

**University of Massachusetts Amherst**

---

**From the Selected Works of Benjamin Bailey**

---

2007

# Multilingual forms of talk and identity work

Benjamin Bailey



Available at: [https://works.bepress.com/benjamin\\_bailey/56/](https://works.bepress.com/benjamin_bailey/56/)

## 13. Multilingual forms of talk and identity work

Benjamin Bailey

### 1. Introduction

Language is our primary semiotic tool for representing and negotiating social reality, including social identity categories. Through talk we position ourselves and others relative to co-present interlocutors, the communicative activities in which we are engaged, and various dimensions of the wider world, including social identity categories and their relative value. This positioning of selves is intertwined with the achievement of intersubjective understanding. We speak and interpret language from subject positions (Davies and Harré 1990), i.e., social identities, that are simultaneously a product and contextual frame of our talk.

Some identity negotiations through language are conscious, intentional, and referentially explicit, but most are not, and aspects of social identities are established, reproduced, or contested in even the most fleeting, instrumental, and seemingly trivial social encounters. In the exchange of greetings, for example, we choose the words, timing, and prosody of our utterances – along with facial and corporeal demeanor – to mark our relationship to our interlocutor, thus positioning ourselves and our addressees. This positioning is contingent and interactively negotiated across turns: the people we greet may provide a response to our greeting that positions them as more or less intimate or higher or lower in social hierarchies (Irvine 1974) or they might ignore our greeting entirely. Terms of address in such greetings – *Miss*, *Ms.*, *Mrs.*, *Dr.*, *Mary*, or none at all – similarly position both speaker and addressee, as do the second-person pronouns, e.g. *tu* versus *vous*, of many European languages (Brown and Gilman 1960) or the multiple status-relationship marking verb endings of such languages as Korean (Lee 1989).

Even the absence of speech positions participants in an encounter. A momentary delay in producing a response to an assessment (Goodwin and Goodwin 1992) can signal disagreement with an interlocutor or something else problematic about the phenomenon or stance invoked by the prior turn. More extended silent co-presence (re)constitutes particular relationships among those who are co-present or displays stances toward widely recognized social categories and who is an authentic member of them (Basso 1972; Wieder and Pratt 1990). To speak – or even not to speak in a social encounter – is always an act of identity (cf. Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985).

Turn-by-turn analysis of naturally occurring language and interaction is a means to understanding how individuals, as social actors, socially position

themselves and are positioned by others. Interlocutors publicly display and continuously update for each other their on-going understandings of talk - including such positioning. Because they must make these negotiations visible to each other to achieve a degree of intersubjectivity, analysts can 'look over their shoulders' to gain a window onto the understandings that interlocutors, themselves, display of these processes (cf. Heritage and Atkinson 1984: 11).

Compared to monolingual, monocultural individuals, multilingual individuals have an expanded set of linguistic resources for the omnipresent task of positioning self and other, and often a broader range of social categories that can be made relevant through talk. On the linguistic level, bilinguals can draw forms from two languages as well as hybrid forms resulting from language contact. On the social and cultural level, many are familiar with relatively diverse cultural frameworks for interpreting and evaluating the world and positioning themselves and others within it.

Take the following example, in which two Dominican American high school students in a northeastern US city switch languages to negotiate a local meaning of the term *hick*. The use of multiple languages both facilitates coming to a common understanding of the word *hick* and highlights facets of speakers' identities as youthful, relatively acculturated, female Dominican Americans. Their bilingualism is a key to expressing social identity distinctions that are relevant in their multilingual, multicultural immigrant community.

Example 1 [(JS #212:40:58) Janelle (US-born) and Isabella (anived in US at age 6) are sitting outside of their school and have just referred disparagingly to some male, immigrant students staring in their direction as 'hicks'.]

Janelle: What do you call a hick? Cause Jose says a hick is someone ridiculous, somebody stupid. Isn't a hick someone who just came back from the country and they can't really dress, they can't speak English? And they, you know,

Isabella: They be like *loea*, *loea*, *lie*::::: *pa*, *epa*::, *huepa*: (high pitched and nasal)

[honey, honey, he:::::y, alright!, alri::::ght!, alri:ght!']

Janelle: //Yeah, right?

Janelle offers a candidate understanding of a *hick* in referential terms: as someone who just came from the (Dominican) countryside, is not acculturated to urban American youth clothing fashions, and can't speak English. Isabella confirms Janelle's candidate understanding of 'hicks' not through reference but by giving a representative direct quotation of their speech: *loea*, *loea*, *e*:::::, *epa*, *epa*, *huepa*. She squints and scrunches her face, using a nasal, slightly high-pitched register. She introduces this direct quote with the African American English habitual *be* (Rickford 1999), meaning that this category of person *habitually* and *repeatedly* says things of this sort. Janelle displays immediate

agreement with this characterization of 'hicks' with an affirmative, overlapping *Yeah, right?*, even before the Characterization is completed.

Janelle and Isabella mockingly use these Spanish words and this way of speaking Spanish ~ associated with a stereotyped island Dominican male style- to position certain recent immigrant male identities and ways of speaking as undesirable in an American urban youth context. *Loca*, *loea*, *e*:::::, *epa*, *epa*, *huepa* is associated with the relative directness and intensity of heterosexual Dominican males from the island in approaching females, a style that is being constructed as inappropriate for this US context. 'Hicks' not only know little English and fail to dress according to urban US youth styles, they also fail to adhere to appropriate local cultural frameworks and practices for heterosexual interaction. This code switched characterization of 'hicks' contributes to both a) the achievement of intersubjectivity between Isabella and Janelle, and b) the construction of a desirable category for them to inhabit, even though the category and associated characteristics are not explicitly named.

The relatively indirect linguistic means by which Isabella and Janelle constitute their common, desirable social position is typical of identity work, which is seldom achieved through direct, Propositional statements of identity (e.g., 'I am a relatively acculturated Dominican American female teen-ager who would like to distance herself from certain recent immigrant male ways of being'). Much more commonly, speakers exploit non-referential social associations of ways of speaking to position themselves and others. Linguistic forms always include a dimension of social associations or *indexical* meanings (Peirce 1955; cf. "voice" in Bakhtin 1981) in addition to their Propositional, or denotive, meanings. Particular ways of speaking, for example, are associated with particular geographic regions, socioeconomic statuses, genders, vocations, etc. These associations, or indexical meanings, vary much more with context than denotive meanings do. In the above example, speaking Spanish is used to disparage a fellow Dominican, but in many other contexts, Janelle and Isabella associate speaking Spanish with a highly valued Dominican identity. Both are bilingual, speak Spanish to monolingual relatives, and regularly code switch in intra-group peer interaction.

The indexical meanings, or active social associations, of linguistic forms are both "brought along" to the interaction as well as "brought about" in the interaction itself (Auer 1992). They are brought along to the interaction in that codes, and specific forms within codes, have social associations that pre-exist particular interactions. They are brought about within interactions in that codes and forms have *multiple* social associations, and interlocutors creatively exploit particular associations in situationally specific ways.

Because they involve both received and negotiated meanings, social identity negotiations provide a means of linking meaning-making processes in interactions at the local level with larger social and historical processes, e.g., racial

formation, acculturation, and social stratification, that both inform, and are informed by these social interactions. At a general level, identity work is a perspective from which to examine the encounter of individual social actors with meanings and structures accrued from history. Individuals use language to both resist and reproduce existing meanings and structures, making identity work a lens for viewing the on-going constitution of society in the present (Giddens 1984).

In this chapter, I first define *identity* as I use the term, emphasizing the socially constructed and processual nature of identity negotiations and achievement. I then analyze an example of identity negotiations in monolingual talk. This example illustrates key principles of identity negotiations through language – that they are interactional, indexical, and contingent – that are applicable to both monolingual and multilingual contexts. In the next section, I give four examples of code switching to illustrate the metaphorical implications that some such switches can have for identity, and I situate such metaphorical switches among functional categories of code switching and broader categories of metaphorical language use. In the final section, I argue that what is distinctive about identity negotiations in multilingual contexts is not so much linguistic as social and political, i.e., that the distinctive salience of multilingual talk in Western societies is a function of social and linguistic ideologies rather than the nature of the forms themselves. To analyze identity work in multilingual contexts is thus to analyze the larger social and political systems in which identity options and the value attributed to associated linguistic forms are created, contested, and maintained (Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004).

## 2. What is identity?

I use the term *identity* in a specific sense that contrasts with popular psychological and biological uses of the term. In popular psychology terms, identity refers to an individual's subjective sense of self, which is perceived as an enduring quality or essence lodged in that individual. In popular biological terms, identity refers to overlapping essential social, behavioral, and phenotypic qualities that are seen as fixed and heritable, such as ethnicity or race (cf. Carbaugh 1996; Tracy 2002). In both cases, identity is treated as relatively fixed, as located in the individual, and as an analytical prime that affects or explains social behavior and meanings.

This popular notion of identity contrasts sharply with the social constructionist perspective that has been dominant in the humanities and interpretive social sciences since the 1970s. From this social constructionist perspective, social identities are a function not of static attributes of individuals or groups, but rather of on-going processes of social differentiation. The fact that social

identity categories have different configurations and meanings across time and space is evidence that they are socially constructed, rather than reflections of essential nature. Even racial categories, which are popularly perceived as biologically-based and thus fixed, can be shown to be a function of time and place rather than attributes of individuals or group members. An individual who counts as White in the Dominican Republic, for example, may count as Black upon immigrating to the United States (cf. Hoetink 1967; Bailey 2002), and the Jewish, Italian, and Slavic immigrants to the United States in the early 1900s who were commonly seen as members of distinct races lost this "racial" distinctiveness over time, becoming White Americans after two to three generations (Waters 1990; Brodtkin 1998). From an analytical perspective, social identity is not what one *is*, but what one *counts as* in a particular time and place.

Two subjective processes of ascription serve to constitute social identities: "self-ascription" – how one defines oneself – and "ascription by others" – how others define one (Barth 1969: 13). These two subjective processes, often under other names, are at the core of identity definitions across many academic fields. Discursive psychologists refer to self- and other-ascription as "reflective positioning" and "interactive positioning" respectively (Davies and Harré 1990); in cultural studies, Stuart Hall refers to identity as "the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past" (1990: 225); and sociocultural linguists Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 586) define identity as "the social positioning of self and other." Individuals typically make reference to empirical attributes of group members in these processes of ascription or positioning, but the membership categories themselves are not based on the sum of objective similarities and differences among individuals or groups. Minor features can be treated as emblems of difference or similarity among groups, for example, and radical differences among group members can be downplayed or denied.

While this conceptualization of identity highlights the subjective, contingent nature of identity constitution and the agency of individuals as social actors, identity construction is fluid only within certain parameters. Our phenomenological understandings develop in an historical world in which history is omnipresent in embodied form, as *habitus* (Bourdieu 1990: 56). Individuals only ascribe identities to themselves, for example, that are imaginable and available in a particular social and historical context, and they are only ratified in identities (through other-ascription) that social history makes available to them. The relative degree of individual agency versus structural constraint experienced by individuals in identity negotiations varies with the specific social histories through which particular categories have been constituted as meaningful. In the US, for example, 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> generation Italian or Irish Americans can situationally choose whether to invoke their symbolic ethnicity (Waters 1990;

Gans 1979), while members of non-White racial groups or linguistic minorities have much less control over whether those facets of identity are treated as relevant by others (Mittelberg and Waters 1992). Negotiations of identity thus take place within specific parameters that history has imposed in a particular time and place.

### 3. The interactional, indexical, and contingent negotiation of identity

In this section, I present and analyze a segment of monolingual interaction among young Korean Americans in which identity negotiations are salient. This monolingual example illustrates a number of principles, common to both monolingual and multilingual contexts, for relating language use to identities: identities are constituted in talk; identity work is interactional; the indexical dimension of linguistic forms is central to identity constitution; and achieved identities are partial, multiple, contingent, and shifting (cf. Bucholtz and Hall 2005). The continuities between this monolingual example and the multilingual examples in the next section lay a foundation from which to argue, in the final section of this chapter, that the salience of identity negotiations in multilingual contexts is a function of politics and ideology rather than formal linguistic difference.

In this example, adapted from Chun (2001: 60), 1.5<sup>2</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Korean American males in their early 20s negotiate shared and overlapping position for themselves through naming and characterizing the social category 'White people'.

#### Example 2

- 1 Jin: I think white people just don't keep it real and that's why  
 2 Dave: That is- that's true man?  
 3 Jin: Cause that's why they always back stabbin', like my roommate who wasn't gonna pay the last month's rent  
 5 JH: white  
 6 Jin: He kicks us out // of  
 7 Eric: //the prototypical whitey  
 8 Jin: Ye:::ah ma::n?  
 9 JH: No social skills.  
 10 Jin: But that's not true for everyone, I don't think.  
 11 EC: Uh huh  
 12 Jin: Cause all those ghetto whiteys in my neighborhood, I think they're cool.

In line 1, Jin explicitly names a category *white people* and states a stance toward them, that they *just don't keep it real*, i.e., that they are insincere or dishonest. David, Eric, and JH respond to this initial assessment with various second

assessments (Goodwin and Goodwin 1992) of agreement in lines 2, 7, and 9. By displaying this congruent understanding of White people, they position themselves as similar *in* some respect(s) to Jin and to each other, but different from White Americans.

*lin* uses a phrase *keep it real* and a grammatical structure, zero copula *they always back stabbin'*, that are strongly associated with African American identities, in characterizing both White Americans as a group and a particular White individual whose insincerity was characteristic of his social group. While these language forms do not constitute a claim by *lin* of being African American, they suggest commonalty of his perspective with African American perspectives on White Americans. This interpretation of these non-referential indexical usages is highly context specific, as the use of forms popularly associated with African American English can have many possible connotations, e.g., such forms can be used by outsiders to mock African Americans.

In line 7, Eric makes the sharing of an African American-like perspective more explicit by referring to *lin's* insincere roommate as *the prototypical whitey*. *Whitey* is a disparaging term that African Americans sometimes use to refer to White Americans as well as the privileged, hierarchical social position inhabited by White Americans. In using this term, Eric is positioning himself and, implicitly, his interlocutors, as Sharing some dimensions of the experience of African Americans as non-Whites in a racially organized society. This proposed positioning of selves vis-à-vis White and Black Americans is ratified by *lin* in line 8, *Yeah man*.

The constitution of identities through talk is always contingent and partial. While these five Korean Americans have initially collaborated *in* differentiating themselves from a disparaged White identity, the positioning of self and other becomes more complicated in lines 9 and 11 when *lin* qualifies the group's criticisms of White Americans *that's not true for everyone* and cites examples of White Americans who do not share the negative attributes that *lin* and others have been attributing to them. *lin* is thus modifying his subject position as one that can be defined in part through opposition to *certain* White American subject positions, but not all of them. His positive evaluation of *ghetto whiteys* may reflect class solidarity - inhabitants of ghettos being relatively poor and powerless, regardless of color - or an alignment with Whites who live in ghettos and who have adopted hip hop practices and ideologies.

While the identity work in this talk highlights opposition to certain White identities, aspects of gender and age are *also* being implicitly performed in this segment. The adoption of African American youth, or hip hop, language is much more common among teen-agers and young adults than among older *adults*, and the adoption of such language by young non-African Americans has been documented primarily among males, for whom it is a resource for enacting *maSCUlinity* (Bucholtz 1999; Cutler 1999; Kiesling 2001; Zentella 1997). *Iden-*

tities that we claim or enact are always at the intersection of multiple social categories, e.g., race, age, gender, ethnicity, and class, even though only one such dimension may be focal in a given interaction or analysis.

Identities in this short segment of talk are partial, multiple, interactionally negotiated and constituted, and rapidly shifting. The specific social position that is being claimed, 'young Korean American males who see White Americans as disingenuous and inhabiting a position of privilege that excludes non-Whites' does not have a specific category name. This example of social positioning relies almost entirely on indexical meanings. Neither the social positions being enacted - Korean American, male, and young - nor a social identity perspective that informs much of their talk - African American - is explicitly named in this talk.

By their nature, indexical meanings are highly context bound, both in terms of the local interaction and the particular social history that infuses linguistic forms with particular social connotations (Bakhtin 1981). The interpretation of any indexical meaning depends not just on the form and context, but crucially on the interpreter's subject position. While these young Korean American males treat their uses of language and their positioning of themselves as desirable, outsiders might interpret it very differently. Their Korean-raised parents, for example, might find their use of African American English - and their implied solidarity with African American perspectives - undesirable, for example. Many first-generation immigrants to the United States make great sacrifices so that their children can achieve socioeconomic mobility. Aligning oneself with African Americans, who face great obstacles to socioeconomic *mobility* in the United States, can be directly counter to *this* desired trajectory (Bailey 2001, 2000; Waters 1994; Chang 1990).

#### 4. Negotiating identities through metaphorical code switching

Research over the last 35 years has highlighted local meanings and functions of code switches in ways that can be subsumed under three broad headings: situational switching, discourse contextualization switching, and metaphorical switching. Such categories serve as a heuristic for highlighting particular functions of code switching and should not be understood as representing discrete or manifest types. Many switches simultaneously serve more than one of these functions. In this section, I briefly describe these three functional emphases of switches and then give four examples of multilingual talk that highlight identity work through metaphorical switches. *While* any instance of multilingual speech has implications for identity in Western contexts dominated by monolingual ideologies, I focus here on cases in which speakers exploit local social associations of codes to position themselves vis-à-vis each other and local categories.

In *situational* switching, distinct codes are employed in particular settings and speech activities and with different categories of interlocutors, i.e. there *is* a direct relationship between code use and observable features of the situation (Blom and Gumperz 1972). Codes are *switched* as observable changes in the context occur, e.g. to accommodate a monolingual speaker who *joins* the group or as interlocutors move to a different institutional setting associated with a distinct code. In switching characterized as *discourse contextualization*, individual switches do not necessarily CO-Occur with external changes in the context or significant *shifts* in *sociocultural* framework. Individual switches serve instead as contextualization, or framing, cues to mark off quotations, changes in topic, repair sequences, etc. from surrounding speech (Auer 1984; Auer 1988, 1995; Alfonzetti 1998; Wei 1998; Milroy and Wei 1995; Bailey 2000). These functions in monolingual speech are typically filled through prosody, word choice, and visual cues. In such unmarked discourse contextualization switching, conventionalized associations between particular codes and social worlds are not treated as relevant by participants (although non-member bystanders may see them as relevant), and the act of code switching itself, rather than the particular social associations of given codes, is what helps to organize the interaction.

In the following example, from Bailey (2002: 239), a code *switch* into Spanish by Dominican American Janelle coincides with a change in footing, a temporary re-framing of talk (Goffman 1979; cf. Zentella 1997: 93):

3) [(JS #210:50:10) *Discussing* whether she needs new immunizations to do her summer job at a hospital.)

Janelle: I don't know if I- I don't know if I have to go again cause-

*dizque no es verdad que* ['supposedly isn't it true that'] after a certain time- after a certain time you have to do it again? You gotta get shots again?

Janelle is unsure whether she needs new immunizations before beginning her summer job. She moves from *reporting* this uncertainty in the first part of her turn, to directly *asking* her interlocutor to confirm that one needs to be re-immunized after a certain period of time. This switch from a statement to a *question* coincides with a cut-off of *cause-* a *shift* in pitch and tempo, and a change of code, from English to Spanish. Code switching is a linguistic resource like prosody or body alignment - that can be activated to highlight this shift in footing, or communicative activity, but it is not being treated here by interlocutors as having any greater metaphorical meaning related to identities than the corresponding monolingual change of footing would have.

Neither situational nor discourse contextualizing switching necessarily has *locally* salient implications for *identity*. Such switching can simply be a means of speaking appropriately to people in ways that they can understand and of managing and organizing conversational sequences.

*Metaphorical* switches, in contrast to situational switches, partially *violate* conventionalized associations between codes and context, activity, or participants. Elements of setting, participants, activities, or perspectives that are conventionally associated with a code can be invoked by a switch into that code when such elements are not otherwise present or active in the conversation. Changes in language can thus constitute alternative cultural frameworks for interpreting experience and constructing social reality. The switch in Example 1, above, has such a metaphorical import in that Isabella's *loca*, *loca*, *epa* brings to life a Dominican male persona and cultural framework for male-female relations that are associated with certain Dominican Spanish ways of speaking but not with American English ways of speaking. This switch simultaneously serves a discourse contextualizing function, i.e. marking off directly quoted speech from the surrounding talk.

Such metaphorically constitutive uses of language can also be monolingual, of course. In Example 2, above, the use of African American English forms by young Korean Americans constitutes them as young non-Whites who see parallels between their racial exclusion and the racial exclusion of African Americans. In both cases, aspects of a sociocultural world that were not demonstrably active in prior talk are invoked and made relevant through use of linguistic forms associated with that particular world.

The following four examples of metaphorical code switches generate meanings about identities, perspectives, and sociocultural frameworks for understanding the world that would not be generated in the same way through continued monolingual speech. In each case, the metaphorical meanings generated depend on specific social and historical associations of language forms and their situated use by speakers.

The first two examples are drawn from Kroskrity's (1993) study of the Arizona Tewa, a small Native American group who are officially members of the Hopi tribe, but who maintain a distinct Tewa language in addition to speaking Hopi. This distinct Tewa language and identity have been maintained despite nearly 300 years of closest proximity to the Hopi.

In Example 4, two middle-aged Tewa men have been discussing, in Hopi, a recent, favorable court ruling on a land dispute between the Hopi and the larger Navajo tribe whose land surrounds Hopi land. The conversation has been proceeding in Hopi, which is common among Arizona Tewa, who live among the numerically dominant Hopi and are always fluent in Hopi. In this particular conversation, their use of Hopi also coincides with their larger tribal interest in confronting the outside Navajos.

Example 4 (Kroskrity 1993: 196-197. In these examples, Hopi language is represented in italics, e.g. *Hopi*, while Arizona Tewa is represented in underlined italics, e.g. Arizona Tewa.)

A: *Tenatyava. Tenatyava. Pay-sen 'ita-m nanami pihi:k'yani.*

('It's come true. It's come true. Maybe now we will live peaceably among each other.')

B: 'u to 'o wi' he:yu-bf- 'i'í-dí han ankhyaw 'u-mu:.  
[You are one among the few who think so.]

While A expresses optimism about the ruling, B suggests that many people are not so optimistic about the eventual outcome. The metaphorical meanings generated by B's switch into Arizona Tewa are a function of the local social connotations of Tewa language, which are directly linked to Arizona Tewa ideologies of identity. Arizona Tewa folk histories position the Tewa as inheritors of a warrior tradition, and the Arizona Tewa view themselves as more pragmatic and realistic regarding issues of conflict than their Hopi brethren, whom they sometimes position as strong in spiritual matters but possibly naive in more worldly affairs. By switching to Tewa in the above exchange, B communicates that he is not just speaking as an individual disagreeing with A. He is also positioning himself as representing a more realistic position in such political matters, a position associated with distinctively Tewa perspectives.

The following Arizona Tewa code switch occurs at a *kachina* dance in Tewa village that includes both Hopi and Tewa. The speaker sits among several observers of the dance.

Example 5 (1993: 199-200)

A: *Hi:wo 'i d'bf-h(-'6l Loloma, loloma, lomahin-yinwa.*

(((in Arizona Tewa) 'They are dancing good!')

((in Hopi)) 'BeautifUl, beautiful, they look good!']

Kroskrity's native consultants found this specific sequence of assessments of the dancing to be highly complimentary. Arizona Tewa see Hopi as highly accomplished in ceremonial, spiritual, and ritual realms. By using Hopi language, the speaker invokes the (implicitly) higher standards of the Hopi for evaluating the dance, and his compliment is thus perceived as communicating relatively greater acclaim than the corresponding Tewa utterances would.

The achievement of intersubjectivity is intertwined with the positioning of selves in these examples. With each of these code switches, there is a shift in sociocultural frameworks for interpreting both the specific words as well as the position from which the words are spoken. In both cases, speakers constitute their identities as both Tewa and Hopi in the process of everyday communicative activities: discussing politics and praising a performance.

Example 6 is one of many instances of Spanish-English code switching in the documentary film *My American Girls* (Matthews 2000), a film about a Dominican immigrant family in New York City. In this segment, Sandra, who

immigrated from the Dominican Republic to New York as an adult, confronts her 14-year-old, US-raised daughter Mayra over Mayra's failure to do her homework. Mayra is hanging out in front of her house with a peer, Wendy, when Sandra addresses her.

### Example 6

- 1 Sandra: *Yo te dije que tufueras arriba para que hacieras algo pero tú dijistes*  
2 *que no podías porque tenías muchas tareas. //Métate inmediatamente.*  
3 ['Mayra, when I told you to do something upstairs you said you  
4 couldn't because you had too much homework. Get in there right  
now.']  
5 Mayra: *IIYo lo hice.*  
[ 'I did it. ']  
6 Sandra: I don't care. *Vete a estudiar. Tú tienes exámenes la semana entera.*  
7 ['Go and study. You have tests all week. ']  
8 Mayra: Wendy *vamo'* ['let's go']  
9 Sandra: [ ]  
10 Mayra: I'm going. Wendy *vamo'* ['let's go']  
11 Sandra: *Vele!* ['Go']  
12 Mayra: I'm going'  
13 Sandra: *Vete!* ['Go']  
14 Mayra: Hold on, I'm going!  
15 Sandra: *Mira, yo te quiero abajo ni para un segundo Oistes?*  
16 ['Hey, I don't want you down here for even a second. You hear  
me?']  
17 Mayra: I'm going!

Both Mayra's switch into English *I'm going* (line 10) to address her mother, and Mayra's and Sandra's non-reciprocal code use (lines 10 to 17) generate metaphorical meanings in this exchange. While it is not unusual for bilingual Latino children in the US to respond to their parents' Spanish with English (Zentella 1997: 57), Mayra initially responds to her mother in Spanish and even addresses her peer Wendy in Spanish (while maintaining an English pronunciation of Wendy's name). It is only after her mother reprimands her and uses the imperative *Vete* that Mayra responds to her mother in English, a pattern that is repeated across the final four turns.

The non-reciprocal code choice in these six turns reflects negotiations about the sets of rights and obligations between speakers (Myers-Scotton 1993). Differing sets of rights and obligations are implied by Spanish and English in this context. In a Latin American cultural framework, parents have significant authority over teen-age children, and parent-child interactions are to be guided by respect for the hierarchical relationship between children and adults. In main-

stream US culture, there is much less hierarchy between parents and children, and teen-agers are given considerable individual choice in pursuing friends, interests, and activities. The individualistic nature of US society and the seductive freedoms offered to US youth are a near universal source of tension between first-generation immigrants to the US and their US-raised children.

In this case, the use of Spanish by Sandra represents an effort to constitute a Dominican world, in which parents have authority in the family and children are obedient. It conjures the world of first-generation labor migrants, a world in which children are obligated because their parents work long hours in low-paying, dead-end jobs so that their children, through education, can have a better life. Sandra thus positions herself as a Dominican immigrant mother of a Dominican child.

Mayra's use of English, in contrast, constitutes an assimilated US world in which teen-agers readily talk back to parents and make personalistic choices about activities and work habits, even if such choices undermine opportunities for socioeconomic mobility. She thus positions herself as an American teen-ager.

Competing visions of the world are thus juxtaposed through the juxtaposition of codes across these turns. Neither Sandra nor Mayra accommodates to the other by switching codes because accommodation would be tantamount to acceding to the other's position. It would be difficult for Mayra to talk back to her mother so brazenly in Spanish, because such behavior would constitute a grave offense in Dominican worlds. Sandra does not switch to English, because in the American world thus constituted, children can be relatively disrespectful to parents with impunity.

The final multilingual example in this section is drawn from the same conversation as in Example I, between Dominican American high school students Janelle and Isabella. In both examples of their talk, code switches into Spanish serve to position them as particular types of Dominican American teen-age females who are different from more recent immigrants. In both examples, Isabella uses direct quotes of a recently immigrated Dominican teen-age male's speech to display negative stances toward the category(ies) of people who talk in such a way. Isabella and Janelle collaborate in coming to a shared perspective on a disparaged category, thus constituting themselves, as interlocutors in the here-and-now, as occupying similar identity positions.

### Example 7

[JS #211:56) Isabella and Janelle are sitting outside of their high school and have been discussing their weekend plans. Isabella has been dating a boy named Sammy for about 10 days, and she is now explaining why she is going to break up with him despite the fact that he is physically attractive. This segment of talk occurs about 40 minutes before the segment in Example 1.]



1 Isabella: He's like- I don't know. He's- he's so jealous.  
2 Janelle: Oh  
3 Isabella: This kid is sickening! He- he tells me to call him before I go to the  
4 club. He- I'm like, I don't have time to call you, pick up the phone,  
5 call you while my friends are outside beeping the horn at me so I  
6 can jet with them to the club. And he's like- I don't know, he talks-  
7 he's like a hick, he talks so much Spanish!

And he *II*( )

8 Janelle: *II*O::h! ((looks away))

9 Isabella: No, but he speaks Spanish, but- 1- the reason- I talk to him- when he  
10 talks on the phone he speaks English a lot because I speak English.  
11 More. I tell him, speak English, speak English.  
12 ((wrinkled face)) *Y que, lo::ca* ['What's up, honey']). He goes,  
13 you know, *ni::na* ['girl'], and you know, and I don't want to hear it.  
14 Janelle: You should have found that out before you went out with him.  
15 Isabella: I know, he's rushing into it. ....

Isabella is explaining why she was breaking up with Sammy, a recent immigrant whom she had been briefly dating. She specifies a particular personality deficiency from which Sammy suffers (*he's so jealous*), gives an example of his jealous behavior, and specifies that he's *like a hick* and *talks so much Spanish*.

Janelle responds (lines 2 and 8) to these assessments (Goodwin and Goodwin 1992) of Sammy with *oh's* and vertical head nods, suggesting a shared understanding of the undesirable nature of a male who is jealous, like a hick, and speaks so much Spanish. Isabella, however, treats some aspect of Janelle's displayed understanding of this as problematic, by initiating a repair *No, but he ...* (line 9). As in Example 1, there are initial, referential descriptions of an undesirable Other, but Janelle and Isabella only treat the characterization as adequate when there is a code switched performance of the speech of this Other. The use of code switching to set off quotations from surrounding talk has often been noted as a function of code switching, and many have noted that the code used for the quotation is not necessarily the same one that the speaker originally used (e.g. Gumperz 1982: 75-76). In this case, the code match between the quoted speech and the antecedent speech is important because the Spanish forms carry social associations for Janelle and Isabella that would not be carried by corresponding English forms. It is only when Isabella enacts Sammy, through a code switched direct quotation of particular Spanish forms - *Y que lo:ca* ('What's up, honey') and *ni:na* ('girl') - that she treats her characterization of Sammy as complete and definitive, and she and Janelle can proceed to speak about the break up from other perspectives. For Isabella, Sammy's addressing her as *loca* and *nina* may invoke a traditional Dominican social framework for their romantic, male-female relationship, a framework that she wishes

to avoid. In establishing the undesirable qualities of Sammy, Janelle and Isabella constitute their own identities - as relatively acculturated, urban, Dominican American teen-age females - as desirable.

While Spanish language can be a unifying emblem of Spanish or Dominican identity in US contexts involving non-Latinos, it can be a key index of difference in local, intra-Latino contexts. The fact that such intra-group boundaries can be situationally highlighted through Spanish use shows that there is not a fixed, one-to-one correspondence between use of a linguistic code and the social affiliation that it expresses. While a notion of 'we-code' versus 'they-code' (Gumperz 1982: 82-95) is appealing from a macrosocial perspective, situated language use reveals no such stable dichotomy, as social meanings and identity associations of particular forms are constituted in specific local contexts.

While language is popularly seen as a referential system for labeling or communicating propositional information, the six examples of talk given in this chapter suggest that direct reference plays only an indirect and often minor role in the enactment of identity. *None* of the social identity positions being claimed by speakers in the six examples in this chapter is referentially named. In three of the examples, a category of Other, who is not present – 'hicks' in Example 1, 'white people' in Example 2, and Sammy (as hick) in Example 3 – is referentially named. The use of explicit category names and a marked style of speaking for constituting an Other against which one defines oneself may be characteristic of relationships between linguistic forms and social identities more generally. One's own identity and ways of speaking are generally treated as normal, natural, and unmarked, so it can be difficult to call attention to them. Identities, like linguistic styles (Irvine 2001) are constituted through meaningful opposition to other identities, so it is through the highlighting of boundaries – through naming and disparaging of an Other or exaggeration of linguistic features seen as emblematic of other identities – that one's own identities and associated ways of speaking are constituted as distinct and discrete (e.g. Basso 1979; Mitchell-Kernan 1972).

## 5. Multilingualism as a social and political phenomenon

The examples of metaphorical code switching that I presented in the previous section illustrate the power of multilingual ways of speaking to constitute socio-cultural world and position selves within them. Although I have tried to highlight the partial, contingent, and situated nature of such identity work through talk, the power of language to reflect and (re)constitute identities in these examples can inadvertently reinforce essentialist beliefs about the relationships between language and identity. The assumption of an essential language-identity link is misleadingly reinforced by Western ideologies in which language, race,

and nation are seen as forming a natural unity. Westerners tend to see *being* ethnically French, *speaking* French, and inhabiting a French *nation-state* as more or less the same thing, for example, and individuals who fit one or two of these criteria but not all three - e.g. French speaking inhabitants of Paris who are of sub-Saharan African descent - are seen as something other than 'just French'.

This ideology is a function of European nation building projects of the last several centuries, in which links among language, nation, and identity were essentialized and naturalized as parts of political projects. This monolingual ideology informs both popular and academic approaches to multilingualism. The fact that social and cultural linguists have focused so much attention on the meanings and functions of code switching, for example - while paying relatively less attention to conespoding monolingual speech - reflects the monolingual ideology that code switching is not an entirely natural form, but something that is in need of explanation (Woolard 2004).

In the following sections of this chapter, I tease out some of the implications of this ideology for understanding identity work *in* multilingual contexts. I first show that privileging formal definitions of multilingualism and assuming an essential language-identity link distract attention from a number of multilingual-like forms of talk that have important implications for social identities. I then argue that the distinctiveness of multilingual talk in Western societies has more to do with monolingual ideologies and politics than with the formal distinctiveness of such ways of speaking, and that perceptions of distinctiveness are rooted in particular subject positions and ideologies. At the local, in-group level, for example, most instances of multilingual speech in Western societies do not generate local metaphorical meanings, and for many multilingual speakers, the two (or more languages) they use in some situations do not form a relevant, or meaningful opposition (*which* undermines the notion of multilingualism as a discrete phenomenon). At the same time, however, such talk is always marked and consequential for identities in the larger context of Western societies. Finally, I argue that the social implications of multilingual ways of speaking are not a function of the formal linguistic distance between forms but of the social histories that have infused forms *with* particular meanings and varying levels of prestige. The value of analyzing identity negotiations in multilingual contexts is not so much in the details of linguistic forms but in the perspective that such analysis gives on social and political processes and meanings. The notion of 'multilingual' thus becomes a more useful social-analytical construct if it is approached as a socially, rather than formally, based concept.

### 5.1. Multilingual-like ways of speaking

Starting from formal definitions of multilingualism or code switching, e.g. the use of two or more grammatical systems in a single speech exchange (Gumperz 1982), distracts attention from the uses to which language is put. From the functional perspective of *identity* work, multilingual speech is simply one way among many of positioning self and other. A more functional approach to talk can encompass a broader range of multilingual, or multilingual-like phenomena that have implications for social identity but that may not meet analysts' more formal criteria for what constitutes multilingualism. If one's starting point is social identity, it may not be central whether a speaker is switching languages, alternating between a dialect and a national standard, register shifting, or *speaking* monolingually in a variety that highlights language contact. If one starts from a more functional perspective, one is relieved, to a degree, of the questions of what exactly constitutes a language (Alvarez-Caccamo 2001, 1998), and what constitutes the competence level in a second or third language that allows one's speech to count as multilingual (Meeuwis and Blommaert 1998). The focus can thus shift to individuals as social actors using heteroglossic (Bakhtin 1981) sets of linguistic resources to negotiate the social world.

From the perspective of social identity, language alternation may be socially meaningful and worthy of analysis regardless of whether a speaker is a competent speaker of a second language. Rampton (1995), for example, has shown how teen-agers in England use short segments of speech in languages of which they know only a limited number of words or phrases to socially position themselves vis-a-vis their peers and the wider society. Such instances of "crossing" involve the use of language that is strongly associated with an ethnic or racial category to which the speaker does not belong. Thus an Anglo British youth may situationally use words or phrases from Caribbean Creole English or Panjabi to position himself relative both to interlocutors (who may not be members of categories popularly associated with those forms), and to the wider, racially organized society (see ch. 14 in this volume).

Similarly, from the perspective of identity work, there is no *a priori* reason why switching among what count as discrete languages should be privileged over switching among what count as dialects. What counts as a language and what counts as a dialect is typically a political question, as captured in the widely-circulated aphorism that a language is a "dialect with a navy." It is not formal or genetic linguistic distance or issues of mutual comprehensibility that differentiates a dialect from a language, but rather the links of a variety to political power, institutions, and states. Varieties, such as Spanish and Portuguese, which are linked to nation states thus count as languages, while varieties that are not at the center of national power typically count, at least popularly, as dialects.

Finally, a more functional perspective can encompass identity work in monolingual speech that has been affected by multilingualism or multilingual situations. Even monolingual speakers may reproduce contact phenomena in their speech from having learned a language in a situation that was formerly multilingual. Thus the English pronunciation of monolingual New York Puerto Ricans, for example, may include a degree of syllable-timing, a feature of Spanish, as opposed to the stress-timing of dominant varieties of Anglo American English (Zentella 1997: 45). Such pronunciation distinguishes the speech of many second- and third-generation US Latinos from more institutionally prestigious varieties and can be used by both in-group and out-group members to constitute a social boundary.

In addition to phonetic effects of language contact, there can also be persistent discourse level patterns inherited from ways of speaking in languages that have been lost through language shift to monolingualism. In such communities, distinctive rhetorical styles can serve as an emblem of social distinction and a locus of both misunderstanding and political struggle in intergroup encounters (Philips 1983; Scollon and Scollon 1981; Tannen 1982).

## 5.2. To whom do the languages of multilingual talk represent a socially meaningful opposition?

The social meaningfulness of multilingualism is a phenomenological question. While the languages of multilingual contexts are popularly seen as distinct by dominant groups in Western societies, in some contexts multilingual speakers do *not* treat the languages involved in such a way. A growing body of literature since the early 1980s has challenged the assumption that the languages used in code switching are essentially distinct and that code switching necessarily involves social meanings that are different from ones communicated in monolingual talk (Meeuwis and Blommaert 1998; Heller ed. *forthc.*; Poplack 1980; Woolard 2004). The multilingual practice that most forcefully undermines assumed distinctions among languages is the relatively frequent, intrasentential code switching that has been widely documented in intra-group peer interaction among the children of international labor migrants to Western societies and in many urban, African contexts (e.g. Myers-Scotton 1993; Swigart 1992). When language alternation functions as a discourse mode in its own right (Poplack 1980), it undermines the assumed opposition between languages, and the assumed unity of a single language with identity.

When languages are not compartmentalized and strictly associated with particular social domains (Fishman, Cooper, and Newman 1971), the search for a function of a particular switch may be akin to trying to explain why a monolingual speaker selects one synonym or phrasing over another (Zentella 1997: 101). In a corpus of 1,685 switches among young New York Puerto Rican girls,

Zentella (1997: 101) assigns fewer than half of her switches to specific conversational strategies, or functions, arguing that the motivations and meanings of such switches were no different at the local level than the motivations and meanings of monolingual speakers' choices among synonyms in monolingual speech. Similarly, Meeuwis and Blommaert (1998: 76) argue that the multilingual talk among Zairians in Belgium can represent "one code in its own right," and that the insistence on two distinct languages as the frame of reference for this form of speech is an ideologically-motivated *a priori* that is not useful in terms of interpreting it.

While languages may have lost their distinctiveness to multilingual speakers in particular local contexts, in larger contexts such as Western nation-states where monolingualism is considered normal and natural, multilingual talk is always salient and seen as requiring explanation in ways that monolingual speech is not. The meanings that one finds in such switching vary with one's subject position and analytical perspective. For many adults, including first-generation immigrant parents, code switching is a haphazard jumble of linguistic elements that is emblematic of the inability to speak what those adults see as the correct language, i.e. the ideological standard that is prestigious in institutional contexts (Lippi-Green 1997; Milroy and Milroy 1985; Silverstein 1996). Right-wing nativist groups typically point to immigrant multilingualism as a form of mongrelization and a threat to prosperity and the social fabric (Piatt 1990). Many academics since the 1970s, in contrast, have celebrated the linguistic sophistication displayed in code switching (McClure 1977; Sankoff and Poplack 1981; Lipski 1985) and the social 'strategies' that some forms of it imply (cf. Myers-Scotton 1993: 74; Gumperz 1982; cf. Woolard 2004). For more politically oriented analysts, such code switching can be seen as a form of resistance to dominant discourses of unquestioning assimilation (Gal 1988: 259) and a means to constructing a positive self in a political and economic context that disparages immigrant phenotypes, language, class status, and ethnic origins (Zentella 1997). The meanings and implications of particular forms for identity work are a function of the interpreter's subject position in a larger sociopolitical field.

## 5.3. Multilingualism as a dimension of social and political practice

Linguistic approaches to multilingualism can veil the social and political history of which multilingualism is part-and-parcel. The social and political conditions, such as migration and social stratification, that afford the on-going co-existence of multiple languages are the same ones that afford on-going inequality and construction of social difference among groups. In cases of labor migration or refugee streams to Western societies that result in multilingualism, immigrant groups commonly assume lower positions in power hierarchies and their degree of assimilation is a political and contested issue. Often the language, culture, re-

ligion, and/or phenotypes of such immigrants are devalued by members of dominant groups, so any expression of identity must engage discourse about the worthiness of those identities. Assimilationist practices are discouraged by group solidarity among oppressed groups, while maintenance of immigrant language and cultural practices are seen by dominant groups as an explanation and justification for on-going inequality. More generally, identity categories and language choice and attitudes are inseparable from power hierarchies and related ideologies about the relative value of identity categories and ways of speaking.

The increased flow of people, goods, and ideas around the world in the last century has made multilingualism and identity negotiations in Western urban centers increasingly visible to Western elites and academics. In relatively stable social and linguistic situations of monolingualism, the social and linguistic categories favored by dominant groups are seen as natural through processes of hegemony or symbolic domination (Bourdieu 1991; Heller 1995). Speakers tend to be relatively unaware of the ways in which their ways of speaking represent performances of identity because speech in stable social situations reproduces what are assumed to be natural, or normal identities. When a member of an ethnic group speaks in a manner popularly associated with that ethnic group, the talk is simply seen as a reflection of a natural, essential, independently pre-existing identity rather than a social negotiation process. The multilingual identity work that is characteristic of more rapidly changing social contexts, in contrast, destabilizes assumptions about an essential unity of language, nation, and identity.

Formal definitions of multilingualism also veil the range of practices and meanings that multilingualism encompasses. The occurrence, form, distribution, and meanings of multilingual talk vary across and within communities, contexts, and interactions. This variation is not random, but rather follows patterns that can be linked to specific questions of power and the construction of social difference. What are relevant social boundaries in a particular context and how did they arise? What are groups' relative and situational interests in boundary-maintenance versus boundary-leveling? How much access to cross-boundary social roles and domains do members of a society have (Heller 1988)?

Patterns and meanings of multilingual talk at the local level can thus be linked to larger sociohistorical questions. Poplack (1988), for example, shows that contrasting patterns of code switching between two communities - a New York Puerto Rican one and a Ottawa-Hull French Canadian one - correlate to contrasting social positions of the two groups. Even though the genetic relationship between French and English is virtually identical to the genetic relationship between Spanish and English, both the form and interpretation of the switching are very different in the two communities. Bilingual New York Puerto Rican switches tend to be smooth and seamless, i.e. unmarked, while French-English switches tend to be highlighted, or marked, through repetition, hesitation, intonational highlighting, and even explicit metalinguistic commentary.

Whereas bilingualism is seen to be emblematic of New York Puerto Rican identity - differentiating members from island Puerto Ricans and non-Puerto Rican Anglophones - Ottawa-Hull French Canadian bilingualism is not associated with a social identity distinct from that of local monolingual French Canadians. For New York Puerto Ricans, use of two languages is both an emblem of a distinctive identity and a practice that draws in immigrant newcomers. In the French Canadian situation, there is no stream of newcomers to incorporate and no distinctive identity bridging disparate communities that needs to be enacted or maintained through language.

Gal (1988: 247) argues that particular code switching ideologies and practices can be linked to even broader political economic and historical contexts. Thus, groups with similar structural positions in the world system - e.g., second-generation labor migrants to Western, industrialized states - will display similarities in code switching meanings and practices. Thus Italian-German switching among the children of Italian labor migrants to Germany will be similar to that of Spanish-English code switching among second-generation Puerto Ricans in the US, both in terms of patterns and local functions.

Within particular communities, code switching practices and meanings shift over time in conjunction with shifting identity politics. Heller (1992), for example, demonstrates how francophone political mobilization in Quebec destabilized conventional patterns of multilingual speech, resulting in significant negotiations and metacommentary on which language, French or English, to speak and what it means to speak one or the other. In Brussels, where relatively frequent, and intra-sentential code switching was once common, younger generations are switching less than the older generations, in part because of the political polarization between French and Flemish speakers in the country. This polarization makes a joint-French-Flemish Brussels identity - as expressed through frequent French-Flemish switching - less tenable (Treffers-Daller 1992).

The implications of multilingual talk for identity negotiations are thus a function of the history that gives rise to constellations of differently valued identity options and infuses ways of speaking with social meanings and perspectives. If historical social relations among groups are particularly coercive and stratified, ways of speaking associated with those groups will be particularly infused with related social associations, and those ways of speaking will symbolize and reconstitute social difference particularly starkly.

The salience and persistence of distinctions between African American and other varieties of American English illustrate the political and historical bases of social meanings of language. These distinctions have persisted for centuries, despite long-term close contact between speakers of African American and other American varieties of English. It is the distinctively coercive and unjust nature of historical social relations in the US - slavery, systematic Jim Crow laws, segregation, and on-going social and economic inequality - that have both

a) sustained African American and other American English as distinct varieties, and b) made African American English salient as a social marker. In contexts of discrimination and inequality, different ways of speaking will tend to persist as markers of social identity, just as the identities themselves are made to persist. In contexts of relative equality, in contrast, identities and ways of speaking assimilate to each other relatively rapidly, as has occurred among European immigrants to the US across three generations.

#### SA. Multilingualism as social construction

While the notion that identity categories such as race or ethnicity are socially constructed is now an academic commonplace, multilingualism, as both a popular and analytical category, is not generally seen as a social construction. There are fundamental parallels, however, in the social and political processes through which difference is constructed among social identity categories and the linguistic forms that count as separate languages. Both, for example, are popularly seen as having self-evident, empirical bases, and both form parts of the highly naturalized assumption of a language-race-nation unity. In both cases, however, the conceptualizations, salience, and social significance of the categories are a function of social and political processes rather than inherent, or essential characteristics of members of the categories. The fact that multilingual speech draws both popular and academic attention may tell us relatively little about the nature of code switching or linguistic forms, and relatively more about popular and academic language ideologies of Western nation-states.

Conceptualizing bilingual speech as a social construction does not minimize its on-the-ground social implications. An example from social identity categories can help make this clear: the fact that Black-White race in the United States is a social construction, for example, does not make race an illusion or socially insignificant (Omi and Winant 1994). Race has been, and remains, a central organizing principle in the United States and a way of representing, rationalizing, and reproducing tremendous social inequality. Approaching race as a social construction allows one to see, however, that race is not about essential biological difference (which is how race is popularly construed) but about social history. What is socially significant about race is a distinctively violent history of coercion and inequality, not details of hair texture, skin shade, or other morphological features. The social constructionist perspective directs attention to the political and historical processes through which race has been constituted and given such significance in the US.

Similarly, approaching monolingualism and multilingualism as socially constructed does not change their social force at the level of lived experience, but it does show that this social force is not a function of formal, or inherent linguistic differences among what count as languages. If multilingual talk is an es-

pecially meaningful mode of speaking, it is not the nature of the forms that make it so but rather particular social and political histories.

Studying identity work in multilingual talk can be a route to understanding society not because of formal linguistic distinctions among languages, but because of the inherent social and political nature of language. In contexts such as Western societies where code switching or multilingual talk has been made to count as particularly socially meaningful, insights into identity negotiations can come from attention to the social and political processes that have made monolingual-versus-multilingual speech a meaningful opposition. The value of analyzing identity negotiations in multilingual contexts is not in the details of linguistic forms but in the perspective that such analysis gives on social and political processes and meanings. Identity work is thus a perspective from which to examine the encounter of individual social actors with history as they resist and reproduce historical meanings and structures in the present.

#### Notes

1. Transcription conventions are as follows:

Janelle:	The speaker is indicated with a name or abbreviation on the left of the page.
<i>loca</i>	Italics indicate words spoken in languages other than English.
['Jerk. 'J]	Text surrounded by single quotation marks and brackets indicates a translation of the immediately preceding language.
	Empty parentheses indicate material that couldn't be heard clearly enough to transcribe.
((smiling))	Double parentheses surround nonverbal, visual, prosodic, or other contextual information.
/// don't- ///He said	Text after double slashes that is directly above or below other text after double slashes indicates words spoken in overlap.
(1.5)	Numerals in parentheses indicate periods of time, in seconds, during which there is no speech.
Da::mn	A colon indicates that the preceding sound was elongated in a marked pronunciation.
if I- I	A hyphen indicates that speech was suddenly cut-off during or after the word preceding the hyphen.
stabbin'	A single apostrophe indicates the elision of a single letter.

2. Second-generation Korean Americans are US-born of Korean immigrant parents. The term '1.5 generation' is used to refer to Korean-born individuals who come to the US before adulthood, typically before the end of primary school, thus receiving much of their socialization in the US.

## References

- Alfonzetti, Giovanna  
1998 The conversational dimension in code-switching between Italian and Dialect in Sicily. In: P. Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction, and Identity*, 180-211. London/New York: Routledge.
- Alvarez-Caccamo, Celso  
1998 From 'switching code' to 'code-switching': Towards a reconceptualisation of communicative codes. In: P. Allier (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction, and Identity*, 29-48. London/New York: Routledge.
- Alvarez-Caccamo, Celso  
2001 Codes. In: A. Duranti (ed.), *Key Terms in Language and Culture*, 23-26. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Auer, Peter  
1984 *Bilingual Conversation*. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Auer, Peter  
1988 A conversation analytic approach to codeswitching and transfer. In: M. Heller (ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 187-213. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Auer, Peter  
1992 Introduction: John Gumperz's approach to contextualisation. In: P. Auer and A. Di Luzio (eds.), *The Contextualisation of Language*, 1-38. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Auer, Peter  
1995 The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In: L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*, 115-135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bailey, Benjamin  
2000 Communicative behavior and conflict between African-American customers and immigrant Korean retailers in Los Angeles. *Discourse and Society* 11 (1): 86-108.
- Bailey, Benjamin  
2000 Socialinteractional functions of code switching among Dominican Americans. *IPrA Pragmatics* 10 (2): 165-193.
- Bailey, Benjamin  
2001 Dominican-American ethnicracial identities and United States social categories. *International Migration Review* 35 (3): 677-708.
- Bailey, Benjamin  
2002 *Language, Race, and Negotiation of Identity: A Study of Dominican Americans*. New York: LFB Scholarly Pub.
- Bakhtin, M. M.  
1981 *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. University of Texas Press Slavic series; no. 1. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barth, Frederik  
1969 Introduction. In: F. Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*, 9-38. Boston: Little Brown and Co.
- Basso, Keith H.  
1972 "To give up on words": Silence in western apache culture. In: P. P. Giglioli (ed.), *Language and Social Context*, 67-86. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Basso, Keith H.  
1979 *Portraits of "the Whiteman": Linguistic Play and Cultural Symbols Among the Western Apache*. Cambridge [Eng.]/ New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Blom, Jan-Peter and J. I. Gumperz  
1972 Code-switching in Norway. In: J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics*, 407-434. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bourdieu, Pierre  
1990 *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre  
1991 *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brodin, Karen  
1998 *How Jews Became White Folks and What that Says About Race in America*. New Brunswick N. J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman  
1960 The pronouns of power and solidarity. In: T. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, 253-276. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bucholtz, Mary  
1999 You da man: narrating the racial other in the production of white masculinity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* (3-4): 443-460.
- Bucholtz, Mary and Kira Hall  
2005 Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies* 7 (4-5): 585-614.
- Carbaugh, Donal A.  
1996 *Situating Selves: The Communication of Social Identities in American Scenes*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Chang, Edward  
1990 *New Urban Crisis: Korean-Black Conflicts in Los Angeles*. Dissertation, Ethnic Studies, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley.
- Chun, Elaine  
2001 The construction of White, Black, and Korean American identities through African American Vernacular English. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11 (1): 52-64.
- Cutler, Cecilia  
1999 Yorkville crossing: White teens, hip hop and African American English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* (3-4): 428-442.
- Davies, Bronwyn, and Rom Harré  
1990 Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior* 20 (1): 43-63.
- Fishman, Joshua A., Robert Leon Cooper and Roxana Ma Newman  
1971 *Bilingualism in the barrio, Indiana University publication.s. Language science monographs*, vol. 7. Bloomington: Indiana University.

- Gal, Susan  
1988 The political economy of code choice. In: M. Heller (ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 245-264. Berlin! New York! Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gans, Herbert  
1979 Symbolic ethnicity: the future of ethnic groups and cultures in America. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2 (1): 1-20.
- Giddens, Anthony  
1984 *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Goffman, Erving  
1979 Footing. *Semiotica* 25: 1-29.
- Goodwin, Charles and Marjorie Harness Goodwin  
1992 Assessments and the construction of context. In: A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, 147-190. Cambridge! New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, John Joseph  
1982 *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge! New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, Stuart  
1990 Cultural identity and diaspora. In: J. Rutherford (ed.), *Identity: Culture, Community, Difference*, 222-237. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Heller, Monica  
1988 Introduction. In: M. Heller (ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 1-24. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, Monica  
1992 The politics of code-switching and language choice. In: C. Eastman (ed.), *Codeswitching*, 123-142. Cleveland! Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Heller, Monica  
1995 Language Choice, Social Institutions, and Symbolic Domination. *Language in Society* 24 (3): 373-406.
- Heller, Monica (ed.)  
(forthc.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*.
- Heritage, John, and J. Maxwell Atkinson  
1984 Introduction. In: J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, 1-15. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.
- Hoetink, Harry  
1967 *Caribbean Race Relations: A Study of Two Variants*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Irvine, Judith T.  
1974 Strategies of status manipulation in the Wolof Greeting. In: R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (eds.), *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*, 167-191. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Irvine, Judith T.  
2001 "Style" as distinctiveness: the culture and ideology of linguistic differentiation. In: P. Eckert and J. R. Rickford (eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, 21-43. Cambridge! New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kiesling, Scott  
2001 Stances of Whiteness and hegemony in fraternity men's discourse. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11 (1): 101-115.
- Kroskrity, Paul Y.  
1993 *Language, History, and Identity: Ethnolinguistic Studies of the Arizona Tewa*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Le Page, R. B. and Andree Taboul'et-Keller  
1985 *Acts of Identity: Creole-Based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge! New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, Hyon-Bok  
1989 *Korean Grammar*. Oxford! New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lippi-Green, Rosina  
1997 *English With an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*. London! New York: Routledge.
- Lipski, John M.  
1985 *Linguistic Aspects of Spanish-English Language Switching*. Tempe, Ariz.: Center for Latin American Studies Arizona State University.
- Matthews, Aaron (ed.)  
2000 *My American Girls*. New York: Filmmakers Library.
- McClure, Erica  
1977 Aspects of code-switching in the discourse of bilingual Mexican-American children. In: M. Saville-Troike (ed.), *Linguistics and Anthropology*, 93-115. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Meeuwis, Michael and Jan Blommaert  
1998 A monolectal view of code-switching: Layered code-switching among Zairians in Belgium. In: P. Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, 76-98. London! New York: Routledge.
- Milroy, James, and Lesley Milroy  
1985 *Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription and Standardisation*. London! Boston: Routledge and K. Paul.
- Milroy, Lesley and Li Wei  
1995 A social network approach to code-switching: The example of a bilingual community in Britain. In: L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), *One Speake!; Two Languages: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*, 137-157. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mitchell-Kernan, Claudia  
1972 Signifying and marking: Two Afro-American speech acts. In: J. Gumperz and D. H. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, 161-179. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Mittelberg, David, and Mary C. Waters  
1992 The Process of Ethnogenesis among Haitian and Israeli Immigrants in the United-States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15 (3): 412-435.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol  
1993 *Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant  
1994 *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

- Pavlenko, Aneta and Adrian Blackledge  
 2004 Introduction: New theoretical approaches to the study of negotiatIOn of identities in multilingual contexts. In: A. Pavlenko and A. Blackledge (eds.), *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*, 1-33. Clevedon/ Buffalo/ Toronto: Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Peirce, Charles S.  
 1955 Logic as semiotic: The theory of signs. In: J. Buchler (ed.), *Philosophical Writings of Peirce*, 98-119. New York: Dover Publications.
- Philips, Susan Urmston  
 1983 *The Invisible Culture: Communication in Classroom and Community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation*. New York: Longman.
- Piatt, Bill  
 1990 *Only English: Law and Language Policy in the United States*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Poplack, Shana  
 1980 Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en espanol- toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18 (7-8): 581-618.
- Poplack, Shana  
 1988 Contrasting patterns of codeswitching in two communities. In: M. Heller (ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 215-244. Berlin/ New York! Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rampton, Ben  
 1995 *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescents*. London! New York: Longman.
- Rickford, John R.  
 1999 *African American Vernacular English: Features, Evolution, Educational Implications*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.
- Sankoff, David and Shana Poplack  
 1981 A formal grammar for code-switching. *Papers in Linguistics* 14: 3-46.
- Scollon, Ronald and Suzanne B. K. Scollon  
 1981 *Narrative, Literacy, and Face in Interethnic Communication*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Pub. Corp.
- Silverstein, Michael  
 1996 Monoglot "Standard" in America. In: D. L. Brenneis and R. K. S. Macaulay (eds.), *The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology*, 284-306. Boulder, Col.: Westview Press.
- Swigart, Leigh  
 1992 Two codes or one? The insiders's view and the description of codeswitching in Dakar. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13: 83-102.
- Tannen, Deborah  
 1982 Ethnic style in male-female conversation. In: J. Gumperz (ed.), *Language and Social Identity*, 217-231. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tracy, Karen  
 2002 *Everyday Talk: Building and Reflecting Identities*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Treffers-Daller, Jeanine  
 1992 French-Dutch codeswitching in Brussels: Social factors explaining its disappearance. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13 (1-2): 143-156.
- Waters, Mary  
 1994 Ethnic and racial identities of second-generation Black immigrants in New York City. *International Migration Review* 14 (1): 57-76.
- Waters, Mary C.  
 1990 *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wei, Li  
 1998 The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In: P. Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction, and Identity*, 156-176. London/ New York: Routledge.
- Wieder, Larry, and Stephen Pratt  
 1990 On being a recognizable Indian among Indians. In: D. Carbaugh (ed.), *Cultural Communication and Intercultural Contact*, 45-64. London /Hove: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Woolard, Kathryn Ann  
 2004 Codeswitching. In: A. Duranti (ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, 73-94. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Zentella, Ana Celia  
 1997 *Growing up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.