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Abstract—With the rise of globalization, transmigration becomes more commonplace. Globalization is often accompanied by multiculturalism that constitutes an important fabric in societies and countries around the world. This has been the case in South Korea. Multiculturalism has resulted in many shifts and challenges within the Korean family dynamics. Multilingualism is an important characteristic that uniquely identifies many multicultural families. Regardless of the unique traits of each multicultural family, what seems to be the common denominator within these families of emergent bilingual children is that translanguaging is practiced for various purposes both inside and outside the home environment. Through questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, and narrative frames, this qualitative case study explores Anglophone fathers’ perceptions of their bilingual children’s language proficiency, the translanguaging practices of Korean-English bilingual families in Korea, and the impact of translanguaging practices on bilingual children’s self-identity development. Three conclusions can be drawn based on the results: Parents of emergent bilingual children generally value high proficiency in both languages, translanguaging is often practiced for communicative purposes, and translanguaging has an important effect on emergent bilinguals’ self-identity development. Implications are drawn regarding the importance and necessity of translanguaging practices both inside and outside of the home environment.
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I. INTRODUCTION

With the rise of globalization, transmigration becomes more commonplace. Globalization is often accompanied by multiculturalism that constitutes an important societal fabric in countries around the world. Over the last three decades, the population of multicultural families in Korea has been steadily increasing. According to the 2021 Population and Housing Census, the number of multicultural households was 385,000, rising by 4.7% from 2020 (Statistics Korea, 2022). Multiculturalism has resulted in many shifts within the family dynamics. Multilingualism is an important characteristic that uniquely identifies many multicultural families. In Korea, the official language is Korean. However, English is taught as a foreign language from the third grade of elementary school up until the end of high school as it is an important subject on the university entrance exam in Korea. In addition, although English is not commonly spoken in Korea, being proficient in English is a highly sought-after ability as it is considered a valuable social capital to possess stemming from neoliberalist government policies within Korea (Piller & Cho, 2013). In Korea, it has also recently become more common to encounter bilingual families, with one of the spouses being a native Korean speaker and the other, a native English speaker. Although Korean-English bilingual families have varying approaches and practices regarding family language policy, what is common in all multicultural and multilingual families is a form of translanguaging (Hereafter, TL) occurring during social interaction between family members. Past research has demonstrated that TL has a tremendous impact on children’s bilingual proficiency, family relations, and self-identity development (Zhao & Flewitt, 2020). Thus, TL is an important aspect of language development in bilingual individuals and can be viewed as the medium through which both languages can be nurtured and preserved. As the number of multicultural families continues to increase in Korea, it will become more imperative to encourage the use of TL at home in a bilingual environment. Thus, identifying how bilingual children employ TL practices according to their own needs and purposes and how parents’ values and beliefs influence their family language policy are important factors in the successful outcome of the bilingual proficiency of bilingual children.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The term “translanguaging” was originally coined by Cen Williams in 1994 from the Welsh term, “trawsieithu” to refer to the alternating use of Welsh and English in the monoglossic language classroom (Yang et al., 2021). In the past, bilingualism was originally situated within the monoglossic ideological framework. The monoglossic ideology of bilingualism states that a bilingual individual possesses two separate compartments for each language which should not be intertwined. For example, when an individual has the ability to use both English and Korean, it was believed and strongly encouraged that the two languages should not be mixed or used together while communicating. Later on, many
researchers began to take on a more heteroglossic view of bilingualism which supports the concept that bilinguals do not possess a separate compartment for each language but rather utilize simultaneously an infinite number of various forms and signs of languages in the linguistic repertoire to make sense of and communicate with individuals in the world around them (Wilson, 2021). The theoretical framework for this study draws from this heteroglossic perspective of bilingualism in which emergent bilingual speakers utilize their full linguistic repertoires from their two languages in order to navigate and make sense of a multilingual world (Higgins, 2019). Put another way, TL conceptualizes language as an activity rather than a discrete entity (Zhao & Flewitt, 2020). This is evident in the morphology of the word “translanguaging” where the grammatical verb ending of ‘ing’ informs that it is an action. Through TL, bilingual learners are able to acquire the flexibility to take control of their own learning “to self-regulate when and how to use a language, depending on the context in which they are being asked to perform” (Karpava et al., 2019, p. 622).

Within the home environment, the discrete boundaries between languages are blurred during everyday interactions (Higgins, 2019). A recent study on the at-home TL practices of 150 bilingual/multilingual Russian-speaking children and their parents in Cyprus, Sweden, and Estonia showed that “family language use and child-directed TL can support, expand and enhance dynamic bilingualism/multilingualism, and reinforce and integrate minority language in a wider context: societal and educational” (Karpava et al., 2019, p. 619). Furthermore, “it is natural that during interactions languages become mixed” (Karpava et al., 2019, p. 622). Very often code switching (Hereafter, CS) is an integral part of the TL process. CS is when bilinguals use a combination of two or more languages in the same conversation or sentence (Karpava et al., 2019). It is important to note the difference between CS and TL. Current research has revealed that when individuals TL, a multifaceted process occurs, one of which is CS (Berlianti & Pradita, 2021; Karpava et al., 2019; Nguyen, 2019). Thus, CS is an integral process of TL, but when bilinguals perform CS, it does not necessarily mean that they are also TL. Bilinguals use TL with their families at home and with friends at school and members of the local community.

Furthermore, TL has numerous benefits for bilingual and multilingual children such as the development of greater metacognitive awareness compared to monolingual children (Lee & Garcia, 2020), negotiation strategies, metalinguistic knowledge, metacognitive ability, and higher-order-thinking skills (Kwon, 2022). TL also plays an important role in biliteracy development in bilinguals (Yang et al., 2021). In addition, biliteracy development is a strong contributor to their health due to the formation of a positive self-identity which are important for mental and psychological well-being (Lee et al., 2021; Park & Lee, 2016). Likewise, TL also has important implications for multilinguals in an academic context as research has firmly established that TL not only contributes to the development of language skills, it also raises students’ scholastic achievement at the secondary and postsecondary levels (García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; Kirsch, 2018). Furthermore, being bilingual or multilingual also results in the acquisition of valuable social capital, greater competitiveness and marketability in the workplace which can lead to higher socioeconomic status (Seo, 2021). Thus, based on the extant literature, TL plays many roles and provides numerous affordances with regards to bilingual language development and maintenance.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Family Language Policy to Support Bilingualism

Family interactions in the home environment are important for language maintenance (Karpava et al., 2019). Family Language Policy or FLP can be defined as the particular language ideologies and beliefs about language practices in the home domain (Higgins, 2019; Piller & Gerber, 2021). Through FLP, how languages are managed, negotiated, and transmitted intergenerationally and under what conditions languages are maintained or lost are explored (Karpava et al., 2019; Liang et al., 2022). Past research has found that family language practices or policies are crucial to the maintenance and revitalization of indigenous and minority languages (Higgins, 2019). According to Said (2021), “as a paradigm, FLP focuses on the manifestation of family ideologies or beliefs about languages and how such beliefs affect decisions about which languages a family learns and uses” (p. 424). In other words, the FLP and the decision made by each family is crucial in terms of influencing the language outcomes of children in a dual or multiple language home environment. Specifically, FLP addresses child language learning along with parents’ language ideologies, choices, and strategies within sociocultural contexts (King & Fogle, 2013). Research shows that the characteristics of a “FLP is closely related to parental language ideologies, attitudes, or beliefs about language learning, bilingualism, and types of interactions” (Lee et al., 2021, p. 3). FLP is a purposeful attempt to practice a particular language use pattern within the home TL space and among family members (Said, 2021). Due to the many tangible benefits of being bilingual mentioned earlier such as cognitive, health, and economic among others, the concept of the bilingual advantage is an impactful language ideology which dictates family language policy decisions (Piller & Gerber, 2021).

B. Identity Development Through Translanguaging

A plethora of extant literature has firmly established that there is a strong link between language use and identity. As Dubiner (2021) states, “People’s identities are set in relation to their language practices and the sociolinguistic milieu in which their lives are situated” (p. 194). The realization of one’s identity is strongly linked to the language one speaks (Richards & Wilson, 2019). For the multilingual individual, identity becomes multifaceted and complex as navigation
among these languages occurs through various acts of TL. Thus, among multilingual individuals, self-identity is greatly impacted through TL. TL plays a unique role in that it fosters the construction of identities (Ho & Tai, 2021). What is unique to multilingual individuals is that self-identity should not be considered as just one, but multiple identities in correspondence to their multilingual abilities. This view on multiple identities constructed through TL has been supported by many scholars (Creese & Blackledge, 2015; Li & Zhu, 2013; Nguyen, 2019; Poza, 2019). Bilingualism is an important aspect of one’s identity (Li, 2011). “Language is a key factor in the construction of identity—as emergent bilinguals develop and refine their language practices, they shape and construct their own identities” (Eller & Nieto, 2021, p. 91). As Peirce (1995) states, “the individual language learner is not ahistorical and unidimensional but has a complex and sometimes contradictory social identity, changing across time and space” (p. 26). In a study conducted on Arabic-Hebrew bilinguals in Israel, it was concluded that ethnolinguistic identities were shaped and reflected through their purposeful intermingling of Hebrew and Arabic in certain contexts (Dubiner, 2021). Thus, because of the strong link between language, social, and individual identity, when students are provided a TL space to fully utilize their linguistic repertoire, they are able to develop a positive bilingual identity about themselves. Parental decisions on language use can affect the identity of the children and influence their use of TL. Specifically, when parents support the use of TL in the home, they nurture not only bilingual proficiency development in their children but also help lead them to how they self-identify themselves culturally as individuals.

IV. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Much of the past research on TL has been situated in the classroom environment and conducted on students within the learning and pedagogical context (Cenoz & Santos, 2020; García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; Holdway & Hitchcock, 2018; Kafle, 2020; Kayi-Aydar & Green-Eneix, 2019; Kirsch, 2018, 2020; Lee & García, 2020; Lio et al., 2020; Rajendram, 2021; Wang, 2020). Currently, there is no extant literature on the TL practices of Korean-English bilingual children in Korea from the perspectives of foreign fathers. Although the focus is on their children’s linguistic practices, it is difficult for young children to properly express themselves in an interview situation. Therefore, the fathers were interviewed for this study. The author believes that the six foreign fathers can provide a unique perspective on the linguistic practices of their bilingual children as they experience language use first-hand from a minority father perspective in Korea.

This research attempts to address the major gaps in TL research among Korean-English bilingual speakers and their families. It is anticipated that the results of this research will bring greater insight into the TL practices of Korean-English bilinguals in Korea and how they are utilized in their daily lives at home, school, and in the community, and its impacts on self-identity development.

Hence, the purpose of this study on bilingual families residing in Korea was to answer the question: What are the Anglophone father’s perceptions of the bilingual proficiency development and TL practices of their emergent Korean-English bilingual children in Korea? Specifically:

1) What are the beliefs and values of foreign fathers regarding family language policy?
2) What are the TL practices of emergent Korean-English bilingual children?
3) How does TL affect Korean-English bilingual children’s self-identity?

V. METHODOLOGY

The method used for this study was a qualitative case study approach. According to Merriam (1998), a qualitative case study is defined as “an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single instance, phenomenon or a social unit” (p. 21). Thus, it allows for an in-depth, information-rich account of participants’ lived-in experiences. A case study is appropriate for this study as it explores the TL practices of Korean-English bilingual families in Korea, a specific bounded context.

A. Recruitment and Participants

The participants and their emergent bilingual children are listed in Table 1 below. The six participants are Anglophone fathers residing in a major metropolitan city in Korea. The participants were recruited through the author’s personal and professional networks. The participants were informed as to the purpose of the study and the requirements for participation. All of the Anglophone fathers are from major English-speaking countries and are married to ethnically Korean women. The children range in age between 5 to 16 years and were born and currently reside in Korea. The children attend school in Korea and are able to speak in both Korean and English in varying capacities.
B. Data Collection

The data for this study were collected through purposive sampling as this technique was most appropriate due to the need to identify and select information-rich cases related to the phenomenon of interest (Palinkas et al., 2015). A pilot interview was conducted with one of the researcher’s colleagues and the questions were subsequently modified and improved for greater clarity and applicability. Subsequent semi-structured interviews were conducted on the six participant fathers. Some of the questions asked included:

1. How would you describe your children’s English and Korean proficiency levels?
2. How important is it to you that your children maintain both languages?
3. Does your family have a Family Language Plan or Policy at home? Explain.
4. How do your children negotiate cultural and linguistic identity in your household?

Due to COVID-19 restrictions at the time of the interviews, all interviews were conducted online via video conferencing platform. Each interview lasted somewhere between 60 to 90 minutes. The researcher conducted, recorded, and transcribed all the interviews. Data accuracy and credibility was achieved through member checks of the interview transcripts and summaries. Triangulation was achieved through semi-structured interviews, questionnaires, and researcher field notes to ensure data validity and credibility. The questionnaires contained specific questions with regards to the parents’ profiles and their parenting experiences in Korea. Researcher field notes were made based on the interviews in which the researcher’s thoughts and impressions during the interview were made of the participants.

C. Data Analysis

Interviews were transcribed verbatim and coded thematically using the qualitative analysis software MAXQDA22. Data were analyzed according to the three coding stages of open, axial and selective which are based on the grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). In the first stage, initial themes emerged and were coded with labels in vivo and short descriptions based on key words in the transcripts. Over 50 codes were identified in the first stage. Such codes included CS, cultural negotiation, linguistic negotiation, and cultural identification. In the second stage, these codes were further reduced to create themes which included self-cultural identification, high value of bilingual proficiency, and identification with Korean culture. In the third stage, connections were made between the various categorical themes and the key concepts in the theoretical framework and literature review such as TL, family language policy, and self-identity. The categories were further analyzed and reduced until no new categorical themes were discovered and data saturation was achieved.

D. Human Subject Protection

Throughout the data collection process, anonymity and confidentiality of the participants were adhered to at all times. In accordance with this, all six participants were labeled as “Participant #” and their children were provided with pseudonyms as indicated in Table 1 above. Participants were fully informed as to how the data would be collected and used for the purpose of research. All aspects of research protocol were conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki (World Medical Association, 2013) concerning the ethical principles regarding human subjects.

VI. RESULTS

The results of the analysis revealed three main themes and five subthemes.

A. Bilingual Practices and Beliefs of Parents

(a). Implicit Family Language Policy

It was interesting to note that there was no explicit or overt family language policy or plan in each of the participating multicultural families. None of the families specifically stated that they had a family language policy in place at home. Furthermore, all of the children are from families with an implicit form of family language planning even though they did not label it as such. For instance, when asked if they have a family language plan, Amelia’s father says, “We just go with the flow.” With regards to Grace’s family, her father stated, “We do some code switching. Grace is still in the developmental bubble right now.” About family language planning, Leonard’s father explains:

\[
\text{Table 1: Demographics of the Participants}
\]

| Participant | Pseudonyms of Children and Age | Children’s Nationalities | Parent’s Perceived Korean Fluency Level of Children | Parent’s Perceived English Fluency Level of Children |
|-------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| 1           | Amelia (9.5)                    | Korean, Canadian         | high-intermediate                                   | intermediate                                      |
| 2           | Mark (9)                        | Korean, Canadian         | low-intermediate                                    | low-intermediate                                  |
| 3           | Nate (13)                       | Korean, Canadian         | high-intermediate                                   | basic                                             |
| 4           | Helen (16)                      | Korean, Canadian         | high-intermediate                                   | intermediate                                      |
| 5           | Tim (12)                        | Korean, Canadian         | high-intermediate                                   | low-intermediate                                  |
| 6           | Leonard (8)                     | Korean, New Zealander    | low-intermediate                                    | basic                                             |
|             | Grace (5)                       | Korean, American         | low-intermediate                                    | pre-basic                                         |
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We don’t officially have a family language plan. Not specifically. I do bath time and there’s a lot of English that goes on there. Our baths can take up to an hour. Lots of games. When we’re playing our Minecraft, we talk about what we’re doing. He helps explain to me. He needs to explain it to me so I can do it. This is what we do.

Thus, it can be observed that although an overt family language policy is not enforced in the home environment, both the parents and their emergent bilingual children demonstrate the value of utilizing both languages in specific situations to convey particular information, knowledge and emotions through translanguaging practices. The implicit nature of the children’s metalinguistic awareness, knowledge, and ability as well as the use of negotiation strategies is evident in the social interactions with family members at home.

(b). Importance of Bilingual Maintenance

Data analysis revealed that it was important to the fathers that their children grow up to be fully bilingual. For instance, Amelia’s father, a strong proponent of maintaining both languages, elaborates on his feelings and thoughts about his desire for Amelia to be bilingual not just for academic success but also to develop and maintain her connection to her Canadian identity:

I think it is important for her to maintain both languages. Not just academically but I think that it would be important for me at least that she gets to know my side of the family. It’s hard because sometimes Amelia’s a stranger to my own mom, you know? My mom doesn’t really know a lot about her because she’s 5000 km away and we don’t really speak on the phone regularly. In the future, if Amelia wants to live in Canada, it’s important that she maintains both languages.

Likewise, Helen and Tim’s father is also a strong proponent of his children maintaining both languages. We can observe based on his statement that he worries about the disadvantages that his daughter will encounter if she does not actively try to maintain both of her languages. He states:

I would like them to be fully bilingual in both languages, but I see that’s becoming less and less of an option. It’s nice that I can speak with my son and he can respond to me in English and we can have those conversations. I’m a little more concerned about my daughter. But it’s like well, at some point, she’s got to make choices of her own. And I don’t want to force her to do this. It’s like she may regret not trying to keep up with it now. But at the same time, you gotta make these choices yourself. But it would be nice if they could speak both languages. But I know they’re not going to be fluent in both. One’s going to be their academic language their working language and the other will be the second language, I think.

Based on the opinions of the foreign fathers, it can be stated that dual language maintenance is important for many reasons. Firstly, as Amelia’s father mentions, it is important in terms of the children’s self-identity because it allows them to develop a better understanding of who they are as bicultural individuals and allows bilingual children to stay connected to their family, permitting better intergenerational communication and the maintenance of stronger familial bonds. Furthermore, as explicitly mentioned by Participant #6, Grace’s father, bilingual proficiency development is also important because of the benefits of bilingualism in their children’s future career and employment. Thus, possession of English as a social capital in Korean society provides the children for greater opportunities of success in school and later on in life.

B. Children’s Motivations for Translanguaging

(a). Contextual Foregrounding Through Linguistic Repertoire

Among the emergent bilingual participants, TL was used in unique ways such as a source of contextual foregrounding. Through TL, participants utilized different aspects of their linguistic repertoires to communicate with family and friends on a level that allowed them to express themselves more fully with their developing linguistic ability. Different aspects of TL were used by the children depending on the contexts at home, school, and in public places. For instance, CS allowed the participants to fill in gaps in their linguistic repertoire in both languages. For example, when Amelia was younger, she did not know the English word for ‘사기’ (‘fraud’) which she code switched with the Korean equivalent. Amelia’s father explains:

Last Christmas, my phone died. I said to my daughter, “Amelia, let’s go to the cell phone shop. I need to change my phone. She said, “Dad, don’t go by yourself. You’re a foreigner.” And she didn’t know the word “fraud” but she knew the word “사기.” I’m like, “What’s 사기?” Amelia said, “Just look it up. I don’t know what it is in English but it’s 사기. You gotta go with grandma or uncle. Because there’s going to be 사기. You’re a foreigner. They’re gonna take your money.”

Contrastingly, in Tim’s family, certain words are used just in Korean. For example, the Korean word ‘eemo’ is used in lieu of the equivalent English word ‘aunt.’ Tim’s father explains, “It has always been ‘eemo.’ My wife refers to ‘eemo,’ especially when she was talking to Tim as a baby. So, if I say ‘aunt’ instead of ‘eemo,’ it doesn’t seem the same. So, we’ve always called her ‘eemo.’ So, that’s who she is.” Thus, we can see that for both the parents and the children, TL creates a specific kind of feeling which arouses certain emotions that are associated with a particular word. TL allows expression of particular emotions through specific terminology in a particular language. For Tim’s
family, ‘eemo’ is reserved only for his mother’s older sister who happens to be their closest relative in Korea and is symbolically representative of warmth, familiarity and love. Thus, specific aspects of the linguistic repertoires of the bilingual speaker are utilized to convey feelings and create an atmosphere while communicating with their family members to fully convey their thoughts, understandings, and desires. The bilingual children’s ability to use their linguistic repertoire in diverse ways through TL allows for a greater range of vocabulary access and expression of feelings and emotions that cannot be fully expressed through a single language.

(b). To Navigate Their Multilingual Reality

TL was also used by the children to navigate their multilingual reality. For instance, some would utilize their linguistic repertoires metacognitively to avoid specific people and situations in their everyday life. For instance, Mark uses his English ability to pretend he cannot speak Korean so he doesn’t need to talk to Korean strangers when they try to make conversation in Korean. His father explains:

I think he’s aware that he’s a little bit different from most kids. He’s also aware of his bilingualism. When people talk to him in Korean, if he wants to talk to them in Korean he will. But if he does not want to talk to them, he will switch to broken English. We’re at a park and somebody runs up or you know a 할머니 (grandma) comes up to pat his head and if he wants to speak to them, he’ll talk to them and speak in Korean right away and address them. But if he’s uncomfortable with them, he pretends he’s a 외국인 (foreigner) and cannot speak Korean.

In the above situation, Mark uses TL through metacognition. He utilizes his metacognitive awareness and skills to avoid uncomfortable situations. Through a TL space, he chooses to reveal one aspect of his self-identity to strangers while preserving the other aspect of his reality. TL allows him to create a protective space in which he can comfortably avoid an uncomfortable communicative encounter with a stranger.

C. Impact of Translanguaging on Self-Identity Development

Self-Identifying With the Majority Culture and Language

All of the participant fathers feel that their bilingual children self-identify as mostly Korean. The older the children, the more strongly they self-identified as Korean and spoke mainly Korean, the majority culture and language. This trend is observed when comparing the younger and older children. As the children moved up in their education, the language of their schooling which is the majority language became their dominant language. They became more proficient and therefore, more at home in the dominant language. Korean. Thus, there is also a gradual progression towards using Korean, as their academic success is dependent on the majority language use. For example, siblings Helen and Nate demonstrate this movement. Their father concedes, “With me, they speak English. But with my wife, English and Korean. And with their friends, it’s all Korean. Now, at church when they go to Sunday school, they’re supposed to use English. But they don’t really do that.” Similarly, Leonard’s father explains:

I think if my wife speaks to him in English, he’ll answer in English. If she speaks to him in Korean, he’ll answer in Korean. Of course, his Korean’s better. All his friends speak Korean, the whole outside world is essentially Korean. So, his Korean is much better. So, trying to keep his English up, that’s the challenge.

Thus, it is clear that as the children get older, the language of their schooling in the majority language, Korean, becomes their dominant language. They become more proficient and therefore, more at home in the dominant language. For example, Amelia displays a preference for speaking in Korean, the majority language. Her father says, “Because of my inability to speak Korean, my daughter resentfully speaks to me in English. My wife and I speak in English to Amelia and we use Korean with our extended family.” Similarly, Tim’s father says, “It’s a forced method because I don’t speak Korean. So, he is forced to function in English with me.” Transitioning towards the majority language and culture is also evident in Nate’s desire to continue to study and in the future, work in Korea. Thus, his predominant use of Korean has led him to culturally identify himself as being more Korean than Canadian.

Similarly, about his children, Helen and Nate’s father states:

They see themselves as Koreans with Canadian passports. They identify with Korean culture more than with Canadian culture. When I ask if they would like to live in Canada now or in the future, they say they only want to live in Korea. They never talk about any future in Canada.

Thus, Helen and Nate have moved to self-identifying themselves with the majority culture and language in Korea and their Canadian identity is not a major aspect of their overall identity. Likewise, Amelia’s father states:

In Korea, Amelia identifies herself as Korean; she lived in Canada for a year, but that didn’t change her sense of identity. While in Canada, she identified herself as both Korean and Canadian. And yet, Amelia was less enthusiastic about playing with non-Korean children, and she felt alienated without her Korean friends.

Therefore, it appears that for the children the length and age of exposure in living in one culture and country can have a strong impact on self-identity formation. The longer the participants reside in one culture and country, the more they learn to self-identify with that culture and country. Interestingly, the fluid nature of self-identity formation can be seen in the changing shifts of what is one’s majority language depending on the situational context. For example, Grace experienced this during a set period of time when she was predominantly exposed to her minority language, English, by spending most of her time with her father. According to her father:
She spent three weeks now at home with daddy. So, now, she gets to speak English all day long. This has happened the previous two holidays when there’s been COVID scares and the kindergarten shuts down. She gets three weeks with daddy and at that time, actually, English almost becomes her instinctual language. But once she’s back at school for a few weeks, Korean seems to become her instinctual language again.

Thus, the fluid nature of identity shows that it is never concrete and can change depending on the context, circumstance, and length of time exposed to a language. For the younger children, it appears that their identity is more fluid than the older children who maintain their use of the majority language under most circumstances.

In summary, according to the foreign fathers, Korean is becoming the dominant language and culture at both school and home. For the younger children, up until the first year of elementary school, English is used in almost equal capacity as Korean but regarding who they culturally identify as is not as certain because they are too young to be self-aware of themselves and have yet to more fully develop their metacognitive abilities.

VII. DISCUSSION

It was found that in the Korean-English bilingual families in this study, TL is generally the norm and is practiced in everyday life which is in line with previous studies (García & Wei, 2014; Kwon, 2022). The findings of this study were also congruent with previous studies in that most families do not implement an explicit family language policy at home (Liang et al., 2022). Although the TL practices of Korean-English bilingual families in this study reveal that they usually don’t have an explicit FLP, through some form of implicit FLP, each family uses both English and Korean, making TL a natural practice at home. This finding resonates with other research pertaining to TL on the fluid nature of TL practices of bilingual families (Karpava et al., 2019; Kwon, 2022). Similarly, none of the foreign fathers in this study had a strong proclivity towards ‘linguistic purism’ and monolingual perspectives regarding everyday language use like participants in other studies (Piller & Gerber, 2021). Also, the boundaries of the one-parent, one-language rule was not strictly adhered to by the families of the participants. This result is similar to a study conducted by Nguyen (2019) on Vietnamese ethnic minority students in Vietnam, in which it was discovered that participants preferred linguistic purism and monolingual perspectives when asked about their linguistic preferences. However, in everyday practice, they did the complete opposite and practiced TL, often mixing together Vietnamese and the minority language spoken at home as well as practicing other aspects of TL (Nguyen, 2019). Similarly, results of the current study further support previous research which has found that although parents state that their children being bilingual is very important to them, the actual FLP they implement in their homes is often inconsistent and uncertain (Lee et al., 2021; Piller & Gerber, 2021; Wilson, 2021). The current literature reveals the salient influence of parental decisions regarding FLP which differ depending on each family’s varying needs and contexts (Lee et al., 2021). Thus, the results of this study further support the past research.

Furthermore, the purposes of TL by Korean-English bilingual children in this study are predominantly communicative, both inside and outside the home environment. Creese and Blackledge (2015) stated, “multilinguals translanguaging to include and facilitate communication with others, but also to construct deeper understandings” (p. 27). Similar to previous studies, TL practices allow the bilingual children in this study to develop negotiation strategies during communication (Song, 2016). The use of negotiation strategies through TL in communication in certain social situations is evident in the case of Mark. Mark’s use of Korean to avoid conversation with the older stranger is an example of what has similarly been observed in other studies where it has been found that “one of the pragmatic functions of code switching is that different languages might be used for social purposes: to include or exclude interlocutors in a stretch of bilingual talk” (Karpava et al., 2019, p. 628). Mark’s purposeful use of pretending not to be able to speak Korean and only utilizing English to the elderly stranger was TL for specific communicative purposes. This demonstrates that the participants have excellent metalinguistic awareness and ability to manipulate the implementation of TL in particular contexts and situations (Karpava et al., 2019). The results of this study also further support the work of Li (2011) who states that multilingual individuals show different identities depending on the social context.

Likewise, the conclusion that there is an emotional attachment to certain words in a language is also supported by this study. According to Wei (2018), “in bilingual first language acquisition where cross-linguistic equivalents are learned, the child additionally learns to associate the target word with a specific context or addressee as well as contexts and addressees where either language is acceptable, giving rise to the possibility of code-switching” (p. 25). For example, Participant #3’s family’s use of ‘eemo’ for the word ‘aunt’ when speaking in both Korean and English shows that ‘eemo’ is emotionally and personally meaningful to them while the English word ‘aunt’ has no emotional connection. This emotional connection with words in a specific language is similar to past studies in which TL is utilized due to one’s desire to express emotions or feelings that can only be expressed in a particular language (Karpava et al., 2019). In other words, the word ‘eemo’ communicates the exact range of nuance needed (Lamanna, 2021) to convey the emotionally meaningful label and identity of ‘aunt.’

Finally, the outcomes of this study have shown the effects of TL on identity development and support previous studies that co-construction of identity and positionality within a certain context occurs through linguistic interaction (García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017). The results of this study contribute to the current research on TL practices in which the effects of TL on Korean-English bilingual children indicate that a discrepancy forms between the proficiency of the
two languages, with one language becoming more dominant over the other. For example, Participant #4’s children Tim and Helen’s communication with each other is in the majority language Korean which aligns with past studies in that the older sibling’s language preference becomes the language used to communicate with the younger sibling (Cho, 2018; Lee & García, 2020). Among the older participants, TL at home led to greater use of the majority language over time, as with results found in past studies conducted in other countries (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017; Nesteruk, 2010).

VIII. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This study sheds new light on the TL practices of Korean-English bilingual families in Korea. However, there are some limitations associated with this study. One is that as a qualitative case study, the results cannot be generalized to the entire bilingual population in Korea as it is specific to only six families of Korean-English bilingual children. In terms of future research directions, it would be interesting to do a similar study to investigate how TL occurs in bilingual families other than Korean-English within and outside of Korea. Likewise, interviewing both parents and not just the fathers would bring an interesting perspective to future studies as well. This would provide more insight on the similarities and differences of bilingual families in different countries and cultures. Likewise, a longitudinal study that investigates a larger number of bilingual families over a longer period of time would provide more insight on the TL practices of families to determine any factors that are common among those families where individuals are able to achieve near equal bilingual proficiency in both languages.

IX. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, TL practices in emergent Korean-English bilingual families in Korea are pivotal in the development and maintenance of bilingual ability, communicative interactions, and self-identity. The results of this study further elucidate and support the salience of TL within bilingual children as an essential aspect of their bilingual fluency. When bilingual families are able to fully utilize their linguistic and cultural repertoires through the process of TL, they will engage in more meaningful dialogues (Kwon, 2022). The active use of TL is the greatest scaffold leading to the edification of bilingual children’s bilingual proficiency and self-identity. In order to establish bilingual sustainability, three important factors need to be considered: an immersive TL home environment, school’s understanding and incorporation of TL pedagogy for the classroom, and government support of bilingual/multilingual families. Addressing the needs of bilingual children in Korea is becoming ever more pertinent as the multicultural school-aged population is steadily on the rise. For these reasons, government support is invaluable as funding and teacher training need to be integrated into the current curriculum in Korea’s public school system. A strong collaboration between parents and teachers are needed in order to support bilingual children (Lee et al., 2021). The government also needs to promote emergent bilingual children’s bilingual development to create a more just and fair society. The current needs of bilingual children in Korea are not being met. The Ministry of Education should create laws to ensure that language and identity development needs are supported for bilingual household children in Korea. It is imperative to create a space that allows bilingual children to engage in TL practices that are culturally-rich and multimodal in order to further develop and sustain their bilingual fluency (Kwon, 2022). It is also important to encourage pride in bilingual individuals’ home language and TL practices (Alvarez, 2014). It is by supporting and encouraging these TL strategies that positive developments will occur with regards to bilingual children’s flourishing fluency and self-identity. The numerous affordances and benefits with regards to encouraging the use of TL in bilingual Korean-English families make the challenges of maintaining TL practices worthy of the time and effort.
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