

---

*It Is More E<sub>z</sub> p<sub>r</sub>essi e for Me : A*

---

---

---

---

---

---

America was only in my head. I couldn't see it.  
A glimpse of my grandmother at the landing gate brought tears of joy  
Finally, I came to know America as a reality.<sup>1</sup> (translated by Park)

---

In a one-on-one poetry workshop, a generation 1.5 immigrant—Author 2 (Park)—composed the above poem to improve her expressive ability in Korean, her heritage language, with a facilitator-researcher—Author 1 (Kim)—whose first language is Korean. In the following conversation, we negotiated the nuances of vocabulary and expressions connected to Park's feelings and encounters:

*Pa* :                    ㅁ

talking through the translingual negotiation. Canagarajah and other translingual scholars (e.g., Horner, Lu, Royster, & Trimbur, 2011; Lee & Jenks, 2016; Williams & Condon, 2016) would argue that this epigraph could be one way to exemplify the meaning-making process.

The term *lingua franca* (e.g., Canagarajah, 2015; Horner et al.,

literacy in both languages (Cummins, 2017). Research has also documented the affordances of translanguaging for education: facilitating higher order thinking and lexical choices in a high school English classroom (Stewart & Hansen-Thomas, 2016), humanizing practices in multilingual classes through poetry and photography (Childs, 2016), and communicative success in undergraduate writing (Canagarajah, 2011a). Enforcing a monolingual ideology may prevent multilingual students from using their full linguistic repertoire to express themselves, thus hindering the development of language use and ways of knowing. Therefore, there is a strong need for the development of translanguaging pedagogy that is liberating and empowering (García & Lin, 2017).

To this end, this article explores a Korean American's early experiences as a generation 1.5 person in the United States through Korean poetry in one-on-one writing workshops. Translanguaging practices are embedded in this project at two levels: (1) Park as a poet and Kim as a facilitator using both Korean and English during *sijo* workshops for this research, ensuring that the poems are the outcomes of translanguaged dialogues between Park and Kim, and (2) lyrics that in fact mixed two languages. Even when poems are in Korean, it was not difficult to find instances where Park integrated linguistic features from both languages in the verses. As such, we conceptualize the *sijo* composing session as a translanguaging event in that the two languages available—English and Korean—were used “in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organize and mediate understanding ... and learning” (Blackledge & Creese, 2017, p. 33). That is, the translanguaged conversations in the poetry workshop in this research aim to help Park develop a translingual disposition by getting her more conversant with semiotic resources such as poetry and her heritage language.

## ATTITUDES TOWARD LANGUAGE DIVERSITY: TRANSLINGUAL PRACTICE

A starting point for honing Park's communication skills in Korean is developing a translingual disposition, characterized as “the disposition of openness and inquiry that people take toward language and language differences” (Horner et al., 2011, p. 311). Although researchers use different terms for movements of communicative practices—including code-meshing (Canagarajah, 2006; Young, 2004), translanguaging (Blackledge & Creese, 2017; García, 2009; García & Lin, 2017), and a translingual approach (Canagarajah, 2013a, 2017; Horner et al., 2011),



academic prose. There has been a well-developed literature on the benefits of using personal writing in English education, for example, personal engagement with English (Park, 2008, 2013b; Widdowson, 1994), increased self-understanding through literature (Carter, 2007), development of rhetorical awareness and negotiation strategies through literacy narratives (Canagarajah, 2011a, 2013a), and enhanced translanguaging dispositions through literacy narratives (Lee & Jenks, 2016).

In keeping with this established tradition, a growing body of research supports the benefits of poetry in educational settings such as higher education (Bizzaro, 1993), bilingual education at high school (Stewart & Hansen-Thomas, 2016), second language research and instruction (Disney, 2014; Hanauer, 2012; Iida, 2012, 2016; Kim, 2018; Kim & Kim, 2018; Newfield & D'abdon, 2015), and teacher education (Cahnmann-Taylor, Bleyle, Hwang, & Zhang, 2016). One such benefit is that autobiographical poetry is useful to either examine (Kim, 2018; Kim & Kim, 2018; Hanauer, 2010) or facilitate language learning (Hanauer, 2011; Iida, 2012). Hanauer's (2010) large-scale study of English as a second language poetry formed a foundation for the scholarship of poetry as research by demonstrating that the unique capacity of poetry leads second language writers to discover meaning. These studies, however, hardly address the learners' process of engaging with poetry and what this process does to language learning, because they rely exclusively on written poems, not the composing process. That is, considerable uncertainty still exists about this complex process of linguistic and meaning negotiated interactions, especially when they entail learners navigating across languages. By using poetry's ability to provide "reflective and linguistically negotiated understandings of personally meaningful events" (Hanauer, 2010, p. 56), we hope that the present research offers another repertoire of tools that can be employed in second language teaching to help learners convey subtle emotions and deep thoughts in poems, thereby humanizing education (Hanauer, 2012).

In fact, in emphasizing the humanizing qualities of poetry writing in second language instruction, Hanauer (2012) suggested a meaningful literacy framework, arguing that "learning a language [is] part of a process of widening and deepening the ways an individual can understand, interpret, feel and express her or his personally meaningful understandings to themselves and within social settings" (p. 108). This meaningful literacy perspective diverges from other approaches to second language instruction in that evocative genres of writing (Park, 2013a, 2013b) such as autobiographical writing and other reflexive writing are at the center of the instructional design.

Self-reflection by narrating life stories enhances learning, not merely the upshot of a learning process (Hallqvist & Hydén, 2013). Using her own poems to describe her significant memories as a Korean American teacher-scholar, Park (2013a) exemplifies how autobiographical writing, particularly via poetry, can contribute to a theoretical understanding of an individual who went through the process of constant negotiation in many positions. Park's poetry uncovers the competing ideologies "permeat[ing] through every fiber of [her] being as a member of an academic community" (p. 8). After all, a combination of profound reflection and emotional attachment, which literacy tasks such as poetry entail, is one of the keys to making something meaningful. Perhaps, however, heritage language literature predominantly focuses on grammar, spelling, vocabulary, and translation yet hardly on learners' literacy practices (Choi, 2015) nor on ecological explanations for adults' Korean learning (Jenks, 2017). Considering this trend, infusing translingual practice into the meaningful literacy framework would surely enrich pedagogy (Kim, 2018; Liao, 2018; Stewart & Hansen-Thomas, 2016). A translingual approach highlights "the permeability of linguistic boundaries" (Lu & Horner, 2013, p. 582) and the flexibility of employing semiotic resources to construct meaning across these boundaries, and meaningful literacy instruction emphasizes learners' authentic purposes for making meaning through highly reflective and emotional literacy tasks (Hanauer, 2012). However, a dearth of research exists on how the new paradigm of translingual practice can be enacted in a way to enhance meaningful literacy. Therefore, with a goal of moving a humanized understanding of translingual practices forward, this study explores how a translingual individual uses self-reflective poetry while simultaneously promoting translingual competence. We argue that writing *sijo* is one way to accomplish this goal.

## SIJO: CULTURALLY-ENGAGED PEDAGOGY

*Sijo* (시조, pronounced SHEE-jo) is three-line structured poetry organized by line and syllable count. *Sijo* consists of around 45 syllables, with each line averaging 14 to 16 syllables. For each line, there are four syllabic groups, each of which is composed of three or four syllables, as shown below. In the first line, a writer presents a problem or a theme of the poem. The second line shows developments in the thoughts of the writer about the theme introduced in the first line. In the last line, a writer concludes the poem with a twist on the original meaning of the poem. Contemporary *sijo* allows some variations in syllable count.

The following sijo is a the well-known traditional sijo written by  
몽 (Chō



## Researchers' Positionality

By engaging in this dialogic relationship as a facilitator-researcher and a poet-researcher, we model the role of reflexivity as a necessary conceptual tool in understanding our lived linguistic histories and challenge the ways in which we see language use to negotiate meanings. This process of reflexivity becomes our foundational positionality. As such, we define reflexivity as recognition of self, other, and experiences beyond the normative practices of using one language at a time to negotiate meaning (Pillow, 2003).

The facilitator-researcher: Kim. Kim completed her formal education up to her master's degree in South Korea and obtained her doctoral degree in the United States. She has taught English at a U.S. university. She communicates primarily in Korean, her first language, while she functions in English at work and informal social venues. She participated in this literacy event by guiding, commenting on Park's sijo drafts, and discussing Park's experiences.

The poet-researcher: Park. Park is a professor at a public university in the United States. She immigrated to the United States with her family when she was 8 years old in the mid-1970s. All of her education was in English, and even though she is fluent in conversational Korean, she prefers to use English in most contexts except when she speaks to her parents' generation. This is her first attempt at writing sijo.

It needs to be noted that our symbiotic relationship facilitated the composing sessions in a unique way because Kim served as a "human resourc[e]" (Jenks, 2017, p. 688). That is, she mediated the writing primarily as a human resource that facilitates the development of heritage language and expressive abilities, as Jenks (2017) illustrates, with more knowledge of sijo, the Korean language, and the Korean culture. Our interactions were very rich particularly because we operated along an axis of Korean to English, rather than merely selecting one language over the other. We spoke each language for different purposes in different amounts with varying mixtures of the linguistic features of the two languages and diverse writing strategies.

## Sijo Instruction and Composing Workshops

In addition to the researchers' positionality, it is necessary to explain how Kim mediated the writing in the workshops to show how her involvement shaped Park's development. First, Kim introduced genre characteristics of sijo by explaining the format and sharing

examples of sijo in both Korean and English. One of the challenges in composing sijo is its structured nature, so we discussed how the syllabic distribution worked by analyzing the structure of sijo samples and the messages the poets attempted to deliver in them. Then, Park composed sijo about her unforgettable memories, following Hanauer's (2012) meaningful literacy instruction. Unlike Hanauer's design, however, we also paid attention to the composing process. For this purpose, all the sessions were digitally recorded and transcribed. We spoke both English and Korean during the sessions to construct meaning and make sense of Park's stories. This process comprised (1) freewriting for brainstorming sijo mostly in English and occasionally in Korean, (2) integrating English in sijo when Park felt it worked better, and (3) engaging in a translanguaged dialogue to revise the poems she had written. To start brainstorming, Park was asked to make a list of her significant life experiences in the United States. Kim encouraged Park to choose topics for sijo chronologically; therefore, this study covers memories from her entrance into the United States to her middle school years. To draft her sijo, she selected sections of her brainstorming notes that stood out to her. During the sessions, which in themselves are manifestations of translingual practice, we discussed the experiences Park had written about, the reasons for the importance of each memory, and the ways to revise the poems confirming Park's linguistic assumptions and suggesting linguistic options.

## Data Analysis

Data analysis was divided into two phases to examine both the sijo products and the composing process.

Phase 1: Analysis of poems.

Phase 2: Analysis of the composing process. Phase 2 was dedicated to analyzing the conversations during the sijo workshops using grounded theory (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Thematic coding was conducted through the constant comparison method (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). We continually revised our categories as we examined the workshop transcripts. From initial analysis, three themes emerged: *g c eg a*, *ea g eg a*, and *d c r e f e ea g*. We noted that overlaps frequently occurred, which in itself reveals the inherently integral nature of language practices. In addition, because *ea g eg a* and *d c r e f e ea g* are quite similar in that both involve discovery, we merged the two, resulting in one code, yet two codes in total. We categorized a unit as *ea g eg a* when it primarily addressed elaboration or redefinition of the memory described, brainstorming ideas, shaping content, or rhetorical strategies. Units identified as *g c eg a* mainly dealt with the format for the sijo structure, word choices, orthography, grammar, sentence structure, and style. Nonetheless, we have to admit that it was extremely hard to separate the two types of negotiation because linguistic choices shift meaning. We deem that this recognition would be vital specifically in a translingually disposed interaction like ours.

## FINDINGS

### Sijo: Understanding the Experience

The sample poems are presented chronologically in this section to show snapshots of significant experiences in Park's life.

머니 삼 , 기 남  
뜨 들 , 도뜨 라

It was a pleasant and happy meeting clinging onto my grandmother and uncle.

Heading toward the Baggage Claim at the Airport, I felt relieved.

Their warmheartedness was transferred to me when I held onto their hands.

The first line describes how Park perceived “ 국 (America)” in South Korea. “머 (imagined concept)” signifies the new land was purely an informational representation of the stories she heard from her family. The second line illustrates the shift in her emotions. The vivid image in this memory was the moment she caught a glimpse of her family through a little crack at the landing gate. She wrote the second line in English. The visual contrast between the Korean and English alphabets creates a powerful effect on the reader because it symbolizes her transition from South Korea to America. Readers can immediately see the creative mix of the two languages, representing both the world she had left and the new land in which she had just arrived. In the third line, the informational representation of the new land “became real” (Session 1) and thus she finally positioned herself as part of this new reality.

In sijo 2, Park uses two derivative forms of “뜨 (hot)”: “뜨 ” and “뜨 라.” Her use of two similar words in this short poem signifies her communicative intention of depicting a strong sense of warmth. Also, sijo 2 displays the image of holding hands twice to highlight the source of joy, family, using “ (holding hands)” and “ 들 (their hands).” The imagery of holding hands, the resulting sense of heat, and her emotional state easily permeate the poem. Sijo 2 captures how Park saw “their hearts through that warmth” (Session 2). She explained:

So that was something very vivid because I was 8. My first brother was 6, and my youngest was 2. So, there was that element of heat. The 2-year old brother was crying and, I mean, at the same time we were excited about being there.

(Session 1)

Coalescence seems to be a running theme in these two sijo in different ways. Her emotions were stretched to a state of relief and delight mingled with “the element of heat” (Session 1) when she finally saw her family at Northeast International Airport.

Immigrant daily life. Park reflected on her life in the United States after she was reunited with her grandmother at the age of 8, resulting in the following:

S 3

루 루 는 비 , 기  
평

Park differentiates written English from spoken English in these two connected poems. Her use of contrasting perspectives is depicted in several ways. First, she deliberately employed the same structure in the two verses. The first lines start with “           로 (in English),” the second lines contain a translanguaged quotation, and the third lines consist of a series of questions, albeit differently nuanced in meaning. Additionally, the parallel structure of the second lines of these poems is interesting because she positioned herself as an emergent bilingual. Her use of adjectives “           (intelligent)” and “           (meticulous)” hints that she put high trust in their perceptions of her literacy skills. Then, in the third line, she deployed twists, thus demonstrating her changing subject positioning. She moved from accepting others’ evalu-

interconnectedness between linguistic and meaning negotiation, frequently to create new meaning and understanding. Thus, overall, the results elucidate the process by which translanguaging practices operated as ongoing negotiations between languages and between meaning and language when the two languages came together.

Linguistic negotiation and the structured nature of sijo. The most prominent practice in the composing process was the conflation of linguistic negotiation with meaning negotiation. Park executed diverse linguistic negotiations to follow the sijo format and clarify her writing. A dominant issue throughout the revisions was how she played with words to construct her meaning while also creating the desired sijo structure. In other words, the sijo form allowed for winnowing of meaning, a judicious selection of the right word with which to convey meaning within the restricted form. For example, “평평 (uneven)” in the third line of sijo 3 was chosen after she tried various words. She identified at least 10 relevant words, such as “not flat,” “hilly,” “평평 (even),” “평평 (uneven),” “평평 다 (not even),” “비 (narrow),” “very narrow,” “very uneven.” Expression revisions were predominantly prompted by an effort to properly format her poem. In sijo 4 (Part I), Park initially wrote “다 (There’s still a long journey ahead)” for the last group of the third line. However, she changed it to “마 (There’s a long journey ahead)” to make it four syllables, which also involved a discussion about the tone she wanted to create and how she could create it. Accordingly, what brought about this change was not only the appropriate number of syllables but also the poetic distancing of her way of writing from the American boy’s way of writing for school. The translanguaged discussions of the syllabic distribution, words, rhetorical choices, and meanings interwove to highlight her sense of ambivalence regarding her school literacy. Putting an autobiographical memory in a poem, then, does not merely mean lexical choices: It also means articulating emotions by organically considering rhetorical effectiveness. The meaningful literacy perspective (Hanauer, 2012) supports this observation; developing lexicon emerged from Park’s authentic purpose to communicate her meaning. The structured nature of sijo motivated and in some cases forced Park to play with language in meaning-centered contexts.

More significantly, the very restrictions of the poetic form provided opportunities to refine and negotiate expressive meaning. The stream of talks to revise sijo 2 is an illustrative example of the unique way in which the syllabic regulation of sijo led Park to redefine her memory and shape the language to vividly convey the essence of this memory. The drafts of sijo 2 are as follows:

*D af 1*

비 기 내려 뜨 남 (A warm and happy greeting after we  
deplaned.)

baggage claim







and employ rhetorical strategies like contrast. Extract 2 illustrates how she revised the third line followed by the second line of sijo 1.

*E / ac 2*

---



---

Kim: [She read Park's draft aloud] "Became more realistic."  
 더 새 나라 내 나라 \_ 다. 된 ?

---

TABLE 2  
Syllabic Distribution for the Third Line of Sijo 1

3	5	4	4
궂 (America)	와 (finally)	나 테는 (to me)	라 (a reality)

(Finally, I came to know America as a reality.)

Extract 2 epitomizes a dynamic interaction between emerging new ideas in the context of linguistic complexity—in this case the structured form of sijo and poetic endings. A stream of thoughts sprang to Park’s mind in response to Kim’s encouragement to consider “the first two chunks.” To create the desired structure, Park came up with the idea that the clause she originally planned for the first half of the third line (“났 [When I met my maternal side of the family at the airport]”) could work better for the second line. This occurred when Kim reminded her of her brainstorming memo about the memory of “a cry of happiness” she felt when she saw family at the landing gate. This prompted Park to describe this sensory detail in the second line, which resulted in “A glimpse of my grandmother at the landing gate brought tears of joy” in sijo 1. Thus, the two languages interwove to support an enhanced understanding of her memory. This translanguaging practice operates as recursive negotiations between languages and between meaning and language particularly when expressing transnational experience within the constraints of the sijo format. This final version, however, did not emerge until another round of extended discussion. Figure 1 shows intermediate drafts of sijo1.

Both the discussion of the revisions as well as the production of the poetry were translingual. Park’s creativity was illustrated when she strategically wove English and Korean together in the second line. She adopted this translingual practice after a 35-minute translanguaged dialogue. To revise the second line, Park started with “머니와 눈 눈 다 (shed tears when I saw my grandmother at the airport),” as shown in the middle portion of Figure 1. At first, she tried several different words to express a glimpse of her grandmother: “눈 (눈 : eye contact),” “눈 는 (눈 는: making eye contact),” and “눈 (eye contact).” Although she eventually threw away these Korean versions, playing with these Korean words evidently crystalized her flurry of thoughts about the memory, which Hanauer (2010) would call “linguistic negotiation of personal thoughts, feelings and experiences” (p. 60). The *g c e g a* of scratching out words and phrases can be seen in Park’s notes (Figure 1) as one way to perfect or clarify the meaning and its nuances. It was a decisive moment when Park wondered if the English version



Korean version and the English version. Rather, our translingual practice created a hybrid version that embodies both languages to express Park's emotions more poetically as well as more truthfully from her own perspective. Thus, Park developed the ability to effectively communicate her experience across languages and cultures. This translingual negotiation illustrates how a translingual disposition emerges, leading to an increase in translingual competence, which was advocated by Canagarajah (2015) in his translingual model of literacy acquisition. In this model, competence is "integrated, with all languages in one's repertoire making up a synthesized language competence" (p. 423).

Ongoing negotiations between language and meaning. As discussed above, the pronounced characteristic of the *sijo* workshops is the convergence of linguistic negotiation and meaning negotiation on the part of the poet-researcher. It is enlightening to see not only how her desire to create meaning led to the intertwining of linguistic and meaning negotiations but also how this conflation helped Park redefine her experiences. Finally, and perhaps most interestingly, the composing process for each *sijo* features recurrent patterns of translanguaging strategies. For example, Park spoke English mostly to brainstorm and explain her memories, but she relied more on Korean while composing *sijo*. Park's strategies corroborate Wei's (2011) argument about the act of translanguaging. Wei asserts that it is "transformative in nature; it creates a social space for the multilingual language

various forms such as poetry can be a transferable teaching strategy in English language instruction.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

Although the results of this study are not generalizable to the larger population of (English) language learners, insights gained from Park's development of translanguaging competence can raise pedagogical questions related to assisting language learners about translanguaging dispositions, translanguaging, and translanguaging practice. This set of characteristics, we would assume, cuts across learning additional languages. Our work concretizes translanguaging (e.g., Canagarajah, 2013b; Horner et al., 2011; Lu & Horner, 2013) through poetry instruction focusing on the composing process. Translanguaging pedagogy can take a wide range of different forms, but we underscore the pressing need for a more expressive approach to language learning, and thus a more personally responsive task (Hanauer, 2012). The qualitative analysis of poetry workshops reveals that a poetry-writing project provides a meaningful venue of self-understanding and self-expression by promoting translanguaging communication. Taking it a step further, we propose *ea gf 'a e ac* by connecting translanguaging literacy (Canagarajah, 2013a) and meaningful literacy (Hanauer, 2012). That is, we suggest that educators incorporate poetry writing in second language instruction as a tool to extend learners' understanding and a second language far beyond a collection of decontextualized grammar and vocabulary. The learning outcomes of this literacy approach in classrooms would be translanguaging dispositions leading to the development of essential abilities to make meaning across differences (Horner et al., 2011) with academic, social, and cultural implications.

First, linguistic negotiations for self-expression through poetry carry academic implications for second language classrooms. The results establish that linguistic changes were frequently driven by Park's desire to communicate her message and emotion, that is, a rhetorical strategy to engage with readers as well as demonstrate self-knowledge. These are complex decisions that decontextualized grammar or vocabulary exercises are not likeet74

“idiomatic novelties” should be considered as “a positive case of transfer from the other languages in one’s repertoire” (Canagarajah, 2011a, p. 402). Not only an instance of transfer, however, “눈 (eye contact)” has been “appropriated and transformed” (Canagarajah, 2015, p. 423) in such a way that the features of both languages are embedded. These different features have not created a mere combination of different codes. They are the outcomes of us positioning ourselves at different points on the continuum of English and Korean. They have resulted in a new understanding in Park’s mind, what Creese and Blackledge (2015) would call “new language reality” (p. 26; see also Garcia, 2009). This organic process of making meaning is why translanguaging negotiation is transformative (Lu & Horner, 2013). Transformations of this sort are extended with the combination of the poet’s willingness to express herself through deep reflection and the facilitator’s cognizance of the target language and poetry writing. Not only in Korean instruction, weaving poetry into English instruction could surely help students engage in transformative learning, thereby critically reflecting on their desires, which Motha and Lin (2014) convincingly theorized as being “at the center of every English language learning moment” (p. 332). For this reason, writing sijo in English would be a worthwhile pedagogical adaptation. Hence, it is recommended that in b(in)-Engl4-333.exa(whe2).-5-4312).7 and ended in

opportunities to learn how linguistic choices shift meaning. Our translingually disposed conversation to revise the poems often led us to discuss how different grammatical choices would make difference in meaning in conjunction with explanations about the grammatical features in question. This practice is consistent with Larsen-Freeman's (2001) grammaring framework that encourages EAL educators to teach form within meaning-centered contexts. Instead of teaching correct form prescriptively as a process of knowledge transmission, her framework enables students to consider various forms to achieve a communicative goal. This is what Williams and Condon (2016) recognize as part of "common ground" between translingual and second language scholars because it respects "student choice based on variable contexts" (p. 12). Thus, we argue that poetry writing might offer a translingual context in second language writing classes, presumably one way to develop "second language writing and translingual writing as related yet distinct areas of research and teaching," as Atkinson et al. (2015, p. 383) highlighted.

Second, the social implication of getting students to be more cognizant of resources such as literary forms and languages is to extend their linguistic heritage. In an autoethnographic study, Jenks (2017) documented the process by which he learned Korean across different social settings including interactions with his family members. Social engagements as a participant in the family community to him was both a motivation to learn Korean and an outcome leading to greater proficiency in Korean. Particularly, his learning trajectory demonstrates that semiotic and human resources including a more competent Korean speaker contributed to Korean learning. Our analysis attests that *sijo* writing allows learning Korean to be mediated by both semiotic resources—including the poems studied and produced, typical poetic endings for *sijo*, and the cultural knowledge accompanied with *sijo*—and a human resource (Kim). This mediation occurred through translanguaging negotiations, sometimes manifested as negotiation to label the stories described in Korean, and other times as negotiation to use nuances of the Korean language. The fluid nature of translingual practice (e.g., Extract 1) indeed substantiates the "inherent plurality of language resources at play in any communicative act" (Lee & Jenks, 2016, p. 318). The convergence of linguistic and meaning negotiations by freely moving across the two languages—Korean and English—was by far the most interesting observation in this study. In particular, this translanguaging negotiation, a new way of expressing, draws on "different dimensions of [multilinguals'] personal history, experience and environment" (Wei, 2011, p. 1223), coupled with translingual disposition resulting in translingual competence. Considering "the permeability of linguistic boundaries" (Lu & Horner, 2013,



p. 582) in the modern globalized world, improving translingual competence is of utmost importance in cross-language and cross-cultural communication.

Finally, teachers and students can benefit culturally from *sijo*—a cross-cultural literacy task—by promoting translingual dispositions and, eventually, intercultural competence through both the products and

Horner, 2013). After all, Liao (2018) illustrates how English-speaking students became more open to linguistic diversity through poetic autoethnographies in college composition courses. Further, given that English communication needs to be understood as “a process . . . of cultural adaptation” essential in a globalized society, as Widdowson (2017, p. 275) articulates, *sijo* written in English could become an effective way of developing English competence by constituting a cultural resource for enhanced global awareness.

## REFERENCES

- Atkinson, D., Crusan, D., Matsuda, P. K., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., Ruecker, T., Simpson, S., & Tardy, C. (2015). Clarifying the relationship between L2 writing and translingual writing: An open letter to writing studies editors and organization leaders.



