

Leppänen, Sirpa, Tarja Nikula & Leila Kääntä (eds.) (2008) *Kolmas kotimainen: Lähikuvia englannin käytöstä Suomessa*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Pp. 445. [Tietolipas 224].

Reviewed by Ulla Paatola

Kolmas kotimainen: Lähikuvia englannin käytöstä Suomessa (“The Third Domestic Language: Close-ups on the Use of English in Finland”) offers case studies on the highly topical issue of how English is used in Finnish society in the early 21st century. As the book reminds us, English is no longer just a foreign language Finns use with non-Finns, but has spread into Finnish media, the education system, Finnish working life, and thus into everyday life, so that nowadays Finns sometimes end up using English even among themselves (e.g., pp. 10–12, 15–16, 23, 25). By taking a neutral, or even positive and permissive stance on this phenomenon, this book describes English as an additional “resource” that Finns have in their speech repertoire in addition to their mother tongue. Thus, I take it that the “third domestic” in the book title refers to English being close to a third national language in Finland alongside Finnish and Swedish – even though the title is not explained in so many words. In Finland, the majority of Finns either speak Finnish or Swedish as their mother tongue, and all Finnish and Swedish speakers are obliged to study the other language at school. Theoretically speaking, then, everyone should know both languages and the language which is not a person’s mother tongue – in most cases Swedish – is traditionally referred to as her/his “second domestic language.” The title of the book thus seems to be a play on the traditional perception that Finland has two domestic languages and indicates that the authors of the book do indeed feel that English has a strong hold in Finnish society.

The book has been written by professors and post-graduate students, eleven altogether, from the Department of Languages at the University of Jyväskylä (except for one author). The volume is edited by three of its authors, Sirpa Leppänen, Tarja Nikula and Leila Kääntä. It contains a foreword by the editors, an introductory article and a conclusion by Leppänen and Nikula, and twelve articles altogether. As similar phenomena and conclusions come up over and over again, it would have been clearer from a reader’s viewpoint if there had been more dialogue between the articles and the authors had referred to each other more. Another thing that

could have been focused on more in some articles is the definition of the terminology employed for a reader outside the field of research.

The book is partly a reaction to the public concern about the future of Finnish, as it is argued that English is not replacing Finnish but co-existing with it (pp. 9–10, 426). Thus, the book is of interest to all who have an opinion on the spread of English and about the preservation and maintenance of Finnish. Further, as the back cover states, the book is aimed at language researchers, students and professionals. Having studied, taught and researched English, I feel the book indeed gives food for professional thought. Selective reading might be useful, however – different articles draw the interest of different audiences as the data and methods vary between authors.

Overall, Leppänen and Nikula present the aims and contents of the book very clearly in their introduction (pp. 9–40), making the work of a reviewer much easier. They point out that even though globalization and the spread of English is a widely recognized phenomenon, there is not enough research on the topic (p. 10). While I do, however, think there is already a lot of research on this phenomenon (e.g., Hakala 2007, Paatola 2007, Louhiala-Salminen & Charles 2006, Nuolijärvi 2006, Tamminen-Parre & Kristiansen 2006, Kankaanranta 2005, Mattfolk, Mickwitz & Östman 2004), I think the book corroborates the findings in previous studies as well as offering information that previous studies have not provided. The main contribution is that the book combines insights from many different domains.

To illustrate that Finns face and use English in various situations and ways, Leppänen and Nikula present a continuum describing (1) situations where English is the only or the main language, (2) bilingual situations where both English and Finnish are used and where code-switching and mixing is regular, and (3) situations where Finnish is the main language but so that English words and phrases occasionally mix with it (cf. Figure 2, p. 22; pp. 22–24). This continuum is useful in relating the articles of the book to one another, as the subsequent articles (excluding the conclusion) are divided into three sections (pp. 26–32). However, only some authors clearly explicate where they are on the continuum, which I think everyone should have done for the benefit of the reader.

The first section (pp. 41–202), representing situation (2) on the continuum (p. 26), consists of five articles and is the most extensive of the three sections. What the articles have in common is close analysis of spoken interaction and conversational analytical concepts and tools. It is

especially worthwhile reading Nikula's, Kääntä's and Pitkänen-Huhta's articles one after the other as they focus on English and education and as Nikula and Kääntä describe Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), whereas Pitkänen-Huhta describes traditional foreign language classrooms.

Nikula (pp. 42–72) has a positive view on English in Finnish classrooms as she demonstrates that students use English both when they discuss the subject being taught and informal issues (pp. 48–49, 54–55). Nikula suggests that this is possible because the students are not afraid of making 'mistakes' as the focus of the lessons is on content. She also comes to the valuable conclusion that teaching in the CLIL format should set an example for foreign language teaching in other types of classroom.

The emphasis of Kääntä's multi-semiotic analysis (pp. 73–106) is the teacher. She too argues that CLIL lessons activate and motivate students through functional assignments in ways that foreign language classrooms do not (p. 80). Overall, Kääntä has adopted the positive view on English that *lingua franca* scholars usually have (e.g., Louhiala-Salminen & Charles 2006, Seidlhofer 2001): even though the teacher(s) she analysed did not speak English as their native language or were trained English teachers, she suggests that they used English competently without apparent problems (Kääntä, p. 100).

Similarly to Nikula, Pitkänen-Huhta (pp. 107–135) analyses students. On the one hand, it is apparent on the basis of her description that Finnish and English have separate functions and that the students' use of English is restricted to a few situation types. English is not the language of action, as the students mostly recycle the English of their text book (pp. 116–117, 119). On the other hand, Pitkänen-Huhta highlights the students' language-consciousness. For example, the mixing of Finnish and English functions as a conscious source of humour.

The last two articles in section 1 deal with the language of young people as well. Arja Piirainen-Marsh (pp. 136–168) analyses code-switching from Finnish/English into English/Finnish in the interaction between boys playing video-games. Even though the boys mostly use Finnish, the vocabulary of the English game enters their interaction phonologically, morphologically and syntactically (p. 144). In conclusion, Piirainen-Marsh states that code-switching signals transitions between actions and marks the beginnings of new actions (pp. 148, 161). Overall, the use of English in the midst of playing is a signal of expertise which can only be acquired by playing the game (p. 163).

Anu Muhonen (pp. 169–202) considers the mixing of English and Finnish in the on-the-air dialogues and monologues of Finnish radio anchors. Muhonen draws two conclusions which I find particularly interesting. First, the use of English signals intertextuality and textual coherence as the anchors often recycle adapted and non-adapted English loan words and phrases which have been uttered earlier in the show (pp. 177–182). Secondly, they create polyphonic discourse by the use of English in that an anchor typically uses English when s/he figuratively steps into another person's shoes and speaks in that person's voice (pp. 183–191).

In contrast to section 1, section 2 (pp. 203–329) deals with written language and situations in which Finnish is supposedly the primary language (Leppänen & Nikula, p. 28). The section opens with Leppänen's topical description of language choices (pp. 204–235), mixing of and code-switching between Finnish and English on fan forum websites written by Finns. She characterises some language choices as a means of "stylization" (pp. 211, 213). For example, writing English-only texts makes it possible for the writers to acquire an international readership. Interestingly, a fan may "stylize" entirely in English when the subject matter is delicate or sensitive, like eroticism (p. 211) (Muhonen comes to this conclusion as well; pp. 185, 190–191). Yet another method of stylization is mixing languages and thus creating an insiders' register in the fan fiction community (p. 217). Overall, code-switching has several discourse level functions in the data (p. 222). Finally, Leppänen consoles those who worry about the future of Finnish by pointing out that although fan fiction writers use English extensively, the Finnish language is still important for them (pp. 208, 230).

The most thought-provoking article for me in the section is the one by Samu Kytölä (pp. 236–274) who shows how Finns express ridicule and racism through the use of English in an online football discussion forum with Finnish as its main language. Several Finns who posted comments on the forum made fun of a presumably Turkish fan's non-idiomatic English by recycling the Turk's posts in their own posts and using non-idiomatic and ungrammatical English on purpose (e.g., pp. 260–265). What is remarkable about this, as Kytölä also points out, is that Finns now know English well enough to feel that they have the authority to judge those whose English is obviously not as good as theirs (p. 252). Thus, since so-called mistakes are not tolerated, English is not the amicable lingua franca in Kytölä's data that it is generally assumed to be (pp. 252–253) (cf., e.g.,

Louhiala-Salminen & Charles 2006: 46, Kankaanranta 2005: 55, Seidlhofer 2001: 143).

The last two articles in the section are by Marianne Toriseva and Terhi Paakkinen. Toriseva (pp. 275–298) takes part in multilingualism discourse by presenting a coverage of a visit to Finland by American skateboarders from a skateboarders' magazine. In contra-distinction to the others, she approaches her data from a systemic functional viewpoint, comparing the number of English features in the theme and rheme of sentences (p. 278), concluding that English elements are usually found in the rheme (pp. 287, 290) in the form of adapted and non-adapted loan words which the readership seems to be assumed to know (pp. 288–290). Toriseva stresses that the terminological choices may not have been the writer's choice, since there are often no Finnish words for such a special field as skateboarding.

Instead of analysing youth language, Paakkinen studies the language of advertising in television and magazines (pp. 299–329). Perhaps not surprisingly, one of her observations is that there is more English in Finnish advertisements than in advertisements in some other countries (pp. 304–305, 325). Contrary to what one might expect – after having learnt this and read all the articles in the book so far – the overall quantity of English elements is not great (p. 305). However, I think it is worth mentioning that even though English does not predominate in quantity, it is positioned visibly so that it seems to predominate (pp. 307, 314–315). What is also striking is the functional difference that the two languages have, facts being presented in Finnish and persuasion carried out in English (p. 316).

Finally, section 3 (pp. 331–420) deals with discourse which is entirely in English (Leppänen & Nikula, p. 30), including description of both spoken and written language and of language attitudes. The section begins with Heidi Koskela's analysis (pp. 332–354) of television sports interviews in which a Finnish reporter interviews athletes and ice hockey players in English (p. 332). Perhaps her most interesting claim is that sportsmen do not need to know the interview language that well, but to manage the interview well, they need to know the interview format (pp. 333, 352). I think this is something that foreign language teachers should be interested in knowing and conveying to their students. In my view, this also supports the lingua franca ideology: what defines good language skills is not idiomatic and grammatical target language performance but understanding others and making oneself understood (cf., e.g., Seidlhofer 2001).

Paakkinen's second article (pp. 355–381) is the most critical one in the book towards the use of English. She analyses Finnish municipalities'

English homepages on the Internet, criticising them for being disorganized (p. 378). I find her data intriguing, and indeed, it would also have been interesting to learn what the Finnish web-pages of the municipalities are like – are they better organized and is their language more vivid?

Tiina Virkkula's article (pp. 382–420) concentrates on Finns' opinions on English in working life. I found her observation that people feel more spontaneous and active when using Finnish and passive when using English particularly noteworthy (p. 408). Perhaps in connection with this, many want to keep their Finnish identity and speak the often ridiculed Finnish English (cf. p. 409). Further, one of the most noteworthy points in the article for those who fear that English will take over altogether is Virkkula's conclusion that English is not the only language of the business world, since Finns choose to show solidarity toward their foreign colleagues by choosing the colleagues' native languages instead of English (pp. 396–397).

Perhaps the most common theme in the book is presenting English as an additional "resource" in the language repertoire of Finns. Because Finns allegedly know English so well, Nikula and Leppänen pose questions in their conclusion (pp. 221–428): Should we require more from school students in English lessons or should we concentrate on teaching other languages at schools (p. 426)? I think these are good questions. I partly agree with the tenets of this book and see English as an additional resource, but I still feel that it is important to remember that a large proportion of the population is not bilingual and for many English is still not an additional resource. I constantly face people in the English classes I teach who claim that their English skills are poor and who are therefore frustrated. For them, using English loan words or being able to communicate some simple sentences in English is not bilingualism. For them, English is not the third domestic language of Finland. Thus, we should not be overly positive, and indeed, I second Nikula and Leppänen, who acknowledge that knowing or not knowing English may enforce the creation or maintenance of inequality in the society in the future (p. 425). Recently, I learnt that some of the same researchers who contributed to this book are working on another book – one in which English is not seen as a resource but as a potential source of problems. I am eagerly waiting for this volume to see how it complements *Kolmas kotimainen*.

References

- Hakala, Hanna (2007) Ersättningsord i finskan. In Guðrún Kvaran (ed.), *Udenlandske eller hjemlige ord? En undersøgelse af sprogene i Norden*. Moderne importord i språka i Norden VI. Oslo: Novus, pp. 135–168.
- Kankaanranta, Anne (2005) English as a corporate language: Company-internal e-mail messages written by Finns and Swedes. In Britt-Louise Gunnarsson (ed.), *Communication in the Work Place*. TEFA 42. Uppsala: Uppsala University, pp. 42–59.
- Louhiala-Salminen, Leena & Mirjaliisa Charles (2006) English as the Lingua Franca of international business communication: Whose English? What English? In Juan Carlos Palmer-Silveira, Miguel F. Ruiz-Garrido & Inmaculada Fortanet-Gómez (eds.), *Intercultural and International Business Communication: Theory, Research and Teaching*. Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 27–54.
- Mattfolk, Leila, Åsa Mickwitz & Jan-Ola Östman (2004) Finlandssvensk språknormering. In Helge Sandøy & Jan-Ola Östman (eds.), *“Det främmande” i nordisk språkpolitik: Om normering av utländska ord*. Moderne importord i språka i Norden II. Oslo: Novus, pp. 219–252.
- Nuolijärvi, Pirkko (2006) Finskfinland. In Tore Kristiansen & Lars S. Vikør (eds.), *Nordiske språkhaldninger: Ei meningsmåling*. Moderne importord i språka i Norden IV. Oslo: Novus, pp. 180–198.
- Paatola, Ulla (2007) [dʒetlæg], [tʃetlægi], [jetlak :i] and more: The adaptation of modern Anglo-American imports in spoken Finnish. In Pia Jarvad & Helge Sandøy (eds.), *Stuntman og andre importord i Norden: Om udtale och bøjning*. Moderne importord i språka i Norden VII. Oslo: Novus, pp. 163–200.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara (2001) Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a Lingua Franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11 (2): 133–158.
- Tamminen-Parre, Saija & Tore Kristiansen (2006) Finskfinland. In Tore Kristiansen (ed.), *Nordiske sprogholdninger: En masketest*. Moderne importord i språka i Norden V. Oslo: Novus, pp. 142–161.

Contact information:

Ulla Paatola
 Research Unit for Variation, Contacts and Change in English
 P.O. Box 24 (Unioninkatu 40 B)
 FI-00014 University of Helsinki
 Finland
 e-mail: ulla(dot)paatola(at)helsinki(dot)fi