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This one-year ethnographic study explores three Korean children and their families’ language socialization practices in a Midwestern US city, with a focus on their negotiation of language ideologies and identities. The language socialization practices of these families who sojourn in the U.S. are examined in the discussion of transnational migration and globalization, and bilingualism.

Three levels of data analyses were used in the study, global (transnational), familial, and interactional. The global-level analyses show how two groups of Koreans, Korean immigrants and Korean early-study-abroad sojourners, enact different language ideologies in their children’s language education. The study also provides in-depth ethnographic analyses of the three Korean families’ language socialization practices in the realm of family. With the prospect of returning to Korea, these families’ current language practices align and match to a great degree with the expectations and practices of their future “imagined communities” (Anderson, 1991; Kanno & Norton, 2003). The examination of diverse practices and the strategic intent of these families show how an individual family’s past and present experiences influence their future vision of participation and membership in Korea.
The micro-analyses of children’s linguistic practices, such as code-switching and addressing practices, show (1) how children acknowledge, highlight, or avoid particular language ideologies in their interactions with their parents or peers and (2) how their understanding of these ideologies is constructed in their language socialization practices. The data also show children’s improvised “bilingual” practices in their negotiation of ideologies, highlighting children’s agency in their language socialization practices while at the same time manifesting their presentation and construction of multiple and shiftable identities across contexts. Based on these results, the study illuminates the location of language ideologies as one aspect of the interplay between language learning and identity.

By linking the families’ local practices to their future and transnational communities, this study broadens the perspective of L2 learning beyond the local context of time and space. Through broad and in-depth analyses of language socialization practices of Korean sojourners, this study highlights the variations in immigrant populations in the U.S. and yields understandings of diverse social and educational practices and identities among them.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction: Language Socialization in a Translocal Context

Everyone who speaks a language goes through a language socialization (hereafter LS) process more than once during a lifetime. In fact, LS is a life-span process, (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986 a, b) by which individuals become socialized into the interpretive frameworks of their culture, community, and other kinds of organizations. Typically, people are socialized into their primary language during their infancy to early childhood, into their school language during their childhood to adolescence, into their professional languages during their adulthood. They are also socialized into diverse forms of language, such as on-line (e.g., Lam, 2004) and gendered (e.g., Ochs, 1990) language use. That is, people’s language socialization into “new domain of knowledge and cultural practice” occurs at different stages of childhood, adolescence, and adulthood (Bayley & Schecter, 2003, p. 3). Having diverse languages (or varieties) in their repertoire through language socialization processes, people shift languages in interaction, signaling their roles and social relationship to others.
When second language (hereafter L2) learners or bilingual children learn a new language, they simultaneously become socialized into this new language. They also acquire knowledge of an interpretative framework of the culture that is different from or often conflicting with that of their first language (or language that they have already acquired). In order to function appropriately in more than one cultural interpretative framework, children need to acknowledge, adopt, negotiate, and sometimes transform the different ways of speaking and associated norms.

Recently, an increasing number of L2 studies carefully document children’s language and cultural learning processes in everyday interaction and/or classroom setting, following a LS framework. Through the analyses of language learning and bilingual development in light of the relationship between language learning contexts (societal and situational) and learners’ socialization process, L2 socialization research illuminates how sociocultural and sociopolitical issues influence children’s language learning and maintenance.

This study is a LS study that particularly emphasizes the global and local contexts of children’s language learning process, illuminating the dynamic nature of the process. It explores three Korean children and their families’ language socialization practices in a Midwestern U.S. city, with a focus on their negotiation of language ideologies and identities. This ethnographic study links these families’ current language learning practices to their past experiences and future prospects. The study situates their practices into a broader discussion of transnational migration and globalization. By doing so, it
locates these three children’s language learning, both in English and Korean, beyond the local context of language learning and use.

The study exceeds the local context in terms of time and space. It goes beyond the local setting of time, by examining how the three children and their families’ future prospects of returning to Korea influence their current language learning practices in the Midwestern American communities. This study also goes beyond the local context of space, by accounting for the families’ current language socialization with respect to their past and current relations to communities in Korea through language ideologies, transnational migration, and globalization. Therefore this study deals with more than one single context of language learning. I call this inclusive notion of context of language learning that this study employs in terms of time and space a “translocal” context of language learning. The translocal context of language learning exceeds the local context through its consideration of learners’ alignment to current and future communities while they are participating in the local and transnational communities. This ecological perspective on the language socialization context (Kramsch, 2002) broadens the field of L2 learning in general and L2 socialization in particular.

This study attempts to illustrate how language ideologies permeate children’s LS practices at home and how children’s linguistic practices reflect, negotiate, or challenge the language ideologies in their foregrounding of “bilingual identity”. In order to examine social and linguistic dimensions of children’s language socialization processes in various contexts, I employed a one-year ethnographic approach, which connects the micro-level account of linguistic practice to its macro-level social and cultural context. Discourse
analyses in this study focus on children’s language learning and use in the local context. This study’s ethnographic approach locates the linguistic practices in a broader social and cultural context, considering children’s language learning as one of major social practices that reflect their identity.

In this chapter, I begin by identifying research gaps in the literature of L2 learning, in particular LS studies, and show how this study contributes to addressing the lacunae. Then I introduce general research questions that guided this ethnography, followed by the theoretical frameworks that underpin the study. Finally, I provide an overview of the chapters.

1.2 Toward a Broader and Inclusive Approach to Second Language Learning

This section identifies the limitations and needs of research in the field of SLA. I first draw on Firth and Wagner’s (1997) call for a sociocultural and sociolinguistic perspective on the SLA research in order to broaden and diversify the field. Then I discuss the recent development of transnational migration and globalization that highlights a new research agenda in L2 education.

1.2.1 Language Learning and Its Social Context

At present, SLA could probably benefit from an enhanced sense of the empirical world’s complex socio-cultural diversity. (Rampton, 1995, p. 294)

The increasing interest in the social and cultural aspects of language learning marks a new turn in theory and research on second language learning and second language acquisition. Over the past two decades, there have been increasing debates on the ontological and epistemological issues of SLA research: that is, what the field
actually needs to study and how researchers might best study it (e.g., the special issue of *Applied Linguistics*, 1993; the special issue of *Modern Language Journal*, 1997). One of the major critiques of mainstream SLA research conducted within the framework of cognitive approaches comes from those who are concerned with social and political aspects of second language use and teaching.

In a thought-provoking article, Firth and Wagner (1997) challenge mainstream SLA research, arguing that it is “individualistic and mechanistic, and that it fails to account in a satisfactory way for interactional and sociolinguistic dimensions of language. As such, it is flawed, and obviates insight into the nature of language, most centrally the language use of second or foreign language (S/FL) speakers” (p. 285). Among those who join this line of thought, Watson-Gegeo (2004) recently asserts that “we are at the beginning of a paradigm shift in the human and social sciences that is revolutionizing the way we view mind, language, epistemology, and learning, and that is fundamentally transforming second language acquisition (SLA) and educational theory and research” (p.331).

In their call for a reconceptualization of SLA, Firth and Wagner (1997) argue that the current field of SLA is critically imbalanced in methodologies, theories, and foci between cognitive and mentalistic orientations as well as social and contextual orientations to language. They propose three major changes in the field of SLA, as follows:
(a) a significantly enhanced awareness of the contextual and interactional
dimensions of language use, (b) an increased *emic* (i.e., participant-relevant)
sensitivity towards fundamental concepts and (c) the broadening of the traditional
SLA database. (p. 286)

Firth and Wagner denounce the conception of language and acquisition as a cognitive and
individual phenomenon at the cost of its social aspects. What they propose is a shift from
the narrow approach that mainly focuses on the cognitive aspect of language learning to a
broader approach that better elucidates the process of second and foreign language
acquisition, so that the field of SLA can be theoretically and methodologically richer

Firth and Wagner’s (1997) claim has resulted in heated debates between cognitive
and social theories that provoke supporting (Block, 2003; Hall, 1997; Liddicoat, 1997;
Rampton, 1997) and opposing responses (Gass, 1998; Kasper, 1997; Long, 1997;
Poulisse, 1997) from each orientation. This tension between cognitive and social
perspectives in SLA goes back to Long’s (1990) discussion on the increase of diverse
theories that attempt to account for SLA. Long (1990) asserts the need for “theory
culling” in the field. Long (1993) continues to maintain this view, arguing that a
theoretically “slimmed down” SLA would allow for knowledge accumulation and the
prevention of a “wild flowering” of disparate and “rivaling” theories (p. 235). Block
(1996) has challenged Long’s insistence on SLA theories being inhibited from expanding
and diversifying. He disputes the assumption that the existence of multiple theories in
SLA is inherently problematic, and he calls for theoretical pluralism.

These debates between the cognitive and social camps in SLA imply that there are
multiple ways to investigate and interpret language use and language acquisition.
Depending on the ontological and epistemological stands on which the research is based, it is true that SLA research can be viewed within its social context or in an individual’s mind, since some parts of language are constructed socially, while others reside within the individual (Gass, 1998). In order to understand the complexity and diversity of the language learning phenomena, however, the field needs to open itself to diverse approaches, so that the results from studies in each approach can compliment each other. Consequently, the two perspectives, social and cognitive, should be treated as complementary, not conflicting. In other words, the social approaches illuminate the social factors that play an important role in language learning, while the cognitive approaches explain language learning that occurs in the mind. As Hall (1997) states, any single approach cannot explain the complex language learning process. In this sense, the field should open conceptual and methodological gates to make “trespassers” go through (Firth & Wagner, 1998).

Influenced by Hymes (1971; 1972a, b; 1974), SLA researchers have moved from viewing language only in terms of linguistic competence, to viewing it as communicative competence, as well. According to Hymes, Chomsky’s concept of “competence” deals with “ideal objects” detached from sociocultural features. Although Chomsky’s concept of “performance” might be concerned with a sociocultural content, it focuses on “psychological by-products of analysis of grammar” unlike a theory of language use, whose focus is on social interaction (Hymes, 1972a, b). Hymes states that communicative competence is “integral with attitudes, values, and motivations concerning language, its features and uses, and integral with competence for, and attitudes toward, the
interrelation of language with the other codes of communicative conduct” (Hymes, 1972a, p. 60). Such competence is acquired through social experience, needs, and motives, and, thus, its social dimension is not restricted to cases in which social factors are related to grammatical factors.

Without dealing with the social context in which communicative events or interactions are situated, SLA researchers have fallen short of embracing Hymes’ (1972a, b) social view of language. That is, they have not adequately addressed the socially realistic study of language although they often assign communicative competence as the ultimate goal of L2 learning and teaching. This failure to incorporate the social context into language acquisition results in a relatively partial and decontextualized view of language learning. The dichotomy of “acquisition” and “language use” proposed by a number of researchers (e.g., Gass, Kasper, and Long) reflects this partial view of language.

Given that the place where acquisition ends and language use begins is not clear, arbitrary tests for measuring acquisition may in fact be poor indicators of ongoing developmental processes that occur with language use. In addition, language use in context reinforces acquisition and at the same time is the indication of acquisition.

Interestingly, Kasper (1997) states that “there is a whole range of issues about SLA that cognitive theory does not tell us anything about, nor does any formal theory of language….one can suspect that the social context in some way influences SLA” (1997, p. 310). A cognitive perspective or any other single theory cannot deal with all of the issues in SLA, and we must acknowledge the significant role that contexts play in
language acquisition. Therefore, the field needs not “theory culling” (Beretta, 1991; Long, 1990), but “theory flourishing” in order to furnish much more information to help us understand diverse aspects of SLA phenomena. SLA needs heterogeneous approaches to, and understandings of, second language phenomena which may be characterized as “firmly rooted in contingent, situated, and interactional experiences of the individual as a social being” (Firth & Wagner, 1998, p. 92).

Recently, SLA researchers have paid close attention to LS framework in an attempt to help bring social factors into SLA research. LS research seeks to understand the process of becoming a competent member of society through language activity. LS research emphasizes interdependence of the acquisition of language and sociocultural knowledge through interaction with other members of a social group.

Language socialization research aims to articulate “interfaces between language, mind, and society by exploring the role of language in human development and socialization” (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996, p. 260). This dissertation uses the language socialization framework that links micro analyses of children’s discourse to macro accounts of beliefs and practices of families and communities (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, b). By doing so, I join the call for a reconceptualization of SLA by Firth and Wagner. To date, LS appears to stand to contribute the most to an understanding of the cognitive, cultural, social, and political complexity of language learning (e.g., Kasper, 2002; Watson-Gegeo, 2004).

The interdisciplinary nature of LS provides the field of SLA with new insights into second language learning and acquisition. First of all, the LS perspective helps
resolve the dichotomous view on language learning as either a cognitive or a social
phenomenon alone. LS framework provides an integrative perspective for understanding
cognitive processes in language learning as social phenomena (Ochs, 1996; Watson-
Gegeo, 1992; 2004). That is, LS views cognition as a social and cultural product, since
the cognitive processes are “built and shaped through interaction in sociocultural contexts
over time” (Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003, p.158) and “cognitive structures” are
“outcomes of speaking” and “of social interaction” (Ochs, 1996, p. 408, see also Section 1.5.3, Relativity, Context, and Culture in Language Learning).

The view that cognition is a social product is supported and informed by
Vygotsky’s (1978) notion, the “Zone of Proximal Development” (ZPD) and Lave and
Wenger’s (1993) “legitimate peripheral participation.” In ZPD, children develop their
cognitive skills through social interaction with adults or more knowledgeable peers in the
ZPD, later internalizing these skills and functioning independently (Vygotsky, 1978).
Similarly, learners begin as legitimated (recognized) participants on the edges of the
activity, and move through a series of increasingly expert roles (Lave & Wenger, 1993).
Both notions imply cognitive development, including language learning, through an
integrated process in which experience and sociocultural contexts play a significant role.

Second, LS’s ethnographic methods adopted from anthropology help SLA move
beyond single, isolated, and idealized utterances to focus on discourse practices within
and across diverse cultural communities. By linking the microanalysis of discourse
practice to more general ethnographic factors such as institutional, social, cultural, and
political (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996), LS provides a richer and broader view of context for
language learning. Watson-Gegeo (1992) argues that the context in LS studies is “the whole set of relationships in which a phenomenon is situated” (p. 51), which enables LS studies to go beyond “thick description” (Geertz, 1973, cited in Watson-Gegeo, 1992) to “thick explanation” taking “into account all relevant and theoretically salient micro-and macro-contextual influences that stand in a systematic relationship to the behavior or events” (Watson-Gegeo, 1992, p. 54). Kasper (1997) also suggests that “language socialization theory has a particularly rich potential for SLA because it is inherently developmental and requires establishing links between culture, cognition, and language, between the macro-levels of sociocultural and institutional contexts and the micro-level of discourse” (p. 311).

1.2.2 Globalization, Transnational Migration, and Education

Globalization circulates resources, ideas, values, and people. Amidst emerging trends in transnational migration, an increasing number of families have went abroad to help their children gain international educational credentials and provide the children an opportunity to acquire English as a global language (Huang & Yeoh, 2005; Orellana, et al., 2001; Waters, 2005). The velocity and intensity of transnational migration has made education more strategic and global. Recently, researchers have emphasized the role of education in driving migration flows (e.g., Orellana, et al., 2001; Waters, 2005). However, Waters (2005) points out that there is general dearth of research examining the specific experiences and intentions underpinning this migration at the familial or individual level.
Such a trend in transnational migration brings with it interesting social phenomena, such as the emergence of transnational families or “split-household transnational family” (Huang & Yeoh, 2005) and children who have “transnational childhood” (Orellana, et al., 2001) whose life potentially located in more than two nations. The socialization process of those children and their families is diversified from that of people who stay in one region. Transnational experiences of these families bring a new perspective to educational research and contexts, highlighting interrelationship among globalization, culture, and education. Lam (2006) describes a research agenda that explores these issues and its potential contribution to the field of education:

Exploring the processes, resources, tensions, and challenges of young people’s socialization and learning in transnational contexts, such as family networks, the flow of diaspora media and popular culture, digitally mediated communities, and organized religion and other cultural institutions, would allow us to begin to understand what it means to learn and grow up in today’s contiguous and overlapping cultural spaces between societies. It would enable us to uncover the kinds of competencies, skills, and knowledge that are developed as young people negotiate multiple cultural representations and societal perspectives and realities. A transnational reframing of the cultural and linguistic resources of migrant and multilingual youth would lead us beyond approaching diversity with tolerance and respect within a multicultural society to looking at how diversity can be leveraged as a global resource to enhance young people’s future contributions as workers, citizens, and intercultural bridges in an interdependent world. (p. 228)

Additionally, the arrival of new populations through the transnational migration changes the face and social reality of immigrant communities in the U.S. While the new population and immigrant Americans may share some similar characteristics, they may differ from each other in terms of their practices and identities due to their diverse levels of membership to the local and transnational communities and their diversified past
sociocultural experiences (discussed in Chapter 3). That is, the new group brings in heterogeneity to immigrant communities (that, in fact, has been never homogeneous). This challenges the mainstream perspective on the US immigrant communities, which considers ethnic communities as homogeneous entities. Furthermore, the transnational flow of languages and cultures also circulates its underlying language ideologies across communities; people seemingly in a single community have divergent and often conflicting norms and language ideologies. Consequently, this leads to diverse ways of language use among members in the community (Gal, 1998; Woolard, 1998).

Globalization also circulates the same resources beyond the local context. Yet, the indexical meanings of the resources differ in time and place. Blommaert (2003) describes this process as follows:

The process of mobility creates differences in value, for the resources are being reallocated different functions. The indexical links between signs and modes of communication, and social value scales allowing, for example, identity construction, status attribution, and so forth – these indexical links are severed and new ones are projected onto the signs and practices (p.619).

Therefore, communicative skills in one language have different social meanings across places. People may use a global language to perform different functions in different regions. The language circulated interacts with a local variety, creating stratification among different varieties. In this sense, globalization generates a stratified order of indexicality for a variety of languages. Strikingly, little research addresses how individuals or families, in transnational space, deal with such stratification and circulate the stratification or “glocalization” (Robertson, 1995) of language, “the simultaneity and
the interpenetration of what are conventionally called the global and the local, or – in more abstract vein – the universal and the particular” (p. 30)

Rampton (1997) suggests that globalization create an important range of empirical phenomena (e.g., new populations and new forms of languages), calling for serious L2 studies since there are varieties that one cannot begin to analyze with preconceived ideas about native speakers vs. non-native speakers and a single variety of well-formed or standard language. He calls for research that recognizes a heterogeneous notion of language and society that goes beyond a static view on linguistic and societal categories, examining “how people negotiate and reconcile themselves both to otherness and incompetence” (Rampton, 1997, p. 330, italic in the original).

With respect to language education, research in the fields of bilingualism and education has yielded understandings about minority language maintenance and English acquisition among immigrant populations in the U.S. L2 studies have begun to acknowledge ESL (English as a Second Language) students’ identity and language practices, which are different from those of native speakers of English. However, little research in the fields of L2 and bilingualism has focused on children and their families who, in the context of globalization, migrate to the U.S. for their children’s education and return to their original countries. In the field of teacher education, there is even less research on how American educators can best meet the needs of such populations. Kanno (2003) claims sojourner students in the ESL classroom should be considered differently from other “regular” ESL students. Kanno also highlights the importance of expanding
the scope of bilingual/multicultural education to include the reintegration issues of students who potentially return to their native countries.

Therefore there is a call for new research in SLA that concerns the increasing population of migrant children via globalization, their strategic intends of transnational migration, and their new language learning practices. This dissertation serves as a response to this call by exploring the language practices and identities of those children and their families who sojourn in the U.S. and eventually return to their native country.

1.3 Objectives and the Significance of the Study

There is a growing population of Korean families migrating transnationally to earn overseas educational credentials and to acquire English as economic capital in the global market (see the statistics and discussion in Chapter 3). This “Korean educational exodus” is rapidly growing and especially common among middle class Koreans, who have decided to take the transnational education route in lieu of trying to maintain or move beyond their current social and economic class.

This new group of Koreans, who are pursuing early study abroad opportunities in the U.S., brings heterogeneity to the Korean-American community in terms of educational practices and identity. Through ethnographic interviews and observations, this study discusses Korean sojourner families’ language education practices from the perspectives of globalization, transnationalism, and bilingualism. Focusing on such populations, this study contributes to “broadening of the traditional SLA database” (Firth & Wagner, 1997, p. 619).
The study first discusses how two groups of Koreans, Korean immigrants and early study abroad sojourners, enact different language ideologies in their children’s language education. The interviews with the study abroad sojourners reveal that their attitudes to language education are closely related to the language ideologies of global English in Korea. That is, they circulate the “glocalized” (Robertson, 1995) English (localized global English) through their transnational migration.

I also examine three Korean families’ language socialization practices, addressing the micro-politics as well as transnational experiences and strategies within the realm of the family. With the prospect of returning to Korea, the families position themselves in their future community in Korea. That is, their current language education practices align and match to a great degree with the expectations and practices of their future “imagined communities” (Anderson, 1991; Kanno & Norton, 2003; Wenger, 1998, see section 4.2 for details) in Korea. The examination of diverse practices and the strategic intent of these families show how an individual family’s past and present experiences influence their future vision of participation and membership in communities, which in turn influence their current practices. The concept of learners’ imagined communities stresses an *emic* perspective (Norton, 2001), meaning the learners’ own understanding of their learning and their agency in their learning that otherwise could not be captured. Each family’s language practices and educational trajectory for their children brings new insight into the process of negotiating identity and language ideologies in a bilingual/transnational setting and shows how children’s education becomes the core project in the process (Orellana, *et al.*, 2001; Waters, 2005; Yeoh, *et al.*, 2005).
In addition to the global and familial contexts of children’s language learning, this study also displays children’s mundane everyday interaction with their parents as part of their language socialization practices. In doing so, this study enhances “awareness of the contextual and interactional dimensions of language use” (Firth & Wagner, 1997). The results from the micro-analyses of children’s code-switching and addressing practices continuously shed light on the location of language ideology as one aspect of the interplay between language learning and identity in a local context in addition to the global context.

In summary, this study addresses a number of notable gaps in the literature, examining a setting, a population, and a particular phenomenon that have received comparatively little attention to date in L2 studies/ LS studies. In doing so, I hope that this study will contribute to the formation of an emergent L2 research tradition that broadens the perspective of language learning and language learners in their social context. By locating Korean-origin families’ local educational practices in their past and future communities, this study expands the perspective on immigrant families’ educational practices beyond the local context. A pluralistic approach to the Korean-American communities in the U.S. highlights the variations in immigrant populations in the U.S. and yields understandings of their diverse educational practices and identities. Such understandings are critical in providing better opportunities for students in the U.S. school system, many of whom are increasingly diverse in terms of languages and cultures of origin. Theoretically, by highlighting the multiple and context specific nature of
language ideologies, this study contributes to a dynamic notion of bilingualism and language learning in transnational space.

1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions were formed and refined throughout data collection, data analysis, and writing up processes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Watson-Gegeo, 1988; Wolcott, 2002). These questions, however, guided this ethnography, rather than pre-designed the data collection and analyses. The general questions that the study followed at the beginning stage include:

- What is the relation between children’s language use and their home language socialization?
- What are the differences among families in terms of parents’ attitudes toward English and Korean, and their language socialization practices?
- What are the language ideologies that underlie each family’s language socialization?
- What are children’s patterns of language use that identify their language socialization process?
- How is children’s identity made manifest in their interaction?

Once I found patterns and themes in children’s language use, I posed more specific questions:

- How are the parents’ attitudes to the children’s language learning related to the language ideologies in Korea?
• What are the differences between immigrant Koreans and the three families in terms of language ideologies?
• How is the future prospect of returning to Korea related to their current language practices?
• What are the social meanings of children’s code-switching and how are these related to the language ideologies enacted in their language socialization context?
• What does the children’s creative use of languages tell about their language socialization practices, particularly language ideologies, and their identity?
• What are the roles of the parents and the children in the children’s language socialization?
• What are the implications of the children’s home language socialization on teachers’ and parents’ understanding of children’s language learning?

1.5 Theoretical Frameworks

In this section, I provide a general theoretical groundwork for this ethnographic study, although I develop a more in-depth and specific theoretical context for the data analysis in each of the chapters. I first introduce a LS framework employed in the study and provide a brief review of L2 socialization research with its advancement. Then I discuss underlying sub concepts that I particularly emphasized within the LS framework such as multiple language ideologies, dynamic perspectives and discursive construction of identity, linguistic relativity, and the ethnography of communication.
1.5.1 Language Socialization

*Language socialization as a new paradigm*

Recently, SLA researchers have paid close attention to language socialization (LS) in an attempt to bring social factors into SLA research. LS research seeks to understand the process of becoming a competent member of society through language activity. LS research emphasizes interdependence of the acquisition of language and sociocultural knowledge through interaction with expert members of a social group.

Language socialization research has built upon the work of child developmental pragmatics in the late 1970s and early 1980s, expending the understanding of children’s discourse to more general ethnographic accounts of cultural beliefs and practices of the communities into which children are socialized.

The study of language socialization focuses on the understanding of how persons become competent members of social groups and the role of language in this process (Ochs, 1996; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, b). There are two underlying premises (Ochs, 1996): (1) the process of acquiring language is deeply affected by the process of becoming a competent member of a society, and (2) this process is realized to a great extent through language. In this respect, language can be viewed as a “system of symbolic resources designed for the production and interpretation of social and intellectual activities” (Ochs, 1996, p. 407). Children are “socialized to use the resources” and at the same time they are “socialized through the use of language” (Ochs, 1996; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, b). The acquisition of language and the acquisition of social and cultural competence are not independent, but intertwined with each other.
Ochs (1996) argues that language socialization concerns diverse ways of assigning various dimensions of social contexts with linguistic forms. The five dimensions of social context include (1) social identity (social personae, roles, relationships, and membership, and rank and status), (2) social acts (speech acts), (3) social activities (speech events, sequences of social acts), and (4) affective stance (mood, attitude, feeling, and disposition as well as degree of emotional intensity) (5) epistemic stance (knowledge and belief).

A basic tenet of language socialization research is that socialization is in part a process of assigning situational, i.e., indexical meanings (e.g., temporal, spatial, social identity, social act, and social activity, affective or epistemic meanings) to particular forms (e.g., interrogative forms, diminutive affixes, raised pitch, and the like). I will refer to this tenet as the Indexicality Principle (Ochs, 1996, p. 410-411, italics in original).

Ochs (1996) argues that language socialization is in principle to learn the Indexicality Principle that exists in a given culture through interaction with other “expert” members (more about indexicality in the previous section of Language ideologies)

The socializing process is viewed as both “individual” and “collective” (Gaskins, et al., 1992, p. 6). It is individual, in that each child creates personal meanings out of the particular set of resources to which they are exposed. Thus LS process is diverse across individuals within a community. It is also collective, in that the resources available to the child were passed down by previous generations. By engaging in collective as well as individual activities, children shape their own developmental experiences.
Nonetheless, in the process, children do not simply imitate the adult world or passively accept cultural resources, but contribute to the creation of social resources (Corsaro & Miller, 1992; Gaskins, et al., 1992; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, b; Ochs, 1996). That is, children and novices take active and selective roles in socializing contexts. Gaskins, et al. (1992) argue that children not only actively seek to understand their worlds, but just as actively “transform or resist certain value-laden messages” (p. 14). Ochs (1996) uses language “praxis” (p. 408) to describe the language practices as resources for socialization that help children and novices develop their own understanding of social activities in which they participate. Ochs (1996) also views language socialization to be potent in that it is a medium not only for cultural continuity, but also for change, stressing its role in constructing a world that abides by traditional conventions and at the same time in creating alternative worlds that challenges those conventions.

Second Language Socialization (SLS)

The traditional LS research or the “first generation LS research” adopting Garrett and Baquedano-López’s (2002) terminology, has focused on very young children acquiring their first language (e.g., Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a) and on the relationship between culturally specific patterns of language socialization and school achievement (e.g., Heath, 1983)\(^2\). Recently, new areas of inquiry have grown out of the old themes (Bayley & Schecter, 2003; Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002). A significant body of LS research has been broadened to include these new areas, particularly in linguistically and culturally heterogeneous settings. This line of research brings in more
de-constructed perspectives on language learning and use. The research focuses on the heterogeneous notions of membership, identity, and roles of adult-expert and child-novice in the “fluid” societal and situation contexts of bi/multilingual settings (Bayley & Schecter, 2003).

Among other topics, LS research in bilingual and multilingual settings has documented the difficulties of maintaining minority languages (Crago, et al., 1993; Pease-Alvarez, 2003; Schecter & Bayley, 2002; Zentella, 1997), adolescents’ language socialization in schools (Harklau, 2003; He, 2003; Pon, et al., 2003), and language socialization in the work place (Duff, et al., 2000; Li, 2000; McAll, 2003). In this line of L2 research, studies challenges the static/unitary perspective of LS by casting doubt on the view that L2 learners socialize automatically into the target norms and culture (Leung, 2001).

LS process in a bi/multilingual setting is often a challenge for L2 or bilingual children due to its complexity, but it may also offer the children much room for creativity. That is, the multiplicity of languages and language ideologies that these children are exposed to in their language learning context offers an opportunity for dynamic and often innovative language practices (Bayley & Schecter, 2003; Watson-Gegeo, 2004). Such practices that are novel to monolingual adults and children reveal children’s agency as they pursue their own choices in the negotiation of conflicting beliefs and cultural ideologies. Children in this dissertation improvise new practices by utilizing such multiplicity. Through their linguistic practices, children dynamically transform their socialization process, incorporating often conflicting norms, language
ideologies, and expectations that exist in a bi/multilingual setting. In this sense, children are not the “passive, ready and uniform recipients of socialization” (He, 2003, p. 128) often presumed in traditional language socialization research, but active negotiators of diverse beliefs about cultural norms and linguistic practices.

Leung (2001) lays out SLS research themes that have been rarely dealt with in the first generation LS research. First, SLS research is particularly valuable for showing language socialization as a lifespan process due in part to the nature of the L2 learning process; SLS often occurs at any time during one’s adolescence and adulthood, either mostly after or simultaneously with the primary language socialization. Through highlighting non-native speakers’ status, SLS research increased the saliency of adult or secondary socialization. L2 learners not only acquire general language proficiency skills within a new culture but also specified discourse types. In addition, adults often find themselves called on to master new communicative skills as they adapt to new discourse practices in new institutional settings or social situations. This line of research suggests that the value of considering “learning” and “socialization” as ongoing processes is confined neither to childhood nor to the walls of a classroom (Leung, 2001).

Second, SLS research emphasizes the bidirectionality of the LS process between novices and experts. Schieffelin and Ochs (1986b) argue that socialization is an “interactive process” (p. 165). In this process, a child or novice is not a passive recipient of sociocultural knowledge, but rather an active contributor to the meaning and outcome of interactions with other members of a social group. Gaskins and Lucy (1987, cited in Gaskins, et al., 1992) also argued that children are not merely “partially adequate stand-
ins for adults” (p. 7), but rather actors whose incomplete statuses allow them to play unique roles in adult culture. Schecter and Bayley (2002) argue that “Who is socializing whom?” (p. 173) in a bi/multilingual setting is a question to be seriously considered when researchers attempt to account for the complexity of language socialization in the realm of families. Schecter and Bayley (2002) point out the importance of children’s autonomous and peer-/sibling-dependent aspect of language socialization:

Clearly, interpretations of patterns of variation and choice within a framework where language socialization is a one-way process in which mothers, teachers, and other caregivers inculcate the values, knowledge, and linguistic repertoire of their culture into children are increasingly problematic in reference to contemporary Western settings where adolescents, and even preadolescents, exercise a fair amount of autonomy within family units. Rather, through their participation in interactions, children also contribute to shaping the process, and caregivers...[...].are often changed as a result (p.172, *italics* in original).

In particular, the parents of L2 children who did not grow up in the context where their children are socialized into often find themselves incompetent in L2 and the local culture and thus dependent on their children who are raised speaking L2. The traditional expert-novice role is not applied to the adult-child in such a context. Therefore, children and parents in SLS studies are often viewed as key players in one another’s language socialization, shifting their roles across contexts (e.g., Pease-Alvarez & Vasquez, 1994).

Finally, because of linguistic and racial differences, L2 learners hardly consider themselves or are considered as full-fledged members of society (Leung, 2001). L2 language socialization studies well describe how L2 learners negotiate their sometimes shifting identities and members across contexts and across interlocutors. For example,
McKay and Wong (1996) describe the reactions of ESL students to the development of linguistic and cultural competence in terms of acceptance or resistance.

1.5.2 Language Ideologies as Multiple

People’s perceptions toward particular languages or language varieties (and toward speakers of these languages) vary in terms of its use, structure, and status. People explicitly articulate, or implicitly embody their perceptions in their communicative practices, through which people rationalize their uses of the language. Silverstein (1979) defines language ideologies as “any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (p.193). These beliefs include, for example, ideas about the status of specific languages, the appropriateness or inappropriateness of some expressions in particular contexts, and how language should be taught to children. Because the beliefs about language, or language ideologies are “constructed from the sociocultural experience of the speaker” (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 496), language ideologies are multiple and diverse across cultures and individuals.

Silverstein (1979) also contends that language ideology does more than merely rationalize linguistic structure; he argues that it affects the structure and its changes. For example, we have witnessed the change of grammar, from the generic “he”, which had been considered as the Standard English, to the gendered “he/she” resulting from the feminist movement and ideology (an example in Kroskrity, 2004). This indicates that language ideologies not only reflect but actually shape how people use language. Thus, Silverstein states that linguistic structures and ideologies are “dialectic,” in a sense that
“structure conditions ideology, which then reinforces and expands the original structure” (p.12).

Similarly, Woolard (1998) argues that language ideologies have their importance in “a mediating link between social forms and forms of talk” (p. 3), which in turn enables an integrated analysis of different levels of social practices. An example of an integrated analysis would include a macro-social level and a micro-interactional level. The mediating link shows how social beliefs shape the societal policy toward specific language structure and use and at the same time construct individuals’ social practices in a given society. Woolard (1998) describes the mediating role of language ideologies as:

[I]deologies of language are not about language alone… [They allow us to] envision and enact ties of language to identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology. Through such linkages, they underpin not only linguistic form and use but also the very notion of the person and the social group, as well as such fundamental social institutions as religious ritual, child socialization, gender relations, the nation-state, schooling, and law (p.3).

Such language ideologies are understood as both verbalized, thematized discussions and implicit understandings and unspoken assumptions (Gal, 1998). Regardless of the degree of explicitness, language ideologies are embedded and reproduced in linguistic practices via indexicality. Indexicality, a mediating link between language ideologies and linguistic practices (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004), signifies beliefs and knowledge beyond the immediate context of the reference. For example, Japanese women tend to use “-ne” makers in order to soften the context, then this “ne” can be an indexical of female gender with a stance, an orientation to the ongoing interaction, and used to signal female gender in discourse. Thus, indexicals may signify something about
the social identities of the participants, for example, or about the activities taking place, or about the feelings or knowledge of the speaker (Ochs, 1990, p.288; 1996).

No two languages can have the same indexical value, e.g., status, solidarity, and economic value. Therefore, a choice of a particular language over another may index, for example, one’s identity or ethnicity or a particular political stance toward the relation between language and identity. Thus, code choice is often related to an indexical process, which Ochs (1990) elaborates on in the following passage:

Choices of one dialect or one language rather than another, can be nonreferential indexes in that code choices may index the communicative context (e.g., the social status of the speaker or the social relationship between speaker and addressee), but do not contribute to the referential or literal meaning of propositions (p. 293).

However, these indexical relations are rather complex, not exclusive, nor one to one mapping; they also vary crossculturally. Acquiring the knowledge of indexical is an important part of children’s language socialization process (Ochs, 1990; 1993; 1996).

Children and other novices gain sociocultural knowledge as they gain knowledge of such indexes and as they come to understand the impact of such indexes on the construction of meaning in social interactions and social life (Ochs, 1990, p. 288).

In a bilingual context, the indexical meaning of a particular code is acquired by children through interactions with their verbal environment. Schieffelin (1994) points out that “one of the major gaps concerns the nature of the verbal environment of bilingual children and its role in understanding what children say and how they say it” (p. 21). Schieffelin goes on to argue that the verbal environment, in which bilingual children are
socialized, holds “cultural and linguistic ideologies associated with political and social attitudes that involve values assigned to the variety of language spoken, and to particular languages themselves as being more or less prestigious” (p. 21). Thus, children’s appreciation and understanding of language ideologies underlying the values of languages are acquired through their linguistic interaction. Children’s understandings are, in turn, revealed in their interaction, through diverse forms of speaking such as children’s code-switching in Chapter 5 of this dissertation.

While language ideologies in socialization practices affect individuals’ linguistic practices and are, in fact, part of linguistic structure and practices, they are hardly deterministic (Ramsey, 1990; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986 a, b; Silverstein, 1979; Woolard, 1998). Children’s linguistic practices are not merely “socialization-driven rule following” (Erickson, 2004, p. 161). Recent research documents how children’s creative, or hybrid linguistic practices are not permissible from their caregivers (e.g., Bayley & Schector, 2003; Chapter 6). Rather, children or novices play an active agent in their socialization process, negotiating often conflicting ideologies (He, 2003; Watson-Gegeo, 2003; 2004).

The conflicting ideologies existing in a bilingual setting, on the one hand, can challenge bilinguals and cause them to go through a painful process of negotiating and adapting differences in cultural and social norms and expectations (e.g., Norton Pierce, 1995). On the other hand, the multiplicity of language ideologies can also provide these children with room for creativity and hybridity by making the context fluid and dynamic. Children in this study, in effect, used these multiple ideologies associated with languages to search for a better way to present their self images (Goffman, 1967). While the data
analyses in this study often associate the bilingual children’s code-switching with language ideologies enacted in their home environment, their code-switching practices go beyond the passive compliance with the particular language ideologies in their home. The code-switching data illuminate the children’s strategic thus agency in their socialization, emphasizing children’s bilingual creativity within constraints of culturally and socially sanctioned ways of speaking. Such creative and improvised language practices are particularly important in accounting for the children’s acts of identity.

1.5.3 Identity as Shiftable across Contexts

In order to avoid an essentialist account of identity that overgeneralizes the categorical similarities and differences among people, I employ an agentive perspective of identity following the tradition of linguistic anthropology that considers language as a form of social semiotic action. The semiotics of language concerns identity not as a set of fixed categories but as an ongoing social and political process (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004).

Identity inheres in actions, not in people. As the product of situated social action, identities may shift and recombine to meet new circumstances. This dynamic perspective contrasts with the traditional view of identities as unitary and enduring psychological states or social categories. (p. 376).

Such dynamic perspective on identity is able to capture variation across individuals within a group or even variation within a single individual across situations.

Language ideologies and indexicality are closely tied to identity, for beliefs about language are also often beliefs about speakers (e.g., Silverstein, 1979) and linguistic structures become associated with social identities (e.g., Ochs, 1993). Bucholtz and Hall
articulate the interrelation among ideologies, indexicality, and linguistic practices
in the creation of identity in the semiotic process:

Ideology is the level at which practice enters the field of representation.
Indexicality mediates between ideology and practice, producing the former
through the latter. Performance is the highlighting of ideology through the
foregrounding of practice. (p. 381).

This dynamic perspective of identity which is shifting across situations is parallels with
“subjectivity” in positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1999).

The recognition of the force of ‘discursive practices’, the ways in which people
are ‘positioned’ through those practices and the way in which the individual’s
‘subjectivity’ is generated through the learning and use of certain discursive
practices are commensurate with the ‘new-psycho-socio-linguistics’. (p. 32).

Davies and Harré’s (1999) perspective of positioning enunciates “the continuity of a
multiplicity of selves” (p. 36) that is produced when one positions variously in the
interaction:

An individual emerges through the processes of social interaction, not as
relatively fixed end product but as one who is constituted and reconstituted
through the various discursive practices in which they participates. Accordingly,
who one is, that is, what sort of person one is, is always an open question with a
shifting answer depending upon the positions made available within one’s own
and others’ discursive practices and within those practices the stories through
which we make sense of our own and other’s lives. (p. 35).

Both approaches, the semiotic perspective and positioning theory, particularly emphasize
individual subjectivity and agency in the linguistic construction of identity and selfhood
(e.g., Ochs & Capps, 1996.). Therefore it conforms to concepts that this study employs in
order to explain identity. First, the perspective underscores the social construction of self, self as a relational term that concerns how individuals view themselves and others in social positions and is constructed mostly through social interactions (Gergen, 1990; Harré, 1987; Miller, et al., 1990). The perspective also complies with Goffman’s (1974) footing that involves individuals’ shift in stance or alignment to others in interactions. Additionally, it also explains how individuals shift and emphasize different voices in their interactions and construct their identity through multiple voices, voices as social indexcials (Bakhtin, 1981). All these concepts emphasize the agency in individuals’ identity construction and presentation.

In a similar vein, Norton (Pierce) (1995, 2000) also conceives of social identity as multiple and shifting, a site of struggle, and changing over time. She links learners’ social identity to its “investment”. The concept of investment, Norton (Pierce) (1995) argues, is a construct that expands learner’s agency, illuminating “the complex relationship between power, identity and language learning” (p.17). She conceives of investment of a shifting and multiple set of relationships that individuals have to particular social contexts which is drawn on Bourdieu’s (1977) notion of cultural capital:

Investment signals the socially and historically constructed relationships of learners to the target language, and their sometimes ambivalent desire to learn and practice it…If learners invest in a second language, they do so with the understanding that they will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which will in turn increase the value of their cultural capital. As the value of their cultural capital increases, so learners’ sense of themselves and their desires for the future are reassessed (Norton & Toohey, 2002, p. 122, cited in Talmy, 2005).
The notion of investment is closely related to Korean parents’ language ideologies and practices (demonstrated in Chapters 3 and 4). The extent to which identities are forged in action rather than fixed in categories is evident in the children’s language use, such as code-switching and addressing practices (in Chapters 5 and 6). For example, children’s addressing practices in Chapter 6 demonstrate that high-status (hierarchy) identity is not entirely given in advance but is interactionally negotiated among children.

1.5.4 Relativity, Context, and Culture in Language Learning

This section draws on a more cognitive view of language and cultural practices in order to pursue the argument about how language symbolically represents the world we experience. The notion of linguistic relativity was first formulated by anthropological linguists. In the strongest interpretation of linguistic relativity, is that linguistic categories are claimed to influence or even determine conceptual categories (Gumperz & Levinson, 1996). However, this notion of linguistic determinism has been criticized for being too static.

Many researchers have recast and interpreted the notion in a more dynamic way. On the one hand, researchers in cognition argue that there is a universal language of thought that underpins all language; in their view, any relative differences among languages are insignificant compared with these universal constrains on cognition. On the other hand, another group of researchers re-examine linguistic relativity and eschew the position on universals versus relativity (Gumperz & Levinson, 1996). Instead, they take a middle position, acknowledging that there are universals, but “universals constrains as
filers leaving open indefinite possible cultural variation within outer limits” (Levinson, 1996, p.196).

Ochs (1996) also interprets linguistic relativity in a more dynamic way and integrates it into her language socialization framework:

The emphasis in language socialization studies is not on how languages as symbolic systems encode local world-view (e.g. as lexical paradigms) and, as such how acquisition of language (e.g., acquisition of lexical paradigms) entails acquisition of a world-view….. Rather the emphasis is on language praxis, what Sapir called “fashion of speaking” (Sapir, 1963)…For example, I am socialized to understand and recognize who I am and who you are and what you and I are doing at any one moment in time in part because our linguistic practices characterize us and our actions in certain ways (i.e., give us and our actions meaning). In this sense, language praxis is a hand-maiden to culture, a medium for the passing of cultural knowledge from one generation to the next. Language socialization research reports this version of linguistic relativity…. (p. 408).

Ochs (1996) argues that there are certain commonalities across communities and communities of practices in the linguistic means used to constitute certain situational meanings, which characterize our humanity. At the same time, there are distinctly local ways of indexing and constituting social situations and cultural meanings. Through the “socializing power” (p. 408) of language, individuals understand both commonalities and the local specifics. She goes on to argue that language socialization is our human medium for not only cultural continuity, but also change; once novices understand the constitutive potential of language, they use language not only for constructing a world, abiding by traditional rules and roles, but also for transcending that world to create alternative worlds.

Whether the notion of linguistic relativity is viewed as static or dynamic, it claims that culture, through language, affects the way in which we think. Certainly, the notion of
linguistic relativity contributes to the understanding of language use in certain contexts, bringing contextual issues its center; our understanding of meanings depends on how context enters into interpretation, and how context is constituted in social interaction, reflecting the sociopolitics of a larger society.

Gumperz and Levinson (1996) argue that there are two ways for context to affect the meaning of utterances. Some conversational meanings arise through pragmatic process, such as Gricean implicature, “contextualized cue” or inference (Gumperz, 1982; 1996b), and illocutionary acts, while other meanings involve indexicals and discourse structure. This means that the meanings of words and utterances heavily depend upon the circumstances in which they occur. Likewise, Hanks (1996a) contends that an utterance can convey more than its semantic meaning, which he states “utterances are made up of semantics plus context” (p. 232).

Among those who pay attention to context-dependent meaning, Hanks (1996a) is interested in how contextual factors enter into the determination of reference, focusing on the deictic expression. Hanks argues that deictic systems, although clearly exhibiting similarities across languages, are to a significant extent constructed over time through culturally specific, situated practices. Reporting his study with Mayans, Hanks (1990) contends that the distinction between lexical deictics and the suffixes in Yucatec Maya reflects a functional distinction that is socially constructed. Thus, the interpretation of a deictic item is bound up with cultural distinctions and practices, which is similar to Bourdieu (1977)’s notion “habitus”.
Gumperz (1996a, b) and Ochs (1996) seek to link meaning, context, culture, and society together. According to this line of view, different use of language yields different interpretive strategies via familiar indexical mechanisms (Gumperz, 1996b), which is “indexicality” in Ochs terms, and “contextualization cues” in Gumperz’s term. According to Ochs (1996), language practices can index sociocultural information, and indexical knowledge is “the core of linguistic and cultural competence and is the locus where language acquisition and socialization interface (p. 414)” (see the section in Language Ideologies). Gumperz (1982, 1996 a, b) outlines his notion of contextualization cues, cues that indicate how an utterance is to be understood and what its rhetorical role in a sequential discourse is. Gumperz claims that the mastering of such cues and their meanings is dependent on direct participation in actual practices and in social relationships. Gumperz (1996a) views linguistic relativity as “a universal by-product of (a) complex social organization, and (b) universal principles of contextualization cueing” (p. 369).

In short, according to linguistic relativity, culture, or context, play an important role in communication. On the one hand, discursive practices always operate in relation to its global and social context. Thus, macro-social forces like the power relation “market place” (Bourdieu, 1977) ultimately influence on access to participation. On the other hand, all interpretation is always context-bound and rooted in individuals’ relationships to and participation in the local context and their intentions and strategies in communication (Gumperz, 1996a).
1.5.5 The Ethnography of Communication

To begin with, the ethnography of communication is interested in the social roles of language in structuring the identities of individuals and the culture of communities and societies. The primary aim of this approach is to provide “a framework for the collection and analysis of descriptive data about the ways in which social meaning is conveyed, constructed, and negotiated” (Saville-Troike, 1996, p. 351).

Through the ethnography of communication, linguistic anthropologists such as Hymes (1972a) and Saville-Troike (1989) study the characteristics of speech events. The ability to participate appropriately in relevant speech events is an important part of communicative competence (Hymes, 1972b). The aim of the ethnography of L2 communication is similar to, but goes beyond that of the ethnography of L1 communication. L2 studies within this framework focus on the contexts and events, particularly where participants struggle to achieve communicative goals through the means of a second or other language. While traditional ethnography of communication in L1 has typically studied relatively well-established and stable speech events, L2 studies have frequently studied more “fluid, transitory, and changeable events” (Mitchell & Myles, 1998, p. 164). Roles and identities of L2 learners may be much more challenged in cross-linguistic and cross-cultural encounters, which are well reflected in the studies of the ethnography of L2 communication (e.g., McKay & Wong, 1996; Norton (Pierce), 1995; Norton, 1997; Rampton, 1995). Chapter 2, “Methodology” will discuss the ethnography of communication further.
1.6 Overview of the Chapters

The theoretical frameworks discussed above offer an analytical framework for examining the children’s language socialization process and their negotiation of language ideologies and identity during the process. The chapters of my dissertation build from the aforementioned theoretical frameworks, LS, language ideologies, identity, linguistic relativity, and ethnography of communication, each focusing on different aspects of the children’s and their families’ language learning experiences in a bilingual/transnational context.

Chapter 2, “Methodology,” introduces the research background, site, participants, and corpus of data. It also delineates the data collection process and the data analysis process in some detail in order to show the empirical basis of my study and thus “scientific rigor” for the validity of the study. I began with a discussion of ethnography in general and the ethnography of communication in particular as a social research method and its aptness and advantages for the current study. Through my own narrative, I then describe a four-phase data collection process. In the next section, I introduce my data analyses procedure. I address how I alternated the data collection process with analysis to find recursive patterns in data and how the relevant concepts and theories emerged and became salient during the process. The section also shows how data analysis methods from discourse analysis were able to add “thick explanation” (Watson-Gegeo, 1992, p. 54) to the interpretations, while ethnographic methods employed in the study, such as participant-observation and interviews provided “thick descriptions” (Geertz, 1973). The final section discusses the validity of the research.
The next four chapters, from Chapter 3 to Chapter 6, contain data analyses, focusing on different aspects and scopes of the participants’ experiences. Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 are concerned about the macro analysis of the ethnographic interviews and observations whereas Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 focus on the micro-analysis of the children’s interaction. Each chapter is self-contained including its own conceptual framework, data sources, and data analysis methods. However, all four chapters are related to one another through the central issues of language socialization, language ideologies, and identity. The following figure describes the relationship among these four data analysis chapters:
Figure 1.1. Overview of the Chapters.
Chapter 3, “Language Ideologies, Migration, and Korean families in the U.S: A Heterogenic Perspective,” focuses on the broader social and historical context in which the three focal families are located. In my discussion of the context, I argue that their language socialization context is transnational in nature, because their practices are locally situated in a bilingual setting similar to that of more settled Korean-Americans in the U.S. However, these families’ practices are constructed differently from those immigrant Koreans due to their future trajectory of returning to Korea. I emphasize this distinctive aspect of their language socialization context, comparing it to the recently increasingly popular Korean educational migration, *Choki Yuhak* ‘early study abroad.’

The prevalent and global social phenomenon embodied in the *Choki Yuhak* practice among Koreans provides a general perspective on that relevant sociopolitical context underlying the participants’ transnational migration and language learning practices.

I begin with the background of *Choki Yuhak* and the relevant language ideologies of English (global Englishes) that in part drives such educational diasporas. The chapter then discusses interviews and focus group meetings with two groups of Korean mothers, *Korean immigrants* and *early study abroad sojourners* in the U.S. Their discourses on children’s language education reveal that these two groups of Korean have different ideological goals for their children’s language socialization. I explore the differences from the frameworks of language ideologies, globalization, and transnationalism. This chapter provides a pluralistic approach to the Korean-origin community in the U.S. by highlighting the variation between the two groups. It also provides a broader context for
three Korean families’ language socialization practices that will be discussed in later chapters.

Chapter 4, “Three Korean Families’ Language Socialization Practices and Their Imagined Communities,” explores the language socialization practices of three Korean families in their familial context. With their future trajectory of returning to Korea, the families’ language socialization practices were organized according to a sense of “preparation” for their return. However, each family’s concomitant positioning in the continuum of the current and the future communities (in a temporal sense) and of the local and the translocal (transnational) communities (in a spatial sense) construes unique practices and strategies for their children’s language education. This chapter examines the effect of the families’ future communities on the children’s language socialization practices into Korean and English. In order to explore such aspects of language learning, this chapter employs the notion of “imagined communities,” a term first coined by Anderson (1991) and expanded by Norton (2001) and Kanno & Norton (2003) for SLA research.

Chapter 4 first delineates each family’s linguistic background, language ideologies, and language socialization practices, which expands the discussion of language ideologies in Chapter 3. The results show that each family has a different image of their returning community, which includes the symbolic cosmopolitan, middle-class educational market, the discontinuing bilingual education, and a place where English is a foreign language subject (e.g., EFL, English as a Foreign Language). I argue that the participants’ future imagined communities, which exist in both private and collective
fashions, provide the families with new possibilities and prospects for the future. At the same time, the communities, like other local communities, impose constraints on their members through ideologies (in this study, language ideologies). In turn, these language ideologies frame the families’ current language socialization practices.

Chapter 5, “Code-switching and Language Socialization: Emphasizing Ideological Borders,” focuses on children’s language use, particularly their code-switching practices and relates them to the language socialization context. The ethnographic description of each family in Chapter 4 locates children’s code-switching data in Chapter 5 within an ethnographic perspective (Stroud, 1992, 1998). These ethnographic data are particularly important in understanding and relating children’s different patterns of code-switching to their language learning context, intersecting code-switching, language socialization, and bilingualism. Together with the ethnographic description of the Chapter 4, Chapter 5 aims to depict the processes whereby the children and their families adopt language ideologies and construct the indexical meanings of two languages in their language socialization process. I conceptualize these processes by drawing upon the concepts from Goffman’s “footing” and Bakhtin’s “voice.”

The data on children’s interactions in this chapter are organized to show how children code-switch so as to highlight or avoid certain ideology in an attempt to achieve their interactional goals in discourse. In this chapter, codes are considered not only to be linguistic forms, but also ideological entities (Bakhtin, 1981; Ochs, 1990). Through code-switching, children shift their social relationships with others. At the same time, they wield power provoking different voices as social indexical values that are co-construed in
their language socialization context (Bakhtin, 1981; Pujolar, 2001; Rampton, 1995; 2006; Woolard, 2004). Through the findings resulting from this analysis of code-switching I continuously intend to shed light on the location of language ideology as one aspect of the interplay between language learning and identity in a local context in addition to the global context (discussed in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4).

Chapter 6, “Language Socialization of Korean Terms of Address: Bilingual Creativity and Hybridity,” explores children’s socialization into Korean terms of address and their creative use of these terms in a Korean-English bilingual environment. I focus on children’s construction of the self in interactional negotiations, examining how these children and their parents or other adult members in the community jointly create socialization practices and continuously define and redefine their roles in the process. Chapter 5 focuses on how children understand the multiplicity of language ideologies and highlight ideological borders through code-switching. Chapter 6, in contrast, emphasizes children’s agency in blurring the boundary of the languages and in negotiating the context of contrasting language ideologies, which brings their hybrid and multi-layered identity to the fore. The data in Chapter 6 accentuate the creative potential of children’s active participation in the socialization process within a bilingual setting. The chapter begins with a general reflection on the discursive role of pronouns, including address and reference terms, in the construction of the self. The next section introduces Korean terms of address, focusing on how the social meanings manage as well as are reflected in social relationships. The findings show that children create their own addressing practices, independence of their parents’ language socialization efforts; Joonho, for example,
creates a bivalent form of an address form {Sicheol}, while Sunjae avoided Korean kinship terms through code-switching. These practices reveal the active role that children play in their socialization process. That is, children do not act according to pre-determined adult norms, but rather create new hybrid practices in collaboration with each other, redefining their social relationships through the dynamic means of language. I conclude the chapter stressing children’s creative potential in their language socialization process.

In Chapter 7, “Conclusions: Implications and Further Research,” I foreground the results of this study for theoretical implications on second language socialization in the field of SLA and discuss implications of these findings for teachers and parents of immigrant/L2 children. Then, I identify the limitations of the study and end the chapter with an outline of further research that articulates the intersection of language learning, globalization, and transnational educational migration.

1 Huang and Yeoh (2005) define it as “one where core members are distributed in two or more nation-state but continue to share strong bonds of collective welfare and unity” (p. 380).
CHAPTER 2

METHODODOLOGY

2.1 Introduction

This study is a one year ethnographic study of three five-year-old Korean children and their families in a Midwestern city, examining their Korean-English bilingual language socialization practices in their home with the negotiation of linguistic ideology and identity as the central focus. In order to examine social and linguistic dimensions of children’s language socialization processes in various social events mostly in their familial context, I employed a one-year ethnographic approach which connects the micro-level account of linguistic practices to its macro-level understanding in the social and cultural context. While discourse analysis in this study focuses on children’s language learning and use in the local context, the ethnographic approach to the data locates the linguistic practices in a broader social and cultural context, considering children’s language learning as a sociocultural process. This study strives to illustrate how language ideologies permeate the local context and how children’s linguistic practices reflect, negotiate, or challenge the ideologies in the foregrounding of their bilingual identity.
Language socialization research requires, but is not limited to, a combination of ethnographic, sociolinguistic, and discourse analytic approaches as the key empirical methods (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996; Watson-Gegeo, 2004). Thus, I collected a broad range of video-and audio-taped data through an ethnographic approach, and analyzed the data through ethnographic description based on my field notes and participant-observation (macro-analysis) and through line-by-line discourse analyses (micro-analysis).

Ethnography as a social research method is valuable, in that it captures the variations in cultural patterns across and within societies, and their significance for understanding social processes (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995), which is consistent with the goals of this study. By exploring the experiences of a small number of learners in depth in natural settings, I aim for “concrete and complex illustration” (Wolcott, 2002) of the individual cases, while also attempting to identify some general threads and significant patterns among them. While involving two languages and cultural systems, this study does not intend to focus on linguistic analyses of the differences nor a thorough description of the cultural similarities and differences. Rather, through my one-year engagement with the three families, I sought to document how particular linguistic practices by the children in a situated context were related to their language socialization practices in their home while they navigate different, often opposing, linguistic and cultural contexts. Important social and cultural meanings were identified and inferred from particular linguistic events and practices, in which the participants created meanings.
through interaction with each other. Thus, this study closely conforms to a microethnographic study described as by Ifekwunigwe (1999):

Also known as focused or specific ethnography, microethnography zeroes in on particular settings (cultural events or ‘scenes’) drawing on the ways that a cultural ethos is reflected in microcosm in selected aspects of everyday life but giving emphasis to particular behaviors in particular settings rather than attempting to portray a whole cultural system (1999, p. 46).

The approach to discourse analysis in this study focuses on particular linguistic events from which social and cultural practices are inferred and conceptualized with particular language use in interaction (Bloome, et al., 2005). While ethnographic methods employed in the study, such as participant-observation and interviews, provide in-depth data and “thick descriptions” (Geertz, 1973), data analysis methods from discourse analysis are able to add more explanatory power to the interpretations of the data by accounting for relevant micro/macro contextual aspects of the practices and thus providing “thick explanation” (Watson-Gegeo, 1992, p. 54).

Through alternating data collection with analysis, recursive patterns in data and the relevant concepts and theories underlying the interpretation of the data emerge, evolve, and become salient (Charmaz, 2000; Corbin & Holt, 2005; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The emergent themes and theories are reinforced and at the same time contested by a priori theories that are already available. Thus, the study combines grounded theorizing and a priori theories (e.g., Frosh & Emerson, 2005).

Focusing on participants’ negotiation of language ideology and identity, the study particularly values the ‘emic’ perspective and attempts to gain insights from a diversity of
perspectives, e.g., those of the children, their teachers and their parents in addition to the researcher. Although the comparison of the individual cases is not the main goal of the study, the data from each participant are compared with one another in order to add richness and complexity to the interpretations.

2.2 Why an Ethnographic Approach?

Language classroom research, second language acquisition (SLA), and bilingual education have drawn on a variety of research methodologies over the past decade (for reviews, see Chapelle & Duff, 2003; Chaudron, 2003; Davis, 1995; Norton, 1995; Siegel, 2003). Ethnography has become popular in language classrooms and educational research (Anderson, 1989; Watson-Gegeo, 1988), which indicates the increasing interest in the social and cultural aspects of language learning (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Hall, 1997; Landolf, 2000; Rampton, 1997) and the promise of ethnography for these research interests.

Ethnography investigates issues that are difficult to address through experimental research, such as the sociocultural process of language learning and the influence of institutional and sociopolitical factors on classroom interaction or on the everyday dyad. Ethnography is particularly valuable for those studies that focus on the role of interaction in language learning and use in diverse social settings and the long term negotiation of identity and its construction in the course of interaction. Thus, the ethnographic approach to language learning complements the challenges in research examining the decontextualized variables and the assumptions about linear relationships and causality among the variables in the development of and acquisition of language skills. Through
deeper engagement with the people who are researched, ethnography captures the richness of their experiences and differences within and across communities. As a result, it reveals a dynamic notion of language learning as a complex mixture of variables. Furthermore, ethnographic studies can serve to question the categories that label and stereotype language learners in the discourse of second language learning and immigration (e.g., minority community, acculturation, mainstream, and native-ness) through a deeper understanding of individual cases, rather than through generalizing the cases.

The ethnographic approach fits well with the premises of language socialization (LS hereafter) research on identity, interaction, and community in language learning. The approach also casts several concepts into doubt such as the fixed and coherent (or stereotypic) notion of identity across contexts; a homogeneous community; language as distinctive, yet unitary form; and discrete boundaries between different cultures and languages. The interdisciplinary perspectives from sociological, psychological, and anthropological disciplines underpinning the notion of LS (Ochs, 1996; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986 a, b) makes possible the main goal of LS research, which is “to articulate interfaces between language, mind, and society by exploring the role of language in human development and socialization” (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996, p. 260). In order to link micro-analytic accounts of children’s/novices’ discourse to ethnographic accounts of cultural beliefs and practices of different social groups, LS research uses a diverse range of ethnographic data, such as recorded and transcribed social interactions, interviews, and
participant-observation (Schieffelin, 1979; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986 a, b; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996).

Schieffelin and Ochs (1996) detail five goals of LS research and methodological tools for achieving those goals, which complement ethnography (p. 252). First, LS research seeks to articulate the organization of communicative practices of novices and expert members. To do so, LS research examines video/audiotaped naturally occurring social interaction organized as coherent practices or activities over time and across situations. The data are gathered neither with idealized accounts of talks, nor through on the spot observations.

Second, LS research examines the context of situations relevant to talk. Through longitudinal observation, LS research can detect when particular contextual features routinely co-occur to create a recognizable situation.

A third goal of LS research is to situate the specific practices within the context of culture on which the meaning of the communicative interactions between expert and novice members is based. According to Schieffelin and Ochs (1996), the notion of culture is “bodies of knowledge, structures of understanding, conceptions of the world, and collective representation [which are] extrinsic to any individual and contain more information than any individual could know or learn” (p. 265). This analysis is what places LS research in the domain of anthropological inquiry.

Fourth, LS research aims to understand how human development is situated in a culture. That is, LS research investigates the relationship between language acquisition and socialization of cognitive and social competence. To look at the relationship,
researchers can investigate the cultural constraints that interfere with children and novices’ participation in particular practices, or cultural preferences that encourage the use of certain forms of language.

Finally, LS research seeks to capture universals and particulars in communicative practices across cultures. For example, the practice of asking questions is a cultural universal and has a similar linguistic form across cultures (Ochs, 1996). This implies that children everywhere have been socialized to use language in similar ways. However, the same practice may differ in the extent to which the practice is preferred, given certain social identities and settings. This indicates that communicative practices have different social meanings and different social significance across speech communities (Ochs, 1996; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996). LS research tries to identify the cultural meaning underlying particular communicative practices.

2.2.1 Language Study through Ethnography: Ethnography of Communication

A sub-field of ethnography, the ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1974) which was developed during the 1970s, focuses on the social meaning of language within the context of particular groups. Linguistic anthropologists interested in language acquisition began to argue against the sole reliance on psychological models and definitions of language. For example, Hymes (1974) suggests:

Linguistic theory treats competence in terms of the child’s acquisition of the ability to produce, understand, and discriminate any and all of the grammatical sentences of a language… Within the social matrix in which it acquires a system of grammar a child acquires also a system of its use, regarding persons, places, purposes, other models of communication, etc.- all the components of communicative events, together with attitudes and beliefs regarding them…. In
such acquisition resides the child’s sociolinguistic competence (or, more broadly, communicative competence), its ability to participate in its society as not only a speaking, but also a communicating member. (p. 75)

The primary aim of this approach is to provide “a framework for the collection and analysis of descriptive data about the ways in which social meaning is conveyed, constructed, and negotiated” (Saville-Troike, 1996, p. 351). Through the ethnography of communication, linguistic anthropologists such as Hymes (1972a) and Saville-Troike (2003) study the characteristics of speech events. The ability to participate appropriately in relevant speech events is an important part of communicative competence (Hymes, 1972b).

The aim of the ethnography of L2 communication is similar to that of the ethnography of L1 communication. L2 studies within this framework focus on the contexts and events, in which participants struggle to achieve communicative goals through the means of a second or other language. Traditional ethnography of communication in L1 has typically studied relatively well-established and stable speech events. On the other hand, ethnographers of L2 communication have frequently studied more “fluid, transitory, and changeable events” (Mitchell & Myles, 1998, p. 164), which reflects the fact that roles and identities of L2 learners in the events may be much more challenged due to their lack of a full-fledged membership in the society.

Several themes are notable in this approach. Many classroom studies of L2 learning focus on the mismatch of power relationships between teachers and students, and, further, among students themselves. In addition, some studies also pay attention to unequal social relationships, within which adult L2 learners need to negotiate
successfully through a medium of L2 use. Those studies show how unequal power relations can control both learners’ overall opportunities and their willingness to take part in L2 interaction, which, in turn, affects their acquisition and use of L2 (e.g., Norton Pierce, 1995). Social identity also plays an important role in L2 learners’ language learning in a social context. Norton Pierce (1995) redefines social identity as “multiple, a site of struggle, and subject to change” (p. 20), integrating language learners and language learning contexts. According to Norton Pierce (1995), language, identity, and context mutually interact:

I foreground the role of language as constitutive of and constituted by a language learner’s social identity. It is through language that a person negotiates a sense of self within and across different sites at different points in time, and it is through language that a person gains access to or is denied access to powerful social networks that give learners the opportunity to speak. (p. 13)

Saville-Troike (2003) argues that ethnographic modes of investigation are also of particular value in the study of the development of communicative competence over time. Heath (1983) describes how children from two culturally different communities in the Piedmont Carolinas learn to use language. Their different cultures put the children in different socialization processes, which results in different experiences at school. Heath (1983) suggests ways in which educators can make use of knowledge from the ethnography of communication to build bridges between communities and schools.

The current study focuses on children’s socialization processes over time both into English and Korean. In these processes, children negotiate different forms and norms of languages, create their own bilingual practices, and assign social meanings to their
practices. Through the framework of the ethnography of communication, these children’s improvisational practices are seen as part of their identity construction in a bilingual setting, which yields important implications for educators and parents of these children.

2.2.2 Critical Ethnography

In recent years, some “critical ethnographers” have criticized earlier research for producing accounts of factual matters that reflect the nature of phenomena rather than values or political issues (Anderson, 1989; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995). For example, most ethnographers were concerned merely with identifying differences in the ways of speaking between oppressed and privileged groups, viewing those differences as cultural (Toohey, 1995). Critical ethnography is, after all, what Lather (1986a) calls “openly ideological research” (p. 146). Critical ethnographers argue that to be of value, ethnographic research should be “praxis oriented” (Lather, 1986a, p. 147). This means that the research should be concerned not simply with understanding the world, but with applying its findings to bring about change. Lather (1986a) maintains that praxis-oriented inquiries seek emancipatory knowledge that “increase[s] awareness of the contradictions hidden or distorted by everyday understandings, and in doing so it directs attention to the possibilities for social transformation inherent in the present configuration of social processes” (p. 147).

Anderson (1989) tells how critical ethnography became popular in the field of education in the 1970s when it raised serious questions about the role of schools in the social and cultural reproduction of social classes, gender roles, and racial and ethnic prejudice. Critical ethnography emphasizes “the complex relationship between human
agency and social structure” (Anderson, 1989, p. 251). In the last decade, a few SLA studies (e.g., Canagarajah, 1993; 1999; Norton Pierce, 1995; Talmy, 2005; Willet, 1995) have been conducted within this framework. For instance, Canagarajah (1993) claims that the field, despite its controversial activity, has managed to see itself as an “apolitical clue to its positivistic preoccupation with methods and techniques” (p. 601).

However, the different orientations to the ethnography do not exist distinctively. Rather, they are interconnected (Canagarajah, 1999). Whether critical or not, ethnographers carry out systemic, intensive, and detailed observations of phenomena under study, examining how particular local phenomena, for example, certain language practices, are socially organized. This study involves the interplay between micro-level linguistic practices and macro-level social structure and language ideologies with attention to the sociopolitical and sociocultural factors that impact language learning process. Therefore, this study is located somewhere between interpretive ethnography and critical ethnography.

2.3 Current Study

2.3.1 The Context

This study was undertaken in the vicinity of a large research university in a Midwestern city in the United States. The city itself is not notably diverse in terms of linguistic and cultural backgrounds, although it is a slowly increasing multicultural city (U.S. Census, 1980-2000). Most Korean immigrant families or visitors settle down in the Northwest parts of the city where school districts are considered better than others by the
Korean community. However, the Korean neighborhoods are neither concentrated nor visible even around the area where more Koreans reside. Korean restaurants and shops are located around the city.

The city has two Korean weekend schools and several church-affiliated Korean language programs. Several Koran churches play a central role in socialization of short term visitors as well as Korean immigrants. The Korean community in the city is different from those in the traditional ethnic enclaves in Korean-American neighborhoods in New York, Los Angles, or Chicago. The Korean social networks exist mainly through Korean schools and churches, or other special social contexts, providing different dynamics for these bilingual children and their families in the city. By focusing on Korean families’ linguistic practices in this Midwestern area, this study can contribute to the understanding of Korean-Americans outside of the ethnic enclaves, in terms of their linguistic and cultural practices.

The focal participants of the study resided in state university family housing in the city. The areas around the university where data collection mostly took place reflect the cultural richness of the university, which consists of a large population of international students from divergent backgrounds. As residents of a very multi-ethnic and multi-lingual neighborhood, the children in this study encounter children from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds yet connect with other Koreans through their social network based on Korean schools and churches.
2.3.2 The Participants: Young Korean Children Learning English as a Second Language

I began the study with three Korean children and their families as focal participants who came to the U.S. at the beginning of the study. The children were five-six years old (all the boys were five years old and one girl who left for Korea at the beginning of the study was six years old) and the children had a very low English proficiency if any (except Sunjae who joined the study a bit later, see the data collection procedure), and were learning English for the first time in their lives. After a shift in the central focus of the study in the middle of data collection (for details, see the Data Collection Procedure section below), I included more children and their families who had different lengths of residence in the U.S. and, thus, different levels of proficiency in both Korean and English (see the following data collection procedure). I observed these children in their school, in their homes, and on the playgrounds during the first half of the data collection period and mainly interactions in their homes for the rest of data collection.

The children’s ages range from five to six, which implies that they are still in the process of developing their first language, Korean, when they are exposed to a second language, English. Around age five, if not earlier, the children begin attending a formal English medium school. The parents primarily speak Korean while interacting with their children, whereas the children at this stage begin to use more English in their interactions with their parents. The home interactions increasingly include bilingual elements. Such a mixture of languages makes home language socialization practices more dynamic, provoking more conflicts and thus active negotiation in the process. Thus the study
particularly illustrates the ways that bilingualism permeates the home, destabilizing the “home=Korean” and “school=English” dichotomy. Thus the study effectively shows, on the one hand, the relationship between the language ideologies, e.g., parental attitudes toward languages and their home language policy, and children’s language learning and use when children comply with their parents. On the other hand, the contexts in which children resist their parents’ language socialization efforts can illuminate their negotiation of language ideologies and at the same time the construction of their “bilingual” identity. Additionally, the study also provides a window into the transition that takes place in the course of childhood as children gradually move from primarily Korean-dominant to primarily English-dominant communication over time when the children are growing up in a bilingual context.

The following is a brief description of the focal participants of the study, and the next chapter provides more detailed description of each family’s language socialization practices in their home. There are three focal children and their families; Joonho, Yongho and Sunjae. Other Korean and international children who were friends of these three children also often appeared in data analyses through their interaction with the three participants. This study also includes seven Korean immigrant families and 15 short-term visiting families in the city, who mainly participated in interviews and focus group meetings for Chapter 3.

The first focal participant of the study, Joonho came to the U.S. three months before the beginning of the study to live with his mother, who had been in the U.S. for three years. He did not have any siblings. At the beginning of my observations, Joonho’s
mother only allowed him to speak Korean at home in order to maintain and develop his language proficiency. Joonho had also been attending a Sunday Korean language school since arriving in the U.S. Although he had only been in the U.S. for three months, his Korean (both oral and written) was not as highly developed as Sunjae’s, another participant of the study, who had been in the U.S. for four years. Joonho’s English was also very limited, especially at the beginning. Thus, his mother tried to create as many opportunities as possible for him to interact in English, while speaking only Korean with him at home. As time went by, however, Joonho’s mother enforced Korean less at home, implicitly allowing English.

Second, Yongho arrived with his family at the beginning of the study. The family had come to the U.S. for the father to attend school. Yongho’s family chose to come to the university for six months to earn credits required for his M.A. degree. The expense for their travel and stay in the U.S. for six months was supported by the father’s current job in Korea. Before they came to the U.S., the family had already decided to stay for one whole year for the sake of the children’s English education. After six month’s stay, Yongho’s father finished his school work and returned to Korea to go back to his job. Since then, the father only visited the family once for 10 days. Yongho was five years old when he first arrived and he has two elder sisters, each eight and ten years old. Yongho’s Korean proficiency was high for his age. He can also read and write in Korean. While Yongho had not learned any English before he came, his two elder sisters could speak English for spoken communication and had literacy skills in English. The parents, at the beginning, promoted English speaking at home, in an attempt to assist the children’s,
particularly Yongho’s, conversational skills in English. The family’s ultimate goal of visiting and staying in the U.S. was to give their children an opportunity to learn English and to have new experiences in the U.S.

A third child, Sunjae, was born in Korea and came to the U.S. when he was two years old. He went to an English medium preschool for one year and became a kindergartener at the beginning of the study. He attended the Sunday Korean language school for one year when he was four years old. Since that time, Sunjae’s parents taught him Korean at home. Sunjae and his father went to the community recreation center in the apartment complex after school almost every day and studied Korean reading and writing for an hour when Sunjae was five years old. Additionally, Sunjae’s mother and Sunjae also regularly read Korean books together at home. Sunjae’s English proficiency was higher than any other boy in the community, and he tested out of ESL at school. Sunjae’s parents spoke only Korean at home except for occasional borrowed English words. When compared with peers in Korea, Sunjae’s Korean proficiency was average, if not advanced, for his age. Although Sunjae’s spoken Korean sometimes sounded a bit awkward according to the other Korean children (it was slower and less colloquial), he was able to elaborate some complex science terms in Korean. Sunjae sometimes code-switched between Korean and English at home. He had one two-year-old brother, who was not speaking much as yet in either Korean or English. Sunjae had never visited Korea since coming to the U.S. by the end of the study.

None of the families went to a Korean church. The children usually played together with other children at the playground of the apartment complex, where the
majority of the residents were international. The three children often played with children from Indonesia, Argentina, and South Africa who were in the same age group and went to school with them. When these children were around children from other countries, they spoke English. When there were only Korean or Korean-American children, they spoke both English and Korean and code-switched frequently.

2.3.3 Data collection procedure

Four phases of the data collection period

I began working with three focal children, Joonho, Yongho, and Seenae ² (a six year Korean girl) instead of Sunjae in January, 2005 and my major observation ended at the end of 2005. However the member checking and other follow-up interviews took place occasionally until the beginning of 2007. While I alternated data collection with data analyses throughout my study and thus these two phases are not separated (see the next section on data analysis), for purpose of clarity my data collection period can be divided into four phases; (1) pre-data collection, (2) observation of children’s interaction at school (3) observation of children’s interaction in their homes (4) focus groups and follow-ups.

The pre-data collection period occurred from the beginning of November, 2004 to the end of December, 2005. During this period, I submitted a research plan to two school districts, one in the northwestern part of the city, where relatively more Korean families reside, and the other where the state university-affiliated-housing belongs. After waiting almost two months, I heard from the superintendent of each school. Only the latter
approved my research at their school district. The observation of participants in school was initially an important element of my research, so this single approval limited the selection of my participants. Being anxious and struggling to find the participants for a while, I had finally heard that there were new Korean families who all went to Roseberry Elementary, one of the schools in the school district that approved my study. One family agreed in early October to participate in my study. I contacted and visited the other two families, and I was able to get their consent at the end of December, 2004, one week after their arrival. I also contacted the ESL teacher of these new Korean children at Roseberry and the classroom teachers. All of them enthusiastically agreed to participate in my study.

The second phase of my study began in January 2005 and ended in June at the end of the 2006 school term. I began observing the children and their families in their homes once a week for about one and half hours, during which time I video taped or audio taped their interactions and carried out informal interviews. My home visit was regularly scheduled for their after school reading hours, and I often read books to the children and talked to them and their parents about their school life. I was also observing the children in their ESL classroom at the beginning of school in January, but I needed to wait for a couple of weeks to get consent from other students in the same classes in order to record the children in the ESL classes and later in their mainstream classrooms. During this phase, I spent a lot of time in their school, trying to depict the process my participants went through in their school life including language learning and socialization. During the first three months, I visited the ESL class for three times per week from 9 AM to 12 PM. There were two classes for kindergarten and one class for the first grade in the
morning. Only once a week, I was allowed to video-record one kindergarten class and the first grade class, both of which my participants attended, and I occasionally audio-taped these two classes on the other two days of my visit. I did not have much knowledge of the ESL class and the U.S school system, so I was interested in finding out more about the ESL class and more generally about the school. During this period, I was trying to find out significant themes of children language socialization in school since I did not decide yet on which aspect of children language socialization practices I was going to focus on. I spent a significant amount of time describing the activities in the ESL classroom and copying the classroom materials, student produced written works, and other documents. For the last three months, I visited two times per week, and I sometimes observed my participants in their mainstream classroom. Around at the beginning of June, I heard that Seenae and her family decided to go back to Korea. I also found out that Joonho was going to move into another school district after the summer. I was very disappointed at this unfortunate news and such incidents changed the focus of my study. This also led to my first “enforced” data reduction process; since the summer, I mainly focused on observing children’s home interactions and saved most of the data from the school site for another project. Such changes, luckily, brought in interesting findings. Around this time, I was also observing the children at the school playground during lunch time and recess.

In the third phase of my data collection period, which occurred from the beginning of the summer vacation to the end of 2005 when Yongho and his family had left for Korea. At the end of the last period, I found an interesting theme (which becomes
the current Chapter 6) and decided to focus on children’s home interaction as my main data source for the dissertation. However, I still visited Roseberry once a week to have a consistent observation on children’s school interaction. During this period, I focused on children’s interaction in their homes, in the playground in their apartment complex, and at other social events. I included more children, Sunjae and Sicheol, who often were in the play group of Joonho and Yongho. I followed the children to diverse settings, such as their soccer games, their birthday parties, and their Korean Sunday school, if they attended. For the last two months, I also arranged a Korean lesson for these children at a community recreation center on a regular basis, so I could observe and interview the children during the lesson. During this period, I became very close to my participants, especially building rapport with their mothers, which enabled me to share many social activities with them and dare to ask some intimate questions. Thus they became an important part of my life as my friends and my research participants. When Yongho and his family left for Korea, I felt that I lost a very good friend.

At the final phase of my data collection from 2006 to early 2007, I interviewed the parents of the participants as member checking. At this point, I felt that I needed to know a broader social context of these three families’ language socialization. Thus I arranged two focus group meetings with sojourn mothers on their attitudes toward and beliefs about language learning in addition to individual interviews with Korean immigrant mothers who had lived in the city for at least more than 5 years. The data analyses of the focus group meetings and interviews become Chapter 3 of the dissertation, “Koreans in the U.S.: A heterogeneous perspective”. During this period, I
focused on the sociocultural and sociopolitical data that are relevant to children’s language learning.

*My positioning in the ethnographic context: Shifting from sensayngnim ‘teacher’ to imo ‘aunt’*

All social research is a form of participant-observation since it is impossible to study the social world without being a part of it (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995). As a scientific method, participant-observation encourages ethnographers to demonstrate both their social participation and their observation skills. As ethnography, my study depends on my observation as the major source of data and is at the same time a method of interpreting the data. My relationship to the participants plays an important role, therefore, in what kind of data I could access while participating in diverse social settings with them, and in the ways I interpret the data to make sense out of these experiences. In this sense, the researcher’s social relationship to participants and the focus of the research are closely interconnected; the focus of the study shapes the researcher’s relation to participants in the research context, by highlighting specific aspects of participants’ experiences.

Throughout the study, my relationship to my participants and the focus of the study shifted in a dialectical fashion. When I first met the families, I offered to be an English tutor for the children since I used to be an English teacher for many levels of students in Korea. Being an English tutor, I could be helpful in providing some advice and assistance for the families. Additionally, in this way, I could closely observe children’s language learning and development, which was the earlier focus of the study.
While visiting their homes, I read books to the children and discussed school related issues with their parents.

In school, I observed the children while I was volunteering as a teacher’s aide in their ESL classroom. In the classroom, I assisted the teacher in various ways: I worked with a group of students when the class was divided into groups; I escorted the children to and from their classrooms; and I sometimes prepared the teaching materials. While I was visiting the class three days per week from January to March 2005, I planned to volunteer on two days and save one day for my full observation (which is what the teacher and I agreed upon when negotiating my entry). However, this plan did not work exactly as I intended; on my observation days, I often found myself working with children while my video camera and audio recorder were running in the corner of the classroom.

My role as an ESL teacher’s aide also provided me an opportunity to work closely with my participants in school, observing their language learning and their school life in general. Through my volunteering, I developed rapport with the ESL teacher, who gave me important information about the focal children and provided insights on their language learning. Through the ESL teacher, I met with other teachers of my participants and had an opportunity to observe the children in their homeroom classroom. Additionally, through this volunteering work, I became an informant to the parents about their children’s school life, which fostered the parents’ trust and made them receptive to my extensive inquires. Until summer 2005, I was positioned as an English teacher to the families, as their address term sensayngnim ‘teacher’ indicated.
During summer, however, my role changed from *sensanygnim* ‘teacher’ to Juyoung-ssi (ssi as respectable suffix) to the parents; and *imo* ‘aunt’ or *acumma* ‘ma’am’ to the children. By the end of the second phase of my data collection, my study began to have a more specific focus on two sociolinguistic topics, children’s addressing practices and code-switching in relation to their home language socialization practices (see the data analysis section). Thus I was trying to find more relevant data to these two themes, focusing on children’s linguistic practices in diverse social settings. I spent most of my time observing the children in their homes while they were interacting with their parents and friends. I also followed the children to diverse social settings with my recorder, for example, to their soccer games, birthday parties, an apple picking farm, and a ski resort. My relationships with the parents became closer, and I built friendships by spending time with them outside their homes. My shifting role from the children’s teacher to their friend or *immo* ‘aunt,’ allowed me to participate in different aspects of their life, which also led to a shifting in the focus of observation.

The term “participant-observation” implies both “emotional involvement” and “objective detachment” (Tedlock, 2000, p. 465). This dualism makes ethnographers both private and public and both objective and subjective. Thus, while I was interacting with my participants, I was trying to be an insider while keeping my ethnographic and analytic lens active. Once I was alone, I became reflective and objective during writing or recording my field notes at home or in my car on the way home.

Building a close relationship with my participants through my participant-observation is also related to my emphasis on the *emic* perspective. While *emic* is a
In this study, I aim to illustrate young children’s language socialization processes, focusing on the negotiation of identity and ideology in a bilingual context. Thus it is crucial to understand children’s linguistic practices from their standpoint, which might differ from those of adult members and their monolingual peers. I consider the children in my study not just “nonnative speakers/learners” who show incomplete competence, but rather the “participant-as-language user in social interaction” (Firth & Wagner, 1997, p. 286). Their linguistic practices are, therefore, viewed as a social process through which they are initiated into cultural meanings and learn to perform appropriate skills, tasks, and roles, while often experiencing changes in their identities. Working closely with the children through my participant-observation over one year, I gained an increasing emic sensitivity towards fundamental concepts such as identity, culture, and ideology in context, in order to understand the complex processes of the children’s bilingual language socialization. My participant-observation thus helped me emphasize an emic perspective, a culture and context sensitive approach that focuses on interpretations and categories used by my participants, while maintaining my researcher’s etic analysis and developing intersubjectivity between my participants and me (Watson-Gegeo, 1988).

**Corpus of data**

The corpus of my data include (1) video/audio recorded children’s interactions with their families and friends at home, at the playground, in the car, and at other social settings, along with audio recorded interviews with their parents; (2) video/audio
recorded children’s activities at school and audio recorded interviews with teachers; (3) children’s written work including school documents such as test scores and school reports; and (4) my field notes. All the audio/video data were digitized and stored in the computer and organized under each child and their family in chronological order. I indexed most of the audio/video files with detailed descriptions on the events and selectively transcribed those that were identified as illustrating important themes. I also typed my field notes and coded them with relevant themes. I converted all other written documents into electronic files either by scanning or by taking photos of them.

2.3.4 Data Analysis

*Alternating data collection and data analysis*

Ethnographic studies need to be conducted in a recursive manner in which data are collected, analyzed, and then reported. The data gathered at the earlier stage of the study are analyzed to form the research questions, followed by more focused data collection. Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest the research design of ethnography as follows:

It must be emergent rather than preordained; because meaning is determined by context to such a great extent; because the existence of multiple realities constrains the development of a design based on only one (the investigator’s) construction; because what will be learned at a site is always dependent on the interaction between investigator and context, and the interaction is also not fully predictable; and because the nature of mutual shadings cannot be known until they are witnessed. (p. 208)
I began analyzing the data after three months of data collection. I noticed children’s addressing practices, particularly Joonho’s shift in his addressing practices from a Korean kinship term to an anglicized Korean name. In my field notes, I described this as:

FN- Joonho 030605
Joonho’s addressing Sicheol [another Korean child who are elder than Joonho] with English pronunciation even in the Korean sentences kept drawing my attention. I have been noticing this practice for a while. Today it hit home when his mother also mentioned it to me and even mimicked his practice. This seems interesting because he tended to address children from other countries with a Korean kinship term, hyeng ‘brother for a boy.’ I kept thinking about what this means; does this have something to do with his English learning? How so? Could it be possible to consider it from a language socialization perspective? The pronunciation is not exactly neither English nor Korean. It seems to me something hybrid, which is what? What can I do with this seemingly simple practice? I may ask him and his friends about it.

Along with Joonho’s improvised practice, I also noticed other children’s addressing practices that I later theorized as practices that index their identity negotiation. I framed their practices within a language socialization approach, which is discussed in Chapter 5 as bilingual creativity and self-negotiation in the children’s addressing practices. While I was analyzing these practices, I focused on their addressing practices during data collection; I was able to ask children and their parents about such practices. The alternation of data collection with data analysis led me to more interesting and well-focused data.

While analyzing children’s addressing practices, another theme emerged; I found that children used code-switching to avoid and emphasize certain indexical meanings associated with address terms. I realized that children’s code choice is related to broader issues of language ideologies and interactional negotiation of power, which I focused on
The code-switching theme opened up an entirely new issue - language ideology. I recognized that language ideology is the overarching theme of my data; the ideology of English in Korea via globalization, the ideology of English in a minority community in the U.S., the relationship between language ideology and language socialization practices in each family, and local ideologies of personhood. It became clear that these global, sociopolitical issues and local linguistic practices interact with each other through language ideologies.

In the final phase of my data collection, I focused on parents’ language attitudes and home language policy. I use the interview data as a “member check” for my analysis; I recounted the ethnographic description of their home language practices from their own perspectives. I also arranged two focus group meetings with parents who were visiting US for a short period of time and also interviewed a group of Korean immigrants individually. These focus group meeting and interviews provided more background information about Korean families’ language socialization practices and how each of the two groups of families, immigrant and sojourner families, enacts different language ideologies in their homes. These data were analyzed and became Chapter 3, which focuses on language ideologies and the status of English and Korean in these two groups of families. In Chapter 3, I relate the discussion of language ideologies to the global language of English in Korea, transnationalism, and bilingualism. Chapter 3 thus
provides the macro account of the ethnographic data on each family’s LS practices described in Chapter 4 and also of the children’s linguistic practices analyzed in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6. Thus, my data collection and analysis process was not linear, but rather dialectical; each process informed the other and they interacted closely with each other.

*Combining grounded theorizing and a priori theory*

Throughout the data collection and data analysis process, I defined and redefined concepts based on the collected data, which, then, led to further data collection. The concepts were identified from language socialization events that played a significant role in my participants’ language learning and use. Then, the concepts developed in the process of seeking social meanings for children’s linguistic practices as data analysis proceeded. For example, I identified Joonho’s language socialization events, more specifically his addressing practices from the data, and then I defined concepts such as “the local notion of self” and “social relationships.” Such concepts later evolved as more fluid notions of “bilingual identity” and “creativity.”

In summary, the preliminary data analysis led me to concepts that were refined for “the chain of theory development” (Charmaz, 2000, p. 515) as the research continued. The process in which concepts are initially identified and constructed from the data and developed throughout the study for theorizing is called “grounded theorizing” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In grounded theorizing, the developed concepts from the data guide further data collection and analysis. Thus, it is “a method in flux” (Corbin & Holt, 2005, p. 50) since the data collection and data analysis processes are not predetermined, but are structured as the research proceeds. Corbin and Holt (2005) stress, however, that
concepts do not just emerge from the data, but are constructed, indicating the researcher’s agency in identifying and developing concepts, given that there are multiple ways of interpreting data and that multiple concepts and theories are possible out of the same data. They go on to argue that the earlier version of grounded theory, in which a theory emerges from data, may imply “one reality” or “one truth” that is embedded in data. I follow the constructionist view on theorizing; theory is constructed out of the data by the researcher. The “constructed” concepts and theory out of data are also brought back to the participants for member checks. As a result, the concepts are redefined in the alternating process of data collection and data analysis. In this sense, these concepts and theory are a co-construction between researcher and participants as well (Charmaz, 2000).

While grounded theory may have different meanings to different people, what is important is that people actually go to the field and construct concepts and theory out of actual data, rather than force the data into the concepts (Corbin & Holt, 2005). In their pioneer work, Glaser and Strauss (1967) emphasize this aspect of grounded theory that will fit the situation being researched, and work when put into use. By “fit” we mean that the categories must be readily (not forcibly) applicable to and indicated by the data under study; by “work” we mean that they must be meaningfully relevant to and be able to explain the behavior under study. (p. 3)

The grounded theorizing approach that puts the data in the center of theory development allowed me to resolve the greatest methodological crux of my study - how to eschew “essentialist” conceptions of culture, identity, and the cultural notion of the
self. My research involved two language systems and their underlying cultural values. Thus there was a dangerous temptation to jump on the interpretation of children’s linguistic practices from the dichotomous conception of “Korean culture” and “American culture” and to force their identity into the categories of “Korean” and “American” identity. Besides, my own subjectivity as a Korean-English bilingual adult also might have construed children’s perspectives from my point of view. However, the grounded theory approach allowed me to focus on the local context of interactions and find meanings out of their practices, using a variety of analytic tools such as asking questions and using analytic charts (maps) and tables that make meanings from the data. These grounded concepts were compared to concepts in the literature at a later stage in order to make theoretical connections rather than to force the data into the theory.

The grounded theory process also led to my second data reduction process. In the course of the concept construction and theory development, the focus of the study narrowed, which influenced the data collection and data analysis processes. For example, when I constructed concepts reading the social meanings of children’s code-switching, my data collection focused on the children’s interactions that are relevant to the topic, which eventually directed me to the maxim “Do More with Less.”

In general, my departure in data analysis is always from children’s interactions in a situated context, which is analyzed through a line-by-line micro-analytic method. Then I conceptualized the local interactions and theorized the concepts through a connection to a broader sociopolitical perspective, incorporating critical discourse analysis that “provides a way of moving between close analysis of texts and interactions, and social
analyses of various types” (Fairclough, 2001, p. 229). Thus data analysis is from micro to macro, an inductive process, which is applied within each chapter and across the chapters - from local (Chapter 5 and 6) to global (Chapter 3) and in between (Chapter 4).

2.3.5 Validity and Ethical Concerns

I believe that it is impossible to develop a meaningful understanding of my participants’ experience without taking into account the interaction between me as the researcher and my participants and, furthermore, without the interplay of different values and beliefs among us. Therefore, knowledge apart from the context embedded in the study is meaningless (Wolcott, 2002). Additionally, establishing generalizability without context and maintaining absolute objectivity in human research are unreachable and even undesirable goals (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Most ethnographers try to show that their interpretations from the gathered data are credible. Credibility is a part of “trustworthiness” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), a qualitative term of validity. Credibility is enhanced through the use of specific procedures and techniques. Prolonged engagement and participant-observation involve a commitment of time and intensity, which is an essential part of validity for ethnographic studies (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The credibility of my study built upon my long-term engagement with my participants over one year through participant-observation to develop rapport with my participants, which is essential for interpretation of practices from the emic perspective. My interpretations were refined by incorporating the emic perspective, disconfirming instances in the data, which led to the search for alternative explanations.
Another essential procedure in raising the credibility of a study is to triangulate by using multiple sources, methods, and investigators (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In this study, I combined observations, interviews (both individual/group), and documents as data sources. Additionally, ethnographers’ field notes play an important role when writing up the findings. Field notes contain “thick description” of the specific events and situations that audiotapes can hardly record, and ethnographers’ subjective reflections, which, as Lincoln and Guba (1985) argue, enhance the transferability of the study. I utilized my field notes to locate the data in the social and analytical world through my own reflexivity. My reflexivity that is constructed based on all the relevant contextual elements that were specifically accessible at the time and place of my data collection and data analysis is a significant data source and an analytic tool that otherwise would not be available.

In addition, “peer debriefing” and “member checks” can be used to ensure the credibility of the findings. Checking with another researcher or the researched allows bias and misunderstanding to be removed and meaning to be reconstructed collaboratively. I included peer debriefing and member checks during the last phase of my data collection period through discussing my findings with other researchers and the participants. All my field work was conducted to build and show the “scientific rigor” that qualitative research has been criticized for lacking, on the grounds that the data and findings it produces are subjective (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995, p. 6).

On the other hand, critical ethnographers use another notion to judge the validity of the study in addition to credibility. They believe that every inquiry is value-bound in
terms of choice of a problem to investigate, methods, way of interpreting results, and the values inherent in the context where the study takes place. Thus, the studies that critical ethnographers conduct are openly ideological and focus on social transformation and emancipation. Given the emancipatory intent of critical ethnography, Lather (1986a, b) proposes “catalytic validity,” referring to “the degree to which the research process reorients, focuses, and energizes participants toward knowing reality in order to transform it” (1986b, p. 160).

Catalytic validity is somewhat similar to so called “research ethics,” that is, reciprocity between the researcher and the researched, but it does not necessarily mean the emancipation of the researched. Reciprocity means that the participants of the research help the researcher conduct studies about them, and at the same time, the researcher helps the participants. Throughout my study, I was volunteering as a teacher’s aide, an English tutor, and a counselor for my participants in an attempt to make them benefit from their participation in the study. The parents who were participating in the individual or focus group interviews often reported that they began to pay more attention to their children’s education, to observe them more closely, and to think about the relevant issue more critically. Informed by me and informing me on their children’s linguistic practices, the parents’ became knowledgeable about their children’s particular linguistic practices. Therefore, this study is valid in the sense that it is reciprocal and it empowers the researched by raising awareness of the issues at hand.
There are several Korean language schools in the city, including two Korean language schools and a couple of church-affiliated Korean language programs. The Sunday Korean language school that Joonho and Sunjae both attended offers two forty-five-minute Korean literacy lessons and one forty-five-minute elective lesson on diverse topics such as Korean culture, music, and sport.

Seenae is a Korean girl who was six years old at the beginning of the study. Her father went to the state university for a quarter as part of his M.A degree, which was supported by his company in Korea. The family considered staying for one year at first, but unfortunately they decided to go back to Korea after staying for six months and dropped out of the study in June 2005. Thus I did not include the data on her family into the data analysis.

This data reduction process was initially caused by unforeseen circumstances (e.g., in Note 3), which is different from my second data reduction process that I intentionally initiated during data analysis.

In a series of courses on qualitative research with Patti Lather at OSU, she emphasized this maxim “Do More With Less” for data analysis process. I remember this maxim was one of the most important lessons for my data analysis in my current study and in my future studies.
CHAPTER 3

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES, MIGRATION, AND KOREAN FAMILIES IN THE U.S.: A HETEROGENEOUS PERSPECTIVE

3.1 Introduction: Korean Immigrants, Korean Sojourners, and Language Ideologies

As introduced briefly in previous chapters, this study depicts three Korean children and their families’ language socialization practices in a Midwestern neighborhood. The three focal families are non-immigrant Koreans who will eventually return to Korea. From an ethnolinguistic perspective, the families’ local linguistic practices, Korean-English bilingual practices, have similarities with those of immigrant Korean Americans in the U.S. However, the families’ motivation and attitudes toward language learning and language socialization may be quite different from those of Korean Americans who do not have any tangible plans to return to Korea.

In order to understand the focal Korean families’ language socialization practices, it is important to begin with the broader social and historical context in which these families were located. The three families were anchored in the communities in Korea through their social networks, educational/cultural backgrounds, and past and future membership. Consequently, language practices were also closely related to those in
communities in Korea. The families’ language socialization practices in the local context in the U.S. should be examined in conjunction with language ideologies and practices in Korea. This chapter discusses language ideologies of English in Korea in general, and how these language ideologies impact on Koreans’ language education in the U.S.

Recently, there has been an increasingly popular migration trend among Koreans called “early study abroad” (a.k.a. Choki Yuhak) that refers to children’s transnational educational migration before college. My participants are marginally part of the Choki Yuhak group, since the families’ main purpose in visiting the U.S. is not mainly the children’s education (the parents’ study, which, in fact, has been a popular “official” reason for Choki Yuhak). However, the families’ practices have many similarities with the group of Choki Yuhak with regards to language ideologies, which are in turn closely related to the language ideologies around “global” English in Korea. Therefore, it is useful to take this new group into account to understand the global context of my participants’ socialization practices.

This new group of Koreans brings heterogeneity to the Korean-American community in the U.S. (that, in fact, has never been homogenous) in terms of language ideologies, linguistic practices, and identity. This chapter emphasizes the heterogeneity in what seems to be Korean-English bilingualism, focusing on the language ideologies that underlie local “bilingual” practices. The two categories of Korean immigrants and early study abroad sojourners are not clear-cut and it is not my intention to categorize them as distinct. However, these categories are methodologically effective in showing how language ideologies are multiple, complex, and context specific; two groups position
themselves differently in their relation to the communities in Korea and the U.S., which leads to their different emphasis on language ideologies. At the same time, these two terms, Korean immigrant and sojourners, also usefully display how local language socialization practices by these two groups reflect their identities (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004).

The interviews with these two groups of mothers reveal that their local linguistic practices have different ideological goals, which become visible in their discourse of language education. This chapter explores the differences and similarities in these two groups of Korean mothers in terms of their attitudes toward language education from the frameworks of language ideologies, globalization, and transnationalism.

The concepts “globalization” and “transnationalism” overlap with each other and are sometimes used interchangeably (Farr & Reynolds, 2004). However, the former has a broader perspective (Kearney, 1995). While globalization takes place in a global space, transnational processes are “anchored” in one or more “territorial, social, and cultural aspects of nations” (Kearney, 1995, p. 548). In Kearney’s distinction, transnationalism emphasizes nationalism in its political and cultural dimensions, whereas globalization occurs without reference to nation, implying impersonal and universal characteristics of the process. However, the global force is in fact localized through the process of being adapted, adopted, and transformed by specific social forces at a particular time and place (Appadurai, 1996; Smith, 2001). Such localization processes are no longer ideologically free, impersonal, nor universal since political and cultural forces of a society are integrated in a unique fashion. For example, the language ideologies of English in Korea are partly shaped through localizing the global English(es). Particularly, Korea’s national
globalization project (segyehwa) in the 1990s had a distinctive impact on global English in Korea (Park, 2004), which will be discussed in later sections.

This chapter begins with the background of the current trend of Choki Yuhak and the relevant language ideologies of English (global English) that in part drives the educational migration. The next sections discuss language ideologies revealed in the discourse of children’s language learning by two groups of Korean mothers – Korean immigrants and Korean sojourners, respectively. By doing so, I aim to illuminate how Korean sojourners’ language ideologies and practices are related to the language ideologies of English in Korea, and how they are different from language ideologies emphasized by Korean immigrants. Emphasizing the relationship between Korean sojourners’ language practices and their transnational communities in Korea, this chapter ultimately provides a global context for the three Korean families’ language socialization practices that will be discussed in Chapter 4.

3.2 Korean Transnational Educational Migration: Choki Yuhak “early study abroad”

After the Hart-Celler Act of 1965, which abolished immigration quotas based on national origin, the number of Korean immigrants in the U.S. gradually increased.¹ According to the Immigration and Naturalization Service records for 2005, 26,562 Koreans legally immigrated to the U.S. that year, while 876, 554 Koreans entered the U.S. with non-immigrant short-term and long-term visiting status. Min (2000) states that the 1997 economic crisis in Asian countries (e.g., the International Monetary Fund) encouraged the recent high wave of Korean immigrants to the U.S. and kept Korean immigrants from returning to Korea due to the economic hardship in their native country.
The traditional ethnic enclaves in California, New York, and New Jersey are still the most favorable places for Korean Americans to settle.

Of the total 1,190,353 Korean Americans in the 2000 US Census, 864,125 Koreans (73.6 percent) were foreign-born, indicating more recent arrivals joining the group directly from Korea. According to the statistics provided by US ICE 2006 (US Immigration and Customs Enforcement), Korea sent the most students to the U.S. in 2006, followed by India and China; Koreans holding active student visas comprised over 14.5 percent of the total student visa holders in the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country Name</th>
<th>Active F-1 Students</th>
<th>% of Total Active F-1 Students</th>
<th>Active F-1/M-1 Country Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOUTH KOREA</td>
<td>83,708</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td>64,453</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>51,660</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>46,513</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TAIWAN</td>
<td>31,499</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>28,965</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>13,233</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>11,503</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>THAILAND</td>
<td>10,540</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SAUDI ARABIA</td>
<td>8,725</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1. Top 10 Countries of Citizenship by Active Student Totals for F-1s

In this massive educational migration, what is more noteworthy is the ever-increasing number of young Korean students who study abroad. The number of students (in grade
1-12 in Korea) who pursued educational visas increased from 4,397 in 2000 to 16,446 in 2004, not counting the number of students accompanying their parents’ business or academic trips outside of Korea. Figure 1 shows the increase in number of students emigrating for early study abroad at different levels of schooling. 

![Graph showing the increase in number of students emigrating for early study abroad during 2000-2004](image)

**Figure 3.1. The number of Korean students emigrating for early study abroad during 2000-2004**

According to Figure 1, the number of “early study abroad” students in grades 1-6 increased 9 times from 2000 to 2004. Additionally in 2004, the number of students in grade 1-6 who left Korea with their parents for their business or study was 6,119, totaling
12,385 students in grades 1-6, which is half of the total non-immigrant study abroad in grades 1-12.

Increasing participation in *Choki Yuhak* in general and the recent rise in the number of students in grades 1-6 in particular, have multiple causes. The most visible reason for the increase is the lifting of Korean state regulations in 2000 that had banned ambitious parents from sending their children to foreign countries. Since then, the early study abroad that was previously allowed to only certain groups became very popular even among the common people, shifting its reputation from studying abroad for “fleeing or escaping” to achieving “better education.” High competition for the colleges in Korea and general dissatisfaction with the educational system is one reason for this trend (Cho, M., 2002).

Recent studies reveal a strong positive relationship between parents’ attitude to early study abroad and some variables that include the degree of value attached to higher education, household income, father’s educational level, and residence in a metropolitan area (e.g. Kim, K. & Yoon, H., 2005; Son, 2005). These variables comprise the characteristics of the Korean middle class. In fact, statistics from KEDI (Korean Educational Development Institute) show that students from Seoul are one third of the total number of students who have made an educational exodus in the past five years. Many scholars are concerned that opportunities to study abroad are limited to middle/upper class children, which may cause the educational gap between the haves and the have-nots to increase.
The mother’s foreign language ability also shows a positive relationship with the parents’ desire for early study abroad (Kim, K. & Yoon, H., 2005). It is often mothers who accompany their children to the foreign countries, while fathers stay behind in Korea and support their half-families in foreign countries. This type of split-household is called kirogi kajok “geese families” and this new transnational family structure has been very common recently in Korea. Other relevant social phenomena associated with such early study abroad include Korean mothers’ giving birth to babies in the U.S. to give the new born babies citizenship for later educational advantages in the U.S., and immigrant relatives’ adopting nieces and nephews while the children are studying abroad.

Another very important cause that propelled the recent escalation in Korean early study abroad is the 1997 implementation of English as a foreign language in the third grade curriculum. The need for introducing English in the elementary school curriculum had been discussed since the early 1970s (Heo, 1995). However, the idea had been criticized and rejected for its alleged negative impact on young children’s learning Korean and constructing a Korean national identity, as well as for increasing children’s unnecessary academic burdens early on (Heo, 1995). At the beginning of the 1990s, with the globalization movement and Korea’s experience holding international events such as the 1998 Seoul Olympics, the need for foreign language skills came to the fore. Globalization, called “segyehwa,” became a major national project under President Kim’s regime in the mid 1990s. Consequently, under the educational aim of raising “global” or “international” individuals, the government decided to adopt English as a formal subject in the elementary school. This incident marked a significant change in foreign language
education policy in Korea, accompanying a variety of phenomena, such as changes in foreign language teaching methods, an escalating need for teacher training, conflicts and tensions between practitioners and policy makers (Jung & Norton, 2002; Shin, 2007), and the bourgeoning private after-school English market (Heo, 1995; Park & Abelmann, 2004). The English education market in South Korea in 2002 is estimated at over $3.3 billion per year in addition to the expenditures on English study abroad, estimated at over $800 million per year (Park & Abelmann, 2004). Considering the ever increasing number of students participating in Choki Yuhak, current costs will exceed those of the previous year.

Many Korean scholars including Jung (1995) argue that considering early English education as a core of Korea’s national segyehwa ‘globalization’ project as is not desirable, and the belief that early English education is the only way to acquire communication skills in English should be corrected. Jung (1995) goes on to argue that true globalization is to know what it means to be Korean in the world, including the knowledge of the history and language of Korea, rather than to adopt other cultures and languages imprudently. (Jung, 1995).

In the past, English had significant meaning as a subject on the college entrance examination, which essentially mandated how English was taught in Korea. With the advance of globalization, English recently has come to exceed its local meaning as a subject on the college entrance examination (Park & Abelmann, 2004), and its local significance has been intensified even more by the early English education curriculum. Such escalated social value of English in Korea is very well reflected in education.
According to a survey on elementary students’ English learning, more than half of the students who participated in the survey began learning English before the third grade in 2003 (Jung, 2004). Korean parents enthusiastically support early English education, but the nation as a whole equally endorses this trend as evidenced in the national globalization projects. Park & Abelmann (2004) call Korea’s longing for English, at both the national and individual levels, “cosmopolitan striving,” a desire to have the symbolic value of English and to feel “at home in the world.” Korean parents’ cosmopolitan striving has class implications, which are revealed and emphasized in their investment in English education (Park & Abelmann). Thus, “education is a site of struggle”, as Heller calls it (2003, p. 477), through which people gain the symbolic value of English that is created and transformed in the Korean local context via globalization.

Globalization makes the same resources move across contexts, but the indexical meanings of the resources differ in time and place. Blommaert (2003) describes this process as follows:

The process of mobility creates differences in value, for the resources are being reallocated different functions. The indexical links between signs and modes of communication, and social value scales allowing, for example, identity construction, status attribution, and so forth – these indexical links are severed and new ones are projected onto the signs and practices (p. 619).

What English indexes in Korea is closely related to language ideologies Korean people hold about English. Language ideologies serve to elucidate how people create and maintain the social meanings and values of certain languages, genres, and styles. The indexical meanings and language ideologies are closely related. Bucholtz & Hall (2004)
contend that “indexicality mediates between ideology and practice, producing the former through the latter (p. 381). The next section introduces the language ideologies of English in Korea that construct the social meanings of English in the local context.

3.3 Language Ideologies of (global) English in Korea

In order to understand ideologies of English in Korea, this section begins with two perspectives on global English, in addition to the seemingly “neutral” perspective that celebrates the contribution and achievement of the globalization of English. Crystal (1997) considers the global spread of English to be a result of the language being “in the right place at the right time” (p. 110). However, others maintain that the spread of English has centralized world cultures and languages, circulating the hegemony of Western English speaking countries-a homogenizing linguistic imperialism operating in educational systems worldwide endangering linguistic diversity and plurality (Philipson, 1999, 2001; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2001). Pennycook (1990, 1991, 1994), for example, considers global English a gatekeeper to positions of prestige in a society that plays an important role in maintaining social, political, and economic inequalities. In contrast, Kachru’s perspective on World Englishes emphasizes the heterogeneity that has resulted in the spread of English. Kachru (1977) describes the spread as the process of “pluricentricity” that brings in new norms, creativity, and hybridity, and finally creates different varieties of English through the process of its local adaptation. Recent sociolinguistic studies of English rap and hip hop in Asian countries are a good example of this heterogeneous perspective of global English.
However, Canagarajah (1999) argues, while Kachru’s perspective captures what the centralist arguments miss (e.g., Philipson, 1999), it does not explain the ideological implications of different varieties of English. Pennycook (2003a) points out the reciprocity between globalization and localization when, for example, “popular culture in North America emerges as a form of protest against mainstream culture, is co-opted by media marketing, is spread around the world, and is appropriated by local groups who are now globally doing local forms of the global” (p. 9). Regarding emerging new forms of English lyrics in Asian music, Pennycook (2003a, b) emphasizes the need to go beyond these two perspectives, including dynamic mediation among global and local forms.

The value of local forms is constructed through the contestation of multiple and often conflicting language ideologies. The indexical meanings of the local forms are a result of the localization process. Korea is one of the nations considered to be a very strong monolingual society. The notion of Korea as monolingual nation has been used politically to unify and strengthen the nation. In addition, the ideology of one ethnic group, illegitimating the possible existence of some minorities in its history (e.g., Chinese minority), has been prevalent. These ideologies together serve to erase social, ethnic, and linguistic diversity, and to create the image of a unified ethnic and linguistic community (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004; Park, 2004). These ideologies of “one language, one ethnicity, and one nation,” contrast somewhat with the currently widespread use of English in various domains such as media, commerce, and education. English was proposed to be an official language in the economy-trade zones of Jeju Island and Kimpo in 2001 and 2002. Additionally, English immersion camps (e.g., English Villages), in which children only
use English among themselves, have been very popular throughout the nation. With the insertion of English into Korean society, the fact that people do not use English for communicative purpose makes the Korean situation distinct from other countries such as India and some Asian countries where English is used for communication.

The distinct practices involving English in Korea should be seen from the framework of language ideologies. Language ideologies influence language forms and use (Silverstein, 1993; Woolard, 1998). They condition how particular languages, varieties, or styles are associated with stances and affect that construct indexical meanings for them. Language ideologies provide possible frameworks for linguistic practices, devaluing alternate forms and reaffirming others. The social meaning of linguistic forms must drive from language ideologies, at the intersection of speakers’ beliefs about a particular linguistic form and their perception of a particular social group.

Through multi-layered discourse analyses of English use in Korean media and in face-to-face interactions, Park (2004) proposes three major ideologies of English in Korea. First, Park identifies the ideology of necessitation, which materializes English as a resource to acquire and secure, in order to survive and obtain prestige in a globalizing world. This ideology was strongly highlighted in the proposal to make English an official language and in the implementation of English as a subject in the 3rd grade. The second is the ideology of externalization, which locates English as foreign to Korea, in opposition to Korean national identity. Externalization is often used to emphasize Korean national identity against foreign and heterogeneous cultural influences. The third ideology is
Koreans’ self-deprecation that views Koreans as inherently poor speakers and communicators of English.

In essence, Park argues that these three ideologies do not necessarily oppose one another. Rather, they differ in emphasis according to particular contexts and discourses. This means that Korean speakers of English focus on one or more of the ideologies according to their situational need. Additionally, Park contends that these ideologies are represented differently in discourse. Necessitation and externalization appear to contrast with one another whereas the ideology of self-deprecation is entailed by the other two ideologies. For example, the people who advocate English as an official language in Korea are consistent with a necessitation view, promoting English. Those who oppose the idea of English as an official language draw their arguments upon the externalization ideology and bring the Korean national identity to the center. However, the arguments from both sides entail the language ideology of self-deprecation, as the ideology that is being naturalized as uncontestable and dominant (Kroskrity, 2004).

In the next section, I discuss how these ideologies permeate the discourse of language education among short-term visitors and Korean immigrants in the U.S. Through the analyses of focus group meetings with Korean mothers in late 2005 and mid 2006, I extend Park’s (2004) ideology of English as necessitation, dividing it into two: the ideologies of commodification and cosmopolitan membership. The data show how Korean mothers promote these two ideologies of English. Additionally, the interviews with immigrant Korean mothers show how positioning in a transnational context can shift and transform language ideologies.
3.4 Korean Sojourners and Their Transnational Investment in Education

For this study, I organized two two-hour focus-group meetings\(^5\) with sojourners visitors who arrived in the city in 2005 and in 2006. The seven mothers in the first group knew each other through their husbands, who went to the same M.A. program in Korea. The husbands were exchange students sent to a relevant program in the state university for six months. After completing their course work, the fathers returned to their jobs in Korea that supported their study. Two out of the seven families planned to return to Korea and the rest of the families decided to stay in the U.S. for another six months, which is the maximum length for their children to attend a U.S. school without penalty. One of my focal families, Yongho’s family, (this family will be described in Chapter 4) belonged to this group. The 8 mothers in the second group that I met in 2006 were a mixture of two families of visiting scholars who were on sabbatical and of six families who were in the same student exchange program. One of the visiting scholar families planned to stay for two years, extending one more year, and all the six families in the student exchange program planned to stay for one year, extending another 6 month stay in the U.S. This means that seven out of eight families were planning to have a split-family structure (geese families) between Korea and the U.S. for at least six months since the fathers needed to return to their jobs in Korea.

Interview topics include questions about their children’s current and past language learning and the mothers’ attitudes toward English education. The topics flowed and shifted naturally as time passed and there did not seem to be much difference between these two groups of mothers.
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3.4.1 English Education as the Best “Investment”

The mothers in both groups unanimously agreed that investing in English education is the most valuable investment for their children, viewing English learning as economic capital through the commodification of language. The following are direct quotes from the meetings:

(FG1 052005- 15:00)
English is the place you can see where the money goes. The more you spend, the more efficient the children’s language learning.

Yes, especially when the children are young, the amount of the money spent in their English education is visible, which makes me happy.

Additionally, one of the mothers complains that her family did not get what they paid for because her 6 year old daughter did not speak English while playing with another Korean girl who was born in the U.S. These two girls spent a lot of time together at their homes and at school, which resulted in helping the other girl improve in Korean, rather than helping her daughter’s English proficiency. The mother noted, “we did not get what we invested in.”

Such mothers’ correlation of English learning and economic investment was associated with two perspectives. First, the symbolic value of English is higher than that of other languages in terms of its cost (Bourdieu, 1991). Second, these parents do not consider the public English education in Korea to be efficient. Otherwise, the parents would not have had to invest as much in English learning. These two perspectives motivated the mothers to emphasize English education through transnational investment.
Most of the mothers said their children started their private English education before the 3rd grade when English becomes an official subject in school. The mothers said some of the parents in Korea teach their children English to prepare for their early study abroad in an attempt to make their learning as efficient as possible and more importantly their investment as profitable as possible (Bourdieu, 1991). Others who are planning to study abroad do not teach their children English at all, being afraid that the English education in Korea might have a negative impact particularly on pronunciation, and interfere with the efficiency of the “real” English learning opportunity in the U.S.

While most parents invest much money and time in their children’s English education, they did not seem satisfied with English teaching in Korea. Better quality English education, in the form of private after-school programs, referred to as “authentic” by the mothers, costs as much, if not more than, that of early study abroad. The parents consider the best English education to be a program in an authentic environment which includes English immersion with native speakers of English. For them, the goal of English education is to gain oral communication skills, which is the most visible product for their investment.

3.4.2 English as a Commodity in the Global Market

The mothers’ view on gaining communication skills in English education parallels the Korean government’s emphasis on listening and speaking skills: “When teaching English, the emphasis should be laid not on accuracy but on successful communication and fluency, not on rote memory but on the acquisition of the language through actual use
of it” (Lee, 1995, cited as in Jung & Norton, 2002, p. 247). The following responses by mothers reflect this view:

FG1 052005(21:00)
The goal of learning English is to achieve communication skills in English. These days communication skills in English are the most valuable asset in my children’s life.

FG2 060506(7:00)
Until now, I think that the U.S. is the center of the world. Thus it is necessary to have communication skills in English in order to survive; whether we like or not, we cannot resist this. This is something we need to do.

The mothers’ perspective echoes the hegemonic power of English as a global language that plays an important role in maintaining social, political, and economic order (Pennycook, 1990; 1991; 1994; Philipson, 1999). In particular, the mothers see communication skills as particularly representative of the power and commodity in the global and local market. One of the mothers considers communication skill in English as a *sine qua non* in an era of globalization.

FG1 052005 (19:50)
For the next generation, they cannot live without English skills. Not just reading and grammar skills, but I mean communication skills in English. The skills will equip them to get jobs and help them attend a better school. It is something that I mean something…I don’t say English will guarantee them a better life, but English is a necessity to have better jobs and education.

Most of the Korean mothers seemed to be very much satisfied with their experience so far in the U.S. and their children’s progress in English. They invested in English education through a transnational strategy, which produces and enriches communication
skills in English, a valuable commodity in the global market. In turn, such transnational investment will generate more capital in their children’s lives and careers.

FG2 060506 (38:45)
I’m so happy with their progress. The children can have the most important skills for their life through this experience [early study abroad]. Once they have communication skills in English during their study abroad, they don’t have to worry about it when they go back to Korea. Since they have the English skill required for their academic and career success in their life, they can focus on something else.

However, it was contradictory to see more than half of the mothers had hired English tutors who taught reading and writing in English. The mothers said that children learned these skills through a communicative rather than a grammar approach. By doing so, mothers believe the children would retain their communication skills well after they return to Korea. Additionally, they said that most of them are staying only for a short period, so they want to provide their children with as many intensive and efficient opportunities as possible. While the mothers emphasized communication skills in English, their notions of communication skills do not seem to include sociocultural knowledge or intercultural understanding. Rather, it appears that communication skills in their sense are restricted to the speaking and listening skills (fluency) that are highly valued and useful in the Korean context.

3.4.3 My Husband Speaks Only Two English Words, “Marlboro Light” and “Eighteen”

This sort of humor regarding a Korean’s English ability indicates their view of their own linguistic skills. One of the mothers jokingly described her husband’s English skills as:
Throughout six months, my husband speaks only two words in English, “Marlboro Light” and “Eighteen”. At a grocery store, he uses the first one in order to purchase the cigarette that he wants. The latter he says when he selects the eighteen holes at the golf course. That’s it.

The mother considered that her husband’s reading and writing skills in English must be sufficient, given that he successfully finished the academic requirements at a U.S. state university, but she claimed that his oral communication skills are very poor. She criticized English education in Korea, which used to mainly focus on a grammatical approach. She complained that after the 10 years of English education in Korea, she and her husband did not develop even rudimentary communication skills. She described her and her husband’s English skills as “useless” and “holed English,” meaning incomplete, noting that what it lacks is practical knowledge. She hoped her children have better English skills that are of practical significance. Here the mother expresses the ideology of self-depreciation (Park, 2004), which conceptualizes Koreans as poor speakers of English. This ideology motivates her to educate her children to excel with their English skills.

Among the mothers, there is a myth that children can speak English like native speakers of English after staying for one year in an English speaking country. They heard from other families who had studied abroad that most children magically speak English very well regardless of their previous proficiency. They also believed that this is true because they already saw the improvement in their own children’s English skills, which they perceived to be much greater than their own; to the mother, her children’s English sounded like that of native speakers. They associate “authenticity” and “excellence” with
their children’s communication skills and believe that such improvement overcomes the children’s initial difficulties and compensates for the parents’ financial investment.

3.4.4 Global English and Cosmopolitan Membership

Another important goal of English education is to provide their children new experiences that broaden their perspectives and provide them an opportunity for global citizenship.

FG 1 052505 (55:00)
Think about how much they can learn by speaking another language. They can get a lot of new experiences and knowledge through English. I think that this is what the most important thing in their study abroad experience. Through this experience, they will see things beyond the national borders of Korea, and becomes free. You know now they will see themselves in the part of world, not merely part of Korea. […] They can live anywhere and they can travel and interact with anyone in the world. How cool is this.

One mother expressed that learning English enables the children to go beyond the national borders and travel around the world, expanding their territorial boundaries. They acquire “cosmopolitan” membership by virtue of the linguistic and economic aspects of global English. Another mother who has two children, 1st and 5th graders, envisaged her children’s academic success.

FG 2 060506 (41:00)
If they (the children) acquired good English skills here, then they could save the time that other students in Korea spend in English and study other subjects such as Korean and Math. And some special high schools called foreign language schools in Korea have classes that are geared to prepare students who are applying for colleges in the U.S. Then later they can study in a U.S. college. I think that this (early study abroad) is the best opportunity for my children to be able to study in the U.S. later and also to become so called seykyeyin “a global
person”. You know, the person can go over national limits and become prestigious members of the world.

The two years she and her families spent in the U.S. provided a foundation for becoming “a global person”. She seemed to have a long-term plan for her children’s education in order to further their life. Their study abroad experience is a way to send their children to the U.S. for a college education. Education in the U.S., in addition to the ability to communicate in English, is a must to acquire mainstream membership from her perspective.

FG 1 052505 (58:00-1:03)
These days if you don’t speak any foreign language, you are considered “frog in the well”, like me (laughter). I want my children to live in the global space. I think any other language skills are okay, but English is the language that is the most widely used so far. So I think speaking English is the must. There is an expression, jiguchon “World Village”, you know. Regardless of nationality, people live together, and a common language will connect the people. My children’s learning and speaking English in a foreign country when they are young will bring them closer to the idea of living in jiguchon with diverse people.

The mothers express their desire to live “at home in the world”. Their wish to live in the world does not necessary preclude ideas of national identity and individual interests, which formed the traditional Korean notion of cosmopolitanism. The next section extends the Korean mothers’ idea of living “at home in the world” as a new concept of cosmopolitanism (Park & Abellman, 2004).

3.4.5 Naturalized Language Ideology of Korean

Kroskirty (2004) argues that a focus on overt ideological contestation should not lead us to lose sight of dominant ideologies being naturalized in discursive
consciousness. He stresses the varying degrees of peoples’ awareness of local language ideologies, suggesting “a correlation relationship between high levels of discursive consciousness and active, salient contestation of ideologies and, by contrast, the correlation of practical consciousness with relatively unchallenged, highly naturalized, and definitively dominant ideologies” (p. 505). The ideology of Korean nationalism that is evoked by Korean language is not new, as it has been emphasized throughout its political history, although it is often unnoticed and unstated. The language ideology of Korean as a national identity recently gains more visibility through debates on English as an official language and as an official subject in the elementary school. In the debates, the language ideology of Korean as ethno/national identity was used against the language ideologies of English as a global language. The Korean government stressed English as a “neutral” global/international language rather than one of the “foreign” languages in an attempt to promote it in the national globalization project. Then the language ideology of Korean as national identity became visible and challenged the ideologies of English. This ideology of Korean as ethno/national identity is ever present and still unchallenged, often being naturalized in discourse among Koreans (Kroskrity, 2004).

The two focus group meetings revealed that they were very conscious about the language ideologies of English as necessitation and self-deprecation (Park, 2004). However, the Korean mothers’ emphasis on the significance of English by foregrounding ideologies of English as necessitation and self-deprecation does not preclude their view of Korean as their first language. With their emphasis on English education, mothers also showed their concerns about Korean parents’ excessive desire for English education. The
parents welcomed the recent spread of English kindergartens and the availability of English cartoons and movies through cable TV, which enables young children to immerse themselves in English at a very young age. Nonetheless, they did not wish their children to be fluent in English at the cost of developing Korean skills. Some addressed concerns regarding Korean parents’ use of English (“poor English,” according to the mothers) to their children in an attempt to assist their children’s language learning.

Another concern was parents’ turning to surgical procedures7 explain for the Korean’s inherited phonetic disadvantage. In terms of language practices, most of the mothers in these two groups taught Korean to their children as young as 2 years old and most of them were satisfied with and proud of their children’s Korean skills. Even the mother who stressed the necessity of English education the most emphasized the importance of Korean, saying “the benefits of English do not compensate for the cost of losing Korean.”

The language ideology that views Korean as emblematic of ethnic and national identity co-exists with the strong desire for English as economic community and cosmopolitanism in their discourse. The mothers’ desire for the cosmopolitan membership via English as a global language and their emphasis and pride on Korean national identity seemingly contradict one another. However, Korean mothers’ emphasis on the hegemonic power of English in their cosmopolitan desire is not antithetical to the ideology of Korean nationalism. Recent literature challenges the traditional notion that nationalism precludes cosmopolitan identity (Clifford, 1992; Park & Abelmann, 2004). In this new paradigm, cosmopolitanism can be nationally articulated, e.g., Korea’s national globalization project (Park & Abelmann, 2004). In addition, cosmopolitanism can be
considered something that is added onto the local nationalism, similar to multilingualism, which is called “elite cosmopolitanism” (Guilherme, 2007). The Korean mothers’ discourse produces the localized view of globalization, so called “glocalization,” (Robert, 1995). Moreover, “glocalization” drives their transnational investment via early study abroad, whose value and images are rooted in Korea.

3.5 Korean Immigrants in the U.S. and Their Transnationalism

In contrast to the sojourners, the Korean immigrants brought the debate over Korean education to the fore. In their debate, the language ideology of Korean as an ethnonational identity was often challenged and accentuated, juxtaposing divergent ideological perspectives on language and identity (Kroskrity, 2004). Multiplicity of language ideologies becomes salient through their contestation over what should be the first or prior language for their children.

According to the 2000 US census, 894,063 out of 1,190,353 people of Korean descent (75%) speak Korean at home, making it the 8th most widely spoken foreign language in the U.S. More specifically, in Shin (2005)’s survey of Korean American adults in four Korean-concentrated cities, approximately 32 percent of the 190 respondents use only Korean, while 61 percent use a mixture of Korean and English with their children at home. The remaining 6 percent of the respondents use only English at their homes. Parental attitudes towards children speaking English at home were divergent. Most parents were neutral if not positive; only 14 percent of parents expressed a negative attitude toward their children’s use of English at home. Additionally, 9 percent of parents reported that they felt good about their children speaking English in the
presence of Korean-speaking friends and relatives. Shin (2005) suggests that parents seem to be very interested in children’s maintenance of Korean, yet they understand the need for speaking English and accept their children’s preference to use English.

Shin (2005) also found differences in attitudes about Koreans’ lack of Korean skills and English skills. The respondents expressed their attitudes regarding incompetence in Korean as “They should learn English” (45.8%) and “It poses problems for living in the U.S.” (16.3%). Although they also expressed negative attitudes toward a lack of Korean skills, the responses include attitudes about ethnicity and moral judgments, such as “It’s not good” (24.4%), “I feel sorry for them” (22%), “It’s shameful” (16.1%), and finally “It’s their parents’ fault” (3%). The respondents in her study view English from a practical perspective as a medium for life in the U.S. However, Korean is related to “the intrinsic value of knowing an ethnic language” (p. 135). The mothers in this study resemble the attitudes in Shin’s (2005) study.

I interviewed 7 immigrant Korean mothers who had been in the US Midwestern city for at least five years. The interview topics included children’s language learning and maintenance. I had known some of them for more than five years through tutoring their children in English and through my volunteer work in the Korean Sunday school and the Asian American association.

In their interviews, some mothers supported Korean education as the index of Korean ethnic identity and others were opposed to it, emphasizing English as a survival tool for succeeding in the U.S. Additionally, due to the increasing influence of globalization and the recent increase in the number of Korean immigrants to the U.S.,
some mothers altered their views of what it means to be and speak Korean. The language ideology of Korean as essential for ethnic identity is no longer dominant or unchallenged in this context.

3.5.1 Language as a Critical Attribute for Ethnonationalism/Transnationalism

Language ideologies are productively used in the creation and representation of various social and cultural identities. The traditional ideology of the primordial unity of language and ethnonational identity often emerges in a transnational and bilingual context. Particularly when the first language has a minority language status in the society, the importance of maintaining one’s first language can be emphasized from the perspective of maintaining and developing ones’ ethnic identity. Yet its value can be challenged by prioritizing mastering the majority language.

The mothers who believe in the critical role of language in maintaining and constructing Korean identity criticized other parents for children’s lack of Korean skills. They presumed that parents’ stressing English learning resulted in their children’s lack of Korean skills.

KA Interview 3 (22:15)
Although they look like Koreans and interact with Koreans, they will have a lot of difficulties in constructing their Korean identity if they cannot speak Korean. If they cannot speak Korean, they are not able to feel or think like a Korean. It is not just language, but it is the way we think. If the parents have a strong belief in teaching Korean, then someday it will happen [children will speak Korean].

KA Interview 4 (11:50)
I feel shame/sad because I think it is not just language itself, but rather it is a matter of who they are. If the parents’ first language is Korean, they need to teach their children Korean. I feel ashamed of the parents who seem proud of their children who speak fluent English, but cannot speak Korean. […] Later when the
children grow up and begin thinking about their identity, they will blame their parents for not teaching them Korean.

KA Interview 5(3:05)
There are some parents who speak English to their children since they themselves have a lot of trouble due to their lack of English skills. So they don’t want to pass this on to their children. Their children may speak English fluently, but it is not necessarily better for the children. One of my friends who was born in the U.S. regrets that she didn’t have the chance to learn Korean when she was young. She wants to be in the Korean network, but due to her lack of Korean skills, she cannot really be part of it.

The responses above view Korean as beyond language skills, equating the Korean language with Korean ethnic identity. Using words that are related to morality such as “shame,” “blame,” and “regret”, the mothers condemned incompetence in Korean as a moral and cultural violation. From their perspective, parents have a moral responsibility to maintain their children’s Korean ethnicity through maintaining the language.

Speaking Korean at home with the children in addition to sending them to a Korean language school is the most common way that parents teach and maintain their children’s Korean skills. When children were young, parents typically taught them basic skills regarding how to read and write in Korean. However, the children’s maintenance and further development of Korean skills seems to rely on their oral use of Korean with their parents at home once they acquired the basic skills. Some mothers reported that their children maintain Korean by reading Korean comic books and through internet chatting with children in Korea. The most efficient way, the parents suggested, is to send children to Korea for a couple of months per year and to have them stay with their relatives. Many parents who obtained permanent residency in the U.S. use this
transnational strategy for their children’s development of Korean language and understanding of Korean culture.

3.5.2 English is for Survival and Korean is a (Luxurious) Necessity

In contrast to the responses emphasizing Korean for maintaining ethnic identity, others privileged English as the majority language. The mothers who expressed this perspective did not teach their children Korean, reasoning that bilingual education is too difficult and would interfere with children’s academic and linguistic development. One mother differentiated the importance of learning English and Korean in US society. She stated that English is a fundamental survival tool for living and success, whereas Korean is “necessary.” In her statement, she did not deny the need for learning Korean, indicating that Korean is “necessary”. However, emphasizing English’s intrinsic importance as a survival tool, learning Korean seems secondary to mastering English.

KA 2 (24:20)
In the U.S., English is sayngjon “for survival” itself and Korean is philswu “necessity.” I really understand why people need to use English with their children. It is so hard. If we need to choose only one, of course we need to go for English. We should accept it as reality. We all know that bilingualism is good and I wish my kids became bilinguals. But that is just ideal.

The mother in the interview above did not necessarily reject the value of bilingualism and the Korean language completely, but she placed the importance of English before Korean for their children. Mothers with this perspective tend to defend themselves against the criticism that they do not teach their children Korean by focusing on the difficulties that children may have in learning two languages.
KA 6 (7:05)
You know, the famous Korean-American professor, the chair of the law school in the one of best universities in the U.S., cannot speak Korean either. In her memoir, his mother said that she stopped pushing Korean and began promoting English at home when she found out that he had language problems and some confusion caused by two languages. If he couldn’t do it, you know he is very smart, then it would be harder for other ordinary children to be bilinguals. It is just hard. Some children can do it, but some cannot. We should accept and understand it.

KA 2 (27:00)
If my children really want to learn Korean, then I will help them. But I wouldn’t push them if they don’t want to. We can feel sorry for them, but we cannot feel resentful or ashamed of them. Think about us. Some Koreans have learned English for 10 years, but then cannot speak it very well. Then people rationalize it as they were born in Korea. It is the same with the children who were born here.

These Korean mothers believe that their children suffer because of the confusion and difficulty caused by learning two languages. They challenged the language ideology of Korean as an essence of Korean ethnic identity by stressing the importance of English and by refraining from teaching Korean. The following response also shows how the notion of “Korean American” deconstructs the primordial relation of language and ethnicity.

KA 7 (3:30)
We speak only English at home. We look like Koreans, but my husband and I immigrated when we were very young and my children were born here. I don’t want to make my children stressed out because of Korean. […] After all we are Korean-American, not Korean. Although we don’t speak Korean, I teach my children about Korean culture and my family often travels to Korea together.

Thus the language ideology of Korean as an ethnic identity is not dominant or uncontested among this group of Koreans (Kroskrity, 2004).
3.5.3 Children’s English Skills and Bilingualism

As for bilingualism, the immigrant Korean mothers who taught English only were pessimistic about their children becoming bilinguals, although they seemed to view bilingualism itself positively. That is, they see that bilingualism would be beneficial for their children, but bilingualism is practically difficult. Therefore they want their children to focus on rather English learning, which plays a significant role in their children’s success in the society. Interestingly, one mother, who immigrated 7 years ago with two children aged 11 and 5 and used only Korean at home, also has pessimistic perspective toward bilingualism. She reasoned that maintaining Korean was a way to make up her children’s “inadequate” English skills compared to their monolingual counterparts.

KA Interview 5 (19:00)
You know, they [my children] cannot be a perfect bilingual. Their English cannot be as good as other children whose parents are native speakers. Their vocabulary is not as sophisticated as their native friends. Their English will never be good as their native friends because they are Korean. We speak Korean all the time at home. They should be able to speak Korean, which will make up for their lack of English skills.

She conceded that the children’s English skills are not going to be perfect, so children need to have additional language skills to be competitive in the society. Regardless of whether they promoted Korean at home or not, the Korean mothers in this study see that their children’s English abilities would be insufficient. Such a perception is in contrast with that of the short-term visitors. As we discussed earlier, the mothers in that group believed that their children would have native-like English skills after a one-year study abroad.
The differences between two groups in their perception toward their children’s English skills may be explained from their context-specific language learning goals. The short-term visitors tend to evaluate their children’s English skills based on the criteria in their returning community in Korea, whereas the immigrant mothers assess their children’s English skills compared to the norms in their local (U.S.) context.

3.5.4 Globalization and the Korean Language in the U.S.

Via globalization, the increasing numbers of Koreans in the U.S., including study abroad students and their families provide immigrant Koreans more opportunities to interact with other Koreans. In addition, globalization provides a new market in which the Korean language has increased economic value. Therefore a new relationship emerges between Korean immigrants and the Korean language in the U.S. The Korean language becomes not only primarily “a marker of ethnolinguistic identity” but “a marketable commodity on its own” (Heller, 2003) similar to Spanish in the U.S. (Pomerantiz, 2002) and French in Canada (Heller, 2003).

KA Interview 5 (7:10)
You know in the past, children do not need to speak Korean because they don’t need to interact with other Koreans. They don’t have many chances. You know, at that time there were not a lot of Koreans in the U.S. unless you lived in a metropolitan city. My friend’s father-in-law did not teach Korean to her husband for the same reason. But now it is changed. You know, there are Koreans everywhere. It’s part of the globalization thing. And look at how much economic growth Korea had in the past decades. Korea is 11th in the world economy and the 4th country for U.S trade. Korea has many international companies, as you know. Some Korean companies became very international via globalization, and they require their employees to have a good command of English in addition to Korean skills. Being bilingual, my children will be perfect candidates for such positions, you know compared to Koreans and Americans. I think the children who come for early study abroad have such a goal, but for them it is still hard to be bilingual.
I’m sure Korean skills will provide children with better opportunities for their life. Recently I’ve seen a lot of examples. We will see that Korean will be a must for my children’s generation and bring better opportunities for them. Then my children will appreciate their heritage and be proud of their Korean identity and Korean skills.

This mother highlighted valuable linguistic resources in the global economic market. She predicts that Korean skills will make their children “the privileged owners of bilingual resources,” granting them additional power over other monolingual Koreans (including English learners) or Americans (Heller, 2003).

Another aspect of globalization concerns the transnational education phenomenon in which students are sent from the U.S. to Korea. One mother mentioned that recently it became popular to send children to Korea for SAT preparation during summer. This is a good example of how globalization has come full circle. Through globalization, many English medium schools and institutions, including SAT preparation institutions, have been established to offer Koreans, in Korea, the opportunity to enroll in American institutions. While they still serve this purpose, they have become a means for Korean parents living in the U.S. (or other countries) to send their children for SAT preparation. This is a new development in the transnational relationship between the communities in the U.S. and Korea. Compared to the common transnational educational investment that sends young Korean children in the U.S. to Korea for the purpose of maintaining Korean language and culture, this transnational exchange takes advantages of the merits of the educational systems that most Korean parents disavow for its dependence on rote learning and high competitiveness, which in part drives Koreans’ Choki Yuhak “early study abroad”.
3.6 Conclusion

This chapter explored language ideologies enacted and articulated in the discourse of two groups of Koreans, Korean immigrants as opposed to Korean sojourners (so called early English/study abroad students and their families). The interviews with Korean mothers in both groups focused on their language attitudes toward Korean-English bilingualism in general.

Exploring the multiplicity of language ideologies (Kroskrity, 2004; Woolard, 1998), this chapter showed that language ideologies link language to ethnicity and to social and economic capital. The interviews with the Korean sojourners revealed that their attitudes toward their children’s language learning were closely related to the language ideologies of global English in Korea. That is, they circulated the “glocalized” (Robert, 1995) English (localized global English) through transnational migration (“globally doing local forms of the global”, Pennycook, 2003, p. 9). The interview data reveal that two language ideologies in particular, (a) language as economic commodity and (b) language for cosmopolitan membership, become apparent and intensified in the discourse of language education, while these two ideologies also serve to naturalize the language ideology of Korean as a solitary national identity (Park, 2004). In contrast, for the Korean immigrant group, this naturalized ideology of Korean is no longer unchallenged or the dominant ideology. Rather, it is highly contested by the language ideology of English as necessitation. However, the Korean language recently has come to have “a marketable commodity on its own” (Heller, 2003) among Koreans in the U.S. via globalization. The analyses of language ideologies in this chapter provide varied and
complex perspectives on the interconnections between language and identity, interconnections that are *contextually specific*.

This chapter provides a pluralistic approach to the Korean-origin community in the U.S. by highlighting the variation between the two groups. It also provides a broader context for the language socialization practices of the focal families and their children that will be discussed in later chapters. The next chapter explores how the three focal families emphasize different language ideologies in their language socialization practices in their home based on how they position themselves, in time and space, between communities in the U.S. and Korean

---


2 The statistic is provided by Korea Educational Development Institute, KEDI (http://std.kedi.re.kr/index.jsp)

3 The residents of *Kangnam*, south of the Han River, have a particularly high correlation with the parents’ desire toward early study abroad or early language learning abroad.


5 All the meetings and interviews were conducted in Korean and then translated into English.

6 The traditional notion of “cosmopolitanism” refers to a stage of being national borderless and being disinterested from private matters.

7 A surgical procedure that cuts the tip of tongue for improving pronunciation of English words that Korean speakers have difficulties articulating.
According to Guilherme (2007), while “deficit cosmopolitanism” that is restricted to the lower socioeconomic levels of a society takes places in the process of transitory bilingualism to reach monolingualism, “elite cosmopolitanism” lies in the upper socioeconomic levels in which multilingualism is the goal.
CHAPTER 4

THREE KOREAN FAMILIES’ LANGUAGE SOCIALIZATION PRACTICES AND THEIR IMAGINED COMMUNITIES

4.1 Introduction: Imagined Communities, Bilingualism, and Transnational Migration

Research in the field of bilingualism is fruitful for studying minority language maintenance and language shift among immigrant populations in the U.S. However, little research has focused on the group of sojourners who eventually return to their original countries (Kanno, 2003). There has been a growing population of Korean families who migrated to the U.S. for their children’s education, particularly for early study abroad and English study abroad opportunities (see Figure 3.1 for the statistics). As the previous chapter demonstrated, the language ideologies that these families enact in their homes are different from those of immigrant Korean families with 1.5 generation or second generation Korean children. The plan to return to Korea highly influences these families’ current language socialization practices. In this chapter, I argue that the language practices and language ideologies of their future community in Korea permeate the sojourn families’ current language socialization practices. That is, their current language socialization aligns with and matches to a great degree the expectations and practices of
their future community. Therefore, their language socialization practices should be considered not only from the perspective of bilingualism in the current local context, but also from the perspective of their relationship to language educational policies and practices in their prospective community.

Using an ethnographic approach, this chapter explores language socialization practices of three Korean families who anticipated returning to Korea. With the future trajectory of returning to Korea, the families’ language socialization practices were particularly organized according to a sense of “preparation” for their return, which generally distinguished them from other immigrant Koreans in terms of language ideologies (as discussed in Chapter 3), and language practices, and membership in local communities. While these three families shared an affiliation with the community in Korea and similar transnational experiences in the U.S., their language socialization practices were diverse across families. The data show that such variation in language socialization practices among these three families was partially a result of their positioning between local and future communities. More specifically, the variation among these families was based on such elements as their length of stay in the U.S., the point of their departure for Korea, and their language proficiencies, and their social relations within both communities. Such differences in familial background and experiences among these three families resulted in their participation in and alignment to the communities both in the U.S. and Korea. Each family’s concomitant positioning in the continuum of the current and the future communities (in a temporal sense) and of the
local community and the community in Korea (in a spatial sense) construes unique practices and strategies for their children’s language education.

In this chapter, I particularly explore these three families’ language socialization practices in a bilingual setting and their relationship to future communities in Korea, using the notion of “imagined communities.” The concept of imagined communities was first coined by Anderson (1991) to emphasize the collective work of imagination in the form of ideologies of nationhood. Norton (2001) and Kanno and Norton (2003) reconceptualize and expand the concept and apply it language learning and identity in SLA research. Norton (2003) and Kanno and Norton (2003), drawing on Wenger’s (1998) theory of learning, conceptualize as “imagined communities” communities that language learners create through their individual “imagination”. They argue that language learning occurs not only through learners’ engagement in immediately accessible communities, but also through their imaginative affiliations. Through their imagined membership, learners align their identity to the imagined communities and organize their current language learning practices accordingly, which in turn leads to real language learning. In this sense, Kanno and Norton (2003) propose that imagined communities are no less real than the communities where learners have daily engagement.

This concept of imagined communities will enrich the understanding of the three Korean families’ language practices, linking their future trajectories of returning to Korea, their alignment to their future communities, and their unique ways of investment (Norton (Pierce), 1995; 2000) in language learning.
This chapter delineates each family’s linguistic background, language ideologies, and language socialization practices through an ethnographic description, which expands the discussion of language ideologies in Chapter 3. The ethnographic description of each family adds a micro, context-specific analysis of linguistic practices to a macro account of language ideologies. The goals of this chapter are (1) to explore how these three Korean families create diverse imagined communities and how they align themselves with such communities; and (2) to examine how language ideologies enacted through their imagined communities underlie their language socialization practices and strategies. By doing so, I attempt to expand as well as specify the concept of imagined communities in transnational space. Finally, the ethnographic analyses in this chapter provide a familial context to the children’s language learning and use, which will be discussed in Chapter 5 and 6.

4.2 The Transnational Social Context of Language Socialization and Imagined Communities

As discussed in Chapter 3, the relationship between language and language ideologies is context-specific; depending on their alignment to the communities in the U.S. and in Korea, Korean parents enact and emphasize different language ideologies in their children’s language education. The following interview with an immigrant Korean mother illuminates how the family’s future trajectory particularly influenced her and her husband’s attitudes toward her son’s language learning:

KA JM
Up until our decision to stay in the U.S. permanently, my husband and I thought of what would be the most valuable and helpful for our son in Korea. We did
things that best fitted to the Korean education system. However, since we decided to stay in the U.S., we changed our approach. Now we need to orient everything to the system here. You know, I used to pay a lot of attention to teaching him Korean and Korean culture. We are still teaching him these, but not in the same way that we used to do. We prioritize things that are important in his schooling. In the past, I viewed his English skills are okay. After deciding to stay, however, we suddenly realized that his English is insufficient, compared to that of his native speaking peers in school. Now my husband wants to teach our son English more because he belongs to the community here. Although I wish that he could learn more Korean, it is hard to motivate him to learn Korean any more. […] For him, English is a second [foreign] language when we returned to Korea. But English is the first language for him if we stay [in the U.S].

The interview demonstrates the immigrant Korean family’s simultaneous membership in multiple communities, the local and transnational. Also, it indicates that their relation to the communities is not fixed but dynamic; it shifts according to their moment to moment positioning in and between communities. The mother’s interview response particularly illuminates how the family’s future prospect of returning to Korea caused a shift in her attitudes to and engagement in her son’s language trajectory. That is, the family’s future membership profoundly affected her and her husband’s investment in language that they considered important for their son and, thus, changed their attitudes toward the particular language. The parents’ shift in their attitudes, in turn, caused a change in the course of their current participation and membership alignment, and imagination of the social values of languages (Wenger, 1998). That is, the family’s imagined “belonging” to the future community brings a new emphasis to language practices and identity.

According to Wenger (1998), there are three modes of belonging- engagement, imagination, and alignment (pp. 174-5):

- engagement – active involvement in mutual processes of negotiation of meaning
• imagination – creating images of the world and seeing connections through time and space by extrapolating from our own experience
• alignment – coordinating our energy and activities in order to fit within broader structures and contribute to broader enterprises

In Wenger’s (1998) view, engagement occurs through our direct experiences of the world whereas imagination and alignment occur boundlessly through our images of the world and our power of direct energy, respectively. However, Wenger notes that imagination in his concept is not just the production of personal fantasies, but it is “a mode of belonging that always involves the social world to expand the scope of reality and identity” (p. 178).

Wenger views that imagination creates a community. While individuals view themselves as a member of a collective community through imagination, their created images of the community may not identical because individuals’ imagination anchors in their social interactions. Additionally, imagining a community does not entail alignment to the community; the mode of alignment involves coordinating of energies, actions, and practices. Wenger (1998) argues that these three modes of belonging are not mutually exclusive and one mode may affect another and communities have all these three modes of belonging with different degree.

Drawing on Wenger’s (1998) notion of imagination as a mode of belonging, Norton (2001) conceptualizes language learners’ future communities as “imagined communities” that influence their current participation in their language learning, both through their resistance to and active investment in their learning. The notion of imagined communities was first coined by Anderson (1991) to explain the collective aspect of imagination in the form of ideologies of nationhood. Anderson proposes the collective
image of the nation-state as an imagined community. In his view, although the members or people of a nation never know or interact directly with most of their fellow citizens, they have an image of each other and share a way to appreciate meanings and create national identities through their imagination. Norton (2001) expands Anderson’s concept and applies it to L2 learning in order to explain the relationship between learners’ imagined communities and their investment in communities of practices of language learning.

Norton (2001) explores a former language teacher’s nonparticipation in ESL classes from the perspective of her continuous alignment with the imagined community of professionals. Norton points out that the discrepancy between the learner’s alignment with her imagined community as professionals and her ESL teacher’s perception of her as a “poor” ESL learner caused the ESL learner’s resistance to current participation. By doing so, Norton highlights the important role of language learners’ imagined communities in their language learning and identity.

Recently, Kanno and Norton (2003) conceptualize the notion further in a special issue of the *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 2 (4), proposing a broad range of imagined communities and their impact on language learners. In their concept, imagined communities

[..] include future relationships that exist only in the learner’s imagination as well as affiliation – such as nationhood or even transnational communities – that extend beyond local sets of relationships. We suggest that these imagined communities are no less real than the ones in which learners have daily engagement and might even have a stronger impact on their current actions and investment (p. 242).
Kanno and Norton (2003) strive to examine how learners’ alignment with imagined communities affects their learning trajectories. They argue that such imagined communities are no less real than any other communities in which learners engage daily. They cite Vygotsky’s (1978) insight about the rule-based nature of such communities and their impact on learners’ lives. Also, Kanno and Norton state that imagined communities are learners’ “alternative vision of reality” in that the images of the communities do not exactly correspond with reality.

As much as Kanno and Norton (2003) emphasize the influence of the communities on learners’ lives, however, their concept examines little (at least explicitly) on how learners’ current situations or past life histories influence their imagination of such communities. While such relationships between imagined communities and learners’ current and past experiences are assumed, such relationships should be specified in order to make the concept more salient theoretically and pedagogically.

In her discussion of immigrant parents’ imagined communities of multilingualism and transnationalism in Canada, Dagenais (2003) argues that parents’ imagination rather draws on reality, in which their “social networks, materials conditions, and educational backgrounds allows them to envisage such possibilities” (p. 274). Likewise, the families in this study created their imagined communities based on their personal past and present experiences in Korea and the U.S., their social relationships, and their knowledge about language learning and educational backgrounds. For them, their imagination is “an appraised vision” that reconstructs images of reality based on their own past and present experiences, which conforms to Wenger’s (1998) notion of imagination that roots in
social interactions. Therefore, the created images of the communities are complex mixtures of their real life history, their current practices, and their membership in a future community.

In short, it is important to articulate not only how individuals organize their current practices in terms of their future prospects, but also how they draw on past and present experiences as they pursue future opportunities. In my view, learners’ current situations and practices partly influence their creation of imagined communities and, conversely, their imagined communities affect their current practices. Such a recursive view provides a more dynamic understanding of imagined communities, emphasizing individuals’ agentive role in building the communities, and also recognizes the importance of diversity in the process of building the communities. In addition, this recursive view illuminates how a collective and societal terrain of imagined communities (Anderson, 1991) affects familial and personal attributes and identities. Locating current practices in a continuum of past, current, and imagined future communities, this view also tends to blur the borders between current and future communities. Pedagogically, by acknowledging such a process of building imagined communities, teachers can help their students guide their creation of imagined communities that have a positive impact on their learning.

My ethnographic analyses of the three families’ language socialization practices are discussed in the framework of the imagined communities. Language ideologies, investment, and identity are central to the notion of imagined communities in this chapter. I examine the families’ language socialization practices in both Korean and
English, focusing on a collective aspect of community membership as well as language ideologies, but also addressing the micro-politics and transnational experiences and strategies within the realm of the family. The families’ language socialization practices in this chapter brings new insight into the process of negotiating identity and power in a bilingual setting and shows how children’s education becomes the core project in the process (Orellana, et al., 2001; Waters, 2005; Yeoh, et al., 2005).

4.3 Language Socialization Practices and Imagined Communities: Three Empirical Cases

All three families had a five-year-old boy who began attending U.S. public school (kindergarten) at the beginning of the study. Through their schooling, the children had their first formal learning experience of English. As a result, their home interactions increasingly included English in the course of time, which made their home language socialization practices more dynamic. Parental reactions to children’s language use at home varied, depending on their emphasis on different language ideologies in their home. Such language ideologies are related to the parents’ imagined communities created, which were based on their past and current experiences, educational background, and social relationships.

Focusing on the language socialization practices of these five-year-old children, the three families shared characteristics and practices of Korean-English bilingualism. However, the families differed in their length of stay in the U.S. (and their point of departure from Korea), the parents’ English proficiency, the children’s Korean proficiency, and most importantly the parents’ transnational experiences and strategic
intentions for the children’s language learning. These differences among the families, I argue, are related to their views of the local and imagined communities and how they position themselves between these two.

4.4 Yongho’s Family: Earning the Prestigious Value of English through Transnational Migration

Yongho’s family arrived in a Midwestern city in December 2004, a week before I met the family for this study. The official reason of their visit was that the father was attending a US university for six months as part of his M.A. degree in business through a student exchange program. The father’s participation in the program was supported by his current job in Korea; he needed to return to this job as soon as he finished the six month’s period. Although the father returned to Korea after six months, the rest of the family extended their stay for a full year, which is considered the maximum length of stay without a penalty. This extension was planned before the family arrived in the U.S. in order to provide more opportunities for the children to learn English. Thus, the more important goal of the family’s visit was the children’s education, particularly English learning. Such an extension of stay in the U.S. created a transnational family structure, which Koreans call Kiruki Kajok (geese families). In this family structure, fathers typically stay in Korea while mothers and children study abroad; this was very common among the families who came for the same reason.

Yongho has two elder sisters, one third-grader and one fifth-grader respectively. His two sisters had literacy skills in Korean for their grade levels. Also, they had English skills through private English tutorials and by attending private institutions in Korea. The
sisters began learning English as early as six years old. However Yongho did not have any English skills and barely spoke English words prior to his arrival in the U.S. He had Korean literacy skills that would be common for Korean children at his age. According to Yongho’s mother, it is typical for Korean children to be able to read and write before they begin their schooling in Korea. Some children begin learning to read and write Korean as early as 3 or 4 years old.

Yongho’s mother majored in Korean language and literature in college and used to teach Korean part-time to a group of children. As part of her preparation for the family’s study aboard, the mother had an English native speaker tutor for about three months, who taught her basic communication skills. Other than this tutoring experience, she did not have a lot of experience in speaking English. The mother remembered that the father often teased her about her English proficiency as “$1000 worth of English” indicating the amount of money that she spent in learning basic English skills. He often said, jokingly, “Why don’t you speak your $1000 worth of English” when they came across occasions when either of them needed to interact with native speakers of English.

The father worked at a major Korean bank and attended a graduate school that was related to and supported by his current job. While his English skills, particularly his reading skills, was generally assumed to be pretty high (from his educational background in Korea and his study in a US program), both Yongho’s mother and father often expressed frustration in his poor communication skills in English. After completing his six month study, he returned to his job in Korea in summer of 2005; he visited the family
once in November for two weeks. The mother and the children stayed in the U.S. until the end of 2005.

4.4.1 Yongho’s Schooling and Friends

When I first met Yongho’s parents at their home, I explained my study to them. They enthusiastically agreed to participate in the study. Later, the mother mentioned that she agreed to do so happily, not because of my role as English tutor for the children, but because of my role as messenger at his school. The parents were particularly concerned about their youngest child’s experiences at school since Yongho could barely speak English and did not have any formal schooling experience in Korea or in the U.S. The mother mentioned that Yongho cried at the school bus stop for the first three days of school and avoided going to school. I found that Yongho’s ESL placement test was incomplete. According to an ESL teacher, Yongho did not finish the test because he did not understand a single word on the test. When I first met with Yongho around other students at school, I asked a couple of things in English such as what city he came from and whether he liked the lunch at school. He responded, loudly in English, “I don’t understand.” As his ESL teacher described, this was his typical response to any questions in English for the first week of school.

Yongho’s mother said she and her husband told Yongho to say “I don’t understand” when he did not understand something in English, hoping that he could clear things up with further interaction. However, she realized that such a strong negative response became a barrier to his interactions with friends and teachers. His ESL teacher said that other children seemed surprised at such a negative response and that they tended
to not ask him any further questions. The mother mentioned that Yongho was very stressed about his inability to communicate in English, which manifested itself in his abrupt shouting at home from time to time.

During the first couple of months of my observation, Yongho seemed quiet in class. His homeroom teacher described him as quiet, but “doing okay” in her comment:

He is doing well. He is not so active, but I know that he understands things well, I mean at least in his mind. Although he is not expressing so much…He just finishes things up quickly and becomes silent. I had a lot of Korean students like him and I know that they tended to pick up things quickly and ended up excelling other students.

In his ESL class, he typically sat alone in the back of the classroom and did not talk to other children. He looked very serious and often showed frustration in his facial expressions.

Yongho’s parents noticed that Yongho had a hard time adjusting in his school life. For the first several months, he came home and told his mother he wanted to return to Korea. However, the month of April was a turning point because Yongho told his mother he wanted to stay in the U.S. longer. He said, “Mom, I want to go to Korea and bring all my toys back to here and stay longer.” He said this at the same time he joined a “NJ brother group” that boys in his apartment complex formed around a boy called “NJ”. He began to have friends who he could hang out with at school and home, which seemed to make his life more meaningful and interesting. To the parents, while it was hard to observe him to go through such painful adjustment, they believed in what is commonly said among Korean parents about children’s adjustment, “becoming a native speaker of
English after one year.” This myth was repeated by many Korean parents who had similar experiences as Yongho’s family. Overall, the parents thought that it was true and they were pleased by what they gained in terms of children’s English skills by their investment.

4.4.2 Language Ideologies and the Imagined Community

Yongho’s mother believes that an overseas educational experience would give her children the following benefits: first, and most importantly, fluency in English, and second, less obviously, cosmopolitan vision and middle class maintenance and mobility. Both of these benefits are considered economic capital in Korea (Bourdieu, 1991). Yongho’s mother emphasized the need of English as a global language for the children’s success. In her interview she said:

You know, the U.S. is still the center of the world. Thus we need to learn English. It not a matter of we like or not. Even thought you don’t like it, you cannot change the trend. If I don’t do it, only my children would have disadvantage.

The mother’s response clearly indicates her view on the hegemonic power of English on individuals’ lives. In her perspective, English is considered a global language, as a gatekeeper to positions of prestige in a society, and plays an important role in maintaining social, political, and economic inequalities (Pennycook, 1990; 1991; 1994). Her perspective reflects the societal context of Korea where English represents the hegemony of Western English-speaking countries and homogenizes linguistic imperialism (Philipson, 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2001). Therefore, Yongho’s family’s study abroad experience and arrangement of transnational family structure are strategies
the family adopted in response to this educational imperative, which highlights English as a global language and overseas education as a necessary credential.

Also, Yongho’s mother mentioned that her children’s study abroad experience was important in helping them understand and expand their selves in the world. She said international educational experiences, such as studying abroad, were nothing new to the families in the region where they live in Korea. The family came from south of the capital Seoul (Kangnam, meaning south of Han River), which is famous for its wealth and ever-high educational enthusiasm among parents. According to the mother, such overseas experiences are considered necessary to compete with others, and not to be left out on the community of which studying abroad was a common experience. According to statistics, the people in Seoul, and particularly from Kangnam areas, showed the highest scores in their desire to study abroad (Son, 2005) and in the actual number of families who returned from studying abroad (Korean Educational Development Institute, 2004). Thus, the family’s study abroad experience can be seen partly as a middle class families’ desire to maintain and acquire social and economic mobility in Korea. The imagined community for the family is the educational context in Korea, specifically the future community in which the family will enter with the cosmopolitan middle class credentials that they will gain after their overseas educational experience and English communication skills.

Language ideologies enacted and adopted by Yongho’s family contrast with the Japanese families in Kanno (2003) who were more concerned with maintaining L1 (and developing it further) and remaining attached to their heritage culture. In case of
Yongho’s family, the strong emphasis on English is different from that of the other two families in this study. The family’s relatively short stay in the U.S. and the children’s relatively high Korean language proficiency in part attribute the difference in addition to the parents’ goal of the accumulation of social and economic capital through their transnational experiences. The mother often said that she was not worried about her children catching up with Korean and other subjects when they return to Korea. She believed that as soon as they return to Korea, the children will make up what they missed during their stay in the U.S. Additionally, she mentioned that what they gain here would be much greater than what the children might lose in the schooling in Korea, referring to the prestigious value of English. For her, what the children learn in the U.S. is added on to their Korean skills without any risk of losing their Korean skills.

As I mentioned earlier, the family had a transnational household arrangement, called *Kirogi Kajok* (geese families) for a short period time to make sure that the children had enough exposure to acquire the necessary English skills. The transnational family arrangement is a typical strategy for the “project of education” among Asian countries, in which parents sacrifice for their children’s education (Huang & Yeoh, 2005; Water, 2005). Yongho’s family is the obvious case of the recent burgeoning migration pattern in which the children’s education is the purpose for the family’s transnational experiences (Orellana, *et al*., 2001; Waters, 2005; Yeoh, *et al*., 2005). Waters (2005), for example, argues such transnational education is a child-centered familial strategy of capital accumulation, involving migration and transnational family arrangements, which results in the family’s social mobility to their destination community. Yongho’s parents envision
the ultimate gain of their transnational experiences as being ushered into their imagined community: the symbolic cosmopolitan, middle-class educational market in Korea.

4.4.3 Language Socialization and Literacy Practices

Language ideologies are revealed in two aspects of language socialization: attitudes and practices (Schecter & Bayley, 2002). While the family desired English immersion experiences, they had a hard time doing so because of the parents’ limited social network in the local community. The lack of opportunities of direct contact with English speakers in reality in part made the parents’ emphasize English rather than Korean at home. In an attempt to help their children’s initial adjustment, the parents tended to use English with their children during the early period of their stay. Over the course of time, English was used more in their home because the children talked to each other in both English and Korean. The parents’ attitudes toward their children’s use of English at home were positive. In fact, they considered it as the indication of English improvement. The mother mentioned that one day when she was talking on the phone to Yongho’s father in Korea, the father overheard Yongho speaking in English to his sisters and was so happy about it.

Initially the parents had negative attitudes to Yongho’s playing with other Korean children rather than other English speaking children. However, later she realized and said that other Korean children provided Yongho access to other children in the complex. When Yongho was invited to Joonho’s birthday party (another Korean boy in this study), Yongho became part of a group of children in the same apartment complex who came from diverse countries. The mother found that even Korean children speak English to
each other, which increased her concern regarding Yongho’s lack of chances to speak English. The mother showed her preference to her children’s speaking English when she told them, “As long as you guys speak English, you can play with your friends at home because playing in English itself is an extension of study.” She encouraged her children to play with other children, thinking that interacting with other English speaking children is part of learning English.

The mother hired a tutor for Yongho’s sister right after their arrival. Specifically, she asked the tutor to teach the children “correct pronunciation.” In the discussion about the origin of the tutor, she expressed a little doubt on the tutor’s a bit divergent pronunciation from “native”, (in the mother term) pronunciation. Three months later, the mother also hired a tutor for Yongho hoping that he could learn some basic English communication skills that would be useful at school. Yongho’s parents often expressed their envy of Joonho because of his ability to interact with other children and his seeming “native-like” pronunciation to them.

Several times during my observation, the children told the mother not to speak “Konglish,” a Korean way of speaking English which typically places English words in Korean structures, which leads to ungrammatical English sentences. By referring to their mother’s English as Konglish, the children imply that her way of speaking English is not authentic and, subsequently, disparaged her English ability. The children particularly told the mother not to speak Konglish especially when she needed to go and visit their school or when the children were with non-Korean friends. The mother, however, did not seem to take seriously the negative attitude about her English language abilities. She said that it
was funny for even Yongho to say it and he most likely got the notion from his elder sisters. In my view, the mother’s strong emphasis on English communication skills on “correct” pronunciation, and her own self-deprecation of her English may have led to the children’s view about her Kenglish.

Additionally, the parents’ attitude toward English was demonstrated in their reactions to Yongho’s impolite and improper use of English. One day Yongho referred to his mother as a “very bad girl” several times with his tutor present. His English tutor was shocked at what he said in English and told him not to refer to his mother that way. The mother’s response was to just be silent and look at him with smile as Yongho continued to repeat the phrase. In another incident, Yongho said to me: “You Ms Song you stop it and shut up and go away.” His mother’s response to the incident was to say, to me on the following day, “first of all, there is no age difference in English. We are in America, thus age is not such important issue and whoever can apologize first.” She also added that he said that he would apologize too if you do it first, but he said he wouldn’t apologize in Korean as Calmos haesseyo “I apologize for what I did wrong” But he would say in English just “I’m sorry.” This incident implies the following two perspectives: first, the mother’s understanding of English communication skills, and second, Yongho’s understanding of English versus Korean (the later will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

The mother applied very different attitudes and norms to English and Korean. One the one hand, she was very easy with her children’s impolite use of English, as illustrated in the two incidents mentioned above. Seen from those incidents and my longitudinal observation on the family’s interaction, communicative skills,
communicative competence, in her view, appeared to exclude pragmatic ability, but rather focused on speaking and listening abilities with correction pronunciation. On the other hand, the mother was very strict about Korean norms and politeness, such as greetings, address forms, and speech levels. During my observation, she often corrected and recast her children’s, particularly Yongho’s Korean utterances. This may be the case that the hegemonic power of English and its social value were stressed over other aspects of English use, such as pragmatic and sociolinguistic appropriateness. Her lack of sufficient knowledge and experience on such aspects of English use and her lack of authority in speaking English in her family (by her Konenglish) might also have contributed to her attitude.

Given that all interactions are a potentially socializing context (Ochs, 1988, p. 6; Schieffelin, 1990, p. 19), the different attitudes that the parents associated with English and Korean when interacting with their children influenced the children’s understanding and construction of the indexical meanings of each language. Yongho’s understanding of the indexical meaning of each language was revealed in his code-switching between English and Korean when interacting with his parents. For example, Yongho associated English with speech acts of complaining and disagreeing while he associated Korean with the act of requesting. Yongho’s association of different speech acts with different languages draw on his understanding of the indexical meanings that were established in his language socialization practices in his home. Chapter five demonstrates more fully how children in the study animate and arrange different voices, as social indexical values of linguistic forms (Woolard, 2003) through code-switching. It also addresses how
children’s voices were constituted in their language socialization practices, an intersecting site for social context and linguistic ideology.

Besides the parents’ emphasis on English communication skills in Yongho’s home, there were not many literacy practices in English at home; the one exception was the children’s English tutorials with a native speaker on a regular basis. The father and mother rarely read books to Yongho. Initially, I planned to read English books with Yongho when I visited him at home, but he often resisted reading them together. By the summer, when he was able to sound out words in English, he began reading some books that he borrowed from school as part of his home work. During the last two months before their return to Korea, the mother had the children study Korean through Korean reading comprehension worksheets.

4.5 Joonho’s Family: Bilingualism through Immersion in Two Communities

Joonho’s mother had been in the U.S. for three years doing her graduate study in a U.S. university while Joonho and his father lived in a suburb in Korea with his grandmother. During school breaks, the mother visited Korea and stayed with Joonho and his father. The mother planned to bring Joonho to the U.S. when Joonho was old enough to attend school. Joonho, at the age of five, arrived in the summer of 2004 with his grandmother; the grandmother returned to Korea after staying in the U.S. for two months. When he was in Korea, Joonho attended a daycare center during day and spent the rest of the time mostly with his grandmother. He was able to read and write neither Korean nor English at all when I first met him in October 2004. Joonho’s mother was eager to bring him to the U.S. in order to provide him with academic assistance, such as home literacy
practices and school-work-related assistance in general. The mother said that Joonho’s grandmother, the major caregiver when Joonho was in Korea, could not provide such academic assistance.

Joonho began his first schooling in the U.S., both the English medium school and the Korean Sunday school. He attended the same elementary school with Yongho for one year and later transferred to a school in another school district as they moved. The Korean Sunday school had a two-and-half-hour curriculum on Sunday afternoon that included two Korean literacy and communication lessons and one recreation lesson such as Korean culture, sports, art, or music. Joonho’s mother was also a teacher in the Korean school that Joonho was attending until 2006, but they were not in the same class.

Every summer, Joonho and his mother visited Korea and stayed with his father and grandmother for two and half months. During that time, Joonho was usually sent to educational institutions to learn diverse subjects. For example, in summer of 2005, he attended a private institution for Korean “public speech” \( (\text{wungpyun}) \) and “mental arithmetic” \( (\text{soksem}, \text{math}) \). In summer of 2006, Joonho attended an elementary school for one and half months in addition to piano and art lessons. During this summer, he also attended a summer camp on Korean culture and traditional rituals for more than one week with children of friends of his parents’.

Unlike his extra-curricular experiences during his visits to Korea, in the U.S. Joonho stayed with his mother after school, and went over school homework and read books with her. For a couple of days per week, when the mother was at her school, Joonho was baby-sat by both Korean families (mostly) and American families (rarely).
depending on their availability. For the rest of days, he either stayed with his mother or participated in some recreational programs.

In her graduate study, the mother majored in language education, and thus, was very interested in and aware of Joonho’s language development. Therefore, she possessed a strong knowledge of language and a good command of English. She often challenged Joonho by saying, “Do you speak English better than I do?” (meaning that I speak Korean at home although I speak English better than you). By asking this question she was trying to convince him not to use English at home. Joonho’s father worked in a Korean suburban city where Joonho and Joonho’s grandmother lived together. He majored in engineering in college. Joonho’s father visited Joonho and his mother in the U.S. two times. In March of 2006, the father stayed with them for 3 weeks, traveling with Joonho and his mother. When Joonho’s mother had a second child in the fall of 2006, Joonho’s father also came to assist his wife. The father left for Korea with their second child after four months.

As of spring 2007, Joonho and his mother were planning to visit Korea during the summer of 2007 and stay there for six months. Their unusually long stay was arranged both for the mother’s school work and for the second child’s one year birthday party. When they return to the U.S., Joonho and Joonho’s mother expect to stay for one more year. During this time, Joonho will attend the school and go to a summer camp. She said that due to their trip to Korea every summer, Joonho never had a chance to go to a summer camp in the U.S., so she wanted him to go to a camp before returning to Korea. Also, she mentioned that another year’s schooling in English would significantly help
Joonho develop his literacy skills, which, she believed, was crucial for maintaining his English communication skills upon their return to Korea.

4.5.1 Language Ideologies and the Imagined Community

When asked about the family’s plan for coming back to the U.S. after the summer 2007, the mother responded that she and her husband made a decision based on the best interest of Joonho’s future academic prospect, particularly his English learning:

SJ 041707 Mom (05:00)
You know, Joonho’s Korean skills are lower than those of his Korean peers in Korea. And his English is not good enough for his grade level yet. At this point, neither language is good enough for his age and grade level. His English development is slowly progressing. If he goes back to Korea at this point, his English development will stop and his English skills will be stuck. In fact, his Korean is behind, you know, regardless of moving back now or not. So since he has been here and learning English for a while, I think that it would be best if we can have him learn English more for a couple of years so that his English skills would at least be on track. I believe in the idea of transfer of language skills from one language to another. Well-developed English literacy skills would be helpful for him to learn Korean later as well. So next summer we are not going to Korea and I will send him to a summer camp and utilize the time here fully.

The mother responded that Joonho’s English learning was the most important consideration for the family’s recent decision to keep a split-family-structure between two nations for a couple of more years. As much as she valued Joonho’s bilingualism and assisted him in developing bilingual skills, the mother compared Joonho’s bilingual abilities to those of monolingual speakers of Korean and English and considered his skills lower than them. By doing so, she viewed his language skills, in a similar way to the perspective of bilingual children, as “two monolinguals in one person” rather than as “an integrated whole” (Baker, 2004, pp. 7-9). Most often bilinguals have varying degrees of
command of the different languages in their repertoires to the extent that they need both languages for the contexts in which each language is used. Thus, a bilingual’s communicative competence is “a composite of many partial competences that complement one another to yield a rich and complex resource” (Sridhar, 1997, pp.50-51) for different functions.

The mother seemed to believe that Joonho’s current English skills were not highly developed enough to be able to transfer skills from one language to another. Such a view reminded me of the “Threshold Hypothesis” that proposes a threshold of language skills, called age-appropriate competence, in order for bilinguals to have cognitive and linguistic advantages (Cummins, 1979). In his revised view, Cummins (2000) suggests that a child’s second language competence is highly related to the level of competence already achieved in his first language. That is, when the first language shows a high stage of development, the achievement of bilingualism and second language learning will be correspondingly easier and greater. This idea typically suggests that children, in particular language minority students, can benefit greatly from bilingual education that allows them to operate in their more developed home language, and even help them further develop the home language. In Joonho’s case, the mother believed that his second language skills would benefit his first language skills that were thought to be lower for his age.

The idea that Joonho’s English development was interrupted by his annual visit to Korea also contributed to the parents’ decision that emphasized Joonho’s English learning. Joonhos’ mother mentioned in her interview that Joonho’s English development
was slower compared to his ESL peers because of their annual trips to Korea. While Joonho’s mother considered their summer trips necessary for Joonho’s development of identity and cultural understanding, and maintaining familial ties, she think that these trips may have had a negative impact on Joonho’s development of English skills. Therefore, she attempted to provide Joonho with a full year of English immersion experience, which might not be available after their return to Korea.

The family’s rather explicit focus on Joonho’s development of English skills is a recent development. During the earlier period of Joonho’s stay in the U.S., the mother was concerned about his adjustment to a Korean education system upon returning to Korea. The mother stressed specifically that acquiring English was not their major goal in having Joonho in the states. However, recently Joonho’s language education became one of the most important reasons in the family’ negotiation of their familial arrangement.

Two major reasons can account for such shift in the family’s attitude. The first is related to the image of the community Joonho is going to participate in when he returns to Korea. Regarding her plans and strategies for the maintenance and further development of Joonho’s English skills after their return, the mother gave a pessimistic answer to the perspective. She said that the school Joonho will attend does not have a lot of facilities that enable him to either maintain or develop his English skills. According to her, it is not very common to encounter other children in the region who have had study abroad experiences. To her, maintaining Joonho’s English communication skills will be more of a challenge than maintaining Yongho’s skills, because Yongho lives in the best region for children’s education. Furthermore, in contrast to Yongho, Joonho needs to
focus on improving his Korean as soon as they return. In this sense, the mother anticipated, in her interview, that Joonho’s English development would stop and be “stuck.” The image of the community in Korea from her perspective focused on the availability and the quality of English education. Her imagined community in Korea implied discontinuing bilingual education (bilingual resources), or at least limited opportunities for English education. Her preference for bilingualism and bilingual abilities, as well as the lack of resources and supports for Joonho’s bilingual maintenance and development that the family would face in their imagined community together, affected the family’s perspective and decision on Joonho’s current English learning. Unlike Yongho’s case, she showed that learning English is important for Joonho as part of a bilingual ability, specifically when Joonho lacked strong Korean skills.

The parents’ confidence in Joonho’s learning and development of Korean upon returning to Korea also contributed to the family’s shift in attitude toward Joonho’s language learning. When Joonho first arrived in the U.S., the mother enforced Korean-only policy at home. She was aware of children’s quick loss of their first language through their schooling in L2 and was afraid that this might happen to Joonho. She often recast Joonho’s English words and asked him to say English words again in Korean. She even led a Korean book club and drama group among Korean children including Joonho, in an attempt to maintain and improve Joonho’s Korean. Until the summer 2005, the mother emphasized Korean literacy practices at home with such activities as reading Korean books, completing reading comprehension in Korean, and doing Korean school homework. English literacy practices at that time only included reading some grade
books that Joonho barrowed from school and writing some simple English words for his school homework.

After Joonho’s first visit to Korea during the summer of 2005, the mother used English to help Joonho transition back into the English speaking environment. She also became more flexible about Joonho’s use of English at home. She began using English when she assisted him with his school homework or when they read English books together. In the interview, the mother explained this as follows:

SJ 040407 Mom 50:00
Before our first trip to Korea in 2005, I was very strict about his use of Korean at home. However, after our first trip in summer of 2005, I didn’t push him so much to use Korean at home. This is the change. Now I use both Korean and English to him. I use English especially when Joonho and I read English books together and when I help his school homework. I still use Korean for everyday stuff, but I sometimes let him use English at home. Because I saw that how quickly he shifted into Korean when we were there. It was very interesting. He never said any single word in English. His Korean improved a lot you know, only for two months. I think that he just immerged quickly into Korean and observed it. In fact, I felt that he had some difficulty using English right after the trip. So I only used English with him except the time when he studied Korean and math in Korean.

This experience spurred the shift in her language policy and also led to the construction of an imagined community as one with a discontinuity of English development and bilingual skills. Joonho’s mother created the imaged community based on her knowledge of language learning, expected recourses and opportunities for language learning, and awareness of Joonho’s language skills, which resulted in a distinctive image of the community from other families’.
4.5.2 Language Socialization and Literacy Practices

On the first day in the Lexington elementary, as his mother described, Joonho ran out of the room during the ESL placement test. He cried in the middle of the test because he did not understand a single word. In contrast, Joonho looked forward to going to Korean school. The mother remembered that he was preparing for school on the Friday before and asked her about his school work and friends several times. Joonho began to read and write in Korean in his Korean Sunday school.

Everyday during his year in kindergarten, Joonho had the following homework to complete: he wrote a one-page-long Korean worksheet from his Korean school and read a couple of English books for his ESL class. During his year in first grade, Joonho and his mother began reading chapter books and also read other books that were checked out of the school and libraries. The mother always assisted and encouraged him to read a certain amount each day. At bedtime, they read English books such as the *Harry Porter* series. Also, Joonho finished a couple of pages of Korean reading comprehension worksheets, which were from Korea, and finished a short math worksheet as well. When they read English books, the mother tried to talk about the story in English with him. She said that she was using English because it was easy to talk about English story books in English rather than translating the story into Korean. Additionally, she wanted to train him to make the correct response to the reading in English to make sure he would do okay at school. When they read Korean books, she asked all the questions in Korean and encouraged him to reply in Korean.
The mother tried hard to remind him of Korean words and characters since Joonho’s Korean was not fully developed. He showed a gradual shift in preference from Korean to English over the course of time. Once, the mother related a conflict with Joonho’s ESL teacher about his home language use. In the parent-teacher conference, Joonho’s ESL teacher suggested the mother use English at home in order to assist Joonho’s English development. The mother said she did not say anything at school, but she told me she disagreed. She said that using English only at home may cause children to lose their first language. She worried that such suggestions may harm a lot of L2 children whose parents accept the suggestions without questioning it. Interestingly, the mother’s language use shifted from her Korean-only policy to a more bilingual/mixed language policy with Joonho.

SJ 040407 Mom 55:00
These days, if he doesn’t understand things in Korean, then I explain them in English again. But sometimes I asked him “what do you say that in Korean?” But you know what? Often I myself use English without noticing it since I used English a lot. You understand this, right?

She explained that she herself became used to using English. More importantly, she also pointed out that it became harder for her to control what he said, when Joonho became older and when he had new experiences and relationships through his own social networks, which she never had when she grew up. She acknowledged the different contexts in which she and Joonho socialized during their childhood.

At the beginning of Joonho’s stay in the U.S., the mother provided a lot of explicit and implicit language socialization. Explicit socialization occurred when the mother
directly corrected what Joonho said in English in Korean. Or, she supplied specific sentences in Korean that he should use in interaction. Socialization also occurred implicitly as the mother recast Joonho’s speech, and narrated around Joonho while he was interacting with others. Joonho typically followed his mother’s language socialization practices. However, often his reactions showed his active negotiation between his mother’s language socialization and his own perspective, which was well demonstrated in his use of Korean terms of address. Chapter 6 will focus on the language socialization practices of address practices. Specifically, it will address how adults socialize children into Korean hierarchical relations through address terms and how children negotiate these relations through creative bilingual practices. The bilingual practices created by Joonho and his friends reveal an important aspect of language socialization: children’s agentive role in their language socialization. Joonho’s mother first tended to correct such creative novel forms of speech, but later she became adjusted to them and used the terms that children were using among themselves. The bidirectional aspect of language socialization between children and their caregivers become salient in the bilingual socialization context.

4.6 Sunjae’s Family: “Good Enough” English and Chinese as a Third Language

Sunjae’s family arrived in the U.S. in 2001 when Sunjae was two years old. The family accompanied the father who was pursuing his graduate study at a U.S. university. Sunjae’s father planned to finish his study in the field of science in 2005 and then work for the university for another two years or so. This timeline indicated that the family would return to Korea in approximately 2008. Sunjae had a two-year-old American-born
brother who neither spoke Korean nor English much in 2005, although he was able to speak both Korean (quite well) and English (a little) by the spring of 2007. Sunjae’s mother once taught children part-time in Korea. Her major in college was arts. She attended several free ESL classes in the city and often interacted with other wives who accompanied their husbands who studied abroad.

Sunjae’s family resembled other immigrant Korean families in the U.S. in terms of their language practices (much more so than the other two families in my study). Sunjae’s parents spoke mostly Korean at home. The parents jokingly said that they do not speak English well, so they want to speak Korean. Given that the father was studying at a U.S. university, his English proficiency was assumed to be pretty high. However, the mother did not have much experience in speaking English before their arrival in the U.S. Thus, she did not feel very comfortable with speaking English, and did not allow me to record her when she spoke English.

When I met Sunjae in 2005, he was in kindergarten, and he was not taking an ESL class. Before kindergarten, he went to an English medium preschool for one year when he was four years old. He also attended the same Korean Sunday school that Joonho attended for one year at four. The mother said that Sunjae learned how to read and write Korean during that year in preschool. After a year, Sunjae did not attend the Sunday Korean School anymore. Instead, Sunjae’s father taught him more advanced reading in Korean and math almost every day for an hour after school during the following year. The mother said that she had read a lot of Korean books to Sunjae, which, she believed, played the most important role in Sunjae’s development and maintenance of Korean. She
said she read books to Sunjae as early as when he was 100 days old in Korea. The parents tried to teach him Korean literacy before they came to the U.S. when he was about 2 years old; they said that they were unable to accomplish this. However, Sunjae’s Korean skills, in terms of literacy skills, were as good as those of Yongho who just arrived in 2005. According to my field notes that described children’s language skills when I first met with them, Sunjae’s oral communication skills in terms of structure and fluency seemed to be better than Joonho’s, who also grew up in Korea until he was five years old.

Since his arrival in the U.S. in 2001, Sunjae did not return to Korea until 2006 when the whole family went to Korea for about 2 weeks. According to Sunjae’s mother, all the relatives whom the family met in Korea envied Sunjae’s English communication skills. Relatives said, “Now that you (Sunjae) have English skills, you are very fine. [for your academic and further career success]. We really envy you.” The mother recalled that some children asked him to speak some English sentences and when he did that, Sunjae became popular among the children. Until their trip to Korea, the mother did not realize the reality of Koreans’ yearning for their children to learn English because it had been five years since they left Korea. She seemed satisfied with Sunjae’s English skills, saying that Sunjae’s English skills were the most important compensation for her five years of hardship in the U.S.

The family planned to go back to Korea when the father finished his work at the university. While the father’s job in Korea was not guaranteed yet, the family believed
that they would return to Korea sooner or later. As of spring 2007, Sunjae was attending a
Chinese Saturday school and Sunjae’s brother was in a daycare program.

4.6.1 Language Ideologies and the Imagined Community

The parents said that they sent Sunjae to a Chinese school so that he could learn
Chinese as a foreign language, in order to have international and multicultural
experiences. The mother and the father had a similar perspective on Sunjae’s Chinese
learning and the following response was from Sunjae’s father:

SO Dad 040207
Well, I think that it [Chinese] is the language for 21st century (laughter). It will be
very useful. And compared to other foreign languages such as Japanese, we
thought that it would be very easy to meet native speakers of Chinese here. I mean
even in this housing complex. So he can interact with them. And it was easy to
find the school that has the beginner’s level. There are some other children in the
school who are learning Chinese as a foreign language as well as Chinese
children. To our disappointment, though, he is not progressing so much. Well, he
is not really speaking any word in Chinese yet outside of school, but I believe that
this experience would help him eventually when it is time for him to learn it
seriously later. I believe it will be worth it then.

According to the interview, Sunjae’s parents viewed Sunjae’s learning Chinese as their
investment in the global language of the future. Recently, Chinese has been a very
popular foreign language in Korea and the U.S. Stressing the symbolic power of Chinese
as “the language of 21st century” or “the global language,” the father implied its
associated social value of Chinese in Sunjae’s future. Additionally, the parents seemed to
take full advantage of the resources that they could access before they returned to Korea.
The mother mentioned that Sunjae even learned 1000-Chinese characters through cartoon
books (Mapep Chencamwun “Magic Chinese 1000 words”) designed for children’s
education. By teaching Sunjae a third language, the family emphasizes a cosmopolitan
vision for Sunjae’s life.

Generally, it is not very common to teach another foreign language to a bilingual
child who is still in the process of development in two languages. Teaching another
foreign language to Sunjae was in conjunction with the development of Sunjae’s English
and Korean skills. Both parents thought that Sunjae’s English was “good enough.” The
following is a response from his father:

I think that his English is good enough. There is not much thing that we can do for
him in terms of English. He is doing well at school. What else can I do?

The mother often labeled the English skills of children who grew up in the U.S. as
“native-like,” which was a notion that has a similar meaning to the father’s view that
Sunjae’s English was “good enough”. When asked, the mother described “native-ness” as
“no difficulty expressing themselves in English and having grade-average reading and
writing skills.” The parents’ decision to teach a third language to Sunjae was based on
their evaluation of Sunjae’s English skills and their evaluation was closely related to their
future trajectory. Sunjae’s mother, in the following interview, indicated that their notion
of Sunjae’s “good enough” English comes from their imagined community in Korea:

What we are doing with Sunjae is in the condition of our return to Korea. We
don’t pay attention to his school subjects. We only check if he finished his school
homework or not. There is not so much I can do for him and I mean also no such
a need… My husband and I think that his English will be good enough in Korea.
At home, we focus on his learning Korean and math. For math, we are trying to
teach him how to interpret and understand the questions in Korean, rather than
mathematical skills. And sports and arts. We don’t teach English at all, except
having him read some English books. If we have to stay here, I would change my
approach to Sunjae’s education, paying more attention to his school life in general. You know, like school [academic] reading and writing skills and other school subjects such as social study and so on.

The mother said that if they would stay in the U.S. she would have a tutor to teach Sunjae English because he would need a better command of English for his academic success. She added that they thought that they would need to pay more attention to his school subjects, which they almost ignored right now.

The interview response implied that the parents’ assessment of Sunjae’s English skills as “good enough” or “native-like” is based on the criteria from the language community in Korea, rather than the criteria in the local community in the U.S. In their imagination of the community in Korea, the requirement and demand for English skills will not be as intense as those in the local community. That is, they envisioned their future community in Korea as one of the EFL (English as a Foreign Language) contexts, in which English is a foreign language subject rather than as a communication tool and medium for schooling. Therefore, they imagined that Sunjae’s English skills would be fully valued in that community in Korea. This image of their returning community enabled the parents to be confident about Sunjae’s current English skills and to invest in another language, which, they believed, will add an additional value to, rather than replace, his English.

In terms of Sunjae’ Korean, the parents always encouraged Sunjae to use Korean at home. While they found that Sunjae sometimes had difficulties expressing his thoughts in Korean, they believed he would overcome such difficulties when he returned to Korea.
4.6.2 Language Socialization and Literacy Practices

Every day, Sunjae finished a one-page Korean reading comprehension worksheet and a one-page Korean math worksheet, both of which were from Korea. He read a couple of Korean storybooks everyday and kept a diary in Korean and English, shifting the language daily. The mother said there was not much difference in his literacy practices in the past and as of 2007, except that he did read a lot more Korean books in the past. He read on average 3 books per day last year in addition to the mother’s bedtime story reading in Korean. Instead of reading these Korean books, Sunjae in 2007 did a one-page reading comprehension worksheet through which he had to read and write short passages in Korean.

The family kept a strict Korean-only policy at home. Sunjae read a lot of educational and non-educational Korean comic books and watched Korean animations, which was, the mother said, the most effective way for children to learn Korean. Sunjae’s mother expressed her difficulty in getting Sunjae to speak Korean. When Sunjae was younger, her strategy was to explain to him what could happen if he could not speak Korean well in school when they return to Korea. At the moment, then, he seemed to understand the need to speak Korean, but by the next day he would forget to use Korean again. Because of this, the mother described how everyday became a battle ground between the mother and Sunjae over whether he would speak Korean or English. In my observation, Sunjae typically spoke Korean to Korean adults and used English to Korean children. Thus, he used participant-related code-switching (Auer, 1995), shifting
languages according to interlocutors, when there were adults and children together, which seemed systematic.

Sunjae’s parents were very strict about Sunjae’s proper use of Korean honorifics and speech levels when talking to adults. Sometimes the parents applied Korean norms, such as the Korean social hierarchy, to English utterances. For example, the father told him to add ajwumma “ma’am” to refer to an American lady in Korean utterance since she is elder and needs to be referred to and addressed with respect. Thus Sunjae needed to refer to Jane (an American friend of his mother’s) as, “Jane ajwumma” in his Korean utterances, which seemed very strange and interesting to other Korean speakers.

According to the mother, Sunjae recently began speaking Kyopho hankwue, “Korean-American Korean.” That is, he put English words in Korean structures because of the lack of Korean vocabulary. She used to correct his Kyopho hankwue by replacing English words in his Korean sentences with Korean words. Lately, because she was having difficulty correcting all the English words in his Korean sentences, she told Sunjae to choose to speak either Korean or English. This indicates that she let him use English instead of mixing two languages in the same sentences. Conversely, Sunjae called his mother’s English “it is not exactly English.” The mother reported that she was a bit upset and embarrassed at his comment on her English in front of his friends when she talked to his friends in English. The mother said Sunjae sometimes paraphrased or recast her English utterances, which was similar to what the mother did with his Korean utterances. This indicates that both Sunjae and Sunjae’s mother had divergent forms of language use in their repertoire and both of them language socialized each other. Such
bidirectionality between adults and children in language socialization is one of the advances of second language socialization, which becomes particularly salient in a bilingual context (Bayley & Schecter, 2003) The bidirectional aspect of language socialization also illuminates the notion of language socialization as a life-span process.

4.7 Diversity in Imagined Communities and Language Ideologies

With the prospect of returning to Korea, the three families’ language socialization practices for Korean and English have some unique characteristics that are different from those of Korean immigrant families who have 1.5 generation or second generation Korean children. The differences in the practices between the two groups are subtle yet crucial to understand. The differences lie in how the families align themselves with their imagined communities, enacting and adopting language ideologies that they believe to be prevalent in those imagined communities. In their emphasis on such language ideologies, the families attempted to maximize the social values of their practices, matching up the expectations of the educational institutions and policies to their imagined communities.

There are two aspects of language socialization practices that connect the three families and, at the same time, that distinguish them from other Korean immigrant families: first, the emphasis on oral communication skills and second, the naturalized and unchallenged ideology of Korean as a first language (Kroskrity, 2004).

In terms of English education, the three families’ language socialization practices reflected the expectations and practices in Korea. They emphasized English communication skills, particularly the oral ability of their children. In the case of Yongho, the mother explicitly focused on his oral communication skills and paid less
attention to his literacy skills. She and her husband considered their own English skills, particularly their low oral communication skills, to be shameful. Therefore, they wanted their children to have better communication skills. In the case of Joonho, the mother seemed to focus on the development of his literacy skills in addition to his oral communication skills. However, she stated that her intention to teach him literacy skills was not for acquiring literacy skills per se, but rather for maintaining his English communication skills through teaching literacy skills. Through advance literacy practices, she hoped that Joonho would maintain his English skills after they return to Korea and his English literacy skills would be transferred into his Korean skills. In Sunjae’s family, the mother considered Sunjae’s English “good enough,” describing his communication skills as “native-like” compared to his peers in Korea. The parents’ view of Sunjae’s “good enough” English skills did not seem to include academic literacy skills required for schooling in the U.S.

These families’ emphasis on communication skills contrasted with their relatively low emphasis on the children’s academic literacy skills. Academic literacy skills can be an index of children’s academic success in U.S. schools. In her interview, Sunjae’s mother indicated that she would pay more attention to his reading and writing skills if they were to stay in the U.S. The parents’ preference for oral communication skills corresponds to the prevalent perspective that Korean parents hold towards English skills in Korea. In Korea, literacy skills in English, particularly reading skills, are considered less valuable than oral communication skills (this is reflected in the parents’ views on their own English skills in Chapter 3 and in this chapter). Due to limited opportunities to
interact with English speakers and the traditional teaching methods focusing on English grammar, Korean students usually have lower oral communication skills in comparison to their higher literacy skills. Additionally, the recent spread of globalization, the Korean national project in mid 1990s (called sekeyhwa “globalization” project), and the recent educational reform promote Korean students’ better communication skills in English (discussed in Chapter 3). In this sense, English communication skills have important social values and thus high economic capital in Korea (Bourdieu, 1991). Thus the parents invest in oral communication skills to maximize their accumulation of economic capital in their returning community.

With respect to their attitudes to Korean learning and use, the three families considered Korean the first language for their children, regardless of how much they emphasized English. This can be seen in the language socialization practices of Joonho and Sunjae. For these two children, Korean is a subject they are required to learn. While the parents’ moment-to-moment strategies were different from each other (taking Joonho to Korea every summer or keeping a Korean-only policy at home), the parents of Joonho and Sunjae socialize the children into Korean as their first language. Given Yongho’s family’s profound social and cultural relation to their rooted community in Korea, the issue of Korean as the first language was a much more unchallenged ideology.

For immigrant Korean families, in contrast, Korean as their first language is contestable (this can be seen in the Korean mother’s interview in Section 4.2. and in Chapter 3). Immigrant Korean families’ need for English as a tool for survival in the U.S. and their often pessimistic attitudes toward maintaining Korean sometimes challenge the
status of Korean as their children’s first language. For some Koreans, the Korean language is believed to interfere with their children’s academic and career success in the U.S. They think that English is, and should be, their children’s first language (as the mother states in her interview in section 4.2.). Therefore, for the second generation Korean children, it is not always true to refer to Korean as their first language. Instead, Korean often becomes a “home language”3 for Korean American children.

Still, the three families’ imagined communities in Korea are not identical, whereas they had similar perspectives and practices of children’s language learning due to their prospect of returning to Korea. The diverse images of their imagined communities are a result of their differences in past and current situations and experiences as I had discussed in the previous sections.

First, Yongho’s family, who visited the U.S. for one year, had a strong affiliation to the educational community in Korea. Subsequently, they aligned themselves mostly with their imagined community during their stay. The imagined community in Yongho’s family is the educational community, more specifically the symbolic community, which the family would enter with their cosmopolitan and middle class credentials such as overseas educational experiences and English communication skills. Thus, the family viewed and utilized the local community as an immersion context for their children’s language learning, in which they worked to acquire the prestigious value of English. Therefore, the transnational migration is considered part of the family’s strategy to accumulate social and linguistic capital for their imagined community (Bourdieu, 1991; Waters, 2005).
In contrast to Yongho’s family, Joonho’s family had been on the transnational circuit between Korea and the U.S. for about three years. The family planned to continue this for a couple of more years. The family’s constant contact and shared practices with both communities make it hard to distinguish their imagined communities from the practices of the local communities. For them, both the communities are their “transnational social fields” (Basch, *et al.*, 1994), in which multiple social relations and transnational social and linguistic practices become habitual and real (Orellana, *et al.*, 2001). Joonho’s education played an important role in the family’s transnational migration, and thus, his language socialization practices became increasingly strategic. Also, the mother emphasized Joonho’s English development in a different way than Yongho’s family. In Joonho’s family, the mother favored bilingualism and bilingual abilities, but the lack of resources and support that the family would face that implies the discontinuing bilingual education in their imagined community guided the shift in the family’s perspective on Joonho’s English learning.

Finally, Sunjae’s family had lived in the U.S. for five years and would continue to live there for a couple of more years before returning to Korea. While Sunjae did not have a lot of opportunities to have direct contact with the community in Korea, the prospect of returning to Korea, which was as real as it was for the other two families, influenced his language socialization practices. Because of the family’s long term engagement in the local practices, Sunjae’s linguistic practices reflected them the most. When it comes to the family’s language practices at home, it is the most “authentic” (only using Korean, rather than mixed languages or code-switching). The family employed less
obvious strategies for Sunjae’s English learning, but they also acknowledged the economic capital of Sunjae’s “good enough” English in their imagined community.

4.8 Conceptualizing Transnational Imagined Communities and Language Education

As I discussed above, the created images of communities among the three families are divergent from one another. However, they share the general image of institutional expectations and practices in Korea. Thus, the natures of their imagined communities are both *individual* and *collective*. On the one hand, it is collective because imagined communities have a collective image of membership and shared ideologies. Like the imagined community of nationhood in Anderson (1991), language ideologies in a Korean educational society shape members’ attitudes and practices. This type of collective power permeates their imagined communities as well as the local communities, influencing those who are in a different time and space. In this fashion, the Korean families in Korea and the three families in this study share practices and ideologies about language education.

On the other hand, their imagined communities are individual in the sense that each family has a different image of an imagined community, which is based on their past and present experiences and background. This also explains how individuals adopt different strategies and different emphasis on the collective power of ideologies. This type of individual diversity is caused, in part, by an act of “imagination,” which is a process that relies on individuals’ current situation and past life history. Given that learners’ learning trajectories depend on the kinds of imagined communities they create,
the process of building imagined communities should be considered equally important as the impact of such communities on current practices and learning.

These two aspects of imagined communities may be common to most imagined communities. However, the *transnational* imagined communities such as the communities in this study differentiate themselves from those *wishful* imagined communities that language learners create in their future trajectory. Typically learners’ imagined communities such as future teacher communities (Pavlenko, 2003) or the international fashion community (Kanno & Norton, 2003) in reality “do not yet exist and never exist” (Kanno & Norton, 2003). Learners are not actually part of the communities until they acquire their access to these communities. Unlike such communities, the transnational imagined communities created by the Korean families in this study do exist in transnational space. The families already hold social and institutional relations within these communities and their access to the community is partially given (since their membership is partially inherited). In this sense, the three families’ future participation in the community is more concrete and tangible than other kinds of memberships in *wishful* imagined communities.

In short, the transnational imagined communities not only exist in these families’ future trajectories, but also exist in the present in transnational space. However, the created images of the imagined communities are not a direct reflection of the communities that exist in transnational space, but reconstructed images on the basis of individuals’ current and past experiences. These temporal and spatial elements of the communities add more complexity to the notion of imagined communities.
While the families’ current practices can be understood in the context of future affiliations and identifications (Kanno & Norton, 2003), this does not mean that their current practices can be seen as a process of moving from “peripheral members” to “legitimate participants” (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Such notions of peripheral and legitimate memberships in Lave & Wenger’s (1991) theory of learning are controversial. For example, those concepts imply a somewhat homogeneous and unitary process in which new members “strive to achieve one convergent end point” (e.g., Haneda, 2006, p. 812). Due to their transnational experiences, the Korean families’ practices and membership identity after returning to Korea may not be identical with more “regular” members in the community in Korea. Specifically, in the case of children who have transnational/overseas experiences, their language practices would not resemble the local children’s language practices in the community (Kanno, 2003). The newcomers’ experiences would not only be divergent from those of regular members, but also would challenge and thus shift the regular or “legitimate” members’ participation. In fact, the new experiences that these study-abroad families will bring would create new practices that the old members could adopt. For example, English only classes, international schools, and institutions, originally designed for returnee students, are now very popular among those who never study abroad. Additionally, more parents want their children to have international education experiences in order to compete with children who have had over-seas educational experiences. Therefore, the diversity and variations in practices and membership, in conjunction with imagined and local communities, need to be seen from the perspective of an individual’s moment by moment agentive positioning and practice
of identity, rather than as a process that leads to a unitary membership from “peripheral” to “legitimate.”

4.9 Conclusion

The three families’ language socialization practices reflect the language ideologies of Korean as the first language and English as prestigious economic capital in Korea. They negotiate and reconfigure these ideologies in their local practices of language learning through diverse transnational education strategies. Having more than one language in their socializing context, their language socialization practices emphasize one language over the other. Additionally, they associate diverse socializing strategies and goals with each language. The families’ seemingly divergent language socialization goals and strategies, seen from the local bilingual context, can be understood consistently within the framework of their imagined communities. The framework contributes to a deeper understanding of learners’ current practices by incorporating their alignment with, and prospective participation in their imagined communities. Thus, the concept of learners’ imagined communities provides an emic perspective, meaning the learners’ own understanding of their learning and the learners’ own contribution to their learning that otherwise could not be captured.

The imagined communities that exist in transnational space, in both private and collective fashions, provide the families with new possibilities and prospects for the future. At the same time, the communities, like other local communities, impose constrains on their members through ideologies (in this study, language ideologies), which frames these families’ current language socialization practices. Such “invisible”
power of imagined communities on their members is as strong as individuals’ power of imagination in the creation of those communities.

The parents in this chapter hoped that their language socialization practices and strategies would positively influence their children’s language development, identity construction, and more subtly, yet importantly, their academic and career success in the future. With their future potentially located in two or more places (Orellana, et al., 2001), children negotiate diverse language ideologies and constitute various identities during their language socialization. In the process, they often challenge traditional practices and meanings that their parents provided as well as create new ones. The next two chapters illuminate how the children of these families negotiate the social and cultural meanings of the two languages, Korean and English, in the language socialization process, which can be seen as they construct their “bilingual” or “transnational” identity.

1 All the interviews in this chapter were conducted in Korean and later translated into English. Underlines indicate English words and sentences embedded in Korean utterance.

2 These institutions are originally designed to enhance confidence and strategies for public speech among children, but these days they expand to include typically Korean literacy and math as basic subjects in their curriculum.

3 Joo (2005) argues that it is not accurate to refer to Korean as the “first language” for second generation Korean children. Instead, she suggests using the term “home” language.
CHAPTER 5

CODE-SWITCHING AND LANGUAGE SOCIALIZATION:
NEGOTIATING VOICES AND EMPHASIZING IDEOLOGICAL BORDERS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on children’s language use, particularly their code-switching practices and relates them to the language socialization context. The previous two chapters discussed children’s language learning from a societal perspective, mostly through parents’ standpoint. This chapter moves the focus from the global and familial contexts of language socialization to the interactional praxis of children’s language learning and use.

In recent years, bilinguals’ conversation has been viewed differently from how it used to be considered. Researchers have moved away from the earlier deficit assumptions underlying bilingual children’s linguistic and cognitive development. Rather than a lack of competence, in particular, bilinguals’ code-switching has been viewed as discourse strategies for stylistic and functional resources in their repertoire that their monolingual counterparts do not possess. Code-switching is one of the most salient linguistic practices for contextualizing the global social context and its immediate context of bilinguals’
interaction signifying their identity and linguistic ideology (Auer, 1995; Gumperz, 1982; Myers-Scotton, 1993). Therefore, this chapter adds a micro analysis of language in use to the macro discussion of social values of languages and language learning by analyzing children’s code-switching in relation to their socialization context. Accordingly, this will provide a multi-layered analysis of language socialization and language ideologies.

Code-switching research has traditionally followed two lines of inquiry, which are sociocultural and interactional approaches. The sociocultural approach has located the code alternation within a broad sociocultural context, considering the motivations for code choice to be determined by social norms and values (e.g., Heller, 1995; Gumperz, 1982; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Hill & Hill, 1986; Schieffelin, 1994). The interactional (or conversational analysis) approach views the meaning of code-switching to emerge out of sequential interactions within the situated local context and seeks explanations without any social metaphor (e.g., Auer, 1995; 1998; Li, 1998; 2002).

While their emphasis differs, both approaches agree on the need to pay attention to micro and macro issues and to account for both local and global contexts in order to have a full understanding of code-switching practices in a given community (Auer, 1998; Gumperz, 1982; Heller, 1988; Jorgensen, 1998; Li, 1998; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Sebba & Wootton, 1998). Thus, recognizing and including both levels of analyses is a starting point for better understanding the phenomenon. Stroud (1992, 1998) calls for an approach that integrates “analysis of language use and social action” (p. 322), which contextualizes the phenomenon within the framework of bilinguals’ local ideologies of personhood, language practices, and social interaction.
The ethnographic description of each family in the previous chapter also locates the data of children’s code-switching in this chapter within an ethnographic perspective (Stroud, 1992, 1998). These ethnographic data are particularly important in understanding and relating children’s different patterns of code-switching to their language learning context, intersecting code-switching, language socialization, and bilingualism. Together with the previous chapter’s ethnographic description, this chapter aims to depict the processes in which the children and their families, in their language socialization process, adopt language ideologies and construct the indexical meanings of two languages. I use Goffman’s concept of “footing” and Bakhtin’s concept of “voice” to conceptualize these processes. These concepts enlarge the scope of code-switching analyses, “bringing them into clear relation within phenomena found throughout monolingual as well as multilingual societies” (Woolard, 2004, p. 87). The major questions that I discuss in this chapter through children’s code-switching include: (1) what are the social meanings that children’s code-switching index?, and (2) how do language ideologies in their language socialization context inform children’s code-switching, through which children present their multiple self and enact multiple “voices”? 

The data on children’s interactions in this chapter are organized to show how children code-switch in order to highlight or avoid certain ideologies in an attempt to achieve their interactional goals in discourse. In this chapter, codes are considered not only linguistic forms, but also ideological entities (Bakhtin, 1981; Ochs, 1990). Through code-switching, children shift their social relationships with others. At the same time, they wield power, by provoking different social indexical values or voices in Bakhtin’s
term that are co-construed in their language socialization context (Bakhtin, 1981; Pujolar, 2001; Rampton, 1995; 2006; Woolard, 2004). Through the findings from this code-switching analysis, I continuously intend to shed light on the location of language ideology as one aspect of the interplay between language learning and identity in a local context in addition to the global context (discussed in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4).

5.2 Code-switching, Language Ideology, and Identity

Often the home is one of the major sites for socializing activities, where members of the household play a crucial role in those activities. It is within this context that children’s early socialization occurs in regard to attitudes toward other speakers and toward languages—“which one to speak, when to speak, how to speak” (Schieffelin, 1994, p. 30) through interaction with their caregivers. This is particularly true for those bilinguals who learn to use more than one language and who are exposed to plural language ideologies where each language has different status and interactional functions.

Through socialization practices at home, children’s understanding of different language systems partially begins to form. Moreover, these practices can be challenged or reinforced through their experiences or other forms of socialization out of the home, such as through peer interaction or school socialization practices. The socialization process of minority children in a multilingual setting is complex due to multiple language ideologies and conflicts often caused by those language ideologies in their language socialization context. On the one hand, the global economic market influences children’ home language socialization practices through a “linguistic marketplace” (Bourdieu, 1977). In particular, parents’ understanding of and attitudes toward each language in terms of its
market value have an impact on their children’s language learning. On the other hand, a local market or a local micro context such as home forms its own set of values and norms, as seen in Chapter 3. However, this may not be consistent with the operation of the global market. Thus, children need to recalculate and negotiate the values of their language when entering different contexts. Researchers argue that children do not passively receive any specific language ideology, but participate in a local context that drives its values in relation to, but ultimately independent of, the larger political economy (e.g., Queen, 2003; Rampton, 1995; 2006; Sebba & Wootton, 1998). That is, children in this chapter associate symbolic power with languages based on language ideologies in a local context, yet often assign the relational (pragmatic) power with their bilingualism, in opposition to adult monolingualism. The relational power of bilingualism revealed in discourse is eventually related to children’s bilingual’s childhood and the construction of the bilingual self.

A lot of attention has focused on what triggers bilinguals’ code-switching. Bilinguals sometimes code-switch according to the participants in the interaction (Auer, 1995; Shin, 2000) or to other external conditions that change in context, such as changes in topic and context (teacher’s speech in / out of the classroom) or in authorship (mark of quotations). Code switching related to external conditions is called “situational code-switching” (Gumperz, 1982). But bilinguals often shift their codes without any apparent changes in the situation. This sort of change in code is triggered by some subtle or symbolic changes in context, for example, relationships among participants in terms of power and solidarity (Woolard, 1995), and makes code-switching a “metaphor” for such
“subtle” alluded changes. Gumperz (1982) calls this type of code-switching “metaphorical code-switching”. In this chapter, I primarily focus on metaphorical code-switching analysis.

Such subtle or metaphorical code-switching is particularly fruitful in the articulation of social or indexical meanings that are associated with languages through code-switching. It further underscores bilinguals’ identity through their positioning in two languages and cultural systems. Typically a bilingual’s two languages are considered to signal and associate the contrasting values of the local minority community and the global society, which results in the “we-code/they-code” metaphor (Gumperz, 1982). Gumperz maintains that the minority language is considered as a “we-code” associated with solidarity and intimacy among in-group members, while the majority language is a “they-code” indexing authority and distance.

However, many researchers have criticized the contrasting metaphor for being too simple and thus failing to describe the complex code-switching patterns in minority communities. They point out that linguistic functions and social meanings of code-switching vary across bilingual communities (Stroud, 1992; Woolard, 1998; Zentella, 1990). For example, the we/they contrast does not fit well with societies such as Papua New Guinea or Indonesia where the stratified bilingual community model of a minority group within the majority society does not work (Errington, 1998; Sebba & Wootton, 1998; Stroud, 1992). Furthermore, the indexical meanings of codes in code-switching depend crucially on the specific interactional circumstances of the language use (Woolard, 2004), rather than on the unitary association of languages to the “we-they”
metaphor. That is, the associated meanings of languages differ according to different
groups of people even in the same minority speech community and with the same people
in different contexts. Stroud (1998) argues that “metaphorical associations to languages
are quite likely a result of continual negotiations and on-going contestations among
community members, a reflection of the fact that a speech community is not an
ideologically homogeneous or amorphous structure, but composed of social groupings
with very different interests” (p. 335). Stroud’s perspective highlights the fact that the
social meanings of codes in a community are neither fixed nor identical, which results in
“continual negotiations and contestations” among different groups of people. Finally,
Woolard (2004) goes on to contend that the “we-they” metaphor is captured best as “a
trope for a speaker’s variable social positioning rather than a literal reference to
enumerable social entities” (p. 77). Bakhtin’s notion of voices as “the speaking
personality and the speaking consciousness” (Emerson & Holoquist, 1981) that was
applied in this chapter to analyzes children’s code-switching captures bilinguals’ social
positioning through code-switching, which underlines their multifaceted and shiftable
identity moment by moment in context.

Thus, this chapter focuses on the “family” as the local context of children’s
interaction, based on the perspective of a community as ideologically heterogeneous
(Stroud, 1988). The chapter examines how the differences in language socialization
practices among families depicted in the previous chapters are related to the variation in
contends that a lot of research focuses on social meanings in bilinguals’ code-switching;
however, not much research focuses on “how and when indexicality emerges, and when it is reaffirmed, amplified, reformulated, or even dissipated” (p.89). This chapter is devoted to how children and adults build the indexical meanings of languages in their socialization practices and how these meanings are brought into play through bilingual children’s code-switching.

5.3 Conceptual Framework: Goffman’s “Footing” and Bakhtin’s “Voices”

In order to explore the relationship between language socialization and code-switching, this study takes both interactional and sociocultural approaches to the data. Goffman’s concept of “footing” is used for the sequential analyses of children’s code-switching in their face-to-face interaction, and Bakhtin’s interpretative framework, in particular the concept of “voicing”, accounts for its social and metaphorical meanings.

Goffman’s (1981) notion of footing, as “the stance or alignment taken by participants to each other” (1981:128) captures changes in relationships of children to other speakers through code-switching. In this framework, Goffman characterizes code-switching as involving “changing hats,” i.e., rapidly altering the social role in which a speaker is active (ibid., 145). In Goffman’s view, such altering involves not only a shift in languages, but also other contextualization cues in Gumperz’s terms (1982), such as gestures and prosody (Goodwin, 1981), which signal such shifts in the speaker’s alignment to the hearer. When applied to code-switching, the notion explains how bilinguals shift their alignment, interactional role, and social relationship to self and others, switching from one language to another.
While the notion of footing provides insight on bilinguals’ sequential interaction through code-switching, it has limitations of analyzing simultaneity that is invoked by metaphorical code-switching (Gumperz, 1982; Rampton, 1995; Woolard, 1999). Metaphorical code-switching involves not as “changing” but as an “enriching” of a situation (Blum & Gumperz, 1972, p. 409, cited in Woolard, 1999). In this perspective, the shift in codes does not replace the previous situation (as situational code-switching does), but adds new information, which is meaningful in relation to the presence of the previous code. Therefore, the meaning of code-switching in the current utterance becomes salient when “the sequencing of different message forms as a figurative simultaneity of social message” (Woolard, 1999, p. 16). Rampton (1998) explains such simultaneity as:

Metaphorical code-switching denies the recipient an easy footing for subsequent interaction. Like figurative language generally, it involves a violation of co-occurrence expectations which makes it difficult for recipients to end their search for meaning in the relatively neat solution normally achieved with ordinary discourse; it instead requires them to run through a much more extensive set of possible inferences (p. 303)

This simultaneous perspective of code-switching allows bilinguals to invoke more than one social relationship and role, and strategically maintain such plurality to perform their multiple and shiftable identities moment-by-moment (Hill & Hill, 1988; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Pujolar, 2001; Rampton, 1995; 1998; Woolard, 1999). In this view, the act of code-switching itself becomes a salient marker of bilinguals’ identity.

Rampton (1995; 1998) considers the simultaneity of the metaphorical code-switching as Bakhtin’s (1984) notion of “double-voice”, a term that describes plurality of
view points and semantic intentions other than speakers’. For example, Rampton’s (1995) 
analysis of British adolescents’ code-switching into Creole and Woolard’s (1999) 
analysis of Castilian mother-tongue teenagers’ code-switching into Catalan are examples of 
double-voicing, in which the interlocutor employs someone else’s discourse “in the 

Bakhtin’s notion of double-voicing is closely related to his view on language. 
Goffman’s notion of a change in footing is similar to a shift that one of Bakhtin’s 
characters in a novel makes from one social language (or “speech genre”) to another 
(Shultz, 2004). Bakhtin argues that any society (or any novel in his case) has more than 
one social language that is “a discourse peculiar to a specific stratum of society 
(professional, age group, etc.) within a given social system at a given time” (Emerson & 
Holoquist, 1981, p. 430). Such a view stresses the linguistically diverse and stratified, or 
“heteroglosic” nature of a language by the distinct social experiences of its speakers who 
belong to diverse social groups. Bakhtin’s view of heteroglossia is related to his notion of 
dialogism, “the characteristic epistemological mode of a world dominated by 
heteroglossia” (Bakhtin, 1981, p.426). With dialogism as his perspective on language, 
human consciousness, and social interaction, Bakhtin (1986) views that one speaker’s 
concrete utterances come into contact with the utterances of other, and at the same time 
current utterances are made incorporating past utterances and in the anticipation of future 
utterances:

Each utterance is filled with echoes and reverberations of other utterances to 
which it is related by the community of the sphere of speech communication…
Each utterance refutes, affirms, supplements, and relies on the others, presupposes them to be known… (p. 91).

Given that utterances are always expressed through a particular voice as “the speaking personality and the speaking consciousness” (Emerson & Holoquist, 1981), an utterance enacts different values and meanings, involving an active process of including speaker’s subjective perspective, intention, and world view (Wertsch, 1991). Ultimately, an utterance reflects potentially the voice producing it but also the voices to which it is addressed. Thus, no one person owns any word, but rather “reaccentuates” it through one’s own voice, making it his own while it remains always someone else’s as well (Bakhtin, 1981). Therefore, the nature of voice is simultaneously individual and social.

The notion of voice is related to the process of constructing identities and language ideologies. Bakhtin (1981) views linguistic varieties not as mere “codes” that can be described in formal terms, but as linguistic ideological entities. The notion of heterogiasia, diversity of languages, rests both unifying and disunifying (centripetal and centrifugal) linguistic and ideological forces. In Bakhtin’s view, when a person interacts with diverse voices and also goes through a “process of selectively assimilating the words of others” (p. 341), he grows up as “ideological becoming.” In a similar vein, Pujolar (2001) states, “the use of linguistic varieties is ideologically invested, i.e. inextricably tied to the forms of culture constructed by particular social group” (p. 128). Pujolar suggests that an analysis of what types of voices are adopted for what purposes, of what types of characters each linguistics variety is used to evoke, can provide important clues as to the social identities of the people. Pujolar (2001) applies a Bakhtinian perspective of bilinguals’ code-switching and describes it as follows:
From a Bakhtinian perspective, the alternation between linguistic varieties or languages can be seen as one particular aspect of the polyphony of utterances. In this way, bilingual speakers can be seen as appropriating the two languages in different ways, in different degrees of our-ownness and otherness…. (p. 174).

While Goffman’s notion of footing ultimately focuses on individual level of linguistic practices, Bakhtin’s approach articulates linkages of “linguistic form, social context, macro-social identity, and consciousness of all of these” (Woolard, 2003, p. 88). In particular, Woolard contends that Bakhtin’s notion of voicing manifests “the dynamic side of meaning-making” allowing simultaneous, ambiguous, and various meanings for any linguistic form.

The analyses of children’s code-switching in this chapter reveal how children negotiate through code-switching different or often conflicting ideologies that accompany each language system. I use Goffman’s footing to analyze the sequential work of children’s code-switching, in particular how the children shift their alignment to others. Children’s shift in social relations is examined in conjunction with their emotional-affective tones¹ (e.g., soft/baby-like/irritated/intense/forceful/assertive) and speech acts performances. I discuss children’s associating different emotional-affective tones with different language in their code-switching from an indexical understanding of bilinguals’ code-switching, going beyond their referential meaning. The affective difference in different languages simultaneously index identity and interactional order (e.g., Koven, 2006; Ochs, 1990; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, b). In this sense, the associated emotional-affective tones are what Bakhtin calls “emotional-volitional tones” as a complex of one’s desires, feelings, and ethnical evaluation (Bakhtin, 1993, cited in Vitanova, 2004) that
drives one’s acts. Through reaccentuating, such tones add a speaker’s new intention and meanings to utterances.

In what follows, I begin with Yongho’s code-switching as the major data analysis in this chapter. Yongho’s code-switching is analyzed within its sequential and metaphorical meanings. The next section introduces Joonho’s code-switching interaction with his mother, which gives a comparative and a context-specific perspective to Yongho’s code-switching. The final section discusses children’s code-switching among themselves, which locates children’s identity in opposition to adult members and other monolingual children.

5.4 Yongho’s Code-switching

Yongho, whose family stayed in the U.S. for one year, learned English during this period for the first time. His home interaction increasingly included English over the course of time. During their stay in the U.S., his parents promoted English even at home, believing that English communication skills would bring them significant economic capital in Korean. In the mother’s view, English is a global language, and acts as a gatekeeper to positions of prestige in the society (Pennycook, 1990; 1991; 1994). In addition, Yongho’s mother applied different norms to Yongho’s impolite and improper language use in Korean and English; she became a “nicer mommy” (Pavlenko, 2004) in English whereas she was very strict about language use in Korean. Such perspective permeated in her interaction with Yongho. Yongho’s home interaction became an important language socialization context (Ochs, 1990). Within this context, Yongho’s
understanding of each language began to form, which is brought into play through his code-switching.

5.4.1 Shift in Speech Acts and Affective/Emotional Tones

When code-switching between English and Korean, Yongho also shifted his affective stances through emotional tones, such as a soft, bay-like tone (baby-talk) or forceful/intense tone. In addition, his code-switching also accompanied a systematic shift in speech acts. The examples in this section show his shifts in codes, emotional tones, and speech acts as well as how he coordinated these three toward his interactional goal.

The following excerpt, example 1, was recorded in the relatively early period of Yongho’s stay in the U.S. In the excerpt, Yongho spoke mostly English, except in line 5. Yongho’s code-switching in this example is not as frequent as others that will be reviewed later in this chapter, but the single, rather simple code-switching in line 5 provides a starting point for what I demonstrate in this chapter. The particular code-switching in this example explicates what Yongho associates with each code in his code-switching and what the interactional functions of the code-switching may be.

Example 1: Yongho 072105 (6:30-7:40)
Yongho and Yongho’s friends and family gathered on one afternoon at Yongho’s house. The group included two of Yongho’s friends, Sunjae and Sicheol, Jisu (Yongho’s elder sister), Yongho’s mother (M), and JS (the researcher). The children were trying to cut a honeydew melon, which is not a common fruit in Korea. Children were playing around the table in the living room and the mother is bringing a big melon to the table.

1   Jisu:   Mom, can I, can I cut it, ( ) please?

2   Yongho:   (loudly) I WANT IT; I WANT IT. I WANT IT.
3 Mother: (to Yongho) No. Antway.
   “No”
4 Jisu: (to JS and possibly to Mother) Na hankwkeyse cut-haysseyo.
   “I have cut it in Korea.”
5 **Yongho:** *Nato.* (with a soft/friendly tone, smiling to his mother)
   “Me too.”
6 Mother: (to Jisu) Kulem cayngey ttak nohko hay.
   “Then do it on the plate”.
7 Yongho: I want it. I want it.
8 Mother: *Aiko, Yongho’inun antway.*
   “Well, not you Yongho.”
9 Yongho: (a bit irritated and a bit louder) I’m five. I will cut it.
10 Mother: (to Yongho, firm but not an authoritative tone of voice). Antway.
   “No.”
11 JS: (to Jisu) Ne, ike kkeptteyri kkalrreya?
   “Are you going to peel it?”
12 Jisu: (to JS) Anio.
   “No.”
13 Mother: (bringing the knife to the table and touching the melon)
14 Jisu: (to mom) Nayka nayka hal..  
   “I will, I will do …”
15 Mother: (put the knife in front of Jisu) *Ike cal tunun khali anilase..*
   “Since this is not a sharp knife…”
16 Jisu: (to Mother) *Ike kkepcilto hayyo?*
   “Do we do (eat) the peel too?”
17 Mother: *Ani, ike kkepcil peskyese mekeya tway. Iltan panul, celpanul calla.* (2).
   *Son chiwuko.* (0.5 )
   “No, we need to peel it. First, we need to cut it in half. Be careful with your hands.”
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Yongho: (Loudly, to Jisu) Watch out your fingers, Jisu!

Jisu: E…(hesitating to cut the melon).

All: (looking at her, laughter)

Mother: (to Jisu) emmaka celpa callacwulkkey. “Mom (I) will cut it in half for you.”

Yongho: (Loudly) I CAN. Once I did when I was five...

Sunjae: (to Yongho) I should try… (unintelligible), Yongho.

Yongho: (to Sunjae, loudly, almost yelling) NO:. (turning to Jisu) You got good!

Sunjae: (to Yongho) Come on, please. P:Lease.(2) Not fair (emphatic)

Yongho: (to Sunjae) You should have to get ( )W:A:T:E:R: m:elon (with a playful tone).

In this example, Yongho wanted to cut the melon, but his mother didn’t allow him to try it since using a knife may be too dangerous for him given his age. Instead, the mother let Yongho’s elder sister cut the melon. In the course of negotiating who cut the fruit from line 1 to line 10, Yongho, Jisu, and the mother all code-switched between English and Korean. In line 1, Yongho’s sister, Jisu, spoke English, asking her mother if she could cut the melon. In line 2, Yongho also used English. But rather than asking as Jisu did, he was asserting his interest in doing the task in an assertive and loud tone. Then the mother in line 3 responded to Yongho first in English, but then repeated it in Korean saying no. In line 4, Jisu talked to JS, who was sitting around the table, about her previous experience in Korean followed by Yongho’s Korean utterance, “nato (me too)” in line 5. By reminding their mother of their formal experience in the task, both Jisu and Yongho tried
to get the mother’s approval. As a response to Jisu’s request, the mother allowed Jisu to cut it by telling her to use the plate, but ignored Yongho’s request. Then in line 7, Yongho asserted that he wanted to cut it too by code-switching into English. The mother still said no in line 9 and Yongho argued that he was five, so he could do the task. In the rest of the excerpt, these children and the mother were continuously talking about cutting the fruit.

What is interesting during the first half of the interaction is the code-switching by two children, Yongho and Jisu. First, Jisu code-switched from English to Korean in line 4 when she talked to JS and her mother. This code-switch is presumably triggered by the participant of the conversation (the participant-related code-switching in Auer’s (1995) term) since her choice of code consisted of Korean for the rest of the example. Since the language of interaction among all the children before her mother enters the conversation was in English, and even though all the children are Korean and are able to speak Korean, Jisu seemed to keep English simply as the code choice when she requested her mother in line 1. However, when Jisu needed to convince her mother about her ability to do the task, she switched into Korean, accommodating her mother who may understand her English, but didn’t speak English on an everyday basis. Jisu’s choosing Korean for the rest of her interaction indicated that Jisu’s code-switching in line 4 unlikely has other meanings.

In contrast, Yongho’s code-switching into Korean in line 5 did not appear to have the same interactional goals as Jisu’s in line 4. Yongho’s Korean only appeared once throughout the interaction (in line 4), making the Korean utterance distinctive.
Additionally, what is more interesting in his code-switching is the shift in his tonal qualities when code-switching. When Yongho spoke English in lines 2, 7, and 9, his tone was loud and forceful/intense: assertive (in line 2) and irritated (in line 9) while his Korean utterance in line 2 sounded very soft and gentle. His tone in English throughout the interaction was rather consistent as the following summary of example 1 shows:

Line 2: (English) loud and forceful
**Line 5: (Korean) soft and baby-like**
Line 7 and 9: (English) loud and forceful (a bit irritated)
Line 18, 22, and 24: (English) loud and forceful
Line 26: (English) loud and playful

Figure 5.1. Affective tones in Yongho’s code-switching in Example 1.

Yongho’s code-switching between Korean and English and his association of each code with tones and speech acts become more apparent in the following examples. In example 2, most of Yongho’s interactions occurred in Korean except in lines 19, 24 and 31, in which his tones and speech acts had dramatic contrast with the rest of his utterances in English.

Example 2: Yongho 090805 (00-3:00)
The two boys, Yongho and Sunjae, Yongho’s mother, and JS were on the way to a soccer game. In the car, the two children did not want to buckle their seat belts and Yongho’s mother and JS tried to convince them to do so. The mother was driving and JS is in the passenger seat, with the two boys in the back.

1 JS: (to Yongho and Sunjae) *Nehuytul ancenbeylthu haysse? Anhayto tway?* ‘Did you buckle up? Don’t you guys need to buckle up?’
2 Mother: (to Yongho and Sunjae) Nehuytul ancenbeylthu hay. ‘You guys need to buckle up’.

3 Yongho: (to Mother) Way appa issulttaynun way ancenbeylthu anhayto tway? (with a really soft and baby-like voice) ‘Why didn’t we have to buckle up when the daddy was driving?’

4 Mother: (to Yongho) Appanum wuncen calhayse anhayto toynuntey, emmanun cokum cosimul hayya toyketun. ‘Your daddy is a good driver, so you don’t have to, but your mom (I) need to be careful about driving.’

5 JS: (to Yongho) Nwuka wuncenhatun hayyahay. Yekisenun pupiya. Anhamyen kyengchalhanthey caphinta. ‘Whoever is driving, you need to buckle up. It is a law in the U.S. Otherwise, policemen will get you.’

6 Mother: (to Yongho and Sunjae) Yonghoi hako Sunjaei hako ancenbeylthu kwakmay. ‘Yongho and Sunjae should buckle up.’

7 Yongho: (to Mom /JS) Ike ettehkey hayya tway? ‘How should I do this?’

8 JS: (to Yongho) Cwipwa nayka haycwulkkey. ‘Let me see. I will help you.’

9 Sunjae: (Looking at Yongho’s top) That’s not fair. I am not allowed to bring my Blade-Blade (a toy like a top)

10 Mother: (to Sunjae) Ne an kacye wasse? ‘You didn’t bring yours?’

11 Sunjae: eu-e.

12 JS: (to Sunjae) Ike kaciko nola. ‘Why don’t you play with this one?’

13 Yongho: (to JS, pointing to the microphone behind the driver’s seat, with a soft voice) Way ike yekieytaka hay nohasseyo? ‘Why did you put this here?’

14 JS: Em…
15 Mother: (to Yongho and Sunjae, soft and polite) *Peylthu maysnayo?*  
‘Did you buckle up?’

16 JS: (to Yongho and Sunjae, with a bit of a threatening tone) *Nanuytul cinssa peylthu an may?*  
‘You guys are not going to buckle up?’

17 Yongho: (with a complaining tone) *Emːma*  
‘Mom’

18 Mother: (to Yongho) *Way?*  
‘Why?’

19 Yongho: **PːLːease (annoyed and resentful).**

20 Mother: (to Yongho) *Peylthu an maykeysstako?*  
‘So, you don’t want to buckle up?’

21 Yongho: (to Mother, with a happy and soft voice) *Emma cilumkiillo ka.*  
‘Mom, take the short-cut.’

22 Mother: (to Yongho) *Emma cilumkilko kalteynika peylthu may.*  
‘Mom (I) will take the short-cut, so you should buckle up.’

23 JS: (trying to put the belt on him)

24 Yongho: **(to JS, with an irritated tone) What?**

25 Mother: (to Yongho) *Ellun Yonghoa. Khun sako natun cakun sako natun peylthu mayssulltay te ancen han keya.*  
‘Yongho, do it quickly. No matter how big the accident is, you will be safer when you buckle up.’

26 Yongho: (to Mother) *Kulayto mwe manhi kulkhichanha.*  
‘But still I will be scratched a lot (in case of accidents).’

27 JS: (to Yongho) *Ellun may. Mikwukeysenun peylthu mayya hanun keya.*  
‘Buckle up quickly. You should buckle up in the states.’

28 Yongho: (to Mother, with a soft voice) *Kuntey appa issul ttaynun an maysse?*  
‘Then why I didn’t have to buckle up when the daddy was driving?’

29 JS: (to Yongho) *Appa issul ttayto maysseya haysse.*  
‘You should have buckled up then too.’
30 Mother:  (to Yongho) Kulay, Yonghoya. Emmaka wunchen hal ttaynun tewuk te mayya hay.
   ‘Yes, Yongho. You must buckle up especially when your mom (I) drives.’

31 Yongho:  A-a (irritated) I DON’T WANT (2). (loudly), Mom. (complaining)

32 JS:  (to Yongho, looking at Sunjae) Sunjaenun mayssney.
   ‘See, Sunjae did buckle up.’

33 Yongho:  (with a soft, baby-like voice, still pleading) Eumcheng silhe.
   ‘I really hate it.’

While Yongho’s mother and JS were trying to convince Yongho to fasten his seat belt, Yongho tried to avoid doing so. In his negotiation with his mother and JS, Yongho code-switched from Korean into English and vice versa.

Yongho talked to his mother in Korean with a soft tone, which seemed to be his attempt to avoid his mother’s demand to buckle up. In line 3, Yongho avoided fastening his seat belt by arguing that since he didn’t have to buckle up when his father is driving, the same should apply now. In line 7, he kept trying to avoid buckling up by pretending that he didn’t not know how to do it, which is unlikely. Furthermore, in line 13, Yongho made a sudden topic change into “the recorder” that was set up in the car by saying, “why did you put this [the recorder] here?” in order to divert the attention from his seat belt. For this, Yongho used an extra soft tone of voice to JS, the same way as he did to his mother in Korean. Such way of talking was not a very common interactional style of Yongho toward JS.

Yongho negotiated this way with his mother and JS until line 17 in which Yongho confronted JS’s firm and assertive warning. In line 17, Yongho reacted to JS by shifting
his tone into an irritated and loud voice in Korean asking his mother’s help. In line 18, however, when his mother didn’t seem to take his side, then Yongho, in the following line, switched into English for the first time in this interaction with the same irritated and annoyed tone of voice, “PLEASE,” in a resentful manner. By doing so, he confronted his mother and asserted his position to his mother’s demand of buckling up. In line 20, the mother interpreted Yongho’s English reaction, “PLEASE” as his objection to her demand to buckle up, and asked him “So you don’t want to buckle up?” in a calm manner. In the next line, Yongho unexpectedly switched back into Korean with his soft and baby-like tone. This unexpected change in his choice of the code and his tone of voice was associated with his speech act of “request” to his mother to take the shortcut. Here Yongho’s request was viewed partially as his wish for the short-cut and at the same time a strategy to move away from the seat belt conversation, which was similar to that of line 13.

In the following line, 22, the mother took up Yongho’s request, but she negotiated with Yongho regarding Yongho’s buckling up, saying that “I will take the short-cut, so you should buckle up.” In line 24, there is another dramatic shift in Yongho’s code-choice and his tone of voice. In contrast to his previous tone of voice in Korean when he requested his mother to take a short-cut, Yongho in line 24 code-switched into English with a hostile and irritated tone, of course, much louder from the previous turn, by challenging JS’s (and his mother’s in line 22) persistence about the seat belt. Then he switched back to Korean in the next line and continued speaking Korean through line 31. In line 31, he finally stopped negotiating with his mother in Korean and showed his
disagreement about the seat-belt, expressing his strong objection, “I DON’T WANT, MOM.” In the final line, he switched back to Korean, while he put his seat beat on, saying he really hates doing so. However, this complaint (or comment) in line 33 didn’t seem to be as assertive as his complaint in line 31. In fact, what Yongho was actually doing in line 33 was still pleading to his mother by using a soft tone in Korean.

Yongho’s code-switching into English in this example afforded a comparison in his voice features, codes, and the content of the utterance or speech acts. His tones of voice in his English utterances were irritated, forceful, and assertive in line 19, 24 and finally 31, in which he complains in English about the seat-belt. The following is a summary of Yongho’s choice of code and the associated tones of voice in example 2:

- Line 3: (Korean) soft, baby-like, Asking question
- Line 7: (Korean) soft, baby-like, Asking question
- Line 13: (Korean) soft, baby-like, Asking question/avoiding the current topic
- Line 17: (Korean) irritated and loud, Complaining/disagreeing
- **Line 19**: (English) irritated, Complaining/disagreeing
- Line 21: (Korean) soft and friendly, Requesting/avoiding the current topic
- **Line 24**: (English) loud, irritated, and hostile, Complaining/disagreeing
- Line 26: (Korean) soft
- Line 28: (Korean) soft
- **Line 31**: (English) loud and intense, forceful, Complaining/disagreeing
- Line 33: (Korean) soft and baby-like, Pleading (*repair)

Figure 5.2. Affective ones and speech acts in Yongho’s code-switching in Example 2.

The summary shows that the contrast between Korean and English in Yongho’s utterances appears consistent: while Korean is associated with a soft and baby-like tone
of voice (except line 17), his utterances in English accompanied a rather loud, irritated, and forceful tones of voice. Additionally, Yongho’s code-switching into English in this example shows a quite dramatic contrast in the surrounding lines in terms of his voice features (voice volume and tone, probably pitch as well), which emphasizes the functional and pragmatic effects of his code-switching. That is, codes and his tone changed abruptly according to the interactional functions of his speech. The relationship between the code-choice and the speech acts that Yongho made and performed also is evident in the summary. On the one hand, Yongho spoke Korean when, for example, he asked a question, made a request, or changed a topic as a way to negotiate his putting seat belt with his mother and JS. On the other hand, when he complained or showed a strong disagreement, Yongho switched into English with a high volume of voice and an irritated tone.

Code-switching is a significant resource for bilinguals to signal emotions or affective stances (e.g., Pavlenko, 2004; 2006). For example, bilinguals may switch into their first language to express intimacy and we-ness, and into their second language to signal distance (e.g., Gumperz, 1982). However, research suggests that the view of L1 as the language of emotions and the L2 as the language of detachment oversimplifies the relationship between code-switching and emotions. Pavlenko (2004) states that second language socialization may change bilinguals’ perceived language emotionally. She views that second language provides with new means of emotional self expressions that they cannot easily express in their first language. For example, a native speaker of
Japanese in Pavlenko (2004, p. 197) describes the difference in her emotional expressions in English and Japanese.

It is easier for me to express things emotionally in English since culturally open expression is condoned. In Japanese culture people are less open with their feelings and expression is not as open you learn to read subtle signals which may not be verbal. For example it is easier to scold someone in English because the expressions are more direct. [...].

The Japanese woman in Pavlenko’s (2004) study expresses her projection of different self-image in different languages; she becomes more direct and expressive in English whereas she becomes very reserved and indirect in Japanese. Monolinguals may do this with their emotional tones themselves, but bilinguals use different codes associated with their emotional tones. Additionally, she is perceived in English not just as expressive in here and now, but as an expressive/direct person over all. Therefore, the analysis of affective expressions needs to go beyond a referential understanding of bilinguals’ code-switching since the affective difference in their different languages may simultaneously index identity and interactional order (Koven, 2006). The next sections focus on Yongho’s code-switching from the perspectives of its indexical meaning, identity, and interactional order.

5.4.2 Shifting in Social Relations

Yongho code-switched between Korean and English by associating distinct affective tones with each code, which he used to presented himself for “rhetorical efficiency” (Myers-Scotton, 1993). In other words, Yongho’s constant code-switching in the excerpt is a shift in “footing” (Goffman, 1981), participants’ change in alignment to
themselves and to others in interaction. Through this shift in footing, Yongho changes his social positioning with others for his interactional goals. Yongho organizes his interactions so as to articulate a sense of self that is layered and unsettled, which works best for moment-to-moment interactional functions.

According to Goffman (1981), people in interaction shift their alignment, stance, and projected self while shifting their footing. Goffman contends that a shift in footing usually involves code-switching or at least some changes in sound markers such as pitch, volume, rhythm, stress, and tonal quality. Yongho’s shift in footing involves code-switching and sound markers (tones) as summarized in table 1. The shift in footing in Yongho’s discourse signals a “recontextualization” of the speech event (Auer, 1992) or a change in “frame” from Goffman’s (1974) perspective. Auer (1992) defines contextualization as:

all the activities by participants which make relevant, maintain, revise, cancel….any aspect of context which, in turn, is responsible for the interpretation of an utterance in its particular locus of occurrence (Auer, 1992, p.4).

Auer argues that (re)contextualization involves the use of various strategies among which, code-switching plays a similar role as changing postures or pitch levels. Thus the shift in codes provides another resource through which communication is being accomplished in a way that allows those involved to be able to interpret what is being communicated. Auer (1995) further argues that code-switching plays the most salient function among bilinguals’ interaction as “contextualization cues” (Gumperz, 1982), the chief function of which is to signal participants’ orientation to one another. Myers-Scotton (1993) views such code-switching as providing a mega-message that comments
on speakers’ perception of themselves and their relations with others, or what Goffman (1959) calls “presentation of self.”

When Yongho switched from English into Korean, he contextualized the communicative event, relying on Korean notion of personhood to position himself in a hierarchical social relationship valued by Korean cultural ideology (Sohn, 1981). Yongho’s code-switching into Korean in example 3, which was embedded in the social action of negotiating a disagreement, served to contextualize the social hierarchy made relevant in this interaction (Kang, 2003). As a result, Yongho emphasized his position in the social hierarchy and presented himself as a dependent, making the shift into a soft and baby-like sound as indexical of this. Doi (1979) called a younger person’s affective dependency on an older person as *amae* in Japanese. The *amae* relationship emphasizes younger person’s dependency on and respect for the elder in return for caring and closeness from the elder. With such affective dependency evoked through his code-switching into Korean, Yongho made speech acts such as requesting and beseeching in Korean into less of “a face threat” to his mother and JS (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Enhancing the addressee’s positive face through his reliance on the social hierarchy (Jung, 2000; Matsumoto, 1988), Yongho reduced the tension in the situation, mitigating potential conflict (Kang, 2003; Zentella, 1997). Thus switching into Korean served as a resource for Yongho to soften and thus negotiated his objection to buckling up. Yongho evoked the Korean social hierarchy by invoking the subordinate and respectful relationship Yongho has to his mother and JS.
By contrast, Yongho’s switch into English in lines 19, 24 and 31 in example 2 recontextualized the event, undermining what his switch in Korean emphasized, and positioned him in this new context. His switch into English had two possible communicative goals; one was a passive one that is related to Korean cultural ideology and the other was more active goal that seeks power to gain control.

The assertive, irritated, and somewhat forceful tones associated with English indicated that Yongho aligned himself differently from the way he did in the previous turns in Korean. Yongho’s tones in English no longer signaled him as being dependent or a subordinate in the social relation with his elders. Rather, the somewhat aggressive and assertive tone appeared to signify his position as independent in a more equal social relation.

Yongho’s switch into English enabled him to avoid the sentence endings or address terms in Korean that indexed social hierarchy in a direct manner, which consequently made the hierarchy between him and the others less evident. Particularly in line 24, when Yongho responded to JS’s effort to put the seat belt on him with, “WHAT?” contrasted with his utterance in line 13 in his soft and very polite tone. Abrupt and aggressive responses such as in line 13 often made JS uncomfortable even in English. However, such a response in Korean would be a more aggressive challenge and a serious discourtesy to his Korean elders, since the hierarchy based on age and status, as embedded in language structures is rather strict in Korean. This does not mean that people cannot show their disagreement or complain in Korean, but that hierarchy is still maintained while people express negativity. Thus, there is often an uneasiness that
constrains younger people’s direct statements toward elders. Yongho’s switching into English allowed him to elude such ideology that guides social relations underlying Korean interactions and language use.

Besides Yongho’s use of affective tones, his switch into English also had a meaningful juxtaposition with Korean in terms of its interactional functions. While Yongho’s Korean utterance was frequently associated with requesting and beseeching, his complaining and disagreeing was manifested in English. This juxtaposition, together with the tones in his code-switching, contributed to establishing interactional contexts. The dynamic process of Yongho’s shifts in contexts revealed his negotiation of language ideology and identity.

In summary, while Yongho code-switched into Korean by shifting toward a social relation as a subordinate relying on affective dependency (with the baby tone), his code-switching into English shows a shift into more equal social relation (with an aggressive and authoritative tone). The next section relates Yongho’s association of code with different social positions that he was taking up through code-switching to his language learning context, in particular to his home.

5.4.3 Yongho’s Polyphony and Double Voicing as Bilingual Identity

According to Bakhtin (1981), a particular utterance is not only related to the directly preceding utterance, but also its social and historical context through “the co-existence of social-ideological contradictions between the present and the past” (p.291). Bakhtin (1981) argues that language is inherently contextual and any utterance must emerge from a given social situation through the process of conditioning and being
conditioned by diverse social, cultural, historical, and institutional elements that all participate in social activities. Bakhtin’s view on language “dialogism,” interprets an utterance in its dialogic context as a response to previous utterances, which simultaneously anticipates future responses. Bakhtin points out that any language is in nature “heteroglossic,” which emphasizes the organization of language(s) into forms and meanings by the distinct experiences of its speakers. The concept of heteroglossia stresses the stratified or “heteroglossic” nature of a linguistic community in which no two languages or varieties of a language have the same status and power. Hence any linguistic varieties are considered ideologically charged (Pujolar, 2001).

The notion of heteroglossia particularly works well with a minority language community in a bi/multilingual society, and Yongho’s home context is no exception. In Yongho’s home, Korean and English co-exist and the two languages have different status and power as a result of the dialogical process of language ideologies. As seen in chapter 4, English in Yongho’s home context obtains prestige or the status of “authoritative word” in Bakhtin’s (1981) term, which is a privileged language with power.

The authoritative word demands that we acknowledge it, that we make it our own; it binds us, quite independent of any power it might have to persuade us internally; we encounter it with its authority already fused to it. The authoritative word is located in a distanced zone, organically connected with a past that is felt to be hierarchically higher. It is, so to speak, the word of the fathers. Its authority was already acknowledged in the past. It is a prior discourse (p. 342).

The language ideology that underlies such a stratification of languages within Yongho’s home underscores Yongho’s language socialization practices implicitly and
explicitly as seen in chapter 4. Through the process of language socialization, Yongho acquires an understanding of each code in terms of its status and power. While the home context is located within a broader social context, which may have a different social influence in his understanding of languages, it is hard to determine “what role such global power differences play in the development of the two languages of young bilinguals with respect to their contextualized pragmatic skills” (Jørgensen, 1998, p. 239). For such children, it may not be clear how the broad social power from community and national levels acts on their lives. It is in fact their home context that mediates broader social issues and children’s lives. It is the parents who enact particular ideologies for the language learning context among plural and often conflicting ideologies of power (Gal, 1998).

Yongho’s switch into English in example 2 operates on an ideology of power that is enacted at his home. Due to the asymmetric power relation of the two languages, Yongho’s shift into English is interpreted as an attempt to recontextualize the situation to gain control of the situation by using what he perceives as the language of power. Associating himself with the status of the language, Yongho presented himself as a voice of authority and elevated himself in social position. His shift into English promoted the pragmatic effect of his speech acts, (e.g., complaining and disagreeing), which contrasted with his association of Korean with requesting and beseeching. The following excerpt, example 3, emphasizes the contrast in his tones and speech acts associated with each language in Yongho’s code-switching.
Example 3 (121905)

Yongho and Yongho’s mother were talking about playing Game Boy and JS was listening to their conversation. Yongho had already played with the Game Boy for the 15 minutes that is allowed for a day. He is asking his mother to let him play more.

1  Yongho: Emma, na Game Boy te hamyen antay? ‘Mom, can I play with the Game Boy more?’
2  Mother: Yongho, haysscanha. Onulun te isang an tay. ‘Yongho, you already did it. Not any more today.’
3  Yongho: (with a soft tone) Emma, na Game Boy hamyen antway? Emma (pleading) ‘Mom, can I play with it? Mom.’
4  Mother: (with an authoritative tone) Antway, Lee Yongho! ‘No, Lee Yongho! (full name)’
5  Yongho: (still pleading with a soft voice) Emma, halwuey 20 pwun. ‘Mom, for 20 minutes per day.’
6  Mother: Antway, kulemyen nwuni elmana nappacinuntey. ‘No, then it will hurt your eyes badly.’
7  Yongho: Kulem 30 pwun, emma. ‘Then 30 minutes, mom.’
8  Mother: 20 pwunto an twaynuntes 30 pwunun an toyci. ‘20 minutes is not possible, then even 30 minutes is no.’
9  Yongho: (high pitch with an authoritative tone, loudly) Ah, I didn’t do it today. I want to do it more, m:o:t:h:e:r.
10: Mother/JS: (laughter).

In example 3, Yongho again maneuvered his tones, codes, and speech acts. He associated his soft and baby-like tone with Korean through line 9, where he then switched into English and transformed his vocal quality into a hostile and authoritative tone. Regarding his speech acts, he also shifted from begging and pleading to complaining and asserting,
paralleling the shift in the indexical values of his voicing. The mother’s response in line 4 sounded authoritative in response to Yongho’s persistent requesting, but it eased up in line 10 when Yongho switched into English. As depicted in Chapter 4, the family’s ultimate goal in visiting the U.S. was to teach their children English. Thus, even though Yongho’s English utterance would be inappropriate if it were uttered in Korean, it was often exempted from his parents’ censure and criticism. Yongho’s mother, for example, directly corrected or recast Yongho’s response in Korean to his elders from “ung” (yes in a neutral form) to “yey” (yes in a polite form). However, her attitudes to Yongho’s somewhat “impolite” utterance in English was relatively easy as such attitudes permeated in the language socialization practices in the home (see Chapter 4 for language ideologies in Yongho’s home). In Yongho’s home, Yongho’s speaking English was highly valued, considering English in the narrowly defined view of “language skills,” rather than of “communicative competence,” that includes pragmatic and social knowledge as its central elements.

The last example of Yongho’s code-switching shows the contrast in his speech acts for each language. In example below, Yongho code-switched from English into Korean in line 17, which is his only Korean utterance in this excerpt. Yongho’s Korean utterance was associated with a soft tone and a speech act of request.

Example 4: At the end 090805 (1:53)
JS, Yongho, Jisu (Yongho’s elder sister) and two friends of Yongho, Sicheol and Sunjae, had engaged in an activity, drawing a map of Columbus Zoo for about one hour in Yongho’s house. The children were playing with each other after the activity, running up and down in the house for about 10 minutes. Then, Sicheol’s mother called in and asked
Yongho’s mother to send the boy home. Yongho began complaining about how much time he had spent on the map drawing.

1  Mother:  (to children upstairs) It’s time go home.

2  Yongho:  Au-eu (coming downstairs with heavy steps and making irritated noise).  (to JS, a loud and irritated tone) Because of YOU!

3  Sicheol: I know.

4  JS:  (to Yongho) Because of me, what?

5  Mother:  (looking at the children, to Yongho) Way?
   ‘Why?’

6  JS:  (to Yongho and Sicheol) Yes, you played (smiling)

7  Yongho:  We spent one hour (a lower tone).

8  Mother:  Caymi isskey nolasscanha. (smiling)
   ‘You guys had fun with that, didn’t you?’

9  Yongho:  (very loudly) NO (2) We, we played (for) less than one minute!
   We spent, e, we spent one hour, e e, and THIRTY MINUTES {on that}, M:O:T:H:E:R

10 JS:  (looking at Yongho’s mom) Mother? (laughter)

11 Yongho:  (loudly) We start(ed) at four thrity, mother. We start(ed) at FOUR THRITY (2).

12 Mother:  Nehuyeuli ichungey ollakase nemwu ttetulko hanikka…(unintelligible)
   ‘You guys went upstairs and were very noisy…’

13 Jisu:  (to Mother) Naman ichungey kassesse.
   ‘I went upstairs by myself.’

14 Sicheol:  (to Yongho) Yongho, will you go to my house?

15 Yongho:  (to Sicheol) We can? (2) No, it is too dark.

16 Sicheol: You can come, if let me {you}. I’m riding a bike.
17 Yongho: (turning to his mother, with a soft tone) *Emma (2), ollakase nolato tway?*  
‘Mom, can I go upstairs and play?’

18 Mother: (no response)

19 Sicheol: No. I mean, can we go to my house?

20 JS: No. [It is] Too late.

21 Mother: (to Yongho) *Kuliko Sicheoli cipen cikum cimcengli hanula pokcaphay.*  
‘And Sicheol’s house will be too messy for packing now.’

22 Yongho: e-e (annoyed)

23 Sunjae: (to Sicheol) Yeh, you are going to Korea tomorrow. And you n:e:v:e:r gonna come back (a bit jokingly).

24 Sicheol: Yes I am.

25 Mother: (to Yongho) *Yongho, nayil Sicheoli hankwuk kanikka cal kalako insahayyaci.*  
‘Yongho, you should say good-bye to Sicheol since he is leaving for Korea tomorrow.’

26 Sunjae: Bye-bye [Sicheol].

28 Yongho: (loudly) bye-bye [Sicheol]


30 Mother: (to Yongho) *Hankwukeyse manna hay.*  
‘Tell him to meet each other in Korea.’

31 Yongho: (in an irritated and assertive tone) **We are not going to meet him, mother.**

32 Mother: (laughter, loudly)

33 Yongho: He doesn’t live in Seoul, mother. He doesn’t live….
The functional differentiation of Yongho’s code-switching patterns reveals how Yongho associated different values with the two language systems in his repertoire. Heller (1995) describes such aspects of code-switching that wield power:

Code-switching becomes available as a resource for the exercise of, or resistance to, power by virtue of its place in the repertoire of individual speakers, on the one hand, and of its position with respect to other forms of language practices in circulation, on the other. This view hinges on a notion of code-switching as a means of drawing on symbolic resources and deploying them in order to gain or deny access to other resources, symbolic or material. (p. 160)

Heller’s view on code-switching as a resource for a power play links code-switching practices to ideologies that legitimate the unequal distribution of resources and the values accorded them. This symbolic recourse of code can be available through its “indexical meaning”:

Choices of one dialect or one language rather than another, can be nonreferential indexes in that code choices may index the communicative context (e.g., the social status of the speaker or the social relationship between speaker and addressee), but do not contribute to the referential or literal meaning of propositions (Ochs, 1990, p. 293).

Through the indexical meanings of each code, bilinguals can do more than just deliver the referential meanings of linguistic signs. Ochs (1990) argues that linguistic signs can index diverse sociocultural information such as social status, roles, relationships, settings, actions, activities, genres, topics, and affective and epistemological stances of participants. She also asserts that the indexical relations between linguistic signs and sociocultural information are complex, being neither one-to-one mapping between linguistic forms and these meanings (as being non-exclusive), nor unified across
communities. Ochs (1990) contends, however, that linguistic signs do not directly index the sociocultural information of context and speakers, but that these signs show affective dispositions of speakers, for example, admiration and love, and then these dispositions constitute or establish social positions or social identities of speakers in a particular situations, which in turn helps define numerous speech activities or acts.

Ochs (1992) demonstrates how the use of the Japanese gender markers, “wa” and “ze”, conveys an affect of gentle or coarse intensity, which in turn indexes the social identity of gender. Seen from this perspective, Yongho’s code-switching into English in example 3 indexes power and authority through the higher status of English in his home. Additionally, his voice quality, being aggressive, irritated and confrontational, defines the pragmatic work of disagreeing and arguing. The indexical work of Yongho’s code-switching is summarized as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code choice</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tone of voice</td>
<td>Soft, baby-like, docile</td>
<td>Loud, aggressive, forceful, intense, irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>Sympathetic, intimate</td>
<td>Apathetic, distant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footing (social positioning)</td>
<td>Emphasizing humility and dependence within hierarchy, and hence solidarity</td>
<td>Enacting the language ideology of English as powerful or higher status in his home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexical meaning</td>
<td>The authority of the other</td>
<td>Self as authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech acts/pragmatic effects</td>
<td>Requesting and begging</td>
<td>Complaining and disagreeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code-switching</td>
<td>Negotiating self-images and power and enacting different voices – performing bilingual identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.3. Indexcial work in Yongho’s code-switching

According to Ochs (1992), one or more linguistic features may index the same social meaning. The above table shows that the tone, the choice of code, and speech acts performance are all constitutive of Joonho’s power wielding practice in his code-switching. Such practice depends on his understanding of how particular linguistic features can be used for particular pragmatic work (by conveying such indexical meanings). The relation of power to certain linguistic forms, here to a language, is not a
simple correlation between a language and power, but is rather mediated and constituted through “a web of socially organized pragmatic meanings” (Ochs, 1992, p. 342).

Yongho’s attempt to exert power over or be subservient to the other through code-switching is a creative linguistic performance that involves “stylization, the highlighting and exaggeration of ideological associations” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 308).

Yongho’s linguistic performance illuminates the creative aspect of indexicality by constructing and arranging the indexical images of himself for his interactional goals. Such performance is a way of bringing his identity to the fore, since linguistic practice, performance, indexicality, and ideology are intertwined in the creation of identity (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004). Bucholtz & Hall (2004) delineate such relationship as follows:

Ideology is the level at which practice enters the field of representation. Indexicality mediates between ideology and practice, producing the former through the latter. Performance is the highlighting of ideology through the foregrounding of practices. (p.381)

Due to the relationship between the ideology and the indexical meaning conveyed through individuals’ performance, Yongho’s code-switching performance is a negotiation of his creativity and social conventions. That is, the indexical meanings associated with each code are co-constituted by his agency and the social structure that are situated in dialogic activities with his parents and others at home. Within Bakhtin’s (1981) framework, the indexical meaning incorporated in Yongho’s utterance was partially his own “voice” and at the same time the “voice” of others. As seen in the table above,
Korean and English in Yongho’s code-switching were often used to construct and convey significantly different ideologies and identities.

English is established as a voice of power in Yongho’s home, while the Korean remains a voice in opposition to such authorial voice. Yongho’s incorporation of such different voices into his utterance was his negotiation of identity and power as he shifted in positioning between “we-they” (Gumperz, 1982) and “I” and “others” (Bakhtin, 1981). Such negotiation process is the moments of what Bakhtin calls “ideological becoming”. Ochs (1990; 1992) argues that a particular indexical meaning goes beyond the immediate context transcending the time and place of utterance production, so the voice as a social indexical become recognizable across contexts. Agha (2005) describes Bakhtin’s metaphor of voice as “discursive figure or figure performed through speech” (p. 39) with the figures referring to role alignment. Agha argues that voicing contrasts, such as in Yongho’s utterance, once perceived, are construed as typifiable voices and involve figures of personhood that are juxtaposed in the structured context. Yongho’s code-switching performance establishes an alignment with voices and thus with social types of persons that voices index. Thus his utterance that is multivocal or “polyphonic” informed by the ideas and representational styles of others signifies the identity and personhood that not only differ from monolinguals but also encompass and go beyond the “we” or “they” identity. That is, bilingual children’s code-switching practice becomes a means to establish borders of identity, in opposition not only to all adults in the community, but also to young monolinguals (Jørgensen, 1998, p. 242).
5.5 Joonho’s Code-switching

In Joonho’s home, the two languages, English and Korean, do not have the same status as in Yongho’s home. As depicted in Chapter 4, the different status of the two languages in these two families is related to the language ideologies that underlie each family’s language socialization practices. The difference in the language socialization practices leads to differences in children’s understanding of each language, which is often revealed in their discourse, in particular through code-switching. The following examples of Joonho’s code-switching illuminate a somewhat different climate in terms of language use and socialization from that of Yongho’s.

Example 5 (Tuesday-SJ111005: 6:23)
Joonho was reading a picture book in English and the mother was sitting by him in their home.

1 Joonho: (pointing the picture in the book) Mom, that’s not right.

2 Mother: Mwelakoyo?
‘What did you say?’

3 Joonho: Not right.

4 Mother: Mwelako?
‘What did you say?’

5 Joonho: Not right.

6 Mother: (Smiling and playful) Mwelakoyo? Mwelakoyo? Mwelako?
‘What did you say? What did you say? What did you say?’

7 Joonho: Nothing.

8 Mother: Hankwukmallo hacako kulaysscanha.
‘I told you that we should speak Korean.’

9 Joonho: Waw, waw (ignoring the mother and playing with a toy)
10  (Pointing to the character in the book) *Emma, emma, ike ‘teeth’ ci? ‘Mom. Mom, this is a ‘teeth’ [tooth], isn’t it?’

11 Mother: *Ike salangni. ‘This is a wisdom tooth.’

12 Joonho: *Salangnici? ‘Is it a wisdom tooth, isn’t it?’

13  (Pointing to the character in the book) *Na, nwunanun ‘does have hair’. ‘I, the sister ‘does have hair’.’

14 Mother: ‘She has’ *hayyaci. ‘You should say “she has”.’

15 Joonho: ‘She has’.

16 Mother: ‘hair’ *ka wulimallo mwintey? ‘What is ‘hair’ in Korean?’

17 Joonho: *Melikalak. ‘hair’

18 Mother: *Meli, meli com pwa. Melika cham tokthukhata. Yaynun cham. ‘Hair. Look at her hair. She has a very unique hair style.’

19 JS: *Joonhoya, Joonhoto meli killese ilehkey hamyen toykeyssta. ‘Joonho, you can let your hair grow like hers.’

20 Mother: *Joonhoto meli mwukkese ilehkey hay? (Laughter) ‘You suggested Joonho having the same hair style as hers?’

21 Joonho: *Emma, kuntey ike “boy” ya. ‘Mom, by the way, this is a ‘boy’.’

22 Mother: *Namcaya. Namca. ‘It is a boy. A boy.’

23 Joonho: *Namcaya emma. Do you know that, mom? ‘It is a boy, Mom.’

‘I know. Come here, Joonho. Come here. Let’s finish reading quickly. Then take a shower, wear your coat over your pajama, and go to the library to drop the books off.’

25 Joonho:  *Emma, na hankwukeyse kulehkey haypoci.*
‘Mom, I, let’s try that in Korea.’

26 Mother:  *Hankwukeyse kulehkey hacako?*  (laughter)
‘Do you want to do that in Korea?’

The mother and Joonho continued reading the Korean story book together.

The above example shows a typical interaction between Joonho and his mother at their home. Joonho’s code-switching was not as strategic and skillful as Yongho’s code-switching, shown in examples 1 to 3. However, Joonho often code-switched between Korean and English. Such code-switching practices have social meanings related to language ideologies. While the mother mostly maintains a Korean-only policy in their home, demanding Korean to be the language of interaction between Joonho and herself, she manages the home language policy rather dynamically across time and contexts in an attempt to assist Joonho’s bilingual abilities in Korean and English. For example, when Joonho and Joonho’s mother engage in a literacy practice in English, the mother often uses English in order to assist Joonho’s understanding and response to the readings in English. Additionally, the mother also promoted English at home for a short period of time after Joonho and she visited Korea in order to make Joonho’s transition from the Korean to the English speaking environment smoother. This particular interaction occurs during their literacy practice in Korean. Although she demanded that Joonho speak Korean in this particular event, she also corrected Joonho’s English as she did his Korean.
In lines 1, 3, and 5, Joonho spoke English and his mother responds in Korean. Joonho kept giving the same answer in English to his mother through line 7, when he seemed to notice his mother’s indirect directive that he use Korean words for his “that’s not right” in line 1. When the mother cued her intention by asking the same questions several times and by acting somewhat dramatically in line 6 with a playful and rising tone, Joonho withdrew his answers in English and rejected her requests by saying “nothing” in English. In line 9, the mother articulated her intention, and Joonho seemed not to listen to his mother’s request by playing with his toy and making noise. In contrast to such behavior, Joonho then code-switched into Korean in the following line.

In line 10, Joonho used an English word, “teeth” in his Korean sentence. His mother quickly replaced the English word “teeth” with a Korean word, and in the next line, Joonho incorporated the Korean word into his utterance. Joonho and his mother did the same thing when he said another English word “boy” in his Korean sentence in lines 21, 22, and 23. At the end of his Korean sentence in line 23, Joonho switched into English saying ‘Do you know that, mom?’ After his mother’s response in Korean in lines 24-5, Joonho switches back into Korean in 26.

Joonho reacted to his mother’s promoting Korean in their home in a variety of ways. On the one hand, he cooperated with his mother in using Korean, such as in example 4. On the other hand, he sometimes pretended to have a lack of Korean skills, which he used to tease his mother. In example 6, Joonho strategically skipped “sasip” (forty) in line 4 and provided a wrong answer in line 12, even though he knew the right word.
Example 6 (Tuesday-SJ111005: 23:00)
Joonho and the mother were reading a story book in English. Joonho was trying to count the ducks in the picture.

1 Joonho:  I will count how many ducks are here.  
(counting the ducks) One. two… three………………. forty.

What is “forty” in Korean? I will tell you.

3 (writing down the numbers on a note pad) Sipici. Iisipici. Kkuliko samsipici. Ku taumun mweya?  
‘It is ten. It is twenty. And it is thirty. Then what is it for forty?’

4 Joonho:  Osip.  
‘Fifty.’

5 Mother:  Ne, ttwinun ke pwa. Ta almyense kuleci. ParkSJ, ne cangnanchikinan.  
‘You, look at how you are skipping forty as you know all about it. Park Joonho (full name), you are just playing mischievously.’

6 Joonho:  Tickle me.

7 Mother:  (tickling him)

8 Joonho:  Hahaha

9 Mother:  Ilehkey hanun kelum wuli malko hamyen emma kumanhaci.  
‘If you say this [tickling] in Korean, I will stop doing it.’

10 Joonho:  Kancilekey hantako.  
‘You are tickling me.’

11 Mother:  Hankwukmalto cal hamyense.  
‘See, you speak Korean well.’

‘No, it is called ‘Hi’ in Korean.’

13 Mother:  Kulay. Park Joonho, nenun cangnani cangnani …. (tickling him).  
‘Is that so? Park Joonho, You are so mischievous, mischievous.’
In example 6, Joonho began with English. Then the mother shifted into Korean in lines 3-5. In line 6, Joonho spoke English again, and again his mother encouraged him to speak Korean in line 9. In the next line, Joonho spoke in Korean. While Joonho switched between Korean and English, his code-switching into Korean was not voluntary, which contrasts with Yongho’s code-switching. Rather he code-switched because of pressure from his mother. Moreover, his vocal quality did not change much from language to language. In example 6 below, Joonho’s code-switching into Korean was triggered by his mother’s sigh that indicated her disappointment.

Example 7 (TH-Joonho 111705)
Joonho and his mother were playing together at his home. JS was watching them nearby. Joonho turned back to JS and asked for a glove that he could use for playing with his mother.

1 Joonho: (to JS) I need your glove.
2 Mother: (sigh)
3 Joonho: (quickly) Cangkap? ‘Glove’
4 Mother: Kulay cangkap. Kulay ‘I need your glove’ hako kulehkey macimakey cangkapilako hamyen… ‘Yes, glove. Yes, you said ‘I need your glove’ and then said ‘cangkap(glove)’ at last like that….’
5 Cangkap philyohay anhay? ‘Do you need a glove or not?’
6 Joonho: Cangkap philyohayyo. ‘I need a glove.’
7 Mother: Cangkap com cwumyen antwayyo? ‘Could you give me the glove?’
8 Joonho:  *Cangkap com cwumyen antwayyo?*  
‘Could you give me the glove?’

9 Mother:  *Cangkap com ssumyen antwayyo?*  
‘Could I use your glove?’

10 Joonho:  *Com ssumyen antwayyo?*  
‘Could I use [your glove]?’

11 Mother:  *Imo, cangkap com cwuseyyo hay.*  
‘Say “aunt, give me the glove”.’

12 Joonho:  *Imo, cangkap com cwuseyyo.*  
‘Aunt, give me the glove.’

In line 3, Joonho quickly responded to his mother by saying a Korean word for the English ‘glove’. Here, Joonho repaired his utterance in Korean when the tension aroused between him and his mother. Then, his mother took advantage of the situation and practiced those expressions in Korean. Generally Joonho’s switching into or avoiding Korean was his negotiation with his mother, in lieu of teasing or pleasing her. However when tension or conflict occurred between them, the code-switching into Korean had a different function. Example 7 below showed rather explicit conflict between Joonho and his mother, in which speaking Korean was not negotiable.

Example 8:
Joonho and his mother were reading a book. Joonho did not want to continue reading the book, so his mother told Joonho that then she would not sign on the book list for him.

1 Mother:  *Ne ike an ilkumyun ike an ceke cwulkkeya. Swumese haypwassca soyong epse.*  
‘If you don’t read this, then I will not sign on that. It does not work if you do it secretly.’

2  *Kulem ne ike mos kacyeka. Ike nalccato cekeya kako emma ssain isseya kaciko kal swu issci.*  
‘Then you cannot take this to school. It needs date and my signature on it in order to take it to school.’
3 Joonho: (throwing the paper to his mother) You are mean (a bit jokingly).

4 Mother: *Eme, ne!* (surprised) *Tasi!*
   ‘Oh, you! Again!’

5 Joonho: (throwing a pencil to his mother) You are mean (quietly)

6 Mother: *Yay! Ne iliwa. Anca!* (firm and authoritative tone)
   ‘There! You come here. Sit!’

7 Joonho: *Emma, ike…* (pointing a book, trying to divert his mother’s attention)
   ‘Mom, this…’

8 Mother: *Anca.*
   ‘Sit.’

9 Joonho: What? (casually)

10 Mother: *Ancayo. Ttokpalo!* (firm and very intense)
   ‘Sit right!’

11 Joonho: U-e (making noise loudly, but still pretending nothing is serious).

12 Mother: *Park Joonho. Ne ike ettehkey haysse emmahantey.*
   ‘Park Joonho (full name). What did you do to me with this?’

13 Joonho: Throw.

14 Mother: *Calhanke katha?*
   ‘Is that a good behavior?’

15 Joonho: *Anio.*
   ‘No.’

16 Mother: *Ttokpalo anca.*
   ‘Sit right.’

17 Joonho: Okay (a bit annoyed)

18 Mother: *Ne calhanke katha?*
   ‘Do you think that this is a good behavior?’

19 Joonho: *Anio.*
‘No.’

20 Mother: Joonhoya, ne ilehke cangnan han chek hanun ke aniya?
‘Joonho, do you pretend as if you were just playing?’

21 Joonho: Emma, na “American” hamyun kancilepkey hay.
‘Mom, tickle me when I speak “American” (English).’

22 Mother: Joonhoya, acik na mal an kkuthnassketun. Ne ike emmahantey ettegkey haysse?
‘Joonho, I have not finished talking. What did you do to me with that?’

23 Joonho: Throw.

24 Mother: Wulimallo hay. Tencyesscanha.
‘Say in Korean. You threw them.’

25 Joonho: Tencyesseyo.
‘I threw them.’

26 Mother: Ne ikesto tenciko ikesto tencyesse. Ne emmahantey mwelako malhamyense tencyesse?
‘You threw this and then threw that too. What did you say to me when you threw them?’

27 Joonho: Emma, na kunyang practice hayssse.
‘Mom, I just did “practice” (probably basketball).’

28 Mother: Ne emmaka ceyil silhe hanun key mweya? Silswu halswu ilssci.
‘What is the one I hate the most? You can make a mistake.’

29 Kulentey ne ike tencimyense emmahantey mwelako kulaysse?
‘But, what did you say when you threw them to me?’

‘Mom, I did not lie. I just said it.’

31 Emma, na. . . I just forgot, you know.
‘Mom, I..’

32 Mother: Ne phyenli halttay ice pelinun keya? Emmahantey tencye nohko.
‘Do you forget whenever convenient for you? After you threw them to me.’
In general, Joonho code-switched into Korean when there was a tension between him and his mother, which indicates that Korean in his home has an interactional power. However, Joonho’s code-switching into English did not have the same meaning as Yongho’s. This is because English does not have the same status between the families. Once Joonho’s mother comments on Yongho’s code-switching into English compared to Joonho’s:

In lines 2 and 4, when Joonho said “you are mean” to his mother, the mother became upset about Joonho’s inappropriate utterance and behavior toward her. When she sounded authoritative and assertive due to his behavior, Joonho avoided the situation by ignoring it or pretending that nothing happened, still using English for his interaction with his mother. When his mother confronted Joonho about what he just did, he responded in English in line 12 with the English word ‘throw’, but with Korean in lines 14 and 16 with the Korean words “anio”, “ani”(no) + “o” (respectable verb ending). In line 20, Joonho tried to reduce the tension by saying ‘Emma, na ‘American’ hamyun kancilepkey hay’ (Mom, tickle me when I speak English), a game Joonho and his mother played to “punish” Joonho for his speaking English at home. His effort to reduce the tension did not work this time and the mother still confronted him in lines 21 and 23. Joonho tended to use Korean thereafter when he apologized for what he did. However, Joonho began his sentence in Korean, but switched to English at the end of line 30. In line 30, he apologized in English first, then he repaired it into Korean.

In general, Joonho code-switched into Korean when there was a tension between him and his mother, which indicates that Korean in his home has an interactional power.
I have noticed that Yongho associates different tones of voice for English and Korean. I am not talking about his pitch. You know, he has a high pitch compared to other kids. Other than the pitch, he uses a high tone in English. He seems to adopt the high and aggressive tone into his English without noticing it.

5.6 Children’s Code-switching among Themselves: Code-switching as Their We-code

As the code-switching excerpts in this chapter show, the indexical meanings of each code are different across families within the same community, which highlights the fact that such meanings are created, negotiated, and transformed in local contexts embedded in a global society. Additionally, these excerpts show that the social meanings indexed in the two children’s code-switching do not determine which code is their “we” or “they” code in Gumpurz’s (1982) terms. Rather, what their code-switching patterns manifest is how they position themselves in relation to, or in opposition to the others in interaction, relying on their understanding of language ideologies and social values attached to each code in their home.

Whatever social meanings the code-switching has for these bilingual children, code-switching itself is a means of performing their identity (Hill & Hill, 1995; Jørgensen, 1998; Makihara, 2005; Pujolar, 2001; Rampton, 1995; Sebba & Wootton, 1998). The next example shows the constant, yet seemingly arbitrary code-switching between English and Korean among children themselves. In the example, the code-switching looks like the “we-code” for the children since adult members (or other monolinguals) locate themselves in opposition to the children’s code-switching or mixing, either by disapproving it or not having it at their disposal (Jørgensen, 1998).
Example 9: Yongho 090805 Car (2) 00:01
JS was driving the three children, Yongho, Joonho, and Sunjae, to their soccer practice.

1 Yongho: If you want to go to California, it takes?

2 Joonho: Forty five?

3 Sunjae: No

4 Joonho: One hundred?

5 Sunjae: No. More than…

6 Joonho: Two hundred?

7 Sunjae: No, no it is about.. seven

8 Yongho: Seven days to go there.

9 Sunjae: No it took me three days and two nights. Sometimes it takes two days and, three, one night .

10 Yongho: It takes, *emchung kyeysok makhimyen* seven days and six nights. ‘if there is a traffic jam’

11 Sunjae: E..Yellowstone.. (responding to Yongho). Really?

12 Yongho: *Wuli appanun ipeney SMUeyse sang patassta. Wuli appaka kukieysenun te yelsimhi hayya hantako haysse*. ‘My dad received an award from his university. My dad said that he needed to work harder there to get it.’

13 Sunjae: *Nay appanun, he stays at school until saypyek* ‘My dad’ ‘at dawn’.

14 Yongho: *Encey, nay appanun dasessiey casse* ‘Sometime, my dad went to sleep at five’

15 Joonho: *Cenye dasessi?* ‘At five in the afternoon?’

16 Yongho: *Ani.* ‘No.’
17 Joonho: *Achim dasessi?*  
‘At five in the morning?’

18 Yongho: *Ani, saypyek dasessi*  
‘No, at five at dawn.’

19 Sunjae: *Nay appanun kukespota te nuckey osimuntey.*  
‘My dad comes home later than that.’

20 Yongho: *Nay appanun saypyek dasessi. Wuli appanun ecceltaynun hakkyoeyse ca.*  
‘My dad comes at five. He sometimes sleeps at school.’

21 Sunjae: *Nay appato cokum cataka ilenase dasi working hay.*  
‘My dad also sleeps for a while and then gets up and is working.’

22 (looking outside of the car) Sometimes we are going in a different way.

23 Yongho: *Nayka i kil alanaysse. Ikey cilumkiliya. I figure out this way.*  
‘I found this road. This is a short-cut.’

24 Sunjae: *Cilumkil?. Weee (rising tone), I like Cilumkil. How about..*  
‘Short-cut?’

‘a short-cut’

25 Yongho: (to Joonho) Hey, No, don’t play (with my toy).

26 Sunjae: Yongho, How about ..What if it supposes to go like this, and then it beats up my Blade-Blade.

27 Joonho: Yeh, cool.

28 Yongho: *Ike tangyenhi hal swu isse. Ike.*  
‘Of course, this can do that. This’.

29 Sunjae: I know.

‘This is not a ‘Blade-Blade’.’

31 Sunjae: I know.

32 Yongho: It can beat Tap-Blade and Blade-Blade.

33 Sunjae: Top blade and Blade-Blade *ttokkathun kecanga.* Then why did you say that?
‘are the same.’

34 Joonho: I have a blade-blade. Kuntey, nan basteyli epse.
‘By the way, I don’t have a battery.’

35 Sunjae: Shining hanun ke?
‘The one that makes ‘shining’?’

36 Yongho: I still have my battery.

37 Sunjae: Where?

38 Yongho: In my Korean home.

‘I don’t have it. I will get the ‘battery’ next, next week again.’

40 Joonho: (to JS and children) Wuli emnayo. Poketmon kadu sacwe...(unintelligible)
My mom is going to buy me a Poketmon Card.

41 Yongho: (to Joonho) Hey, you are copying me.

42 Sunjae: Yeh,

43 Joonho: Na edissnunci, panun cwul ala.
‘I know where it is… where they sell it.’

44 Sunjae: Yeh?

45 Yongho: Me too. It is ‘K-mart’. Sicheol copied me.

46 Sunjae: You copied Mike. You said you didn’t copy Mike and

47 Yongho: Because, maca. ‘Dualist’. Joonho copied me ‘Dualist’. Sicheol copied me
‘You are right.’

48 ‘Dualist’ and ‘Human Torch’. He copies me a lot. So I don’t like him.

49 Sunjae: I know. He is a liar.

50 Joonho: He is a cry baby.

51 Yongho: I know he is a cry boy. (to Joonho) Your bike is in my truck.

Yongho: We can get it out.

Joonho: Library (unintelligible) (to JS) *Imo, wulicipun library lang kakkawa*. ‘Aunt, my home is close to the ‘library’.’

JS: *Kulay, cogkeyssney*. ‘That is good.’

Yongho: We don’t care out it.

As the example indicates, all three children not only code-switched within their single turn (or in a single sentence), but also code-switched between turns, following each other’s code choice. For example, the children code-switched in their turn in line 10 (Yongho), in lines 21-22 (Sunjae), and in line 34 (Joonho). Also, all of the children spoke Korean in lines from 1 to 9 and then switched into English from lines 10 to 21. While their code-switching patterns in this excerpt may include diverse interactional functions, (it is not my intention to examine specific functions of children’s code-switching here) code-switching appeared to be a natural device of commoditization for these three Korean bilingual children’s interaction.

5.7 Conclusion: Creating Indexicality and Negotiating Identity through Code-switching

This chapter demonstrates that the children in this study animated and arranged different voices, both metaphorical and physical, according to their situated context. And their voice, as a “social indexical value of a linguistic form” (Woolard, 2004) is constituted in part by their language socialization practices, an intersecting site for social
context and linguistic ideology. That is, social and interactional meaning for each code emerges in context, and these meanings are brought into play by bilingual children’s code-switching. Such code-switching is a key site for these children’s acts of identity, as they negotiate interactional power and diverse voices for themselves vis-à-vis others (Bakhtin, 1981).

Voicing contrasts in code-switching may also involve a shift in personhood (Agha, 2005) in situated contexts and can be part of bilingual children’s self presentation, which is multi-layered and shiftable. For example, Yongho shifted his social relation to his mother and negotiated his self images by incorporating different voices through code-switching. Joonho also used code-switching to reduce tension between himself and his mother, evoking different self images (Kang, 2003). However, these children also often used code-switching as their shared and unique linguistic style among themselves (e.g., as their “we-code”), which highlights their identity in opposition to adults members and to their monolingual counterparts, who either disapprove code-switching or not having it at their disposal (Hill & Hill, 1995; Jørgensen, 1998; Makihara, 2005; Rampton, 1995; Sebba & Wootton, 1998). Having code-switching in their repertoire, these children replace the traditional notion of “we” and “they” with a fluid notion of identity that is negotiated and shifted in the course of interaction across different contexts.

1 Some call this “affective prosody” in linguistic literature. However, in this chapter, I use “affective tones” in order to be consistent with the concept “emotional-volitional tone” (Bakhtin, 1993) that I introduce later.
CHAPTER 6

LANGUAGE SOCIALIZATION OF TERMS OF ADDRESS: BILINGUAL CREATIVITY AND HYBRIDITY¹

6.1 Introduction

Terms of address convey sociocultural meanings such as social roles, positions, and relationships between interlocutors (Brown & Gilman, 1960; Mühlhäusler & Harré, 1990). The use and acquisition of these terms depend on a large amount of social knowledge (Hanks, 1990). That is, learning to use these terms in a certain community requires not only linguistic knowledge of the lexicon and grammar, but also sociocultural knowledge about the structure of social relationships and the notion of personhood which operates in that culture. Thus children’s acquisition and use of these terms is particularly related to their construction of the self.

The Korean children in this study who are in a Korean-English bilingual environment must negotiate different sociocultural and linguistic norms while navigating different settings. In Korean-American community contexts, which include but are not limited to the home, these children are socialized into the social relationships associated with Korean through interactions with their parents and others while speaking Korean. These bilingual children, however, are also exposed to ideologies about social
relationships associated with linguistic practices in English. How bilingual children incorporate these differing ideologies is part of their socialization and also part of their identity construction. This process, though often a challenge for these children due to its complexity, offers much room for creativity. The multiplicity of languages and ideologies that such children are exposed to offers an opportunity for dynamic and often innovative language practices (Bayley & Schecter, 2003; Watson-Gegeo, 2004).

This chapter explores children’s socialization into Korean terms of address and their creative use of these terms in a Korean-English bilingual environment. I focus on children’s construction of the self in interactional negotiations, examining how these children and their parents or other adult members in the community jointly create socialization practices and continuously define and redefine their roles in the process. The previous chapter focuses on the relationship between the home socialization context and children’s code-switching patterns. The code-switching data reveal that how children’s understanding of multiple language ideologies and languages is constructed and how children use this multiplicity as their resources in discourse. This chapter, in contrast, highlights children’s agency in blurring the boundary of the languages and in negotiating the context of contrasting language ideologies, which brings their hybrid and multi-layered identity to the fore. The data in this chapter accentuate the creative potential of children’s active participation in the socialization process in a bilingual setting.

The chapter begins with a general reflection on the discursive role of pronouns, including address and reference terms, in the construction of the self. The next section
introduces Korean terms of address, focusing on how the social meanings manage as well as are reflected in social relationships. Then the data analyses focus on two specific aspects of Korean American children’s language socialization: (1) how these children are socialized into Korean address terms by their parents; and (2) how the children create their own bilingual practices. The following discussion highlights how children’s improvised bilingual practices in this study eliminate their emerging bilingual (and bicultural) self.

6.2 Terms of Address and the Self

The self as a relational term concerns how individuals view themselves and others in social positions and is constructed mostly through social interactions and particularly through linguistic interactions between individuals who are in some social relation to each other (Gergen, 1990; Harré, 1987; Miller, et al., 1990).

In particular, terms of address reflect and also help constitute social relationships between individuals in a given sociocultural system. The use and interpretation of these terms depend on social and cultural knowledge (Hanks, 1990; Levinson, 1983; Mühlhäusler & Harré, 1990; Silverstein, 1976) and individuals acquire this social and cultural knowledge through the very linguistic practice that has these terms (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, b). For instance, terms of address in Korean index clearly demarcated hierarchies between speakers, addressees, and others referred to in discourse. According to local language ideologies, the terms used by a younger or junior person in an interaction typically define and create a hierarchical relationship with an elder. Through the use of polite forms of address terms, individuals in junior positions recognize and
comply with their roles and act according to the social norms which govern relationships between an older brother (hyeng) and a younger brother (tongsayng) or between an older married woman (acwumma) and a young child.

Thus, addressing is not only a linguistic practice that referentially denotes persons in discourse, but also a social practice that indexes and makes relevant implicit rules and frames for individuals (Hanks, 1990). In this sense, Mühlhäusler and Harré (1990, p. 94) argue that the sociocultural information indexed through address terms (in their case, personal pronouns) locates the speaker “in a moral order of rights and duties of speaking and of acting through speaking”. The appropriate use of these terms mediates individuals’ sociocultural positioning as persons within a given sociocultural world. Through this positioning, individuals demonstrate their understanding of and compliance with socioculturally defined roles and responsibilities towards others. At the same time, address terms, as indexicals of social relations, also play a significant role in the construction of the self (Ochs, 1990).

6.3 Address and Reference Terms in Korea

Korean has an extensive set of hierarchical address-reference terms that are sensitive to (or index) degrees of social relationships between speakers and addressees and/or references2. Korean, however, does not have a neutral second person form such as the English “you3,” nor a second person pronoun that refers to a person regarded as socially superior (Hwang, 1990; Lee & Ramsey, 2000; Morita, 2003; Park, 2005; Sohn, 1999). Instead, there is extensive use of nominal substitutes such as kinship terms, e.g., nwuna “elder sister for a boy”, enni “elder sister for a girl”, hyeng “elder brother for a
boy”, and oppa “elder brother for a girl”, social positions, e.g., senpaynim “senior at school or work”, titles, e.g., sensayngnim “teacher” and sacangnim “president of a firm”, and teknonyms, e.g., X emeni “mother of X”. These nominal forms encode social relationships between people in terms of age, social status, kinship, and in- and out-groupness, and it is not an exaggeration to say that a speaker cannot properly utter a single sentence in Korean without demarcating the social relationship between herself and the addressee or referent (Sohn, 1999). Therefore, Koreans are likely to find it more relaxing while speaking English as far as address terms are concerned, since the single form of ‘you’ in English replaces a set of hierarchy-laden terms of address in Korean (Lee & Ramsey, 2000).

Vague expressions that do not index hierarchy are only acceptable for people who are not close to each other. Typically, once people know each other better, vague terms are replaced by hierarchically laden terms (Park, 2005). It is considered to be rude or unfriendly to use expressions that do not denote age, social status, or kinship among those who have known each other for a while. When two adult strangers meet for the first time, for example, they both use polite address terms (usually full name + ssi, a formal suffix) with each other until they become close. Then, the younger person or the person in the lower rank begins to address the older one as enni/nwuna ‘elder sister’ or oppa/hyeng ‘elder brother’ while the older one either uses the first name only or continues to use name + ssi to the younger person. In this fashion, a reciprocal and egalitarian, but distant relationship is transformed into a hierarchical but intimate one since these hierarchical
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“fictive” kinship terms index not only hierarchy, but also family-like closeness based on a cultural ideology of in-groupness (Sohn, 1981).

Compared to adults, children determine hierarchy in their peer relations more quickly and explicitly. Children do not use the polite term ‘name + ssi’ to address each other. Additionally, reciprocal non-hierarchical intimate forms of address (e.g., mutual first names) exist only for those who are the same age. That is, a difference as little as one year (e.g., between a three year old and a four year old) would conventionally require the younger child to address the older one with a fictive kinship term. Therefore, when children first meet each other, they typically ask each other directly about their ages. In addition, adults provide children’s ages and supply appropriate terms to use when introducing them to each other. In short, the vast majority of a child’s relationships are hierarchical yet intimate, through the use of multiple ‘fictive’ kin address terms such as enni/nwuna ‘elder sister’ or oppa/hyeng ‘elder brother.’

Thus using terms that index deference or hierarchy does not necessarily imply distance in Korean (Hwang, 1990), similar to Chinese (Blum, 1997) and Japanese (Matsumoto, 1988). That is, hierarchy and solidarity are not at opposite ends of the spectrum in Korean culture as Brown and Levinson (1987) propose in their theory of politeness. Because of the interaction of these two indexical meanings, hierarchy and solidarity, Korean kinship terms play an important role in defining, in the moment, interpersonal relationships among interlocutors and can be strategically deployed to invoke solidarity to relax tension when a conflict occurs (Kang, 2003) or to emphasize hierarchy to establish authority.
From the moment young Korean babies begin to interact with others, they are socialized into the proper hierarchical terms of address and reference for others that locate them within a complex social space. Children must therefore remember how they are hierarchically situated with respect to their peers and learn to manage this intricate web of interpersonal relationships.

6.4 Language Socialization as Practice

From early on, Korean-speaking children learn to shift self-references across contexts, e.g., using the humble form of “I” (ce) or the plain form of “I” (na), as their relations with others change (see Morita’s chapter in this volume for similar examples in Japanese). Children’s proper use of address terms indicates their understanding of their social positions. Thus, children’s acquisition of the address system and the acquisition of social and cultural competence (in this case, social relations and self-positioning) are not independent, but intertwined with each other, which is the premise of the language socialization approach to language learning. In this approach, language is viewed as a “system of symbolic resources designed for the production and interpretation of social and intellectual activities” (Ochs, 1996, p. 407). Language in this sense is both the goal of and a tool for socialization. That is, children are socialized to use language and, at the same time, they are socialized through the use of language (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986).

Children, however, do not just imitate the adult world or passively accept cultural resources in the process of socialization, but also contribute to the creation of such resources (Bayley & Schecter, 2003; Corsaro & Miller, 1992; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, b). While children are socialized through the resources passed down by previous
generations, they create personal meanings out of the particular set of resources to which they are exposed. In this sense, Gaskins, et al. (1992) argue that socialization is not only collective but also individual. Furthermore, children often transform or resist certain value-laden messages (Gaskins, et al., 1992; He, 2003), taking active and selective roles in socialization.

Recent work has considered socialization as not only a developmental process, but also as a moment-by-moment practice of identity construction (Langman, 2003). In this view, children engage in practices of identity appropriate for their age. Children’s practices, for example, are not viewed as just “a trial and error movement” toward adult-like practices, but practices in their own right, as Makihara (2005) discusses in her work on Rapa Nui children’s adoption of a new Rapa Nui Spanish style. Langman (2003) suggests that language socialization is not simply a developmental process leading to adulthood, but rather an on-going process that defines what it means to be an age-appropriate person in a social group.

Socialization as practice becomes salient especially for bi/multilingual children who are provided with different social norms and values from those of their parents. In a bi/multilingual context, there is no guarantee that adult norms will be the predetermined set of norms by which children are socialized. The social norms that monolingual adults have been socialized into may no longer be valuable to children who are speaking more than one language. Multiple languages and cultures provide these bilingual children with a broader range of selections from which they can make their own choices (Bayley & Schecter, 2003). Additionally, the fluidity of context also makes room for creativity in
children’s socialization processes. As a result, children may not choose one language and its associated culture over the other, but create hybrid practices which belong somewhere in between.

6.5 Language Socialization of Korean Terms of Address

Before examining how children’s addressing practices construct their identity, this section shows how they are socialized to use these terms, mostly through interaction with their parents or other adults. Traditionally, most language socialization research focuses on this process, i.e., how young children are socialized into culturally appropriate ways of speaking, presumably acquiring the cultural knowledge underlying language practices and constructing a view of themselves and others (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, b).

Typically adult input plays an important role in socializing children into specific ways of speaking (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, b), and previous research has looked in particular at linguistic practices that index cultural affect or social status and roles in relationships (e.g., Andersen, 1986; Blum, 1997; Clancy, 1986, 1989; Morita, 2003; Platt, 1986). In the case of Korean, adults commonly supply the terms that children should use with others. Since parents are often blamed for their children’s improper use of language (in particular, for impoliteness when speaking to elders), parents have a strong interest in ensuring that their children acquire and use socially appropriate terms of address. In this way, adults socialize children into the proper use of these terms and more importantly into the social relationships that they index, both explicitly and implicitly.

Explicit socialization occurs as adults define relationships between children and others and also model children’s relationships with others, providing them with proper
terms to use. Socialization also occurs implicitly as parents recast children’s speech, indirectly correct terms children have used, and narrate around children about roles and relationships.

6.5.1. Defining Relationships for Children

Defining relationships for children commonly occurs when children meet strangers for the first time. The following is an occasion when I (JS) first met Sunjae, one of the participants, in his home:

Example 1.

1. JS to Sunjae: *apulo ettekey pwulullay?* Joonhonun imolako pwulununtey. Neto molako pwulullay?
   ‘How are you going to address me from now on? Joonho addresses me as *imo* ‘aunt’. Would you, too, like to address me as *imo* ‘aunt’?’

2. Sunjae’s mother to Sunjae:
   *kulay, imolako pwulle. Animyen nwunalako pwulutunci... acik kyelhon an hayssunika.*
   ‘Yes, address her as *imo* ‘aunt’. Or, why don’t you address her as *nwuna* ‘elder sister’ since she is not married yet.

Sunjae’s mother and I explicitly discuss how he should address JS. JS suggests the term *imo* ‘aunt’ while Sunjae’s mother recommends the term *nwuna* ‘elder sister’ instead. Here, Sunjae’s mother indicates why the latter term is appropriate by saying “since she is not married yet”. Additionally, she implied that the term *acwumma* ‘a married woman’ is not appropriate for JS, which is a term that Sunjae typically uses to address women JS’s age; in fact, he insisted on using *acwumma* to address JS (which will
be discussed in 7.2.) In this excerpt, Sunjae’s mother informs Sunjae of the indexical meaning of such terms.

6.5.2. Modeling for Children

In addition to explicitly instructing children about which address terms to use, adults frequently animated children’s voices, providing models for them. While modeling terms for second and third persons (from a child’s perspective) occurred frequently, modeling terms for the first person (for children to refer to themselves) occurred less often.

In this community, adults commonly referred to themselves with their titles or kinship terms while talking to children. For example, teachers referred to themselves as sensayngnim (sensayng ‘teacher’ + nim ‘respect suffix,’ literally ‘honorable teacher’). The following excerpt is from a first grade Korean heritage language classroom in the city.

Example 2.

1 Sicheol to teacher:  
   nato meli callassnunteyyo.
   ‘I got a hair cut too.’

2 Teacher to Sicheol:  
   sensayngnim ci nan cuwuey mospwakaciko.
   ‘Since the teacher [I] didn’t see you last week.’

This example shows how the first-grade teacher at the Korean heritage language school socializes children into the proper term of address by using the term sensayngnim ‘teacher’ to refer to herself in front of the class. She often used other nominal or verbal honorific suffixes (such as sensayngnim + kkeyse ‘honorable teacher + nominal marker
(honorific)’ and *hasseysseyo ‘did (honorific) + past + polite speech level’*) to refer to or describe herself when speaking to students. This kind of self-exalting expression would be considered awkward when speaking to another adult in Korean, since honorific expressions and terms are supposed to be used for others, not for oneself. Here, however, it is used purposefully. By referring to herself as *sensayngnim* in front of her students, the teacher provides a proper term for students to use and at the same time indexes the teacher-student relationship (Mühlhäusler & Harré, 1990; Silverstein, 1976). In the classroom, particularly in lower grades, teachers seldom used the pronoun “I.” The complex social indexicality of such terms is apparent in the fact that parents of children address or refer to teachers with the same honorific term regardless of children’s presence, but teachers do not refer to themselves as *sensayngnim* when talking to parents. Instead, they use the first person humble pronoun of “I” *ce* in these cases.

In much the same fashion, Joonho’s mother frequently referred to JS, the researcher as *imo ‘aunt’*:

Example 3.

1. Mother to Joonho: *Joonhoya, kase imohantey, imo siksa hasile osilako hay.* ‘Joonho, go and tell *imo ‘aunt’, “Imo, please come (HON) and eat (HON) dinner (HON)”’

2. Joonho to JS: *imo, siksa hasile oseyyo.* ‘Imo, come (HON) and eat (HON) dinner (HON).’

Here, Joonho’s mother refers to JS as *imo ‘aunt’* while she is interacting with him.

Although the relationship between the mother and JS was close, and she usually called JS by her first name, she always referred to JS as *imo ‘aunt’* in front of Joonho and used the
honorifics that would be appropriate for Joonho to use in these cases. In so doing, she socialized Joonho into the appropriate terms of address, as well as the social relationships and respect that such terms index.

In fact, Joonho’s mother often spoke on behalf of Joonho. For example, when JS asked Joonho what he did over the weekend, his mother responded to JS by speaking for Joonho, from his point of view:

Example 4.

1 JS to Joonho:  *Joonhoya, ecey mwe hayssse?*  ‘Joonho, what did you do yesterday?’

2 Joonho: (no response)

3 Joonho’s mother to JS (and Joonho):  *Sicheoli hyenganey cipey kassesseyo.*  ‘[I] went to Sicheol hyeng’s ‘brother’ house.’

4 Joonho’s mother to Joonho:  *kekise caymisskey nolassci, kuchi?*  ‘[You] had fun there, right?’

Here, Joonho’s mother spoke to JS in Joonho’s voice, using terms like *hyeng* ‘elder brother’ and verb endings (-‘yo’) that would be appropriate for him to use in this situation. In this way, Joonho’s mother provides him with a model for how to speak to JS, thus indirectly socializing him. This kind of child-centered talk is very common in Korean (see Morita 2003 and this volume for discussion of a similar phenomenon in Japanese). Such a shift in the adults’ point of view can occur even when a child is not present. For example, a wife can refer to her husband as *appa* ‘daddy,’ taking her child’s perspective when talking to her neighbor (Cho, 1982, p. 3):
Example 5.

*wuli appan acik an wasseyo.*

Our *appa* ‘daddy’ hasn’t come yet [My husband hasn’t come home yet].

Similarly, a grandmother refers to her grown-up son as *apem* ‘dad,’ taking her grandchild’s perspective while talking to her daughter-in-law (Cho 1982: 44):

Example 6.

*apem acik an tule wassni?*

Hasn’t *apem* ‘dad’ come in yet? [Hasn’t my son come in yet?].

Here, the dad is neither the speaker nor the listener; he is the father of the speaker’s grandchild. The term *apem* ‘dad’ thus refers to the father from the point of view of the (non-present) grandchild. In a similar manner, the parents of the participants in this study referred to the researcher as either *imo* ‘aunt’ or *sensayngnim* ‘teacher’ regardless of their children’s presence.

6.5.3. Recasting

Parents also frequently repeated and corrected terms that children used while talking to them. In the following example of recasting Joonho is talking to his mother about the events of the day:

Example 7.

1 Joonho to mother: *onul Sicheol pakkeyse wulesse.*
   ‘Today, Sicheol cried outside.’

2 Mother to Joonho: *Sicheol hyenga maliya? Sicheol hyengaka way wulessnumtey?*
‘You mean Sicheol _hyeng_ ‘brother’? Why did Sicheol _hyeng_ ‘brother’ cry?’

3  Joonho to mother: _waynyahamyen Sicheol hyeng_ keympoi kaciko nollyeko hayssnutey, kaciko kasse. ‘Because Sicheol _hyeng_ ‘brother’ wanted to play with the Game Boy, but [a friend of his] took it away.’

In the first line Joonho refers to a boy who is older than him with his first name only. In the next turn the mother recasts this as “Sicheol _hyeng_” ‘brother’. Following her recasting of his speech, Joonho then refers to the boy as “Sicheol _hyeng_” in the next line.

6.5.4. Narrating around and about Children

Children were also socialized as overhearers (Miller, 1994; Miller, _et al._, 1992). In the following excerpt, Joonho’s mother referred to Sicheol as _hyeng_ while talking to JS in front of Joonho and Sicheol who were playing together.

Example 8.

_wuli Sicheolinun cham cohun hyengiya. hangsang Joohnolul cal tolpwa cwuntanika. Joonholang kathi issumyen hyeng nolusul thokthokhi hantanika. Joonhoto Sicheolilul cal ttala._

‘(Our) Sicheol is a really good _hyeng_ to Joonho. (He) always takes good care of him. When (he) is with Joonho, he plays the _hyeng_ ‘elder brother’ role well. Joonho also follows Sicheol’s lead.’

By referring to Sicheol as _hyeng_ in this example, the mother socializes her son, Joonho, into a hierarchical relationship while defining for the children, who are intended overhearers (Goffman, 1981), the kinds of actions and stances that constitute this relationship. In taking on this role of a _hyeng_, Sicheol is expected to take care of Joonho
and to be protective of him, while Joonho is expected to be dependent upon Sicheol and respectful towards him.

6.6 Children’s Negotiation of Self and Bilingual Creativity

Despite parents’ socialization efforts, the data on children’s addressing practices show that children make their own choices through improvised practices; they do not always comply with their parents’ or other adult members’ input, but innovate new practices as a way to avoid Korean status-charged address terms. In my data, Joonho and Sunjae pursued different strategies. Joonho would omit *hyeng* ‘brother’ when referring to Sicheol and also anglicized his name. Sunjae, on the other hand, avoided using Korean kinship terms by code-switching into English. Such practices reveal children’s agency as they pursue their own choices in the negotiation of conflicting beliefs and cultural ideologies. Through such practices, children dynamically transform the socialization process, incorporating often conflicting norms, ideologies, and expectations. In this sense, children are not the “passive, ready and uniform recipients of socialization” (He, 2003, p. 128) often presumed in traditional language socialization research, but active negotiators of diverse beliefs about cultural norms and linguistic practices.

6.6.1 Omitting the Kinship Term ‘Hyeng’ through Anglicizing a Korean Name

Joonho regularly used the Korean kinship term *hyeng* in various contexts to address or refer to other children, including children from other countries, when he first entered school in the U.S. As time went by, however, Joonho rarely addressed or referred to one of his closest Korean friends, Sicheol, as “*hyeng*” or “Sicheol *hyeng*.” Instead,
Joonho addressed or referred to Sicheol by using his first name with an English pronunciation. He would use this anglicized form, which I call `{Sicheol}`, even in the midst of otherwise entirely Korean utterances.

The differences between these two terms, Sicheol and `{Sicheol}` include both phonetic and prosodic features, namely Sicheol [ɕɪ.ʧəl] and `{Sicheol}` [sɛ.ʧəl]. The former was pronounced as two distinct syllables [ɕɪ] and [ʧəl], which constitutes two Korean words. Neither syllable is strongly accented, but the second syllable has a higher tone. The latter was pronounced with a strong accent on the first syllable [sɛ]. The pronunciation of `{Sicheol}` typically occurred with an exaggerated pitch. Joonho could have picked up this form, `{Sicheol}`, in school where, for example, his ESL teacher addresses Sicheol as [sɪ.ʧɜ.ɬ]. In her pronunciation, she tried to pronounce each vowel individually. However, the spelling in the name, Sicheol, does not reflect the original Korean pronunciation exactly, which results in the teacher’s distinctive pronunciation. Joonho’s pronunciation of `{Sicheol}` was not identical with the teacher’s pronunciation. The major difference is located in the way the first vowel was pronounced. The first vowel in the teacher’s pronunciation is [ɪ], but the first vowel in `{Sicheol}` is pronounced as [ɛ]. The [ɛ] pronunciation in `{Sicheol}` is unusual since native speakers of English would rarely pronounce the name [sɛ] with the spelling, ‘si’. The pronunciation of `{Sicheol}` was Joonho’s own unique creation, which he used in English as well as Korean
utterances. The following extracts show how Joonho used the anglicized \{Sicheol\} in Korean utterances:

Example 9.

Joonho to Sicheol: \{Sicheol\}, nahako ike kaciko nollay?
‘Sicheol, do you want to play with this with me?’

Joonho to Mother: \textit{emma, na \{Sicheol\} cipey kato tway?}
‘Mom, can I go to Sicheol’s house?’

According to Joonho, the anglicized form \{Sicheol\} was actually an English term. When asked “Why don’t you call Sicheol \textit{hyeng} any more?” and “Don’t you need to address him as \textit{hyeng}?”, Joonho told me that \{Sicheol\} was English and thus he did not have to use the hierarchical kinship term, \textit{hyeng}. In this metapragmatic analysis (Agha, 1998), Joonho seemed to draw a distinction between different norms attached to two cultural systems. That is, he appeared to believe that using \{Sicheol\} invoked a different set of norms in the midst of a Korean utterance. Through this hybrid practice of embedding English addressing practices into Korean sentences, Joonho thus performed code-switching.

As Auer (1998) notes, what counts as a code in code-switching depends on the speech community members’ point of view. Regardless of whether two codes seem similar to out-group members, when switching produces meaningful effects for bilinguals, the codes should be considered distinct (Auer, 1998). In this case, Joonho’s anglicization plays an important pragmatic function. By using \{Sicheol\}, Joonho could address or refer to Sicheol without using the hierarchical kinship term \textit{hyeng}, thus
circumventing Korean norms of address through code-switching (Auer, 1998). In this sense, Joonho’s practice is different from the typical nominal borrowing that may not have any particular functional effect. The fact that Joonho did not use (1) ‘Sicheol’ (the Korean first name alone) nor (2) ‘{Sicheol} + hyeng’ (English code + hyeng), shows that this practice was consistent and not accidental (only ‘Sicheol hyeng’ and ‘{Sicheol}’ were found in my data). In fact, the difference between {Sicheol} and ‘Sicheol’ was salient both to adults and children in this community. For example, Joonho’s mother noticed and mentioned this practice to me several times during the first several months of my observations. In fact, Joonho’s mother often corrected the use of {Sicheol} by recasting it (see excerpt 7). However, as time went by, she began to ignore it. Other adults found this practice interesting and some of them also mimicked it. Among Joonho’s Korean-speaking peers, {Sicheol} became a shared practice, and a kind of ‘we-code’ (Gumperz, 1982). When I discussed this practice with a group of Sicheol’s friends, for example, they had a perspective similar to Joonho’s:

Example 10.

Insu, Sunjae, and Sicheol are all friends of Joonho’s. Insu, Sunjae, and Joonho are 5 years old whereas Sicheol is 6 years old.

1 JS: (to Insu and Sunjae) nehuytul way Sicheol hyengilako pwuluci anhni? ‘Why don’t you call Sicheol hyeng [e.g. elder brother].

2 Insu: mikwukeysenun brother ilako haci anhayo. caki familyeykeyto brother ilako anhhayyo. Hankwukey kamyen hyengilako pwuleyo. ‘In the States, [we] don’t call him “brother.” Even family members don’t use the term “brother” here. If I go to Korea, I will call him hyeng.’

3 Sunjae: yengelonun brother ilako haci anhayo. hankwukeysenun hyengilako pwululkkeyeyyo. kekin hyengiyeyyo.
‘(We) don’t use “brother” in English. I would call him hyeng if I were in Korea because he would be a hyeng to me [there].’

4 JS:  
*ku*lem*yen nanun? Nanun *yengelo ettehkey pwulle?*  
‘Then what about me? How do you address me in English?’

5 Sunjae: e.. Ju*young? (smiling)  
‘um.. Ju*young?’

6 JS:  
*e. kun*te*y ne Ju*young ilako hanpento an pwullesscanha.*  
‘Well, you don’t address [me] as Juyoung though.’

7 Sunjae: Juyoungen hankwuk ilum. kulayse kulayyo.  
‘Because Juyoung is a Korean name, we don’t address you that way.’

8 JS:  
*ku*lem*yen Sicheolun?  
‘What about Sicheol?’

9 Sunjae:  
*Sicheol*…. *ku*ken hankwuk ilum aniyeyyo.  
*Sicheol*…. That is not a Korean name.’

10 Insu:  
*Sicheol*un *yen*ge.  
*Sicheol* is an English name.’

11 JS:  
(to Sicheol) *nen*un ettehkey sayngkakhay?  
‘What do you think about this?’

12 Sicheol: It doesn’t make sense (raising his voice). If I were in Korea, I would be seven years old and they were six years old…and.. *ku*lem*yen hyeng icanhayo.*  
‘Then as you see I am a hyeng.’

13 JS:  
*kun*te*y Sicheoli hanpento hwanaykena hancek epscanha.  
‘But you didn’t seem to be so upset about their calling you that way.’

14 Sicheol:  
*waynyahamyenyo, waynyahamyen hyeng icanhayo.*  
‘Because, because I am their hyeng.’

15 JS:  
*hyengila*se chammunkeya?  
‘Because you are their hyeng, you are enduring it? [e.g., forgiving them for their mistake?]’

16 Sicheol: *Yey-ey* (quickly).
‘Yes’

17 Sunjae: (to Sicheol) It’s okay, {Sicheol}.

This interaction reveals how these children associate different social relationships and practices of terms of address with Korean and English. Insu and Sunjae link the anglicized form of {Sicheol} to the instantiation of a status-neutral social relationship. At the same time, they note that the creation of such relationships, and indeed, the salience of age itself, is context-dependent: “If I go to Korea I will call him hyeng” (line 2), “I would call him hyeng if I were in Korea” (line 3), and “If I were in Korea, I would be seven years old” (line 12).” It is not that these children do not understand the practice of hierarchical peer relations, but rather that they choose not to create such relationships through the practice of anglicization.

{Sicheol} can be considered a ‘bivalent’ form, simultaneously Korean and English (Woolard, 1998). Woolard (1998, p. 7) uses the concept ‘bivalency’ to describe bilingual words or segments like {Sicheol} that “could ‘belong’ equally, descriptively and even prescriptively, to both codes”. Woolard argues that the significance of bivalency resides in its role in making the boundary between codes less distinct, and in bilinguals’ strategic use of such bivalent elements in their interactional negotiations. On the one hand, when embedded in Korean utterances, {Sicheol} may be considered ‘Korean with an accent’ because of its derivation from a Korean proper name. On the other hand, {Sicheol} can be considered English through the way children in the community use and rationalize it.
The practice of \{Sicheol\} thus makes the indexical values associated with the address term ambiguous. Through this ambiguity, it blurs “the commitment to indexing any single rights-and-obligations set” attached to each code (Myers-Scotton, 1993, p. 7) and as a result, enables the children to creatively define what exactly this term entails. In this sense, \{Sicheol\} is an example of a ‘contextualization cue’ (Gumperz, 1982) or a change in ‘footing’ (Goffman, 1981). Auer (1995) argues that code-switching works much like prosodic or gestural contextualization cues by signaling participants’ orientations to each other. By enacting this bivalent term, Joonho and the other children create hybrid identities that draw from local language ideologies to create new ones (Myers-Scotton, 1993; Stroud, 1992).

Joonho’s hybrid practices are reminiscent of the Japanese American child discussed by Morita in this volume, who uses the English ‘you’ in Japanese utterances. A similar practice can be found in Lee’s (1975) study of Korean-English bilinguals in Hawaii. Lee found that Korean-American adults used the English pronoun ‘you’ in Korean sentences to avoid indexing the social relationships associated with Korean address terms. In all of these cases, using the English pronoun ‘you’ instead of using address terms that denote any social relationships in each language is also creative, yet constrained by a lack of knowledge of appropriate terms to use in the situation.

6.6.2. Avoiding Korean Kinship Terms through Code-switching

Sunjae, who came to the U.S four years before my study began, seldom used Korean kinship terms such as hyeng and nwuna ‘elder sister (for a boy)’ despite his
parents’ socialization efforts. He avoided using such terms through code-switching. The following exemplifies Sunjae’s typical strategy:

Example 11.

Sunjae (five years old) is asking Misun (eleven years old) whether she would like to play with him and his friends.

1  Sunjae to Misun:  
   Misun, neto kachi hallay?
   ‘Misun, do you [plain form] want to play too?’

2  Misun to Sunjae:  
   melako?, ne? nwunalako pwulle.
   ‘What did you say? Did you say ‘you’ [plain form]? Address me as nwuna (elder sister).’

3  Sunjae to Misun:  
   (switching into English) Do you want to play?

In this example, Sunjae addresses Misun with her first name and ne (the plain form of ‘you’) in Korean. Misun, a recent arrival to the U.S., sanctions him for this behavior since usually the first name alone and ne are used when an elder person addresses or refers to a younger person or between same-status, close friends. She tells Sunjae to address her as nwuna ‘elder sister.’ In order to avoid using this term, Sunjae quickly switches into English and addresses Misun as ‘you’ in English. Misun told me that Sunjae never addressed her as nwuna, and whenever she pointed this out to him he would immediately change to English and persist in using English thereafter. Sunjae’s mother also said that she told Sunjae to address Misun as nwuna on several occasions, but he would not use the term.
Sunjae also avoided using other kinship terms that would have located him in a subordinate relationship vis à vis his peers. In this example, he remained silent when pressed to use the term hyeng:

Example 12.

Joonho, Sunjae, Sicheol, Joonho’s mother, and JS were having lunch together at Joonho’s. Joonho and Sunjae are five years old and Sicheol is six years old.

1 Joonho: (to his mother) emma, na namkyeto tway?
   ‘Mom, can I leave some food [on my plate]?’

2 Joonho’s mother: (to Joonho) Okay.

3 Joonho: (to Sunjae and Sicheol) aytula, namkyeto toynta
   ‘Guys, you don’t have to finish everything.’

4 Joonho’s Mother: (to Joonho) mwe, aytulanun (.3) hyengalang Sunjaenun annamkinney.
   ‘What? Did you say ‘guys’? Hyeng ‘brother’ [e.g., Sicheol] and Sunjae will finish [their food].’

5 Joonho: (looking at his mother and smiling).

6 Joonho: Sunjae, ne namkilkeeya.
   ‘Sunjae, are you going to leave some food [on your plate]?’

7 Joonho’s mother: Joonhoya neto ta mektunci.
   ‘Joonho, then why don’t you finish too?’

8 Sunjae: (to Joonho) Sicheolinun…..?
   ‘What about Sicheol?’

9 Joonho’s mother: Sunjaeya, Sicheoli hyenga aniya?
   ‘Sunjae, isn’t Sicheol your hyeng ‘brother’?’

10 Sunjae: (no response, keeps looking down and eating his food)

11 Sicheol: (to Joonho’s mother) hyenga macayo.
   ‘Right. [I am his] hyeng ‘brother’.’
12 Sunjae: (still no response, keeps eating)

13 Joonho’s mother: (looking and smiling at Sunjae)

14 Joonho: (to Joonho’s mother) kuntey Sunjaenun tasessaliya. ‘By the way, Sunjae is five years old.’

In line 4, Joonho’s mother reprimands Joonho for addressing Sunjae and Sicheol as *aytul*, a third person plural term typically used by adults to refer to children or by children to refer to other children who are either the same age or younger. She quickly recasts this utterance as “*hyengalang Sunjae*” ‘elder brother and Sunjae’. Then, Joonho smiles at his mother, perhaps acknowledging his mistake. Sunjae’s response, however, is different from Joonho’s. In line 9, when Joonho’s mother sanctions Sunjae for referring to Sicheol as “Sicheol” and not as “Sicheol hyeng.” Sunjae becomes silent in lines 10 and 12. His silence here may be interpreted as a form of resistance towards the term, since he never called Sicheol *hyeng* at any point during my study. While Joonho and Sicheol ratify Joonho’s mother’s understanding of the importance of hierarchical peer relationships by confirming Sicheol’s status as a *hyeng* and by noting Sunjae’s age, Sunjae remains silent through the end of this encounter.

Besides *hyeng* and *nwuna*, Sunjae also avoided using the kinship term *imo* ‘aunt.’ When Sunjae and JS first met, his mother and JS tried to convince him to address JS as *imo* or *nwuna* (see excerpt 1). However, he did not address JS with either of these terms. Although he had ample opportunity to hear other children addressing JS as *imo* ‘aunt’ or *sensayngnim* ‘teacher,’ Sunjae either omitted such address terms, used my first name alone (see line 5 in excerpt 10), or used *acwumma*, a polite term similar to English
‘ma’am’ usually used for married women. Sunjae’s mother and I were surprised at his use of this term, since it is considered inappropriate (and even rude) for unmarried women. Since no other children in this community addressed JS as *acwumma*, Sunjae’s use of this term is his own choice to avoid using the kinship terms *imo* ‘aunt’ or *nwuna* ‘elder sister’.

As noted earlier, using a kinship term such as *imo* or *nwuna* indexes not only hierarchy but also a family-like close relationship (Sohn, 1981). The fact that Sunjae chose to use *acwumma* (which indexes hierarchy, but can be somewhat distancing) instead of using fictive kin terms such as *imo* or *nwuna* with JS reveals that he may in fact have been resisting the kinship relationship that such terms convey. This became clear when he said in an interview that “These terms, *nwuna* and *hyeng*, are only for family members. You are not my *imo*. So [if I call you *imo*], it will make people confused”. Similarly, Sunjae noted that if he were in Korea, then he would address Sicheol as *hyeng* because Sicheol would be a *hyeng* to him there. Sunjae’s resistance to these address terms stood in contrast to his proper use of honorifics such as polite verb endings. Sunjae would switch between non-honorific and honorific registers depending on his addressee’s age, thus demonstrating that he recognized the salience of age-based hierarchies in Korean. By resisting the extension of such terms to fictive kin as is commonly practiced in Korea (see Wang, *et al.*, 2005), Sunjae puts forth a context-sensitive notion of identity which recognizes the indexical power of address terms to instantiate relationships.
6.7 Conclusion

This study explores how Korean American children learn to use terms of address and reference in a bilingual environment. The data reveal that adult input plays an important role in children’s socialization and that children’s use of these terms is mediated through their caregivers. However, children’s bilingual practices were not directly imposed by their caregivers. Joonho, for example, created a bivalent form of {Sicheol}, while Sunjae avoided Korean kinship terms through code-switching. These practices reveal the active role that children play in their socialization process. That is, children do not act according to pre-determined adult norms (Langman, 2003) but rather create new hybrid practices in collaboration with each other, redefining their social relationships through the dynamic means of language.

Besides adults’ input and children’s own agency, the notion of context is also important. Here, context is not necessarily physical, but is “constituted by what people are doing and where and when they are doing it” (Erickson & Shultz, 1981, p. 148). What the Korean-American parents and their children do in this study differs from what typical Korean parents and children would do in Korea. The nature of a bilingual environment supplies multiple resources for the children (and also their caregivers) to choose from, and the caregivers often adapt and change their socialization practices according to the children’s choices. For example, Joonho’s mother eventually let Joonho address Sicheol as {Sicheol} and she began to address him that way as well. Sunjae’s mother eventually relented and did not continue to try to get Sunjae to use kinship terms with others, although she did enforce the use of other honorifics such as polite verb
endings. The caregivers’ adapted practices and the children’s own novel practices together create, define, and redefine the context, which in turn, influences children’s socialization practices recursively. In short, the hybrid, flexible, and fluid nature of the bilingual context plays an important role in the children’s socialization processes (Bayley & Schecter, 2003).

The practices created by the children in this study are also unique manifestations of an ongoing process of identity construction. Children’s linguistic practices select and highlight local ideologies of personhood that index how they view themselves in a particular social relationship. Through code-switching and through the creation of novel linguistic form, these bilingual children use and avoid address terms that index social values and social relationships, negotiating conflicting ideologies, that, in turn, are part of their construction of self.

---

1 This chapter is to appear in A. Reyes & A. Lo. (Eds.), *Linguistic Anthropology of Asian Pacific America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

2 For example, the following shows the complexity of the Korean personal pronouns (Sohn, 1999, p. 207, 409):
   - First person pronouns: *na* (plain), *ce* (humble)
   - Second person pronouns: *ne* (plain) *caney* (familiar) *caki* (intimate) *tangsin* and *tayk* (blunt), *elisin* (deferential, rare)

3 Hwang (1990) points out that ‘*tangsin*’ could be the most similar to English “you,” but it has very limited usage. Children do not use this term to address or refer to anybody, higher or lower.

4 These names were transcribed phonetically by four linguists that included one Korean, two native speakers of English, and one Indian speaker of English. There were some
individual differences and the transcripts shown in the paper are the most common ones among them.

5 In Korean, ages are calculated according to the calendar year and a baby is considered one year old at birth. At the beginning of a new calendar year, people’s ages simultaneously increase by one year. For example, if Sicheol was born in November 2000, then he would be one year old until the end of 2000. On January 1st in 2001, he would turn two years old. Thus people are typically one or two years older when they convert their ages into the Korean age system.

6 This use of first name alone to someone more than twenty years older than you would be considered hugely inappropriate in Korea.

7 The absence of regular interaction with Korean-Americans of different age groups might also have contributed to Greg’s reluctance to use these terms.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION: IMPLICATIONS AND FURTHER STUDIES

7.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I briefly recapitulate findings from Chapters 3-6. The findings discuss the global social context of language learning and its impact on the children’s language socialization in the local context. The findings also elucidate the relationship between parental attitudes to their children’s language learning and diverse images of future communities. Finally the results focus on children’s “bilingual language practices,” code-switching and hybrid addressing practices, linking them to the language socialization context and to children’s presentation and construction of “bilingual” identity.

Then I draw implications based on these findings of the study. I consider major theoretical implications for SLA and Applied Linguistic fields in general and for the LS research in particular, concerning the context, language ideologies, immigrant communities, and bilingualism and identity. Then I identify limitations of the current study and conclude the chapter by suggesting future research directions.
7.2 Summary of Findings

7.2.1 Positioning and Language Ideologies

In terms of language ideologies enacted and articulated by two groups of Koreans, *Korean immigrants* as opposed to *early study abroad sojourners* (so called early English/study abroad students and their families), parents’ responses to their children’s language education differed between these two groups. The interviews with the temporary sojourn families revealed that their attitudes and practices are closely related to the language ideologies of the global English in Korea. That is, they circulated the “*glocalized*” (Robertson, 1995) English (the localized global English) through transnational migration (“globally doing local forms of the global”, Pennycook, 2003b, p. 9). The interview data also revealed that two language ideologies in particular, (a) language as economic commodity and (b) language for cosmopolitan membership, became salient and intensified in the discourse of language education. And these two ideologies also served to naturalize the language ideology of Korean as first/national language. In contrast, for the Korean immigrant group, this naturalized ideology of Korean was no longer uncontestable by the language ideology of English as necessitation (as a mainstream language). Interestingly, the Korean language came to have “a marketable commodity on its own” among Koreans in the U.S. via globalization (Heller, 2003). The analyses of language ideologies in these two groups of Korean provide a heterogeneous perspective to the Korean-American community and emphasize complex
and context-specific nature of language ideologies working on the interconnections between language and identity

Such differences between these two groups in terms of language ideologies lead to different practices. The language socialization practices among three sojourn families have some unique characteristics that are different from those of Korean immigrant families. Their differences in practices are subtle yet crucial to understand their positioning between their local community and the community in Korea. The differences lie in how the sojourn families align themselves with their future “imagined communities” (Anderson, 1991; Kanno & Norton, 2003), enacting and adopting language ideologies that they believe to be prevalent in their aligned communities. In their acknowledgement of such language ideologies, the families attempted to maximize the social values of their practices, matching up the expectations of the educational institutions and policies to their imagined communities.

There are two aspects of language socialization practices that connect the three families together and, at the same time, that distinguish them from other Korean immigrant families in the U.S.: (1) their emphasis on oral communication skills and (2) the naturalized and unchallenged ideology of Korean as a first language (Kroskrity, 2004).

In terms of English education, again, the three families’ language socialization practices reflected the expectations and practices in Korea. They emphasized English communication skills, particularly the oral ability of their children. The families’ emphasis on communication skills contrasted with their relatively low emphasis on the
children’s (academic) literacy skills in English. With respect to their attitudes to Korean learning and use, the three families considered Korean the first language for their children, regardless of how much they emphasized English.

7.2.2 Diversity in Imagined Communities and Language Socialization Practices

The three families’ future imagined communities were not identical, whereas they had similar perspectives and practices of children’s language learning due to their prospect of returning to Korea. For Yongho’s family, the imagined community in Korea was “a highly competitive educational community”, specifically the symbolic community that the family would enter with their cosmopolitan membership and middle class credentials such as overseas educational experiences and English communication skills. In Joonho’s family, both the local US-based and imagined communities were their “transnational social fields” (Basch, *et al*., 1994), in which multiple social relations and transnational social and linguistic practices became habitual and real (Orellana, *et al*., 2001). Joonho’s mother considered their imagined community as “discontinuing bilingual education” due to the lack of resources and support that the family would face in Korea. For Sunjae’s family, their future community was “an EFL context” in which English is a subject in the school curriculum, rather than a communication tool. Therefore Sunjae’s English was considered good enough for their imagined community, which turn in, gave the family a room for warning for learning another “global” language, Chinese.

The families’ imagined communities that are transnational in nature not only exist in these families’ future trajectories, but also exist in the present in transnational space. However, the families’ created images of their future communities are not a direct
reflection of the communities that exist in transnational space, but rather are reconstructed images on the basis of individuals’ current and past experiences. Such aspect explains diverse images of their future communities.

7.2.3 Language Ideologies and Identity in Children’s Bilingual Practices

Children’s interactions in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 show that they negotiated language ideologies in their language socialization practices at home. The children acknowledged, highlighted, and avoided particular language ideologies in their interactions with their parents or peers. For example, Yongho’s code-switching in Chapter 5 highlighted the multiplicity of language ideologies, associating different ideologies with different codes. In this sense, codes are considered not only linguistic forms, but also ideological entities (Bakhtin, 1981; Ochs, 1990). Through code-switching, Yongho shifted his social relationships with others, emphasizing indexical meanings associated with the codes. The indexical meanings provoked in his code-switching were neither his own creation, nor a cultural product that exists ubiquitously in the society. The indexical meanings provoked in his code-switching were rather unique to his family. These meanings were constructed in his language socialization practices. Yongho’s code-switching showed how he wielded power, provoking different social indexical meanings, or “voices” that were co-constructed in their home socialization context (Bakhtin, 1981; Pujolar, 2001; Rampton, 1995; 2006; Woolard, 2004). While his code-switching practices were related to the language socialization context, the practice was not directly imposed by his parents, but his creative way of responding to the language ideologies in his language socialization context.
The code-switching data illuminate how children’s understanding of multiple language ideologies is constructed and how children use this multiplicity as their interactional resources in discourse. Children’s addressing practices in Chapter 6, in contrast, highlights children’s agency in blurring the boundary of the multiple languages and in negotiating the contrasting language ideologies. Children’s addressing practice “{Sicheol},” an anglicized elder Korean boy’s name, is a strategy that children created, independently from parents’ language socialization practice. Using {Sicheol} a ‘bivalent’ form, simultaneously Korean and English (Woolard, 1998), the children in the study blur “the commitment to indexing any single rights-and-obligations set” attached to each code (Myers-Scotton, 1993, p. 7). By so doing, they avoided the social relation invoked by a Korean address term without breaking the hierarchy in Korean.

Children’s creative practices in these two cases elucidate their presentation and construction of identity. Yongho’s code-switching highlights bilinguals’ multi-layered identity, which is shiftable across time and place. The addressing practice, {Sicheol}, also demonstrates children’s ambiguous identity that let these children stand between two languages and two cultures. Both examples are strategic and thus indicate children’s agency in their socialization process.

The practices created by the children in this study are also unique manifestations of an ongoing process of identity construction. Children’s linguistic practices in these examples select and highlight or blur local ideologies of personhood. By code-switching and by using an improvised linguistic form, these bilingual children use and avoid certain social values and social relationships, negotiating conflicting ideologies, that, in turn, are
part of their construction of “bilingual” self. The children’s bilingual practices window into how these children journey from beginning to acknowledge these differences to better balancing themselves between two languages and cultures as they grow older, having their understanding of and strategies for social participation more sophisticated (Kanno, 2003).

7.3 Theoretical and Pedagogical Implications
7.3.1. Revisiting Context in SLA: Beyond the Local

Firth and Wagner’s (1997) reconceptualization of SLA emphasizes “a significantly enhanced awareness of the contextual and interactional dimensions of language use (p. 286)”. Recent research in SLA has paid more attention to the context in which interaction and learning take place. It is a very important development that SLA research moves from the exclusively context-free psycholinguistic perspective to a sociocultural perspective that includes contextualized language use. The findings of this study underscore the importance of context for better understanding of L2 learning. The results of this study also suggest that SLA research needs to go beyond the local immediate context in order to have a more complete picture of what is going on in terms of learners’ investment (Norton, 1995; 2000). I argue that the local context should be considered in its ecological sense, rather than one spot and one time occurrence. That is, the consideration of the local context needs to include the historical perspective of context and how the context is related to learners’ past and the future experiences.

The results of this study show that the three families’ language socialization practices were motivated and influenced not only by the local immediate community, but
also the communities in Korea that are remotely located yet closely connected with these families through their social tie. For example, language socialization practices in Yongho’s home were closely related to the practices in Korea, where the family came from and will return to. Examining the family’s home socialization without considering their future imagined community can only show one side of the coin; it is unable to explain why the mother showed different attitudes to Korean and English. The family’s experience is neither comprehensible nor meaningful (not to me as a researcher, and more importantly, not to them) apart from the relativity of these two contexts (Schecter & Bayley, 2002) – the locally situated context and the translocal context. This idea is consistent with the ecological perspective of interaction (Erickson, 2004; Kramsch, 2002). Erickson (2004) describes this as:

….Some of the sources of the topics and of the framing purposes of talk that is done locally may lie in matters of the past lives or of the anticipated future lives of speakers, and these matters may involve not only the lives of those particular speakers as local social actors in an immediate encounter, but my be institutionalized so as to involve the lives of many others in analogous circumstances… (p. 112).

Such perspective captures a dynamic interaction between language users and the context that goes beyond the immediate context, incorporating learners’ past and future lives, which appear to offer a more inclusive way of dealing with L2/bilingual children’s language learning experiences.
7.3.2. Second Language Socialization: Toward a Dynamic Perspective

Language socialization research has built upon the work of child developmental pragmatics in the late 1970s and early 1980s, expanding the understanding of children’s discourse to more general ethnographic accounts of cultural beliefs and practices of the communities in which children are socialized. The traditional study of language socialization focuses on the understanding of how persons become competent members of a community and the role of language in this process (Ochs, 1996; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, b). There are two underlying premises: (1) the process of acquiring language is deeply affected by the process of becoming a competent member of a society, and (2) this process is realized to a great extent through language (Ochs, 1996).

The findings in this study challenge the traditional notion of language socialization, “persons become competent members of a community.” First, the notion of “community” is not unproblematic. As discussed in Chapter 5, a community is not ideologically homogeneous (Gal, 1998; Kroskrity, 2004; Stroud, 1992; Woolard, 1998). As the discussion of two groups of Koreans in Chapter 3 and the descriptions of families in Chapter 4 indicate, a community particularly in a bilingual/multilingual setting is a far cry from a homogeneous entity in terms of language use; it has multiple language ideologies and norms, which leads to various ways of language use. The notion of “a (speech) community” in the traditional language socialization research implies somewhat invariable language socialization practices among people in the same community, which is never true as seen in Chapter 4. Rather than using a static notion of a community, L2
socialization research needs to develop a more dynamic notion of context for language learning.

Additionally, the notion of “becoming competent members” implies a somewhat dichotomous perspective, “competent/incompetent.” It also suggests a universal and totalizing process of socialization that leads to an end point. In a bilingual/multilingual setting, in particular, bilinguals’ language skills and their repertoire are different from these of monolinguals and such notion of “competent members” becomes contested; questions arise such as whose competency? And how competent should a person be? For example, the code-switching among children themselves in Chapter 5 demonstrates the code-switching itself is a salient communication skill for those children. “Becoming competent members” among those children means to be able to code-switch, rather than to achieve the competency that monolinguals have in their single language.

Therefore, the development of a more dynamic conception of language socialization in a bi/multilingual setting is called for (Bayley & Schector, 2003). Schector and Bayley (2002) stress “the ephemeral quality of the bilingual persona in fluid societal and situational contexts” (p.171). The ephemeral quality explains bilinguals’ fluid identity that shifts moment-by-moment. Langman (2003) also suggests that language socialization in a bi/multilingual setting should be viewed as “not only simply developmental process leading to adulthood, but rather a component of what it means to be human, namely to be a member of a group” (p. 183). This new perspective explains bilingual children’s socialization into diverse cultures and norms that co-exist in the context, which highlights children’s agency in their socialization process. These new
concepts are very helpful for understanding the dynamic processes of second language socialization. SLA needs to move forward to develop a more complete model that illuminates a dynamic process of language socialization among bi/multilingual children.

7.3.3 Transnational Migration and English Education

Transnational educational migrations into English speaking countries via globalization such as the Korean early study abroad has been very popular and has become a globalized phenomenon (Lam, 2006; Orellana, et al., 2001; Waters, 2005). The number of Korean students alone has increased dramatically for the last five years. The issues relating this social phenomenon has been dealt with in many disciplines such as sociology, intercultural communication, social psychology, and ethnic studies. However, little research in the field of language education discusses the relevant issues.

The increasing number of temporary sojourn students in ESL classes in metropolitan cites such as Chicago reportedly takes a third of the total ESL enrollment, which is large enough to change a classroom atmosphere. This leads several practical questions. Are teachers aware of such populations in their schools and the differences in participation and identity that might exist between these temporary study aboard students and immigrant ESL students? Are these students’ needs adequately addressed?

One of the most important contributions of this study is that it suggests the potential differences that the trajectory of going home makes to the language socialization of these families. As my findings indicate, for example, there are differences in their attitudes toward language learning in general and literacy practices in particular between immigrant families and temporary study abroad families. Thus, it is important
for teachers of these temporary sojourn students to understand the role of their home language socialization practices in their language learning. Furthermore, teachers’ knowledge of the relationship between such families’ future trajectories of returning to their native countries and current language learning is also valuable. Teachers’ such knowledge is necessary to acknowledge and understand their students’ diverse processes of language socialization and language learning.

In terms of these students’ needs, Kanno (2003) points out that the fields of SLA and bilingualism have practically no knowledge about how to assist those students who return to their home country after staying for a certain amount of time. Kanno stresses the importance of educational support and necessary information for these students, particularly emphasizing the issue of returnee students’ reintegration in their own countries:

As the boundary between immigrants and temporary sojourners starts to blur—“immigrants” deciding to go back to their country of origin and “temporary sojourners” who end up staying in the host country permanently— the educational reintegration of returnee students should be just as important a part of bilingual/multicultural education as the reception of newly arrived students. (p. 139)

While these returnee students may receive some favors when they return to the Korean school system, *e.g.*, being allowed to enter prestigious foreign language middle or high schools and receiving preferences for their college entrance examinations, their reintegration to the context also takes “a year or a year and half after reentry- before they stopped accepting or rejecting existing community practices and began to stake out their own stance on belonging” (Kanno, 2003, p. 125). In particular, young children such as my participants can choose to enter “returnee classes” in elementary school that are
designed for young children’s fast and smooth reintegration into the Korean school system. In these classes, the young students are also viewed and treated differently from the mainstream Korean classes as they were in their US ESL classes. Regardless of their joining such classes, the children may go through a “painful” negotiation once again after their return, which has not been addressed properly in the literature of ESL/bilingualism or EFL (English as a Foreign Language).

Additionally, the increasing transnational education migration brings a new perspective to the notions of ESL/EFL contexts. The term ESL is used to refer to situations in which English is being taught and learned in countries, contexts and culture in which English is the predominant language of communication (e.g., Australia, Canada, and New Zealand). EFL is used in contexts where English is neither widely used for communication, nor used as the medium of instruction (e.g., Brazil, Japan, and Korea). The distinction between these two contexts becomes vague due to the recent trend in transnational migration. When children and their families cross borders of countries, they potentially extend the boundaries of the EFL/ESL contexts by moving around language ideologies and practices. When EFL students and their families sojourn to an ESL context, they bring EFL perspectives to the context in which they maintain their EFL-originated language ideologies and practices during their stay (for example, Yongho’s family). In contrast, when they return to the EFL context after staying for a while in an ESL context, they may also ship their ESL related practices back to their old context, applying the new practices to the context or maintaining them among a group of returnees. As a result, the two contexts of ESL and EFL become more closely interrelated.
and the boundary between the two contexts begins to blur. The results can be clearly visible as more students shuttle more frequently between these two contexts. Therefore, more active collaboration among researchers, practitioners, and policy makers between ESL and EFL contexts is called for to understand causes, processes, impacts of such migration on L2 learning and teaching.

7.4 Limitations and Further Research

There are a number of areas that this study might have improved. First, this study only focuses on three Korean boys and their friends and families. While the gender difference is not the central concern of the study, including a group of girls would have provided an interesting and different story form that of these boys. It was shame that a girl participant left for Korea in the middle of study and thus I did not have a chance to form a group of girls around her. However, by focusing on a group of boys who spent a lot of time together (so did their mothers) in the neighborhood, I was able to have rich data on their interactions among themselves.

Another limitation concerns the small number of participants who came from a single ethnic group who stayed in the same place. The extent to which these findings are “generalizable” to other populations in other geographical regions is unclear. However, generalizability is a concept developed in a research paradigm whose epistemology and ontology are profoundly different from the paradigm where this study is situated. Researchers in this paradigm, generally positivist paradigm, are principally concerned with the discovery of social fact or truth, without particular social and historical contexts. Thus, they believe that “truth can transcend opinion and personal bias” and across
contexts (Lincoln & Guba, 2000, p. 8). However, Lincoln & Guba (1985) criticize that truth and scientific knowledge apart from the context imbedded in the study are not effective, nor possible. They argue that generalizability is meaningless without context, and objectivity in human research is an unreachable, and even an undesirable goal. A strength of ethnography and qualitative research lies in, in fact, the findings and theories developed from a specific context (through ground theorizing) is not generalizable and allows for an understanding of what is specific to a particular group. In fact, the grounded theory developed in ethnography can be transferred to various cultures and social situations. For example, with respect to the grounded theory developed in Heath’s (1983) study, although the language and literacy uses of the specific communities in the study are different from those of other communities such as Asian and Latino, it can explain the language behaviors of and difficulties that students from those communities face at schools due to the differences between school and home literacy practices.

Another limitation of this study is the comparative lack of attention to the children’s participation in school. Although I have collected substantial data on children’s language learning and interactions in their ESL and mainstream classrooms, I have not included much of their socialization practices in school in this dissertation. Therefore how language practices or language ideologies in school influence children’s understanding of languages is beyond my emphasis on their language socialization. The data from school would have made a significant contribution in forming a more complete picture of children’s language socialization process. However, I saved those data for another project in order to strengthen the focus of this study- the role of home language
socialization practices in children’s language use. Because the data on children’s interactions in school bring in a whole new set of issues (e.g., classroom/school culture, teaching and learning practices, and teachers’ attitudes to and understanding of Korean culture and language, school policy, and so forth), they deserve to be treated separately in another study. For the same reason, I opted out the data on the children’s language socialization practices in a Korean Sunday school in this dissertation.

These limitations in this dissertation, in turn, set new research agendas. A parallel study that focuses on children’s language socialization in school will be valuable for a better understanding of children’s bilingual socialization. There are a number of studies that view classrooms as a socializing space, focusing classroom interactional routines (e.g., Kanagy, 1999; Ohta, 1991; Poole, 1992; Willet, 1995). More recent studies explore language socialization of immigrant students in high school (Duff, 2000; Harklau, 2003; Pon, et al., 2003; Rymes, 1997; Talmy, 2005), in a Chinese heritage school (He, 2003), and in college (Atkinson; 2003; Morita, 2000). These studies touch the notion of ethnicity, cultural identity, and personhood and deal with the critical role of language in socializing minority students in multilingual contexts. However, most of these studies focus on adolescents or adult language learners. Research focusing on young children’s process of learning English in school and its interaction with their home language socialization will make a significant contribution to the field of second language socialization. In particular, exploring the role of language ideologies enacted by teachers (or co-constructed in the classroom) in children’s language use (their native language and English) will develop a very interesting line of research on second language socialization.
Another research agenda concerns the role of gender in children’s language socialization. It was assumed that gender played out in Yongho’s interactions with his mother in Chapter 5 (in particular, his intense/forceful tone in English). Lacking a comparative data on girl-mother interactions, I did not have much to say about the gender effect. Therefore integrating different genders of children into the research will bring us an interesting result in the area.

Personally, I expect to see research that explores children’s language learning after they return to their native countries such as the following research topics: how these returnee children are adjusted to their new context; what role these students play in their language classroom; what strategies families and individuals adopt for these children’s maintenance and further development of language skills, particularly in English; and how such efforts are viewed by others in the community. These new research agendas will generate and disseminate important theoretical and pedagogical implications that enhance our understating of diverse language learning phenomena, broadening and enriching the field of SLA.
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APPENDIX A: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

All Korean speech is transcribed according to the Yale Romanization system, following the transcription convention below:

**Bold:** Bold indicates researcher’s emphasis or focus of discussion.

*brother:* Underlining words are English words in Korean sentences.

*hyeng:* Italics indicates Korean speech.

‘you’:* Single quotes indicate English translation of Korean speech.

HON: HON represents honorifics (nominal and verbal suffixes).

[ ]: Brackets enclose author’s addition.

( ): Parentheses enclose transcription comments on the interaction.

(.4) The number in parentheses indicates pause in tenths of a second.
## APPENDIX B: KOREAN ROMANIZATION TABLES

### [HANGUL ORDER]

#### Consonant table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Hangul</th>
<th>Yale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ㄱ</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ㄲ</td>
<td>kk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ㄴ</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ㄷ</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ㄸ</td>
<td>tt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ㄹ</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ㅁ</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ㅂ</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ㅃ</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ㅅ</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ㅆ</td>
<td>ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ㅇ</td>
<td>ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ㅈ</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ㅉ</td>
<td>cc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ㅊ</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ㅋ</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ㅌ</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ㅍ</td>
<td>ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ㅎ</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Vowel table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Hangul</th>
<th>Yale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ㅏ</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ㅑ</td>
<td>ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ㅒ</td>
<td>yay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ㅓ</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ㅕ</td>
<td>ey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ㅖ</td>
<td>yey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ㅗ</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ㅘ</td>
<td>wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ㅙ</td>
<td>way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ㅚ</td>
<td>oy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ㅛ</td>
<td>yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ㅜ</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ㅝ</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ㅞ</td>
<td>wey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ㅟ</td>
<td>wi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ㅠ</td>
<td>yu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ㅡ</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ㅢ</td>
<td>uy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ㅣ</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>