UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

ENGLISH ELEMENTS IN THE SPOKEN DISCOURSE OF

FINNISH TEENAGERS PLAYING AN ENGLISH VIDEO GAME

A Pro Gradu Thesis in English

by

Petri Vuorinen

Department of Languages
2008

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA
KIELTEN LAITOS

Petri Vuorinen
ENGLISH ELEMENTS IN THE SPOKEN DISCOURSE OF FINNISH
TEENAGERS PLAYING AN ENGLISH VIDEO GAME

Pro gradu -tutkielma

Englannin kieli
Helmikuu 2008   78 sivua + 2 liitettä

Tutkielman tarkoituksena on kuvata miten englanninkielistä tietokonepeliä pelaavat pojat käyttävät englannin kieltä keskinäisessä vuoropuhelussaan. Lähtökohtana tutkielmassa on, että tietokonepelin englanninkielisyys vaikuttaa pelaajien puhekäyttäytymiseen ja kielivalintoihin. Syytä tähän etsitään pelien tutkimuksesta, jonka mukaan pelien immersiivisyys eli mukaansa tempaavuus vaikuttaa pelaajien käyttäytymiseen. Tutkimusaineistona on käytetty videomateriaalia, jossa on samanaikaisesti kahdella kameralla kuvattu sekä pelaajien vuoropuhelua että pelin tapahtumia ruudulta. Aineiston pohjalta on mahdollista verrata miten puhevuorot liittyvät pelin tapahtumiin.

Tutkimuskysymykset käsittelevät kolmea osa-aluetta: 1) Millaisia englanninkielisiä elementtejä pelaajien puheesta löytyy, 2) miten pelaajat käyttävät näitä elementtejä ja 3) miksi englantia käytetään. Erityistä huomiota kiinnitetään koodinvaihtoon, eli tilanteisiin joissa pelaajat vaihtavat hetkellisesti (tai pysyvästi) puhekielensä kokonaan englantiin. Tarkoituksena on saada selville mitä erityisiä merkityksiä pelaajat voivat koodinvaihdolla viestittää. Tutkimusmenetelminä käytetään sekä lingvististä analyysia että keskusteluanalyysin periaatteita. Lingvistinen analyysi antaa hyvän kuvauksen siitä, millaisia englanninkielisiä elementtejä pelaajien puheessa esiintyy. Keskusteluanalyyttisten periaatteiden avulla saadaan selville millaisia kielen vaihtelun mekanismeja pelaajat käyttävät, ja mihin tarkoituksiin näitä mekanismeja käytetään.

Tuloksista käy ilmi, että pelaajien vuoropuhelussa englanninkielisiä elementtejä esiintyy runsaasti. Suurin osa englanninkielisistä elementeistä on ns. insertioita, joissa englanninkielinen sana tai lauserakenne on lisätty suomenkielisen keskustelun lomaan. Aineistosta löytyy myös suuri määrä lainasanoja, jotka suurimmaksi osaksi liittyvät pelissä esiintyvään esineistöön. Lisäksi aineistosta löytyy myös useita koodinvaihtotilanteita, joissa puhekieli vaihtuu hetkellisesti englanniksi. Nämä vaihdot liittyvät useimmiten tilanteisiin, joissa pelaajat haluavat viestittää omia tulkintojaan pelitilanteen asetelmista tai viittaavat pelin menneisiin tai tuleviin tapahtumiin. Lisäksi analyysin perusteella voi todeta, että kyseinen pelimaailma on varsin rikas englanninkielinen ympäristö, jossa toimiminen edellyttää pelaajalta sekä hyvää ongelmanratkaisukykyä että englanninkielen taitoa.

Tutkielman loppupäätelmä on, että interaktiivinen englanninkielisen tietokonepelin pelaaminen stimuloi monipuoliseen englanninkielen käyttöön. Pelin tapahtumat ja vuorovaikutteisuus luovat tilanteen, jossa pelaajilla on luontainen taipumus hyödyntää englanninkielentaitoaan.

Asiasanat: language alternation, code-switching, borrowing, conversation analysis, immersion, video games.

Table of contents

List of tables

1. Introduction

In modern Finland the majority of people are influenced by English through the media. According to Leppänen and Nikula (forthcoming), particularly young people who watch MTV, play electronic games, read youth culture magazines or/and use the Internet are constantly in an environment that embraces English as the universal language of communication. Together with extensive formal training from school, these domains of language use create a situation in Finland where young people not only acquire elaborate English skills but also live in an environment that creates a growing requirement for the active use of these skills. In terms of bilingualism, Auer (1998: 4) has said that for a person to be called bilingual they have to display regular use of two languages in their everyday lives. An interesting question is, whether it can be said that adolescents who are associated with the above domains are functionally bilingual, that is, their use of English has become a habitual part of their day-to-day lives.

This study is interested particularly in the case of adolescents playing electronic games. These games are predominantly English, and thus, create many kinds of environments where players need to use varying degrees of functional English skills. From a linguistic point of view these environments create interesting situations where Finnish and English are in contact. In these contact situations the use of both languages involved tends to change. These changes are called language contact phenomena. As a language contact phenomenon this study directs its attention to the act of code-switching, or in other words the alternating use of two languages within a speech event. More precisely, the main focus of this study is on investigating code-switching in a particular conversational event in which two adolescent boys are communicating with each other while playing an English electronic game.

In this particular speech event the participants are playing a single player action-adventure game where one of the boys is the actual player and the other one assists by giving advice and commenting on the progression of the game. The game features an elaborate storyline and extensive use of English dialogue, thus it takes relatively good English skills for the players to be able to follow the progression of the narrative and to operate the within the game environment. The participants in this

study do this fascinatingly well: they follow the overall storyline, participate in the dialogue and manage the progression of the game with expertise. Indeed, they display good skills in not only understating written and spoken English, but also in producing English verbally.

Since this thesis is grounded in the study of bilingualism, chapter two will be devoted to illustrating how bilingualism has been defined and how the participants in this study can be categorized according to different typologies of bilingualism. The ultimate goal will be to establish good grounds for the argument that the participants in the study can be called bilinguals. This is not a simple task because bilingualism has been defined in so many different ways. However, by looking at the more recent approaches to bilingualism it is possible to argue that the participants can be identified as such, not only because of their formal training, but because of their regular use of bilingual skills.

The third chapter will focus on the main purpose of this study which is to investigate the act of code-switching as an illustration of bilingual competence in the given conversational situation. First some examples of how code-switching is and has been defined will be presented and also some guidelines on how to tell apart code-switching from other language contact phenomena will be offered. Next some of the most important approaches to code-switching research will be evaluated in order to show that the one chosen for this study is well suited. The analysis of the code-switching data will be done according to the framework of the conversational approach to code-switching. This approach was first structured by Peter Auer (1984) and has been since endorsed by several prominent researchers of code-switching. Using this approach provides three great advantages: a) it presents a solid way of identifying code-switching from other language contact phenomena, b) it views code-switching as a conversational tool and focuses on its interactional value and c) it provides an analytical system to answer the question of to what purpose code-switching is used.

Additionally, some ideas from game studies are incorporated into this study in order to gain a better understanding of the type of interaction that is going on between the game and its players. More precisely, the concepts of game↔player interaction and

immersivity are introduced. These concepts will provide some insight into what kind of a role can be assigned to the input given by the electronic game in the conversational event. This role is no doubt significant because the game provides strong visual and auditory output which the players react to and interact with. Although the verbal interaction in a gaming session is primarily between the players there are numerous other actions that are performed in order to interact with the game.

In conclusion, this study aims at both describing the code-switching phenomenon as it is presented in the spoken discourse of the participants in this particular discourse event and at the same time describing one of the strategic ways in which the participants use their bilingual skills. Moreover, the aim is to give a coherent picture of the discourse event by incorporating some aspects from studies on how games and their players interact.

2. Bilingualism

Although code-switching is the main focus of this study, it is important to take a look at the field of bilingualism, since code-switching as a linguistic phenomenon has been defined in bilingual studies. Bilingualism is a difficult term to handle because it has not yet been defined in a way that most researchers could agree upon. One reason for this is that bilingualism has been, and is, studied from so many perspectives that it has become impossible to conjure up a compact definition that would cover all its interdisciplinary characteristics. According to Romaine (1995: 7-11) the fields of linguistics, psychology, sociology and education among others have all been involved in the study of bilingualism, all from their own distinctive perspectives. Baker (1996: 4) goes on to add politics and geography to the mixture.

Nevertheless, linguists have often claimed bilingualism as their turf, although many linguistic theories have proven to be too narrow to be able to capture the true essence of the subject matter. Baetens Beardsmore (1986: 3) even suggests that linguistic theories that have been imposed to bilingualism are the reason for the state of flux in the field. Linguistic theorists who take defining structure as their ultimate goal have not been able to agree upon the functioning of a single language, not to mention the co-functioning of two or more languages. The only solution according to Romaine (1995), Baker (1996) and Baetens Beardsmore (1986) is that one has to take an interdisciplinary view on bilingualism which combines the findings in the fields of linguistics, psychology, sociology and education.

Furthermore, Romaine (1995: 8) points out a problematic situation in bilingual studies: bilingualism is often approached through monolingual standards although when looking at the language situations in the world today, it is easy to see that it is actually monolingualism that represents an exception to the rule and not the other way around. Thus, the sociolinguistic approach to bilingualism has become more dominant as the main focus has shifted away from structural definitions to portraying how languages co-exist and function in a social context.

2.1. Defining bilingualism

As mentioned above, bilingualism has been defined from numerous points of view and no single universal definition exists. The purpose here is to gather guiding principles from bilingual studies that will be relevant to the present study. The initial distinction to be made is one that is supported by most researchers in the field of bilingualism (Baker 1996, Baetens Beardsmore 1986, Romaine 1995), and that is the distinction between *bilingualism*, *multilingualism* and *plurilingualism.* In reality, there is actually no distinction, because the term bilingualism is commonly used when referring to all three. Baetens Beardsmore (1986: 3) states that: "There is no evidence to suggest that the fundamental principles affecting language usage are any different whether two, three or more languages are being used by one and the same speaker..." Therefore, in this study I will use the term bilingualism to cover all the above phenomena. Next we will take a look at how the term bilingualism is, in fact, defined.

Baker (1996: 4) states that the first distinction when defining the term bilingualism is to be made between *societal* and *individual* bilingualism. Societal bilingualism is the possession of a group of people whereas individual bilingualism is a language property possessed by an individual person. Baetens Beardsmore (1986: 4) describes societal aspects of bilingualism as forming a "background canvas" for any bilingual study, even in the case study of only one bilingual speaker. Additionally, according to both Baker (1996: 4) and Romaine (1995: 12) societal and individual bilingualism are strongly interrelated and one is bound to affect the other. Thus, although in the present study there will be little focus on societal bilingualism, I feel it is important to describe the position of English in the Finnish society, because the data that is analyzed represents a new type of situation where Finnish and English are in contact. This description will be given in chapter 5 where the specifications of this study are discussed.

As an individual possession bilingualism has been defined in a wide spectrum of ways beginning with Bloomfield's (as quoted in Romaine 1995: 11) definition of a person who has "native-like control of two languages" all the way to Diebold's (as cited in Romaine 1995: 11) notion of an individual who has bilingual skills even though they cannot produce complete meaningful utterances. Diebold (in Romaine

1995: 11) argues that a person may have good receptive control over a language although not having productive control. These definitions can be said to form a continuum within which the possible bilingual attributes are being evaluated. According to Baker (1996: 7) Bloomfield's definition represents a maximalist interpretation of bilingualism and Diebold's a minimalist approach, both of which are, in Baker's opinion, too extreme. This raises the question whether some middle ground should be defined in order for researchers to be able to make some kind of classification of who is bilingual and who is not.

According to Baker (1996:) establishing criteria for defining a minimal condition for a person to be called bilingual is not possible ("it would only lead to arbitrary cut-off points"), and according to Mackey (as quoted in Romaine 1995: 11) it is not even necessary. Mackey says that bilingualism has to be considered as an entirely relative concept, and thus defines bilingualism as vaguely as "the alternate use of two or more languages". As a solution to the ambiguous use of the terms "bilingual" and "bilingualism", many researchers, according to Baetens Beardsmore (1986: 4), have started to use typologies to delimitate their particular area of investigation from a larger field of studies. This has helped to avoid over-generalizations in a field of study that has become very inclusive.

However, the use of typologies requires the use of tools to describe individual bilingualism in order to form a foundation for typological labeling. According to Mackey (as quoted in Romaine 1995: 12) there are four elements which must be addressed when forming a description of a bilingual's aptitude. These elements are: degree, function, alternation and interference. The most interesting element, in terms of this study, is naturally language alternation which involves code-switching. However, I will take a brief look at all the mentioned elements in the following to form a concluding perspective on the situation in which the data in this study exists. I will begin by looking at degrees of bilingualism.

2.2. Degrees of Bilingualism

To begin with, defining an individual's degree of bilingualism relies to a great extent on terms which are used to represent a person's monolingual language ability. The

terms are numerous: language skills, language competence, language performance, language ability, language proficiency and language achievement are all used. Baker (1996: 5) distinguishes specific meanings for all these terms, but I will use the term *language proficiency* because it withholds the notion of both formally and informally acquired language skills as well as individual characteristics. Additionally, since many writers use the term language proficiency synonymously with language competence when describing bilingual aptitude, I will also consider them identical although persist in using the former term.

Romaine (1995: 15) lists types of tests that have been used to measure bilingual proficiency, and thus help determine an individual's degree of bilingualism. The tests fit into four categories as follows: rating scales, fluency tests, flexibility tests and dominance tests. These test groups all comprise of different instruments of testing that will not be discussed here. However, it is important to look into the methods of assessment used as a basis for these tests. In order to assess bilingual proficiency one needs to take into account the categories of language abilities in which language proficiency is measured. However, there are special distinctions to be made when applying these categories to bilingual language proficiency. First of all, a common problem is that when bilingual language skills are measured, monoglot norms are used. According to Romaine (1995: 19) this poses a threat to assessing bilingual skills because the very essence of bilingualism is two (or more) languages existing and functioning in relation to each other. Secondly, in continuation to the former, when assessing bilingual skills one should always be assessing two languages and not one.

The basic, most common categorization of language proficiency is illustrated in Baker (1996) as follows:

Table 1. Language abilities (Baker 1996: 6)

	Oracy	**Literacy**
Receptive Skills	Listening	Reading
Productive Skills	Speaking	Writing

The division in Table 1.1. is between receptive/ productive skills and oracy/ literacy. These four variables form an array of the four basic language skills: listening, reading, speaking and writing. However, when applying this categorization to bilingual abilities one must remember that proficiency levels are measured in both/ all the languages at an individual's disposal. Be as it may, it is evident that even when using merely these four variables, language proficiency is not a clear-cut case but rather forms a multi-colored landscape of different language proficiency combinations: individual people can posses countless variations of these skills. Nevertheless, the above categorization is quite limited in terms of distinguishing abilities in different levels of language, such as grammatical and phonological levels. In the following a more precise illustration is presented to focus on language abilities/ skills at different levels of language.

Romaine (1995) presents another type of categorization by Mackey, in which these basic language skills are applied to different levels of language use. The illustrated categorization presented by Romaine is somewhat more complex and goes as follows:

Table 2. Measuring degree of bilingualism (Romaine 1995: 13)

Skills	Levels				
	Phonological/ Grammatical A B	Lexical A B	Semantic A B	Stylistic A B	Graphic A B
Listening					
Reading					
Speaking					
Writing					

In Mackey's categorization language skills in both / all languages are measured in five different linguistic levels. According to Mackey (as quoted in Romaine 1995: 12) assessing language skills (listening, reading, speaking, writing) at phonological/grammatical, lexical, semantic, stylistic and graphic levels will create a series of continua that will be efficient in measuring bilingual proficiency. Romaine

(1995: 18) would add communicative competence to the list of linguistic levels since it has become a major topic in the second language acquisition discussion. In essence communicative competence can be seen as differing from the use of styles in the sense that it is not enough to know different styles of a language, you also need to know when and where to use a particular style.

Needless to say, there are always problems when trying to assess something as abstract as language proficiency. Romaine (1995: 18) states that many researchers have come to the conclusion that language proficiency cannot be divided into isolated components, but has to be measured as a whole, consisting of certain variables, such as the ones illustrated above. Thus, the focus is on the fact that different language skills at different linguistic levels are always strongly interrelated.

Nevertheless, however problematic the field of language assessment may be, researchers have made typologies that characterize different levels of bilingual proficiency. The following typologies are commonly used in the field of bilingual studies to help researchers focus on a certain aspect of bilingualism and to apply bilingual theories to specific cases of bilingualism.

2.2.1. Typologies according to degree of bilingualism

The two most extreme measures of bilingualism are the ones introduced earlier when first defining bilingualism. Bloomfield's description of a bilingual having "native-like control of two languages" was labeled maximalist, because it raised the bar of an individual to be recognized as bilingual extremely high. Other researchers, as well, have put forward maximalist views on bilingualism. Halliday, McKintosh & Stevens (as cited in Baetens Beardsmore 1986: 7) give forth the notion of *ambilingualism* to define a person "who is capable of functioning equally well in either of his languages in all domains of activity without any traces of one language in his use of the other". This definition is strict indeed and chances are that there are not many people like this. It would be remarkable to find a person who would function in all areas of life equally well in two languages. Most likely he/she would have certain areas of life within which one language would be stronger than the other.

The other extreme is Diebold's notion that a person does not even have to be able to produce complete meaningful utterances in the second language to be called bilingual. Diebold calls this type of bilingualism *incipient bilingualism*. This category allows people with virtually no bilingual competence to be included into the bilingual category. However, between these two extremes there are more reasonable typologies that help group bilinguals into more definitive categories.

Baetens Beardsmore (1986: 8-10) lists three typologies of bilingualism that have proven to be of value in research and discussion. The first one is *natural bilingualism*, which is used to describe a person who has gained their bilingual competence naturally without any formal instruction. This type of bilingualism is very common in bilingual communities, where the language of the home may be different from that of the surrounding community, or in situations where the community itself requires or induces functioning in two or more languages. The second type of bilingualism that Baetens Beardsmore describes is *secondary bilingualism*, which differs from natural bilingualism by the way in which the bilingual proficiency has been acquired. In secondary bilingualism the second language has been added alongside the first language through formal instruction.

The third type of bilingualism discussed here is closely related to ambilingualism in the sense that it focuses on an individual's equal proficiency in both/all languages. It is called *balanced bilingualism* and as the term suggests, it covers bilinguals who master two languages equally well. However, Baetens Beardsmore says that balanced bilingualism also withholds the notion of having a proficiency level of close to monoglot norms, whereas Baker (1996: 8) says that the term lacks the notion how proficient the bilingual is. According to Baker, the point of proficiency is the fact that it differentiates balanced bilingualism from ambilingualism. A young child with low proficiency in two languages can be still called a balanced bilingual.

Nevertheless, the concept of balanced bilingualism has been strongly criticized for being too ideal, since once again it would be extremely difficult to find a person who would be equally proficient in two languages in all areas of life in all possible circumstances. Additionally, the notion of balanced bilingualism excludes a huge number of bilinguals whose bilingual competence is unbalanced and one language

dominates over the other. This phenomenon is approached in *language dominance* tests where the focus is on identifying which language dominates over the other, to what degree and in which domains (Romaine 1995: 15).

There are also typologies of bilinguals whose bilingual proficiency is low in either one of their languages or in both. Baetens Beardsmore (1986: 10-14) introduces the controversial issue of *semilingualism.* Semilingualism refers to bilinguals, who have acquired both of the languages they use poorly, or not according to monoglot standards. In other words a person whose original mother tongue has deteriorated after living in a foreign society and whose second language has not developed up to the norms of the surrounding monoglot society would be called a semilingual. According to many critics semilingualism is not a just term because bilingual people should not be rated against monoglot norms. Moreover, many other features of this typology have been criticized and the term semilingual has been determined too negative (see e.g. Baetens Beardsmore 1986, Baker 1996 and Romaine 1995).

However, Baetens Beardsmore (1986: 14-15) also presents two typologies that have proven to be refined and useful. These typologies deal with bilinguals with relatively low proficiency in their second language. These bilinguals are referred to as *semi-speakers* and *near-passive bilinguals*. Low-proficiency semi-speakers are capable of manipulating words in sentences to suit their own purposes, whereas high-proficiency semi-speakers can use the language fairly fluently. However, high-proficiency semi-speakers can be distinguished from fully fluent speakers because of their occasional deviations from the local grammatical forms. Near-passive bilinguals may know many lexical items and short phrases, but cannot manipulate the language according to their own needs as proficiently as semi-speakers. These two typologies raise the question of how bilinguals use their languages in the society they live in, which leads to the idea of *functional bilingualism* that will be dealt with next.

2.3. Functional bilingualism

Defining bilingualism through bilingual competence measuring has proven to be difficult, therefore many researchers have turned to look at language use in order to identify distinct types of bilinguals and bilingualism. Baker (1996: 11) defines

functional bilingualism as "an individual's use of their bilingual ability". Baetens Beardsmore (1986: 15-16) presents the minimalist and maximalist interpretations of functional bilingualism which are somewhat similar to the ones presented when first defining bilingualism. According to the minimalist view, a person who can perform some activities i.e. go to the store, bank, post office, in a second language can be called functionally bilingual. According to the maximalist interpretation a person "is able to conduct all of his activities in a given dual linguistic environment satisfactorily". The maximalist interpretation is close to what people commonly think of as bilingual competence. This definition is quite general in nature, however it does concentrate on the fact that a person should be, in fact, able to use the language competence he/she has. Contrary to the terms balanced or fluent bilingual, this view does not set any monoglot standards for second language competence, but rather the standard of being able to function in two languages.

Functional bilingualism can also be divided into many subcategories but here we will only take a look at two main categories: *receptive* and *productive* bilingualism. According to Baetens Beardsmore (1986: 16-18) receptive bilingualism refers to a person who can understand a second language but cannot necessarily speak or write it. Another term for this type of bilingualism is *passive bilingualism*, however the term has been much criticized because receptive language competence is not seen as a passive attribute. Productive bilingualism, on the other hand, means that a person can not only understand but also speak and possibly write in two or more languages.

Finally, Auer (1988: 191-192) argues that there really is no other type of bilingualism than functional bilingualism. He says that bilingualism cannot be only mental or an individual's perception of themselves but, on the contrary, bilingualism is an interaction skill. Moreover, Auer (ibid.) elaborates by saying that bilingualism is an "achieved status" which you can gain by displaying your command of two or more languages in everyday situations.

In conclusion one has to say that describing the level of bilingualism of the participants in the present data is quite difficult in a number of ways. Firstly, the participants are quite competent bilinguals judging by the fact that they have received ample formal training in English. Both of them had studied English at

school for five years at the time when the recordings were made which makes them secondary bilinguals. However, very little of their every day use of the two language is known. This raises a problem in terms of them being functional bilinguals because this would require for them to use English regularly. What is known about the boys though, is that they are frequently involved with English through the use of media. Especially through playing the type of electronic games that they are actually doing in the present data. This type of use of bilingual skills is not the same as going to the store or having human relations in English but it does display a certain type of functional bilingualism.

2.4. Societal bilingualism

Societal bilingualism refers to a situation where two or more languages coexist as languages of use within a society. A term that is commonly used when speaking of societal bilingualism is diglossia. According to Baker (1996: 36) diglossia is used when describing how the use of two languages (or more) is distributed according to different situations and functions within a society. Moreover Baker (ibid.) speaks about language communities which tend to assign certain roles for different languages. In Finland the most obvious distinction would be that of the role of Swedish in a Finnish language community or Finnish in a Swedish language community. One could also take a more geographical point of view and look at how the use of Swedish is distributed across different regions in Finland. However, this study is mostly interested in the role of English in the Finnish society. As it will be shown in the next chapter English has a quite unique status in Finnish educational, media and business life.

2.4.1. English in Finland

According to Leppänen and Nikula (forthcoming: 9) English is the most important foreign language in Finland and it has a major influence on Finnish social life. This influence is powerfully shown in three major areas: education, media and business. Moreover, Leppänen and Nikula (forthcoming: 42-44) divide language contact situations within the above domains into roughly three categories:

a) Situations where English is being used as the primary language of communication. These situations are frequent for example in international business life where in many sectors English has become the common language of commerce.

b) Situations where English is an additional resource alongside Finnish. This type of language use is found, for instance, in youth culture magazines which derive their language from English terms, slogans and expressions.

c) Situations where speakers use an interlaced mixture of both Finnish and English, frequently drawing elements from both languages. An example of mixed language use is found in game play situations such as the ones in the present study.

First of all, English has a very strong and unique status in the educational system of modern Finland. In Finland children enter school at the age of seven and they can begin to study their first foreign language as early as the first grade. However, most commonly foreign language teaching begins in 3rd grade. According to Statistics Finland (Vuosiluokkien 1-6 kielivalinnat, 2006) by the end of elementary school (grades 1-6) 90.7% of Finnish children had chosen English as their obligatory first foreign language in 2006. Additionally, another 8.3% had chosen English as their secondary (optional) first foreign language. Moreover, according to Statistics Finland (Vuosiluokkien 7-9 kielivalinnat, 2006) In the upper elementary school (grades 7-9) 90.7% of students had chosen English as their first foreign language and overall 99.2% had studied English as either first, second or third foreign language. This means that by the end of compulsory education, at the age of 16 to 17, over 99% percent of Finnish students have studied English for approximately 6 years. Furthermore, over 99% percent of those who go to high school choose English as their first foreign language (Lukion koko oppimäärän suorittaneiden kielivalinnat, 2006). Additionally, Lappänen and Nikula (forthcoming: 10) point out that English tuition is offered "in the form of content-based language learning, IB-gymnasiums and courses in higher education". Not to mention the growing number of English immersion kindergartens.

Moreover, Leppänen and Nikula (forthcoming: 9-12) emphasize the strong position that English has in the Finnish media and business life. Through the media English movies, television programs, video games, magazines, articles, advertisements and websites are strongly present in Finnish people's everyday lives. For example playing electronic games which are predominantly English is very popular in Finland. Addtionally, Leppänen and Nikula (forthcoming: 10) state that English has gradually become a *lingua franca* in Finnish business life. All these factors demonstrate quite clearly that not only is English strongly present in Finnish social life but also that in modern Finland a very large proportion of the population have received formal training in English skills.

3. Code-Switching

For many years now code-switching has gained rising interest as an object of study in the field of bilingualism. It has been approached, just like bilingualism, from many perspectives. Possibly the most dominant perspective in recent years has been the sociolinguistic perspective, in which the focus is on the reasons behind and the outcomes of code-switching. However, extensive input during the early years of code-switching studies came from theoretical linguistics whose goal was to establish rules by which code-switches occur. More recently there has been a notable rise of applying the methods of conversational analysis to code-switching with the idea that code-switching phenomena should always be interpreted within its closest environment: the utterance (Auer 1998: 1-2).

All of the above approaches to code-switching will be visited in this chapter, however, the main focus will be on the conversational approach, and further, on applying the framework of conversation analysis to the study of code-switching. Nevertheless, it is important to take into account how the past years of code-switching studies have shaped our knowledge of the phenomenon. It was through the structural approach that code-switching gained its status as a legitimate object of study and not just a random event, and the sociolinguistic approach helped generate the conversational approach that is now the focus of this study.

However, before going into different approaches to code-switching, it is important to define what is in fact meant by the term. After all, there are also other language contact phenomena that are very close to code-switching such as interference/transfer and borrowing. One has to properly define what is meant by code-switching in order to minimize problems that often emerge when analyzing speech events that contain different types of language contact phenomena.

3.1. Defining code-switching

According to Kovács (2001: 61-63) the term code-switching was first introduced by Jakobson in 1952. Jakobson presented the idea of different languages or different styles of a language functioning as different 'codes' that need to be understood

correctly in producing and interpreting speech. He used the term 'switching codes' to describe a situation when there is alternation in the use of these codes. The actual term 'code-switching' was first used by Vogt as early as 1954. However, it was not until some extensive studies on bilingualism and code-switching by researchers such as Weinreich, Clyne, Hasselmo and Blom and Gumperz that the field of code-switching research began to blossom. (Kovács 2001; 61-63)

Gumperz' (1982) widely accepted definition of code-switching as "the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems" has been the bottom line of the sociolinguistic approach. Li Wei (2005a: 376) says that Gumperz' definition marked the beginning of a new research paradigm that viewed the act of switching codes as a discourse strategy. Myers-Scotton (as cited in Wei 2005a: 376) has labeled this new perspective the *interactional paradigm*. Gumperz (1982) himself also refers to code-switching as "conversational code-switching" which displays his view of identifying code-switching as a resource of communicative competence. A more recent definition comes from Peter Auer, the "father" of the conversational approach to code-switching. Auer (1998: 1-2) takes Gumperz' notion of conversational code-switching further in his definition which refers to code-switching as the "alternating use of two or more 'codes' within one conversational episode"(Auer 1998: 1). His definition highlights the fundamental principle that code-switching should always be looked at from the point of view of its conversational context, which "it both shapes and responds to" (Auer 1998: 2).

Nonetheless, the above definitions are quite general in nature, and leave much to be negotiated in terms of what to include in code-switching and how to label different types of switches. According to the above definitions there is no limit to how small a switched item can be or how it can be positioned e.g. within a sentence structure. Thus, there is a need to categorize switches according to their size and position within or outside the sentence structure of the base language. For example, Auer (1988: 203) accepts single word switches as long as they are followed or preceded by other switched items i.e. are relevant to the communicational structure. Otherwise he sees them as transfer. There will be more discussion on single word switches and

switched inflections in chapter 3.1.1: Code-switching vs. borrowing. However, next we will take look at the positioning of switches within the base language.

According to Boztepe (2003: 4) the most commonly used terms for instances of code-switching that are situated either within or outside sentence structure are: inter-sentential and intra-sentential switching. Inter-sentential switches occur between sentences and intra-sentential switches occur within a sentence structure. In addition to the above categorization Poplack (as cited in Romaine 1995) has identified tag-switching, which refers to the insertion of small phrases in another language into the base language. In Finnish/English switching tags would occur at the beginning or the end of a sentence structure as follows:

I mean, haluaisin ostaa ison auton, en keskikokoista.

'I mean, I would like to buy a big car, not a medium sized one.'

Sellaiset uudet kuusipaikkaiset lava-autot ovat hienoja, *you know.*

'Those new six seat pick-up trucks are nice, you know.'

Halmari (1997) refers to the same type of switches as extra-sentential switches.

As mentioned earlier the term "codes" can refer to languages or different varieties of the same language. In this study codes will refer exclusively to languages and more precisely to Finnish and English since the focus of the study is on Finnish/English code-switching. However, in code-switching terminology there are specialized terms for what is thought to be the base language into which elements are adapted and the other language that "donates" elements into the base language. According to Kovács (2001: 64), the base language is commonly referred to as the matrix language and the donating language is commonly referred to as the embedded language. Also the terms recipient and donor, and host and guest languages are in use. However, in this study the term matrix language and embedded language will be used exclusively. Finally, although according to Kovács (2003: 64-65) the existence of a base language has been both accepted and criticized (mostly because identifying it depends strongly on the point of view of the study), the above terms will be used in this study because they have been as widely accepted as they have been criticized.

Additionally, a distinction has to be made between the terms code-switching and *code-mixing*. Kovács (2001: 62) says in her overview on code-switching research

that the two terms are often used as complementary terms in a way that code-switching is reserved for inter-sentential switching and code-mixing is used for intra-sentential switching. In some studies the term code-mixing has been used in cases where a switched item has been subjected to morphological inflections of the matrix language but has not been phonologically adapted. Additionally, Kovács (2001: 62-63) lists other terms which are in use, such as *language alternation*, *code-alternation*, *code interaction*, *code-blending* and *code-shifting*. For example Gafaranga (2005) uses the term language alternation because, in his view, different authors use the term code-switching in such variable ways that there is no real consensus as to what counts as code-switching. On the other hand, Auer (1988: 187) uses the term language alternation to cover both code-switching and transfer. However, in the present study the term code-switching will be used in the way Auer has defined it: to include embedded language items that either initiate further use of the embedded language or respond to previous use of the embedded language. In this way it is possible to distinguish between code-switching and other language contact phenomena.

3.1.1. Code-switching, interference and borrowing

First of all, the main point of this section is to differentiate between two conceptually very different language contact phenomena of code-switching and interference. The challenge in making this distinction is that though the concepts are very different in nature, they are often very difficult to separate by means of structural analysis. Secondly, although the definition of code-switching and the question of code-switching vs. borrowing will be dealt with more thoroughly in section 3.1.2., it is necessary to examine these three phenomena in relation with each in order to make the discussion pertinent, because that is how they appear in actual data. Thus, somewhat minimal definitions of code-switching and borrowing will be needed here. Finally, a functional distinction between code-switching and interference is very essential in terms of this study because, as mentioned above, the two concepts are quite contradictory in nature. A good deal of research in the past years has been done to establish code-switching as not a random event but as a communicative tool in bilingual talk, whereas interference is seen as a deficit in bilingual skills.

Romaine (1995: 12) presents two contradicting views on code-switching by Weinreich and Mackey, who have both been pioneers in defining code-switching as an attribute of bilingual talk. This illustrates the shift of status that code-switching went trough in the early years of its study. The first one has a negative stance on the phenomenon whereas the latter one has a positive approach to code-switching. Weinreich's notion is that code-switching is a sign of deficit in bilingual competence. Mackey, on the other hand sees code-switching as an indicator of growing bilingual competence, and a showcase of an individual's skills of being able to manipulate two languages in bringing them together without breaking grammatical rules in either one. Later Weinreich had to change his views whereas Mackey's view has gained much support. Romaine (1995: 11-12) concludes that nowadays there can hardly be found any linguist who would consider code-switching a deficit in bilingual competence, not a communicative tool.

Language interference, on the other hand, is considered as an intrusion of features of one language into the use of another, which is seen as negative and a deficit in bilingual competence. Baetens Beardsmore (1986: 45) defines interference as follows:

> "Originally the concept of interference referred to the use of formal elements of one code within the context of another, i.e. any phonological, morphological, lexical or syntactic element in a given language that could be explained by the effect of contact with another language".

Thus, in general language interference means that features of one language are noticeable in the use of another language.

However, Baetens Beardsmore (1986: 45) elaborates this distinction by suggesting that ever since the introduction of the concept of communicative competence it has become evident that the same language user may behave differently depending on the types of participants involved and, thus in some cases what might first seem as interference can also be interpreted as a conscious choice for purposes of familiarity or solidarity etc. Baetens Beardsmore calls this conscious choice of manipulating the language of use "*strategic competence*".

Romaine (1995: 52) on the other hand, brings forth the notion of *transference* which as a term has a similar meaning as interference but a more neutral connotation. Additionally, the theories of transference refer more to process rather than a linguistic phenomenon. Heller (1988: 4) points out that the term transfer has been used in connection with language learning. Romaine (1995: 52) describes transfer as depending on how similar or dissimilar a person's first language is with the second language. According to the level of similarity there can be certain amounts of positive or negative transfer, or both. For example, if two languages have similar use of word order, the knowledge of the first language's word order can positively transfer to the use of the second, new, language. However, if the rules of word order are very dissimilar in two languages the knowledge of the word order in the first language may transfer negatively to the use of the second language leading to errors. If the languages are considerably similar there can be considerable positive transfer in areas of language with similarities and negative transfer in areas with dissimilarities. On the other hand, if the languages are very dissimilar there can be considerable negative transfer. Thus, the balance of positive and negative transfer depends on the languages. It is this negative transfer that the notion of interference is closest to. Romaine (1995: 52) also refers to the term "*crosslinguistic influence*" which again is similar in meaning as the former two terms but has an even more neutral connotation and can function as an umbrella term for many phenomena.

Additionally, Romaine (1995: 51-52) introduces distinctions between code-switching, interference and borrowing by Weinreich, Mackey and Haugen. According to Weinreich interference withholds the notion of rearrangement of patterns, which means that interference in someway breaks the rules of the primary language in use. Mackey focuses on the conceptual difference between interference and borrowing and sees interference as conditional and individual, whereas borrowing is systematic and collective. Haugen, on the other hand, distinguishes code-switching as the alternate use of two languages, interference as the overlapping of two languages and borrowing as elements from one language in another that have become so commonly used that they cannot be referred to as either switching or overlapping.

Poplack (as cited in Heller 1988: 4) agrees with Mackey and makes a distinction based on the consistency of use within a speech community. According to Poplack (ibid.) code-switching and borrowing are used consistently in a similar fashion by speech community members whereas transfer (i.e. interference) is a random event. Baetens Beardsmore (1986: 138), on the other hand, takes into account the triggering mechanisms, for they are different in both phenomena. Interference operates at a more subconscious level, where the speaker is not aware that he/she is producing features that are strange to monoglot norms. Code-switching, however, operates nearer to the surface of consciousness and is seen as somewhat voluntary to the speaker. A speaker uses code-switches when it is meaningful to them. This leads to the conclusion that the term strategic competence which was introduced earlier by Baetens Beardsmore is really linked to code-switching and not interference.

After looking through the accounts above it becomes clear it is quite difficult to distinguish between code-switching and other language contact phenomena. Heller (1988: 11) even says that it is most likely not possible on "purely formal grounds". However, in terms of this study it is essential to make this distinction in order to conduct a pertinent analysis. Thus, a theory is needed that can set apart code-switching and interference in a practical way; in a way, that can be somewhat consistently applied to variable conversational material. Such a theory may be present in Peter Auer's conversational approach to code-switching. In that approach code-switching is defined according to the functional meaning it carries in relation to participants of the conversation. Thus, code-switching is characterized by its function of initiating a change in the language of use (for any possible purpose) within a conversational episode. Accordingly, transfer in the sense of interference is defined by the lack of any conversational function. In other words, there is no apparent reason for the use of an other-language item within a conversation. Auer's definition of code-switching will be looked at later in more detail; however, his definition of transfer is of interest now.

Auer (1988: 200) uses the term transfer to refer to other language items that do not initiate further use of the other language. However, he stresses that he does not use the term in the traditional sense. Auer (1988: 2004) labels two types of transfer: transfer$_L$ for the linguistic interpretation and transfer$_p$ for the participant oriented

interpretation. Transfer$_L$ represents a linguist's view of the discourse event by taking a monolingual standard as a point of reference by which the participants' speech is examined. Transfer$_L$ is what might be also referred to as negative transfer or interference. Auer (ibid.) states that, in conversation, transfer$_L$ refers to instances of another language that do not posses a discourse function. On the other hand, transfer$_p$ refers to instances where the speaker reveals a "reason" for the use of an item in another language. Additionally, this reason has to be apparent to the other participants in the conversation. In the conversational approach, the task of the analyst is then to identify and present this reason in the analysis by means of conversation analysis. It is this transfer$_p$ that Auer defines as language alternation that does not initiate further use of the other language. However, nowadays Auer (1998: 6) refers to transfer$_p$ elements as *insertions* because of confusion that was caused by varying use of the term transfer.

Therefore, one could sum up Auer's definitions in the following way: code-switching is language alternation that leads to further use of the switched language and has a conversational function. Insertions are instances of language alternation that do not lead to further use of the switched language. Interference (or transfer), on the other hand, refers to other language elements that are noticeable in the use of the primary language with no visible conversational function. These characterizations are quite straightforward and present a consistent method of classifying different language contact phenomena in conversational data. However, one has to still keep in mind Auer's (1988: 200) remark that in the end category boundaries always tend to be somewhat unclear, which is something that an analyst just has to accept. Oversimplification of these boundaries will only lead to loss of realism.

In conclusion, one can say that it is possible to perform a consistent analysis on conversational data through close inspection of the conversational structure. Through this type of inspection one can single out instances of code-switching that really perform the function of switching between languages as opposed to insertions that have a conversational function but do not change the language of use. Most importantly, this type of inspection gives tools to single out instances of interference that have no conversational function what so ever. Finally, it seems to the present writer already at this point that the conversational approach has indeed been able to

produce some clarity to code-switching studies. Thus, it strengthens the notion that it will be well suited for analyzing the particular discourse events in this study.

3.1.2. Code-switching vs. borrowing

A problematic area when analyzing code-switching data is distinguishing between code-switches and borrowing. Borrowing is essentially the integration of other-language items into the base language. Thus, it is different from code-switching because it does not represent a switch to the use of another language but rather taking an item from the embedded language and assimilating it into the base language.

According to Boztepe (2003: 5-8) there are two major approaches that try to answer the question whether it is necessary to distinguish between code-switching and borrowing, and how the distinction should be made. A group of researchers follow Poplack's argument that single embedded language items that are inserted into the matrix language should be treated differently than longer stretches of switches. Poplack (as cited in Boztepe 2003: 6) has suggested that an embedded language item has to be syntactically, morphologically and phonologically integrated into the matrix language before it can be called a loanword. However, this type of categorization was later changed because in many cases phonological integration proved difficult to distinguish. Hence, borrowings became identified by their syntactic and morphologic integration with the possibility of phonological integration. Additionally, occasionally borrowed items began to be called *nonce borrowings* or one time borrowings. Loanwords on the other hand are according to Poplack, (as cited in Boztepe 2003: 6) nonce borrowings that have a high frequency of use and have become accepted in a community. Thus, within time a nonce borrowing can gain the status of a loanword within a community.

On the other hand, Boztepe (2003: 7) points out that there are researchers such as Myers-Scotton who believe that there is no need for a categorical distinction between code-switching and borrowing. According to Myers-Scotton (2002: 153-157) code-switching and borrowing are not two distinct processes but rather she sees them as processes in the same continuum together with code-switching, and that linguistic models that apply to code-switching should also apply to borrowing. Myers-Scotton

(ibid.) continues by saying that Poplack accepts as code-switching material only those instances of embedded language that show no assimilation to the matrix language, and in her opinion this view is too narrow. Boztepe (2003: 8) also agrees that there does not seem to be much reason to differentiate between code-switching and borrowing if one is in the business of constructing grammatical constraints.

However, since the focus of the present study is on describing code-switching on a conversational level, it is relevant to follow the guidelines of the conversationalist approach. As mentioned earlier Auer (and others) places the emphasis on the analysis of the conversational structure. If an embedded language item initiates or responds to the use of the embedded language it is considered a code-switch. Thus, there is no need to categorize switched items according to their size, or level of integration to the base language. In fact, Auer (1984: 8, 1998: 13) says that when trying to discover the meaning of code-switching such distinctions are irrelevant; the importance is in function, not in form. Moreover, Auer (1998: 13) argues that the emphasis in analyzing embedded language items should be on what the participants recognize as such. Sometimes an item that seems like a code-switch, or borrowing, from an analyst's monolingual point of view might not be perceived as such by the participants of the conversation. In that case, such items should be treated either as transfer or as integrated items that do not perform the function of a code-switch.

Nevertheless, in the scope of this study the present writer feels it is relevant (and interesting) to incorporate a little structural analysis by keeping track of embedded language items that do not initiate code-switching, but are otherwise clearly of foreign language origin. This will be done according to the guidelines of Halmari (1997) and Kovacs (2001) who use phonological integration as the main criterion to distinguish incidental borrowings from code-switches. Both Halmari and Kovács who have worked on Finnish/English code-switching have shown that in a language pair such as Finnish/English, where the phonology of the two languages is considerably different, the distinction by phonological criteria is an appropriate choice. Moreover, the work by Jarva and Nurmi (2006) will be used as a reference guide in separating incidental borrowings from new established loanwords. In this way one can get a more comprehensive view of the language use in these particular speech situations at hand. And even further, embedded language items that are not

viewed as such by the participants can indicate the emergence of new loanwords or even a new mixed code. In fact, Auer (1998: 17-20) too recognizes the role of borrowings when one is describing the emergence of a mixed code.

3.2. Structural approach to code-switching

Although the focus of this study is not on testing or formulating rules that govern code-switching it is still important to take a look into the field of structural linguistic analysis on code-switching first and foremost because structural analysis has shown that code-switching is not a random event in a speech act as it was believed early on. Contrarily, as Romaine (1995: 125) states, modern research on code-switching has shown that it is highly predictable where a switch can and cannot occur. Auer (1998) states, and Boztepe (2003: 10) concurs, that it has become clear that code-switching requires more bilingual competence from language users than speech events without code-switching. Thus, attitudes towards code-switching in bilingual speech have changed dramatically from the early days of code-switching studies.

Boztepe (2003: 10) lists researchers such as Poplack, DiSciullo, Muysken, Singh, and Myers-Scotton as contributing major influential works in the structural analysis of code-switching. All of these researchers introduced constraints and models that shed valuable insight on, especially, intra-sentential code-switching. One can also mention the name of Helena Halmari (1997) who has quite successfully applied constraints on Finnish/English code-switching. Most constraints/models have had the ultimate goal of being universally applicable, none of which have been able to attain that goal. However, most constraints have had to been successfully modified to suit the needs of specific language pairs. Auer (1998: 3) concludes that intra-sentential code-switching has been proven to be constrained by "syntactic and morphosyntactic considerations which may or may not be of a universal kind". Boztepe (2003: 10) follows on the same lines by saying that even though no universally accepted principles for code-switching have been found, structural work on code-switching has brought much information about individual language pairs and the code-switching event in general.

3.3. Sociolinguistic approach to code-switching

The sociolinguistic approach to code-switching aims at finding reasons for the alternating use of languages. Why do speakers choose to switch between languages (or dialects) within a speech event or even within an utterance? According to Boztepe (2005: 11) the beginning of the sociolinguistic approach to code-switching has often been linked with the work by Blom and Gumperz (1972). In their work Blom and Gumperz introduce the concepts of *situational* and *metaphorical* code-switching which were designed to explain and describe the reasons why speakers engage in code-switching. Gafaranga (2005: 184) describes metaphorical code-switching as "giving a socially predetermined 'flavor'" to an utterance. This means that a speaker can resort to code-switching when they want to coordinate their speech act with an identity associated with a particular language. However, as Romaine (1995) mentions, Gumperz later moved on from the dichotomous concept of situational and metaphorical switching in order to stress the multiple functions of code-switching.

Other concepts introduced into code-switching theory by Blom and Gumperz (1972) were the three social attributes which affect language choice: 1) setting, 2) social situation and 3) social event. According to Boztepe (2003) Blom and Gumperz' setting refers to the physical setting in which the interlocutors interact. Social situation then refers to an arrangement of interlocutors within this setting interacting during a specified length of time. The concept of social event defines a specific stretch of time during which a particular interpretation of a social situation is valid.

Later, Gumperz (1982) also introduced the concept of the '*we*' and '*they*' codes. Kovács (2001: 65) describes these codes as follows: "the 'we-code' is the language mainly used in in-group conversations and 'they-code' the one used in out-group conversations". This means that if the speaker wishes to identify with the minority language group he/she will use the 'we' code, on the other hand, if the speaker wishes to identify with the majority language group he/she will choose the 'they' code. Moreover, Romaine (1995: 165) describes the 'we' code as informal and personal whereas the 'they' code is more formal.

Gumperz (as quoted in Boztepe 2005: 11-12) also introduced the idea that code-switches function as *contextualization cues* that carry reference to larger social meanings. This approach has also been adopted by Auer (1998: 4, 2005: 405) who argues that code-switches may or may not carry indexical meanings that reflect a "wider social and cultural context". However, Auer (ibid.) stresses that these correlations have to be visible in the conversational structure, and that language is also a force in actually molding the social context. Myers-Scotton (as quoted in Boztepe 2005: 14) has introduced a similar type of Markedness Model according to which language choice indexes the rights and obligations between the participants in a conversation. Li Wei (1998: 157) describes the Markedness Model as possibly the most influential sociolinguistic model on code-switching since the introduction of Gumperz's paradigm. Mayers-Scotton argues that a speaker chooses the "form" of their utterance, using the linguistic repertoires available to him/her, in a way that enforces the rights and obligations which s/he wants to during that particular conversation. However, Boztepe (2005: 14) concludes that the Markedness Model has been much criticized, especially by researchers associated with the conversational approach, for describing speakers' linguistic behavior as merely rules that already exist within the society, as opposed to the speakers being part of shaping that society. On the other hand, according to Auer (1998: 8-9) Myers-Scotton does not agree with the framework of the conversational approach.

Joseph Gafaranga (2005: 282-283, see also Li Wei 1998, 2005, Auer 1984) claims that the overall problem with much of the sociolinguistic research on code-switching is that it has heavily relied on the language-reflects-society principle. A line-up of linguists has recently questioned that principle as too straightforward. Gafaranga (2005: 287-291) argues that language does not merely reflect society; it is rather a part of society and active in shaping it. Moreover, Gafaranga (ibid.) even questions the prevailing notions of language and society in sociolinguistics as being outdated. According to Gafaranga (2005: 289) and Auer (1998: 16-21) recent studies have shown that "languages" can be more than just the entities that have been labeled as such (e.g. Finnish, English, German etc.). In some cases the medium of communication i.e. matrix language is actually a mixture of two languages and code-switching would actually occur from bilingual talk to monolingual talk. Auer (1998:

16-21, 2005: 106-109) refers to this type of phenomenon as the emergence of *mixed codes* or as '*hybrid*' *language use*.

3.4. Conversational approach to code-switching

As mentioned above, there is now a rising interest in code-switching studies to open up the relationship between language and society for discussion. Many linguists feel that sociolinguistic studies in the past have drawn too straightforward conclusions about how larger structures of society are reflected in isolated instances of code-switching. The conversational approach to code-switching claims that instances of code-switching should, first and foremost, be interpreted through what can actually be found in the conversation itself, and not through what the switch possibly reflects. After interpreting instances of code-switching within a conversation by analyzing it from the inside, one can turn to see if it is actually possible to link some instances of code-switching to a larger social context. Nevertheless, the fundamental principle is that all the conclusions that an analyst comes to must be shown to be relevant for that particular event.

The conversational approach to code-switching was first introduced by Peter Auer (1984) and has since gained much support from various researchers. Auer's (1998: 4) initial claim is that in terms of code-switching conversational structure is "sufficiently autonomous" from linguistic structure and social structure for it to be studied in its own right. Thus, the primary objective of the analyst is to examine the conversational structure of a speech event in order to find out what function other-language elements serve. According to Auer (ibid.) the conversational context that is constructed in the course of every conversation and the participants' ultimate goal is to achieve coherence within the conversational event. Auer (1984: 5) calls this "the sequential implicativeness of language choice in conversation", which means that language alternation i.e. code-switching always has an effect on what the speaker or other speakers contribute as the conversation continues. However, Auer (1998: 4) later continues in saying that after the sequential analysis the next step is to follow up on the possible implications that instances of code-switching would function as references to a wider social context.

Moreover, when it comes to analyzing the meaning of code-switching, Auer (1984: 17-19) argues, as mentioned above, that code-switches function as contextualizing cues that link the conversational event to resources from a wider social context. Auer (ibid.) says that contextualizing strategies consist of four basic types: verbal, prosodic, gestural and kinesic cues (see also Auer 1992). Their main function is to let other participants of a conversation in on what is going on in the conversational context. Thus code-switching functions as a verbal contextualizing cue which can be used to establish many things, for example a change in footing or participant constellation. More on functions of code-switching will be presented in the next chapter.

Gafaranga (2005: 291) goes on to stress that conversational structure is a worthy area of research, in itself. As opposed to Auer (1998: 4) who sees conversational analysis as sufficiently autonomous to function as a starting point, or first level of analysis, Gafaranga (2005: 291) argues that in terms of the quest to understand language alternation one does not necessarily have to go any further than to establish sequential coherence within a speech event and in that way find the situated meaning and purpose for a switch. On the other hand, if one wishes to go beyond what sequential analysis can offer, Gafaranga (2005: 297) emphasizes that one has to do it in a way that does not generalize these correlations to apply to any other instances of code-switching than the one at hand. Or vice versa, if one wants to give an overall presentation of code-switching within multiple situations, as is the case in this study, one can "relate language alternation to the observable language-defined social structure"(Gafaranga 2005: 297). This means that social structures that are clearly implied in the conversation can be considered in the analysis. However, in this case one has to refrain from associating instances of code-switching to social structures that are not implied in the conversation.

In fact, Gafaranga (2005: 291) calls generalized "assumptions" of the relationship of language and society myths, because there are no sufficient theories of what counts as language, how society is structured and how these two interact. As mentioned earlier, Gafaranga stresses that language is actually a significant factor in structuring society. Additionally, Gafaranga (2005: 291) states that "linguistic phenomena are too flexible and changing to allow any straightforward correlation".

Li Wei (2005b: 382) introduces three benefits that she sees in applying the methods of conversation analysis to studying code-switching. Firstly, she sates that only by looking at what the participants themselves intend to convey and, on the other hand, understand by the switched element is it possible to draw any conclusions of what purpose code-switching carries in a particular situation. According to Li Wei (2005b: 382) the methods of conversation analysis give researchers the appropriate tools to show that their analysis of a particular conversational event is relevant from the point of view of the participants. Secondly, Li Wei (2005b: 382) says that the framework of conversation analysis keeps researchers from "importing intuitions" into their analysis because in the CA framework all such suppositions must be "demonstratively" shown to have been constructed within the conversation. This type of procedure leads to the third point which, in Li Wei's (2005b: 182) words, is "the balance of social and conversational structures". This means that since analysts are obliged to point out all their claims from the conversation at hand; they cannot refer to social structures that might or might not be relevant concerning the task at hand.

What all this means in terms of this study is that one has to primarily look at the data in terms of how it explains itself. In other words, all instances of code-switching have to be interpreted according to clues that the participants give as to what the intention of the speaker is and how the receiver understands/interprets these intentions. If some instances of code-switching remain unclear after this type of sequential analysis then one can turn to look for possible answers from a wider social context, however, keeping in mind that these social correlations must be somehow implied in the conversation and they cannot be applied to any other situation than precisely the one at hand.

3.4.1. Discourse and participant related code-switching

Auer (1984: 12) divides code-switching into two categories according to whether they function as organizing the conversational structure of the discourse event, or whether they signal language competence or preference of the speaker. The first type is referred to as *discourse related code-switching* and the second type as *participant*

related code-switching. Discourse related code-switching is, in fact, what was earlier referred to as a contextualizing strategy that speakers use to signal a change in the conversational context. In his data of German/Italian code-switching Auer (1988: 199) has found that commonly these types of switches signal change in participant constellation, change in mode of interaction, change in topic, sequential contrast or change between informative and evaluative talk. Participant related code-switching, on the other hand, often operates in the form of negotiating the language of use. This can happen at the beginning or in the midst of a conversation, according to participant competence or preference towards the languages in use.

Auer (1988: 192-193) uses the same type of division also for insertions which, as mentioned before, are other-language items that do not initiate or respond to further use of the other language. *Discourse related insertions* are then items that are used by participants to structure the conversation in a meaningful way, but that do not lead to further use of the other language. *Participant related insertions* are then other-language items that reflect the speaker's competence or preference for the other language. A good example of participant related insertion would be the case where the speaker uses other-language terminology to refer to a specific entity in a specific domain.

3.4.2. Mixed codes

Auer (1998: 16-21) sketches a continuum from frequent code-switching to the emergence of a mixed code. By a mixed code Auer refers to situation where the alternating use of two languages has become the norm in a speech event and deviating from that would actually constitute a code-switch. In other words the participants consider the mixed code as their primary language of use.

The first step in this continuum is that the line between insertions and code-switches becomes unclear. A speaker may initiate a language negotiation sequence in order to change the language of use (participant related code-switching) and then not follow up on it. In other words return back to using the initial language. Similarly, a speaker may initiate a change in topic by code-switching (discourse related code-switching) and then proceed with the new topic but return to the initial language of use. In these

cases one cannot talk of code-switching because the language of use does not change, nor can one talk of insertions because the switched items do not constitute a structural unit.

The second step is the frequent use of borrowings. Additionally, these borrowings may function as initiating further use of other-language items. According to Auer this can lead to the exclusive use of borrowed other-language items even in places where they could effortlessly be substituted for the initial language counterparts. This phenomenon is quite clearly visible in the data of the present study, where common items are referred to using their (borrowed) English names instead of their Finnish ones. Auer also points out that another similar implication of the emergence of a mixed code is the frequent use of other-language *discourse markers*. These instances where previously (see chapter 3.1.) referred to as tag switches (Poplack) or extrasentential switches (Halmari). However, Auer (1998: 19) says these other-language discourse markers are difficult to analyze in terms of language alternation because their supposed function as incorporating other-language elements into the base language is not clear cut.

Moreover, the frequent use of language alternations, borrowings and discourse markers leads to the fact that their function as contextualization cues begins to diminish as they are no longer so explicitly salient within the conversational context. Thus this leads to the fact that switched items that might be perceived as such by an analyst no longer carry that function for the participants. This leads to the final step in classifying the emergence of a mixed code.

The final step that classifies the emergence of a mixed code is that embedded language elements take on meanings or functions that are not present in their monolingual environment. In other words they begin to live a life of their own in the new linguistic context and are no longer interpreted through their function as incorporating another language to the conversational sequence but as equal constituents in the surrounding linguistic structure. This process is called grammaticalisation.

The above steps were included in this paper in order to see weather one could speak of a mixed code in terms of the data in this study. The steps will not be analysed very profoundly but rather discussed in chapter 7 to describe the nature of the data. This means that all the extracts taken from the data will be looked at to see weather one could see the possible emergence of a mixed code.

4. Game studies

The purpose of this chapter is to give a concise description of how the interaction between an electronic game and a player is viewed in modern game studies. The nature of this interaction gives a basis for discussing the role of the computer game in the present conversational data. Questions such as does the game-world function as a topic in the conversation or is it perhaps part of the setting of the conversation or, even further, can it function as a participant in the conversation, can be answered more thoroughly with some knowledge of player↔game interaction. Additionally, an analysis of the characteristics of the game that the participants are playing will be given in order to illustrate what type of a game-world is in question in the present study.

Jan van Dijk (2004: 145-161) defines interactivity as a sequence of action and reaction. However, he acknowledges that the concept of interactivity has become very complicated in modern new media studies. Despite this complexity he offers quite a straight forward model that distinguishes four levels of interactivity. The first level of interactivity requires the establishment of a space that holds potential for action and reaction. This would be the entire gaming system consisting of the game console (or computer), the game screen (monitor), the controls for operating the game (game-pads) and the programmed game which incorporates all these assets. Thus, what you get is an environment that allows you to interact with a computer program.

The second level defines the degree of synchronicity, i.e. how uninterrupted the sequence of action and reaction is. This level can vary in different stages of the game depending on what type of sequence is in progress. If the game is, for example, in a story telling phase there might be interruptions in player's ability to react to the actions on the screen. However, for example in battle scenes the sensorimotor reactions to screen events are immediate. The third level of interactivity measures the extent of control that the interacting parties have in the interaction. Usually when players interact with computer games, the ultimate control over the final outcome of the interaction is with the computer program (i.e. the programmer). However, the

players do have a reasonable amount of control within the preordained structure of the game. Van Dijk (2004: 148) reserves the fourth level of interactivity for interaction between humans because in his words it requires "understanding of meanings and contexts by all interactors involved", and is not yet possible even with the most developed of artificial intelligences.

According to King and Krzywinska (2003: 109) an important feature in an interactive gaming experience is the potential to explore and gain a sense of presence within "the virtual world of the gamescape". They present a continuum of freedom that describes the amount of possible voluntary exploration within the gamescape and in controlling the progression of the game. In one end of the freedom continuum are games that allow no individual freedom to explore and in the other end there are games that encourage and inspire vast individual exploration. Moreover, King and Krzywinska (2003: 108) argue that the degree of freedom that a game has constitutes a strong link to the sense of presence in the game-world.

Moreover, an interesting concept that is used in game studies to describe this 'sense of presence' in the game-world is *immersivity*. It is used refer to a state where the player is immersed in the game-world so that they strongly identify with the characters of the game and react vividly to events in the game. According to Kuivakari (1999: 52) the term refers to the structures of the game that create an immersive "holding power" and virtual presence that keeps the player attached to the game experience. Minna Tarkka (1996: 195) defines immersivity as not only describing a virtual reality that surrounds a user, but the ability of an interactive program to entangle the user into its world. Tarkka (1996: 195-196) lists four elements that constitute immersivity in new media texts: illusory, functional, dramaturgic and interactional elements.

From a sociologist's point of view Henry Jenkins (2002: 153-186) describes immersive electronic games as being special spaces for children that they can own. He sees game spaces as strong references to the woods and safe back alleys that the children of the modern generation no longer have. They represent imaginary places that are much more vivid and rich than the normal living environment. Since modern children are largely captives of their own home or their own room the promise of

new fascinating micro worlds inspires them. Jenkins argues that it is very important for children to be able to claim a place for themselves, a place where adult rules do not apply.

And finally from an educational point of view, James Gee (2003: 7) argues that well designed electronic games, even the violent ones, incorporate learning principles that are very similar to the ones that are supported by recent learning theories in cognitive science. In fact, Gee (2003: 7-9) says that the learning experience that is inbuilt in modern electronic games is a much more effective one than the learning experiences that children are offered in schools. Thus, he sees that electronic games should be taken seriously as learning environments, particularly when they are getting more and more sophisticated as we speak.

In conclusion one can say that the game provides an environment for the players to interact with the computer (or console), however, the game cannot function as an 'equal' participant in the conversation. Rather, the participants communicate verbally with each other while the game and its contents constitute a resource for that conversation. Whether that resource provides or functions as a topic for the conversation, or something more, has to be explicated in the sequential analysis.

4.1. Description of the game

The game that the participants of this study play is Final Fantasy X. Here I will sketch a depiction of the game according to how game researchers have categorized games by their interactional and visual properties. This can be thought of as an analysis of the gamescape using the terms that were provided above.

Final Fantasy X is an action-adventure-fantasy game that belongs to a long sequel of the Final Fantasy game series. It features a third person point of view into an isometric (two dimensional graphics that create a three dimensional perspective) gamescape. However, the key features of the game are its detailed graphics, interesting characters, compelling storyline and brilliant use of dialogue.

According van Dijk's categorisation (presented above), the game has level three type interactivity: a) It establishes a space which holds potential for interaction, b) the interaction has a very high level of synchronicity (controlling the characters with the controller) and c) there is a reasonable level of control in the part of the player. The player has very good control in terms of time dimensionally controlling the events of the interactional situation. In terms of content, however, player control is quite limited. The player can advance in a multitude of ways but he/she will always end up following a preordained structure. Thus, the freedom to explore in Final Fantasy IX can be divided into two categories: freedom in movement (roaming) and freedom in actions. The freedom in roaming about in the game world is quite limited because even though it is not a straight forward game of progression, the ultimate goal in Final Fantasy X is to progress according to the predetermined storyline. This means that the spaces that are offered to the player to explore are limited in order to keep the story progressing.

Freedom in actions, on the other hand, is vast in Final Fantasy X. Within the framework of progressing in the game according to the predetermined story line, the player can make countless personal choices in how to equip the characters, what skills to develop and use, what items to collect and use, how to proceed in battle sequences etc. In my opinion this is one of the most enticing features of the game. The chance to personalize the way you progress in different situations is really a key feature in this game.

What is really interesting in terms of this study, is that since the game is strongly based on a storyline that is developed through storytelling sequences and an elaborate dialogue between the characters, the players not only interact physically (by using the controls) with the game but they also constantly verbally participate in or comment on the dialogue. Moreover, the game offers a wide variety of imaginatively named weapons and items of use, not to mention the vast variety of menus, maps and instructions that together constitute a large English vocabulary that the players have to deal with.

5. The present study

The present study focuses on analyzing English elements that can be found in the spoken discourse of two Finnish teenage boys playing an English action adventure videogame. More precisely, the goal of this thesis is to describe how the participants draw elements from the English content of the video game and incorporate them into their Finnish conversation. The hypothesis is that many language contact phenomena such as language alternation, language integration and borrowing are involved, however the main focus will be on how the participants actively use their knowledge of the two languages to convey their intended meanings. In other words, how they display their bilingual skills and can they be seen as functionally bilingual.

5.1. Description of the data

The data consists of two 62 minute simultaneously taped video recordings of the participants conversing with each other while playing a videogame. One camera has recorded the participants' interaction while the other one has captured events on the game screen as they speak. The material has been transcribed according to the conventions of conversation analysis into 26 pages of dialogue to enable closer analysis. Although the participants ultimately direct their speech messages to each other, their utterances are also almost constantly intertwined with the actions, dialogue and textual elements of the game. Thus, the transcript of the conversation includes not only the participants' utterances but also the narration and dialogue of the game. Additionally, there are comments on textual elements on the game screen if they are similar to what the speaker is saying. The data is part of a larger corpus of video data collected for a research project in the Department of Languages at the University of Jyväskylä.

5.2. Participants

The participants in the conversation are two 15 year old boys who are friends and play a lot of video games as well as watch TV and movies. In other words they are regularly in contact with English through the media. Both boys are skilled players of video games in general and, in particular, of the game which they play in the present

data. For the boys playing video games is a social activity, in which they are often in contact with multiple players, either directly in the same space or through an internet connection. In this particular game play situation there are only two players and the participants interact only with each other, there are no other human players connected to the game. In this game there is only one active player, while the other participant gives instructions to the player and comments on his actions and performance in the game. This is a good illustration of how gameplay functions as a co-operative social event rather than a solitary affair. The conversational activity between the participants is naturally integrated into the act of playing forming an essential part of the gaming experience. Thus, the research setting is a naturalistic discourse situation and not something merely constructed for the sake of research.

Both participants have studied English in school for six years, however the one who actually controls the game, the actual player (referred to as P), has lived in the United States for a one year period at the age of six. This has had some positive impact on his spoken skills of English. The second participant (referred to as F for "friend") lacks this experience and is not as fluent in spoken English as P. P's school grades in English are also a bit higher (9-10) than the F's (7-8), thus overall he seems to be a bit more competent in English than F. Additionally, the boys have a somewhat different socio-economic status where P's family belongs to the upper middleclass in Finland and the F's family belongs to the working class. Although divisions in social class in Finland are not very dramatic, a higher economic status has enabled participant P to occasionally travel abroad to English speaking countries and enhance his English skills, whereas at time of the recordings participant F had never traveled to an English speaking country.

5.3. Research questions

The main research questions in this study are as follows:

1. What kind of English elements can there be found in the data?
2. What linguistic elements constitute the English elements found in the data?
3. What local meanings can one find to exist behind the use of the English elements, particularly code-switching?
4. Is there evidence in the data to suggest the emergence of a mixed code?

5.4. Methods of analysis

As mentioned earlier the method of analysis in this study is twofold. First it is based on Auer's (1984, 1988) interpretation of applying the methods of conversation analysis to the study of code-switching. This method is used to identify and categorize the different types of English elements in the data. Secondly, there is the linguistic analysis which is used to characterize what linguistic elements are present in the English elements. Finally, there is the sequential analysis, which is also based on Auer's (1984, 1988) research, which is aimed at looking for local meanings for the use of the English elements and especially code-switches.

The analysis will focus on how the participants give meaning to and interpret the instances of code-switching, borrowing and transfer in their speech. The overall argument in chapter 3 was that bilingual speakers use code-switching as a tool in acting out their communicational strategies i.e. they create local meanings for the code-switched items. Thus, it is reasonable to claim that each instance of code-switching has a purpose (conscious or not) which the speaker makes identifiable for the recipient, and thus, to the analyst. Moreover, in chapter 3 we saw how Peter Auer argued that this type of close analysis can, and should, be conducted according to a pre-structured framework, in this case according to the framework of conversation analysis. Conversation analysis (CA) is based on the close inspection of the sequential structure of a speech event. This means that what is said is always in relation to what has been said before and what will be said next. Thus, it is possible to find meanings to code-switched items by looking at their sequential position: what has been said before that might have initiated the switch or what is said next that might have been initiated by the switch.

A key factor in the present analysis was in establishing a connection with participants' conversation and the video game. In other words, the goal was to establish a link between the English language in the video game and the English language elements that the participants use in their conversation. This was done by following the events on the game screen simultaneously as the participants' dialogue

progressed. This method proved useful in not only establishing a connection with the player and the game, but overall in identifying the contexts for the code-switches.

5.4.1. The preliminary analysis

In the preliminary analysis the transcript was scanned for English items which where marked for further analysis. Next, all items that represented borrowing were identified according to the guidelines of Poplack, Halmari and Kovacs presented in chapter 3. This means that all English language items that showed both morphological and phonological integration to Finnish were categorized as borrowings and not as instances of language alternation. However, it should be mentioned that this distinction is somewhat categorical and, according to Auer (1998: 13) not relevant in terms of finding meanings for code-switching. The purpose for making this categorisation in the present study was to get a more comprehensive picture of what types of phenomena are visible in the present data. One must also keep in mind that many researchers (Poplack, Lauttamus etc.) see borrowing and code-switching as similar processes and one cannot completely discard one when investigating the other. However, all items that could be identified as established loanwords were dismissed from further analysis as items that have been fully assimilated into the matrix language and thus, represent no functional use of bilingual skills.

Examples of how the distinction described above was carried out in the present analysis can be seen in the two extracts below. As mentioned earlier the players are referred to with the capital letters P and F in all the extracts. The game characters are generally marked with small letters by the first letter in their name. The list of character names can be seen in appendix 1. In extract 1 the player P responds to a statement made by a character (Tromell Guado) in the game. P starts of with an English insertion "friends", but then continues his utterance in Finnish. The two following English items "frendejä" and "lordeja" are clearly borrowings since they show both morphological and phonological integration into Finnish. In these items morphological integration becomes apparent through added inflections, which is often the case in the present data. Additionally, in this example one must also consider if the term "frendejä" is an established loanword because it is used by

Finnish adolescents quite frequently. In cases like this the dictionary "Oikeeta suomee" by Jarva and Nurmi (2006) was used to identify words that have recently become frequently used in Finland. The above dictionary is a collection of new foreign words that have become so frequently used in Finnish language talk that Jarva & Nurmi (2006) consider them to be fully integrated into the language. If the word is in this collection it can be said be frequent enough to be no longer seen as an English item as such. Therefore, for example the word "frendejä" was dismissed from further analysis as it was considered an established loanword.

Extract 1.

602. t   [of course your friends are al]so welcome

603. P   fri**e::nds** (0.2) ^ei ne mitään <u>fren</u>dejä oo kun ne on (lordeja)^ [(0.4)]
                  [(ja ohan ne sit-)]

604. F   [^mm^]

Extract 2 shows another example of how a Finnish inflectional ending is added to the English word (brotherhood), but here the phonological integration of the items is even more evident. In line 614 the word 'brotherhood' is pronounced as if mimicking the English pronunciation in a very Finnish style. In line 618 the same word is pronounced as if it was a Finnish word, with some extra emphasis on the r-sounds.

Extract 2.

614. F   ^hmhm^ (0.5) >mutta **mum**↑mielestä siihen <u>bra</u>terhuudii<
                  (brotherhood) pystyy <u>täs</u>sä

615. F   jo <u>pis</u>tää kaikkee

616. P   mummielestä ei=

617. F   =mummielestä pystyy

618. P   <^mää oon kyllä aika varma et ei pysty^> (0.6) brotherhoodiin
                  (pronounced by stressing the r's)

619. P   >no jos< <u>pys</u>tyy ^mut^ ei siinä oo mitään järkee koska-

Additionally, the use of the names of the characters of the game was not included in the present analysis, because just as established loanwords their use presented no

apparent use of bilingual skills as the names where not in any way "English". However, names of places and names of weapons were included in the analysis because they were almost always comprised of English words with meaning. For example the place name "Ancient Baknah City" has a semantic meaning that gives the players information about the place in question. Similarly the names of numerous weapons in the game give information about that particular weapon. For example the name "Bomb Core" refers to a grenade type of weapon and the name itself gives a hint of what kind of action the weapon can be used for. This type of distinction might seem arbitrary, but I believe that these proper noun items mentioned above are an essential part of interacting with the game as they carry meanings that contribute to the overall semantics of the game.

Finally, all instances that demonstrated language alteration, as defined by Auer (1998), were identified and divided into two categories: insertions and codes-switches. Instances of English that were not morphologically and phonologically integrated and did not lead to further use of English or respond to previous use of English were categorised as insertions. Instances where an English item, whether it be long or short, initiated further use of English or responded to previous use of English were categorised as code-switches. An example of a code-switch can be seen in extract 3, where the players are mimicking the utterance made by a game character (driver). At first, the friend (participant F) anticipates the coming utterance by the driver by trying to copy the exact pronunciation of the expression. This change in tone indicates clearly that the speaker is attempting to talk in the voice of the game character. The speech act also initiates a short sequence where both players speak English as they are trying to imitate the original utterance made by the driver character. This sequence ends in line 36 where the last English item "aboards" is pronounced as if it was Finnish in order to smooth the transition back to Finnish, which happens after a short pause.

Extract 3.

30.   F   ↓van der [shu-schuuba-]
31.   d   [ride ze shoopuf?]
32.   F   (hh) $ri[de$]
33.   P   [ri]↑de ze shoopuf?=

34. F   =(hhh)=

35. d   =all aboards=

36. F   =(hh) aboards *(pronounced in Finnish)* (0.5) tuo on hyvä puhumaan
             tuo äijä

In extract 4 there are nice examples of the type of language play that the participants were engaged in throughout this discourse.

Extract 4.

44. F   =hmhh (0.5) ihan ku joku submarine *(pronounced in Finnish)*
             >kaptan<

45. P   *(rykäisee)* submarine kaptain *(both words pronounced in Finnish)*

46. K   ^la kaptön^. (1) tuo on aika pitkä tuo Moonflow. *(word on screen)* (2)
             tai sillei

47. P   ainzent *(ancient)* **Bak**nah siti *(city)*

48. F   *(muminaa)*

First participant F suggests that a character in the game resembles a submarine captain. The phonology in the item "submarine kaptan" is distinctively Finnish, but since there are no Finnish inflections added, this item falls into the category of insertions. Participant P repeats the same item with an even more Finnish pronunciation, which again is categorised as an insertion. This is followed by participant F's playful interpretation of "captain" in a "French" type of pronunciation. Naturally, the item "la kaptön" is not categorised in the analysis as an English insertion, but it does provide a good illustration of how the participants play around with words.

After this French item, there are two English items, of which the first one ("Moonflow") is read directly from the game screen and refers to route or pathway through which the characters of the games travel to different destinations in the game. The second one ("aincient Baknah siti") refers to the particular destination to which the characters are travelling at the moment. Both items are essentially placenames, but are distinctively English and carry semantic meaning. All the English items in this extract represent insertions because they are clearly English,

they are not morphologically integrated into Finnish and they are isolated items that do not actually change the language of converse as a code-switch would.

5.4.2. Analysis of the local function of language alternation

In the main stage of the analysis the items that had been previously identified as either insertions or code-switches were sequentially analyzed in order to arrive at a locally constructed meaning. Close inspection was conducted in order to find out how the speaker had conveyed his intended meaning for a particular item and/or how the recipient had expressed how they interpreted that particular item. Paul ten Have (1999) gives a good description of how to conduct a conversation analysis using the knowledge that has been acquired in CA studies so far (for applications of CA to various areas of research see Richards and Seedhouse 2005; for applying CA to SLA studies see Markee 2000). In that description ten Have (1999: 102-103) points out that the ideal starting point in CA is to look at naturally occurring conversational material with open eyes without a preset agenda.

However, since the focus of the present study is so strongly directed on a particular phenomenon, i.e. code-switching, it was impossible and also impractical to go through the material without directing ones attention to the instances of code-switching. Thus, the analysis followed the lead of Auer, who used conversation analytic methods in a modified way. When Auer (1988: 187), who initiated the conversational approach to code-switching study, describes his process of analysis he clearly says that he subjects the instances of code-switching he has previously identified to a close conversation analytic inspection. This means that he uses analytic methods that are from conversation analysis even though the structure of the analysis is necessarily not. In fact, Auer (1988: 187) calls his approach a 'linguistically enriched' version of conversation analysis.

In the present analysis there were two main principles according to which the meanings were sought. First, there was the sequential analysis which shows how the participants linguistically highlight their change of code and how the change of code might have reflected previous or following speech. However, it has to be said that this was not an easy task since the local meaning of many of the English elements in

the present conversational data were so well established in the players' "game talk" that they were not negotiated in any explicit way. Leppänen and Nikula (forthcoming) refer to such game talk as mixed 'activity' language in which the embedded language elements are featured in an unmarked way. Thus, in this study, if the sequential analysis did not reveal a purpose for the switch it was followed by a video analysis in which the focus was on what on-screen elements might influence the code-switch. In fact, on screen events were often in a key position to help understand why a participant switched to English when they did not highlight their use of English in any way.

A good example of a sequential analysis can be seen by looking at extract 5. In the extract there is first character speech which is then overlapped by speech by participant F, who is commenting, in English, on what the character is saying. In this situation participant F's choice of English is clearly signalling that he is commenting on the content of the chanracter's utterance, also by switching to English he directs his speech to a particular character (Wakka) who is apparently ignorant of the fact that his new friend belongs to a tribe that he is an enemy of. By switching back to Finnish, participant F signals that the what he says next is aimed more directly at participant P, who takes the bate and comments on F's utterance.

Extract 5.

375.	t	it was strange (0.5) even though Wakka had always hated the Al Bhed
376.	F	she's an Al [Bhed (.) ↑hehe. (.) ↑hehe.] (hhhh)=
377.	r	[Rikku at your service]
378.	t	=he never realised Rikku was one of them
379.	F	she's an Al Bhed. (.) hehe (.) hehe (hhh) (0.4) eikä <u>tajunnu</u> (.) Wakka on vähän
380.	F	hida:sälynen
381.	P	^hh° nii onki^=

However, sequential analysis did not prove fruitful in all occasions. As seen in extract 6, English elements were often read directly from the game screen. In these occasions the interpretation was that the English words were used to refer to the particular item or entity that was present on screen. Additionally, it is evident that

using the English word on screen is much more efficient than attempting to translate it into Finnish. In a way this would be the same thing as the concept of "most available word", which is suggested in code-switching literature (e.g. Grosjean 1982: 152) to be a common reason for switching. This means that a speaker uses a word in whatever language it is most available to them at a particular moment, in this case the English words on screen are very available. Moreover, there was a strong tendency for the participants to use English words from the game screen and modify them slightly in their speech. These instances were naturally categorised as borrowings.

Extract 6.

622. F   vai mikä:? se o

623. P   **mutta** [mummie]lestä ei pysty (.) >mulle on ihan sama katotaan< (11) no nih?

624. r   [what wou-]

625. F   bu bukker *(pronunced in Finnish, read from the screen)*

626. P   staff *(pronunced in Finnish, read from the screen)*

627. F   Bracer *(read from the screen)* (1.5) siinois <kolome paikkaa>

628. P   official ball (1) evade *(pronunced in Finnish)* ja kaunter *(counter)* *(reads all words from screen)*

629. P   (.) ^eipä oo pikkusen hyvä^

All in all, one can say that the main stage of the analysis consisted of using sequential analysis and game screen analysis together. Regularly the English elements where both sequentially related to their immediate linguistic context and to elements on the game screen.

6. Results

The results of the analysis were manifold. Primarily the goal was to describe the players' use of English while they were playing the English video game. This was achieved through a linguistic analysis of the English constituents that were used, and through conversation analytic methods of defining what language contact phenomena were present and how they were used as resources in participating in the game play event. The results of the linguistic analysis showed that the players used quite a wide variety of different English constituents in their speech. The conversation analysis showed that actual code-switches, as defined in this study, were not as frequent as insertions and borrowings. However, counted together these three phenomena showed quite a high frequency of English use in the data. Moreover, the purposes for using the English elements were examined through a close sequential analysis, which showed that most commonly borrowings and insertions were used as references to particular instances in the game, whereas code-switches were more often instances of taking part in the dialogue of the game.

According to the analysis there where overall 213 English elements in the present conversational data. As shown in table 3, 32% of those where categorized as borrowings, 52% as insertions and 16% as code-switches. As mentioned earlier, established loanwords were dismissed in this analysis because they do not represent use of functional bilingual skills.

Table 3. English elements in the data

borrowings	insertions	code-switches	total
69 (32%)	110 (52%)	33 (16%)	213

The percentages show that actual code-switches, as they have been defined in this study, make up only about a sixth of the English elements in the data, whereas borrowing is more than twice as common. However, a clear majority of the English elements in the data were insertions. This is well in accordance with Auer's findings.

Below we will look more closely at what types of linguistic structures were found in the mentioned categories.

6.1. Borrowings

As seen in table 3, borrowings were quite frequent in the present data. Table 4 shows what linguistic constituents the borrowings consisted of. Interestingly, the borrowings in the data were comprised of only one or two word components. There were no clusters of three or more words. Most commonly the borrowings in the data consisted of a single noun. They counted for over 70% of all the borrowings.

Table 4. Borrowings

1 word			2 words	
adjective	noun	verb	noun + noun	adjective + noun
1 (1,5%)	49 (71%)	9 (13%)	9 (13%)	1 (1,5%)

Commonly these single noun components were modifications of the names of different artifacts in the game. This was also the case with the two word noun clusters which were also quite common in the data.

Extract 7.

611. P   nyt ihanaa.

612. F   <u>ba</u>roque *(pronounced in Finnish)* swordi *(sword) (reads from screen)*

613. P   nyt saahaan <u>para</u>nnettua meidän aseita ^vähäse^

614. F   ^hmhm^ (0.5) >mutta **mum**↑mielestä siihen <u>bra</u>terhuudii<
         (brotherhood) pystyy <u>täs</u>sä

615. F   jo <u>pis</u>tää kaikkee

616. P   mummielestä ei=

617. F   =mummielestä pystyy

618. P   <^mää oon kyllä aika varma et ei pysty^> (0.6) brotherhoodiin

619. P   *(prounced with extra stress on the r's)* >no jos< <u>py</u>styy ^mut^ ei siinä
         oo mitään järkee koska-

Extract 7 shows examples of both single noun and double noun borrowings. All three borrowings, 'baroque swordi', 'brotherhuudii' and 'brotherhoodiin' are good illustrations of how the players refer to specific items by using their English terms as they are visible on screen and modifying them according to Finnish grammatical and pronunciation rules. The use of English in instances like these could also be explained by the 'most available word' –theory. It could be logical to think that it is easier for the players to use English with these items that are visible on the screen rather than attempt to translate them into Finnish. Thus, I believe the reason for these English borrowings are twofold: to be precise and because its more efficient.

Additionally there were a few borrowings which consisted of a verb. These instances were quite interesting because they represented quite imaginative use of wordplay by the participants. Extract 8 shows nicely how F takes the English verb "use" and turns it into the form "ju:ssin" (on line 420) which refers to teaching the game characters to use new skills.. Here we can also see how the English item is clearly adopted from the utterance by the game character Rikku (on line 418) who is combining potions into new potions and using them in new ways.

Extract 8.

417.   F   =>**vähän** [**Tai**duksella *(Tidus)* on siisti kilipi<]
418.   r   [I can combine items and use] them like this (1) it's not that
          tough really
419.   F   pys↑tyykö tuo- (0.2) ai ↓nii ei tietenkään kun tuo on se overdraivi.
          (overdrive) (3)
420.   F   mutta kyllähän sen ju:ssin *(use)* pystyy opettaan (1) se on käte:vä. (2)
          vai mitä
421.   P   joo totta^kai^=

Overall, the borrowings in the data consisted mostly of single or double nouns and they were direct references to items or texts on the game screen.

6.2. Insertions

As mentioned in the beginning of the chapter, insertions made up the majority of the English elements in the data. The range of insertions found in the data varied from single word insertions to full clauses. Table 5 below shows that insertions could be divided into four categories according to their structure: 1 word, 2 word, verbless clause and full clause insertions. Additionally, some insertions were categorized as tags according to their function. These items could have been categorized as verbless clauses, however, in code-switching studies they often form a group of their own because of their distinct positioning.

Table 5. Insertions

1 word	2 words	verbless clauses	clause	tag
55 (49,5%)	21 (19%)	2 (2,5%)	22 (20%)	10 (9%)

As seen in table 5, a clear majority, nearly half, of the insertions consisted of a single word and approximately a fifth consisted of two words. However, there was a significant number of longer insertions such as complete clauses, incomplete clauses and tags. Counted together, these longer stretches counted for almost a third of all occurrences.

6.2.1. One word insertions

Table 6. One word insertions

adjective	noun	verb
10 (18%)	40 (73%)	5 (9%)

Just as with borrowings, most commonly the single word insertions were nouns. They were also used to perform the same function as the single noun borrowings: most often they referred to a weapon or other type of item visible on the game

screen. These items or names of weapons differed from borrowings because they were not inflected according to Finnish grammatical rules. Extract 9 shows an instance were player P reads the name of a weapon from the game screen and inserts it into his otherwise Finnish clause.

Extract 9.

233. P   [^pitäskö laittaa blitzball^]= *(reads from the screen)*
234. K   =ei::h

Single adjective insertions, however, were not directly related to events on the game screen. Although there were ten instances of adjective insertions they consisted of only two words: annoying and gay. Player F used these terms to express dislike towards characters in the game. Yet, the words are not present on the game screen nor are they visible in the game dialogue at any point during the game. Thus they are a part of the player's personal vocabulary. Extracts 10 and 11 show how these adjectives were used.

Extract 10.

115. P   kuulitsää @bluibluiblui[bluiblui]@
116. F   [(hh) $blubi$]
117. P   >se kuulosti tältä< yubluibluibi (0.3) (hh)=
118. F   =<u>tuo</u> on ihan <u>annoying</u> *(pronounced in Finnish)* äijä
119. P   jo- Rikku.
120. F   niin mutta **tuo** <u>pö</u>de (niin ku.)

Extract 11.

954. se   that binds two hearts for eternity
955. F   tolla on niin ↑**gay** ääni tolla Seymourilla.=
956. P   =mmm?
957. F   ↑njaa. ↑njaanjm? (0.3) (hhhh) (4) se on vielä niin <u>e</u>sa:n näkönen (2)
958. F   ^se on [gayn näkönen^]
959. P   [tuo LORd] *(lausuttu kuten kirjoitettu)* (Zaun) (.) ^on^ <u>sii</u>stin näkönen

Similar to nouns, the single verb insertions were directly tied with the simultaneous events on the game screen. Most of them were repetitions or anticipations of an utterance in the game dialogue. The reasons for this type English use can be traced to the player being immersed in the game experience. Thus he lives with the dialogue by reacting to it in English. A good example can be seen in extract 12 (line 349), were player F anticipates, or co-utters, the first word of a game character's utterance.

The type of insertion visible in this case could also be interpreted as a code-switch since the participant takes part in the English dialogue and thus switches to English. However, since the English element did not lead further use of English by neither of the participants it was considered an insertion.

Extract 12.

348. r   =oh okay
349. F   [^open^]
350. a   [open] your eyes
351. F   Al Bhed (0.6) hö**h** (.) vähän kebut silmät=
352. a   =as I thought
353. r   um no good=
354. F   =(hHh)

Another type of single verb insertion can be seen in extract 13, were player F uses the English term 'rules'(line 863). This English term is not visible in the game screen events, but is rather part of the player's own English vocabulary.

Extract 13.

861. t   =why this guy's just a priest right
862. a   those with power use that power (1) [Maesters have] power
863. F   [^(aurinkolasit rules)^] *(pronounced in Finnish))*
864. t   wait (1) you sure you don't have something against Yevon
865. a   (hh[hhh)]

6.2.2. Two word insertions

Table 7. Two word insertions

noun + noun	adjective + noun	verb + noun	adjective + noun + noun
13 (62%)	6 (28%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)

As seen in table 7, the two word insertions consisted mostly of two nouns or an adjective and a noun. There was one case were an adjective was followed by two nouns, but that instance was also included in this two word category because it was a single case. All of the double noun insertions were weapons or other items from the game such as 'aqua shooter', 'share extractor', 'blitzball launcher' and so on. This was also the case with adjective + noun insertions. They were commonly names of weapons or menu items such as 'dark attack', 'empty mode', 'full blade' and so on. The only three word insertion was: 'ancient Bakanah city´, which was also read off the screen. Additionally, there was one verb + noun insertion. In this case player P read a blinking text from the screen that said: "customizing equipment". Simultaneously, a game character was customizing his equipment, thus the term does not refer to the name of the equipment but to the act of customizing his equipment.

6.2.3. Clauses

As mentioned above, clauses and tags accounted for approximately a third of all the insertions in the data. This shows clearly that there is more depth in the participants' command of English than to throw in a few words here and there. Full clauses alone added up to 20% of all the insertions. As mentioned earlier, it was sometimes difficult to determine weather an isolated longer stretch of English, that was inserted within English dialogue, was to be defined as a code-switch (i.e. switching to English to take part in the dialogue) or as an insertion (i.e. an English element without the further use of English). However, for the sake of clarity, all items, long or short, where looked at as insertions if they did not lead to the further use of English by neither of the players.

Nearly all of the English clauses that were inserted in the data were closely related to the events on the game screen. They were either instances where a player in some way takes part in the dialogue of the game or then reads out loud texts from game screen. Good illustrations of both cases can be seen in extracts 8 and 9, where player P reads a clause from the screen (extract 14, lines 148 and 149) and then repeats a clause from the dialogue (extract 15, lines 316-320).

Extract 14.

145. F   nii ja sit ↑alkaa sattuu [(0.5)] se on niin >hullun **nopee**< ja sit kun se
              alkaa tekee
146. P   [^ja sit s-^]
147. F   (lämää tuntuu)
148. P   readying? depth chaaags *(charges)* *(reads from the screen)*
149. F   mi**kä**? ton nimi on joku share exactractor *(both words pronounced in
              Finnish and read from the screen)*
150. F   (0.5) jotain sinne päin (1) tolla on tuo naitmeeri *(nighmare)*
151. F   tolla (1) Taiduksella *(Tidus)*

There are three different phenomena visible in extract 8. First player P reads the clause 'readying depth charges' from the screen. After this player F read the name of a weapon ('share reactor') from the screen after which he makes his own Finnish inflections on the word 'nightmare'. This is a very common case in the data and also represents the how inserted clauses are most often direct references to instances on the game screen.

Extract 15 (lines 319 and 120) shows a situation where the players repeat a part of the dialogue that they find amusing. This was also a very common way for the players to take part in the dialogue.

Extract 15.

314. t   Yuna (.) Lulu (0.5) I told you about her remember (0.8) she was the one
              who helped me before I was washed up on Besaid
315. t   she's an Al Bhe- [(0.3) bee] äää äh ähä=
316. F   [(hhhhh)]

317.	F	=(H[HH]HH) $tuo o **VÄHÄ** hyvä kohta$=
318.	P	[(hh)]
319.	P	=(hh) (0.4) SHE'S an AL BHÄBÄÄ[bäbääb]
320.	F	[Bhed]
321.	w	[wow you] owe her your life (0.5)
322.	w	what luck meeting here ya

Nevertheless, there were a few cases where the inserted clause was not directly connected to events on the game screen. Extract 16 shows a case where player F uses a mixed clause (line 124) to describe a situation on the game screen. This clause is not from the dialogue nor is it otherwise visible on screen, but rather demonstrates F's impulsive command of English and ability to combine it with Finnish. This is a good illustration how the game experience entices the players to use English in creative ways.

Extract 16.

123.	P	^nii joo se on vaan <u>parann</u>eltu semmone^
124.	F	Yuna is inside the pöde (1) (hhh) (0.5) tää on rassaava kun tässä ei oo kun
125.	F	Taidus *(Tidus)* ja Wakka *(pronounced in Finnish)*
126.	P	no ku ne on AINOOt jotka **ui** (0.5) ja Rikku *(pronounced in Finnish)* tietenkin. (0.5)
127.	P	muut ei ui=

6.2.4. Verbless clauses and tags

Verbless clauses and tags were separated from full clauses because they show a different type of English use. Full clauses demonstrate quite progressive use of English skills, whereas verbless clauses demonstrate a more limited command of English. However, in the present data the verbless clauses were read directly from the game screen and thus do not give noteworthy implications of the speakers language skills. Tags on the other hand function more like catchy tunes from a pop song: they are often repeated without any particular purpose, merely because they

sound nice. All clauses that lacked a predicate where categorized as verbless clauses. Tags were defined as in chapter 3: small phrases that are added at the beginning or end of a sentence.

The two verbless clauses were both directly tied to events on the game screen. In fact they were read directly from the screen as seen in extract 17. In line 267 player F reads 'infested with fiends' from the screen and then repeats it in line 268 and ads a clause ('miss the bugs') from a previous scene in the game.

Extract 17.

266. P   =hei (toi on Guado) *(laus. kuten kirj.)* (1) TÄÄ taitaa olla p- <u>pe</u>laaja. (3) ^eikä oo ku^

267. F   se on vartija (3) infested with fiends *(pronounced in Finnish., read from the screen)*

268 F   (1) (hhh) siel- on infestad ^wa-^ (2) aa (miss the bugs)

269. P   <u>T</u>ÄÄ tais olla pelaaja (0.3) joo Miyu *(read from the screen)* (2) kato se

English tags were more common than verbless clauses, however, they were not as common as one could have expected compared to the use of full clauses. It would have been logical to think that tags would have been easier to use and thus would have been inserted more often than clauses but this was not the case in this data. However, it must be said that many tags occurred in stretches where the players were speaking only English and were thus categorised as code-switches.

Most of the tags were short repetitions of what a game character had uttered. Extract 19 shows a common case where the players play around with a filler that a game character uses. In lines 68 and 74 player F finds the character's use of 'ya' amusing and repeats it. In line 74 he even comments on the filler to indicate why he has picked it up. These tags are short but they do indicate a change from the Finnish articulation system to using English pronunciation and thus they were relevant in terms of this study. Similar cases where very short tags are repeated by the players are quite common in the game.

Extract 19.

67.	w	yeah (0.5) why build a city over a river ya
68.	F	**ya**? (hh)=
69.	t	=uh well it would be convenient with all that water there
70.	w	nope that's not why (1) they just wanted to prove they could defy the laws of nature
71.	t	mmm I'm not so sure about that
72.	w	Yevon has taught us (2) when humans have power they seek to use it (1) if you don't
73.	w	stop them they go too far ya
74.	F	**ya**? (0.2) tuo sanoo aina ya?
75.	t	yeah but don't you use machina too (1) like the stadium and stuff right

Other types of tags can be seen in extracts 20 and 21 where the tags themselves are not directly adopted from the game. In extract 20 uses the common English expression 'oh my god' in reference to a game character's hair. This insertion is clearly not directly from the game but a part of the player's own vocabulary. Extract 21 on the other hand shows an interesting scenario where the players are not talking about the game but arguing about how loud the volume should be. Here player F uses an English swear word ('goddammit') that is clearly from his own vocabulary. However, one can wonder if he had used the Finnish equivalent if they hadn't been playing the game.

Extract 20.

962.	P	eihä se nyt niin pitkä ^(oo)^.
963.	F	^no on se nyt^ (.) vähän reilu päätä pidempi (7) oh my God *(all words pronounced in Finnish)*
964.	F	(**oumfgh**) (hhh) (8) jos mää tapaisin ton Seymourin
965.	F	mää ottasin <u>sak</u>set ja leikkasin siltä ton <u>le</u>ti:n pois (0.6) to etu:^letin^
966.	P	mää ottasin kirveen ja leikkaisin sen pään irti

Extract 21.

1156.	P	no <u>per</u>kele älä huua
1157.	F	<u>goddam</u>mit *(pronounced in Finnish) (takes the remote controll)*

1158. P   noh (.) kai mää saan **omassa talossani** pitää kovalla= *(takes the remote*
            control from K)

1159. F   =**oikeesti** iha vähän ärsyttää jos se on noin kovalla.

1160. P   eihän TÄÄ oo es kovalla

1161. F   mut se on <u>är</u>syttävää se on ↑<u>lii</u>an kovalla

1162. P   tää on hyvää musiikkia

6.3. Code-switches

As mentioned earlier the bar for defining a code-switch is raised quite high in this study. Thus, the number of identified code-switches is not very high. However, there are quite long stretches of speech that are conducted in English, which show nicely how the players are engaged in the game and the dialogue. Table 8 below shows what linguistic elements constituted the code-switched items. However, since code-switching was defined as a switching point after which another language is used, it is not relevant to go through these items individually but to look at the entire scenarios where the switches have occurred as a whole to see what linguistic elements it contains.

Table 8. Code-switches

1 word	verbless clause	clause	tag
2 (6%)	4 (12%)	16 (49%)	11 (33%)

Additionally, it has to be noted that the distinction between an insertion and a code-switch was often difficult to make. This was because often the players took part in the dialogue of the game which often could have been interpreted as code-switch because the surrounding text (dialogue) was in English. Although the players themselves did not necessarily continue with using English the game characters did. However, to make the distinction clear, the decision was made that a code-switch had to be followed by further use of English by the players themselves. This rather problematic distinction will be discussed further in chapter 7: Conclusions.

Below, in extracts 22-26, are the five longest code-switched stretches in the data. There were more, but these five illustrate well how code-switching was used in the data and what types of structures can be found in these instances. Extract 16 shows in a good way how insertions and code-switches were intertwined in the data. By looking at this extract one can see how difficult it is to differentiate between an insertion and a code-switch in a data which has computer characters as 'co-interlocutors'. In these code-switching extracts I have, unlike in the precious extracts, discarded some transcript information and used boldface to indicate an insertion, boldface and italics to indicate a borrowing and underlined text to indicate the code-switched items. This will make it easier to perceive which is which.

Extract 22.

27.	P	joo ostettiin me se >paska<
28.	F	se paska on kallista
29.	P	paska on aika kallis. (3) onks täs kukaan **blitzball play-**
30.	F	↓van der [shu-schuuba-]
31.	d	[ride ze shoopuf?]
32.	F	(hh) $ri[de$]
33.	P	[ri]↑de ze shoopuf?=
34.	F	=(hhh)=
35.	d	=all aboards=
36.	F	=(hh) **aboards** *(pronounced in Finnish)* (0.5) tuo on hyvä puhumaan tuo äijä
37.	P	se on **(Zizerman)**
38.	F	(hhh) mää veikkaan että tuolla ei oo ***(Zizermaneita)***.
39.	P	se puhuu ku se **(Zizerman).**=
40.	F	all aboordz? *(aboards)*
41.	P	aa zig rai de zhoo[paf]?
42.	F	[tuo] kuski on vähän [kämy]
43.	d	[shoopuf] launchin=

First in line 29 there is an insertion where player P inserts 'blitzball play-' which refers to 'blitzball player'. A bilitzball player is a type of character in the game. After this, though, the players begin a word play which is centred on an utterance that

character d says in line 31:'ride ze shoopuf?' First in line 30 player F anticipates the forthcoming utterance by uttering his own version of the clause. In lines 32 and 33 the players continue to make their own adaptations of the clause. In lines 36-39 there are one word insertions and then again in 41 and 42 the players switch to English to imitate character d's utterances. As one can see from this extract and from table 8, code-switches tend to linguistically consist of larger components (clauses and tags) than insertions that often consist of one or two words.

Additionally, this extract shows how the players play around with their pronunciation to display affection towards the characters of the game. The players mimic and emphasise the original phrases (in lines 31 and 35) in different ways through the extract to strengthen the mutual understanding that this character is funny and likeable. This type of language play highlights the interactional dimension of game play which is not only centered on progressing in the game but also in appreciating the fine details of the game.

Extract 13 displays another type of code-switching scenario from the data. Here the players are not so much playing with language as they are taking part in the dialogue. In line 81 player F is responding to the game characters' talk of war by asking what war they are talking about. At the same time he is anticipating the answer which comes in the following lines. In fact, one could say that the player is borrowing the voice of the character to participate in the dialogue. This episode shows nicely how the players' use of English is triggered by the dialogue of the game and how the players are immersed in the game play experience.

In lines 90, 92 and 94 the players repeat parts of utterances from the dialogue. Again these repetitions are said by mimicking the characters' voices as if speaking in their voice. This type of activity was also referred to by Lappänen and Nikula (forthcoming) and in their study. One could say that in these types of instances the players step into character and act out parts of game scenes.

Extract 23.

79. l   or war will rage again
80. t   war

81.	F	<u>what war.=</u>
82.	y	=more than a thousand years ago (1) mankind waged war using
		machina to kill
83.	w	they kept building more and more powerful machina
84.	l	they made weapons so powerful (1) it was thought they could destroy
		the entire world
85.	y	the people feared that Spira would be destroyed
86.	w	but the war did not stop
87.	t	wh-what happened then
88.	y	Sin came and it destroyed the cities and their machina
89.	l	[the war en]ded
90.	P	[<u><Sin came></u>]
91.	l	and our reward (1) [was Sin]
92.	P	[↑<u>was Sin.</u>]
93.	w	so Sin's our punishment for lettin' things get out of hand eh
94.	F	<u>ey?</u> (hhh)
95.	t	man that's rough
96.	F	*(spins his hand as if animating the character)* prr
97.	w	yeah it is=

In extract 24 the players refer to clauses in the dialogue that are not part of the immediate events on the game screen at that time. At first in lines 174-177 player P reports an utterance that is going to be said by a character further in the game. Reporting this utterance requires quite long stretches of English speech. The reason player P reports this utterance is to ensure player F of what is going to happen soon in the game in order to answer P's original question in lines 170-171. He uses this reported utterance to help player F remember a particular scene in the game. This shows how the players use key phrases index particular events in the game.

Extract 24.

170.	F	(hh hh) (0.8) se meni ihan (***budgettiin***) (0.4) onks tuolla muka Rikku
171.	F	*(pronounced in Finnish)* [sisällä]
172.	P	[**on** Rikku *(pronounced in Finnish)* on] sisäl
173.	F	mää en **muis**tanu

174. P   no KU KAtopa ku me saahaa se. (.) <u>I was done back there. (0.6) you</u>

175. P   <u>give me aaa- you big **mea**nie?</u> (0.5) sanoo **Tai**ttukselle *(Tidus)*

176. F   ↑niin muute suattaapi ollaki

177. P   >se oli se< <u>you big meanie I was done-</u> *(The microphone falls from the ceiling)* ^noo noo^

178. F   no=

179. P   =↑sieltä se tulee [euu::]

180. F   [(hh]hh) (0.6) (HH)

181. P   tarttetaan ***duck teip(.)piä***

182. F   ^eikä tartteta kyllä se nyt siinä^ toiset viis minuuttia ↑pysyy

183. P   <u>aa rai↑ze zuuba?</u> *(ride ze shoopuf)*

184. F   <u>[^↓raize?^]</u>

185. l   [are] you hurt

186. y   [uh no I'm fine]

Moreover, in lines 183-184 the players look back on the 'ride ze shoopuf' clause to play with it some more. Again these English phrases are intended to refer to a certain amusing past event in the game. This is most likely done in order to get back into the game after an incident with the microphone that is recording the players talk (in lines 177-182). In line 183 Player P signals that he wants to concentrate on the game again by referring to an event that both players had previously found entertaining. At the same time he is also inviting player F to forget the microphone and join him in the game experience. In line 184 player F signals that he accepts the invitation by mimicking a part of the same phrase. This sequence illustrates how codes-witches can carry variable meanings if you look at the context very carefully.

In extract 25 the players repeat character utterances immediately as they are heard in the game. Although, some of the repetitions are linguistically quite insignificant, as in lines 306-310 where the players play around with English tags, from an interactional point of view they represent a clear indication of which language the players are oriented to in this sequence. First in line 290 player P draws F's attention to what is happening on the screen to prove that he was right about his earlier predictions (in extract 24) of what was going to happen in the game. In line 191 Player F agrees that P had been right. The switch begins in line 293 where player F

anticipates character r's future utterance 'you big meanie' as to signal to player P that now he remembers this event which he could not recall earlier in extract 24. This code-switch leads to a long sequence where the players mimic and repeat characters' utterances, which demonstrates how the players identify themselves with the characters by mimicking their tone of voice.

Extract 25.

290.	P	=kato nyt
291.	F	nii
292.	t	hah (0.3) Rikku (0.5) you're Rikku (1) hey you're okay (.) how you been
293.	F	(hhh) (0.4) ihan <u>lie</u>skassa (0.4) ^↑<u>you big meanie.</u>^=
294.	r	=terrible
295.	t	yeah you don't look so good what happened
296.	r	you beat me up remember
297.	t	eh (1) oh that machina (0.8) that was you
298.	r	yhym
299.	F	^↑<u>yhym (xxxxxx)</u>^ (hh)
300.	r	oh that really hurt you know
300.	r	oh that really hurt you know
301.	F	@↑<u>you big meanie:</u>@
302.	r	you big meanie
303.	F	(@↑<u>wim beanie</u>@) (hhhh)
304.	t	w-wait but you attacked us
305.	r	nuh-uh it's not exactly what you think=
306.	P	=↓<u>nuh-u::h?</u>
307.	F	[<u>nuh-u:h?]</u>
308.	w	[yo]
309.	P	[↑<u>yo::.]</u>
310.	F	[<u>yo::.]</u> (1) yo ↓<u>ma::n</u> *(pronounced in Finnish)* <u>(piuh)</u> yo man (hhh)
311.	w	friend of yours
312.	t	uh you could say that

One can also see that the players use repletion of characters' utterances to underline a certain undertone in the dialogue. In this extract player F shows that he has recognised a hint of romance between the two characters (Rikku and Tidus). This recognition underlined in line 193 where F states in Finnish that Tidus is 'ihan lieskassa' which can be translated that 'Tidus is all fired up over Rikku'. In the same line F mimics Rikku's future utterance by adding an exaggerated affectionate tone. The same thing happens again in line 301 just before the character actually says the phrase. Adiitionally, in line 299 K implies affection between the characters by exaggerating the tone in Rikku's utterance in line 298.

Piirainen-Marsh and Tainio (forthcoming: 25) have analysed this same extract their research paper and say that the "prosodic repetition" seen in this extract "serves as a resource for displaying affective stance". This type of prosodic repetition can be seen again in lines 306 and 307 where both players repeat a part of Tidus' utterance and again add an affectionate tone. The players' use of different tones in their repetitions can be seen in lines 309 and 310 where they repeat Wakka's utterance with a completely different, macho, tone. In these simultaneous repetitions the players emphasize Wakka's different stance in the situation.

Extract 26 illustrates how the players also read out loud texts directly from the screen and then added comments. In line 257 player P reads the text 'whatcha got' from the screen after which player F repeats it by adding his stylistic pronunciation. This sort of language play was very common in the data, however not in instances where the players were reading texts from the screen. Most commonly reading text from the screen constituted only an insertion without any continuation in English. Nevertheless, there where cases, such as this one, where the original player utterance was followed by sequence of language play. Commonly these cases were linked instances where one of players read the screen text in a funny way so that the other player found it intriguing enough to start a sequence of language play.

In lines 263-265 there is a different type of code-switch sequence. The players react to character a's command 'guard Yuna' (in line 262). Player F's comment 'no way dude' (line 263) is not from the game dialogue, but from his own vocabulary. This comment leads to repetitions by both players. In this case the players are talking in a

character's voice and replying to the command in line 262 on the character's behalf. This displays yet again how the immersiveness of the game can trigger the use of English in the form of a code-switch. Here we can also see prosodic repetition which in this case was originated by a player's utterance. The original utterance (in line 263) displays a negative stance towards the command, and the repetitions function in reinforcing that stance. Additionally, the way the repetitions are pronounced shows that there is also language play involved.

Extract 26.

256. o   [O'aka at your service]
257. P   >whatcha got<= *(reads from the screen)*
258. F   =^hmm watchaga^ *(whatcha got)*
259. P   ^*(mumbling)*^
260. F   ^*(mumbling)*^ (4) (hhhh) (8) Guadosalam
261. F   (siellä joskus oli xxxxxxx)=
262. a   =guard Yuna
263. F   no way dude
264. P   no wa**y::** dude *(pronounced in Finnish)*
265. F   >no way:: dude<= *(pronounced in Finnish)*
266. P   =hei (toi on Guado) (1) TÄÄ taitaa olla p- pelaaja.
                (3) ^eikä oo ku^

Overall, the analysis showed that the code-switches in the data where closely related to the events in the game. In nearly all cases they where stimulated by either visual or vocal elements from the game. Moreover, it became clear that code-switches were particularly triggered by a vocal stimulus from the game. This means that when the players heard a sound or an utterance that was somehow intriguing to them, they often switched to English to comment or elaborate on that utterance. This was also true in instances where the players were referring to a preciously heard or forthcoming utterance. Additionally, the players used code-switching to underline the game characters' characteristics, and to emphasise nuances in the relationships between the characters as well as their emotional stances in a given situation.

7. Conclusions

This thesis was aimed at describing the type of English use that can be found in the spoken discourse of two adolescent boys playing an English video game. This description was to answer three main questions: How much English, what kind of English and for what reason? The methods of analysis were chosen accordingly, to get as wide-ranging a picture of the players' use of English as possible. Thus, the analysis was based on the interactional approach to code-switching which provided good methods for answering all of the research questions.

The use of methods from the interactional approach to studying code-switching proved to be an appropriate choice for this study. The guidelines that Auer (1988, 1998) had stated laid a good foundation for identifying the different phenomena that are present when two languages interact. The goal was to find a method that would give the tools for a consistent analysis of what is a code-switch, and Auer's proposals offered just that. The only ambiguities arose due to the fact that the computer game played such a major role in this conversational setting. It was difficult to define the line between a code-switch and an insertion in cases where the actual human speakers did not continue to English after an insertion but the computer characters did. Nevertheless Auer's methods proved to be good tools in giving an accurate description of what is going on in the data.

The linguistic analysis in itself was intended to give description of what kinds of English elements were used in the data. It was necessary to describe how complex the English elements were in order to show the level of the players' English competence. Borrowing and inserting single nouns does not indicate as much competence as making clauses in English or switching to English for a longer period of time. Overall, the results show that the players used a wide array of linguistically different types of insertions and switches, which displays quite an elaborate command of English.

Moreover, the sequential analysis showed that the players were able to not only navigate through the game and its menus in English, but they were also able to take

part in English conversations in the game. The sequential analysis revealed that the players had good understanding of nuances of the English language and could appreciate the richness of the dialogue and respond to it accordingly. Additionally, the results show that not only did the players respond to the dialogue they also took actively part in it. This means that the players both showed their understanding of the dialogue by commenting it and inserted their own lines to enrich it. This demonstrates good knowledge in not only linguistic rules of English but also understanding sociolinguistic rules of language use.

Thus, in the light of the results of this study together with my personal observations of the video data I believe it is reasonable to argue that the participants could be labelled as functionally bilingual in this particular setting. Weather this functional bilingualism could be transferred to different setting e.g. the grocery store is a different question altogether. However, it is important to recognize that in their gameplay setting the participants could perform all the actions they needed in English. They went to store to buy weapons in English, they took part in conversations in English and solved numerous problems in English. It is essential to notice that what they actually spoke out was only a fraction of all the different actions they performed in English during the continuation of the game. Thus, I would argue that even though their English competence in that particular setting would not transfer to situations in the a wider social context, the skills they demonstrated in the present data could and should be referred to as functional bilingualism.

Finally, there is the question of the emergence of a mixed code. If one looks at Auer's criteria listed in chapter 5, one can conclude that there are clear signs of a mixed code in the data. Firstly, as mentioned earlier, the line between insertions and code-switches is very difficult to distinguish because the participants did not always continue speaking after a switch they initiated. Secondly, there is a frequent use of borrowing, which could be seen in table 3. Thirdly, there is a quite frequent use of discourse markers i.e. tags which has lead to the fact that they do not function so strongly as other language elements. Finally, there is the case of grammaticalisation which means that other language items take on meanings that would not have been present in their monolingual environment. There was no distinctive evidence of grammaticalisation in the data most likely due to the close connection with the

language and the video game. However, the data was full of imaginative structural modifications of English words which do demonstrate a certain first step into grammaticalisation. Moreover, it has to be mentioned that the name "mixed activity language" which was used by Leppänen and Nikula (forthcoming) can well be used to describe the language in the present data. The name suggests that a mixed code is present, but functional only in the particular game play setting and not in a wider social context.

Thinking of future studies there are at least two elements that could be incorporated into this type of research to give additional accuracy. First, it would have been interesting to have a chance to interview the participants. This would have added a great deal of insight to the analysis. One could have gone through the transcript with the players to see what they thought were the reasons for the switches in each case. Moreover, there were many ambiguous lines in the transcript that could have been cleared with the participants. Additionally, an interview would have given more insight to what elements the players viewed as code-switching and which elements they did not see as such.

Secondly, one could do a more detailed analysis of the conversation (using the methods of conversation analysis) and of the multimodal resources of the setting to help distinguish the shifts in the intended recipient of an utterance. This would aid in, for example, making a clearer distinction between an insertion and a code-switch. There were cases in the data where a participant inserted a small English phrase in the midst of English game dialogue. Clearly, if one could define the intended participant positioning of the speech act, this type of insertion would represent a code-switch because undoubtedly the participant switches to English to take part in the dialogue. However, since the computer characters could not be treated as equal participants in the conversation, these types of cases were treated as insertions.

Bibliography

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

Auer, P. 1988. A conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In
M. Heller (eds*.), Codeswitching. Anthropological and Sociolinguistic
perspectives*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 187-213.

Auer, P. 1998. Bilingual conversation revisited. In P. Auer (eds.), *Code-Switching in
Conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. New York: Routledge, 1-24.

Auer, P. 2005. A postscript: code-switching and social identity. *Journal of
pragmatics* [online] 37 (3), 403-410. (14 Sep 2006)
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=PublicationURL&_tockey=%23TO
C%235965%232005%23999629996%23533227%23FLP%23&_cdi=5965&_p
ubType=J&_auth=y&_acct=C000052082&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_useri
d=1234512&md5=c2569bcbb57b4bf3981ca563f20c50f1

Auer, P. and A. di Luzio 1992.*The Contextualization of Language*. Amsterdam:
Benjamins.

Baetens Beardsmore, H. 1982. *Bilingualism: basic principles*. Clevedon:
Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. 1997. *Foundations of Bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon:
Multilingual Matters.

Blom, J. and J. Gumperz. 1972. Social meaning in linguistic structures: code-
switching in Norway. In Gumperz, J. and D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in
sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt,
Rinnehart and Winston, 407-434.

Boztepe, Erman. 2003. Issues in Code-Switching: Competing Theories and Models*.
Working papers in TESOL and applied linguistics* [online], 3 (2), 2003.
(11.2.2008) http:/www.tc.columbia.edu/tesola/webjournal/Boztepe.pdf.

Dijk, van Jan. 2004. Digital Media. In J. Downing (eds.), *The Sage handbook of
media studies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 145-163.

Gafaranga, Joseph. 2005. Demytholizing language alternation studies: conversational
structure vs. social structure in bilingual interaction. *Journal of pragmatics*
[online] 37 (3), 281-300. (14 Sep 2006)
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=PublicationURL&_tockey=%23T

OC%235965%232005%23999629996%23533227%23FLP%23&_cdi=5965&
_pubType=J&_auth=y&_acct=C000052082&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_us
erid=1234512&md5=c2569bcbb57b4bf3981ca563f20c50f1

Gee, J. P. 2003. *What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy*. New York (N.Y.) Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Grosjean, F. 1982. *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gumperz, J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halmari, H. 1997. *Government and code-switching: explaining American Finnish*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamin, cop.

Have, P. T. 1999. *Doing conversation analysis: a practical guide*. London: Sage.

Heller, M.1988. *Codeswitching. Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Huhtamo, E. and S. Kangas (eds.). 2002. *Mariosofia: elektronisten pelien kulttuuri*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Jarva, V. and T. Nurmi. 2006. *Oikeeta suomee: suomen puhekielen sanakirja*. Helsinki: Gummerus.

Jenkins, H. 2002. ”Täydellinen liikkumavapaus”. Elektroniset pelit sukupuolisidonnaisina pelikenttinä. In E. Huhtamo and S. Kangas (eds.), *Mariosofia: elektronisten pelien kulttuuri*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 153-187.

King, G. and T. Krzywiska 2003. Exploration and virtual presence in game-worlds. *Digital game research association* [online]. (11.2.2008) http://www.digra.org/dl/order_by_author?publication=Level%20Up%20Confer ence%20Proceedings

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

Kuivakari, S. 1999. *Keholliset käyttöliittymät*. Helsinki: Tekes.

Leppänen, S. and T. Nikula. *Diverse uses of English in Finnish society*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University.

Li Wei. 2005a. Starting from the right place: introduction to the special issue on Conversational Code-Switching. *Journal of pragmatics* [online] 37 (3), 275-279. (14 Sep 2006) http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=PublicationURL&_tockey=%23T

   OC%235965%232005%23999629996%23533227%23FLP%23&_cdi=5965&

   _pubType=J&_auth=y&_acct=C000052082&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_us

   erid=1234512&md5=c2569bcbb57b4bf3981ca563f20c50f1

Li Wei. 2005b. "How can you tell?" Towards a common sense explanation of

   conversational code-switching. *Journal of pragmatics* [online] 37 (3), 375-389.

   (14 Sep 2006)

   http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=PublicationURL&_tockey=%23TO

   C%235965%232005%23999629996%23533227%23FLP%23&_cdi=5965&_p

   ubType=J&_auth=y&_acct=C000052082&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_useri

   d=1234512&md5=c2569bcbb57b4bf3981ca563f20c50f1

Markee, N. 2000. *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah (N.J.): Lawrence Erlbaum

Piirainen-Marsh, A. and L. Tainio (in progress). Prosodic repetition as a resource for

   participation in the activity of playing a video game. Submitted to the *The

   Modern Language Journal.*

Richards, K. and P.Seedhouse (eds.). 2005. *Applying conversation analysis*.

   Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Romaine, S. 1995. *Bilingualism*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tarkka, M. 1996. Narratiivisuus ja vuorovaikutuksen tilat. In Tarkka M., K. Hintikka

   and A. Mäkelä (eds.), *Johdatus uuteen mediaan*. Helsinki: Edita, 193-206.

Tilastokeskus [online]. (11.2.2008) http://www.stat.fi/til/ava/tau.html.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Symbols for the game characters:

m	= game character Maechen [meichen]
d	= game character Driver
w	= game character Wakka [waka:]
t	= game character Tidus [taidəs]
l	= game character Lulu [lulu:]
y	= game character Yuna [juna]
a	= game character Auron [o: 'ron]
k	= game character Kimahri [ki'ma:ri]
o	= game character O'aka [oaka]
r	= game character Rikku [riku]
t	= game character Tromell Guado [tromel kwa:dou]
s	= game character Shelinda
se	= game character Seymour Guado
j	= game character Sir Jecht [dzekt]
tm	= game character Tidus' mother
tc	= Tidus as a child

Appendix 2

Transcription keys:

CAPITALS	= indicates loud speech
underlined	= indicates stressed speech
bold	= indicates a highly stressed word
(word)	= indicates uncertain transcription
(xxx)	= indicates unclear speech
^word^	= indicates quiet speech
<word>	= indicates slow speech
>word<	= indicates fast speech
word:::	= indicates a lengthened sound
sa-	= indicates a cutoff word
(.)	= indicates a short pause, less than a second
(3)	= indicates a pause and the approximate length
[word]	
[word]	= indicates overlapping speech
word=	
=word	= indicates latching utterances
.	= indicates falling intonation
?	= indicates rising intonation
↓	= indicates low toned speech
↑	= indicates high toned speech
(hhh)	= indicates laughter
(HH)	= indicates loud laughter
$word$	= indicates laughing speech
@word@	= indicates playful speech
♪word♪	= indicates singing speech
#word#	= indicates a sad voice
°hhh	= indicates an inward respiration
hhh°	= indicates an outward respiration