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.

Conversational code-switching among Korean-English bilingual children

Sarah J. Shin

University of Maryland, Baltimore County

and Lesley Milroy

University of Michigan

1. Introduction

In this paper we explore pragmatic dimensions of code-switching by first-grade Korean American schoolchildren. Growing up as members of the Korean immigrant community in New York City, the children discussed here have all entered school with Korean as their mother tongue, and at the time of the investigation alternated between English and Korean. English is acquired as a second language during childhood and becomes an important medium of communication both in the school and in the

community. In this introductory section we briefly review some concepts and frameworks which proved helpful in highlighting the systematic character of the children's 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 the New York Korean community, and Sections 3 and 4 deal with methodology. Finally, Section 5 sets out an analysis of the mixed language data recorded in the children's school, and Section 6 summarizes major conclusions.

Although a large body of research reveals code-switching as a normal and widespread phenomenon of bilingual discourse (see, for example, Timm, 1975; Gumperz, 1982; Poplack, 1980; McClure, 1981; Romaine 1995) not only laypersons but some researchers have often assumed that those who mix languages do not know either language adequately. Romaine (1995) notes that understanding of bilingualism has been adversely influenced by the use of terms such as 'the ideal bilingual', 'full bilingualism' and 'balanced bilingualism', which carry the implication that there are other kinds of bilingualism which are not ideal, full or balanced. Although such thinking appears to derive   from   political and cultural ideology rather than from linguistic evidence, it often develops into full fledged theories which have serious practical consequences. For example, Martin-Jones and Romaine (1986) demonstrate that the   notion of 'semilingualism', to this day   influential in educational psychology, is based on the assumption that language alternation is evidence of some sort of deficit, an assumption which is at odds with   sociolinguistic evidence.

Gumperz's   pioneering work on bilingual discourse strategies revealed that language alternation, far from constituting a language or communicative deficit, provided

2

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 stressed that other behaviors such as gestures or prosodic patterns were also exploitable as contextualization cues, and were thus functionally parallel to code-switching.

Gumperz's analysis of language choice and language mixing as interactional strategies is further developed and systematized by Scotton (1976, 1980, 1982, 1983) and particularly by Myers-Scotton's (1993) 'markedness' theory of language choice. Basing her arguments chiefly on East African bilingual conversational materials, she argues that bilingual speakers are innately endowed with a knowledge of socially relevant markedness which is associated with the normative and expected practices in a given community. This entails an awareness by competent speakers of the social consequences of choosing a particular language (or opting to mix languages) in a particular social context. 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 the implicatures triggered by these choices. Readers are directed to Myers-Scotton (1993) for details of this influential and suggestive theory. Although it is claimed to be both comprehensive and predictive, 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. However, the idea of particular choices being (un)marked in particular situations is a useful one to which we shall return later.

Auer (1995) represents 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 argued that not only was such a list theoretically problematic and unmotivated, but it could also in principle never be complete. Developing Gumperz's idea of code-switching as a contextualization cue, he suggested that the problems posed by an analysis in terms of functions could be solved by adopting the sequential framework of Conversation Analysis. As procedures for organizing the ongoing interaction, Conversational participants appear to exploit variable spoken language elements at all linguistic levels (see further Li and Milroy 1995). Auer's suggestion was that code-switching worked much like other (for example) prosodic or gestural contextualization cues, the chief function of which is to signal participants' orientation to each other. While a particular utterance may be contextualized by its prosodic shape as ironical or mocking or as a side-sequence outside the current topic, the same job could be done by code-switching. Auer argued that since the contrast set up by codeswitching was particularly visible, switching served as a particularly salient contextualization cue in bilingual communities. His work has proved to be particularly suggestive for the data analyzed in Section 5.

Auer drew 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- 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). It is this kind of sequential analysis which we shall apply in our own analysis in

Section 5. For further details of the framework and its implementation see Auer (1995);

Li & Milroy (1995).

2. The social context of Korean-English code-switching

Korean Americans are among the more recent immigrant groups to enter American

society, with over two-thirds of the present Korean population in the United States having

arrived after 1970 since the passage of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Act of

1965. Of the Asian and Pacific Islander population in the U.S., Koreans ranked fifth in

number (about 800,000 in 1990) after the Chinese, Filipino, Japanese and Asian Indian

immigrants. The 1990 U.S. Census indicated that Korean Americans are urban dwellers:

95% of Korean Americans lived in cities while only 5% lived in rural areas. New York

state contained the second largest Korean population (76,029) after California among the

50 U.S. states.

According to various surveys conducted among Korean immigrants in the United States,

English acquisition was ranked as the highest priority, but also as the most difficult task (Kim,

B.-L.: 1988: 264). Since high proficiency in English is equated with prestige and economic and

social success to many Korean immigrants, there is a strong desire among Korean Americans to

learn English. However, most English language instructions that the immigrants received in

Korea have been limited to book learning in high school and college, with very few opportunities

to use and practice English in real life contexts. Many Koreans work in racially mixed settings

and those who operate small businesses often have regular commercial contact with Caucasian

and African American, Chinese and Latino American customers (Kim, I, 1981; Hurh and Kim,

1984). However, these relationships are confined to the workplace and remain for the most part formal and of   secondary importance.

Given these facts, it is not surprising that first-generation immigrant communication among Korean Americans is almost exclusively in Korean; several surveys have indicated that this language is used for over 75% of spousal communication and 72% of parent-child communication (Kim, Sawdey and Meihoefer, 1980; Hurh and Kim, 1984). For the most part, Korean Americans contract informal social ties primarily with other Korean Americans, regardless of socioeconomic status, geographic location, or the size or concentration of the local Korean population (Kim, B.-L., 1988: 265). Hurh and Kim's (1984) study of the Los Angeles Korean population indicated that high proportions of Koreans (75-90 %) reported a network of close kin, neighbors, and friends who were also Korean. More than half of the kin and a third of the neighbors were persons with whom they had daily contact. Only a third had white friends, and these were mostly people they had met through the workplace. Korean social networks are thus typically composed of other Koreans who may be family, friends, recreational colleagues, and fellow church congregants. The informal social organization of the community in which the children described below live and interact is thus very likely to provide them with opportunities to speak and hear Korean.

3. Subjects

3.1 Korean children

Twelve Korean children, six male and six female, participated in this study. The twelve subjects were selected on the basis that they were all in one first grade class of 27

students and had Korean as their native language. Each child's name, sex, age at the beginning of the fieldwork period (May, 1995) and order of birth are listed in Table 1. Besides Matthew, Joshua, Abel, and Kyung who were born in the U.S. and Gina who was born in Argentina, all other children were born in Korea and have subsequently moved to the States with their families. Kwon's family had moved to Mexico soon after his birth and came to the States when he was four. Except for David whose first contact with English was in Mrs. Kim's first grade class, all eleven children attended English-speaking kindergarten in the U.S. before becoming first graders. At the time of this study, ten out of the twelve Korean children were enrolled in daily pull-out Korean/English bilingual class and ESL class. Matthew and Kyung had passed the school board's English proficiency test in the beginning of the school year and thus were exempt from the two classes.[i] When the test was administered again in April, 1995, Grace, Kathy, Gina, and So Hee also achieved passing scores and would be exempt from the bilingual and ESL classes starting second grade.

(Place Table 1 about here.)

The high proportion of recent immigrant population in this part of New York City is reflected in the composition of the class. Aside from the 12 Korean students, there are 5 Chinese, 1 Afghan, 1 Russian, and 6 Hispanic students whose native languages are something other than English. Only 2 out of the 27 students are native speakers of English. Out of about 970 students enrolled in the school, around 700 speak English as a second

language. In addition, more than half the student population at this school is of an Asian descent.

3.2 The teacher

Mrs. Kim, the homeroom teacher, immigrated to the United States at the age of seven with her family from Korea. Since then, she has received her elementary, secondary, and college education in the States. While her ability in Korean has not progressed much since moving to America, Mrs. Kim can nevertheless carry on a simple conversation in Korean and speaks Korean with the Korean parents of her students. There is no trace of Korean accent in her English, but some of her Korean students attempted to speak to her in Korean in the beginning of the school year. Mrs. Kim reported having specifically instructed her Korean students not to speak to her in Korean out of consideration for the non-Korean students in her class. The fact that ten of her twelve Korean students had the opportunity to speak Korean in the daily pull-out bilingual Korean/English class also led her to insist on English as the main language in her classroom. However, although she did not allow her Korean students to address her in Korean, Mrs. Kim did not attempt to prevent   hem speaking Korean among themselves.

4. Data collection

4.1 Recording equipment

Each subject wore a small light-weight wireless radio microphone. Sound signals were transmitted to the radio receiver connected to a cassette-recorder placed in a box in the back corner of the classroom. The light-weight wireless transmitter-receiver system

recorded speech from any part of the classroom while allowing children to   move freely
around as they were accustomed to.

4.2 Elicitation procedures for spontaneous speech

The fieldworker (the first author), a bilingual Korean/English speaker adopted the
role of a classroom assistant, participating in the daily routines of the class. This allowed
her to collect a tape-recorded corpus of spontaneous speech and to observe children's
language choice and language mixing patterns without considerably imposing her presence
as a researcher. Unlike the homeroom teacher who spoke only English and instructed her
Korean students to speak English to her (but see 3.2), the researcher spoke both English
and Korean when addressing the Korean children. This was done to see how the bilingual
children would respond to utterances made in both languages by an adult bilingual
speaker. Since the default language of the classroom is English, it was felt that the
researcher's use of both languages would create additional occasions for the bilingual
children to code-switch between the two languages. The main goal in the speech elicitation
process was to obtain insight into the structure of everyday spoken language of the
bilingual children engaged in various classroom-related activities. Such ethnographic,
modified participant observation procedures -- where the researcher produces the relevant
talk as a participant in the classroom as well as observe the class -- allow observation of
classroom with minimum observer effect (Milroy 1987; see also Moffatt & Milroy 1992;
Zentella 1981; Lin 1988, 1990 for reports of similar studies of different groups of bilingual
children at school).

Based upon Mrs. Kim's evaluations of students' language proficiency, the twelve Korean students were organized as six pairs such that members of each pair   showed comparable proficiency in both English and Korean, as shown in Table 2. This was done to prevent significant mismatch in bilingual proficiency between students and to obtain the largest amount of conversational data as possible.

(Place Table 2 about here.)

Audio-recordings were made in three situations:

1) *storytelling*: telling to the partner a spontaneously created story or some other account based upon an activity in class.

2) *math*: this activity type involved counting in some form, such as in buying and selling toy goods in an imaginary store, sorting and counting different plastic shapes, or measuring how far a snail travels in a given amount of time.

3) *play*: as part of the "Learning Center" in which children are free to play educational games with one another (e.g., various board games, wooden blocks, and jigsaw puzzles).

The recordings for each Korean-Korean student pair for each activity type lasted between 20 and 75 minutes, yielding a total of approximately ten hours of recorded speech.

4.3 The Data

The entire speech corpus for the Korean-Korean pairs consisted of   approximately 8,000 utterances, unevenly distributed across subjects and activity types. Figure 1 shows the percentage of extra-sentential code-switching (e.g. code-switching across utterance boundaries) for each subject for each of the three activity types. [ii] The percentages were calculated by dividing the number of extra-sentential code-switches produced by a given child in a given activity by the total number of all utterances produced by the child in that activity.

(Place Figure 1 about here.)

Two patterns are clearly evident in Figure 1. First, the overall amount of code-switching is quite low when considered as a proportion of the entire corpus. Low rates of code-switching in children's bilingual speech are documented in other studies which have examined bilingual children's use of various language pairs (e.g., Moffatt & Milroy, 1992; Köppe & Meisel, 1995). Second, each child is quite consistent in either code-switching or avoiding code-switching across the three different activity types. A two-way analysis of variance with pairings of subjects and activity types as two factors revealed that pairing of subjects was a significant effect on the amount of code-switching at 0.05 level (*p*-value=5.09×10^{-8}) while the activity type was not a significant effect (*p*-value=0.1585). There was no interaction between pair and activity types (interaction *p*-value=0.7324). Since subject pairings were decided on language proficiency grounds with students in each pair having comparable proficiencies in Korean and in English, this result suggests that language proficiency was partly responsible for the amount of

12

extra-sentential code-switching. Had the twelve subjects been paired differently (e.g. a child who speaks better English than Korean paired with another child who is better in Korean), the amount of code-switching produced by each child could have been different. This result suggests the importance of the role of the interlocutor in code-switching, and indeed we will shortly see that these Korean-English bilingual children demonstrate sensitivity to the language abilities and language preference of their interlocutors.

Figure 1 also indicates that five children (i.e., Jae, Abel, Joshua, Kyung and Matthew) produced very little code-switching, always below the 5% level. The recordings of these children's spontaneous speech show that they spoke almost entirely in English. Kyung and Matthew are particularly proficient in English being the only two in the sample of twelve who passed the school board English proficiency test to a level which exempted them from both the ESL and the Korean/English bilingual pull-out classes. Unlike the somewhat less fluent English conversations of their Korean peers in the class, Kyung's and Matthew's English utterances are quite native-like in vocabulary, grammar and style. Thus, high level of proficiency in English appears to partially account for the low rate of code-switching. However, English proficiency cannot solely explain why the less competent speakers of English (i.e., Jae, Abel and Joshua) also produced small amounts of code-switching. As will be shown in the pragmatic analysis, a clear individual preference for English - a preference not entirely dependent on competence - largely accounted for the low rates of code-switching by the latter group.

The preference of some of the Korean-English bilingual subjects of this study for English seems to have been heightened by the classroom setting, since children usually see the school as a domain for the dominant language of the community.[iii] It is thus possible

that had the recordings been made in the home or in another institution such as a Korean church, more language mixing may have been observed. Since code-switching is highly marked (Myers-Scotton, 1993; Li 1994), given that English is the unmarked code in the classroom, it is reasonable to seek an account of its use in pragmatic terms. Like Auer (1995), Myers-Scotton (1993), and Li (1994), we analyze it in the following sections as an interactional resource.

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 on-going 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 sequence where both participant-related and discourse-related code-switching are exemplified.

Consider (1) below where Jae and Abel are given a snail to study. Their assignment is to measure the length of the snail, identify the different body parts, and measure how far it travels. After Mrs. Kim walks away from them in line 21, Jae and Abel digress from their assignment and begin to talk about cooking and eating snails. In line 33, Abel initiates a switch into Korean saying that one can eat the snail shell because it is hard. It is possible that he may have meant that one cannot eat the shell because it is hard, but in any event, Jae corrects Abel by saying that one cannot eat it. Abel then responds with an additional piece of information, namely that the hardness of the shell could cause one to

die in case of ingestion. In line 38, the Korean sequence ends when Jae explicitly directs Abel to switch to English. This directive effectively ends the use of Korean for the rest of the activity and the conversation continues entirely in English until the researcher later approaches to check on their progress (as shown in (2)). In Auer's framework, the switch to English in lines 38 and 39 in (1) would constitute a participant-related code-switching where the switch is motivated by the language preference of one of the participants.

In contrast, Jae's initial switch from English to Korean in line 24 can be analyzed on two different levels as exemplifying discourse-related code-switching. At a superordinate level, Jae's code-switch in line 24 after Mrs. Kim walks away from the two boys contextualizes a shift in footing, marking out contrastively the beginning of a sequence which does not constitute part of the classroom task. At a lower level of analysis, we may note that Jae's disagreement in line 24 with Abel's claim that he eats snail shells is accompanied by a code-switch into Korean, despite his evident preference for English. In line 27, Abel also switches into Korean and expresses agreement with Jae. Comparable patterns are reported by Li and Milroy (1995), where Chinese/English bilinguals used code-switching to contextualize dispreferred responses. In both this study and in theirs, preferred (unmarked) responses are characterized by language alignment while dispreferred responses are marked by contrasting language choices. In the current example, a dispreferred response - a disagreement in this case - is marked by a code-switch.

(1) Abel and Jae follow the movements of a snail assigned to them. They

measure the length of the body, how long it travels, etc. Abel and Jae have

been speaking exclusively in English for ten minutes. Mrs. Kim approaches

their desk and checks on their progress.

1   M. Kim: OKAY/

2   HOW LONG IS IT/

3   MEASURE IT/

4   Jae: UH/

5   THREE INCH/

6   Abel: MINE [IS/

7   M. Kim: [THREE WHAT?/

8   Jae: (2.0)   [THREE

9   M. Kim: [THREE INCHES?   [OH OKAY/

10   Jae: [THREE INCHES/

11   M. Kim: DID YOU MEASURE IT?/

12   Abel: YEAH/

13   M. Kim: OKAY SO IF THAT'S SNAIL'S LENGTH/

14   PUT A SPACE BETWEEN THIS/

15   OKAY SNAIL'S LENGTH HOW LONG IS IT/

16   WRITE IT IN/

17   Jae: (3.2) THREE/

18   M. Kim: OKAY NOW LOOK AT THE EYES/

19   LOOK AT THE EYES/

| 20 | | AND THEN LOOK AT THE MOUTH/ |
| 21 | Jae: | EAT IT/ |

(M. Kim walks away from Jae and Abel.)

| 22 | Abel: | WELL THE SHELL/ |
| 23 | | I EAT IT/ |

24 Jae: SHELL   *nun*   *mos*   *mek-ci* / [iv]

shell   TOP   cannot   eat-right

(You can't eat the shell, can you?)

25   *ike-n*   *pelyeya-toy*/

this-TOP   discard-must

(You should throw this out)

26   *ike*   *man*   *mek-ko*/

this   only   eat-and

(and eat only this)

27 Abel: *e*/

yeah

(Yeah.)

| 28 | Jae: | WE NEED TO COOK IT/ |
| 29 | | PUT THIS RIGHT KID=/ |

30 Abel: =AND PUT IN   *elum*   AND WE COULD EAT IT RIGHT=/

and   put   in   ice   and   we   could   eat   it

right

(and if you put ice in it you could eat it, right?)

31   Jae: =YEAH/

32   [(unintelligible)

33   Abel: [*ike   nemwu   ttakttakhay-se   meke/*

               this   too   hard-because   eat

               (You eat this because it's too hard)

34   Jae: *mos   meke/*

               Cannot   eat

               (You can't eat it.)

35   Abel: *e   ttakttakhay/*

               Um   hard

               (Yeah, it's hard.)

36   Jae: [(unintelligible)

37   Abel: [(unintelligible)   *ha-myen   cwuke/*

                                  do-if   die

               (You die if (unintelligible).)

38   Jae: (emphatically) SPEAK ENGLISH/

39   Abel: OKAY/

40   (touches the head of the snail) OOOOH/

41   Jae: NO LEAVE IT/

42   EY IT'S GONNA GO IN/

43   Abel: IF YOU SCARE HIM/

44		HE'S GONNA GO INTO THE SHELL RIGHT?/
45	Jae:	ABEL JUST SEE/
46		(3.5) NOW WE DID MOUTH EYE FEET FEET FEET/
47		FEET FEET LEAVE HIM ALONE LIKE THAT ABEL/
48		IT'S GONNA GO IN/
49		SEE ITS FEET/
50	Abel:	(3.5) (softly) IT'S GOING/

In (1) above, we suggested that the code-switches found in lines 24 and 38 could be analyzed as discourse-related and participant-related respectively. In some cases, however, particular contextualizations can be interpreted differently or even be multifunctional, as we shall shortly see. Although the distinction between participant-related and discourse-related code-switching is central to Auer's 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 (see (3) below for an example). 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 (Auer, 1984: 12). In the following sections, we

analyze participant-related and discourse-related code-switching separately in greater detail.

5.1 Participant-related code-switching

Participant-related code-switching in the Korean-English children's bilingual data may be seen as either preference-related or competence-related.[v]   The former 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. Auer (1984) remarks that bilingual conversationalists carefully monitor their partner's speech production, adapting   their own language choice to the assessed bilingual abilities of the other. Such accommodation to co-participant's language abilities can be given a competence-related meaning.

5.1.1 Preference-related code-switching

Sequence (2) below grants some insight into Jae's preference for English as exemplified in (1) above. In (2), his fluent Korean conversation with the researcher shows that his reluctance to speak Korean does not emerge from lack of proficiency, since his sentences are well-formed and apparently produced without difficulty. Rather, given the status of English both as the peer language of the young and as the language of the classroom, we may surmise that Jae's preference for English exemplified in (1) originates in his sense of English as the unmarked choice for classroom use. In addition, Jae's

preference for English seems to derive from his relationship with an older brother who first introduced Jae to speaking English. A child in an immigrant family is exposed to the second language in different ways depending on whether he/she is a firstborn child or not. While oldest children in an immigrant setting learn the second language when they enter school, younger siblings begin speaking the second language before they enter school through interaction with the older siblings at home. McClure (1981: 75), in her study of the children of Mexican immigrants in the Southwestern United States, notes that besides simply learning the second language earlier, younger siblings are often influenced by the language attitudes of the older siblings. Therefore, a child whose older siblings are well integrated into the mainstream community may identify more with the speakers of the dominant language and prefer to be associated more with that group. Interestingly, in the current bilingual corpus, all five children who produced low amounts of code-switching (i.e. Jae, Abel, Joshua, Kyung and Matthew) are either second or third siblings.

(2) Snail observation continues. Researcher approaches Jae and Abel.

1	Res:	*eti*	*pwa*	*ta*	*hay-sse?/*	
		where	see	all	do-PAST	
		(Let's see. Did you finish it?)				
2	Jae:	*ike*	*twu-kay*	*nun*	*mos*	*pwa-sse/*
		this	two-CLASS	TOP	not	see-PAST
		(We didn't see these two)				
3	Res:	*mwe*	*etten*	*twukay*	*lul*	*mos* *pwa-sse/*

what   which   two   ACC   not   see-PAST

(Which two didn't you see?)

4   Jae: *ike*   *hako*   *ike=/*

this   and   this

(this and this)

5   Res: *=yoke lang*   SHELL *hako*   FEELER   *hako*   *mos*   *hay-sse/*

this   and   shell   and   feeler   and   not

do-PAST

(You didn't see this and the shell and the feeler?)

6   *ike*   *hako*   *ike*   *nun*   *hay-sse/*

this   and   this   TOP   do-PAST

(Did you do this and this?)

7   EYES *hako*   FEET

eyes   and   FEET

(eyes and feet?)

8   Jae: *ikes*   *to*   *hay-sse/*

this   also   do-PAST

(I also did this)

9   Res: *ikes*   *to*   *hay-sse?/*

this   also   do-PAST

(You also did this?)

10   MOUTH   *to*   *hay-sse?/*

		mouth	also	do-PAST

(You also did the mouth?)

11   *o*   *kulaysse/*

       oh   that is

       (Oh, is that so)

12   *Twulise*   *kachi*   *hay-sse*   ABEL *hako?/*

       twosome   together   do-PAST   Abel   with

       (Did you do it together with Abel?)

13   Jae: NAY/

       (yes)

Besides Jae and Abel, another pair of boys produced very low overall rates of code-switching. As in (1), individual preferences for either Korean or English can be observed in the following language negotiating sequences. In (3), Joshua consistently uses English while Kwon consistently uses Korean in lines 7 through 30. In line 31, this pattern of competitive language choices ends when   Kwon finally gives in and switches to English. In Auer's terms, this choice constitutes a participant-related code-switch, since it is quite clear that Kwon's preferred language is Korean while Joshua's is English. As in the case of Jae and Abel, English again wins out in this sequence, probably because of its status as unmarked choice in the school context.

In the sequence following line 31, the negotiated language of interaction, namely English, is maintained by both participants until line 47 when Kwon briefly switches to Korean. This switch, which again seems to contextualize disagreement,   may be analyzed

as discourse-related, in contrast with the participant-related switch in line 31. Notice, however, that Kwon immediately switches back to English in the following utterance in a repetition which seems to constitute self-initiated self-repair (Auer, 1984) and English is maintained by both speakers for the remainder of the conversation. Again, as in (1) we find that participant-related and discourse-related switches appear in the same sequence. Note, however, that Kwon's initial code-switch into Korean in line 8 may be analyzed as *both* discourse-related and participant-related. While this switch contextualizes Kwon's disagreement with Joshua's prior utterance, it also indicates his preference for speaking Korean.

(3) Kwon and Joshua play 'cashier'. Joshua plays the cashier and Kwon plays the customer. Joshua struggles with the cash register drawer which is jammed.

1	Joshua:	OH MAN!/
2	Kwon:	(3.5) (cash register opens) LET ME SEE (a banging noise)/
3		NO (unintelligible) (a banging noise)/
4	Joshua:	(5.5) GERRR-/
5		(1.8) WHY DOES (unintelligible) COME DOWN?/
6	Kwon:	(2.0) BECAUSE YOU HAVE TO TOUCH THIS=/
7	Joshua:	=NO NO NO NO NO=/
8	Kwon:	=*nay nay/*
		(yes yes)
9		(6.5) NO *ceki kinyang neya-toy/*

| | | no | there | simply | insert-should |

(No, you should just insert there.)

10   (loudly)   *kinyang*   *ne!/*

                       simply   insert

                       (Just insert it!)

11   Joshua: I WANT TO PUT (unintelligible)/

12   Kwon: *naol-kkeya/*

                  come out-FUT

                  (It will come out.)

13   *ilehkey*   *hay/*

                  this like   do

                  (Do like this.)

14   Joshua: [(softly) I WANT THE MONEY/

15   Kwon: [*ai si/*

                  (ah, geez)

16   (3.0)   *ai*   *copa*   *copa/*

                  ah   give   give

                  (Ah, Give me. Give me.)

17   *ne*   *mola*   *ne*   *mola/*

                  you   not know   you   not know

                  (You don't know. You don't know.)

18   (4.5)   *ai*   *si/*

(Ah, geez.)

19 (1.2) *ya:!/*

(Hey!)

20 (3.0) *ike pwa/*

this look

(Look at this.)

21 *iccok ey nun cal mos hay-ss-canha/*

this side at TOP well not do-PAST -not

(You didn't do well on this side.)

22 (2.7) *tto tto!/*

again again

(See you're doing that again!)

23 *a si/*

Ah geez

(ah, geez.)

24 Joshua: (1.0) IT'S IN HERE/

25 OKAY LET'S GO/

26 Kwon: *ani nay-ka ike mancess-nuntey* (0.7) *ike*

no I-NOM this touched-and this

mancess-nuntey ettehkey i-ccok-ey lul ka?/

touched-and how this-side-LOC ACC go

(Why if I touched this, how come it goes to this side?)

27	Joshua:	(1.6) HERE/
28		(1.4) SEE/
29		(1.0) SEE/
30		(unintelligible)/
31	Kwon:	SEE?/
32		(6.0) YES!/
33		(banging noise) IT'S BACK OVER HERE/
34		(banging noise) CAN'T FIX/
35		I TOLD YA/
36		LOT OF TIME=/
37	Joshua:	=NO SEE/
38		SEE THAT'S GREEN/
39		(1.0) GREEN SEE?/
40		(1.7) (loudly) OOH!/
41		(4.0) THIS GOES (banging noise)/
42		(4.5) YES! (banging noise)/
43	Kwon:	(3.0) COME ON YOU'RE TAKING SO LONG=/
44	Joshua:	=OK WHAT DO YOU LIKE TO BUY?/
45	Kwon:	(loudly) QUIET!/
46		(0.8) AH YOU HAVE IT/

47		ne	ku-ke	twu-kay	ne	isse-sse/
		you	that-one	two-class	you	have-past

                     (you, you had two of those.)

48   YOU HAVE SOMETHING NOW/

49   Joshua: QUARTER?/

50   Kwon: YOU HAVE TWO THINGS/

51   TWO (.) BAD (0.9) TWO (.) BIG THINGS/

52   YOU LOST IT WOO--/

53   (3.0) IT'S GONE MAN/

54   (4.0) IT'S GONE/

55   PUT IT BACK/

56   (1.9) NO PUT IT BACK/

57   (PICKS UP A PLASTIC COIN) OH! (1.0) I FOUND ONE!/

58   [IT WAS LIKE RIGHT OVER/

59   Joshua: [IT'S NOT YOURS/

60   Kwon: YES/

61   Joshua: NO/

     In this sequence we see again similar patterns to those evident in (1) and (2).

Individual preferences for one language or the other (in this case Kwon for Korean, Joshua

for English) and when the negotiated language of interaction is decided, it is more or less

maintained by both participants for the rest of the conversational sequence. We also see

that Kwon's initial switch to his preferred language in line 8 can be analyzed as discourse-

related in that it contextualizes disagreement in much the same way as the example noted

in (1) above. Overall,   it is apparent that these rather young 6 and 7 year old bilingual

conversationalists are able strategically to deploy code-switching to negotiate and accommodate to each other's preferences in a way which also structures the ongoing interaction. We turn now to competence-related code-switching, which, insofar as it appears to be motivated by   a speaker's competence limitations in one or another language, is participant rather than discourse-related.

5.1.2 Competence-related code-switching

When (4) was recorded, Kathy and David were paired to carry out a story-telling task where each child has a snail and creates stories with snails acting as characters. Mrs. Kim is listening to their story. In line 1, Kathy asks David which park their snails will go to. David's response 'animal park' (line 4) follows a considerable delay marked by both filled and unfilled pauses. Since 'animal park' is a loan translation of the Korean compound noun which corresponds to 'zoo', it is reasonable to suggest that David is searching for an appropriate English word during the long delay and that the loan translation is his best effort.   Kathy however has difficulties with 'animal park' and in lines 5 and 6,   explicitly asks Mrs. Kim the meaning of the expression. After David fails to provide an adequate explanation of   'animal park' in English (lines 7-8, 11), Kathy switches to Korean and presses David to talk (line 12). Mrs. Kim is also present at this point. Note that from this point on, Kathy uses Korean to address David; she seems to have interpreted David's wrong choice of word, long pauses and 'ums' as indicating lack of competence to carry out this activity in English.

Note also that throughout this sequence Kathy consistently uses English to address Mrs. Kim (lines 14 and 28), as she has been instructed to do. Thus, Kathy's switching

displays her own abilities in English and her sensitivity both to David's weaker control of English and to the social norms which require her to use English with Mrs. Kim. Later in the same conversation ((5) below), Kathy explicitly encourages David to tell the story in Korean. Such accommodation to the bilingual abilities of the other participant in the conversation has been reported also 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 of grammar and pronunciation and adapted their own language choice accordingly.

(4)

1	Kathy:	WHAT PARK/
2	David:	(1.5) UM/
3		(6.5) UM/
4		(4.0) ANIMAL PARK (chuckles)/
5	Kathy:	(2.0) (to Mrs. Kim) HE SAID ANIMAL PARK?/
6		WHAT IS ANIMAL PARK?/
7	David:	UM/
8		(2.0) WHAT (1.0) A RABBIT AND (0.7) UM/
9	M. Kim:	YOU TELL HER OK?/
10		ALRIGHT NICE AND LOUD YOU TELL HER/
11	David:	UM/

12 Kathy: (4.5) *ppalli*   *malhay*   DAVID/

                  quickly   talk   David

                  (Come on. Talk. David.)

13 David: (9.0) um/

14 Kathy: (5.0) (to Mrs. Kim) HE DON'T TALK/

15 M.   'KAY/

Kim:

16   *(to Kathy) tell him he needs to talk/*

17 Kathy: (2.5) *malhay-yatoy/*

                  talk-should

                  (You should talk.)

18 David: *nay-ka*   *mwusun*   *mal*   *hanunci*

                  I-NOMwhat kind   talk   do

                  mollukeysse/

                  not know

                  (I don't know what kind of thing to say.)

19 Kathy: *ne-ka*   *hayyaci*   *nay-ka*   *mwulepo-myen*

                  you-NOM   do should   I-NOMask-when

                  ne-ka   *mwusun*   *ma-lul*   *hayyaci*

                  you-NOM   what kind   talk-ACC   do should

                  (unintelligible)/

                  (You should do it so when I ask, you should say something

(unintelligible).)

20   (4.0) (urgently)   *ppalli*   *hay-pwa=/*

                            quickly   do-see

                            (Come on. Try.)

21 David: *=alasse/*

            okay

            (Okay.)

22   BACK/

23   (2.3) BACK=/

24 Kathy: *=key*   *mwusun*   *mal-iya/*

            that   what kind   talk-COP

            (What kind of talk is that?)

25 David: *e*   *molla*   *na*   *kulehkey*   *ha-myenun*

            Um   not know   I   that like   do-if

            (unintelligible)/

            (Um, I don't know if you do it like that (unintelligible).)

26 Kathy: *ne*   *nay-ka*   *cikum*   *mola*   *kulenunci*   *ale?/*

            You   I-NOM now   something   say   Know

            (Do you know what I just said?)

27 David: (1.0)   *a*   *mwusun*   PARK *nyakwu*   *malhay-ss-ci/*

                    ah   what kind   park   COP   say-PAST-right

            (Ah. You said what kind of park, right?)

28 Kathy: MRS. KIM, DAVID DOESN'T KNOW WHAT I'M SAYING

ABOUT/

29 M.   OK THEN JUST TRY/

Kim:

30   TRY TO EXPLAIN TO HIM/

31   OK?/

32   YOU'RE DOING A GOOD JOB KATHY/

33   (to David) YOU ARE TOO/

(5)

1 Kathy: *ne-ka*   *na*   *hantey*   *mola*   *kulay/*

            you-NOM   I   to   something   say

            (You say to me something.)

2   (5.0)   *hankwukmal-lo/*

                             Korean-with

                             (In Korean.)

3 David: *alasse/*

            Okay

            (Okay.)

Although language negotiation strategies similar to those in (2) and (3) are evident,

where code-switching is preference-related, the underlying motivation for code-switching

in (4) and (5) seems not to be preference for a language, but rather a limited competence in English on the part of one of the participants. Since using a language with which one of the participants is not comfortable can create confusion and communicative difficulty for both conversationalists, the more skilled bilingual speaker is likely to adapt to the linguistic needs of less proficient speakers in an effort to reduce overall collaborative effort. Although students are normally expected to perform classroom activities in English, continuing the conversation in English with David would most probably have resulted in severe difficulty or even   breakdown of communication.

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 is socially adequate and accommodates all parties' language competences and preferences. Discourse-related code-switching on the other hand can be seen to organize and structure the ongoing conversation with respect to such procedures as   turn-taking, topical cohesion, sequencing of activities and repair. Bilingual speakers can make use of two (or more) codes by deploying language alternation as a contextualization strategy in addition to whatever other organizational strategies are available to monolingual conversationalists (such as gesture and a wide range of prosodic phenomena – see Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 1996). The following sequential analysis will focus in turn on four major organizational tasks facing conversationalists, all of which have been extensively researched by conversational analysts (for a review see Levinson 1983). These are: 1) turn-taking, 2) preference

organization, 3) repair, and 4) procedures for 'bracketing' side-sequences. As Auer (1995) notes, an analysis of discourse-related code-switching in terms of these general conversational tasks is for a number of reasons preferable to a simple listing of conversational functions. Most importantly perhaps, it grants insight, within a broader analytic framework, into the use of code-switching as an additional conversational resource by bilingual speakers. We turn first to examine how code-switching contextualizes turn-taking.

5.2.1 Code-switching contextualizing turn-taking

Consider extract (6), where Kathy and Gina do 'sort-by-shapes'.

(6)

1	Kathy:	[*poca/*
		see let's
		(Let's see.)
2	Gina:	[YOUR TURN/
3	Kathy:	(2.0)
4	Gina:	*icey ne hay/*
		now you do
		(Now you do it.)
5	Kathy:	(0.5)

6	Gina:	*ya*	*ne*	*yoko*	*hay/*		
		hey	you	this	do		

(Hey, you do this.)

7		*na*	*ike (.)*	*na*	*ike (.)*	*ne (.)*	*ne/*
		I	this	I	this	you	you

(I, this. I, this. You. You...)

ₗ(unintelligible)/

8	Kathy:	ᶦ*ani*	*nay-ka*	*pick*	*hay-yaci*	*kunyang/*
		no	I-NOM	pick	do-should	simply

(No, I should just pick.)

In line 2, Gina requests that Kathy take her turn in picking out shapes by uttering 'your turn' in overlap with Kathy's **'poca'** (let's see). Although explicitly selected as next speaker, Kathy does not at this point take the floor – hence the two second pause (a silence attributable to Kathy) after which Gina code-switches, repeating her request in Korean. In effect, the metapragmatic nature of Gina's contribution is contextualized by code-switching. In line 6, after Kathy once again declines to take her turn – again we find 'her' empty slot marked by a pause - Gina repeats her request yet again, this time soliciting Kathy's attention with the token **'ya'** ('hey') and requesting more specifically that Kathy perform a particular task. However, Kathy again fails to take the turn, and Gina's next utterance in line 7 is replete with pauses and repetitions. Finally, Kathy speaks up and turn transition is completed, but in fact she rejects Gina's turn 6 request, and proposes an alternative task for herself. Dispreferred responses of this kind are typically marked by

delays (see Pomerantz 1984 and 5.2.2 below), and indeed we might analyze (6) with respect to the patterns associated with preference organization. The chief point at issue here however concerns the role of the switch in line 4 in coordinating turn-taking. In the literature, such switches have frequently been said to serve the function of reiteration (e.g., Gumperz, 1982; McClure, 1981).

A similar pattern is evident in (7) below where failure to perform an expected action brings about a specific request. The 'sort-by-shapes' activity continues, and Kathy has just finished counting all the circles. In line 1, Kathy reports that there are forty-four circles, and in lines 2 and 3, Gina sings the number while waiting for Kathy to write it down on the worksheet. Both the 3.5 second pause and the 1.4 second pause mark the significant delay in Kathy's next expected action and Gina specifically prompts Kathy with the token '**ya**' ('hey') to write down the number in line 5. As in (6) above, note that the metapragmatic nature of this request is contextualized by a code-switch which comes only after a second, shorter pause. Gina deploys the language switch to contextualize a change in footing so that her melodic chanting is sharply contrasted with her request. Again we may note that this sequence is marked as a dispreferred response. In CA terms, Gina's question in line 6 constitutes a first pair part of an adjacency pair, question/answer and also a repair initiator. Since the two parts of adjacency pairs are highly cohesive, the utterance of a first pair part strongly constrains the next turn speaker to reply in the same language (Auer, 1984). Thus the delays and the switch mark Kathy's response as dispreferred (see further Li and Milroy, 1995). Finally, after a 3 second pause the turn transition is completed as Kathy writes down the number and shows the worksheet to Gina.

(7)

1   Kathy: FORTY FOUR/

2   Gina: (melodically) FORTY FOUR/

3   (melodically) FORTY FOUR/

4   (3.5) FORTY FOUR/

5   (1.4)   *ya*   *ppalli*   *hay/*

                  hey   quickly   do

                  (Hey, do it quickly.)

6   *ne*   *mo*   *hanya:/*

        you   what   do

        (What are you doing?)

7   Kathy: (3.0) *yekisse*   *yekisse* (unintelligible)/

               here is   here is

               (Here it is. Here it is. (unintelligible))

    In (8), Yooni and Grace do 'sort-by-shapes'. Yooni has already done this activity and is doing it again with Grace. Grace responds to the researcher's question about her preferred color with the word 'pink'. Grace repeats this response following the researcher's repair initiator in line 3. The researcher then incorporates Grace's choice of the word 'pink' in her next question which is still in Korean. In line 7, Yooni selects herself as the next turn speaker by volunteering her own answer to the researcher's question. Note that Yooni's utterance is delivered in English (in contrast to the

researcher's Korean) in overlap with the second part of the researcher's question. Previous analyses of conversational code-switching have suggested that this type of contrasting language choice is used by speakers attempting to seize the floor or to attract the attention of other participants in the conversation. Li (1994) notes that while in dyadic conversation, the identity of the next turn speaker is usually clear, in multi-party conversation, self-selection by one or another speaker takes place unless the next turn speaker is specified. In this case, although the researcher specified Grace as the next turn speaker, Yooni takes the next turn. This analysis is supported by the researcher's field notes, which   recorded her impression that Yooni seemed to be interested in remaining in the spotlight in the presence of the researcher. It is noteworthy that prior to the sequence shown as (8), Yooni was frequently observed to interrupt Grace's utterances and to seek the researcher's attention when the researcher's remarks were addressed to Grace.

(8)

1	Res:	*...kulikwu*	*mwusun*	*saykkkal-i*	*ceyil*
		…and	what	color-NOM	most
		coha	GRACE	*nun/*	
		like	Grace	TOP	
		(...And what color do you like most, Grace?)			
2	Grace:	(2.0) PINK/			
3	Res:	*e?/*			
		(what?)			

4   Grace: PINK=/

5   Res: =PINK   *man   ceyil   coha?/*

         pink   only   most   like

         (You like only pink the most?)

6   *₁ttanke   nun/*

         other one   TOP

         (How about other ones?)

7   Yooni: ⌈I LIKE PINK A:ND YELLOW/

The type of contrasting choice of language found in (8) differs from the switching in (6) and (7) in that while the code-switching in (6) and (7) is carried out by the same speaker (i.e., Gina), code-switching in (8) is done by a different speaker (i.e., Yooni) from the speaker in the prior turn (i.e., researcher). Li (1994) notes that such contrastive choices of language by different speakers in consecutive turns are not always clearly distinguished in the existing literature from the changing of language by the same speaker in the same turn. He emphasizes that such a distinction is important because code-switching by the same speaker demonstrates a willingness and ability to accommodate his or her interlocutor, while contrastive choices of language by different speakers in consecutive turns index the role relationships of the participants.

So far, we have examined a range of issues raised by code-switching at turn transition points. When the current speaker issues a question, a request, or a command, the next turn speaker may respond in various ways -- by remaining silent or by giving a response. In the event that a response is not immediately provided, the current speaker may

reiterate the current request as in (6) or request a repair initiator as in (7). Code-switching

contextualizes turn transition by building up a contrast, much as do changes in pitch or

tempo in monolingual conversations.

We look more closely now at an issue which has been raised already – the manner in

which code-switching serves to contextualize the next turn speaker's responses as

preferred or dispreferred.

5.2.2 Code-switching contextualizing preference organization

Although we have alluded to preference marking to account for the pause patterns

in (6) and (7), a clear example of   the use of code-switching to contextualize a

dispreferred response (more specifically, a disagreement) was found in (1). A similar

pattern of using code-switching to contextualize disagreement is evident in sequence (9).

In this sequence, Gina narrates a story on the topic 'What can go wrong with some home

appliances?' which does not make sense to Kathy. Gina's utterances in lines 1 through 4

are characterized by pauses, a pronoun error (i.e., 'a boy' and 'she') and frequent

repetitions, all of which apparently   make the story difficult for Kathy to understand. As

Kathy voices her dissatisfaction with Gina's story, Gina repeats the last part of her

previous utterance. Kathy's   subsequent reiteration of her dissatisfaction suggests that she

hears this repetition   as Gina's reluctance to take account of her complaint in the

immediately preceding turn. The language of this repeated complaint in line 7 contrasts

with that of Gina's preceding turn. Gina then aligns her code choice with   Kathy's when

she also switches into Korean and insists that her story makes sense. In line 9 a 2.2 second

pause marks Kathy's response as dispreferred as she voices her dissatisfaction for the third

time. Notice that Kathy's choice of code once again contrasts with that of Gina's immediately preceding turn. Finally, in line 10, Kathy code-switches once again and explains that she does not understand Gina's story the way it was told. What is interesting here is that Kathy's dispreferred responses (i.e., lines 7, 9 and 10) are made in a language which contrasts with that of the preceding turn. This kind of non-alignment is reported also by Auer (1984) and Li (1994) in German/Italian and Chinese/English bilingual communities respectively. Thus, language alignment/contrast may be viewed as an additional strategy which bilingual speakers employ to organize (dis)preference in their conversations.

(9)

1	Gina:	UH UM (0.9) ONE BOY BUY UM (.) UM (0.8) THE UM (0.6)
		UM REFRIGERATOR/
2		(1.3) AND AND SHE OPENED/
3		AND AND SHE OPENED THE/
4		(2.0) UM (1.0) U:P AND SHE GO- AND SHE AND SHE CAN'T
		OPEN AND SHE GOES SOMEWHERE AND SHE AND SHE
		AND I SHE SAW IT AND OPENED/
5	Kathy:	THAT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE/
6	Gina:	AND THAT OPENED/
7	Kathy:	*mal-i an toy:/*
		talk-NOM not make

42

(It doesn't make sense.)

8   Gina: *toy/*

make

(It does.)

9   Kathy: (2.2) DOESN'T MAKE SENSE/

10   *Mwusun   malhay-ssnunci   mollukeysse kulaykacikwu=/*

what kind   talk-PAST   not know   that way

(Like that, I don't know what you're saying.)

In extract (10), where Grace and Yooni play with blocks, we find two examples of dispreferred responses which are organized somewhat differently. The first is in line 4 where Yooni disagrees with Grace's idea of placing the stop sign in a certain spot. Note once again that Yooni's disagreement is contextualized by her contrasting language. Yooni's second dispreferred response is found in line 8.   Relevant here is Levinson's (1983: 334-335) comment that preference organization structures prior and subsequent turns, extending beyond the ranking of alternative second pair parts of adjacency pairs. One of the features of dispreferred seconds, Levinson (1983) notes, is their displacement over a number of turns via use of 'next turn repair initiators' or 'insertion sequences'. The dispreferred second in line 7 is different from that in line 4 in that it is delayed by two 'next-turn repair initiators', which give the next speaker an opportunity to repair the prior turn in the following turn. Note that the dispreferred second in line 8 occurs after Grace has failed   to comply in a manner   acceptable to Yooni, in this case by suddenly shifting the focus of attention from the placing of the stop sign to the water in the make-shift lake

(line 7). In addition to her failure to comply with Yooni's request, Grace's contrasting language choice with that of Yooni's preceding turn seems to index   interactive 'trouble' of the kind associated with dispreferred second parts.

In the event, Yooni's next turn utterance in line 8 both communicates her dissatisfaction with Grace's failure to do the repair, and functions as a further   repair initiator. By issuing this second repair initiator, Yooni offers Grace another opportunity to respond positively to her complaint. This in fact does happen, when Grace agrees with Yooni in line 9. The following schematized pattern of the way language choice structures the conversation structure shows that dispreferred second pair parts are marked by code-switching, while preferred second pair part is accompanied by code alignment. As is clear from this example, preference organization affects not only the second pair part but also operates across a given speaker's turns, giving rise to repairs of first pair parts in subsequent turns (Levinson, 1983: 337).

lines 1-3 (Grace):	Initial turn	(English)
line 4 (Yooni):	Disagreement	(Korean)
lines 5-6:	Repair Initiator 1	(Korean)
line 7 (Grace):	Failure to do the repair	(English)
line 8 (Yooni):	Disagreement	(Korean)
line 9:	Repair Initiator 2	(Korean)
line 10 (Grace):	Repair	(Korean)

(10)

1   Grace: OH I GOT IT/

2   OVER HERE!/

3   I GOT IT/

4   Yooni: *keki   haci-ma:/*

             there   do-not

             (Don't do it there.)

5   *ku-ke   ettehkey   ka:/*

             that-one   how   go

             (How does that one go?)

6   *Ettehkey   kanunke   ya/*

             how   going   COP

             (How is it going?)

7   Grace: LOOK AT THIS (.) WATER/

8   Yooni: *ani:/*

             No

             (No.)

9   *yol-wu   yoke* (unintelligible)   *cel-lo*

             here-through   this one   there-through

             kanunke   ani-ya?/

             going   no-COP

             (This (unintelligible) through here. Isn't it going through there?)

10   Grace: *e/*

         Yes

         (Yes.)

    In the next section, we look   more specifically at the way the language choices

made by the Korean-English bilingual children contextualize repairs.

5.2.3 Code-switching contextualizing repair

    Consider (11) where Kyung and Matthew play 'store'. In line 1 the researcher

picks up a ball and asks the children what it is called in this game.

(11)

 1   Res: *ike-n   mwe   ya?/*

                  this-TOP   what   COP

                  (What is this?)

 2   Kyung: CUP   [CAKE   *yo/*

                  cup   cake   COP

                  (It's a cupcake.)

 3   Matthew: [CUP CAKE   *yo/*

                         cup cake   COP

                         (It's a cupcake.)

 4   Res: *ike   nun?/*

```
                    this    TOP

                    (How about this?)

5    Matthew:       RULER/

6    Res:           e?/

                    (what?)

7    Matthew:       RULER=/

8    Kyung:         =ca    yo/

                    ruler   COP

                    (It's a ruler.)
```

    In this sequence, the researcher tries to participate in an ongoing conversation between Kyung and Matthew who are buying and selling toy goods in a 'store' activity. Preceding this sequence, both Kyung and Matthew had been laughing because Matthew had called a pen a lollypop. Perceiving that the mismatch between the real world names of items and the names assigned by the two children   in this game has generated much laughter, the researcher points to certain items in the 'store' and asks the children in Korean to identify them. Although the children had previously been speaking exclusively in English, they answer the researcher's question in Korean, as evidenced   by the Korean grammatical morpheme (copula) 'yo'. Structurally, Kyung and Matthew's responses constitute a second pair part of an adjacency pair format question/answer. Recall Auer's (1995) comment that in bilingual language negotiation, there is more pressure to accommodate to co-participant's language choice in turns with a high degree of cohesion with previous turns - such as second pair parts - than in initiative turns.

In line 4, the researcher points to another item and asks the children to identify it. In contrast to his previous response utterance, Matthew offers a one-word answer in English. The researcher's question '*e*?' (what?) is a 'next turn repair initiator', which offers Matthew an opportunity to confirm or to reformulate his original assertion. Notice that the researcher realizes her repair initiator in a language which contrasts with the language of Matthew's previous turn. Matthew simply repeats his previous utterance in English, foregoing his opportunity to do a repair. Immediately following Matthew's utterance, Kyung code-switches and reformulates Matthew's response. In doing so, Kyung seems to have interpreted the researcher's repair initiator (in Korean) as indicating a problem of understanding arising from Matthew's language choice. In her account of French/English code-switching paractices in Canada, Heller (1982) similarly notes that participants regularly attribute misunderstandings between participants to a problematic language choice.

Another possible interpretation of Kyung's code-switch in line 8 is that she interpreted the researcher's repair initiator in line 6 as a request to switch languages. 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 exactly what needs repair may not be apparent. He goes on to state that it is only through a sequential analysis which focuses on each move of the conversationalists that repairables can be detected and meanings inferred.

In addition to the other-initiated self-repair displayed in extract (11), examples of code-switches that were used to contextualize self-initiated self-repairs were found - that

is, repairs that are done by the speaker himself or herself within the same speaking turn without prompting from others. Consider the following extract.

(12) Yooni and Grace do 'sort-by-shapes'.

1 Yooni: CAN I USE YOUR ERASER?/

2 Grace: (1.5)

3 Yooni: *Na* ERASER *sse-to-toy?/*

 I eraser use-even-okay

 (Is it okay if I use your eraser?)

4 Grace: *Ne* *iss-cyanha* *keki* *ey/*

 You have not there LOC

 (You have it over there.)

In extract (12), Yooni asks to borrow Grace's eraser despite the fact that she has her own. Grace's 1.5 second pause is heard as a preface to a negative (i.e., dispreferred) response from Grace, as is suggested by Grace's ultimate response. Hence, Yooni draws the inference that her request is problematic and reformulates her request in Korean before the turn is complete. Thus, Yooni's self-repair delays Grace's dispreferred second part response. In the existing code-switching literature, patterns similar to those presented here have often been reported as repetition, emphasis, clarification, confirmation, word-finding, self-editing, and so forth. However, as Li (1994) argues, all these conversational functions can be described in a principled framework as phenomena arising from repair, a very

general conversational organizational procedure. In the following section, we investigate code-switching contextualizing side-sequences.

5.2.4 Code-switching   contextualizing   side-sequences

Although conversations are pervasively a pairs structure – such as question/answer, request /concession (or refusal), various kinds of embedded, non-linear sequences occur which are in some sense 'asides' to the main topic at hand. Presequences, 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). Side-sequences occur at unpredictable points in the conversation where it is halted, often by the need for clarification. It then picks up where it left off, as illustrated in   (13) and (14) below, where Kathy and Gina are telling a story on the topic 'What can go wrong with some home appliances?'.   We can see here that a code-switch   brackets off a side-sequence from the main body of talk on this topic.

(13)

1   Res: WHY DON'T YOU TELL GINA (1.4) ABOUT THE

            WASHING MACHINE/

2   Kathy: (1.0) NOW?/

3   Res: YES NOW/

4   Kathy: OK/

5		(1.0) UM:: A LITTLE (0.5) I MEAN (.) A ONE=/
6	Gina:	=NO THAT'S NOT (unintelligible)/ (researcher walks away.)
7	Kathy:	(3.2) (softly) AGAIN/

8		(1.6) *yenge* *lo* *malhalkka?/*
		English in talk shall
		(Again, shall I talk in English?)

9	Gina:	*Khukey* *malhay/*
		Loudly say
		(Say loudly.)

10	Kathy:	(2.0) UM: (1.0) A WOMAN A WOMAN/
11		[HAD/
12	Gina:	[WHOSE MACHINE/
13	Kathy:	A WOMAN HAD A WASHING MACHINE/
14		BUT (1.8) SHE PUT A LOT OF CLOTHES/
15		SO UM (1.8) THE CLOTHES=/
16	Gina:	=UH HUH/
17	Kathy:	GOT (0.8) MORE AND MORE=/
18	Gina:	=UH HUH/
19	Kathy:	AND THEN/
20	Gina:	CLOTHESES MACHINE/
21	Kathy:	NO I SAID MI- (.) A WOMAN PUT UH (0.7) A WOMAN
		HAD A WASHING MACHINE AND THEN (0.5) THE

WOMAN PUT A LOT OF (0.7) UM CLOTHES IN THERE/

       In this sequence, the researcher asks Kathy to tell Gina her story about what could go wrong with a washing machine. Kathy's rather hesitant start with pauses and hesitation is interrupted by Gina. Although it is not clear how Gina ended her sentence due to an unintelligible piece of recording, it seems that she was dissatisfied about some aspect of Kathy's previous utterance. After some hesitation accompanied by pauses, Kathy asks Gina in Korean whether she should continue telling the story in English. Also in Korean, Gina tells Kathy to speak loudly. Interestingly, Kathy code-switches for her metapragmatic question before continuing her story (line 8) and again when she switches back into English for her subsequent narration (line 10). Gina's metapragmatic instruction in line 9 is also in Korean. Thus, code-switching is used to bracket off structurally distinct parts of the discourse - the side sequence from the narrative on the topic of faulty home appliances.

       In (14) below, a similar pattern is evident. Kwon and So Hee are working on a storytelling activity with the theme 'If I had a popcorn popper that never stopped popping popcorn, I would...'. Again, the storytelling activity takes place in English, while side comments which serve to organize the main storyline are in Korean. Moreover, English utterances were generally produced much more slowly than Korean utterances, supporting Auer's (1995) suggestion that language alternation and other contextualization cues often bundle together. In the spontaneous speech data, examples like (13) and (14) were fairly common.

Giacalone Ramat (1995:51) discusses a similar example where adult bidialectal speakers use code-switching as a bracketing device to separate side-sequences from the main topic of the conversation.

(14)

1	So Hee:	IF I HAD A POPCORN POPPER/
		I'LL I'LL GIVE MY CO-(unintelligible)
2	Kwon:	IF I GOT A POPCORN/
3		UM UM THERE'S TOO LOT I GO TO THE GARBAGE/
4	So Hee:	IF I HAD A POP POPCORN POPPER/
5		I'LL GIVE MY PARENTS AND MY MOM (unintelligible) A
		LOT OF (unintelligible)/
6	Kwon:	I WISH COULD I HAVE A POPCORN BUT/
7		BUT IF IT IT'S LOT I GIVE TO MY FRIEND/
8		AND AND IF MY FRIEND HAS A LOT/
9		HE THROW IT ON THE GARBAGE (2.0)/
10		UNDER THE GARBAGE (1.3)/
11	So Hee:	*Tasi/*
		Again
		(again)
12		I/
13		I'LL EAT THEM WITH MY (unintelligible)/

14   *Hay   ca*   YOUR TURN/

            do   then   your   turn

            (Do it then. Your turn.)

15   Kwon: IF I GOT A POPCORN/

16   I THOUGHT I EAT IT/

17   IF IT'S A LOT I GIVE IT TO MY FRIEND (1.6)/

18   THEN MY THEN (1.0)/

19   EAT IT/

20   So Hee: *a   ya   kulen   ke   epse/*

            ah   hey   that kind   thing   not exist

            (ah hey there's no such thing.)

21   SENTENCE   *haci-manun   ke-ya/*

            Sentence   do-not   it-COP

            (you're not supposed to do sentences.)

22   Kwon: SENTENCE/

23   *Alasse/*

            (okay.)

24   So Hee: *ne   mence   hay/*

            you   first   do

            (you do it first.)

25   *Ppalli=/*

            (quickly.)

26   Kwon: =OK/

27   WHEN I HAVE A POPCORN I EAT IT BUT IF IT'S THERE A

                     LOT I THROW IN THE GARBAGE/

6. Conclusion

The application of the sequential type of analysis developed by Auer (1984, 1995) has shown to be useful in revealing how these six and seven year old   Korean-English bilingual schoolchildren from New York City employ code-switching to structure their discourse. Very salient however was the status of English as the designated classroom language, a fact which led to low overall rates of code-switching in the spontaneous speech data. Since language alternation is so rare, we suggested that it should be viewed as highly marked in the sense discussed by Myers-Scotton (1993). This markedness gave it a prominence in the discourse which invited analysis of its use by even very young children as a   resource for organizing conversational discourse. Auer's distinction between participant-related and discourse-related code-switching was found to be a useful one. Analysis of participant-related code-switching patterns revealed that while some children have a clear preference for English, others were more open to speaking Korean because of either preference for Korean or lack of competence in English. In both cases, however, participants employ code-switching to negotiate the language for the interaction and accommodate other participants' language competences and preferences.

With respect to discourse-related code-switching, we suggested that these   young Korean-English bilingual children employed language alternation as a contextualization strategy. Contrary to the assumption that code-switching is evidence of linguistic deficit or

communicative problem in bilingual children, the sequential analysis suggested that code-switching was used as an *additional* means to communicate discoursal meanings to other participants in the conversation. While monolinguals can be shown to make use of contextualization cues such as change in tempo and loudness to organize the interaction (for details see Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 1996), bilingual children and adults have the option of switching to another language in addition to using those other contextualization cues. We presented data which suggested that discourse-related code-switching might be viewed as a general procedure available even to very young speakers for organizing conversational tasks such as turn-taking, preference marking, repair and bracketing of side-sequences. The bilingualism of these children thus emerges as an additional linguistic and interactive resource.

References

ATKINSON, J.M. & HERITAGE, J. (1984). *Structures of social action.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

AUER, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

AUER, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 115-35)*.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

COUPER-KUHLEN, E., & SELTING, M. eds. (1996). *Prosody in conversation.*

    Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GIACALONE RAMAT, A. (1995). Code-switching in the context of dialect/standard

    language relations. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two*

    languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching (pp. 45-67)*.*

    Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GUMPERZ, J.J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HURH, W.M. & KIM, K.C. (1984). *Korean immigrants in America: A structural analysis*

    of ethnic confinement and adhesive adaptation. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson

    University Press.

JEFFERSON, G. (1972).   Side sequences. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp.

    75-110). New York: Free Press.

KIM, B.-L. (1988). The language situation of Korean Americans. In S.L. McKay & S.C.

    Wong (Eds.), *Language diversity problem or resource?: A social and educational*

    perspective on language minorities in the United States (pp. 252-75)*.* Boston:

    Heinle & Heinle.

KIM, B.-L., SAWDEY, B. & MEIHOEFER, B. (1980). *The Korean-American child at school and at home: An analysis of interaction and intervention through groups.* Project Report (9-30-1978 through 6-30-1980) Project funded by administration for child, youth and families, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Grant #90-C-1335 (01).

KIM, I. (1981). *New urban immigrants: The Korean community in New York.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

KÖPPE, R. & MEISEL, J. (1995). Code-switching in bilingual first language acquisition. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 276-301)*.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LEVINSON, S. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge University Press.

LI, W. (1994). *Three generations, two languages, one family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain.*   Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

LI, W. & MILROY, L. (1995). Conversational code-switching in a Chinese community in Britain: A sequential analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* **23**, 281-99.

LIN, A.M.Y. (1988). Pedagogical and para-pedagogical levels of interaction in the

    classroom: A social interactional approach to the analysis of the code-switching

    behaviour of a bilingual teacher in an English language lesson. *Working Papers in*

    Linguistics and Language Teaching (University of Hong Kong Language Centre)

    11, 69-87.

LIN, A.M.Y. (1990). *Teaching in two tongues: Language alternation in foreign language*

    classrooms. Research Report 3, City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.

McCLURE, E. F. (1981). Formal and functional aspects of the code switched discourse of

    bilingual children. In R.P. Duran (Ed.), *Latino language and communicative*

    behavior (pp. 69-94). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

MARTIN, S.E. (1992). *A reference grammar of Korean: A complete guide to the grammar*

    and history of the Korean language. Rutland, Vermont: Charles E. Tuttle.

MARTIN-JONES, M. & ROMAINE, S. (1986). Semilingualism: A half-baked theory of

    communicative competence. *Applied Linguistics*, **7**, 26-38.

MILROY, L. (1987). *Observing and analysing natural language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

MOFFATT, S. & MILROY, L. (1992). Panjabi/English language alternation in the

    classroom in the early school years. *Multilingua*, **11**, 355-84.

MYERS-SCOTTON, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon

    Press.

POMERANTZ, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 57-101)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

POPLACK, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en espanol: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* **18**, 581-618.

ROMAINE, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd edition). Oxford: Blackwell.

SCOTTON, C.M. (1976). Strategies of neutrality: Language choice in uncertain situations. *Language* **52**, 919-41.

SCOTTON, C.M. (1980). Explaining linguistic choices as identity negotiations. In H. Giles, W.P. Robinson, & P.M. Smith (Eds.), *Language: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 359-66)*. Oxford: Pergamon.

SCOTTON, C.M. (1982). The possibility of code-switching: Motivation for maintaining multilingualism. *Anthropological Linguistics* **24**, 432-43.

SCOTTON, C.M. (1983). The negotiation of identities in conversation: A theory of markedness and code choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* **44**, 115-36.

SHIN, S.J. (1998). *Paibu dollar please!: Bilingual Korean American children in New York City*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Program in Linguistics, University of Michigan.

TIMM, L. (1975). Spanish-English code-switching: El Porque y how not to. *Romance Philology* **28**, 473-82.

ZENTELLA, A.C. (1981). Ta bien, you could answer me en cualquier idioma: Puerto Rican codeswitching in bilingual classrooms. In R. Duran (Ed.), *Latino language and communicative behavior* (pp. 109-32). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

---

[i] There were two levels of ESL pull-out classes (i.e., beginner and intermediate) both of which were taught by a monolingual English-speaking teacher. Except for David who was enrolled in the beginner level class, all of the other nine Korean children were members of the intermediate ESL class. However, all ten children were pulled out to the same Korean/English bilingual class one period a day.

[ii] Unlike extra-sentential code-switching, intra-sentential switching has often received attention of researchers working to formulate syntactic constraints on code-switching. For a syntactic analysis of intra-sentential code-switching by the Korean-English bilingual children, see Shin (1998).

[iii] In this class, there is a definite bias for the use of English since all classroom instruction takes place in English. Although the use of Korean is not prohibited (and for that matter, the use of Chinese among Chinese-speaking students and Spanish among Spanish-speaking students) these other languages do not enjoy the official status that English does in the classroom. Moreover, the 15 other non-Korean students in the class place pressure on the Korean students to speak English when interacting with them. This is a very different atmosphere from a bilingual classroom where the focus is clearly on a bilingual medium.

iv We use the Yale System of Romanization for utterances in Korean (Martin, 1992).

v Although Auer does not clearly divide participant-related code-switching into preference-related and competence-related switching (in fact, he uses the degree of competence to explain a speaker's preference for one language or the other), we feel that this is a useful distinction. For example, Auer (1995: 125) states ' By *preference*-related switching, a speaker may simply want to avoid the language in which he or she feels insecure and speak the one in which he or she has greater *competence.* Yet *preference*-related switching may also be due to a deliberate decision based on political considerations (italics ours).' In this paper, we call the first type of switching 'competence related' and the latter type 'preference related'.