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ABSTRACT

The goal of this dissertation is to make empirical and theoretical contributions to the understanding of the nature of the sociolinguistic grammar of bilingual language use. Specifically the main goal will test the claims of a theoretical methodology—that is, Optimality Theory (OT)-inspired—that imposes order on the vast array of sociolinguistic functions of code-switching and reach for generalizations, i.e., to what extent (or whether) Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) model of OPTIMIZATION in code-switching generalizes over Korean-English bilingual data.

In the dissertation, the Korean-English bilingual data demonstrate the operation of the five constraints of Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011): FAITH, POWER, SOLIDARITY, PERSPECTIVE, and FACE. In other words, these universal constraints find empirical presence in the data analyzed in this dissertation. The Korean Heritage Students (KHS) data demonstrate that the interaction and optimal satisfaction of the five constraints yields a grammar that shows a complete domination-hierarchy among the following constraints, a desirable result, given OT: FAITH>>PERSPECTIVE >>FACE>>SOLIDARITY>>POWER. Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) had argued that the ideal in an OT-inspired account—where all constraints are potentially in conflict with each other—would be a grammar that resolves the conflict in a strict domination hierarchy. The Korean Early Study Abroaders (KESA) data also demonstrate the presence of a ranked grammar as follows; FAITH>>{PERSPECTIVE, FACE}>>POWER>>SOLIDARITY. The result of a preliminary data analysis of the KHS-KESA interactions indicates that the grammar of KHS acquiesces to KESA as follows, which could be an act of sociolinguistic accommodation; FAITH>>{PERSPECTIVE, FACE}>>POWER>>SOLIDARITY. This result, however, is counterintuitive considering the
stableness of the grammar of KHS compared to KESA’s. However, this is an interesting issue left for future research.

The research of the nature and design of a sociolinguistic grammar of bilingual interaction, that is, patterns of language use, contributes to the field of code-switching by shifting the theoretical focus of a study of bilinguals’ linguistic choices, i.e., code-switching, from monolingualism (or double monolingualism) to bilingualism—from monolingual grammars to bilingual grammars. This is not a new approach to bilingualism. Ferguson (1979) and Kachru (1987) already suggested in their early studies on multi-/bilingualism. In addition, the results of the research empirically validate the theoretical framework of OPTIMIZATION as a key construct of a sociolinguistic grammar (of bilingual language use); the Korean-English bilinguals data demonstrate the operations of five constraints and their interactions to build up a particular ranking for the optimal bilingual grammar of KHS and KESA. Finally, the domain of interaction across groups of quite similar (but not the same) bilinguals, KHS and KESA, shows that there might (must) be an interaction: that OT-grammars are mutable, in that domain. This is another research project for future that could bring an answer to the question of “How (and when/ where) do “processes” of linguistic accommodation, identification, and stance-taking interact with OPTIMIZATION?”
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Chapter 1. Introduction

1. Overview

The goal of this dissertation is to explore the nature of the sociolinguistic grammar of bilingual language use through a study of Korean English bilingual students in the United States, Korean Heritage Students (hereafter KHS) and Korean Early Study Abroad (hereafter KESA) students in the US. The focus of this research is on the bilingual grammar of KHS. However, the research will be extended to the grammar of KESA to compare the bilingual grammars of the two groups with the same ethnicity but different socio-cultural backgrounds. These two groups of Korean-English bilinguals represent two related contexts of situations that have been a major issue of sociolinguistics; KHS being an example of the context of diaspora and KESA being the example of the context of global mobility.


The second group, KESA, is also a special group that comprises the big part of global citizens who are supposed to move frequently from one country to another. They are competent
in both Korean and English, transnationally moving back and forth, and navigate their linguistic repertoire to use their linguistic capital properly that they acquired from their frequent transnational movements. Thus, the study of the systematic patterns of these KHS and KESA bilinguals’ linguistic choices advance our theoretical understanding of the nature and design of a sociolinguistic grammar of bilingual interaction.

The study of sociolinguistically significant patterns underlying KHS and KESA bilinguals’ code-switching (CS) will provide insight into what a sociolinguistic grammar of these bilinguals looks like. In this dissertation, I will investigate specific functions of these bilinguals’ CS in terms of grammar [system]. This provides a range of meta-functions realized differently in concrete contexts of situation. In addition, this study will provide cross-linguistic/cultural evidence in support of Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) theory of OPTIMIZATION in bilingual language use. Furthermore, it will also extend Bhatt and Bolonyai’s theory of OPTIMIZATION to the domain of interaction across groups of bilinguals, KHS and KESA, and show if, and to what extent, the grammars of the two different groups are mutable. In the following subsections of the chapter, the research problem, and its significance will be discussed, followed by a brief discussion of the methodology, ending with a discussion of the organization of the chapters.

1.1. Introduction to the Research Problem

Bilingualism has been attracting the interest of many sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists since more and more people get involved in the spread of globalization with the accelerated development of online technology. Code-switching (CS) as the most common language practice of bilinguals has been the main issue of these studies. The fundamental
question of these studies on CS is “Why do bilinguals switch codes in discourse?” In other words, their major research question is “What are the functions of code-switching in bilinguals’ language practice?” The answers to this question are varied and more than 130 functions of CS have been suggested in the 120 studies (Bhatt and Bolonyai, 2011:522).

Among the studies of specific functions of CS suggested by the previous studies, however, there have been two major streams of theoretical approaches to CS. One is the macro-discursive approach to CS. This approach is based on the social-functional models which take indexical approach to CS. In this approach, CS is explained in terms of its connection with characteristics of the communities where it occurs. They are “macro-social factors such as group membership, identity affiliations, and the politics of bilingual language contact” (Bhatt and Bolonyai 2011:523). Myers-Scotton (1993), one of the leading scholars of this approach, investigates social motivations for CS. Myers-Scotton develops Markedness Theory to explain the socio-psychological motivations for CS using data collected in various settings in Kenya, Africa. According to Myers-Scotton, speakers’ linguistic choices depend on his/her estimation of what choices offer the greatest benefit to enhance interpersonal relations and/or material or psychological rewards and to minimize costs (Myers-Scotton 1993, Myers-Scotton, C. & Bolonyai, A. 2001). Myers-Scotton (1988) also claims that all linguistic code choices are indexical of a set of rights and obligations holding between participants in the conversational exchange maintained in a community.

Heller (1988), another leading scholar of this macro-discursive approach to CS, claims that CS as a conversational strategy creates strategic ambiguity “either by violating conventional associations (without redefining them), or by refusing to define them (where they
do not exist), or by refusing to choose among them (where several frames of reference are in competition)” (1988:82). According to Heller,

…The exact nature and meaning of CS is only derivable from an understanding of the larger social context and of the exact nature of the social situation and the social relationships involved. Since these are not always clear, the meaning of a code-switch may be ambiguous itself (or rather, the meaning is always ambiguous but it is usually possible to decide on a meaning). (Heller 1988:92)

Thus, the analytic focus of this macro-discursive approach is generally on explaining the patterns of symbolic meaning of CS, such as authority, solidarity, or dominance. This symbolic meaning of CS is derivable from a set of rights and obligations that the interlocutors bear to each other as a function of all of the levels of their relationship, from the most personal to the most socially constrained. (cf. Heller 1988)

The second major theoretical approach to CS in sociolinguistics is a micro-discursive approach based on a conversation-/discourse-analytic model where CS is a contextualization cue. Auer (1984, 1998), as the leading scholar of this approach, argues that bilingual code-switching should be analyzed as a contextualization cue because it works as such. Li (1994, 2002) claims that the sequential organization of alternative choices of language provides a frame of reference for interpreting the functions and/or meanings of conversational code-switching. Li also claims that meaning emerges as a consequence of bilingual participants’ contextualization work and is brought about by the speakers through the very act of code-switching (2002:165-167). As a result, in this conversation/discourse-analytic model, the analytic focus of CS is how people signal their orientation to one another in situated bilingual interactions and use CS as an orderly conversational resource in constructing interactional meaning.
These two major theoretical approaches of sociolinguistics to CS have developed their own methodological and empirical paradigms. Therefore, they have been considered theoretically incommensurable. Following Gardner-Chloros’ (2009) view that these two approaches are complementary rather than incompatible, Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) proposed a theoretical framework inspired by Optimality Theory. Bhatt and Bolonyai try to account for inter-community variation in CS with the theoretical assumption that there is a system—a sociolinguistic grammar—underlying all bilingual use. According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, a sociolinguistic grammar consists of a set of principles that mobilize the most effective means of communication of meaning in any interactional bilingual context. Moreover, they propose a specific model of sociolinguistic grammar, which uses five general principles of CS instantiated in different community grammars in terms of different order of computational hierarchy. Bhatt and Bolonyai claim the five principles—informally labeled as FAITH, POWER, SOLIDARITY, FACE, and PERSPECTIVE—span over basic aspects of meaning such as conceptual, relational-interpersonal, and discourse-presentational meanings, which are always available for access in the act of meaning-making in bilingual communication.

Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) proposal of a sociolinguistic grammar of bilingual language use is theoretically attractive in that it is an attempt to establish a unified theoretical framework in which a systematic explanation of community-specific patterns of CS can be provided. Moreover, in this unified theoretical framework, both the macro- and the micro-aspects of bi-/multilingualism can be explained. With this theoretical perspective, Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) theory motivates the research of this dissertation, a study of bilingual interactions, linguistic choices, and the nature of bilingual grammar through a case study of Korean students in the United States.
Like other heritage speakers from diasporic communities in the United States (hereafter the US), Korean Heritage Students (hereafter KHS) in the US have been studied regarding the effects of heritage language competence. The focus group of this dissertation, KHS, is a representative group of 2nd generation of heritage speakers in the US whose socio-cultural identity is more American than Korean, but whose linguistic choices have been variable depending on their socialization process.

Among the various studies on KHS, Cho (2000) investigates the role of heritage language in social interactions and relationships and claims those who have the competence of their heritage language have many socio-cultural advantages as well as personal and societal benefits, which implies positive contribution of heritage language education to the society involved. Jeon (2008) examines the link between language ideology and maintenance of heritage Korean language in America based on three years’ research of three different sources of data. According to Jeon, there are close relationships between KHS’s language ideology and their attitude toward language learning and maintenance. Jo (2000, 2002) also investigates the relationship between KHS’s ethnic identity and their language ideology. In Jo’s research, she claims that KHS’s fluency of Korean does not necessarily lead to their homogeneous ethnic identity formation. According to Jo, KHS negotiate their sense of ethnic identity by interacting with social meanings of their language use and identify themselves and other KHS on a continuum of “Koreanness” or “Americanness”. Similarly, Lee, J. S. (2002) examines the role of cultural identity and heritage language maintenance among KHS and claims that heritage language proficiency relates to strength of bicultural identification.

Kang (2003) examines conflict-negotiating strategies in Korean American discourse and claims that code-switching serves to instantiate social hierarchical relationships and norms that
guide the observable actions used in navigating meaning and social relations. Kang and Lo (2004) investigate ways of articulating heterogeneity in Korean American narratives of ethnic identity and claim it is the discourse in which Korean Americans are embedded that point to different concepts of identity positioning, such as “ethnic” (e.g. “Korean”) versus “racial” (e.g. “Asian American”) terms, even within a single ethnic community, like the Korean American community. They demonstrate different ideologies about the fixed nature of identity operating within the Korean American community, in narratives told by Korean Americans about Korean Americans.

Many of these studies focus on KHS and their relationship with language ideology, which leads to heritage language fluency, as well as their ethnic identity recognition from a sociolinguistic point of view. Or, they focus on the role of heritage language in KHS’s social interactions and relations from an educational point of view. Some of the studies focus on KHS’s linguistic practices, such as code-switching, as used in conflict negotiation strategies in Korean American discourse. Yet, research results do not give a systematic explanation of KHS’s linguistic choices in their bilingual interactions. Therefore, the research provided in this dissertation sets to fill the gap amongst the cohort of studies on KHS by providing a study of KHS’s systematic linguistic choices in their interaction with in-group members or/ and out-group members.

The second focus group is the Korean Early Study Abroad (KESA) group, named joki yuhak in Korean. This group is also a special group making up Korea’s elite group of “global citizens” moving frequently between Korea and the US or any other English speaking country during their education. They are competent in both Korean and English, transnationally moving back and forth, easily navigating their transnationally acquired linguistic capital properly. The
Korean name of KESA, “joki yuhak”, is defined as pre-university educational migration of the Korean middle class built on Korean family belief that valued linguistic and cultural capital, such as English and its culture, must be acquired abroad, especially in English speaking countries (Park and Lo, 2012). The members of this group have picked up Korean language and culture in Korea before going abroad. However, they also understand the global advantages that use of English provides them in the hypercompetitive Korean society where ‘the structure of neoliberal competition and class-based inequalities are dominant’ (Park and Lo 2012: 150).

While there are various English resources to learn publically or privately in Korea, still the most valued resource of English for the Korean people, who are seeking the most valued linguistic capital in the globalizing world, is the Standard English that can be acquired in an English-speaking country. Accordingly, many Korean parents send their children to study abroad in an English speaking country at an early age, also known as the ‘critical age’, for fully-immersed language acquisition and education in English through college-age, even with an undesirable result of a separated family, also known to Koreans as ‘a goose family’. With this language ideology and desire for a valued linguistic capital of their parents, KESA have good competence in both Korean and English language and culture. Additionally, their frequent transnational movements, from Korea to the English-speaking country, make them global citizens, as they navigate their linguistic repertoire to accomplish social functions in the transnational contexts. Thus, KESA are also an empirically significant group from which the grammar of bilingual interaction is investigated in the research of this dissertation.

Many sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists have discussed the trend of Korean people’s educational migration to an English-speaking country. Their focus is on KESA’s identity constructions and their language ideologies that arise in the transnational context of
globalization (Park and Abelmann 2004; Park 2004, 2010; Song 2007, 2009; Kang 2012; Park & Bae 2009; Shin 2012; Lo & Kim 2011, 2012; Park & Lo 2012; Kang & Abelmann 2011). However, there are few studies on how and why KESA choose their linguistic practice in their interaction with other people in the transnational contexts. In other words, few scholars have studied the grammar of bilingual interaction in the transnational context of globalization. Thus, the study of KESA’s grammar of bilingual interaction in this dissertation will shed light on the study of sociolinguistic grammars of bilingual interactions performed in the transnational context of globalization.

The reason why I choose this group as another empirical resource is that their ethnic identity as Korean gives them an apparent similarity to KHS as Korean-English bilinguals in the US, even with their different socio-cultural background and thereby different identity recognition. Thus, by comparing the bilingual grammars of KHS and KESA, who have similarities in their ethnicity and linguistic practices as Korean-English bilinguals, I will attempt to explain the linguistic choices of the two groups, the ways in which bilingual grammar of each group is different, and what makes up the difference of grammar of the two groups of Korean-English bilinguals.

By looking at the interaction between KHS and KESA, I will also investigate whether, and in what ways, the grammar of bilingual interaction responds to differences in audience design. In other words, when KHS and KESA interact with each other, does KHS or KESA adjust to each other in their bilingual interaction and build a new grammar of their bilingual interaction? The investigation of these questions, including the ones mentioned above, will be within an appropriate sociolinguistic theoretical framework, which seem to me to be Bhatt and
Bolonyai’s theory of Optimal Grammar, which presents a unified account of bilingual language use and variation across cultures.

1.2. Research Questions

This dissertation explores the systematicities that underlie the linguistic choices, that is, code-switching (hereafter CS), of the Korean-English bilinguals in the United States. They are bilingually competent in both English and Korean. Among them, Korean Heritage Students (hereafter KHS) are more competent in English and less competent in Korean. On the other hand, Korean Early Study Abroad (hereafter KESA) are more competent in Korean but less competent in English than KHS. The dissertation will show the systematic patterns of linguistic choices, that is, CS, of these two groups of Korean-English bilinguals in the US receive a straightforward account within an optimality-theoretic (OT) framework of assumptions as outlined in Bhatt & Bolonyai (2011), broadly following the spirit of the OT-model of Prince & Smolensky (1994). The key insight in Bhatt & Bolonyai’s theory is that sociolinguistic grammars differ from each other in terms of how each grammar prioritizes a restricted set of potentially violable sociolinguistic constraints. Thus, the research performed in this dissertation will (a) test the theory of Bhatt & Bolonyai against new data, (b) show how optimization works in two related contexts of situations (the context of diaspora [KHS] and the context of global mobility [KESA]), and (c) present a detailed ethnography of an under-researched and under-theorized context: Korean bilingualism in globalization.

The three major research questions that I will explore in this dissertation are, thus,

1. What are the systematicities that underlie/govern the Korean Heritage Students’ (KHS) linguistic choices, CS, in the natural conversations with other KHS?
2. What are the systematicities that underlie/govern the Korean Early Study Abroad’s (KESA) linguistic choices, CS, in the natural conversations with other KESA?

3. Given the difference in bilingual dominance between the two groups—KHS, English dominant, and KESA, Korean dominant—what specific adjustments, if any, are made in the respective grammars of the two groups when interacting with each other? In other words, how stable are these grammars; whether, and to what extent, are the grammars in flux; and to what extent, does audience matter in the grammatical design?

1.3. Methodology

The goal of this dissertation is to explore a sociolinguistic grammar of Korean-English bilinguals’ linguistic choices. Thus, the naturalness of the data is very important to validate a sociolinguistic grammar, which describes systematicities of the bilinguals’ linguistic practices in a natural conversation. Therefore, the data for this dissertation were collected from natural conversations of KHS and KESA with their own in-group or/and out-group members, which were self-video-recorded by the subjects themselves. All the data were recorded in a quiet place where the subjects could communicate with each other freely about topics that were driven by one of the interlocutors or given by the interviewer in a conversation of informal interview.

The focus of this dissertation is on KHS’s linguistic choices in their interaction with in-group members to explore of a bilingual grammar of KHS. As such, additional data was collected for the research of KHS: 14 recordings of KHS data were collected. As for the data for the research of KESA, two recordings of new data and the data used in Lee, Y. S. (2009) were used to figure out a bilingual grammar of KESA and compare it with KHS’s. Finally, one recording of KHS and KESA interaction data was collected to explore the adjustment of two grammars in their interaction with each other.
All the data collected were transcribed by the researcher with the help of one of the interlocutors participating in each data collection in the event that the researcher could not figure out well. The data were coded for the five constraints of CS proposed by Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) considering the socio-cultural factors related with each constraint that could be captured in the context of each conversation, which were observed by the researcher repeatedly in watching the video-recordings of the data collection. All coded data were calculated and the total number of CS coded for each constraint in each data was recorded and compared in a table made for each group (KHS and KESA) as well as an interaction between KHS and KESA. A hypothetical ranking of the data, which indicates an interaction of five principles, is made and verified through the data analysis. In the next section, I will provide the organization of the dissertation.

2. Organization of the dissertation

The organization of the remainder of this dissertation is as follows:

Chapter 2 provides an overview of the previous studies that motivate a study of Korean English bilinguals’ linguistic choices for this dissertation and that provide important information for the theoretical framework of this dissertation, Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) theory of OPTIMIZATION. The sociolinguistic studies of CS, which proposed specific functions of CS, will be reviewed with a focus on how they contribute to building up the theoretical framework of OPTIMIZATION proposed by Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011). In addition, a review of various studies on Korean-English bilinguals’ linguistic practices in the US is necessary to indicate by what means the study of Korean-English bilinguals’ linguistic choice in this dissertation contributes to this area of study. In the final section, an introduction of Bhatt and
Bolonyai’s (2011) theoretical framework of OPTIMIZATION is detailed as the basis of research performed in this dissertation. A respective review of the five principles: FAITH, POWER, SOLIDARITY, FACE, and PERSPECTIVE, will be given to show how they cover the functions of CS as identified in previous studies, as well as how these constraints interact with one another to establish a bilingual grammar of CS based on the empirical data provided by the authors.

Chapter 3 provides a discussion of the three main research questions, and the methodology to collect data. The data of this dissertation are video-recorded natural conversations of subjects who are KHS or KESA. In this chapter, a detailed description of the data is provided, including the procedure and protocol of data collection, the ethnographic information of the subjects, and how the data were coded for the various constraints of Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) Optimal Grammar.

Chapter 4 provides how the five constraints (principles), FAITH, POWER, SOLIDARITY, FACE, and PERSPECTIVE, are operational in KHS’s and KESA’s CS. The data collected from KHS and KESA will verify that these five principles are operational in their linguistic choice and establish a bilingual grammar of CS for each group.

Chapter 5 provides a bilingual grammar of KHS and of KESA established within the theoretical framework of Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) OPTIMIZATION and a pilot case study of specific adjustments, if any, made in the respective grammar of the two groups when interacting with each other.

Chapter 6 provides a conclusion and discusses the limitations of the dissertation with some directions for further research starting from the dissertation.
Chapter 2. Literature Review

1. Overview

The main concern of this dissertation is to explore a sociolinguistic grammar of code-switching (hereafter CS) as bilinguals’ language practice through a case study of two groups of Korean-English bilingual students in the United States, KHS and KESA, within Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) theoretical framework of OPTIMIZATION. First, in order to indicate how this dissertation fills certain gaps in the areas of sociolinguistic study of Korean-English bilinguals in the US, this chapter begins with a review of the previous studies on Korean-English Bilinguals’ language practices. This is followed by a review of previous studies of the code-switching (CS), which provided important information for Bhatt and Bolonyai’s theoretical framework of OPTIMIZATION, the theoretical framework that guides the analysis of data in this dissertation. Finally, Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) theoretical framework of OPTIMIZATION is reviewed in detail at the end of this chapter.

2. Sociolinguistic Studies on the Korean-English Bilinguals in the US

2.1. Studies on KHS

As reviewed in the preceding section, Korean Heritage Students (hereafter KHS) in the US have been studied concerning the effects of their heritage language competence. They are named 2nd generation Korean heritage people in the US whose socio-cultural identity is more American than Korean, but whose linguistic choices have been variable depending on their
socialization process. This group of Korean English bilinguals, KHS, has been a main interest of many scholars of sociolinguistics and of second language acquisition (Cho 2000, Jeon, 2007, 2008; Jo 2000, 2002; Joo, 2009; Kang, 2003; Kang and Lo, 2004; Lee, J. & Oxelson 2006; Lee, J. & Shin, S. 2008; Lee, J. 2002, 2005, 2006, 2008; Lo, 1999; Lo & Reyes, 2004; Palmer, 2007; Park, E., 2008; Park, J., 2007; Yi, 2008). As mentioned in the preceding section, many of these studies on KHS have focused on the relationship between KHS’s language ideology. This leads to the fluency of their heritage language and their ethnic identity recognition from a sociolinguistic point of view, or on the role of heritage language in KHS’s social interactions and relations from an educational point of view.

In addition to these previous studies on KHS, there are some studies on KHS’s code-switching (hereafter CS). Kang (2003) provides an interactional account of conflict negotiating strategies in Korean American discourse with a focus on CS among Korean Americans. According to Kang, speaking Korean at particular moments evokes ideologies of social hierarchy that serve to mitigate potential conflicts. Kang also argues that Korean social ideology of relative status has a major influence on how bilingual Korean Americans interact with one another, regardless of whether they are using Korean or English. Thus, she claims that the use of CS, among other mitigating strategies in discourse, serves to instantiate these social hierarchical relationships and norms that guide the observable actions used in navigating meaning and social relations.

Lo (1999) investigates the relationship between CS, speech community membership and the discursive construction of ethnic identity through a discourse analysis of a conversation between a Chinese American, who can speak Korean learned from his Korean friend, and a Korean American in Los Angeles. According to Lo, CS helps the two Asian American men in
the data to construct various moral stances as characteristic of a given ethnic category, simultaneously projecting category memberships for speakers and recipients through the assignment of participant roles. Lo (1999) claims that these ethnic identities are contingent, as CS that is not reciprocated rejects proposed claims to membership in a speech community.

Lee, G. & Cossairt, J. (2006) examine KHS’s CS within the social psychological framework of Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) developed by Giles and colleagues (1984, 2001, 2004), in which code-choice functions as a strategy of convergence or divergence available to bilingual speakers. They explore KHS’s identity negotiation, and socialization through CS in a recreational setting of seven high school and college students of Korean heritage currently living in the US. According to them, among the KHS of his study, Korean serves as the most salient marker of in-group membership and CS occurs in inter-group contexts to accommodate non-Korean speakers and in intra-group contexts to facilitate communication and negotiate interpersonal interactions. With these results, they claim that the participants’ language use and attitudes toward Korean and English reflect a negotiated ethnic identity in which bilingualism plays a central role, allowing both a differentiation from and an integration into the larger mainstream of American culture.

There are also some studies on CS of Korean American bilingual children within the framework of conversational analysis (hereafter CA; Shin and Milroy, 2000) and related to the concept of speech community membership and ethnic identity (Yoon, 1996). According to Shin and Milroy (2000), Korean-English bilingual children employed language alternation as a contextualization strategy. By applying the sequential analysis developed by Auer (1995), they suggest that code-switching was used as an additional means to communicate discoursal meanings to other participants in the conversation (2000: 381). Shin and Milroy propose many
possible interpretations of Korean-English bilingual children’s CS based on CA. They suggest that Korean-English bilingual children perform participant-related CS to negotiate the proper language for the interaction while they do discourse-related CS to “organize and structure the ongoing conversation with respect to such procedure as turn-taking, topical cohesion, sequencing of activities and repair” (2000:370). However, they did not provide a theoretically integrated interpretation of CS of bilingual children in their second language acquisition contexts.

Yoon (1996) claims that CS is not imperfect speech, but a verbal strategy to metaphorically convey a social identity, a sociocultural attitude, and/or a social psychological status (1996:395). Unlike Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Model which offers an overall explanation of CS as indexical of social negotiation of participants’ mutual rights and obligations, Yoon claims that for Korean-English bilinguals, CS may be viewed as a reflection of the social relationship between speaker and addressee (1996:397). Yoon suggests that code-choices and CS are dependent on the type of group membership, that is, in-group vs. out-group, that conversation participants hold (398). According to the result of her analysis of code choices among the first generation fluent Korean-English bilinguals, group membership determines the degree of use of one language or the other; the more distant the conversation partners are, the more they use Korean during conversation, while the close or more intimate the relationship they have, the more they use English. Yoon claims that her analysis provides insight into some characteristics of code-choices and CS between honorific and non-honorific language. However, she does not consider the existence of the general principles of bilingual behavior, which can account for specific instances of CS in different socio-cultural contexts and only focus on the explanation of a specific instance of CS of Korean-English bilinguals.
The studies with a focus on KHS’s CS present CS as conflict negotiation strategies in Korean American discourse, the relationship between CS, speech community membership and the discursive construction of ethnic identity, or CS as a strategy of ethnic identity negotiation. The studies on Korean-English bilingual children’s CS also suggest that CS is used as a contextualization strategy or as a reflection of the social relationship between speaker and addressee. Even though these studies on KHS’ or Korean-English bilingual children’s CS present some socio-pragmatic functions of CS in their studies, they still do not provide a systematic explanation about Korean-English bilinguals’ CS in their interactions with in-group members or out-group members. Thus, the study of this dissertation would fill the gap among the studies on KHS’s CS by providing a study of KHS’s bilingual grammar which systematically explains KHS’s CS in their interaction with in-group members or/ and out-group members. In the next section, previous studies on KESA will be reviewed.

2.2. Studies on KESA

The trend of Korean people’s educational exodus (Song 2009:2) to English speaking countries for their children’s bilingual education, also known as ‘Korean Early Study Abroad (KESA)’ or ‘chogi yuhak’, has drawn a lot of interest from many scholars in the area of sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology. Research has been conducted regarding the issues of interrelationship between language ideologies and bilinguals’ identity construction in the transnational space of globalization. (Park and Abelmann 2004; Park 2004, 2009 ; Park, H. 2007; Song 2007, 2009; Kang 2012; Park & Bae 2009; Shin 2012; Lo & Kim 2011, etc.) The focus of these studies is commonly on Korean people’s language ideologies and identity
construction based on their desire for ‘symbolic capitals’ (Bourdieu 1991) in the context of
globalization, which they claim encourage Korean people’s educational exodus.

Among the previous studies on Korean people’s language ideologies and the
consequences of their desire for success in the globalizing world, Park, J. S. (2004:75-76)
introduces three ideologies of English which are shared by all Koreans, *necessitation*,
*externalization*, *self-deprecation*, which he claims constantly interact with each other and
cannot be isolated in discussing Koreans’ attitude toward English. Park, H. (2007) also
investigates ideologies of Global English in (South) Korea by looking at “the roles and
functions of Global English in Korea, the user’s social-cognition of shifting dynamics between
global and local languages, the linguistic manifestation of that cognition in public discourse,
and the impact of public discourses on private linguistic practices—language choice, use and
attitude” (2007:2). According to Park, H., “English is an “extra” social resource which is not
equally distributed among all members of society, and those equipped with English are capable
of acquiring social prestige and even affection in some cases from other members of the Korean
linguistic community” (2007:161).

Among the studies on KESA in America, Song (2007) presents an ethnographic study of
KESA children and their families’ language socialization practices with a focus on their
negotiation of language ideologies and identities. According to her, two groups of Koreans in
America, *Korean immigrants* and *Korean early-study-abroad sojourners* enact different
language ideologies in their children’s language education. For Korean early-study-abroad
sojourners, she argues that their language socialization context is transnational in nature similar
to that of Korean immigrants, but these families’ practices are constructed differently from
those Korean immigrants due to their future trajectory of returning to Korea. Song (2007) also
claims that these two groups of Korean have different ideological goals for their children’s language socialization. In analyzing these two groups’ language ideologies, Song adopts Park, J. S.’s (2004) three ideologies of English and extends ideology of English as *necessitation* into the ideologies of commodification and cosmopolitan membership.

According to Song, KESA parents view English education as the best investment for their children and economic capital through the commodification of language (2007:95). In addition, Song presents that they also think English education will provide their children a “cosmopolitan membership” by virtue of the linguistic and economic aspects of global English (2007:100). However, Song’s data show that KESA parents also maintain so-called Korean nationalism, the language ideology that views Korean as emblematic of ethnic and national identity (2007:103). On the other hand, for Korean immigrants, Song argues that multiplicity of language ideologies becomes salient through their contestation over what should be the first or primary language for their children (2007:104). According to her, for Korean immigrants, “English is for survival and Korean is a (luxurious) necessity” (2007:108).

The previous two studies on Korean people’s language ideologies of English in Korea, Park, J. S. (2004) and Park, H (2007), and Song’s (2007) ethnographic study of KESA families in the US provide some important background knowledge to understand KESA’s language ideology and identity constructions through their language use. However, their studies could not show how and why KESA do their linguistic choice in their bilingual interaction in the transnational contexts in terms of bilingual grammar. Thus, the project of investigating KESA’s grammar of bilingual interaction in this dissertation will fill the gap that the previous studies on KESA leave in their research.
3. Sociolinguistic Studies on Code-Switching

Code-switching (hereafter CS) has been studied by many sociolinguists as most bi-/multi-linguals' language practices in the bi-/multi-lingual contexts. One of the major interests of these studies is why bilinguals deploy CS and many sociolinguists have been investigating and presenting specific socio-pragmatic functions of CS from various points of view. To name a few of specific functions of CS suggested by the previous researches, Callahan (2007) considers CS a form of accommodation to the interlocutor among the service workers and the customers in a service account. Canagarajah (1995:208) observes that CS helps reconcile the socio-psychological conflicts in a revolutionary society, where language is a sensitive issue for the community, by providing a way to reduce the social distance in its reconciling the tension between the two languages involved, and the values and ideologies embodied by each language. Bond & Lai (2001:179) claims that CS has a distancing function, permitting bilinguals to express ideas in their second language that would be too disturbing in their first.

Backus (2001:152-153) claims that CS is used to convey cultural connotations in that the word of the embedded language insertion has any connotations that connect it to the embedded language culture. Furukawa (2007:371) presents that CS used as a powerful tool for double voicing in Hawaiian comedy shows to marginalize the Filipino origin jokes as the “Other” and disrupt of official views of reality. De Fina (2007:371) suggests that CS is used as an important index of ethnic affiliation in socialization practices to construct Italian ethnicity as a central element in the collective identity of an all-male card-playing club, that is, to create in-group cohesion among the Italian immigrants in the US.
Bolonyai (2005) argues that CS is used to constitute and exploit different sources of power even among young children who “act as rational, social actors in making strategic and meaningful linguistic choices with the overall aim to achieve optimal outcomes in a given interaction” (2005:3). Similarly, Gal (1988) and Heller (1995) present the function of CS to produce or resist symbolic domination. Bamiro (2006) suggests CS is used to mark identity, solidarity, exclusion from an in-group membership, status manipulation, and social and communicative distance. Aronsson (2000) presents CS reveals footing in bilingual play. Carol Meyer Scotton (1977) says a set of motivations for CS has to do with accommodation to various elements, such as environment, to eternal pressures (i.e. social expectations of situational norms). According to her, speakers do CS to align themselves with the groups with which they wish to be identified or distance themselves from the groups with which they do not want to be identified.

In addition to all these previous studies on specific socio-pragmatic functions of CS mentioned above, CS as multi-/bilinguals' primary language practice has been studied by many sociolinguists about its various functions in various communicational contexts. Among these studies, there are two major sociolinguistic approaches to CS, social-functional models (Gumperz, 1982; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Heller, 1995) and conversation-/discourse-analytic models of CS (Auer 1998; Li, 1994). First, socio-functional models of CS are macro-analytic approach to CS, which attempts to provide “the explanatory mechanisms for the ways actors in society select from alternative structures and available options” (Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai 2001:1). On the other hand, conversation-/discourse-analytic models of CS are micro analytic approach to CS and focuses on “detailed description of the sequential organization of language
choice in conversation and interpretation with reference to the more general patterns of language preference and language ability of the speakers involved” (Li & Milroy 1995:284).

As a representative scholar of a social-functional model and a macro-discursive approach to CS, Myers-Scotton (1983:116) claims that the negotiation principle, as a complementary principle to a cooperative principle of a conversation, directs the speaker to choose the form of his/her conversational contribution such that it symbolizes the set of rights and obligations which he/she wishes to be in force between speaker and addressee for the current exchange. Thus, in her Markedness Model of CS (Myers-Scotton, 1993), CS indexes the set of rights and obligations (RO set) that a speaker wants to establish in the conversational context and CS can be a marked or unmarked choice depending on the speaker’s intention of indexing a marked or unmarked RO set, respectively. As for RO sets, Myers-Scotton suggests that an RO set is an abstract construct derived from situational factors and stands for the attitudes and expectations of participants towards each other, and that RO sets are means by which the social negotiations are achieved (1993:85).

Myers-Scotton also argues linguistic varieties are indexical, which means that the use of each variety in one community’s repertoire points to a somewhat different RO set within the interaction. Moreover, according to her, the salience of the various attributes that a linguistic variety has come to index in a given community varies depending on the type of interaction (85-87). Thus, Myers-Scotton claims that the unmarked choice as a vehicle for a given RO set in a specific interaction is the linguistic variety, which is the most expected while the marked choice is the most unusual.

In addition, Myers-Scotton argues there is nothing universal about which codes are marked or unmarked. According to her, what is universal is speakers’ communicative
competence to perceive linguistic choices as marked or unmarked relative to RO set (90). She asserts that Markedness Model of CS is a speaker-centered model, where the speaker is a goal-directed rational actor who makes “choices primarily based on enhancing their own positions, or at least communicating their own perceptions (1993:111). In other words, within the framework of this socio-functional model, the speaker negotiates a particular identity in relation to other participants in the communication and CS can be considered as ‘bids to alter the RO sets which holds between participants. Thus, in this framework, CS is bilinguals’ strategy of communication in which speakers weigh the costs and rewards of alternative choices (1993:152-153).

As another scholar of macro-discursive approach to CS, Heller (1988) introduces a functionalist approach to code-switching as follows;

Code switching is seen as a boundary-leveling or boundary-maintaining strategy, which contributes, as a result, to the definition of roles and role relationships at a number of levels, to the extent that interlocutors bear multiple role relationships to each other. It is an important part of social mechanisms of negotiation and definition of social roles, networks and boundaries. At the same time, it is effective only where interlocutors share an understanding of the significance of the pool of communicative resources from which code-switching is drawn. Conventions must be shared in order for their violation to have meaning (Heller 1988:1)

Based on this functionalist approach to code-switching, Heller (1988) also suggests that code-switching should be investigated within “a dynamic model in which code-switching can be seen as a resource for indexing situationally salient aspects of context in speakers’ attempts to accomplish interactional goals.” This approach is mainly functional and many other sociolinguistic researches of code-switching take this functional approach and investigate functions of code-switching in various social contexts.
Heller (1995) considers CS a means of drawing on symbolic resources and deploying them in order to gain or deny access to other resources, symbolic or material. Most of these resources, she claims, are related indirectly to the methods people have of calculating honor, or status or prestige and their value is a function of processes of power and solidarity (160). According to her, CS is a form of language practices, which are inherently political in so far as language forms part of processes of power and CS is one way to manipulate valuable linguistic resources and the definition of their value (166). In sum, these social-functional models present an indexical approach to CS and explain it in terms of speakers’ motivation or macro-social factors such as group membership, identity affiliations, and the politics of bilingual language contact. The analytic focus of these studies is generally on explicating patterns of symbolic meaning of switches (e.g. authority, solidarity, dominance).

As a leading scholar of Conversational Analysis (CA), Auer (1995) claims that code-switching (CS) should be investigated by “analyzing the signaling value of the juxtaposition of languages and deriving the conversational meaning of code-alternation from it” (119). In this approach, Auer says, a sequential account of language choice is required, in which the language chosen for one speech activity must be seen against the background of language choice in the preceding utterance. Thus, according to Auer, the question to be answered in this perspective is not what verbal activities are associated with one language or the other, but instead: in which activities do bilinguals tend to switch from one language into the other (120). Within this approach of CA, CS is considered as a “contextualization cue” (Gumperz 1982) for the participants of discourse to signal their orientation to one another, which is used as a sequential conversational resource to construct interactional meaning. Thus, Auer claims that CS should be investigated on the conversational level as a contextualization cue because it shares the
features of other contextualization cues and “the situated interpretation of CS as a contextualization cue is strongly related to sequential patterns of language choice” (1995:123-127).

Li and Milroy (1995) analyze the Tyneside Chinese-English bilinguals’ generation-specific CS as a sequential organization of language choice by different speakers from different generations within the framework of CA. They claim that CA approach of a sequential analysis will provide interpretation with reference to the more general patterns of language preference and language ability of the speakers involved. Through the sequential analysis of Chinese-English bilinguals’ CS to contextualize preference organization and repairs of the conversation, Li and Milroy argue that CA approach to CS helps understand better the strategies which bilingual speakers with different language preference and language ability use to manage conversational interaction and the procedures to arrive at local interpretations of CS (1995: 298).

While the scholars of CA claim that a sequential analysis avoids an imposition of analyst-oriented classificatory frameworks, the focus of CA is too much on the local functions of CS and the sequential analysis with too much detailed description seem to be rather analyst-oriented to the contrary of their claim. Moreover, even with its descriptive methodological contribution to the analysis of discourse data, CA cannot provide a general framework of bilinguals’ grammar of CS within a community of practice, which could explain and predict bilinguals’ use of CS. This is explained by the fact that CA focuses on specific details of the micro-interactional level of discourse and could miss the macro-discursive factors, such as power and solidarity, to explain the bilinguals’ use of CS. Thus, CA should be complemented by a macro-discursive theoretical framework, which could describe the whole framework of the bilingual grammar of one community of practice.
Gardner-Chloros (2009) indicates the controversial aspects of CS found between the two major approaches to CS, that is, macro-discursive approach of socio-functional model and micro-discursive approach of conversational-analytic model. She claims that these two different approaches are not incompatible, but potentially complementary for a study of CS. As a theory which combines the macro- and micro-discursive approaches to CS as bilinguals’ linguistic practice, Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) Optimal Grammar of bilinguals’ language use will be reviewed in the next section with a focus on how it is inspired, what is the main system of the theory, and how it works for the empirical data.

4. Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) theoretical framework of OPTIMIZATION

4.1. Theoretical motivations and assumptions

Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) present an analysis of the sociolinguistic functions of CS concerning the interaction and optimal satisfaction of “five socio-cognitive principles”, which they claim are general principles to control the patterns of CS in a bi-/multi-lingual community. According to them, the framework of OPTIMIZATION that they proposed is theoretically motivated by two fundamental questions of the studies on bilingual behavior, code-switching: why do bilingual code-switch? What accounts for inter-community variation in observed patterns of CS? The theoretical assumption of their proposal is that there is a system—a sociolinguistic grammar—underlying all bilingual use. They suggest that a sociolinguistic grammar is a set of principles that mobilize the most effective means of communication of meaning in any interactional bilingual context.

The sociolinguistic grammar they proposed uses five general principles of code-switching, informally labeled as FAITH, POWER, SOLIDARITY, FACE, and PERSPECTIVE,
instantiated in different community grammars in terms of different order of computational hierarchy. These five principles span over basic aspects of meaning such as conceptual, relational-interpersonal, and discourse-presentational meanings that are always available, if not always present, in bilingual communication. Bhatt and Bolonyai suggest that this framework of CS interfaces with Halliday’s (1994) functional approach to language as a system, where language use is conceptualized in terms of three fundamental functions: “ideational”, “interpersonal”, and “textual”. Thus, with the premise that the study of the functional dimensions of CS should be performed within an integrative framework including a few general principles, they take a multi-functional view of CS with the rank of five principles in relation to one another (2011:522). The goal of their study, they suggest, is to test the different optimization possibilities of ordered preferences of the five principles that instantiate different, community-specific, grammars with a focus on inter-community variation of CS.

In addition, Bhatt and Bolonyai claim that ‘local’ functions of CS are specific instantiations of the interactions of these ‘global’ principles, or (products of) their interaction and that these principles motivate a theoretical framework for exploring the nature of multilingual competence. Bhatt and Bolonyai’s claim outlines a unified framework for creating a typology of CS among various multilingual communities. Moreover, it can clarify the connection between the macro/global and the micro/local dimensions of multilingualism (2011:523).

The core of their socio-cognitive model, Bhatt and Bolonyai suggest, is premised on the theoretical assumption of OPTIMIZATION, an operation (of individual and community grammars) that selects from a set of plausible linguistic expressions one that is contextually most appropriate: the optimal output. They also suggest that the socio-cognitive grammar of CS of a
community results from the particular ranking of the five principles proposed in their framework. These five principles are universally available for actors to draw on, but the ranking of principles is community-specific. Individuals come to develop an awareness and a shared grammar of locally meaningful use of two or more normatively organized codes through the socialization and interaction with other members of the same community of practice. With the variation of CS practices between communities, Bhatt and Bolonyai hypothesize that the grammars of specific CS communities will vary in terms of how the constraints are ranked as a function of differences in socio-cultural norms and values, history of bilingual contact, structural position of bilingual group within the larger social-historical context, and collective agency in how communities organize their bilingual resources and (re)negotiate meanings of code choice and CS in particular socio-political economies (2011:524).

4.2. Methodological Assumptions

Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) present the methodological assumptions for the empirical scope of the research that

i) only socio-pragmatically meaningful CS in the oral or written texts are focused,

ii) CS from apparent psycholinguistic difficulties are excluded,

iii) established or cultural borrowings meeting given criteria are excluded,

iv) bilinguals producing CS are rational

v) the database is taken from bi-/multi-lingual contexts where CS is a communal sociolinguistic practice,

vi) CS without accomplishing any socio-pragmatic work are excluded. (2011:523)
Bhatt and Bolonyai assume that members of a discourse community of practice that use CS as a social practice have common knowledge of ways of relating to each other, ways of using their languages, and ways of mixing them. This is their basis of the notion of a sociolinguistic grammar, which follows Eckert and McConnell-Ginet’s (2003) work on community grammars that are assumed to be shared by the interactional participants. In addition, they argue that while shared knowledge of the social regularities of ways of talking does not determine linguistic choice *per se*, it is a requisite for a speaker “to build on in conveying one’s communicative intentions” (Gal, 1983:69, cited by Bhatt & Bolonyai: 524)

### 4.3. Principles of CS and their empirical bases

With the theoretical and methodological assumptions presented in the preceding sections, Bhatt and Bolonyai proposed five principles as generalization over only those instances of CS where the alternative monolingual form-meaning pair is perceived as less than optimal in terms of

(a) speaker’s/writer’s individual goals and socio-structural opportunities,

(b) economy of expression of socially contextualized ideational meanings (FAITH)

(c) framing relational-interpersonal (POWER, SOLIDARITY, FACE) communication,

(d) discourse-interactional orientations (PERSPECTIVE)

With these five principles, Bhatt and Bolonyai suggest that CS is multi-functional and builds, simultaneously or separately, different types of meaning and a single CS has the potential to create ideational, relational-interpersonal, and discourse-interactional aspects of meaning. In addition, they claim that this multi-functional perspective of CS can help to show systematic links and ordered relations among the range of potentially available functions and principles at
work in bilingual discourse (2011: 524). They suggest that all these principles are proposed with empirical bases of CS that generalize over 130 functions assigned to CS by the previous studies. In the following sections, each principle will be introduced with its own empirical motivation and some examples to show how they are operational for CS in a given social context of bilingual interactions.

4.3.1. **Principle of Symbolic Domination (POWER)**

PRINCIPLE OF SYMBOLIC DOMINATION (POWER). Social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize symbolic dominance and/or social distance in relational practice. Actors switch to the language that is best positioned to index or construct power, status, authority, social distance, and/or difference between self and other(s).

According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, this principle of POWER is expected to be operational when people intend to create unequal relations of power and domination through their use of linguistic practices. POWER predicts that CS is used as a resource to maximize symbolic dominance, status difference, and/or social distance in relational practice.

Specific functions of CS presented in the previous studies being motivated by the meta-principle of POWER in Bhatt and Bolonyai’s framework are as follows; CS to increase social distance (Eastman, 1992; Rindler-Schjerve, 1998); CS to assert “control” (Gal, 1979; Heller, 1988; Woolard, 1988; Zentella, 1997); CS to negotiate “interactional power” and “statusful power” (Myers-Scotton, 1988); CS to produce or resist “symbolic domination” (Bolonyai, 2005; Gal, 1988; Heller, 1995); CS to engage in the act of “power-wielding”; CS as a means of “exclusion” (Callahan, 2004; Grosjean, 1982); CS as a means of “divergence” (Burt, 1992); CS as a means of “boundary maintenance: (Blommaert, 1992; Woolard, 1988); CS as a means of “elite closure” (Canagarajah, 1995; Myers-Scotton, 1990); CS for the assertion of “superiority”
As for the direction of the CS, Bhatt and Bolonyai present as follows,

The direction of the CS itself is not determined a priori and no language is assumed to confer power automatically. Rather, the formulation of the principle foregrounds that social agents switch strategically to the language that is best positioned to construct or index dominance, status, authority, social distance, and/or difference between self and other(s).

(2011:528)

Some examples from diverse social contexts are provided to illustrate the operation of POWER and I introduce one of them to show how the principle is empirically motivated. The excerpt in (1) (= (4) of Bhatt and Bolonyai, 2011) is from a casual conversation among Kashmiri (mother-tongue) Pandit family members, in New Delhi, India, where the languages involved are Hindi and English, the unmarked code of the interaction is Hindi, and English is the code of power and prestige. For this family, Kashmiri as the mother tongue of the family is used only for most intimate (solidarity) functions and the indexicality of the codes involved is stable and transparent.

\[(1)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{A: zamiin par aapka bhii hak hai} \\
& \quad \text{“You also have the (ancestral) right to that land”} \\
b. & \quad \text{B: are hameN kyaa karna hai zaraa si us zamiinka (1.0) tumhe cahiye kyaa} \\
& \quad \text{“What am I going to do with that little piece of land? Do you want it?”} \\
c. & \quad \text{A: mujhe nahiN cahiye but you should demand what is yours} \\
& \quad \text{“I don’t want (the land) . . .”} \\
d. & \quad \text{B: I am not interested, if you are, you do it}
\end{align*}
\]

In the data, in line (1c), speaker A switches from Hindi to English and Bhatt and Bolonyai explains this CS as an example indicating operation of POWER. According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, in this excerpt, speaker A in line (1c) performs the exercise of assertiveness and authority by the CS from Hindi to English. As to this CS of A, Speaker B in line (1d) also
switches from Hindi (in line 1b) to English to express distance in his response to speaker A’s suggestion (2011:529).

In addition to this example, Bhatt and Bolonyai add two more examples, one from the data of the Hungarian-American community and the other from Canagarajah’s (1995) study of Jaffna, Sri Lanka. With all these examples, they argue that the meta-principle of POWER works for CS to maximize symbolic dominance and/or social distance in relational practice.

4.3.2. Principle of Social Concurrence (SOLIDARITY)

PRINCIPLE OF SOCIAL CONCURRENCE (SOLIDARITY).
Social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize social affiliation and solidarity in relational practice. Actors switch to the language that is best positioned to index or create solidarity, affiliation, connection, intimacy and/or similarity between self and other(s).

Bhatt and Bolonyai argue that this meta-principle of SOLIDARITY works for social actors to select CS from the linguistic resources at their disposal if it enables them to maximize relational meanings of connection, inclusion, similarity, and intimacy. In addition, according to them, the direction of switch is to a language that people see as being best positioned to bring about the desired effects of SOLIDARITY (2011: 530).

Among the three examples provided, the following example, (2) (= (8) of Bhatt and Bolonyai, 2011), from the conversation between three multilingual Kashmiri speakers illustrates how SOLIDARITY is operational for CS to effect identity affiliation, that is, in-group solidarity.

(2) a. Si: What are the politicians doing about the migrant problem I would like to know  
b. F: They do nothing, they say “kashmiriyon ko pahle khud organize hona paRhega”  
   “They do nothing, they say ‘Kashmiris themselves have to first get organized’.”  
c. Si: Well, then  
d. K: organize hona pRhega, yahii to hamaarii problem hai  
   “will get organized, that is our problem”  
e. F: asyi kaasharan aas dohay yahay problem . . .
“We Kashmiris have always had this problem”

According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, the speakers in the data are discussing the plight of migrant Kashmiris (Hindi is shown in italics and Kashmiri is in boldface). They explain that the CS in (2b) animates the local politicians’ response to the Kashmiri migrant problem, indicated in the quoted material. Then the CS to Kahsmiri, the in-group language, by the same speaker in line (2e) is explained to present the community’s perspective on the historical problem in getting organized: the knowledge, and attitude, shared by all Kahsmiri of their inability to organize and speak up as a group. Thus, the CS to Kashmiri, the language of solidarity, serves the function of recalling shared knowledge and presenting perspective of the community on the issue and bring about maximization of affect and identity affiliation. (2011: 530)

The examples, one from Hungarian-English CS and the other from Myers-Scotton’s (1993) English-Swahili-Luo CS are presented by Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) to illustrate the use of CS as a resource for maximizing the relational impact of SOLIDARITY. The data from Korean-English bilinguals’ CS provided in the next chapters will show how the principle of SOLIDARITY works for the CS in another diasporic context.

4.3.3. Principle of Face Management (FACE)

PRINCIPLE OF FACE MANAGEMENT (FACE).
Social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize effective maintenance of “face” or public image of self in relation to others. Actors switch to a language that is best positioned to manage their interpersonal relations consistent with face needs of self and/or others (e.g. appreciation, tact, deference, respect positive or negative politeness).

In this principle of FACE, Bhatt and Bolonyai understand the concept of ‘face’ as Goffman (1967) defines, “an image of self-delineated in terms of approved social attributes – albeit an image that others may share” (Goffman, 1967:5) and suggest that face-work, both self-
oriented and other-oriented, reflect a dialogic face relationship between self and others. They assume that the most basic practice for face management is politeness as actions people take to minimize face threats in social interaction as Brown and Levinson (1987) defines.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), positive politeness is the use of language for positive face needs, such as signal appreciation, approval, liking, and connection, and negative politeness is the use of language for negative face needs, such as maintain distance, restraint, autonomy, and freedom from imposition. Among other studies on face, politeness is not considered simply about face threat avoidance. As Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) presents, it may involve other forms of face-work such as showing respect, honor, and dignity (Penman, 1990), considerateness (Goffnam, 1967), tact (Janny & Arndt, 1992), and deference or discernment (Ide, 1989). It may also display social appropriateness and “legitimate” or “correct” language use (Watts, 1999). In order to account for inter-community variation in face-work, Bhatt and Bolonyai adopt a more encompassing notion of politeness and argue that in bilingual interaction also, face management can be optimally accomplished through CS (2011: 532).

This meta-principle of FACE explains the following functions of CS reported by the literature on CS; bilinguals’ use of CS as a “deference strategy” (Heller, 1988); CS to avoid “risking loss of face” (Gumperz, 1982); CS “to preserve the face of the addressee” (Li, 1994); CS to mitigate or defuse a face threat (Gross, 2000; Heller 1988’ Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai 2001); CS to “dampen directness” (Gardner-Chloros & Finnis, 2003); CS to mitigate requests (Lipski, 1985; Zentella, 1997); CS to mark “dispreference” in face-threatening situations (Li & Milroy, 1995); CS to signal “shifting authorship” for less direct attacks (Stroud, 1998); CS to “attack a powerful addressee’s face “ (Gross, 2000). (Bhatt and Bolonyai, 2011:532)
One of the examples to show the operation of the meta-principle of FACE is from a family talk of a Kashmiri family living in New Delhi, India, as follows. (Hindi: normal font, Kashmiri: italicized, switched items in Hindi: bold)

(3) a. A: kyaa baj rahaa hai  
“What time is it (getting to be)?”
b. B: bas cay pinee ka waqt ho rahaa hai  
“Just getting to be the time to have tea.”
c. C: vuch aayas caay tyayTh  
“[referring to B] Look, he’s getting the urge to drink tea.”
d. D: mujhe bhii piini hai, main bana detii huN  
“I also want to drink (tea), I will make it.”
e. C: D vanyi chak vatshmatsayi, zaraa A ke liyee bhii paanii rakh degii  
“D, now that you are up, can you put some water (for tea) also for A?”
f. D: haaN  
“Yes (Okay).”

(= (11) in Bhatt and Bolonyai, 2011)

In this data, C is a parent of B and D, who are visiting home, and A is C’s housemaid, who has worked for many years. A speaks Hindi but does not know Kashmiri, while B and D speak predominantly Hindi and English and C uses predominantly Kashmiri and Hindi. The CS of C in (3e) is introduced as a case where FACE is operational. In the data, C speaks in Kashmiri in (3c) and continues using Kashmiri in (3e), but switches to Hindi when she needs to make an explicit request for D to also make tea for A—a face threatening act. Bhatt and Bolonyai explain that under the constraints of FACE, Speaker C code-switches to Hindi to maximize the maintenance of face. In addition, the strategy C chooses to minimize the face-threat is the creative use of positive politeness: the CS to Hindi enables her to manage positive face needs, showing considerateness and anticipating appreciation from Speaker A, while simultaneously displaying to her children (Speakers B and D) the strong social bond (solidarity) between herself and the maid. Thus, with the CS to Hindi in (3e), they argue, Speaker C is able to manage multiple face goals (2011:532).
This example and one more example from Hungarian-English CS are presented in Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) to illustrate the skillful use of CS as a “dialogic” tool in the management of multiple face needs and more examples from Korean-English CS will be provided in the dissertation to support the operation of FACE for bilinguals’ CS in various bilingual contexts.

4.3.4. Principle of Perspective Taking (PERSPECTIVE)

PRINCIPLE OF PERSPECTIVE TAKING (PERSPECTIVE).
Social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize perspectivity in interaction. Actors switch to a language that is best positioned to signal what is assumed to be currently salient point of view and socio-cognitive orientation in discourse.

According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, the central idea of this principle is that the expression of perspectivity is an omnipresent feature of effective communication whereby people foreground some aspect of the world from a particular vantage point and signal its salience discursively (Linell, 1998; MacWhinney, 2005; Slobin, 1996). By quoting MacWhinney’s idea (2005:1), Bhatt and Bolonyai suggest that making our current perspective and cognitive orientation prominent means ‘giving clear cues to our listeners about which perspectives they should assume and how they should move from one perspective to the next [so that] we maximize the extent to which they can share our perception and ideas’.

Based on this idea, they argue that the notion of perspective “refers to a set of interrelated discursive constructs such as Goffman’s (1979) footing and frame (Goffman, 1974), Bakhtin’s (1981) voice, Ochs’ (1992) stance, and Davies & Harre’s (1990). It also refers to conversational resources and functions that might mark perspective taking and shifting (pronouns, quotations, intertextuality, repetition, emphasis, discourse markers) (cf. Schiffrin, 2006)”. As a socio-pragmatic constraint on CS, the specific intuition of PERSPECTIVE is that participants’ perspective relevant to the discourse implicature must be profiled to achieve a
certain degree of salience within the discourse context. Therefore, CS is a mechanism of discourse profiling intended to discriminate between perspectives that are highly relevant and need to be foregrounded, and those that are not (2011: 533).

According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, there are three main functions of marking perspectivity through CS, that is, a) to focalize some aspect of reality relative to another (contrasting function), b) to construct various visions of reality simultaneously (multiplicity function), c) to bring alternative visions of reality into a common focus (leveling/neutralizing function). Among the functions of CS proposed in the previous studies on CS, they suggest, the following functions of CS are accommodated into PERSPECTIVE; CS as “quotation” (Auer, 1995; Koven, 2001; McClure & McClure, 1988); CS as “message qualification”, “reformulation”, “elaboration”, and “clarification” (Callahan, 2004; Gumperz, 1982; Lin, 1996); CS as “parenthetical remarks” and “off-stage” talk (Halmari & Smith, 1994); CS as “reiteration”, “repetition”, and “emphasis” (Callahan, 2004; Gumperz, 1982; Rindler-Schjerve, 1998); CS as shift of “key” and “tone” (Auer, 1995); CS as “sarcasm”, “irony”, and “parody” (Stroud, 2004; Woolard, 1988), CS as “role-shift” (Auer, 1995; Zentella, 1997); CS as “double voicing”, “bivalency”, “heteroglossia”, and “hybridity” (Bhatt, 2008; Rampton, 1995’ Woolard, 1999), “footing” (Auer, 1998; Zentella, 1997), and CS as a “contextualization cue” (Auer, 1995; Gumperz, 1982; Li, 1994), etc. As an example of CS under PERSPECTIVE, a narrative of an upper-middle class Kashmiri woman living in the Kashmiri community of New Delhi, India, is given in (4= (13) of Bhatt and Bolonyai, 2011), where English is in bold face, Kashmiri is italicized, and Hindi is in normal font.

(4) a. mai jab chotii Thii
    “when I was little”
Bhatt and Bolonyai explain that in the data, the woman is responding to a question, justifying why she did not speak Kashmiri to her three children when they were young. In her narrative, the woman starts her story of her past as a young married woman in Hindi and then switches to Kashmiri (4d) to align herself with her community’s attitudinal stance. Then, she switches to English noun phrase, “Kashmiri accent” (4d) as a direct quote—the voice of the others (non-Kashmiri speakers). This layered CS in (4d), Bhatt and Bolonyai argues, indicates the operation of PERSPECTIVE in that the CS from Hindi to Kashmiri enables an articulation of different ideological spaces within which different perspectives are brought into prominence, which is an important function of CS. In other words, the CS from Hindi to Kashmiri in (4d) enables the woman to switch from the perspective of a narrator to another perspective—the “role” of a mother—that allows her to articulate the linguistic mythologies that are shared by members of her Kashmiri diaspora community. According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, it is in this new perspective only that she can situate, and justify her linguistic actions of the past, embracing and incorporating another perspective almost simultaneously, made salient with a switch to English phrase, “Kashmiri accent”, the voice of the others (2011: 534).

The switch to English in (4e) is also considered a CS in perspective that involves a declaration of the speaker’s linguistic intentions/actions with a concomitant switch to English, which Bhatt and Bolonyai suggest is a highly valued commodity in the Kashmiri diaspora.
community and outside in New Delhi, India. Bhatt and Bolonyai indicate that the use of English in India generally indexes class ideologies. For example, the CS to English in (4e) indexes the speaker’s membership of the English-knowing bilingual (upper-) middle class while at the same time it ratifies her intentions using the medium (English) as the message (access to power/knowledge through the acquisition and use of English). The CS back to Hindi in (4f) is also considered a CS back to perspective of the narrator and end of her response.

In addition to this Kashmiri example, Bhatt and Bolonyai provide two more examples of PERSPECTIVE, one from Hungarian-American bilinguals’ conversation about their first experience in the US, and the other from Gardner-Chloros et al’s (2000) study on CS within a Sikh Punjabi community in West London. In these two examples, the CS occurs in order to ensure an optimal way of the discursive articulation of perspectivity, such as to contrast different voices, foreground different viewpoints, mark a change of footing, and point to a shift in the speaker’s perspective of events, etc., which Bhatt and Bolonyai argue are motivated by PERSPECTIVE. The Korean-English data given in the dissertation will be another example to support the operation of PERSPECTIVE.

4.3.5. Principle of Interpretive Faithfulness (FAITH)

PRINCIPLE OF INTERPRETIVE FAITHFULNESS (FAITH). Social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize informativity with respect to specificity of meaning and economy of expression. Actors code-switch to the language that more faithfully and economically captures the intended conceptual, semantic-pragmatic, often socio-culturally or ideologically grounded, meaning.

In Bhatt and Bolonyai’s framework, this principle is intended to ensure full, faithful, and parsimonious interpretation of communicative intentions and meanings. They suggest the base of this socio-cognitive principle is Gricean and neo-Gricean theories of meaning and intentionality (Gibbs, 1999; Grice, 1975; Levinson, 1995). In these theories, intentions have
cognitive and social character. In other words, “while they exist as subjective mental entities in the mind of individuals, their functions are social and become meaningful only as ‘part of the intersubjective quality of human experience’ (Gibbs, 1999:38)” (Bhatt and Bolonyai, 2011: 526).

Bhatt and Bolonyai argue that CS as a communicative practice constitutes an intentional action, which entails optimization in the creation/interpretation of meaning in, situated bilingual discourse. Thus, according to them, the actors code-switch if it allows them to maximize the conditions for meaning to be created and understood with greater specificity and economy of expression than it would be attainable through monolingual code. In other words, CS occurs when it is perceived as more sufficient or efficient to faithfully capture the intended meaning—“whether in terms of its lexico-conceptual content, semantic-pragmatic entailments, or social, cultural, historical, political or ideological inflections and/or indexicalities. Therefore, within the framework of Bhatt and Bolonyai’s Optimal Grammar, this principle of FAITH makes distinctiveness of meaning salient through CS (2011:526).

The functions of CS in the previous studies which can be subsumed under the meta-principle of FAITH are as follows; CS to convey “highly specific” cultural connotations (Backus, 2001); CS to capture the pragmatic force of an utterance through le mot juste (Gardner-Chloros, Charles & Cheshire, 2000; Myers-Scotton & Jake, 1995); CS to express the “cultural logic” of an act (Lin, 1996); CS for words that are culturally bound or belong to “a semantic domain that has strong associations with the embedded language” (Backus, 2001:48); CS for words which create aesthetic effects or “stylistic embroidery” (Callahan, 2004; Valdés-Fallis, 1976); CS for words which encode ideological meanings (Pfaff, 2001), “political and philosophical associations” (Davies, 2008) or religious invocations (Callahan, 2004). With cross-linguistic
and cross-cultural differences in connotational meanings, Bhatt and Bolonyai claim that CS motivated by FAITH should be found frequently in bilingual practices.

One of the examples given by Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) for a case of CS motivated by FAITH is the following portion of article in (5 = (1) of Bhatt and Bolonyai, 2011), which is from an English daily newspaper in India (The italics indicates the language switched to .)

(5) There have been several analyses of this phenomenon. First, there is the “religious angle” which is to do with Indian society. In India a man feels guilty when fantasising about another man’s wife, unlike in the west. The saat pheras (“seven circumnavigations”) around the agni (“fire”) serves as a lakshman rekha (“line one doesn’t cross”)

According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, the Hindi expressions in the data are rooted in Vedas, the most important historical narratives and the Ramayana, the great Hindu epic of India. Thus, without knowledge of the Sanskrit Vedic traditions and cultural-historical literacy of the indigenous people, the reader cannot fully understand the text in the data. In the data, the Hindu word saat pheraas refers to the ritual in which the bride and the groom walk around the fire together, pledging commitment to each other for seven births. agni is the sacred fire in the wedding ritual, in which fire is believed to be the messenger who operates on behalf of the wedding couple to take the prayers of the people to the gods in heaven and bring back their blessings to the people. lakshmana rekha refers to the line of protection drawn by Lakshmana (in the epic Ramayana) around Sita’s hut to protect her from dangers of the external world. In Ramayana, Maricha, the demon transformed himself into a deer and disguised his voice as Rama’s and called for Lakshmana’s help to lure Lakshmana away from Sita and give an opportunity to Ravana to approach Sita, who would be left unprotected. Lakshmana, however, draws a line around the hut and tells Sita not to cross it lest she will encounter danger. Thus, the Hindu phrase, lakshmana rehka (literally, ‘a line’) has become a symbol of protection, and
transgressing it has acquired the meaning of allowing undesirable results to occur (Bhatt, 2008: 185).

Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) explain that the CS to Hindi in the data serves as vehicles of cultural memory, as is shown in the preceding paragraph, as far as their significations are concerned—recalling within the global, the local-cultural practices of the past. According to them, it is the orientation to socio-cultural faithfulness that precipitates the CS to Hindi and renders it as the optimal linguistic choice that, unlike English, can produce an immediate, authentic, and particularized interpretation of meaning among the Hindi-English bilingual readership of the newspaper (2011:526). They also argue that the alternative choice, monolingual English would bleach the cultural context in which the textual meaning is situated, leading to an altered reading that does not have any intertextual meaning that CS here entails (2011:527).

With the example given in (5) and two more examples are provided to illustrate FAITH, one from a context of a Hungarian immigrant community in North Carolina and the other from Auer's (1998) data, a conversation between five Spanish-German bilinguals in Hamburg. With these examples, Bhatt and Bolonyai suggest that CS for cultural specificity, conceptual accuracy, and immediacy of socio-cultural meaning is favored by FAITH within their framework of OPTIMIZATION. In the next section, I will introduce how these five principles work in the framework of OPTIMIZATION.

4.4. How the System of OPTIMIZATION Works

Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) suggest that the five socio-cognitive principles mentioned above are non-categorical constraints, some of them are defeasible in appropriate contexts, and a particular rank of these principles is essentially the socio-cognitive grammar of CS of a
community. They also claim that these five principles encode the linguistically significant generalization that CS is constrained, systematic, and predictable and thereby can be understood as operations of a sociolinguistic grammar of a multilingual community. With this understanding of the five principles and a sociolinguistic grammar, Bhatt and Bolonyai argue that the principles are considered “universal constraints over contextually appropriate code-switches (2011:535).

As for the possibility of empirical conflicts between the principles of the bilingual grammar, such as conflict between POWER and SOLIDARITY, and the resolution that the bilingual grammar can provide, Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) adopt Prince and Smolensky’s (2004) Optimality Theoretic framework (OT). Specifically, Bhatt and Bolonyai adopt the insights, terminology, and methodological procedure of OT, and extend it to the socio-pragmatic domain of CS. Thus, following the logic of OT, they assume that the constraints are violable and in potential conflict with each other. With basis on this assumption, Bhatt and Bolonyai hypothesize that a “particular” bilingual grammar is a set of hierarchically ranked conflicting universal constraints. In addition, they hypothesize that community patterns of CS may differ from each other in terms of how respective grammars rank the set of violable constraints. (2011:535).

For the constraint-rankings of individual community grammars, Bhatt and Bolonyai hypothesize that all constraints are presumed to be unranked with respect to each other. Therefore, they argue that where a CS involves two potentially conflicting constraints, the hierarchy of the constraints for a particular bilingual grammar is built recursively until a point in the data set is reached where no counter-evidence to the grammar appears¹. For example, in

¹ For the precise method of establishing the rankings of the grammars of the two communities in question, Bhatt and Bolonyai suggest that the ranking of the competing, often conflicting constraints is empirically driven and
Kashmiri data (1), where a CS involves two potentially conflicting constraints, POWER (CS to English) and SOLIDARITY (CS to Kashmiri), the CS to English for POWER (assertiveness) violates SOLIDARITY and this CS gives an empirical evidence to Bhatt and Bolonyai’s hypothesis that POWER outranks SOLIDARITY in the multi-lingual grammar of Kashmiri multilinguals (2011:535). Similarly, in the data (5), the CS to Hindi violates POWER, but assures FAITH, which provides an evidence of the ranking between POWER and FAITH that FAITH outranks POWER that outranks SOLIDARITY. This is an example of how to build the rank of constraints recursively for a particular bilingual grammar (2011:536).

The important standard theoretical assumption that Bhatt and Bolonyai make in the establishment of a sociolinguistic grammar based on the rank of constraints is that the constraint rankings for a particular community are stable, not changeable across different contexts of situations (2011:536). According to them, the grammar allows speakers to alternately code-switch to express POWER or SOLIDARITY not because the ranking between the two constraints are changeable, but due to the interaction of some other, higher-ranked, constraint with them.

---

proceeds algorithmically in the following way:

(i) Assume as an initial hypothesis that all constraints (say, C1–C5) are unranked in terms of each other.

(ii) Compare the interaction of relevant constraints (C1, C2 and C3) on any given linguistic data of code-switching (since not all, only some, constraints are in conflict with each other) and demote the constraints C2 and C3 vis-à-vis C1 if that data violates C2 and C3 but satisfies C1–C4 and C5 are not relevant in this data.

(iii) Next, compare the interaction of constraints C2–C3 for other piece(s) of linguistic data of code-switching since both of these constraints are relevant – demote C3 vis-à-vis C2 if the data violate C3 but satisfy C2; so far the constraint demotion algorithm we have used has come up with the following ranking for the data: C1 _ (immediately dominates) C2_ (which immediately dominates) C3.

(iv) Similarly, now compare the interaction of C4 and C2 for other linguistic data, and demote C2 below C4 if the data violates C2 but satisfies C4. Compare also the interaction of C5 and C2 and demote C2 below C5 if the linguistic data violates C2 but satisfies C5. So, the grammar at this point is C1, C4, C5>> C2>> C3. In other words, this grammar discriminates along three levels of domination,

(v) Next, look for linguistic data of code-switching that shows interaction of C1, C4, and C5. If there is an interaction, we proceed as above, but if there is no interaction, we leave the three constraints as unranked with respect to each other. This is precisely the ranking pattern (grammar) we find for Kashmiri–Hindi–English code-switching ([FAITH, PERSP, FACE]>> POWER >> SOLID).

(vi) Finally, comb the data of code-switching to look for apparent violations of the ranked grammar we have established. If in our data we do not find any violations of the ranking pattern, the constraint-demotion-algorithm–methodology is stopped. What this suggests to us is that this ranked-constraint grammar is uniformly observed in the community. (2011:536)
With these assumptions, they argue that the patterns of CS they investigated emerge from the interaction and optimal satisfaction of these universal constraints.

Bhatt and Bolonyai have made some adjustments of the OT framework to express accounts of bilingual behavior as is schematized in the following Figure 1.

\[
\text{Input:} \quad \text{Candidate set:} \quad a \quad b \quad c \quad d \quad e \quad \ldots
\]

\[
\text{Optimal output:} \quad o
\]

\[Lex(L_1), \quad Lex(L_2) = \text{lexicon of a language}; \quad \text{GEN} = \text{Generator function}; \quad a, \quad b, \quad c, \quad d, \quad \ldots = \text{competing input candidates}; \quad \text{EVAL} = \text{Evaluator function}; \quad \text{CON} = \text{set of universal constraints on code-switching}; \quad o = \text{output}\]

Figure 1. An Optimality-Theoretic Model of Bilingual Grammar

The figure indicates an Optimality-theoretic model of bilingual grammar, in which the “input, \((L_1, \quad L_2)\) (linguistic items with equivalent translation) is drawn from the lexicons of each of the two languages, \(Lex(L_1)\) and \(Lex(L_2)\), and serve as input to the function GEN (Generator). And the function GEN mixes the given linguistic items in all possible ordered arrangements and generate a candidate set of potential outputs, \(a, \quad b, \quad c, \quad d, \quad e\ldots\) (surface structures). All these
potential outputs are subject to the function EVAL (evaluator), a set of language-pair specific ranked constraints used to evaluate, that selects the optimal (i.e. the most appropriate in the context) output from the competing candidate outputs of GEN with the help of the function CON, a set of universal constraints on CS, that feeds into the function EVAL.

With this adjustment of Optimality Theory (hereafter OT, Prince and Smolensky 2004), Bhatt and Bolonyai use the following notations from the convention of OT to explain the ranking and choice of optimal options among possible candidates of language choice for a bilingual grammar;

i) \{x, y, z\} : universal constraints

ii) \{x >> y, y>>z, x>>z\} : ranking between \{x\}, \{y\}, \{z\}, x dominates y, which in turn dominates z

iii) *! : violates the highest ranking constraint

iv) ☞ : choose candidate as the optimal, grammatical option.

Tableau 1. Output = cand_2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. cand_1</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☞ b. cand_2</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tableau 2. Output = cand_1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☞ a. cand_1</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. cand_2</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this adjusted system of OT, Tableau 1 and 2 illustrate the process of choosing an optimal output between two competing candidates, \( cand_1 \) and \( cand_2 \), for a certain input of two different bilingual grammars of CS, Grammar A (hypothetically Hindi-English CS) and Grammar B (hypothetically Hungarian-English CS). These two grammars have three universal constraints \{x, y, z\} and each grammar has different ranking of constraints; for Grammar A, the ranking is \( x \gg y \gg z \), and for Grammar B, the ranking is \( y \gg x \gg z \). According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, candidates are evaluated algorithmically from left to right in the tableau for the highest-ranking constraint to the lowest-ranking. Thus, in the Tableau 1, which shows Grammar A’s choice of the optimal candidate among the output candidates, \( cand_1 \) violates the highest-ranking constraint \{x\}, is evaluated as “contextually least preferred”, which is marked by “*!”. Therefore, Grammar A chooses \( cand_2 \) as the optimal choice, which is marked by the symbol ☞ (The shaded cells in the tableaux indicate that the output of the constraints do not affect the choice of the optimal candidate.).

On the other hand, Tableau 2 displays Grammar B’s choice of the optimal candidate among the output candidates. As is assumed above, Grammar B has a different ranking of the same universal constraints, \{x, y, z\}, compared to Grammar A, that is, \( y \gg x \gg z \). Thus, in the tableau, between the same two competing candidate output for the same input as in Grammar A, that is, \( cand_1 \) and \( cand_2 \), the optimal output is \( cand_1 \). In Grammar B, \( cand_2 \) violates \{y\}, the highest ranked constraint, and is evaluated as less preferred (Bhatt and Bolonyai 2011:537).

With this empirical basis of theoretical assumptions in their socio-cognitive model of CS, Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) summarize their theoretical framework as follows;

All possible code-switched output representations for a given bilingual input are examined by a set of (violable) ranked constraints, which evaluate their contextual appropriateness. The
optimal, harmonic, code-switched output representation is the one that has the least serious constraint violations, i.e. violations of constraints ranked lower in the hierarchy. (2011: 537)

To better understand how the system of Bhatt and Bolonyai’s OPTIMIZATION, the Optimal Grammar of Kashmiri-Hindi-English CS suggested by them will be introduced in the next section.

4.5. Optimal Bilingual Grammar: Kashmiri-Hindi-English CS

Bhatt and Bolonyai hypothesize the ranking of the five constraints for the grammar of Hindi-Kashmiri-English CS as follows,

{(6) Hindi-Kashmiri-English constraint ranking (= (16) of Bhatt and Bolonyai, 2011:537)

{FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE} >> POWER >> SOLIDARITY

In the given rank in (6), FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE are not ranked each other, which is indicated in the tableaux as a dotted vertical line between them and which Bhatt and Bolonyai argue means that these three constraints, FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE, are not in conflict with each other here. In addition, these three constraints outrank the other two constraints, POWER and SOLIDARITY, where there is a conflict and POWER outranks SOLIDARITY (2011: 537)

As an empirical data that demonstrate the interaction of POWER and SOLIDARITY, the following excerpt from (1) is given (= (4) of Bhatt and Bolonyai, 2011:537).

(1)

c. A: mujhe nahiN cahiye but you should demand what is yours
   “I don’t want (the land) . . .”

d. B: I am not interested, if you are, you do it
Tableau 3. Interaction of POWER and SOLID (POWER >> SOLID)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. mujhe nahiiN chaiye, <em>but you should demand what is yours</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. mujhe nahiiN chaiye, magar tohyi gasyi panun hakh mangun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is shown in Tableau 3, CS from Hindi to English in (1c, (a) in the tableau), which is interpreted to express assertiveness and authority in 3.3.1, violates SOLIDARITY because English indexes power. None of the other constraints is involved in this interaction. In other words, there is no difference between the two competing candidates, (a) and (b), relating to these three constraints. However, as for the candidate of (b), CS to Kashmiri, there is a violation of POWER because Kashmiri indexes solidarity. Thus, (b) violates the higher-ranked constraint and is marked by (*!). Therefore, in this interaction of POWER and SOLIDARITY, (a) is evaluated to be the optimal candidate in Tableau 3 by virtue of candidate (b)’s violation of the higher-ranked constraint, POWER.

As an empirical data for the interaction of FAITH and POWER, the following CS from English to Hindi excerpted from (5) is given.

(5) The saat pheras around the agni serves as a lakshman rekha
    “The seven circumnavigations around the fire serves as a line one doesn’t cross”

In this sentence, the CS from English to Hindi satisfies FAITH, but violates POWER because the CS is not to the language of power, English. According to Bhatt and Bolonyai’s hypothesis on the bilingual grammar of Hindi-English CS, FAITH outranks POWER. Thus, as is shown in Tableau 4, CS to Hindi for FAITH of (a) is a better output candidate than the monolingual
candidate of (b) and considered the optimal choice because (b) violates the higher-ranked constraint, FAITH while (a) violates the lower-ranked constraint, POWER\(^2\) (2011:538).

Tableau 4. Interaction of FAITH and POWER (FAITH>>POWER)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The <em>saat pheras</em> around <em>agni</em> serves as a <em>lakshman rekha</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The seven circumnavigations around <em>agni</em> serve as the line (one never crosses)</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the next step, the interaction of PERSPECTIVE and POWER is considered to verify the hypothesis about the rank between these constraints. The next data is given in (2 = (8) of Bhatt and Bolonyai, 2011) to prove it. In the data, three multilingual Kashmiri speakers are discussing the plight of migrant Kashmiris (in the data, Hindi is shown in italics and Kashmiri is in boldface). According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, F’s CS from English to Hindi in the quoted

\(^2\) For a reviewer’s question about a case where there is no CS even with a possibility, for example, where a word of matrix language is used instead of a more ‘interpretively faithful’ embedded language, Bhatt and Bolonyai answer that it can be explained within the parameters of their model; a violation of FAITH will result in a sub-optimal output. According to them, as a clear explication of how this system works, the example in (1) has three items that are switched, *saat pheras, agni, and lakshman rekha*. Thus, there could be conceivably at least four options here, where the last option shows no switch:

(i) a. The *saat pheras* around *agni* serves as the *lakshman rekha*.
   b. *The seven circumnavigations around agni* serves as the *lakshman rekha*.
   c. ??*The seven circumnavigations around fire* serves as the *lakshman rekha*.
   d. ???*The seven circumnavigations around fire* serves as the line one does not cross.

Among these options, (ia) is maximally faithful, option (ib) violates FAITH once (indicated by ?), (ic) violates FAITH twice (indicated by ??), and (id), the monolingual option, violates FAITH thrice (indicated by ???). Thus, according to Bhatt and Bolonyai’s explanation, in this scenario, we see how each violation of FAITH degrades, renders sub-optimal, the candidate options available to the bilingual speaker – so the maximally switched option (ia) is the best option and the monolingual option (id) is the worst according to the prediction of their model.

(2011: 538-9)
material of (2b) animated the local politicians’ response to the Kashmiri migrant problem. On the other hand, F’s CS to Kashmiris as the in-group language in (2e) is interpreted to “present the community’s perspective on the historical problem in getting organized: the knowledge and attitude shared by all Kashmiris of their inability to organize and speak up as a group” (2011:530). In this data, F’s CS to Hindi in the quoted part of (2b) is for F’s perspective change from the narrator to the character voice under PERSPECTIVE. However, the CS to Hindi violates POWER. Thus, the interaction of PERSPECTIVE and POWER yields the right results for the given data (2b).

(2) a. Si: What are the politicians doing about the migrant problem I would like to know
   b. F: They do nothing, they say “kashmiriyon ko pahle khud organize hona pāRhegaa”
      “They do nothing, they say ‘Kashmiris themselves have to first get organized’.”
   c. Si: Well, then
   d. K: organize hona pRhegaa, yahii to hamaarii problem hai
      “will get organized, that is our problem”
   e. F: asyī kaasharan aas dohay yahay problem . . .
      “We Kashmiris have always had this problem”

The Tableau 5 shows why the bilingual candidate (a) is the optimal choice compared to the monolingual candidate (b); FAITH and FACE cannot make any difference between the two candidates and as for PERSPECTIVE, (b) violates it; for the next two constraint, POWER and SOLIDARITY, (a) violates POWER. According to the hypothesis, PERSPECTIVE outranks POWER and (b)’s violation of PERSPECTIVE is evaluated as more serious than (a)’s violation of POWER. Thus, (a) is chosen as the optimal candidate.

Tableau 5. Interaction of PERSP and POWER (PERSP>>POWER)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. They do nothing, they say “kashmiriyon ko pahle khud organize hona pāRhegaa”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. They do nothing, they say “Kashmiris should first themselves get organized”</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, there is one more step to verify the hypothesis about the rank of five principles of the Optimal Bilingual Grammar of Kashmiri-Hindi-English CS given above; the interaction of FACE with POWER and SOLIDARITY. The following data is given in (7= (5) of Bhatt and Bolonyai, 2011) as an example to show this interaction. According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, in the data, speaker C speaking in Hindi has two linguistic choices available to him for CS in (7d), CS to Kashmiri or CS to English, and he chooses CS to English to distance himself, *qua* POWER, from the future request for money, a face-threatening act (2011:529). Thus, CS in (7d) is necessitated under FACE. There are three options for the speaker C in this CS: CS to English, the language of power, CS to Kashmiri, the language of solidarity, and no CS to either language, that is, the monolingual Hindi, as is shown in Tableau 6.

(7) a. A: . . . jeb mein paisa honaa chahiye
   “You need to have money in your pocket.”
   [. . .]
b. C: are, aisaa kuch nahiN hai
   “Oh, it’s nothing like that.”
c. B: kyuN, aap bina paisoN ke apnaa kaam caletO ho
   “Why, are you getting through life without money?”
d. C: mujhe paise kii kabhi zarurat paRhegii, *I will ask B*
   “When/If I ever need money, I will ask B.”

Tableau 6. Interaction of FACE, POWER and SOLID (FACE>>POWER>>SOLID)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. mujhe paise ki kabhi zarurat paRhegii, <em>I will ask B</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. mujhe paise ki kabhii zarurat paRhegii, <em>ba pratsh B-as</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. mujhe paise ki kabhii zarurat paRhegii, main B-se maang luluNgaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 6, the CS to English in (a) violates SOLIDARITY, the CS to Kashmiri in (b) violates POWER, and the monolingual Hindi in (c) violates FACE, one of the highest constraints in the hypothesis about the ranking of constraints of the Optimal Bilingual Grammar.
of Kashmiri-Hindi-English CS. Thus, based on the logic of optimality, candidate (a) is evaluated to be the optimal candidate- with the least serious violation- over candidate (b) and (c) (2011:540).

With this empirical data for an Optimal bilingual grammar of Kashmiri-Hindi-English CS and the empirical data for an Optimal bilingual grammar of Hungarian-English CS, Bhatt and Bolongyai (2011) demonstrate how an optimal bilingual grammar can give the empirical generalizations with a set of potentially conflicting ranked constraints. As a result, they claim that a particular bilingual grammar is a set of ranked constraints which exhibit different rankings in different bilingual grammars. Furthermore, they argue that the different rankings of the different bilingual grammars account for the different CS patterns that each bilingual grammar has.

In conclusion, considering common functions of code-switching as bilinguals’ linguistic practice found in different bi-/multi-lingual communities in the globalizing world, Bhatt and Bolonyai’s socio-cognitive model premised on the theoretical assumption of OPTIMIZATION would to be an ‘optimal’ theoretical framework for a study of CS (code-switching) as bilinguals’ linguistic choices in their interaction. Therefore, I adopt Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) theoretical framework of OPTIMIZATION as the main theoretical framework of this dissertation to explore the systematicities that underlie KHS and KESA’s CS in their bilingual interaction, which will provide the bilingual grammar of Korean-English bilinguals’ linguistic choices in the US.
Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter provides an overview of the research questions that are explored in this dissertation and the methodology that is applied to the investigation of these research questions. As for the methodology, with a methodological concern regarding the validity of the data and its analysis, I discuss the type of data collected. I will discuss the ways in which they were collected and coded for the analysis to build up a bilingual grammar of KHS’s linguistic choice. In addition, I will present the ethnographic information of the subjects involved in the data in order to provide a better understanding of the data analysis.

1. Research Questions

The goal of the research performed in this dissertation is to explore the nature of the sociolinguistic grammar of the bilingual language use through a qualitative study of Korean-English bilinguals’ linguistic choices. In order to achieve this goal, this dissertation examines the systematicities that underlie the linguistic choices of Korean-English bilinguals in the US, KHS and KESA, with a focus on KHS. Through the examination of the systematic linguistic choices of KHS and KESA, a sociolinguistic bilingual grammar is explored for each group of KHS and KESA within the theoretical framework of OPTIMIZATION presented by Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011). By supporting the explanatory power of the five universal principles of Code-switching (hereafter CS), FAITH, SOLIDARITY, POWER, FACE, PERSPECTIVE, postulated by Bhatt and Bolonyai’s Optimal Grammar with a case study of Korean-English bilinguals in the US, this dissertation will contribute to researches on sociolinguistic grammars of bi-/multi-linguals’ CS in various global and bi-/multi-lingual contexts. In other words, this dissertation will shed a light on a study to explore universal principles of sociolinguistic bilingual grammars.
to explain numerous functions of CS suggested by many sociolinguistic studies of CS. Furthermore, this dissertation investigates whether the bilingual grammar of KHS is different from that of KESA or not, if different, what makes the difference of the bilingual grammars of KHS and KESA, and finally if KHS and KESA interact with each other, which grammar comes over in their interaction.

Following Bhatt and Bolonyai’s claim that different communities of practice have different grammar of linguistic practices, the basic assumption of this dissertation is that each group of Korean-English bilinguuals has their own particular socio-cognitive grammar of bilingual interaction, which is different from the grammar of the other group. With this assumption, the major research questions of this dissertation are provided as follows.

1. What are the systematicities that underlie/govern the Korean Heritage Students’ (KHS) linguistic choices, CS, in the natural discourse with other KHS?

2. What are the systematicities that underlie/govern the Korean Early Study Abroad’s (KESA) linguistic choices, CS, in the natural conversations with other KESA?

3. Given the difference in bilingual dominance between the two groups—KESA, Korean dominant, and KHS, English dominant—what specific adjustments, if any, are made in the respective grammars of the two groups when interacting with each other? In other words, how stable are these grammars; whether, and to what extent, are the grammars in flux; and to what extent does audience matter in the grammatical design?
These three major research questions will be investigated with the following specific questions to explore the specific data related with each major question based on the five socio-cognitive principles proposed in Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011).

1-1. Are there KHS’s systematic CS operated by FAITH?
1-2. Are there KHS’s systematic CS operated by PERSPECTIVE?
1-3. Are there KHS’s systematic CS operated by FACE?
1-4. Are there KHS’s systematic CS operated by SOLIDARITY?
1-5. Are there KHS’s systematic CS operated by POWER?
1-6. Are there KHS’s systematic CS operated by none of the above?
1-7. What is the ranking of the principles that underlie KHS’s CS?

2-1. Are there KESA’s systematic CS operated by FAITH?
2-2. Are there KESA’s systematic CS operated by PERSPECTIVE?
2-3. Are there KESA’s systematic CS operated by FACE?
2-4. Are there KESA’s systematic CS operated by POWER?
2-5. Are there KESA’s systematic CS operated by SOLIDARITY?
2-7. Are there KESA’s systematic CS operated by none of the above?
2-6. What is the ranking of the principles that underlie KESA’s CS?

3-1. In the interaction between KHS and KESA, is there any conflict between CSs of each group, for example, one switches to a language for solidarity but the other switches to the same language for power?
3-2. If there is conflict of the grammar of each group, in what way is it adjusted in the interaction?

3-3. How can this kind of adjustment of two different bilingual grammars be explained within the theoretical framework of OPTIMIZATION?

The answers to these questions will not only help us to better understand the systematicities of Korean-English bilinguals’ linguistic choices in their bilingual interaction, but will provide us some insight into the extension of Bhatt and Bolonyai’s Optimal Grammar of bilingual language use to the case of bilingual interaction between the bilinguals from different communities of practice.

2. Data

The most important feature of the data to answer the research questions given in the preceding section is the naturalness of the discourse that the subjects were interacted in. Three sets of data were collected from arranged discourse settings where some subjects were asked to talk with each other about some topics related to their bi-cultural experience in the US and the interviewer who is a friend of them informally interviewed others. The first set of data was collected from the groups of KHS to find out the systematicities of KHS’s linguistic choices in their interaction with their own group members. The data are video-recordings of KHS students’ natural discourse where two to four KHS students are talking about their cultural preference or non-preference to the two cultures that they are involved in and in a style of chat.

---

3 The only reason for recording the discourses of the data in video clips is to transcribe the contents of the data exactly. The video clips will not be open to public and the subjects of the data will not be identified.
or of informal interview led by the interviewing friend. The total number of 14 video-recordings of data was collected for KHS’ linguistic choices among their own group members of KHS; 8 recordings are styles of informal interview and 6 are styles of chat.

The second set of data collected from the groups of KESA to find out the systematicities of KESA’s linguistic choices in their interaction with their own group members. This data includes two video-recordings of KESA’s natural discourse where two to three KESA students are talking about their cultural preference and identity recognition among their experiences in the US. In addition to this data, the data of Lee, Y. (2007) was also used to figure out a sociolinguistic grammar of KESA’s CS and compare it with KHS’s. And the final set of data is two video-recordings of KHS and KESA’s interaction with each other. One recording is an informal interview where a KHS was informally interviewed by a KESA and talking about their cultural experience and identity recognition in the US. The other is a natural conversation where a KHS and KESA were freely talking about their bi-cultural experiences in the US.

In the following sub-sections, the procedure of data collection for each data set, such as who are the subjects and how they are recruited, what are the contents of the data, and how they were collected, will be provided.

2.1. Subjects

In order to understand what comprises the sociolinguistic grammar of bilinguals’ language practice, we should figure out the ethnographic background of the bilinguals, which could provide the basis of understanding the sociolinguistic grammars of the Korean-English bilinguals, KHS and KESA, who have the same ethnicity, Korean, but who belong to socio-culturally different communities of practice.
2.1.1. Ethnographic Background of Korean Heritage Students (KHS)

Korean Heritage Students (KHS) are Korean students who were born in the US or immigrated to the US with their family when they were infants or preschooler and have spent all their school life in the US. They are members of Korean immigrant society, which has been established as one of the biggest Asian immigrant communities with a long immigrating history in the US. Unlike the first generation of Korean immigrant who used to live in socio-economically poor conditions, KHS, who are known as the second generation of Korean Americans, have been raised in a socio-economically good condition.

While they are raised in a Korean immigrant society, KHS have recognized themselves as Asian-Americans with Korean ethnicity and felt more comfortable in American culture than in Korean. English is their first language and Korean is their heritage language that they have acquired not only from their parents and grandparents at home but also from a Korean school, which they could attend during the weekends. So, their fluency of Korean is various depending on their family background as well as their motivations and efforts to learn the language. In the past, there were many KHS whose fluency of the Korean language was very low. Most of them had an English accent in their Korean which was sometimes mocked by Korean people in Korea and which made them feel more different from Korean people in Korea.

However, with the acceleration of globalization through the development of technology, KHS also have as many chances to experience Korean culture in various technological online. Yet, in general, they have less chance to visit Korea than KESA and thereby less chance to experience Korean culture in reality. So, they are considered to have more competence in English and American culture and less competence in Korean language and culture than KESA.
This ethnographic background of KHS should also have influence on their linguistic choices in their interactions with their own group members and/or with other people in the US.

2.1.2. Ethnographic Background of Korean Early Study Abroad (KESA)

Along with the spread of globalization to local areas of the world, the local people of developing countries have recognized the power of English in the contexts of globalization. South Korea is one of the countries where English has been considered as ‘symbolic capital’ (Bourdieu 1991) everywhere including schools and job markets as well as political and economic contexts. The increasing number of Korean Early Study Abroad (KESA) students since 1990s (Korean Educational Development Center, 2008) reflect Korean people’s recognition of the power of English in the globalizing world.

Ahn (2009) considers the trend of KESA as the transnational educational exodus for enhancing educational human capital and KESA families trying to escape the neo-liberal educational environment of uncertainty in South Korea by sending their children to English-speaking countries to “obtain particular advantages, such as the acquisition of English or credentials from foreign educational institutions”.

This trend of KESA has historical background related to the history of English in Korea. According to Flattery (2007:2), English has had a variety of functions in Korean society over the last century, and its development since the Korean War has been mainly the result of international trade, particularly with the US. According to Flattery (2007), since the Korean War, English has been used a lot in South Korea because of the politically and economically close relationship with the US. Thus, the proficiency of English has been associated with
middle class and cosmopolitan values and considered as a way to the opportunity to achieve social prestige and economic success (Collins 2005:423-424).

Since the 1988 Olympics, the Korean government has eagerly associated English with globalization, or Segyehwa in Korean. The Korean government began to promote the education of English as a tool for a successful international trade at a governmental level and the capital to succeed in the job market at a personal level in the increasingly globalizing world. In addition, as Lee (2004, 2006) suggests, the use of English in Korea has been culturally more and more involved in the Korean youth culture with values against traditional Korean cultures. According to Lee (2004, 2006), the English language use in pop-cultures, such as TV-commercials and K-pop music, is associated with representations of Korean Youth and addresses kinds of English used for young artists’ expression of group identity and resistance against mainstream norms and values (2004:430).

As a result, English has been taught and studied in various ways in South Korea privately as well as publically with the increasing recognition of the importance of English proficiency mentioned above. The people with better English proficiency are preferred in the job market, the government encourages learning English, and the idea of modernization is related to the use of English in the Korean youth culture. Therefore, children start learning English in their 3rd grade and continue to learn it till they graduate college not only through their public educational curriculum but also through their private lessons.

However, even with these continuous public and private learning of English through their school life, it is not easy for Korean students to acquire a good fluency of English, the measurement of which is based on the norms of the Standard English spoken in the US and the UK. As a result, Korean parents, who are eager to provide their children with a good fluency of
English as valuable capital for their success in the increasingly globalizing world, decide to send their children to an English speaking country, such as the US, the UK, Canada, or some countries in the South East Asia. The Korean parents want their children to study in one of those countries speaking English as a native language before their critical age of language acquisition ends, even with a hardship of their family separation called “goose family”.

With this socio-cultural background of Korea, the focus group of KESA recruited for the dissertation came to the US or Canada at their age of 10 to 13, which could be considered as “critical age” for language acquisition and they continued studying there till they entered a college. Therefore, they are competent in both Korean and English. As for their socio-economic conditions, even with some difference in the degree of status, most KESA students of this group belong to the middle class of Korean society (Ahn 2009). Their parents’ passionate attitudes toward their education cover their insufficient economic conditions. Thus, they have their parents’ best support enough to enter a good-ranked university in the US.

While they were studying abroad, KESA have visited their family in Korea regularly once or twice a year during the vacations and kept in continuous contacts with their friends and relatives in Korea through various technological ways of communication as well as by their regular visits. In addition, the advanced technological ways of communication, such as emails, smart or internet phones, or various websites for social network, can deliver them current news and entertainments occurring and performed in their home country, South Korea. Thus, they could catch the changing aspects of their culture and language and keep up with the current Korean culture and language use in Korea. At the same time, however, KESA also understand American culture pretty well and sometimes feel more comfortable in American culture than in
Korean. Nevertheless, still they recognize themselves as Korean and appear to have Korean cultural value in their relationship with other people.

This ethnographic background of KESA who are competent in both Korean and English language and culture should have influence on their linguistic choices to construct their various identities in their frequent transnational movement.

2.1.3. Recruitment of Subjects

The researcher recruited the subjects of the data for the research through some KHS (Korean Heritage Students) and KESA (Korean Early Study Abroad) students that the researcher knows in person. Nine students of KHS were recruited by a male KHS through his personal relationship with them and three students of KHS were recruited by a female KHS among her classmates of the college. Thus, the total number of 14 KHS students was involved in the KHS data. As for KESA data, the researcher recruited four KESA students among the KESA students who were attending the same college and the same Korean church that the researcher is attending. The researcher’s daughter recruited two KESA students, all of whom were attending the UC, Berkeley, CA. However, it is noted that the researcher’s daughter was not involved in the data. Thus, the total number of six KESA students was involved in the KESA data. Finally, as for the data for the KHS and KESA interaction, one KESA student was recruited by one of the KESA subjects and one KHS student was recruited by one of the KESA subjects.
2.1.4. Ethnographic information of the subjects recruited

The information of each subject’s ethnographic background is provided in the following tables. Each subject’s competence of each language is calculated by subjects themselves based on the self-proficiency test form given in the appendix, where four skills of language proficiency, speaking, listening, reading and writing, are evaluated by the subjects themselves with questionnaires about each skill with 5 scales (1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest). The average score of the whole questionnaires about four skills estimated each subject’s proficiency of Korean and English.

(8) Individual information about subjects

Table 7. KHS data 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>US arrival</th>
<th>Family residence</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Cultural identity recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. KHS data 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>US arrival</th>
<th>Family residence</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Cultural identity recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E(4.5) ≥ K(4)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More Korean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tableau 9. KHS data 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>US arrival</th>
<th>Family residence</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Cultural Identity recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tableau 10. KHS data 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>US arrival</th>
<th>Family residence</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Cultural Identity recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(4) ≥ K(3.5)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(4.5) ≥ K(4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More Korean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tableau 11. KHS data 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>US arrival</th>
<th>Family residence</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Cultural Identity recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E(4) ≥ K(3.5)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E(4) ≥ K(3.5)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More Korean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tableau 12. KHS data 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>US arrival</th>
<th>Family residence</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Cultural identity recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Tennis friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Tennis friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tableau 13. KHS data 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>US arrival</th>
<th>Family residence</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Cultural identity recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(4.5) ≥ K(4)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More Korean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tableau 14. KHS data 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>US arrival</th>
<th>Family residence</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Cultural identity recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E(4.5) ≥ K(4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More Korean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tableau 15. KHS data 9, 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>US arrival</th>
<th>Family residence</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Cultural identity recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tableau 16. KHS data 11,12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>US arrival</th>
<th>Family residence</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Cultural identity recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(4.5) ≥ (4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hw</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(2.5)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tableau 17. KHS data 13, 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>US arrival</th>
<th>Family residence</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Cultural identity recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(2.5)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tableau 18. KESA data 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>US arrival</th>
<th>Family residence</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Cultural identity recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E(4) ≥ K(3.5)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>More Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E(4) ≥ K(3.5)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>More Korean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tableau 19. KESA data 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>US arrival</th>
<th>Family residence</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Cultural identity recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>K(5) &gt; E(3)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>K(5) &gt; E(3)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More Korean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tableau 20. KESA data 3 (Berkeley)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>US arrival</th>
<th>Family residence</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Cultural identity recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>K(5) &gt; E(4)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Mid-high</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>K(5) &gt; E(4)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Mid-high</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>More Korean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21. KHS and KESA interaction data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>US arrival</th>
<th>Family residence</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Cultural identity recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O (KHS)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>E(5) &gt; K(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Tennis friend</td>
<td>More American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH(KESA)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>K(5) &gt; E(3)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Tennis friend</td>
<td>More Korean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Procedure of Data Collection

For the protocol of the data collection, the forms of recruiting subjects for the research were provided for all the subjects recruited. These forms include a form of consent\(^4\) to the research, which describes the goal of the research and confidentiality of the subjects involved in the data, and a form of self-evaluation of fluency to figure out the subjects’ proficiency of each language. The forms were distributed to the subjects by the researcher before the data collection started and collected after it was finished.

2.2.1. KHS Data

The data of KHS 1 to 8 were self-recorded by the subject O using a built-in camera of his laptop. The meetings for the data collection were arranged in a private small room where the subject O informally interviewed other KHSs with some questions related to their bi-cultural experiences in the US, such as their cultural preferences between Korean and American culture, cultural identity recognition, and so forth. The interviewer spontaneously gave the questions to the interviewees according to the researcher’s direction about the topics and both were freely talking about the topic of the given question.

\(^4\) The consent form and the form of self-evaluation of fluency are added as appendix.
The data of KHS 9 and 10 were self-recorded by the subject C using the researcher’s camcorder. The meetings for the data collection were arranged in C’s apartment where A, C, and G were freely talking about their bi-cultural experiences in their campus life and eating dinner or snack together.

The data of KHS 11 and 12 were self-recorded by the subject B using the researcher’s camcorder too. The meetings for the data collection were arranged in B’s apartment where B and HW were freely talking about their bi-cultural experiences in their school and church and eating dinner or snack together.

The data of KHS 13 and 14 were self-recorded by the subject C using the researcher’s camcorder too. The meetings for the data collection were arranged in a study room of a café and a conference room and A, C, D, and G were talking freely about their bi-cultural experience in their campus life and their cultural preference between the two cultures and eating snacks together.

2.2.2. KESA Data

The data set of KESA recruited from the researcher’s church were collected from two meetings of two KESA’s natural discourses recorded in a voice recorder and a camcorder in order to get a better description of the data. Two meetings were arranged for the data collection, one for each group of 2 KESA and one hour for each meeting; one meeting in a quiet conference room, and the other meeting at a quiet study room of a café. At each meeting, first, the subjects were freely talking about their experience of Korean culture they had with their family or Korean friends in a personal context and with other Korean students at their school in the US. The subjects were also freely talking about their feeling or recognition that they had of Korean culture, that is, what they like or dislike about Korean culture they experience in Korea.
or in the US. Later, the subjects of each KESA group were freely talking about their experience of American culture, which they think is different from Korean and favorable or unfavorable. The researcher were out of the discourse area in order to give the subjects a more comfortable and natural context to communicate with each other.

The data for KESA from Berkeley were collected from two times of meeting of two KESA; the meetings were arranged in TJ’s apartment where they were freely talking about their bi-cultural experience in the US and in Korea. The data were self-recorded by HB and the video-file of the data was sent to the researcher by mail.

2.3. Data Transcription

The CS data collected for the dissertation were manually transcribed according to simplified transcription convention without making pauses, overlap, or back channeling. Words in Korean are transcribed according to the Yale romanization system, in which the phones for consonants and vowels are given in the following table. The subjects’ names are pseudonym made from the initial of each subject’s American or Korean name.

(9) Tableau 22. Yale Romanization

|ㄱ|ㄲ|ㄴ|ㄷ|ㄸ|ㄹ|ㅁ|ㅂ|ㅃ|ㅅ|ㅆ|ㅇ|ㅈ|ㅉ|ㅊ|ㅋ|ㅌ|ㅍ|ㅎ|ㅏ|ㅓ|ㅗ|ㅜ|ㅡ|ㅣ|ㅐ|ㅔ|ㅚ|ㅟ|ㅑ|ㅕ|ㅛ|ㅠ|ㅒ|ㅖ|ㅘ|ㅙ|ㅝ|ㅞ|ㅢ|
|k|kk|n|tt|l|m|p|pp|ss|ss|ng|c|cc|ch|kh|th|ph|h|
|ㅏ|ㅓ|ㅗ|ㅜ|ㅡ|ㅣ|ㅐ|ㅔ|ㅚ|ㅟ|ㅑ|ㅕ|ㅛ|ㅠ|ㅒ|ㅖ|ㅘ|ㅙ|ㅝ|ㅞ|ㅢ|ㅏ|ㅔ|ㅗ|ㅜ|ㅡ|ㅣ|ㅐ|ㅔ|ㅚ|ㅟ|ㅑ|ㅕ|ㅛ|ㅠ|ㅒ|ㅖ|ㅘ|ㅙ|ㅝ| 의해|ㅢ|ㅏ|ㅔ|ㅗ|ㅜ|ㅡ|ㅣ|ㅐ|ㅔ|ㅚ|ㅟ|ㅑ|ㅕ|ㅛ|ㅠ|ㅒ|ㅖ|ㅘ|ㅙ|ㅝ|ㅢ|ㅏ|ㅔ|ㅗ|ㅜ|ㅡ|ㅣ|ㅐ|ㅔ|ㅚ|ㅟ|ㅑ|ㅕ|ㅛ|ㅠ|ㅒ|ㅖ|ㅘ|ㅙ|ㅝ|ㅢ|ㅏ|ㅔ|ㅗ|ㅜ|ㅡ|ㅣ|ㅐ|ㅔ|ㅚ|ㅟ|ㅑ|ㅕ|ㅛ|ㅠ|ㅒ|ㅖ|ㅘ|ㅙ|ㅝ|ㅢ|ㅏ|ㅔ|ㅗ|ㅜ|ㅡ|ㅣ|ㅐ|ㅔ|ㅚ|ㅟ|ㅑ|ㅕ|ㅛ|ㅠ|ㅒ|ㅖ|ㅘ|ㅙ|ㅝ|ㅢ|ㅏ|ㅔ|ㅗ|ㅜ|ㅡ|ㅣ|ㅐ|ㅔ|ㅚ|ㅟ|ㅑ|ㅕ|ㅛ|ㅠ|ㅒ|ㅖ|ㅘ|ㅙ|ㅝ|ㅢ|ㅏ|ㅔ|ㅗ|ㅜ|ㅡ|ㅣ|ㅐ|ㅔ|ㅚ|ㅟ|ㅑ|ㅕ|ㅛ|ㅠ|ㅒ|ㅖ|ㅘ|ㅙ|ㅝ|ㅢ|ㅏ|ㅔ|ㅗ|ㅜ|ㅡ|ㅣ|ㅐ|ㅔ|ㅚ|UPLE|ㅏ|ㅔ|ㅗ|ㅜ|ㅡ|ㅣ|ㅐ|ㅔ|ㅚ|ㅟ|ㅑ|ㅕ|ㅛ|ㅠ|ㅒ|ㅖ|ㅘ|ㅙ|ㅝ|ㅢ|ㅏ|ㅔ|ㅗ|ㅜ|ㅡ|ㅣ|ㅐ|ㅔ|ㅚ|ㅟ|ㅑ|ㅕ|ㅛ|ㅠ|ㅒ|ㅖ|ㅘ|ㅙ|ㅝ|ㅢ|ㅏ|ㅔ|ㅗ|ㅜ|ㅡ|ㅣ|ㅐ|ㅔ|ㅚ|ㅟ|ㅑ|ㅕ|ㅛ|ㅠ|ㅒ|ㅖ|ㅘ|ㅙ|ㅝ|ㅢ
The data transcribed were classified in terms of monolingual Korean sentences, monolingual English sentences, and intra-sentential code-switches. Both inter-sentential CS, CS from one monolingual sentence to the other monolingual sentence, and intra-sentential CS, some English or Korean words or phrases switched in a Korean or an English sentence, were observed in the data. The CS observed was coded for the five socio-pragmatic principles with a basis on the definitional criteria of each principle and the linguistic and sociolinguistic/ethnographic information of the context where the CS occurs, which the researcher observed through watching the video file of the data.

2.4. Corpus Data Detail

2.4.1. KHS data

The CS from each data set of KHS are coded for each principle based on the methodological assumption about meaningful CS given by Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) and the following corpus data is collected for each principle from the KHS data. While the size of data in the following box is huge enough to suggest an optimal bilingual grammar of CS for KHS, this is not a fixed and prescriptive bilingual grammar of CS for KHS. Thus, in order to verify the working of five (or more potential) universal principles, more meaningful data for KHS’s CS should be collected.

(10) Tableau 23. Corpus of KHS data coded for five principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KHS 1</th>
<th>KHS 2</th>
<th>KHS 3</th>
<th>KHS 4</th>
<th>KHS 5</th>
<th>KHS 6</th>
<th>KHS 7</th>
<th>KHS 8</th>
<th>KHS 9</th>
<th>KHS 10</th>
<th>KHS 11</th>
<th>KHS 12</th>
<th>KHS 13</th>
<th>KHS 14</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAITH</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSPECTIVE</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLIDARITY</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>3065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.2. KESA data

Compared to the CS data for exploring an optimal bilingual grammar of KHS, the CS data for an optimal bilingual grammar of KESA is not that huge. Thus, in order to increase the validity of the result of the research for an Optimal bilingual grammar of KESA with a small quantity of data, the data collected for the study of KESA’s CS in Lee (2009) was also re-investigated for a better result of the research performed in this dissertation. However, the amount of the data for an optimal bilingual grammar of KESA is very small and cannot be considered as corpus data. Therefore, the number of CS coded for each principle in KESA data was not calculated and made into table.

2.4.3. Data for KHS-KESA interaction.

Like the CS data for KESA, the quantity of the CS data for KHS-KESA interaction is very small and the number of CS coded for each principle in KESA data was not calculated and made into table. Therefore, more data should be collected for a further research based on the corpus data for this interaction to test the result of a pilot study provided by the research performed in this dissertation for the interaction of these two groups of Korean English bilinguals.
Chapter 4. Constraints Operational in Bilingual Grammars

1. Overview

In this chapter, the five constraints (or principles) of Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) Optimal Grammar, FAITH, POWER, SOLIDARITY, PERSPECTIVE, and FACE, will be discussed with the CS excerpts from KHS and KESA data. Specifically, I will find out how these five principles work in the empirical data of Korean-English bilinguals’ code-switching and what each principle implies in the data.

2. Five Principles of CS and their Empirical Basis

As is mentioned in the previous chapter, within Bhatt and Bolonyai ‘s (2011) framework of OPTIMIZATION, five principles of bilingual language, FAITH, POWER, SOLIDARITY, PERSPECTIVE, and FACE, are supposed to underlie the diverse contexts of CS operations. Thus, as introduced in chapter 2, these principles are presented as generalizations over only those instances of CS where the alternative monolingual utterance is perceived as less than optimal in terms of speaker’s/writer’s individual goals and socio-structural opportunities, economy of expression of socially contextualized ideational meanings (FAITH), framing relational-interpersonal (POWER, SOLIDARITY, FACE) communication, and (d) conversation interactional orientations (PERSPECTIVE). Bhatt and Bolonyai present their views as follows;

The five meta-principles reflect the view that CS is multi-functional and builds, simultaneously or separately, different types of meaning. Thus, a single code-switch has the potential to create ideational, relational-interpersonal, and discourse interactional aspects of meaning. In some cases, a code-switch may be more closely and unequivocally associated with one type of meaning and one particular principle; in other instances, a code-switch might appear to “do multiple things” within the functional scope of two or more principles. Complemented by an approach inspired by Optimality Theory, such a multi-functional
perspective of CS can also help to show systematic links and ordered relations among the range of potentially available functions and principles at work in bilingual discourse. (2011:524)

According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, these five principles are theoretically postulated from sociolinguistically significant generalizations found in the literature of CS, where they categorizes 130 functions of CS extracted from 120 studies based on the descriptions and explanations of functions provided by the studies. For example, if a study discussed CS as a resource for exercising power, the CS is included under the meta-principle of POWER, even though at the level of interaction with other principles, the CS may potentially involve a change of footing, and thus falling under the meta-principle of PERSPECTIVE. On the other hand, if a CS was considered to produce a humorous effect, it is listed under PERSPECTIVE, even though the CS may simultaneously create SOLIDARITY or POWER (2011:524). As for the cases where multi-functionality of a CS is found, the author’s intended focus is considered foremost for categorizing the function of CS into one of these five principles. At the same time, for the CS described with similar “basic-level” concepts (e.g. “control”, “power”, “domination”) by many studies, the functions of the CS is coalesced into a particular meta-principle (POWER) (2011:525).

In analyzing their own empirical data under these five meta-principles, Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) focus on using interpretive resources in a maximally inclusive way. Thus, the following information related to the empirical data analyzed was considered when assigning individual CS in the data to the five principles;

(a) immediate sequential and larger interactional context;

(b) norms of interaction and symbolic values associated with codes at a given individual /interactional level, at the community level, and at the socio-cultural level;
(c) individual speakers’ language competence and preference;
(d) ethnographic, sociolinguistic, sociopolitical, and historic cultural background resources (Bhatt and Bolonyai, 2011: 525)

With the theoretical and methodological consideration of analyzing the empirical data of CS mentioned above, in the following sections, the five constraints operational in bilinguals’ optimal grammars presented by Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) will be tested with the empirical data of the Korean-English bilinguals’ CS in the United States. The principles will be tested in the order presented in Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011).

2.1. Principle of Interpretive Faithfulness (FAITH)

PRINCIPLE OF INTERPRETIVE FAITHFULNESS (FAITH).

Social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize informativity with respect to specificity of meaning and economy of expression. An actors code-switch to the language that more faithfully and economically captures the intended conceptual, semantic-pragmatic, often socio-culturally or ideologically grounded, meaning.

As mentioned in the preceding chapter of literature review, in Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) theoretical framework of OPTIMIZATION, this principle of FAITH is a socio-cognitive principle, which follows neo-Gricean theories of meaning and intentionality (Gibbs, 1999; Grice, 1975; Levinson, 1995) and aims to ensure full, faithful, and parsimonious interpretation of communicative intentions and meanings (2011:526).

According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, CS as a communicative practice constitutes an intentional action, which entails optimization in the creation/interpretation of meaning in situated bilingual discourse. Thus, they suggest the actors code-switch if it allows them to maximize the conditions for meaning to be created and understood with greater specificity and economy of expression than it would be attainable through the monolingual code. In other
words, CS occurs when it is perceived as more sufficient or efficient to faithfully capture the intended meaning—“whether in terms of its lexico-conceptual content, semantic-pragmatic entailments, or social, cultural, historical, political or ideological inflections and/or indexicalities. Therefore, the principle of FAITH makes distinctiveness of meaning salient through CS (2011:526).

Bhatt and Bolonyai suggest that the functions of CS investigated in the previous studies that can be subsumed under the meta-principle of FAITH are CS to convey “highly specific” cultural connotations (Backus, 2001), CS to capture the pragmatic force of an utterance through le mot juste (Gardner-Chloros, Charles & Cheshire, 2000; Myers-Scotton & Jake, 1995), or CS to express the “cultural logic” of an act (Lin, 1996), or CS for words that are culturally bound or belong to “a semantic domain that has strong associations with the embedded language” (Backus, 2001:48), or CS for words which create aesthetic effects or “stylistic embroidery” (Callahan, 2004; Valdés-Fallis, 1976), or CS for words which encode ideological meanings (Pfaff, 2001), “political and philosophical associations” (Davies, 2008) or religious invocations (Callahan, 2004). With cross-linguistic and cross-cultural differences in connotational meanings, Bhatt and Bolonyai claim that CS motivated by FAITH should be found frequently in bilingual practices.

In the data of the Korean Heritage Students’ (KHS) CS in their in-group interaction, the total number of 403 CS was coded for the meta-principle of FAITH. The following Excerpt # (1) illustrates how CS can deliver connotational meanings with cross-cultural differences the words or phrases have in two different cultures, Korean and American, and how the CS can be explained under the meta-principle of FAITH.
In the example of Excerpt # (1), E and O are siblings; both have been educated in the US from the elementary school till now in their college. They have their relatives in Korea whom they visited sometimes during their summer vacation. Their solidarity language is Korean, which is used in the contexts where the main issue of talking is Korean culture and their identity as a KHS in the US among the American college students. E is older than O and was a junior of premedical college and O was a freshman of U of I majoring in accounting at the time of data collection.

Excerpt # (1)

1E: I don’t even know if my kids will be 100% Korean if I have them.
2O: So you might marry a white guy or a different race?
3Then if you do marry a Korean person, and your kids are 100% Korean.
4Wouldn’t you want them to experience life with just their type of people?
5E: Only people who look like them. It wouldn’t be culturally identical.
6For them, they would have to assimilate to Korean culture.
7O: So even if you marry a Korean person, you think your kids would be Americanized?
8And you think they wouldn’t fit in with Koreans in Korea?
9E: Yeah, they would have to assimilate. So if they were born here…
10It’s very unlikely that I would actually marry a yuhaksayng.
            (student studying abroad)
            (If I marry to a Korean, I am sure that I will marry a Korean-American)

In the Excerpt # (1), E and O are talking about the cultural aspects of their kids in their future. In the data, in (1-1), E starts the conversation in English, which is the language of the conversation, with her doubt that she will marry a Korean in the US. She says that she might
have a kid who is not a pure Korean. In this data, English is used as the language of the conversation where E and O’s socio-cultural experience in the US and their identity as a Korean-American are discussed through the topic of the conversation, that is, the future kids of E living in the US as a global or multicultural context. In the US as a global context, the possibility of mixed blood is higher than that in Korea, a local and one ethnic cultural context. Therefore, in (1-1), E said that she cannot be sure if her kids will be 100% Korean if she had them in the future. In other words, E suggests that she would marry a non-Korean person, which O mentions in (1-2). However, in (1-3) and (1-4), O adds a question to E’s opinion about the Korean-American kids’ cultural experience in the US by hypothesizing them as E’s future kids. In the data, E and O are using English when they are talking about their future kids’ socio-cultural experience and their identities in the US and E switches to Korean, “yuhaksayng”, (a student studying abroad) in (1-10), which is compared with E’s switch from Korean to English, “Korean-American”, in (1-11). Within the framework of Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) OPTIMIZATION, the first switch from English to Korean, yuhaksayng, (a student studying abroad) in (1-10) is implemented by FAITH with respect to specificity of meaning and economy of expression. E’s CS maximizes her intention to inform that she is not in the same socio-cultural group with Korean students studying abroad in the US highlighting her personal culture distinctiveness, yuhaksayng, even though ethnically they are all Koreans. In other words, even though there is a corresponding English expression, “a student studying abroad”, E chooses the Korean word because the latter expresses the socio-pragmatic meaning of the word, “yuhaksayng”, “a Korean student studying in the US, who is not in the same group with E”. This switch thus aligns with FAITH, for reasons of specificity and economy of expression. E’s continuous use of Korean in the following sentence in (1-11) seems to imply her recognition of
her ethnic identity as a Korean. Her intrasentential switch to English word, “Korean-American”, with a Korean Objective particle (OBJ) in (1-11) shows again E’s recognition of her identity as a Korean-American and of the difference of identity between these two groups of Korean students in the US, that is, “yuhaksayng” and Korean-American. Even with the existence of Korean word, “caymikyopo (Korean resident in America)”, for the English word, “Korean-American”, E chooses the latter in (1-11). The English word expresses the socio-cultural meaning of the word, “Korean-American”, “a Korean in the US who is more Americanized in his/her socio-cultural aspects than yuhaksayng”, better in its specificity of meaning and economy of expression. Therefore, this intrasentential CS to English in (1-11) is also implemented by FAITH.

The second example of CS under FAITH comes from another set of KHS’s CS data in which O is leading the conversation as a friend of H and Y. In the data, O, H, Y were all 18 year-old college freshmen KHS at the time of data collection and they were attending the same elementary school, middle school, and high school, and the same Korean church. O is male and Y and H are female. H came to the US at 5 with her family and has been living in the US since then. Y came to the US at 10 with her family and has been living in the US since then. O came to the US at 8 with his family and has been living in the US since then. In the following data, Korean is the solidarity language of O, H and Y.

Excerpt # (2)

1O: kulemyen have you ever experienced any conflicts as heritage people in the U.S.?  
   (then)  
2  So it can be anything like racism, and if so, what kind?  

3H: na-n junior high ttay track hakoissess-nuntey kunyang ancaiss-nuntey etten  ay-ka  
   I-CONT  time doing-while just sitting-but some kid-SUB  
   (When I was a junior high, I was tracking, just sitting and some kid was throwing a stone...)
4 tol tenci-myense…
stone throw-ing

5O: tol-lul tency-e?
Stone-OBJ throw-END?
(Was he throwing a stone?)

6H: ung, tol tenci-myense name calling haysse.
Yes, stone throw-ing name calling did
(Yes, while he was throwing a stone, he did name calling)

7O: ne-ka ku yeyki haycwess-ten-kes kat-ta. Cheumey wassul-tyay nay-ka
You-SUB that story told –ADJ –thing like-END first time came-when I-SUB

8 interview han taypwupwun ay-tul-i yenge-lul mos hay-kacko cokum bully
interview doing mostly child-PL-SUB English-OBJ not speak-CONJ a little bully

9 toyssta-ko hayss-nuntey, neney-nun that didn’t matter?
became-and said-but You-CONT

(I feel like you told me the story. Most kids that I took interviews said that when they first came, they got treated a little bullied, how about you, that didn’t matter?)

10 Your being fluent in English didn’t matter with you being bullied in Junior High?

11H: Yeah. Just based on color.

12 O: Just because you’re yellow?

13H: ung, yellow.

In the Excerpt # (2), the topic of the conversation is KHS’s experience of conflicts as heritage people in the US, such as racism. In the conversation, O is playing the role of the interviewer and one of the participants of the conversation at the same time with H and Y as his friends. In (2-1), O starts the conversation in Korean and then switches to English to change his perspective from a friend of H and Y to the interviewer of the conversation by asking a question about the topic of the conversation “any experience of conflicts as heritage people, such as racism, in the US”. As to this question, in (2-3), H answers in Korean as the solidarity language
of the conversation, which shows H’s social affiliation with O as KHS, who are supposed to experience the same kind of conflicts in the US as Korean heritage people. But, in (2-3), H switches to English word “junior high” and “track” as parts of Korean sentence. This intrasentential CS could be interpreted as a CS implemented by FAITH. H knows the corresponding Korean word for “junior high” and “track” as “cwunghakkyo” and “talliki” respectively. However, H switches to English word “junior high” and “track” in order to deliver the most specific and economic word for what she means in the context, the school she was attending in the US and the exercise that she did in the US, not in Korea.

H’s intra-sentential switch to English word “name calling” in (2-6) and O’s intrasentential switch to English word “bully” in (2-8), are also implemented by FAITH with the same reason. Instead of Korean word for “name calling”, “yok”, the English words can deliver faithfully what H means in the context, “name calling to her by American kids in an American way”. The English word, “bully”, in (2-8) also can deliver what O means in the context, “American kids’ harsh treatment of heritage kids with the reason of low fluency of English”, more faithfully than the corresponding Korean word “wangtta”.

In (2-9), O’s switch to English question, “That didn’t matter?” is implemented by PERSPECTIVE, which will be explained in the following section for PERSPECTIVE. Moreover, in (2-10), O specifies what he means by switching to English in (2-9). Finally, in (2-11), H switches from Korean in (2-6) to English as a response to O’s preceding CS for changing his perspective. So, H’s CS here in (2-11) can be also explained as a case of CS where we can see an operation of PERSPECTIVE, which will be also demonstrated in the following section for PERSPECTIVE.
There is another example of CS under FAITH in the following data. In the data, A, C, G were female college sophomores attending the same school, but with different majors; A studies premed biology, C accounting, and G law. They were talking about their prospective career.

Excerpt # (3)

1G: There are main values for peptay.
    Law college = law school
2C: Which one do you want to go to? Do you have a particular school? Eps-e?
    Not have-END?
    (Don’t you have any?)

3G: kunyang cohun tey?
    Just good place (school)
    (I like to go to) just a good school?)

4C: Harvard?

5G: Different schools are good at different laws. Like D.C. is good for constitution law,

6 Cornell for constitution law, Harvard for business law, they are all different.

7A: ne-n? (to C) Are a lot of accounting majors, like, um, do a lot of internship and stuff?
    you-CONT
    (How about you?)

8C: Internship? Yeah mac-a. ku cen-eyto himtulesse
    Right-END that before-also hard-END
    (yeah, you’re right. It was also hard in the past.)

9 It’s all ppayk especially in Korea. Here too but especially in Korea.
    connections
    (It’s all connections.)
10A: ne naynyen-ey hal-keya?
    You next year-in doing-END?
    (Are you doing it next year?)

11C: naynyen summr-nun an-hal-ke kathay kunyang kuke mweci?
    Next year summer-CONT not-doing-thing like just that what is it?
    (I feel like not doing it next summer. Just the thing, what is it?)

Salamtul wa-se hayssten ke
    People came-and have done thing
(The thing that people came and did)

12A: career fair?
13C: career fair  Kass-nuntey  They only accepted people who graduate next year in 2015.
   Career fair  Went-but
   (I went career fair but)

14       They didn’t even look at after 2016, 2017 resumes.

15A: oh really?

16G: ah cincca?
   (ah, really?)
17C: They didn’t even look at it.

In (3-1), G is talking in English and switches to Korean word, “peptay (law school)”, even though she knows the corresponding English word, “law school”, for “peptay” in Korean. G’s CS to Korean here falls under FAITH in that the Korean word delivers a cultural connotational meaning of the word “peptay”, that is, the hardest college for Korean students to enter, while most Korean parents want their children to enter. In the preceding part of the data, G was talking about the current situation of the job market for a lawyer that there are too many lawyers for few good positions and only the lawyers with high qualification and good educational background could have a good job. Thus, G’s intrasentential CS in (3-1) is a good example of CS implemented by FAITH.

C’s CS to Korean in (3-2) seems to fall under SOLIDARITY. In (3-2) C is asking G in English first, which sounds less interested or less friendly because English is the official language among them that they use everywhere and to anybody in the US. Thus, C switches to Korean, which is a solidarity language among the group members of KHS to show her interest as a friend in G’s future. Then, in (3-3), G recognizes C’s expression of solidarity by her CS to Korean, accommodates herself to C’s expression of solidarity, and replies to C in Korean.
However, C accepts G’s CS to Korean as a way of expressing her modesty, which could be considered to fall under FACE from C’s point of view. Therefore, in (3-4), C gives G an example of a good law school G has in her mind, “Harvard”, one of the best law schools in America, which might sound somewhat jesting to G. Thus, in (3-5, 6), G’s CS to English seems to imply that what she means in (3-3) is what she really means, not an expression of conceit.

In (3-7), A, who seems to notice a possibility of misunderstanding between G and C, changes their interest to C’s future and starts her turn in Korean, their solidarity language. However, right after she starts in Korean, A switches to English, which falls under PERSPECTIVE in that the question is not about C’s specific situation of her future, but about the current job situation of the area of accounting, which is C’s major. In other words with CS to English in (3-6), A changes the perspective of her question from a private perspective as C’s friend to a more general perspective. Thus, in (3-8), C seems to answer to A with less stressful feeling by giving a general comment on the current situation of accounting job market; C’s CS to Korean in (3-8), “mac-a. ku cen-eyto hiimtulesse” (you’re right. It was also hard in the past.), falls under SOLIDARITY in that by CS, C sounds comfortable in her affirmation of A’s question, which gives her a good excuse of her experience of failure in getting an internship. And in (3-9), C switches to English again to explain why she could not get a chance of internship; it was not her fault, but the fact is that she did not have a connection in that area. Thus, C’s CS to English in (3-9) is implemented by PERSPECTIVE; C wants to give an appropriate excuse for her failure in getting an internship by switching to English as the power language of the conversation.

However, there is C’s intrasentential CS to Korean in (3-9), which falls under FAITH.
Like “peptay” in (3-1), the Korean word “ppayk” has a connotative meaning for Korean people, which the corresponding English word, “connections”, doesn’t carry in its use; it has been considered the most important resource for the success of Korean people in a Korean society. Thus, by switching to the Korean word “ppayk”, C implies her understanding the importance of “connections’ in her success of getting an internship in the area of accounting, even in America. This is supported by the contents of the following conversation from (3-10) to (3-17). Here, C was talking about her disappointment that she experienced when she attended a career fair where the agents didn’t even look at her resume only because her expected graduation is after 2015.

With these three cases of data that instantiate the operation of FAITH as well as other principles, SOLIDARITY, POWER, PERSPECTIVE, and FACE, and other more examples that I found in the corpus data of KHS’s CS, I argue that the five principles proposed by Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) are operational in KHS’s CS and establish their optimal bilingual grammar. In the next section, I specifically focus on how the principles of POWER and SOLIDARITY as principles of relational frames are operational in Korean-English bilinguals’ CS.

2.2. Principles of Relational Frames: Power and Solidarity

According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, power and solidarity can be understood as socio-cognitive structures, or relational frames that allow individuals to organize, represent, and construct their knowledge about social relations, self and other categorizations, and social order (Brown and Gilman, 1960, cited by Bhatt and Bolonyai, 2011:528). In the literature, many instances of CS index these two acts of identity (Gal, 1987; Heller, 1995; Woolard, 1988, cited by Bhatt and Bolonyai, 2011:528). Thus, these social relational frames of dominance and
affiliation are encoded in two principles, PRINCIPLE OF SYMPOLIC DOMINATION (POWER), PRINCIPLE OF SOCIAL CONCURRENCE (SOLIDARITY), in their framework of OPIMIZATION. They suggest that these two principles are operational in social contexts where any structure of socio-psychological reality of power and solidarity is relevant, for example, hierarchy and equality, dominance and affiliation, similarity and difference, exclusion and inclusion, convergence and divergence, closeness and distance, etc. (2011:528).

Bhatt and Bolonyai argue that CS as an important symbolic resource of constructing relations of dominance and affiliation has been noticed by many researchers, which can be explained under the meta-principles of POWER and SOLIDARITY. For example, Gumperz’s (1982) WE code and THEY code were to explain a pattern of CS found in relatively stable bilingual situations where the minority language and the majority language convey oppositional values with respect to relations of solidarity and power; WE code for SOLIDARITY, and THEY code for POWER.

Among the functions of CS noted in the previous researches, Bhatt and Bolonyai identified the following CS functions that would fall under SOLIDARITY; CS to express ethnic affiliation and identity (de Fina, 2007; Gal, 1979; Heller, 1995; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Poplack, 1988; Woolard, 1988); CS to invoke “the vehicle of ‘nationhood’” (Gafaranga, 2001); CS to create “in-group cohesion” (de Fina, 2007) or construct “co-membership” in a speech community (Rampton, 1995) or “symbolic alignment” with a cultural community of practice (Doran, 2004). The CS used for “accommodation” (Callahan, 2007; Giles & Coupland, 1991), “convergence” (Burt, 1992), “boundary leveling” (Heller, 1992; Woolard, 1988), and “reducing the social distance” (Canagarajah, 1995; Myers-Scotton, 1993) are also included under SOLIDARITY and CS used to create affective identity affiliations and conveying “warmth”,

87
“closeness”, or “intimacy” (Camilleri, 2001; Pavlenko, 2004) are also considered examples of SOLIDARITY.

As for the CS functions assigned to the meta-principle of POWER, repeatedly lined up in the following, Bhatt and Bolonyai mentioned the CS to increase social distance (Eastman, 1992; Rindler-Schjerve, 1998); CS to assert “control” (Gal, 1979; Heller, 1988; Woolard, 1988; Zentella, 1997); CS to negotiate “interactional power” and “statusful power” (Myers-Scotton, 1988); CS to produce or resist “symbolic domination” (Bolonyai, 2005; Gal, 1988; Heller, 1995); CS to engage in the act of “power-wielding”; CS as a means of “exclusion” (Callahan, 2004; Grosjean, 1982); CS as a means of “divergence” (Burt, 1992); CS as a means of “boundary maintenance: (Blommaert, 1992; Woolard, 1988); CS as a means of “elite closure” (Canagarajah, 1995; Myers-Scotton, 1990); CS for the assertion of “superiority” (Myers-Scotton, 1988); CS for the assertion of “authority” (Gal, 1988; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Stroud 2004); CS for the assertion of “expertise” (Bolonyai, 2005; Gal, 1979) (2011:528).

Bhatt and Bolonyai argue that the principle of POWER predicts that CS is rendered as a resource if it helps to maximize symbolic dominance, status difference, and/or social distance in relational practice and that the direction of CS itself is not determined a priori and no language is assumed to grant power automatically. Rather, they suggest, the formulation of the principle foregrounds that social agents switch strategically to the language that is best positioned to construct or index dominance, status, authority, social distance, and/or difference between self and other(s) (2011: 528).

In the data of KHS’s and of KESA’s CS, these two principles, POWER and SOLIDARITY, are also found to be operational in their in-group and out-group interaction and the direction of the CS seems to be different between their in-group interaction and out-group interaction.
Moreover, there seems to be some different ways of operation in each group of Korean-English bilinguals. In their in-group interaction, for KHS, Korean and English are both used as their solidarity language even though all the interlocutors recognize English as the power language of the conversation, which is officially used in the US. On the other hand, for KESA, Korean is used as their solidarity language and English their power language in their in-group interaction in the US for the data collection. Thus, this kind of difference found in the operation of the two principles, POWER and SOLIDARITY, in KHS’s and KESA’s CS, could give us a clue that the bilingual grammars of these two groups of Korean-English bilinguals’ CS could be different from each other. In the following section, the operation of each principle in the Korean–English bilinguals’ CS will be presented with the empirical data of KHS’s and KESA’s CS in their in-group communication; how the principles are operational for the CS of KHS and of KESA and how they are different.

2.2.1. Principle of Symbolic Domination (POWER)

PRINCIPLE OF SYMBOLIC DOMINATION (POWER). Social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize symbolic dominance and/or social distance in relational practice. Actors switch to the language that is best positioned to index or construct power, status, authority, social distance, and/or difference between self and other(s).

As is noted in the corpus data of KHS’s CS, there is no CS coded for POWER in the data of KHS’s CS. It might be related to the characteristics of the KHS subjects that their cultural bases are more American and thereby their recognition of the power relation among the peer group members is not that serious, especially in the conversation of the data, where they were freely talking about their socio-cultural experience as a Korean American in the US. According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, as mentioned above, the direction of CS itself is not determined \textit{a priori}
and no language is assumed to grant power automatically. Rather, they suggest, the formulation of the principle foregrounds that social agents switch strategically to the language that is best positioned to construct or index POWER. Thus, for KHS, Korean as an honorific language could be a power language in their relationship with other students of different age. Therefore, I was looking at the data where the KHS subjects have age difference. However, even in those data, no CS coded for POWER is observed, which could be understood as the characteristic of American culture that among the peer group with small age difference, there might not be age related power relationship. Therefore, for KHS who were born and raised here and received all their education here, there might not be a power relationship based on the age difference in their peer group members’ in-group interaction.

As for the data of KESA’s CS, the following data indicates the operation of POWER in the CS of KESA. In the data, A, B and C were female college students attending the same college and the same Korean church. A was one year older than C and C was two years older than B. They were talking about a class that A and B were attending at the time of the interaction and that C had already taken in the previous semester. Thus, A and B were getting C’s advice for getting a good grade in the class.

Excerpt # (4)

1B: *enni co* Tayken-ilang kyayney-lang hal ke *a-nya*?
   Sister team Tayken-with them-with to do thing *not-TAG*
   (Are you, sister, going to do your team project with Tayken’s team, aren’t you?)

2A: *molu-keysse*
   Not know-**END**
   (I have no idea.)

3C: *kentey ne nacwungey honcaha-myen co-to mos ccanta*
   By the way you later alone-if group-also can’t make up
   (By the way, later, you cannot make a group alone)
4B: Presentation-ul cincca manhi hay. Creative-hakey hay yenkuk-el ha tunci presentation-OBJ really much do creative-ly do play-OBJ do or (Many teams do presentation a lot. They do it creatively, such as performing a play)

5 Theme show-lul ha-tunci
Theme show-OBJ do-or
(or playing a theme show)

6C: kaluche cwulkkey
Teach give-will
(I will let you know.)

7A: ca kulem pwa pwa midterm iss-ko final-un encey-ya? okay, then, look look midterm have-and final-CONT when-QUE (okay, then, let’s see! We have midterm and when is the final?)

8B: sipil wal o il
11 month five day
(November 5th)

9A: huek! (sound for being surprised)

10B: Eight week course-la kulenka pwa
Eight week course-because that so like
(It might be because this is eight week course.)

11A: Two thirty one-un taum cwu swuyoil-i sihem-itentey
Two thirty one-CONT next week Wednesday-SUB exam-is-and
(As for 231, we have exam on next Wednesday.)

12C: That exam’s hard

13A: na kuke easy A- lako tuless-e
I that easy A-is that heard-END
(I heard that course is an easy A)

14C: Oh no nwuka kulay? Hyenceng-ika kulayssci?
Who said so Hyenceng-SUB did?
(Who said so? Hyenceng did, didn’t she?)

In the data, most communication is performed in Korean, which is the solidarity language of the conversation, and some interasentential CS to English, a power language of the
conversation, are observed. Here, all the intrasentential CS to English seems to fall under FAITH. Compared to their corresponding Korean words, most of the English words in the data, “presentation, creative, theme show, midterm, final, eight week course, two thirty one”, and “easy A”, were used in the context of the conversation related to the class of American college. In other words, the CS to English enables the KESA subjects in the data to maximize the informativity with respect to specificity of meaning and economy of expression. English is the language for KESA to capture the intended conceptual, semantic-pragmatic, and socio-culturally grounded meaning more faithfully and economically in the conversation of this data. However, in (4-12), C’s CS to English is considered to fall under POWER. As mentioned above, in the data A and B were asking C’s advice on how to get a good grade in the classes that C took in the previous semester and thereby has an idea of how to get a good grade in those classes. Thus, as for the classes that C took already, C might have some knowledge about the contents and exams of the classes. Therefore, in (4-12), C’s CS to English as a response to A’s utterance about 231 seems to express “assertiveness’ and ‘authority’ to her opinion as a person who took the course and exam before them. Thus, C’s switch to English in (4-12) falls under POWER.

As is the data of KHS’s CS, there are few CS implemented by POWER in the data of KESA’s CS. Even with the aspect of KESA that they are more Korean in their cultural trend, the members of KESA are also Americanized and more globalized in their social relationship with the members of a peer group and thereby they might be less concerned about the power relationship based on age or other authorities among the peer group members. Nevertheless, in their out-group interaction, such as in their interaction with older generation like parents or grandparents there should be found more cases of CS implemented by POWER. In the next
section, the operation of Principle of Social Concurrence (SOLIDARITY) will be investigated with the empirical data of KHS’ and KESA’s CS.

2.2.2. Principle of Social Concurrence (SOLIDARITY)

**PRINCIPLE OF SOCIAL CONCURRENCE (SOLIDARITY).**

Social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize social affiliation and solidarity in relational practice. Actors switch to the language that is best positioned to index or create solidarity, affiliation, connection, intimacy and/or similarity between self and other(s).

In the corpus data of KHS’s CS, the total number of 1218 CS is coded for SOLIDARITY and this is the second largest number of CS among the KHS’s CS coded for five principles. This is not a surprising result for the group of KHS considering their recognition of dual identities as both Korean and American among the people who recognized themselves only as American in the US. The group of KHS recruited for the dissertation recognized themselves different not only from the Korean students from Korea to study abroad, but also from the Korean American, so called “twinkie” among them, who cannot speak Korean very well and who are more Americanized than them (the subject group of KHS of this dissertation). Thus, the direction of CS is dynamic, that is, their CS is to a language, sometimes to English, and sometimes to Korean, that they see as being best positioned to bring about the desired effects of SOLIDARITY.

In the following data, O, H, and Y, who have been friends since they were attending the same elementary, middle and high school and the same Korean church, are talking about their expectation of choosing a spouse in the future based on their race and ethnicity. O is leading the conversation by asking some questions about the topic to H and Y.
Excerpt # (5)

1O: neney-ka kyelhon-ul ha-myen namca-ka
   You-SUB marry-OBJ do-if man-SUB
   (if you marry a man, the man)

2 Would you guys personally prefer Korean or American?

3 And why?

4H: Korean.

5O: Korean? Y-to Korean?
   also

6Y: (nodding)

7O: Would you care if your spouse in the future is a Korean-American like you, or

8 Early Study Abroad students who aren’t that fluent in English?

9H: sangkwan epse.
   Care not exist
   (I don’t care)

10O: kulem taptaphal kes kath-cianha? H-ka yenge-lo malha-kosip-untey
   then irritating thing like-TAG H English-in speak- want to-but
   (Then, it would be irritating, wouldn’t it, H? when you want to speak in English

11 mos alatut-kena hamyen?
   cannot understand-like if
   and the other part cannot understand it)

12H: ani, kuke-n ani-ko.
   No that-CONT not-and
   (No it’s not the case)

13Y: na-nun twinkie- tul-i te taptaphay.
I-CONT twinkie- PL-SUBJ more irritating
(As for me, twinkies are more irritating)

14O: kulem Y-nun hankwukmal-ul hayyatoyn? Then Y-CONT Korean-OBJ do-have to
then, as for Y, you mean your spouse should be able to speak in Korean, don’t you?)

15Y: ung. (Yes)

16O: Then are you guys open to other races? Whites, Blacks, Mexicans.

17 (H and Y are shaking their heads)

18O: No? Not open to any other?

19H: White?

20O: You’re open to whites?

21H: (nod)

In (5-1), O starts the topic of the conversation, “when you marry a man...” in Korean, which is
the solidarity language of the conversation. Then, he switches to English in (5-2, 5-3), to
change his perspective from an friend of the other two speakers to the leader of the conversation
by asking H and Y about their preference of ethnicity of their spouse in the future as a Korean-
American. To this question, H answers in English in (5-4), “Korean”. Then O repeats H’s
answer and ask Y the same question by code-mixing “Y-to Korean? “, which means “Y, do you
also prefer Korean?” O’s switch to Korean sentence with English word, “Korean” seems to be
implemented by SOLIDARITY in that O knows that H and Y are KHS and they have the same
sociocultural background and identity recognition and O wants to let them know that he belongs
to their community of practice, as a KHS, and can guess Y also prefer Korean. By switching to
Korean for solidarity, O also switches his perspective from the leader of the conversation to a friend of H and Y. Nevertheless, in (5-7), O switches to English again for changing his perspective, new to the leader of the conversation. As a response to H and Y’s answer to the first question, O asks a more specific question about H and Y’s choice of their spouse in the future among the Koreans in the US, a KHS or a KESA who is not fluent in English. To this question, H answers in Korean, “sangkwan epse (I don’t care)”, which is the solidarity language of the conversation. As to this response, in (5-10, 5-11), O switches to Korean again, which is implemented by SOLIDARITY. O tries to make H think better about the result of her choice of spouse among the Koreans in the US based on his experience as one of KHS like H. Therefore, O can guess H might prefer KHS to KESA based on his own preference as a KHS like H.

But, in (5-12) and (5-13), H and Y both disagree with O in that they don’t think KHS are better than KESA as their spouse in the future. In (5-13), Y even said “twinkies”, which means Korean Americans who are more Americanized in their socio-cultural aspects and cannot speak Korean well, are more irritating to her. Here in (5-13), Y’s intrasentential CS to English word, “twinkie” is considered as an operation of FAITH in that the word “twinkie” conveys cultural connotation of “Korean people whose skin is yellow but whose inside is white like American people with white skin”, which cannot be expressed by the corresponding Korean word, “caymikyopo” or another synonymous English word, “Korean American”. In (5-14), O rephrases what he understands from Y’s response in (5-13) in Korean by using a tag question as “Y, you mean your spouse should be able to speak in Korean, don’t you?”

With Y’s affirmative answer to him, in (5-15), O expands his question about H and Y’s choice of spouse as the leader of the conversation. So, he switches to English again to change his perspective from a stance of H and Y’s friend to the stance of a leader, of the conversational
content. As to O’s question of their openness to the race of their spouse of in the future, H and Y are expressing their negative response by shaking their heads in (5-16). In (5-17), O tries to confirm if they are not open to the race other than Korean by rephrasing the meaning of H and Y’s body language, “shaking their heads”, in English to keep his perspective as the leader of the conversation. To this question of O in (5-18), H hesitates and says, “White”, in English, which is H’s CS from Korean in (5-12) to English. This CS of H is implemented by FAITH in that H tries to respond with the word that O provides in the preceding question in (5-16). In this data, H, Y, and O are talking about their private interest in their spouse in the future and use CS to show their similarity and solidarity as KHS, which instantiates the operation of SOLIDARITY. In addition, there are also instances of CS operated by other principles, FAITH and PERSPECTIVE.

In the following excerpt from the same data, O is asking about H and Y’s preference of music between American and Korean, which also gives an example of CS operated by SOLIDARITY.

Excerpt # (6)

1O: Do you guys prefer Korean or American music and why?

2H: Korean music.

3O: Why Korean music? So you’re into K-pop and everything?

     How explain-END I with something more fit-END
     (How can I explain this? There is something that fits me better.)

5O: K-Pop-i?
     k-pop-SUB
     ((you mean) K-pop?)

6H: ung. (yes)

7O: kasa-ka animyen mwenka feel-i te coh-a?
     Lyrics-SUB if not something feel-SUB more like-END?
(Is it lyrics or anything that makes you feel better?)

8H: *kasa-lang feel-i mwenka mac-a*, melody-lang.
Lyrics-and feel-SUB something fit-END melody-with
(It is lyrics and something that fits me, and melody.)

9O: *Kulemyen Y-nun? kuntey* how about different types of music besides pop?
Then Y-CONT however
(Then, how about you, Y?, But, how about different types of music besides pop?)

10H: ballad

11O: ballad-to hankwuk?
Also Korean
(As for ballad, you also like Korean ballad?)

12H: *ung* (Yes)

13O: *cwulo hankwuk umak tul-e, kulem?*
Mostly Korean music listen-END, then?
(Then, most of the time, do you listen to Korean music?)

14H: *ung* (yes)

In this excerpt, O is asking H and Y about their preference of music between Korean and American and starts his question in English in (6-1). As to this question, H replies in English in (6-2). In this conversation between O and H, the solidarity language seems to be English; H accommodates to O by replying in English to O’s question in English. In (6-3), O continues asking a question in English about the reason why H likes Korean music better. However, as to this question, H starts her answer in English and right after switches to Korean in (6-4). This CS of H takes an affiliating stance with respect to Korean, as it is in that medium she finds her core identity, hence a switch for SOLIDARITY. In (6-4), for H, the reason why she prefers Korean music should be best explained in Korean, which could create cultural similarity between O and her. Thus, H switches to Korean for SOLIDARITY and O accommodates to H in their continuing conversation about the music from (6-5) to (6-8).
In (6-9), O starts to ask the same question to Y, but changes his mind and keeps asking a more specific question of H about her preference of different genre of music. Here, O switches to English to change his perspective again from a friend of H to the leader of the conversation. Thus, the CS of O in (6-9) is considered an example of PERSPECTIVE. However, in (6-11), as to H’s reply in (6-10), O switches again to Korean to keep his solidarity as a friend who knows and understands both music of Korean and of American like H. Thus, O’s CS to Korean in (6-11) also can fall under SOLIDARITY, which is supported by the continuing conversation between O and H in Korean from (6-12) to (6-14).

With these two excerpts from one KHS data set, we can see the operation of SOLIDARITY as well as those of other principles, FAITH and PERSPECTIVE. In the following section, principle of Face Management (FACE) will be investigated with the empirical data of KHS’s CS; how the principle of FACE is operational for KHS’s CS.

2.3. Principle of Face Management (FACE)

PRINCIPLE OF FACE MANAGEMENT (FACE).
Social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize effective maintenance of “face” or public image of self in relation to others. Actors switch to a language that is best positioned to manage their interpersonal relations consistent with face needs of self and/or others (e.g. appreciation, tact, deference, respect, positive or negative politeness).

According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, this principle of FACE captures the generalization that social actors deploy CS to enact, approve, or challenge the public image, or face they orient to, claim for themselves or attributes to others in situated social interactions. With Goffman’s (1967) definition of face, “an image of self-delineated in terms of approved social attributes –
albeit an image that others may share” (Goffman, 1967:5), face-work is understood as both self-oriented and other-oriented, and to reflect a dialogic face relationship between self and others.

As the most basic practice to achieve face management, the concept of politeness (Brown and Levinson, 1987) is suggested to refer actions people take to minimize face threats in social interaction. Positive politeness is the use of language for positive face needs, such as signal appreciation, approval, liking, and connection. Negative politeness is the use of language for negative face needs, such as maintain distance, restraint, autonomy, and freedom from imposition. Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) adopt a more encompassing notion of politeness in order to account for inter-community variation in face-work that have been presented by many other scholars. Thus, I follow Bhatt and Bolonyai’s notion of politeness mentioned in the preceding chapter and consider the functions of CS reported in the literature. Those functions are “deference strategy” (Heller, 1988), to avoid “risking loss of face” (Gumperz, 1982), “preserve the face of the addressee” (Li, 1994), mitigate or defuse a face threat (Gross, 2000; Heller 1988’ Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai 2001), “dampen directness” (Gardner-Chloros & Finnis, 2003), mitigate requests (Lipski, 1985; Zentella, 1997), mark “dispreference” in face-threatening situations (Li & Milroy, 1995), signal “shifting authorship” for less direct attacks (Stroud, 1998), and “attack a powerful addressee’s face “ (Gross, 2000). With these functions in mind, I will demonstrate how this meta-principle of FACE is operational in the following empirical data of KHS’s CS in their in-group interaction.

In the following excerpt of the data, O is leading the conversation with a topic of the choice of spouse in the future in the interaction with H and Y, who have been his female friends since they were attending the same elementary, middle, and high school and the same Korean church. In the data, his focus is on the race of the spouse in the future.
In (7-1), O starts the topic of the conversation with a question in Korean if H and Y know, Heinz Ward, who is half-black and half-Korean. Then, he switches to English and adds an explanation of Heinz Ward’s race. This switch to English is a CS implemented by PERSPECTIVE in that O changes his perspective from a friend of H and Y to the leader of the conversation who should provide general information about the topic of the conversation, “the race of the
spouse in the future”, to the participants in it. Then in (7-2), O switches again to Korean to go back to his stance as H and Y’s friend and add more information about Heinz Ward, that is, his wealth and fluency of Korean. As to O’s question, Y answers in Korean in (7-3), “nan... pwumonim (As for me, parents’… (Opinion is important))”, from which O can guess the parenthetical meaning. So, O intercepts Y by adding his supposition in (7-4), “your parents accept him as your spouse like “He is handsome, we like him” they said”.

To O’s additional supposition about her parents’ accept of her spouse from the race of half- black and half-Korean, Y shows negative response in Korean in (7-5) that she does not want to have a spouse of half- black and half- Korean, which could sound like her being a racist. As a result, Y feels a risk of face-threat here. Then, in (7-6), O wants to make sure of Y’s openness to other races as her spouse in the future with a nuance of his suspicion about Y’s racism, still in mitigating attitude speaking in Korean. As a result, recognizing O’s suspicion, in (7-7), Y switches to English, from her Korean in (7-5), and says “No”, asserting both that she does not want to have a half-black and half-Korean spouse in the future and that she is not a racist as O suspects in (7-6). Therefore, Y’s CS to English in (7-7) is for POWER in that Y is asserting and distancing herself from O by switching to English. In addition, this switch of Y to English is a CS of FACE; Y tries to preserve her face to express strongly her disagreement with O’s suspicion of her being a racist. As to this response of Y, O also switches from Korean in (7-6) to English in (7-8). O asserts directly what he understands from Y’s response in (7-7) to his confirming question of Y’s openness to the race of half-black and half-Korean as her spouse in the future. This CS of O in (7-8) is also a CS of FACE; in (7-6), O expresses his suspicion of Y’s racism indirectly by asking Y in Korean if she really does not want a spouse of half-black, half-Korean. This indirect suspicion is expressed in Korean as the language of solidarity, which
implies O tries to mitigate his threatening of Y’s face. However, with Y’s assertive response in (7-7) by CS to English, O also switches to English and asserts Y’s racism using an asserting question to Y, “You don’t want Blazian kids?” which is a face threat to Y. Therefore, O’s CS to English in (7-8) is a CS of FACE. In other words, with this CS, O threatens Y’s face by asking Y if she does not want “Blazian kids”, a general term to indicate mixed people of half-Asian and half-African, which could imply that Y harbors racism in her choice of spouse in the future. As to O’s direct expression of the risk of a face threat, Y switches to Korean in (7-9) to deflect the risk of a further face threat that could happen when she responds to O’s question in English; she should say something related with racism which should threaten her face. Thus, Y’s CS to Korean in (7-9), “yay mwule pwa (ask this guy)”, to turn O’s question to another participant of the conversation, H, to avoid the risk of her face threat is an instance of CS operated by FACE too.

In the next data, Excerpt # (8), A, C and G were female UIUC sophomore students at the time of data collection. A and G were from Chicago and they were attending the same high school. C is from New Jersey and they all met at the college and became friends.

Excerpt # (8)

1C: I heard from TaYen-enni that the woman was like 30 years old and I was like then why is that 30 year- old doing here like in undergrad

2G: undergrad~

3A: RSO

4C: yeah interviewing undergrad people

5 way kulemyen nai-lul samsip-sal-ina mek-kwu
why then age-OBJ 30-year nearly eat-and
(why then, at the age of 30 years,)

6 what is she doing here?
In the data, C is talking about an interview she had recently to be a member of a Korean organization, where she felt her pride hurt. In this data, C is complaining about the interviewer’s qualification for the undergraduate interviewees regarding her age and fluency of English compared to one interviewee C knows of, who C thinks is better qualified than the interviewer. In (8-1), C is talking about a 30-year-old woman who was interviewing undergrad, which is an indirect complaining. C thinks the 30-year-old woman was not qualified to interview the undergraduate for her age, intelligence, and fluency of English. Therefore, C is indirectly complaining about the woman to G and A in the conversation till (8-4) with G’s and A’s short responses in (8-2) and (8-3), respectively. In (8-4), however, C switches to Korean because she can construe her complaint better in Korean. Therefore, C’s switch to Korean here is an instance of CS implemented by FACE; C switches to Korean in order to complain better. In the following utterance, however, C switches again to English, which illustrates a CS of FACE again. C’s mentioning of the 30-year-old woman in Korean with the same meaning of English
words she uses in (8-6) will challenge norms of politeness in Korean culture. Therefore, FACE is involved in C’s switch to English in (8-6).

In the data, C frequently switches from Korean as the solidarity language of the conversation to English and vice versa for her perspective change from narrator to interlocutor. However, (8-11), C’s switch to English is motivated by FACE again in that the corresponding Korean phrase has a nuance of insult for the person mentioned. In Korean culture, the younger people should show respect for the older in mentioning them and C is younger than the woman is. Therefore, the Korean sentence and phrase corresponding to the English ones in (8-6) and (8-11) make C’s self-image hurt by mentioning it in public. Thus, C’s CS to English in (8-6) and (8-11) instantiate the operation of FACE in the data. Here, we can see some conflicts between the direction of the CS and the operation of FACE. In other words, both C’s CS to Korean in (8-5) and C’s CS to English in (8-6) and (8-11) are instances of the operation of FACE. This implies that like the case of POWER mentioned in Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011:528), the direction of the CS is not determined a priori and no language is assumed to confer FACE automatically. In addition, the CS as the optimal candidate will be chosen through the interaction of the principles and the direction of the CS is also determined through the process of choosing an optimal candidate in the interaction of the principles. This will be discussed in the next chapter about the bilingual grammar of Korean-English bilinguals.

With the empirical data of KHS’s CS presented here, I demonstrate the operation of FACE and other principles in a bilingual grammar of KHS’s CS. In the next section, the operation of Principle of Perspective Taking will be discussed with the empirical data of KHS’s CS.
2.4. Principle of Perspective Taking (PERSPECTIVE)

PRINCIPLE OF PERSPECTIVE TAKING (PERSPECTIVE).

Social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize perspectivity in interaction. Actors switch to a language that is best positioned to signal what is assumed to be currently salient point of view and socio-cognitive orientation in discourse.

As for the central idea of this principle, Bhatt and Bolonyai asserts that the expression of perspectivity is an omnipresent feature of effective communication, whereby people foreground some aspect of the world from a particular vantage point and signal its salience discursively (Linell, 1998; MacWhinney, 2005; Slobin, 1996). According to them, making our current perspective and cognitive orientation prominent means ‘giving clear cues to our listeners about which perspectives they should assume and how they should move from one perspective to the next [so that] we maximize the extent to which they can share our perception and ideas’ (MacWhinney, 2005:1).

Bhatt and Bolonyai also suggest that the notion of perspective is a useful conceptual tool that refers to a set of inter-related discursive constructs such as Goffman’s (1979) footing and frame (Goffman, 1974), Bakhtin’s (1981) voice, Ochs’ (1992) stance, and Davies & Harre’s (1990), as well as conversational resources and functions that might mark perspective taking and shifting (pronouns, quotations, intertextuality, repetition, emphasis, discourse markers) (cf. Schiffrin, 2006). Thus, as a socio-pragmatic constraint on CS, they suggest, the specific intuition of PERSPECTIVE is that participants’ perspective relevant to the discourse implicature must be profiled to achieve a certain degree of salience within the discourse context and CS is a mechanism of discourse profiling intended to discriminate between perspectives that are highly relevant and need to be foregrounded, and those that are not (2011: 533).
According to Bhatt and Bolonyai, there are three main functions of marking perspectivity through CS, that is,

a) to focalize some aspect of reality relative to another (contrasting function),

b) to construct various visions of reality simultaneously (multiplicity function),

c) to bring alternative visions of reality into a common focus (leveling/neutralizing function).

Among the functions of CS proposed in the previous studies on CS, they suggest, the following functions of CS are accommodated into PERSPECTIVE; CS as “quotation” (Auer, 1995; Koven, 2001; McClure & McClure, 1988); CS as “message qualification”, “reformulation”, “elaboration”, and “clarification” (Callahan, 2004; Gumperz, 1982; Lin, 1996); CS as “parenthetical remarks” and “off-stage” talk (Halmari & Smith, 1994); CS as “reiteration”, “repetition”, and “emphasis” (Callahan, 2004; Gumperz, 1982; Rindler-Schjerve, 1998); CS as shift of “key” and “tone” (Auer, 1995); CS as “sarcasm”, “irony”, and “parody” (Stroud, 2004; Woolard, 1988); CS as “role-shift” (Auer, 1995; Zentella, 1997); CS as “double voicing”, “bivalency”, “heteroglossia”, and “hybridity” (Bhatt, 2008; Rampton, 1995’ Woolard, 1999), “footing” (Auer, 1998; Zentella, 1997), and CS as a “contextualization cue” (Auer, 1995; Gumperz, 1982; Li, 1994), etc.

Considering the conceptual usefulness of PERSPECTIVE suggested by Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) and the functions of CS proposed in the literature which accommodated into PERSPECTIVE, as is mentioned above, the following examples from the empirical data of KHS’s CS will demonstrate the operation of PERSPECTIVE in the bilingual grammar of KHS’s CS.

Excerpt # (2), presented in the preceding section for FAITH (Chapter 4: 80-81) and repeatedly given below, also includes the examples of CS operated by PERSPECTIVE.
Excerpt # (2)

1O: *kulemyen* have you ever experienced any conflicts as heritage people in the U.S.? (then)

2 So it can be anything like racism, and if so, what kind?

3H: *na-n* junior high *ttay* track *hakoissess-nun* ey *kunyang ancaiss-nunte* *etten ay-ka*
   
   (I-CONT) time doing-while just sitting-but some kid-SUB
   
   (when I was a junior high, I was tracking, just sitting and some kid was throwing a stone.)

4 *tol tenci-myense*…
   
   stone throw-ing

5O: *tol-lul tency-e?*
   
   Stone-OBJ throw-END?
   
   (Was he throwing a stone?)

6H: *ung, tol tenci-myense* name calling *hayss.*
   
   Yes, stone throw-ing name calling did
   
   (Yes, while he was throwing a stone, he did name calling)

7O: *ne-ka ku yeyki haycwess-ten-kes kat-ta. Cheumey wassul-ttay nay-ka*
   
   You-SUB that story told –ADJ –thing like-END first time came-when I-SUB

8 interview *han taypwupwun ay-tul-i yenget-lul mos hay-kakko cokum* bully
   
   interview doing mostly child-PL-SUB English-OBJ not speak-CONJ a little bully

9 *toyssta-ko hayss-nun* ey
   
   that didn’t matter?

   became-and said-but You-CONT

   (I feel like you told me the story. Most kids that I took interviews said that when they first came, they got treated a little bullied, how about you, that didn’t matter?)

10 Your being fluent in English didn’t matter with you being bullied in Junior High?

11H: Yeah. Just based on color.

12 O: Just because you’re yellow?

13H: *ung*, yellow.

In (2-9), O’s switch to English question, “that didn’t matter?”, is implemented by PERSPECTIVE.

In (2-8), as a response to H’s narrating her experience of racism, as a participant of the conversation, O describes other KHS’s general experience of being bullied by American kids because of their low fluency of English. Then, O switches to English to change his perspective from a narrator of the conversation to the interlocutor of the conversation to ask H if she has had the same kind of bully experience. Then in (2-10), he specifies what he means by switching
to English in (2-9). In other words, O’s switch to English is implemented by PERSPECTIVE in that he can maximize his perspective as the interlocutor of the conversation by CS. In (2-11), H switches from Korean in (2-6) to English as a response to O’s preceding CS for changing his perspective. So, H’s CS here in (2-11) can be also explained as a case of CS where we can see an operation of PERSPECTIVE in that her CS presents her change of perspective from a narrator of personal experience to an evaluator of the basis of racism which many heritage children experience in their secondary schools. So, H switches from Korean in (2-6), where she describes her personal experience of racism, to English in (2-11), where she evaluates the basis of racism that she experienced as the color of skin, not as a lower fluency of English from a more objective point of view.

In the next data, Excerpt # (9), O starts the conversation the topic of which is the preference of food and asks if H and Y can last a month without Kimchi in (9-1). To this question, in (9-2), H answers in Korean, “um, ani (No)”. However, in (9-3), Y reminds H of their common experience of lasting a month without kimchi by asking H a tag question, “hacianh-ass-e, wuli (we did, didn’t we)?” As to Y’s reminding her of their experience, in (9-4), H switches to English and says “yeah, but I thought I was gonna die”. This switch of H is a case where PERSPECTIVE is operational. Y implies that both Y and H can last a month without kimchi and that Y and H are in the same position as more Americanized KHS who can last a month without kimchi. However, H opposes to Y’s implication and explains that she is not in the same position with Y in the experience of lasting a month without kimchi. So, H’s switch to English in (9-4) serves to articulate her change of perspective from a more Americanized KHS to a KHS whose cultural base of food is Korean. In (9-5), O’s switch to Korean is also a CS implemented by PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY. Here, O changes his perspective from the
interlocutor of the conversation to a friend of H and Y who knows about the *khi-khunun* camp they were attending in the past. At the same time, this CS is also a case of the operation of SOLIDARITY, where O’s switch to Korean, which is the solidarity language of the conversation, maximizes the solidarity of the participants of the conversation, O, H, and Y. However, in (9-7), O switches to English again to change his perspective from a friend of H and Y, to the interlocutor of the conversation and ask about the camp. In other words, O changes the theme of the conversation from H and Y’s preference of food to the *khi-khunun* camp that they were attending in the past. Thus, O’s CS to English in (9-7) is another example of PERSPECTIVE. In addition, in (9-8), H responds to O’s question in English and then switches to Korean with some English phrases. The CS to Korean here is considered as an example of the operation FAITH; H’s CS to Korean is for a better description of the *khi-khunun* camp based on what she heard about *khi-khunun* camp in Korean and thereby an instance of FAITH.

Excerpt # (9)

1O: Can you guys last a month without Korean food? Without *kimchi*. (kiimchi)

2H: um, aní.
   (uh, no)

3Y: ha-cianh-ass-e, wuli?
   Do-not-PAST-END. Us?
   (we did, didn’t we?)

4H: Yeah, but I thought I was gonna die.

5O: kuke? *Ku-ttay neney mak* Purdue *eye* *khi-khunun* camp?
     that that-time you just in height-grow camp?
     (You mean *ki-kunun* camp that you were attending at Purdue at that time?)

6H: Yeah.

7O: Was that over a month?
8H: It was 3 weeks, 1 week swi-ko, 3 weeks tasi hayse. Khikhunun camp lay. Rest-and again do-END height-grow camp is said. (We should take rest one week and do it again for three weeks, that is called Khikhunun camp)

9O: Wasn’t that it?

10H: Calcium Scientific.

11O: So pretty much Khikhunun camp height-growing

With these data including the data for the operation of other principles, the empirical data of KHS’ CS demonstrates the operation of the meta-principle of PERSPECTIVE for the bilingual grammar of KHS’s CS. In the following chapter, optimal bilingual grammars of KHS’s and KESA’s CS will be established with the empirical data of KHS’s and KESA’s CS based on the interaction of the five principles to build up a ranking of the principles in the optimal bilingual grammar of CS for each group of Korean-English bilinguals. In addition, grammars in flux in the interaction of KHS and KESA will be also investigated with the empirical data of KHS and KESA’s interaction with each other.
Chapter 5. The Bilingual Grammars of Korean-English Bilinguals in the US

1. Overview

As demonstrated in the preceding chapter, the five principles proposed by Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011), which can be viewed as universal sociolinguistic constraints over contextually appropriate CS, are operational in Korean-English bilinguals’ CS in the US. Following Bhatt and Bolonyai’s theoretical assumption that the five general meta-principles/constraints of CS are “violable”, in potential conflict with each other, and that a “particular” bilingual grammar is a set of hierarchically ranked conflicting universal constraints, I will investigate the interactions and optimal satisfaction of these five principles to determine the grammar of KHS’s and KESA’s CS, in terms of ranked constraints.

In order to find out the constraint-rankings of the bilingual grammars of KHS and KESA, I begin with the methodological hypothesis that all constraints are initially unranked with respect to each other and that when a CS involves two potentially conflicting principles — such as POWER (CS to English) and SOLIDARITY (CS to Korean)—the violated constraint of the optimal (attested) candidate will be ranked lower than the other. For example, in the data Excerpt # (4), discussed earlier in chapter 4 (90-91), C’s CS to English in (4-12), “That exam is hard”, as a response to A’s utterance to express ‘assertiveness’ and ‘authority’ to her opinion as a person who took the course and exam before A, is a POWER switch, while violating SOLIDARITY. Thus, this example provides us a clue to hypothesize that in the grammar of KESA, POWER outranks SOLIDARITY. In a similar way, the ranking of five principles in KHS’s and KESA’s bilingual grammar will be hypothesized and tested in the following sections through the interaction of the principles observed in the data collected from each group.
Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011:536) theoretical assumption that the constraint rankings for a particular community are stable, not changeable across different contexts of situations will be also adopted in the analysis of the data to build the bilingual grammars of Korean-English bilinguals. As is mentioned in the preceding chapter, the bilingual grammar allows speakers to alternately code-switch to express, for example, POWER or SOLIDARITY, not because the ranking between the two constraints are changeable, but due to the interaction of some other, higher-ranked, constraint with them. Thus, with these assumptions, Bhatt and Bolongyai’s claim that the patterns of CS they investigated emerge from the interaction and optimal satisfaction of these universal constraints will be tested and verified through the analysis of the data from KHS and KESA in the following section.

2. Optimal Bilingual Grammars of Korean-English Bilinguals in the US

Following Bhatt and Bolonyai’s theory of OPTIMIZATION, optimal bilingual grammars of Korean-English bilinguals’ CS in their in-group and out-group interaction in the US are investigated with the analysis of the empirical data related to each interaction in this section. First, the bilingual grammar of KHS are examined through the data excerpts relevant with the interaction of principles to build up the ranking of the constraints in the grammar of KHS. Secondly, the bilingual grammar of KESA are examined through the data excerpts to instantiate the interaction of principles to build up the constraint ranking in the grammar of KESA. Finally, the grammar in flux that could be a potential adjustment of the grammars of KHS and KESA are investigated with the excerpts to exemplify the adjustment of the grammars of the two groups of Korean-English bilinguals in the US.
2.1. The Bilingual Grammar of KHS

2.1.1. Expected Hierarchy of Five Principles

In the data of KHS collected for the dissertation, the hierarchy of five principles operational in the optimal bilingual grammar of KHS that I hypothesize is as follows:

(11) FAITH > PERSPECTIVE > FACE > SOLIDARITY > POWER

In the following subsections I show how the constraint interaction and optimal satisfaction yield the grammar, the ranking, of the Korean Heritage Speakers.

2.1.1.1. Interaction of SOLIDARITY and POWER

I first look at the interaction of the two potentially conflicting constraints, SOLIDARITY and POWER, as they appear in the following data Excerpt # (10). In the data, A, C, D, G were all freshmen of University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) at the time of data collection. A and G were attending the same high school in Chicago, but became friends when they met at their dorm of UIUC after their graduation of high school. C and D were from New Jersey and attending the same Korean church where they became friends. A, G, C met at their dorm and became friends and C introduced D to A, G for the data collection. A, C, G are female friends of each other and D is male. D met A and G first time at the meeting for the data collection of the dissertation.

Excerpt # (10)

1C: ne yetelp-si-pwute ilhay?
   You eight-o’clock-from work
   (Do you work from 8 am in the morning?)

2D: ilkop-si pan-pwute nawa-se
   Seven-o’clock half-from come out-and
   (I come out at 7:30)

5 The hypothesized ranking was determined from an earlier pilot study conducted in 2013.
3G: achim?
   (In the morning?)

4D: ya.

5G: etise?
   (Where?)

6D: I work at this office

7A: Here?

8D: Ya, I don’t do anything, literally sit there.

9A, G: ehhh ..

10C: Seven hours or six hours?

11G: What do you do?

12D: facebook.

13A: achim yetel-si puwte? Hahaha
   morning eight-o’clock from
   (from 8 o’clock in the morning?) (all laughing)

14D: “mwuhantocen”-to po-ko
   “mwuhantocen”-also see -and
   (I also watch “munhantocen”.)

15 (A,C, G all laughing)

In the data, A, C, D and G are talking about D’s weekend hourly job of keeping a church office.
In (10-1), C asks D in Korean if he starts working from 8 am and D answers in Korean in (10-2) that he starts earlier at 7:30. As is mentioned above, C and D are close friends from the same hometown in New Jersey and attending the same Korean church. Thus, their use of Korean as their solidarity language in this conversation is natural. In (10-3), G also joins the conversation by asking D in Korean, “In the morning?” and their conversation in Korean continues till (10-5). In (10-6), as to G’s question in (10-5) in Korean,“etise? (where?)”, D switches to English to
change his stance (a PERSPECTIVE switch) about his work from a light and informal attitude to a serious and formal attitude. In other words, when he answers to C and G’s question about his work in Korean in (10-2) and (10-4), his replies are short and he doesn’t seem to anticipate continuing the conversation about his work. But, when G asks the question “where?” in Korean in (10-5), he appears to decide to talk about his work in detail and switches to English in (10-6), “I work at this office”, an official, institutional stance (PERSPECTIVE). Following D’s CS to English, A, C, and G all switch to English and continue asking about D’s work during the weekend, which could be understood as A, C, and G’s accommodating D in the way of speaking about his work; they all appear more involved and specific in their questions about D’s work.

However, as to D’s answer in (10-12), “facebook”, to G’s question “what do you do?” in (10-11), A switches to Korean in (10-13), which is the solidarity language of the conversational interaction, is presented as a friendly bantering, a response given only by friends without any offense. Thus, A switches to Korean to express her non-offensiveness in what she says in (10-13), “achim yetel-si puwte? (From 8 o’clock in the morning)?”, and all are laughing at the end of her utterance, which implies that all including D understand why A says in (10-13). Thus, A’s CS in (10-13), from English to Korean, is an example of CS under SOLIDARITY. In (10-14), D also switches to Korean and says, “mwuhantocen’-to po-ko (I also watch “mwuhantocen” (a Korean TV show which is very interesting and funny). D’s CS here in (10-14) is also an example of CS under SOLIDARITY in that what D says in Korean in (10-14), “mwuhantocen’-to po-ko (I also watch “mwuhantocen” ), implies that D understands why A says “achim yetel-si puwte? (From 8 o’clock in the morning)?” in Korean in (10-13) and tries to let A know his understanding by giving a satisfactory reply to A in Korean; the Korean TV-show,
“mwuhantocen” is a kind of routine leisure activity for Korean college students in the US (to watch early in the weekend morning). Thus, in (10-15), A, C and G are all laughing, which implies D’s answer is what they expect.

The following excerpt is the continuous conversation of Excerpt # (10).

**Excerpt # (10).**

16 D: Do you guys watch it?

17A: I did sometimes. *Cip-ey ka-myen pwa. kacoktul-i chayngkye ponikka*
   Home-at go-if watch family-SUB keep watch-because
   (I watch it when I get home because my family keep watching it)

18D: *na-n yocum “sending him kwuntay” cengmal caymisse.* (laughing)
   I-CONT these days army really interesting
   (I watch “sending him army” and it is very interesting)

19C: *cincca sanai?*
   Real man
   (a real man (male) )

20D: ya.

21C: *cincca sanai-lako iss-e. kwuntay yayki-ya.*
   Real man-like exist-END army story-END
   (It is titled as “real man”. It is a TV show about Korean army.)

   *Kuntey cincca caymisse*
   And really interesting
   (and it is really interesting.)

22A, G: *cincca?*
   (really?)

The data of interest for us here when A switches to Korean in (10-17), to explain why she watched the show, “*Cip-ey ka-myen pwa kacoktul-i chayngkye ponikka* (I watch it when I get home because my family keep watching it), and this is an affiliative, solidarity exression, an activity done with family. Thus, A’s CS here, in (10-17), is considered to be a switch to express SOLIDARITY. In (10-18), D also switches to Korean to accommodate A in her solidarity work
and says “na-n yocum “sending him kwuntay” cengmal caymisse (I watch “sending him army” and it is very interesting)”. So, D’s CS to Korean in (10-18) is also an example of CS implemented by SOLIDARITY.

(1) Emerging Hierarchy of SOLIDARITY and POWER

The ranking between SOLIDARITY and POWER is provided by the data excerpt in Excerpt # (10), A’s CS to Korean in (10-13), “achim yetel-si puwte? (From 8 o’clock in the morning)?”, and D’s CS to Korean in (10-14), “mwuhantocen”-to po-ko (I also watch “mwuhantocen” (a Korean TV show which is very interesting and funny). However, considering the status of English as the power language in the casual interactions of college students in the US, A’s and D’s CS to Korean in (10-13) and (10-14) respectively are considered to violate POWER. Furthermore, data in (10-17) and (10-18) supports the hypothesis that SOLIDARITY outranks POWER in KHS community, yielding:

(12) SOLIDARITY >> POWER

(2) Choice of Optimal Candidate

The process of choosing an optimal candidate in the interaction of SOLIDARITY and POWER in the data Excerpt (10) is provided in the following tableaux. The following tableaux indicate that the five examples of CS in the data, (10-13), (10-14), (10-17), (10-18), and (10-19), choose their optimal candidate based on the hierarchy which ranks SOLIDARITY >> POWER.

Tableau 24. Interaction of SOLIDARITY and POWER (10-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. achim yetel-si puwte?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. From 8 o’clock in the morning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Tableau 24, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, POWER, and b. violates the higher constraint, SOLIDARITY. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

**Tableau 25. Interaction of SOLIDARITY and POWER (10-14)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☞ a. “mwuhantocen”-to po-ko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I also watch “mwuhantocen”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 25, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, POWER, and b. violates the higher constraint, SOLIDARITY. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

**Tableau 26. Interaction of SOLIDARITY and POWER (10-17)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☞ a. Cip-ey ka-myen pwa kacoktul-i chayngkya ponikka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I watch it when I get home because my family keep watching it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 26, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, POWER, and b. violates the higher constraint, SOLIDARITY. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

**Tableau 27. Interaction of SOLIDARITY and POWER (10-18)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☞ a. na-n yocum “sending him kwuntay” cengmal caymisse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I watch “sending him army” and it is very interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 27, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, POWER, and b. violates the higher constraint, SOLIDARITY. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

**2.1.1.2. Interaction of PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY**

In the data Excerpt # (10) given in the preceding section, there are some examples of CS where PERSPECTIVE is involved, as mentioned above, and we can find the interaction of
PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY in the examples. In order to make it clear, I repeat the data here in part:

Excerpt # (10)

1C: ne yetelp-si-pwute ilhay?
   You eight-o’clock-from work
   (Do you work from 8 am in the morning?)

2D: ilkop-si pan-pwute nawa-se
   Seven-o’clock half-from come out-and
   (I come out at 7:30)

3G: achim?
   (In the morning?)
4D: ya.
5G: etise?
   (Where?)
6D: I work at this office
7A: Here?
8D: Ya, I don’t do anything, literally sit there.
9A, G: ehhh ..
10C: Seven hours or six hours?
11G: What do you do?

As mentioned above, in (10-6), as to G’s question in (10-5) in Korean, “etise? (where?)”, D switches to English to change his stance about his work (object of stance) from a casual and informal attitude to a serious and formal attitude (footing shifts), which is achieved through the power language of the conversation, English as the official language of college life in the US. Regardless of his intention, when G continues asking about his work during the weekend in Korean, D appears to decide to talk about his work in detail and answers switching to English in (10-6), “I work at this office”, which indexes a change of stance, a PERSPECTIVE switch.
Following D’s CS to English, A, C, and G all switch to English and continue asking about D’s work during the weekend, which could be understood as A, C, and G’s accommodating D in the way of speaking about his work; they all look more involved and specific in their questions about D’s work..

The following data excerpt from the same group of KHS of Excerpt # (10) also provides an example of CS operated by PERSPECTIVE.

Excerpt # (11)

1C: kuliko wuli-ka wuli-kathun ilen salam-tul malko cincca hankwuk-eyse
   And we-SUB we-like this people-PL not really Korea-from

2 on salam-tul iss-canha kulen salam-tul-ilang chinhaki
   come people-PL are-TAG such people-PL-with making friends

3 cincca elyewun kes kathay.
   Really difficult thing like
   (And, I feel like very difficult to make friends with the Korean people, who really came from Korea, not those Korean people like us)

4A: eng pwulphyenhay.
   Yes uncomfortable
   (Yes, (I an also) uncomfortable (with them))

5C: kuliko tto mak emcheng mikwuk salam iss-canha.
   And also just very American people is-TAG

6 Kulen salam-to chinhacikki himtun kes katha.
   Such people-also making friends hard thing like
   (And, there are also very Americanized people and such people seem to be also hard to make friends)

7A: mac-e, (nodding)
   Right-END
   (You’re right!)

8G: ya…

9C. ne-nun ? (indicating G)
   You-CONT
   (How about you?)
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In the data, A, C, D, and G are talking about their identity as Korean Americans. In (11-1~3) and (11-5~6), C says that she feels like difficult to make friends with two different groups of Korean students in UIUC. One group is Korean American students who are more Americanized than “us”, KHS, and whose Korean proficiency is lower than “us”. The other group is Korean students from Korea whose English proficiency is lower than “us” and who seem to be only familiar with the Korean culture. In (11-4) and (11-7), A agrees with C in her preceding utterance. But, in (11-8), G’s response is not clear and looks hesitating to agree with C. Thus, in (11-9), C asks how G thinks about her identity. And in (11-10), G identifies herself as a second generation of Korean people in the US, who are actually the first group mentioned by C. At this time, G speaks in Korean as the solidarity language of the conversation to keep solidarity in the group. In other words, G tries to show how she is similar to the group of “us”
by speaking in Korean as their solidarity language even with her recognition of her own identity as a second generation of Korean American. In (11-11), A, who was attending the same high school with G, agrees in Korean that G is a second generation of Korean in the US, which implies that A also thinks that G belongs to the group of more Americanized Korean American. And, in (11-12), G clarifies her identity by switching to English as the language of more Americanized Korean American. Thus, G’s CS to English in (11-12) is considered to be an example of CS under PERSPECTIVE. Here, we can find the interaction of PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY. G’s switch for PERSPECTIVE violates SOLIDARITY. In (11-13, 11-14, 11-15), A and D continue speaking in Korean to G as a response to G’s CS to English to clarify her identity as a more Americanized Korean American who cannot speak Korean very well and say that G speaks Korean surprisingly well unlike other second generation kids of Korean in the US, which implies their solidarity work for G.

(1) Emerging hierarchy of PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY

The emerging hierarchy of PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY in the data Excerpt # (10) and Excerpt # (11) is PERSPECTIVE over SOLIDARITY. Thus, the hypothesized hierarchy (10 below) between PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY finds empirical support:

(13) PERSPECTIVE >> SOLIDARITY

In the data Excerpt # (10-6), D’s CS to English, “I work at this office”, under PERSPECTIVE violates SOLIDARITY and no CS to English violates PERSPECTIVE. None of the other principles, FAITH, FACE are involved in this interaction. Thus, D’s CS to English in (10-6) as the optimal candidate in the conversational exchange provides a source of the hierarchy hypothesized in (13). In the data (11-12), G’s CS to English, “I am actually twinkie”, under PERSPECTIVE also violates SOLIDARITY and no CS violates PERSPECTIVE. Thus, G’s CS to
English in (11-12) as the optimal choice in the context also provides a source of the hierarchy hypothesized in (13)

(2) Choice of Optimal Candidate

The process of choosing an optimal candidate in the interaction of PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY in the data excerpt given in Excerpt # (10) and Excerpt # (11) is provided in the following tableaux. The following tableaux indicate that the two examples of CS in the data, (10-6) and (11-12), choose their optimal candidate based on the hierarchy of PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY as PERSPECTIVE >> SOLIDARITY supporting the hypothesis of the hierarchy given in (13).

Tableau 28. Interaction of PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY (10-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☛ a. I work at this office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. na yeki samwusil-eyse ilhay</td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 28, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, SOLIDARITY, and b. violates the higher constraint, PERSPECTIVE. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

Tableau 29. Interaction of PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY (11-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☛ a. I am actually twinkie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. nan sasil twinkie ya.</td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 29, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, SOLIDARITY, and b. violates the higher constraint, PERSPECTIVE. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.
All these data given above with the tableaux indicating the process of choosing the optimal candidate in the interaction of PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY empirically support the following hierarchy between PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY hypothesized in (13) as PERSPECTIVE >> SOLIDARITY. Thus, the following hierarchy between the three principles, POWER, SOLIDARITY, and PERSPECTIVE in (14) is emerging from the empirical data of KHS’s CS above which supports the hypotheses of the hierarchy given in (12) and (13).

(12) SOLIDARITY>>POWER

(13) PERSPECTIVE>>SOLIDARITY

And now, coming the two partial rankings in (12) and (13), we get a partial grammar established, so far, given in (14) below.

(14) PERSPECTIVE>> SOLIDARITY>>POWER

In the next section, I will continue to present the empirical data that illustrates the interaction of FACE and SOLIDARITY.

2.1.1.3. Interaction of FACE and SOLIDARITY

The following data, Excerpt # (8), is presented in the section of the principle of FACE in Chapter 4. In the data, C is talking about a 30-year-old woman who was in charge of the interviews of undergraduate students of UIUC in the Korean organization. In the preceding conversation of the data, C said she heard from Tayen that the woman is 30 years old. Tayen is a female friend of C attending the same church and older than C. Thus, C calls her ‘sister’, which is a title used by Korean women for an older close friend. TACS is the organization that C was applying for and took the interview from. KPMG seems to be another organization that is well known to Korean undergraduate students. Here, I extend the data excerpt of Excerpt # (8)
with two more utterances of A and C. In the data, I look at the interaction of the two meta-principles, SOLIDARITY and a hypothetically higher ranked principle, FACE.

Excerpt # (8)

1C: I heard from TaYen-enni that the woman was like 30 years old and I was like then why is that 30 year-old doing here like in undergrad

2G: undergrad-
3A: RSO
4C: yeah interviewing undergrad people

5 way kulemyen nai-lul samsip-sal-ina mek-kwu why then age-OBJ 30-year nearly eat-and (why then, at the age of 30 years,)

6 What is she doing here?
7 Kuliko Tayen enni-to interview-lul mak hayss-day. and Tayen sister-also interview-OBJ just did-it is said (And I heard that she also just interviewed Tayen.)
8 Kundey Tayen enni-nun, but Tayen sister-CONT (But, as for Tayen)

9 she got a full time job offer from KPMG or something right?
10 Kundey kulen salam-un interview-hako ancaiss-e. But, such a person-CONT doing sit-ting- END (But, was such a person sitting and doing interview?)

11 That 30 year-oldwoman. michyess-e. Crazy-END (It is crazy)

12A: kunde TACS-ka com time commitment-ka manhun-ke kathay. but TACS-SUB a little time commitment-SUB much-thing seem (But, TACS seems to require much time commitment)

13C: kunyang kulen-ke patass-e. na-n calnass-ta. just such-thing receive-END I-CONT extraordinary-END

As explained in the section of FACE in Chapter 4, in the data, C is complaining about the interviewer’s qualification for the undergraduate interviewees regarding her age and fluency of
English compared to one interviewee, Tayen, whom C knows of and who C thinks is better qualified than the interviewer. From (8-1) to (8-4), C is indirectly complaining in English to G and A about the woman in the conversation, but in (8-5), C switches to Korean because Korean is the better language of the construal of her complaining about the woman. Therefore, C’s switch to Korean here is an instance of FACE.

In the next utterance, however, C switches again to English, which illustrates a CS of FACE again. As mentioned before, C’s mentioning of the 30-year-old woman in Korean with the same meaning of English words she uses in (8-6) will challenge norms of politeness in Korean culture. Therefore, FACE is involved in C’s switch to English in (8-6). In (8-11), C also switches to English under FACE. In the Korean culture younger people are expected to show respect to the older in their use of language, the corresponding Korean phrase of “that 30 year-old woman” in (8-11), “ku selhunsal mekun yeca”, has a disrespectful construal and thereby a nuance of insult. Thus, C’s CS to English (8-11) is to mitigate the insult, an issue of FACE. In sum, C’s switches in (8-5), (8-6), and (8-11) are all implemented by FACE.

However, in these examples of FACE observed in Excerpt # (8), we notice two types of CS as an optimal candidate for FACE in one data excerpt; CS to Korean in (8-5) and CS to English in (8-6) and (8-11). Then, how can it be explained within the framework of OPITMIZATION? It will be answered in the next sub-sections.

(1) Emerging Hierarchy of FACE and SOLIDARITY

The emerging hierarchy of FACE and SOLIDARITY in the data Excerpt # (8) is FACE over SOLIDARITY. Thus, the hypothesized hierarchy between FACE and SOLIDARITY (15 below) finds empirical support:

(15) FACE >> SOLIDARITY
In (8-6) and (8-11), C’s switch to English, “What is she doing here?” and “that 30-year-old woman”, respectively under FACE, to mitigate a face-threat as explained in the preceding section, violate SOLIDARITY and no CS to English violates FACE. None of the other principles, FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, are involved in this interaction. Thus, C’s CS to English in (8-6) and (8-11) as the optimal candidates in the conversation provides a source of the hierarchy hypothesized in (15) as FACE >> SOLIDARITY.

In addition, C’s switch to Korean in (8-5) under FACE also supports the hypothesized hierarchy in (15); the rank emerging from this example of FACE in (8-5), FACE over POWER is implied by the rank given (12) and (14) where SOLIDARITY outranks POWER. We can find it in the process of the choice of optimal candidate in the next subsection.

(2) Choice of Optimal Candidate

The process of choosing an optimal candidate in the interaction of FACE and SOLIDARITY in the data excerpt given (8-5) is provided in the following tableaux.

Tableau 30. Interaction of FACE and SOLIDARITY (8-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. way kulemyen nai-lul samsip-sal-inakmekkwu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. why then, at the age of 30 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 30, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, POWER, and b. violates the higher constraints, FACE and SOLIDARITY. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

Tableau 31. Interaction of FACE and SOLIDARITY (8-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. What is she doing here?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ku yece kekise mwe hako issnum-keya?</td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Tableau 31, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, SOLIDARITY, and b. violates the higher constraint, FACE, and the lowest constraint, POWER. Thus, although SOLIDARITY that a. violates is higher than POWER that b. violates, b also violates FACE that is higher than SOLIDARITY in the rank. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

**Tableau 32. Interaction of FACE and SOLIDARITY (8-11)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. that 30 year-old woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <em>ku selhun-sal mek-un yeça</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 32, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, SOLIDARITY, and b. violates the higher constraints, FACE, and the lowest constraint, POWER. Thus, although SOLIDARITY that a. violates is higher than POWER that b. violates, b also violates FACE that is higher than SOLIDARITY in the rank. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

The instances of the interaction of FACE and SOLIDARITY are not easy to find among the KHS data collected for this dissertation. Thus, more KHS data is needed beyond what I found in my data to support the hypothesis for the ranking of these two meta-principles, FACE and SOLIDARITY, as FACE>> SOLIDARITY presented in (15).

### 2.1.1.4. Interaction of PERSPECTIVE and FAITH

In the following excerpt from the data (8) presented in the preceding section, I look at the interaction of the meta-principles, PERSPECTIVE and FAITH in KHS’s bilingual grammar.

Excerpt # (8)

14A: *kunde TACS-ka com time commitment-ka manhun-ke kathay.*
   but TACS-SUB a little time commitment-SUB much-thing seem
   (But, TACS seems to require much time commitment)

15C: *kunyang kulen-ke patass-e. na-n calnass-ta.*
   just such-thing receive-END I-CONT excellent-END
(I just got a feeling (from the people of the organization that they are showing off, like) “I am excellent (=better than you”)”

16 They are all like Korean Koreans.

17 Do you know what I mean they are all from like international students

In (8-14), as a response to C’s complaint about the interview, A downplays the status of the organization, TACS, that C was applying to, in an effort to console C for her bad experience of the interview of TACS. But, in (8-15), C still continues her indirect complaint about the interviewing people by providing a rationale of her complaint; she felt the interviewing people were showing off their knowledge even though they are not qualified enough to interview KHS in that they are Korean-Korean but without a good fluency of English.

As mentioned above, what is interesting here is C’s non-switch to English even for her change of perspective at the second part of the utterance in (8-15), “na-n calnass-ta” (I am extraordinary); C changes her voicing to express the interviewing people’s attitude toward her. So, we can expect C’s CS to English under PERSPECTIVE here. But, C does not switch to English to express FAITH; the English version of “na-n calnass-ta”, “I am extraordinary”, does not deliver the negative nuance that the Korean phrase, “na-n calnass-ta”, does. Thus, this non-CS of C here is an example that demonstrates the interaction of PERSPECTIVE and FAITH; FAITH outranks PERSPECTIVE in KHS’s bilingual grammar of CS.

Another example of KHS’s CS that demonstrates the interaction of PERSPECTIVE and FAITH is found in the following data, Excerpt # (7), given in the section of FACE in Chapter 4 (pp.100-101) and repeated below. In the data, O, H, and Y have been friends from their elementary school attending the same church. H and Y were attending the same middle school and high school. O is male and H and Y are female. O is leading the conversation with a topic
of H and Y’s choice of spouse in the future. At this time, his focus is on the race of the spouse in the future.

Excerpt # (7) (repeated from Chapter 4, pp 100-101)


2 Hankwukmal cal hay. Ton-to emcheng manhi pel-e. Korean well do money-also huge much earn-END (He speaks Korean very well. He also earns a lot of money)

3Y: na-n… pwumo-nim… I-CONT parents-honorific END (As for me, parents…)


5Y: an-tway. Not-become (No way)

6O: kulayto antway ne-nun? still not-become you-CONT (you still say no?)

7Y: No.
8O: You don’t want Blazian kids? (slang used to describe kids of half Asian and half African American descent)

9Y: yay mwule pwa. Her ask-IMPER_END (Ask this guy)

As demonstrated in the section of FACE, in (7-1), O starts the topic of the conversation with a question in Korean if H and Y know “Heinz Ward”, who is half-black and half-Korean. However, right after mentioning the name “Heinz Ward”, O switches to English and adds an explanation of Heinz Ward’s race. This switch to English is a CS implemented by PERSPECTIVE. O changes his perspective from a friend of H and Y to the interlocutor of the conversation who
should provide general information about the topic of the conversation, “the race of the spouse in the future”, to the participants in it.

Then in (7-2), O switches again to Korean to go back to his stance as H and Y’s friend and add more information about Heinz Ward, that is, his wealth and fluency of Korean. As to O’s question, Y answers in Korean in (7-3), “nan... pwomonim (As for me, parents’… (opinion is important)”, from which O can guess the parenthetical meaning. So, O intercepts Y by adding his supposition in (7-4), “your parents accept him as your spouse like “He is handsome, we like him” they said”. Here, in (7-4), we can see O’s voicing change in the quoted part of the supposition, “e, cal sayngkyessney. Coha,” and expect a CS under PERSPECTIVE. However, there is no CS. Since doing that would violate FAITH. In this example, PERSPECTIVE and FAITH interact and FAITH outranks PERSPECTIVE. In (7-4), O wants to provide the real meaning of the expression that H or Y’s parents can utter in Korean. Therefore, O doesn’t switch to English even as he switches voicing from his own to H and Y’s parents’. Thus, this non-CS of O in (7-4) illustrates the ranking of the two meta-principles, FAITH and PERSPECTIVE in the bilingual grammar of KHS’s CS: FAITH outranks PERSPECTIVE.

One more example that shows the interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE in the bilingual grammar of KHS’s CS is found in the following Excerpt # (12), which is part of the same data set with Excerpt # (7). In the following data, O is starting a topic about H’s and Y’s preference of the race of their kids’ spouse in the future. O is the interlocutor of the conversation and speaks in English as the power language of the conversation, which is generally used in an official and public context of the college life in the US.

Excerpt # (12)

IO: Okay, say 20 years down the road, 30 years down the road, you guys have kids and they’re looking for people to get married with now. Would you guys mind American?
In (12-1), O asks H and Y if they would mind an American as their kids’ spouse in the future and H and Y both answer “Korean” in (12-2). In (12-3), O asks again to confirm if both H and Y want Korean and H and Y do confirm their response in (12-4). So, in (12-5), O gives them a supposition, “what if your daughter is madly in love with a white dude?” As to this supposition, Y assures O of her preference of Korean as her kids’ spouse in the future in (12-6) and (12-8). However, H’s response in (12-10) is less certain than Y’s. So, O keeps asking H about her attitude toward her kids’ spouse in the future with a different race or ethnicity in (12-11) by
giving H a probable utterance that H will say to her kids, “Go break up with him. I don’t care.” Here, we can see another example of the interaction of PERSPECTIVE and FAITH. O gives the utterance in the quotation mark with H’s voicing in the future and thereby O’s CS to Korean for his change of voicing is expected here under PERSPECTIVE. However, H is a Korean American whose socio-cultural aspects are more American and her kids in the future will be more American than H in their language and culture. Thus, the probable language that H will use for her kids in the future will be English and O does not switch to Korean under the operation of FAITH. Therefore, this non-CS of O in (12-11) also supports the ranking of the two meta-principles, PERSPECTIVE and FAITH that FAITH outranks PERSPECTIVE.

(1) Emerging Hierarchy of PERSPECTIVE and FAITH

The emerging hierarchy of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE in the data (8-15), (7-4), and (12-11) is FAITH over PERSPECTIVE. Thus, the hypothesized hierarchy between FAITH and PERSPECTIVE (16 below) finds empirical support:

(16) FAITH >> PERSPECTIVE

(2) Choice of Optimal Candidate

The processes of choosing an optimal candidate in the interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE in the data excerpt given in (8-15), (7-4), and (12-11), are provided in the following tableaux.

Table 33. Interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE (8-15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. kunyang kullen-ke patass-e. “na-n calnassta”</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. kunyang kullen-ke patass-e. “I am excellent.”</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Tableau 33, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, PERSPECTIVE, and b. violates the higher constraint, FAITH. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

**Tableau 34. Interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE (7-4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☞ a. “e, cal sayngkyessney. Coh$a,$”</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. “Uh, he looks good, I like him”</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 34, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, PERSPECTIVE, and b. violates the higher constraint, FAITH. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

**Tableau 35. Interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE (12-11)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☞ a. “Go break up with him. I don’t care.”</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. “kaylang heyecye. Nan sankwan anhay”</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 35, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, PERSPECTIVE, and b. violates the higher constraint, FAITH. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

2.1.1.5. Interaction of FACE and FAITH

In the following data, Excerpt # (13), the participants of the conversation, A, C, D, and G are attending the same college and D met A and G first time at this meeting. But, after introducing to each other, they become close in short time by talking to each other using a Korean honorific system for close friends. D and C are attending the same church and they are both from New Jersey. A and G were attending the same high school in Chicago, but they didn’t know each other very well when they were attending high school. They became friends when they entered the college and became roommates. D is male and the other three are female
1G: Do you have to go to kwuntay?
    (army)

2D: No but I'm going to do ROTC next semester.

3G: Oh really? That's like really ppaksey.
    (very hard)

4C: That's what I said. toykey ppaksey.
    (pretty much hard)

5G: achim-pwute saypyek-pwute
    Morning-from dawn-from
    (from morning, from the dawn)

6D: I'm going to wake up and wake her up probably

7C: why
8A: kathi wunton ha-ca-ko
    Together exercise do-let’s-because
    (He wants to exercise with you together)

9C: antway (no way)

10G: yay namchin ROTC ha-daka ppacye-ss-nunte…
    this one boy friend ROTC do-ing drop out-PAST-CONJ
    (Her (A) boyfriend was doing ROTC, but he dropped out)

11A: right. cincca cheume wassul ttay, like, he was a friend in high school,
    really first time (he) came when
    (Really when he first came here)

12 ettehkey sayngkyessmun-ci al-canha
    how (he) looks-thing know-END
    (I know how he looks like.)

13 kunte chemey ttak pwass-nuntey,
    but first time abruptly saw-CONJ
    (But, when I first abruptly saw him)

14 mak meli-lul ppakppak min-keya
    just head-OBJ bald shave-END.
    (he just has his head shaved)
In the data, A, C, D, G, are talking about the difficulty of being an ROTC. In (13-1), G starts the topic by asking D in English, “Do you have to go to kwuntay?”, and G’s intrasentential CS to a Korean word “Kwuntay” (“army”) is operational under FAITH. As is mentioned in the preceding chapter, the Korean word ‘kwuntay’ has a socio-cultural meaning that the corresponding English word “army” cannot express; it is a mandatory military duty for all the over-18-year-old Korean male adults. In other words, in (13-1), G switches to a Korean word, "kwuntay", when she mentions the word "army" based on her knowledge of the Korean word, "kwuntay", as "the military duty of Korean men over 18 years old". Therefore, by switching to the Korean word "kwuntay", G asks D if he should do the military duty in Korea, not asking if he should go to any army in the US or in Korea. So, in (13-1), G’s CS to Korean is considered to be operated by FAITH. As to D’s reply in (13-2), “No, but I'm going to do ROTC next semester” and in (13-3), G responds with a surprise, based on the hardship that goes on in ROTC, and switches to a Korean word, "ppaksey"(very hard), to emphasize hardship, under FAITH. The Korean word "ppaksey" is a popular word among young Korean people and used for what they should do as their duty or for their own good, but not eagerly, such as military duty or a demanding course work as a requirement of graduation or for getting a good job.

In (13-4), C adds her agreement to G by saying, “That's what I said. toykey ppaksey.”, and she also switches to the Korean word, toykey ppaksey, for “very hard” in English under FAITH, which is what she said to D when he told her about his planning to do ROTC. In (13-5), G switches to Korean, “achim-pwute saypyek-pwute” (from morning, from dawn), under SOLIDARITY and emphasizes the difficulty of waking up early in the morning for ROTC training. However, D keeps speaking English in (13-6), “I'm going to wake up and wake her (C) up probably”, under PERSPECTIVE not to change his stance showing his will to do ROTC even
with the hardship that G and C expect him to meet in doing ROTC. As to C’s response in (13-7), “why?”, to D’s utterance that he will wake her up, A cuts in the conversation in (13-8) by answering C in Korean, “kathi wuntong hacako” (He wants to exercise with you together). In (13-9), C replies also in Korean, “antway” (no way), which is CS under SOLIDARITY: A and C are trying to accept D’s decisive attitude toward ROTC rather lightly in their own way of light joking.

In (13-10), G continues their conversation about the hardship of ROTC in Korean, “yay namchin ROTC ha- daka ppacye-ss-nunte…” (Her (A) boyfriend was doing ROTC, but he dropped out). In (13-11), A admits that what G is saying is true and starts the conversation about her boyfriend’s dropout of ROTC in Korean, “cincca cheume wassul ttay” (when he first came here). Then, A switches to English and explains how she could recognize her boyfriend doing ROTC, when she first met him at the college. This switch of A is an instance of PERSPECTIVE. A explains how she and her boyfriend met; they were attending the same high school. In (13-12), A switches back to Korean and continues her conversation about how she felt when she first met him at the college till (13-14). She knows how he looked like because she and he were friends at the high school, but when she first saw abruptly at the college, he had a bald head. What is interesting here is that A didn’t switch to English in (13-14) even though it could bring about her face loss; the Korean phrase, “mak meli-lul ppakppak min-keya” (He just has a bald head” in English), has a derogatory meaning to make fun of a person with a bald head that the corresponding English phrase does not deliver. The guy that A is talking about is her boyfriend and her non-switch to English, even FACE is involved, and choosing instead to continue in Korean phrase “mak meli-lul ppakppak min-keya” shows commitment to FAITH. In other words, A wants to express how much she was surprised to see
her boyfriend with baldness and bring up an additional feature of ROTC that D has to tolerate by exaggerating the funny appearance of “baldness” that can be expressed in Korean better. Thus, this non-CS of A is an example that illustrates the interaction of FAITH and FACE and the ranking of the two principles that FAITH outranks FACE.

The following data, Excerpt # (14), also demonstrates the interaction of FAITH and FACE in the bilingual grammar of KHS’s CS. In the data, A, C, and G are the same KHS participants of the data given in Excerpt # (13). They were all freshmen attending the same college at the time of data collection.

Excerpt # (14).

1G: Oh so my teacher told me again that I don't look like a freshman. So I think I like ohay-hay

Misunderstand-do  
(I misunderstand (his saying that I don’t look like a freshman))

2 Cepen-eynun nay-ka ttoktokhay-se I don't seem like a freshman. (all laughing)
Last time-PART I-SUB smart-because
(Last time, I think it might be because I am smart.)

3 Kuntey alko-po-nikka he looked at me and he was like you really don't look like a
But  know-see-now
(But, now I came to know that he looked …)

4 freshman. I was like nayka noan-inka-pwa. (laughing continues)
I-SUB old-looking face-is-like
(I might look older than what I am)

5A: No, No! It just means you look mature.

6G: Yeah, that's old.

7A: So, No! It's good.

8G: I was so happy. I was like Ywu sensayng-nim-i na poko
Ywu teacher-HON-SUB I to
In the data, A, C, and G are talking about their age and their appearance for their age. In (14-1), G starts the conversation about her misunderstanding of her teacher’s saying that she does not look like a freshman and switches to English word, “ohay-hay” under FAITH and SOLIDARITY; she wants to express the seriousness that the Korean word “ohay-hay”, has and that the corresponding English word, “misunderstand” does not. Thus, it is a CS operational under FAITH. In addition, she wants the other two girls, A and C, to understand what she felt as a
member of the same community of practice, KHS. Thus, it is also a CS operated by SOLIDARITY.

In (14-2), G continues the conversation about her misunderstanding of her teacher’s mentioning of her appearance for her age. At the first part of the utterance, G speaks in Korean under PERSPECTIVE; she talks about why the teacher said she does not seem to be a freshman from her personal point of view, “Cepen-eymun nay-ka ttoktthokhay-se” (Last time, I think it might be because I am smart). G chooses Korean as the solidarity language of the conversation. However, at the second part of the utterance, she switches to English under PERSPECTIVE again and says, “I don't seem like a freshman”. This is actually what the teacher said. Here, G changes her perspective from her personal point of view to the actual one.

In (14-3), G did the same thing that she did in (14-2). At the first part of the utterance, she speaks in Korean under PERSPECTIVE when she talks about her personal understanding of the reality, “Kuntey alko-po-nikka” (But, now I came to know that.). At the second part of the utterance in (14-3) and the first part of (14-4), she switches to English under PERSPECTIVE again to express the reality, “he looked at me and he was like you really don't look like a freshman, and I was like”. Here again, G changes her perspective from a personal point of view to the realistic one. Then, G switches to Korean under FAITH, “nayka noan-Inka-pwa” (I might look older than what I am), to express what she recently understands about the teacher’s mentioning that she doesn’t look like a freshman. She guesses that it is not a positive compliment, but a negative criticism that she looks older than what she is. Thus, what G says in Korean at the second part of (14-4), “nayka noan-Inka-pwa”, was a face threat to herself. The Korean word, “noan” (face looking older than the real age) has a hurtful nuance of negative comment on a woman’s oldness that the corresponding English phrase cannot deliver. Thus, by
choosing Korean, G expresses more faithfully what she understands about the teacher’s talk about her appearance for her age even at the risk of a face threat to her. Here, G’s CS to Korean illustrates the interaction of FAITH and FACE and the ranking of the two meta-principles, FAITH and FACE that FAITH outranks FACE.

In (14-5), A speaks in English, “No, No! It just means you look mature” under FACE to mitigate the face threatening that G could meet in her understanding of the teacher’s comment on her appearance for her age, and tries to give G a positive understanding of the teacher’s comment. The corresponding Korean phrase for A’s utterance in (14-6), “anya, anya, kuken tanci neyka sengwukhay pointanun ttus-iya.”, still has a hurtful nuance of negative comment on a woman’s oldness. Therefore, A speaks in English which does not carry the negative nuance. However, A’s effort to let G have a positive understanding does not work. Thus, in (14-6), G switches to English under PERSPECTIVE and says, “Yeah, that's old.” G expresses her change of stance for the teacher’s comment from a personal and subjective one in (30-4) to a realistic and reasonable one.

In (14-7), A still insists on the positive meaning of the teacher’s comment on her appearance in English under PERSPECTIVE to keep her stance for the positive nuance of the comment. In (14-8), G accepts A’s effort to comfort her with a positive aspect of the comment and says in English, “I was so happy. I was like”, under PERSPECTIVE. G expresses her real feeling at the time of the teacher’s comment on her appearance for her age in reality. Then she switches to Korean at the second part of (14-8) and says, “Ywu sensayng-nim-i na poko” (Mr. Ywu told me…), under SOLIDARITY. G wants to share her personal feeling with A as her close friend about the teacher’s comment on her appearance mature for her age. At this time, in (14-9), A supports G with her witness of the moment that the teacher came to G and
commented on her appearance mature for her age. Here, A speaks in Korean, “maca cincea wakaciko kulaysse” (Right, really he came and did so), under SOLIDARITY. Then, A and G keep talking in Korean till (14-12) under SOLIDARITY to share their experience as close friends and debate on the teacher’s comment. G still says the teacher meant that she looks older than what she is. A denies G’s negative understanding. In (14-12), G keeps talking negatively about the teacher’s comment and switches to English at the second part of (14-12) under PERSPECTIVE to express her real feeling at the time of the teacher’s comment.

In (14-13), A changes the flow of the conversation from G’s personal experience related to her appearance mature for her age to people’s response when they know of her age at the tennis center. In (14-14), G says that she does not have any sense about age and illustrates how much she did not have a sense about people’s age. All these conversations are performed in Korean under SOLIDARITY for A and G’s conversation about a personal topic, but at the second part of (14-15), G switches to English under PERSPECTIVE to provide real information for the person whose age she could not guess right. In (14-16), G switches back to Korean under SOLIDARITY and at the second part of (14-16), G repeats the same kind of CS to English under PERSPECTIVE to give the real age of the person that she mentions in (14-15).

As other data present in the preceding sections, the data Excerpt # (13) and Excerpt # (14) also demonstrate the operations of the meta-principles, FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE, SOLIDARITY, and the interaction of FAITH and FACE. Thus, we can see the five meta-principles are working in the bilingual grammar of KHS’s CS and the ranking between them are emerging through the interactions between them. In the following section, how the hierarchy of the two principles, FAITH and FACE, is emerging through the interaction of these two meta-principles will be provided.
(1) **Emerging Hierarchy of FACE and FAITH**

The emerging hierarchy of FAITH and FACE in the data (27-11) is FAITH over FACE. Thus, the hypothesized hierarchy between FAITH and FACE (17 below) finds empirical support:

(17) **FAITH >> FACE**

(2) **Choice of Optimal Candidate**

The processes of choosing an optimal candidate in the interaction of FAITH and FACE in the data excerpt given in (13-14), and (14-4), are provided in the following tableaux.

**Tableau 36. Interaction of FAITH and FACE (13-14)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☞ a. <em>mak meli-lul ppakppak min-keya</em></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. he just has his head shaved</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 36, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, FACE, and b. violates the higher constraint, FAITH. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

**Tableau 37. Interaction of FAITH and FACE (14-4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☞ a. <em>nayka noan-inka-pwa</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I might look older than what I am</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 37, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, FACE, and b. violates the higher constraint, FAITH. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

**2.1.1.6. Interaction of PERSPECTIVE and FACE**

In the following data Excerpt # (15), A, D and O, who are friends attending the same college and joining the same sports team, are talking about what they like or dislike about Korean and American culture they have experienced in America and in Korea.
Excerpt # (15)

1D: When I was young, adults mostly like mwusi-hay. Ignore-END
((Adults) ignore me)

2O: mwusiha-nda (repeating what D says in Korean). Ignore-END
(They ignore you.)

3D: Unless you’re like a certain age or something.

4O: Mhmm. mac-a, mac-a. Okay, um kulem your likes of American culture?
Right-END right-END (then)
(You are right !)

5D: People are nice, especially the South.

6 A: Yupp.

7 O: I think American people are friendlier. Like, you see each other on the sidewalks like, “hey,”

8 but in Korea, you say like, “annyeng.” then “Pyengsin sayikki! Mweya?”
“Hi” “Fool bastard What?”
(you say like “hi”, (then they say), “what, fool bastard!”)

9A: They’re just very like…

10D: You’re shopping and they’ll always say “Hi!”’. In Korea,

11 if you say “Hi!”’, mak ccayle-pwa.
Just give a malicious look-END
(They just give us a malicious look)

In (15-1), D is talking about his experience of Korean culture that he dislikes, that is, the adults ignored him because he was young. For the phrase, “mwusi-hay (ignore)” he switches to Korean in order to deliver a cultural nuance of the word “mwusi-hay (ignore)” in Korean, which implies a discriminating attitude toward a person’s words or opinion based on his/her age, gender, and/or social status. D verbalizes this implication in (15-3). Therefore, D’s CS to English in (15-1) is interpreted as the operation of FAITH. As for D’s replying for the question about his dislikes of Korean culture in (15-1), O repeats D’s Korean words in (15-2), which
implies that he is thinking if he has had the same kind of experience. In addition, D adds the condition to avoid a discriminating treatment from Korean adults that people should be at certain age or something in their social status in Korea for a decent treatment. In (15-4), after thinking and D’s mentioning of the condition for a decent treatment in Korean culture, O agrees with D in Korean, which is the solidarity language of the conversation, as both a friend of D and a KHS with the same dislikes about Korean culture. In (15-4), O changes his perspective from the perspective of a friend of D to that of the interlocutor of the conversation by CS to English. Therefore, O’s CS from Korean to English here, can be interpreted as a case where PERSPECTIVE operates over SOLIDARITY within the framework of OPTIMIZATION. As to O’s question in (15-4) about D’s likes of American culture, in (15-5), D answers that people are nice, especially in the South and A also agrees with D in (15-6). O also adds his opinion in (15-7), which shows O’s agreement with A and D, with an example of American people’s friendliness saying “hey” to the people on the sidewalks. In (15-8), by changing his voice into Korean people on the street in Korea, O suggests that people in Korea are not so much friendly as those in America. In addition, the CS in (15-8) provides an example where PERSPECTIVE operates over FACE; the second Korean phrase, “Pyengsin sayikki! Mweya?” (“What, fool bastard!”), as an anticipated response to the first one, “Annyeng.” (“Hi”), could cause a face threat to O by his mentioning it publically, but O still mentions it (violation of FACE) to express the real voice and words of Korean people by CS to Korean changing his voice, which is operated by PERSPECTIVE and FAITH. As to O’s description of Korean people’s unfriendliness on the street, A and D all want to add their experience about it in (15-9) and (15-10). In (15-10), D keeps saying in English that in America, when you are shopping, they’ll always say hi, and that in Korea, when you say hi. Then, in (15-11), D switches from English to Korean to
describe Korean people’s response to the greeting on the street, “mak ccaylye-pwa (They just give us a malicious look)”. D’s CS in (15-11) is a case where FAITH is operational to express Korean people’s unfriendliness better in its cultural nuance. Therefore, here, we can also find an example of CS where FAITH comes over POWER in the interaction of the five principles.

The following data, Excerpt # (16), also demonstrates the interaction of PERSPECTIVE and FACE in the bilingual grammar of KHS’s CS. In the following data, O is asking D and A about their parents’ openness to different races in their choice of spouse.

Excerpt # (16)

1O: Are your parents open to different races?
2 Like say you weren’t dating M (A’s girlfriend) right now
3 Kuntey payk-in yeca-tun, huk-in yeca-lul teyliko wa-ss-e. But, white-person woman-or black-person woman-OBJ bring come-PAST-END (But, you brought a white or a black woman (to your parents as your girlfriend))
4A: Honestly, my mom wouldn’t care as long as I love her, but then my dad, “Only Korean”.
5O: Ah, cincca? (really?)
6A: Yeah, he’s really strict.
7 D: This might sound really racist…
8 I’m sure they’re gonna be okay with everything if I say I love her.
9 But if I suddenly just one day brought like a huk-in yeca, Black-person woman (a black woman)
10 and was like, “emma, kyelhon hal-keya.” They’ll be like, “michin….” Mom marry do-will-END crazy… (Mom, I will marry her!) “Crazy (bastard)”
11O: Koreans can be the most racist people…
12A: I agree.
13O: mak “kkamtwungi” kuleko. umm…
recklessly black person (nigger) did so
(Recklessly, they call a black person a nigger)
14 Besides your parents, are you guys open to different races?
15 You (D) obviously are because you’re dating a different race.

16A: Honestly, I wouldn’t date a black girl. I have no problem with them, but I just wouldn’t.

In (16-1), O asks a direct question to D and A, “Are your parents open to different races?”, in English as the power language of the conversation. In (16-2) and (16-3), O provides an imaginary case to A, where, in a supposition that A were not dating M (A’s current girlfriend), A brought his girlfriend of different race, white or black, to his parents. However, in this imaginary case, O switches to Korean in (16-3), which could be interpreted as the case performed by PERSPECTIVE in that the difference of race is more remarkable among Korean people, who are mono-cultural, than among American who are multi-cultural in their races and languages. Therefore, O changes his stance by CS to Korean from an American whose ethnicity is a Korean to a Korean in America whose cultural base is still on Korean culture. Thus, this case is considered an example that shows an interaction of POWER and PERSPECTIVE, where PERSPECTIVE operates over POWER. However, in (16-4), A keeps speaking in English, which could be understood as his voicing as a Korean American who is more American than Korean in his culture, and says his mother is open to different races, but his father is not, in his choice of spouse. In (16-5), O seems to keep his stance as a Korean in America by speaking in Korean continuously. O seems to be surprised to A’s answer in (16-4). Considering A’s family background that his parents were grown up in Korea and moved to America after they were married, their cultural background is more Korean than that of A, D and O. Therefore, O might
expect both A’s parents not to open to different races for A’s spouse in the future. However, in (16-6), A seems to understand that O’s response to his answer should be about his father’s attitude of “only Korean” for his daughter-in-law. Thus, he replies in (16-6), “Yeah, he is really strict”, still in English, which might reflect his constant stance as a Korean American. In (16-7), D adds his opinion about A’s father’s attitude toward his future daughter-in-law of a different race, that is, “only Korean”; “That might sound really racist.” In (16-8), D talks about his parents’ openness to different races for his spouse in the future that they are going to be okay with everything if he says he loves her. However, in (16-9) and (16-10), D explains why he says in (16-7), “That might sound really racist.” In (16-9) and in (16-10), D switches to Korean phrases, huk-in yeca, (a black woman), “emma, kyelhon hal-keya” (Mom, I will marry her), under PERSPECTIVE and FAITH. In (16-9), D changes his stance from an American to a Korean for a black woman because he knows that he and his parents are different in their stance for a black woman as a spouse. In other words, D wants to express his parents’ attitude toward a black woman as his future spouse faithfully from a Korean point of view. For Korean parents, “huk-in yeca” (a black woman), would be the last candidate they want to expect for their future daughter-in-law, which might sound racist as D mentions in (16-7). In (16-10), D also switches to Korean and says “emma, kyelhon hal-keya”, in order to animate what he would say to his parents introducing a black woman to them as his future spouse. Thus, these two CS to Korean of D is operated under PERSPECTIVE and FAITH. At the second part of (16-10), D switches to Korean again to perform what he expects his parents to say, “michin…” (crazy.. (meaning “bastard”), under PERSPECTIVE and FAITH too. D’s CS to Korean here, however, might bring a face threat to D. What he says in Korean, “michin…” as what his parents would say for his bringing a black woman as his future spouse, is a bad word for educated Korean people to say in
front of other people. Thus, D’s saying that his parents would say “michin…” in front of the black woman he will bring as his future spouse could arouse a face threat to D. However, D still chooses the CS to Korean to animate a probable response of his parents to his bringing a black woman as his future spouse. Therefore, D’s CS to Korean here is an instance of PERSPECTIVE and FAITH. In other words, this switch of D illustrates the interaction of FACE and \{PERSPECTIVE, FAITH\} and the ranking of these meta-principles that PERSPECTIVE and FAITH outranks FACE.

In (16-11), O provides his opinion about Korean people’s racism in English under PERSPECTIVE; O wants to express his opinion about Korean people’s racism from an American point of view and A also agrees to O in (16-12). In (16-13), O switches to Korean and says, “mak “kkamtwungi” kuleko” (recklessly, they call (a black person) a black person) under PERSPECTIVE and FAITH to provide the reason why he says “Koreans can be the most racist people…” in (16-11). Here, we can find another example of CS that illustrates the interaction of \{PERSPECTIVE, FAITH\} and FACE. The Korean word for a black person, “kkamtwungi”, is a derogatory word referring a black person and the person who uses the word for a black person will be accused for a racist. Thus, O’s saying this word “kkamtwungi” for a black person under PERSPECTIVE and FAITH might cause a face threatening for him in front of his friends. But, O still chooses the word for PERSPECTIVE and FAITH. Thus, here in (16-13), O’s CS to Korean also illustrates the interaction of \{PERSPECTIVE, FAITH\} and FACE and the ranking of these principles that PERSPECTIVE and FAITH outrank FACE.

In (16-14), O switches back to English under PERSPECTIVE to come back to his position as the interlocutor of the conversation and asks a question about A’s and D’s openness to different races and guess D should be open to different races as his dating girls based on D’s
dating with different races. But, in (16-15), A says he would not date a black girl while he is not a racist. Compared to D’s openness to different races that O mentions in (16-14), A’s mentioning in (16-15) sounds like racism, which could cause a face threatening to A. Thus, A chooses English, which is the language of the US as a nation of multi-culture and multi-race, under FACE and expresses his opinion as a Korean American speaking English as his primary language.

The data of Excerpt # (15) and of Excerpt # (16) demonstrate the operations of the meta-principles, FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE, SOLIDARITY, and POWER, and the interaction of \{PERSPECTIVE, FAITH\} and FACE. Thus, we can see the five meta-principles are working in the bilingual grammar of KHS’s CS and the ranking between them are emerging through the interactions between them. In the following section, how the hierarchy of the two principles, PERSPECTIVE and FACE, is emerging through the interaction of these two meta-principles will be provided.

(1) Emerging Hierarchy of PERSPECTIVE and FACE

The emerging hierarchy of PERSPECTIVE and FACE in the data excerpt (15-8), (16-10), and (16-13) is PERSPECTIVE over FACE. Thus, the hypothesized hierarchy between PERSPECTIVE and FACE (18 below) finds empirical support:

(18)  PERSPECTIVE >> FACE

In the data excerpt (15-8), O’s CS to Korean under PERSPECTIVE to change his voicing into Korean people on the street in Korea, provides an example where PERSPECTIVE operates over FACE; as is mentioned above, the second Korean phrase, “Pyengsin sayikki! Mweya?” (“what, fool bastard!”), as an anticipated response to the first one, “Annyeng.” (“Hi”), could cause a face threat to O by his mentioning it publically, but O still mentions it (violation of
FACE) to express the real voice and words of Korean people by CS to Korean changing his voice, which is operated by PERSPECTIVE and FAITH. None of the other principles, SOLIDARITY and POWER, is involved in this interaction. Thus, O’s CS to Korean in (15-8) as the optimal candidate in the conversation provides a source of the hierarchy hypothesized in (18): PERSPECTIVE>> FACE.

In (16-10), D’s CS to Korean also illustrates the ranking of PERSPECTIVE and FACE as PERSPECTIVE over FACE; D’s CS to Korean is under PERSPECTIVE to perform what he expects his parents to say, “michin…” (crazy.. (meaning “bastard”), which might bring a face threatening to D in that what he says in Korean, “michin…” as his parents’ saying that he expect when they meet a black woman as his future spouse is a face threatening word for educated Korean parents to say in front of other people. However, D still chooses the CS to Korean under PERSPECTIVE and FAITH. None of the other principles, SOLIDARITY and POWER, is involved in this interaction. Thus, D’s CS to Korean in (16-10) as the optimal candidate in the conversation also provides a source of the hierarchy hypothesized in (18): PERSPECTIVE>> FACE.

In (16-13), O’s CS to Korean, illustrates the ranking of PERSPECTIVE and FACE as PERSPECTIVE over FACE. The Korean word for a black person, “kkamtwungi”, is a derogatory word referring a black person and the person who uses the word for a black person will be accused for a racist. Thus, O’s saying this word “kkamtwungi” for a black person under PERSPECTIVE and FAITH might cause a face threatening for him in front of his friends. However, O still chooses the word for PERSPECTIVE and FAITH. None of the other principles, SOLIDARITY and POWER, are involved in this interaction. Thus, O’s CS to Korean in (16-13) as the optimal
candidate in the conversation also provides a source of the hierarchy hypothesized in (18): PERSPECTIVE>> FACE.

(2) Choice of Optimal Candidate

The processes of choosing an optimal candidate in the interaction of PERSPECTIVE and FACE in the data excerpt given in (15-8), (16-10) and (16-13), are provided in the following tableaux.

Tableau 38. Interaction of PERSPECTIVE and FACE (15-8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☞ a. Pyengsin saykki! Mweya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☞</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. what, fool bastard!</td>
<td>☞<em>a</em></td>
<td>☞<em>a</em></td>
<td>☞</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 38, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, FACE, and b. violates the higher constraints, PERSPECTIVE and FAITH. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

Tableau 39. Interaction of PERSPECTIVE and FACE (16-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☞ a. michin…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☞</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. crazy…</td>
<td>☞<em>a</em></td>
<td>☞<em>a</em></td>
<td>☞</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 39, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, FACE, and b. violates the higher constraints, PERSPECTIVE and FAITH. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

Tableau 40. Interaction of PERSPECTIVE and FACE (16-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☞ a. kkamtwungi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☞</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. a black person</td>
<td>☞<em>a</em></td>
<td>☞<em>a</em></td>
<td>☞</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 40, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, FACE, and b. violates the higher constraints, PERSPECTIVE and FAITH. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.
2.1.2. The Rank of Five Principles

The rank of the five meta-principles, FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE, SOLIDARITY, and POWER, emerging from the analysis of the empirical data collected for an optimal bilingual grammar of KHS’s CS within the theoretical framework of Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) OPTIMIZATION is as follows, which supports the hypothesis of the rank given in (8).

(19) FAITH >> PERSPECTIVE >> FACE >> SOLIDARITY >> POWER

This rank of five principles provides an empirical generalization of Korean-English CS in a community of practice of KHS (Korean Heritage Students) in the United States. In the next section, a bilingual grammar of KESA (Korean Early Study Abroad) is explored through empirical data and compared with that of KHS to investigate how they are different in their rankings of the five meta-principles.

2.2. The Bilingual Grammar of KESA

2.2.1. Expected Hierarchy of Five Principles

The data of KESA’s CS collected for the dissertation is not that much comprehensive compared to that of KHS’s and thereby I couldn’t find a lot of examples to illustrate the interactions of five meta-principles, FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE, SOLIDARITY, and POWER. Thus, the hierarchy of five principles operational in the optimal bilingual grammar of KESA’s CS that I explore in this section should be supported by more data that will be collected for further research. The rank of five meta-principles that I hypothesize for the bilingual grammar of KHS’s CS is as follows;

(20) FAITH > PERSPECTIVE > FACE > POWER > SOLIDARITY
The hierarchy of the constraints hypothesized for the grammar of KESA in (20) is very similar to that of KHS except the rank of the lowest two principles, POWER and SOLIDARITY; in the grammar of KHS, SOLIDARITY outranks POWER, but, in the grammar of KESA, I hypothesize that POWER outranks SOLIDARITY. KESA subjects’ recognition of English as the power language seemed to be stronger in their in-group interaction as well as in their out-group interaction than KHS’s. In addition, KESA subjects are not so much confident in their proficiency of English as KHS are. Finally, in a pilot study of KESA’s CS performed by the researcher in (2007), the rank between POWER and SOLIDARITY in KESA’s in-group interaction was POWER over SOLIDARITY. Thus, I hypothesize that POWER outranks SOLIDARITY. In the following sections, I will investigate how the rank of five principles in the optimal bilingual grammar of KESA is emerging from their interaction in the empirical data.

2.2.1.1. Interaction of SOLIDARITY and POWER

With the hypothesis of the hierarchy of the five principles presented in (20), I first look at the interaction of the two principles of the lower rank, SOLIDARITY and POWER, in the data, Excerpt # (4), given in the preceding chapter and repeated here. In the data, as introduced before, A, B and C were female college students attending the same college and the same Korean church. A was one year older than C and C was two years older than B. They were talking about a class that A and B were attending at the time of the interaction and that C had already taken in the previous semester. Thus, A and B were getting C’s advice for getting a good grade in the class.

Excerpt # (4)

1B: enni co Tayken-ilang kyayney-lang hal ke a-nya?
Sister team Tayken-with them-with to do thing not-TAG
Are you, sister, going to do your team project with Tayken’s team, aren’t you?)

2A: molu-keysse
   Not know-END
   (I have no idea.)

3C: kentey ne nacwungey honcaha-myen co-to mos ccanta
   By the way you later alone-if group-also can’t make up
   (By the way, later, you cannot make a group alone)

4B: presentation-ul cincca manhi hay. Creative-hakey hay yenkur-el ha tunci
   presentation-OBJ really much do creative-ly do play-OBJ do or
   (Many teams do presentation a lot. They do it creatively, such as performing a play)

5 theme show-lul ha-tunci
   Theme show-OBJ do-or
   (or playing a theme show)

6C: kaluche cwulkkey
   Teach give-will
   (I will let you know.)

7A: ca kulem pwa pwa midterm iss-ko final-un encey-ya?
   okay, then, look look midterm have-and final-CONT when-QUE
   (okay, then, let’s see! We have midterm and when is the final?)

8B: sipil wal o il
   11 month five day
   (November 5th)

9A: huek! (sound for being surprised)

10B: eight week course-la kulenka pwa
   Eight week course-because that so like
   (It might be because this is eight week course.)

11A: two thirty one-un taum cwu swuyoil-i sihem-itentey
   Two thirty one-CONT next week Wednesday-SUB exam-is-and
   (As for 231, we have exam on next Wednesday.)

12C: That exam’s hard

13A: na kuke easy A- lako tuless-e
   I that easy A-is that heard-END
   (I heard that course is an easy A)
As explained in the preceding chapter, in the data, most communication is performed in Korean, which is the solidarity language of the conversation, and some intra-sentential CS to English, a power language of the conversation, are observed. But, all the intra-sentential CS to English seems to fall under FAITH in that compared to their corresponding Korean words, most of the English words in the data, “presentation, creative, theme show, midterm, final, eight week course, two thirty one, and easy A”, which were used in the context of the conversation related to the class of American college, enable the KESA subjects in the data to maximize the informativity with respect to specificity of meaning and economy of expression. In other words, English is the language for KESA to capture the intended conceptual, semantic-pragmatic, and socio-culturally grounded meaning more faithfully and economically in the conversation of this data. However, in (4-12), C’s CS to English is considered to fall under POWER. As is mentioned above, in the data A and B were asking C’s advice on how to get a good grade in the classes that C took in the previous semester and thereby has an idea of how to get a good grade in those classes. Thus, as for the classes that C took already, C might have some knowledge about the contents and exams of the classes. So, in (4-12), C’s CS to English, “That exam is hard”, as a response to A’s utterance about the course 231 seems to express C’s “assertiveness” and ‘authority’ to her opinion as a person who took the course and exam before them. Thus, C’s switch to English in (4-12) falls under POWER. However, C’s CS in (4-12) violates SOLIDARITY. Thus, C’s CS in (4-12) illustrates the interaction of POWER and SOLIDARITY and the ranking of these two principles as POWER over SOLIDARITY in the bilingual grammar of KESA.
The following data Excerpt # (17) also demonstrates the interaction of POWER and SOLIDARITY in the bilingual grammar of KESA’s CS. In the data, J, M, and S are attending the same University and the same Korean church. Among them, M is the oldest who returned school after he finished his military duty in Korea, J is the second oldest and S is the youngest. They are talking about M’s dream company, TBWA. It is a consulting company M has been preparing to enter after his graduation. In the conversation, their solidarity language is Korean, while they are frequently switching to an English word or phrase under FAITH. On the other hand, their power language of the conversation is English, which is the language of school and of the town where they are living.

Excerpt # (17)

1J: hyeng TBWA tuleka-myen coh-keysseyo.
   Brother enter-if like-will-END
   (Brother, I hope you will enter TBWA)

2M: cincca ka-kosiph-e cincca kekin nauy dream company-ya.
   Really go-want-END really there my dream company-END
   (I really want to go (to the company). The place is really my dream company.)

3 Wenlay kwuntay cetay hwuey phyenipha-lyekohayss-nuntey,
   Originally army discharge after transfer-intended-but
   (Originally, I was planning to transfer after I finished my military duty. )

4 situation-i na-lul makass-tenkekath-a.
   situation-SUB I-OBJ prevented-like-END
   (But, it seems that situation did not allow me to do it. )

5S: TBWA-nun mwusun hoysa-eyyo?
   TBWA-SUB what company-END
   (What company is TBWA?)

6M: I will be an accounting executive. Being like a bridge between client and copywriter.

7S: pap sacwu-seyyo, nacwungey
   Meal treat-Hon-END later
   (You should treat me with meal later.)
8M: *nacwungey yeça sokaysikyecwu-myen sacwu-lkkey.*
   Later    woman introduce-if treat-will
   (Later, if you introduce a girl to me, then I will treat you.)

In (17-1), J calls M “*hyeng*” (brother) showing their closeness and respect to M, and expresses his well-wish of M’s entering his dream company, TBWA, using an honorific form. In (17-2) ~ (17-4), as to J’s well-wishing, M admits that TBWA is really his dream company. In addition, M explains that he originally planned to transfer after his finishing of military duty in Korea to the department of the major that will help him to enter TBWA. But the situation that M was in at that time might not allow him to do it. In M’s narrating here, he switches to an English phrase, “dream company”, in (17-2) and to an English word, “situation”, in (17-4) under FAITH. M expresses what he meant by the word faithfully and economically. Both the phrase, “dream company”, and the word, “situation”, are used frequently by many people as borrowing words and should be used better by KESA in the US too.

However, as a response to S’s question in Korean in (17-5), “*TBWA-nun mwusun hoysa-eyyo?*” (What company is TBWA?), M switches to English in (17-6), “I will be an accounting executive. Being like a bridge between client and copywriter”, under POWER. M answers in authority what he will be doing in the company when he enters it. In fact, M is the only one who knows about the company, TBWA, among them. However, M’s CS to English here violates SOLIDARITY. Thus, M’s CS to English in (17-6) illustrates the interaction of POWER and SOLIDARITY and the rank of these two principles as POWER over SOLIDARITY in the bilingual grammar of KESA’s CS.

The data in (4-12) and (17-6) demonstrate the operations of the meta-principles, FAITH, SOLIDARITY, and POWER, and the interaction of POWER and SOLIDARITY. Thus, we can see the
meta-principles are working in the bilingual grammar of KESA’s CS and the ranking between them are emerging through the interactions between them.

As mentioned in the preceding chapter, however, there are few CS implemented by POWER in the data of KESA’s CS. Even with the aspect of KESA that they are more Korean in their cultural tendency, the members of KESA are also Americanized and more globalized in their social relationship with the members of a peer group. Thus, they might be less concerned about the power relationship based on age or other authorities among the peer group members. But, in their out-group interaction, such as in their interaction with older generation like parents or grand parents, there should be found more cases of CS implemented by POWER. Therefore, in a further research, more empirical data should be collected to support the rank of the two meta-principles, POWER and SOLIDARITY, as POWER over SOLIDARITY in the bilingual grammar of KESA. In the following section, how the hierarchy of the two principles, POWER and SOLIDARITY, is emerging through the interaction of these two meta-principles will be provided.

(1) Emerging Hierarchy of SOLIDARITY and POWER

The emerging hierarchy of POWER and SOLIDARITY and in the data (4-12), (17-6) is POWER over SOLIDARITY. Thus, the hypothesized hierarchy (21 below) between POWER and SOLIDARITY in the optimal bilingual grammar of KESA finds empirical support.

(21) POWER >> SOLIDARITY

In the data (4-12), C’s switch to English, “That exam is hard”, instantiates POWER to express ‘assertiveness’ and ‘authority’ to her opinion as a person who took the course and exam previously. This switch violates SOLIDARITY. None of the other three constraints, FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE, is involved in the interaction. The optimal choice is guaranteed by the logic of the interaction and optimal satisfaction between POWER and SOLIDARITY. The
candidate which includes the violation of the lower-ranked constraint will be the optimal choice. Thus, the emerging rank of POWER and SOLIDARITY from C’s CS to English in (4-12) is POWER over SOLIDARITY, which supports the hypothesis of the rank given in (21).

In the data (17-6), M’s CS to English, “I will be an accounting executive. Being like a bridge between client and copywriter”, is an instance of POWER to answer in authority what he will be doing in the company when he enters it. M’s CS to English here violates SOLIDARITY. None of the other three constraints, FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE, is involved in the interaction. Thus, the emerging rank of POWER and SOLIDARITY from M’s CS to English in (17-6) POWER over SOLIDARITY, which supports the hypothesis of the rank given in (21).

(2) Choice of Optimal Candidate

The processes of choosing an optimal candidate in the interaction of POWER and SOLIDARITY in the data excerpt given in (4-12) and (17-6) are provided in the following tableaux.

Tableau 41. Interaction of POWER and SOLIDARITY (4-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ☞ that exam is hard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <em>Ku sihem elyewe.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 41, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, SOLIDARITY, and b. violates the higher constraints, POWER. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.
Tableau 42. Interaction of POWER and SOLIDARITY (17-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ☞ I will be an accounting executive. Being like a bridge between client and copywriter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 42, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, SOLIDARITY, and b. violates the higher constraints, POWER. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

### 2.2.1.2. Interaction of FACE, FAITH and POWER

In the data Excerpt # (18), C, A, and D were attending the same college and the same Korean church. Among them, C was the oldest, A was the second oldest, and D was the youngest in their age. In this excerpt, they were talking about a news about their assistant pastor’s having a baby girl.

Excerpt # (18)

1A: I want to go to see centosa-nim’s baby
   Assistant pastor-HONsuffix

2C: nasyess-e?
   Gave birth-END?
   ((Did his wife) give a birth?)

3A: ecey pam-ey.
   Yesterday night-PART
   ((She gave birth last night.)

4C: ettekhay!
   (What a surprise!)

5A: ttal nahuysess-tay
   Daughter gave a birth-is said
   ((I heard) she gave birth to a baby girl.)
6D:  *sotwu* baby  
Small head  
(A baby with a small head)

7C:  *mwe*?  
(what?)

8A:  *cakun meli* baby  hahaha  
Small head  
(small head baby)

9D:  *ilum-i mwe-yess-tela*?  
Name-SUB what-was-like?  
(What was her name that I heard?)

10A:  *Yeci*

11C:  *ipputa Choy Yeci*  
Pretty  
(It is pretty, *choy yeci*)

12A:  *cayenpwunman ha-syess-tay.*  
Natural delivery did-HON-is said  
(She had a natural delivery, I heard)

13D:  *wancen kamkyek ha-sye-ss-e.* congratuations *ponay-ss-teni*,  
completely touched do-HONOR-PAST-ending send-PAST-CONJ,  
(He was completely touched. I sent (by text) ‘congratulation’.

14ecey thank you so much! (laughing)  
yesterday,  
(yesterday (he sent) thank you so much )

15A: uh~ I didn’t even message it

16  *pam-ey ka-l-kka? pam-ey ka-myen silyey-i-nka?*  
night-PART go-FUT-END? night-PART go-if bad-manners-is –ending  
(uh~ I didn’t even message it. Shall we go at night? If we go at night, is it bad-manners?)

17C:  *ani. mwun pak-eys po-myen toy-ci.*  
no door out-PART see-if okay-ending  
(No. if we see out of the door, it will be okay.)

In (18-1), A starts the conversation about their assistant pastor’s new born baby in English and intra-sententially switches to a Korean word, “*centosa-nim*” (assistant pastor), under FAITH and
FACE. She wants to express an appropriate title to call her assistant pastor of the Korean church she was attending by adding a Korean honorific suffix “-nim” to the title. This Korean title, “centosa-nim”, refers to an apprentice pastor who is not ordained yet and working for an ordained pastor. Thus, the corresponding English title, “an assistant pastor”, does not deliver the same meaning as the Korean title, “centosa-nim”. Thus, A’s CS to the Korean word, “centosa-nim”, is operated under FAITH. In addition, this CS will give a way to A to preserve A’s positive face to show respect to the assistant pastor by adding an appropriate honorific suffix “-nim”. Therefore, A’s CS to the Korean word, “centosa-nim”, is also operated under FACE.

In (18-2), C responds in Korean as their solidarity language and says, “nasyess-e?” (Did (his wife) give birth to a baby?), and all of them continue talking in Korean about what they heard about the assistant pastor’s newborn baby till (18-12); they heard that the assistant pastor gave birth to a baby girl with a small head named, “Yeci”, the night before. In (18-13), D intrasententially switches to an English word, “congratulations”, under FAITH to express faithfully what she texted in English. In (18-14), D switches to an English phrase, “Thank you so much”, under FAITH again to express faithfully what the assistant replied by text in English.

In (18-15), A responds in English, “uh~ I didn’t even message it.”, under PERSPECTIVE to express the risk of a face threatening that she could have from not even sending a message to the assistant pastor like a confession. Then, she switches to Korean in (18-16), “pam-ey ka-l-kka? pam-ey ka-myen silyey-i-nka?” under FACE to avoid a face threatening of her by asking C and D a solution using Korean as the language with a better system for a face work. In (18-17), C suggests a solution to A that she could visit the assistant pastor at night and see the baby from outside of the door.
In the data (18-1), A’s CS to the Korean word, “centosa-nim”, illustrates the interaction of three principles, FAITH, FACE, and POWER and the rank between them; FAITH outranks POWER and FACE outranks POWER. There is another example that demonstrates the interaction of FACE and POWER; in (18-16), A’s CS to Korean, “pam-ey ka-l-kka? pam-ey ka-myen silyey-i-nka?”, also shows the interaction and the rank of FACE and POWER as FACE over POWER.

(1) Emerging Hierarchy of FACE, FAITH and POWER

The emerging hierarchy of FAITH, FACE, and POWER in the data (18-1) and (18-16) is FAITH over POWER and FACE over POWER. Thus, the hypothesized hierarchy (22 below) between FAITH, FACE, and POWER in the optimal bilingual grammar of KESA finds empirical support:

(22)  {FAITH, FACE} >> POWER

In the data (18-1), A’s CS to Korean, “centosa-nim”, under FAITH, FACE to express to express an appropriate title and respect to the assistant pastor of the Korean church that she was attending. This switch violates POWER. None of the other two constraints, PERSPECTIVE, SOLIDARITY, are involved in the interaction. The optimal choice is guaranteed by the logic of the interaction and optimal satisfaction between FAITH, FACE and POWER. The candidate which includes the violation of the lower-ranked constraint will be the optimal choice. Thus, the emerging rank of FAITH, FACE and POWER from A’s CS to Korean in (18-1) is {FAITH, FACE} over POWER, which supports the hypothesis of the rank given in (22).

In the data (18-16), A’s CS to Korean, “pam-ey ka-l-kka? pam-ey ka-myen silyey-i-nka?”, under FACE to avoid a face threat of her by asking C and D a solution using Korean as the language with a better system for a face work. However, A’s CS to Korean violates POWER.
None of the other three constraints, FAITH, PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY, is involved in the interaction. Thus, the emerging rank of FACE and POWER from A’s CS to Korean in (18-16) is FACE over POWER, which supports the hypothesis of the rank given in (22).

(2) Choice of Optimal Candidate

The processes of choosing an optimal candidate in the interaction of FAITH, FACE, and POWER in the data excerpt given in (18-1) and (18-16) are provided in the following tableaux.

Tableau 43. Interaction of FAITH, FACE, and POWER (18-1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. centosa-nim</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the assistant pastor</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 43, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, POWER, and b. violates the higher constraints, FAITH and FACE. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

Tableau 44. Interaction of FACE, and POWER (18-16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. pam-ey ka-l-kka? pam-ey ka-myen silyey-i-nka?</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Shall we go at night? If we go at night, is it bad-manners?</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☞</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 44, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, POWER, and b. violates the higher constraint, FACE. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

2.2.1.3. Interaction of FACE and FAITH

In the data Excerpt # (19), A, B, C, and D were attending the same college and the same Korean church. In the data, C was the oldest, A the second oldest, D the third oldest, and B the
youngest girl. In the following excerpt, they were talking about finding a classroom on the campus.

Excerpt # (19)

1B: na-to cikum swuep ka-yatoy-nuntey kekise hanuntey
I also now class go-have to-but there do-but
(I also have to go to the class that I have there…)

2C: na armory-nun sa haknyen-indey cido chaca-ss-cana. (laughing)
I armory-CONT 4 grade-even map find-PAST-END
(I am still looking for Armory in a map even though I am in my senior year)

3D: il haknyen ttay cito talko tani-cana? Kuremyen mikwuk ay-tul-i do you need help
1 school year time map carrying go-ending then American guy-PLU-SUBJ

4 ileko mak towa-cwe il haknyen ttay-nun koma-we. mak kukey this willingly help-give. 1 school year time-CONT thank-ending without reason that,

4 school year time-CONT someone help-give-if face sold-conversation marker

(If you are carrying a map in your freshman year, American guys will eagerly help you like ‘do you need help’ and it is grateful in the freshman year. But, such a thing in your senior year, you know, it should be a shame on you if someone would help you with it)

6C: na-n kwaynchanh-a nan may hakki mwule-pwa may hakki freshmen
I-CONT fine-END I-CONT every semester asking-END every semester freshmen
(As for me, it is okay because I ask (a help to find a road) every semester, it is like a freshman every semester)

7A: kilka-eyse cito kkenay-cianha?
Roadside-on map take out-TAG
(You take out the map on the road, don’t you?)

8C: na-n solcikhi cito kkenay-to moll-a
I-CONT frankly map take out-even not-know-END
(Frankly speaking, I don’t know (how to read a map) even with a map in hand.)

9D: kukey cito ponun pep-i iss-e. keki-ey hauff hall-i iss-ko
then map reading way-SUB exist-END there-at hauff hall-SUB located-and

10 kuke-l chac-ko yep-ey D-3-lako issta. Kuliko cito-lul po-myen
that-OBJ find-and side-at D-3-like exist. And map-OBJ see-if
(That is, there is a way to read a map. Hauff hall is located there and you can find D3 beside it. And look at the map again and you find a,b,c,d, here and here is 1,2,3,4. The place you find is located upper side of G3.)

12C: eti-ka oyn-ccok olun-ccok-inci
Where-SUB left-side right-side-whether
((I don’t know) where is left side and where is right side.)

13D: kulel tay-nun kiswuksa-ka i panghang-inikka ilehkey
Such time-CONT dorm-SUB this direction-because like this
(At that time, your dorm is this way and you will do this way.)

14C: ah

15D: ilehkey south lang main ilang toy-iss-canh-a
Like this south and main with become-exist-TAG
(South and main is located like this)

16C: nanun acikto hauff hall kanun shortcut-ul molu-keysse
I-CONT still hauff hall going shortcut-OBJ not know-END
( I still don’t know a shortcut to hauff hall)

17A: eps-e (laughing)
Not exist-END
(There is none.)

18C: manyang kel-e (laughing)
Without thinking walking-END
(Without thinking, I am walking.)

In the data, the solidarity language is Korean and all the participants use intra-sentential CS to English in their utterance in Korean under FAITH to express what they want to say faithfully and economically. In (19-1), B is saying that she is going to a class held in Armory. In (19-2), C responds to B with a risk of face threatening by saying that she should look at the map to find where Armory is even though she is a senior attending the college for four years where Armory is a building of the campus. As to C’s saying with a risk of face threatening, in (19-4), D adds her critical comment on C’s utterance that she does not know where Armory is without a map. D
thinks C should have known where Armory is with her four years’ attendance of the school. D says when freshmen carry a map to find a classroom in the campus, they can get help from American students on the road. However, D criticizes a senior who asks some help to find a classroom. Thus, D says the senior should be ashamed. However, in (19-5), the Korean words, “ccok pali-cana”, used by D for “she or he should be ashamed” in English, has some derogatory meaning that could make a risk of face threatening to D when she mentions it, but that D still wants to add to her comments on C’s saying in (19-2). Thus, here D’s using of Korean words, “ccok pali-cana”, instantiates an interaction of FAITH and FACE and the rank of these two principles as FAITH over FACE.

In (19-6), however, C denies the shame that D implies with the derogatory words, “ccok pali-cana”. C says that she is okay with the fact that she asks help to find a classroom every semester. C continues that she felt like herself being a freshman every semester. Here, C switches to an English word, “freshman”, under FAITH. C’s response in (19-6) is a kind of positive face work for her to preserve her face; C suggests that she does not think it embarrassing to ask a help to find a classroom on the campus even in her age of a senior.

In (19-7), A also suggests an idea to C that she should take out a map to find the classroom instead of asking a help to other students, which could bring a face loss to C. However, in (19-8), C still rationalizes her act of finding a classroom by asking a help instead of reading a map even with the risk of face loss. This is another way of preserving her face; she says actually she doesn’t know how to read a map. In (19-9), D starts explaining to C how to read a map. This seems to be D’s indirect expression of apology to C for her utterance in (19-4) and (19-5) that could make a face threat to C. Thus, D continues explaining how to read a map
in (19-10) (19-11), (19-13), and (19-15). However, C appears to be uninterested in learning how to read a map in (19-12), (19-14), and (19-16).

In this data Excerpt # (19), we can see the operation of the principles, SOLIDARITY, FAITH, and FACE, and the interaction of FAITH and FACE in the bilingual grammar of KESA. With the limit of the small size of the KESA data, this is the only data that I could find for the interaction of FAITH and FACE among the KESA data and there should be more data collection that supports the rank of these two principles in the bilingual grammar of KESA. In the following sections, I will demonstrate the emerging hierarchy of FAITH and FACE and the choice of optimal candidate in the optimal bilingual grammar of KESA.

(1) Emerging Hierarchy of FACE and FAITH

The emerging hierarchy of FAITH and FACE in the data (19-4) and (19-5) is FAITH over FACE. Thus, the hypothesized hierarchy (20 below) between FAITH and FACE in the bilingual grammar of KESA finds empirical support:

(23) \( \text{FAITH} \gg \text{FACE} \)

In the data (19-4) and (19-5), D’s critical opinion about C’s not knowing where Armory is without a map in spite of her four years’ long attendance of the school includes the Korean words, “ccok pali-cana”. These Korean words have some derogatory meaning that could make a risk of face threatening to D when she mentions it. However, D still mentions the Korean words, “ccok pali-cana”, instead of its English version, “It should be a shame on you”, in order to emphasize that C should know how to read a map to find a classroom in order to preserve her face as a senior student of the college. Thus, D’s non CS to English in (19-5) illustrates the interaction of FAITH and FACE and the rank of these two principles as FAITH over FACE. None of the other constraints, PERSPECTIVE, SOLIDARITY, and POWER is involved in the interaction.
The optimal choice is guaranteed by the logic of the interaction and optimal satisfaction between FAITH and FACE. The candidate which includes the violation of the lower-ranked constraint will be the optimal choice. Thus, the emerging rank of FAITH and FACE from D’s non-CS to English in (19-5) is FAITH over FACE, which supports the hypothesis of the rank given in (23).

(2) Choice of Optimal Candidate

The process of choosing an optimal candidate in the interaction of FAITH and FACE in the data excerpt given in (19-5) provided in the following tableau. In the interaction, D’s non-switch is her optimal choice to satisfy FAITH (to inform the derogatory meaning of Korean phrase, even with its violation of FACE (she should switch to English for FACE).

Tableau 45. Interaction of FAITH and FACE (19-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. sa haknyen ttay-nun nwuka towa–cu-myen ccok palice ana.</td>
<td>☜</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. sa haknyen ttay-nun nwuka towa–cu-myen , it should be a shame on you</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 45, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, FACE, and b. violates the higher constraint, FAITH. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

2.2.1.4. Interaction of PERSPECTIVE and FAITH

The following data, Excerpt # (20), is excerpted from the same data set that the data (41) is excerpted. Thus, the profile of A, C, and D is the same as is given in Excerpt # (20); they were attending the same college and the same Korean church, and C was the oldest, D the second oldest, and A was the youngest among them. In the data, they were talking about the
Excerpt # (20)

1A: *wuli mwusun sacin olakaissun-keya?*
   We what picture uploaded-END
   (What pictures of us are uploaded there?)

2C: *honca ssulecyeiss-nuntey patak-ey ile-kwu issnun-ke*
   Alone being fell flat- and floor-on this-like staying-thing
   ((the picture) that I was staying like this on the floor being fell flat by myself)

3D: ha ha ha ha *swumanhun ku tali-lul*
   (Laughing) a lot of that leg-OBJ
   (with those many legs)

4C: *twu cut-i issess-e hayekan pisushayss-e*
   Two cut-SUB there were-END anyway was similar-END
   (There were two cuts. Anyway, they were similar.)
   5A: *pwa-yakeyss-ta*
   See-would-END
   (I would see it)

6C: *na cincca H-inka J-inka wa-kaciko*
   I really H-is she J-is she came-and
   (I really, H or J came and)

7 *ce salam cosimhala-ko kwulyok-sacin cenmwunka-lako*
   that person be careful-is said humiliating-picture professional-is said
   ((said) “Be aware of that person” “He is a professional (photographer) taking humiliating pictures.”)

8 *kuntey mwupangpi sangtay-lo issessta ta ccikhyess-e*
   but nonprotection condition-in existing all taken-END
   (But, we were in condition of non-protection and got the picture taken)

In (20-1), A asks what pictures of them were uploaded on the website of the church. In (20-2), C answers that it was a picture in which she has a humiliating posture of being fell flat alone. In (20-3), D adds what she saw in the picture to C’s description in (20-2); there were so many legs in the picture. In (20-4), C says there are two cuts and they are very similar. Then, A says in
(20-5) that she would see it. In (20-6), C starts explaining how those pictures were taken in a way of regretting it. In addition, in (20-7), C is telling what she heard from H and J before the pictures were taken, “ce salam cosimhala-ko kwulyok-sacin cemwunka-lako” (Be aware of that person and he is a professional (photographer) taking humiliating pictures.) Here, C changes her stance from her own to H and J’s. Thus, C’s CS to English is expected here for PERSPECTIVE. However, C does not switch to English as an instance of FAITH. C uses the Korean words that she heard from H and J. In Korean, the word, “humiliating”, is more effective than the corresponding English one to deliver the sense of the word, “humiliation”, to KESA. Thus, C’s non-CS to English in (20-7) illustrates the interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE and the rank between them as FAITH over PERSPECTIVE.

The following data, Excerpt # (21), also illustrates the interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE. In the data, S is a KESA who came to the US when he was a sixth grader. S went back to Korea in his 10th grade, and came back to the US to attend the college. In this excerpt, he is narrating how he chose his major when he first came to the college in the US. He also mentions what he likes in the way of studying his major.

Excerpt # (21)

1 S: cheumey mikwuk-ey wassel ttay first class-ka horticulture-yess-eyo.
   First time the US-to came when first class-SUB horticulture-was-HON-END
   (When I first came to the US, the first class was horticulture.)

2 First year ttay-nun swiwess-eyo,
   When-CONT was easy-HON-END
   (In the first year, it was easy)

3 waynyamyen yenge-to ta mos alatuless-ciman, ku class teacher-ka nemwu cohass-eyo.
   For English-also all not understood-but that class teacher-SUB very good-END
   (For that class teacher was very good even though I could not understand English all.)

4 Science team season-i iss-nuntey, late November to February-kkaci-intey
   Science team season-SUB have-but late November to February-till-and
(I have a science team season from late November to February and)

5kuttay-mata every Tuesday 7pm kkaci ka-se twu sey sikan tongan ha-nuntey
then-times 7pm-by go-and two three hours for do-and
(Every season, I go by 7pm every Tuesday and work for two or three hours and)

6hankwuk-eyse aytul-ilang hayss-ten kacok-kathi kkunkunham-ul nukkyess-eyo
Korea-in guys-with doing-ADJ family-like stickiness-OBJ felt-HON-END
(I felt emotional stickiness like a family that I felt when I was with my friends)

7kulehkeyhayse iltan salamtul-kwa chinhaycita po-ni
in that way once people-with get acquainted see-and
(In that way, once I was acquainted with people and)
8Kongpwuhanun-kes-i caymisskey nukkyeciki sicakhayss-eyo.
Studying-thing-SUB interesting feeling started-HON-END
(I started to feel it interesting to study (it) )

9Kekise hanun key mwe-nya-myen identification-i-eyyo.
There doing thing what-QUE-if identification-is-HON-END
(What I am doing there is identification.)

10Trees and flowers, Drive-hamyense “Ah, na ceke ala, ala” hamyense
Trees and flowers, Drive-doing-and ah, I that know know doing-and
(Trees and flowers, while I was driving, I am doing “I know that, I know.”)

11confidence-lul hoypokhan-ke kath-ayo.
Confidence-OBJ restoring-thing like-HON-END
(I felt like recovering my confidence.)

12Kulayse te manhun sikmwul-tul-ul al-kosip-ese googling-hamyense po-ni
Thus more much plat-PL-OBJ know-want-and googling-doing-and see-and
(Thus, I wanted to know more plants and did googling and

13Talun aitul-pota te manhun plants-lul alkey toyess-eyo.
Other students-than more many plants-OBJ know became-HON-END
(I came to know the names of plants better than other students.)

14Cohahanun-key issumyen dig up-hanun senghyang-iese, kulehkey alkey toyessko-yo.
Favorite-thing have-if dig-up-doing tendency-and in that way know became-END
(It is because I have a personality that I would dig up what I like to do. )

In the data, S says that the first class he took at the college in the US is ‘horticulture’. Even with
his difficulty of understanding what he learned in English, S says, it was easy for him to do in
the first year because the teacher was good. The science team season he had spent working with other people of ‘horticulture’ made him feel emotional stickiness to the members like a family. It also made him more interested in studying ‘horticulture’. S was working on identifying the plants, trees and flowers, during the science team season. He was becoming more confident in himself. S’s confidence was recovered when he recognized more and more plants’ names while he was driving. Therefore, the more S wanted to know the names of plants, the more he googled them. Thereby, he came to know the names of the plants better than other students. His personality made him dig up what he likes to do. In his narration, S switches to English intrasententially. The following CS in S’s narration are instances of FAITH; “first class”, “horticulture” in (21-1); “First year” in (21-2); “class teacher” in (21-3); “Science team season”, “late November to February” in (21-4); “every Tuesday 7pm” in (21-5); “identification” in (21-9); “Trees and flowers”, “Drive” in (21-10); “confidence” in (21-11); “googling” in (21-12); “plants” in (21-13), “dig up” in (21-14). With these intrasentential CS, S expresses what S wants to describe faithfully and economically. However, in (21-10), when S changes his voicing, “Ah, na ceke ala, ala” (I know that, I know (that)), under PERSPECTIVE. He wants to express his self-assured utterance to himself about his knowledge of the plants he noticed on the road. Thus, here, S’s switch to English is expected for PERSPECTIVE. However, S does not switch to English here, which seems to be a result of an operation of FAITH. For S, the language we expect him to use when he speaks to himself should be Korean. S feels more comfortable in Korean as his first and native language when he speaks to himself as well as to his close friends of KESA. Thus, S’s non-CS to English here even with his change of perspective illustrates the interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE. The rank of these two principles is FAITH over PERSPECTIVE in the bilingual grammar of KESA.
(1) Emerging Hierarchy of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE

The emerging hierarchy of FAITH and FACE in the data (20-7) and (20-10) is FAITH over PERSPECTIVE. Thus, the hypothesized hierarchy (24 below) between FAITH and FACE in the bilingual grammar of KESA finds empirical support;

(24) FAITH >> PERSPECTIVE

As mentioned above, in the data (20-7), C’s non-CS to English demonstrates the interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE and the rank between them as FAITH over PERSPECTIVE. None of the other constraints, FACE, SOLIDARITY, and POWER is involved in the interaction. The optimal choice is guaranteed by the logic of the interaction and optimal satisfaction between FAITH and PERSPECTIVE. The candidate which includes the violation of the lower-ranked constraint will be the optimal choice. Thus, the emerging rank of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE from C’s non-CS to English in (20-7) is FAITH over PERSPECTIVE, which supports the hypothesis of the rank given in (24).

In the data (21-10), S’s non-CS to English even with his change of voicing, “Ah, na ceke ala, ala” (I know that, I know (that)), to express his self-assured utterance to himself seems to be a result of an operation of FAITH. S wants to express what he really said to himself even with his change of perspective. Thus, S’s non-CS to English here also illustrates the interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE and the rank of these two principles as FAITH over PERSPECTIVE. None of the other constraints, FACE, SOLIDARITY, and POWER is involved in the interaction and the emerging rank of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE from S’s non-CS to English in (21-10) is FAITH over PERSPECTIVE, which supports the hypothesis of the rank given in (24).
(2) Choice of Optimal Candidate

The processes of choosing an optimal candidate in the interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE in the data excerpt given in (20-7) and (21-10) are provided in the following tableaux.

Tableau 46. Interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE (20-7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ḋẹ sаlmа cosimhаlа-kо kwultyok-sаcіn cmnwunka-lаkо</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Be aware of that person and he is a professional (photographer) taking humiliating pictures.</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 46, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, PERSPECTIVE, and b. violates the higher constraint, FAITH. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

Tableau 47. Interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE (21-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>PERSP</th>
<th>FACE</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>SOLID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ḋẹ Ah, na ceke alа, alа”</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I know that, I know (that)</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tableau 47, candidate a. violates the lower constraint, PERSPECTIVE, and b. violates the higher constraint, FAITH. Therefore, a. is the optimal choice for the context.

2.2.1.5. Interaction of PERSPECTIVE and FACE

With the limit of the small amount of KESA data, I could not find an empirical data that supports the hypothesis of the hierarchy between the two principles, PERSPECTIVE and FACE, as PERSPECTIVE over FACE presented in (17) FAITH > PERSPECTIVE > FACE > POWER > SOLIDARITY.
The rank of these two principles in the bilingual grammar of KESA’s CS will be left to investigate in the further research with sufficient data collection of KESA’s CS. In the meantime, the rank of PERSPECTIVE and FACE in the optimal bilingual grammar of KESA’s CS is unranked.

### 2.2.2. The Rank of Five Principles

The rank of the five meta-principles, FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE, SOLIDARITY, POWER, for an optimal bilingual grammar of KESA within the theoretical framework of Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) OPTIMIZATION is given in (25). This rank, however, has limited support from the small amount of the KESA data and thereby needs to be investigated in a further research with more sufficient data of KESA’s CS.

(25) FAITH >> {PERSPECTIVE, FACE} >> POWER >> SOLIDARITY

Even with the limitation of the supportive data, this rank of five principles provides an empirical generalization of Korean-English CS in a community of practice of KESA (Korean Early Study Abroad) in the United States, which is different from that of KHS in the rank of POWER and SOLIDARITY, and in the rank of PERSPECTIVE and FACE.

However, what makes the ranks of the five principles different between the bilingual grammars of KHS and KESA is beyond the focus of the research performed in this dissertation. Thus, a further research should be done about the sociolinguistic and/or sociocultural factors that make the difference of the ranks between the bilingual grammars of KHS and KESA with a corpus of data to support the rank of the principles in each grammar.
2.3. Grammars in Flux: Some KHS and KESA Speculations on Transitional Competence

In this section, a pilot study of the bilingual grammars in flux captured in the interaction of KHS and KESA is explored through an empirical data collected from the natural conversation of the interaction of one KHS and one KESA. The focus of this pilot study of the grammars in flux is on how the bilingual grammar of KHS and that of KESA are adjusted in their interaction. Thus, I will demonstrate a preliminary data analysis regarding the adjustment of the bilingual grammars of KHS and KESA presented in the preceding sections. However, further research should be done with more supportive data to verify the result of this pilot study of bilingual grammars in flux in the interaction of KHS and KESA..

2.3.1. The Interaction of five principles in the interaction of KHS and KESA

Like the data of KESA’s CS collected for the dissertation, the data collected for the interaction of KHS and KESA is small in its amount compared to that of KHS’s. Therefore, I couldn’t find a lot of instances for the interactions of five meta-principles, FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE, SOLIDARITY, and POWER in the interaction of KHS and KESA. However, the data presented here will provide a clue to find the grammars in flux in the interaction of KHS and KESA. As a result, it will shed light on further research of an empirical generalization of the grammars in flux. In addition, it will also provide a key for a study of bilinguals’ transitional competence in the interaction of two different bilingual communities of practice in the bi-/multi-lingual contexts of globalization.

In the data collected for the interaction of KHS and KESA, there are two subjects, that is, one KHS, O, and one KESA, TH. O is a KHS who was leading the conversations of KHS data presented in the preceding sections for the bilingual grammar of KHS. TH is a KESA who came to the US when he was an eight grader and has been living in the US for seven years since
then. O and TH were attending the same middle school and high school, and the same Korean church. At the time of data collection, O was attending the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and TH a community college in Chicago. In the data, Korean is used as the solidarity language of the conversation and there are frequent intra-and inter-sentential CS to English that could illustrate the interaction of the five principles.

The first data excerpt that I am looking at demonstrates the interaction of the principles, FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE, POWER, and SOLIDARITY. In the data, O and TH are talking about TH’s applying for the US army to get a US citizenship, which most KESA wants to acquire for their getting a job in the US after their graduation of the college.

Excerpt # (22)

1O: Tell me more about your Army and everything. You’re going in January?

2TH: Yeah, January 12th.

3O: And then boot camp, right? Boot camp is in South Carolina?

4TH: Yeah, not the North one.

5O: And how many months do you go to boot camp and then where do you go from there?

6TH: It said it’s going to take 9 weeks.

7O: 9 weeks exactly?

8TH: Yeah. For the boot camp, 9 weeks and 3 days. *Ku taum-ey ATHI-lako* The next-in ATHI-is said

9O: ETHI?

10TH: ATHI. I don’t know what it stands for, though. Kuntey, it’s sort of job training.

11 It takes 9 weeks too. So 9 weeks and 3 days for the job training.

12O: um, boot camp for 9 weeks then ATHI for 9 weeks?

13TH: Yeah. It’s a total of 18 weeks for only the training part.
14O: What exactly is ATHI? You said job training,

15 but wuntong ppakseykey hako kulenkeya? animyen is it…
Exercise severely doing such-thing-END otherwise,
(But, is it such a thing like doing exercise severely? Or is it…)

16TH: ike-nun com kaluchye cwunun-ke? Nayka icye
this-SUB a little teaching give-thing? I now
(This is like teaching thing? I will now..)

17O: paywun ke-lul?
Learned thing-OBJ
(Teach) what you learned?)

18TH: kuchi... ani ani, ike-nun icye nayka… Boot camp is physical training.
Right no no this-SUB now I
(Right... no, no, this is that now I…)

19O: What training?

20TH: Physical.

21O: ah, physical training. Okay.

22TH: kulaykaciko ike-nun mwe wuntonghanun ke kulen kaynyem-intey
And then this-SUB some exercising thing such concept-and
(And then, this is like exercising, such concept and..)

23 ATHI-nun icye nay job-i warehouse-eyse ilhanun kulen job-iya,
ATHI-SUB now my job-SUB warehouse-in working such job-END
(ATHI is… now my job is working in a warehouse, (it is) such a job.)

24 Kulayse kulen ke-ey kwanhayse it’s just like accounting,

25 how to move the leg machine…

26O: So it’s just more educational stuff, right?

27TH: Yeah.

28O: Gotcha. So boot camp’s more physical and ATHI is more using your brain?

29TH: ung (yes) Then 4 years of…

30O: 4 years of service? Ah man… Do you look forward to your 4 years?
31TH: Hmm?

32O: Do you look forward to it? Do you think it’s gonna be fun or…

33TH: solcikhi malhamyen com kaki silhun maum-to yocum sayngkikin ha-ci. 
Frankly speaking a little going dislike heart-also a little arising do-END 
(Frankly speaking, I felt recently a hesitating mind to go to the army arise inside.)

34O: icey-nun kaki ceney? Why? 
Now-CONT going before 
(At this time, just before you go?)

35TH: Cause it’s gonna take 4 years. I’m gonna be separated from like… Everyone.

36O: Yeah, that’s true. Kuntey you said you kind of have a say in where you want to go for the four years, right? Like you can say, “I want to go back to Chicago”.

37TH: No, it’s like they’re gonna tell me. They’re gonna give me some options and I choose one of them.

38O: Ah, so you have no say before. You can’t be like, “Can you put Chicago in as one of the options?”

While they were talking in Korean in the preceding utterances, O switches from Korean to English when they starts talking about TH’s attending the US army and asks TH to tell him about his story of attending the US army in (22-1). O’s CS to English here is operational under FAITH, POWER, and PERSPECTIVE. O and TH are talking about the US Army, which can be described in English more faithfully and more economically. Thus, O’s choice of English to ask about TH’s attending the US army is an operation of FAITH. In addition, English is the official language and thereby the power language of the conversation in the US. Therefore, it is also a CS of POWER. Finally, O changes his stance in his CS to English from a friend of TH sharing Korean culture to a Korean American who has an American citizenship and does not need to go the US Army to acquire it. Thus, O’s CS to English here is also an instance of PERSPECTIVE. We can see the interaction of {FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, POWER} and SOLIDARITY in O’s CS to
English in (22-1). The emerging rank of these principles is \{FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, POWER\} over SOLIDARITY, which is part of the optimal bilingual grammar of KESA.

O and TH continue speaking in English till (22-9), where TH shortly switches to Korean under SOLIDARITY. TH explains the process that he should join the US army but that he does not know well either, which is mentioned in (22-10). In other words, TH’s short CS to Korean here is to tell O that there comes another process that he does not know well either (like O). This could be better expressed in Korean as their solidarity language in the conversation. However, TH seems to realize that English should be better to explain the process that he should join the US army. Thus, TH switches back to English in (22-10). Then, O and TH continue speaking in English about the process till (22-14).

In (22-15), O switches to Korean under FAITH to express what he guesses for ATHI, that is, for the hardship of the job training TH will take in the US army. In other words, O wants to express the hardship of the training that he guess with his CS to Korean using the Korean word, “ppakseykey”, which is more expressive and appealing than its English version, “severely”, to TH as a KESA. In (22-16), TH switches to Korean under SOLIDARITY to accommodate to O in his trying to guess what ATHI is in Korean. TH tries to explain the job training in Korean till (22-18). However, in (22-18), TH switches to English again for FAITH and POWER to avoid the difficulty of explaining ATHI in Korean. This could be noticed in (22-16) and in the first part of (22-18). In his CS to English in the second part of (22-18), TH tries to explain the characteristic of the trainings in the US Army better in English, starting from the boot camp. Here, we can see the interaction of FAITH and POWER in TH’s CS to Korean. The emerging rank between these two principles is FAITH over POWER.
In (22-22), TH switches to Korean again. In the preceding utterance, O asks TH in (22-19), “What training?” to what TH said in English in (22-18), “Boot camp is physical training”. TH answers in (22-10), “Physical”. O responds in (22-21), “Ah, physical training. Okay. Thus, TH’s CS to Korean in (22-22) as to O’s mishearing of TH’s English word, “Physical”, is operational under FACE to avoid a risk of face threatening related to his Korean accent or lack of confidence in his speaking in English. We can see the interaction of FACE and POWER in TH’s CS to Korean and the emerging rank of these two principles is FACE over POWER. TH tries to explain what ATHI is in Korean, but, still he uses intra-sentential CS in (22-23) under FAITH. Finally, TH switches back to English in (22-24) and (22-25) under FAITH and POWER again. TH explains the concept of ATHI better in the language to deliver an authentic meaning of ATHI.

In (22-26), O accommodates to TH and speaks in English to express what he understands from TH’s explanation of ATHI. In (22-27), O continues speaking in English to confirm his understanding of two training programs that TH will take in the US Army: boot camp and ATHI. After this conversation about boot camp and ATHI, O and TH continue their conversation in English till (22-32). In (22-33), TH switches to Korean, “solcikhi malhamyen com kaki silhun maum-to yokum sayngkikin ha-ci.”(Frankly speaking, I felt recently a hesitating mind for going (to the US Army) arise inside.), under SOLIDARITY. TH expresses his recent hesitating feeling about attending the US army for getting a US citizenship. TH wants to share this feeling with O who is a close friend of his. In (22-34), O also switches to Korean under SOLIDARITY, and switches back to English under PERSPECTIVE. O asks TH if there is any inevitable reason why he felt recently a hesitating mind for going to the US Army just before he is going. This question is not from O’s personal curiosity, but rather from a general point of
view. TH’s CS to English in (22-35) to answer O’s question in (22-34) indicates that TH also understands O’s perspective change in his question, “why?” In addition, TH also changes his perspective to answer O’s question. Thus, both O’s CS to English in (22-34), “why”, and TH’s CS to English in (22-35), “Cause it’s gonna take four years. I’m gonna be separated from like… Everyone.”, are operated by PERSPECTIVE.

In (22-36), O mentions that what TH provided in (22-35) is not a good answer for his question, “why”. As far as O knows, TH has a good reason to go to the US Army even with four years’ length of military service. TH can choose where wants to go for the four years. Therefore, O uses a quoted expression to change his voicing to what TH can say for his choosing a place to go for the four years, “I want to go back to Chicago.” In this quoted expression, we can expect a CS to Korean under PERSPECTIVE. O changes his voicing to TH’s at the office of the US Army in the future. However, there is no CS in O’s mentioning the quoted expression, which is implemented by FAITH. What TH will say at the office of the US Army is English, not Korean. Thus, O’s non-CS to Korean is the optimal linguistic choice here under FAITH. Here, we can find the interaction of PERSPECTIVE and FAITH. The rank of these two principles emerging from O’s non CS to Korean in (22-36) is FAITH over PERSPECTIVE.

In (22-38), we can see the same kind of example which demonstrates the interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE. “Can you put Chicago in as one of the options?” is the quoted expression that O expects TH to say at the office of the US Army. Here again, O’s non-CS to Korean is under FAITH like the one in (22-36). We expect O’s CS to Korean under PERSPECTIVE. However, O does not switch to Korean. The emerging rank of these two principles is also FAITH over PERSPECTIVE.
The following data, Excerpt # (23), also provides empirical data that illustrate the interaction of meta-principles. In the data, O and TH are talking about TH’s kids’ in the future and TH’s opinion about their marriage to a different race or ethnicity.

Excerpt # (23)

1O: *eh, ne aytul iss-nuntey icey kyayney-ka,*
You kids have-and now they-SUB
(If you have kids and they say,

2 “*eh, appa… ce-nun hankwuk salam malko talun nala-ka cohta*”
Dad I-HON-SUB Korea people not other country-SUB like
(Dad, I like a person from other countries rather than Korean people.)

3TH: *kyayney sentayk-i-ci.*
Their choice-is-END
(It should be their choice)

4O: You think so? You don’t care?

5TH: I don’t really care about it. It’s their lives. I mean…If they want to marry, then…

In (23-1) and (23-2), O supposes that TH’s kids in the future would say, “*eh, appa… ce-nun hankwuk salam malko talun nala-ka cohta*” (Dad, I like a person from other countries rather than Korean people.), and asks TH what he should do with his kids. In (23-3), TH responds in Korean and says, “*kyayney sentayk-i-ci.*” (It should be their choice) Here, in the quoted expression, “*eh, appa… ce-nun hankwuk salam malko talun nala-ka cohta*”, we can see again the interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE and the emerging rank of these two principles is FAITH over PERSPECTIVE. With the change of O’s perspective, we expect O’s switch to English for PERSPECTIVE, but O does not switch to English under FAITH. Thus, the emerging rank of these two principles is FAITH over PERSPECTIVE.
In (23-4), O switches to English under PERSPECTIVE to clarify TH’s intention to his future kids’ openness to spouse of other races or ethnicity. In (23-5), TH also switches to English under PERSPECTIVE and POWER to clarify his intention that he doesn’t really care about it. It’s their lives and if they want to marry, then they would. In addition, TH’s CS to English is under POWER. His previous utterance in Korean as their solidarity language includes the same intention of TH about his future kids’ openness to spouse of other races or ethnicity. However, O wants to clarify if it is TH’s real intention. Thus, TH switches to English as the power language of the conversation to express his intention with assertiveness and authority delivered by the power language of the conversation, English. Here, we can see the interaction of POWER and SOLIDARITY and the emerging rank of these two principles is POWER over SOLIDARITY.

One more data excerpt that illustrates the interaction of five meta-principles in the interaction of KHS and KESA is presented in Excerpt # (24). In the data, O and TH are talking about TH’s emotional tendency of crying when he watches a sad movie or soap opera and his mother’s attitude toward it.

Excerpt # (24)

1O: Did you watch it with H? Or did you watch it by yourself?

2TH: na, emma-lang H-lang kathi pwass-nuntey
   I mom-with H-with together watched-and
   (I was watching it with my mom and H)

3O: seys-i ta?
   Three-SUB all
   (All of you three?)

4TH: eh.

5O: seys-i ta wuless-e?
   Three-SUB all crying-END?
   (Were you all three crying?)
6TH: *ani, emma-lang H-nun na-poko michinnom-ilay.*
   No, mom and H-SUB I-to crazy guy-call
   (No way, my mom and H called me a crazy guy.)

7O: *cenghwakhi mwe-lako..*? *kunyang potaka wule-kacko emma-ka*
   Exactly what- is like just watching crying-and mom-SUB
   (Exactly, what did you say? You are just watching and crying, and your mom.)

8TH: *emma-ka, “ah, michinnom. Cekes tto cilcil ccakoissney” ilayss-e.*
   Mom-SUBJ ah crazy guy that again dribbling extracting said like this
   (Mom said like this, “ah, crazy boy, he was extracting his tear again”)

9O: *ah, cincca? Kuntey mwenka neney emeni-kathci anhusintey?*
   Ah really but, something your mother-like not-END?
   (Ah, really?, But, there is something that is not like your mother)

10TH: *wuli emma na-hanteyn kulay. Na kuntey sulpun-ke pomyen toykey cal wul-e*
   Our mom me-to do-END I but sad-thing watch-if very well crying
   (My mom did it to me. But, I am crying well when I watch a sad thing.)

In (24-1), O asks TH if he watched a popular Korean soap opera with his mother and sister or alone. In the preceding utterance, TH says that he was crying while he was watching the last episode of the soap opera. Here, O’s question is actually about TH’s risk of face loss in case of his crying at the sad scenes of the soap opera watching with his mother and sister, H. In the preceding conversation, O and TH were using Korean in their conversation about TH’s crying at the sad scenes of the TV show. Then, O switches to English in (24-1) under PERSPECTIVE and asks, “Did you watch it with H? Or did you watch it by yourself”. Here, O makes his tone of asking more seriously because the question is about TH’s face loss. However, in (24-2), TH still answers in Korean as the solidarity language of the conversation and says he watched it with his mom and sister. This attitude of TH could imply that TH might not think his crying at a sad scene of the TV-show watching it with his family is a face loss to him. Or TH might not care about his face loss from his crying at a TV-show watching it with his family.
In (24-5), O still tries to find out a way to preserve TH’s face in his crying at the TV-show watching it with his mother and sister, H. O asks TH if all the three (TH, his mother, and his sister, H) were crying at the TV show at that time. But, in (24-6), TH’s answer in Korean, “ani, emma-lang H-nun na-poko michinnom-ilay” (No, my mom and H called me a crazy guy.) suggests that TH really might not care about his face loss from his talking about his family and himself. In (24-6), the Korean word, “michinnom”, is a bad word of abuse in Korean which could bring a risk of face loss to the person speaking it in public. Thus, TH’s saying to O that his mother and sister called him ‘michinnom’ for his crying at the TV show will bring a face threatening to him as well as to his mother and sister. So, TH’s CS to English is expected under FACE. But, TH still uses the Korean word ‘michinnom’ under FAITH to deliver the faithful word that he heard from his mother and sister. Thus, TH’s non-CS in (24-6) illustrates the interaction of FAITH and FACE in the grammars in flux in the interaction of KHS and KESA. The emerging rank of these two principles is FAITH over FACE.

One more example that instantiates the interactions of FAITH and FACE and of PERSPECTIVE and FAITH is found in (24-8). As to O’s question in (24-7) about what his mother exactly said about his crying at the TV show, TH answers in (24-8) with the exact words of his mother in the quoted utterance. Here, we expect TH’s CS to English under PERSPECTIVE to change his voicing to his mother’s in the quoted utterance. But, TH does not switch to English under FAITH to express the exact words that his mother mentions. Thus, TH’s non-CS to English here demonstrates the interaction of PERSPECTIVE and FAITH and the emerging rank between these two principles is FAITH over PERSPECTIVE. In addition, the quoted utterance of his mother’s saying, “ah, michinnom. Cekes tto cilcil ccakoissney” (“ah, crazy boy, he was extracting his tear in dribbling again”), includes the same word of abuse, ‘michinnom’ (crazy
boy), which TH says his mother and sister called him, a pronoun, ‘cekés’ (that thing), that his mother used to refer to TH, and the phrase, ‘cilcil ccakoissney’ (extracting his tear in dribbling), which also has a derogatory nuance. With the use of all these derogatory words in the utterance, his mother’s saying to TH quoted by him in (24-8) will bring a risk of a face threatening to TH and his mother. Thus, we can expect here TH’s CS to English under FACE because the corresponding English words could weaken the risk of a face threatening to TH and his mother. But, in (24-8), TH does not switch to English under FAITH to express what his mother exactly said to him. Thus, TH’s non-CS to English in (24-8) also illustrates the interaction of FAITH and FACE in the grammars in flux in the interaction of KHS and KESA. The emerging rank of these two principles here is FAITH over FACE.

2.3.2. Emerging rank of the five principles in the grammars in flux

The emerging rank of the five principles in the bilingual grammars in flux from the empirical data of the interaction of KHS and KESA provided in Excerpt # (22), Excerpt # (23), and Excerpt # (24) is as follows.

(26) FAITH>> {PERSPECTIVE, FACE} >> POWER >> SOLIDARITY

The rank of the five principles presented in (26) is the same with the rank of KESA presented in (25), which implies that the bilingual grammar of KESA could be the adjusted one of the two optimal bilingual grammars of KHS and KESA in the interaction of KHS and KESA. Considering the fact that the difference of the ranks of the five principles between the two bilingual grammars of KHS and KESA seems to be the rank of POWER and SOLIDARITY, the adjusted part of the grammars in flux is the rank of POWER and SOLIDARITY. The reason why the grammar of KESA is the adjusted one between the two grammars of KHS and KESA should be investigated in a further research with more sufficient data to support the hierarchies
presented for the bilingual grammars and grammars in flux of KHS and KESA in the dissertation.
Chapter 6. Conclusion

1. Overview

The research in this dissertation explored the nature of the sociolinguistic grammar of bilingual language use through a study of the bilingual grammars of Korean-English bilingual students in the United States. The code-switching patterns of two groups of Korean-English bilinguals — Korean Heritage Students (KHS) and Korean Early Study Abroad students (KESA) — are analyzed to establish their respective bilingual grammars, using the central idea of OPTIMIZATION in the theoretical framework of Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011). OPTIMIZATION, as a theoretical construct, allows us to answer a rather fundamental question about bilingual language use: what are the creative processes underlying bi-/multi-linguals’ use of their linguistic repertoire? This dissertation demonstrates how slightly different code-switching patterns in two bilingual groups are a result of different optimization outcomes of universal, but violable, potentially conflicting sociolinguistic constraints, i.e., specifically, this dissertation shows that the differences in the bilingual behavior (output/outcomes) between two sets of Korean-English bilinguals are due mainly to the minor differences in their grammars, understood as ranked sociolinguistic constraints.

I first analyzed the corpus of KHS data to determine how the five principles, FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE, POWER, and SOLIDARITY interact with each other and how their interaction and optimal satisfaction yield the bilingual grammar of KHS. Next, KESA data, which is relatively small compared to the corpus of KHS, is examined to understand the nature of the bilingual grammar of KESA. Finally, I analyzed, briefly, the interactional data between the two groups of Korean bilinguals to see whether, and to what extent, there is any adjustment in the
grammars of the two groups, any discernible accommodations to each other where there are sociolinguistic-grammatical differences.

This chapter is organized as follows: first, the discussion of the result of the research will be provided; second, the empirical and theoretical contributions of the research will be discussed; third, the limitations and problems regarding the data collection and the analysis of the data performed in the research will be discussed; and, finally, the chapter will be concluded with a discussion of directions for further research.

2. Discussion of Results

The five constraints (or principles) of Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) Optimal Grammar, FAITH, POWER, SOLIDARITY, PERSPECTIVE, and FACE, were discussed with the CS excerpts from KHS and KESA data. The first goal of the research was to show how these five principles are operational, i.e., to establish their empirical presence in the bilingual grammar of Korean-English bilinguals’ linguistic choices, and the data analysis in chapter 4 indicates that there are many instances of the presence of these constraints in CS among the Korean-English bilinguals’ linguistic choices, across all three sets of interactional data: KHS-KHS, KESA-KESA, and KESA-KHS.

In the data of KHS, FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, and SOLIDARITY were more frequently observed than the other two principles, FACE and POWER. One tentative explanation for different frequencies of constraint violations/satisfaction might come from the demographics of the data pool: students in their 20s, attending a college in a multi-sociocultural society, the US. Occasions to mobilize FACE and POWER, while important constraints, are in fact rare since the talk-in-context from which data were collected were generally less face-threatening and more casual, less formal.
The bilingual grammars of KHS and KESA are investigated through the data analysis indicating how the five principles interact with each other to establish the bilingual grammars of these two groups of Korean-English bilinguals in the US. Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) hypothesis that a particular bilingual grammar is a set of hierarchically ranked conflicting universal constraints is adopted as the theoretical basis of the research. The first result of the data analysis for the bilingual grammar of KHS demonstrates that the interactions of the conflicting constraints operational in KHS’s CS build up a ranking of the five principles presented in (19), which is repeated below:

(19) FAITH >> PERSPECTIVE >> FACE >> SOLIDARITY >> POWER

In this grammar, POWER is ranked lowest, within admittedly a very small number of operation of this constraint. The interaction of FACE and SOLIDARITY shows that SOLIDARITY can be violated if it interacts with FACE issues. So FACE outranks SOLIDARITY (which outranks POWER). In addition, the data involving the interaction of PERSPECTIVE and FACE shows that PERSPECTIVE outranks FACE, i.e., when these two constraints are in conflict with each other, the data showed that FACE was violated to save a violation of PERSPECTIVE. Finally, the data that shows interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE yields a ranking where FAITH outranks PERSPECTIVE. As a result, the data show, for the first time, a robust and complete domination hierarchy; all previous attempts at OPTIMIZATION have yielded only partial domination (cf. Bhatt & Bolonyai 2011), much like the grammar of KESA, which I discuss next.

The data analysis for the bilingual grammar of KESA indicates that the interactions of the conflicting constraints operational in KESA’s CS also build up the rank of the five principles as is presented in (25), which is repeated as follows,

---

6 cf. 4. 4. How the system of Bhatt and Bolonyai’s OPTIMIZATION works (Chapter 2: 44-49)
The ranking between PERSPECTIVE and FACE could not be determined because I could not find any instance of an interaction of these two principles. However, with more data collection, the ranking of these two principles in the bilingual grammar of KESA, much like I found in KHS, could be determined, which I leave for my future research goal. As mentioned in the preceding chapter, the ranking of KESA is developed with limited support from the small amount of the KESA data that was collected and thereby needs to be investigated better in a further research with more data of KESA’s CS. However, even with this limitation of the supportive data, the ranking of five principles contributes to providing an empirical generalization of KESA’s CS to establish a bilingual grammar of KESA.

Comparing the ranks of five principles driven from the data analysis for the bilingual grammars of KHS and KESA, the rank of POWER and SOLIDARITY is observed to be different between them. There are perhaps many sociocultural and/or sociolinguistic factors involved in the difference of the ranking of these two principles. However, it is beyond the focus of the research performed in this dissertation to speculate on what this difference means, or what might be an adequate explanation of this difference. Clearly, after establishing firmly the hierarchically ranked constraint-grammar, the next step will be to theorize on the sociolinguistic and/or sociocultural factors that contribute to the difference of the ranking between the bilingual grammars of KHS and KESA.

Finally, the data of the interaction of KHS and KESA are examined, as a pilot effort, to provide clues for any accommodation that may appear when the two groups of bilinguals interact with each other. The result of a preliminary data analysis regarding the adjustment of
the bilingual grammars of KHS and KESA indicates that the grammar of KESA defines the interactional norms in KHS-KESA interactions (see, 26 below).

(26) FAITH>> {PERSPECTIVE, FACE}>> POWER>>SOLIDARITY

It must be pointed out that that constraint-ranking (26), differs, by and large from the grammar of KHS in the ranking of the two constraints, POWER and SOLIDARITY, the former outranking the latter. It is not clear to me why that is the case, since I was expecting that the KHS would show a more stable grammar than KESA, and that it will be the KESA community, as trans-nationals with limited stay in the U.S., who were presumably less stable in their acquisition of the new habitus and would converge to the KHS grammar. Again due to limited data, and due mainly to counterintuitive results, I am going to leave the issue of “grammars-in-flux” to future research.

3. The Contributions of the Research

The research performed in the dissertation contributes to the study of bilinguals’ sociolinguistic grammar both empirically and theoretically. First of all, the research is able to capture robust empirical generalizations of Korean-English bilinguals’ linguistic choices, specifically code-switching, and situate them within the theoretical framework of Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) OPTIMIZATION. The results of the research demonstrated in the preceding section empirically support Bhatt and Bolonyai’s theory of OPTIMIZATION. The results show that five principles proposed in the theory of OPTIMIZATION, FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE, POWER, and SOLIDARITY, are operational frequently in Korean-English bilinguals’ linguistic choices in their in- and out- peer-group interactions. In addition, many instances verify the interactions of these five constraints to establish the optimal bilingual grammars of two groups.
of Korean-English bilinguals, KHS and KESA, by building up the rank of five principles in their bilingual grammars of linguistics choices.

In other words, Bhatt and Bolonyai’s (2011) theory of OPTIMIZATION provides a systematic explanation of Korean-English bilinguals’ CS combining the specific functions of CS presented in the previous studies of sociolinguistics mentioned in the preceding chapters. The results of the research, on the other hand, empirically validate the operations of five constraints and their interactions to build up a particular ranking for the optimal bilingual grammar of each group of Korean-English bilinguals. In addition, the result of the data analysis for the bilingual grammar of KHS presents a fully ranked grammar of the five principles as FAITH >> PERSPECTIVE >> FACE >> SOLIDARITY >> POWER in the grammar. This result provides a theoretical support for Bhatt & Bolonyai’s socio-cognitive model of OPTIMIZATION as a unified theoretical framework for creating a typology of CS among various multilingual communities.

Furthermore, the focus groups of the research, KHS and KESA, represent two related contexts of situations which have been a major issue of sociolinguistics, that is, the context of diaspora, KHS, the context of global mobility, KESA. In the dissertation, specific functions of CS as these two groups of bilinguals’ linguistic choice are explained in terms of a grammar [system], which provides a range of meta-functions realized variably in different concrete contexts of situation. In addition, it also extends Bhatt and Bolonyai’s theory of OPTIMIZATION to the domain of interaction across groups of bilinguals, KHS and KESA, and shows the grammars of the two different groups are mutable in this domain. Therefore, the study of the sociolinguistic grammars of KHS and KESA bilinguals’ linguistic choices performed in the
dissertation advances our theoretical understanding of the nature and design of a sociolinguistic grammar of bilingual interaction.

4. Limitations in the Research and Areas for Further Research

While the research of the dissertation provides a theoretical and empirical contribution to the study of sociolinguistic grammars of bilinguals’ linguistic choice, it also has some limitation and problems in its data collection and analysis. As mentioned in the procedure of data collection, I tried to maintain the naturalness of the discourse where the subjects were involved. Thus, instead of participating in the discourse and observing the subjects’ interaction with each other, I recorded the data in a video file and transcribed it watching the video file. However, with the confidentiality of the data required for the privacy of the subjects, I was the only person watching the data and transcribing it. Only one of the subjects involved in the data was helping me to transcribe English part of the data correctly and make sure my understanding of the interaction was accurate. Therefore, the analysis of the data provided in the dissertation has limitations in so far as only one person was transcribing, and coding the data—the inter-rater reliability for coding was thus compromised. Further research of the sociolinguistic grammar of bilinguals’ CS will thus need training of additional coders (for coding data for the 5 constraints) so that a personal bias in understanding data could be reduced.

In addition, the focus of the research was on the bilingual grammar of KHS and a large corpus of data was collected for the CS of KHS only. Thus, the amount of the data collected for the bilingual grammar of KESA and for the grammars in flux in the interaction of KHS and KESA is not sufficient to verify the analysis of the data for the grammar of KESA and the grammars in flux. Therefore, the more data a further research could collect for the study of the
sociolinguistic grammar of bilinguals’ linguistic choice, the better supportive grammar the research could establish for the bilinguals’ linguistic choice.

In a further research of the study of the bilingual grammar of KHS and KESA, the question about what makes the bilingual grammars of these two groups different needs to be answered based on a more comprehensive corpus of the data for the research. The answer to the question in the further research will shed light on the study of the fundamental sociocultural and sociolinguistic factors that make the specific ranks of the five principles different for different communities of practice of bilinguals even with the same ethnicity.
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APPENDIX

I. Recruiting Subjects for a Research on Bilinguals’ Code-Switching

The Purpose of the Research:
To investigate how two groups of Korean-English bilinguals, Korean Heritage Students and Korean Early Study Abroad (조기유학생), use code-switching in their communication with other bilinguals in the same or different group.

The basic eligibility criteria of the subjects
1. Korean Heritage Students (6 undergraduate students over 18 or in their 20s for two groups)
   i) Those who were born in the US or who immigrated to the US before their education started and have received all their education in the US.
   ii) The fluency level of Korean is good (more than 2.5 average of 5 scale in their self-evaluation test of fluency given by the researcher) enough to use it fluently as part of their communication

2. Korean Early Study Abroad (6 undergraduate students over 18 or in their 20s for two groups)
   i) Those who were born and grown up in Korea to enter the elementary school where they acquire the Korean language as their native tongue and then started early studying abroad in a country where English is spoken as the native language, such as the US, Canada, Australia or New Zealand, between their age of 10 and 13 before they entered a high school.
   ii) The fluency level of English is good (more than 3 average of 5 scale in their self-evaluation test of fluency given by the researcher) enough to use it fluently as part of their communication

The time and the commitment for the subjects to do for the research
1. The subjects will be asked to do two times of one-hour meeting for a talk about a given topic, which will be recorded in a video-camera and in a voice recorder and compensation of $10 or corresponding value of food or snack depending on your preference will be provided for the participation in this research.
2. The schedule for the meetings will be arranged based on each participant’s personal schedule.

Contact of the principal investigator for more information
Young Sun Lee: ylee33@illinois.edu, 217-778-7898
II. AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH (KHS)

Purpose of this Research
You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Young Sun Lee (a Ph. D student of Department of Linguistics, UIUC). The purpose of this research is to investigate how Korean Heritage Students use code switching to position themselves appropriately in the communicative contexts.

What You Will Be Expected to Do
If you agree to participate in this research, you are asked to talk about some topics related to your living in America with your friends in a natural discourse. The entire time to take will be about two hours. Your talk will be both videotaped and voice-recorded, which will not be publically opened at all. The only reason of videotaping of your talk is to transcribe who says what in the talk without any confusion from the similarity of the voice of each person in the talk.

Your Rights to Confidentiality
The obtained data will be treated with absolute confidentiality. You will be given a Alphabetic letter to conceal your actual identity. No information will be released that could reveal your identity. All the data will be stored in a secure location in my computer and the project investigator, Young Sun Lee will have access to them.

Your Rights to Withdraw at Any Time
Your participation in this research is voluntary. You may withdraw from it or discontinue participation at any time, and you may require that your data be destroyed, without any consequences.

Benefits
The benefit expected from this research is to gain a better understanding of how Korean Heritage Students use code-switching as a language resource for their proper positioning among the Korean Heritage students attending a US college. This knowledge may in turn help understanding Korean Heritage Students’ identity constructions through their language use between two different groups of Korean students in the US, Korean Early Study Abroad and Korean Heritage Students

Possible Risks
To our knowledge, there are no risks or discomforts involved in this research beyond those found in everyday life.

Dissemination
This research will be disseminated in conference panel presentations and in conference proceedings.

Your Rights to Ask Questions
You may ask questions about the research at any time. You can contact the project investigator Young Sun Lee at ylee33@illinois.edu and if you have any questions about your rights as a
participant in this study, please contact the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board at (217) 333-2670 or via email at irb@illinois.edu.

Giving Consent to Participate
By signing the consent form, you certify that you are 18 years of age or older, that you have read and understand the above, that you have been given satisfactory answers to any questions about the research, and that you have been advised that you are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation in the research at any time, without any prejudice. (You may keep a participant’s copy of this form).

Name (printed)

________________________________________

Signature Date

III. AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH (KESA)

Purpose of this Research
You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Young Sun Lee (a Ph. D student of Department of Linguistics, UIUC). The purpose of this research is to investigate how Korean Early Study Abroads use code switching to position themselves appropriately in the communicative contexts.

What You Will Be Expected to Do
If you agree to participate in this research, you are asked to talk about some topics related to your living in America with your friends in a natural discourse. The entire time to take will be about two hours. Your talk will be both videotaped and voice-recorded, which will not be publically opened at all. The only reason of videotaping of your talk is to transcribe who says what in the talk without any confusion from the similarity of the voice of each person in the talk.

Your Rights to Confidentiality
The obtained data will be treated with absolute confidentiality. You will be given a Alphabetic letter to conceal your actual identity. No information will be released that could reveal your identity. All the data will be stored in a secure location in my computer and the project investigator, Young Sun Lee will have access to them.

Your Rights to Withdraw at Any Time
Your participation in this research is voluntary. You may withdraw from it or discontinue participation at any time, and you may require that your data be destroyed, without any consequences.

Benefits
You will be paid $15 for the participation in this data collection. The benefit expected from this research is to gain a better understanding of how Korean Early Study Abroad use code-
switching as a language resource for their proper positioning among the Korean students attending a US college. This knowledge may in turn help understanding Korean Early Study Abroad’s identity constructions through their language use between two different groups of Korean students in the US, Korean Early Study Abroad and Korean Heritage Students.

Possible Risks
To our knowledge, there are no risks or discomforts involved in this research beyond those found in everyday life.

Dissemination
This research will be disseminated in conference panel presentations and in conference proceedings.

Your Rights to Ask Questions
You may ask questions about the research at any time. You can contact the project investigator Young Sun Lee at ylee33@illinois.edu and if you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, please contact the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board at (217) 333-2670 or via email at irb@illinois.edu.

Giving Consent to Participate
By signing the consent form, you certify that you are 18 years of age or older, that you have read and understand the above, that you have been given satisfactory answers to any questions about the research, and that you have been advised that you are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation in the research at any time, without any prejudice. (You may keep a participant's copy of this form).

Name (printed)__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Signature Date
III. Self-Evaluation of Fluency

Name: ______________________   Age: _____________   Gender: _____________

I Korean

1. Reading:
   1) How much do you understand what you read in Korean in general speed?
      A. magazine:  1. 10-29%  2. 30-49%  3. 50-69%  4. 70-89%  5. 90-100%
      B. newspaper: 1. 10-29%  2. 30-49%  3. 50-69%  4. 70-89%  5. 90-100%
      C. novel:     1. 10-29%  2. 30-49%  3. 50-69%  4. 70-89%  5. 90-100%
      D. textbook:  1. 10-29%  2. 30-49%  3. 50-69%  4. 70-89%  5. 90-100%
   2) What makes your reading slow in your understanding Korean reading materials?
      1. sentential structures  2. logical structure of a paragraph  3. Expressions in Hanja (Chinese letter)
      4. Unfamiliar idiomatic expressions  5. Unfamiliar vocabulary

2. Writing: How much can you write what you like to express in Korean without a dictionary?
   A. email:  1. 10-29%  2. 30-49%  3. 50-69%  4. 70-89%  5. 90-100%
   B. a short essay: 1. 10-29%  2. 30-49%  3. 50-69%  4. 70-89%  5. 90-100%
   C. a long essay (e.g. a term paper): 1. 10-29%  2. 30-49%  3. 50-69%  4. 70-89%  5. 90-100%

3. Speaking: How much can you speak what you like to express only in Korean?
   1. 10-29%  2. 30-49%  3. 50-69%  4. 70-89%  5. 90-100%

4. Listening: How much can you understand what you hear in Korean?
   A. Korean song: 1. 10-29%  2. 30-49%  3. 50-69%  4. 70-89%  5. 90-100%
   B. Korean entertainment show: 1. 10-29%  2. 30-49%  3. 50-69%  4. 70-89%  5. 90-100%
   C. Korean movie/soap opera: 1. 10-29%  2. 30-49%  3. 50-69%  4. 70-89%  5. 90-100%
   D. Lectures or presentations in Korean: 1. 10-29%  2. 30-49%  3. 50-69%  4. 70-89%  5. 90-100%
II. English

1. Reading:
   1) How much do you understand what you read in English in general speed?
      A. magazine: 1. 10-29% 2. 30-49% 3. 50-69% 4. 70-89% 5. 90-100%
      B. newspaper: 1. 10-29% 2. 30-49% 3. 50-69% 4. 70-89% 5. 90-100%
      C. novel: 1. 10-29% 2. 30-49% 3. 50-69% 4. 70-89% 5. 90-100%
      D. textbook: 1. 10-29% 2. 30-49% 3. 50-69% 4. 70-89% 5. 90-100%
   2) What makes your reading slow in your understanding English reading materials?
      1. sentential structures 2. logical structure of a paragraph 3. Expressions from other languages
      4. Unfamiliar idiomatic expressions 5. Unfamiliar vocabulary

2. Writing: How much can you write what you like to express in English without a dictionary?
   A. email: 1. 10-29% 2. 30-49% 3. 50-69% 4. 70-89% 5. 90-100%
   B. a short essay: 1. 10-29% 2. 30-49% 3. 50-69% 4. 70-89% 5. 90-100%
   C. a long essay (e.g. a term paper): 1. 10-29% 2. 30-49% 3. 50-69% 4. 70-89% 5. 90-100%

3. Speaking: How much can you speak what you like to express only in English?
   1. 10-29% 2. 30-49% 3. 50-69% 4. 70-89% 5. 90-100%

4. Listening: How much can you understand what you hear in English?
   A. English song: 1. 10-29% 2. 30-49% 3. 50-69% 4. 70-89% 5. 90-100%
   B. English entertainment show: 1. 10-29% 2. 30-49% 3. 50-69% 4. 70-89% 5. 90-100%
   C. English movie/soap opera: 1. 10-29% 2. 30-49% 3. 50-69% 4. 70-89% 5. 90-100%
   D. Lectures or presentations in English: 1. 10-29% 2. 30-49% 3. 50-69% 4. 70-89% 5. 90-100%