Modern English Education, Vol. 9, No. 3, Winter 2008

Linguistic Power and Code-Switching in the Foreign Language Classroom*

Jai-Hyoung Cho, Ock-Hwan Kim
Ajou University, Indiana University

Cho, Jai-Hyoung & Kim, Ock-Hwan. (2008). Linguistic power and code-switching in the foreign language classroom. *Modern English Education, 9*(3), 1-19.

In this paper, we will demonstrate that the social status of a language is not just closely related to the sociopolitical status of the language and its users but is a powerful factor in language choice. More specifically, we will first show the different patterns and/or characteristics of code-switching (CS) frequently witnessed in the discourse of an adult Korean language classroom in the United States. Among several views entertained in the literature, we will take the viewpoint that language dominance with respect to bilinguals' identity plays an important role in CS. When a majority language is seen as giving higher social status and more political power, a shift towards the majority language may occur. We will then investigate the micro-politics of some Korean heritage speakers who apparently are not dominated by but dominant over the instructor. We will associate this 'reversed' dominance relation with the characteristically frequent code-switching behavior, which distinguishes the target group from the rest students in the classroom. We will then explore some conscious or subconscious strategic motivation that lies extensively beneath this practice of code-switching in the classroom. Crucially, in the present case, we will show that divergence-*they*-code in the sense of Gumperz (1982)-is a means to create social distance from one's interlocutor through which social disapproval is communicated.

[code-switching/ power/ dominance/ identity/코드전환/권력/지배/정체성]

I. INTRODUCTION

* This research was supported by 2004 Ajou University Research Fund.
* We are grateful to three anonymous reviewers for their valuable and inspiring comments. Needless to say, all shortcomings are ours.

Code-switching (CS, hereafter) is the practice of moving between variations of languages in different contexts. In an educational context, for instance, it is defined as the practice of switching between a primary and a secondary language or discourse. Bilinguals are typically known for their ability to code-switch during communication. This phenomenon occurs when bilinguals replace a word or phrase from one language with a phrase or word from another language. Traditionally, CS has been viewed as a strategy to compensate for diminished language proficiency, in the sense that bilinguals code-switch because they do not know either language completely. One of the current views, however, is that language dominance (i.e., which language is more powerful/important) with respect to bilinguals identity plays an important role in CS. According to Baker (2001), identity concerns the shared characteristics of members of a group, community or region. Identity provides the security and status of a shared existence. Sometimes identity is formed/identified via dress, religious beliefs, rituals, but language is almost always present in identity formation and identity display. Language is an index, symbol and marker of identity. A plethora of researches are documented from the study of CS manifested among Spanish-English bilinguals in the United States (Auer, 1998; Broner & Tarone, 2001; Toribio, 2002, among many others).

The social status of a language—its prestige value—will be closely related to the sociopolitical status of a language and will also be a powerful factor in language choice. When a majority language is seen as giving higher social status and more political power, a shift towards the majority language may occur. A language s symbolic status is also important in language choice. A heritage language may be an important symbol of ethnic identity. As a tool of widespread personal communication and as medium of mass education, the Korean language is less valued among the Korean community in the United States. When the personal balance sheet includes employment, educational and vocational success and interpersonal communication, the credit of positive attitudes towards language as a cultural and ethnic symbol is diminished by the costs of perceived prior needs and motives. Goodwill towards the language stops when the personal pay-off is limited. There is a paradox beginning to emerge in the relationship between majority and minority language. Majority languages such as English have high status as languages of international communication. At the same time, globalization appears to awaken a basic need for an anchor in a local language and a local community. Becoming a Korean can revive and reawaken the need to belong to one s local heritage and historical groups. In becoming part of a large

whole, a local identity is essential and fundamental. The push to become a member of the global village seems to lead to a strong pull towards primary roots.

Bearing this much in this paper, we will first demonstrate the different patterns and/or characteristics of CS which are frequently witnessed in the discourse of an adult Korean language classroom in the United States. We will then investigate the micro-politics of some Korean heritage speakers who apparently are not dominated by but dominant over the instructor. We will associate this inverse dominance relation with the characteristically frequent code-switching behavior, which distinguishes the target group from the rest students in the classroom. We will then explore some conscious or subconscious strategic motivation that lies extensively beneath this practice of code-switching in the classroom.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In a seminal account of discourse strategies, Gumperz (1997, 2001) adopts and identifies four different kinds of contextualization cues such as prosody, paralinguistic signs, lexical forms and formulaic expressions, and code choice which consists of CS, style switching, phonetic/phonological/morphological choices. Gumprerz (1982) also identifies six basic discourse functions that CS serves in conversation. Saville-Troike (1982) independently identifies eight different functions of CS, some of which overlap with those proposed by Gumperz. These functions include ideological statement, exclusion of other people within hearing, avoidance strategy, and repair strategy. CS has many other functions that go beyond the fore-mentioned discursive ones.

Some of these functions are signaling group identity and/or ethnic identity, and showing solidarity among members of the same speech community or ethnic community (Crystal, 1987; Gal, 1978; Li, 1995; Lo, 1999; Myers-Scotton, 1993). The noncompliance to CS, the linguistic misalignments the speaker shows, can be seen as an attempt on the part of the speaker to distance her/himself from the other participants, because the s/he does not want to be taken as a member of that community, or because s/he does not want to accept the participant who is making the switch as part of her/his community (Lo, 1999). Gumperz s (1982) distinction of *we*-code versus *they*-code is related to one of the basic functions just mentioned, namely solidarity. While the *we*-code refers to in-group relations and a language or variety which is sometimes under valued, the *they*-code refers

to the dominant language which tends to serve as the means of communication for out-group relations with the main stream society.

CS also functions as a device to establish an identity and negotiate relations of power and dominance (Bolonyai, 2005). CS from the relatively powerless (or less dominant) language into the powerful (or more dominant) language has certain interesting meanings in a bilingual context. Bourdieu (1977, 1991) integrates micro-level linguistic variation with macro-level societal factors and then shows how macro-societal power translates into micro-interactional structures. In a minority language context, the macro-sociological power infiltrates the conversational exchange such that a speaker who uses the power language also exerts interactional power over his/her co-participants. Within the linguistic market, the dominant language becomes a distinct capital which produces a sense of the speaker's distinction in discourse.

This type of linguistic market is reproduced in schools and classrooms where, for the most part, teachers have the power. This is because in face-to-face communication, participants who may be in a position of overriding power compared to the other participants have the tendency to be dominant because of their expert knowledge, their status in society, or an upper sense of authority over other members. The relationship between dominant and dominated languages (e.g. English vs. Korean) mirrors the unequal distribution of linguistic capital as mediated by formal education. As a language of minority people who do not contribute to the main stream society of the United States, the Korean language does not occupy any prestigious status in the market of the country. Given the fact that the properties of linguistic markets endow linguistic expressions with a certain value, part of one's language socialization involves knowing when and how to produce utterances that are highly valued in those markets.

According to LePage and Tabouret-Keller (1985), the individual creates the patterns of his linguistic behavior so as to resemble those of the group or groups with which from time to time he wishes to be identified, or so as to be unlike those from whom he wishes to be distinguished. This is concerned with the dichotomy of convergence vs. divergence, in which convergence is a means to create assimilation to the world an individual wants to be identified. On the contrary, divergence is a means to create social distance from one's interlocutor through which social disapproval is communicated. This distinction can be supplemented by Gumperz's (1982) dichotomy of *we*-code vs. *they*-code.

Based on this conceptual framework, the following three questions will be addressed throughout the remaining of this research:

(1) What are the patterns/characteristics of the CS manifested in this classroom discourse?
(2) How different is the relationship between each group of the participants in the classroom the teacher vs. the heritage students, the teacher vs. the other students, and the heritage students vs. the other students?
(3) What does the reversal of dominance between the teacher and the heritage students originate from?

III. METHODOLOGY

The current study is based on detailed observation of language patterns manifested in a low-intermediate level Korean language course at a large mid-western university in the United States. The class is part of the Korean language and culture program affiliated to the East Asian Language and Culture (EALC) department. The course lasts fifty minutes a day and five days a week; including two hours of lecture, two hours of review/practice, and an hour of discussion session a week. This class is monolingual in the sense that no other language is allowed other than Korean, the target language (L2). The syllabus dictates that students should use only Korean within the classroom and the instructor more often than not warns the students against speaking English, reminding that English use in the classroom will negatively influence their final grades. The class requires a monolingual Korean textbook and an accompanying workbook. Each lecture and review/practice session is mainly conducted through grammar-translation method. Originally the Friday session was set for discussion activity, but it has transformed to a teacher-centered review session week by week. All in all, every session is conducted through typical IRE (Initiation Response Evaluation) format. Because the class is uneven regarding students' language proficiency, it is almost always the case that the voice of four Korean heritage students (target group, henceforth) dominates that of the remaining nine students. Confronted with the state of affairs, the teacher unsuccessfully struggles to give the nine students as many turns as possible.

The instructor, one of the key participants for the present study, is a single Korean woman in her mid or late thirties. She has been pursuing a Ph D degree for five years now at the department of anthropology. As a native speaker of Korean, she has taught Korean at the EALC for two years. Despite some accent, her English sounds reasonable. In interviews, however, one of her American students labeled it

'understandable' and one of the target group 'not bad.' In personal communication, she accusingly labeled her English 'Konglish,' a pejorative term for Korean-accented English.

Thirteen students are enrolled in the class: three Americans (one female graduate (represented as A1 in excerpts), one female undergraduate (A3) and one male undergraduate (A2)), two female Japanese undergraduates (J1 and J2), one female Israelite undergraduate (I) and seven Korean undergraduate heritage speakers. Out of these seven Korean heritage speakers, one female (H5) and two male undergraduates (H6 and H7) have almost the same low level of Korean proficiency as the remaining American and Japanese classmates. But the rest four male undergraduate students (H1, H2, H3, and H4), who are the research target of the current paper, have a good command of Korean compared to their classmates. Crucially, they and only they are the participants who exclusively show frequent CS behavior from L2 (Korean) to L1 (English).

Before delving into the characteristics of their CS patterns, motivation toward the target language (TL, Korean) of each student in the class needs to be mentioned. What motivated her/his decision to enroll in the Korean language course can constitute one of important factors concerning the CS pattern. Two of the American students (A1 and A2) have been to Korea and A2 in particular has a girlfriend there. He is thinking of immigration to Korea to be married with the girlfriend after his graduation. One of the two Japanese students (J1) has a Korean boyfriend and she plans to marry and live with him there. The three non-target Korean heritage speakers (H5, H6, and H7) want to learn Korean, according to the questionnaire, just because they think learning and using two languages are 'interesting' and 'convenient.' Each of the four target students has different motivation to take this course: better chance to earn high grade (H3), potentially better job opportunity in Korea as an international lawyer (H1), parents' insistence for their son to learn Korean in order not to lose the root bond (H4), and ease and department requirement (H2). In a sense, compared to the non-target counterpart, the target students seem to be more instrumentally motivated and, interestingly enough, more sensitive to their grade.

Finally, a note on the perspective of the present study is on order. This research aims to look into individuals and events in their natural settings (Tetnowski & Damico, 2001). That is, rather than attempting to control contextual factors through the use of laboratories or other artificial environments, the current study, as a qualitative research, is more interested in presenting a natural and holistic picture of the phenomena being studied. This picture includes

both the broader sociocultural context (e.g., the ideological orientations of the speech community as a whole) as well as micro-level phenomena (e.g., interaction within the classroom). Therefore, rather than using a large group of randomly selected participants with the goal of generalizing to a larger population, the present study works more intensively with fewer participants, and is less concerned about issues of generalizability.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Data were collected over a two-month period by the following means: a total of eight hours and thirty minutes of observation, five hours of audio-taping of ten Friday sessions, field notes, questionnaires, and interviews. The classroom observation started on Friday of late February and lasted to late April. Every classroom discourse was recorded by way of two cassette recorders with high-tech wire microphones set up: one was for the whole classroom members and the other for any specific pair/group that included target student(s). We also took field notes as detailed as possible to supplement transcriptions afterwards. We used to take a seat in the last row and keep a low profile. We told her that she was more than welcome to use us as her classroom aid whenever she found it necessary, and she would sometimes ask us to take part in pair/group activities especially when a student was absent.

When transcribing the recorded audio tapes, we used to pay special attention to clusters of speech or conversation that include English. We usually put the transcribed speech down on three-way juxtaposed columns, the purpose of which is to make easier to compare the speech patterns of each group: target heritage, non-target heritage, and the remaining Americans and Japanese (The Israelite usually does not contribute anything to the classroom discourse).

Questionnaires were given to the seven Korean heritage students, though we were primarily interested in the four target subjects only. They did not mind putting their name on the questionnaire sheet. Interviews with the teacher, two American students, one Japanese student, one non-target heritage student, and the four target students have been conducted right after the class near the classroom or in the café of the main library.

V. PATTERNS OF CODE-SWITCHING

Setting the scene, we will first demonstrate the different patterns of CS exhibited in the speech of the target group and the remaining students. The present study starts from the observation of an ironic situation that the more fluent speakers of L2 (Korean) use L1 (English) more frequently in the environment that only Korean use is strongly required. On the contrary, students with relatively poor capacity of Korean stick with only Korean use shrinking from English use. In the following, the primary difference of patterns regarding CS will be manifested. Note the difference between a target student (H2) and the rest (A1 and A2 on the one hand; and H5 on the other).

Excerpt 1

1 T: '*Pwulhayng cwung tahayng-ita,' mwue-ka pwulhayngic-yo?*
'Here is a phrase 'It's better than the worst.' What do you think is 'something worst'?'

2 H2: **Suffer, suffer** *aniye-yo?* **Suffer?**
'It is to suffer. Don't you think it is? I mean, to suffer.'

3 A2: *Wun-i . . an cohun kes. . . .*
'Something that is not fortunate.'

4 A1: *Tachin kes. Kyo . . tong . . sako . . . nase . . .*
'It is to be injured. I mean, the injury from car accident '

5 H5: ↓**Misfortune**.↓ [1]

Right before the regular Friday quiz, the teacher refers to a certain page in the textbook, in order to make sure that students are well aware of the expression. As usual, the teacher starts the session with a question concerned with the identification of a phrase *pwulhayng* 'misfortune' from a proverb in Korean. Apparently, the response of the three groups is not basically different from each other. A closer inspection, however, brings us a significantly different interpretation here. Let us

[1] The transcription conventions are as follows:

. .	short pause
. . .	relatively long pause
italics	Korean code
bold face	English code
(laugh)	editorial comment
↑ ↑	louder volume
↓ ↓	whispered or lower volume
H1, H2, H3, H4	Korean heritage students who belong to the target group
H5, H6, H7	Korean heritage students who do not belong to the target group
A1, A2, A3	American students
J1, J2	Japanese students

first consider the response of two heritage students. Toward the teacher's question, one of the target speakers (H2) gives an appropriate answer in English (in Line 2). H5, a non-target heritage student, also uses the same code in Line 5. However, take note of the different speech volume between the two. Unlike H2's speech, H5's English is produced in a subdued voice. According to Broner and Tarone (2001), she seems to engage in this sort of answer 'as a way to help herself master the L2' rather than as a way to contribute to the classroom discourse. In short, H2's English seems to be for public display and H5's for rehearsal. The third part, A1 and A2, forward answers in their L2 (in Line 3 and Line 4, respectively). However, this three-way different pattern is conflated with two-the target group contingent on frequent use of English and the remaining students contingent on Korean only, when the context is extended from this word-to-word translation to a little bit free discussion stage.

The following example is interesting in that CS behavior is exclusively limited to the target group especially when the topic of discussion digresses to issues that are more complicated or are not related to the contents in the syllabus. Excerpt 2 is a part of a digression from the original topic assigned by the teacher. One of the two groups with six members was originally talking about beautiful forests in Korea, when H1 mistook a term concerning woods for fish. As usual, she forwards his speech in a loud voice.

Excerpt 2

1 H1: *Sasimi*'s **my favorite**.
2 J1: *Ah*, A1-*i ceyil cohanun*, *eh*, *hoyye-yo*?
'Ah, A1, is it sushi that you like most?'
3 A1: *Cey-ka ceyil cohanun hoy-ka sakeye-yo*.
'Sake is the sushi that I like most.'
4 H4: **Heh?**
5 H1: **Uh? What's** *sake*?
What kind of fish is it?
6 H4: **That's not a fish.**
7 H3: **Just shut up, dude.**
8 SS: (laugh)
9 H1: **I know what I'm talking about.**
When it comes to sushi, I know what I'm talking about.
10 H3: **all right, all right.**
11 T: *Eh, onul-un yenge-lul nemwu sse-yo,* H1.

'Uh, H1, you are using English too much, today.'
H1, *onul* **discussion** *cemswu-ka ancohul kes kata-yo,* H1.
'H1, I'm afraid your discussion grade should be too low.'
12 H1: *Aigo!*
'Ugh!'
13 SS: (laugh)

Compared with the target group speakers, the Japanese and American students do not use English even though the content of discourse is not what expected in the class (Line 2 and Line 3). Basically, except for at best word-to-word translation from Korean to English, the American and Japanese students rarely change into English use. On the contrary, the target groups are continuously changing into the English code. Ironically enough, their command of Korean is much stronger than that of the non-target students especially when confronted with those unexpected (and so unfamiliar) topics and expressions as shown in Excerpt 2.

Misunderstanding J1's '*yes-no*' interrogative as *wh*-question in Line 2, A1 provides an answer in Line 3 that her favorite food is *sake*, which (*sake* 'kind of Japanese alcohol') is an error for *sasimi* 'raw fish.' After a heritage speaker's (H1) interruption in Line 5, a debate breaks out between them in English. Take note of the teacher's warning toward one of the Korean heritage speakers (H1) that his grade would be subject to negative influence due to English use. This is not surprising to recollect that this kind of warning is also found in the syllabus. Despite the teacher's usual warning that CS would negatively influence their grade, those CS behaviors continue to appear in every session by only the four target heritage students. If this is really a widely appearing (and even predictable) pattern, it is not a trivial work to take into account the macro- and micro-politics lurking under this phenomenon. The next section will then be devoted to the quest of how that macro-politics translates into micro-politics in this classroom environment.

VI. REVERSAL OF DOMINANCE

We will here focus on the teacher-students relation: the teacher vs. the target group, the teacher vs. the remaining students, and the target group vs. non-target students. Showing contrastive response pattern of students toward the instructor, we will argue that the standard teacher-students dominance relation is reversed in this classroom. But we should make it clear that the so-called reversal of dominance in

this classroom is only confined to the relation between the teacher and the four target students whereas the relation between the teacher and the other students seems to be the same as regular classes. Let us consider the following:

Excerpt 3

1 T: *Elma tongan pyengwuen-ey isseya hapni-kka?*
'How long does he have to stay in the hospital?'

2 H2: *Yengcin-i-nun,*
'Youngjin,'

3 T: *Ye.*
'Yes.'

4 H2: (starting to eat) *Eh, icwu-tongan isseya hay-yo.*
'He has to stay for two weeks.'

5 T: *Ney, pyengwuen-ey icwu-tongan isseya toy-yo.*
'Right, he has to stay in the hospital for two weeks.'

6 H2: (choking)

7 H2, H1, H3: (laugh/giggling)

8 T: (blushing) *Yelepwun, eh, onul cemsimsiksa-nun-yo, toytolokimyen swuephaki ceney hako osey-yo. Oynyahamyen, hankwuke sikan-un mal-ul hacanha-yo? Mal-ul haki ttaymwun-ey yelepwun-i mekko issumyen cohci anha-yo. Masinun ken koynchanhciman meknun ke-nun cohci anha-yo. Alkeyssupni-kka? Ku taum-ey sam pen, sam pen-un . . .*
'Guys, uh, why don't you come to class after having your lunch somewhere else? You know, you have to say something in this Korean language class. I mean, it wouldn't work if you eat something. Drinking seems to be okay, but eating is not accepted. See what I mean? Well, next, question number three, I mean, number three,'

9 A1: (sigh/grimacing after staring at H1)

10 H2: *Ce-yo?*
'You mean, me?'

11 H3: (facing H2) ↑**Shit, you**!↑

12 T: (ignoring H2 and H3) H6-*ka* A1-*hantey hanpen mwulepollay-yo?*
'H6, would you ask A1?'

13 H6: *el.ma . . to, . . tong.an, eh, . . pyengwen?. . ah, pyeng . . wen-el . . -ey isseya . . ha, hapni-kka?*
'How long does he have to stay in the hospital?'

14 A1: *Ye, Yeng . . cin . . -i-nun twu, eh, icwu-tongan-ey, eh, tongan . . isseya*

. . *-hay-yo.*
'Youngjin has to stay for two weeks.'

In this excerpt, the teacher is giving the students a chance to reflect the content of the textbook that will be covered in the regular Friday quiz. This is usually done in the traditional IRE pattern for a couple of minutes. H2, one of the target students, abruptly chokes answering the teacher's question, when he is having a snack that he brought with him. The teacher being mad, admonishes and warns him not to eat any food during the session. Take a careful look at the contrastive responses between the target students and an American student. The former, not feeling guilty, apologetic or shameful, laugh or giggle whereas the latter gets angry and sighs at their nasty behavior and response. H3, another student in the target group, does not even watch his language in front of the teacher (Line 11).[2] According to Hancock (1997), a student usually depends on 'subdued voice' in the presence of what he calls 'referee,' to which a teacher can belong. If Hancock is correct, H3, let alone H2, in this classroom does not seem to look up to his teacher.

Helplessly, the teacher avoids more confrontation with the target students by her usual policy of just ignoring them. Well aware that they are always cooperative, she rather turns to H7 and A1 as a pair to ask-and-answer the following question (Line 12). She knows they will save her face and help to continue the class activities and they actually do (Line 13 and Line 14). Regarding teacher-student relationship, the two groups of students reveal a crucial contrast: it is only the four heritage speakers that are not respectful to the teacher. On the contrary, the remaining students recognize her authority as a teacher. In addition, take note of the response of an American student (A1) toward the target students. In an interview, A1 said that the class suffered from a problem in that though the instructor was good enough, the heritage students used too much English and were too hard on the teacher. Excerpt 2 clearly betrays the standard expectation that in the classroom, the teacher is assumed to be in a position of overriding power compared to the target group of students because of her expert knowledge, her status in school, or sense of authority over students. But in reality her authority does not seem to be recognized by the four heritage students. Put differently, the regular teacher-students dominance relation is reversed with respect to the teacher and the target group.

Then, one ensuing question should be why this is the case. Let us observe the following example. Excerpt 4 is a small but very informative example, which can

[2] As an anonymous reviewer points out, this behavior is a case not only of language dominance but also of bad discipline.

direct us to the issue of the origin of the reversed dominance relationship. This time, let us first think on the teacher's side. Inadvertently, the teacher is herself subservient to the power of her students:

Excerpt 4

1 T: *Ca,* **body shop**-*un eti-lul malhay-yo?*
'What is a body shop?'

2 H3: **Mechanic.**

3 T: *Yehe,* (laugh embarrassingly) *han,* ↓*hankwuk-eyse-nun,*↓ *ah, mikwuk-eyse-nun ilen mal ssuna-yo?*
'Right, uh, in Korea , umn, is this a usual term in the States?'

4 H2: *Yeh, manhi sse, manhi sse-yo.*
'Yes, it is used widely.'

5 H4: *Etise?*
'Where?'

Not sure if the use of *body shop* is accepted or not in everyday English, she asks the students if she is right. She seems to take the expression *body shop* to be Korean English (what she calls 'Konglish'). Take a notice of her embarrassing manner of speech, sheepish laugh, stammering, and the prominently lower tone. In addition, the question in Line 3 does not sound like an information-seeking question but rather a confirm-begging interrogative. She just tries to say that 'this phrase is used at least in Korea.' The lack of confidence in linguistic terms on the teacher's side may be one of the crucial factors of the reversal of dominance relation.

It is then not too much to say that the usual power pattern of teacher-student relation is overwhelmed by the language power in the major language market (a foreign language classroom in the United States). In this sense, the four Korean heritage speakers are in a dominant position over the instructor because they possess power capital in their own market place. What helps to turn over the standard dominance relation here is related with the question of with what kind of capital they are living in the situation. A personal talk with a visiting scholar from Korea who is also teaching Korean in the same program is very suggestive. He recognizes a tendency among his senior students of Korean, saying that "They seem to look down on my English and then always try to teach me in English in the class. Basically, the Korean heritage undergraduates seem to feel superior to me. And they are not so enthusiastic compared to American students." In the following section, we will demonstrate what they do (or think) in order to maintain this power of theirs

in the classroom. We will also show how they linguistically behave in order to signal that they do not belong to the world (including the language) of the instructor but to the world of their American classmates. Put more directly, what is their motivation of the frequent dependency of CS?

VII. *COUNT-ME-IN* STRATEGY

The four heritage students seem to try to show themselves and those who will pay attention to them that they have feet firmly planted in the American world of power and prestige. Needless to say, language is the crucial free pass that helps them to be counted in the world that they want to belong with.

Excerpt 5

1 T: *Ca, ku taum-ey, minsokchon cinan cwu-ey kongpwu hayssci-yo?*
'All right, next, we looked into a folk village last week, didn't we?'
Kulem, video-lul pokilo haci-yo.
'Then, you're going to watch a video about it.'

2 H4: *Yenge-lo toye isse-yo, sensayng-nim?*
'Is it narrated in English?'

3 T: *Yey, yenge-lo toye isse-yo.*
'Yes, it is in English.'

This excerpt is from one Friday session that was concerned with some traditional customs of Korea. After brief explanation of each event and/or activity, the instructor decided to provide the students with a videotaped documentary. Right before she turned on the TV set, H4 asked the question in Line 2. Ironically, why should a heritage speaker like H4 be the one who asks if the narration is conveyed in English? He is a lot better than the rest of the American/Japanese/Jewish students in speaking and hearing Korean. This is supported by the teacher's confirmation that he has hitherto been a strong candidate of A+ winner in the class. More than anything else, the following excerpt will lead readers to a great surprise (or a shock).

Excerpt 6

1 T: H4, *Cwumal-ey mwue halkkeye-yo?*
'H4, what are you planning to do this weekend?'

2 H4: *Nayil sihem-i issese congil kongpwuhayya toy-yo.*
'I have an exam tomorrow, so I have to study all day long.'
3 T: *Thoyoil-ey sihem-i isse-yo?*
'Exam on Saturday?'
4 H4: *Yey, wuli kwoa-nun kulen key isse-yo.*
'Yes, my department is a little bit different.'
5 T: *Kulem tosekwoan-ey isskeyssney-yo?*
'Then, you will stay in the library?'
6 H4: *Yeh, chinkwu-tul-ul mannayahay-yo. Kulentey, mikwuk chinkwu-tul-un hankwuk salam-tul-un tosekwianey-man issta-ko isanghtako malhay-yo. Cayswu-ka epseyo.*
'Yes, I have to meet my friends there. By the way, my American friends always say it's weird that Korean students are always staying in the library all day long. That sucks whenever I heard.'

This excerpt is from an unintended recording of a conversation between the teacher and H4 after a Friday session. All of the students, other than H4, the teacher and us, left the classroom. Helping the teacher with teaching materials, we failed to turn off one of our two cassette recorders set near H4. What really makes this example interesting is that the never-ending CS during the session totally disappears when H4 has a personal talk with the teacher in the absence of other students in the classroom after the class. As Johnston pointed out in personal communication, the CS for him (or for the target students) is definitely for public display signaling that he does not belong to their world but to your/our world in the sense of Gumperz (1982). Besides, this excerpt provides us a clue to look into his social mentality or value system concerning identity/nationality. As an American, he does not feel comfortable about the attitude of his American friends toward Korean students in general.

Again, let us compare the following brief couple of examples with the previous one. In a small group talk, H4 addresses American and other heritage students with English, asking whether they want to speak in English or Korean. They accusingly answer in unison that they want to speak in Korean. Comparing Excerpt 6 and Excerpt 7, we are led to the conclusion that his CS may rightly be taken to be 'display' strategy.

Excerpt 7

H4: **You guys want Korean or English?**

A1, A2, H6: ↑ **Korean!** ↑

To Japanese student, H3, another target student, addresses first in English and then switches to Korean depending on her response. Almost the same behavior (or strategy) as above-mentioned H4.

Excerpt 8

H3: (abruptly) J1, **why were you late for the class yesterday?**
J1: *Eh?*
'What, say that again?'
H3: *Ah, way hakkyo-ey nucesse-yo?*
'Why were you late for the class?'

His teacher told us in an interview that she did not like his 'racist inferiority complex.' She informed me of his presentation in the class about his bad experience in the childhood. He was born in a 'white village,' where his family was the only Asian people in the neighborhood. When a child, he was really desperate when he took a walk with his dog in the village street. Additionally, in the questionnaire, he said he feels embarrassed when an American friend spots him talking with Korean people in Korean. In an interview, he said that he enrolled this class because it is easier to get a good grade than in other subjects in his own department. Interestingly enough, then, he is interested in getting a good grade and always takes risk of using English against the teacher's policy at the same time. In this sense, conscious/unconscious desire to display their 'real' identity/nationality might be more important than the original motivation of the target students

VIII. CONCLUSION

Based on the classroom discourse of the university Korean language course in the United States, we have shown that the different patterns and characteristics of CS are not produced randomly but derived from a consistent sociolinguistic context and motivation. It is well known that when a majority language is regarded as giving higher social status and more political power, a shift towards the majority language may occur. We have added another confirmation to the known fact by investigating the micro-politics of some Korean heritage speakers in the multiethnic classroom. Despite the general dominance relationship between a teacher and her/his students, in which the former commands

power over the latter, the heritage speakers in the classroom are apparently not dominated by the teacher but rather are dominating the instructor. We have associated this 'reversed' dominance relation with the characteristically frequent code-switching behavior, which distinguishes the target group from the rest students in the classroom. We have then explored some conscious or subconscious strategic motivation that lies extensively beneath this practice of code-switching in the classroom. Crucially, in the present case, we have shown that divergence-*they*-code in the sense of Gumperz (1982) is a means to create social distance from one's interlocutor through which social disapproval is communicated.

We interpret the observation as a typical case that the Korean heritage students exploit the practice of CS as a strategy of convergence toward the prestige and power of the dominant English-speaking culture. In the environment of classroom, the dominance of the teacher may be a given thing because of general societal patterns of power. Contrary to the general tendency, however, in the foreign language classroom of a minority language (Korean) in the major language setting (the United States) the teacher from the minority language background does not seem to have a total dominance over some of her heritage students. As a result, frequent CS from the target language to English is witnessed throughout every session. In short, there lies beneath the CS behavior a complicated political strategy concerning identity/nationality signal. Without deeper understanding of the CS phenomenon quite frequently witnessed and reported in the minor language class in the major language setting, language instructors and/or planners might have a pessimistic future with respect to a foreign language fluency or mastery.

REFERENCES

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

Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. New York: Multilingual Matters.

Bolonyai, A. (2005). 'Who was the best?: Power, knowledge and rationality in bilingual girls' code choices. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 9*, 3-27.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Broner, M. A. & Tarone, E. E. (2001). Is it fun? Language play in a fifth-grade Spanish immersion classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(3), 363-379.

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

Gal, S. (1978). Variation and change in patterns of speaking: Language shift in Austria. In D. Sankoff (Ed.), *Linguistics variation: Models and methods* (pp. 227-238). New York: Academic Press.

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

Gumperz, J. J. (1997). Contextualization and understanding. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 229-252). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (2001). Interactional sociolinguistics: A personal perspective. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 215-228). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hancock, M. (1997). Behind classroom code switching: Layering and language choice in L2 learner interaction. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(2), 217-236.

Le Page, R. B. & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Li, W. (1995). Variations in patterns of language choice and code-switching by three groups of Chinese/English speakers in Newcastle upon Tyne. *Multilingua*, *14*, 297-323.

Lo, A. (1999). codeswitching, speech community membership, and the construction of ethnic identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 3*, 461-479.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Saville-Troike, M. (1982). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Tetnowski, J., & Damico, J. (2001). A demonstration of the advantages of qualitative methodologies in stuttering research. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 26*, 17-42.

Toribio, A. J. (2002). Spanish-English code-switching among US Latinos. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 158*, 89-119.

Jai-Hyoung Cho
Department of English Language and Literature, Ajou University
San 5, Wonchon-dong, Youngtong-gu, Suwon 442-749, Korea

Tel: (031) 219-2823/ H.P.: 016-9202-1432
Email: jhc@ajou.ac.kr

Ock-Hwan Kim
Department of Linguistics, Indiana University
Memorial Hall 322, Bloomington, IN 47405-7005, USA
Tel: (812) 855-6456
Email: ohkim@indiana.edu

Received in September 10, 2008
Reviewed in October 14, 2008
Revised version received in December 12, 2008