

©Walter de Gruyter. Access to this work was provided by the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) ScholarWorks@UMBC digital repository on the Maryland Shared Open Access (MD-SOAR) platform.

Please provide feedback

Please support the ScholarWorks@UMBC repository by emailing scholarworks-group@umbc.edu and telling us what having access to this work means to you and why it's important to you. Thank you.

Participant- and discourse-related code-switching by Thai–English bilingual adolescents¹

SUPAMIT CHANSEAWRASSAMEE and SARAH J. SHIN

Abstract

This paper attempts to show ways in which two Thai brothers (aged 9 and 13) living temporarily in the United States, employ bilingual code-switching to organize their conversation. Using the sequential analysis developed by Auer (1984, 1995), this paper describes how the two boys employ code-switching to negotiate the language for the interaction and accommodate the language competences and preferences of conversational participants, as well as to organize conversational tasks such as turn-taking, preference marking, repair, and bracketing of side-sequences. The sequential analysis suggests that code-switching is used by the two boys as an additional communicative resource to achieve particular conversational goals.

Keywords: bilingual adolescents; bilingual code-switching; conversation analysis; discourse-related code-switching; Thai–English bilingualism; participant-related code-switching

1. Introduction

This paper reports on the bilingual conversation of two Thai brothers, aged 9 and 13, at home in the United States over an eleven-month period. Specifically, this paper explores pragmatic dimensions of bilingual code-switching by the two Thai adolescents. Sons of the first author, the two Thai brothers came to the U.S. with their mother, who was pursuing a doctoral degree at an American university. The boys were enrolled in American public schools and were educated in English during their three-year stay in the U.S. The data for the current study come from that period. Upon completion of their mother's graduate studies, the boys returned to Thailand with her. The first author's husband (the boys' father) stayed behind in Thailand during the time his wife and sons lived in the U.S. to provide financial support for his family.

In this introductory section, we briefly review some concepts and frameworks which proved helpful in highlighting the systematic character of the two boys' code-switching behavior, chiefly those of Myers-Scotton and Auer, who in different ways have developed the insights of John Gumperz. Section 2 sets out salient social and demographic features of Thais in the U.S., and Sections 3 and 4 deal with methodology. Finally, Section 5 sets out an analysis of the mixed language data recorded in the boys' conversation at home, and Section 6 summarizes major conclusions.

1.1 Bilingual code-switching as a communicative resource

A large body of research reveals that code-switching (the alternating use of several languages by bilingual speakers in the same conversation) does not indicate lack of competence on the part of the speaker, but results from complex language skills (see, e.g., Grosjean 1982; Gumperz 1982; Hansen 2003; Li 2000; Milroy and Muysken 1995; Romaine 1995; Shin 2005). Gumperz's pioneering work on bilingual discourse strategies shows that code-switching provided an additional resource which bilinguals systematically exploited to express a range of social and rhetorical meanings. From this perspective, code-switching is 'an element in a socially agreed matrix of contextualization cues and conventions used by speakers to alert addressees, in the course of ongoing interaction, to the social and situational context of the conversation' (Gumperz 1982: 132). Gumperz stresses that other behaviors such as gestures or prosodic patterns are also exploitable as contextualization cues, and are thus functionally parallel to code-switching.

Gumperz's analysis of language mixing as an interactional resource is further developed by Myers-Scotton's (1993, 1995, 2000) 'markedness' theory of language choice. Basing her argument chiefly on East African bilingual conversations, Myers-Scotton (2000) contends that bilingual speakers are endowed with a social knowledge of the normative and expected practices in a community (unmarked speech). This requires bilingual speakers to be aware of the social consequences of language selection or a mixture of codes in different social contexts. Thus, while the unmarked choice in any context is the normatively expected one, speakers who make marked (i.e., unexpected or unusual) choices in specific contexts are responsible for implicatures triggered by these choices (Myers-Scotton 2000: 144–153). Readers are directed to Myers-Scotton (1993) for details of this influential theory.

Although it is claimed to be both comprehensive and predictive, integrating psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, and structural viewpoints and capable of associating the social symbolism of particular languages with the

conversational strategies of speakers, Myers-Scotton's theory presents difficulties in that it is not always clear how specific analyses can be supported or refuted; in particular, it is difficult to determine which languages become marked or unmarked in a given bilingual interaction (see also, Alfonzetti 1998; Auer 1995; Hansen 2003; Muysken 2000; Shin and Milroy 2000).

1.2 Auer's sequential conversation analytic framework

Auer (1995) presents a very different development of Gumperz's interactional paradigm. Critical of Gumperz's characterization of speakers' linguistic choices as realizations of a pre-established set of functions (such as addressee selection, to mark emphasis or interjections), Auer argues that not only was such a list theoretically problematic, but it could also never be complete. Developing Gumperz's idea of code-switching as a contextualization cue, Auer (1984, 1995, 1998) suggests that code-switching can function as a contextual cue like other pragmatic devices – such as intonation and pause. More specifically, 'code-switching has and creates communicative and social meaning, and is in need of an interpretation by co-participants as well as analysts' (Auer 1998: 1). Thus, while a particular utterance may be contextualized by its prosodic shape as ironic or mocking or as a side-sequence off the current topic, the same effect could be achieved by code-switching. His work has proved to be particularly suggestive for the data analyzed in Section 5.

Auer draws a useful distinction between participant-related switching (motivated by the language preferences or competences of participants) and discourse-related switching (setting up a contrast which structures some part of the discourse – for example, reiteration of an utterance for emphasis in a different language). Auer points out that the discourse functions of code-switching have received a great deal of attention in the existing literature, while processes of language negotiation and preference-influenced or competence-influenced language choices are usually not subsumed under conversational code-switching, but are considered to be either determined by societal macro-structures or by psycholinguistic factors. The distinction which he draws between discourse-related and participant-related code-switching allows language alternation of all kinds to be discussed within a single framework.

To study code-switching as a contextualization cue requires the analyst to focus on the sequential development of interaction, because the meanings of contextualization cues unfold as interaction proceeds, and cannot be discussed without referring to the conversational context. The framework provided by Conversation Analysis (CA) is appropriate for this kind of analysis (see Atkinson and Heritage 1984; Levinson 1983: Ch.6). In Auer's view, the CA approach has at least two advantages. First, it

gives priority to ‘the sequential implicativeness of language choice in conversation, i.e. the fact that whatever language a participant chooses for the organization of his or her turn, or for an utterance which is part of the turn, the choice exerts an influence on subsequent language choices by the same or other speakers’ (Auer 1984: 5). Second, it ‘limits the external analysts’ interpretational leeway because it relates his or her interpretations back to the members’ mutual understanding of their utterances as manifest in their behavior’ (Auer 1984: 6). This kind of sequential analysis was the basis for a significant number of subsequent studies of bilingual interaction (e.g., Cromdal 2004; Gafaranga 2000; Gafaranga and Torras 2002; Hansen 2003; Li and Milroy 1995; Moyer 2000; Shin and Milroy 2000; see also Auer (1998) for an excellent collection of studies that are based on this framework). It is also what we shall apply in our own analysis in Section 5.

2. The social context of Thai–English code-switching

The 2000 U.S. Census reported 146,577 persons of Thai ancestry living in the U.S., which is less than 0.1 percent of the total U.S. population. Of the Asian and Pacific Islander population in the U.S., Thais ranked 11th in number, or 1.3 percent of the total Asian and Pacific Islander population in the U.S. The first group of Thais pioneered settlement in the U.S. in 1952–1953 via ‘a grant from a local hospital,’ but most settlers followed in 1960 (Codman-Wilson 1992: 40). Because many of these early pioneers had worked with American missionaries or in missionary hospitals in Thailand, their English was already on a communicative level when they arrived in the U.S. Most of the children of these early immigrants were encouraged to speak English and eventually ‘lost their fluidity in the Thai language’ (Codman-Wilson 1992: 40).

After the passage of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965 which gave immigration priority to foreign professionals, physicians and nurses formed the bulk of Thai immigration to the United States (Codman-Wilson 1992: 2). Fueled by a shortage of medical professionals in the U.S. in the early 1960s and lured by the promise of new opportunities and money, many Thai doctors and nurses immigrated to the United States with their spouses, children, and other family members (Codman-Wilson 1992; Wibulpolprasert and Pengpaibon 2003).

In the early days of Thai immigration to the U.S., there were very few Thai restaurants, grocery stores, or ethnic associations (Codman-Wilson 1992). But as more Thais came to America, ethnic Thai associations began to be formed to provide their members with psychological and material support. Often organized by Thai nurses, ‘the initial power bloc of the community,’ Thai associations were instrumental in helping many

new immigrants adjust to their life in America (Codman-Wilson 1992: 41). In addition, informal pooling of financial resources made it possible for many Thais to open restaurants which relied mostly on family labor. Many Thais immigrated to the U.S. via Los Angeles and settled there (Reimers 1985: 247) and operated Thai food markets, Thai restaurants, beauty shops, ice cream shops, and gas stations (Sakdisubha 1987). In the late 1970s and early 1980s, Thai immigrants consisted mostly of businessmen and students (Codman-Wilson 1992: 43).

A significant portion of recent Thai immigrants to the U.S. is composed of students who are staying in the U.S. temporarily. The first author belongs to this group. The total number of Thai students in the United States increased from 34 in 1921 to 1,630 in 1964 (Barry 1967: 2), and to 8,937 in 2003, ranking Thailand 9th among the top 15 countries that sent students to the U.S. (U.S. Embassy in Thailand 2005). Many of these students bring their families with them, creating opportunities for their children to be educated in English in American schools. Given the perceived importance of English as the lingua franca, this option is increasingly favored by Thai students who are studying in English-speaking countries. The two subjects in the current study attended American public schools for three years before returning to Thailand with their mother.

There are currently very few studies that investigate Thai–English bilingual code-switching. This study attempts to contribute to filling this important gap. It also attempts to contribute to a growing body of literature on the bilingual development of sojourner populations (those who stay in a host country on a temporary basis).

3. Subjects

Two Thai boys, aged 9 and 13 upon their arrival in the U.S., participated in this study. The two subjects were the first author's sons who came to the U.S. in spring, 2004, to live with their mother, who was pursuing a doctoral degree at a U.S. university. Ethnically of mixed Chinese-Thai ancestry, the two boys are native speakers of Thai and are acquiring English as a second language in America. Detailed information about each subject follows.

3.1 Winner – the older brother

Winner, the older brother in this study, was 13 years old when he arrived in the United States and was 15 during the data collection period. Prior to his arrival in the U.S., he had had some exposure to English. He was introduced to the English alphabet and children's songs in English when

he was in kindergarten. Winner attended a private elementary school where he was exposed to minimal English and finished grade seven in a public middle school in Thailand before coming to the U.S. Academically gifted, Winner finished grade seven in Thailand with all A's and was first in his class. While attending middle school in Thailand, Winner was enrolled in a Mini English Program (MEP) on Saturdays. As an MEP student, Winner learned all school subjects in Thai on weekdays but studied mathematics, science, English, and conversational English in English on Saturdays. In the MEP, American-educated Thai teachers taught science, mathematics, and conversational English while foreign teachers (an American in the first semester and a Filipino in the second semester) taught English. Winner later stated that the English he learned in the MEP provided a strong foundation for his studies in the U.S.

However, upon his enrolment as a seventh grader in a public middle school in the U.S., he was assessed as a non-English speaker on the IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT) and was placed in a high-beginning ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) class. When he got into the eighth grade, he was initially placed in an intermediate ESOL class, but was quickly reassigned to an advanced ESOL class. As in Thailand, Winner has been academically successful in America. He was selected 'Student of the Month' in October, 2004, and was on the Honor Roll for four consecutive marking periods in eighth grade. Among his many accomplishments, he represented his school in a mathematics tournament and won third-place in the integers section. In May, 2005, Winner passed the IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT) and exited the ESOL program. Thus, it took Winner one year and three months to be fully mainstreamed into English-only instruction. In high school, Winner continued to excel in all subject areas and finished the ninth grade with all A's.

3.2 *Willy – the younger brother*

Willy, the younger brother, celebrated his 9th birthday one day before he left Thailand, and was 11 years old during data collection. Like his older brother, Willy was exposed to some English from kindergarten through third grade at the same private elementary school his brother attended in Thailand. Although not as academically gifted as his older brother, Willy generally had positive views about schooling and being educated in the States. He even wrote in his personal journal that he loved school so much that he wished he could go to school on Saturdays, too. Upon his arrival in the U.S., Willy knew some basic English vocabulary – such as 'cat' and 'dog' – as well as some formulaic expressions such as 'How are you?' and 'Thank you.'

Willy also took the IPT and was assessed as a non-English speaker. He was pulled out for ESOL instruction for approximately 30 minutes a day, twice a week. At the end of his fourth grade (June, 2005), his English was assessed as ‘progressing’ and ‘independent’ except in punctuation, grammar, and information organization. Then in the middle of fifth grade (January, 2006), his abilities in listening and reading were assessed as ‘independent.’ Willy exited the ESOL program in June, 2006. It took Willy two years and three months to be fully mainstreamed into English-only instruction, one year more than the amount of time his older brother took to be mainstreamed. Even though Willy remained in the ESOL program longer, his confidence in English grew steadily throughout his stay in the U.S., resulting in higher skills in subject areas such as mathematics, science, and social studies. Like Winner, Willy achieved the Honor Roll for all marking periods. In fifth grade, Willy was placed in a gifted and talented (GT) mathematics class and in a GT science class, but still struggled with reading and writing in English. Willy finished the fifth grade with A’s in all subjects except for English reading and social studies. His homeroom teacher recommended that he ‘enlarge and extend his language arts abilities’ during summer. Willy was recommended for placement in GT mathematics and GT science courses in middle school.

4. Data Collection

4.1 Elicitation procedures for spontaneous speech

The current study constitutes part of a larger study on the bilingual development of the two Thai brothers (see Chanseawrassamee 2007). The conversational data for this study comes from audio-recordings made over eleven months (from Month 15 to Month 25). All 24 audiotape recordings, lasting 30 minutes each (12 hours total), were made in the living room at the boys’ home, where the three family members – Winner, Willy, and their mother (the first author) – had meals together on the floor around a big tea table in front of the television. The audiotape recorder was placed on a cupboard in the corner of the living room next to the television. There were four different conversational grouping categories for the audio-recordings. Of the 24 recordings, 18 were dyadic conversations (1) between Winner and mother; (2) between Willy and Mother; and (3) between Winner and Willy. The 6 remaining recordings were triadic conversations among (4) Winner, Willy, and Mother.

All six dyadic conversations between Winner and his mother took place while Winner ate his dinner. Winner usually came home from school about one and a half hours earlier than did Willy; as a result, Winner spent this time alone with his mother. There were only five recordings of dyadic conversations between Willy and his mother because it was generally more difficult for her to completely separate the boys

so she could be alone with Willy. In addition, there were seven dyadic conversation sessions between Winner and Willy, two of which were recorded by the first author while she was present in the home but did not participate in the boys' conversations, and the other five recorded by the two brothers themselves while their mother was out of the house running errands. While waiting for their mother to return, the boys did their homework or grammar lessons, played chess, or had their snacks.

The six triadic conversations involving Winner, Willy, and their mother took place during dinnertime. Dinner involved the process of preparation and cooking (before), as well as eating (during), and cleaning-up (after) (Ochs and Taylor 1992).

We cannot claim that the speech data we present in this paper are completely naturalistic since the boys were fully aware that they were being recorded. It was important that we ensure the boys' privacy by not recording their conversation without their knowledge (for an excellent discussion of the methodological and ethical problems of surreptitious recording, see Milroy & Gordon 2003). When parents study the language of their own children, issues such as parental bias and intrusion of privacy may arise (Glesne 1999; Booth, Colomb, and Williams 2003). For example, Li (1999: 123–124) notes that she was an observer whose 'observation may be biased with a mother's subjectivity, and the interpretation of the interactions between Amy [her daughter] and me may not be totally objective.' Additionally, the parent/researcher may manipulate, to some extent, children's bilingual development in terms of first language maintenance, second language scaffolding, and support for bilingual education (p. 123), as well as attitudes and interest toward learning a new language (Long 1998). Yip and Matthews (2000: 197) point out that, despite systematic data collection, presentation of data can be biased when the parent is also the researcher – 'undoubtedly there is selection bias whereby unusual utterances are more likely to be recorded than unremarkable ones, and non-native-like examples at the expense of well-formed ones.'

Despite such difficulties, however, being a parent/researcher provides many advantages that come with a personal relationship with participants and opportunities for close observation of activities that may not be easily accessible to outside researchers. Furthermore, a familial relationship between the researcher and the participants may help to alleviate any discomfort the participants might experience with a researcher they may not know.

Aside from parental bias, some researchers have recognized issues arising from excessive intrusion. For instance, Bongartz and Schneider (2003: 17) noted: 'To safeguard against overstepping the researcher's access to personal situations and to protect the [sons'] need for autonomy, Schneider involved [her two boys] in developing sensitivity about when and how to observe them.' To decrease the amount of researcher intru-

sion, when observations or taping sessions became uncomfortable or intrusive, they were stopped. Bongartz and Schneider (2003: 17) note, 'when the boys commented on parts they found too personal or embarrassing, these parts were removed from the final draft of the study.' As in Bongartz and Schneider's (2003) study, the two Thai brothers in the current investigation had full control over when they could be recorded and when they could not. On one occasion during the pilot study, the boys were angry at their mother for something she did and refused to be tape-recorded. When their anger subsided, they agreed to be recorded again. At other times they recorded their own activities and interactions. In addition, the boys reviewed the written drafts of their mother's work and voiced objections to any material they found embarrassing. The mother then promptly deleted these parts from her submissions to her professor.

We have some evidence that the boys may have sometimes tried to 'perform' their conversations for the sake of the microphone (for example, see sections 5.1.1 and 5.2.3). Since the brothers were aware that their speech could be heard by their mother's American professors, they may have produced more English utterances than they might have otherwise. However, as we shall argue, these very instances of code-switching into English can be analyzed as participant – and/or discourse-related and provide important insights into the ways in which code-switching is used by the boys as an additional communicative resource.

4.2 The data

The entire speech corpus consisted of a total of 12,254 utterances produced by the two boys, unevenly distributed across the four conversational grouping categories. Table 1 shows the total number of code-switches produced by the two boys across the conversational categories. The percentages were calculated by dividing the total number of code-switches produced by the boys in a given conversational category by the total number of all utterances produced by the boys in that category.

Table 1. *Total number of code-switches produced by the two boys.*

Conversation categories	(1) Winner + Mother	(2) Willy + Mother	(3) Winner + Willy	(4) Winner + Willy +	Total
Total Number of Code-Switches*	457 (22.8 percent)	678 (29.5 percent)	733 (14.2 percent)	746 (26.9 percent)	2,614 (21.3 percent)
Utterances	2,008	2,295	5,179	2,772	12,254

* Total number of code-switches includes both extra-sentential code-switching (i.e., code-switching across utterance boundaries) and intra-sentential code-switching (i.e., code-switching within utterance boundaries).

The total number of code-switches produced by the two brothers in all four conversational categories was 2,614 (21.3 percent) out of a total of 12,254 utterances, which is significantly more than the rates (below 5 percent) reported in previous studies involving bilingual children (e.g., Köppe and Meisel 1995; Shin and Milroy 2000). One possible explanation for this difference may be in the setting. While the current study was conducted at home, these other studies were carried out in schools. Many language minority children feel pressured to speak only English at school because their native languages are often devalued by their teachers and peers (Pavlenko 2002; Shin 2005, 2006; Wong Fillmore 1991). The home, then, may be considered a safe haven in which the two boys freely use their native language to communicate with each other.

In addition, the greater number of code-switches in the current study may be explained by the fact that the data collection started in June 2005, which was the 15th month of the boy's residence in the U.S. By this time, the boys had learned a great deal of English and were becoming more and more comfortable in it. Their rapidly increasing proficiency in English resulting from sustained and systematic exposure to the language in school makes it possible for English to be incorporated into sibling interaction which previously was entirely in Thai. Since their school experiences are mostly in English, they are likely to use English to talk about matters related to school (e.g., schoolwork, teachers, and friends) even at home. In addition, it is natural for them to choose English to talk about living in the U.S. (e.g., apartment, weather, food) since these experiences occur in a largely English-speaking medium.

Tables 2 through 5 show the number of code-switches produced by each brother in the four conversational grouping categories. Note that Willy generally produced more code-switching as a proportion of his total number of utterances than did Winner although the differences between the boys are relatively small. What is perhaps more significant is the difference in rates of code-switching between the boys' conversation with each other (i.e., (3) Winner + Willy) and their conversation when their mother is a participant (i.e., (1) Winner + Mother; (2) Willy + Mother; (4) Winner + Willy + Mother). Notice that both boys produced substantially less code-switching when they were talking to each other than when they were talking with their mother. These data are likely to lead to a conclusion that the mother's presence has an influence on the two boys' language use; for example, one could hypothesize that the mother initiated a great deal of code-switches (see also, Mishina 1999).

Table 2. Total number of code-switches produced by Winner and his mother in dyadic conversations.

Sessions	(1) Winner + Mother					
	Winner			Mother		
	CS	Total Utterances	percent	CS	Total Utterances	percent
1	116	444	26.1	7	415	1.7
2	47	235	20.0	4	263	1.5
3	137	362	37.8	11	364	3.0
4	53	292	18.2	8	403	2.0
5	40	357	11.2	5	355	1.4
6	64	318	20.1	4	325	1.2
Total	457	2,008	22.8	39	2,125	1.8

Table 3. Total number of code-switches produced by Willy and his mother in dyadic conversations.

Sessions	(2) Willy + Mother					
	Willy			Mother		
	CS	Total Utterances	percent	CS	Total Utterances	percent
1	78	349	22.3	6	431	1.4
2	163	490	33.3	8	333	2.4
3	139	463	30.0	10	396	2.5
4	169	478	35.4	6	327	1.8
5	129	515	25.0	5	341	1.5
Total	678	2,295	29.5	35	1,828	1.9

Table 4. Number of code-switches produced by each boy in dyadic conversations with each other.

Sessions	(3) Winner + Willy					
	Winner			Willy		
	CS	Total Utterances	percent	CS	Total Utterances	percent
1	61	446	13.7	86	362	23.8
2	22	409	5.4	39	274	14.2
3	44	276	15.9	70	388	18.0
4	39	292	13.4	66	469	14.1
5	27	239	11.3	40	352	11.4
6	42	420	10.0	48	398	12.1
7	83	484	17.1	66	370	17.8
Total	318	2,566	12.4	415	2,613	15.9

Table 5. *Number of code-switches by each boy and their mother in triadic conversations.*

Sessions	(4) Winner + Willy + Mother								
	Winner			Willy			Mother		
	CS	Total Utterances	percent	CS	Total Utterances	percent	CS	Total Utterances	percent
1	18	175	10.3	36	204	17.6	0	94	0.0
2	63	205	30.7	29	120	24.2	2	134	1.5
3	38	208	18.3	123	363	33.9	6	218	2.8
4	122	315	38.7	61	153	39.9	3	113	2.7
5	106	300	35.3	65	264	24.6	0	142	0.0
6	37	226	16.4	48	239	20.1	4	86	4.7
Total	384	1,429	26.9	36.2	1,343	27.0	15	787	1.9

However, examining the mother's speech data, we find that her code-switching, in both dyadic and triadic conversations, is generally very rare (below 5 percent). Her speech addressed to the boys is almost entirely in Thai and her code-switches are often single English words or phrases (e.g., *ESOL*, *field trip*, *hang around*, *celebrity*, *honors class*, *middle school*, and *summer*) inserted in an otherwise Thai discourse (see also the conversational excerpts involving the mother in section 5). Thus, it does not seem likely that the mother's use of code-switching could have influenced the boys to code-switch more.

One potential explanation for the boys' higher rates of code-switching when their mother is a participant is the fact that the conversational topics when the boys are talking to their mother as opposed to when they are talking to each other are quite different. For example, when the boys are by themselves, their interaction involves activities that they are used to doing completely in Thai (such as playing chess or drawing). On the contrary, when the boys talk to their mother (who is naturally interested in their school experiences), they have more opportunities to code-switch to talk about school-related events which occur in English. The influence of topic and context on the language choice of bilingual speakers has also been found in many previous studies (e.g., Auer 1998; Cefola 1981; Cheng 2003; De Jong 1986; Gumperz 1982; Halmari 2004; Hansen 2003; Jørgensen 1998; Moffatt and Milroy 1992; Montes-Alcalá 2001; Moyer 1998). Furthermore, in his study of the language use of Dutch-Australians and German-Australians in Australia, Clyne (2003) found that children's shift to English is present even though parents interact with their children largely in their native languages.

Another plausible explanation is that, because the boys' mother was an English teacher in Thailand, they may have thought that she was interested in their use of English. The boys know that their mother

brought them to stay with her in the United States to learn English, and therefore may have tried to use more English to please her. It is also possible that they used English hoping that that would help their mother with her studies. Although the first author did not specifically share with the boys that she was interested in their code-switching and language choice, they knew she was recording their conversations to examine their language use. Since her dissertation would be written in English and read by English-speakers, they may have felt that they needed to speak more English so the 'audience' (her professors and classmates in the doctoral program) would understand what they were talking about.

In the following sections, we examine code-switching as an interactional resource following Auer's (1995) sequential analytic framework.

5. Participant-related vs. discourse-related code-switching: An example

As noted above, Auer (1995) sees discourse-related code-switching as contributing to the structural organization of the ongoing conversation by establishing a contrast in language choice between two continuous stretches of talk. Participant-related code-switching on the other hand, invites participants' assessment of the speaker's preference for, and competence in, one language or the other. In order to illustrate the basis of subsequent analyses, we briefly review a conversational extract where both participant-related and discourse-related code-switching are exemplified.

Consider excerpt (1) below in which the brothers are talking about Winner's artwork. Winner, the elder brother, generally prefers Thai over English. He uses more Thai than English in his interactions, especially when he is around Willy. Willy, on the other hand, prefers English and takes any chance he can get to speak it. He also uses English to assert himself and stand up against his older brother. In line 1, Winner tells Willy in Thai that his art teacher came back to school after some period of absence. He brags about his artwork and states that his teacher displayed it for everyone to see. In line 11, Winner mumbles what his art teacher said about his work, which is followed by Willy's request for Winner to speak more loudly in line 12. In line 13, Winner satisfies one of Willy's requests, that is, to quote his art teacher. Notice that this statement is accompanied by a switch into English, which was the language in which the art teacher made her comment. Winner's switch to English in line 13 would constitute a discourse-related code-switching, which is motivated by his need to quote his teacher in the original language.

However, Winner's response in line 13 fails to satisfy Willy's other request for Winner to speak more loudly. Therefore, in line 15, Willy switches to English to reiterate his request. Willy's code-switch into Eng-

lish in line 15 can be analyzed on two different levels as exemplifying both a discourse-related code-switching and a participant-related code-switching. On one level, Willy's code-switch in line 15 can be analyzed as discourse-related code-switching in that it contextualizes Willy's dissatisfaction (dis-preference) toward Winner for not responding adequately to his request to speak more loudly (see also, Li 1998; Li and Milroy 1995). On another level, it can be analyzed as participant-related code-switching where the switch is motivated by Willy's preference for English. Willy's use of the English 'honey, honey' instead of the expected Thai address form, *phii winnāə* (Brother Winner) and the imperative 'you have to ...' in line 15 seem to suggest that Willy is trying to be on an equal level with his older brother (Kummer 1992). Thus, for Willy, the use of English allows him the option of not abiding by the politeness rules in Thai:

(1) Winner and Willy are talking about Winner's artwork (Session 1, Month 18).

- 1 Winner: *līi rīu rýplāaw khruu ART phīi nāə*
[Willy] know QP teacher brother [Win]ner
- 2 *khāw maa léəw wan nīi*
she come already day this /
- 3 *léəw léəw wan nīi phīi nāə tham thamyaan*
then then day this brother [Win]ner do work
- 4 *chājmáj phīi nāə tham sūaj chājmáj*
QP brother [Win]ner do beautiful QP
- 5 *phīi nāə tham [ʔəɔg maa] /*
brother [Win]ner do exit DV
(‘Willy, today my Art teacher came back to school. So, today, I handed in my art work which I made which was so beautiful, right?’)
- 6 Willy: *[cháj] /*
right
(‘Right!’)
- 7 Winner: *thīi man mīi dīnsǎə chājmáj /*
which it have pencil right
- 8 *léəw khruu ʔaw paj choo wóoj /*
then teacher take DV show IPP
(‘The one I used graphite pencils on, right? My teacher took it to display.’)
- 9 Willy: *rǎə /*
QP
(Really?)
- 10 Winner: *ʔaw paj choo tham jàəŋ nīi tham jàəŋ nīi /*
take DV show do like this do like this
- 11 *khruu bǎəɔg wāa [ʔaraj ná] /*
teacher say that what MP
(‘My teacher displayed it like this. She said something like ...’ [pause for thinking])
- 12 Willy: *[phīi nāə phīud daŋ daŋ sīi] /*
brother [Win]ner speak loud loud MP
(‘Winner, speak louder!’)

- 13 Winner: WE HAVE GOOD ARTISTS HERE. WE HAVE SOME GOOD
 14 ARTISTS HERE. /
- 15 Willy: HONEY, HONEY. YOU HAVE TO SPEAK LOUDER
 16 BECAUSE BECAUSE NO MOM SAID THAT SHE CAN'T
 17 HEAR YOU /
- 18 Winner: *mĕĕ khráb /*
 mother PP
 ('Mom!' [to check if she could hear him or not])
- 19 Mother: *háy 'araj /*
 EXCL what
 ('What?')
- 20 Winner: (*laughing*) *léw ɲaj 'á /*
 then what MP
 ('Then what?')
- 21 Willy: GOD! GET ON MY NERVE! /
- 22 Winner: *'áaw jàa phúud jàaɲ nī dī /*
 EXCL don't speak like this MP
- 23 *léw khâw GT ríusýg jaɲɲaj 'á lī /*
 then enter feel how MP [Willy]
 ('Don't say something like that. How did you feel when you joined the
 GT class?')
- 24 Willy: *ríusýg wáa phū nō kamlaj duu khàaw*
 feel that brother [Win]ner PROG watch news
- 25 *jūu 'á léw phū nō kō māj jōm*
 PROG MP then brother [Win]ner then not allow
- 26 *phúud dàaj /*
 speak as well
 ('I feel that you are watching news [on TV] and you aren't talking with
 me at all.')
- 27 Winner: *'əə ríu léw lī mýawaan phū nō*
 EXCL know already [Willy] yesterday brother [Win]ner
- 28 *doon lèg bàad / duu dī māj ríurýaj ləj*
 PASS steel cut / look MP not know at all
 ('Hey, Willy, did you know that I got a cut on my finger yesterday? I
 didn't realize it at all.')
- 29 Willy: *nǎj / 'áaw lèg bàad dàaj ɲaj*
 where EXCL steel cut MODAL MP
 ('Where did you get cut? Oh. How did it get cut?')

In lines 15–17, Willy challenges Winner that mother, who was in the kitchen preparing dinner, could not hear Winner because he spoke so softly. Thus, in line 18, Winner calls out to his mother to check if she could hear him. Once satisfied to learn that he was audible to his mother, Winner laughs and says ‘Then what?’ in Thai in line 20. Willy, then, contrasts Winner’s language choice in the previous turn by saying, ‘God! Get on my nerve!’ in English in line 21. His switch here again constitutes both a discourse-related code-switching to show his dissatisfaction toward Winner and a participant-related code-switching, which is motivated by his preference for English (see also, Li 2002, 2005). Note that in line 22, Winner contrasts his language choice to that of Willy’s previ-

ous turn to scold Willy for saying what he considers to be bad language. Then in line 23, he changes the topic to ask Willy about his GT class. As Willy does not satisfy Winner's request for information (lines 24 through 26), Winner changes the topic yet again in lines 27 and 28. This time, Willy takes up the offer and continues the conversation on the cut on Winner's finger.

Although the distinction between participant-related and discourse-related code-switching is central to Auer's (1995) and to our own analysis, it is important to note that these are not mutually exclusive categories, since some code-switches may be interpreted as *both* participant-related *and* discourse-related, as in lines 15 and 21. Auer recognizes the multiple functions contextualized by code-switching in his demonstration that particular turn-internal switches which contextualize emphasis or reiteration may also be participant-related, in the sense that they reflect the speaker's language competence and his/her interpretation of other participants' reactions. The important point, however, is that discourse-related and participant-related code-switching are not intended to be two generic categories for assembling language alternation types into groups. Rather, they characterize general procedures used as interpretive resources by participants (see also, Gafaranga 2000; Gafaranga and Torras 2002; Hansen 2003; Jørgensen 1998; Li 1998; Li and Milroy, 1995; Moyer 2000; Sebba and Wootten 1998; Serra 1998; Shin and Milroy 2000). In the following sections, we analyze participant-related and discourse-related code-switching separately in greater detail. Although space considerations limit us to building our account of the Thai brothers' code-switching upon one example for each type of switch below, there were numerous similar examples in the overall speech data.

5.1 *Participant-related code-switching*

Participant-related code-switching in the Thai brothers' bilingual data may be seen as either preference-related or competence-related. Preference-related code-switching allows speakers to ascribe to other participants' individualistic preferences for one language or the other. However, individual preference may not bear on a participant's code-switching behavior if the competence ascribed to the co-participant prevents it from doing so. Bilingual conversationalists monitor their co-participants' speech production carefully and adapt their own language choice to the assessed bilingual abilities of the other (Auer 1984). Such accommodation to co-participant's language abilities can be interpreted as competence-related.

5.1.1 Preference-related code-switching

In excerpt 2, the boys are playing the Yu-Gi-Oh!TM cards in the living room while their mother is preparing lunch in the kitchen.² In lines 2 through 4, Willy struggles to tie the curtains. Then, the boys sit down at the tea table and shuffle the cards. The conversation in lines 1 through 23 is exclusively in Thai except for the card name ('Pot of Greed') which is spoken in English and Willy's singing in English (line 18). Starting line 24, notice that the boys consistently use English to produce specific utterances that are required for the game (e.g., line 24 – *I summon! Dark blade attack!*) and Thai for everything else. Thus, code-switching seems to be used to contextualize the play frame. In lines 24 and 26, Winner uses English to play his card and finishes his turn by using the Thai word, *phàan* ('I pass'). Triggered perhaps by Winner's use of the Thai word, *phàan* ('I pass'), Willy tells Winner to speak English in line 27 and provides the phrase 'The end' in English. It is interesting that Willy uses Thai to tell his brother to speak English. As mentioned earlier, Willy prefers English over Thai and grabs any chance he can to speak it. Although this excerpt comes from Month 8 when the boys still had considerable difficulty in English, Willy was observed to be trying to speak English more than his brother.

In fact, in lines 28–30, Willy tries to speak English but his speech is replete with pauses, repetitions, and corrections. After Winner prods Willy to wrap up his turn in Thai in line 31, Willy uses English to announce that his turn is over in line 32. Then in line 33, Willy tells Winner to speak English again, this time reminding him that they are being videotaped for their mother's class project. Since Willy thinks that the videotape might be watched by his mother's professors and classmates who are English-speaking, he apparently feels that they need to speak English. However, the boys' mother did not share with them the information that she was specifically looking for their code-switching or language choice. Willy's preference for English here seems to have been motivated by his assumption that he is expected to speak English since the 'audience' would not understand Thai:

(2) Winner and Willy are playing Yu-Gi-Oh!TM cards while waiting for lunch. (From Month 8, pilot study data)

- 1 Winner: *rew /*
 quick
 ('Quickly!')
- 2 Willy: (Tying the curtain)
 háj man mâj pen ?â tón càb háj
 EXCL it not be MP have grasp DV
- 3 *man bèeb nia tón ruu jàj jàj nòi*
 it like this have hole big big somewhat

- 4 [?]yb /
EXCL
(‘Oh no! It can’t be tied. We have to grasp it like this. It needs a bigger hole to be tied. OK, I got it.’)
(Winner sings a Thai song to tease Willy.)
- 5 Willy: *khun mɛɛ bɔ̀ɔg wáa háj tham khêɛ nîi cháj pà /*
PT mother say that DV do just this yes MP
(‘Mom wanted us to do only this [tying the curtains], right?’)
(Willy sits at the tea table and starts singing a Thai song similar to Winner’s.)
- 6 Willy: *phîi nâə [?]aw loŋ paj wáj khâaŋ láaŋ*
brother [Win]ner take down DV place side below
7 *hə /*
MP
(‘Winner, take this down there.’)
(Willy unpacks and shuffles his cards.)
- 8 Willy: *maa /*
come
(‘Come on.’)
- 9 Winner: *[wêed] /*
magic
(‘Magic card!’)
- 10 Willy: *[wêed] / [?]yj / kàbdàg / talòg wà /*
magic EXCL trap funny IPP
- 11 *râəm maa kɔ̀ɔ dâaj tua dii kòɔn ləj nà nâ /*
start DV then get CLASS good before at all MP MP
(‘Magic card! Oh! Trap card! This is fun! I had a good card from the beginning.’)
- 12 Winner: POT OF GREED /
(Pot of Greed is a magic card.)
- 13 Willy: *háj phîi nâə phîi nâə [?]aw*
EXCL brother [Win]ner brother [Win]ner take
14 [?]ajni loŋ paj wáj khânláŋ hə /
this down DV place below MP
(‘Hey, take this down there.’)
(This utterance may mean, ‘Hey, look over there!’ Willy does this often to distract Winner.)
- 15 Winner: *jûŋ / cháj káad wêed POT OF GREED /*
meddlesome use card magic
(‘Don’t mess with me. I’ll use my magic ‘Pot of Greed’ card.’)
- 16 Willy: [?]yym /
EXCL
(‘OK’)
- 17 Winner: *phàan /*
pass
(‘I pass.’)
- 18 Willy: COME ON *taalàaláa COME ON BABY /*
(Thai rhythm)
(‘Come on.’)
- 19 Winner: [?]òg káad dâaj kêɛ sɔ̀ɔŋ baj ná
release card MODAL just two CLASS MP
20 *tua nyŋ cháj káad dâaj khêɛ sɔ̀ɔŋ baj ná*
CLASS one use card MODAL just two CLASS MP
(‘You can use two cards for one turn.’)

- 21 Willy: *mǎajkhwaam wǎa janyaj*
 mean that how
 ('What do you mean?')
- 22 Winner: *tua nyɲ ʔəg káad dáaj khéɛ sǝɲ baj ná*
 card one release card MODAL just two CLASS MP
 ('With a magic card, you can use two cards for one turn.')
- 23 Willy: *riú*
 know
 ('I know.')
- 24 Winner: I SUMMON / DARK BLADE ATTACK
- 25 Willy: *hǎj phanháa rǝə* (unintelligible)
 EXCL 1,500 QP
 ('Wow, is it worth 1,500?')
- 26 Winner: AND ONE CARD FACE DOWN ON THE FIELD *phàan /*
 pass
 ('Here's one card facing down on the field, I pass.')
- (When they play the Yu-Gi-Oh!™ card game, they imagine that they are in a battle and the table, on which they put the cards, is the battle field.)
- 27 Willy: *hǎj bǝg phaasǎaʔanʔkrid dǝ* THE END /
 EXCL say English MP
 ('Hey, speak English, "The end."')
- 28 (Selecting his cards) I SUMMON AMAZON PALADIN / IN
- 29 THE / OH I SUMMON MONSTER IN / FACE MODE
- 30 FACE DOWN MODE AND FISSURE /
- 31 Winner: *léew ɲaj tǝ ʔá /*
 then how further MP
 ('What's next?')
- 32 Willy: AND THE END UH END MY TURN
- 33 *phúud phaasǎa ʔanʔkrid nǝj sǝi tǝɲ choo*
 speak language English a little MP must show
- 34 *kháw nǝj wǎa khraj pen khraj /*
 they a little that who be who
 ('Speak English. We must show them a little bit of who is who.')

5.1.2 Competence-related code-switching

In excerpt (3), Winner and his mother are talking about an event called 'Celebrity Day' at his high school. In line 1, Winner inserts the English phrase 'Celebrity Day' in an otherwise Thai sentence to introduce his mother to the event. In line 2, his mother repeats the word 'celebrity.' Winner interprets her repetition as a sign that she does not know the word and repeats it in line 3. Despite her acknowledgment that she knows what the word means as shown by her use of the Thai exclamation showing agreement (ʔəə) in line 4, Winner is not convinced that she understands what the event entails and switches to Thai in lines 5–7 to describe it. In doing so, Winner seems to have interpreted that while his mother probably understands what the words 'celebrity' and 'day' mean, she is not likely to be familiar with the concept of dressing up as a

famous person as part of a school activity, which most Thais would find strange.

Thus, Winner's code-switch in line 5 displays his sensitivity to his mother's perceived lack of cultural and linguistic background to understand the uniquely American event. Such accommodation to the bilingual (as well as bicultural) abilities of the other participant in the conversation has also been reported by Auer (1984: 47), who observed that the Italian–German bilingual children he studied monitored their partner's speech production very carefully for 'mistakes' or insecurities in grammar and pronunciation and adapted their own language choice accordingly. Similarly, Shin and Milroy (2000: 367) showed that a Korean–English bilingual child adapted to her classmate's difficulties with English by using Korean when addressing him but switched to English to address her teacher, who required her to use English in the classroom:

(3) Winner and his mother are talking about an event called 'Celebrity Day' at his school (Session 1, Month 19).

- 1 Winner: *lɛw wan nɪi pen CELEBRITY DAY ɲaj mɛː /*
 then day this be MP mother
 ('Mom, today is Celebrity Day [at my school].')
- 2 Mother: CELEBRITY /
- 3 Winner: CELEBRITY /
- 4 Mother: *ʔə /*
 EXCL
 ('Yes.')
- 5 Winner: *kɔ khyɪ hɑj tɛɲtua ʔarajkɔɔdɑaj*
 then be DV dress up whatever
- 6 *thɪi tuaeng chɔɔb thɪi tɛɲtua taam daaraa*
 which oneself like which dress up like superstar
- 7 *thɪi tuaeng chɔɔb /*
 which oneself like
 ('[Celebrity Day] refers to the day on which everybody can wear anything they like or dress up like their favorite superstar.')
- 8 Mother: *ʔə /*
 EXCL
 ('Yes.')
- 9 Winner: *phɔm hɛn baɲkhon mɛː sɑj sɪi lɪyɲ prɛːd*
 I see someone mother wear color yellow intense
- 10 *lɑj mɛː /*
 at all mother
 ('Mom, I even saw someone wearing bright yellow.')
- 11 Mother: *ʔɑw lɛw winnə mɑj rɪu rə /*
 EXCL then Winner not know QP
 ('But didn't you even know about this?')
- 12 Winner: *phɔm rɪu tɛ phɔm mɑj chɔɔb /*
 I know but I not like
 ('I did, but I don't like it.')

As argued earlier in excerpt (1), Winner's switch in line 5 in excerpt 3 can also be interpreted as discourse-related code-switching. His mother's repetition of the word 'celebrity' can be analyzed as a 'next turn repair initiator' which offers Winner an opportunity to reformulate his original utterance. As Winner simply repeats his mother's utterance in line 3, foregoing his opportunity to do a repair, his mother code-switches and produces the Thai agreement marker (ʔəə) in line 4. The purpose of her use of this agreement marker may be ambiguous to an outsider. However, Winner seems to have interpreted it as another repair initiator, to which he responds positively this time by switching to Thai to explain the event in lines 5–7, completing the repair. His mother's use of the agreement marker (ʔəə) in line 8 again invites Winner to further elaborate on the topic, to which he responds positively in line 9 when he describes a specific person he saw wearing a bright yellow costume. Li (1994) points out that the request of a participant in a conversation that other speakers confirm or reformulate their statements suggests that to them as participants there is a problem, although to non-participants what needs repair may not be exactly apparent. He goes on to state that it is only through a sequential analysis which focuses on each move of the conversationalists that repair initiators can be detected and meanings inferred. Similarly, in her account of French–English code-switching practices in Canada, Heller (1982) notes that participants regularly attribute misunderstandings between participants to a problematic language choice, and code-switch accordingly.

5.2 Discourse-related code-switching

Participant-related code-switching as illustrated so far is motivated by a need to negotiate the proper language for the interaction – ideally, one that accommodates all participants' language competences and preferences. Discourse-related code-switching, on the other hand, 'contextualizes' various speech activities and organizes the ongoing conversation with respect to such procedures as turn-taking, topical cohesion, sequencing of activities, and repair (for an explanation of these procedures, see Atkinson and Heritage 1984; Levinson 1983: Chapter 6). Bilingual speakers can make use of code-switching as a contextualization strategy in addition to whatever other organizational strategies are available to monolingual speakers (such as gesture and a wide range of prosodic phenomena – see Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 1996).

The following sequential analysis will in turn focus on the two Thai brothers' use of code-switching to coordinate (1) turn-taking; (2) preference organization; and (3) the bracketing of side-sequences. Readers interested in a formal discussion on conversation analysis may wish to

review Levinson (1983) among other works (Ford and Thompson 1996; Schegloff 1998; Wells and MacFarlane 1998) but here we are chiefly interested in illustrating examples in the current data in which code-switching coordinates some very common conversational organizational procedures. As Auer (1995) notes, an analysis of discourse-related code-switching avoids the problem of simply listing the discourse functions of code-switching as discussed in the Introduction. Most importantly, it makes use of a more general conversational framework to show how code-switching provides an *additional* conversational resource for bilingual speakers. In what follows, we present an example of code-switching used to contextualize turn-taking.

5.2.1 *Code-switching to coordinate turn-taking*

In excerpt (4), Winner and his mother are talking about Winner's friends who have been placed out of the ESOL program. Willy is listening in on the conversation. As Winner tells his mother that someone in the ESOL program no longer needs to attend ESOL (lines 1–4; 6–10), his mother recalls Winner's previous statement that some ESOL students attend mainstream classes because there is no room for them in ESOL (lines 11–13). She adds further that a friend of Winner's had to return to the ESOL program after experiencing some difficulties in a mainstream French class (lines 15–20). In line 21, Willy tries to enter the conversation by asking '*thammaj 'â?*' (why?), which overlapped with his mother's previous utterance. In lines 22–26, she further clarifies that a student is still in ESOL until he or she passes the IPT test. Willy then agrees with his mother in line 27, but Winner immediately takes the next turn by reiterating part of his mother's previous turn in line 28.

Willy's attempts to enter the conversation in Thai fail and Winner and mother both ignore him and continue their conversation. Then in lines 31–33, Willy switches to English to grasp the turn and to attract the attention of his brother and mother, contrasting his language choice with that of the previous utterance. Notice that Willy's utterances overlap with those of his mother in the previous turn (line 30) and his brother in the next turn (line 34–35). Willy's statement that the Thai word '*khun*' is not a polite word is completely ignored by his co-participants, as can be seen in Winner's utterance in line 34–35 which have nothing to do with the use of '*khun*'. Similarly, despite acknowledging Willy's attempts to grasp the turn, his mother rejects them by telling him to stop interrupting her (line 36) so that she and Winner could continue their discussion.

Despite his three failed attempts, Willy tries again to use English to take his turn in lines 47–51. Willy's utterances, 'I'll throw you in trash' and 'I'll throw you in trash easier' in lines 49 and 51 may indicate how

desperately he wants to take a turn. Unfortunately, his fourth attempt also fails as the three participants finish their dinner at this point and leave the table to take the dishes and left-over food back to the kitchen. What is important here is that Willy's code-switching contextualizes his attempts to take a turn by building up a contrast, much as do changes in pitch or tempo in monolingual conversations (on which see Schegloff 1998; Wells and MacFarlane 1998; Ford and Thompson 1996):

- (4) A conversation involving Winner, Willy, and their mother. Winner and Mother are talking about the ESOL students at his school while Willy is listening (Session 2, Month 18).

- 1 Winner: *baanphon chòogdii ná mēē thūi lūd càag*
 somebody lucky MP mother that loose from
- 2 *prookrem bēēb / māj māj ríutua lūd càag*
 program type / not not conscious loose from
- 3 *prookrem bēēb māj ríutua khyy māj campen*
 program type not conscious be not need
- 4 *tōj khāw ESOL iig lēw*
 have to enter again already
 ('Mom, somebody got lucky because they exited the ESOL program without knowing it. That is, they don't have to attend the program any more.')
- 5 Mother: *mii dūaj rǎo /*
 have also QP
 ('Can that happen?')
- 6 Winner: *mii kōo phýan lāw hāj phōm faj lēw*
 have then friend tell DV me listen already
- 7 *wāa khon wiatnaam kōo pen jān nān*
 that person Vietnam then be type that
- 8 *mýankan khon wiatnaam tōnrēēg kōo jān jūu*
 also person Vietnam at first then still be
- 9 *naj ESOL jūu tēē wāa māj tōj khāw*
 in be but that not must enter
- 10 *paj ESOL lēw*
 DV any more
 ('Yes. My friend told me that there was one Vietnamese student who was, at first, in the ESOL program, but now he does not need to attend the program any more.')
- 11 Mother: *māj nān man māj kiaw phrō wāa man māj*
 no that it not involve because that it not
- 12 *mii thūi (0.8) man māj mii thūi rian khāv*
 have place it not have place study they
- 13 *cād hōj hāj lojtua [mājchāj rǎo]*
 manage room DV balance not QP
 ('Wait a second. That's not true. [You told me before] that they were put into the mainstream classes only because there was no room in the ESOL classes and that this would help to free up some space, didn't you?')
- 14 Winner: [ʔə] /
 EXCL (agreement)
 ('Yeah.')

- 15 Mother: *man mâj kiaw nəð cə ʔaw jàaŋnán*
it not involve [Win]ner FUT take like that
- 16 *mâjdâaj nân khyy sǝmmúd wâa khâw mii*
no that be suppose that he have
- 17 *panhâa r̥y̥aŋ / r̥y̥aŋ ph̥y̥an ʔiig khon thii*
problem story story friend another person who
- 18 *mii panhâa r̥y̥aŋ phaasâafarâpsès r̥y̥aŋ ʔaraj nân*
have problem story French story what that
- 19 *nâ sùdtâaj kǝ tǝŋ klàb paj ESOL màj*
MP finally then have to return DV ESOL again
- 20 *[phrɔ́ wâa]*
because that
(‘You can’t assume that he exited the ESOL program like that. Remember your friend who had a problem with the mainstream French class? He ended up having to go back to the ESOL program because ...’)
- 21 Willy: *[thammaj ʔâ]*
why MP
(‘Why?’)
- 22 Mother: *trâabdajkǝtaamthii ch̥y̥y khun jaŋ kh̥y̥nthabian*
as long as name you still register
- 23 *jùu troŋnán ná nâa kǝ khyy thæ (0.8) khun*
be right there MP [Win]ner then be you you
- 24 *kǝ jaŋ mâjdâaj ʔǝgmaa [m̥y̥a khun] jaŋ màjdâaj*
then still not come out when you still not
- 25 *ʔǝg maa khun kǝ tǝŋ klàb paj sǝb*
exit DV you then must return DV take a test
- 26 *hâj man phàan nâ*
DV it pass MP
(‘As long as a student is registered [in the ESOL program], that student is still an ESOL student until he or she passes the IPT test.’)
- 27 Willy: *[ʔyy]*
yeah
(‘Yeah.’)
- 28 Winner: *phrɔ́ ch̥y̥y thabian khun jaŋ jùu naj ESOL jùu /*
because name register you still be in still
(Because you are still registered in the ESOL program, right?)
- 29 Mother: *mâj jàaŋ nân riag wâa taam / khâw riag ʔaraj ʔâ*
no type that call that like they call what MP
- 30 *taamthaanpatibàt ch̥aj / t̥ɛ thaanthr̥idsadii [m̥ajch̥aj]*
practically yes but theoretically no
(‘Exactly. So, practically, [their attending the mainstream classes] may be regarded as exiting the ESOL program, but, in reality, according to the rules, they are not exited.’)
- 31 Willy: [OH, PLEASE
DON’T USE / KHUN BECAUSE KHUN IS NOT A POLITE
WORD HERE.]
- 34 Winner: *[khâw bǝg]*
he tell
- 35 *wâa phɔ́ phɔ́ khâw khâw ESOL l̥ɛw ʔâ]*
that when when he enter already MP
(‘He told me that when he attended the ESOL program, ...’)

- 36 Mother: ^ʔə hāj līi dīaw mēē khuj kòon /
OK EXCL [Wil]ly just mother talk first
(‘OK. Hey, Willy, let me talk first.’)
- 37 Winner: phəw khāw khāw ESOL léew ^ʔá /
when he enter already MP
(‘When he attended the ESOL program, ...’)
- 38 Mother: ^ʔə /
EXCL
(‘Yeah.’)
- 39 Winner: khāw bəw wāa ESOL myǎn man mājchāj
he tell that like it not
- 40 RANK khəw khāw paj ləj ^ʔá / khāw bəw
of he DV at all MP he say
- 41 man ŋəj māag ləj ^ʔá khāw chəw rian
it easy much at all MP he like study
- 42 ESOL thūsud léew ^ʔá /
most already MP
(‘He said the ESOL program was easy for his level. That’s why he really likes being in the program.’)
- 43 Mother: kəw chāj jāw thūi mēē bəw wāa təon ma
then right like which mother tell that when come
- 44 təon rēeg rēeg man kəw māj khriəd jūléew
when first first it then not stressed already
- 45 tē wāa phəw rəəm rian chán thūi jāag khyn
but that when begin study class that hard COMP
- 46 man kəw təw khriəd jūléew /
it then must stressed already
(‘Right, I see. As I told you, it would not be so difficult when first starting your studies. However, at later stages, it will be more stressful because it will get more and more difficult.’)
- 47 Willy: [YES, SIR. YES, BECAUSE IT’S YOUR TEST, MAN. AND
48 IT’S SO EASIER/ BUT IT’S EASIER, EASIER / MAN. YOU
49 KNOW WHAT THEN / THEN, I’LL THROW YOU IN TRASH,
50 IT’S EASIER, MAN. / I’LL THROW YOU IN TRASH EASIER
51 THAN IN BIG (unintelligible), YOU KNOW?]
(At this point, the three have finished their dinner.)
- 52 Mother: ^ʔəw winnəw paj kəb paj lūug paj / winli /
EXCL Winner DV keep go child go Willy
- 53 winnəw əw paj kəb paj lūug paj /
Winner take DV keep DV child DV
(‘Winner, let’s take these to the [kitchen] to put them away. Willy, Winner, take this.’)
- 54 Willy: ^ʔé nān CHEESE rýpləaw khəb /
EXCL that QP PP
(‘Mom, is that cheese?’)
- 55 Mother: ^ʔə dīaw mēē sýy hāj wanlǎŋ /
OK just a moment mother buy DV later on
(‘OK, I’ll buy it for you later.’)

5.2.2 Code-switching to coordinate preference organization

According to Levinson (1983) and Yule (1996), participants in a conversation can interpret co-participants’ utterances as either (1) preferred

(acceptance, granting of a request, or agreement) or, (2) dis-preferred (refusal, rejection, or disagreement). While monolingual speakers may communicate their dis-preference toward their interlocutors with pauses and the use of preface markers such as ‘well’ (Levinson 1983: 307–308), bilingual speakers have the additional option of using code-switching to accomplish this task (Al-Khatib 2003; Auer 1984, 1995; Bain and Yu 2000; Cromdal 2004; Halmari 2004; Hansen 2003; Jørgensen 1998; Sebba and Wootten 1998; Shin 2005). The mere contrast in language choice with that of the previous turn works as a communicative strategy (Alfonzetti 1998).

In excerpt (5), Willy, the younger brother, is trying to do his math lesson while his mother helps to time his practice. Winner sings and keeps distracting his brother with questions about why people fart (lines 1, 5, and 7), to which Willy replies unsympathetically, ‘Because you are crazy’ (lines 2, 4, 6, and 8). It is apparent that Willy is trying to stop Winner from bothering him with his terse responses, but in line 9, it is he who is reprimanded by his mother for calling his older brother a crazy person. Emboldened by their mother’s backing, Winner laughs and sings happily again in line 10. At this point, Willy has had enough of this and tells his brother to shut up (line 11).

Notice that Willy’s directive is accompanied by a switch into English, which helps convey his dissatisfaction and gives his message an extra punch. However, Winner ignores his younger brother again and keeps singing in line 12. Willy then uses English to ask his brother whether he understood what he was asking him to do (line 13), but decides that he probably could not stop his older brother from annoying him and switches to Thai to ask his mother to time his math practice (line 14). What is noteworthy here is that Willy’s responses in lines 2, 4, 6, and 8 are in Thai, until, at some point, he decides that repeatedly telling his brother to stop bothering him in Thai is not producing the desired effect and switches to English (line 11), the language that contrasts with that of the preceding turn and occurs together with other contextualization cues such as higher pitch and volume. Thus, Willy’s use of language contrast works as an additional communicative tool to convey his dissatisfaction toward his brother’s annoying behavior:

(5) Willy is doing his math lesson. Winner is singing a song in English, while mother is helping to time Willy’s math practice (Session 1, Month 15)

- 1 Winner: (Using the rhythm of the song of the TV series, *Smallville*)
thammaj tòd kandûaj
 why fart altogether
 (‘Why do people fart?’)

- 2 Willy: *kɔ́ phrɔ́ phũ nɔ́ pen ʔájbáa ɲaj*
then because brother [Win]ner be crazy guy MP
(‘Because you are crazy.’)
- 3 Winner: (Singing the song of the TV series, *Smallville*) SAVE ME
- 4 Willy: *kɔ́ phrɔ́ phũ nɔ́ pen PSYCHO ɲaj*
then because brother [Win]ner be MP
(‘Because you are a psycho.’)
- 5 Winner: (Singing the song of the TV series, *Smallville*) OH MY NEED
tɛɛ raw cà tɔ́d kan thammaj tɔ́h tɔ́d
but we FUT fart together why must fart
(‘But why do we need to fart?’)
- 6 Willy: *kɔ́ phrɔ́ phũ nɔ́ pen ʔájbáa ɲaj /*
then because brother [Win]ner be crazy guy MP
(‘Because you are crazy.’)
- 7 Winner: *tɔ́d thammaj /*
fart why
(‘Why do we fart?’)
- 8 Willy: *kɔ́ phrɔ́ phũ nɔ́ pen ʔájbáa ɲaj /*
then because brother [Win]ner be crazy guy MP
(‘Because you are crazy.’)
- 9 Mother: *lii dàa jiu dáaj /*
[Wil]ly scold still MV
(‘Willy, don’t scold your brother.’)
- 10 Winner: (laughing and singing in English, *Incomplete* by Backstreet Boys)
- 11 Willy: (yelling) SHUT UP. SHUT YOUR MOUTH DOWN /
- 12 Winner: (singing in English, *Incomplete* by Backstreet Boys)
- 13 Willy: DID YOU UNDER ... UNDERSTAND THE PROBLEM? NO? /
- 14 (2.0) *mêɛ khráb càb weelaa háj nɔ́j khráb /*
mother PP measure time DV MP PP
(‘Mom, please time my math practice.’)
- 15 Mother: *ʔaw kɛ́nǎj lá /*
take at point MP
(‘At what point do you want me to start timing?’)
- 16 Willy: *pébnɲɲ khráb mêɛ yym /*
just a moment PP mother umm
(‘Mom, just a moment.’)
- 17 Winner: (still singing in English, *Incomplete* by Backstreet Boys)
- 18 Mother: *náb jaj*
count yet
(‘Should I count, or not yet?’)
- 19 Willy: *ʔookhee khráb nɲɲ sɔ́ sáam*
OK PP one two three
(‘OK, one, two, three.’)

5.2.3 Code-switching to coordinate side-sequences

Code-switching can occur at any point in the conversation to signal a divergence from the main topic (Auer 1984). Pre-sequences, insertion sequences, and side sequences are all stretches of talk which occur either before or during the conversational topic at hand and generally set the scene or clarify misunderstandings (see further Levinson 1983). We are concerned only with side sequences here, which are examined in detail by Jefferson (1972).

In excerpt 6, Winner and Willy use English to talk about the types of movies they like to watch. Notice that their use of English contrasts with Willy's use of Thai in lines 5–6, and 9 to ask his mother for water and ice, which is off the main topic at hand. After Willy gets what he wants, both Winner and Willy return to the topic of movies and use English in lines 7–8 and 10–16. When Winner wants to terminate Willy's Thai-based side-sequence, he says 'Oh, ice, ice, ice' in English, followed by the phrase, 'You know?' in lines 10–11. Then, Willy grabs this opportunity to switch to English and the boys' conversation about movies continues. What is noteworthy here is that Willy uses Thai to set apart the side-sequence (asking for water and ice) from the main topic:

(6) Winner and Willy are sitting in the living room and talking about movies while having dinner (Session 2, Month 19)

- 1 Winner: WHAT MOVIE DO YOU LIKE BEST? /
 2 Willy: (2.5) YOU DO YOU MEAN CARTOON? /
 3 Winner: AMERICAN PIE? /
 4 Willy: YES, ABSOLUTELY (laughingly) /
 (The boys' mother comes into the living room to fill their glasses with water.)
 5 *hāj tæm hāj lī*
 EXCL fill DV [Wil]ly
 6 *dūaj sāj hāj lī dūaj /*
 also put DV [Wil]ly as well
 ('Mom, fill my glass, too!')
 7 Winner: AND WHAT TYPE OF MOVIE DO YOU LIKE, RATED-R? /
 8 Willy: YES, RATED-R. (Louder) VERY GOOD ANSWER. /
 9 *khǎo / khǎo námkhǎj /*
 beg beg ice
 ('May I have some ice?')
 10 Winner: OH, ICE, ICE, ICE. YOU KNOW? / WE GOT A GOOD
 11 ANSWER FOR YOU. YOU KNOW WHY? /
 12 Willy: UH HUH. /
 13 Winner: BECAUSE THEY'RE GONNA SEE IT. YOU ARE CRAZY. /
 14 Willy: WHO CARES? /
 15 Winner: YEAH, I THINK RATED-R IS FOR PEOPLE LIKE ME, NOT
 16 LIKE YOU. /

We should note that the boys seem to be performing this dialog for the sake of the microphone. Winner's utterance in line 13, 'Because they're gonna see it. You are crazy,' suggests that he is aware of being audio-taped. Recall that a similar example was seen in excerpt (2) (line 32) where Willy tells his brother in Thai to 'Speak English. We must show them a little bit of who is who.' The boys' use of code-switching to coordinate side-sequences here can be further analyzed as a deliberate attempt to hold back sensitive information from their mother. Since *American Pie* is an R-rated movie with a very strong sexual content, they

probably felt that their watching of the video would not be approved by their mother. Their contrasting language choice here – English for talking about the movie between themselves and Thai for asking their mother for water – is perhaps further accentuated by the boys' need to keep this information somewhat hidden from their mother. On the other hand, it seems as though the boys do want to communicate to the English-speaking 'American' audience (e.g., their mother's professors, who are likely to be reading transcripts of their conversations) that they are old enough to watch this sexually explicit film. Their use of English seems to make it possible for them to share with the American audience what they cannot readily share with their mother.

6. Conclusion

By comparing the language choice in one utterance against the language choice in the previous turn, the sequential analysis developed by Auer (1984, 1995) showed ways in which the two Thai–English bilingual brothers use code-switching to structure their conversation. Auer's (1984, 1995) distinction between participant-related and discourse-related code-switching was found to be useful in revealing ways in which code-switching is used as an *additional* tool for conveying meaning, leading to more effective communication. The two Thai brothers used code-switching to negotiate the language for the interaction and accommodate other participants' language competences and preferences.

The overall rates of code-switching in the spontaneous speech data of the two boys was significantly greater than those found in other studies of bilingual children (e.g., Köppe and Meisel 1995; Shin and Milroy 2000). The setting of the study seems to have had a clear effect on the overall rates of code-switching. Since this study took place at the boys' home, there were more occasions to use both Thai and English. Had the recordings been made at the boys' schools, where the expected norm is to speak English, there would have been much lower rates of code-switching.

In addition, it was noted that the boys' rates of code-switching in dyadic conversations with each other were somewhat lower than those in dyadic and triadic conversations with their mother. Since the mother spoke almost entirely in Thai to the boys, it is not likely that she could have influenced the boys to code-switch more. Rather, we believe that the boys code-switched more when talking to their mother because they were discussing school-related events which their mother was naturally very interested in hearing about. Since the boys' schooling experiences in the U.S. were mostly in English, the topic of conversation with their mother provided more occasions to code-switch into English. Furthermore, the boys may have tried to speak more English to please their

mother who used to be an English teacher in Thailand. Since the boys knew that their conversations were recorded for their mother's research, they may have tried to speak more English around her so that her professors and classmates could understand what they were talking about.

There were some clear differences in the language preference of the two boys. While Winner preferred Thai and used it mostly to interact with his mother and brother, Willy clearly preferred English and was observed to take any chance he could to speak it. This finding is in agreement with previous research on bilingual children, which shows that younger siblings tend to be more dominant in the language of the host society than older siblings because they are exposed to the second language at an earlier age and have fewer opportunities to interact alone with their native language-speaking parents and/or caretakers (Halmari 2004; Montes-Alcalá 2001; Shin 2002; Vihman 1998; Wong Fillmore 1991).

In addition, Willy, as the younger brother, used English to assert himself and to stand up against his older brother (although his attempts were not always successful). Our analysis of Willy's discourse-related code-switching suggests that his mere contrast in language choice to that of the previous turn produced the effect of helping him better communicate his dissatisfaction toward his brother. While monolingual speakers may make use of contextualization cues such as change in tempo and loudness to organize the interaction, bilingual children and adults have the option of switching to another language in addition to using those other contextualization cues. Thus the bilingualism of the two brothers emerges as an additional linguistic and interactive resource.

Appendix: Transcription conventions

The transcription of conversational data in this article adapts procedures in Conversation Analysis as used by Atkinson and Heritage (1984). The following are the most frequent conventions used:

- (.) a micropause less than a second duration.
- (*n*) a timed pause where *n* is the duration of the pause in seconds.
- :
- :: a longer vowel.
- / indicates utterance boundary.
- ! indicates an animated tone, not necessarily an exclamation.
- ? indicates a rising intonation, not necessarily a question.
- = links contiguous utterances (adjacent utterances with no interval in between).
- [overlapping utterances.
- [

Notes

1. We are grateful to Jodi Crandall, Thomas Field, John Hartmann, Susan Strauss, and the two anonymous *Multilingua* reviewers for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this article. Responsibility for any remaining shortcomings is entirely our own.
2. This excerpt comes from videotaped data collected for the pilot study during Month 8.

References

- Alfonzetti, Giovanna (1998). The conversational dimension in code-switching between Italian and dialect in Sicily. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity*, 180–211. London: Routledge.
- Al-Khatib, Hayat (2003). Language alternation among Arabic and English youth bilinguals: Reflecting or constructing social realities? *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 6(6). 409–422.
- Atkinson, J. M. & J. Heritage (1984). *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, Peter (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Auer, Peter (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In Lesley Milroy & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, 115–135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, Peter (ed.) (1998). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Bain, Bruce & Agnes Yu (2000). Toward a fuller appreciation of code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32. 1405–1411.
- Barry, Jean S. J. (1967). *Thai students in the United States: A study in attitude change*. New York: Ithaca, Southeast Asia Program, Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University.
- Bongartz, Christiane & Melanie L. Schneider (2003). Linguistic development in social contexts: A study of two brothers learning German. *The Modern Language Journal* 87. 13–37.
- Booth, Wayne C., Gregory G. Colomb, & Joseph M. Williams (2003). *The craft of research* (2 ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cefola, Penchusee L. (1981). A study of interference of English in the language of Thai bilinguals in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University.
- Chanseawrassamee, Supamit (2007). Bilingual development of two Thai brothers during their sojourn in the U.S. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Maryland, Baltimore County.
- Cheng, Karen Kow Yip (2003). A study of interference of English in the language of Thai bilinguals in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University.
- Code-switching for a purpose: Focus on pre-school Malaysian children. *Multilingua* 22. 59–77.
- Clyne, Michael (2003). *Dynamics of language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Codman-Wilson, Mary Louise (1992). Thai cultural and religious identity and understanding of well-being in the U.S.: An ethnographic study of an immigrant church. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Field of Joint Garrett/Northwestern Program in Religious and Theological Studies.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth & Margret Selting (1996). *Prosody in conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Cromdal, Jacob (2004). Building bilingual oppositions: Code-switching in children's disputes. *Language in Society* 33. 33–58.
- De Jong, Eveline (1986). *The bilingual experience: A book for parents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, Cecilia E. & Sandra A. Thompson (1996). Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In Elinor Ochs, Emmanuel A. Schegloff, & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*, 134–184. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gafaranga, Joseph (2000). Medium repair vs. other-language repair: Telling the medium of a bilingual conversation. *The International Journal of Bilingualism* 4(3). 327–350.
- Gafaranga, Joseph & Maria-Carme Torras (2002). Interactional otherness: Towards a redefinition of code-switching. *The International Journal of Bilingualism* 6(1). 1–22.
- Glesne, Corrine (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. New York: Longman.
- Grosjean, François (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Gumperz, John J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halmari, Helena (2004). Code-switching patterns and developing discourse competence. In Diana Boxer & Andrew D. Cohen (eds.), *Studying speaking to inform second language learning*, 115–146. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Hansen, Jesper (2003). The development of bilingual proficiency – A sequential analysis. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 7(4). 379–406.
- Heller, Monica (1982). Negotiations of language choice in Montreal. In John Gumperz (ed.), *Language and social identity*, 108–118. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jefferson, Gail (1972). Side sequences. In David Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in social interaction*, 75–110. New York: Free Press.
- Jørgensen, J. N. (1998). Children's acquisition of code-switching for power-wielding. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity*, 237–261. London: Routledge.
- Köppe, Regina & Jürgen M. Meisel (1995). Code-switching in bilingual first language acquisition. In Lesley Milroy and Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, 276–301. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kummer, Manfred (1992). Politeness in Thai. In R. J. Watts, S. Ide, & K. Ehlich (eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory and practice*, 325–336. New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Li, Wei (1994). *Three generations, two languages, one family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Li, Wei (1998). The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity*, 156–176. London: Routledge.
- Li, Wei (2000). Dimensions of bilingualism. In Li Wei (ed.), *The bilingualism reader*, 3–25. New York: Routledge.
- Li, Wei (2002). 'What do you want me to say?' On the Conversation Analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society* 31(2). 159–180.
- Li, Wei (ed.) (2005). *Conversational code-switching*, Special issue of *Journal of Pragmatics* 37(3).

- Li, Wei & Lesley Milroy (1995). Conversational code-switching in a Chinese community in Britain: A sequential analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 23. 281–299.
- Li, Xiaoxia (1999). How can language minority parents help their children become bilingual in familial context? A case study of a language minority mother and her daughter. *Bilingual Research Journal* 23(2/3; Spring and Summer). 113–125. Retrieved June 16, 2005, from Web site: <http://brj.asu.edu/v2323/articles/art7.html>
- Long, Susi (1998). Learning to get along: Language acquisition and literacy development in a new cultural setting. *Research in the Teaching of English* 33. 8–47.
- Mishina, Satomi (1999). The role of parental input and discourse strategies in the early language mixing of a bilingual child. *Multilingua* 18. 317–342.
- Milroy, Lesley & Matthew Gordon (2003). *Sociolinguistics: Method and interpretation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Milroy, Lesley & Pieter Muysken (eds.) (1995). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moffatt, Suzanne & Lesley Milroy (1992). Panjabi/English language alternation in the classroom in the early school years. *Multilingua* 11. 355–384.
- Montes-Alcalá, Cecilia (2001). Written code-switching: Powerful bilingual images. In Rodolfo Jacobson (ed.), *Code-switching worldwide II*, 193–219. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Moyer, Melissa G. (1998). Bilingual conversation strategies in Gibraltar. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity*, 215–236. London: Routledge.
- Moyer, Melissa G. (2000). Negotiating agreement and disagreement in Spanish–English bilingual conversations with *no*. *The International Journal of Bilingualism* 4(4). 485–504.
- Muysken, Pieter (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol (1993). *Social motivations for code-switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol (1995). A lexically based model of code-switching. In Lesley Milroy & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, 233–256. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol (2000). Code-switching as indexical of social negotiations. In Li Wei (ed.), *The bilingualism reader*, 137–165. New York: Routledge.
- Ochs, Elinor & Carolyn Taylor (1992). Science at dinner. In Claire Kramsch & Sally McConnell-Ginet (eds.), *Text and context: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study*, 29–45. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Pavlenko, Aneta (2002). ‘We have room for but one language here’: Language and national identity in the U.S. at the turn of the 20th century. *Multilingua* 21. 163–196.
- Reimers, David (1985). *Still the golden door: The third world comes to America*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Romaine, Suzanne (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Sakdisubha, Kandawadee (1987). Communication and assimilation patterns of two generations of Thai immigrants. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Norman, Oklahoma University.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel A. (1998). Reflections on studying prosody in talk-in-interaction. *Language and Speech* 41. 235–263.
- Sebba, Mark & Tony Wooten (1998). We, they and identity: Sequential versus identity-related explanation in code-switching. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity*, 262–286. London: Routledge.

- Serra, Cecilia Oesch (1998). Discourse connectives in bilingual conversation: The case of an emerging Italian–French mixed code. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity*, 101–123. London: Routledge.
- Shin, Sarah J. (2002). Birth order and the language experience of bilingual children. *TESOL Quarterly* 36. 103–113.
- Shin, Sarah J. (2005). *Developing in two languages: Korean children in America*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Shin, Sarah J. (2006). High-stakes testing and heritage language maintenance. In Kimi Kondo-Brown (ed.), *Heritage language development: Focus on East Asian immigrants*, 127–144. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Shin, Sarah J. & Lesley Milroy (2000). Conversational codeswitching among Korean–English bilingual children. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4(3). 351–383.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2004). Ancestry: 2000. Retrieved August 11, 2004, from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2004pubs/c2kbr-35.pdf>
- U.S. Embassy in Thailand (2005). Study in the U.S.A. (March, 24) Retrieved October 8, 2005, from http://bangkok.usembassy.gov/services/irc/ref_stu.htm
- Vihman, Marilyn May (1998). A developmental perspective on code-switching: Conversations between a pair of bilingual siblings. *The International Journal of Bilingualism* 2(1). March, 45–84.
- Wells, Bill & Sarah MacFarlane (1998). Prosody as an interactional resource: Turn-projection and overlap. *Language and Speech* 41. 265–294.
- Wibulpolprasert, Suwit & Paichit Pengpaibon (2003). Integrated strategies to tackle the inequitable distribution of doctors in Thailand: Four decades of experience. *Human Resources for Health* 1. 1–12.
- Wong Fillmore, Lily (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 6. 323–346.
- Yip, Virginia & Stephen Matthews (2000). Syntactic transfer in a Cantonese–English bilingual child. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 3(3). 193–208.
- Yule, George (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Supamit Chanseawrassamee is Senior Lecturer of English at TOT Academy, TOT Corporation Public Company Limited (formerly, Telephone Organization of Thailand). Her research and teaching interests include bilingual language acquisition, code-switching, and Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Address for correspondence: TOT Academy, TOT Corporation Public Company Limited, 174 Ngamwongwan Road, Nonthaburi 11000, Thailand. Supachan9@gmail.com

Sarah J. Shin is Associate Professor of Education and Co-Director of the M. A. Program in ESOL/Bilingual Education at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County. She specializes in bilingualism, TESOL teacher education, and heritage language education. Her recent publications include her book, *Developing in two languages: Korean children in America* (Multilingual Matters, 2005) and her article, 'Preparing non-native English-speaking ESL teachers' (*Teacher Development*, 2008). With Jin Sook Lee, she has edited a special themed issue of the *Heritage Language Journal* on Korean (2008). Address for correspondence: Department of Education, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, 1000 Hilltop Circle, Baltimore, MD 21250, USA. shin@umbc.edu