

---

<FOREIGN>

A study on code-switching in the ELFA corpus

Pro Gradu thesis  
Department of Modern Languages  
English Philology  
University of Helsinki  
Autumn 2012  
Kirsi Turunen  
Student number: 012362309

# Contents

1	INTRODUCTION .....	1
2	ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA.....	4
	2.1 ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA IN GENERAL .....	4
	2.2 ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA IN FINLAND.....	8
	2.3 ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA IN ACADEMIA .....	10
3	CODE-SWITCHING .....	13
	3.1 CODE-SWITCHING IN GENERAL .....	13
	3.2 CODE-SWITCHING IN ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA.....	16
4	MATERIAL AND METHODS.....	19
	4.1 THE ELFA CORPUS .....	19
	4.2 METHODS .....	21
5	ANALYSIS.....	23
	5.1 QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF CODE-SWITCHING IN THE ELFA CORPUS .....	23
	TABLE 2: CODE-SWITCHING (CS) ACCORDING TO SPEECH EVENT TYPE .....	25
	5.2 QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF CODE-SWITCHING IN THE ELFA CORPUS.....	27
	5.2.1 <i>Word-search</i> .....	29
	5.2.2 <i>Addressee specification</i> .....	32
	5.2.3 <i>Referential code-switching</i> .....	34
	5.2.4 <i>Slips</i> .....	38
	5.2.5 <i>Other instances of language alternation</i> .....	40
6	DISCUSSION .....	43
7	CONCLUSION .....	46
	BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	49
	APPENDIX 1: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS.....	54

# 1 Introduction

English is undoubtedly the language of globalisation. There are now at least four times as many non-native speakers of English in the world as there are native speakers (House 2010: 263). Thus, English is no longer used to communicate with native speakers only and ownership over the language continues to be debated. One important question is whether English should be assessed and whether language teaching should be conducted according to norms of a standard variety – usually of British or American English – or whether language awareness for other varieties should be in the foreground (cf. Seidlhofer 2001, Jenkins et al. 2011).

When speakers from different linguacultural backgrounds choose English as their medium of communication, they use English as a lingua franca (ELF) (Jenkins 2009: 200). One of the main notions regarding ELF is that it is not assessed according to native speaker norms, and thus differences compared to English as a native language (ENL) are not seen as errors but as variants (Jenkins 2006: 140). Within the framework of English as a foreign language (EFL) these differences are considered errors. In EFL, English is a learner language, an interlanguage and the speaker a language learner with gaps in language skills. In ELF, the speakers are considered language users who bend the language according to their needs.

Since the beginning of this century, the study of ELF has grown into a massive new research agenda (Seidlhofer 2009: 37). As Jenkins sums up, earlier research on ELF focused mainly on surface linguistic features and now research has moved its focus to pragmatic skills and strategies that underlie these features (Jenkins 2011: 928).

Defending the view that ELF should not be considered in a standard English normset, Seidlhofer states that “[t]he primary concern of our research is not to document what linguistic forms occur in ELF but how they function pragmatically in the achievement of meaning, how they are used strategically to co-construct discourse” (Seidlhofer 2008: 33.3).

Today, English has spread throughout various domains: trade, politics, entertainment just to name a few. English has gained ground as a means of communication in the academia as well. International research groups, workshops, panel discussions and the like make use of English; more and more academic papers are written in English. English is also used as a medium of instruction in several universities and at least the majority of them “perceive themselves to be deeply international” (Jenkins 2011: 926). The number of English-medium programmes in Europe has risen drastically in just a few years; a study showed a threefold increase during the years 2002 to 2007 (Wächter 2008: 3). To understand the lingua franca use of English in academia, Professor Anna Mauranen launched the ELFA project of English as a lingua franca in academic settings<sup>1</sup> in 2001. The project collected data of spoken ELF discourse from universities in Tampere and Helsinki. The ELFA corpus – a million-word corpus of English as a lingua franca in academia – is the first large corpus in the field and it was completed in 2008 (Mauranen 2010).

In the spring of 2010 I attended a course on English as a lingua franca at the University of Helsinki given by Niina Hynninen, one of the ELFA group members. During this course I became familiar with the ELFA corpus. For my course work in a methodology course in corpus linguistics given by Jukka Tyrkkö I analysed code-switching. These two courses, and the notion that code-switching had been studied in other ELF data but not in the ELFA corpus, gave the idea for this study, and I was happy to be given the permission to use the ELFA corpus. The main finding of studies about code-switching in ELF had been that the speakers do not use code-switching due to linguistic deficiency but as a communicative strategy that is possible for them.

One might hypothesize that in a situation where English is the only language shared by all the speakers, other languages would not be used. However, a short look at the ELFA corpus revealed that these lingua franca speakers also make use of languages other than English. These were marked with the tag <FOREIGN> in the corpus, and became the starting point for my research. In this paper, I shall first discuss the concept of English as a lingua franca, and especially English as a lingua franca in academia to offer

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information about the corpus, see <<http://www.helsinki.fi/elfa/elfacorus>>.

background information for the study. Chapter three serves as the theoretical framework for the study, and I shall take a look at language contact situations. The focus will be on code-switching and research that has been conducted on code-switching in ELF. Chapter four presents the data and methods used in this study. The software used for data analysis is also presented in this chapter. Chapter five offers an analysis of the data. The quantitative analysis gives an overview of code-switching in the whole corpus answering the following questions: How often does code-switching occur in the corpus? What are the languages that are used? What is the frequency of code-switching in the different speech event types of the corpus? How long are the switches?

Based on the quantitative analysis, I have chosen a balanced representation of the phenomenon of code-switching in the ELFA corpus and the qualitative analysis then focuses on a part of the corpus to answer my research question:

1. *What are the functions of code-switching in the ELFA corpus?*

I shall introduce a typology of the functions of foreign language usage with examples of each type. In chapter six, I shall discuss my findings and compare them with the results of two earlier studies dealing with code-switching in ELF that are presented in chapter three, namely those of Alessia Cogo (2009) and Theresa Klimpfinger (2009). Finally, chapter seven offers a conclusion of the study.

## **2 English as a lingua franca**

Serving as background for this study, this chapter discusses the use of English as a lingua franca. The first part offers a presentation of English as a lingua franca in general, including the spread of English, research conducted on ELF, questions of the ownership of English and the threat that its spread poses on other languages. In the second part, the focus is narrowed to English as a lingua franca in Finland. Finally, I shall discuss English as a lingua franca in the world of academia and the motivations for studying it.

### **2.1 English as a lingua franca in general**

The history of the English language can be divided into periods of Old English, Middle English, Modern English, and the new phase: Global English (Taavitsainen and Pahta 2008: 25). According to David Crystal, only one reason plays a significant role in the process of a language becoming a world language: “the power of the people who speak it” (Crystal 2004: 30). He considers different kinds of power that are or have been at work in the spread of English: political, technological, economical, and cultural power, and he discusses ten English-ruled domains: politics, economics, the press, advertising, broadcasting, motion pictures, popular music, international travel and safety, communications, and education (Crystal 2004: 30-38). In the field of education, “[s]ince the 1960s, English has become the normal medium of instruction in higher education for many countries – including several where the language has no official status” (ibid.: 37). This is also what makes my focus on academic English important.

The different groups that use English in the world today can roughly be labelled as those who use the language (a) as a native language (ENL), (b) as a second language (ESL), or (c) as a foreign language (EFL) (Jenkins 2003: 14). English used to be learnt as a foreign language in order to use it with its native speakers in the US and UK (ibid.: 15). A widespread and debated classification of the spread of English in the world has been

Kachru's (1997) model of three concentric circles. Here ENL countries constitute the Inner Circle, ESL countries the Outer Circle, and EFL countries, where English does not have an official status, the Expanding Circle. This model now seems outdated and according to Jenkins (2003) Kachru's model has been criticised for, for instance, being "based on geography and genetics rather than on the way speakers identify with and use English" (ibid.: 17). Kachru's model implies that the situation would be similar in all the countries within a circle and forgets that there is a fuzzy area between the Inner and Outer Circles – as English can be a native language for people who live in an Outer Circle country – and between Outer and Expanding Circles as there are countries that are going through a shift from EFL to ESL status. Many speakers are bi- or multilingual and the differentiation between first, second, and further languages is not that clear-cut and the proficiency of English may be similar regardless of the circle the speaker represents. Furthermore, "[t]he fact that English is somebody's second or third language does not of itself imply that their competence is less than that of a native speaker" (ibid.). In the same vein, House (2010: 363) suggests that Kachru's model might be out-of-date as a descriptive tool since English is continually diversifying around the world.

The spread of English has now reached the point where non-native speakers of English have outnumbered the native speakers and the majority of its use occurs in situations where it serves as a lingua franca (Seidlhofer 2001: 133-134). Thus, the three labels ENL, ESL, and EFL can be complemented by ELF. The international usage of English as a lingua franca is variably covered by the terms international English, world English, and global English (House 2010: 364). According to Jenkins, Cogo and Dewey, ELF is part of the paradigm of global Englishes (Jenkins et al. 2011: 283). The idea of and need for a lingua franca is not new. However, as Crystal states, "the prospect that a lingua franca might be needed for the whole world is something which has emerged strongly only in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and since the 1950s in particular" (Crystal 2004: 29). The first identifications of ELF "in its modern sense" were reported in the 1980s by German researchers, Hüllen and Knapp (Jenkins et al. 2001: 282).

There are some different opinions in defining English as a lingua franca, but a widely shared view is that a lingua franca is a language used for communication between

speakers from different first language backgrounds. This perspective does not exclude native speakers, although a minority of ELF researchers do that (Jenkins et al. 2011: 283). The current use of the term *lingua franca* has moved away from its original meaning – *lisan al farang* in Arabic – when it was used to describe an intermediary or contact language. House formulates the prominent features of English used as a *lingua franca* today: It is functionally extremely flexible, it is spread across many different linguistic, geographical and cultural areas, and it is open to foreign forms. ELF is used in both international and intra-national intercultural communication. In each of the different communication situations the speakers of the particular discourse community negotiate their own use of the *lingua franca*, its forms, meanings and discourse strategies (House 2010: 364).

The fairly new field of English as a *lingua franca* studies the consequences of the globalisation of English. The research first focused more on linguistic factors, on phonology, lexis and morphology, but the focus has now shifted to functional factors (Jenkins et al 2011: 296).

The focus in ELF research is on language use (rather than on development) and on the sociopragmatic functions of language choice. From the perspective of pragmatics, ELF as one type of non-native-non-native interaction is best examined with a focus on how meanings, forms and functions are negotiated given the varying resources available to *lingua franca* speakers. This interactional approach is concerned with social rather than individual or psychological aspects (House 2010: 366-267).

A crucial distinction to be made is that of a language learner versus a language user. In ELF research a speaker of English as a *lingua franca* is considered to be a user of the language, not a learner. Therefore, the question is about varieties and not of deviant forms. In the same vein, code-switching is considered a pragmatic strategy and not evidence of gaps in language knowledge (cf. Jenkins 2010, Cogo 2009, Klimpfinger 2007, 2009). The new situation of English has raised questions about the ownership of the language (see e.g. Widdowson 1994). Who sets the norms of English(es) today? And

as English is taught worldwide, it is important to ask whose English should be taught. Related to this question, the fact that native speakers are sometimes seen as better language teachers has been under the microscope (see e.g. Brutt-Griffler and Samimy 2001). Traditionally British and American varieties have set the norm for language learning. But when the language used differs from these norms, it can be seen as a deviant form, where speakers are regarded as language learners, rather than as a different form, where speakers are seen as language users. Thus, language awareness, the notion of several different varieties and registers of English should maybe become more important in teaching English as a foreign language (see e.g. Seidlhofer 2001).

There is a lot of discussion on whether English threatens other languages, if it is an imperialistic language (e.g. Phillipson 1992). According to Seidlhofer it is “far removed from its native speakers’ linguacultural norms and identities” (2001: 134). Similar to this view House proposes that ELF is “a mere tool bereft of collective cultural capital” (2003: 560). Opposite to that are languages that function as identity markers. House supports the idea that ELF should be used more (in the EU) for instrumental purposes. According to her this would not threaten speakers’ first languages. Leitner (2009: 223) states that English cannot be a culturally neutral language, but that ‘deculturalisation’ always leads to ‘reculturalisation’, that is, English becomes to represent new cultures and function according to their needs. However, English can be seen as a threat when it causes domain loss, when the spectrum of language usage is being narrowed by the use of English. Another question, then, is whether this kind of development should be seen as neutral or as a threat to fight against.

In “The future of English” David Graddol (1997: 14) describes how in Europe languages are hierarchically related to status, and that those people who speak one of Europe's big languages will have better access to material success. The “big” languages referred to here are English, French, and German. Jenkins notes that “[b]y the end of the twentieth century, however, a single one of the three ‘big’ languages, English, had become the ‘biggest’, the *de facto* European *lingua franca*” (Jenkins 2003: 42). With a focus on the Nordic countries – Denmark, Iceland, Sweden, Norway, and Finland - the Norwegian linguist Lars S. Vikør (2000) discusses in his article “Northern Europe: Languages as

Prime Markers of Ethnic and National Identity” the nature of the challenge English and its “intrusion” bring to the Nordic societies. English is one of the most important factors in creating a European identity, and many people want to integrate with this international world. According to Vikør there is a general feeling of great pressure:

Anglo-American cultural and linguistic influence pervades everybody's lives nowadays in some way or other. In certain domains of life, such as science, technology, commercial life, and youth culture, the national languages run the risk of being relegated to the position of ‘secondary languages’ in relation to English – in any case many people believe this to be happening (ibid.: 128).

But there are also evident reactions against the spread of Anglo-American cultural and linguistic influence in all of the countries, and he argues that the fear of national languages losing ground would give rise to a more active policy for strengthening and promoting these languages (ibid.: 129).

## **2.2 English as a lingua franca in Finland**

Although ELF is not regional (Jenkins et al 2011: 285) but fluid by nature and its use is negotiated in every new communication situation, I propose some background information on the use of English in Finland since this study of ELF usage in Finnish universities is situated in the bigger frame of English as a lingua franca in Finland.

The factors that have accelerated the use of English in Finland include Finland joining the EU in 1995, the growing importance of international communication and mass media in everyday life, advanced information technology, international trade relationships, transnational ownership, outsourcing, economic growth, tourism, and immigration (Leppänen et al. 2009: 28-29). The Research Institute for the Languages of Finland has published a language policy for the Finnish language: “Suomen kielen tulevaisuus. Kielipoliittinen toimintaohjelma”. English is acknowledged as a useful and needed lingua franca, but the status of the Finnish language and its versatile and wide use are to

be secured also in the future. However, it is pointed out that the publication was not written to fight against English (Hakulinen et al. 2009: 11).

Taavitsainen and Pahta (2008: 37) suggest that a shift from 'English as a foreign language' to 'English as a second language' has taken place in Finland, and the writers present empirical evidence thereof. English in Finland is used as a lingua franca for international use and 'glocalised' for local use. English is used in the public discourse for communicative and image-creating functions; it is used in ways that require advanced skills from both the speaker or writer and the audience. English can be seen as a marker of attitude: its connotations are often positive and relaxed. Taavitsainen and Pahta (ibid.) argue that English has increasingly become a natural part of language resources for Finns.

A national survey conducted in 2007 and published in 2009 studied the use, meaning, and attitudes towards English in Finland. The purpose of it was to draw a picture of how Finns master and use the language and what their attitudes towards it are (Leppänen et al. 2009: 17). The survey had 1495 participants from all over the country and from different social groups. The questionnaire consisted of 49 questions that were divided into eight subcategories: "Background information", "Languages in your life", "English in your life", "Proficiency and studies in English", "The use of English", "English and native language mixed", "The future of English in Finland", and "Education and profession". The survey shows that the functions and meanings of English in Finland are so multiple that we cannot speak of them as one singular phenomenon (ibid.: 16-17). The research group ponders on the question whether more resources should be devoted to learn English if it is becoming an integral part of work and leisure to ensure that no one would be excluded (Leppänen et al. 2009: 20). The results of the survey show that Finns describe themselves as monolingual, although other languages are used and encountered a lot, although not by all social groups. English is valued, even more than Swedish, which is the second official language in Finland, and Finns think that learning and knowing English is important and have a positive attitude towards it. However, it is not seen as a threat to the national languages and culture. Also the knowledge of other foreign languages is seen as important. The majority think that English is still a foreign

language. The survey also showed that the role of English will remain stable, and even increase in the future. It is important for every social group to know English, and although information is believed to be available in Finnish also in the future, non-proficient speakers will be excluded to some extent (ibid.: 147-149).

### **2.3 English as a lingua franca in academia**

A study conducted by Wächter shows a threefold increase in the number of English-medium programmes in European universities from 2002 to 2007 (Wächter 2008: 3). Taavitsainen and Pahta's (2008) paper "From global language use to local meanings: English in Finnish public discourse" offers background information on the Finnish education system. Finland, too, has taken part in the Bologna process of the European Higher Education Area<sup>2</sup>. This has brought along new master's programmes in English, so that in the academic year 2005–2006 ca. 450 courses were offered in English at the University of Helsinki. In addition, the most dominant language of academic publishing is English. English has become a part of basic education in Finland but as Taavitsainen and Pahta state, "[t]he higher the educational level, the more important English becomes" (ibid.: 31). However, as they point out, the knowledge of other languages is valued as well (ibid.).

Research into ELF is especially vibrant in the fields of business and academia, and it has accelerated since the beginning of the millennium. Jenkins's paper "Accommodating (to) ELF in the international university" (2011) points out what makes an international university and looks at university language policies and practices and what relevance the research on academic ELF has for multilingual academic communities. She argues that the language policies of universities lag far behind the real language practice and that ELF is still regarded by many as "an inferior kind of English" (ibid.: 926). She points out that it is important for the native speakers of English as well to acquire it to effectively use this different kind of English (ibid.: 928).

---

<sup>2</sup> For more information, see <[www.ehea.info](http://www.ehea.info)>.

Also the focus of this paper is on English used as an academic lingua franca as it explores the ELFA corpus – the first large corpus collected for the study of academic ELF. The ELFA research team has already published numerous empirical research papers. The head of the ELFA project and a pioneer in the field of ELF studies, Mauranen has studied for instance signalling and preventing misunderstanding in academic ELF (2006a). In her paper “Features of English as a lingua franca in academia” (2010) Mauranen discusses some discourse and lexicogrammatical features in ELF with the help of the ELFA corpus. She offers four arguments for the study of academic speech. Academic language has a high social prestige and is thus *influential*. It is also *demanding* and offers sophisticated data with “notable variation in degrees of formality and familiarity” (Mauranen 2006b: 148). The international research community has a long history in using lingua francas, and the academia is inherently *international*. New members must acquire the language used in academia, it is nobody’s first language. The “academic communities have their own particular *genres*, which to a large part constitute the communities as a set of discourse communities or communities of practice” (ibid.: 149).

The academic context brings special features with it. Annelie Knapp (2011) discusses the use of English as a non-native language in university lectures and seminars at a German university. Knapp presents parameters of variation that are relevant for the study of English medium instruction: Whether English is used as a lingua franca or not, genre of discourse, number of participants, variety and common ground in the linguistic resources available, the interactional goals and the institutional or non-institutional framing of the interaction (ibid.: 68). She has found that the lecturer in English-medium instruction normally controls the discourse and allocates turns of speaking, and thus restricts spontaneous negotiations of meaning, which seem to be characteristic of other types of lingua franca discourse (ibid.: 56). As English is used in an institutional discourse, the speakers are bound to a specific spatial and temporal framework with clearly defined goals (ibid.: 57). She argues that understanding is more difficult when a “lack of shared subject knowledge, which is characteristic of instructional discourse, is

combined with a lack of shared linguistic resources and cultural background knowledge”  
(*ibid.*: 57).

### 3 Code-switching

Languages are constantly in contact all over the world, with the degree of stability of the contact situations varying. One simple definition of language contact is “the use of more than one language in the same place at the same time” (Thomason 2001: 1). This study will not problematize the definition of the fuzzy term *language* but instead it will take all instances in the ELFA corpus tagged as <FOREIGN> to belong to a language other than English.

This chapter offers a theoretical framework for the study of functions of the instances when a language other than English is used in the ELFA corpus. We shall look at the phenomenon called code-switching. The second part offers a closer look at research on code-switching in English as a lingua franca conducted by Alessia Cogo (2009) and Theresa Klimpfner (2009).

#### 3.1 Code-switching in general

The study of code-switching is a vast field and the use of the term is rather heterogeneous. With the words of Gumperz – one of the pioneers in the field – “[c]onversational code switching can be defined as the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems” (Gumperz 1982: 59).

Research on code-switching has mainly focused on bilingual speech where speakers share more than one language. It has followed two different paths: the linguistic and the sociolinguistic. The linguistic branch focuses on the structure of code-switching, on the underlying grammatical knowledge (Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz 2005: 3).

Considering the grammatical structures of code-switching, a distinction can be made between intersentential and intrasentential code-switching for example. In other words, a

switch can take place between sentences or within a sentence. In this study, however, these grammatical structures will not be taken under scrutiny.

The branch of sociolinguistics focuses on functions of code-switching. It mainly studies how cultural and situation specific beliefs, values and norms, or linguistic ideologies affect speakers' choice of different variables (Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz 2005: 3). The supposition that speakers would rely on code-switching due to gaps in knowledge has changed as findings on the field have shown that speakers do not lack grammatical knowledge. Instead the speakers using code-switching are seen as proficient bilinguals, although they may show more ability in one language than the other (Myers-Scotton 1997: 224). The focus of this paper is on the functions of code-switching in academic ELF interaction which has not yet been studied widely.

To explain the functions of conversational code-switching from a sociolinguistic viewpoint, Gumperz presented a categorisation of six types: quotations, addressee specification, interjections, reiteration, message qualification, and personalization versus objectification (Gumperz 1982: 75-80). Myers-Scotton has proposed three different, although overlapping motivations for code-switching. Firstly, it can "add a dimension to the socio-pragmatic force of one's "discourse persona" either through the individual lexical choices made or through the way in which CS [code-switching] is patterned" (Myers Scotton 1997: 225). It can also function as a discourse marker and signal a change in topic for example. The third possible motivation is to fill lexical gaps in the matrix language, which is the language that serves as the base language in a conversation (ibid.). However, as Gumperz states, the compilation of such a list only constitutes a first step in the analysis (Gumperz 1982: 82). Nilep argues that "[c]ode switching may serve any of a number of functions in a particular interaction, and a single turn at talk will likely have multiple effects. Therefore, any finite list of functions will be more or less arbitrary" (Nilep 2006: 10).

Auer (1998) has criticised the distinction between linguistic and sociolinguistic approaches in code-switching research. According to him these approaches are not enough to explain how code-switching is used in everyday interaction, but should be

analysed on the level of their production, as it is a part of conversational practices. Based on Auer's arguments, Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (2005) take the perspective of "communicative practices" to study code-switching.

Communicative practices involve real life actors interacting in everyday situations in pursuit of their own context specific communicative goals and are, by their very nature, collaborative endeavors requiring active cooperation from speakers and listeners over a string of exchanges. Such conversational cooperation does not just happen, it must be actively initiated and maintained by more than one individual (ibid.: 4).

They suggest that the best way to study bilingual practices is to examine its communicative effects. They come to the conclusion that code-switching is used as an indexical strategy that bilinguals employ in addition to other discourse strategies such as style switching and voicing (ibid.: 21).

In this study, I have grouped all instances that are marked in the corpus with the tag <FOREIGN> as instances of other language usage. As code-switching is the use of two different languages in one speech exchange by proficient bilinguals, I propose *lexical borrowing* as a category distinct from code-switching. Lexical borrowing is the insertion of lexical items from another language into the grammatical frame of another language. On the surface, this looks very similar to code-switching. However, borrowed items are accessible and used by monolingual speakers as well, whereas code-switching is a characteristic of bilingual speakers. "When their frequency reaches an unknown threshold level, these EL [embedded language] lexemes move from being CS [code-switched] forms to becoming borrowed forms and therefore now part of the lexicon of the recipient language as well as donor language" (Myers-Scotton 1997: 228).

### 3.2 Code-switching in English as a lingua franca

On the one hand, code-switching is described as the use of two or more languages in one conversation where the speakers speak or at least understand the language into which switching occurs. On the other hand, ELF presents a situation where speakers from different linguistic backgrounds use English as their shared language of communication. This implies that speakers do not share other languages and one might think that the speakers in ELF situations do not switch codes. However, studies have shown that the pragmatic strategies used by ELF speakers include code-switching which is not considered a sign of lacking language knowledge but instead a strategy that shows creative use of plurilingual resources to enable communication (cf. Jenkins 2006, 2011, Cogo 2009).

Alessia Cogo (2009) has analysed code-switching in the framework of accommodation research in ELF pragmatics. Her paper argues that ELF speakers face the challenge of managing difference in communication as they come from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. She studied code-switching and other-repetition as accommodation strategies that are used in order to adapt speech for communicative purposes, to enhance efficiency and cooperation in communication (ibid.: 254). In addition, ELF speakers use these pragmatic strategies to signal affiliation to their multilingual community (ibid.). Based on previous research, she argues that “not only have ELF speakers been found to deal with potentially problematic situations carefully and appropriately, but they also use pragmatic strategies to enhance their communication” (ibid.: 257).

Cogo conducted a case study on a group of teachers of modern languages in an institution of higher education. Her data consisted of forty hours of mainly casual conversations. She found out that code-switching is not used due to linguistic deficiency in bilingual or multilingual speakers but it is “testimony to the creativity of ELF speakers, who use language skilfully, drawing on their multilingual and multicultural repertoire” (ibid.: 270). She distinguished three different pragmatic functions for code-switching. Code-switching serves as an extra tool for communication and it gives the

possibility to express greater nuances. Secondly, code-switching is used to ensure understanding beyond cultural differences and it serves for reaching greater efficiency in conversation, and code-switching can be used to signal solidarity and membership to a group.

Theresa Klimpfinger (2009) has also conducted a qualitative study on the functions of code-switching in ELF. Her data consisted of eight workshop and working group discussions from a conference, twelve hours of naturally-occurring conversations in total. The working group discussions were later incorporated into VOICE – the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English<sup>3</sup>. In her typology of code-switching functions, she drew from the frameworks of bilingual research, and research on communication strategies and identity. According to her findings, code-switching in ELF has four different functions: specifying an addressee, introducing another idea, appealing for assistance, and signalling culture (ibid.: 352). One switch most often serves several functions (ibid.: 366-367). The total number of code-switching instances in her data was 104. The number of instances where switching occurred into another language than the speaker's first language exceeded the number of switches into the speaker's first language: 54 to 50. The majority of switches consisted of single words (ibid.: 358-359).

By specifying an addressee through code-switching, the speakers directed their speech to one specific addressee in a group of speakers. When introducing another idea, the motivation for code-switching is that another language is more appropriate in discussing the particular subject (ibid.: 351). Unlike in the other categories, the examples of this category all include a translation of the switch, a paraphrase, or an attempt of them (ibid.: 364). Appeal for assistance functions as a communicative strategy to enhance the effectiveness of communication (ibid.: 351). Klimpfinger (2009) argues that appeal for assistance would be more frequent in goal-oriented conversations. She shows that the speakers signal culture in two distinct ways. Firstly, they use emblematic switches, that is, they code-switch “for exclamations, pause fillers, or function words to implicitly give a linguistic emblem of this culture” and secondly “in order to explicitly refer to concepts associated with a specific culture, such as a name of a city or a greeting” (ibid.: 352).

---

<sup>3</sup> For more details on the VOICE corpus, see <<http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/>>.

She concludes that code-switching is an effective feature of ELF and that “ELF speakers resort to more than two languages in a most creative way to fulfil different discourse functions, to apply certain communication strategies, and to communicate their multilingual identity” (ibid.: 366-367). Thus, code-switching constitutes an integral part of discourse practices in ELF communication.

The two studies presented here offer the background to which I shall compare my own findings of code-switching in English as a lingua franca.

## 4 Material and methods

This chapter offers a presentation of the material and methods that are used to give an overview of code-switching in ELFA and to find answers to the proposed research question:

1. *What are the functions of code-switching in the ELFA corpus?*

### 4.1 The ELFA corpus

English has become the major lingua franca, also in academia, as discussed in chapter 2.3. To investigate academic discourses, to find special features in English as a lingua franca, and to compare it with other varieties of English, the project *English as an academic lingua franca* (ELFA<sup>4</sup>) was started in 2001. It is based at the University of Helsinki and directed by Professor Anna Mauranen. The project consists of two parts: the corpus project ELFA (English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings) and SELF (Studying in English as a Lingua Franca), which is a micro-analytic project that seeks to understand ELF by studying participant experience (Mauranen et al. 2010: 184).

One of the advantages of a large corpus is that it offers the possibility to “reveal linguistic regularities and patterning while also keeping track of variability in the material” (ibid.: 184). The ELFA corpus consists of 131 hours of recorded speech, one million transcribed words (ibid.: 185). The compilation started in 2001 and the corpus was completed in 2008. To include a wide range of disciplinary domains, the data was collected from the Universities and the Technological Universities of Tampere and Helsinki. The corpus consists of data from seven different university disciplines: social sciences (29% of data), technology (19%), humanities (17%), natural sciences (13%),

---

<sup>4</sup> For more information on the ELFA project, <see [www.helsinki.fi/elfa](http://www.helsinki.fi/elfa)>.

medicine (10%), behavioural sciences (7%), and economics and administration (5%) (ibid.: 185-187).

What motivated the compilation of spoken discourse is that there is far more research on academic writing than speaking. Moreover, language change is bound to be more visible in spoken language, since it is spontaneous and unedited, “because speakers influence each other’s language use in face-to-face interaction” (Mauranen 2006b: 148), and the focus is more on communicational effectiveness than on correctness of form:

In spoken interaction, as speakers co-construct shared understanding and negotiate meanings to achieve communication, language is employed to serve interactional purposes, without so much concern for its ostensible correctness as its intelligibility and ability to maintain communicative cooperation (Mauranen et al. 2010: 185).

Communication was found to be successful in all occasions, with goals of the events reached and without communicative breakdowns (ibid.: 185).

Interviews and public material of the institutions offered information in the corpus compilation work (ibid.: 185-186). Each speech event is marked with information of academic discipline, the speech event type, academic role of the speakers, their age and first language (L1) (ibid.: 186). The categorisation of speech event types was not based on linguistic features but on genre labels that are also used by the discourse community. The speech event types thus include seminar discussions (33%), PhD thesis defence discussions (20%), lectures (14%), conference presentations (9%), seminar presentations (8%), conference discussions (7%), lecture discussions (6%), PhD thesis defence presentations (2%), and panel discussions (1%). The proportion of the event types is equivalent to how important they are perceived to be on three different parameters: typicality, influence, and prestige (Mauranen 2006: 152).

One aim was to ensure a wide range of native languages among the speakers. The speakers’ first languages are many, 51 different ones. Finnish was the L1 of 28.5% of the speakers. Other major speaker groups include German (8.2%), Russian (6.6%),

Swedish (6.4%), and Dutch (5.6%). Since the definition of ELF includes native speakers of English, they were not excluded from the corpus. English is the L1 of 5% of the speakers. However, situations where English native speakers were in dominant positions or contexts of English language usage that differ from ELF, ELT (English Language Teaching) and CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) were not recorded (Mauranen et al. 2010: 185-186). Another aim in the compilation work was to favour multi-party discussions, which forms 67% of the corpus.

The corpus was transcribed and tagged according to conventions that can be found in the ELFA transcription guide (2004). Switching into a foreign language was tagged <FOREIGN> text </FOREIGN>. However, the guide says that “if it’s a long stretch, say, of Swedish, no need to transcribe it all” (2004: 7). This study brought in awareness some inconsistencies with the tagging conventions. It can be understood that because so many different people worked with the transcribing of the huge database that some differences in tagging were unavoidable. I came across some occurrences in the corpus that clearly should have been tagged as <FOREIGN> but have been left outside this study.

## **4.2 Methods**

Corpus linguistics can be described as a “methodology rather than an independent branch of linguistics” (McEnery et al. 2006: 3). However, it is not restricted to a single aspect of language. By definition, a corpus is “a collection of sampled texts, written or spoken, in machine-readable form which may be annotated with various forms of linguistic information” (ibid.: 4). When building a corpus, the sample of speakers and text categories which make it balanced and thus representative of a language variety in a given context should be taken into account (cf. ibid.).

To find code-switching occurrences in the ELFA corpus I searched for the tag <FOREIGN> in the corpus with the help of a corpus software called AntConc. A total of 646 occurrences of the use of languages other than English were found in this corpus. To analyse these occurrences, I used Microsoft Excel to first sort them according to the

different languages that were used, then the length of the switches, and finally according to the different speech events and disciplines. The results of the quantitative analysis are presented in the first part of the next chapter. To perform qualitative analysis on code-switching in this corpus, I used the results of the quantitative analysis to choose a part of occurrences that would show a balanced representation of the phenomenon in this data.

This is a study in sociolinguistics in that it looks at a linguistic phenomenon in a social context, taking into consideration how the social context affects language. This is a study in corpus linguistics in that it uses a corpus, a collection of texts, to study the linguistic phenomenon in a given context. Since the corpus was compiled and the background material on the social reality collected before this study was made, it was not possible to get answers to all the questions that arose during the study. Further, this is a study in pragmatics in that it studies how context defines the different non-linguistic functions of a linguistic phenomenon. In the qualitative analysis I explored recurring patterns of the phenomenon with the means of discourse analysis to explain the functions of code-switching in ELFA and to develop a classification of the occurrences. This classification will be presented with examples from the corpus. Finally I shall compare the results of this study to results of similar studies, namely those of Alessia Cogo (2009) and Theresa Klimpfinger (2009), both of whom have studied functions of code-switching in English as a lingua franca. These studies were presented in the previous chapter.

## 5 Analysis

The analysis of the ELFA corpus for code-switching consists of a quantitative part that gives an overview of code-switching in the whole corpus (section 5.1). This part looks at how often, into which languages the switches are made, where in the corpus and how long the switches are. The qualitative analysis focuses on the functions of code-switching in a part of the ELFA corpus (section 5.2).

### 5.1 Quantitative analysis of code-switching in the ELFA corpus

With the help of AntConc software I searched for the tag <FOREIGN> to find code-switches in the ELFA corpus. The data has 1,035,985 words and it showed a total number of 646 instances of code-switching, which I then grouped according to the languages used in the corpus (*Table 1*). The languages that were used most for switches were Finnish (222), German (146), Russian (47), Swedish (27), and French (22). The group of ‘other’ languages switched into includes some 16 different languages with less than six occurrences each. Some switches did not have a transcription (unrecognisable speech) or they were words such as *aha* that were not possible to be grouped into any one language without deeper analysis; these form their own groups. The number of code-switches in one text ranged from 1 to 103. The ELFA corpus has a total number of 165 texts, of which code-switching occurred in 82. As the qualitative analysis shows, not all code-switching occurred into speakers’ L1s.

Table 1: Code-switching in the ELFA corpus according to the language switched into

<b>Language switched into</b>	<b>Number of instances</b>	<b>Percentage of total 646 switches</b>	<b>Percentage of speakers to whom this is a native language</b>
<b>Finnish</b>	223	34.5%	28.5%
<b>German</b>	146	<b>22.6%</b>	8.2%
<b>Russian</b>	47	7.3%	6.6%
<b>Swedish</b>	27	4.2%	6.4%
<b>French</b>	22	3.4%	3.6%
<b>Polish</b>	10	1.5%	1.8%
<b>Italian</b>	6	0.9%	2.9%
<b>other</b>	36	5.6%	42.0%
<i>Nih, jaa, aha, etc.</i>	66	(10.2%)	
<b>unidentified</b>	63	(9.8%)	
<b>Total</b>	646	(100.0%)	100.0%

The speech event types in the ELFA corpus include seminar discussions (USEMD), PhD thesis defence discussions (UDEFD), lectures (ULEC), conference presentations (CPRE), seminar presentations (USEMP), conference discussions (CDIS), lecture discussions (ULECD), PhD thesis defence presentations (UDEFP), and panel

discussions (UOTH). The next table (*Table 2*) shows the distribution of speech events and code-switching in the whole corpus.

*Table 2: Code-switching (CS) according to speech event type*

<b>Speech event type</b>	<b>Number of words</b>	<b>Number of CS</b>	<b>Frequency of CS in every 10,000 words</b>
<b>CDIS</b>	74,035	42	5.67
<b>CPRE</b>	94,314	68	7.21
<b>UDEFD</b>	208,210	61	2.93
<b>UDEFP</b>	21,773	66	<b>30.31</b>
<b>ULEC</b>	141,642	74	5.22
<b>ULECD</b>	57,720	41	7.10
<b>UOTH</b>	13,414	11	<b>8.20</b>
<b>USEMD</b>	346,673	275	<b>7.93</b>
<b>USEMP</b>	78,204	8	<b>1.02</b>
<b>Total</b>	1,035,985	646	

When the frequency of code-switching in the corpus is calculated with the help of the number of words in each speech event type, it shows that code-switching is most frequent in panel discussions and defence presentations and least frequent in seminar presentations (*Table 2*). The high number of code-switching in panel discussions and defence presentations and why these text types have not been chosen for qualitative analysis in this paper will be discussed in the next chapter.

Looking at the number of text files in each speech event type (*Table 3*) and in how many of them code-switching occurs, it can be seen that all in all discussions have a higher percentage of events with code-switching than monologues. In the whole corpus code-switching occurs in nearly half of the text files. Seminar presentations show the lowest percentage of text files with code-switching (19%) and the highest percentage can be found in panel discussions and defence discussions..

*Table 3: Text files with code-switching*

<b>Speech event type</b>	<b>Number of text files</b>	<b>Number of text files with CS</b>	<b>Percentage of text files with CS</b>
<b>CDIS</b>	14	8	<b>57%</b>
<b>CPRE</b>	34	14	41%
<b>UDEFD</b>	14	13	<b>93%</b>
<b>UDEFP</b>	10	4	40%
<b>ULEC</b>	20	8	40%
<b>ULECD</b>	12	7	<b>58%</b>
<b>UOTH</b>	1	1	<b>100%</b>
<b>USEMD</b>	33	22	<b>67%</b>
<b>USEMP</b>	27	5	19%
<b>Total</b>	165	82	50%

The types of switching range from single words to longer chunks. To see what kind of switches occurred, I divided the switches into four groups: single words, short phrases of

two to four words, longer phrases of five or more words, and unrecognisable speech. Code-switching most often took the form of single words – 414 occurrences – and short phrases – 140 occurrences out of 646. Longer phrases of five or more words constituted only 31 of the total switches and unrecognisable speech made the grouping impossible in 61 instances.

The following section turns to the qualitative analysis of the corpus.

## **5.2 Qualitative analysis of code-switching in the ELFA corpus**

This analysis concentrates on code-switching within the speech event type of seminar discussions (USEMD). This was the biggest group with 33% of all the words, and 43% of all the code-switches in the corpus. The frequency of code-switching was 7.93 per 10,000 words. This group had a fairly high number of text files including code-switching: 22 out of 33. The number of code-switching in one text ranged from 1 to 103, the same as in the whole corpus. This speech event type also has the same variety of subject fields as the whole corpus: behavioural sciences, economics and administration, humanities, medicine, natural sciences, social sciences, and technology.

The highest frequency of code-switching was to be found in the text type of defence presentations (*Table 2*). The remarkably high percentage compared to any other group can be explained by the fact that 63 of the 66 switches in this text type occur in just one text file that belongs to the field of translation studies. In the same vein, of the 61 switches found in the text type of defence discussions 37 switches occurred in one file of translation studies. Defence discussions also entailed a remarkably high number of text files with code-switching – 13 out of 14 (*Table 3*). In this speech event type the use of Latin is an intrinsic part of the communication (e.g. ‘kustos’). Although the text type of panel discussions (UOTH) showed the second highest frequency of code-switching in the corpus it does not offer enough material for a qualitative study and it is not balanced enough with only one text file.

The analysis of the 275 instances of code-switching in USEMD showed that the speakers did not always switch into their native languages. In 61 instances the speakers used a language other than their mother tongue and in 208 occurrences they used their native language. Six instances remained unknown due to three different reasons: (1) multiple speakers were speaking and the text passage was tagged with <SS> in the corpus, (2) the mother tongues of all the speakers in the corpus could not be identified and coded, and (3) four instances were too unclear to transcribe.

Following from the closer analysis of the 275 individual instances I will next propose a typology of functions of code-switching in the seminar discussions of the ELFA corpus. The switches marked with the tag <FOREIGN> have been divided into four main categories: (1) Word-search, (2) Addressee specification, (3) Referential code-switching, and (4) Slips. Finally, I shall present examples of instances that are tagged in the corpus as switches into a foreign language but are not considered to be examples of code-switching in this study as explained in section 3.1. These examples include lexical borrowings and names. It is to bear in mind that the four main categories overlap to some extent.

In order to contextualise the following examples, they are presented with background information available in the text files. These include information on the academic discipline, title of the event, native languages of speakers appearing in the extracts and their academic roles. Although gender and age group are available in the corpus files they will not be presented here, since the use of foreign language items is not analysed according to those items in this study. The speaker abbreviations (e.g. S1, S2) refer to those used in the corpus. In addition, some immediate textual context is included in the examples to help understand the categorisation made here. Bold font is used in the excerpts to highlight the elements of a language other than English. The transcription conventions can be found in appendix 1. I have offered English translations of the switched items in square brackets.

### 5.2.1 Word-search

In some instances code-switching was used in order to get help in situations where an English equivalent was not found. Some of these were answered by the person herself, some of them by other speakers.

The next example is from social sciences, from the discipline of international relations. In answering a question from another participant about “defining the centre”, the speaker switches into Finnish to ask “mikä on manner” [what is continent].

*Excerpt 1: Mikä on manner?*

S2: GERMAN, RESEARCH STUDENT

S3: FINNISH, UNDERGRADUATE

<S2> okay , what what do you mean by centre you've used sometimes the word centre so bringing the north closer to the centre what is the centre who defines what the centre is </S2>

<S3> well basically the historical centre when we think the periphery and the centre so , er i would say <FOREIGN> **mikä on manner** </FOREIGN> er the continental europe would be the centre because of the history and then there would be peripheries like mediterranean countries although they are nearer to the centre than than we are but still the main players on the stage like france and germany according to history </S3>

There were two other speakers in the seminar group that had Finnish as their native language. Thus, it could be that the speaker addressed the question to the other Finnish speakers in the room, but she comes up with the answer to her own question (“the continental europe”), and it is possible that she was thinking aloud, asking herself the question. We can see that the switch does not disrupt the interaction as the speaker’s talk continues without any further pondering of the searched term.

The next example of the same group is from a biology seminar that discusses inbreeding in captive and wild populations. The difference to the first example is that the speaker does not answer the question herself but that the answer comes from another speaker.

*Excerpt 2: Mikä on olla sukua? Lisääntyä mikä se niinku mikä?*

S1: JAPANESE, JUNIOR STAFF

S2: FINNISH, UNDERGRADUATE,

S3: SWEDISH, UNDERGRADUATE

S6: SWEDISH, FINNISH, MASTER'S STUDENT

S8: ITALIAN, JUNIOR STAFF

<S2> and they say in this article that that c- mhm mhm the reason might be that there is some differences in mhm @i don't know@ be- in bef- behaviour <S6> mhm </S6> <S1> [mhm] </S1> [of wolf] <S8> mhm </S8> because if they're mhm so <FOREIGN> **mikä on olla @sukua@ läheistä sukua** </FOREIGN> </S2>

<S3> er [related] </S3>

<S6> [yeah closely related] yeah </S6>

<S2> yes <S6> yeah </S6> closely related that the mhm wolf maybe don't mhm <FOREIGN> **@lisääntyä@ mikä se niinku mikä** </FOREIGN> </S2>

<S3> breed </S3>

<S2> breed together <S6> yeah </S6> <S3> mhm </S3> and when there come other wolf then they start to breed <S8> mhm-hm </S8> er [because the] <S1> [oh] </S1> behaviour </S2>

<S6> yeah </S6>

<S1> mhm-hm yeah that's interesting <S6> mhm-hm </S6> yeah mhm-hm </S1>

The first turn of talk in this example shows how actively the other speakers affirm S2's choice of word as she shows uncertainty in her speech. She then asks a direct question in Finnish when searching for a word: "mikä on olla @sukua@ läheistä sukua" [what is to be related closely related] and gets an answer from two other speakers. The first one, S3,

answers the first part of her question by saying “er related” and simultaneously S6 replies to the second part of her question with “yeah closely related yeah”. S2 then continues by agreeing with the answer and then continues and integrates the answer “closely related” to her speech. In the same turn of talk she asks another direct question in Finnish: “@lisääntyä@ mikä se niinku mikä” [to breed what it like what] and again gets immediately an answer from S3: “breed”. After S2 has repeated the word, S6 and S3 affirm this by “yeah” and “mhm” and after S2 has incorporated the item into her speech S8 affirms this by “mhm-hm”.

The next example shows a moment of word-search that does not appear in the form of a direct question. The example is taken from a discussion in women’s studies, on female body in the third world countries.

*Excerpt 3: lapsen etu*

S1: FINNISH, SENIOR STAFF

S5: FINNISH, MASTER’S STUDENT

<S5> [...] , and for that for a child to grow up in such an environment would be extremely unhealthy and it's all for the <FOREIGN> **lapsen etu** </FOREIGN> the er </S5>

<S1> advantage [for yeah] </S1>

<S5> [what yeah] what's good for the child </S5>

<S1> what's good </S1>

<S5> and it's seen as it's it's better for the child not sort of not to be , er there's a child is not let to be born in such family </S5>

The first speaker, S5, a native Finnish speaker, uses the Finnish equivalent “lapsen etu” [child’s advantage] without a pause, right after the English definite article. Hereafter she tries to find the English equivalent, starting again with the English definite article and then giving a sign of willing to continue by using the filler “er”. Also a Finnish speaker, S1 then cuts in trying to suggest a translation “advantage for yeah”, but S5 continues before S1 has finished her suggestion and comes up with the solution “what’s good for

the child”, although she first acknowledges S1’s suggestion with a “what yeah”. This is followed by S1’s repetition of S5’s solution before S5 continues her talk and uses the form “it’s better for the child”.

### 5.2.2 Addressee specification

In a number of instances code-switching was used to address a part of the group. Clearly, the categories are overlapping. For instance, when a speaker switches language to look for help in a word-search moment she is simultaneously specifying an addressee.

The first example is taken from a seminar discussion in education in behavioural sciences. In this text file there were a total of 26 switches, 23 of which were done by the same speaker (S23), mainly into German and Finnish. She was a Finnish speaker who – as seen in the excerpt below – attested that German is her favourite language. She expresses a couple of times that she has some difficulties with English.

*Excerpt 4: Willkommen, Deutsch ist meine Lieblingssprache, ah so, jajaja*

S13: GERMAN, FINNISH, ACADEMIC ROLE UNKNOWN,

S23: FINNISH, JUNIOR STAFF

<S23> [...] okay who are you and fr- where are you from </S23>

<S13> <NAME S13> from switzerland <S23> from </S23> switzerland

</S13>

<S23> switzerland and where in switzerland </S23>

<S13> from the north </S13>

<S23> okay <FOREIGN> **willkommen** </FOREIGN> </S23>

<S13> @thank you@ </S13>

<S23> @okay@ <FOREIGN> **deutsch ist meine lieblingssprache**

</FOREIGN> </S23>

<S13> <FOREIGN> **ah so** [@@] </FOREIGN> </S13>

<S23> <FOREIGN> **[ja ja] ja** </FOREIGN> okay [...] </S23>

When S23 finds out that S13 is from Switzerland, she uses the opportunity to greet her in German saying “willkommen” [welcome]. However, S13 does not respond to this in German, but in English with a “thank you”. When S23 expresses that German is her favourite language (“deutsch ist meine lieblichssprache”) S13 responds in German with a confirming “ah so” [oh yeah]. S23 confirms this in German (“[ja ja] ja”) after which she continues to speak in English.

The next example occurs in the end of a philosophy seminar. Prior to this part of the text, the participants discuss philosophy and this switch marks a change in topic, moving to suggest that they should call it a day.

*Excerpt 5: Onko se siinä?*

S1: FINNISH, SENIOR STAFF

S2: FINNISH: JUNIOR STAFF

<S2> <FOREIGN> **onko se siinä** </FOREIGN> </S2>

<S1> yeah i guess we are running late </S1>

The first speaker – S2 – addresses another Finnish speaker in Finnish (“onko se siinä” [was that it]) who answers in English.

The fact that these discussions took part in an instructional context showed in a number of code-switching instances. In other words, code-switching was sometimes used to ensure the participants’ understanding. The next example is from a seminar in forestry.

*Excerpt 6: lainan vakuus*

S9: FINNISH, MASTER’S STUDENT

S13: FINNISH, SWEDISH, SENIOR STAFF

<S9> [...] and then er problems about this mess in land tenure systems er is that if you don't own the land you cannot use the land as collateral and then you [can't] </S9>

<S13> [everyone] knows what collateral means <FOREIGN> **lainan vakuus**  
</FOREIGN> </S13>  
<S9> it's the thing with what you can er borrow money from the bank you  
need to have some kind of thing to </S9>  
<SU> security </SU>  
<S13> mhm </S13>  
<S9> yeah , so they cannot get credit and it's then er pretty hard to raise from  
the poverty [...] </S9>

A member of the senior staff, S13 interrupts the master's student S9 to ask whether "[everyone] knows what collateral means" and translates the term immediately into Finnish: "lainan vakuus". After this, the presenter S9, a Finnish speaker, continues by explaining the term in English. An unknown speaker fills in to help with the explanation, after which follow the affirming "mhm" from S13 and "yeah" from S9. After a pause S9 continues with her explanation she was giving before the interruption.

### 5.2.3 Referential code-switching

Most of the instances that were tagged as <FOREIGN> in the corpus were grouped into this category. Unlike the switches that were specified to a limited group of speakers, these switches were meant for the whole group. And unlike the switches in the first group, these switches were used to look for help and to look for an English equivalent.

In a number of code-switching occurrences the speakers relied on shared cultural or subject field knowledge. This first example is taken from a seminar discussion in behavioural sciences.

*Excerpt 7: liberté, égalité, fraternité*

S1: RUSSIAN, JUNIOR STAFF

S2: DUTCH, SENIOR STAFF

<S2> for instance by Brubaker a well-known scholar here who argues that Germany - he he he contrasts Germany to France and he he thinks that German nationhood relies on things like - er German national identity er relies on things like er er culture language history <S1> mhm </S1> whereas French nationhood relies on more the kind of the ideas of the French revolution <FOREIGN> **liberté égalité fraternité** </FOREIGN> and here, here so he sees this kind of er well contrast as still influencing today's policies and er well i i have my doubts about this theory but it's often said it's it's often according to this kind of theory you have these so-called typical civic nations </S2>

The first speaker, a native speaker of Dutch, explains her switch beforehand by stating that they are “the ideas of the French revolution”. She does not translate these ideas – “liberté égalité fraternité” [freedom equality brotherhood] which suggests that she thinks the listeners are familiar with these ideas of the French revolution. Nor do any of the listeners interrupt her.

A web project in the city of Tampere called *Mansetori*<sup>5</sup> was discussed by a multidisciplinary group in a master's thesis seminar on information society. They used the name eleven times in total. *Mansetori* has also an official translation of the name in English – Manse square – as their web page suggests, but this name was not used by the group. In excerpt 11, a native speaker of Chinese (S5) tells that she is interested in “mansetori” as part of her project.

*Excerpt 8: Mansetori*

S1: FINNISH, SENIOR STAFF

S5: CHINESE, MASTER'S STUDENT,

S18: FINNISH, SENIOR STAFF

<S5> [...] i include here also case studies, at the moment i think i would like to use this <FOREIGN> **mansetori** </FOREIGN> as the Finnish case study

---

<sup>5</sup> For more information, see <www.mansetori.fi>.

and i think it might be nice to see how the situation is going on now after the programme was launched , erm about around five years i think </S5>  
<S18> yeah something like that </S18>  
<S1> [mhm-hm] </S1>

The switch is not translated, and as S5 continues, she refers to “mansetori” as the Finnish case study, which helps to locate the switch in a language.

Speakers sometimes refer to a regional specialty when they switch codes. Although a concept with an English equivalent, the speaker chooses to use Finnish instead. Excerpt 12 is from a multidisciplinary master’s thesis seminar in social sciences. The native Swahili speaker S10 talks about buying a medicine “at the apteekki” [pharmacy], where students do not get a 10 per cent discount anymore. The switch may be triggered by her reference to a local, Finnish phenomenon.

*Excerpt 9: apteekki*

S10: SWAHILI (TANZANIA), MASTER’S STUDENT

S15: FINNISH, MASTER’S STUDENT

<S10> [...] in the case of health care and we now have to pay everything if you go to buy this medicine at the <FOREIGN> **apteekki** </FOREIGN> no 10 per cent (per cent) <S15> yeah </S15> for students anymore [...]</S10>

When analysing the seminar discussions for the 275 instances that were tagged as <FOREIGN> to mark the use of a language other than English, it showed that these languages were used in some instances as objects of discussion rather than as mere tools for communication. During one session in women’s studies the participants were discussing examples of sexually loaded words in different languages. 45 of the 275 switches occurred in this text file alone.

*Excerpt 10: naistutkimus*

S1: FINNISH, JUNIOR STAFF

<S1> [...] (so i) ha- have some finnish words here for just for you to see and and maybe you have some examples from your own language . now we can see how much you've learned finnish (xx) <SU> @@ yeah </SU> okay so , for example , we're in the women's studies department , so we're learning <FOREIGN> **naistutkimus** </FOREIGN> then . so <FOREIGN> **nais** </FOREIGN> meaning a woman and <FOREIGN> **tutkimus** </FOREIGN> research , er and if you're a person , a researcher a female researcher in this area then you're <FOREIGN> **naistutkija** </FOREIGN> [...] </S1>

Fifteen speakers with seven different L1s took part in this discussion. A total of 46 switches were tagged in it, three of which had been too unclear to be transcribed. Out of these switches, 24 instances occurred into Finnish, 16 into German, and three into Italian. One instance had been transcribed incorrectly as *E-N* and not tagged because of that, although it is more probable that the speaker referred to the German feminine suffix *I-N* in this context. The difference cannot be recognised only by listening to the pronunciation, since the English E and German I are pronounced similarly.

Another file that showed a high number of code-switching where the switches served as objects for the discussion was a seminar discussion in the field of education. The participants tried to negotiate the definition of the German *bildung*, brought up by the German speaking instructor who explained that it was not possible to translate the term. This discussion had eight participants with four different L1s, German as the most prominent L1 with four speakers. *Bildung* and its derivatives were used in a total of 90 instances.

*Excerpt 11: Bildung*

S1: GERMAN, JUNIOR STAFF

S2: GERMAN, UNDERGRADUATE,

NS7: ENGLISH (USA), ACADEMIC ROLE: OTHER

<S1> [...] you don't have <FOREIGN> **bildung** </FOREIGN> in german  
you are <FOREIGN> **gebildet** </FOREIGN> that's yes that's @@ er you  
<FOREIGN> **man hat nicht bildung sondern man ist gebildet**  
</FOREIGN> yeah that's the difference erm so @@ erm so and this er  
humboldt [@@] <SS> [@@] </SS> you-u you don't acquire <FOREIGN>  
**bildung** </FOREIGN> you are <FOREIGN> **gebildet** </FOREIGN> or you  
are not [@@] </S1>

<NS7> [what] is the translation </NS7>

<S2> [there is no translation that's the problem @@] </S2>

<SS> [@@] [@@] </SS>

### 5.2.4 Slips

Some of the switches marked in the corpus could not be grouped into the above categories, because they did not serve an apparent function. Thus, they are labelled as slips. In the first example a Finnish speaker switches to Finnish for the filler “noh” that could be translated as “well”.

*Excerpt 12: noh*

S23: FINNISH, JUNIOR STAFF

<S23> [...] it was really wonderful time and it was <FOREIGN> **noh**  
</FOREIGN> it was my only time when i have been somewhere when they  
are playing football [...] <S23>

The speaker in the next example is the same as in excerpt 12. She is the one who in excerpt 4 said that German is her favourite tongue. In excerpt 13, the speaker uses the German equivalent “belgien” for Belgium. German is one of the official languages in Belgium, which could explain, why she refers to that name. On the other hand, during the discussion session she also uses the German “dänemark” for Denmark and Finnish “färsaaret” for Faroe Islands.

*Excerpt 13: Belgien*

S23: FINNISH, JUNIOR STAFF

<S23> mhm-hm , it's very very very interesting and like you said <NAME  
S3> it's not only about rights it's about duties too and here <FOREIGN>  
**belgien** </FOREIGN> is one very very interesting example have you known  
that you are so interesting have you been [thinking that you others have only  
rights] </S23>

<SS> [@@] </SS>

The next example shows a Finnish speaker switching to Finnish (“joo” [yes]) when answering a question from S6. It is to note that S6 is a Somali speaker. What we cannot tell is what S6’s knowledge of Finnish is.

*Excerpt 14: joo*

S1: FINNISH, SENIOR STAFF

S6: SOMALI, ACADEMIC ROLE UNKNOWN

<S1> okay thank you very much so <COUGH> it's important , important  
problem and i i think we er . can have much discussion , on this topics it's  
it's obviously very , <S6> yeah can i </S6> familiar <FOREIGN>  
**joo** </FOREIGN> please sit down and you can already </S1>

### 5.2.5 Other instances of language alternation

This section introduces the tagged items that were not considered to be examples of code-switching in this study. These included borrowings and names.

#### *Borrowings*

One group of instances that were marked with the tag <FOREIGN> in the corpus are examples of items that are borrowed from another language and already integrated into the target language, a phenomenon that was discussed in chapter 3. These are separated from code-switching since the borrowed items are already established in the language that it has been borrowed into and would be understood by a monolingual speaker.

The first excerpt is from the field of humanities, more specifically from women's studies. There are eight speakers present in the seminar discussion. These two instances of items tagged as <FOREIGN> are the only ones in this speech event and the only ones of the tagged ones in the seminar discussions that I could identify as borrowings. The participants discuss the use of psychoanalysis in film theory. The foreign item here, *mise-en-scène* is part of theatre and film terminology. The speakers in this excerpt all have Finnish as their native language, but the other participants in the seminar included other native languages as well: Polish, English (UK), Lithuanian, and Japanese.

#### *Excerpt 15: mise-en-scène*

S1: FINNISH; SENIOR STAFF

S2: FINNISH, UNDERGRADUATE

S4: FINNISH, MASTER'S STUDENT

SS: MULTIPLE SPEAKERS

<S4> [psychoanalysis] is just one way <S2> yeah </S2> of [of] <S1>  
[mhm-hm] </S1> , looking at <S2> yeah </S2> camera angles [and] <S2>  
[yeah] </S2> point of views and cuts [and] <S2> [yeah] yeah </S2>  
<FOREIGN> **mise en scène** </FOREIGN> and all [that] </S4>

<SS> [mhm] </SS>

<S1> mhm-hm and you mainly concentrate on the text i think or if i mean the that er </S1>

<S2> yes [and the] </S2>

<S1> [film] as a text [or] </S1>

<S2> [ye- ye- yes] and yeah and yeah i don't yeah pay that much attention on on editing or that sort of thing <FOREIGN> **mise en scène** </FOREIGN> </S2>

The borrowed item is incorporated in the target language and does not raise any signs of miscomprehension in the other participants.

### *Names*

One group of occurrences that were tagged as <FOREIGN> can be categorised as names. Some of these were translated or explained in English, whereas others were not. In this study they do not count as code-switching, as there most probably is no English equivalent to these names. This first example is from a seminar in women's studies. The speaker S1 talks about a group called "mainiot maikat". The speaker says that she has tried to find an English equivalent for the name but is not certain how to call it. She offers the translation "splendid teachers" for the name. The explanation passes unquestioned in the group and the speech flows further.

### *Excerpt 16: Mainiot maikat*

S1: FINNISH, SENIOR STAFF

<S1> [...] we have this er we have a group called i don't know how to call it in english i tried to figure it out but it's something like splendid teachers it's <FOREIGN> **mainiot maikat** </FOREIGN> in finnish and er we we are

going to make a book on er some ideas on how to improve the seminars and so on and we will publish it in the net [...] </S1>

During a seminar discussion in the field of forestry, the name of the Finnish oil company, Neste Oil comes up.

*Excerpt 17: neste*

S13: FINNISH, SWEDISH, SENIOR STAFF

<S13> the roundtable where <FOREIGN> **neste** </FOREIGN> oil from finland is a mem- a full member for instance so that is for certifying they provide certification they have certain rules [...]

The name is not translated and the speech continues without any interruptions.

## 6 Discussion

In this study, I have analyzed whether and to what extent code-switching occurs in the ELFA corpus and what functions it serves in seminar discussions. This study has shown that, first of all, code-switching into a number of different languages appears in the corpus. The 646 instances found in the corpus were grouped according to the languages switched into, the speech event types and the text files they appear in, and the length of the switch. In the quantitative analysis, unlike in the qualitative analysis, the occurrences were not analyzed according to whether they would count for code-switching or not as defined in section 3.1. However, the number of instances that were tagged as other language usage and separated from code-switching in the part of the qualitative analysis, namely borrowings and names, proved to be fairly small. Based on this, it could be argued that the number of occurrences tagged as <FOREIGN> that would not count as code-switching as defined in this paper would also be small in other parts of the corpus.

The quantitative analysis shows that the languages that were used in the corpus mainly corresponded to the percentage of speakers of that particular language. However, German had a remarkably high percentage of occurrences (22.6 %) compared to the percentage of speakers (8.2 %) in the corpus. The explanation for this high percentage can be seen in excerpt 14: Of the 146 instances of German in the whole corpus, *bildung* and its derivatives counted for 90 instances.

The instances of language alternation were grouped according to speech event type. Also frequencies per every 10,000 words were calculated for every group. All in all, multiparty communication showed a higher frequency of code-switching than monologic events. A remarkably high frequency in the text event type of defence presentations could be explained by one specific text file from translation studies. Seminar presentations showed a low frequency of code-switching, which, however, may be explained by the fact that presentations are often planned beforehand.

After categorizing the switches according to how many different text files entailed occurrences in each speech event type, we could see that the percentage varied between 19% and 100%. The latter was the case of the text event type of panel discussions which only had one text file. To analyse further reasons for the outcomes of the other event types would require a closer look at the particular files. The quantitative analysis also presented the length of switches. Short utterances of only single words were most common in the corpus with 414 occurrences. This result compares to that of Klimpfinger (2009): The majority of code-switching in her data also consisted of single words.

Based on the quantitative analysis, the group of seminar discussions were selected for qualitative study. The 275 switches in this group were first analysed according to whether the speakers switch to their native or another language. The result of the analysis was that 61 of 275 times the speakers used a language other than their mother tongue. Klimpfinger's study presented the opposite result: 54 of the 104 switches in her data occurred into an L2.

With the help of fourteen examples, four different categories of code-switching were identified in the ELFA corpus: (1) Word-search, (2) Addressee specification, (3) Referential switching, and (4) Slips. The first two groups are especially overlapping, since word-search was sometimes followed by the speaker herself, sometimes by others and sometimes by a mixture of both. In the group of addressee specification the examples showed that code-switching can mark a change of topic and it can be used to ensure understanding which might be triggered by the educational context. Referential code-switching made use of speakers' shared knowledge. Even though no translation of the switched item occurred, hints to a specific language were found which could help situate the switch. Switches in this group were also used to refer to context-specific phenomena. Where paraphrasing of the switched items in English was used, the switches offered extra information in the communication or they even functioned as objects of longer passages of communication. The group of slips resulted from code-switches that could not be categorised into any of the previous groups, because they did not serve any apparent function. These switches could be considered as personal communication strategy, some unintended, some used to cover gaps in language knowledge.

It would not have been necessary to tag the items in the group 5.2.5 which included borrowings with the tag <FOREIGN> at all, based on that they are already integrated into the target language and would be understood by a monolingual speaker familiar with the terminology of the subject field. The same applies to names. Names of people, companies, institutions and objects that do not have an English equivalent were not considered as code-switching in this study.

One should bear in mind that although the background information stored in the corpus tells us a lot about the groups and what the speakers' native languages are, we do not know what the whole linguistic repertoire of each speaker is. In the same vein, if I had done the recordings myself or if I had had video material, I could have based my analysis on different things – e.g. whether the speaker looks at someone particular in the group when asking her question.

Although I agree with Cogo (2009) that the speakers use code-switching skilfully in ELF interaction, my findings imply that the speakers sometimes resort to code-switching due to linguistic deficiency. In line with Cogo's (2009) findings, also in the seminar discussions of the ELFA corpus code-switching serves as an extra tool for communication and it gives the opportunity to express greater nuances, signal solidarity and membership to a group and it serves for reaching greater efficiency in conversation. The results of this study compare also to the results of Klimpfinger's study (2009) on code-switching in ELF. In the ELFA corpus as well, code-switching is used to specify an addressee, introduce another idea, appeal for assistance and to signal culture.

All in all, the main finding of this study results in the same argument than Cogo's and Klimpfinger's studies: Code-switching is an intrinsic element of ELF and the ELF speakers use code-switching as a pragmatic strategy drawing skilfully and creatively from the linguistic repertoires at hand.

## 7 Conclusion

In their state of the art article, Jenkins, Cogo and Dewey (2012) state that the focus of ELF research has shifted from finding and analyzing the linguistic elements that are intrinsic to ELF to defining the functions that these elements serve. In the same spirit this study did not focus on the grammatical construction of code-switching but on whether and to what extent code-switching occurs in the ELFA corpus and what functions it serves.

I used the ELFA corpus that had items in foreign languages already tagged in it. The languages that were used could be identified in the majority of these items with the help of personal language knowledge and several other references. The items were also categorized according to the length. The quantitative analysis also offers the distribution and frequency of the items in the different speech event types.

The qualitative analysis of this thesis focused on items in a selected speech event type. Because the group of seminar discussions showed a balanced representation of the phenomenon of code-switching in dialogic event types of the corpus, it can be suggested that the findings of this group are representative also of other speech event types in the ELFA corpus with dialogical nature. In the qualitative analysis, the functions of 275 occurrences of foreign languages were analyzed. The functions were found to be overlapping and in line with with the previous research on the subject. This study confirms an important finding of previous studies, namely that code-switching is used skillfully as a pragmatic strategy by the ELF speakers for a number of functions.

Research has begun to demonstrate how proficient (and not merely non-proficient) ELF speakers exhibit substantial linguistic variation in their interactions for a range of purposes, including the projection of cultural identity, the promotion of solidarity, the sharing of humour and so on, rather

than (primarily) to promote intelligibility between speakers from different first language groups or as a result of interlocutors' different levels of proficiency (Jenkins et al. 2011: 296).

A corpus this large naturally has a lot of positive sides and allows us to find out if certain linguistic patterns occur in ELFA and we are able to make statements and analysis based on the recurring patterns. Some questions (such as how well the speakers know each other and their linguistic backgrounds and what the speakers/listeners who are in the room but not recorded react to different situations) arose during this study that could have been answered with a different type of data, for instance with field observations and interviews. Still, it is most important to note that this particular data presented valuable findings and answers to the research questions. We shall keep in mind that the findings based on this corpus reveal us what is true in this collected data. However, as this is a representative corpus, it allows for generalisations for the population from which the corpus was sampled (McEnery et al. 2066: 121).

One characteristic of ELF is its fluidity and flexibility. Thus, it might be best that the focus in English language teaching and in teaching English as an academic lingua franca would focus on fostering the awareness of its flexibility and on teaching the importance of different pragmatic strategies, emphasizing that these do not have to be considered deviant forms of language usage in ELF. As Jenkins states, "ELF is a means by which English is continually being re-enacted and reinvigorated through the inventiveness of its speakers as they respond to their immediate communicative and expressive needs." (Jenkins et al. 2011: 304).

In the introduction to the book *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*, Mauranen argues against using native speakers of English as proof readers of academic writing:

No policy of having the L2 authors' texts checked by native speakers for linguistic correctness has been applied, because this was regarded as an irrelevant practice in a book presenting international English scholarship.

Whether English has been the first or an additional language to the writers, they have been addressing an international audience, not primarily ENL [English native language] communities. Their contributions thus reflect the kind of language use (Mauranen et al. 2009: 6).

This study, too, has been written in ELF and not checked by a native speaker of English. I began studying English philology at the University of Helsinki in 2005. I had travelled a lot by then, lived in Kenya for a period of time. I had also spent a couple of years in Germany. But I had never been to Britain or the USA for more than a couple of weeks. Of course I had heard these native varieties of English on various media and been taught them when learning English in Finnish schools. At the university I was troubled by not being coherent enough in my use of English, I thought I should choose one native variety and follow it, and be careful not to draw from different kinds of varieties. According to the English Philology homepage of the university<sup>6</sup> “[t]he proficient English skills already possessed by the students are further honed during the studies to approximate as closely as possible the language use of an educated person speaking English as his/her mother tongue.” We were to take a test in pronunciation and were given only two options: British or American English. I felt misplaced with my idiolect when trying to imitate Received Pronunciation for half an hour as best as I could. Most of my own experience in communicating in English has been with people that do not speak it as their mother tongue. We have used English as a lingua franca.

---

<sup>6</sup> Citation is taken from < [www.helsinki.fi/modernlanguages/subjects/english.html](http://www.helsinki.fi/modernlanguages/subjects/english.html) >.

## Bibliography

- AntConc corpus software. Accessed at <http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/software.html>, date of access June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010.
- Auer, Peter (ed.) 1998. *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Brutt-Griffler, Janina and Samimy, Ketko K. 2001. "Transcending the nativeness paradigm". In *World Englishes*, 20 (1), pp. 99–106.
- Cogo, Alessia 2009. "Accommodating Difference in ELF Conversations: A Study of Pragmatic Strategies". In Mauranen, Anna and Elina Ranta (eds.) 2009. *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*, pp. 254–273. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Cogo, Alessia and Martin Dewey 2006. "Efficiency in ELF Communication: From Pragmatic Motives to Lexico-grammatical innovation". In *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, No.5/2, pp. 59–93.
- Crystal, David 2004. "The Past, Present, and Future of World English". In Gardt, Andreas and Bernd Hüddauf (eds.) 2004. *Globalization and the future of German*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 24–46.
- ELFA transcription guide 7/2004. Accessed at <http://www.helsinki.fi/englanti/elfa/ELFA%20transcription%20guide.pdf>, date of access April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010.
- Graddol, David 1997. *The Future of English? A guide to forecasting the popularity of the English language in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. The British Council.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Gumperz, John J. and Jenny Cook-Gumperz 2005. "Making space for bilingual communicative practice". In *Intercultural Pragmatics* 2–1, pp. 1–23.
- Hakulinen, Auli, Jyrki Kalliokoski, Salli Kankaanpää, Antti Kanner, Kimmo Koskenniemi, Lea Laitinen, Sari Maamies and Pirkko Nuolijärvi 2009. "Suomen kielen tulevaisuus – kielipoliittinen toimintaohjelma". Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen verkkojulkaisuja 7. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus.
- House, Juliane 2010. "The Pragmatics of English as a lingua franca". In Trosborg, Anna (ed.) 2010. *Pragmatics across languages and cultures*, pp. 363–387.
- House, Juliane 2003. "English as a lingua franca: A threat to multilingualism?" In *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7 (4), pp. 556–578.
- Hülmbauer, Cornelia, Heike Böhringer, and Barbara Seidlhofer 2008. "Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF): Precursor and partner in intercultural communication." In *Synergies Europe*, No 3, pp. 25–36.
- Jenkins, Jennifer, Alessia Cogo, and Martin Dewey 2011. "Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca". In *Language Teaching*, Vol. 44, No. 3, 2011, pp. 281–315.
- Jenkins, Jennifer 2011. "Accommodating (to) ELF in the international university". In *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 43, Issue 4, 2011, pp. 926–936.
- Jenkins, Jennifer 2006. "Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA". In *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 137–162.
- Jenkins, Jennifer 2009. "English as a lingua franca: interpretations and attitudes". In *World Englishes*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 200–207.
- Jenkins, Jennifer 2003. *World Englishes. A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1997. "World Englishes and English-using communities". In *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 17, pp. 66–87.

- Klimpfinger, Theresa 2009. “‘She’s mixing the two languages together’ – Forms and Functions of Code-Switching in English as a Lingua Franca”. In Mauranen, Anna and Elina Ranta (eds.) 2009. *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. pp. 348–371. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Klimpfinger, Theresa 2007. “‘Mind you, sometimes you have to mix’ – The role of code-switching in English as a lingua franca”. *Vienna English Working Papers*, 16 (2), pp. 36–61.
- Knapp, Annelie 2011. When comprehension is crucial: Using English as a medium of instruction at a German university. In De Houwer, Annick and Antje Wilton (eds.) 2011. *English in Europe Today. Sociocultural and educational perspectives*. John Benjamins B.V., pp. 51–70.
- Leitner, Gerhard 2009. *Weltsprache Englisch: Vom angelsächsischen Dialekt zur globalen Lingua franca*. München: C. H. Beck.
- Leppänen, Sirpa, Anne Pitkänen-Huhta, Tarja Nikula, Samu Kytölä, Timo Törmäkangas, Kari Nissinen, Leila Kääntä, Tiina Virkkula, Mikko Laitinen, Päivi Pahta, Heidi Koskela, Salla Lähdesmäki and Henna Jousmäki 2009. *Kansallinen kyselytutkimus englannin kielestä Suomessa: Käyttö, merkitys ja asenteet*. Jyväskylän yliopisto: Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 132.
- Mauranen, Anna and Elina Ranta (eds.) 2009. *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Mauranen, Anna 2006a. “Signaling and preventing misunderstanding in English as lingua franca communication”. In *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* Vol. 177 2006, pp. 123–150.
- Mauranen, Anna 2010. “Features of English as a lingua franca in academia”. In Mauranen, Anna and Niina Hynninen (eds.). *The Electronic Journal of the Department of Modern Languages, English Unit at the University of Helsinki*, Vol. 6 2010, Special Issue on English as a Lingua Franca, pp. 6–28.

- Mauranen, Anna 2006b. "A Rich Domain of ELF – the ELFA Corpus of Academic Discourse". In *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp.145–159.
- Mauranen, Anna, Niina Hynninen, and Elina Ranta 2010. "English as an academic lingua franca: The ELFA project". In *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol. 29, pp. 183–190.
- McEnery, Tony, Ricahrd Xiao, and Yukio Tono 2006. *Corpus-Based Language Studies. An advanced resource book*. New York: Routledge.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol 1997. "Code-switching". In Coulmas, Florian (ed.) 1997. *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Nilep, Chad 2006. "'Code Switching' in Sociocultural Linguistics". In *Colorado Research in Linguistics*, Vol 19, pp. 1–22.
- Pakir, Anne 2009. "English as a lingua franca: analyzing research frameworks in international English, world Englishes and ELF. In *World Englishes*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 224–235.
- Phillipson, Robert 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara 2001. "Closing a conceptual gap: the caser for a description of English as a lingua franca". In *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 11, No.2, pp. 133–158.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara 2008. "Of norms and mindsets". In: *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics. International Forum on English as an International Language, special issue edited by Sharifan, Farzad; Clyne, Michael*, 31(3), pp. 33.1–33.7.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara 2009. "Common ground and different realities: world Englishes and English as a lingua franca". In *World Englishes*, Vol. 28. No. 2, pp. 236–245.
- Taavitsainen, Irma and Päivi Pahta 2008. "From global language use to local meanings: English in Finnish public discourse." In *English Today* 95, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 25–38.

Thomason, Sarah Grey 2001. *Language Contact. An Introduction*. Georgetown University Press.

Vikør, Lars S. 2000. "Northern Europe: Languages as Prime Markers of Ethnic and National Identity". In: Stephen Barbour and Cathie Carmichael (eds): *Language and Nationalism in Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., pp. 105–129.

Wächter, Bernd 2008. "Teaching in English on the Rise in European Education". In *International Higher Education* (52), pp. 3–4.

Widdowson, Henry 1994. The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28 (2), pp. 377–389.

## Appendix 1: Transcription conventions

<S1>	Utterance begins
</S1>	Utterance ends
<SU>	Unidentified speaker
<SS>	Several simultaneous speakers
@ @	Laughter
[text]	Overlapping speech
<FOREIGN> text </FOREIGN>	Switching into a foreign language
,	Pause