

Troping on prejudice

Stylised “bad Finnish” performances and reflexivity among adolescents in Eastern Helsinki

Heini Lehtonen

University of Helsinki

This paper studies reflexivity in interaction among adolescents in Helsinki in the light of stylised performances that are labelled by participants as “bad Finnish”. *Stylised “bad Finnish”* can be seen as an enregistered discourse register. It is an emblem in which certain linguistic features are connected to ideas about certain kinds of people and their characteristics. In particular, *stylised “bad Finnish”* is an indexical for social personae associated with “immigrants”, “foreigners” and non-native Finnish. The participants in this study came to Finland as children and learned Finnish as a second (or third or fourth) language, and they still have to face the excluding attitudes of the society. With their stylised performances and in their reactions to them, the participants position themselves with regard to the social personae indexed by *stylised “bad Finnish”*, their stereotypical characteristics and the wider societal discourses that touch upon themselves. *Stylised “bad Finnish”* is sometimes used for expressing distance from stereotypical immigrants, but sometimes for displaying solidarity with those who share the experiences of immigration and learning Finnish. Although it also works as a trope, seemingly detached from ethnicity, in interaction with native Finns it may still be delicate because of its pejorative social indexical potential.

Keywords: reflexivity, stylisation, social indexicality, trope, youth language, immigration, interactional sociolinguistics

Introduction

This paper explores reflexive practices in interaction among adolescents in the suburbs of Helsinki, where the national languages meet not only the languages of the neighbouring areas, but also languages brought by refugees and immigrants from other continents. Compared to the situation in some other European

countries, this new urban super-diversity is relatively new in Finland: the largest waves of immigrants began to arrive starting in the 1990s. In their interactions, the participants in my study negotiate the categories of ‘Finnishness’ and ‘foreignness’. In doing so, they also position themselves with regard to discourses about immigration.

I will explore reflexivity in the light of stylised performances that make use of a discourse register I call *stylised “bad Finnish”* (*tyylitelty “huono suomi”*, with *huono suomi* ‘bad Finnish’ being the label the adolescents themselves employ,¹ cf. Lehtonen 2011; Lehtonen 2015). The register incorporates certain conventionalised linguistic features and evokes associations with non-native Finnish or a kind of learner language. I will examine the nature of these performances as a *trope* (Agha 2007: 24) as well as analyse cases where *stylised “bad Finnish”* is clearly involved in interactions in which the participants reflect on their own personal trajectories.

The paper answers the following questions: Whose voice is it in the stylisations? To which extent is it the voice of the participants? How do they position themselves with regard to it? Finally, I will discuss how *stylised “bad Finnish”* offers ways to reflect on one’s own trajectories, and, more generally, on its nature as a resource to socially position oneself with respect to political and social discourses in a society that is trying to find ways to deal with a new kind of diversity. *Stylised “bad Finnish”* offers an interesting point of departure for the analysis of reflexivity, because in these stylisations, adolescents with immigrant backgrounds have to take a stance towards stereotypical voices of non-native Finnish, or ‘foreignness’, as well as possibly pejorative stereotypes of immigrants that the media and society impose on them.

I gathered my data during ethnographic field work in two suburban junior high schools, where I spent over one school year and participated in the everyday life of the pupils. The data consist of a field diary, interviews with 37 adolescents and spontaneous recordings both during the lessons and at breaks, as well as retrospective interviews where I played the recordings to the participants and we talked about them. The participants were 13 to 18 years old at the time of the data gathering and they speak 16 first languages altogether. The protagonists of this paper are three girls whom I call Mary, Aziza and Kara, and a boy I call Abdi. These adolescents represent a generation in the riptide of late modern transnational mobility. Mary, Kara and Abdi came to Finland as children, Aziza was born in Helsinki into a Somali family. They speak several languages and go to

1. Using the “bad Finnish” label as a researcher, even as an emic one, is not totally unproblematic. With the term, I am engaging in the enregisterment of the pejorative label. Since the turns that the adolescents themselves identify as “bad Finnish” are always clearly stylised performances, I have coined the term *stylised “bad Finnish”*.

school in Finnish. Abdi came as a small child as a refugee from Somalia. Mary and Kara both started school in another country: Mary in an East-African country in English, Kara in Denmark in Danish. At home, Kara speaks Turkish. Mary speaks both English and Swahili at home, as well as Finnish with her younger siblings who were born in Finland, which is typical in families with an immigrant background. Abdi and Aziza, too, report speaking Finnish with their younger siblings, although communicating in Somali with their parents. Thus, the linguistic biographies of Mary, Kara, Aziza and Abdi are characterised by mobility, diversity and transnationalism. They question and redefine the homogeneous and essentialistic relationship between language and national identity (Heller 2008), and their identities are better understood in terms of so-called *new ethnicities* (Hall 1989; Harris 2006).

Linguistic ethnography and interactional sociolinguistics can contribute to the discussion about the ways in which interacting individuals draw both on their own life trajectories and on shared societal discourses when positioning themselves with regard to both. The participants in this study position themselves both as (former) learners of Finnish as a second language and as legitimate Finnish speakers; as people who know the world outside the monolingual national hegemony as well as people who recognise and oppose the stereotypical and even racist discourses that touch upon them. It is possible to achieve this using similar semiotic resources – revealing the stance in a given context is a matter of interactional analysis and its multi-voiced nature. To illustrate this, I will lean on the theories of *social indexicality* (Agha 2007) when analysing the contextualisation potential of the stylisations.

The link between reflexivity, voice, stance-taking and social indexicality is illustrated in the following section. After that, I will detail the socio-demographic milieu of the study, focusing especially on the discourses of ‘Finnishness’ or ‘foreignness’, followed by a description of the *stylised “bad Finnish”* register, its social indexicality and the enregisterment process. Later, I will examine some interactional functions of *stylised “bad Finnish”* and show how *stylised “bad Finnish”* can be regarded as a *trope*. Following on that, I will carefully analyse interactions where the adolescents negotiate their positioning with regard to *stylised “bad Finnish”*, and, by doing so, also reflect on their personal trajectories. Finally, I will discuss *stylised “bad Finnish”* as a form of reflexivity.

Reflexivity, social indexicality and stylisation

Developments of late modernity as well as sociological and anthropological approaches within sociolinguistics and applied linguistics have challenged scholars of language and society to see reflexivity as a central factor in social positioning

through language in interaction. Following the sociological tradition, Pérez-Milans (2016) defines reflexivity as a rising form of socially conditioned self-awareness through which the individual determines her course of action in relation to the social circumstances. He also points out that linguists can no longer be satisfied with looking at reflexivity as only the researcher's action towards his/her field, nor with analysing interviews in terms of their content alone. Pérez-Milans calls for the analysis of reflexive actions within talk-in-interaction. Positioning oneself and others with regard to dynamic social categorisations is an endlessly ongoing dialogic process. Interactors reflect their positions in interaction both with regard to more widely shared stereotypical ideas and with regard to their own trajectories – and they do so by drawing on the relationship between the two. Finding the right methods to tackle reflexivity in interaction may well be the observer's paradox (Labov 1972: 61) of late modern sociolinguistics.

Among sociolinguists, especially in the 'new' paradigm of the sociolinguistics of globalisation (Blommaert 2010; see also Coupland 2010; Blommaert & Dong 2010), many have turned to the theories of social indexicality developed in linguistic anthropology. *Social indexicality* means that semiotic signs have the potential, in a given social and interactional context, to evoke social personae, their characteristics or relationships between them (Agha 2007: 17; cf. Ochs 1992). I understand *social personae* to be socially shared stereotypical ideas about types of people, their social behaviour and their characteristics (cf. Visakko 2015: 46–47). The link between speech and social personae poses a methodological challenge: social personae are not directly characters in the speaking event – although they may take the voice of a character – but rather, they are a texture of social indexes that the interlocutors partly share and are thus able to interpret and use for the contextualisation of speech. In order to provide an understanding of this texture, sociolinguistics needs a theory of social indexicality as well as a solid understanding of social interaction.

Agha theorises mechanisms of *enregisterment* through which social indexicality develops. He defines enregisterment as follows:

“processes whereby diverse behavioral signs (whether linguistic, non-linguistic, or both) are functionally reanalyzed as cultural models of action, as behaviors capable of indexing stereotypic characteristics of incumbents of particular interactional roles, and of relations among them.” (2007: 55)

and

“processes and practices whereby performable signs become recognized (and re-grouped) as belonging to distinct, differentially valorized semiotic registers by a population.” (2007: 81)

For Agha, reflexivity is a central factor in the processes of enregisterment. This is accomplished not only through semiotic signs and how they are used, but crucially also by metapragmatics, or what is thought and said about the signs and about their users (Agha 2007: 169, 177, 186). In other words, social personae are attached to *emblems* that consist of a perceivable thing (such as the signs in *stylised “bad Finnish”* performances), a social persona, and “someone for whom that thing is an emblem” (Agha *ibid.* 234–235). To explore the ways in which something is or becomes an emblem to people, sociolinguistics must include an understanding of metalanguage and metatalk (more generally metapragmatics), which have been addressed in sociolinguistics in the study of linguistic attitudes and in dialogic takes on language, as well as in work on stylisation, style-shifting and contextualisation (for the discussion on sociolinguistic perspectives on metalanguage, see Coupland & Jaworski 2004). Metapragmatic comments are sometimes explicit (e.g. *the Somalis always say wallahi, Kara speaks bad Finnish*) but very often implicit. Implicit metapragmatic data may be found in e.g. linguistic performances, such as *stylisation*, which makes use of ‘another’s’ voice (Bakhtin 1981: 362; Rampton 2006: 224–225; cf. Coupland 2007: 149–50). That voice may carry contextualisation cues that make certain social personae relevant for the situation. This is why the analysis of stylised performances and the reactions to them are methodologically relevant for the understanding of social indexicality and reflexivity (cf. Coupland & Jaworski 2004: 27–36).

The division into explicit and implicit metapragmatics is not strict but rather gradual. Reflexivity is everywhere: whenever we produce a turn in interaction, we take a stance towards what was said before and towards what we ourselves are imposing on the dynamics of social positioning. We presuppose the social indexicality of semiotic signs for stance-taking, but at the same time, we renew and reshape their potential as social indexes (Ochs 1992; Agha 2007: 64–67, cf. Visakko 30–31). Here, “we” includes us researchers: social indexicality can even be seen as the key to solving the observer’s paradox, since we have to accept that everything we utter in and about social reality becomes a part of it.

Since social indexicality is also about the relationship between different social personae, it not only brings about one type of people, but also their relation to *other* types of people, thus revealing relevant, current forces and movements in the society. For instance, *stylised “bad Finnish”* may relate to social and political discourses about immigration. In their *stylised “bad Finnish”* performances as well as in interactive reactions to them, the participants in this study employ the social indexes that were enregistered over the course of centuries, while also renewing and reshaping the social indexicality of semiotic signs and employing this indexicality in positioning themselves with regard to social personae that are made

relevant in the interaction at hand. At the same time, when socially positioning themselves, the adolescents make sense of themselves and their relationship to their surroundings: the metapragmatic comments concern finding the balance between more widely shared stereotypes and their own personal trajectories of who they used to be and what they desire to become.

In addition to the theories of social indexicality, my tools for analysing the stylised “*bad Finnish*” performances include ideas of *contextualisation* in interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz 1982a, b; Gumperz 1992; Auer 1992: 4), conversation analytical tools on the mechanisms of interaction (Sacks 1992a, b), the Bakhtinian view on *polyphony* (Bakhtin 1981), as well as an understanding of *stance* and *stance-taking* (Jaffe 2009) and of social positioning theory (Davies & Harré 1990). Stylisations employ a more or less enregistered set of signs the participants associate with a social persona. Stylisations are often easy to recognise as such, and those found in my data are no exception. They are marked as performances, e.g. with a change in voice quality. Stylisations break the routine flow of interaction and invite the participants to pay attention to themselves and to the rhetoric and poetic means they employ (cf. Rampton 2006: 227). Stylisations serve as a tool for contextualization. In order to understand the stylised performances, the participants need to interpret a number of social-indexical links. That is, they need to recognize whose/what kind of enregistered voice it is they are hearing and how it relates to the situation at hand.

The idea that the speaker is not the only one behind his/her words is by no means new: it has been stated by Goffman in his *production format* (1981: 144–145) and by Bakhtin (1981) when he presents the idea of everything having been already said and recycled. In a certain interactional event, the participants are not only those who are physically present: there are also other characters involved, and their turns are represented by the voices that can be heard in stylisations or in quotations, for instance. These characters² work on a different analytical level from *social personae*: the characters are a kind of metafictional speaker boxes, i.e. characters in a narrative, but they are associated with social personae, which are metapragmatic ideas of certain types of people.

When it comes to reflexivity, an interesting question lies in the relationship between the physical speaker, his/her social positioning and the character the speaker creates for the interaction. The speaker may affiliate him- or herself with the voice of the character, or disaffiliate him- or herself from that voice, as in Bakhtin’s *unidirectional* and *vari-directional double-voicing* (Bakhtin 1981;

2. Agha (2007: 177) refers to them as characterological figures.

Rampton 1995: 223; cf. Coupland 2007: 102). The interpretation of the relationship between the speaker and the double-voice may be ambiguous; with the voice, the speaker may take a step aside and thus shed another light on what is being said, which serves as a stance-taking device. All this plays a role when interpreting *stylised* “*bad Finnish*” performances. If a person with an immigrant background uses a voice that can be associated with stereotypical – and possibly pejorative – ideas about immigrants and non-Finns, the crucial question is whether the stylised voice is his/hers or someone else’s, that is, on ‘which side’ the speaker positions him- or herself with regard to *stylised* “*bad Finnish*”.

Theoretically, *stylised* “*bad Finnish*” can be seen as a form of *tertiary foreigner talk* (Ferguson 1975; Valdman 1981; Rampton 1995: 228–229), similar to the *stylised Asian English* described by Rampton (*ibid.*) or the *Gastarbeiterdeutsch* that German-Turkish adolescents use to bring in the voice of their parents who came to Germany as *Gastarbeiter* (Keim 2008 [2007]: 417–433). In all these cases, the assumed ‘foreigners’ play the part of a foreigner with the language they were given by the natives, first in simplified teacher talk and *primary foreigner talk*, then in (possibly) mocking stylisations. Tertiary foreigner talk is easily simplified as an empowering way to encounter the prejudice by those whom it may concern. This may sometimes work; however, as I will show, there is a serious undertone and a fine-tuned instrument behind the carnival: exploring the border between one’s own voice and the voice of the other by stylisation is a delicate act. *Stylised* “*bad Finnish*”, however tertiary it may be, carries prejudice and stereotypes, and one does not choose one’s stance towards them only once, but every time they are made relevant. Before the actual analysis of the *stylised* “*bad Finnish*” performances, I will provide a glimpse into the social reality where the data was gathered. This will be addressed below.

Setting the scene: Discourses about diversity

The schools where I gathered my data are located in the North-Eastern suburbs of Helsinki. The concrete blocks built in the 60s and the 70s are populated by lower social classes: less than 10 percent of the population has an academic degree, the unemployment rate is among the highest in the capital area, and the number of people receiving income support is above average. The suburbs are also characterised by a relatively high number of people speaking another language than Finnish (or Swedish or Sámi) as their first language. (Helsinki Region Infoshare.) In the schools where the data was gathered, the number of pupils with immigrant

background³ may be as high as 50 percent. After Finnish, the largest linguistic groups in the schools are Russian, Somali and Estonian, followed by Arabic, Kurdish and ex-Yugoslavian languages. When looking at internet discussions about the suburbs and their schools, one can see that they suffer from a relatively bad reputation, and the adolescents in my data recycle these prejudices; they call their schools *pakolaiskoulu* ‘refugee school’ and describe the pupils (themselves) as being especially hard to handle compared to pupils in other Helsinki schools. The suburbs are experienced as boring, lacking the possibilities of the city.

The migration history of Finland after World War II involves no significant waves of immigration before the 1990s.⁴ In the 1960s and in the 1970s, more than 100 000 Finnish workers emigrated to Sweden, and up until the 1990s, most immigrants coming to Finland were so-called return migrants. (Korkiasaari & Söderling 2003.) During the years 1990–2014, however, the number of people with immigrant backgrounds increased from 0.8 percent to 5.9 percent (Statistics Finland). In 1983, only 11 347 people spoke a first language other than Finnish, Swedish or Sámi; in 1993, the number was 59 459; and by the end of 2013, it had reached 289 068 (about 5.3 percent of the population; Statistics Finland).⁵

The first significant waves of refugees in the 1990s arrived from the war zones of Yugoslavia and Somalia. The disintegration of the Soviet Union as well as the enlargement of the EU also changed Helsinki’s linguistic diversity. Thus, the number of Russian and Estonian speakers has grown remarkably. Most foreign citizens settle down in the capital area. However, different districts of Helsinki vary greatly with respect to the number of people speaking a ‘foreign’ first language: whereas their number in some North-Eastern districts is over 20 percent, in some Western and Southern districts it is as low as 3 percent (Helsinki Region Infoshare). In 2015, Finland received over 30 000 asylum seekers, most of them coming from Afghanistan and Somalia (Migri), with some in hope of being reunited with their family members who had arrived earlier.

Settling down in an ethnically and culturally relatively homogenous country has not been easy, as the case of the Finnish Somalis – in my data as well as more widely – illustrates. In the media, the arrival of the Somalis in the 1990s was

3. With “immigrant background” I here refer to people who were born somewhere else or to people whose parents were born somewhere else. I do not wish to state that these people could not be regarded as Finns.

4. In the 1970s, some refugees arrived from Chile and Vietnam, but the numbers are relatively small.

5. In Finland it is only possible to announce one language as one’s mother tongue for the official register.

referred to as *the Somali shock*. They arrived in relatively large numbers and were visibly different, both culturally and linguistically as well as ethnically (Somalis in Helsinki 2013). The Somalis became the somewhat stereotypical representatives of ‘an immigrant’ or ‘a refugee’, which does not help them settle down in the region even though the 2nd generation is already born in Finland (cf. Suurpää 2002: 115–116). Open Foundations has done research on the Somalis in nine European cities including Helsinki. What is striking in the report concerning the Finnish Somali population compared to the others in the study is that the Finnish Somalis hesitate to position themselves as “Finns” as the excluding attitude of the main population is so strong (Somalis in Helsinki: 32–33). The participants in my study already experience these prejudices as teenagers, although they have lived (almost) their whole lives in Finland, have Finnish citizenship and speak Finnish. In Extract 1, Abdi and his friend Raman, interviewed by myself, talk about how they feel about “being a Finn”.

Extract 1. Interview. Abdi (A); Raman (R); interviewer HL (H).

- 08 A: [kyl me nyt Suameess_ollaa tiätsä- (.) no kut toi sana on
 well you know in Finland we are- (.) 'cause that word was
 09 keksitty niim me ollaa just sen sanam mukaa.
 invented so we are just what it says.
- 10 H: [eh he he
 11 A: [ulkomaalaisia.
 foreigners.
 12 H: nii.
 yes.
 13 A: mm. (.) ku kattoo vaan sil[lee.
 mm. (.) like if you just look.
- 14 H: [voisitteks< miksette te os
 could you< why aren't you
 15 suomalaisia.
 Finns.
- 16 R: hä.
 what.
- 17 A: siks ku mä en oo- (.) [valkonen eh he he
 'cause I'm not- (.) white eh he he
 ((12 lines omitted))
- 30 R: [ku me ollaa erilaisii.
 'cause we are different.
- 31 A: ihovväri ja sit kaikki tälle;en;
 skin colour and all that;
- 32 H: mhyhy?
- 33 A: kummiskit tulee; (.) huamattuu jossaiiv vaihees.
 some day you will; (.) notice it anyhow ((or: it will be
 noticed))
- 34 R: mm.

Abdi clearly states that one reason for his difficulty in positioning himself as a Finn is his skin colour, or the fact that others see him being different from the majority and will always exclude him because of that (lines 17, 31–34). In other words, the shared conception of the category of ‘Finn’ has not yet changed in such a way that a non-white person could be representative of Finnishness – even though there are already politicians, entertainers, journalists and writers with immigrant backgrounds in Finland, including those with African and Middle-Eastern backgrounds. Dark skin colour is one index in the texture of indexes of the social persona of a ‘non-Finn’ (sometimes labelled “immigrant”, or “foreigner”).⁶ If someone “looks like a foreigner”, as Abdi himself experiences that he does, many of the social semiotics s/he employs, including language, will be read against this and in relation to what her/his outlook indexes. Thus, adolescents with immigrant backgrounds are constantly forced to re-position themselves with regard to discourses about ‘non-Finns’.

It seems that the category labels *maahanmuuttaja* ‘immigrant’ and *ulkomaalainen* ‘foreigner’ are associated with certain kinds of social personae and stereotypically also with race and ethnicity (cf. Huttunen 2009; Haikkola 2012). These social personae are relevant for the analysis in this article, since they share characteristics with the social personae evoked by “bad Finnish” stylisations. In other words, the linguistic features and indexes of race and ethnicity are a part of the same indexical texture, and by employing linguistic features as the means of contextualisation, the speaker can express stance towards the social personae and the ideological social processes in which they are involved. In the following section, I will clarify what kinds of linguistic features function as social indexes in stylised “bad Finnish” and why.

The enregisterment of “bad Finnish”

Hoono soomi is a phrase that would probably ring a bell in the minds of most Finnish-speaking people who grew up in Finnish society. The phrase means ‘bad Finnish’, which in standard pronunciation and orthography would be *huono suomi*. *Hoono soomi*, with diphthongs assimilated into long vowels, imitates a non-native pronunciation. The phrase was probably already used in the late 19th

6. Just recently, I came across a news story (Yle News, Kotimaa, February 10, 2016) about a suspected incident of sexual harassment, where the suspect was described as *ulkomaalaisen näköinen* ‘foreign-looking, looking like a foreigner’. To describe a suspect like that, you have to rely on a relatively widely shared idea of what a “foreigner” looks like – or what a ‘Finn’ of a ‘native person’ looks like or does not look like.

century to describe the Finnish spoken by the Swedish-speaking population. Nowadays, however, it is used iconically for all non-native Finnish and language use that is not regarded as skilful enough or that has ‘foreign’ influences. In this section, I will sketch out which linguistic features are enregistered in *stylised “bad Finnish”* and in which way.

The phrase *minä puhu hoono soomi* (‘I speak bad Finnish’)⁷ frequently occurs in *stylised “bad Finnish”* performances. I have several and variations of it in my interview data, in sequences where some kind of non-native Finnish is described, and it is easy to find more occurrences in social media or online discussions. For instance, a blogger, describing her observations on how speakers’ first language affects their spoken Finnish, writes that she has “found new material for the good old ‘Mina puhu hoono soomi’ phenomenon”.⁸ The phrase *minä puhu hoono soomi* carries some features that are widely enregistered in *stylised “bad Finnish”*. These include the first person singular pronominal variant *mina* : *minu-*, the verb stem (without the personal conjugation) as the predicative, and simplified object marking.

Among the features of *stylised “Bad Finnish”*, the pronominal variant *minä* is especially interesting since it is the written standard variant but it can be left out in a written text, which is often stylistically preferable as the person is revealed through verb conjugation. The most common variant in the spoken language of the capital area is *mä* : *mu-* (and *mina* : *minu-* is only used for stress and contrastive functions (cf. Paunonen 1995 [1982]: 162; Lappalainen 2004: 71–72; Lehtonen 2006; Lehtonen 2011). In Finnish as a second language textbooks and in teacher talk directed to language learners, *minä* is, however, overused, and it has come to carry associations with learner language (cf. Lehtonen 2011, 2015a, b). In my data, the most common function of *minä* (instead of *mä*) is a stylisation of ‘foreign’ Finnish.

The following Extract 2 below comes from my field diary, and it shows that the participants in my study are aware of the connection between learner language and the textbook register, the pronoun *minä* (as well as the second person singular pronoun *sinä* : *sinu-* instead of *sä* : *su-*) and the stylisations of learner language. Shadi and Mary are in a Finnish as a second language class. The task is to build sentences using some given verbs. According to my field notes, Shadi produces a turn *selitä minulle mitä sinä ostat* ‘explain to me what you are buying’. Since there are no verbal instructions on the work sheets, it seems that the linguistic choices come from Shadi herself. The noticeable thing in Shadi’s turn is that morphologically, it is completely standard, and it contains two occurrences of *minä*, *sinä*

7. ‘I speak bad Finnish’ (I speak-0 bad-0 Finnish-0).

8. <<http://ritamentor.blogspot.fi/2006/09/puhu-hoono-soomi.html>>

pronouns. This deviates clearly from the girls' routine way of talking to each other, and it can be seen as a change in footing: Shadi is shifting her orientation towards the task (in Finnish conversations, this can be done by switching to standard-like speech, cf. Lehtonen 2015a, b; Lappalainen 2004).

Extract 2. Field diary. Finnish as a second language class.

Tytöt tekevät ryhmätyötä, jossa pitää rakentaa dialogi verbeistä.

Shadi: selitä minulle mitä sinä ostat

Mary (huonon suomen aksentilla): selitä minulle mitä sinä ostat
(silmiään pyöritellen).

The girls are working on a group assignment where you have to build a dialogue with some verbs.

Shadi: explain to me what you are buying.

Mary (in a bad Finnish accent): explain to me what you are buying
(rolling her eyes).

Mary repeats Shadi's turn, which shows it contains something noticeable. She does not simply copy it, but adds phonetic and/or prosodic cues that I, at the time of taking the notes, identified as a "bad Finnish accent".⁹ This connects the standard-like morphology with associations of 'non-nativeness'. I have also noted that Mary "rolls her eyes". This expresses Mary's stance towards the situation, which I interpret as some kind of wondering disapproval (cf. Kaukomaa et al. 2015). That is, Mary shows that Shadi's register is somehow inappropriate. She disapproves of the whole task as such, or of the fact that she is positioned as a Finnish learner who needs this kind of unnatural textbook exercise. In other words, Mary expresses awareness of how overtly standard-like speech sounds 'non-native' or 'foreign' and of how she might be associated with this kind of language and positioned as a learner of Finnish instead of being seen as a speaker of Finnish with full rights to the language. This is a reflexive act: because of her personal trajectory, Mary is potentially seen as a typical speaker of a written-like learner variety, and to legitimise her use of Finnish as a language of her own, she has to re-position herself constantly with regard to learner Finnish.

In public discourses, even if *stylised "bad Finnish"* is employed with no discriminatory intentions, the label *huono suomi* alone carries the prejudice and normative attitudes faced by immigrants hoping to settle down in Finland and become a part of the society. When searching the Internet, one is able to find several discussions where people express their worries or even aggression caused by doctors or other professionals who only speak "hoono soomi". Nevertheless, even without

9. This, of course, is some sort of a folk label to note that I have heard something that the participants would call "bad Finnish". This cannot and should not be understood as a label that a linguist and a researcher would unproblematically use.

using the label, prejudices come alive in *stylised* “bad Finnish”. For instance, on 26 January 2016, MEP Jussi Halla-aho, a prominent figure in the right-wing populist party the True Finns (Perussuomalaiset), posted on his Facebook wall a news story about a robbery where “a dark-skinned man” hit a woman in the face and stole her wallet (Iltalehti 26.1.2016).¹⁰ Halla-aho posted the link to the story with the introductory comment “*Mina tahto, mina otta.*” meaning approximately ‘I want, I take’. In his comment, Halla-aho employs the two most commonly enregistered features of *stylised* “bad Finnish”: the pronoun *minä* (here varied as *mina* to make an even more ‘foreign’ impression) as well as verbal stems without personal conjugation as predicates (*tahto* - : *tahtoo*, *otta* - : *ottaa*). Halla-aho brings in the robber’s voice in *stylised* “bad Finnish”, while the only thing we know about the robber is that he was a “dark-skinned” male. Dark skin (which Abdi, in Extract 1, experienced as something that would always exclude him from the “Finns”), “bad Finnish” and criminal behaviour are tied together into a character who takes what he wants and does not wish to respect good morals or the rules of society.

To sum up, linguistic features that are registered under the label “bad Finnish” have social indexical links with social personae that incorporate some phenotypical features and certain kinds of (unwelcome) behaviour. *Stylised* “bad Finnish”, with linguistic features enregistered into it, is an emblem to which a social persona is attached, and a metapragmatic analysis of it shows how this emblem can be employed as a resource for interpreting the social world. If a person is regarded as an “immigrant” or a “foreigner” (e.g. due to outward appearance), he/she can be associated with the stereotypical social personae that *stylised* “bad Finnish” might bring to the interaction. Thus, a close look at the ways in which Kara, Mary, Aziza or Abdi and their friends position themselves towards the stylised “bad Finnish” performances offers relevant lens to the study of reflexive practices of *new ethnicities*.

In examining my data, I found that the label “bad Finnish” emerged in several interviews. When used by the adolescents, “bad Finnish” was mostly used to describe somebody else’s way of speaking: that of their parents or of friends who “can’t speak Finnish”. The participants often excluded themselves from those who speak “bad Finnish”. If their Finnish was regarded as “bad Finnish”, it is because they reported to accommodate themselves to their friends or “accidentally” speak “bad Finnish” if the other person speaks it too. In the following interview excerpt (Extract 3), Kara and Aziza (a Helsinki-born Somali girl) talk about how they understand “bad Finnish”.

10. <http://www.iltalehti.fi/uutiset/2016012621020892_uu.shtml>

Extract 3. Interview. Aziza (A); Kara (K); interviewer HL (H).

- 01 A: tiätsä jos jollaki o huano suamee nis sittem mä vastaan
you know if somebody has bad Finnish then I answer
- 02 niikut takas sille m< [sille huanolla suamella.
like back to them x< them in bad Finnish.
- 03 K: [mhe he he he huanoks<
 [mhe he he he in bad<
- 04 K: nii mäki; (.) oikeestis se menee sillee.
me to; (.) really that's how it goes.
- 05 A: mm se ot tosi haus[kaa.
mh it's really funny.
- 06 K: [a< aina kuj joku puhuu mulle huanoo
wh< whenever somebody speaks bad Finnish
- 07 suamee sit mul menee itekki väärin sit mä; (.) jatkan
to me then I get it wrong too then I; (.) go on to the
- 08 toiselle niiku- (.) joo @mitä:@ th tyylili
other like- (.) yeah @wha:t@ th like
- 09 [tällee (sit sit<)
that (then then<)
- 10 A: [mitä sinä sano ante(e)ksi minä ↑'ei ummār(r)ä.
what you say↑ sorry I NEG-0 understand
 ↑what you say↑ excuse me me ↑no 'understand.
- 11 [he he
- 12 K: [heh heh just tollasta oikeesti.
he he just like that really.

In the above Extract 3, “bad Finnish” is treated as something somebody either “has” or does not have. According to themselves, the girls would normally not have it, but only “by mistake”, if somebody else speaks “bad Finnish” (lines 1–8). In line 8, Kara begins a stylised performance framed as a quotation, which is meant to be an example of how her speech – according to herself – becomes when she speaks “bad Finnish” “by mistake”. Aziza takes the show further: in line 10, she performs a longish turn in what is easily recognised as *stylised “bad Finnish”*. It has the pronominal variants *minä*, *sinä*, the verbal stem *sano* (without the personal conjugation *sanot*) as the predicative, the non-conjugated negation verb *ei* (also typical of these stylisations), as well as prosodic and phonetic cues indexing non-native speech. Both girls laugh at the performance, and Kara also praises it verbally (line 12). It seems that Aziza is successful in picking up the right social indexicals for Kara (and other possible participants) to recognise them. Kara’s evaluation “just like that really” (line 12) should not be interpreted as concerning the way some people (who learned Finnish as a second language) really speak, nor should Aziza’s stylisation be regarded as the exact thing that happens “by mistake” to herself or Aziza when accommodating to somebody else’s speech. Rather than that, Kara recognises the enregistered *stylised “bad Finnish”*, the way she and her friends have learned to bring a non-native, ‘foreign’ voice into their Finnish speech.

Immigrant adolescents' self-positioning with regard to "bad Finnish" is ambivalent. On the one hand, they wish to express distance from it, but, on the other hand, they sometimes position themselves as people who might use it, whether deliberately or not (cf. Rampton 1995: 159 on both closeness to and distance from stylised Asian English). Despite all this, they have also mastered the linguistic resources and their indexical potential to the extent that allows them to take part in the troping practices in *stylised "bad Finnish"*. Similarly, to *stylised Asian English* (Rampton 1995) or to the stylisations of *Gastarbeiterdeutsch* (Keim 2008 [2007]), *stylised bad Finnish* is used differently with peers and with adults, and its interactional functions vary situationally according to the participant framework. It has several functions: for Kara and her friends, it is a conscious common fun code of the peer group, and in general, it can be used for expressing solidarity with other Finnish as a second language speakers, but also for distancing oneself from the parents' generation (see Extract 9), for questioning the authority (see Extract 4), and as an excuse to "get away with" something).

It is important to point out that *stylised "bad Finnish"* does not always carry a (clear) connection to ethnicity, immigration or language learning; sometimes its main purpose is just to mark a change in footing (Goffman 1981: 128), as might be accomplished by a shift to any other register. I will touch upon this in the following section, where I will focus on *stylised "bad Finnish"* as a trope. After that, I will take a closer look at how the adolescents display the relationship between their own trajectories and "bad Finnish".

Stylised "bad Finnish" as a trope in stance-taking

In this paper, I understand *trope* as an enregistered set of features that is so conventionalised that, through these features, a speaker is able to express a whole stance towards the ongoing interaction (cf. Agha 2007: 214). Certain core phrases of *stylised "bad Finnish"* performances can be seen as a trope: they open a contextualisation (interpreted in the given situation) by means of certain linguistic features and of semantic contents of 'not knowing' or 'not understanding'. The context that a trope opens is not always or only the most 'obvious' association with social personae, but a more general stance that people have learned to activate during the social life of the trope, as it has been recycled in interaction. In Silverstein's (2003) terms, the most obvious would be the 1st order index, which higher order indexicality builds on (orders $n + 1$, that is 2nd order, 3rd order and so on). In a trope, higher orders of indexicality have developed a life of their own, but as Silverstein (ibid. 212) notes, all indexical potential is "always immanent".

For instance, *stylised “bad Finnish”* is associated with immigration, ‘foreignness’ and non-native Finnish, but in interaction, it may foreground other kinds of characteristics or stances that build on the association with the things mentioned but slowly become disentangled from them (cf. Ochs 1992).

In the interviews, a practice that the adolescents repeatedly connected with conscious *stylised “bad Finnish”* is “getting away with it”, avoiding an unpleasant situation and not having to deal with it. One participant gave an example: when riding the bus without a ticket, his friend got away with it by speaking “bad Finnish” to the ticket inspector. Another participant explained the reasons for addressing the teachers in the class with *stylised “bad Finnish”* using descriptions such as “if you don’t know anything”, “you don’t feel like trying” or “to get away with it more easily”. *Stylised “bad Finnish”* is a social indexical for this behaviour; the incapability of dealing with the situation is treated as a stereotypical characteristic of those social personae that are heard in stylised “bad Finnish”. I have observed similar uses of *stylised “bad Finnish”* in the media, so the trope seems to be more widely recognised.¹¹

In Extract 4, *stylised “bad Finnish”* clearly builds a stance commenting on an act of escaping a situation.

Extract 4. Field diary. Schoolyard during a break.

Aziza ja Kara sentään lupasivat muistaa huomisen haastattelun. Kun Shadi kuuli tästä, hän kommentoi: “Vittu mikä pari.” Yritin nostattaa: “Tekin saatte sitte taas kuvailla.” Mary iski takaisin: “Mä en tee sun kans mitään ennen ku me saadaan kattoo se mitä me tehtii viime vuonna.” – Aziza kommentoi Maryn ehdottomuutta huonolla suomella: “Mina ei osa puhua mina osa vain katsoa.”

At least Aziza and Kara promised to remember our interview tomorrow. When Shadi heard about this, she commented: oh fuck what a couple. I tried to keep up the spirit: “You’ll get to shoot videos yourselves again.” Mary hit back: “I won’t do anything with you before we get to see what we did last year.” – Aziza comments on Mary’s strict attitude: “Mina ei osa puhua mina osa vain katsoa.” ‘Me no can talk me only can watch.’

11. A yellow press news story about the Finnish Big Brother reality TV-show (Ilta-Sanomat 24.11.2009) offers an example to show that this function of ‘escaping an unpleasant situation’ is even more widely recognised. The winner in 2009 was Aso, whose Kurdish background became clear on the show. The news story tells about the inhabitants receiving an unpleasant task, where they have to blackmail other inhabitants. It is said that Aso “escaped the task out on the yard” and said, horrified: *mini ei tiedä, mini ei osaa sanoa mitään*. ‘Me not know, me no can say anything’. The quotation is, of course, the journalist’s interpretation, but it clearly has features that are enough to bring the trope to life.

Mary is angry with me because we still had not had a chance to watch some videos I made with the girls. She refuses to work with me before seeing the videos. In the situation, Aziza comments on Mary turning me down – in fact escaping the situation – in a phrase expressing Mary’s incapability to communicate. Since this is only a field note, I cannot be exactly sure about the linguistic details of Aziza’s utterance, but I feel relatively confident in saying that I probably got *minä* as well as some deviant verb forms right; that is, the most common features of *stylised “bad Finnish”*. In Mary’s behaviour, Aziza possibly sees a typical action of an adolescent rebelling against authority (which I, as an adult and a researcher, still was), and a situation where one might trope on *stylised “bad Finnish”* (cf. Rampton 1995: 80–81).¹²

When adolescents with immigrant backgrounds employ *stylised “bad Finnish”* as ‘an excuse’, they are troping on prejudice that touches upon themselves. They are not imitating the way they themselves speak or have spoken before, and it does not matter whether their parents actually speak like that. They are troping on the enregistered register that has its roots in processes older than the adolescents themselves and that lean on the prejudice towards speakers of “bad Finnish” incapable of engaging in adequate interaction. Nevertheless, the indexical potential of the trope lies not only in the assumed characteristics of the “bad Finnish” speakers, but also in the relationship between nativeness and non-nativeness. ‘Escaping the situation’ using “bad Finnish” is possible because the ‘native’ is also stereotypically seen as unable to engage in meaningful communication with the ‘non-native’. Stereotypically, native vs. non-native is seen as a dichotomy, although in reality it is not. I shall now turn to how Mary and Kara navigate between these two extremes.

Reflecting on personal trajectories

I will now take a closer look at situations where *stylised “bad Finnish”* is used as a self-reflection on one’s own trajectory as a Finnish speaker, or a speaker with an immigrant background is positioned partly as someone with “bad Finnish”. When this happens, it leads to metapragmatic negotiation of one’s linguistic skills.

Extract 5 is from an interview. The turn I will focus on in this excerpt is Mary’s *minä em puhus suamee voitko sinä autta m(h)inua* (lines 12–14). It clearly has some typical features enregistered in *stylised “bad Finnish”*, e.g. *minä* : *minu-*, *sinä* : *sinu-* (instead of *mä* : *mu-* cf. lines 4–7), as well as deviations from standard pronunciation in the quantity of vowels (*autta* instead of *auttaa*). This part of the

12. In Rampton’s study on language crossing, *stylised Asian English* is used for similar interactional functions (1995: 80–81).

turn is clearly framed as a performance with *esim vaikka* ‘for instance’ and *ni sillee* ‘like that’, and as a quotation using the quotative *mä oon sillee* ‘I am like’ (line 11). The narrative makes it quite clear whose voice we are supposed to hear in the performance. It is Mary herself and her friends who also moved to Finland (from somewhere else) and attended a preparatory class for immigrant pupils (lines 4–7).

Extract 5. Interview. Mary (M); Shadi ; Kadri; interviewer HL (H).

- 01 H: - - Mary sä sanoit että- (.) joskus; (.)
 Mary you said that- (.) sometimes; (.)
- 02 leikit sillai aksentilla. (.) mi< minkälaisissa
 you kind of play with an accent. (.) wha< in what kind of
- 03 tilanteissa ja- (.) mite.
 situations and- (.) how.
- 04 M: no e:i mut ku; (.) esim jos mull_on kaverit jotka om
 well no: but li:ke; (.) if I have friends that have
- 05 muuttanut tännes Suameen niikut tai- (.) mull_on kaverit
 moved to Finland or like- (.) I have friends
- 06 jotka- (.) sillon kum mä muutin Suameem mä olin niikuv
 that- (.) when I moved to Finland I was like
- 07 valmistaval luakal,
 on a preparatory class.
- 08 H: joo.
 yes.
- 09 M: ja- (.) me- (.) tutustuin siäl niij joskus me vaam mu<
 and- (.) we- (.) got to know each other there so sometimes
- 10 muistellaa et joo muistaksä mitem me puhuttii sillom
 we just remember back like yeah do you remember how we
- 11 me ei osattu suamee, (.) mä oon sille joo-o, (.) no esim
 then we didn't know Finnish, (.) I'm like yeah, (.) well for
- 12 vaikka ha ha ha [minä em puhus suamee voitko sinä
 I neg-1SG speak Finnish-PAR can-2SG-Q you
 like ha ha ha me no speak Finnish can you
- 13 H: [mhyhy.
- 14 **autta m(h)inua** [ha nis sillee.
 help I-PAR
 help m(h)e ha like that
- 15 H: [mhyhy.
- 16 H: joo. (.) leikitteks te joskus sillä sitte- (.)
 yes. (.) do you play around like that then- (.)
- 17 [niikuk keskenänne millasissa tilanteissa esimerkiks.
 like amongst yourselves in what kind of situations for
- 18 M: [jo(h)o(h)
 yea(h)h(h)
- 19 M no- (.) em mä tiiä no- (.) joskus sillei iha huviksee esim
 well- (.) I don't know well- (.) sometimes like just for fun
- for instance*

- 20 kum me ollaa ulkona ja sil[lee.
when we're outside and stuff.
- 21 H: [mm- (.) mm-m.
- 22 H: ja se tuntuu siltä että te tavallaav vähä nauratte sille
and it feels like you kind of have a laugh like
- 23 että- (.) se oli sillon kun;
that- (.) that was back then;
- 24 M: mm-m.
- 25 H: kun opis< opittiiv vasta suamee.
when lear< when we were still learning Finnish.
- 26 M: mm.

What is noticeable in this excerpt is that, whereas the participants mostly keep their own way of speaking apart from *stylised "bad Finnish"*, here Mary herself is part of the group who can be interpreted as a speaker of learner language or non-native Finnish. However, the performance in lines 12 and 14 is not a performance of how Mary as a language learner really did speak. Rather, it is a performance of the means that Mary employs when bringing the voice of a Finnish learner into the interaction. In other words, the performance recognises the enregisterment process that associates the overuse of *minä* with learner language and non-nativeness, and also with the stereotypes and the prejudice with which these registers are loaded. In spite of this, among adolescents with immigrant backgrounds, these features may function as means of expressing solidarity and displaying understanding of the similarity of their personal trajectories as immigrants. The adolescents' self-positioning towards "knowing Finnish" is ambiguous. Sometimes it is important to position oneself as a legitimate speaker of Finnish, but there are situations where it is more important to explore one's past as someone who learned Finnish as a second language and to express solidarity among those who share these experiences.

Mary's performance in Extract 8 is self-reflective in at least two ways. Firstly, she clearly affiliates herself with others who also have learned Finnish as a second (or third, fourth, fifth) language, and not being the only one having to face the prejudice of the majority probably empowers her. Secondly, however, the fact that she is able to perform the stylisation – to linguistically differentiate the voice of her former self from what she has become – shows, as such, that she has mastered Finnish well enough to be able to do this. That is to say, she has mastered the standard, the Finnish spoken in her surroundings, and she has learned the fine semantic potential that a single variant of a personal pronoun *minä* might carry. Thus, Mary is not only positioning herself as someone who once did not know Finnish, but also as someone who has changed, developed and learned, and has thereby become a speaker of Finnish. To put it more simply, you have to know Finnish well to be able to speak "bad Finnish".

I will now explore excerpts (Extracts 6a–6c) from a spontaneous discussion where *stylised “bad Finnish”* becomes associated with Kara’s routine way of speaking, first implicitly and then explicitly. This poses a problem (Extract 6a), since normally Kara and her Finnish-born friends position themselves on the same side with respect to *stylised “bad Finnish”* performances (in the interviews, they explicitly do so). Kara responds to the situation by making her multifaceted linguistic biography relevant – something with which the others will not be able to compete (Extract 6b). In the end, the girls negotiate their way out of the conflict so that *stylised “bad Finnish”* again becomes their shared practice (Extract 6c). The analysis of the extracts reveals a fine-tuned reflexive work carried out with *stylised “bad Finnish”* and in responses to it.

The discussion is long and has several intertwining topics, but due to space constraints, it is only possible to present three shorter parts of it (Extracts 6a, 6b, 6c). Before the first extract (6a), the stereotype “the Turks are hairy” has come up. Kara comes up with a counterexample, stating that her uncle does not have any hair at all (line 33). This turn *mut jotkut ei< mun_enol ei ook k^harvaa ollenkaa* (line 33) is central for the interaction that follows. Ella imitates parts of it four times in total, in a series of stylised performances (lines 35, 41, 45, 47), thus implicitly suggesting that Kara’s speech can be heard as “bad Finnish”

Extract 6a. During a break. Kara (K); Ella (E); Tiina (T). The girls have visited the nearby super market and are on their way back to the school. The parts identifiable as stylised “bad Finnish” performances are in boldface.

- 33 K: mut jotkut ei< mun_enol ei ook k^harvaa
ollenkaa.
but someone-PL NEG-3SG my uncle-ADE NEG-3sg be hair-PAR
at.all
but some aren't< my uncle doesn't have any hair at all.
(('is not hairy at all'))
- 34 E: fmu ↑enoll_ ei ook k^harva(a) ↑ollenka(a)n.f
my uncle-ADE NEG-3sg be hair-PAR at.all
my uncle doesn't have any hair at all.
- 35 T: ih hi hii hi hi
- 36 K: oikeesti.
really.
- 37 T: sun eno on<
your uncle is<
- 38 K: eh he he tai siis< kyl [sill_on niikuj jalois. eh he he
eh he he he or I mean- fsure he has on his legs.f eh he
he he
- 39 T: [sun eno om posliini.
your uncle is porcelain. ((shaved))
- 40 K: [((nauraa))
((laughter))

- 41 E: [mu enol ei ok karva(a) ollenka(a)n.
my uncle-ADE NEG-3sg be hair-PAR at.all
my uncle doesn't have any hair at all.
- 42 K: tai siis kyl sill_on mut [sillä< tiädätsä täss näi.
or I mean yes he does but like he< you know like here.
- 43 T: [ei kulmakarvoja.
[no eyebrows.
- 44 K: sillei o oikeestik karvaa täs.
he really doesn't have hair here.
- 45 E: ei k^harvaa ollenkha(a)n.
NEG-3sg hair-PAR at.all
no hair at all.
- 46 K: ei sill_o oikee[sti.
he really doesn't ((have)).
- 47 E: [ei k^harvaa,
NEG-3sg hair-PAR
no hair.
- 48 K: [älä jaksa.
cut it out.
- 49 T?: [se on (-) posliini.
he is (-) porcelain.
- 50 K: tiätsä, (.) sillä oj jalois ja, (.) täs ja,
you know, (.) he has on his legs and, (.) here and,
- 51 E: (- -) kuj Jerellä Jere o aina tällee heittää tolle(e)
(- -) when Jere has Jere always says to her
- 52 aina kaikkee tälläst.
always this kind of things.
- 53 T: mitä kuuLuu Kara:, (.) Kara:,
how are you Kara:, (.) Kara:,
- 54 E: vittu vaan auraa vittu sit kum mä sanoj jotai
(she) just fuckin' laughs then when I say something
- 55 @↑lopeta oike(e)sti↑@.
@↑cut it out really. ↑@
- 56 (.)
- 57 E: @↑mikä sua vaiva(a)↑@.
@↑what's wrong with you↑@
- 58 ((background noise))
- 59 E: Karal tulee välil sellasii kausii millon se puhuu
Kara has these phases when she speaks
- 60 huanoo suamee.
bad Finnish.
- 61 K: mhe he he
- 62 E: huanoo suamee.
bad Finnish.
- 63 K: eh he he heh he he [((laughter))
- 64 E: [se puhuu iha täydellist suamee
she speaks totally perfect Finnish
- 65 sit se puhuu vähä< välil
then she speaks a little< every now and then
- 66 K: e heh [pätkii hih
e heh [the thought is cut hi

Kara's turn (line 33), which Ella starts to imitate, happens to contain some deviations from the most typical prosody and pronunciation: the last syllable of *ollenkaa* is clearly stressed, although the main stress in Finnish is on the first syllable only, and the full stop *k* is slightly aspirated, although unvoiced full stops are not aspirated in Finnish. This might make the turn sound somewhat 'funny'. In addition, the contents are funny, with the idea of a completely hairless man. Ella smilingly repeats Kara's turn, with the aspiration, but also deviating from the standard a little bit more, e.g. with respect to the quantity of long vowels (line 34). The repetition expresses that the turn contains something to pay attention to, possibly something funny (cf. Tainio 2008). The possible interpretations here are that Ella is making fun of Kara's way of speaking or that she finds the idea of a hairless man funny. For one reason or another, both Kara and Tiina orient towards the latter, and do not treat Ella's turn as a performance that would make fun of Kara's way of speaking (yet).

Ella repeats parts of the turn four times, each time reducing the part she repeats and exaggerating the aspiration even more (lines 34, 41, 45, 47). All this time, Kara does not tackle the problem that Ella might be making fun of her language. Nevertheless, Kara does show that she has now had enough of the joke. She finally bursts out *älä jaks*a (line 48; probably best translated as something like 'cut it out'). As a response to this reaction, Ella engages in a narrative (lines 51–57) describing interactions between herself, Kara, and a male friend of the two (Jere). In this narrative, it becomes apparent that for Ella, this is about language. She claims that Jere is allowed to greet Kara in a *stylised* "bad Finnish" kind of register, but if she would try the same, Kara would ask her to stop. Ella brings Kara's character and voice into the narrative in quotations (lines 55, 57) that are phonetically and prosodically (through the pitch and the quantity of vowels) marked as *stylised* "bad Finnish" performances. Indirectly, Kara's way of speaking becomes associated with "bad Finnish". Kara does not have to interpret this implicit equation between herself and "bad Finnish", though, because it is made explicit: Ella says that Kara has phases when she speaks "bad Finnish" (lines 59–60).

Later, the girls get into a small disagreement on which lesson they have next (before Extract 6b). After Kara and Tiina have been unsuccessful in convincing Ella that they do not have English, Ella responds with a clearly stylised and somewhat aggressive turn that says 'be quiet because you don't know anything' (line 223). In her response to this (line 224), Kara reacts for the first time to the possibility that Ella might be making fun of her language. She says "well are you trying to fuck with me really, well you don't know Dan- fuck you you don't know many languages". What Kara does next, in Extract 6b, is interesting. She challenges Ella, using her diverse linguistic resources as her weapon. She lists all the languages she speaks: Danish, Turkish, Finnish, English and Swedish (lines 232, 234, 239).

Extract 6b. During a break. Kara (K); Ella (E); Tiina (T).

- 222 ((background noise))
- 223 E: oLe hiLja kun mistään et mithä(ä)n tiedä.
 be-IMP.2SG quiet when nothing-ELA NEG-2SG nothing know
shut up cause you don't know anything about anything.
- 224 K: no yritätsä ↑vittuilla mulle ↑oikeesti.=no et säkääv
 well are you trying to ↑fuck with me really.=well you
- 225 varmaa tans< vittu et säkää osaa mont kiältä.
 don't probably know Dan< fuck you don't know many languages
- 226 E: osaam minä.
 I do.
- ((three lines omitted))
- 229K: no hei kelaap paljo mä osaav
 well hey think how many I know
- 230 vittu.
 fuck.
- 231E: mäki osaar ranskaa ku piaRaisee se lemuaa.
 I know French too ku piaraisee se lemuaa (('when you fart it stinks'
 pronounced with an uvular R))
- 232K: vittu mä osaa tanskaa mä osaa turkkii mä osaa suamee,
 fuck I know Danish I know Turkish I know Finnish,
- 233?: kup piaRasee se le mu?
 ((when you faRt it sti-ii?))
- 234K: vittu- (.) [enkkuu sil< sillee.
 fuck- (.) English ki< kind of.
- ((background noise, mock French))
- 239K: ruatsii.
 Swedish
- ((two lines omitted))
- 242K: KEELAAV VIIS VITTU.
 THINK FUCKIN' FIVE.
- 243T: mäki osaa.=mä osaan [kiinaa.
 me too.=I know Chinese.
- ((three lines omitted))
- 248K: niim mitä sä osaat enkkuu ruatsii ja suamee vaa.
 so what do you know just English Swedish and Finnish.
- 249E: >enkkuu ruatsii suamee<, (.) ja viroo jotenkute.=
 >English Swedish Finnish<, (.) and Estonian sort of.=
- 250 mä ymmärrän sitä [sillai (-)
 I understand it like (-)
- 251K: [mh-
- 252 ((background noise))
- 253K: vittu mut et sä sitä kunnol näi [osaa.
 fuck but you don't really know it like that.
- 254E: [en nii.
 I don't.

- 255K: non ni.=ei sitä lasketa os< okei >yhe sana<
you see.=that doesn't count c< okay >one word<
- 256 kyl mäki osaan .hhh somalii.
then I know .hhh Somali too.
- 257E: nii:. (.) mut mitä sä ees vähä osaat.
ye:s. (.) but what you know a little at least.
- 258K: no hei kelaam mä osaar ruatsii.
well hey think about it I know Swedish.
- 259T: mä osaa japanii?
I know Japanese?
- 260E: mä osaan thaimaat?
I know Thailand? ((sic!))
- 261K: no<
well<
- 262E: mä osaar ranskaa.
I know French.
- 263K: enk[kuu.
English.
- 264E: [italiaa?=espanjaa?
Italian?=Spanish?
- 265 ((the teacher talks about where the lesson will be))
- 267 K: kelaam mä osaa viis kiältä.
think about it I know five languages.
- 268 E: @mä osa(a)n viis kiältä.@
I know-1sg five language
@I know five languages.@
- 269 ?: (- -)
- 270 K: *mt* älä vittu jaksa oikeesti.
**mt* cut it fuckin' out really.*

On an ideological level, I find Kara's act remarkable: with the help of the linguistic awareness that she has gathered in spite of her young age (because of her mobile and transnational biography), Kara questions the monolingual norm and the viewpoint of the hegemonic majority that Ella represents. Kara is stating that her linguistic repertoire is as valuable as that of Ella's, although their access to the main language of the country differ.

Kara counts that she knows five languages in total, and announces that triumphantly (line 242). Ella and Tiina first do not take this as a serious invitation to compete, before Kara directly asks Ella which languages she knows, counting English, Finnish and Swedish (line 248). Ella still tries to compete with her by naming languages she knows, naming even Estonian, which she might understand a bit. Kara does not accept this: she has named only those languages in which she could converse. With the criteria that Ella is using, Kara adds Somali (which she has learned from her friends) and Swedish (which she understands since she knows Danish). It is metapragmatically and ideologically interesting that the girls negotiate their understanding of what it means to "know" a language (lines 249–264,

cf. Blommaert & Backus 2011), and end up counting even languages they know “one word in”. The conflict still remains unsolved.

After a short interruption by a teacher, Kara gets back to the argument that has proven its power: she repeats that she knows five languages (line 267). What now follows is somewhat similar to the previous excerpt (Extract 6a), where Ella imitated Kara’s turn. Ella once again repeats a part of Kara’s turn, clearly making turning it into a *stylised “bad Finnish”* performance, mainly prosodically and phonetically (through voice quality and the quantity of vowels, line 268). This is her weapon against Kara’s broad linguistic knowledge: with the stylisation, she states that Kara’s Finnish can be heard as that of a language learner – even if she knows five languages. Ella positions Kara’s Finnish qualitatively on a different level from hers. Kara has had enough and she quite clearly expresses that she would like Ella to stop (line 270). It is clear that at this point, *stylised “bad Finnish”* is no longer a fun code shared equally by Kara and Ella. The situation is tense and reconciliation is needed.

The following excerpt (6c) documents the negotiation that solves the conflict. Kara and Ella gradually slide into a *stylised “bad Finnish”* performance, and finally, it becomes their common voice and stance again.

Extract 6c. During a break. Kara (K); Ella (E); Tiina (T).

- 277 ? : missä kaikki muut oppilaat [o.
where are all the other pupils.
- 278 K : [annam mun
gimme my
- 279 keksit vittu.
fuckin’ biscuits.
- 280 (.)
- 281 K : voinko ottaa sinult yhen keksin?
may-1sg-Q take-INF you-ELA one-GEN biscuit-GEN¹³
may I have a biscuit from you?
- 282 E : @miksi vitus[sä;@
why SWEARW-INE
@why the fuck;@
- 283 K : [mä haluum maistaa. =sinä saa
I want-1sg taste-INF you get-@
I want to taste.=you get
- 284 [minulta.
I-ELA
from me.

13. In Finnish, the cases of the total object are genitive and nominative (sometimes glossed as ACC), and the case of the partial object is partitive.

- 285 E: [eno koska sinä@ vittu laitoit [@heitit
 ↑maahan.@
 well because you SWEARW put-PST-2sg throw-PST-2sg
 ground-ILL
 @well because you@ fucking put @threw it on the ↑ground.@
- 286 K: [heh
- 287 heh [he he
- 288 E: [@heitit ↑maahan.@
 throw-PST-2sg ground-ILL
 @threw it on the ↑ground.@
- 289 K: £Tiina soi sen.f he
 NAME eat-PST.3sg it-GEN
 £Tiina eated it.£ ha
- 290 E: Tiina nii(h) hi Tiina [£nappasi ja soi.f
 NAME yes NAME snatch-PST.3sg and eat-PST.3sg
 Tiina yea(h) hi Tiina £snatched and eated.£
- 291 K: [he he
- 292 E: @saNoi, (.) sisältä ei ↑paha.@
 say-PST.3sg inside-ELA NEG-3sg bad
 @said, (.) inside not ↑bad.@
- 293 K: eh he heh he heh he he
- 294 E: @ota ↑k^heksi.@
 take.IMP.2sg biscuit
 @have a ↑biscuit.@
- 295 K: ↑kii↑tos:.
 ↑thank↑you:.
- 296 E: @>minä tiedän että sinä ei annam minu< mutta
 annan
 I know-1sg that you NEG-3sg give I-ø but
 give-1sg
 I know you don't give me but I give
- 297 [silti.@
 still
 anyway.
- 298 K: [eh he he annanha. .hhh
 eh he he I will. .hhh
- 299 ? : [(- -)
- 301 K: [@voitko sinä avata.@
 can-2sg-Q you open-INF
 @can you open.@
- 302 T: jos minä saan yhden [keksin.
 if I get-1sg one-GEN biscuit-GEN
 If I get a biscuit.
- 303 E: [@ei hän osaa.@
 NEG-3sg she can
 @she can not.@
- 304 (.)
- 305 E: @hän tyhmä. (.) sinä vi(i)sas.@ (.) eiku
 (s)he stupid you clever no.like
 @she stupid. (.) you clever.@ (.) no I mean
- 306 @mInä vi(i)sas.@

- I clever
 @I clever.@
- 307 T: ja minä viisas hän tyhmä.
 and I clever she stupid.
- 308 E: niinkus se oli tällei tom mutsi oli tälle
 yeah 'cause she was like her mother was like this
- 309 X:lle ja Y:lle. (.) @hän tyhmä. (.) sinä
 to X and Y. (.) he stupid. (.) you
- 310 viisas.@
 clever.

Kara asks for biscuits, which Ella has in her bag (line 278). Ella does not react, and Kara asks again for a biscuit (line 281). There is a clear stylistic difference between the requests: whereas the first is an imperative with an offensive *vittu* (lit. *cunt*, used like 'fuck, fucking'), the second has the form of a question with a polite auxiliary *voida*. It also slides slightly towards the written standard and/or stylised "bad Finnish" with the pronominal choice *sinä* : *sinult*. Ella's answer (line 282) to Kara's request for biscuits is marked as a performance through voice quality, and it has phonological cues (such as *i* instead of *i*) that index stylised "bad Finnish". Nevertheless, the taboo word *vittu* here and in Ella's next turn (line 285) does not belong to most typical stylised "bad Finnish" performances, but rather recycles the aggressive voice that Kara has been using in the conflict. Kara is also switching between 'routine speech' and stylised "bad Finnish": *Mä haluum maistaa* is common Helsinki speech, whereas *sinä saa minulta* has the two most common features of stylised "bad Finnish" (lines 283–284). The end of Ella's next turn ([@heitit ↑maahan.@) is prosodically clearly marked as a performance, and the turn makes Kara laugh (lines 285–286). Ella repeats the successful performance, and now Kara, too, engages in stylised "bad Finnish" (line 189). Her turn *£Tiina soi sen.£* is prosodically and phonetically (*soi* instead of *söi* 'she ate') marked and expresses good will, also in form of the laughter. Indeed, Ella responds with the *nii*-particle expressing affiliation (Sorjonen 2001: 167), and kind of re-performs the event that Kara has described in her turn, exaggerating and expanding the stylised "bad Finnish" elements. Kara rewards the performance with lots of laughter. (Lines 290–293.) Ella now kindly offers Kara biscuits (line 294), and does this in stylised "bad Finnish", employing exactly the feature that has been in the core of the conflict (the aspiration of *k*). From this point on, both Ella and Kara converse exclusively in stylised "bad Finnish", seemingly amusing themselves. The conflict is solved: stylised "bad Finnish" is the girls' common fun code again.

Stylised "bad Finnish" finally gets associated with Kara's mother (that is, with adult immigrants), and this seals the reconciliation of the conflict about how to position oneself and the other with respect to "bad Finnish". Ella and Tiina vary and recycle the turn *hän tyhmä, sinä viisas*, which reportedly was used by Kara's

mother to some common friends of the girls (lines 208–210). The turn can be identified as *stylised “bad Finnish”* because of the deletion of the copula, and in lines 305–306, Ella also adds phonetic cues (through the quantity and quality of vowels). Among Kara, Ella and Tiina, *stylised “bad Finnish”* performances are thus back in their place: associated with categories with which they do not associate themselves or each other. Nevertheless, for Kara, the relevance of this negotiation is slightly different than for Ella and Tiina: immigration and learning Finnish as a second language are clearly part of her own personal trajectory, and for her, positioning herself as someone who does not have “bad Finnish” means emphasising the difference between herself and her parents.

Conclusions and discussion

I have shown that *stylised* performances like *mina ei suami puhu*, *mina ei ymmärrä*, *mina puhu hoono soomi* (‘me not speak Finnish’, ‘me no understand’, ‘me speak bad Finnish’) are used as contextualisation cues whenever ‘learner language’, ‘non-Finnishness’ or ‘non-nativeness’ are made relevant for interaction. The stylisations have some prominent features (excessive use of standard-like personal pronouns *mina* and *sinä*, simplified verb conjugation and often prosodic and phonetic features). These features are enregistered into a register and organised under the labels *hoono soomi* (iconically imitating non-native pronunciation) or *huono suomi*, meaning ‘bad Finnish’. Some of the features have their roots in simplified foreigner/teacher talk, others in (assumed) difficulties of non-native speech. In this paper, I have studied *stylised “bad Finnish”* performances in interaction among adolescents as a form of reflexivity, the core question being how the participants position themselves with regard to this discourse register. Immigration and learning Finnish are a part of their personal life trajectories, and they are “seen” as foreigners by others, which forces them to engage continuously in reflexive practices regarding ‘Finnishness’.

The label “bad Finnish” alone is pejorative and excluding, and it carries a normative view on language based on the monolingual norm. It comes from the assumption that a certain “good” or “correct” Finnish exists and “bad Finnish” is a poorer version of it. Both the label and the register were first – and still are – used by native Finns. Thus, when adolescents with an immigrant background who factually have learned Finnish as a second language engage in *stylised “bad Finnish”* performance, they are not imitating the way (they think) that immigrants learning Finnish actually speak, but performing a stance with respect to the stereotypes and prejudice they encounter in “bad Finnish”.

The *stylised “bad Finnish”* register is an emblem widely attached to certain social personae associated with ‘non-nativeness’, ‘non-Finnishness’, ‘immigrants’, ‘foreigners’ and their stereotypical characteristics. When a social persona is brought up in interaction, the participants can display their stance towards it and the societal discourses in which it is involved, and this is why stylisation offers such a fruitful source for exploring reflexivity. Reflexivity here means the ways in which speakers, given their personal trajectories, position themselves with regard to wider understandings about the relevant categorisations in the society.

Although not all functions of *stylised “bad Finnish”* depend on the speaker’s ethnic or linguistic background, its social indexical potential makes it possible for speakers who once were learners of Finnish and who belong to an ethnic minority to explore and express their relationship to ‘Finnishness’ and ‘nativeness’. I have shown that in my data, the immigrant adolescents’ self-positioning with regard to ‘Finnishness’ and ‘nativeness’ is ambiguous: in some contexts, it is important to claim ownership of Finnish, while in others, *stylised “bad Finnish”* functions as a way of reflecting on one’s trajectory as a learner of Finnish or an immigrant. Conversely, for speakers unambiguously regarded as ‘native Finns’, *stylised “bad Finnish”* clearly represents the voice of *another* and social personae with whom they hardly share characteristics.

Stylised “bad Finnish” has developed into a trope that not only carries associations with ethnicity or non-nativeness, but also expresses a stance leaning on higher orders of indexicality. One function for which *stylised “bad Finnish”* is used is to escape an unpleasant situation, to “get away with it”. This is a widely shared practice in which ethnicity might fade into the background: troping on one of the core phrases of *stylised “bad Finnish”* simply builds a stance with respect to the situation at hand; ethnic relations in the situation are not especially forwarded and go unnoticed. Nevertheless, social indexicality always builds upon the relationship between the social personae evoked by it and ‘others’. *Stylised “bad Finnish”* indexes the relationship between ‘foreigners’, ‘immigrants’ and ‘Finnish learners’ (the social persona evoked by it) and ‘native Finns’. In this constellation, the latter are often the authority, deciding on the conditions of the interaction. At the core of the enregisterment is the idea that *stylised “bad Finnish”* indexes an incapability to live up to these conditions. Thus, the uneven relationship between these social personae is always potentially present. For instance, when Aziza comments on Mary’s rebellion against me in *stylised “bad Finnish”* (Extract 4), she is commenting on the relationship between me as an authority and Mary as rebelling against that authority.

When people from a group that is the object of stereotypes reclaim ownership of the stereotypes or embrace them, it can be seen as empowering and

emancipating. Carnivalising the stereotypes weakens the power of evil prejudiced talk. In some cases, this might be happening with *stylised* “bad Finnish”, too. If *stylised* “bad Finnish” performances are a shared practise among adolescents with immigrant backgrounds and Finnish-born adolescents, the immigrant adolescents seem to position themselves on the same side as their Finnish-born peers with regard to “bad Finnish”. Here, stylisations are a way to show that “bad Finnish” is not their voice either. Nevertheless, as the interaction between Kara and her Finnish-born friends shows (Extract 6), the case is not always unproblematic. Immigrant adolescents still might be positioned differently by others, as actually belonging to the group who speak “bad Finnish”. As long as this is the case, *stylised* “bad Finnish” fails to reconstruct the biased relationship between ‘natives’ who “know Finnish” and “speak real Finnish” or “good Finnish” and between other ways of speaking. The normative view on language and the monolingual norm are still underlying, which becomes clear also in the evaluative label “bad Finnish”.

In addition, in the social media for instance, *stylised* “bad Finnish” is clearly used in expressing a pejorative, aggressive or even racist stance towards immigrants. My data, as well as examples from the media, show that people with immigrant backgrounds are constantly faced with normative and restrictive views and accounts that exclude them from Finnishness and from the ownership of Finnish. All of this makes stylising in “bad Finnish” a highly reflexive practice: when employed in interaction, participants display their stance towards the societal issues attached to it, thus socially positioning themselves and others. Even though immigrant adolescents say *stylised* “bad Finnish” is “just for fun”, it actually is troping on prejudice.

References

- Agha, A. 2007. *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Auer, P. 1992. Introduction: John Gumperz’ approach to contextualization. In *The Contextualization of Language* [Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 22], P. Auer & A. Di Luzio (eds.), 1–38. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/pbns.22.03auer
- Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays*. Austin TX: University of Texas Press.
- Blommaert, J. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization* [Cambridge Approaches to Language Contact]. Cambridge: CUP. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511845307
- Blommaert, J. & Backus, A. 2011. ‘Knowing language’ in superdiversity [Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies 67]. <http://www.academia.edu/6365319/WP67_Blommaert_and_Backus_2011._Repertoires_revisited_Knowing_language_in_superdiversity> (1 July 2016).
- Blommaert, J. & Dong, J. 2010. Language and movement in space. In *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*, N. Coupland (ed.), 367–385. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781444324068.ch16

- Coupland, N. 2007. *Style. Language Variation and Identity*. Cambridge: CUP.
doi:10.1017/CBO9780511755064
- Coupland, N. (ed.) 2010. *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781444324068
- Coupland, N. & Jaworski, A. 2004. Sociolinguistic perspectives on metalanguage: Reflexivity, evaluation and ideology. In *Metalanguage. Social and Ideological Perspectives* [Language, Power and Social Processes 11], A. Jaworski, N. Coupland & D. Galasiński (eds), 15–52. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110907377.15
- Davies, B. & Harré, R. 1990. Positioning: 'The discursive production of selves'. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20 (1): 43–63. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5914.1990.tb00174.x
- Ferguson, C. 1975. Toward a characterization of English foreigner talk. *Anthropological Linguistics* 17 (1): 1–14.
- Gumperz, J. 1982a. *Discourse Strategies* [Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 1]. Cambridge: CUP. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511611834
- Gumperz, J. 1982b. *Language and Social Identity* [Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 2]. Cambridge: CUP.
- Gumperz, J. 1992. Contextualization revisited. In *The Contextualization of Language* [Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 22], P. Auer & A. Di Luzio (eds), 39–54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/pbns.22.04gum
- Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Haikkola, L. 2012. Monipaikkainen nuoruus. Toinen sukupolvi, transnationaalisuus ja identiteetit. 'Multisited Youth. Second generation, transnationalism and identities'. The Department of Social Sciences, University of Helsinki.
- Hall, S. 1989. New ethnicities. In *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, D. Morley & K. Hsin-Cheng (eds), 441–449. London: Routledge.
- Harris, R. 2006. *New Ethnicities and Language Use*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1057/9780230626461
- Heller, M. 2008. Language and the nation-state: Challenges to sociolinguistic theory and practice. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12 (4): 504–524. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9841.2008.00373.x
- Helsinki Region Infoshare. <<http://www.hri.fi/en/>>
- Huttunen, L. 2009. Mikä ihmeen maahanmuuttaja? A blogpost in the blog En ole rasisti, mutta... Maahanmuutosta, monikulttuurisuudesta ja kritiikistä. <<http://enolerasisti.wordpress.com/2009/12/30/laura-huttunen-mika-ihmeen-maahanmuuttaja/>> (15 November 2014).
- Jaffe, A. (ed.) 2009. *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford: OUP. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195331646.001.0001
- Kaukomaa, T., Peräkyä, A. & Ruusuviuri, J. 2015. How listeners use facial expression to shift the emotional stance of the speaker's utterance. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 48 (3): 319–341. doi:10.1080/08351813.2015.1058607
- Keim, I. 2008[2007]. 'Die türkischen Powergirls'. *Lebenswelt und kommunikativer Stil einer Migrantinnengruppe in Mannheim* [Studien zur Deutschen Sprache 39], 2nd edn. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Korkiasaari, J. & Söderling, I. 2003. Finnish emigration and immigration after the World War II. Finnish Immigration Institute. <http://www.migrationinstitute.fi/fi/tietopalvelut/artikkelit-esitelmat#quicktabs-fi_tietopalvelut_esitelmat=1> (28 February 2016).
- Labov, W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Oxford: Blackwell

- Lappalainen, H. 2004. *Variaatio ja sen funktiot. Erään sosiaalisen verkoston jäsenten kielellisen vuorovaikutuksen tarkastelua* (Variation and its functions. Analysing interaction of a social network). Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Lehtonen, H. 2006. Morfologinen variaatio maahanmuuttajataustaisten helsinkiläisnuorten puheessa (Morphological variation in the speech of adolescents with immigrant background in Helsinki). In *Helsinki kieliyhteisönä* (Helsinki as a linguistic community), K. Juusela & K. Nisula (eds), 255–274. Helsinki: Department of Finnish and Finnish literature, University of Helsinki.
- Lehtonen, H. 2011. Developing multiethnic youth language in Helsinki. In *Ethnic Styles of Speaking in European Metropolitan Areas* [Studies in Language Variation 8], F. Kern & M. Selting (eds), 291–318. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/silv.8.12leh
- Lehtonen, H. 2015a. Tyylitellen. Nuorten kielelliset resurssit ja kielen sosiaalinen indeksisyys monietnisessä Helsingissä (Stylising. Linguistic resources of adolescents and the social indexicality of language in multi-ethnic Helsinki). Helsinki: Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies, University of Helsinki. <<https://helda.helsinki.fi/handle/10138/155659>>
- Lehtonen, H. 2015b. *Sano vai sanoi* – mitä merkitystä on yhdellä i: llä? Jälkitavujen i-loppuisen diftongin sosiaalinen indeksisyys monietnistyvässä Helsingissä (*Sano or sanoi* – the meaning of an i'). In *Helsingissä puhuttavat suomet. Kielen indeksisyys ja sosiaaliset identiteetit* (Finnishes spoken in Helsinki. The indexicality of language and social identities). M.-L. Sorjonen, A. Rouhikoski & H. Lehtonen (eds), 84–123. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Migri – The Finnish Immigration Service Turvapaikka- ja pakolaistilastot. <http://www.migri.fi/tietoa_virastosta/tilastot/turvapaikka-_ja_pakolaistilastot> (29 February 2016).
- Ochs, E. 1992. Indexing gender. In *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (eds) 335–358. Cambridge: CUP.
- Paunonen, H. [1982]1995. *Suomen kieli Helsingissä. Huomioita Helsingin puhekielen taustasta ja nykyvariaatiosta* (Finnish in Helsinki. About the development and the variation of spoken Finnish in Helsinki). Helsinki: Department of Finnish, University of Helsinki.
- Rampton, B. 1995. *Crossing. Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rampton, B. 2006. *Language in Late Modernity. Interaction in an Urban School*. Cambridge: CUP. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511486722
- Sacks, H. 1992a. *Lectures on Conversation*, Vol. I, G. Jefferson (ed.). Cambridge MA: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H. 1992b. *Lectures on Conversation*, Vol. II, G. Jefferson (ed.). Cambridge MA: Blackwell.
- Silverstein, M. 2003. Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language and Communication* 23: 193–229. doi:10.1016/S0271-5309(03)00013-2
- Somalis in Helsinki. 2013. Open Society Foundations. <<https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/sites/default/files/somalis-helsinki-20131121.pdf>> (1 July 2016).
- Sorjonen, M.-L. 2001. *Responding in Conversation: A Study of Response Particles in Finnish* [Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 70]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/pbns.70
- Statistics Finland: Population. <http://www.stat.fi/til/vrm_en.html> (29 February 2016).
- Suurpää, L. 2002. *Erilaisuuden hierarkiat. Suomalaisia käsityksiä maahanmuuttajista, suvaitsevaisuudesta ja rasismista* (Hierarchies of difference. Finnish conceptualisations about immigrants, tolerance, and racism). Helsinki: Finnish Youth Research Society.
- Tainio, L. 2008. Toisten puhujien matkiminen luokahuoneessa (Imitating other speakers in the classroom). In *Nuoret kielikuvassa. Kouluikäisten kieli 2000-luvulla* (Picturing youth. The language of school pupils in the 2000's), S. Routarinne & T. Uusi-Hallila (eds), 146–164. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

- Valdman, A. 1981. Sociolinguistics aspects of foreigner talk. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 28: 41–52.
- Visakko, T. 2015. *Self-promotion as Semiotic Behaviour. The Mediation of Personhood in Light of Finnish Online Dating Advertisements*. Helsinki: Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies, University of Helsinki.

Appendix. Transcription symbols

.	falling intonation
;	slightly falling intonation
?	rising intonation
,	slightly rising intonation
–	level intonation
[utterances starting simultaneously
(.)	a short pause (< 0.2 seconds)
(.)	a longer pause
<u>xx</u> (underlining)	emphasis
↑	rise in pitch
↑xxx↑	high pitch between the arrows
£	smiling voice
xx<	a word interrupted
(h)	laughter within talk
@	change in the voice quality
°xxxx°	quiet voice
.hh	breathing in
hh	breathing out
.joo	word pronounced breathing in
xxx::	a sound prolonged
(-)	unclear
((laughter))	explanations by the transcriber
niil_oli	legato pronunciation
ha, he, heh, hi	laughing