Language Socialization Practices of Seven Adolescents of Korean Heritage in the US

Lee, Gi-ven · Song Mi-jeong*
(Seoul National University)

Abstract

Lee, Gi-ven · Song, Mi-jeong. 2011. Language Socialization Practices of Seven Adolescents of Korean Heritage in the US. *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea, 20*(1). pp. 135-159. This study explores cultural and linguistic practices, identity negotiation, and power dynamics manifested in language socialization practices in a recreational setting of seven high school and college students of Korean heritage currently residing in the US. In conjunction with interviews, audio-tapings and observations of these students' weekly basketball games serve as the data sources. Analyses of data demonstrate that the basketball game offers a prime context for these students to speak Korean, practice Korean sociocultural values and rules, negotiate their identity, and establish their own position in the group. While they all speak English for the majority of time in their day-to-day interactions, the students mostly use Korean in the basketball setting, particularly when talking about Korea-related topics. In terms of negotiating their ethnic identity, the Korean-born students seem to negotiate their identity more strictly than the US-born students, who appear to negotiate their identity more ambiguously and flexibly. Also, the power and authority to control the interaction seems to depend upon the symbolic and material resources that the students own.

Keywords: language socialization practices, Korean heritage, cultural and linguistic practices, identity negotiation, power dynamics

---

* Corresponding author: Song Mi-jeong

www.kci.go.kr

I. Introduction

In an era of increasing globalization, the population of youths who have crossed cultural and linguistic boundaries multiple times from early on in their life is rapidly increasing (Lam 2004: 2006). Young students who have experienced frequent migrations from one country to another tend to have complex sets of cultural and linguistic histories, identity conflicts, power dynamics, and often uncertain future trajectories (Bayley & Schecter 2003; Watson-Gegeo 2004). As Lam (2004, 2006) has noted, this multi-cultural and multi-lingual youth population brings in with them a more heterogeneous notion to each society due to their diverse local and global experiences. As several researchers (Gee 1999; Lam 2006; Rampton 1997) have indicated, it is an urgent issue to develop a new approach to examining this new population. Lam (2006) suggests, "exploring the processes, resources, tensions, and challenges as young people's socialization and learning in transnational contexts" is an urgent issue because it helps us "understand what it means to grow up, interact, and learn in today's contiguous and overlapping cultural spaces between societies" (p. 228).

However, as Waters (2005) points out, there is little research examining how young migrating students participate in diverse social communities and develop their social, cultural, and linguistic knowledge, skills, and competence. In particular, as Lo and Reyes (2004) notes, despite the increasing number of Asian-American immigrant adolescents in the US, including Korean-American adolescents, how they socialize in the US, especially outside the classroom, has received relatively little attention from scholars in sociolinguistics and bilingualism. Several studies on these areas have focused on how immigrant children develop and maintain their heritage language in the US (Kouritzin 2000; Pease-Alvarez 2003; Schecter & Bayley 1997). These studies have reported that social networks such as home domains and communities play a major role in the development and maintenance of students' mother tongue as well as their ethnic identity formation. In addition, the language socialization of Korean immigrant children residing in the US is often described as "a site of

www.kci.go.kr

struggle" because they have to maintain Korean cultural rules and linguistic skills, acquire the target language and culture, and experience identity transformation (Park 2006: 149).

As children move into adolescence, they tend to engage in less communication at home (Tseng & Fuligni 2000); rather, they try to socialize and interact more with peers outside the home domain, internalize social and cultural norms and values, and are accustomed to the social ideologies and power relations (Giordano 2003; Norton 1997), and this socialization and interaction with their peer groups can be the core part of adolescents' cultural and linguistic practices, "negotiations of dynamic, sometimes contradictory, and multiple identities, as well as power relationships" (McKay & Wong 1996: 577).

Employing a language socialization (LS) approach (Schieffelin & Ochs 1986a, 1986b), we examine how a group of young men of Korean heritage, some born in Korea and some born in the US, currently attending US high school and college, socialize together. In particular, this study explores their cultural and linguistic practices, identity issues, and power dynamics as manifested in language socialization practices in a recreational setting. In conjunction with interviews, audio-tapings and observations of these students' weekly basketball games serve as the data sources.

The term *Korean heritage used* in this paper differs from the term the 1.5 generation, which Danico (2004) uses to refer to those who were born in Korea and immigrated to the US permanently in their early childhood, mainly for their parents' economic purposes. The students in this study refer to two groups of male students, some born in Korea and some born in the US, who have experienced living and studying in both contexts for a number of years; consequently, it is assumed that they might have more fluid and flexible sets of cultural values and beliefs than those who come to the US permanently. All of the students here are from professional families (e.g., one of their parents is a professor in Korea). "Korean young men or adults," "Korean adolescents," and "Korean bilingual speakers" are interchangeably used in this paper.

www.kci.go.kr

II. Language Socialization Research

The ultimate goal of language socialization research (LS) is to understand how a person becomes an active, competent member of social groups and the role of language in this process (Ochs 1996; Ochs & Schieffelin 1984, 2008; Schieffelin & Ochs 1986 a, b). This perspective emphasizes that using language and participating in society are not independent but closely related processes. Schieffelin and Ochs (1986a) state that members are "socialized to use the resources" and at the same time, they are "socialized through the use of language" (p. 163). In this view, language is regarded as a "system of symbolic resources designed for the production and interpretation of social and intellectual activities" (Ochs 1996: 407). Acquiring the meaning of symbolic resources through diverse semiotic forms, such as participating in activities and events and talking with others, is an important part of the language socialization process.

However, as these scholars note (Ochs 1990, 1996; Schieffelin & Ochs 1986 a, b), no two languages can have the same indexical value in terms of status, group membership, and solidarity. A choice of a particular language over another may index one's identity, ethnicity, or a particular political stance toward the relation between language and identity. Such indexical relations are not self-evident; rather, they are complex, implicit, and culturally varied. Therefore, in order to acquire the knowledge of indexical meanings, participating in mundanely organized social activities and events is important. As more or less experienced and inexperienced members jointly and recurrently engage in socially and culturally situated routine activities, they "develop an understanding about social actions, events, emotions, esthetics, knowledgeability, statuses, relationships, and other socio-cultural phenomena" (Ochs 1996: 408). Thus, the LS framework enables us to uncover the kinds of cultural and linguistic practices, identity issues, as well as power dynamics demonstrated as seven Korean young adults with frequent migrating experiences socialize together in the US while playing basketball.

When people move from one country to another, they not only learn a

www.kci.go.kr

linguistic system but also learn a diverse set of sociocultural practices, which can have a great impact on the formation of their identity as well as on the establishment of their power relationships (Norton 1997 2000; Woolard & Schieffelin 1994). In other words, based on the symbolic and material resources that people possess, people construct their own version of identity, one that is created, negotiated, and constantly renegotiated influenced by the personal, institutional, political, and social environment. In particular, immigrant students' experiences constitute "a complex negotiation and renegotiation of social identity in the new society," a process that has greatly influenced their attitude toward their and others' use of language and toward the learning of the target language (McNamara 1997: 561). Although all of the students in this study share the same cultural and language background and are at a transition stage of their life, moving into adulthood, their migrating experiences as well as the symbolic and material resources that they own in terms of their language ability, age, and status are varied, which might have different implications for developing their identity as well as exacting their power dynamics.

Bourdieu (1977) contends that "Language is not only an instrument of communication or even of knowledge, but also as an instrument of power and authority" (p. 648). He argues that "Speech always owes a major part of its value to the value of the person who utters it" (p. 652). In some societies, acquiring some forms of symbolic and material resources such as members' language ability or age is considered to increase the *cultural capital*, which Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) termed to "reference the knowledge and modes of thought that characterize different classes and groups in relation to specific sets of social forms" (Norton 2000: 10). Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) argue further that some forms of cultural capital have a higher exchange value than others. Those who have access to a wider range of cultural capital have the power and authority not only to speak in interaction but also to command listeners (Bourdieu 1977; Gee 1999), which will in turn influence how they will understand their relationship to the world and their possibilities for the future (Norton 2000). For example, in Korean society, age is one of the most important cultural and social markers through which their hierarchical

www.kci.go.kr

relationships are usually established (Lee 2010). Thus, before correctly inferring the partner's age, people are not expected to use causal verb endings (i.e., *iya* or *inde*[1]) but polite language forms (i.e., *iyeyo* or *iseyo*), which is linked to the authority, power, and control in communication.

III. Methodology

1. Contextual Information

This study took place at a basketball court in one of the apartment complexes in the southern part of the US where several Korean families lived. The apartment had several facilities, including a basketball court, swimming pool, and a clubhouse with a billiard table. Every Friday evening, a group of Korean high school and college students came to this place to play basketball, swim, or play billiards together and enjoyed themselves until around midnight. They had been doing this event more than two years when the study began. These students brought with them their friends from various ethnic, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds who might or might not speak Korean. Once a good number of students arrived, the teams were formed. While two teams were playing, the rest of the students usually sat on the playground in the corner of the court and waited for their turn while talking about their daily lives. Although English was the medium of communication for these speakers in their everyday lives in the US, the students used mostly Korean, particularly when there were only Korean students, and the Korean students' interaction on the ground was the focus of this study.

1) The Revised Romanization of Korean in July 2000 was adopted for Korean pronunciation.

www.kci.go.kr

2. Participants

The participants in this study included seven young men of Korean heritage, ranging in age between fifteen and eighteen (i.e., sixteen and nineteen in Korean age). Although these students shared the same Korean ethnic heritage, their backgrounds were distinctive in terms of their place of birth, their length of living and studying in Korea and the US, and their status. The demographics of the participants in this study are presented in Table 1.

Factors \ Name		S	R	Y	E	C	T	J
Place of birth		America	America	Korea	America	America	Korea	Korea
Age		15.5	16.5	17.7	17.5	17.9	18.8	17.3
Length of years living in __	Korea	12.0	6.0	7.9	6.0	7.0	12.3	12.0
	America	3.5	10.5	9.8	11.5	10.9	6.5	3.8
	elsewhere							1.5
Length of years studying in __	Korea	9.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	7.0
	America	0.4	7.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	6.5	3.6
	elsewhere							1.2
Each student's __ ability	Korean	fluent	fluent	fluent	fluent	fluent	fluent	fluent
	English	low	fluent	fluent	fluent	fluent	fluent	fluent

Table 1. The Participants' Background Information

Four boys (S, R, E, and C) were born and spent their early childhood in the US while their parents were studying in graduate school. Among these students, except for S, who was born in the US and moved back to Korea when he was three years old and spent most of his life in Korea until he came back to the US to study recently, the three students almost fully developed their bilingual ability from birth on. They learned English through various social activities such as schooling and sport activities outside the home domain in the US and Korean mainly from their parents at home. After their

www.kci.go.kr

parents completed their schooling and moved back to Korea, they attended Korean elementary schools where they developed their Korean ability fully. After completing their elementary education, they came back to the US to continue their middle school studies. All of the students in this group held US citizenship. These three students had often experienced linguistic and sociocultural journeys from US to Korea and vice versa. Although Y was born in Korea, his background was similar to that of these three (R, E, and C). The only difference was his birthplace. He was born in Korea and came to the US with his parents when he was two months old and developed his Korean and English ability fully.

T and J were born and raised in Korea and recently came to the US to study. T came to the US in his second year of middle school, and he is a college freshman in Austin, Texas. T had also studied in an American elementary school in Boston for one and a half years. Like T, J had also attended an English-speaking international elementary school [in Vietnam] for a year before having come to the US in his first year of high school. However, compared to the US-born students, these two students spent more of their time in Korea than in the US and did not hold US citizenship.

All of the students exclusively used English at school. Except for T, a college freshman, who was living with an English-speaking American student off-campus, the six students were living with their parent or relative and attending the same public high school near the apartment complex. J and E had one brother each, and R had one older sister; J said that he mostly used Korean when he talked to his brother at home, whereas E mostly used English when he talked with his younger brother who was also born and raised in the US. Although R had a sister, he rarely talked to her at home. S and Y attended Korean churches where they had some Korean interaction. Although some of the students sometimes found ways to socialize in Korean (e.g., attending Korean churches), and there were some variations in their use of both languages, all of them appeared to use English predominantly both at home and in school. During the interview, as to what percentage of Korean and English the students would use in their day-to-day interaction, J said that

www.kci.go.kr

he would speak about 30% of Korean and about 70% of English, which indicated the highest use of Korean and the lowest use of English among the students. The rest of the students used less than 20% of Korean and more than 80% of English. All of them, except for S, who seemed to struggle to follow school work at the moment, performed very well at school. In the interview, when asked how they evaluated their speaking ability in both languages, the students, except for S, said that they felt confident in using both languages in daily conversation. Based on the interview and casual conversation with them on the basketball court, we also evaluated at least their speaking ability of both languages as fluent.

3. Data Collection, Procedures, and Analysis

"The relation between language behaviors and cultural ideologies is not explicit or obvious but must be constructed from a range of ethnographic data, including interviews, observations, and transcripts" (Schieffelin & Ochs 1986: 168). In order to understand how a group of Korean bilingual speakers socialize together in a particular social setting in the US, we collected data from several sources, including the transcripts of a semi-structured interview, the transcripts of audio-taped conversations on the court, as well as the observational notes of the activity. The interview was conducted by the first author at the club house or in the first author's home in the same apartment complex as the basketball court before or after the game, with a minimum of one hour per student. At the beginning of the interview, the researcher asked simple questions regarding their birthplace, educational backgrounds, family members, and their language socialization practices both in school and outside the school. Later, she explored more complex issues in relation to their cultural and linguistic matters, identity issues, and power relationships. During the interview, although the students occasionally used Korean when responding to the researcher, most of the conversation took place primarily in English (See the interview questions in Appendix). In order to audio-tape the students' language socialization practices, before each game started, a compact-size audio

www.kci.go.kr

recorder with a microphone was given to one of the students who was asked to turn it on and off.[2] At first, some students seemed to be aware of the presence of the tape recorder (e.g., "Hey, say something. The recorder is here."), but as the time passed by, they did not seem to pay attention to it. After each game, the audio-taped data were transcribed immediately by the first author, but the transcripts were analyzed by the two researchers. After having transcribed the audio-recorded data, the two researchers usually met at the basketball court and watched some part of the game. Out of seven audio-taped data, the transcripts from the five tapes, which contained interaction only with Korean students, were used for this study. Observing the game on a bench near the basketball court for about three to four hours, we took notes of their regular activity (e.g., Who did or did not come to play the game? Who sat on the ground? Who left early?). After having prepared all of the data sources, we carefully examined the data several times to find some interesting phenomena that could explain the cultural and linguistic practices, identity issues, and power relationships that revealed in the process of language socialization practices of seven Korean adolescents at the basketball court in the US.

IV. Results and Discussion

1. Basketball Game

Basketball is a common activity for many boys. However, for the students who come to play basketball on Friday evening in this study, it has taken on a very symbolic social meaning. It offers a prime context for the seven young male students of Korean heritage to speak Korean, practice Korean cultural

2) The student who kept the tape recorder was asked to turn it on when they had only Korean interaction and to turn it off when they had English interaction because in the interview, the students said that they did not use Korean as there were other students who did not speak Korean.

www.kci.go.kr

values and social norms, negotiate their identity, and establish their own position in the group. It is a place where new arrivals, i.e., young male Koreans newly arrived in the US, and longer-term group members meet, play basketball, share information, and create a sense of belonging and bondedness. While the students integrate and acculturate into US. society through English in their everyday lives, it is their norm to speak Korean within this particular context. In other words, the students do not simply come to play the game; rather, as they repeatedly engage in such a routinely organized social activity with group members, they practice not only Korean but also learn how to locate themselves strategically and flexibly with respect to ongoing interactions, group boundaries, and social ideologies (Ochs 1993). Therefore, the basketball game in this context is not a common and simple activity that many boys do; it is a primary context for these speakers to practice complex sets of sociocultural knowledge, negotiate their multiple identities, as well as explore power dynamics.

2. Korean Cultural and Linguistic Practices

Although the degree of use of Korean and English varies among these speakers, they all speak English for the majority of the time in their day-to-day interactions both at school and at home. However, once they come to play basketball on Friday evening, although code-switching does occur frequently from Korean to English and vice versa depending upon the situations and topics, Korean is the base language for their interaction and communication. In particular, as they talk about Korea-related issues and topics (e.g., When, where, and how do they get a Korean identification card in Korea? or When is the appropriate time for them and Korean college students to go to the obligatory military service?), they tend to use Korean much more than English.

There is no specific introduction for the newcomers. However, soon after they begin to talk on the playground, the students usually know what Korean language forms to use to whom (i.e., polite form or casual form). For

www.kci.go.kr

example, as the younger students talk to the older ones, they are not supposed to ask the older ones' age directly. When there is a situation in which the younger ones are not sure the other's age, they are expected to use polite verb endings (i.e., *iyeyo, iseyo, not inde* or *iya*), especially at the early stage of setting up their relationships. Those who do not follow such cultural rules and social norms in interaction are considered impolite or uneducated in Korea. The following example illustrates how the misuse of Korean lexical forms, *iyeyo, iseyo, inde,* and i*ya,* creates tension and conflict in establishing their relationships in Korean conversation and how the students in the two groups (e.g., the Korean-born and the US-born students) react to the misuse of the language form.

The following is a casual conversation among the four young male students of Korean heritage on the court while eight boys are playing basketball. Both S and R are fifteen and sixteen years old, respectively, whereas J and Y are seventeen years old. S is a newcomer while J, R, and Y have been playing basketball here for some years. H is the oldest and a regular group member who left the place just before the conversation took place.

1. S: [addressing J]
   형 몇 살이야?
   Brother, how old [are you]?
2. Y: [snickering laugh]
   3J: 이게, 몇 살이야?↑개기지 말라고 했지!↑↑(laughs in a dumbfounded but playful manner)
   Jerk! how old [am I]?↑watch your language!↑↑
4. R: [to J]:
   아까 아까도, 현형 보고 몇 살이야 [라고 했어]. 몇 살이예요? 몇 살이예요? (laughing jokingly)
   Minutes ago, minutes ago, S asked H, the oldest boy, how old [he was]. How old are you? How old are you?
5. J: 몇 살이면 어쩔건데?
   What are you going to do about my age?
6. R: [To J]
   몇 살이예요? 키는 좀 커보이는데 (playfully)

www.kci.go.kr

How old [are you]? [you] look a little tall

↑ : raised tone
↑↑: highly raised tone
[ ] : omission

The extract starts with S, a newly arrived group member, asking J's age using the impolite form i*ya* as opposed to the polite form *iyeyo*. Y's snickering in line 2 can be taken as evidence of his recognition of S's problematic use of Korean. In response to S's question, although speaking laughingly and jokingly, in line 3, J also employs emphatic language, *Gaegiji malago haeji, whi*ch corresponds to English, w*atch your language*, and warns S to use language in an appropriate manner. J, however, does not directly tell S the correct Korean form he should use; that is, rather than offering correction, he expects S to infer it from the situation. After listening to the interaction between J and S, in line 4, R first tells J that S had made the same interactional mistakes a few minutes ago to even the oldest student in the group, and he then repeats the correct Korean form several times in lines 4 and 6. These comments demonstrate that having noticed the tension between J and S, R makes it the subject of commentary. Such an acknowledgement may well represent an effort to reduce the tension between J and S, while, simultaneously, modeling the correct Korean form for S.

The example clearly illustrates how the boys socialize with others within a specific social activity and what role language plays in this socialization process. As scholars have noted (Ochs 1996; Schieffelin & Ochs 1986 a, b), there is no clear distinction between language acquisition and language socialization for these speakers. However, choosing Korean over English in this particular situation would point to multiple meanings, such as one's identity, ethnicity, group membership, or a particular stance toward the relation between language and identity. Although English is their everyday language, as seen in the example above the entire interaction takes place in Korean. Within this particular context, Korean is their norm to speak. It is the most salient marker to differentiate the students from the larger US mainstream society in which

www.kci.go.kr

they are living and at the same time, to create a convergent point in which they practice Korean, learn Korean cultural values and social norms, negotiate their identity in relation to others, and establish their social position in the group. However, to successfully participate in the culturally and socially organized mundane interaction, the students have to speak Korean fluently, and at the same time, they have to know how to speak it appropriately regarding ongoing interactions, group boundaries, and social ideologies (Ochs 1993 1996). Misuse of language, as in S's case, could become a potential source of tension. However, in responding to their mistakes, the two groups of the students demonstrate distinctive attitude; while the Korean-born students who have lived and studied in Korea longer than in the US seem to react to their mistakes more rigorously and strictly, the US-born students who have almost equally socialized in both societies seem to take them more flexibly and sympathetically. During the interview, when asked what he thought about S's mistake at the court, J commented, "It's important to use polite forms of Korean as we don't know each other well," whereas C responded that, "I really don't care about others' use of language because I myself do the same thing often [misuse of polite forms]."

3. Complexity of Identity Negotiation

Identity negotiation is a complex issue for these students, which is often foregrounded in their interactions in either subtle or obvious ways. As scholars have stated (Norton 1997, 2000; Norton & Toohey 2004; Woolard & Schieffelin 1994), identity is not a fixed trait, but it is created, negotiated, and constantly changed in the course of interactions. A variety of factors, including the students' perceptions and identifications of themselves and their friends, their attitude toward their own and their friends' use of English and Korean, their current status as Korean or Korean-American, their trajectories in the future, and their perception of mainstream US society all affect their identity formation. The students in both groups are not certain if they plan on staying in the US or returning to Korea after they complete their education. However,

www.kci.go.kr

in terms of negotiating their ethnic identity, the Korean-born students demonstrate stronger Korean ethnic identity, whereas the US-born students negotiate their identities more ambiguously based on their relationship to their parents, their birthplace, their exposure to both cultures, and their perceptions of how others label them. For instance, in the interview, when asked how they identify themselves, the two Korean-born students regard themselves as Korean, and their Korean identity has grown even stronger as they have lived in the US longer. However, those who hold both Korean and US citizenship, including even S, think of themselves as Korean, Korean-American, or Asian-American depending upon the situation. This contrast can be seen in particular in their attitudes toward other Korean-American students. For example, T and J express stronger emotions toward other Korean-American students who do not speak Korean and do not follow Korean cultural rules and social norms, whereas the US-born students seem to sympathize with them. Their complex and conflicted identification is apparent in the following conversation:

T, J, R, and C are watching the basketball activity on the floor. T and J hold Korean citizenship, whereas R and C hold both Korean and American citizenship. They are discussing L, a Korean-American student, who does not speak Korean and hang out with Korean students at school and who is playing basketball for the first time without being introduced to these boys.

1. T: [to J]
   너 다닐 때 있었어?
   Have you seen [him] at school?
2. R: [to T]
   응 senior-야.
   Yeah, [he is]a senior.
3. J: [to T]
   L? 응
   L? Yes, [I've seen him].
4. T: 한번도 못 봤어 나 재. 한번도.
   [I] have never seen [him]. [I] have never seen [him].

www.kci.go.kr

5. J: [to T]
   미국애들이랑 [만] 놀아.
   [He only] hangs out with American students.
6. T: [to J]
   한국애랑 한번도 안놀아? ↑
   [He] has never hung out with any Korean students?
7. J: [to T]
   제 좀 쓰레기야.
   He is trash.
8. C: [To T and J]
   그 여자 예쁘던데.
   [His] girlfriend is pretty.
9. R: [to T]
   응 그 여자 예뻐.
   [His] girlfriend is pretty.
10. T: 어쨋든간에, 한번도 못 봤어 한번도.
    Anyway, [I] have never seen [him]. Never.
11. J: 재, typical Asian이야.
    [He] is a typical Asian.
12. R: Typical Asian이야 (imitates J and laughs).
    [He] is a typical Asian.
13. J: Don't repeat after me (insinuates that he will hit him).
14. R: 혼자 막 조용하게 걸어가. 가. 난 여기에 I don't belong here (gestures walking)
    [He] walks away quietly alone. [He] walks [alone]. I [don't belong] here. I don't belong here.

In the extract above, watching the game, T, the oldest boy in this group, notices a new face, L, and asks J if J has ever seen L at school. Following both J's and R's affirmative answer, T's comment in line 4 can be seen as an indirect question asking J for an explanation for why he has never seen L. When J tells T that L hangs out only with American students, not with Korean students, T, in lines 6 and 9, behaves as if he cannot believe what is happening in front of him. Responding to T's comments, J, in lines 7 and 11, calls L "trash" with confidence. He also says that L acts like a typical Asian.

www.kci.go.kr

Attributing the generic Asian behavior to L, J implies that L does not follow specific Korean cultural rules and social norms. In lines 8 and 9, C and R, on the other hand, by bringing up L′s girlfriend, tries to say something nice about L, while redirecting the focus of the conversation, but they are ignored by T. In line 12, when R imitates J′s speech, J commands R to stop. In line 14, R adopts L′s voice, but describes how L usually behaves in school and how L should behave socially. At the same time, R′s joking and imitation can be taken as evidence of R′s indirect joking about J, but his purpose is ambiguous.

As illustrated in the interaction above, for these speakers, identity negotiation is a complex issue loaded with a high degree of emotions and conflicts. Although the students in both groups are uncertain about their future, they are distinctive in terms of identifying who they are, what Korean and Korean-American students should do, and how they should behave. The two Korean-born students, who have lived and studied in the US for a shorter period of time, who are relatively older than other students, and who only hold Korean citizenship, maintain stronger Korean ethnic identity and expect others to follow Korean sociocultural rules and values. As they encounter other Korean heritage students like L, who does not speak Korean and does not respect Korean sociocultural rules and values, they express stronger emotions toward them. For example, in the interview, T, who identifies himself as Korean and whose identity has strengthened since he lived in the US, expresses, “Koreans, wherever they live, should know Korean.” In contrast, the US-born students, who have almost equally socialized in both cultures for a number of years and who hold both Korean and US citizenship, seem to negotiate their identities more ambiguously and flexibly depending upon the situations. E says, “I identify myself as Korean when I talk to my father in Korea, but I consider myself American most of the time.”

www.kci.go.kr

4. Power Dynamics

As Bourdieu (1977) argues, speech is not equally produced, distributed, and validated. It is the diverse and ever-changing symbolic and material resources that dictate who to speak and who to listen. Those who can access a wide range of resources have power and authority to control their interactions. Interestingly, within this context, the value of the resources seems to be determined based on the symbolic and material resources that the students have, including the students' language ability, sociocultural knowledge, and/or citizenship status. For example, as seen in the first and second conversation examples, as the students talk about Korean cultural values and social norms, T and J, who are the oldest in the group and who know more about Korean society, mostly dominate the conversation. However, as they talk about the application and admissions procedures of a US university, as seen in the following example, the two US citizenship holders R and Y seem to control most of the interaction. The following example shows how the students' citizenship status operates in their conversation as they talk about the application process of a US university.

R, Y, J, and T are talking about US college application and admissions procedures while other students are playing basketball. While R and Y hold both Korean and US citizenship, J and T only hold Korean citizenship. R is a high school junior, J and Y are high school seniors, and T is a college student in the Honors Program.

1. J: [to Y]
   야 너 UT [University of Texas at Austin] early지원했냐?
   Did you apply to UT early [admission]?
2. R: [to J]
   저 형 early 못하잖아? [US citizen] Citizen이 아니라서, 아니라서...
   [You] can't apply for early [admission because you aren't an American] citizen. [You are] not a US citizen…
3. J: 왜? UT에 early 같은 것 없어?
   Why? UT does not have early [admission]?

www.kci.go.kr

4. Y: citizen 아니면 early는 지원 못해. 그렇지만 Honors Program에는 지원 가능하다고 들었어. Honors Program에 들어가면 시민권자는 financial aid 신청할 수 있어.
   Like you, non-US citizens cannot apply for early admission. However, I have heard that even a non-US citizen can apply for the Honors Program. Even though you get in the Honors Program, [but you cannot apply for the financial aid because you are not a US-citizen can].
5. J: [to T]
   Honors?
   Honors?
6. T: [to J]
   그거 필요없어
   [You] don't need [to apply for the Honors Program].

The conversation starts with J's asking Y if he has applied for the University of Texas at Austin (UT-Austin) early admission. In listening to J's question, in line 2, R tells J that he cannot apply for early admission because he is not a US citizen. However, R blurs his speech because he realizes that it is impolite to directly address such an issue to J who is older than him. Not hearing R's comments clearly, J in line 3 asks Y again if UT-Austin does not have early admission. In responding to J's question, Y suggests that J cannot apply for early admission because he is a non-US citizen, but he can apply for the Honors Program. However, he adds that even if he gets in the Honors Program, he cannot apply for the financial aid because he is a non-US citizen. In line 5, after listening to Y, J looks at T, who is currently in the Honors Program at the UT-Austin, and waits for his confirmation. Although T tells J that he does not need to apply for the Honors Program in an emphatic manner, he drops the topic. In the interview, when asked what kinds of ideas they might have had about the US citizenship, all of the students related it to the financial issue and the freedom of choice. When asked what T thinks about having and not-having US citizenship, he responded, "As living as an alien without having US citizenship, living in the US, is so expensive. Also, if you are a US citizen, you can choose whether to go to the military service or

www.kci.go.kr

not, but for me, I don't have such a choice."

As seen in the example, the students' citizenship status plays a role of *cultural capital* in the course of their language socialization practices at the basketball court. In the previous two interactional situations as the students talk about Korean sociocultural issues and topics, T and J have the conversational floor most of the time, whereas the other students tend to listen to them and even try to please them. However, as they discuss the admissions procedure and financial aid of a US university, R and Y, the US citizenship holders, tend to talk longer and control the interaction.

V. Conclusion

The study attempts to explore the language socialization practices of seven young men of Korean heritage, some born in Korea and some born in the US, each currently attending high school or college in the US. In particular, the study examines the cultural and linguistic practices, identity negotiation, and power dynamics manifested in the course of their language socialization processes at a basketball court. The study shows that the basketball game offers a prime context for these seven Korean adolescents to socialize with others. Through the socialization processes, they practice Korean and Korean cultural rules and social norms, negotiate their multiple identities, as well as establish their position in the group.

As scholars in sociolinguistics have noted (Ochs 1996; Schieffelin & Ochs 1986 a, b), using language and socializing with others are not independent activities but closely related processes. As seen in the three examples of the interaction, the students in this study are socialized to learn Korean and Korean cultural norms and values, and at the same time, they are also socialized through the use of Korean. For the seven Korean young male students, using Korean language and interacting with other Korean students at the basketball court play a symbolic role in "the production and interpretation of social and intellectual activities" (Ochs 1996: 407). Participating in the

www.kci.go.kr

routinely organized basketball game, the students learn to "develop an understanding about social actions, events, emotions, esthetics, knowledgeability, statuses, relationships, and other socio-cultural phenomena" (Ochs 1996: .408).

As Park (2006) noted, the language socialization processes of Korean bilingual speakers in the US are often described as a site of struggle and conflict because the students usually have to maintain their mother tongue at home and at the same time, they have to acquire the target language and culture at school. However, this study shows that although the students sometimes exhibit some degree of conflicts and struggles about their current status as well as about their future career plan, from our analysis of the data, we have observed that the language socialization processes of seven Korean adolescents at the basketball court uncover very dynamic, fluid, futuristic, and positive social aspects. The basketball setting that they have voluntarily created allows these migrating students to bond together, feel the connectedness and sameness, negotiate their multiple identities as Korean, Korean-American, or even an alien, practice Korean and Korean cultural norms and values, and practice their power dynamics in the group.

As Bourdieu (1977) contends, each social group values different forms of symbolic and material resources. Those who have a wide range of symbolic and material resources, which Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) refer to as the *cultural capital,* have the power and authority not only to speak in interaction but also to command listeners (Bourdieu 1977; Gee 1999). In this social group, the students' language ability tends to serve as the role of *the cultural capital,* which influences the establishment of their position in the group and the turn of the conversation. That is, the students' Korean speaking ability allows the students to participate in the particular social activity and to have the conversational floor. Also, as Lee (2010) identified in her study, age is another important cultural and social marker, through which their hierarchical relationships are usually established. As the students did not use correct social marker based on the others' age, like S, they seem to be in trouble, losing power, authority, and control in conversation. Along with the students' language ability as well as their age, the students' status, whether they have

www.kci.go.kr

US citizenship or not, appears to play an important role in the course of language socialization practices. As seen in the first two examples of their interactions, the two Korean citizenship holders J and T, particularly T, the oldest in the group, controls most of the conversation. However, as shown in the third example of their conversation, he drops the topic in the middle as the students talk about how US citizenship plays a role in US college admission procedures.

Although the findings of the study may not be generalized beyond this particular setting due to the small number of the participants, the results from this study can provide insights for those researchers who are working with bi- or multi-lingual speaking students, especially adolescents with Korean heritage in the US.

Appendix
(Interview Questions)

1. Where were you born?
2. Tell me about the places you have lived.
3. What are your future goals?
4. Where do you plan to live after your schooling?
5. How do you identify yourself? In what ways do you identify yourself as Korean and as American?
6. Tell me about the languages you speak?
7. How did you learn them?
8. Tell me about the history of your education.
9. When do you use each language? How often? To whom?
10. Why do you use each language?
11. How do you feel about using Korean and English in a conversation?
12. How do you feel about your Korean friend's using Korean and English in a conversation?
13. What language do you and your friends generally speak when you are with other Korean-English speakers? Why?
14. How do you feel when you and your friends use English or Korean in front of you?
15. How has your living in the States affected your sense of Korean identity?

www.kci.go.kr

References

Bayley, R. & Schecter, S. R. (2003). Introduction: Toward a dynamic model of language socialization. In Bayley & Schecter (eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*, 1-6. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information,* 16, 645-668.

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, culture and society*. Transl. R. Nice, London: Sage.

Danico, M. Y. (2004). *The 1.5 Generation: Becoming Korean American in Hawaii*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Giordano, Peggy C. (2003). Relationships in Adolescence. *Annual Review of Sociology* 29, 257-281.

Kouritzin, S. G. (2000). A Mother's Tongue. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 311-324.

Lam, W. S. E. (2004). Second language socialization in a bilingual chat room: Global and local considerations. *Language Learning and Technology,* 8, 44-65.

Lam, W. S. E. (2006). Culture and learning in the context of globalization: Research directions. *Review of Research in Education,* 30, 213-237.

Lee, G. (2010). Speaking up: Six Korean students' oral participation in class discussions in US graduate seminars. *English for Specific Purposes,* 28, 142-156.

Lo, A. & Reyes, A. (2004). Language, identity and relationality in Asian Pacific America: An introduction. *Pragmatics,* 14, 115-125.

McKay, S. L. & Wong, S. L. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 577-609.

McNamara, T. (1997). Theorizing social identity: What do we mean by social

www.kci.go.kr

identity? Competing frameworks, competing discourses. *TESOL Quarterly,* 31, 561-567.
Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly,* 31, 409-429.
Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: gender, ethnicity and educational change.* New York: Longman.
Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. In J. W. Stigler, R. Shweder, & G. Herdt (eds.), *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development*, 287-308. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Ochs, E. (1993). Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction,* 26, 287-306.
Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. Rethinking linguistic relativity. In J. J. Gumperz, & S. C. Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity, Studies in the social and cultural foundations of language*, 407-437. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. Shweder & R. LeVine (eds.) *Cultural theory: Essays on mind, self and emotion*, 176-320. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. (2008) "Language Socialization: An Historical Overview." In P.A. Duff and N.H. Hornberger (eds.), Encyclopedia of Language Education, 2nd Edition, Volume 8, *Language Socialization,* 3-15. New York: Springer.
Park, Y. J. (2006). Korean children's identity construction while living in two languages. *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea,* 14, 2.147-168.
Pease-Alvarez, L. (2003). Transforming perspectives on bilingual language socialization. In R. Bayley & S. Schecter (eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies,* 9 - 24. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Rampton, B. (1997). A sociolinguistic perspective on L2 communication strategies. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (eds.), *Communication*

www.kci.go.kr

strategies: psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives. London: Longman.

Schecter, S. R., & Bayley, R. (1997). *Language socialization in bi- and multi-cultural societies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Schieffelin, B. B. & Ochs, E. (1986a). *Language socialization across cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schieffelin, B. B. & Ochs, E. (1986b). Language Socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 15, 163-191.

Tseng, V. & Fuligni, A. J. (2000). Parent-Adolescent Language Use and Relationships Among Immigrant Families With East Asian, Filipino, and Latin American Backgrounds. Journal of Marriage and Family, 62, 465-476.

Waters, J. L. (2005). Transnational family strategies and education in the contemporary Chinese diaspora. *Global Networks,* 5, 359-377.

Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *Modern Language Journal,* 88, 331-350.

Woolard, K. A. & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language Ideology. A*nnual Review of Anthropology,* 23, 55-82.

이귀분
givenlee@snu.ac.kr

송미정
mjs@snu.ac.kr

논문 접수일: 2012.03.30.
논문 심사일: 2012.04.15.~2012.05.10.
게재 확정일: 2012.05.15.

www.kci.go.kr