obvious logic, but the mind has its reasons for connecting two seemingly unlike notions.

2. Let's track this process a little bit. For example, a girl responded to the word *happiness* by writing, 'I feel like a big orange sun is coming up inside my body, heating up my toes, my shins, ascending through my body, blazing out of my head like a sunflower and rising into the sky, becoming a second sun, pulling the real sun into it like a black hole.' (pp. 8-10)

Due to the experimental nature of this project, I had no way of knowing ahead of time how each session would play out. My objective for using the above exercise was to help activate and articulate “the imagined image” (Bachelard 1987, p. 13) as well as memories, thoughts, feelings, and the writing process itself. From this point in the session, participants engaged in writing a poem.

Data Analysis

The process of analysis began when I started transcribing the data (a total of 411 minutes of recorded sessions). I began with the audio transcription. Once the audio transcription was complete, I added video transcription. The methods and conventions used for transcribing the data were influenced by conversation analysis (Goodwin, 2000; 2003; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Sacks, 1992) and Du Bois’ (2006) transcription symbols.¹⁵

While transcribing the data, I did my best to engage in “unmotivated looking,” a conversation analytic exercise where “in the course of analysis, new interactional phenomena may be spotted” (Kasper & Wagner, 2011, p. 124). In other words, when I started transcribing I did not know specifically what I was looking for. As I transcribed, however, I began to notice patterns in participants’ streams of speech and in their nonverbal conduct. Identifying these patterns was to a certain extent a recursive process in that I didn’t necessarily spot them the first time I transcribed them onto the page. Often I would identify a pattern after

¹⁵ See Appendix for transcription conventions.

reading other research on different aspects of language and interaction, and then recall something similar in my own data. After identifying the patterns I decided to use for my findings, I added more detail to the transcription that was important to the analysis at hand.

Although 4 participants participated in the study, in my findings I focus on 2 (Sol and Seung-jae). There are several reasons for this. First, when I began collecting data, my research agenda was quite open-ended (for example, I was not sure if I would be looking for patterns across participants or within individual sessions). As I researched further and during the transcription process, I decided that my study's focus on self-expression and the individual voice in language would be best suited for a more in-depth analysis of individual speakers as opposed to identifying patterns across sessions. Also, the frameworks that I applied to analyze the data (conversation analysis and intertextuality) take a phenomenological stance to research by focusing on ways particular individuals use language and on language as it emerges in specific contexts.¹⁶

Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis provides a framework for describing how people make sense (or create structure) in the process of interacting. By analyzing small

¹⁶ This focus on the individual is reflected in conversation analysis' emic (participant perspective) approach to research and its dynamic view of context (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990). For conversation analysts, context is "dynamic" in that it is shaped by participants as they engage in interaction. It is a construct that "links processes of interpretation to action within a reflexive, time-bound process" (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, p. 287). In other words, context and the circumstances that inform an event are shaped just as much by the outside circumstances as by what participants do within the interaction itself and how participants interpret what is happening in the moment.

bits of talk in great detail, conversation analysts have identified a number of features that are central to sense-making in ordinary conversation. A fundamental principle in CA research is that meaning in conversation is a joint production, an interactional achievement that involves active participation by both speakers and listeners. Additionally, in CA talk-in-interaction is considered a form of socially shared cognition. It is “the dynamic interface between individual and social cognition... [and] culture and social reproduction” (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, p. 184). This idea of cognition as a distributed process that occurs in social interaction echoes Bakhtin’s vision of human consciousness as inextricably bound to others.

CA researchers have demonstrated how conversation is organized sequentially through turn-taking. The adjacency pair sequence is the basic unit of turn-taking organization. An adjacency pair consists of a sequence of turns that go together (such as a greeting or a question) in which the second pair part has meaning only in relation to the first. Within the adjacency pair organization “action and interpretation are inextricably intertwined. Each participant must analyze the developing course of others’ actions in order to produce appropriate reciprocal action” (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, p. 288).

Another important conversational feature CA describes that is particularly relevant to SLA literature is repair (Kasper & Wagner, 2011). Repair refers to ways that speakers deal with problems of speaking, hearing, and understanding in conversational interactions. Repairs are marked by any number of verbal and

nonverbal features such as delayed turns, speech perturbations, as well as shifts in posture and gaze). In SLA literature (and in CA literature more generally), repair tends to be viewed not as a breach in the social order (by exhibiting what the other participant cannot make sense of), but as a resource for sense-making (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986; Kasper and Wagner, 2011). This view is based on the observation that the participant who initiates a repair prefers to correct it on their own (a self-repair) unless they invite the other's co-participation (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977).

Within the framework of conversation analysis, Harvey Sacks (1992) has shown that, along with interactional procedures like turn-taking and repair, people who engage in spontaneous conversation repeat sounds and words in systematic ways. In his lectures discussing ways people use language, Sacks (1992) observes numerous instances of spontaneous talk in which words appear to be selected by reference to sounds and associations. For instance, in one case that Sacks presents, a speaker says (in a conversation about Christmas presents and problems in the family), "Oh, God! Christmas has gotten so damn painful...no one likes what they're getting." A few moments later, the same speaker says, "all the stores...make such a big killing over Christmas...and Christmas is becoming commercialized" (p. 306). In considering why the speaker chose "has gotten" in the first instance and "is becoming" in the second, Sacks notes that "gotten" appears in the local environment of repeated /g/ sounds (in "God" and "getting"), whereas "becoming" forms a sound relationship with "big

killing” and “commercialized.” Sacks’ data suggests that, like the use of recurrent patterns of sound in poetry (alliteration, assonance, rhyme),¹⁷ speakers, to a certain degree, render meaning by repeating sounds in language.

In addition to analyzing the intricacies of verbal conduct, CA research (and CA-inspired research like sociocognitive approaches to SLA) frequently documents nonverbal conduct like gaze, gesture, and posture shifts when studying embodied cognition (Goodwin, 2000, 2003, 2007; Goodwin and Goodwin, 1986; Mori and Hasegawa, 2009). CA emphasizes the integration of both verbal and nonverbal conduct because “none of these systems in isolation would be sufficient to construct the actions that the participants are pursuing” (Goodwin, 2003, p. 36).

Intertextuality

Along with CA, another framework I used to analyze my data is connected to the topic of intertextuality, or how speakers make meaning by repeating and recontextualizing words and phrases in discourse. For the data that I analyzed under this rubric, I drew on research in SLA that employs Bakhtin’s theories for analyzing narrative, and on Tannen’s (2007) research on repetition in dialogue.

In her review of using autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics, Pavlenko (2007) situates Bakhtin’s analytical framework in relation to SLA research concerned with “text reality.” Studies that focus on text reality

¹⁷ Preminger & Brogan (1993) note in their article on sound in poetry that the compilation of sound patterns in poetics and in language in general is “probably closer to consciousness ” and is “less submerged in our response to denotation, when the pattern identified was not expected” (p. 1181).

examine “how bilinguals construct selves in their respective languages or in a second language...and how language learning experiences are reflected in L2 users’ positioning and narrative plots” (p. 170). To understand how L2 learners author themselves in narratives, research focusing on text reality describes “how linguistic features and narrative structures are deployed to perform specific interactional and narrative functions” (ibid). Using Bakhtin’s principles of answerability, emotional-volitional tone, and double-voicing has allowed researchers like Vitanova (2010) and Koven (2003) to identify linguistic features L2 speakers use within and across different contexts. By identifying these features, they demonstrate the creative interplay of different voices, social and cultural influences in L2 learners’ constructions of self.

Tannen (2007) also applies Bakhtin’s theory of dialogism in her research on repetition and the poetics of ordinary conversation. In examining instances of dialogue in conversational stories, she shows that repeating words fundamentally changes their meaning because, as a word is repeated, it is always recontextualized. Particularly relevant to my analysis is her work on reported speech, or how people communicate another’s words at a later time. Tannen demonstrates that reported speech is not reported but constructed; it is “primarily the creation of the speaker rather than the party quoted” (p. 103). Tannen cites Bakhtin’s (1981) dynamic conception of context as the inspiration for her argument:

The speech of another, once enclosed in a context, is—no matter how accurately transmitted—always subject to certain semantic changes. The context embracing another’s word is responsible for its dialogizing background, whose influence can be very great. Given the appropriate methods for framing, one may bring about fundamental changes even in another’s utterance accurately quoted. (cited in Tannen, 2007, p. 104)

Summing Up

The process of this study, from its inception to analyzing the data, has been very open ended. Embodiment, under its many guises, relates to the interconnections between the brain, the body, and the environment, and how meaning-making happens as a consequence of the interactions between all three. Bringing poetry and second language learning together under this rubric and finding an analytical focus has been a recursive process. It has involved approaching my data from several different perspectives, rethinking my research questions, and even changing my conception of what embodiment is and how poetry, second language learning, and linguistic self-formation might be implicated within it. Upon entering the transcription process, I realized quickly that I needed to put whatever conceptions I had entering the project aside and remain open to what the data was showing me. In Chapter 4, I describe in detail the participants’ processes from three different poetic dimensions.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter is divided into three sections. Each section analyzes a different embodied dimension of L2 discourse within the poetry-making activity and demonstrates that such processes reveal the aesthetic nature of embodied experience L2 learning. The data in Part 1 and Part 2 are comprised of conversational excerpts from a 90-minute video-recorded poetry-writing session involving Sol (a 19-year old international student from South Korea) and myself. Building on Sacks' (1992) research on the poetry of ordinary conversation, Part 1 concentrates on Sol's sound selection at the level of phonemes and morphemes, as well as how the poetic function (in Jakobson's sense of the word), is generated in dyadic conversation. Drawing on Hanauer's (2010) model of the poetry writing process, as well as research in conversation analysis and conversational narrative, Part 2 traces Sol's embodied, sense-making processes (verbal and nonverbal conduct) throughout the development of her poem.

The data in Part 3 are comprised of conversational excerpts from a poetry-writing session that spanned the course of 2 days (totaling 195 minutes of video-recorded interactions) and involve Seung-jae (a 28-year old international student from South Korea and heritage learner/L2 speaker of English) and myself. Applying theories of intertextuality, Part 2 examines how Seung-jae constructs

himself across different conversational contexts (the interview protocol, a draft of his poem, and the poetry writing process itself) and how Seung-jae's construction of self (or "dialogic voicing" in Bakhtin's sense) relates to the context in which it is uttered.

Part 1: Sound Patterning and Word Selection

This section examines several instances of Sol's discourse, paying particular attention to her coordination of sound patterns and the level of phonemes and morphemes. Building on conversation analytic work concerned with the sequential organization of talk, I connect Sol's process of word selection as it relates to *sound-sequencing*, whereby "the sound of some word [is] used to find words later which [have] similarities in sound to it" (Sacks, 1992, p. 305).

Over the course of transcribing Sol's session, it became apparent that Sol's talk was rich with sound patterns. That is, Sol's utterances seemed to be influenced by sound-selection, whereby sounds are transformed into other words. As discussed by Sacks (1992), sound-sequencing appears to be a likely poetic process from which words come to be selected over the course of an utterance.

In my findings, the first example of Sol's sound-selection occurs approximately 20 minutes into our recorded session, right after Sol finished writing down what she "saw" upon hearing the abstract word "shock." When I inquire about what she came up with, Sol responds:

Excerpt 1

01 S: I said the person's **frightened face first**,
02 cause...when- uh
03 when we **face shock**
04 it is...almost come **from**
05 another people's saying,
06 or some other news,
07 S: [so I thought the **conversational circ-f situation**.
08 C: [mhm [yeah
09 yeah yeah
10 um...so seeing somebody ELSE'S[frightened face,=
11 S: [yeah =yeah
12 C: so when you think of shock
13 you think of seeing somebody ELSE who's shocked.
14 S: yEAh.
15 C: Mmm.
16 And then does that make you shocked,
17 S: Yeah.
18 C: Can you think of a time when you uh-
19 do you have a memory where you experienced
20 umm...seeing this
21 S: uhm...because I::like to seeing
22 the horror movies so=
23 C: =really?
24 S: Yeah so
25 I rEAlly enjoy them so
26 I- uh:: I watch them and
27 **the fear-**
28 **the fear-**
29 **the frightened person's face**,
30 uh...when they **meet** the
31 ...**murda- murdaler**

With regard to the issue of word selections by reference to sound patterns, I found a number of phenomena of interest. Perhaps most apparent is the repetition of the /f/ sounds in *frightened face first* (line 1). Why does Sol select these words in this order? (For instance, she could have just as well said, "First I said the frightened person's face"). One way to investigate whether sound is

relevant to Sol's selection is to consider some of the differences and similarities between the production of *frightened face first* in line 1 with *frightened person's face* in line 29. Here, we can see that the word selections in both lines appear to be taken up through repetition of the initial /f/ sounds. Similarly, in lines 30–31, a new sequence of sound is taken up through repetition of the initial /m/ in *meet the murda- murdaler*.

In the next excerpt, Sol is telling me her understanding of the word *recognize*:

Excerpt 2

01 S: umm..I think it is...hmm...uh-
02 **considering something**...uh-
03 in familiar **circumstance**.

I identified several notable sound relationships between *considering*, *something*, and *circumstance*. First, the recurring vowel sound /ʌ/ in considering, something, circumstance, then the /ing/ in considering and something, and also the patterned variation of /k ʌ/ and /s/ in considering and circumstance.

The next fragment of sound flurries occurs when Sol is recollecting a time she experienced recognition:

Excerpt 3

01 S: when uh-
02 when I **heard** my-
03 when I **heard** from a friend
04 **that** I **have** a **bad** **habit**,
05 before I **heard** from **her**
06 C: Uh huh
07 S: I didn't know
08 that I **act** like **that**.

09 But yeah,
10 ...after I heard
11 I tried to...fix it.

Here we can see a sound relationship forming with the repeated /h/ sounds in heard, have, habit, and her, as well as a recurrence of the short vowel sound /æ/ in that, have, bad, habit, act, and after.

About twenty minutes after producing *circumstance* in Excerpt 2, Sol selects the word again at a later time. As in Excerpt 2, the word's selection appears to be influenced by sounds generated from prior words. After Sol tells me more specifically the nature of her bad habit (eating too slow when having a meal with friends), I ask her if she has tried to break the habit by eating faster.

She responds:

Excerpt 4

01 S: No. ((laughing))
02 And it- uh...
03 Now I enjoy the meal.
04 C: Uhuh
05 S: When I have a meal alone
06 and with friends,
07 C: Yeah
08 S: I am accustomed- customed to
09 the circumstance.

Excerpt 5 focuses on Sol's variation of /k/-/a/ sounds. Prior to the start of the excerpt, I suggested to Sol that using dialogue might be a way to more vividly capture the immediacy of the moment she is attempting to recreate. When I suggest this strategy again, and Sol replies:

Excerpt 5

01 S: I want to use the picture
02 or image
03 or something else
04 ...some imagery.
05 But I **cannot describe** that **because** I-
06 it is some **conversation**
07 and dialogue. I-
08 it is not the **action**,
09 C: Mhm
10 S: So I do not know how to
11 ...**describe** this **situation** with
12 ah some...some **concrete** word.

Excerpt 6 also provides supportive evidence that Sol does, to a certain extent, build her utterances through a process of sound selection. In the extract below, Sol's recycling of the sounds /v/, /əʊ/, and /b/ in lines 3–6 demonstrate her dependence on phonological features, and reveals how she builds new words out of prior sounds. Additionally, my repetition in lines 7–9 seem to serve as a form of comprehension, while also results in the identification of the part of speech Sol is searching for.

Excerpt 6

01 S: I- I forgot-
02 I forget now the
03 **objective**
04 **adverb**
05 **verb**
06 and the- and the-
07 C: object
08 **adverb**
09 **verb**
10 ah- noun?
11 S: Yeah noun.
12 I want to use noun.

In calling attention to how Sol builds new words from repeated sounds, we also see a sense of what Jakobson calls “grammatical parallelism,” or recurrent returns. Together, these examples reveal a sense of Sol’s voice that we do not get in her written poem; Sol’s alternating bursts of speech create a particular rhythm that is absent in the written poem and capture how language learning, in some sense, occurs poetically through sound patterning and “recurrent returns” (Jakobson, 1960).

Part 2: Word Searching and Story Structure

Another prevalent finding I observed in Sol’s session relates to conduct described in word search activities. Within this activity, the emergence and repetition of this embodied conduct can be seen as a resource that L2 speakers draw on for sense-making.

The excerpts below began approximately 25 minutes into the recorded session and occur during different stages in the poetry-writing process. The first two excerpts happen during the activation stage of the poetry writing process. Hanauer (2010, p. 19) describes this stage as “an experimental and/or associative process that triggers the writing process.” Such triggers might be real world events, sensory images and sounds, and intertextual influences, to name a few. Together, Excerpts 1-2 constitute approximately one minute of interaction during which Sol is describing her image-directed observations of the abstract word, *recognize*, and illustrate how Sol’s language and bodily conduct

complement each other and contribute to her emergent conceptualization of *recognition*.

The word search activity occurred during the first half hour of the meeting, directly after Sol had written down her mental images in response to the abstract word *recognize*. As researcher and facilitator of the activity, I encouraged Sol to expand on the image-directed observations she depicts upon hearing the word. Here, I investigate a range of Sol's embodied conduct during the word searching to explore how her conduct is crucial to how she forms her understanding.

Excerpt 7

01 C: what does that moment
02 when somebody recognizes something
03 S: yeah,
04 C: what does that moment feel like?
05 S: um:: I think it is (1.0)
06 mm::
07 uh::
08 considering something,
09 (1.0) uh: in familiar
10 (.5) circumstance
11 C: Mhm,=
12 S: =Yeah.

As I finish the utterance, *what does that moment feel like*, Sol, fidgeting with her earring, diverts her gaze from me and stares into midair (lines 1-5). Consistent with what Goodwin & Goodwin (1986, p. 63) describe as a “solitary search,” Sol’s gaze aversion indicates that she is focusing on how to articulate what is on her mind and is not looking for any response from me. While staring into midair, Sol produces, *um: I think it is*, followed by a 1-second pause in line 9.

Here, in addition to her gaze aversion, Sol's solitary search is marked by a non-lexical speech perturbation, sound stretches, and pauses.

Next, Sol shifts her bodily orientation to a "thinking posture" (line 5).¹⁸ She removes her hand from her earring and places it under her chin while moving her gaze slightly upward. Holding this posture, Sol initiates a new unit of talk, accompanied by speech perturbations and sound stretches (*mm: uh considering something, uh: in familiar...*). Then, while producing *circumstance*, Sol drops her thinking posture and shifts her gaze to me (line 10). In response to Sol's signal, I return her gaze with an acknowledgement token (*mhm*), indicating my understanding of Sol's verbal description (the token also serves to encourage Sol to continue her explanation). Latching onto my response, Sol nods affirmatively while producing the token, *yeah*, and then returns her gaze out into midair.

Taking into account the orientation between the speaker and hearer is important for understanding Sol's emergent organization of her conduct (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, p. 291). The language and bodily conduct that Sol and I frame together (through mutual monitoring) help organize her perception of the situation she is navigating through. As hearer, my sustained gaze at Sol displays a heightened attention, and establishes relevance toward the unfolding course of Sol's actions. In line 11, I join in the talk at the exact moment when I am invited to; not until Sol returns her gaze to me, displaying her readiness to

¹⁸ Goodwin & Goodwin (1986) note that speakers systematically withdraw gaze from recipients when they begin to be involved in a word search, and simultaneously produce a characteristic "thinking face," which visibly suggests that the speaker has no immediate explanation and is still formulating a response.

receive a response, do I display her acknowledgement. Simultaneously, Sol exercises her authority by not only accepting her search in line 12 (*Yeah*), but by elaborating on it further in lines Excerpt 8.

Excerpt 8

13 Before we recognize something,
14 we do not-
15 ..we cannot be aware that
16 but-
17 but after recognition,
18 we think-
19 we start to think about

Re-directing her gaze to midair, Sol now re-orientes her engagement, entering an additional word search to expand her previous explanation (line 13). Here, another kind of bodily conduct, gesture, emerges as an integral part of Sol's actions. In line 13, Sol begins, *before we recognize something*. At the precise moment Sol produces the word, *recognize*, she brings her right hand—with fingers drawn together in a bunch—upward to desk-level in a tight, circular motion, peaking just above the desk, and then lowers it. McNeill (1992) describes how simple rhythmic hand movements (typically a sharp up-and-down movement of the hand) can function at a metapragmatic level. He notes that “the semiotic value of a beat lies in the fact that it indexes the word or phrase it accompanies as being significant, not for its own semantic content, but for its discourse-pragmatic content” (p. 15). Additionally, from an SLA perspective, Gullberg (1998) suggests that beats are “closely related to the interactive phenomena essential to managing L2 discourse, signaling the ongoing process of

communicative effort” (p. 152). Consequently, Sol’s new piece of talk in line 13 becomes intensified by her simultaneous production of gesture with talk, and in turn displays an ongoing progression toward a heightened involvement in the emerging activity (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1992. p. 168).

Expanding her proposition in lines 14-15, Sol initiates a self-repair, changing the auxiliary verb *do* to a modal, *can*. As she projects the repair, *we cannot be*, she lifts her right hand (still loosely clenched) to desk-level. Then, in precise timing with *aware* she creates a pointing gesture by extending her hand—with fingers spreading—outward toward the surrounding space in front of her body. More specifically, Sol’s gesture points toward space that is visible both to her and me.

The word search activity comes to a close in line 19. Sol says, with lowering intonation, *we start to think about*, while turning her gaze toward me, which shows that she has completed her thought. In describing Sol’s word searching in Excerpts 7-8, we see that Sol’s conceptualization of *recognition* involves doing several things at once. She is making sounds, using gesture, gaze, and interacting with me. It is through the combination of these structures, their emergent organization and synchronization, that work to build her understanding.

Another poetic feature that emerges in Sol’s process of making meaning connects to structures found in conversational narrative. Following the word search activity described in Excerpts 7 and 8, I encourage Sol to elaborate on

her explanation by asking her if she could give me an example. Excerpt 9 characterizes more of the “discovery” phase of the writing process, in which the writer “finds new underlying meanings and gives new directions to the emerging poem” (Hanauer, 2010, p. 19).

Excerpt 9

20 C: can you give me an example?
21 S: mm
22 C: can you think of an example
23 S: um
24 when uh
25 when I heard my
26 when I heard from a friend
27 that I have a bad habit,
28 before I heard from her
29 C: uh huh
30 S: I didn't know that I act like that
31 but yeah
32 after I heard
33 I tried to fix it
34 C: yeah
35 cause you-
36 did you not see it before,
37 S: yeah I didn't know I did like that
38 C: yeah
39 yeah,
40 that's a great example
41 S: uhhuh

The talk Sol produces here exhibits structures associated with storytelling: she introduces a temporal setting (*when I heard*), characters (*my friend*), and a situation (*I have a bad habit*). Sol then offers an evaluation of the situation in lines 28-33, thereby offering a more concrete understanding of what recognition means to her.

At this point in the activity, I ask Sol if she is interested in expanding on her conception of recognition as the subject for her poem. Sol responds yes. She then spends approximately 5 minutes writing silently. After signaling to me that she has finished her written description, I ask her to read to aloud what she has written:

Excerpt 10

01 S: One day my friend asked me the reason why I chew some grubs so
02 many times. She said it is almost thirty times per one full of mouth.
03 Before she questioned, I wasn't aware that I chewed so many times
04 like that and ate slowly. I just thought that other peers eat
05 something so quickly and I'm the normal person. After the trivial
06 accident, I have tried to eat more quickly, but it still takes longer
07 time to have a meal.

From here, Sol's writing process transitioned to what Hanauer describes the "permutation" stage, in which "the poem develops through a series of rewrites" (Hanauer, 2010, p. 19). This phase constituted the longest of all the stages (about 1 hour). Altogether, Sol wrote three drafts over a period of 1 hour (see appendix for a copy of her drafts). Much of this time was spent in conversation with me, wherein we spoke mostly about imagery (how to capture this moment using words that conjure concrete images) and aesthetic considerations (how the poem looks on the page, where to make a line break, etc.). The conversation was mostly in a question-answer format. Sol would not know what to do or say, and then I would ask her a question to help her think through or generate some new word or image. I also suggested writing strategies that might help her to work through the drafting process, as well as different

genres of writing that could help capture what she was looking for. Excerpt 11 shows an example of this process and occurred approximately 48 minutes into the recorded session. Sol had just finished reading her second draft to me. With the exception of moving the events of her experience into lines (a suggestion that I made), few changes had been made from her first draft. Sol appeared somewhat lost with regards to what do next, so it was at this point I reminded Sol about the prewriting activity about imagery and encouraged her to draw on more specific images that could give the reader something more concrete to work with. Right before Excerpt 11 begins I asked Sol where she was when this experience happened and what she was doing. At the very moment I say, *where are you what do you see* (lines 1-3), Sol shifts her gaze from the written draft and outward to midair, once again displaying the kind of conduct typical during the start of word search activities.

Excerpt 11

01 C: where are you
02 what do you see (S redirects gaze to midair)
03 in this moment
04 S: uh
05 I: am cleaning the dining room
06 after dinner. (S looks at C)
07 C: okay
08 in uh
09 in your apartment?
10 S: yeah dorm
11 C: the dorm
12 S: yeah

While staring in mid-air, Sol produces *uh I: am cleaning the dining room after dinner*, then redirects her gaze to me, indicating that she has completed her

thought. I then ask for clarification (*in your apartment?*), and Sol responds with the acceptance token “yeah” followed by a more specific answer, *dorm*. I accept Sol’s answer as she repeats the word (line 11). Sol repeats the acceptance token, *yeah*, and the word search comes to an end.

Taken together, Excerpts 7-11 reveal how the body is inextricably bound to cognitive processes. As Schegloff (1991) observes:

The very things that it occurs to speakers to express, their implementation in certain linguistic forms, and the opportunity to articulate them in sound with determinate and coordinate body movements...enter into the very composition, design, and structuring of conduct and is part and parcel of whatever processes—cognitive or otherwise—are germane to the conception and constitution of acts, messages or utterances in the first instance (pp. 153-154).

Part 3: Repetition and Intertextuality

My findings for this section concern the last participant to partake in my study, Seung-jae, whose repetition of a ‘prior text’ was crucial for his conceptualizing “shock,” the abstract word that triggered his writing process.

While my Part 2 findings involve tracing Sol’s word searches within the poetry-writing process, my findings in this section focus on the operation of intertextuality within Seung-jae’s writing process. I also illustrate that Seung-jae’s repetitions of a pivotal phrase serve as occasion and permission for querying and

reshaping his understanding of his family and of himself. He discovers a more authentic story of his origin.

Seung-jae tells me, “I didn’t really study [English] much in Korea,” to which I respond, “Well, if you lived here for 6 years you probably picked up a lot.”

Seung-jae then continues:

Excerpt 12

01 S: well
02 outside of my house I used always English
03 and then in the house I used Korean so
04 so
05 C: mm
06 S: and also I-
07 I keep in touch with my American friends and also my
08 England friends
09 **its kind of advantage for me for using English**
10 C: yeah yeah

Seung-jae recycles the text in bold five times over the course of two poetry-writing sessions. I focus on the first three.

He first uses it approximately two minutes into the first recorded session when he is telling me his history of his learning English (line 09). Born in the United States, at age 6 Seung-jae moved to Korea, where he lived until age 10. A year later, he returned to Korea. To describe this unique opportunity for immersion, which enabled him to pick up the language more readily than other non-native English speakers, he says, “it’s kind of advantage for me using English.”

Thirty minutes later, he uses the same phrase a second time, drawing on the text and reframing it in his written response to the word “shock”:

Excerpt 13

01 C: okay
02 okay why don't you read it to me
03 S: ((reading)) When I was six, I went back to Korea. When I arrived in
04 Korea, I couldn't speak Korean well. My fellows asked why I can't
05 speak well and where I have been living before I met them. I told
06 them that I was born in the U.S. and didn't used Korean much. After
07 I told them about my story, they started to call me Banana. Even
08 when I went to elementary school, they told other friends and all the
09 friends and all of the other students called me banana. Before I
10 came to Korea when I was living in the U.S. **my parents told me**
11 **that using English is a big advantage for me, but when I came**
12 **to Korea, speaking English didn't seem like an advantage.**
13 None of my friends couldn't speak English. Before I graduated
14 elementary school, I had only four friends. My memory of the
15 elementary is a horror, and still I really don't like to eat bananas.
16 After I graduated elementary school I never tell others that I was
17 born in America. This memory is the most shocking memory to me.

Although he deploys the phrase to evaluate his experience of learning English, we see here from added context that the phrase also reflects the evaluation made by Seung-jae's parents. In this new context, we can see that Seung-jae was taking on his parents' voices when he used the phrase for the first time in Excerpt 12. In this session of writing poetry, responding to the trigger word “shock,” the phrase takes on a very different meaning.

Excerpt 14 reinforces this new meaning further. The excerpt follows Seung-jae's talk about his experience learning English and occurs 52 minutes into our recorded session (about 20 minutes after the previous excerpt). Seung-

jae was working on a new draft for his poem and had been writing (and visibly struggling to write) for about 8 minutes.

Excerpt 14

01 C: what are you thinking
02 S: uh
03 kind of
04 well
05 shocked and
06 for this kind of experience for me is #hardest#
07 before that I like banana but
08 C: uh-huh
09 S: after hearing this name people-
10 or friends call me
11 I hate bananas
12 so
13 C: mhm
14 ((pause))
15 S: this experience
16 I want to use and
17 they call me names and
18 ((pause))
19 well and also
20 actually was not
21 parents told me that
22 having an American citizenship and
23 **speaking English was advantage but**
24 **actually,**
25 **it was not advantage**
26 **it was disadvantage**
27 growing up
28 when I was in
29 kindergarten and elementary school,
30 C: mhm

Taken together, Seung-jae's repetition of his talk in Excerpts 12, 13, and 14 can be viewed as a process of self-realization. In the process of learning to express themselves in a second language, learners have an opportunity to

develop unique ways of talking, thinking, and meaning through the interplay of what Bakhtin (1986) refers to as a “double-voiced discourse,” or “the actualizing of consciousness”:

To express oneself means to make oneself an object for another and for oneself (‘the actualizing of consciousness’)...But it is also possible to reflect our attitude toward ourselves as objects. In this case, our own discourse becomes an object and acquires a second—its own—voice...Any truly creative voice can only be the *second* voice in the discourse (p. 110).

In referring to Bakhtin’s notion of heteroglossia, our language is borrowed from others (even borrowed from ourselves). An author’s task therefore is not exclusively creative, for the author also exercises syncretism in relaying elements of the world of his experience. If instead of giving expression to this impulse to heteroglossia, one imposes monology (or single-voiced discourse), language becomes deaf to different voices. Instead, Seung-jae undergoes ‘becoming’ by selectively assimilating others’ perspectives (and by relating his own perspective to those of others).

Coda

The traditional approach to SLA, which views language learning as an internal cognitive process, is currently being transformed with the understanding that learning and using another language are embodied processes (Watson-

Gegeo, 2004). In considering language learning from this new perspective, my findings reveal things about how language works that are usually obscured—a kind of poiesis, creativity, and learning happening on the threshold of semantic processing. By studying L2 learning as it unfolds in real time, we see how poetic expression and meaning emerge from a combination of the constraining structures of the language system (and for L2 learners, the constraints imposed by two language systems) and their phenomenological experiences in the world.

In the introduction of this study, I compared the experience of L2 learning to Bachelard's notion of an epistemological break in that it involves redirecting attention to another linguistic system with structures and concepts that can be quite different from a learner's native language. By tracing how learners connect talking, thinking, and imaging in their second language, I have demonstrated that making sense in another language is, to a certain extent, a poetic process. The delicacy with which Sol renders meaning by repeating the sounds, rhythms, and syntaxes of the new language is one example of how L2 learners create sense and structure poetically. Similarly, the way Sol repeatedly coordinates her body through gesture and gaze while searching for words creates a rhythm that helps to organize her perception and shape her subjective understanding of the abstract word *recognition*. Building on these poetic features, we see how Sol's organization of larger units of discourse through story structure allows her to formulate a more authentic understanding of what *recognition* means to her.

Bakhtin's construct of intertextuality and the creative interplay of different voices constitute another poetic process through which we see the L2 subject emerge. By applying Bakhtin's ideas to the language learning experience, we see how L2 learning is mediated not only by individual learners, but by a manifold of social and cultural influences that the individual experiences in everyday life. In his struggle to create meaning, Seung-jae's repetition and selective assimilation of his parents' words across different contexts allow him to populate these words with his own semantic and expressive intention. Learning and using a second language thus allows Seung-jae to reframe and revise his childhood memory and achieve a more authentic voice.

An important insight this study contributes to in SLA is that the ways we organize language (poetically or otherwise) are embodied processes, shaped by participants as they engage in interaction. For the researcher (as well as the participants), Seung-jae and Sol's aesthetic moments could not have been grasped had they been removed from the situated event and interactive circumstances in which they were realized. Words, poetry, people, and actions become meaningful because of their placement within larger activities and life worlds.

In his lectures on *Art as Experience* (1934/2005), John Dewey says, "Because the actual world, that in which we live, is a combination of movement and culmination, of breaks and re-unions, the experience of a living creature is capable of esthetic quality" (p. 16). In thinking about "breaks" in second language

learning, and how the imagination (or new thinking) transpires from disunity, I have found Dewey's account helpful. I believe that it is the materialization of meaning through poiesis, the distinct ways different individuals come to organize sounds, string words together, and create structure in ordinary experience, that makes human subjectivity and aesthetic moments possible. Analysis of these kinds of experiences in human interactions, and how subjects emerge from within them, seem to me the kind of work that needs to be included in a paradigm that emphasizes the primacy of embodiment in shaping cognition. It is in this spirit that I offer this study.

APPENDIX A
TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

SYMBOL/EXAMPLE	MEANING
(1.2)	pause, timed
..	hold/micropause
...	pause under 1 second
(1.2)	timed pause
:	lag/prosodic lengthening
[]	overlapping speech
=	latching
.	terminal intonation
,	continuative intonation
-	truncated intonation
?	appeal intonation
rEALLy?	higher shift in pitch
wor-	truncated/cut-off word
:	lag/prosodic lengthening
..	hold/micropause
@	laugh
@you're @kidding	laughing words
#	transcribed words uncertain
((words))	analyst comment

APPENDIX B
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL



Academic Affairs
Office of Academic Research • Institutional Review Board

February 25, 2011

Ms. Courtney Scarborough
c/o: Prof. Caroline Vickers
Department of English
California State University
5500 University Parkway
San Bernardino, California 92407

CSUSB
INSTITUTIONAL
REVIEW BOARD
Expedited Review
IRB# 10055
Status
APPROVED

Dear Ms. Scarborough:

Your application to use human subjects, titled "Conceptualizing an Autopoiesis of Second Language Acquisition" has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The attached informed consent document has been stamped and signed by the IRB chairperson. All subsequent copies used must be this officially approved version. A change in your informed consent (no matter how minor the change) requires resubmission of your protocol as amended. **Your application is approved for one year from February 25, 2011 through February 24, 2012. One month prior to the approval end date you need to file for a renewal if you have not completed your research. See additional requirements (Items 1 – 4) of your approval below.**

Your responsibilities as the researcher/investigator reporting to the IRB Committee include the following 4 requirements as mandated by the Code of Federal Regulations 45 CFR 46 listed below. Please note that the protocol change form and renewal form are located on the IRB website under the forms menu. Failure to notify the IRB of the above may result in disciplinary action. You are required to keep copies of the informed consent forms and data for at least three years.

- 1) **Submit a protocol change form if any changes (no matter how minor) are made in your research prospectus/protocol for review and approval of the IRB before implemented in your research.**
- 2) **If any unanticipated/adverse events are experienced by subjects during your research,**
- 3) **Too renew your protocol one month prior to the protocols end date.**
- 4) **When your project has ended by emailing the IRB Coordinator/Compliance Analyst.**

The CSUSB IRB has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval notice does not replace any departmental or additional approvals which may be required.

If you have any questions regarding the IRB decision, please contact Michael Gillespie, IRB Compliance Coordinator. Mr. Michael Gillespie can be reached by phone at (909) 537-7588, by fax at (909) 537-7028, or by email at mgillesp@csusb.edu. Please include your application approval identification number (listed at the top) in all correspondence.

Best of luck with your research.

Sincerely, 
Sharon Ward, Ph.D., Chair
Institutional Review Board

SW/mg

cc: Prof. Caroline Vickers, Department of English

909.537.7588 • fax: 909.537.7028 • <http://irb.csusb.edu/>

5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393

The California State University • Bakersfield • Channel Islands • Chico • Dominguez Hills • East Bay • Fresno • Fullerton • Humboldt • Long Beach • Los Angeles
Maritime Academy • Monterey Bay • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento • San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San Jose • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sonoma • Stanislaus

APPENDIX C
INFORMED CONSENT

INFORMED CONSENT



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD COMMITTEE Department of English
APPROVED 02/25/11 VOID AFTER 02/29/12
IRB# 10055 CHAIR Ashwanti Ward, Ph.D. APPENDIX B:
CONCEPTUALIZING AN AUTOPOIETICS OF SLA
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to investigate the act of reading and writing poetry during the process of second language acquisition, specifically looking the role of the body in this process. This study is being conducted by Courtney Scarborough under the supervision of Dr. Caroline Vickers, Professor of English, California State University, San Bernardino. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino.

In this study, I will be asking you to let me to study how you respond to abstract concepts in English. As part of this research, I may ask you to do the following:

1. Respond to a prompt that asks you to write down image-directed observations, to translate an abstract concept to a mental image (about 10-20 minutes)
2. Ask you questions after you respond to the prompt (about 10 minutes)
3. Video record your session with me so that physical gestures can be included within the data transcription (about 20-30 minutes)

No one will see or hear the video recordings except the researchers. Your name will not be used. I will use a pseudonym (fake name) in place of your name.

Your participation in this study is totally voluntary. You can stop participating in the study at any time without anything negative happening.

Risks to you are minimal but may include psychological discomfort or embarrassment about being video-taped and observed because the research involves a reconstruction of multisensory experiences, and a process of self exploration and careful consideration of the accuracy of poem to lived experience. To make these risks less, I will only video-tape if you say it is okay. I can stop recording anytime you feel you want to.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact my advisor, Dr. Caroline Vickers, Professor of English at this phone number: (909) 537-5684, and email address: cvickers@csusb.edu. Additionally you can contact me, Courtney Scarborough at this phone number: (760) 703-0205, and email address: scarborc@coyote.csusb.edu

Do you have any questions for me before we go on?

I understand this research will be Video Recorded Initials _____

Signature of Witness: _____ Today's Date: _____

Signature of Investigator: _____ Today's Date: _____

909.537.5824 • fax: 909.537.7086 • <http://english.csusb.edu/>
5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393

The California State University • Bakersfield • Channel Islands • Chico • Dominguez Hills • East Bay • Fresno • Fullerton • Humboldt • Long Beach • Los Angeles
Maritime Academy • Monterey Bay • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento • San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San Jose • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sonoma • Stanislaus

APPENDIX D
VIDEO USE INFORMED CONSENT

VIDEO USE INFORMED CONSENT



Department of English

APPENDIX C: VIDEO USE INFORMED CONSENT FORM

As part of this research project, I will be making a videotape recording of you during your participation in the experiment. Please indicate what uses of this videotape you are willing to consent to by initialing below. You are free to initial any number of spaces from zero to all of the spaces, and your response will in no way affect your credit for participating. I will only use the videotape in ways that you agree to. In any use of this videotape, your name would *not* be identified. If you do not initial any of the spaces below, the videotape will be destroyed.

- The videotape can be studied by the researcher for use in the research project.

Please initial: _____

- The videotape can be shown to subjects in other experiments.

Please initial: _____

- The videotape can be shown in classrooms to students.

Please initial: _____

- The videotape can be shown in public presentations to nonscientific groups.

Please initial: _____

I have read the above description and give my consent for the use of the videotape as indicated above.

SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD COMMITTEE
APPROVED 02/25/11 VOID AFTER 02/24/12
IRB# 10055 CHAIR Sharon Wood, Ph.D.

909.537.5824 • fax: 909.537.7086 • <http://english.csusb.edu/>
5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393

The California State University • Bakersfield • Channel Islands • Chico • Dominguez Hills • East Bay • Fresno • Fullerton • Humboldt • Long Beach • Los Angeles
Maritime Academy • Monterey Bay • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento • San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San Jose • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sonoma • Stanislaus

APPENDIX E:
DRAFTS OF SOL'S POEMS

DRAFTS OF SOL'S POEM

Shock	the person's frightened face, bomb, scream.
Ench	
<u>recognize.</u>	det detector. CSI, thriller movie,
	<p>One day, ^① my friend asked me the reason why I chew some grubs so many times. ^② She said it is almost 30 times per one full full of mouth.</p> <p>^③ Before she questioned, I wasn't aware that I chewed so many times like that and ate slowly. ^④ I just thought that other peers eat some something so quickly and I'm the normal person.</p> <p>^⑤ After the trivial accident, I have tried to eat more quickly, ^⑥ but it takes longer time having a meal.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">still</p> <p>→ After supper, I am washing the dishes ^{while} friends* were cleaning the table, ^{one of them} asked me.</p> <p>① My friend asked the reason that I chew so many times when I have a meal after dinner.</p> <p>② I became to know that then. she said I chew 30 times per one full of mouth.</p> <p>③ I became to know my eating habit.</p> <p>④ I thought ^{that} my peers were so my peers ate so quickly and I'm normal.</p> <p>⑤ After then, I try to eat eat more quickly.</p> <p>⑥ But, it is tough and I'm still eat I still have some grubs slowly.</p> <p>“Why do you chew so many times?”</p>

After supper, I was washing the dishes,

So many dishes.

"Why do you chew so many times?" asked my friend.

looking ^{at} her face, I turned off the water.

"You chew 30 times per one full of mouth" & she said.

Interesting discovery, ~~was~~ discovered before.

~~When~~ Having a meal together, my friends weren't quick

But I was slow.

Now, no more ~~telling my story~~ ^{speaking}, ~~as I am~~ ~~more~~ just ~~eating~~ eating and listening,

To eat more quickly.

But, I keep having some grubs after my friends leave the table.

~~I~~ I'm still slow.

APPENDIX F
DRAFTS OF SEUNG-JAE'S POEM

DRAFTS OF SEUNG-JAE'S POEM

Shock.

(electricity), death of my friend. lightning. girl friend. fired.
→ When I was 6. elementary school. "Radio shock",
surgery, politicians (Korean). 2006, 1993 Baseball.
2002 World cup.

When I was 6, I ~~go~~ have went back to Korea. When I arrived in Korea, I couldn't speak Korean well. My fellows asked why I can't speak well and where I have been living before I met them. I told them that I was born in the U.S. and didn't use Korean much. After I told them ~~that~~ about my story, they started to call me a "Banana". Even when I went to elementary school, they told other friends and all of the other students called me a "Banana". ~~Before I came to Korea when I was living in the U.S., my parents told me that using English is a big advantage for me, but when I ~~was~~ came to Korea, speaking English didn't seem like an advantage. None of my friends couldn't speak English. Before I graduated elementary school, I had only four friends. My memory of the elementary is a horror, and still I really don't like to eat bananas.~~ After I graduated elementary school I never tell others that I was born in America. This memory is the most shocking memory to me.

- Friends started to call me a "banana!"
- all the other students called me 'banana'.
- Parents told me having a U.S. citizenship & speaking English is an advantage → ~~was not an~~ disadvantage.
- Only 4 ~~the~~ friends,
- kids acts strangely. - call names,
- elementary school & kindergarten was horror hate banana.

I couldn't speak Korean well.

friends started to call me a 'banana', soon all the other students called me a 'banana.'

Parents told me that U.S. citizenship and speaking English is an advantage, but it was not.

I only had four friends.

My kindergarten and elementary school was a horror.

I never eat banana now.

fake friends.

parents
discernible

hand-
shakes

open-and-
exposed

actions

- false friends, soon all students called me banana.
- my childhood, walking alone. playing alone. ←
- U.S. citizenship, but a Korean

~~Having, born in America.~~

Can't speak Korean well.

friends ask, I

birthdy party. 8th.

everybody happy.

singing ~~for~~ but not with my name.

shocked. angry. fight.

At my 8th birthday, I invited all of my classmates. Everybody was happy, ~~until~~ until my classmates sang the birthday song. They didn't put my name, instead they put banana. I ~~thought~~ ~~they don't know~~ I was upset, got angry. I shouted to them, they hit me. I was not part of them. ~~They were not~~ I was just an outsider.

On a bright sunny day.

Everybody was happy. Some was talking, some was playing with a ball. We were ⁱⁿ my garden. They ^{boys} were drinking juice, some were eating ^{food}. My mother bring the cake. Everybody ~~started~~ stopped and gather around me. They gave me presents.

Then started to sing. ~~then~~ I was happy. But people put a 'banana' into the song. (With a American ~~city~~ citizenship and yellow skin, banana was a bad nickname) I was upset. My mother was upset. But ^{everyone else} others ~~that~~ was smiling. "Stop," I cried. They didn't stop. They sang more loudly. I got angry. A drop of a tear came out. "Stop," I screamed. But they were laughing. I ~~hit~~ punched one of the boys, all of the other boys hit me.

On a bright sunny day. Everybody was laughing.
Some ~~was~~ ^{were} talking, some ~~was~~ ^{were} playing with a ball. We were
in my madang. Some ~~was~~ ^{were} drinking juice, some ~~was~~ ^{were} eating
Choco-Pie. My mom bring the birthday cake with a big smile.
Everybody stoped, then ~~sit~~ around me. They give me presents,
then started to sing. "

"Happy birthdy to you. ... Happy birthday dear bananna."
Mom's face became dark. "Stop," I cried. Everyone else ~~was~~ ^{is}
smiling. "Stop it," I screamed again. ?

"... ~~Happy~~ HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO BANANNA!"

A drop of a tear came out. People ~~were~~ ^{all} laughing. I punched
one of the boys. All of the other boys hit me.
My father ^{said} ~~one~~ ^{one} Jin-Koren, "a man or boy ^{can} ~~could~~ cry three times. When they
~~was~~ born, when ~~their~~ parents dies, and when ~~their~~ friends
dies."

The Bananna.

On a bright sunny day. Everybody is happy. Some were talking, some were playing with a ball. We were in my madang. Some were drinking juice, some were eating Choco-Pie. My mom brings the birthday cake with a big smile. Everybody stops, then sit around me. They give me presents, then starts to sing.

"Happy birthdy to you. ... Happy birtchday dear Bananna."

Mom's face becomes dark. "Stop," I cried. ~~Everybody is~~ Everyone else is smiling. "Stop it." I screamed again. People are laughing.

" ... HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO BANANNA!"

A drop of a tear came out. My father said, "a man can cry three times. When they are born, when parents die, when a friend die."

REFERENCES

- Alvarez-Caccamo, C. (1996). The power of reflexive language(s): Code displacement in reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(1), 33-59.
- Atkinson, D. (2002). Toward a sociocognitive approach to second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86, 525-545.
- Atkinson, D. (2010). Extended, embodied cognition and second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(5), 599-622.
- Atkinson, D. (Ed.) (2011). *Alternative perspectives to second language acquisition*. New York: Routledge.
- Atkinson, D., Churchill, E., Nishino, T., & Okada, H. (2007). Alignment and interaction in a sociocognitive approach to second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 169-188.
- Bachelard, G. (1987). *On poetic imagination and reverie*. (C. Gaudin, Trans.). Putnam: Spring Publications. (Original work published 1950).
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination. Four essays by M.M. Bakhtin* M. Holquist (Ed.). (C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. M. Holquist (Ed.). (C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barsalou, L. (2008). Grounded cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59, 617-645.
- Bauman, R., & Briggs, L. (1990). Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 10, 59-88.
- Becker, A.L. (1995). *Beyond translation: Essays toward a modern philology*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Behn, R., & Twichell, C. (Eds.). (1992). *The practice of poetry: Writing exercises from poets who teach*. NY: Harper Perennial.
- Boden, M. (2006). *Mind as machine: A history of cognitive science*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Brouwer, C.E. (2003). Word searches in NNS-NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning? *Modern Language Journal*, 87, 534-545.
- Chafe, W. (1994). *Discourse, consciousness, and time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Churchill, E., Nishino, T., Okada, H., & Atkinson, D. (2010). Symbiotic gesture and the sociocognitive visibility of grammar in second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 234-353.
- Dewey, J. (2005). *Art as Experience*. NY: Penguin Group. (Original work published 1934).
- Felski, R. (2008). *Uses of literature*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Freeman, M.H. (2002). Momentary stays, exploding forces: A cognitive linguistic approach to the poetics of Emily Dickinson and Robert Frost. *Journal of English Linguistics* 30(1), 73-90.
- Freeman, M.H. (2005). The poem as complex blend: Conceptual mappings of metaphor in Sylvia Plath's 'The Applicant.' *Language and Literature: Journal of the Poetics and Linguistics Association*, 14(1), 25-44.
- Friedrich, P. (1986). *The language parallax: Linguistic relativism and poetic indeterminacy*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Gibbs, R. (2006). *Embodiment and cognitive science*. Cambridge University Press.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books, pp. 3-30.
- Goffman, E. (1969). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. London: Penguin.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

- Goodwin, C. (1984). Notes on story structure and the organization of participation. In M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 225-246.
- Goodin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1489-1522.
- Goodwin, C. (2003). The body in action. In J. Coupland & R. Gwynn (eds.), *Discourse, the body, and identity*. New York: Palgrave/Macmillan, pp. 19-42.
- Goodwin, C. (2007). Participation, stance and affect in the organization of activities. *Discourse & Society*, 18, 53–73.
- Goodwin & Duranti, A. (1992). Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C. & Goodwin, M.H. (1992). Assessments and the construction of context. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 147-190.
- Goodwin, C. & Goodwin, M.H. (1986). Gestures and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica*, 62, 51-75.
- Goodwin, C. & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversational analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19, 283-307.
- Gullberg, M. (1998). *Gesture as a communication strategy in second language discourse: A study of learners of French and Swedish*. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J., & Levinson, S. C. (Eds.). (1996). Rethinking linguistic relativity. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanauer, D. (2003). Multicultural moments in poetry: The importance of the unique. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 60(1), 69-88.
- Hanauer, C. (2010). *Poetry as research: Exploring second language poetry writing*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hanks, W. (1996). *Language and communicative practices*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Hymes, D. (1981). "In vain I tried to tell you": Essays in Native American ethnopoetics. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hymes, D. (1998). When is oral narrative poetry? Generative form and its pragmatic conditions. *Pragmatics*, 8(4), 475-500.
- Hymes, D. (2000). Poetry. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 9(1-2), 191-193.
- Hiraga, M. (1999). Blending and an interpretation of haiku: A cognitive approach. *Poetics Today*, 20(3), 461-481.
- Hiraga, M. (2006). Kanji: The visual metaphor. *Style*, 40(1-2), 133-147.
- Jakobson, R. (1960). Closing statement: Linguistics and poetics. In T. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 350-377.
- Jakobson, R. (1966). Grammatical parallelism and its Russian facet. *Language*, 42, 398-429.
- Johnstone, B. (2000). The individual voice in language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29, 405-424.
- Kasper, G. & J. Wagner. (2011). A conversation-analytic approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition*. New York: Routledge, pp. 117-142.
- Kendon, A. (1990). *Conducting interaction: Patterns of behavior in focused interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Koven, Michele. 2002. An analysis of speaker role inhabitation in narratives of personal experience. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(2), 167-217.
- Kramsch, C. (Ed.) (2002). *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives*. London: Continuum.
- Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1974). *La révolution du langage poétique*. Paris: Seuil.
- Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art*, ed. by Leon S. Roudiez, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Larson-Freeman, D. (1991). Second language acquisition research: Staking out the territory. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 315-350.
- Levinson, S., Kita, S., Haun, D., & Rasch, B. (2002). Returning the tables: Language affects spatial reasoning. *Cognition*, 82, 155–188.
- Maturana, H., & Varela, F. (1992). *The tree of knowledge: The biological roots of human understanding*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Maynard, D. (2006). Cognition on the ground. *Discourse Studies*, 8(1), 105-115.
- McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and mind: What gestures reveal about thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mori, J., & Hayashi, M. (2006). The achievement of intersubjectivity through embodied completions: A study of interactions between first and second language speakers. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(2), 195–219.
- Mori, J., & Hasegawa, A. (2009). Doing being a foreign language learner in a classroom: Embodiment of cognitive states and social events. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47, 65-94.
- Mukarovsky, J. (1936/1970). Aesthetic function, norm and value as social fact (M. Suino, Trans.). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Norrick, N. (2000/2001). Poetics and conversation. *Connotations* 10(2-3), 243-267.
- Norton, B. & McKinney, C. (2011). An identity approach to second language acquisition. In Atkinson, D. (ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition*. New York: Routledge, pp. 73-94.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning*. London: Longman.
- Ochs, E. & Capps, L. (1996). Narrating the self. *The Annual Review of Anthropology*, 25, 19-43.

- Pavlenko, A. (2001). 'How am I to become a woman in an American vein?': Transformations of gender performance in second language learning.' In A. Pavlenko, A. Blackledge, I. Piller, & M. Teutsch-Dwyer (eds.), *Multilingualism, second language learning, and gender*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 133-174.
- Pavlenko, A. (2005). Bilingualism and thought. In A. DeGroot & J. Kroll (eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism: psycholinguistic approaches*. New York: Oxford University Press, 433-450.
- Pavlenko, A. (2007). Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(2), 163-188.
- Pavlenko, A., & Lantolf, J. 2000. Second language learning as participation and the (re)construction of selves. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford University Press, pp. 155-178.
- Perloff, M., & Dworkin, C. (Eds.). (2009). *The sound of poetry / the poetry of sound*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Preminger, A., & Brogan, T.V.F. (Eds.) (1993). *The new Princeton encyclopedia of poetry and poetics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Richardson, A. (2004). Studies in literature and fiction: A field map. In A. Richardson & E. Spolsky (Eds.), *The work of fiction: Cognition, culture, and complexity*. Ashgate, pp. 1-29.
- Richardson, A. & Steen, F. (2002). Literature and the cognitive revolution: An introduction. *Poetics Today* 23(1), 1-8.
- Rizzolatti, G. & Craighero, L. (2004). The mirror-neuron system. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 27, 169-192.
- Sacks, H. (1992). Poetics: Requests, offers, and threats. The "old man" as an evolved natural object: Lecture notes, March 11, 1971. In J. Jefferson (Ed.), *Lectures on conversation, vol. 2*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, pp. 318-331.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Sapir, E. (1949). *Language: An introduction to the study of speech*. New York: Harcourt.

- Schegloff, E. (1984). On some gestures' relation to talk. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 266-296.
- Schegloff, E. (1991). Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In L. Resnick, J. Levine, & S. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association, pp. 150-171.
- Schegloff, E. (1998). Body torque. *Social Research*, 65(3), 535-595.
- Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361-182.
- Shklovskij, V. (1917). Art as technique. In J. Rivkin & M. Ryan (Eds.), *Literary theory: An anthology*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp. 15-21.
- Silverstein, M. (1984). On the pragmatic 'poetry' of prose: parallelism, repetition, and cohesive structure in the time course of dyadic conversation. In D. Schiffrin (Ed.), *Meaning, form, and use in context: Linguistic applications*. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, pp. 181-199.
- Sherzer, J. (1982). Poetic structuring of Kuna discourse: The line. *Language in Society*, 11, 371-390.
- Tannen, D. (2nd ed.). (2007). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tsur, R. (2nd ed.). (2008). *Toward a theory of cognitive poetics*. Brighton and Portland: Sussex Academic Press.
- Turner, M. (1996). *The literary mind: The origins of thought and language*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Turner, M. (2006). *The artful mind: Cognitive science and the riddle of human creativity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Varela, F., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (2000). *The embodied mind: Cognitive science and human experience*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Van Lier, L. (2002). An ecological-semiotic perspective on language and linguistics. In C. Kramsch (ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives*. London: Continuum, pp. 140-164.

- Vitanova, G. 2004. Gender enactments in immigrants' discursive practices: Bringing Bakhtin to the dialogue. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 3(4), 261-277.
- Vitanova, G. (2010). *Authoring the dialogic self: Gender, agency and language practices*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Watson-Gegeo, K.A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *Modern Language Journal*, 88(3), 331-350.
- Whorf, B. (1956). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Yu, C. Ballard, D., & Aslin, R. (2005). The role of embodied intention in early lexical acquisition. *Cognitive Science*, 29, 961-1005