CONVERSATIONAL CODE-SWITCHING
in a video game context in Finland

Anna-Riikka Kärnä

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA

KIELTEN LAITOS

Anna-Riikka Kärnä

Conversational Code-Switching in a video game context in Finland

Englannin kieli

Kandidaatintutkielma

Marraskuu 2015

Tämän proseminaari-työn tarkoitus on tutkia, millaista suomen ja englannin kielen välillä tapahtuvaa koodinvaihtoa suomalaisessa tietokonepelidiskurssissa on sekä selvittää, pitävätkö keskustelijat itse koodinvaihtoa merkityksellisenä ja mitä merkityksiä se keskustelussa saa. Koodinvaihtoa on tutkittu kieliopillisesta, sosiolingvistisestä, kaksikielisyyden ja keskustelunanalyysin näkökulmasta. Tutkimusala on saanut näkyvyyttä viimeisen kymmenen vuoden aikana muun muassa englannin kielen kasvavan aseman kautta. Suomessa koodinvaihtoa on tutkittu monessa eri kontekstissa fan fictionista radioon ja Internetin jalkapallofoorumeihin. Tämä tutkimus tarkastelee koodinvaihtoa kahden äidinkielenään suomea puhuvan nuoren keskustelussa, kun he pelaavat englanninkielistä Final Fantasy -videopeliä. Tutkimus täydentää siten aiempaa tutkimusta koodinvaihdosta suomen kielessä.

Viitekehyksenä tutkimuksessa käytettiin pääasiassa keskustelunanalyysia ja Auerin (1984) kaksikielisyyden teoriaa, jossa koodinvaihdosta puhutaan kontekstualisoinnin keinona. Koodinvaihdolle ei voitu ennalta antaa merkitystä, vaan kielenmuodon vaihto sai tulkintansa kulloisessakin puhetilanteessa. Jos kyseessä oli koodinvaihto, oletettiin että puhuja signaloi puheen kontekstin muutosta. Auerin (1999) mukaan kaikki kielenmuodon vaihto ei ole koodinvaihtoa, joten koodinvaihdon rinnalle nostettiin myös tässä tutkimuksessa lainaamisen ilmiö (engl. language mixing). Tutkimuksen analyysiosiossa yksittäisten sanojen erottelu lainoihin ja koodinvaihtoon osoittautui kuitenkin hankalaksi, niinpä analyysi keskittyi kontekstin vaikutuksen arviointiin. Tästä syystä koodinvaihtoa on pyritty tarkastelemaan keskustelussa ja sen kontekstissa yksittäisten esimerkkien sijaan.

Tutkimuksessa kävi ilmi, että pelaajat käyttävät englannin kieltä suomen kielen rinnalla yllättävän usein. Englannin kielen käyttö toimi sekä pelaajien omana puhetyylinä että moniäänisyyden kontekstivihjeenä. Käytettävissä olleiden resurssien ja aiheen laajuuden vuoksi kaikkia koodinvaihtoon liittyviä teorioita ei esitelty, ja esiteltyjen esimerkkien määrä oli rajallinen. Koska tutkimuksen tavoitteena oli lisätä tietoa koodinvaihdosta ja monikielisyydestä Suomessa, lisätutkimusta tarvitaan selvittämään mitä kielimuodon valinta kertoo puhujasta ja siitä millaiseksi hän on tulkinnut kielenkäyttötilanteen eri konteksteissa.

Avainsanat: code-switching, language mixing, conversation analysis, English in Finland

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

As Heller (1982: 118) points out: "In the absence of norms, we work at creating new ones". In Finland, such an example has emerged in connection to multilingualism. The alternating use of English and Finnish has become one of the most striking features of interaction in the youth culture (and elsewhere), in particular, where international contacts or popular culture exist. No doubt English is increasingly present in the lives of those Finns who are not from a bilingual family background nor involved in international affairs. Various forms of cultural entertainment and electronic media, such as the Internet and electronic games, ensure the spread and popularity of English in the youth culture.

It is safe to say that monolingualism is no longer the norm everywhere. In popular use, we often refer to 'Finglish' as the mixture of English and Finnish. In linguistic terms, 'Finglish' consists of the English lexical items that have been inserted into the framework of the Finnish grammar. Typical of these language contact situations or a language itself is that it also uses code-switches (CS) from English into Finnish (e.g. Leppänen 2007); whereas, CS is regarded as a linguistic feature of bilingual interaction.

Numerous calls have been made to increase linguists' awareness of language mixing and alternation and to develop more realistic approaches to language(s) and second language teaching. Traditionally such research has been carried out in the context of adult migration in an English speaking country; however, somewhat problematic has been the presumption that one needs to have an excellent command of two or more languages to be able to code-switch and to call or to be called multi- and bilingual.

The increasing use of English has also triggered a strong interest among the Finnish researchers to investigate the use of the language as a social and discursive phenomenon. One of the undertakings is VARIENG (the centre of Excellence for the Study of Variation, Contacts and Change in English), under which, in 2007, a research unit from the University of Jyväskylä conducted a national survey on uses and of attitudes to English in Finland (Leppänen et. al. 2011). Finns have widely expressed their opinions in favour and against the spread of English (e.g. Leppänen et. al. 2011; Leppänen and Pahta 2012). The growing awareness and the sudden outburst of different attitudes are not surprising, for varying reasons. Firstly, a number of linguists have shown interest in the phenomenon of language shift, code-switching and borrowing and some have even predicted and speculated the

consequences of the future spread of English in the public. Secondly, the citizens encounter the English language daily through the media, popular culture, advertisements, and the Internet (see Leppänen et al. 2011). My focus in this investigation will be upon the use of English in a youth context of computer games.

The present study will hopefully extend the knowledge of previous research in the field. To do this, I selected as a specific context the practice of playing English electronic games, since it is so popular in the youth culture today. Most of the games children and adolescents play are in English, and characteristic of these events is that gamers interact not only with each other but also with the game characters. It is quite unlikely that two Finns would speak English to each other without a special trigger to speak English. Focusing on the use of English by two Finnish adolescents, the present study aims to answer the question of what type of functions individual instances of English may have in the conversation. The players have acquired a more or less extensive knowledge of English through and outside of formal education. What kind of examples of English can be found in the data? Do the participants insert items from English into Finnish or do they alternate between two languages? How and why do they engage in it? The analysis will be done according to the framework of the conversational approach to code-switching. It will apply Auer's (1984; 1998) ideas on code-switching and language mixing.

The present study demonstrates that English is part of the language repertoire of the gamers. They interact with each other and the game characters frequently either in English or Finnish. Participants tend to adapt the game specific vocabulary into Finnish; however, sometimes they also switch from Finnish into English to communicate longer phrases. The event demonstrates one particular instance of multilingualism in Finland in which CS carries local conversational meaning.

The structure of the present study is as follows: the first section presents the framework for understanding code-switching, whereas the rest of the paper will be focused on the investigation. Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6 will describe the data, then analyze a few samples of the data and finally discuss and draw conclusions based on the findings in the light of the theoretical framework.

2 UNDERSTANDING CODE-SWITCHING

A researcher confronts a jungle of linguistic jargon in searching for the definition of code-switching. In academic research code-switching is often referred to as "switching", "mixing", "code-choice" or "code-change" for which I also use the abbreviation CS. The best-known definition of CS must be from Poplack (1980: 214), which is "the alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituent". Today a desired switch may take place within a single sentence or a clause and is no longer restricted to identify a separate speech situation or an activity (e.g. Kovács 2001; Auer 1995). In the present study, language alternation functions as a cover term for code-switching and language mixing as suggested by Auer (1998). He (1995: 116) defines language alternation as "a relationship of contiguous juxtaposition of semiotic systems, such that the appropriate recipients of the resulting complex sign are in position to interpret this juxtaposition as such". In regard to this, it is important to note that it is the participants' perception of what counts as CS and not the analyst's that matters. The following chapter briefly describes how language alternation has been conceptualized in research so far. The main focus here will be on Auer's (1984; 1995; 1998; 1999) conceptual framework which will be used as a theoretical tool for analysis. The research field is vast and due to the limitations of time and space, a profound overview of CS research is impossible.

2.1 Globalization and code-switching

We know that the role of the English language has changed notably over the ten years and one of the most relevant issues is that it is used more often by non-native speakers than by its native speakers. Majority of earth's population speaks at least two languages (especially if dialects count), and as a result, as Auer (1984: 1) mentions, "the growing interest in code-switching and related issues … seems only natural". If earlier CS research was mainly carried out in the context of adult migration in the English speaking countries; today, there is an increasing amount of research conducted in Germany, Sweden, Finland, Asia and elsewhere in the world. Many of these contexts still focus on migration where children, adolescents or adults are asked to integrate into a new country and to attain a second language (e.g. Auer's study of Italian migrant children in Germany). Nevertheless, a study by Rampton (1995) indicates that "language crossing" (a term he uses) may take place also in contexts where

speakers have no ethnic attachment to a language, such as young people of Anglo and Afro-Caribbean descent using Panjabi or Indian English in Britain. These situations are expected to multiply in the multilingual and -cultural neighbourhoods. Furthermore, there are an increasing number of examples of situations in which the speakers of a bilingual code are not immigrants or in the target language culture. Instead they may be Finns in Finland using English at a hobby or at work. Similarly, it may be a radio host in South-Africa switching between different vernacular forms of English such as studied by Blommaert (2005) or Malaysians taking influences from African American in the their rap and hip-hop lyrics as studied by Pennycook (2007). Needless to say, multilingualism, and in particular the English language, has come to stay in society and works as a trigger to the usage of a foreign or a second language outside of formal language classrooms.

2.2 Growing interest in code-switching

CS has become a vast field with a variety of research interests, typologies and findings, which surely compensate one another but also differ to a considerable degree. CS has been described and interpreted in many ways, and hence there seems to be no theoretical agreement to how CS is defined and conceptualized. CS is studied in the fields of syntax, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics and bilingualism just to name but a few - all of them contributing to the understanding of the bi- and multilingual code and why people engage in it. As Auer (1998: 1) mentions it all started from the pioneering works of Shana Poplack on the syntactic aspects and John Gumperz on the sociolinguistics aspects of CS in the 1970s, which were a push or an inspiration for future research. Since then researchers have focused their investigation on the conversational functions, the grammatical constraints or the social meanings of switching. It is in the interest of the present study to investigate the conversational functions of CS.

2.3 Three different perspectives on code-switching

The three different perspectives on CS are respectively conversation analysis (CA), sociolinguistic and syntactic or grammatical approach. Conversation Analysis claims to be better suited than other approaches to demonstrate what motivations speakers have for the linguistic choices they make (Auer 1998). This claim puts it in competition with the two alternative approaches.

One is the macro sociolinguistic paradigm which, in general, aims to answer the question which social groups show language alternation, in which situations and why. In other words, the sociolinguistic approach seeks to understand the social and personal motivation and the larger context that lay beyond the use of CS. According to one of its proponents, Carol Myers-Scotton (1988), CS may be seen as an index of social negotiation of rights and obligations between its speakers. Myers-Scotton (1988: 156) argues that for the listener switching is "a symbol of the speaker's intentions", whereas for the speaker "it is a tool to express his social rights and obligations". She further explains how social consequences motivate individuals' linguistic choices. In practice, I understand it as follows. A teenager may use teenage slang to signal his solidarity and belonging to a peer group. One of the social consequences that motivates his/her code-choice is to be cool. Myers-Scotton's (1988) research focused on the speech communities of colonialized countries in Africa. She is known for her "markedness" model in which CS is explained through an unmarked and marked code. If one switches from an unmarked language (e.g. Finnish) to a marked language (e.g. English), this could index either solidarity or distance between the speakers (Myers-Scotton 1988). Myers-Scotton is, of course, only one of the researchers in the field; however, she is quite often mentioned in regard to CS.

The other alternative, the syntactic approach, on the other hand, focuses on the grammatical factors that its supporters see play a role in why people alternate between two or more languages. They believe that the main motivation for CS is that it is rule-governed. The question that the syntactic approach normally asks about CS is what is syntactically possible and what is not. Linguists like Poplack (1980) have made significant efforts towards defining criteria between a borrowing (loan words) and CS. According to Poplack (1980), borrowing occurs in the lexicon, while CS occurs at either the syntax or the utterance construction level. Among others, Auer (1984: 2) challenges this idea by pointing out that "code-switching is not merely a matter of linguistic well-formedness – it also has communicative content left unexplained by the analysis of syntactic surface constraints". It is important to know how languages such as English and Finnish work together; however, I agree with Auer that in order to understand what functions it carries in interaction and society it is important to investigate either the social or conversational context. I started off the analysis with a focus on the grammatical factors of CS and borrowing; however, I realized that I could say little

about what caused a switch in the first place or about its meaning in interaction based on grammar.

Auer (1998) criticizes not only the syntactic but also the sociolinguistic paradigm. He argues that the meaning of CS should not be driven solely from a description of a macro-situation but from instances which have conversational relevance to the participants, since, as Wei (1998: 162) points out, "the idea of local creation of social meaning" becomes neglected and the analysis relies solely on "the analyst's perception of the correlation between one linguistic variety and a particular interaction type". I consider that all three aspects are important in the quest to understanding the phenomenon of CS; however, conversation analysis (CA) serves as a good starting point for the present study, due to the minimal background information I had about the participants and gaming culture. Description of the macro-situation would be guesswork. The main aim here is therefore to understand what motivates the gamers to switch between Finnish and English in the moment-to-moment of interaction beyond the syntactic level and the roles and norms of appropriate social behavior. I see syntactic level of analysis would be beneficial if the aim in the present paper would be to provide material for teaching of English as a lingua franca.

2.4 Auer's approach to conversational code-switching

I will focus here on the aspects of CA that will be valuable for the analysis of the present study. Through conversation analysis priority is given to how speakers communicate to one another their emergent understanding of the previous turn in talk. In the core of it is to understand if the gamers give any conversational meaning to instances of English. According to Auer (1998), to be able to do this, CA focuses on the sequential patterns in which CS occurs. He further argues that CS does not simply reflect social situations (e.g. ethnic identity); rather it is means to create social situations. In other words, context does not determine the linguistic details of interaction, and thus, it is not given priori in this sense. According to CA advocates, as pointed out by Wei (1998: 163):

> We must not assume that, in any given conversation, speakers switch languages in order to 'index' speaker identity, attitudes, power relations, formality, etc.; rather, we must be able to demonstrate how such things as identity, attitude and relationships are presented, understood, accepted or rejected, and changed in the process of interaction.

What speakers show and demonstrate in real time become resources for the analyst to make claims and to draw conclusions. This emphasizes the precondition that if a participant orients to a switch and demonstrates its relevance, it is an example of CS (Auer 1998). Wei (1998: 163) crystallizes the task of the CA analyst as follows "to show how our analyses are *demonstratively relevant* to the participants" (original italics). Hence, in CA, emphasis is given to the local creation of social meaning instead of an analyst's perception of some symbolic value that is attached to a particular language variety.

The target of analyses is the conversational structure and the mechanism whereby bilingual speakers interpret each other's moves and negotiate which language(s) to use. One of the most important questions is "*how* the meaning of code-switching is constructed in interaction" as argued by Wei (1998: 169). According to Auer (1995) and Wei (1998) the meaning of code-switching itself is 'otherness'. 'Otherness' here refers to 'other language' and it is important to analyze if speakers make it visible in the course of interaction. Do they use two codes or languages instead of one bilingual code?

Auer (1998; 1995) proposes to think of CS as a contextualization cue or a contextualization strategy, since it works in many ways like other contextualization cues. He suggests it is comparable to the functions of prosodic and gestural cues used in monolingual conversation. The notion of contextualization comes from Gumperz (1982). Auer (1995: 123) defines it as strategic activities that speakers use in order to "make relevant… some aspects of context which, in turn, is responsible for the interpretation of an utterance in its particular locus of occurrence". He gives examples in which a code-switch may contextualize a different speech genre, turn at talk, topic shift, participant roles, social identities and attitudes. The same contextualization cue (e.g. a switch from language A to language B) may have a different function in a different context (see Auer 1995). Furthermore, speakers may make use of prosodic cues, such as extra emphasis and pauses, and verbal markers, such as metalinguistic comments or hesitations, to make a language alternation "a locally noticeable phenomenon" (Auer 1999: 5). It is therefore important to pay attention to how the participants themselves react to each switch. How a turn continues after a switch? Is it preceded or followed by a prosodic cue? What does the switch contextualize?

Auer (1999: 2) identifies two ways of identifying switches: a switch is either "discourse related" or "participant related". The difference between them is that discourse related switch indexes or contextualizes some aspect of the situation or conversation (e.g. shift in topic, participant constellation, activity type etc.) and participant related switching, on the other hand, indexes some feature(s) of the speaker. In the latter case, a shift indicates something about the speaker's preference of language or something about the speaker's linguistic competence. Auer (1995: 125) describes a situation in which "a speaker may simply want to avoid the language in which he or she feels insecure and speak the one in which he or she has greater competence". Yet, it may also be a political consideration as described by Heller (1995).

Furthermore, Auer (1999) mentions insertional and alternational type of switches to shed light on how language is embedded in the talk and how it can be interpreted. In insertional CS the conversation has a matrix language and a word or a phrase is inserted into a turn that is dominated by another language. The alternational type differs from this on the grounds that one cannot predict which language is used after a switch has occurred because the two languages alternate.

Finally, Auer (1995: 126) describes a language situation in which a switch "may occur in the middle of a speaker's turn without affecting language choice for the interaction at all". According to him (1999: 5), all cases of language alternation are not necessarily code-switching and as an example he introduces a contact situation that he calls language mixing (LM). Some researchers use switching and mixing interchangeably as synonyms; however, Auer (1999) points them out as different phenomena. In the present study, a helpful and a good question to ask was whether the use of two languages is best characterized as the alternate use of two languages, as described above, or as the use of just one bilingual code.

Language mixing can be identified as a type of language alternation "which in itself constitutes the 'language'-of-interaction" (Auer 1999: 6). As I understand it, every individual alternation does not carry meaning or does not have a describable function; rather, it may function as a part of a particular style. Auer (1999) mentions that the more frequent CS becomes, more likely as a consequence it is to be used as language mixing, which means that its local meaning has disappeared. This is probably a case in many bilingual communities

where switching is frequent. Auer (1999: 1) suggests that the phenomenon is better discussed by interpretive sociolinguistic approaches, since it is "meaningful (to participant) not in a local but only in a more global sense".

According to Auer (1995: 126), the dichotomies of discourse- vs. participant related language alternation on the one hand, and code-switching vs. language mixing on the other, "provide a theory for the ways in which language alternation may become meaningful as a contextualization cue". In the present study, the distinction between CS and LM will be useful in order to understand which instances of English have local conversational meaning. It may be that the participants use one bilingual code, although it might be difficult to tell them apart, since most of the talk is in Finnish and I assume only insertional switches occur in the data.

The use of English is Finland is often explained on the pragmatic grounds (e.g. Taavitsainen and Pahta 2003). Speakers do not wish to index a target language culture identity or a native speaker identity; rather English is a means to communicate and to pass on a message. In the present study, the influences of a wider social context are probably quite minimal, and thus, I assume most instances of CS can be explained through its conversational function. CA is likely a good match to study the present data.

3 DATA AND METHODS

3.1 Research questions

The aim of the present study is to find the functions expressed by the use of English in the speech of Finnish teenagers. The prime hypothesis is that the participants are using both Finnish and English in their speech, although Finnish still remains as the matrix language of the conversation. Furthermore, the objective here is not to analyse the frequency of the English words, but rather use this as metalinguistic information, if needed. The main goal is to analyse the conversational meaning of CS. To be able to do this, it is necessary to ask and analyse if the participants alternate between two languages or if they only transfer items from one language to the other without a describable function. Hence, the research question is as follows: Do participants code-switch between English and Finnish, such as in bilingual communities? In addition, throughout the study there has been a broader research question guiding some of the discussion in this paper. It derives from Auer's (1984: 7) research on bilingual conversation on how one "does being bilingual" or multilingual. It is a question that is strongly connected to the present study and is partly covered through the analysis of language alternation in the present data.

3.2 Participants and the research setting

The study of language alternation and code-switching has traditionally focused on analysis of interaction in bilingual communities, such as Italian migrant children in Germany (Auer 1984) or Puerto Rican migrants in the United States (Poplack 1980). Recent developments in the field, and in sociolinguistics, have, however, shifted the focus also into a foreign language context.

In the present study, an excerpt of a conversation between two Finnish boys aged 15 – 16 is analysed. The participants speak Finnish as their mother tongue and they have studied English as their first foreign language in school for 5 to 6 years. Outside of school they are likely to speak, write, listen, and read in English, for instance, through video games such as in this sample text. Most of the talk in the sample text centres on the actions and developments in the game called Final Fantasy IX. The following features characterize the language contact situation quite well: 1) participants are free to create and negotiate their language choices (for

example the use of English) because as Auer (1984: 7) also describes "patterns of situational specific-language use" are not institutionalized. Participants are not supervised by anyone. 2) the participants are involved in two realities between the game world (in English) and the real world (in Finnish) which creates a bilingual language situation and functions as a trigger to speak English, and 3) the speakers alter between the languages with such a low frequency that the matrix language can be identified (that is Finnish).

3.3 Data

The data has been videotaped and recorded in a natural language situation in which the participants play a video game called Final Fantasy IX at home. The material has been collected in 2004 by Professor Sirpa Leppänen and it is available for further research at the University of Jyväskylä. Final Fantasy IX is narrated in English and all of its game characters speak in English. One of the players at a time is in control of the character interaction. However, other participants are likely to stay involved in the game through the characters' epic storytelling, which takes place alongside the game actions. The data extract involves Pekka (16), Kalle (15) and some of the Final Fantasy game characters that speak in the background of the actual conversation. The participants not only interact with one another but also with the game characters. The turns of the game characters have been referred to in the transcript with small letters (g) whereas the turns of participants are identified with capital letters such as (P) and (K).

The original transcript has been made by researchers at the University of Jyväskylä and it was given to me ready transcribed. There is in total around 16 hours of the transcript from which approximately one hour has been chosen for this study. 60 minutes were analysed to get a large enough set of examples of the participants' use of English. The analysis of language alternation in the present study is based on around 20 instances of English which have been taken for further examination in the next chapter. The matrix language of the participants is Finnish, and thus parts of the conversation have been translated into English.

The transcript aims to imitate the conversation precisely. If an English word was pronounced properly, it has been written in its correct written form. If a word has been integrated phonologically into Finnish, it is noted in the transcript in the brackets after the word.

Additional prosodic details have been added, as well as information about any physical movements (e.g. nod of the head) by the researcher of the original transcript.

3.4 Methods of Analysis

I approach the data described above from a conversation analytic (CA) perspective, pioneered by Auer (1984). The research will apply Auer's (1984) model of bilingual conversation that should be applicable to other bilingual communities as well. The aim of this study is not duplicate already existing works on code-switching, although Piirainen-Marsh and Tainio (2009) have previously published and analysed the same data of Final Fantasy IX. One could compare some of the research findings to those founded in Piirainen-Marsh and Tainio's more extensive study in 2009.

I began the study with a bold aim to count the quantity and frequency of the instances of English in the data. It turned difficult and pointless in regard to the research question because I had no means to say if the participants code-switched or not based on grammar. I realised quite soon that the most beneficial method to analysis would be provided by the conversation analysis (CA). First of all, frequency did not give information about the functions of English, although it may have been a valuable tool to discuss how often the participants make use of English. Furthermore, the data is limited for any generalizations about the frequency of the use of English in Finland, in any other domain, except perhaps in this specific sociolinguistic context of playing the Final Fantasy video game. Secondly, it was difficult and time consuming for the purposes of this study to find adequate grammatical criteria by which to distinguish between every English word if it was a code-switch, a transfer or a borrowing. Now in retrospective I thought that it is probably common sense knowledge that an element of language A that has become part of language B (e.g. through borrowing) cannot be counted or analysed as alternation between two or more languages (Auer 1984). There were many borderline cases in which the pronunciation or morphology were not enough to distinguish whether the case is a code-switch, a mix, or a transfer. The most appropriate solution was to focus on fewer instances of code-switching and try to explain the local meaning that they carry in the conversation. 20 instances seemed a big enough number of samples to be able to do what intended in the time and space of the present study.

The analysis is based on representing 20 extracts of the use of English in the data applying Auer's (1984) model of bilingual conversation. The analysis respects as much of the detailed information as available from the transcript and the video recording, such as pauses, hesitations, overlaps, filters, and backchannels. What are of primary interest here are the visible and observable techniques and strategies of CS that the participants use.

4 ANALYSIS

The role of English was brought up as a focus of the present study. In particular, I wanted to find out if the participants considered code-switching had any meaning for them in the course of the interaction. It is not an easy task to accomplish, when there is no virtual or physical contact to the participants. Furthermore, it is questionable if the participants were able to say if they switch a language or not. However; to be able to accomplish the goal of the present study, Auer's theory of conversational code-alternation was applied.

Auer (1984: 2) speaks of the importance of studying local functions of code switching instead of drawing conclusions from its 'global' social meanings. This approach was also applied in the present study. This meant that instead of thinking that A code is the 'we' code (Finnish) and B code is the 'they' code, the research focus was on what kind of local meaning the participants create or construct for code-switching and by which means. Needless to say, the conversational context, more precisely the turn-by-turn sequence, is in the center of the analysis, and thus each argument is supported by extracts from the data.

4.1 "Värvää blitzball playerssejähhh": Creative uses of English

Typical of the participants' language use is that words that do not have an easy equivalent translation in Finnish are often spoken in their original language (in this case in English) or the English equivalent is inserted into the Finnish grammar taking the form of a Finnish verb, such as in extract 1 on rows 587, 591 and 592 "regenereittaa", "rigenereittaa", and "regenereiddaa" (regenerate). This illustrates well the innovative ways to using a language, as the equivalent Finnish translation is "regeneroitua" or even "uudistua". In the game industry (for example in Final Fantasy) vocabulary may not have been translated into Finnish such as in extract 2, on row 212, "blitzball" (a game in the Final Fantasy video games) or if translations exist people involved still prefer to use the English items, such as in extract 3, on rows 1188 and 1189, "Tower Of Death" and "taueri" (tower), especially if it is a proper noun.

In extract 1, participant P is controlling the flow of the battle while participant K is following it on the side. The gamers' talk is conducted for the most part in Finnish. Participant K asks from P "doesn't his head regenerate at some point" referring to the game character. Participant P does not reply immediately; rather he comments something on his

own game "this it is good" on his turn on line 589. P replies two turns later "no regeneration head doesn't regenerate". Here the word "regenerate" takes two different forms "rigenereittaa" and "regenerei-" in which the English origin word is inflected morphologically and phonetically into Finnish. K's reply "oh so how I had the memory that it regenerated" re-modifies the word differently. Here the word "regenereiddaa" is spoken in a quieter voice. This extract illustrates how the participants are re-negotiating and re-creating the word, both of them knowing what it means. It is also an example of a word that recurs in the game dialogue and in the menus and is central in succeeding in this type of game.

> Extract 1:
> 587. K ei[ks tuo sen] **pää**kin regenereittaa *(regenerate)* jossain vaiheessa,
>   Doesn't his head regenerate as well at some point,
> 588. P [(xxxxxxx)]
> 589. P tällä on hyvä
>   This is good
> 590. K ^mm^=
> 591. P =e:i? rigenereittaa *(regenerate)* pää ei re^generei-^ *(regenerate)*
>   No regeneration head doesn't regenerate
> 592. K jaa miten mulla oli semmonen muistikuva et se ^regenereiddaa?^
>   Oh so how I had the memory that it regenerated?

In extract 2, participant K is playing while P follows on the side. The gamers' talk is conducted for the most part in Finnish. Here, on row 212, P comments "Yuna there recruits blitzball players". He uses the English word "players" which he has inflected into Finnish "playerssejähhh" in a playful manner. K replies "yeah" in Finnish but continues the turn in English and says "her hooher" probably referring to Yuna. His words are obscure. There is a small break after which K continues his turn and turns once more back into Finnish with a topic shift "I think there is a box here somewhere". On row 217, participant P searches for a right proper noun "there in that what's it command center" and once he remembers it, inflects it into Finnish. This example illustrates how the players do not correct each other's language use. English words are used were an equivalent Finnish word is available such as the word "playerssejähhh".

Extract 2:

212. P ^Yuna (siellä)^ (1.8) **värvää** blitzball playerssejähhh°= *(players)*
        Yuna there recruits blitzball players

213. K =(joo her hooher) (1.4) tää[llä on boxi mummielestä jossai]
        Yeah her hooher I think there is a box here somewhere

214. P   [hyp (.) hyp (.) hyp (.) hyp (.)] hyp (.) hyp

215. P (0.2) niin niitä on tuolla sisä:llä.
        Yea they are inside there

216. K no niin? onki
        Yeah that's true

217. P ^tai tuo- tuolla:- mm phh° (.) mikä tuo on tuo command centterissä^ *(centre)*
        Or there in that what's it command center

In extract 3, participant P is playing while K follows on the side. Here too the gamers' talk is conducted for the most part in Finnish. The participants talk about a place inside one of the game characters Sin, which they both consider "psychic", in rows 1183-1186. On row 1186, K first validates P's observation "little weird" after which he changes the topic. He doubts if Auron is dares to go in Fareplane. P does not react to K's enquiry but redirects the conversation back to the place inside Sin which he calls by the English name "Tower of Death" on row 1188. After a short pause (4 seconds) he continues in Finnish describing it as "really big tower". The English noun is inflected into Finnish as "taueri". It is again an example of creative uses of English. Game specific proper names are often in English like in this example.

Extract 3:

1183. P =nii? Sinin *(Sin)* sisällä. on tommonen paikka
        Yea, there is a place like that inside Sin

1184. K no just? joo.
        Yeah right

1185. P se on <u>vähän</u> (psy[ko)]
        It's a little psycho

1186. K   [vähä] ↓o:uto (.) Auron ei uskalla mennä
        Little weird, Auron doesn't dare go

1187. K sinne Farplaneen?=
        In that Farplane

1188. P =Sinin *(Sin)* sisä:llä on semmonen paikka ku Tower Of Death. (0.4) ^semmonen

       Inside Sin there is a place called Tower of Death it's

1189. P hirveen iso (.) taueri^ *(tower)*

       Really big tower

1190. K ^hmh [no (xxxxxxxx)^]

       Hmh well

Sometimes this style of speaking goes as far as replacing in English also those words that would have a Finnish equivalent, such as in extract 4 "don't have any cash". This is similar to extract 3 as it can be classified as an *insertional* code mix. It works here only as a reference to money.

Extract 4:

320. K   [ei oo] yhtään cas:hiä=

       Don't have any cash

Extracts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 demonstrate a situation in which the English item or a word has been inserted into the Finnish grammar, and consequently, the speaker has added Finnish endings into the word, such as in "cas:hiä" (any cash) and "difendasi" (he defended). This phenomenon is often criticized as Anglicism.

In extract 5, there are several creative uses of English such as "jumppia" (jump), "damsua" (damage) and "riggi" (broken). Here participant P plays around with the English origin words, and finally in the end of the sequence on row 518 participant K also does this to a non-game related word altering the Finnish pronunciation of a word to resemble English phonetics ("it's gonna break soon"). Some of these are used as language mixes and they do not seem to have a conversational function as contextualization cues such as "jumppia" on row 514. It is noteworthy; however, that in case "difendasi" (defend) on row 511 participant P pauses momentarily, says "er" and speaks the word ("well (0.3) I (.) er defended (0.3) well who cares"). K had just on a previous turn made a command to "bang head". The discourse marker "er" signals bafflement on row 51. The word "difendasi" could also be just a slang word without a describable function. On row 517, P pauses for 2 seconds before the word "damsua" (damage). "Damsua" can be counted as a fairly common slang word too without a describable function here.

Extract 5:

510. K Wa<kkaa ja pamauta (0.8) >päätä<

   Whack and bang head

511. P ^joo^ (0.3) noh määh- (.) öö difendasi *(defend)* (0.3) >no ei sillä väliä<=

   Well I er defended well who cares

512. K =^juu^

   Yea

513. P RONSO RAGEllä::

   Ronso raged

514. P (.) joo jumppia *(jump)* vaa:n (.) ^öö^ (4) >pitäskö

   Yea just jump eh should

515. P sittenkin< vaan ihan vetää tuo pää paskaks (1) ^veetään tuo pää kakkaks^

   We smash that head after all lets smash that head shit

516. K ^mm^ oho?=

   Mm oh

517. P =↑oho (2) se teki ihmeen paljon (0.2) [damsua]

   Wow it did surprisingly lot of damage

518. K   [se menee] riggi kohta

   It's gonna break soon

In extract 6, there are many examples of game specific words which are inflected into Finnish "power" on row 1514, "sphere" on row 1515, and "strength" on row 1518. These seem to have no descriptive function in the conversation. Most of them recur in the game dialogue and in the menus and players should know what they mean to display expertise as players.

Extract 6:

1514. P =OH täst saa niin paljon **powe**ria.

   wow this gives so much power

1515. K ei oo ku yks niitä (.) tyhmiä Sperejä *(Sphere)* (1) <Agility>

   dont have more than one of those dumb spheres of agility

1516. K ja siinä on jotain kivaa siinä yläällä,=

   and there is something fun up there

1517. P =ah:::

   ah

1518. K strengthiä.
        strenght
1519. K **OO**? (.) [**neljä**.]
        oo four
1520. P   [^neljä^] (.) niin tän kaikki strengthit
        four yea all of this things' strengths
1521. P on neljä.
        are four

4.2 Multiple voices

As described earlier one of the characteristics of the language situation is that participants are involved in two realities between the game world (in English) and the real world (in Finnish) that kind of creates the bilingual language contact situation in this context. One could make the presumption that 'we' code (Finnish) is related to the real world and that 'they' code (English) is related to the game world, although it is not useful here as a presumption. In many of the examples below one can notice how the participants make player's comments about the game world and characters either in Finnish or English. Leppänen (2007: 156) talks about players' shifts between "univocality" and "polyvocality". Here the player orients toward the activity as a person playing the game ("I-as-the-player-talking-about-the-game) (ibid.). The participants also get involved in the events and conversations that take place in the game world between the game characters. This is apparent, for example, when either of the participants targets their talk toward one of the game characters as if part of the game world. Leppänen (ibid.) describes this as players orienting toward the activity as a game character (I-as-the-game-character-talking-in-the-game). One of the roles of the English language is that the participants mimic game characters and repeat in English what they have said earlier or are about to say. Leppänen (2007) points out that player can also talk simultaneous in two voices, as a player and as a character. This can be analyzed on how they alternate between different footings.

In extract 7, participant P mimics the game character with the phrase "he'd propose to Lulu" on row 87. Often the participants also try to imitate the voice of the game character when this happens. P here orients to the activity as a game character. K's response on row 88 is laughter, which implies that imitation can simultaneously be an indicator of humour and

have the purpose of entertaining oneself and other players. A bit later on row 90 P comments how Wakka speaks Caribbean or Jamaican. Here P orients himself as a player playing the game and talking about it. He shifts here into Finnish. Noteworthy is that he has done this earlier in the extract on row 85 when he says in Finnish "man he is crazy" referring to the game character Wakka. In the end of the extract on row 93 participant P code-switches again into English and repeats Wakka's earlier line "just like that" and imitates wakka's "ya" sound in his Finnish word "joo" which follows. In sum, in this example English signals an orientation to the game as a game character and Finnish as a player of the game. Often participants apply both footing in the same sequence of talk.

> Extract 7:
>
> (w = avatar Wakka)
>
> 84.   P mä pelasin sevverran et mää sain ^Ättäk (Attack) Reelsin
>   I played enough to get attack reels
> 85.   P Wakalle (.) vitsi seon hullu^
>   to Wakka man he is crazy
> 86.   w he'd say that (0.5) when we son the cup ya (0.5) he'd propose to Lulu
> 87.   P @he'd propose to Lulu@=
> 88.   K =(Hhhh)=
> 89.   w =and [then one day he goes off] and becomes a crusader [just like that]
> 90.   P   [(hh) tuuo puhuu tollai [ihan]   [tai karibiaa tai ja]maikaa
>   He speaks like or Caribbean or Jamaican
> 91.   K   [mmm,]
> 92.   K ^mm^=
> 93.   P =>just like that< (.) [joo.]
>   Just like that yea

In extract 8, participant P mimics the game voice's previous turn "are you ready" on row 431. P orients to the game as a game character and as a player. K's reply "yes" is something they select together from the game menu. K comments how he sounds like Mr. Bean (a character from a popular TV show). Here K brings yet another voice into the conversation. K comments later "what a voice" which is an evaluation of the game voice. K here orients toward the activity as a person playing the game (I-as-the-player-talking-about-

the-game). Part of the experience of playing is to evaluate the game such as "man I hate that desert place" on row 428.

Extract 8:
(p= the game)
428. K vähän mää kyllä vihaan sitä aavikkopaikkaah,
              man I hate that desert place
429. P ^hmmmm ↑hmmmm^
430. p   are you red-
431. P @↓are you ready@
432. K @↓yes@(0.5) (hhh) kunnon Mr Bean
              (laughter) real Mr Bean
434. p   Maester Kinoc p[lease]
435. K   [(hhh)] ^$**mikä ääni**$^ (hh) °hh
              what a voice

In extract 9, there is a long sequence of game characters talking between rows 1140-1447. Participant K is part of this conversation on row 1442 "so you talk" as a response to Kimahri's comment. K laughs at row 1146 and comments in Finnish on row 1448 that Kimari is so real. This illustrates how the participants empathize with the game characters and how they become part of the game world. K here orients to the activity as one of the game characters talking in the game. K takes two simultaneous voices. Here English signals the shift of footing on row 1442; whereas on row 1448 Finnish signals the shift of footing of "I as player of the game". On row 1448, K mentions that "Kimahri is so real" in Finnish.

Extract 9:
(k = avatar Kimahri, t= avatar Tidus)
1437. P nyt Khimari ↑luottaa. Tiittukseen ^sen takia [se puhuu sille^]
              now Kimahri trusts Tidus that's why he is talking to him
1438. K   [vähä:n ene:]män
              a bit more
1439. P niih
              yea
1440. k   in dark times she must be (0.5) she must shine bright
1441. t   huh
1442. K so you talk

1443. k   now are dark times Yuna tries hard

1444. t   we should help her then

1445. k   if we worry she tries harder

1446. K (Hhhh)=

1447. k   =do not frown

1448. K nii? aito tuo Kimari

          yea? Kimahri is so real

4.3 "It's like It's like a gift from God": Examples of insertional code-switching

There are plenty of examples in the data in which English is used. It is more difficult to say for which purposes the participants use it. According to Auer (1984) this, for which purpose it is used, makes all the difference whether the participants are actually code-switching or not because not all instances of language switching count as code-switches. Here I will present some examples of insertional code-switching and will explain briefly what I think their conversational functions are.

In extract 10, the participants go through a short conversation in which K asks P to "throw that Anima" on row 914. P rejects K's idea on row 915 with words "cant". K's next comment is preceded with heavy breathing. He uses the English word "sniff" after which he repeats the word in Finnish "kyynel". Here insertional code-switch works as a repetition and is probably meant as "cry more". It may be an expression of a lack of interest in another person's comment.

Extract 10:

914.   K heität (.) ton (.) (Animan)

          throw that anima

915.   P ei voi,

          cant

916.   K °h°hh sniff kyynel

          pfft cry more

In extract 11, participant P uses an English expression "m- almighty powerful" instead of the Finnish equivalent "mahtava" on row 1333. As seen from this example, P hesitates a little at the beginning of his English expression to index a code-switch.

Extract 11:

(se = avatar Seymor)

1332. P   [mikseise ite tapa sit Siniä] *(Sin)* (0.4) jos se on niin. m-
              why don't you kill that Sin yourself if he is so

1333. P almighty po[werful]

1334. se   [are you a]fraid

1335. P ^are you afraid?^

1336. K of course I'm not,

1337. seYuna [(1) t]ake me as your pillar of strength (2) as Yunalesca had her (1) Lord Zaon

1338. K   [**hmh** mihin? se meni]
              where did he go?

Extract 12 is an insertional code-switch. The sequence unfolds as follows. On row 15, participant P asks "should we play Blitzball or should we go and kill Sin" in Finnish. K accepts his proposal and says "yeah" in Finnish. On row 17, participant P repeats "let's kill Sin" in English. CS functions here as repetition. K laughs and the game goes on. The sequence ends here with P's comment in Finnish that "Gatta is the real one".

Extract 12:

(g = avatar Gatta, lz= avatar Luzzu)

15.   P >pitäskö pelata vähän blitzballia< (0.8) vai mennäänkö vaan tappaa Sini
              Should we play Blitzball or should we go and kill Sin

16.   K ^joo^=
              Yeah

17.   P =let's kill Sin=

18.   K =(hhhh) (xxxxxxx)*(hh)
              (Laughts)

19.   P Luschu

20.   g   why only you sir I wanna fight too

21.   P ^n:^ >Gatta<=

22.   lz =orders are orders

23.   P Gatta on **ju**st aito
              Gatta is the real one

In extract 13, the gamers have a small conflict. K says on row 198 in Finnish that he thinks there will be fights. P rejects K's idea on row 199 with his comment "no there won't". K repeats again in Finnish on row 200 "I think there will". P refuses to believe K and on row 201 repeats in Finish "for sure there won't". Finnish has been the language of interaction until the row 202. K code-switches on row 202 from Finnish into English and says quietly "but I am not sure". It is the shift in language that provides him with an opportunity to back up. He changes his footing. This is emphasized with a more quiet voice and laughter. It is not so embarrassing to admit to be wrong in English as in Finnish. P on the other hand sticks to his original opinion, and continues his turn in Finnish "for sure there won't". English here functions as a change of footing and an act of saving face and resolving a conflict.

Extract 13:
198. K =mummielestä täällä tulee kyllä tappeluita
            I think there will be fights
199. P ^e:i tu.^
            No there won't
200. K mummielestä tulee?
            I think there will
201. P <ei varmaan [tuu]>
            for sure there won't
202. K   [^but] I äm (am) not sure^ (hhhhh)
            but I am not sure
204. P <#ei varmana muuten tu:le#> hh°=
            for sure there won't be

In extract 14 P is in control of the character and is fighting a battle. The participants talk about the use of Al Bhed potions in the game. The conversation is in Finnish until the row 741. On row 741 participant P's starts in Finnish and switches to English to change a footing and a topic. The comment "au yeah now you're gonna die" is targeted to a game character P is fighting against. P orients to the activity as a game character talking in the game, as described earlier.

Extract 14:
738. P VITSI NE AL BHED- mikä me- AL Bhed Potions vähän
            man those Al Bhed what we- Al Bhed Potions

739. P ne on hyviä

        they are so good

740. K ^nii^

        yea

741. P TONNI kaikkien ene-^energiaa (saa)^ (.) AU YEAH (.) >**NOW** you're gonna **die**<

        we get tons everyone's energy Au yeah now you're gonna die

742. K (hhh)=

743. P =va-E<u>K</u>a: pistetään nää (.) kädet pois

        first we blow these hands away

In extract 15, participants are in a battle. P starts in Finnish, "now people die". K's discourse marker "ow?" signals his bafflement. There is 1 second of silence. K continues in English "I don't wanna be there". He empathizes with the game characters and talks as if he is one of the game characters. So here again English signals a shift in footing. There is 3 seconds of silence. P has not taken up the next turn so K continues in Finnish "all the chocobos died too" and breaths heavily. He changes his footing back to a player talking about the game and signals this in Finnish. Now P takes up his turn and continues in Finnish commenting the flow of the game events "damn that is powerful".

Extract 15:

892. P   [nyt **KU]O**LEE porukkaa=

        Now people die

893. K =aih? (1) I don't wanna be there (3.4) kaikki

        ow? I don't wanna be there all

894. K chocobotkin kuoli °h°hh=

        all chocobos died too

895. P =ei vitsi tuo on voimakas

        damn that is powerful

In extract 16, the sequence starts in Finnish with participant P sharing his personal opinion that the game character Seymor wanted all the crusaders out of his way so that nobody would oppose. His idea is approved by K who marks his turn with "hmm". After a second break K switches into English "that is quite true". He speaks in a quieter voice than normally.

Extract 16:

(se = avatar Seymor)

1320. P se halus ne kai:kki (.) Cruseiderit *(Crusaders)* eestä po:is. et se pystys tota:.=

     he would like all the Cruseiders out of his way that he could

1321. se=anyone else (0.3) [would be expected] to show [their sorrow]

1322. P   [et sillä ei ois ketään,]   [^vastassa.^]

     that he would have anybody fighting against him

1323. K ^hmm (1.5) that is quite true^=

1324. se=but you are a summoner

In extract 17, participants share how much they like the game. P starts the sequence in Finnish saying how he thinks the game is well made and that he has totally fallen in love with it on row 1416. He repeats this on line 1418 in Finnish "it is so good". P mentions that Final Fantasy X can be good too. K takes up the turn and mentions how he will buy the game when it comes to sale. K has not finished his sentence when P cuts in. P tries to say something already earlier on row 1422 "ah" but K does not notice this. P speaks on top of K again in English "it's like". K starts "mää" but stops his turn. P repeats again "it's like a gift from God". This is an expression he could have said in Finnish but decides to do it in English. Perhaps P uses English to get K's attention, which he finally gets on row 1423. K continues the sequence in Finnish on row 1424.

  Extract 17:

  (s = avatar Shelinda)

  1416. P @TÄÄ on mummielestä niin hyvin tehty tää tarina [määon] siis **ihan**. rakastunu tähän

        I think it is so well made that story I am so in love with

  1417. s   [haa]

  1418. P peliin ^tää on niin hyvä^@

        this game it is so good

  1419. P (xxxxxxx)*=

  1420. P =X kakkonenkin voi olla <u>vähä</u> ^hyvä.^

        Second one can be pretty good

  1421. K arvaa <u>ka</u>:hesti hom[maanko sen] ^niin no kuhan se tulee^ (0.6) [↑mää niin ku] ↑mää,-

        Guess twice if I will buy it well when it comes I

  1422. P   [<u>ah</u>::::::]   [^it's like^]

1423. P it's like a <u>gif::t</u> (.) from God=

1424. K =mää jonotan vaikka **vii**kon siinä ovella. saakeli että mää saan se
        I will que even for a week in front of the door damn that I will get it

1425. P se on niin ihanaa <u>ah</u> (.) tää on niin hyvä peli
        iIt is so wonderful this is so good game

In extract 18, participant P tells to K in Finnish that he could play next. His first turn is in Finnish "you could as well". K does not say yes or no but comments "guess if I know how to fight anymore". K has not given in to P's proposition. P reacts to this with a switch into English "it's now your-". His sentence is cut short and he self-corrects with an emphasis "your time has come".

Extract 18:

1464. P >säähä voisit (iha hyvi)<
        You could as well

1465. K ar[vaas kahe:sti] osaisinko enää tapella=
        Guess if I know how to fight anymore

1466. P [it's now your,-]

1467. P =**your <u>time</u>** (.) ^has come^

4.4 "Se on niin gay": Examples of insertional language mixing

Auer (1998) would categorize the below examples of the use of English as code mixing. The difference between a language mix and a code-switch is that the latter carries situational meaning. There is something that both of the speakers consider meaningful. This does not mean that long phrases of English are code-switches and that short items are language mixes. Many of the examples of the use of English in the data demonstrate insertional CS or language mixing. The participants tend to switch into English only for one or two words, after which they continue speaking in Finnish, such as in extract 19 below.

In extract 19, the matrix language is Finnish. Majority of the talk is in Finnish and English words are only added where appropriate or needed. Speaker K makes a negative comment about the game environment "this is an annoying place". K replaces the finish word "ärsyttävä" with its English equivalent "annoying". It is as if the English word was just one word in K's vocabulary equivalent to the Finnish translation. K does not hesitate, which

implies that he does not search for the word to use. It is rather automatic for him. What is of interest here is that participant P continues to speak in Finnish after K's comment. With P's reply "yeah it is", P shows that he understands K. The English word "annoying" is not grammatically changed or embedded into Finnish. According to Auer (1999) this is an example of *insertional* code mix, as it does not carry participant related or discourse related meaning in the sequence.

Extract 19:
(lz= avatar Luzzu, w = avatar Wakka,)
59.   lz =they still need some time to get them ready (2.4)
60   our job is to keep Sin at bay till they're done
61.   K tää on ihan an[noying]
              This is so annoying
62.   w   [uumh]
63.   K paikka
              place
64.   w uuuumh
65.   P nii onki (3) Wakka vähän, (0.8) ^raivoo^
              yea it is Wakka is a bit furious
66.   K <**joo**>=
              yeah

Extract 20 is similar to extract 19 as it is also classified as an *insertional* code mix. In this example a Finnish word "homo" is replaced by an English equivalent "gay". This expression is common in colloquial language. It has been repeated even four times in this short sequence of conversation. What is of interest is that both of the participants use the same expression in English. As in extract 19, the word "gay" is a reference such as the Finnish word "homo" and it has no conversational meaning here. Perhaps it has social meaning to the participants or to the community of teenagers but this discussion is out of the scope of the present study.

Extract 20:
262.   P ^Master Kinoc (.) vä<u>hä:n</u> se on aa- (0.4) si**ka** äijä^=
              Master Kinoc is so sick dude
263.   K =no ei tässä oo mitään niin ärsyttävää ku Seymour (1)
              well nothing is so annoying as Seymor

264. K [seon niin gay]
   he is so gay

265. P [^niin no joo] totta se on niin [gay^]
   yea that's so true he is so gay

266. K   [suoraan] sanottuna seon niin? [gay]
   frankly he is so gay

267. P   [<**se**? **on**] gay.>
   he is gay

5 DISCUSSION

As I quoted Heller (1982) earlier, in the absence of linguistic norms we tend to create new ones. This is also characteristic of the present data. The participants come up with inventive and creative ways of using English and often unexpected variations of words and sentences related to a situational specific-language use, such as the specific vocabulary of Final Fantasy, as seen from many of the examples above. These variations are often examples of language mixing in which English words are also modified according to the rules of the Finnish grammar. They have become part of the gamers' vocabulary and speaking style.

Furthermore, it seems there are no external rules how to speak or write while playing a computer game unlike at school or in any other formal setting where a teacher or a parent may be in the role of controlling spoken or written language. In the present context, the players are the ones who influence the language situation: who is playing, where, when and what is spoken. Of course, for them it still is important to understand the other and to become understood by the other; however, their language use is not institutionalized. What is striking in the data is that the participants do not correct each other even if their English is not grammatically right or their pronunciation has a strong Finnish accent. There are; however, a few examples where the participants self-correct some instances of English. The present data demonstrates how the participants re-create and re-negotiate their language choices.

The value of the present study is encompassed in its rich examples of how English is used by the gamers in conversation. English is used quite often and there are many examples of different types of uses of English. Firstly, the players do not necessarily know the Finnish equivalent of a specific word or they wish to signal belonging to the players' community, and thus prefer to use English origin words (examples of participant related Cs or LM). As shown by earlier research, it is also evident in the present data that some words or terms are simply the most readily available in English at the time of speaking. In the midst of playing, there is little or no time to search for a Finnish equivalent because the phase of the game is fast. There is neither a need to translate the English words as this knowledge is shared among the speakers of the community and the gamers are able to understand one another. Secondly, CS is used to enrich and to intensify one's speech. Sometimes an English word fits better to describe a particular situation or a character. Thirdly, CS is used as a contextualization cue to

change a footing, a topic, to draw attention, or to negotiate the turns. This was fascinating because English was not only used as a bilingual code but in fact it carries various conversational functions. Finally, English is used to empathize with the game characters. Many times English is used to signal a footing of "I as the game character talking in the game", whereas Finnish is used to signal "I as a player talking about the game" as described by Leppänen (2007). In other words, code-switching functions as a multitude of voices.

It was not in the scope of the present study to analyze the social identity of the Finns. However, throughout the study there had been a broader research question guiding some of the discussion in this paper. How does one do being multilingual? Many of the earlier studies in code-switching are conducted with bilinguals from birth (Poplack 1980; Myers-Scotton 1988; and Auer 1984). Recent studies have, however, shown a shift from investigating code-switching in multilingual communities to communities traditionally known as monolingual and many calls have been made to show that monolinguals are not necessarily monolinguals in their language repertoire, for example, in Finland (Leppänen et al. 2008). Wei (2007: 7) has identified a bilingual speaker in more general terms as "someone with the possession of two languages". Anyone who knows one or two languages can be ascribed a bilingual identity.

The majority of the Finnish English speakers are exposed to two or more languages not from the birth but later in life as in the present study. A second or a foreign language is more often acquired through formal education than in a naturalistic context only. Nevertheless, as Wei (2007: 5) points out, "late acquisition in an unstructured context can still result in a high level of proficiency in the target language". According to her, bilingualism should be seen as a result of self-identification and attitude instead of only someone's cognitive capacity. The present study demonstrates how two Finnish adolescents switch smoothly between English and Finnish and it is safe to say that they could be bi- or multilingual. English seems to be a real resource in their language repertoire, also as a contextualization cue, in situations where they could well speak only in Finnish. As Wei says (2007: 22), "more and more people will become bilinguals" because bilingualism is not a "static" or "unitary" phenomenon and attitudes to bilingualism change.

6 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, many researchers would agree with Leppänen (2007: 149) that the use of English is "far from uniform [and] it, in fact, varies considerably within and across domains and contexts". The present study has been an attempt to demonstrate how two Finnish adolescents use the English language in a situation where they could also talk only in Finnish. Instead they alternate between English and Finnish. Furthermore, it has been an attempt to explain and describe if English instances carry any conversational function and if yes what kind. It was not enough to look at the separate expressions, items or words participants used in English, but rather to seek to analyze as much of the sequence of the conversation as possible and relevant. One of the dilemmas encountered during the research was to define how long sequence would suffice to draw conclusions about any situational meaning of CS. From the examples above one can notice that some of the sequences are longer and some shorter depending on how long the participants carried on their talk around the same situation. It was interesting to notice that these situations changed quickly, perhaps because the game itself is fast-forward and a lot of things happen in a very short time. This is also reflected in the speech of the participants as their turns tend to be short and precise.

An idea of two codes that are used in juxtaposition is no longer an awkward phenomenon in Finland. In fact, due to the increasing use of English we have seen a boom of research in the field of CS (e.g. Leppänen et al. 2008). Many linguists see it as a creative use of language. The present data supports the findings of the uses of English among Finnish teenagers. The data is not large enough to make generalizations outside of this context; however, its value is encompassed in its rich examples of how English is used in a computer game context.

The assumption in the start of the study was that it makes more sense to study the conversational meaning of CS than to analyze the macro-sociolinguistic aspects because English is likely to have a pragmatic function for the gamers. It was helpful in this case to analyze the local functions CS served in the interaction. However; a further topic of research could be related to the macro-sociolinguistic aspects, such as the social identity of the gamers, or to try to combine both micro and macro analysis. The data provides also an appropriate setting for an analysis of second language learning as the participants frequently

repeat and mimic the game characters and are likely to learn new words and expressions in the activity (e.g. Piirainen-Marsh and Taino 2009). The present study was successful as a response to the call to diversify the research contexts of CS, and future research should aim to do that too.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, Two languages*. Cambridge: CUP.

Auer, P. (1998). Bilingual conversation revisited. In P. Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. Abington: Routledge.

Auer, P. (1999). From Code-switching via Language Mixing to Fused Lects: Toward a Dynamic Typology of Bilingual Speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3 (4), 309-332.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. (Ed.) (1982). *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, M. (1982). Negotiation of language choice in Montreal. In J. Gumperz (ed.), *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, M. (1995). Code-switching and the politics of language. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, Two languages: cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: CUP.

Kovács, M. (2001). *Code-Switching and Language Shift in Austarlian Finnish in Comparison with Australian Hungarian*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press.

Leppänen, S. (2007). Youth language in media contexts: insights into the functions of English in Finland. *World Englishes* 26 (2), 149–169.

Leppänen, S., Nikula, T. and Kääntä, L. (Eds.) (2008). *Kolmas kotimainen : lähikuvia englannin käytöstä Suomessa.* Helsinki : Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Leppänen, S. and Pahta, P. (2012). Finnish culture and language endangered: language ideological debates on English in the Finnish press from 1995 to 2007. In J. Blommaert,

S. Leppänen, P. Pahta, and T. Räsänen (eds.), *Dangerous multilingualism: northern perspectives on order, purity and normality.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Leppänen, S., Pitkänen-Huhta, A., Nikula, T., Kytölä, S., Törmäkangas, T., Nissinen, K., Kääntä, L., Räisänen, T., Laitinen, M., Koskela, H., Lähdesmäki, S., and Jousmäki, H. (2011). National survey on the English language in Finland: Uses, meanings and attitudes. *Studies in Variation, Contacts and Change in English, eSeries* [online]. http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/series/volumes/05/evarieng-vol5.pdf. (3 November 2015).

Myers-Scotton, C. (1988). Code-switching as indexical of social negotiations. In M. Heller (ed.), *Codeswitching. Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Cambridge: CUP.

Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. Oxon: Routledge.

Piirainen-Marsh, A. and Tainio, L. (2009). Other-repetition as a Resource for Participation in the Activity of playing a Video Game. *The Modern Language Journal* 93 (2), 153–169.

Poplack, S. (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.

Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescents*. New York: Longman.

Taavitsainen, I. and Pahta, P. (2003). English in Finland: Globalisation, language awareness and questions of identity. *English Today* 19, 3-15.

Wei, L. (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*. Abington, UK: Routledge.

Wei, L. (2007). Dimensions of Bilingualism. In L. Wei (ed.), *The Bilingualism Reader*. London: Routledge.

APPENDIX

Transcription Conventions

. Falling intonation

, Level or slightly rising intonation

? Rising intonation

- Cutoff

↑ Change in pitch height: higher than preceding speech

↓ Change in pitch height: lower than preceding speech

> < Faster tempo

< > Slower tempo

: Sound stretch

<u>really</u> Stressed syllable

CAPITALS Loud voice

emphasis Emphasized voice

^ ^ Quiet voice

$ $ Smiling voice

@ @ Animated voice

(.) Pause, less than 0.3 seconds

(0.5) Length of pause

ºhhh In-breath

hhhº Out-breath

 (hh) laughter

 [ ] Overlap

= Latching of turns

(xxx) Can't make out what the speaker says

(word) An estimate of what the speaker has said