Code Switching as a Communicative Strategy: A Case Study of Korean–English Bilinguals

Haesook Han Chung
Defense Language Institute

Abstract

This study examines purposes of code switching (CS) and how CS is used as a communicative strategy between Korean–English bilinguals. Data were collected through videotaping of conversations between a first-generation Korean–English bilingual adult and two Korean–English bilingual children. Qualitative data analysis indicated that CS could be brought about and shaped by the dynamics of the relationship of the speaker–addressee and by cultural features embedded in the Korean language. The analysis also posited that CS functions as a communicative strategy for facilitating family communication by lowering language barriers as well as by consolidating cultural identity. Results raise further awareness that CS is a versatile strategy to meet the complex communicative demands between or within generations of an immigrant family.

With linguistic globalization as a growing trend in the modern world, most of the world's speech communities are multilingual, which makes contact between languages an important force in the everyday lives of most people. In Sridhar's (1996) list of factors that lead to societal multilingualism, the most significant factor is "migration" (p. 48). As people move from one country or region to another, there is contact with various speech communities in a natural setting, which brings about multilingualism. Hence, even as individuals maintain their home languages, an area where several languages are spoken becomes, over time, likewise a place of multilingualism. When viewed as a phenomenon per se, multilingualism raises issues such as how one acquires two or more languages, how the languages are cross-accessed for communication in multilingual communities, and how the use of two-plus languages embodies and shapes one's cultural identity.

In a multilingual society, each language uniquely fulfills certain roles and represents distinct identities, and all of them complement one another to serve "the complex communicative demands of a pluralistic society" (Sridhar, 1996, p. 53). For example, in the United States, English functions as the medium of education, administration, legal system, the nation's press and media outlets, and communication among different language users, whereas minority languages essentially serve to establish and reinforce the ethnic identities of their speakers and their communities. Moreover, in order to meet "the complex communicative demands," speakers who live in a community and household where two or more languages coexist frequently switch from one language to another, either between or within utterances. This phenomenon, known as code switching (CS)[1], has recently attracted a great deal of research attention.

With the recognition of the importance of CS in the study of language contact, the studies on CS have generally been analyzed in terms of (a) the linguistic constraints that determine the form taken by CS (Romaine, 1995; Sánchez, 1983) and CS's structural patterns (Muysken, 2000), and (b) the sociolinguistic functions, which determine when, with whom, and why CS takes place (Adendorff, 1996; Grosjean, 1982; Myers-Scotton, 1995; Tay, 1989). These studies address not only grammaticality of sentences but also their usage, or acceptability, with reference to the functions of language; thus, the contexts in which either language is employed provide explanations of CS.

While previous studies have looked at the structure of sentences and social meanings of CS, which identify how CS serves a variety of functions in diverse communities, relatively little is known about the function of CS in the Korean–English bilingual community. Choi's (1991) and Lee's (1997) studies focus on linguistic constraints when CS between English and Korean occurs, and Shin's (2002) study tests a framework for CS from borrowing between English and Korean. In his general characterization of CS, Crystal (1987) presents a number of possible reasons for switching from one language to another. One reason presented by Crystal for the switching behavior is the notion that when speakers may not be able to express themselves in one language, they switch to the other to compensate for the deficiency.

Adendorff's (1966) view is contrary to the notion that CS is a compensation for a linguistic deficit in bilingual speakers; he sees CS as "functionally motivated" (p. 389) behavior. If CS is functionally motivated, a study that investigates the function of CS occurring with Korean–English bilinguals will be meaningful. Language behaviors are influenced by cultural aspects; thus, the function of code choices and CS varies in different cultures or language communities, and by different social situations. Therefore, while reviewing characteristics ingrained in the Korean language and culture, this paper aims to examine the communicative intents of switchers and what is gained by communicating with CS, through a Korean–English bilingual family conversation.

Literature Review

Sociolinguistic analysis of language choice in the interactional contexts rests upon Fishman's notion of "who uses what language with whom and for what purposes" (as cited in Sridhar, 1996, p. 51). Fishman provides a framework with which to analyze the linguistic choices available to multilingual speakers and their reasons for choosing one code from among the several that are available to them. Myers-Scotton (1995) extends the framework with a study of what bilingual speakers gain by conducting a conversation in two languages, that is, through CS. Her examination focuses on CS as a type of skilled performance with communicative intent and not a compensating strategy used by deficient bilinguals. While providing a general theoretical treatment of the socio-psychological motivations for CS in urban Africa settings, largely dealing with CS between Swahili and English in Nairobi, Kenya, Myers-Scotton explains CS in terms of her "markedness" model of language choice. According to her, members of a multilingual speech community are aware of the range of codes that would be appropriate for a particular type of conventionalized exchange, and they assign meanings to choices based on such expectations. 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 implications triggered by these choices. Any deviation from the neutral or unmarked choice conveys symbolic social messages entailing the speaker's marked communicative intention. For example, as Grosjean (1982) notes, choosing a particular language or opting to mix languages in a particular social context can signal group solidarity, or ethnic identity markers. Making marked or unexpected choices implicitly conveys the speaker's social identity or dynamics of interaction during conversation. Myers-Scotton's and Grosjean's interpretations of code choices indicate that choosing one variety over another has relevance to the intentional nature to a message. Code choices are not just choices of content, but are "discourse strategies" (Myers-Scotton, p. 57), by which the speaker becomes a creative actor. Linguistic code choices are used for "accomplishing" the speaker's communicative intention more than for simply conveying referential meaning.

Tay (1989), Myers-Scotton (1995), and Adendorff (1996) examined the various strategies used by switchers and how the impact of speech is increased by the switching behavior. CS is viewed as a linguistic advantage of communicating solidarity or affiliation with a particular social group. According to Tay, despite differences in the formal characteristics of the languages involved in CS, common communicative strategies have evolved in multilingual communities, an example of which is a dynamic, multilingual country, Singapore. Tay indicates the "unconscious" nature of CS behavior, which means that typical code switchers are usually not aware of why they switch codes at certain points in discourse. Furthermore, she suggests that rather than try to

delineate linguistic forms of CS, the researchers should study communicative aspects of CS further. Hence, she approaches CS in terms of a communicative device and lists some categories for describing the total communicative effect created by CS. Tay's study demonstrates that CS as a communicative strategy establishes "group identity and solidarity" and "rapport" (p. 413) in multilingual discourse.

Adendorff (1996) describes the spontaneous or subconscious nature of CS by giving examples of interaction occurring spontaneously between guests in a TV studio and additional examples of CS behavior between people in a marketplace setting, where interaction takes place spontaneously as well. In examining CS between English and Zulu in a classroom setting in South Africa, through interaction between high school teachers and students, he identifies the range of discourse purposes served by switching. In this view, CS is "a communicative resource" (Adendorff, 1996, p. 389) that enables teachers and students to accomplish a considerable number and wide range of social and educational objectives. Emphasizing that CS is "a form of sociolinguistic contextualizing behavior" (p. 400), Adendorff defines contextualization cues as a basis from which to infer intended meanings. According to him, contextualization cues as a "meta-message" (p. 389) are marked choices to give additional meaning to what is said and done in a conversation; therefore, choice entails intended meaning. By choosing one code of phonetic, lexical, syntactic, or a formulaic expression, speakers depart from what they would conventionally do in these same circumstances. All marked choices have an important discourse function in addition to their referential function. His data demonstrate that switching into Zulu from English in the classroom setting functions as encouragement—building solidarity between teachers and students and establishing authority—and fulfills both academic and social objectives. Adendorff concludes that because "[l]anguages are carriers of social, (i.e., symbolic) meaning and express the identity value systems of their user" (p. 401), an understanding of social meaning is important to interpret behavior of language choice.

Tay (1989), Myers-Scotton (1995), and Adendorff (1996) have reported that CS serves a variety of functions in diverse domains. CS is used as a communicative strategy between speakers, according to the switcher's communicative intents. The nature of CS is spontaneous and subconscious; thus, while a study of CS between Korean–English bilinguals cannot uncover the purposes for switchers' choices, research into the entailed symbolic social messages and cultural value systems of its users will provide further understanding of the dynamics of language contact and socio-expressive functions across a specific bicultural context.

Method

Participants

The participants of this study are my two children and their father, my husband. While videotaping, I also participated to a slight extent in their conversations, by answering or listening to their utterances. The two children are Korean–English bilinguals, and the father is a first-generation Korean–English bilingual. The father was born and educated in Korea, where he obtained his master's degree. Since middle school, he has been studying English as a foreign language; his study focus has mainly been on grammar and reading. He came to the United States in his early 30s to study. During his 12 years in the Los Angeles area, he obtained a second master's and doctoral degrees from a North American institution. He is Korean-dominant and understands English fairly well. His English proficiency in reading and writing is highly advanced, and his speaking proficiency is advanced.

The first child is a 1.5-generation girl, born in Korea and raised in the United States from the age of 2. She was 11 years old and a sixth grader at the time of this study. Before entering kindergarten, she learned from her mother how to read and write Korean and was immersed in the Korean community. By the age of 3, although she had limited English input and ability, she would try out her somewhat "different language" (English) by fits and starts on others, the "different-looking persons," whom she encountered on the street or playground. She did not know English well, but she was picking it up from TV and people outside the home and could produce the distinctive rhythm of English and, notably, its peculiar alveolar-fricative sounds. Before kindergarten, her primary tool of communication was the Korean language.

In spite of pressure from her parents to use only Korean at home, as she attended school and interacted with other English-speaking children, our daughter shifted quite often to English in the home domain. Consequently, her proficiency in Korean gradually regressed, and English became her dominant and convenient language. There was a certain period of time during which she often expressed her strong resistance to learning and using Korean. When she became a second grader, she asked me in all seriousness when her eye and hair color would change to blue and blonde. She thought that because she spoke English, her appearance would also be transformed to that of her school friends. Whereas her father was unrelenting in his attempts to make his daughter use more Korean at home, I came down on the side of letting my child's language acquisition play out naturally, and have been more flexible about her language behavior; I speak with my daughter in both languages. As she advanced to the fifth grade her contact with the Korean community increased, and with her growing maturity, she began to appreciate the need to communicate with relatives in Korea and other Korean speakers, and

understood the importance of learning and using Korean. She has been attending Korean language classes at a Saturday school from first grade until the present, and, because she has been English-dominant, the exposure to Korean has resulted in her developing greater receptive skills in Korean than productive skills. Today, she is able to understand Korean movies and soap operas. Although Korean remains her weaker language, she is a fairly competent bilingual in both languages.

The second child, born and raised in the United States, was a 4.5-year-old boy, who had entered kindergarten from preschool. Before he started attending preschool at the age of 1.5, he understood both languages at home, although he could not make himself understood fluently in either Korean or English. By being around preschool caretakers and friends, and growing up with a sister with whom he spoke English, he caught on to English more quickly than Korean. Meanwhile, during the preschool stage, he sometimes showed syntax confusion between the two languages. The sentences he produced about his day at the preschool often had one or two Korean nouns situated in English sentence structure, which has a contrasting feature of Korean language's subject-object-verb order. That is, the structure of his sentences adhered to English's subject-verb-object order, but there would be Korean words sprinkled in. At the time of the study he was absolutely English-dominant but had fairly good receptive competence in Korean in that he understood what he heard and comprehended Korean children's stories read by family members.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

The data were collected in October 2004 through a 3-hour videotaping in my house. Conversation conducted after dinner until bedtime was videotaped in a natural situation. At the beginning, taping was conducted unbeknownst to participants in order to obtain their uncontaminated speech. Although they noticed the videotaping when I moved the recording apparatus, the participants didn't pay any particular attention to the camera and me. Because videotaping of family members at meals or doing casual activities indoors or outdoors had frequently been done for the purpose of sending it to relatives in Korea, all were accustomed to the camera.

To examine when CS occurs, children's conversation with each other and/or with their parents was transcribed. Transcriptions were organized and analyzed by the situation and manner that triggered CS and by the intentional meanings or functions of CS that switchers used during the conversation. Whereas a varying degree of switching occurred during the conversation, I selected the three extracts to focus on the language behaviors of the bilingual daughter, the father for his stress on the use of Korean at home, and the dynamics between the father and the children. Moreover, I used the extracts to analyze and examine the participants' linguistic behaviors in terms of when

and for what purpose the participants made the language choices, how CS conveyed or enhanced the switcher's attitude, emotion, or intents, and what the entailed cultural messages were.

Results

The interactions between family members reveal that Korean is the preferred language of the father, whereas the bilingual daughter shifts back and forth from English to Korean, and CS is hardly ever triggered by the English-dominant son throughout the course of documented informal conversations in the home domain. The analysis of when and why CS occurs in many cases suggests that CS is triggered by who the speakers are (i.e., CS depends on who is talking and listening. For example, the daughter's language behavior differs when she is speaking with her mother, from when she is speaking with her father); in other words, the identities and particularly the dynamic of the relationship of the speakers-addressees bring about CS. For example, the father's shifts are mostly used for clarifying his meaning, or helping his children to understand his intention depending on their language proficiency. The shifts play a role of confirmation or translation. At the same time, the daughter shifts much more often between the two languages. Her choice of CS depends on whom she is talking with and is simultaneously triggered by other factors, such as her own language proficiency, reinforcement or repetition, and cultural features. Although the son has enough receptive competence in Korean, his usual language is still English except when he calls to or addresses family members.

In the recorded informal conversation, the language behavior is negotiated according to the addressee; the language shifts which occur depend on whom the speaker addresses.

Extract 1

> Daughter: *Um-ma* (Mommy), piano *sunsang-nim* (teacher + suffix of honor) asked me to bring the Bach book next time; would you find it for me? *A-cham* [this doesn't carry any meaning—similar to "by the way" when a thought or idea occurs to someone abruptly, signifying a transition of the topic], Joseph *jundosa-nim* (pastor + suffix of honor) said we would have a special activity after service.

> *A-pɘah* (Daddy), *jundosa-nim-kɘe nuga na* ride *hae jul kɘ unji mu-a* (silence for a second) *mu-du*, um, um, um, ask *hae juseyo.* (Please ask Pastor Joseph who is going to give me a ride.) Please ask him, *A-pɘah* (Daddy).

As can be seen in the extract, in spite of her preference for using English, the daughter uses more Korean in her sentence when addressing her father. Although it is not clear whether the daughter's switching to English in

utterances directed to her mother is due to an inability to express herself in Korean or the mother's more lenient attitude, she exercises CS with regard to the addressee. It is also interesting to see that the daughter transitions to a new topic by using the Korean "*A-cham*" as filler in the course of talking to her mother in English. Whereas she speaks more English to her mother, who is more flexible about her daughter's language behavior, the daughter shifts to Korean when speaking to her father, who stresses to her the use of Korean at home. However, when she feels uncomfortable about pronunciation or appropriate choice of words, she shifts to her more comfortable language, which is English. However, she gets stuck on pronouncing the correct form of Korean "muru" (ask) but achieves her intended meaning by switching to English after the second trial and several "um"s, which indicates her lack of competence to carry out a conversation in Korean. Furthermore, in Extract 2, when she is not sure of the corresponding Korean word for "ride" and "drawer," she switches to English in order to continue her sentence without pause. In Extract 2, with her English-dominant brother, her language choice is English. When she switches to Korean with her bother, the switch often entails an intention to exaggerate or tease him.

In addition, the daughter switches between the two languages when reinforcing or repeating what she has said, which also has the effect of clarifying her point. In Extract 1, after delivering her request to her father in Korean, she reinforces her request by reiterating in English, saying, "Please ask him." Extracts 2 and 3 also show that CS happens in order to reinforce the righteousness of her anger toward her brother; first, she utters in English, "Yes, I did," and then rephrases the same messages in Korean. In Extracts 2 and 3, her language behavior illustrates that her emotional state might be one factor that affects her language choice. When the daughter is upset, she uses more English than Korean, even with her father. When she is upset, her first choice in response to the father was English, saying, "Yes, I did." and "He broke my other chapsticks before." In conversing with her 4.5-year-old brother (Extract 2), she switches to Korean as she finishes using English—*mani mani* (very, very much) in order to punctuate her brother's stupidity by teasing or insulting him with a childish expression usually reserved for toddlers or young kids. Moreover, in Extract 3, she emphasizes her unalleviated feeling toward her brother by repeating the message in Korean, "*Na-nun Midum-i mi-wo.*" (I hate Midum [her brother's Korean name].)

Extract 2

When the brother broke his sister's chapstick again, his sister became angry, and an argument ensued between them. Interrupting the two, their father tried to send them to bed.

Daughter: *Umma* (Mommy), please tell him [her brother] not to go into my room! I hate him! *Midum*, how many times have I told you not to come into my room? You ruin everything! I really hate you, you, dudu [meaning "an idiot," the term his sister usually uses whenever she teases or insults him]!

Father: *Musun ma:l burut-si gurae*! (You should not call your brother like that!) *No-ga jal* keep *haeyaji*. (You should keep it in a safe place.)

Daughter: Yes, I did. *Nae-ga* drawer-*ae jal dwo suyo*. (I put it safely away in my drawer.)

Father: *Midum*, say sorry to *Nuna* (Sister).

Son: *Nuna* (Sister), sorry, I'll give you my Spiderman sticker.

Daughter: I don't care. I hate you, you, stupid!!! *mani, mani* (very, very much)

As his daughter switches to the other language for reinforcement, the father also employs CS when he repeats or emphasizes his message. As can be seen in Extract 3, the father reprimands his daughter for her continuous complaining about her brother's behavior; he first says in Korean and, then, repeats in English, "Stop and go to bed."

The second extract illustrates when and why the father switches from Korean to the other language. In contrast to his language choice when he persuades his daughter, he primarily relies on English to make his meaning more understandable with his English-dominant son. Even with his daughter, he mixes in the English word, "keep," in the midst of discourse in Korean, for the Korean word "bogwan" (keep or put), which he might think would be hard for the daughter to understand. In Extract 3, when telling the time, he mixes in numbers in English within the framework of Korean sentence structure for clarifying his meaning because Korean has a complicated number system.

Extract 3

Father: *Guman hago, u-seo jagoura.* (Stop arguing with each other, and go to bed.)

Daughter: He broke my other chapsticks before.

Father: I told you. Stop and go to bed.
Pulsu nine-thirty-*da* ["da" is a word denoting statement ending in Korean]. (It's already 9:30 p.m.)
Midum, say good night to *Nuna* (Sister).

Son: Good night, *Nuna* (Sister). Good night, *A-pɘah* (Daddy).

Father: I love you, *Midum*. Hug-*do haeyaji*. (Give me a hug.)

Son: (hugging his daddy) I love you, too, *A-pɘah* (Daddy).

Daughter: If you break my thingy one more time.

Son: *Um-ma* (Mommy), bed-time story-*nun* ["nun" is a Korean topic marker used after a noun or a subject]? (How about a bedtime story?) Would you sleep next to me?
Daughter: *Na-nun Midum-i mi-wo.* (I hate Midum.)

Father: *U-seo jaranik'a.* (I told you to go to sleep.) Go to bed. *Grunda*e (By the way), homework-*un da hat-ni*? (Are you done with your homework?) (hugging his daughter) I love you, *Sarang* [the daughter's Korean name]. (facing to me) *Dangsin-do* (you, too), I love you.

In all three extracts, every family member uses Korean words instead of English when calling, or addressing each other. Given that the children have their own English names, it is remarkable that the father uses only their Korean names when he addresses the two children, and that the daughter addresses her brother by Korean name regardless of the language choices in the home domain. When the English-dominant son calls his daddy or mommy, he shifts to Korean each time he specifically calls *A-pɘah* (Daddy) and *Um-ma* (Mommy) from his primary language. When calling his sister, he uses *Nuna* (Sister), the term of specific relationship for calling his older female sibling, and does not follow the American way of calling each other by name within the same generation. In addition to using the term of relationship, in Extract 1, while speaking in English to her mother, the daughter switches to Korean to mention her Korean piano teacher or her Korean pastor. She calls them by honorifics such as *sunsang + nim* (teacher + suffix of respect for authority or elders) and *jundosa* (pastor) + *nim,* while she calls her school teachers by adding a name after a title, such as Mr. Jones or Mrs. Bushnell.

More interestingly, regardless of their comfortable language status, each family member employs only English when saying "I love you," and "Good night," or asking each other for a "hug." English is the only code used to express the father's affection toward his daughter, son, and wife, even with his strong will to maintain Korean language and the fact that his primary language is Korean.

Discussion

This study's results suggest that CS is used for facilitating family communication with each other despite language barriers and cultural differences between generations. In the interactions between family members, CS functions as a communicative strategy to clarify or reinforce the speaker's point, overcoming the gap of linguistic competence between the two languages.

In relation to this, CS is used to promote each other's comprehension between family members who have a different preferred language. Moreover, CS is employed to meet the complex communicative purposes, which fill a linguistic need for appropriate word or a lack of appropriate expression due to different cultural values. The purpose of the linguistic choices and the result created by the choice reveal that CS is used as a communicative strategy to achieve particular conversational goals in interactions with other bilingual speakers.

A Communicative Strategy as Lowering Language Barriers

The shifts by the family members show that CS is exercised according to the addressee, that is, the dynamic of the relationship of the speaker–addressee to each other and to their particular language proficiency. For example, even with English as her preferred language, the daughter tries to use Korean with her father, who stresses to her the use of Korean at home. CS is employed to negotiate the language for the interaction and accommodate each other's language competences and preferences. Alongside the daughter's language choice, the father also switches back and forth between the two languages within a sentence, in consideration of his children's language proficiency. According to Auer (1998), a participant-related CS invites speakers' assessment of the listener's preference for and competence in one language or the other. In Auer's framework, the father's switching from one language to the other in the same utterance or conversation with his daughter, as exemplified in Extracts 2 and 3, would constitute a participant-related CS where the switch is motivated by considering the listener's language competence. This is well exemplified in the father's mixing English numbers, as he notes the time and admonishes his daughter for being late going to bed. My experience in teaching Korean to Korean–English bilingual children and English speakers indicates that counting in Korean is one of the most difficult language skills for them to either produce or to comprehend promptly because Korean has a complicated number system. Especially when reading the time, Korean draws from a pure-Korean number system for the hour, but defers to a Sino-Korean numbers for the minute. In this aspect, the father's shifts are intended to clarify his point, helping his children to understand his points depending on their language proficiency, that is, a role of confirmation or for the purpose of translation. However, this entails a question of language proficiency for further study: Must switchers surpass some point of proficiency in their weaker language in order to be considered capable of switching to or from that language? Furthermore, how do switchers instantaneously measure listeners' proficiency in both languages outside of the home domain, where multilingual and multicultural interactions take place?

In addition to the father's language choices, the examples of the daughter's shift also suggest that CS is used to accommodate her lack of Korean competence. While trying to speak in Korean to her father, she resorts to her

preferred language to try to clarify her message when facing insecurities in pronunciation and vocabulary choices. The effect of repeating the same message by switching code performs the function of reinforcing her point. In this sense, CS functions as a strategy to promote communication between first-generation parents who use Korean and their English-dominant children.

A Communicative Strategy as Consolidating Cultural Identity

The function of code choices and CS varies in different cultures or language communities. Kramsch (1998) claims that since culture is acquired, socially transmitted, and communicated in large part by language, the language choice must be examined in light of culture and in relation to the specific interactions. The language choices of participants in this study reveal that the factors determining the shifting vary in relation to particular social and cultural values. In Extracts 1 through 3, every family member uses Korean words when calling or addressing each other, instead of using English. Grosjean (1982) argues that switching into a minority language can signal group solidarity, or ethnic identity markers; that is, switching serves to emphasize group identity. In this aspect, the language choice of family members bonds their cultural identity across generations regardless of their comfortable-language status or different degree of acculturation to the other culture(s) they have been exposed to.

In addition, the English-dominant son, whose language shift is rarely triggered during interactions, uses Korean when addressing his sister, thus revealing a specific semantic feature. He chooses the Korean term of kinship for calling his older female sibling, not following the American way of calling each other by name within the same generation. Although the family is a universal aspect of all cultures, Korean culture is more family-oriented and has developed more mechanisms to maintain order in family—as well as in society—than American culture. Generally, the relationships based on Confucianism are inherently unequal, according to sex, age, and status. This hierarchy of relationships, rather than equal relationships, is well represented in the characteristics of the Korean language. The younger sister or brother is expected to show due respect to the older one by using an appropriate term of stratifying the relationship. In applying Myers-Scotton's (1995) argument, the brother's "marked" choice in CS implies that although he is linguistically English-dominant, he is still capable of associating the social symbolism of the Korean language with the conversational strategies of his family members. In sum, his language choice of the Korean word, *Nuna* (Sister), illustrates that he is endowed and reinforced from the inception of his use of language with knowledge of socially relevant markedness, which is associated with his cultural identity.

Besides the son's language behavior, whose function is to consolidate cultural identity, the daughter's linguistic choices also entail knowledge of her cultural background and values. While speaking in English to her mother,

the daughter switches to Korean when speaking of her piano teacher or her pastor. In emphasizing the use of honorific words by young people toward elders, parents, and grandparents, the parents have inculcated in their children the use of the affix "*nim*," a practice which follows a proper Korean social norm. Hence, she calls them by titles such as *sunsang + nim* (teacher + honorific suffix) and *jundosa + nim* (pastor + honorific suffix) as a token of honor instead of calling them by names, thus giving them the proper respect due to those in positions of authority—especially to teachers—in Korean culture. In Korean culture, addressing another by name is considered a rude, inappropriate behavior, especially when the addresser is younger or lower in social status than the addressee. A speech act of calling someone by name, or by title without "*nim*" implies an attitude of breaching courtesy, looking down on, or intimidating an addressee when the relationship between a speaker and an addressee is not equal in terms of age or social status.

Grosjean (1982) argues that CS is triggered when a switcher cannot find a corresponding word or expression in one language or when the language being used does not have the appropriate lexical item, set phrase, or sentence. The shifts employed by the family in the study are used to fill this lack of facility in one language. In contrast to American culture, Korean society lacks the practice of exchanging "Good night" before going to bed. Korean society simply employs a relatively meager selection of acts of greeting and the action of hugging or kissing does not exist, even among family members. Hence, people who are rooted in Korean culture will have difficulty asking for or showing overt affection. The expression of one's affection toward his children or spouse with an "I love you" is suppressed by the influence of Confucianism in Korean culture. Under the influence of Confucianism, a husband or a father who brags of or expresses his affection overtly toward his wife or children is made fun of and labeled a fool. However, switching to English allows the Korean-dominant father to the discourse of expressing his affection toward his children as well as his wife. It might be emotionally easier for Korean men, whose sensibilities are grounded in Confucianism, to say those expressions in English. In this aspect, family members' choice of English to exchange "Good night" with each other or to ask for a "hug" before going to bed shows that CS is used as a bridge to connect different cultures between first-generation Korean parents and both 1.5- and second-generation Korean–English bilingual children living in a multicultural community.

Conclusion

This study supports the possibilities that CS in a family setting provides a resource for assisting communication and boding cultural identity across generations. The analysis helps raise awareness that CS, far from constituting a language or communicative deficit, supplies an additional resource that

bilinguals systematically exploit to express a range of social and rhetorical meanings. Moreover, this study also indicates that since CS is becoming increasingly common in more parts of the world, it is of the utmost importance to understand how CS, as a communicative strategy, functions in various settings, that is, across various linguistic and cultural systems. The limited data in this study point to the need for future research focusing on CS, related to how the communicative demands are achieved by switchers from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds in their multilingual and multicultural interactions.

References

Adendorff, R. (1996). The functions of code switching among high school teachers and students in KwaZulu and implications for teacher education. In K. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices form the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language education* (pp. 388–406). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Auer, P. (Ed.). (1998). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity.* London: Routledge.

Choi, J. O. (1991). Korean–English code-switching: Switch-alpha and linguistic constraints. *Linguistics*, *29*, 877–902.

Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Lee, M. (1997). An analysis of a common structure in Korean–English code-switching: A test of the matrix language framework. *Foreign Language Education, 3*(1), 53–68.

Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1995). *Social motivations for code switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Sánchez, R. (1983). *Chicano discourse: Socio-historic perspectives*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Shin, S. J. (2002). Differentiating language contact phenomena: Evidence from Korean–English bilingual children. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 23*, 337–360.

Sridhar, K. K. (1996). Societal multilingualism. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 47–70). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Tay, M. W. (1989). Code switching and code-mixing as a communicative strategy in multilingual discourse. *World Englishes*, *8*, 407–417.

Endnote

[1] While Sridhar (1996) draws a distinction in alternation between code mixing that occurs intra-sententially, and code switching that occurs inter-sententially, the single term, code switching, is used for both cases in this paper.