

Code-Switching Behavior of Korean-English Bilingual Teenagers*

Jeongsook Lee**

Ajou Univeristy

Unkyoung Maeng

Ajou Univeristy

Lee, Jeongsook & Maeng, Unkyoung. (2013). Code-switching behavior of bilingual teenagers. *Modern English Education*, 14(3), 67-95.

The purpose of this study is to investigate code-switching behavior of Korean-English bilingual teenagers. More specifically this study investigates why and when the teenagers switch from one language to another. It also explores how the teenagers' parents support their bilingual children to develop both language skills. Two Korean-English bilingual teenagers residing in Korea participated in this study. Data were collected through 27 video clips, questionnaires, and interviews. The findings of this study were as follows: 1) Teenagers used code-switching diversely as a conversational strategy as well as a learning strategy. They produced diverse code-switching utterances to carry out the situational and conversational functions. 2) The code-switching was seen mostly at the inter-sentential level when the teenagers conversed in their non-dominant language and it occurred mostly in simple sentences. Teenagers switched back to their dominant language, English from Korean quickly and inserted code-switched utterances in the English matrix sentence. 3) Parents used one person – one strategy flexibly and sensitively to develop their children's bilingualism. Based on the findings, the present study offers some implications for bilingual education and also future studies.

[bilingual/code-switching(CS)/inter-sentential CS/one person-one language strategy(OPOL)/이중어/코드 스위칭/문장간 코드 스위칭/OPOL책략]

* This paper is based on the first author's MA thesis under the direction of the corresponding author.

** First author: Jeongsook Lee, Corresponding author: Unkyoung Maeng

I. INTRODUCTION

Bilingualism has become very important on account of globalization of the world. Bialystok, Craik, Green and Gollan (2009) posited that “as the world becomes more interconnected, bilingualism is becoming the rule and not the exception” (p. 89). Bilingual contact generates various language phenomena as Field (2005) noted that “psychological responses to primarily social encounters and the interactions of speakers may initiate various language mixing behaviors” (p. 358). Code switching (hereafter CS) or code mixing (CM) is an interesting bilingual speech behavior seen from the bilingual speakers in different language contacts.

Code switching is a bilingual speech act where two or more linguistic codes are used in a single conversation (Grosjean, 1982; L. Kim & Rezaeian, 2009). It is sometimes understood as a lack of second language proficiency, as it is frequently seen in which learners of second language can't complete a sentence in the target language. Shin and Milroy (2000) argued that it is often assumed that language mixing is due to the lack of each language, although the general current of thought is “CS as normal and widespread of bilingual discourse” (p. 352).

As inter-language is considered as an ongoing process to a second language acquisition, code switching is likely to be assumed as a language strategy to develop the first two languages in bilinguals. The evidence discussed about this issue can be found from some research. Leyew (1998) noted that “Poplack has pointed out that the ability to code switch intrasententially and intersententially may be used as a measure of bilingual competence” (p. 206). With regard to the patterns of language alternation, Leyew added that fluent bilinguals make greater use of larger-sized constituents, whereas unbalanced bilinguals tend to rely heavily on intrasentential code-switching, making only minimal use of the intersentential type.

Korea has been a unitary country and can't be excluded from that trend of bilingualism. Since the Korean government allowed international marriage and employment of foreigners in the 1990s, international marriage has been increasing dramatically for recent decades (K. J. Kim & D. B. Jeong, 2011). Keeping pace with the worldwide trend, a number of investigators in Korea have approached bilingualism in terms of linguistic problems and attempted to find and solve these problems. Recently, some studies have been focused on the area of Korean-English bilinguals having interaction with other factors in the perspective of sociolinguistics (H. H. Kim, 1988; K. R. Kim, 2003; S. Y. Kim, 2009; J. K. Park, 1993, 1994, 2007; J. S. Shin & Milroy, 2000), and linguistics (J. O. Choi, 2006, 2007; L. Kim & Rezaeian, 2009; J. K. Lee, 2010). However, it is rarely found in the studies focused on simultaneous bilingual teenagers, who are on the stage of shifting to adults from children, and whose two first languages might go through different phases compared to their early childhood.

Furthermore most of researchers in the area of bilingualism chose adult bilinguals as participants (H. H. Kim, 1988), showing great interest in bilinguals' language behaviors and came up with a large amount of results. In recent decades, as simultaneous bilinguals' language patterns were assumed to be different from those of second language learners, a growing body of research has turned their focus on young bilingual children to see if they can distinguish between the two different languages from their early ages and how they use CS in different language contexts (Comeau, Genesee & Lapaquette, 2003; Ervin-Tripp & Reyes, 2005; K. R. Kim, 2003; Lanvers, 2001; Nicoladis & Genesee, 1996; Nicoladis & Secco, 2000; Quay, 2008). Noguchi (1996) conducted a study and found that language supporting strategies given by bilingual families were important for their children's balanced language development; the most important key which leads to the successful bilingual development is flexibility. Most researchers usually observed their own children's language use in the perspective of linguistic development. However, the studies often resulted in different phenomenon, which leads to a debate.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate the code switching behavior of Korean-English bilingual teenagers. To be more specifically the study investigates how the teenagers code switch in light of two structurally different language developments (Korean and English). In addition, since parents seem to play an important role on successful bilingual development, this paper will also attempt to find how parents support their children in relation to their teenagers' bilingual competence development. For the study the following research questions were investigated:

- 1) Why and when do bilingual teenagers code-switch between two languages?
- 2) How do bilingual parents support their children to develop their bilingual ability?

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1. Bilingualism

Many researchers have shown great interest in bilinguals' two language development (Dominguez, 2009; Ervin-Tripp & Reyes, 2005; Lanvers, 2001; Lunden & Silven, 2011; Mishina-Mori, 2005; D. Nam, 2011). A substantial amount of debate has arisen regarding bilinguals' cognitive and language development with the fact that early bilinguals' language development is relatively slower than those of monolinguals. Edwards (2004) cited that "early studies tended to associate bilingualism with lowered intelligence..." (p. 15). However, recent studies have proved that bilingualism has lots of benefits in terms of intelligence, non-linguistic problem-solving tasks, and complex cognitive tasks (Baker,

2006; Bialystok et al., 2009). Cummins (1975, 1977) found that balanced bilinguals were actually superior to matched non-balanced bilinguals on the fluency and flexibility scales of verbal divergence and marginally on originality. He added that the evidence supports cognitive advantages for being bilingual (cited from Baker, 2006, p. 153).

In line with many benefits, it was considered that balanced bilinguals had two language systems inside the head, while monolinguals had one system. However, Cummins (1981) suggested a common underlying proficiency model (CUP) and claimed that two languages are visibly different in outward conversation but they do not function separately. This Cummins' CUP theory is more persuasive than the former theory which claimed the two language systems in terms of bilingualism.

Theorists have attempted to define bilinguals in other ways. Butler and Hakuta (2004) proposed that "bilingualism is a complex psychological and socio-cultural linguistic behavior and has multi-dimensional aspects" (p. 114). Bilinguals are classified according to bilingual characteristics (Butler & Hakuta, 2004):

- 1) balanced and dominant based on language proficiencies
- 2) compound, coordinate and subordinate based on organization of linguistic codes and meaning
- 3) simultaneous and sequential based on age of acquisition
- 4) incipient, receptive and productive based on functional ability
- 5) additive and subtractive based on effect of L2 learning on the retention of L1
- 6) elite, folk, circumstantial and elective based on language status and learning environment. (pp. 116-117)

According to the categorization of above dimensions, the participants of present study fall into the balanced bilinguals since they have been growing in bilingual families and exposed to two different languages simultaneously. When it comes to a balanced bilingual, no one is regarded as a perfectly balanced bilingual on account of social environmental requirement (Daller, Yildiz, De Jong, Kan & Basbagi, 2011). In other words, all bilinguals are non-balanced.

As the term illustrates, simultaneous bilinguals can be assumed to be exposed to two different languages from their first day of life. One of the most salient phenomena seen from those bilinguals is language use in different language contact. The language use refers to language alternation, which further refers to code switch or code mix.

2. Code-Switching

Language alternation is a normal, common and important aspect of bilingualism (Brice & Anderson, 1999). A great amount of research has been conducted to observe the

patterns of the language alternation in bilinguals' utterances. Two interesting bilinguals' behaviors are code-mixing and code-switching. The two terms sound almost the same. However, there are many debates attempting to define the terms. Leyew (1998) overviews the two terms borrowed from the previous scholars: Wardhaugh (1986) and Fasold (1984) define code-mixing as the use of at least two languages together to the extent that interlocutors change from one language to the other in the course of a single utterance; Gumperz (1975) defines the bilingual performance of code-mixing as the juxtaposition in a single speech event of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems. He calls the alternate use of codes within a single sentence intrasentential code-switching, whereas the alternate use of codes between sentences is intersentential code-switching; Hudson (1980) defines code-switching as the use of different varieties at different times by the same speaker; Gingras (1974) defines code-switching as the alternation of grammatical rules drawn from two different languages which occurs between sentence boundaries; Bokamba (1990) views the terms code-switching and code-mixing in a similar way of Gumperz. Bokamba adds that code-switching is intersentential switching and code-mixing is the embedding of various linguistic units such as affixes words, phrases and clauses from two distinct grammatical sub-systems within the same sentence and speech event (cited from Leyew, 1998).

Since Gumperz's definition of CS was widely used (Macswan, 2004), this study considered the code-switching as the alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituent, which is further put into the category of intersentential alternation, and the code-mixing as an intrasentential alternation occurring when the switch is made within a sentence. CS scholars observed bilingual speech and found some functions of CS which have been often used as criteria by socio-linguists; 1) CS enhances effective communication among bilinguals; 2) CS serves a social function by strengthening interpersonal bonds of community members; 3) CS serves to emphasize or elaborate what speakers convey; 4) CS facilitates the topic shift of conversation (S. Y. Kim, 2009).

3. Previous Studies on Code-Switching

Auer (1999) reported that less proficient bilinguals can use code switching effectively to pursue their socially motivated purpose in either the bilingual or monolingual community. Other research showed that code-mixing is generated by bilingual children's limited linguistic resources (Nicoladis & Secco, 2000). On the other hand, adults, especially parents who interact with bilingual children, used code-mixing to lead their children to develop linguistic skills and socialization; the father of the young bilingual child code-mixed in three different categories (social word and interjections, food and body parts). The parents used slightly different language strategies to help with the child's bilingual

acquisition. Much of parents' code-mixing can be accounted for by use of words in the child's productive vocabulary (Nicoladis & Secco, 2000).

K. R. Kim (2003) observed a Korean language school and an American nursery school to describe the sociolinguistic constraints in very young bilingual children. She analyzed bilinguals' language behavior in two categories of situational and conversational CS. Language selection by Korean/English bilingual children was ground to three situational factors; topic (CS effectively as part of their communicative competence), discourse type (personal narration, conversational content, role play, storytelling, play, song and jokes) and participants (individual difference in language proficiency, language preference, imitation). She further separated conversational code switching based on McClure's categories-quotation, addressed specification, emphasis, clarification, elaboration, focus, interruption and objectivization (cited from K. R. Kim, 2003). One of the interesting findings from the data was that the Korean-English bilingual children didn't code switch with sensitivity to the interlocutor's language proficiency. However, they changed the language code according to the interlocutor's language preference. CS was seen most for the purpose of emphasis, addressee specification and attention/attraction in free conversational settings at both the intersentential and intrasentential levels. The most situational category of intersentential and intrasentential CS was seen in play, followed by songs and jokes across the three settings (home, the observer's apartment and the American school), while intersentential CS frequently occurred during personal narration and storytelling in the Korean school setting. Her findings show that the language behavior seems to occur automatically and effortlessly whenever required by the situation and that even very young bilingual children can utilize this behavior.

H. H. Kim (1988) investigated CS patterns of three very young bilingual children in sociolinguistic view and showed that young bilingual children code-switched by the category of 'adaptation to addressee's language use', which resulted in changing to the children's non-dominant language. H. H. Kim suggested that children change codes according to their language preference although they can use both languages. The CS data in her study also showed that the situational CS occurred three times as much as the stylistic CS and she found the oldest participant switched more for stylistic functions, which was interpreted that the difference seen by this phenomenon might be explained by the developmental difference. While serving situational functions, participant's language dominance affected the CS patterns the most, followed by the addressee's language dominance, imitation, adaptation to addressee's language use, language preference, role play, game, song and storytelling and directed to switch. H. H. Kim interpreted that the age and language proficiency were the main factors which caused children to change codes in the category of the participant's language dominance. In the criteria of the stylistic CS, the CS was affected by expression the most, followed by emphasis, teasing/joking, attention/attraction, clarification, interjection, focus, quotation and elaboration in order.

Bilingual children's dual language development starts to decline slightly as they put more focus on the community language, which develops different patterns of code alternation (Ervin-Tripp & Reyes, 2005). J. K. Park (1994) observed 8 preschool Korean-English bilinguals children and reported that children clearly perceive English as the school language and the unbalanced bilingual children alternated between two languages more frequently than the balanced bilingual children in the school setting, while conversely in the home setting. The bilingual children in both settings used situational CS (adaptation of other's language, message form) more than stylistic CS (attention, interjection, focus, quotation). In addition, intersentential code switching was the one that occurred the most frequently regardless of the children's language proficiency. The unbalanced bilinguals showed intrasentential CS within Korean structure by inserting English words, whereas the balanced bilinguals used it within English structure. Brice and Anderson (1999) found that the 6-year-old girl showed slightly different hierarchy; she used nouns the most and then verbs followed it whereas adults showed a hierarchical order of using noun, prepositional phrases, adverbs/adjectives and verbs. They also predicted that bilinguals use different syntactic elements in code mixing along with their dual language development. Thus, it is considered that the use of CS or CM affects bilinguals' language acquisition since it serves as a bridge between two languages.

There are few studies that explored bilingual teenagers who might undergo many changes in terms of language choice. As teenagers step into a new stage of life, they seem to show different patterns of CS in association with the developmental perspective. J. O. Choi (2007) conducted an experiment with Korean-English bilinguals to observe CS patterns. He found some changes among the different stages (infancy/early childhood bilingual stage, childhood/adolescent bilingual stage, early adulthood bilingual and adult bilingual stage). He also reported that "CS patterns between adolescence and those of adulthood are different in that the frequency of certain CS tokens varies one from the other" (p. 272). J. O. Choi's study (2007) implicates that adolescence is an important period in which it connects childhood to adulthood in the linguistic field including sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic area. S. Y. Kim (2009) attempted to find the functions of Korean-English bilinguals' CS with relation to the study of bilingual teenagers' CS and found that the participants used mostly intersentential CS. Her findings also suggested that bilinguals use the "we code" for co-construction of solidarity through in-groupness and change codes for emphasis, elaboration, and topic shift.

4. Language Strategies and Language Choice in Bilingual Families

In effect, language strategies used in bilingual families can play an important role as it can facilitate bilingual children's CS leading to balanced language development. Therefore it's essential to take a look at what kind of efforts bilingual parents use for the development

of bilingualism in their children. Harding and Riley (1986) observed bilingual families and investigated how parents perceive of bilingualism and how they manage languages within the home environment as discourse strategies for their kids' successive linguistic development. Harding and Riley found five different types of bilingual families as followings: Type 1 parents each speak their own language to the child from birth. Type 2 parents speak the non-dominant language to the child. Type 3 parents share the same first language which is not the dominant language of their community. The parents speak their own language to the child. Type 4 parents have different L1 and neither of their languages is a dominant language of their society. Each of them speaks his or her own language to their child from birth. Type 5 parents share the same first language which is the dominant language of their society. One of the parents always addresses the child in a language which is not his or her first language.

As seen in the study of Harding and Riley (1986), there are the two common basic language management strategies that bilingual parents use to facilitate the development of their child's bilingualism: one person-one language strategy (OPOL) and home-community language strategy (H/CL) (Noguchi, 1996; Quay, 2008). The formal strategy which is normally used in bilingual families is that the parents with different L1 speak to their children in each other's language. The second language strategy is that the parents speak the minority language at home and the children learn the majority language through interactions with people outside of the family. Such a strategy is usually used by immigrants moving into a new country.

Noguchi (1996) examined bilingual families' language strategies focusing on the emotional considerations in maintaining strategies after children begin formal schooling. She found that 79% of the families adhering to OPOL experienced difficulties in insisting on that strategy. She also notified the important role of bilingual parents since parents can help their children learn how to cope with linguistic difficulties and cultural marginality, giving them greater self confidence in establishing their dual identity by modeling. Thus she designed flexibility, ingenuity, and sensitivity into alternate strategies to raise well-adjusted bilinguals. J. K. Park (2007) also posed the importance of a parental role because much of their children's bilingual ability depends on parents' attitudes and efforts as an ongoing strategy. However, his finding revealed that in spite of the parents' endeavor, children showed a lot of loss or attrition in a non-dominant language.

With relation to language choice in home environment, Goodz (1989) reported significant positive correlations between parental and children's rates of code mixing. On the other hand, much research failed to prove the statistical relationship between children's rates of code mixing and their parents' discourse styles (Nicoladis & Genesee, 1996). Despite the conflict of ideas on 'familiarity', Comeau, Genesee and Lapaquette (2003) suggested that familiarity might play a role on the children's rates of CS. More recently, in J. K. Lee (2010)'s study having observed Korean-English adult bilinguals' CS, he found

that bilinguals showed more mixed utterances when they talked with their family members and acquaintances rather than with strangers.

As seen in several studies, the parents' language use which can be referred to language attitude in the home environment can influence their teenagers' two language development in which it might facilitate using both languages fluently.

III. METHOD

1. Participants

Two Korean-English bilingual teenagers participated in this study. Both of them were living in Korea in bilingual families (father; American, mother; Korean) at the time of contact and were attending a middle school in Osan.

AA is a boy who was born in the USA, living with his parents and two elder sisters. His first sister (JE) was a college student who also took an important role affecting AA's language development since she was close to a balanced bilingual. His second sister was handicapped with Down's syndrome who couldn't produce either language well, though she could understand both. AA was exposed to English and Korean from his birth. He usually read Korean and English books, enjoyed watching English as well as Korean programs and had some Korean monolingual friends living in the same apartment complex, who could speak a little English. AA preferred to use English on a daily basis as his dominant language was English. He mentioned that he switched languages according to the person's language use and nationality of the person he talked to. AA's father assumed his son's English was as perfect as native speakers, while AA's mother thought AA's Korean ability was not lower than monolingual Koreans in his age.

KL is a girl and an only child who was born in Korea, and never lived in the U.S. However, her family has spent several months every year in the states to enjoy vacations with relatives of father's side. KL is the only child in her family. As in AA's case, KL also tried to expand her bilingual ability by reading books and watching TV in both languages. Even if her dominant language was English, she had many Korean friends and liked to play with them. Regarding the reasons of her CS, she also switched according to the person's language use and nationality of the person she spoke to. KL usually switched back to English when she spoke in her weaker language, Korean.

2. Data Collection and Data Analysis

Questionnaires, semi-structured interviews and video recording were used to collect data. To avoid observation's paradox, the parents of each participant were asked to video record

their teenager's conversation with family members in the home environment where natural discourse utterances could be produced. They were required to capture mother-participant conversation, father-participant conversation and family-participant conversation separately. Twenty seven video clips were collected by each family for two months. The total amount of video clips was 7 hours long. Twenty video clips from AA's parents were classified into 4 categories: 5 of mother only with AA, 3 of mother with JE and AA, 5 of parents with AA, 7 of parents with JE and AA. Father with AA video clips weren't recorded because when the father was home, other family members were always home, too. However, the patterns of father-AA's talk were seen in family conversation. The parents of KL video- recorded only 7 sessions: 3 of father-KL, 3 of mother-KL, 1 of parents-KL.

Collected raw data were all transcribed and a native speaker of English checked the English part of transcription. All data were analyzed by two researchers and the intra-reliability was 77.14% and inter-reliability was 79.02%. Conversational CS and situational CS were used to analyze participants' code-switching behavior. These categories were further divided into several functional categories as mentioned in H. H. Kim's (1988) and K. R. Kim's (2003) studies. Conversational CS includes quotation, addressee specification, expression, emphasis, attention/attraction/interruption, clarification, elaboration, focus, topic shift, and objectivization. Situational CS includes participants (individual differences in language proficiency, language preference, and dominant language of addressee), topic (conversational content), adaptation to other's language use (imitation, response in the same language, directed to switch) and discourse type (personal narration, role play, storytelling, play, song and jokes). In addition parents' questionnaires and interviews were analyzed to see what kinds of parental strategies were used for the sake of their teenagers' simultaneous language development.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Function of CS Patterns

The utterances of the two bilingual teenagers were analyzed from the perspectives of sociolinguistics to find out why and when bilingual teenagers code-switch. As table 1 shows, the two participants produced 105 CS utterances in total. Conversational CS occurred more than situational CS. As conversational functions intersentential CS occurred approximately six times more than intrasentential CS and as situational functions intersentential CS occurred seven times more than intrasentential CS. This result is not surprising because previous researchers discovered that bilingual teenagers rarely used intrasentential CS (S. Y. Kim, 2009).

Conversational CS occurred the most while participants serving the function of expression and then attention/attraction/interruption, addressee specification, emphasis, focus, clarification, elaboration, quotation, and objectivization in order. However no CS data for 'topic shift' were found. Especially AA used more CS when performing the function of 'expression'. AA seemed to change codes mostly into Korean from English to express his feelings of unwillingness, thankfulness, fear, disappointment, anger, happiness, surprise, and body conditions, when he was around his sister or mother. His sister who was regarded as a productive bilingual played an important role in activating AA's CS performance. No data were found from AA and KL in the category of 'topic shift', which corresponds to a teenager's general characteristic of not wanting to lead conversation with adults, regardless of their linguistic area. The participants rarely initiated the conversation. The ones who led the conversation and changed topic were his mother in AA's case and her father in KL's case.

TABLE 1
CS Utterances (frequency/%)

Conversational CS	CS Utterances			Situational CS	(frequency/%)		
	Inter. CS	Intra. CS	Total		Inter. CS	Intra. CS	Total
Quotation	1(1.9)	0(0)	1(1.9)	Participants	10	3	13
Addressee-specification	8(14.8)	0(0)	8(14.8)		(19.6)	(5.9)	(25.5)
Expression	21(38.8)	2(3.7)	23(42.5)	Topic	3(5.9)	0(0)	3(5.9)
Emphasis	5(9.2)	1(1.9)	6(11.1)	Adaptation to	26	2	28
Attention/attraction/interruption	6(0.1)	3(5.4)	9(16.5)		(50.9)	(4.0)	(54.9)
Clarification	1(1.9)	1(1.9)	2(3.8)	Discourse type	6	1	7
Elaboration	1(1.9)	0(0)	1(1.9)		(11.8)	(1.9)	(13.7)
Focus	2(3.7)	1(1.9)	3(5.6)				
Topic shift	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)				
Objectification	1(1.9)	0(0)	1(1.9)	Total No.	45	6	51
Total	46(85.2)	8(14.8)	54(100)		(88.2)	(11.8)	(100)

Note: Inter. CS: intersentential CS. Intra. CS: Intrasentential CS. Adaptation to: Adaptation to addressee's language use.

Situational CS occurred the most at the category of 'adaptation to addressee's language use' followed by participants, discourse type and topic. This happened mostly when the participants conversed with their mothers. As they preferred to speak English and felt comfortable in that language, the participants usually tried to talk in English. However, their mothers' consistent talk in Korean drew their response in Korean. The participants' CS patterns were affected least by topic. They had a tendency to continue speaking English about their school and social lives whereas they changed language code when talking about

house chores or personal lives, which resulted in a very small amount of CS utterance in topic. In the category of participants, the data revealed that AA and KL showed a small amount of CS which was affected by addressees' dominant language. Unlike the results of participants' survey this result revealed that they code-switched by their own language preference or proficiency rather than the interlocutors' nationality. In 'discourse type', most of the CS patterns occurred when AA was learning a Korean game, Kong-ki which he wasn't interested in learning though his mother was very excited to teach him a Korean traditional game. AA chose the personal narration type of discourse, in other words, personal monologue to show his un-interest in the game to his mother indirectly.

As seen in the functions of the CS patterns, the distribution of the CS implicate that the teenagers used CS diversely as a conversational strategy as well as a learning strategy. Nevertheless, it seems too early to predict that the teenagers would produce more diverse CS patterns in various contexts. The teenagers were already moving from a stage of young age balanced language performance to a stage of process of attrition of Korean due to imbalanced language use.

1) Conversational CS

One of the categories in conversational CS is 'quotation'. Generally, bilinguals switch codes when they want to convey the exact meaning of what the others have said in direct or indirect ways. In excerpt (1a), AA's father was talking to his wife about Pepe, their puppy. Then AA's mother responded in Korean. Because of her sudden Korean utterance, AA's father didn't catch the meaning at first so he questioned what his wife addressed as shown in line 3. In line 5 he translated his wife's utterance in English with a rising tone intending to make sure he got it. However, as a bilingual, AA repeated his mother's utterance in a rising tone in order to catch the exact meaning.

(1a) AA in family dinner

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. F: Pepe ate a little bit of food
this morning. | 5. F: fat? |
| 2. M: 살췌어. (fat) ¹ | 6. M: 응. (Yeah) |
| 3. F: Huh? | 7. AA: 살췌다고? (Did you say
that Pepe is fat?) |
| 4. M: Pepe 살췌다고. (Pepe is
fat.) | 8. F: Yeah... |

Bilinguals sometimes code-switch when they want to specify the speaker. This category is called 'addressee specification'. This function usually accompanies certain kinds of non-

¹ Participants' utterances were presented as it is and if the utterances were Korean, the meaning of the utterances were presented in parentheses.

verbal behaviors, such as an eye contact or gestures. Bilinguals also choose the speaker simply by calling his/her name. The excerpt showed this phenomenon at the intersentential level. In line 2, AA switched into English when he changed the conversational object from his mother to his father.

(2a)AA in family

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 1. M: 아니었어? (It wasn't?) | 3. F: That was fun. |
| 2. AA: (<i>to dad</i>) ² Did you see reading a book? | |

(2c)KL in family dinner

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. M: 맛있어? (Delicious?) | 4. M: Yeah. |
| 2. KL: (<i>nods her head and says</i>)
And it's good, too. | 5. KL: 왜 이제 이모 안 와? 안 와?
(Why doesn't she come any more? Why not?) |
| 3. F: That's what happened to your sister? She didn't make it yesterday?
Huh? | 6. F: Speak up. |
| | 7. KL: I'm eating. |

The following excerpts show the CS patterns in the function of 'addressee specification' that occurred in a direct way. AA specified her mother by calling her "emma", instead of "mom" who was involved in another conversation. In excerpt (2f), AA was looking for his shorts while his mother and father were talking about the fried chicken. AA wanted to make sure some chicken was left for him. In line 10 he called his mother with the Korean word "emma" to make it clear that he was talking to his mother, not to his father. This type of CS utterance could also be interpreted that AA used it to get his mother's attention.

(2f)AA with his parents

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1. M: AA! What are you doing? | 9. F: I don't want to eat it. Leave it alone. Fine. |
| 2. AA: Changing | 10. AA: 엄마! (Mom!) I want to find my shorts. Would you like to eat it all? |
| 3. M: Changing what? | 11. M: You ate. One piece, two piece like that... |
| 4. F: Changing his clothes. | |
| 5. M: Mar, this chicken is not old. | |
| 6. M: 빨리 먹어. (Eat it quickly.) | |
| 7. F: That's fine. I'm not hungry | |
| 8. M: 먹어. (Eat it.) | |

² Descriptions of situations or manner were presented in italic.

From the CS data above, it was seen that when the teenagers used the function of ‘addressee specification’, they switched language codes to the addressee’s dominant language even though they switched back to their dominant or preferring language right away.

One of the categories in conversational function that these teenagers used a lot was ‘expression’. The teenagers switched when they wanted to express their feelings in different moods. In excerpt (3a), AA was doing homework at the computer desk near the kitchen. His mother just got back from work. She wanted AA to take out the trash but AA ignored his mother’s request at first. His mother switched into AA’s dominant language to emphasize and make him understood better but AA responded in Korean. “Mola” in this case means unwillingness. AA wasn’t willing to listen to his mother as he was busy doing his homework. As seen in the excerpts below, the teenagers chose Korean to describe their feelings of unwillingness, thankfulness, fear, disappointment, anger, happiness, surprise, and body conditions at the intersentential and intrasentential level.

(3a) AA his mother and JE

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1. M: AA! 이거좀 버리고 올래?
쓰레기좀? (AA! Can you take
out the garbage, please?)</p> <p>2. AA: ...</p> | <p>2. M: Before dinner after dinner
doesn’t matter. Throw it away.
Is good?</p> <p>4. AA: 몰라. (I don’t know)</p> |
|--|--|

The teenagers used CS patterns to emphasize what they wanted to say. The form was usually shown in the form of repetition. In excerpt (4a), AA chose Korean to speak to his mother when he found Keri’s phone number and repeated the same Korean utterance twice. He wanted to emphasize the fact that it was he who found the number in his mother’s cell phone.

(4a) AA with mother and JE

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1. M: 여기 케리 폰 넘버가
안들어있는데. (I can’t find Keri’s
phone number in my cell phone.)</p> <p>2. JE: 엄마가 save 했잖아.
(You saved it.)</p> <p>3. M: 근데 없어. (But it’s not
here)</p> <p>4. JE: 줘봐. (Give it to me.)</p> <p>5. M: 케리좀 찾아봐. (Find
Keri, please.)</p> <p>6. AA: Can you do it again?</p> <p>8. M: 몰라 English로 했어. K.E.R.I.
(I don’t know. I saved it in English.)</p> | <p>9. JE: K.A.R.I.</p> <p>10. M: 다 지웠어?(Did you erase
all?) Everything? Nothing in
there?</p> <p>11. M: If you want to record it, AA
finds Keri’s phone number.</p> <p>12. AA: 여기 있잖아요. (Here
it is.)</p> <p>13. M: If you want to record it,
JE, say, hi.</p> <p>14. AA: 여기 있잖아요. (Here
it is.)</p> <p>15. AA: Hi.</p> |
|--|---|

Attention, attraction and interruption were put in the same category for the analysis of the CS data as it seemed not to be practical to separate them into different categories due to its subtle meaningful distinction. In her study of analyzing young bilingual children's CS patterns, H. H. Kim (1998) grouped 'attention, attraction or retention' in the same category, while K. R. Kim (2003) replaced it with her newly developed category 'interruption' as an analysis tool for CS data in her study. The bilinguals in this study sometimes used CS strategically in the combined function of attention/attraction/interruption to achieve specific conversational goals. In excerpt (5a), AA used Korean to give attention to JE when she raised her voice. The utterance could be interpreted that AA interrupted his sister's utterance in a different code to get her special attention. AA didn't want to argue with JE when it was recording.

(5a) AA with mother and JE

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AA: This thing is the camera? 2. JE: I don't want to be in the camera. 3. AA: Then don't be in it. 4. JE: If it's about you then keep it by you. 5. M: It's focus on AA. Don't worry. 6. JE: Earlier it wasn't. 7. AA: Yes, it was. 8. JE: OK. Do we have to argue about it, AA? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. AA: JE, 가만 있어. (JE, calm down,) We don't have to argue. 10. M: You don't have to argue. Finish the floor. 11. AA: I restarted the camera so that we can be better but you guys continue... 12. JE: AA, don't you have homework? 13. JE: 빨리 do it. (Quickly do it.) |
|--|---|

CS occurs as a form of translation among bilingual children in order to clarify a misunderstanding or resolve ambiguity (K. R. Kim, 2003), which is categorized as 'clarification'. In the following excerpt, in line 6, AA came up with an idea of what to do and spoke to his mother in Korean and then translated his prior Korean utterance into English twice to clarify any possible misunderstandings existing in the conversation, considering his father whose Korean proficiency was not low.

(6a) AA with parents

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. F: So many things to do. 2. AA: I know. 3. F: Just not today. 4. M: 그러면 다음주에는 뭐 plan 있어? (Then do you have any plans next week?) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. M: We need to buy a laundry machine. 6. AA: 사우나 가자. 으으 추워. (Let's go to Sauna. It's cold.) 7. AA: Let's go Sauna. 8. M: 응. 어떻게? (Yeah. What?) 9. AA: Mom! Let's go Sauna. |
|--|--|

10. M: 사우나? (Sauna?)
 11. AA: Probably gonna be no school tomorrow.

12. M: I don't think so.

Intrasentential CS of this pattern was seen in excerpt (6b) which could provide possible interpretation out of other conversational functions as well. AA's father and mother were talking to each other about her new job and JE was talking to herself in a monologue form of discourse about the food. As seen in line 6, AA quickly responded to JE's Korean monologue in English then changed to Korean to talk to his mother who was conversing with his father by calling his mother "emma". However, he translated it to English instantly and repeated it twice to clarify the meaning for his father.

(6b) AA in family dinner

1. M: I don't know they'll give me lunch or buy myself, tomorrow, CDC.
 2. F: You have to buy yourself food.
 3. M: Really?
 4. JE: 내가 너무 많이 집어 넣었나 봐. (I put it too much.)

5. AA: Too hot?
 6. AA: 엄마! tomorrow 가는거야? Mom! Are you going tomorrow? Are you going tomorrow? Mom talks with dad.
 7. M: 응? (Huh?) tomorrow.

The function of 'clarification' didn't affect the teenagers' CS behavior respectively. However, the pattern did happen in the presence of other family members who couldn't speak their second language well.

The purpose of elaboration is to extend the meaning of a prior utterance (H. H. Kim, 1988; K. R. Kim, 2003). Generally, bilinguals use this function to add more information to their prior speech. In line 6 in excerpt (7a), AA responded in Korean spontaneously to his father's question. The CS data from all of AA's video recordings showed this phenomenon only once. In other words, AA never used Korean when he talked to his father as his father always responded to his speech in English except this case. More Interestingly, AA didn't switch into English in his next utterance. Rather, he chose to make a full sentence in Korean to elaborate the meaning for his father who was confused with the Korean word "Ajick".

(7a) AA with parents

1. M: I can't see your face, AA.
 2. AA: I'm just tired.
 3. M: So you have any plan, AA?

4. AA: On base, someone's having a party. 'cause it's Eric's birthday party.
 5. F: Did Pepe eat?
 6. AA: 아직 (Not yet)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>7. F: 아직? (Not yet?) 아직 what?
(Not yet,what?)</p> <p>8. AA: 아직 안했어(I didn't do it yet).</p> <p>9. F: Oh, no! She's starving. Did you eat?</p> | <p>10. M: AA suck the food like a vacuum machine.</p> <p>11. F: Did she eat this morning?</p> <p>12. AA: Yeah.</p> <p>13. F: Thank you AA!</p> |
|--|--|

Focus is defined as a mechanism for highlighting a specific part of a given sentence (K. R. Kim, 2003). A general characteristic of this function is to repeat a word or phrase in the intrasentential CS (H. H. Kim, 1988). In line 3 in excerpt (8a), AA highlighted the Korean word “udduckeh” by switching code into Korean to emphasize the way the security guards could keep the pets warm.

(8a)AA with his parents

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1. AA: Where are they going to keep them? Of course, they're gonna keep them outside. They're gonna freeze to death.</p> <p>2. M: They will do something.</p> <p>3. AA: 어떻게 (How)? They will bring them outside and put a</p> | <p>blanket over them. Do you think that's going to keep them warm?</p> <p>4. M: Maybe they will bring them to their home. I don't know.</p> <p>5. F: We are not keeping them.</p> |
|--|---|

Seen in the excerpts above, the bilingual teenagers sometimes used a conversational function, ‘focus’ to achieve a conversational goal.

Bilinguals use CS to express objective truth (K. R. Kim, 2003). The following excerpt shows this function. When AA's mother tried to teach him the next step of the Korean game, Kongki Nori, AA declared that the movement in the game looked impossible for him to complete.

(9a)AA with his mother

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. AA: OK.</p> <p>2. M: 높이 올려서 잡고, 손을 잘 모아.
(Catch it after throwing high and grab them well with your fingers.)</p> | <p>3. M: OK? Your turn.</p> <p>4. AA: 그거 못해.(I can't do it)</p> <p>5. M: It's not easy.</p> |
|---|---|

2) Situational CS

Previous research has advocated that bilinguals' language behaviors are directly affected by the social functions of participants, setting, and topic (H. H. Kim, 1988). In the current

study, the teenagers' considerable amount of CS patterns could be explained by the situational functions.

The sub-categories in the function of 'participant' are 'individual differences in language proficiency', 'language preference' and 'dominant language of addressee'. The category of 'individual differences in language proficiency' refers to the speaker's language dominance which can sometimes overlap, by definition, with the category of 'language preference'. In this study, the teenagers' dominant language was English in the perspective of language production. They preferred to use English. Most of their CS utterances appeared when they had a conversation with their mother, which can implicate that the CS produced by the teenagers was primarily affected by their language dominance.

In excerpt (1a), KL responded in Korean to her mother's question and then changed to English. KL usually spoke English even when she talked to her mother especially in her father's presence.

(1a)KL with her mother

KL looks at her toenails.

1. KL: 엄마! 이거 발톱이 아파.
(Mom! This toe is hurting.)

2. M: 깎으셔. (Cut it.) That's why.

3. KL: No! It's pushing at this.
There's something here

In excerpts (1d), AA was looking at a heater, inside a package which his mother wanted to exchange for a new one as the purchased heater didn't work well. As seen in the excerpts below, AA switched languages frequently. He produced Korean utterances intersententially regardless of his mother's language choice as he knew that his mother's dominant language was Korean. AA spoke Korean to convey the meaning clearly to his mother.

(1d)AA with his mother

1. M: AA야 go get the heater.
Everything is here? AA 봐봐.
(Check it, AA)

2. M: What are you doing?

3. AA: ...

4. AA: 다야 (That's all).

As seen in line 8 in excerpt (1j), at first AA spoke in English considering his father whose dominant language was English. When his mother was talking to her husband about her dental problem, AA stopped what he was doing and approached his mother to check her teeth and changed language code into her dominant language, Korean, though she was speaking in English. However, the CS pattern shown in this excerpt can't be interpreted in only one function as it conveys some complex social functions.

(1j)AA in family

1. M: 또 남았어? (Any leftover?)

2. F: a little bit.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>3. M: want some little bit more.
조금만 더 줘. (Give me a little more.)</p> <p>4. F: Maybe one scoop and a couple of tomatoes.</p> <p>5. M: Come here, AA. Sit down.
...</p> <p>12. M: When I chew, this side didn't reach.
AA goes to mom.</p> | <p>13. AA: 어 갑자기 이렇게 됐어?
(Why did it suddenly become like this?)</p> <p>14. M: Why?</p> <p>15. AA: 왜 이렇게 됐어? 이렇게.
(Why did it become like this? Like this?)</p> <p>16. M: 몰라. (I don't know.)</p> <p>17. M: Give Pepe food.</p> <p>18. AA: 이상해. (Strange.)</p> |
|---|--|

This category was shown at intrasentential level from both participants. As seen in excerpts (1k), KL inserted the English words, 'appear' and 'toenails' in her Korean sentence even though she knew the translation equivalents for them in Korean. She chose English words because she couldn't take those words out of her lexical repertory right away.

(1k)KL with her mother

- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| <p>1. KL: 다 계속 찔랐는데 또 appear. (I continued to cut it all but it appears again.)</p> | <p>2. M: I have seen it.</p> |
|---|------------------------------|

In excerpt (1m), AA and his mother were talking about their pet turtle which AA kept in the balcony of his room. They couldn't find the turtle there. AA tried to respond in Korean but as the family preferred to call it "Turtle", he used the English name with the Korean present form of verb "sumeo" meaning "hid" in the Korean sentence order. Therefore, AA didn't insert a Korean word into an English matrix sentence.

(1m)AA with his mother

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. M: Where's Turtle go?</p> <p>2. AA: Turtles?</p> <p>3. M: 응.(Yeah.)</p> | <p>4. AA: Turtle 숨어. (It hid.)</p> <p>5. M: (laughs) Turtle 숨어? Where?</p> <p>6. AA: Disappeared in the air.</p> |
|---|--|

The phenomenon seen in the intrasentential CS can support the idea of bilingual teenagers' unbalanced language development under puberty.

Generally, bilinguals switch language code according to a topic. It was known that Korean- English bilinguals assume English as a school language. As they go to an English school, they choose English to talk about their school lives. The function of 'topic' was found in AA's discourse with his mother. In lines 8 and 10 in excerpt (2a), AA changed code to English when his mother changed the topic from 'house chores' to 'school life'.

However, it was seen in excerpt (2b) that when AA was asked about his girlfriend, he didn't switch language code as the topic was about his personal life.

(2a)AA with his mother

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. M: AA, 어디갔어? 이리와. (AA, where are you? Come here.)</p> <p>2. AA: Huh?</p> <p>3. M: You stay around here. Now, I need to follow you then. 저기 black one 도 니꺼야. (That black one is yours, too.)</p> <p>4. AA: 응? (Huh?)</p> | <p>5. M: 저기 니꺼 아냐? 까만것. (Isn't it yours over there? The black one?)</p> <p>6. AA: 아니. (No.)</p> <p>7. M: AA, AA 오늘 어땠어? 오늘 학교 어땠어? (AA! How was your school?)</p> <p>8. AA: Good.</p> <p>9. M: Good 말구.</p> <p>10. AA: Good. It wasn't bad.</p> |
|---|---|

The teenagers in the current study produced a considerable amount of CS in the function of 'adaptation to other's language use', especially in the sub-category of 'response in the same language' as table 2 illustrates. It implicates that the bilingual teenagers spontaneously alternated the two languages and enjoyed being bilinguals.

TABLE 2

Adaptation to Addressee's Language Use		(frequency/ %)	
Adaptation to addressee's language use			
Sub-Function	Intersentential CS	Intrasentential CS	Total
Imitation	2(7.2)	0(0)	2(7.2)
Response in the same language	21(75.0)	1(3.6)	22(78.6)
Directed to switch	3(10.6)	1(3.6)	4(14.2)
Total	26(92.8)	2(7.2)	28(100)

In excerpt (3a), AA was talking about the "Gag concert", a Korean TV program, with his mother. When his mother asked AA which corner he liked the most, he answered incorrectly then his mother corrected his incorrect utterance to "negaji". AA copied it right away.

Imitation: (3a) AA with his mother

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. M: (<i>laughs</i>) 네가지. (four)</p> <p>2. AA: (<i>laughs</i>) 네가지. (four)</p> <p>3. AA: Hmm... The school plays where the principle is upset</p> | <p>about the kids. I know the guy, 가루상.</p> |
|---|---|

Personal narration:

(4a)AA in family dinner

1.M: AN, 배불리. 그만 먹어.
아 vegetable 먹어야지. Bean.
(AN! Are you full? Stop eating. Ah,
you should eat vegetable.)

2.AA: 으응~(no)

AA says to himself

3.AA: 잘 먹겠습니다.(Thank you.)

(4b)AA with his mother

1.M: 이걸 뭐라고 부르는지
알아? (Do you what this is
called?)

2.AA: 으응~ (No.)

3.M: 공기. 공기놀이.(Kongi
Nori)

4.M: 어떤 사람은 이렇게도
한다. 볼래? 올리고 sweep up.
이렇게.

(Some people can even do like this.
See? Throw it up and sweep up
like this.)

5.AA: 아, 난 못해. (Ahh, I can't
do it)

6. M: AA. AA. 이렇게 길게
한줄로 올리고, 이렇게 해서
올리고. 한줄로.

(AA, like this put them on your
back of your hand and like this
throw them on the back of your
hand.)

7. AA: How do you do it?

2. Parental Language Management Strategies

As seen in the studies done previously on bilingualism, it is assumed that the parents' role can't be ignored in light of children's bilingual development. Parents who want to raise their children bilingually tend to stick to the two common language strategies which are OPOL and H/CL. However, as Noguchi(1996) noted that "a number of cases in which rigid adherence to one of those language-use strategies appeared to have led to emotional strain or communication problems in the family, particularly once the children reached school age"(p. 245), it may be even harder if the parents insist on those common language strategies for the bilingual teenagers who passed over the threshold of a new linguistic stage and have just stepped onto the next linguistic stage which seems more complicated linguistically and psychologically.

According to the questionnaire of the participants, both of them answered that they read books and watched TV in Korean and English and had Korean and English friends, which could be explained by the parents' efforts for their teenagers' bilingual development. AA's mother reported that AA enjoyed translating for a friend who couldn't understand either one of the languages. Regarding their language use at home, both of them answered they usually used two languages. Inferred from the participants' answers, it is perceived that their parents have adjusted certain language policies at home.

AA spent most of his life in English countries. His mother said that he was far better at English than Korean even when he was very young in spite of her Korean input because his sister at school age interacted with him in English. Regarding the language strategies, AA's father said "I mostly use English with him so he can learn from my English example and his mother uses mostly Korean with him so he can learn from her example". From his statement, it is seen that AA's parents have flexibly followed OPOL strategy. Contrary to AA's case, KL had no experience living in English countries. Her father stated, "Mostly we concentrated on English in her early years because we never planned to stay in Korea for this long and knew she would have to use English as her primary language. After she started school, we just worked with her on her homework." As KL's family was living in a monolingual community, KL's parents were concerned about her unbalanced two language acquisition. So, they sent her to English kindergarten at the base ABD school to prepare her for the public school. KL's father added "After about a year with just English we hired a Korean tutor to come once a week to help her with her Korean. This has worked pretty well." KL is the only child in her family. Her father was the only person who gave her English input. However, he was often away from home because of his special job condition. So they developed a new strategy, that is, "temporary intensive training" which is in line with "flexibility" (Noguchi, 1996). Temporary intensive training is a language management strategy normally adopted by immigrant families. When immigrant parents find their children having a period of difficulties with the majority language, they focus on only the target language until their children resolve the language problem. Then the parents go back to their original language strategies to activate their children's balanced bilingual development. Parental efforts concerning the language strategies were seen in the following examples: parent-parent interaction, father-participant interaction, mother-participant interaction and sibling-participant interaction

Parent-Parent Interaction:

(1a)AA with parents

1. M: 요즘 애들 무서워. 조심해야돼.
특히 초등학생.

(These days children are scary. We should be careful,

especially elementary children.)

2. F: I forgot what 초등학생 is.

3. M: Elementary

4. F: Elementary?

5. M: 응:(Yeah)

(1c-2)KL with parents

1. K: Today we were at the PX.
We went to eat the chicken wrap
and Mr. Ron took off his hat and
tried to hit dad.

2. F: Um Hum.

3. M: You should smack him.

Father-Participant Interaction:

(2a) AA with father

1. AA: Yeah. I'll have to show you. Ugh I think either they're guessing or they got proven.
2. F: Proof?

(2b)KL with father

1. KL: That's what happens if you don't have a lock.
2. F: Wok?

Mother- Participant Interaction

(3a-2)AA with mother

1. AA: I see a lot of Korean drama like Bones something. I don't know, copying a lot of CSI.
2. M: 아 나도 뭔지 모르겠다.(Ah, I don't know what it is.)
3. AA: The one that we watched drama. You said you don't understand it.

(3c)KL with mother

1. M: 물 마셔야 돼. (You should drink water.)
2. KL: ...
3. M: 물 마셔야 된다고.(You should drink water.)

Sibling-Participant Interaction

(4a)AA with JE

1. AA: I went to school today.
2. JE: Did you have AVID?
3. AA: Yeah.
4. JE: What did you guys do in AVID?

3. AA: Yeah, they had proof like a lot of proof about it. So I don't know well anyway. They'll never live without it.

3. KL: A lock.
4. F: You mean a lock?
5. K: I said that....

4. M: 아 그게 뭐더라. 그게 뭐지?
(Ah, what is it?)
5. AA: Ghost?
6. M: Ghost. 그 computer movie 맞지?(Ghost, that's the computer movie, right?)
7. AA: 응.(Yeah.)...

4. KL:...
5. M: I'm talking to you.
KL points to TV.
6. KL: 저기 TV. (Look, TV...)

5. AA: Nothing.
6. JE: Nothing. What do you mean?...

As the teenagers belonged to two different communities, the home community seemed to provide essential linguistic resources for the teenagers. Knowing this fact, their parents were always sensitive to their teenagers' language use and tried to provide the most effective environment as follows: First, both parents of the teenagers tried to be a good model as bilinguals. So, when they talked to each other in the presence of their teenagers, they alternated the two languages flexibly. Regarding this fact, no data was collected from KL's parents. However, they reported that they often used two languages. Second, each parent of the teenagers tried to act as a monolingual when they interacted with their teenagers in order to help with their teenagers' bilingual development. Fathers were more apt to stick to speaking English, whereas mothers used two languages flexibly. Third, the two parents used media, such as TV, books, newspapers, and a computer as a strategy to increase the teenagers' exposure to their weaker language. KL's parents even hired a

Korean language tutor to teach KL more advanced Korean knowledge. Both teenagers' parents helped the teenagers make Korean friends and join local church activities in order for them to improve Korean language through its culture.

Like the result of a previous research (Altarriba & Heredia, 2008) the data showed an ongoing process of 'attrition' of the teenagers in spite of their parents' efforts to develop their children' bilingual ability. Knowing bilingual development often occurs in spurts (Noguchi, 1996), constant as well as wise efforts are required on the parental side in the long run.

V. CONCLUSION

Simultaneous Korean-English bilingual teenagers in the bilingual home environment produced diverse CS utterances over both in situational and conversational functions. The total amount of CS at each function wasn't significantly different, which cannot be interpreted that the teenagers preferred to switch in certain function over the other. However, the results showed that the teenagers code-switched predominantly at the intersentential level in both functions. Among categories of conversational CS, the teenagers used 'expression' (42.5%) the most, and among the categories of situational CS, the teenagers used 'adaptation to addressee's language use' (54.9%) the most. As seen in the results of CS patterns, the teenagers preferred to switch from English to Korean to deliver their feelings more strongly to their mothers who spoke Korean as a first language. The teenagers tended to switch for adaptation to the interlocutor's language use. The high degree of frequency of the two categories, along with other functions, indicates that the teenagers used CS strategically for conversational purposes.

The teenagers CS utterances were similar to those of young children's in that both of them code-switched dominantly in the category of 'adaptation to addressee's language use', which means two different age groups used CS simultaneously, according to the addressee's language preference. Like most of the very young bilingual children's CS utterances mentioned in a previous study (H. H. Kim, 1988) the teenager's Korean CS utterances were occurred in simple sentences. The teenagers produced mostly a single-word or phrase utterances when they switched to Korean. However unlike the behavior of young children mentioned in a previous research (H. H. Kim, 1988) the teenagers switched Korean to English. Like the findings of Nicolaidis and Secco (2000) the results indicate that the teenagers alternated between two languages and code-switched more when conversing in their weaker language. However teenagers in this study did not use most of CS because of their lexical gaps as children mentioned in the study of Nicolaidis and Secco but they used most of CS as a conversational strategy.

When examining parental language strategies, the result showed that parents used various methods to develop their teenagers' bilingual ability. Both parents of the teenagers used OPOL strategy with flexibility and sensitivity as Noguchi (1996) suggested. Further, they used media, such as TV, newspapers and books in order to expose their teenagers more to their weaker language, Korean. They also had their teenagers make Korean friends, had them join local community activities, and invited Korean people to their houses.

As Korean has put more focus on English education, public schools have adopted various teaching methods for the learners' second language acquisition. It is known that the role of help outside the classroom is as important as that inside the classroom in terms of second language acquisition. The result of this study gives a useful insight that for the children's bilingual acquisition, parents can help with children's two language acquisition, making home another bilingual place. This study also has some limitations in that it investigated a small number of participants. Thus, a further study with a larger number of participants is needed to validate and generalize the results of this study. In addition, a longitudinal study from the teenage stage to young adult stage is suggested to examine what process teenagers go through to gain more balanced proficiency in both languages in the developmental perspective.

REFERENCES

- Altarriba, J., & Heredia, R. R. (Eds.). (2008). *An introduction to bilingualism: Principles and processes*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Auer, P. (1999). From code-switching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 3(4), 309-332.
- Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bialystok, E., Craik, I. M. F., Green, W. D., & Gollan, H. T. (2009). Bilingual minds. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 10(3), 89-129.
- Brice, A., & Anderson, R. (1999). Code mixing in a young bilingual child. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 21(1), 17-22.
- Butler, Y. G., & Hakuta, K. (2004). Bilingualism and second language acquisition. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism* (pp.114-145). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Choi, Jae-Oh. (2006). Korean-English bilingual code switching: General rule and linguistic constraints revisited. *Bilingual Research*, 31, 253-276.

- Choi, Jae-Oh. (2007). A longitudinal study of code switching: A case of Korean-English bilinguals: A case of Korean-English bilinguals. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23(1), 261-286.
- Comeau, L., Genesee, F., & Lapaquette, L. (2003). The modeling hypothesis and child bilingual code mixing. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 7(2), 113-126.
- Cummins, J. (1981). *Bilingualism and minority language children*. Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Daller, M. H., Yildiz, C., De Jong, N. H., Kan, S., & Basbagi, R. (2011). Language dominance in Turkish-German bilinguals: Methodological aspects of measurements in structurally different languages. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15(2), 215-236.
- Dominguez, L. (2009). Charting the route of bilingual development: Contributions from heritage speakers' early acquisition. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 13(2), 271-287.
- Edwards, J. V. (2004). Foundations of bilingualism. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism* (pp.114-145). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Ervin-Tripp, S., & Reyes, I. (2005). Child code-switching and adult content contrasts. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 9(1), 85-102.
- Field, F. (2005). Long-term effects of CS: Clues to structural borrowing. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 9(3&4), 341-360.
- Goodz, N. S. (1989). Parental language mixing in bilingual families. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 10, 25-44.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Harding, E., & Riely, P. (1986). *The Bilingual Family: The handbook for parents*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, Hyun-Hee. (1988). Sociolinguistic and syntactic aspects of code-switching in Korean English bilingual children: A naturalistic, longitudinal study. *Study of Educational Psychology*, 2(1), 105-132.
- Kim, Ki-Jung, & Jeong, Dong-Bin. (2011). Perceptions of multicultural family mothers on early childhood English education. *Studies in English Language & Literature*, 37(3), 195-225.
- Kim, Kyung-Ryung. (2003). The sociolinguistic constraints on Korean-English bilingual children's code switching behavior. *Bilingual Research*, 22, 140-162.
- Kim, Lan, & Rezaeian, F. (2009). A comparative study in bilingual speech of Persian/English and Korean/English code-switching and light verb constructions. *Comparative Studies*, 13(2), 415-433.

- Kim, Su-Yeon. (2009). Strategic code-switching in Korean-English bilingual teenagers' discourse. *The Journal of Linguistic Science*, 50, 1-20.
- Lanvers, U. (2001). Language alternation in infant bilinguals: A developmental approach to code-switching. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(4), 437-464.
- Lunden, M., & Silven, M. (2011). Balanced communication in mid-infancy promotes early vocabulary development: Effects of play with mother and father in mono- and bilingual families. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15(4), 535-559.
- Lee, Jun-Kyu. (2010). A structural account of intra-sentential code-switching in Korean-English bilingual speech. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 18(3), 93-110.
- Leyew, Z. (1998). Code-switching: Amharic-English. *Journal of African Cultural Studies*, 11(2), 197-216.
- Macswan, J. (2004). Code switching and grammatical theory. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism* (pp.283-311). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mishina-Mori, S. (2005). Autonomous and interdependent development of two language systems in Japanese/English simultaneous bilinguals: Evidence from question formation. *First Language*, 25(3), 291-315.
- Nam, Dae-Hyeon. (2011). Native-speakerness: A case study of two Korean-English bilinguals. *Studies in Foreign Language Education*, 25(2), 171-193.
- Nicoladis, E., & Genesee, F. (1996). A longitudinal study of pragmatic differentiation in young bilingual children. *Language Learning*, 46, 439-464.
- Nicoladis, E., & Secco, G. (2000). The role of a child's productive vocabulary in the language choice of a bilingual family. *First Language*, 20, 3-28.
- Noguchi, G. M. (1996). The bilingual parent as model for the bilingual child. *Policy Science*, 245-261.
- Park, Joo-Kyung. (1993). Language choice and codeswitching behavior of eight Korean bilingual children at home and at school. *First Language*, 6, 119-137.
- Park, Joo-Kyung. (1994). Home-school difference in code-switching behavior of Korean bilingual children. *English Teaching*, 47, 171-188.
- Park, Jin-Kyu. (2007). Bilingualism with tears: A case study of two Korean immigrant families. *Modern Studies in English Language & Literature*, 51(3), 245-266.
- Quay, S. (2008). Dinner conversations with a trilingual two-year-old: Language socialization in a multilingual context. *First Language*, 28(1), 5-33.
- Shin, J. Sarah, & Milroy, L. (2000). Conversational code switching among Korean-English bilingual children. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 4(3), 351-383.

APPENDIX
Parents' Questionnaires

- Q1. English/Korean language level: a) none b) poor c) normal d) well e) very well
Q2. Language use with the teenager: a) English b) English & Korean c) Korean
Q3. Language use with your spouse: a) English b) English & Korean c) Korean
Q4. How do you think of your teenager's English level?
Q5. What kind of strategies have you been doing to develop your teenager's two language abilities?
(e.g., one person-one language strategy, home-community language strategy)
Q6. Write the history of your teenager's language development along with language strategies you
have adjusted.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Jeongsook, Lee
Ajou University Graduate School of Education
Daerim e-Pyeonhansang 1 Danji Apt. 111-603, Wondong,
Osan-si, Gyeonggi-do, Korea
Tel: 010-4847-7162
Email: tobeornot1972@hotmail.com

Unkyoung Maeng
Ajou University Graduate School of Education
San 5 Wonchung-dong, Youngtong-gu,
Swon, Kyungi-do 443-749, Korea
Tel: (031) 219-1883
Email: my5329@ajou.ac.kr

Received 15 June 2013
Revised 3 August 2013
Accepted 23 August 2013