

Georgia State University ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

Middle and Secondary Education Faculty
Publications

Department of Middle and Secondary Education

2015

A Heritage Language Learner's Literacy Practices in a Korean Language Course in a U.S. University: From a Multiliteracies Perspective

Jayoung Choi

Georgia State University, jayoungchoi@gsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/mse_facpub

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), and the [Junior High, Intermediate, Middle School Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Choi, J. (2015). A Heritage Language Learner's Literacy Practices in a Korean Language Course in a U.S. University: From a Multiliteracies Perspective. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education (JoLLe)*, 11(2): 116-133.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Middle and Secondary Education at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Middle and Secondary Education Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

A Heritage Language Learner's Literacy Practices in a Korean Language Course in a U.S. University: From a Multiliteracies Perspective

Jayoung Choi

ABSTRACT: Drawing on multiliteracies, the author examines how a multiliteracies curriculum in a 3rd-year Korean heritage language (HL) class at a southeastern U.S. university contributed to the development of a student's HL literacy skills. Print-based and multimodal responses (i.e., a digital animation movie) to the readings of students' choices and language logs were aligned with the four components of a multiliteracies pedagogy (i.e., situated practice, overt instruction, critical framing, and transformative practice). The qualitative data analysis suggests that a multiliteracies curriculum helped an HL learner develop motivation to read in Korean, adopt an agentive take on Korean language learning, and form an emerging literate identity as a legitimate reader and writer in the HL. The author discusses important implications for reading/literacy educators in various contexts.

Keywords: Korean, heritage language, multiliteracies, university-level language classroom, multimodal reading response



Jayoung Choi is a clinical assistant professor of ESOL/Literacy education at Georgia State University. Her research interests include adolescent English and heritage language learners' literacy practices and identity development and multimodal literacies taken up and practiced by ELLs and ESOL teachers. Her work has been published in *Foreign Language Annals*, *TESL Canada Journal*, and *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*. She can be reached at jayoungchoi@gsu.edu or 404-413-8380.

Heritage language (HL) learners¹ who are exposed to and speak a language other than English exclusively in their homes and communities exhibit relatively lower reading and writing skills compared to their higher speaking and listening abilities in their HL (Byon, 2008; Felix, 2009; Jensen & Llosa, 2007; Kondo-Brown, 2010; Mikulski, 2010). The lower literacy competencies exhibited by many HL learners is attributable to the paucity of bilingual programs and to English-only curricula in U.S. schools, as this lack of availability leaves parents primarily responsible for maintaining and developing their children's HL (Lee & Oxelson, 2006; Olsen, 1997; Potowski & Carreira, 2004). The lack of structured and sustainable programs for the HL learners in their formal schooling to develop all four language domains is a true loss for the national linguistic and cultural asset. HL learners are deprived of the opportunity to expand their linguistic repertoire, to develop a more sophisticated and deepened understanding about the HL history, culture, and community, and to construct a healthier cultural and ethnic identity (Lee & Wright, 2014).

Nevertheless, it is a welcoming phenomenon that an increasing number of HL learners have been enrolling in foreign language classes in the United States hoping to improve their HL skills when they enter universities (Byon, 2008; Sohn & Shin, 2007). However, whether or not the university language courses meet the literacy needs of HL learners has not yet been determined (Gambhir, 2008; Ilieva, 2008; Jensen & Llosa, 2007; Jeon, 2010; Kondo-Brown, 2010; Schwarzer & Petr 'on, 2005). For example, because in some cases low enrollments do not financially justify establishing separate HL and non-HL tracks (Gambhir, 2008) or because of a lack of instructor's training on teaching HL learners (Potowski, & Carreira, 2004), many HL learners find themselves unchallenged and frustrated in language classrooms. Hence, university language course curricula that address HL learners' literacy needs play a pivotal role in sustaining their interest in and enhancing of their knowledge about HL language and culture.

In this article, I examine how a multiliteracies curriculum in a 3rd-year Korean HL class at a

southeastern U.S. university contributed to the development of a student's HL literacy skills. I first turn to the theoretical framework of the study, multiliteracies, and pertinent literature on language learners' literacy practices in the classroom contexts and literacy practices in HL classes.

A Multiliteracies Pedagogy

In developing a 3rd-year Korean HL course, I went beyond the traditional notion of literacy as a single form of print-based reading and writing. I drew on the theoretical concept, multiliteracies (the New London Group, 1996), that takes into consideration "the multiplicity of communications channels and media, and the increasing saliency of cultural and linguistic diversity" (p. 63) reflecting rapidly changing social, global, and technological landscapes. Multiliteracies involves meaning-making through orchestrating various modes of representation rather than solely relying on the written or spoken language, which has been the dominant mode in school curriculum (Jewitt, 2008; Kress, 2000; the New London Group, 1996). Central to multiliteracies is the notion of design, the intentionality in using resources for meaning construction. The design framework accentuates learners' agency and transformation in the process of meaning making by utilizing available semiotic resources. As Kress (2000), one of the New London Group (1996) scholars, posits, "The work of the text maker is taken as transformative of the resources and of the maker of the text. It gives agency of a real kind to the text maker" (p. 340). In designing texts, the use of multimodal resources is essential (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000):

The increasing multiplicity and integration of significant modes of meaning-making, where the textual is also related to the visual, the audio, the spatial, the behavioural, and so on meaning is made in ways that are increasingly multimodal-- in which written-linguistic modes of meaning are part and parcel of visual, audio, and spatial patterns of meaning. (p. 5)

When applied in the classroom, a multiliteracies pedagogy is comprised of four components: situated

practice, overt instruction, critical framing, and transformative practice (the New London Group, 1996). "Situated practice" is primarily concerned with immersing learners in an authentic learning environment in which they engage in rich literacy tasks by interacting with others and by drawing on their out-of-school interests and expertise. Nevertheless, the sociocultural view of literacy that emphasizes practice through immersion does not overlook 'overt instruction' to ensure that learners develop metalinguistic skills for the ultimate immersion learning experience (Vygotsky, 1986). After all, learners must be able "to gain conscious awareness and control of what they acquired" (the New London Group, 1996, p. 85). In addition to situated practice and overt instruction, a multiliteracies curriculum creates spaces for learners to step away from what they know and have learned and to examine their work critically ("critical framing") and to recreate their realities, identities, and discourses by challenging common practices and discourses ("transformative practice"; Kern, 2000).

A Multiliteracies Pedagogy in Action in Language Classes

In this section, I explore the application of the theoretical concept, multiliteracies, in the university-level language classroom. A number of English as a Second Language (ESL) and foreign language university classes have increasingly incorporated multiliteracies into their curriculum. In these courses, students composed digital stories about personal topics (Alameen, 2011; Vinogradova, Linville, & Bickel, 2011), created digital videos for a science project in an English as a foreign language setting (Hafner & Miller, 2011), communicated with other global interlocutors by using video conferencing software (Guth & Helm, 2012), and searched and studied groups in Facebook in an intermediate Spanish class

(Blattner & Fiori, 2011). The studies have collectively reported that a multiliteracies approach to language teaching and learning helps develop students' linguistic competencies, agency, and learner communities.

Research more pertinent to the current study took place in a university ESL reading course in Taiwan (Lee, 2013). After the class read classic literature in English, the students created multimodal responses instead of expressing them in an exclusively linguistic format. The students' work included skits, comic strips, and operatic music that represented their understanding of the text. The analyses of videotaped group presentations, peer evaluations, and open-ended surveys indicated that multimodal reading responses empowered language learners often limited by language abilities, helping them to comprehend the text better. In a radio show, one group of students created a sequel to the literature that reflected their lived experiences with and knowledge of the traditional Taiwanese puppet shows. While creating the multimodal reading response, "they [the ESL students] created, entered,

and sustained the story world and transformed it to make it fit their own world" (p. 197). Importantly, Lee found that sharing various multimodal reading responses to the single text seemed to enhance the class's understanding of the text collectively and that presenting it multimodally reinforced their understanding of the literature. Lee documented that in this process, the students appeared to gain confidence as learners of

English and were more likely to sustain an interest in reading in English. Lee's study highlights that language learners gained more nuanced understanding about reading contents when permitted to express what they learned multimodally. In addition, the study suggests that a multiliteracies pedagogy that builds on students'

Designing identities and text through divergent literacy components ranging from unimodal literacy practices and skills instruction to multimodal reading responses could importantly contribute to expanding the timely theoretical concept, 'multiliteracies.'

lived experiences, especially through situated and transformed practices, helps learners see themselves as readers and writers in the target language.

Literacy Practices in Heritage Language Classes

Researchers (e.g., Byon, 2008; Felix, 2009) have emphasized the importance of literacy instruction in HL classes to meet the needs of HL learners with reading and writing, needs that are different from those of non-HL foreign language learners. Nevertheless, many HL curricular approaches have not adequately reflected the unique needs of the HL learners (Kondo-Brown, 2010). Instead, HL instruction has focused on explicit grammar (Schwarzer & Petr 'on, 2005), spelling instruction (Pyun & Lee-Smith, 2011), and vocabulary and translation practices with prescribed reading materials (McQuillan, 1996). For instance, Schwarzer and Petr 'on (2005) studied three Spanish HL learners' disappointing experiences with a college grammar-focused Spanish HL course. The mismatch between the HL curriculum and the HL learners' needs was clearly demonstrated by one of the participants, Felipe, who lost his desire to take any Spanish courses despite his voluntary literacy engagement with poetry writing in the HL outside of the class and his major being bilingual education. This is not to point out that such explicit language instruction is unnecessary for HL learners; however, these studies call for balanced language and literacy instruction in HL courses.

In only a few HL studies, researchers have examined literacy practices of HL learners in the classroom context by focusing primarily on writing (i.e., collaborative fiction writing in a third-year Hebrew HL college course; see Feuer, 2011) not on reading, with the exception of a recent study by Choi and Yi (2012). For instance, one student in Nichols and Colon's (2000) study, Marta, had displayed a great deal of spelling mistakes in HL writing at the beginning of the course because of 8 years of formal schooling only in English. However, after participating in timed free-writing on multiple topics in the Spanish HL courses for 4 years, she showed a significant growth in writing fluency and orthographical accuracy. Although feedback was not given to the written work by the instructor, through

her growing familiarity with written HL and rich language input in class, Marta was able to self-monitor her own errors in writing and to improve HL writing skills significantly.

Given the sparseness of literacy studies on HL learners (Lo-Philip, 2010), it is not surprising that any research examining HL learners' multiliteracies engagement, especially multimodal practices at the university level, is scarce. I was able to locate only two studies conducted in primary and secondary HL class settings in the United Kingdom (see Lytra, 2011) and a theoretical paper that discussed the importance of digital storytelling for HL learners (Vinogradova, 2014). Considering the call for multimodal research in the English as a second language field (Block, 2013; Lotherington & Jenson, 2011) and for more language teachers to adopt multiliteracies in curriculum (Blattner & Fiori, 2011; Gonglewski & DuBravac, 2006), not incorporating students' use of multimodal resources (Jewitt, 2008) in in-class literacy practices does a disservice to the current generation of the students, including HL students.

Method

Drawing on the theoretical framework and previous research that point to the importance of multiliteracies practices particularly for HL learners, in this study, I aimed to explore how a multiliteracies curriculum in a 3rd-year Korean HL class contributed to the development of a student's HL literacy skills. The following research question guided the study: "How did one heritage language learner take up multiliteracies practices in the course?"

Context: The 3rd-Year Korean HL Literacy Course

As part of a larger study of literacy practices that built on HL learners' out-of-school interests, such as popular culture (Choi & Yi, 2012) in the advanced Korean HL classroom setting, the current study reports on one HL learner's gains in literacy skills within the multiliteracies curriculum in a third-year Korean HL offered at a southeastern U.S. university. I was the instructor of the course, which met twice a week for 15 weeks for the duration of 85 minutes. I

had the liberty of designing the curriculum for this advanced course, which provided the students with rich literacy experiences. Key literacy practices in the curriculum included composing projects, such as autobiographic essays, poems, and movies; a research paper about a person that they respect in their community; and self-selected reading outside the class for one hour that was discussed in small groups, using both print- and multimodal- based reading responses coupled with explicit instruction and scaffolding (i.e., print-based reading responses and language logs in which the students self-monitored and attended to their spelling, grammar, and vocabulary).

The course consisted of 10 U.S.-born and 9 Korea-born Korean American students with 11 females and 8 males. The students' majors varied from management and computer science to various engineering studies. Although it was a third-year course, their proficiency levels in Korean ranged from low to advanced. Research consent was obtained from all students in the course.

The Participant

In this paper, I focus on one focal student, Jenny (pseudonym). I chose Jenny as the focal participant because she was representative of the U.S.-born students in the course (a) who had not had prior experience with reading and writing in Korean, and (b) who showed a higher engagement with and much growth in reading and writing in Korean as exhibited in the interviews and my assessment of their course work.

Jenny was born and raised in a Korean household in the United States while predominantly listening to and speaking Korean with her family members. However, she did not have much exposure to reading and writing in Korean at home or inside school. I considered her proficiency in Korean as low-intermediate, as she had a considerable number of orthographical errors in her writing and low oral fluency in Korean. She considered herself quiet and liked to figure things out by herself. She appeared to be shy when participating in group or peer activities in the course. She was soft spoken and had a heavy English accent when pronouncing Korean words.

When enrolled in the course, she was majoring in computational media.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data sources consisted of the course materials (students' work and lesson plans) and the entire copies of Jenny's class work, which included an autobiographical essay, six print-based reading response entries, language logs, a storyboard for the multimodal reading responses, and a digital animation movie. Also included were one 30-minute long individual interview session and an audio recording of an in-class group talk session about the learning experience at the end of the course, which was later transcribed for analysis, as well as two email correspondences (right after the interview and 1.5 years past the completion of the course), and researcher journal entries. As a Korean-English bilingual, I translated the Korean data, which was later reviewed by the participant.

I first read and viewed multiple times all of Jenny's texts produced in the course (autobiography, print-based reading responses, language logs, and a multimodal reading response) and other texts (transcripts from a recorded class talk, one interview transcript, and two email correspondences; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Yin, 2003). While keeping the research question in mind, I annotated initial interpretations and themes by paying attention to content and linguistic features in her written work and color-coded them (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Merriam, 1998). For her multimodal reading response, Jenny utilized visual data analysis tools (i.e., visual meaning of foregrounding and backgrounding, placement of image elements, and colors) developed by Cope and Kalantzis (2009). Jenny's experiences with the multiliteracies tasks in the course led to the major coding categories, such as increased motivation in reading in Korean, agentive take on Korean language learning, and formation of Korean literate identity.

Findings and Discussion

In this section, to explore how one heritage language learner took up multiliteracies practices provided in a university language course, I describe reading and writing opportunities in the course by specifically

focusing on one HL learner's, Jenny, and her experiences with them. I do so by closely examining four components of a multiliteracies pedagogy (i.e., situated practice, overt instruction, critical framing, and transformative practice) in the curriculum.

Increased Motivation in Reading in Korean through Individual Silent Reading and Print-based Reading Responses

The curriculum provided the HL learners with rich, situated practice. That is, the students were immersed in rich reading and writing experiences by reading a text of their choice for one hour every other week, documenting their individual reading in six print-based reading response entries, and discussing it in a small, book-club setting (Daniels, 2002). The students were asked to bring books from their family members and friends. Many brought in translated English books in Korean. I also provided approximately 20 books with different proficiency levels, topics, and genres, including children's books. The children's picture and chapter books were often circulated among the lower level learners throughout the course. Each student was required to consult me regarding their appropriate reading level as proficiency levels greatly varied within the class. However, the students had the freedom to stop reading if they found it uninteresting or not suitable for their reading level.

Given Jenny's lower proficiency in Korean, I recommended easier children's books; however, she insisted on the book whose original text in English consists of eight chapters with different stories about life lessons and leading a successful life. Jenny completed reading one half of the 173-page translated book that she brought from home, called *마시멜로 이야기* [*Don't eat the marshmallow...yet!: The secret to sweet success in work and life*]. She used to dread reading in Korean as evinced in the deliberate stretching of each letter of the word, 'Korean,' in the interview below. However, when invited to read a text of her choice, she willingly and pleasantly took up the challenge by selecting a book she had a pre-established familiarity with and personal interest in and that generated an extra boost for her to sustain and increase engagement with reading a longer text:

When I look at a Korean book, I am like uh (laughing). . . it's K-o-r-e-a-n (laughing while stretching out each letter). My Korean skills are not good yet, but this made me try to do my best in trying to read it and understand it. (interview, 05/04/2010)

A student like her who had not read any Korean books prior to this course could have easily given up on reading because of frustration if he or she had not had genuine interest in the reading material.

In addition, the specific directions in the print-based reading responses addressed both situated practice and overt instruction in that they fostered students' deeper engagement with reading, beyond reading word-for-word, by prompting them to make predictions, guesses, and personal connections to the text and to further critique it while simultaneously paying attention to language features, such as vocabulary and grammar. Jenny's reflections in print-based reading responses included her evaluations and impressions, such as, "두번째 챕터에 이야기는 첫번째 챕터에 이야기 처럼 많이 비슷해서 좀 심심했어요" [*the story in the second chapter was a bit boring as it was similar to the one in the first chapter*] (print-based reading response entry #4, 03/11/2010); and predictions about text, "내용은 좀 엉뚱하고 이상하게 생각을 합니다. 아마도 사장님이 햄버거를 마시멜로를 부르는 이유가 복잡하고 기뻐거예요" [*I think what I am reading was a bit bizarre and strange. I speculate the reason the boss refers to the hamburger as marshmallow must be complicated and interesting*] (print-based reading response entry #1, 01/21/2010). Drawing on her reading experiences in English, it is likely that Jenny would have utilized similar strategies while reading without the specific instructions. However, the probing questions, intended as a reading guide, might have made her reading experiences in Korean more engaging. One of her print-based reading response entries is shown in Appendix A.

Agentive Take on Korean Language Learning through Language Logs

Based on the print-based reading responses, the students had the opportunity to develop metalinguistic skills by examining their own writing in Korean. Each student completed five follow-up

language logs in which they self-corrected their written work that had been submitted to and received feedback from me. Instead of directly correcting the errors, I encouraged the students to monitor their own mistakes by pointing out error types in spelling, word choice, vocabulary, spacing, and grammar. Language logs were an important part of the multiliteracies curriculum in the Korean HL course that aimed to provide overt instruction. I incorporated overt skills instruction to meet the HL learners' needs for improving spelling and grammar as they lacked formal literacy instruction prior to coming to the university language class. Nevertheless, the skills instruction was not discrete and random, but drew on the students' own writing and increased their awareness about their language use.

In completing the language logs throughout the course, Jenny did not passively perform what was asked of her. Instead, she actively engaged in first identifying her problem areas and then working toward improving her writing conventions in Korean. One of the weakest areas of Jenny's writing, as recognized by both her and the instructor, was orthographic accuracy and grammatical knowledge, which are common problematic areas for HL learners (Pyun & Lee-Smith, 2011). The last column of a language log required students to reflect on their own errors (see Appendix B for a language log entry). Jenny deeply reflected on her writing conventions and identified a consistently recurring linguistic pattern, which was the incorrect use of honorifics² in addressing seniors, such as her parents. She wrote, "honorific 을 더 많이 필요하다. 부모님들 위에 서 쓰실테 써야된다 [*More honorific is needed. When writing about parents, it has to be used*]" (02/27/2010). Whereas the lack of the grammatical feature was prominent in her earlier

writings, in later writing samples in the course, I noted the improvement of this grammatical feature, though she was not accurate all the time. This shift indicates that she was taking control of her own language learning and that she clearly took advantage of the curricular opportunities (i.e., reading responses and language logs) in which she paid specific attention to linguistic features (grammar, spelling, and vocabulary) of the text. The findings above demonstrate Jenny's proactive and agentive take on the component of the multiliteracies curriculum that also addressed overt instruction.

Literate Identity in Korean through a Multimodal Reading Response

As a culminating reading activity in the course, each student created a multimodal reading response in which he or she told two stories from their individual reading(s) to the class. To do this, I guided them to revisit their text as well as print-based reading responses in order to create a storyboard. Creating a storyboard was a form of overt instruction in the multiliteracies curriculum. I provided the students with scaffolding and modeling for how to select two important storylines that could be featured in the storyboard. In this process, they distanced themselves from their readings and print-based reading responses with a different audience in mind (from instructor to a wider audience; i.e., critical framing). Students' multimodal reading responses included PowerPoint and poster board presentations, booklets, a puppet show, and movies using movie-making software.

Jenny created a silent black-and-white, digitally animated movie (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3-THL3pnBJU>),

Nonetheless, various multiliteracies curricular opportunities, particularly the multimodal reading response, encouraged her to build on her out-of-class interests in animation and story-making/telling and to represent and communicate meaning beyond the linguistic mode while still learning linguistic features through overt instructional opportunity, such as language logs.

which well reflected her personal interests and expertise in animation and storytelling. As a computational media major, she exhibited a strong interest in digital animation production as shown in an email exchange: “I wanted to make the finished product relevant to my interest, animation. I have always wanted to make my own animated series, . . . so I made my presentation in *Flash*” (email, 10/26/2011). Jenny also drew on the strong identity as a writer, reader, storyteller, and animator that she had developed only in the English language since youth, “아직도 취미를 이야기를 쓰고 어떤 이야기는 그려서 만화로 보여줘요 . . . 제가 어릴때 부터 책을 많이 쓰고 만화영화를 많이 만들고 한 책장을 채우는것이 제 포부였어요” [*still write stories and share my cartoons with others as my hobby. . . It has been my dream to write a lot of books, make many animation movies, and filling one book shelf with such work since young*] (Jenny’s autobiography final essay).

To examine how her multimodal reading response that allowed her to capitalize on her personal interests and knowledge helped her improve reading comprehension, I now pay particular attention to her *linguistic* and *visual representation* of one story, called “위대한 아들을 키운 위대한 아버지” [*A great father who raised a great son*], which is about a father who taught his son a lesson about the importance of honesty and integrity. She considerably fleshed out the storyline in the multimodal reading response (i.e., 23 sentences) whereas her print-based reading response about the same story had included only eight sentences (see Appendices C and D). More linguistic details that she included in the multimodal reading response suggest that she must have reread the text, which could have contributed to her better understanding of the content. In addition to a more detailed linguistic representation of the story, drawing images that accompanied the linguistic text for the multimodal reading response helped her go back to the text and understand the content thoroughly as she pointed out in an email, “With the storylines, drawing pictures to go along with my summary forced me to make sure I understood the material in the stories” (05/05/2010).

To demonstrate how she gained a more nuanced understanding of the content and how she

represented the content in more sophisticated ways using visual, a non-linguistic mode, I describe one scene from the movie in detail that included three animated images accompanying the linguistic text, “아들이 억울한 표정으로 아버지한테 거짓말을 했어요. 아버지는 속지 않았어요” [*The son lied to his father with a hurt face. The father was not deceived*]. See figure 1 below:



Figure 1. Linear representation of one animated scene from Jenny’s multimodal reading response. The images from top to bottom changed for animation effects. The linguistic text on the top of the visual, “위대한 아들을 키운 위대한 아버지” [*A great father who raised a great son*], was the title of the story and the text below the visual is the linguistic explanation of the story, “아들이 억울한 표정으로 아버지한테 거짓말을 했어요. 아버지는 속지 않았어요” [*The son lied to his father with a hurt face. The father was not deceived*].

In the original story, the son comes up with elaborate excuses for his tardiness to the father. The first image shows that the son is exaggerating his excuses, expressed by the English word, “lies,” inserted three times, the hand gestures, and the facial expressions (i.e., the mouth wide open and big eyes staring at the

upper side on his artificially sad face). As if to signal his turn to speak in the storyline, he is placed in the foreground. By contrast, the tiny fraction of the top of the father's head shown with the three eclipses right above, situated on the left of the frame, significantly marks his speechlessness and grave disappointment. In the next image, the close-up of the father's raised eyebrows and thinly stretched lips powerfully illustrate the father's sense of resentment toward the son. Lastly, the son's posture, his shoulders, back, and arms bent forward, while facing his father who still maintains a stern face with a question mark added in the front, indicates his failed attempt to deceive his father that quickly led to a sense of disgrace and shame. The visual description of the son in this image sharply contrasted with the depiction of his self-assuredness conveyed by the frontal view in the first image.

All of the visual meanings that Jenny represented and communicated powerfully add much more nuance, emotion, and intricate tensions of the characters to the "flat" linguistic text (Lotherington & Jenson, 2011). Her deliberate design of visual elements to complement the linguistic text on a deeper level maximizes the dramatic effects of the storylines. Although she initially identified this reading as a challenging tale to comprehend as she wrote in print-based reading responses, she reached a sophisticated understanding of the text through multimodal representation. She was able to express a subtleness that would not have been possible to communicate in a text format due to her lower proficiency. At the same time, it is important to note that her immaculate multimodal design of the text does not equate to an accurate understanding of the original text. Not having the advanced linguistic means to express the details of the tale, in a few places, she copied or slightly paraphrased some phrases from the original text. Some detailed information was also misguided, such as the exact time of an event.

Although an HL learner's acquisition of Korean literacy cannot be quantitatively measured, it was evident that the multiliteracies curriculum in an advanced Korean HL class made an HL learner feel more confident with her Korean and sustained her interest in HL literacy practices in her life. During an

interview at the end of the course, Jenny was confident that she was gradually making improvements in Korean: "I know that I am improving really slowly, so it seems like I am not improving but I am actually improving." In addition, the fact that she continued reading Korean picture books on her own even after the completion of the course is a telling example of the effects of the multiliteracies curriculum on her sustained engagement with Korean literacy: "I have felt confident enough to peruse Korean picture books on my own during the summer though. I've recorded myself reading one picture book out loud" (email, 10/26/2011).

The findings suggest that a multiliteracies curriculum helped Jenny transform her identity from only an English reader, writer, and storyteller to an emerging Korean literate individual. In other words, a multiliteracies curriculum that "acknowledges, emphasizes, and enthusiastically includes students' diverse, multilayered, and dynamic identities" (Vinogradova, 2014, p. 318) played an important role in the process of her discovering her Korean literate identity. Here I draw on identity as being socially mediated and constantly negotiated through interactions with others, while also engaged in meaning making practices (Gee, 2003; Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998). A large number of orthographical and grammatical errors and lack of vocabulary knowledge found in her written work, as well as her low fluency in speaking, had situated Jenny as a lower proficient learner in the third-year Korean HL course. She also had barely talked, so she did not have a strong presence in class. Nonetheless, various multiliteracies curricular opportunities, particularly the multimodal reading response, encouraged her to build on her out-of-class interests in animation and story-making/telling and to represent and communicate meaning beyond the linguistic mode while still learning linguistic features through overt instructional opportunity, such as language logs. Consequently, the in-class literacy practices enhanced her engagement with Korean literacy and additionally fostered her *Korean literate identity*. Additionally, Jenny shared the animation movie that she had made with her family and friends, even non-Korean friends, to present herself as a Korean storyteller, reader, and writer. These are

telling examples of transformed practice in a multiliteracies pedagogy.

Discussion

The Korean HL multiliteracies curriculum included four components: (a) situated practice through immersion into reading and writing in Korean based on students' interests, (b) overt instruction for helping students monitor and self-identify linguistic areas to improve and making storylines, (c) critical framing in that it helped learners distance themselves from their creations with a different audience in mind for their multimodal reading responses, and (d) transformed practices through multimodal reading responses to help the HL learners see themselves as readers and writers in the HL for the first time.

As shown in Jenny's example, these opportunities helped her gain more literacy skills in Korean, leading to confidence in Korean and a new literate identity. This transformation was particularly possible as HL learners were invited to draw on their interests in selecting texts to read and write about and as they took charge of their own linguistic features, developing metalinguistic skills. The findings are congruent with Lee's (2013) study in that Jenny connected her life with comprehending the text in the target language, Korean, as the Taiwanese ESL students at the university level enhanced their understanding of a piece of literature in English and gained more confidence in the English language.

The current study that has explicated a multiliteracies curriculum, as experienced by one HL learner, contributes to the fields of language and literacy education for the following reasons. First, the classroom-based literacy research can be a valuable contribution to a dearth of literacy studies of HLs, particularly of less commonly taught languages, which is a call from Kondo-Brown (2010). Furthermore, the expanded notion of *literacies* practices, which includes multimodality (the New London Group, 1996) enacted in the HL setting, addresses the scarcity of studies in this regard in language research settings compared to first language literacy contexts (Blattner & Fiori, 2011; Block, 2013; Gonglewski & DuBravac, 2006;

Lotherington & Jenson, 2011). Lastly, the exhaustive, in-depth, and comprehensive description of one learner's various literacy events could be an invaluable contribution to the wider fields. Many multimodal literacy studies have narrowly focused on one creation of a multimodal project often involving autobiographic composing about the self (e.g., Hull & Nelson, 2005). Designing identities and text through divergent literacy components ranging from unimodal literacy practices and skills instruction to multimodal reading responses could importantly contribute to expanding the timely theoretical concept, 'multiliteracies.'

Pedagogical Implications

Provided that an increasing number of HL learners with divergent proficiency levels have been enrolled in foreign language postsecondary courses (Byon, 2008; Sohn & Shin, 2007), the pedagogical implications of the current case study could not be more relevant to and timely for HL instruction. Tapping into students' out-of-school interests and giving students choices in in-class literacy practices (Choi & Yi, 2012) should be a vital consideration when designing an HL curriculum. Given some HL learners' access to HL books at home and their interest for reading opportunities in an HL course (Jensen & Llosa, 2007), longer and authentic reading materials (Maxim, 2002) should be embedded in HL classes. In addition, individualized reading activities that respect each student's pace and that encourage personal reflections and connections, instead of set comprehension questions, can further engage learners with reading (Day & Bamford, 2002).

Second, the level of literacy engagement shown in the study would have been unachievable without the provision of sufficient and explicit modeling and scaffolding, especially through the use of print-based reading responses and language logs. Sociocultural approaches to literacy instruction do not preclude explicit skills instruction (Vygotsky, 1986). Given such issues as multiple proficiency levels in one class and difficulty with engaging students with literacy practices, the implications could be applicable to any language and literacy class. Lastly, to encourage enhanced literacy engagement, learner agency, and literate identity, HL, second, and foreign language

courses should give the students the opportunity to become designers of their own meaning-making through the integration of different modes, other than the linguistic mode (Kress, 2000; the New London Group, 1996). Provided that the pressures for standardized testing and mandated standards are not as prominent in post-secondary language classes as in K-12 content area courses, HL/foreign language classes at the post-secondary level, might be an appropriate place to enact such a literacy curriculum that builds on the students' out of school interests in technology and the "designing" act.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Despite the potential contributions to the field and implications for language and literacy instruction, the study includes limitations that point to directions for future research. First, the inability to measure prolonged effects is one of the limitations of the study. Given that the course was short-lived (only 15 weeks), whether or not the multiliteracies curriculum opportunities positively reinforced sustained literacy practices and promoted learner agency and Korean literate identity long after the end of the course is a worthwhile future investigation. Future studies that examine prolonged engagement with literacy could enrich the study findings.

Additionally, the multiliteracies curriculum in the Korean HL class could have addressed more transformative practices by having students critique the texts that they chose to read or through critical engagement with sociocultural issues pertinent to the Korean HL community. A good example is

Leeman, Rabin, and Roman-Mendoza's (2011) study in which they examined a Spanish critical service-learning program in a university HL course that led the students to take on identities as language experts and to become activists in their community.

As shown in Jenny's example, these opportunities helped her gain more literacy skills in Korean, leading to confidence in Korean and a new literate identity. This transformation was particularly possible as HL learners were invited to draw on their interests in selecting texts to read and write about and as they took charge of their own linguistic features, developing metalinguistic skills. The findings are congruent with Lee's (2013) study in that Jenny connected her life with comprehending the text in the target language, Korean, as the Taiwanese ESL students at the university level enhanced their understanding of a piece of literature in English and gained more confidence in the English language.

Lastly, the participant's exceptional capabilities with the computer/media and visual literacies could make it hard to make the findings more transferrable to other settings in which there might be lack of resources, such as technology. Still, many of the students at this setting were knowledgeable of designing, interpreting, and communicating via multimodal means. Thus, future studies could report on a multiliteracies pedagogy for language learners who are not skillful with technology or do not have access to it. Future studies that address these points could contribute to deepening and expanding our current understanding of the important concept, "design," from both instructor's and learner's perspectives to achieve literate identity.

Endnotes

¹I use the term, "heritage language learners" to refer to "learners that have identity and/or linguistic needs with regard to language learning that relate to their family background" (Carreira, 2004, p. 18).

²I adopt the definition of "honorifics (indexical politeness forms) as grammatical and lexical forms encoding the speaker's socio-culturally appropriate regard towards the addressee (i.e., addressee honorification) and the referent (i.e., referent honorification)" (Sohn, 1999, p. 408).

³*Adobe Flash* is a multimedia creating software used to create interactive and dynamic webpages and animations.

References

- Alameen, G. (2011). Learner digital stories in a Web 2.0 age. *TESOL Journal*, 2(3), 355-369. doi:10.5054/tj.2011.259954
- Blattner, G., & Fiori, M. (2011). Virtual social network communities: An investigation of language learners' development of sociopragmatic awareness and multiliteracy skills. *CALICO Journal*, 29(1), 24-43. doi: 10.11139/cj.29.1.24-43
- Block, D. (2013). Moving beyond “lingualism”: Multilingual embodiment and multimodality in SLA. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education* (pp. 54-77). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Group.
- Byon, A. S. (2008). Korean as a foreign language in the USA. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 21(3), 244-255. doi: 10.1080/07908310802385915
- Carreira, M. (2004). Seeking explanatory adequacy: A dual approach to understanding the term “heritage language learner.” *Heritage Language Journal*, 2(1), 1-25.
- Choi, J., & Yi, Y. (2012). The use and role of pop culture in heritage language learning: A study of advanced learners of Korean. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(1), 110-129. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2012.01165.x
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2000). Introduction: Multiliteracies: The beginnings of an idea. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures* (pp. 3-8). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2009). A grammar of multimodality. *The International Journal of Learning*, 16(2), 361-425.
- Daniels, H. (2002). *Literature circles: Voice and choice in book clubs and reading groups* (2nd ed.). Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Day, R., & Bamford, J. (2002). Top ten principles for teaching extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 14(2), 136-141.
- Felix, A. (2009). The adult heritage Spanish speaker in the foreign language classroom: A phenomenography. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 22(2), 145-162.
- Feuer, A. (2011). Developing foreign language skills, competence and identity through a collaborative creative writing project. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 24(2), 125-139. doi: 10.1080/07908318.2011.582873
- Gambhir, V. (2008). The rich tapestry of heritage learners of Hindi. *South Asia Language Pedagogy and Technology*, 1. Retrieved from *South Asia Language* <http://salpat.uchicago.edu/index.php/salpat/index>
- Gee, J. P. (2003). *What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Gonglewski, M., & DuBravac, S. (2006). Multiliteracy: Second language literacy in the multimedia environment. In L. Ducate & N. Arnold (Eds.), *Calling on CALL: From theory and research to new directions in foreign language teaching* (pp. 43-68). San Marcos, TX: CALICO.
- Guth, S., & Helm, F. (2012). Developing multiliteracies in ELT through telecollaboration. *ELT Journal*, 66(1), 42-51. doi:10.1093/elt/ccr027
- Hafner, C. A., & Miller, L. (2011). Fostering learner autonomy in English for science: A collaborative digital video project in a technological learning environment. *Language Learning & Technology*, 15(3), 68-86.
- Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hull, G., & Nelson, M. E. (2005). Locating the semiotic power of multimodality. *Written Communication*, 22(2), 224-261. doi:10.1177/0741088304274170
- Ilieva, G. N. (2008). Project-based learning of Hindi: Managing the mixed-abilities classroom. *South Asia Language Pedagogy and Technology*, 1.
- Jensen, L., & Llosa, L. (2007). Heritage language reading in the university: A survey of students' experiences, strategies, and preferences. *Heritage Language Journal*, 5(1), 98-116.
- Jeon, M. (2010). Korean language and ethnicity in the United States: Views from within and across. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 43-55. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00982.x
- Jewitt, C. (2008). Multimodality and literacy in school classrooms: Review of research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 32(1), 241-267. doi:10.3102/0091732X07310586
- Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kondo-Brown, K. (2010). Curriculum development for advancing heritage language competence: Recent research, current practices, and a future agenda. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 24-41. doi:10.1017/S0267190510000012
- Kress, G. (2000). Multimodality: Challenges to thinking about language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 337-340. doi:10.2307/3587959
- Lee, H. (2013). An examination of ESL Taiwanese university students' multimodal reading responses. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 52(3), 192-203. doi:10.1080/19388071.2013.774449
- Lee, J., & Oxelson, E. (2006). "It's not my job": K-12 teacher attitudes toward students' heritage language maintenance. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30(2), 453-477. doi:10.1080/15235882.2006.10162885
- Lee, J., & Wright, W. E. (2014). The rediscovery of heritage and community language education in the United States. *Review of Research in Education*, 38(1), 137-165. doi:10.3102/0091732X13507546

- Leeman, J., Rabin, L., & Roman-Mendoza, E. (2011). Identity and activism in heritage language education. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(4), 481-495. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01237.x
- Lo-Philip, S. (2010). Towards a theoretical framework of heritage language literacy and identity processes. *Linguistics and Education: An International Research Journal*, 21(4), 282-297. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2010.09.001
- Lotherington, H., & Jenson, J. (2011). Teaching multimodal and digital literacy in L2 settings: New literacies, new basics, new pedagogies. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 226-246. doi:10.1017/S0267190511000110
- Lytra, V. (2011). Negotiating language, culture and pupil agency in complementary school classrooms. *Linguistics and Education: An International Research Journal*, 22(1), 23-36. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2010.11.007
- Maxim, H. H. (2002). A study into the feasibility and effects of reading extended authentic discourse in the beginning German language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 86(1), 20-35. doi: 10.1111/1540-4781.00134
- McQuillan, J. (1996). How should heritage languages be taught? The effects of a free voluntary reading program. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(1), 56-72. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.1996.tb00843.x
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and expanded from case study research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mikulski, A. M. (2010). Receptive volitional subjunctive abilities in heritage and traditional foreign language learners of Spanish. *Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 217-233. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01018.x
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60-92.
- Nichols, P. C., & Colon, M. (2000). Spanish literacy and the academic success of Latino high school students: Codeswitching as a classroom resource. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(5), 498-511. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2000.tb01994.x
- Olsen, L. (1997). *Made in America: Immigrant students in our public schools*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Potowski, K., & Carreira, M. (2004). Towards teacher development and national standards for Spanish as a heritage language. *Foreign Language Annals* 37(3), 421-431. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2004.tb02700.x
- Pyun, D., & Lee-Smith, A. (2011). Reducing Korean heritage language learners' orthographic errors: The contribution of online and in-class dictation and form-focused instruction. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 24(2), 141-158. doi:10.1080/07908318.2011.582952
- Schwarzer, D., & Petr 'on, M. (2005). Heritage language instruction at the college level: Reality and possibilities. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(4), 568-578. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2005.tb02523.x
- Sohn, H. (1999). *The Korean language*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Sohn, S. O., & Shin, K. (2007). True beginners, false beginners, and fake beginners: Placement strategies for Korean heritage speakers. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(3), 407-418. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.2007.tb02866.x
- Vinogradova, P., Linville, H. A., & Bickel, B. (2011). "Listen to my story and you will know me": Digital stories as student-centered collaborative projects. *TESOL Journal*, 2(2), 173-202. doi: 10.5054/tj.2011.250380
- Vinogradova, P. (2014). Digital stores in heritage language education: Empowering heritage language learners through a pedagogy of multiliteracies. In T. Wiley, D. Christian, J. K. Peyton, S. Moore, & N. Liu (Eds.), *Handbook of heritage, community, and Native American languages in the United States: Research, educational practice, and policy* (pp. 314-323). New York, NY and Washington, DC: Routledge and Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language* (A. Kozulin, Ed. & Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Appendix B
Jenny's Language Log Entry

2/2/10

2010 학년도 봄 학기, KOR3002H

이름:

문법 및 철자/맞춤법/띄어쓰기 로그 (Grammar, Spelling, & Spacing Log)

틀린 철자/맞춤법/띄어쓰기	맞은 철자/맞춤법/띄어쓰기	느낌, 소감, 및 기타
1. <u>곳</u> 사에 있어서 (a)	1. <u>곳</u> 대에 있어서	honorific 을 더 많이 필요한다. 부모님을 위하 서 쓰실에 써야된다.
2. <u>부모님</u> 이 (b)	2. <u>부모님</u> 께서	
3. <u>개</u> 셨어요 (c)	3. <u>개</u> 셨어요	
4. <u>대학</u> 로 <u>단일</u> 동안 (c, b)	4. <u>대학</u> 로 <u>다니실</u> 동안	
5. <u>부채</u> 를 <u>받</u> 았어요 (a)	5. <u>학자</u> 를 <u>대</u> 불 받았어요	
6. <u>낼</u> 수있도록 (d)	6. <u>낼</u> 수있도록	
7. <u>일</u> 했어요 (b)	7. <u>일</u> 하셨어요	
8. <u>재</u> 일 <u>나이</u> <u>많은</u> 딸 (c, a)	8. <u>재</u> 일 <u>나이</u> <u>많은</u> 아들	
9. <u>자기</u> <u>감</u> 지를 (a)	9. <u>자기</u> <u>거</u> 라고	
10. <u>은</u> 작 <u>처</u> 음이네가 (b, c)	10. <u>어</u> 름 오셨고	
11. <u>살</u> 는거 <u>위</u> 에서 (c, a)	11. <u>살</u> 는것에 <u>대</u> 해	
12. <u>모</u> 를 <u>원</u> 했어면 (c)	12. <u>무</u> 를 <u>원</u> 했으면	
13. <u>곳</u> 대 <u>책</u> 두 <u>만</u> 이 (c)	13. <u>그</u> <u>때</u> <u>책</u> 도 <u>만</u> 이	
14. <u>잘</u> <u>돼</u> 는 <u>개</u> 인 <u>연</u> 습을 <u>실</u> 행했어요	14. <u>잘</u> <u>돼</u> 는 <u>개</u> 인 <u>명</u> 원을 <u>차</u> 려했어요.	
15. <u>한</u> <u>다</u> <u>만</u> (c) (a, b)	15. <u>한</u> <u>다</u> <u>만</u> 에	

Notes. Column 1: incorrect spelling and spacing; column 2: correct spelling and spacing; column 3: reflections.
Types of mistakes identified: (a) vocabulary word choice, (b) honorific, (c) spelling, and (d) spacing.

Appendix C
Jenny's Description of the Tale in the Print-based Reading Response

조나단이 얘기해준 이야기 때문에 찰리가 지칠해면서 살라구 예쓰게 시작했어요. 조나단 사장님이 찰리 위에서 신경을 쓰요. 시간을 같이 보내서 찰리가 감사해요. 둘다 많이 치내줬어요. 어늘 아침 조나단이 마하트마 간디에 난 이야기를 얘기해준다. 한 아버지가 아들한테 차를 고쳐주고 5 시에 대려주라고 말씀했어요. 아들이 차를 빨리 고쳤는데 시간이 많이 나맛다구 영화를 시컷 봤어요. 시개를 다시 봤때 5 시를 넘었어요. 아들이 아버지께 부탁을 못만나고 거짓말을 해서 아버지가 많이 속상했어요.

[Because of Jonathan's story, Charlie began trying hard to live. Jonathon, the president of the company, cares about Charlie. Charlie is thankful because they got to spend time together. The two of them became closer. This morning, Jonathan told the story about Mahatma Gandhi. A father told his son to fix his car and then to bring it back at 5 p.m. Although the son finished fixing the car early, he went to watch movies because he had a lot of time left. Later when he saw the clock, it was over 5 p.m. Because the son did not obey and keep his promise, his father was very upset.]