

영어교육, 60권 4호 2005년 겨울

## A Young Boy's Reaction Toward the Bilingual Situation and His Code Switching Behavior

Seonghee Choi

(Kyonggi Institute of Technology)

**Choi, Seonghee. (2005). A young boy's reaction toward the bilingual situation and his code switching behavior. *English Teaching*, 60(4), 197-215.**

This paper explores a young boy's reaction toward Korean/English bilingual situation and his code switching behavior. In particular, it describes a child's mental reaction toward learning another language which is not his native language, the characteristics of his code switching behavior, the relationship between code switching and his overall proficiency of a second language and the major motivations of his code switching. The findings show that various factors affect a child's code switching, which are setting, time, psychological conditions, addressees, characteristics of each language, and initiation language of a conversation partner etc. It is also shown that the overall proficiency of a bilingual speaker is highly related with his code switching pattern. The subject of this study switched languages during his speech in order to realize not only pragmatic function but also social and psycholinguistic function. The study also shows that, in any case, mixing or switching languages is a natural and normal aspect of early bilingual. Therefore, it is suggested that parents or teachers in early bilingual situation should not try to stop their children from mixing and view bilingual children's code switching behaviors in a positive light.

### I. INTRODUCTION

Language acquisition is an everyday and magical feat of childhood (Genesee, 1980). Within three to five years, all children become fully competent in at least one language. We seldom worry about whether or not it will happen. Even more remarkable are those children who simultaneously acquire proficiency in two, or more, languages during the preschool years. Within the same time frame as it takes monolingual children to learn one language, bilingual children learn two languages and become adept at using them in socially diverse and appropriate ways.

Bilingual acquisition is complex. In comparison with monolingual children who usually learn language from their parents, bilingual children may depend not only on parents but

also on grandparents, playmates, or childcare and daycare workers to learn their languages. Bilingual children may learn their languages primarily in the home, like monolingual children, or in the daycare, or neighborhood. Bilingual children's exposure to their languages can also differ greatly. Their language exposure can fluctuate greatly over time.

It is estimated that there may be as many children who grow up learning two languages as one. Despite this, childhood bilingualism is poorly understood by many and regarded with skepticism by others. Because of lack of familiarity with or knowledge about childhood bilingualism, parents, educators, and early childhood specialists may express doubts about childhood bilingualism and they may expect negative consequences to result from children learning two languages during the preschool years.

Most observers of children learning two languages simultaneously note that there is some mixing of languages. There is a great deal of controversy about how much mixing occurs and what it means. Recent research by Goodz (1994) suggests that mixing increases somewhat during early childhood, peaking at 30 months or so, and then declining. In bilingual situation, mixing languages and switching from one language to another is part of the child's normal linguistic environment.

Code switching is a frequently occurred phenomenon in bilinguals' discourse (Myers-Scotton, 1993). Many linguists consider code switching a very critical issue in bilingualism (Arnberg, 1987; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Romaine, 1994, 1995), and it has a significant impact on bilingualism both at the societal level and individual level (Romaine, 1994). It is generally understood that code mixing (CM) and code switching (CS) are used for communicative needs. Speakers build on the coexistence of alternate forms in their language repertory to create meanings that may be highly idiosyncratic and understood only by members of the same bilingual speech community.

Early CS studies considered the social functions of switching (Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Fasold, 1987). Some researchers (Fantini, 1985, 1993; McClure, 1977; Milroy, 1987; Myers-Scotton) insist that CS is a strategy to influence interpersonal relations. In addition, the psycholinguistic aspects of CS was also attracted by researchers (Clark & Clark, 1977; Dodd & White, 1980). There still is, however, no agreement among CS researchers as to what constitutes CS.

The purpose of this study is to explore and better understand a child's language choice and development in a bilingual situation through qualitative observational research. Specifically, the study tried to seek answers such as 'what is a child's reaction toward learning another language which is not his native language?', 'what are patterns or characteristics of his language choice called CS?', 'what is the relationship between CS and the overall language proficiency?' and 'what are major motivations for CS?'.

## II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

### 1. Definition of Code Switching

According to Myers-Scotton (1993), CS “involves the use of two or more languages in the same conversation, usually within the same conversational turn, or even within the same sentence of that turn” (p. vii). Gumperz defines a CS as “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passage belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems” (1982, p. 59). Crystal (1987) points out that CS occurs when an individual who is bilingual alternates between two languages during his/her speech with another bilingual person, suggesting a number of different forms of CS including alteration of sentences, phrases from both languages succeeding each other and switching in a narrative. Berthold, Mangubhai and Bartorowicz (1997) adds the definition of CS with the notion that it occurs where “speakers change from one language to another in the midst of their conversations” (p. 213). Generally, CS can be defined as the alternating use of two languages on word, phrase, clause, or sentence level (Valdes-Fallis, 1978). Further, Cook (1991) puts the extent of CS in normal conversations amongst bilinguals into perspective by outlining that CS consists of 84% single word switches, 10% phrase switches and 6% clause switching.

When a speaker code-switches, s/he stops speaking language A and begins to speak language B, or s/he chooses one set of features of language A over another set. These features may be phonological, lexical, or syntactic. According to Blom and Gumperz (1972), there are two general kinds of CS, situational and conversational: Situational switching involves a change in setting, topic of conversation, or participants; Conversational switching occurs within a single activity. Two languages may be mixed in the same sentence to convey a single message.

Some researchers (Ritchie & Bhatia, 1996; Sridhar & Sridhar, 1980) distinguish CS and CM. CM refers to a common mode of switching of languages within sentences (Sridhar & Sridhar, 1980). CM is also distinguished from borrowing on the following grounds (Gibbons, 1987; Sridhar & Sridhar, 1980): Borrowing is restricted to single lexical items, can occur in the speech of monolinguals, represents a restricted set of expressions with some creativity in the margins, and represents mostly nouns and a few adjectives. On the other hand, CM involves every level of lexical and syntactic structure, including words, phrases, clauses, and sentences, presupposes a certain degree of bilingual competence, draws creatively upon practically the whole of the vocabulary and grammar of another language, and draws on every category and constituent type in grammar, not restricted to nouns or adjectives. However, it can be said that CS still includes a form of CM as the concept of intra-sentential CS.

## 2. Reasons of Code Switching

It is known that there are a number of possible reasons for the switching from one language to another (Crystal, 1987; Gal, 1979; Genishi, 1976; Hakuta, 1986). Crystal (1987) proposed three reasons for the CS. The first of these is the notion that a speaker may not be able to express him/herself in one language so switches to the other to compensate for the deficiency. This type of CS tends to occur when the speaker is upset, tired or distracted in some manner.

Secondly, switching commonly occurs when an individual wishes to express solidarity with a particular social group. Rapport is established between the speaker and the listener when the listener responds with a similar switch. This type of switching may also be used to exclude others from a conversation who do not speak the second language. A good example of such a situation may be two people in an elevator in a language other than English. Others in the elevator who do not speak the same language would be excluded from the conversation and a degree of comfort would exist amongst the speakers in the knowledge that not all those present in the elevator are listening to their conversation.

The final reason for the switching behavior presented by Crystal (1987) is the alteration that occurs when the speaker wishes to convey his/her attitude to the listener. Where monolingual speakers can communicate these attitudes by means of variation in the level of formality in their speech, bilingual speakers can convey the same by CS.

Crystal (1987) views that CS is not a language interference on the basis that it supplements speech. Where it is used due to an inability of expression, CS provides a continuity in speech rather than presenting an interference in language. He insists that CS should be viewed from the perspective of providing a linguistic advantage rather than an obstruction to communication. Further, CS allows a speaker to convey attitude and other emotives using a method available to those who are bilingual and again serves to advantage the speaker.

Crystal (1987) asserts that a varying degree of CS may also be used between bilingual conversationalists depending on the person being addressed, such as family, friends, officials and superiors and depending on the location, such as church, home or place of work. This means that there are patterns which are followed reflecting when it is appropriate to code switch with regard to addressee and location. These patterns are the established norm for that particular social group and serve to ensure appropriate language use. Milroy (1987) is a further proponent of this proposal with the observation that bilingual speakers attribute different social values to different codes, or languages. Since a different social value is associated with each code, the speaker considers use of one code more appropriate than the other with different interlocutors.

A similar study was carried out by Gal (1979), who concluded that the participant in the conversation is the variable to which the others were subservient in a study of CS. The notions of Gal (1979), Bell (1984) and Milroy (1987) suggest that CS occurs naturally and unobtrusively such that it is not an interference to language but rather a verbal mechanism of presenting an individuals' social standing with regard to a particular conversational participant.

### 3. Code Switching as the Process of Language Acquisition

CS is also considered in relation to language acquisition. A number of theories have been postulated as to how an individual attains language. The first to be considered is that of Chomsky (1972, 1975, 1979) where he suggests that language acquisition takes place as the brain matures and exposure to the appropriate language is obtained. Chomsky also suggests that people are aided by innate universal language structures and as children learn, they realize how to express the underlying universal structure according to their particular culture, as described by Bootzin, Bower, Zajonc and Hall (1986). From this point of view, addressees in conversations serve as facilitators of language development by means of exposing students to cultural elements required to express the universal structure appropriate to the cultural and social requirements of the individual. This biological theory is not accepted by behaviourists who suggest that language acquisition is a verbal behaviour which is an example of operant conditioning, as advocated by Skinner (1957). Behaviorists argue that individuals are reinforced by their own speech which matches the reinforcement of providers of affection during childhood. Further, grammatically correct constructions get desired results so the individual tends to repeat them. A point to note here is that the theories rely on exposure to appropriate samples of the language. It is argued that the same is true when acquiring a second language.

Although switching languages during a conversation may be disruptive to the listener when the speaker switches due to an inability to express her/himself, it does provide an opportunity for language development (Cook, 1991). As may be derived from discussion above, language development takes place through samples of language which are appropriate and CS may be signalling the need for provision of appropriate samples. The listener, in this case, is able to provide translation into the second language thus providing a learning and developing activity. This, in turn, will allow for a reduced amount of switching and less subsequent interference as time progresses. These principles may also be applied in the second language classroom.

Cook (1991) asserts that CS may be integrated into the activities used for the teaching of a second language. This approach is one which uses CS as a foundation for the development of a second language learner who can stand between the two languages and

use whichever is most appropriate to the situation rather than becoming an imitation native speaker (Cook, 1991).

Cook (1989) provides another method of using CS as a second language teaching tool through reciprocal language teaching. For example, a teacher uses CS by starting the lesson in the first language and then moving into the second and back (Cook, 1991). This makes the lesson as communicative as possible and this approach gets teachers to balance the use of languages within each lesson with the teacher allowed to switch languages at certain key points, such as during important concepts, when students are getting distracted, during revisions or when students are praised and told off. On this basis, switching may be used as an effective teaching strategy for second language learning.

CS may be viewed as an extension to language for bilingual speakers rather than an interference and from other perspectives it may be viewed as interference, depending on the situation and context in which it occurs. This conclusion is drawn from the notions that switching occurs when a speaker: needs to compensate for some difficulty, express solidarity, convey an attitude or show social respect (Berthold, Mangubhai & Bartorowicz, 1997; Crystal, 1987).

The switching also occurs within postulated universal constraints such that it may be integrated into conversations in a particular manner (Cook, 1991; Saunders, 1988). CS may facilitate language development as a mechanism for providing language samples and may also be utilized as a teaching method for teaching second languages (Cook, 1989; 1991).

### **III. METHOD**

#### **1. Subject**

The subject for this study has been observed for three years from when he was two and half years old until when he grew up as a five year old boy (is called S later on). Both of his parents are Korean students who pursue Ph.D. degrees in a big university in the north-east area of USA. The family has lived in USA for about three years. S was two and half years old when his family arrived at USA. S's speaking ability was pretty fluent in Korean at that time.

Since both parents have been students, S has attended to the daycare center from 9 in the morning to 6 in the evening for two and half years, where English is used as a primary language. Since S has attended to the daycare center, he has mainly learned English at the center. At home, his main input has been Korean as his parents use Korean most of the time. Since he was the only son, he did not have any brothers or sisters to talk with except

his parents.

## 2. Data Collection

The data for this study came from observations and observation notes, audio-recordings for two years and nine months. Before this study had started, it was found that the subject hardly used his native language (Korean) but only used English at the daycare center because there were no people who speak his native language at the daycare center. For that reason, his CS was mostly observed in the morning or in the evening at home and at the places outside or on weekends when he did not attend to the daycare center.

As a result, many usable data were from the observation at home and outside of the daycare center. The researcher took the role of a participant observer. Since the researcher of this study was the subject's mother, it was believed that this observational data had direct and broader scopes than any other observational data. Most of audio-recordings were done in the evening; at the dinner time, right after he came home or before the bed time at home, on the playground with Korean friends or at the shopping shops on weekends, two or three times a week.

## 3. Data Analysis

As a qualitative study, observational notes were collected for the analysis and the transcripts of audio-recordings were also used for the analysis. The qualitative data analysis is not a simple description of the data collected but a process by which the researcher can bring interpretation to the data (Powney & Watts, 1987). The themes and coding categories in this study emerged from an examination of the data rather than being determined beforehand (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). The strategy of analytic induction was followed in this study (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

First, the researcher identified all instances of CS. Second, each instance was coded and labeled according to its potential function. Third, all the codes were screened and instances labeled with the same or similar codes were grouped together. This was followed by a careful examination of the relationships between and among different codes. Codes with similar nature were then grouped into major categories to suggest patterns. Finally, each pattern was reexamined to ensure that it truly reflected the nature of its supporting data, and example(s) representing each pattern were selected to illuminate the nature of the subject's reaction toward two languages and characteristics of his CS pattern.

## IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. A Boy's First Reaction Toward Another Language and Bilingualism

Before starting to go to the daycare center, S had spent four months with his mother at day time, and learned and used simple formulaic words such as 'mommy', 'thank you' in English at home or outside home. However, for the first three months he started to go to the daycare center, he showed rejection symptoms toward hearing and speaking English. That is, he even stopped using English words like 'mommy' and 'thank you' that he had used, and shouted to his mother not to use any English when she used some English intentionally (e.g., Do you like it?) at home. At the daycare center, everybody including the teacher and friends except him used English but he could not understand English. As a result, he showed some hate and rejection symptoms toward English which is not his native language.

Saville-Troike (1987) indicated that when everyone around the child is speaking a different language, there are only two options-to speak the language they already know, or to stop speaking entirely and many children follow the first option for some period of time. But in S's case, he chose to stop saying English and rejected to listen to any English at home. For some children, this may lead to increasing frustration, and eventually children give up trying to make others understand their language.

After three months, however, he suddenly began to speak in English, did not show any rejection symptoms toward English, and did not show any different reaction toward two languages (Korean and English). That is, it took three months for S to show natural and favorable reaction toward another language which is not his native language during attending a daycare center. As Haugen (1953) presented that necessity is a mother of bilingualism, S managed to deal with another language after three months, surviving at the daycare center.

According to Valdes-Fallis (1978), "all natural bilingual situations have in common the fact that bilingualism will occur at those times when the speakers' first language will not meet all communicative needs" (p. 3). Valdes-Fallis (1978) presents that the word 'bilingual' is a general term that includes varying degrees of proficiency in two languages.

That is, bilingual does not mean that speakers are perfectly balanced in their use or strength in both their languages, but rather that they can function, to whatever degree, in more than one language. From this perspective, S began to become bilingual after three months for which he had attended the daycare center. In other words, it was observed it took three months for him to realize and accept that he needed to communicate with his teacher and friends who all speak in another language (English) which is not his native language.

## 2. Language as an Identity Marking

"Bilingual individuals know from early childhood the appropriate conditions under which to speak each of their two languages"(Valdes-Fallis, 1978, p. 4). Some communities have a rigid separation of functions for their two languages: Language A is used at home and with family, and language B is used for school and work. Other communities show different patterns: Language A is used with certain members of the family and intimate friends, and language B is used with less intimate bilinguals.

In S's case, at the daycare center he attended from morning to evening, English was used, and Korean was used at home and with family. Until S became four years old, he was accustomed to these situations and maintained each language at the daycare center and at home. One day after he became four years old, there occurred a surprising incident at the daycare center in the morning. As usual, his mother brought him to the daycare center, and when she was about to leave him, she said in Korean "geomsim da meogeo, gurigo wihemhage nolgimara (Eat all lunch and don't play dangerously)".

At the time, he looked around worrying other people's hearing his mommy's words and whispered to her ear, saying "egiseonun gureon mal hazimayo (don't say those words here)". He expressed that he was ashamed of her because she spoke in Korean that nobody else used, He wanted his mother to speak in English which everybody used there. From the perspective of identity marking, he showed that he strongly wanted to belong to members of the daycare center, and the community which his teachers and friends belonged to. He did not want to look different from his community at the daycare center, and expressed his feeling that he did not want to look different because of her mother's using different language.

At any place outside home, he showed a strong desire to belong to the community which use English as a communication medium. For example, he hardly used the word "Daddy" to call his father at home. However, at every place outside home such as a supermarket or a toy store, he always used the word "Daddy" exactly and used English most of the time, in fact all the time where even one other person except his parents near him. That is, he did not want to use Korean in front of other people except his family and some Korean families. It was observed that he perceived that he could not belong to the community outside home if he used Korean, and he expressed a very uncomfortable feeling in those cases. Even at the time when his English was not so fluent, he always tried to speak in English or when he could not express in English the words he would like to say, he expressed with his body language outside home.

All the above examples were from the beginning stage of bilingual of S. As many researchers (Myers-scotton, 1993; Saunders, 1982) mentioned, S's case proved that one of prominent functions of CM and CS is identity marking. In S's case, he chose the language

for the community identity he belonged to. Myers-Scotton (1997) also emphasizes the role of community attitudes in CS. That is, it is shown that the norms of community play a role in CS and what one's community peers do affect the choice of language used.

### 3. Code Switching and the Overall Proficiency of a Bilingual Speaker

Some researchers assume that the main reason for CS is lack of sufficient proficiency in the opening language or that the selection of words in CS from one language rather than another language is more or less random. However, Valdes-Fallis (1978) insists that CS presupposes a degree of proficiency in two languages that enables a speaker to alternate. Myers-Scotton (1997) also strongly believes that "speakers engaged in CS are proficient bilinguals" (p. 224). In S's case, he distinctively showed that he made more CS when he became more fluent in both languages, especially when he became fluent in his second language, English. That is, until he became four years old, he did not make much CS.

His second language (English) proficiency increased suddenly when he became four years old, and his native language (Korean) proficiency had been preserved pretty well since he had heard Korean from parents and spoke Korean with them at home all the time. According to his increasing proficiency of languages, he made much more CS and his English use of full sentences was increased, confirming Bentahila and Davies' study (1992), which researched two groups of Moroccan Arabic/French bilinguals, with age and its interrelation to French proficiency as the main independent variable. The result showed that the older group used much more French. In contrast, the younger children who are less proficient in French showed fewer full sentences in French in their CS discourse.

Before S became 4 years old, that is, less proficient in English, his ML had been mainly Korean and words in EL had been mostly content morphemes in English as follows:

#### Excerpt 1)

Mother: Neo meo-ha-ni? (What are you doing?)

S: paper-ga-ji-go house keu-ri-go iss-eo-yo. (I am drawing a house on a paper now)

The later S's CS was as follows:

#### Excerpt 2)

Mother : Meo keu-ri-go iss-ni? (What are you drawing?)

S : Keu-nyang I-geo. (Just this one)

Mother : (wants to see what he is drawing)

S: No, if you go away, if you go there, I will draw it.

As Zentella (1997) found that children's language choices were the linguistic proficiency of the person to whom they were speaking. The subject of this study, S also confirmed Zentella's finding. S's example is that he was willing to use both languages interchangeably to his parents since he knew they could understand and speak both languages.

In other words, the more he became proficient, the more full sentences he used as shown in the above examples. His CS clearly supported that CS was related with the overall proficiency of a bilingual speaker. The older S became, the more comfortable he became to use both languages at any situation. At later stages, he showed that he did not feel that the use of Korean was threatened by the presence of English also. This may imply that as he became more and more fluent in English and could control two languages freely within the scope of his perception of two communities.

Some may insist that the use of words from both languages in a single sentence is evidence that the child cannot distinguish between the two languages, but according to Romaine (1995), in reality, this is not a sign of confusion. In fact, it has been shown that the use of two languages in one sentence by mature bilinguals reveals a great deal of linguistic skill (Romaine, 1995). It is also true that, while young bilingual children sometimes use words from two languages in the same sentence, they produce far more sentences using only one language. This clearly shows that they are able to keep their languages separate.

The question then becomes, in what circumstances do children use words from both languages in the same sentence? They do it only when talking to people that they know can understand both languages and who do not get upset with them for using such sentences. In other words, the social context in which children find themselves determines whether and to what extent they use more than one language in a single sentence. The same happens with bilingual adults; they use words from two languages in the same sentence only in sociolinguistic settings in which it is appropriate (De Houwer, 1995).

#### 4. The Major Motivation of the Subject's Code Switching

As Zentellar (1997) pointed out, the choice of language in a particular situation may depend on a myriad of factors. S's one major motivation for CS was a discourse marker providing emphasis. The following factors were also especially decisive for the subject's CS: the settings, time, his psychological conditions, addressees, kinds of words (characteristics) in each language, and initiation language of a conversation partner.

##### 1) A Discourse Marker Providing Emphasis

Myers-Scotton (1993) presents that there is a continuum of well-formedness in bilingual

or mixed speech with CS as one of the poles and this continuum takes account of two factors: the extent to which grammatical structures produced are predictable and speaker motivations. Myers- Scotton views the major motivations of CS can be presented as follows: (1) to add a dimension to the socio-pragmatic force of one's "discourse persona" either through the individual lexical choices made or through the way in which CS is patterned; (2) to function as a discourse marker (e.g., providing emphasis); (3) to lexicalize semantic/pragmatic features from Embedded Languages (EL) which better convey the speaker's intentions than related lexemes from the Matrix language (ML). That is, the relevant point here implies that speakers select a bilingual mode because it suits their intentions. Among the factors suggested above, S's example of CS functioning appeared as a discourse marker providing an emphasis as follows:

Excerpt 3)

Mother: I-yachae-rul meog-eo-ra. (Eat this vegetable.)

S: O-jing-eo-reul meog-eul-laeyo. (I would like to eat a squid.)

Mother: I-geo meog-eu-myeon, na-jung-ae o-jing-eo jul-kae.

(If you eat this first, I will give you a squid later)

S: No, No, I don't like it. I want o-jing-eo (a squid).

In the above example, S wanted to emphasize that he did not want to eat the vegetable and wanted to eat a squid. Therefore, S's CS from Korean to English played a role to provide an emphasis in the discourse: To emphasize that he didn't want vegetables. Within the sentence, he again made CS from English to Korean to emphasize that he wanted a squid.

According to Hymes (1972), all native speakers show a cultural knowledge of how to speak their language appropriately in different speech situations, in keeping with their community's "ways of speaking". Zentella (1997) presents that while monolinguals adjust by switching phonological, grammatical, and discourse features within one linguistic code, bilinguals alternate between the languages. Children in bilingual speech communities acquire two grammars and the rules for communicative competence to know where, when and how two languages can be used.

## 2) Setting

S always used English to his teachers and friends in the daycare center where he attended to and where English was used most of the time. In addition, S always chose to speak in English outside home; at the daycare center, at the supermarket, at the bookstore, at the toy store, on the playground etc. In another Korean family's house, he used

languages between Korean and English interchangeably but more Korean. That is, he mostly spoke in Korean at home and in other Korean family's house. That means, in his case, the place clearly affected his language choice. He showed extreme concerns about the setting (the place and the environment) where each language was used.

### 3) Time

Right after S came back from the daycare center before the dinner time, his CS occurred much more than any other time at home. That is, he used more English than Korean right after he was back from the daycare center where English was used. It might be due to the fact that the use of English at the daycare center still affected his language choice unconsciously even though the setting was changed.

### 4) Psycholinguistic Condition

When S was angry, excited or very pleased, he usually makes CS. In other words, he tended to use English. That is, his language choice direction was from Korean to English. The examples are as follows:

#### Excerpt 4)

Mother: Mok-yok ha-za (Let's have a shower in the bath)  
S: Man-hwa young-hwa bo-go. (After I watch the cartoon)  
Mother : An-dae, neo-mu neuz-eosseo (No, it is too late.)  
S: I don't want to have a shower! (expressing his anger)

#### Excerpt 5)

S: I-bab neo-mu ma-na (This rice is too much for me.)  
Mother: Keu-geo da meok-eu-myeon, Kroger-ae dae-ri-go gal-kae. (If you eat it all, I will take you to Kroger.)  
S: Kroger? Oh, yeah! I will eat all ov'em. (expressing his excitedness or pleasure to go somewhere after dinner)

### 5) Addressee

It has been known that some factors of addressees who affect a child speaker's language choice are physical features, gender, and age etc. In S's case, people's physical features and age were factors that affected his language choice. That is, when S met an adult whose physical feature looks a Korean, he oftentimes started to speak in Korean. Also, when he

called to his grandmother who lived in Korea and could not speak English, he did not use English since he already perceived she could not understand his English. As a result, this study showed that a bilingual speaker's CS is affected not only by his own overall proficiency of second language but also by his addressee's language proficiency.

But when he met young children on the playground outside home and of course even though they perfectly looked like Koreans, he always chose to speak in English. As a result, even though physical features were one of the distinctive factors for his language choice, age was more decisive factor for S's language choice between Korean and English. Concerning the factor of gender, however, it has not been observed from S how gender affects his language choice.

On the other hand, in the situation where only one person in the group is not Korean and all the others in the group are Koreans, the subject of this study chose to use English. That is, when the medium was English in conversations, even though I initiated the conversation in Korean to him, he responded to it in English. When he made a choice to use language, he was extremely sensitive to the presence of the addressee who is not Korean. This example implied that the subject of this study completely acknowledged that he was living in the setting where English was the main medium for communication. In other words, the medium of the community and the setting were more important factors than the factors of individual physical features and age.

##### 5) Kinds of Words of Each Language

S usually used Korean at home, however for specific some words, he always used English. The following words were always used in English. He hardly used the following words in Korean. It might be due to the characteristics of English language itself; some of these English are simpler forms of expression rather than Korean forms. The examples are as follows: Thank you, Mommy, I like it, I want it, I can, I don't know, almost, That's all etc.

###### Excerpt 6)

Mommy: Yeo-gi tal-gi iss-da, meok-eo-ra (Here are strawberries, eat them)

S: Oh, thank you.

###### Excerpt 7)

S : Mommy, mommy, Bab ju-se-yo. Bae go-pa-yo. (Give me rice. I am hungry)

###### Excerpt 8)

S : Na-nun almost da meok-eosseo (I ate almost)

Excerpt 9)

S: Ja-gi-jeon-ae, I-dak-go, se-su-ha-go, chaek-il-go, no-rae-ha-go, that's all.  
(Before I go to bed, I will wash teeth, wash my face, read a book, and sing a song, that's all)

Another distinctive feature is that whenever the situation occurs he has to use the words such as because, no, and negative sentences which includes the word 'not', they are really become an impetus for S to switch from Korean to English as shown in the following examples:

Excerpt 10)

S: flowers ka-ji-go wass-eo eom-ma jul-lyeo-go. (I brought flowers to give mommy)

Mother: Wae eom-ma-geo-man ka-ji-go wass-eo, Appa-geo-neun?  
(Why did you bring only mommy's, how about father?)

S: Because you are a girl.

Excerpt 11)

S: Mommy, chaek-il-za. (Let's read a book.)

Mother: I-chaek il-geul-ka? (Do you want read this one?)

S: No, I don't want it. I like this.

#### 6) Initiation Language of a Conversation Partner

The initiation language also affects S's language choice. That is, when I ask something in English, the main language of his answer is English. If I start to speak in Korean, the main language of his answers is sometimes Korean or sometimes English. That is, as long as his conversation partner can use English, he tends to use English. It may be because S spends most of day time at the daycare center where English is used, and at home he does not have chances to speak in Korean with parents as many as with friends or teachers in English at the daycare center.

## V. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This observational study examined a young boy's reaction toward two languages and his CS between Korean and English. The subject's first reaction toward another language which is not his native language, the characteristics of his CS such as identity marking, the

relationship between CS and the overall proficiency of the subject as a bilingual speaker and the subject's major motivations of CS has been explored and discussed.

As shown in the results, various factors affected the subject's CS, such as setting, time, psychological conditions, addressees, characteristics of each language, and initiation language of a conversation partner etc. It was also shown that the overall proficiency of a bilingual speaker is one of main factors of CS.

This study shows that, in any case, mixing or switching languages is a natural and normal aspect of early bilingual. Therefore, it is suggested that parents should not try to stop their children from mixing. It is generally agreed that bilingual children will naturally stop doing it, unless mixing is a frequent form of language use in the community. Pham (1994) reports that children's attitudes toward CS are greatly affected by the attitudes of their caregivers. A recognition on the part of parents or teachers of the expressive power of code switched discourse, and the sophisticated linguistic knowledge required to effectively employ the mode, should serve to alter the prejudicial opinions they have about the practice.

Many researchers (Myers-Scotton, 1993; Sridhar, 1996; Tabors, & Snow, 2001; Zentella, 1997) mention that CS is a device of great semantic power. Children who code switch are expanding their CS strategies from the merely communicative to the rhetorical, and the well-informed educator can assist in this development, just as she assists the development of other communicative capacities of her students. Harding and Reilly (1987) maintain that CS significantly enhances the expressive capacity of an individual. McLaughlin, Blanchard and Osanai (1995) also urge educators to recognize the communicative and metaphorical values of CS.

To summarize, bilingual language development can follow a number of different patterns. Especially for sequential bilinguals, there is often imbalance in the child's languages as one or the other language predominates especially as this study showed. For certain children, language mixing and CS are part of the linguistic repertory. After all, CS is a complex phenomenon which reflects a person's sociological and psychological aspects through languages in the environment where two or more languages are used.

It is then important for parents and educators in early childhood education programs to realize that CM and CS are common linguistic devices in many of the communities from which their children or students come. Rather than indicating that children are confusing their two languages, such phenomena can be a sign of linguistic vitality. Young children are in the process of learning to switch languages in the sophisticated manner they hear around them. In the end, educators, parents and caretakers in early childhood education programs need to be sensitive to these complexities in bilingual language development.

## REFERENCES

- Amberg, L. (1987). *Raising children bilingually: The pre-school years*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bell, A. (1984). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society*, 13(2), 145-204.
- Bentahila, A., & Davies, E. (1992). *Cognitive processing in bilinguals*. Amsterdam: Noth-Holland Publishing.
- Berthold, M., Mangubhai, F., & Batorowicz, K. (1997). *Bilingualism & multiculturalism: Study book*. Toowoomba, QLD: Distance Education Centre.
- Blom, J., & Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures: Codeswitching in Norway. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 407-434). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bootzin, R. R., Bower, G. H., Zajonc, R. B., & Hall, E. (1986). *Psychology today: An introduction*. New York: Random House.
- Chomsky, N. (1972). *Language and mind*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Chomsky, N. (1975). *Reflections on language*. New York: Pantheon.
- Chomsky, N. (1979). *Language and responsibility*. New York: Pantheon.
- Clark, H. H., & Clark, E. V. (1977). *Psychology and language*. New York: Harcourt Brace: Jovanovich.
- Cook, V. (1989). Reciprocal language teaching: Another alternative. *Modern English Teacher*, 16, 48-53.
- Cook, V. (1991). *Second language learning and language teaching*. Melbourne: Edward Arnold/ Hodder Headline Group.
- Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Houwer, A. (1995). Bilingual language acquisition. In P. Fletcher & B. MacWhinney (Eds.), *Handbook of child language* (pp. 219-251). London: Blackwell.
- De Houwer, A. (1998). By way of introduction: Methods in studies of bilingual first language acquisition. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 2(3), 249-263.
- Dodd, D. H., & White, R. M. (1980). *Cognition: Mental structures and processes*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Fantini, A. (1985). *Language acquisition of a bilingual child: A sociolinguistic perspective*. San Diego: College Hill Press.
- Fasold, R. (1987). *The social linguistics of society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gal, S. (1979). *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- Genesee, F. (1980). The social psychological significance of code switching for children.

- (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED200024)
- Genishi, C. (1976). *Code switching in four six year old Spanish- English speakers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.
- Gibbons, J. (1987). *Code-mixing and code choice*. Britain: The Bath Press.
- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Goodz, N. S. (1994). Interactions between parents and children in bilingual families. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community* (pp. 61-81). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Harding, E., & Reilly, P. (1987). *The bilingual family: A handbook for parents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haugen, E. (1953). *The norwegian language in America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hymes, D. (1972). Introduction. In C. Cazden, D. Hymes & V. P. John (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. xi-xvii). New York: Teachers College Press.
- McClure, E. (1977). Aspects of code switching in the discourse of bilingual Mexican-American children. In M. Saville-Troike (Ed.), *Linguistics and anthropology* (pp. 93-115). Washington, DC: George Town University Press.
- McLaughlin, B., Blanchard, G. A., & Osanai, Y. (1995). *Assessing language development in bilingual preschool children*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.
- Milroy, L. (1987). *Observing & analysing natural language: A critical account of sociolinguistic method*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1997). Code-switching. In C. Florian (Ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 217-236). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Pham, L. (1994). Infant Dual Language Acquisition Revisited. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 14, 185-210.
- Powney, J., & Watts, M. (1987). *Interviewing in educational research*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ritchie, W. C., & Bhatia, T. C. (1996). *Handbook of second language acquisition*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Romaine, S. (1994). *Language in society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Romaine, S. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). (1995). *Bilingualism*. London: Blackwell.

- Saunders, G. (1982). *Bilingual children: Guidance for the family*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Saunders, G. (1988). *Bilingual children: From birth to teens*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1987). Bilingual discourse: Communication without a common language. *Linguistics*, 25, 81-106.
- Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal behaviour*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Sridhar, K. (1996). Societal multilingualism. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 47-70). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sridhar, S. N., & Sridhar, K. K. (1980). The syntax and psycholinguistics of bilingual code mixing. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 34(4), 407- 416.
- Tabors, P., & Snow, C. (2001). Young bilingual children and early literacy development. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (pp. 159-178). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Valdes-Fallis, G. (1978). *Code switching and the classroom teacher*. Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual*. London: Blackwell.

Applicable Level: early childhood

Key words: code switching, code mixing, bilingual situation, bilingualism, early childhood

Seonghee Choi

Kyonggi Institute of Technology

3Ga-102, Jeongwang, Shiheung, Gyonggi

Tel: (031) 4964-756 / H.P.: 011-9064-6358

Fax: (031) 4964-639

E-mail: schoi@kinst.ac.kr

Received in August, 2005

Reviewed in September, 2005

Revised version received in November, 2005