Play in two languages.
Language alternation and code-switching in role-play in North Sámi and Norwegian

Carola Kleemann
Finnmark University College

Abstract:

This article analyses how children in a Sámi kindergarten[1] use their languages, North Sámi and Norwegian, in everyday life. My focus is on role-play in periods of free play in a kindergarten where children speak both North Sámi and Norwegian. Role-play is a *bilingual context* in that one sequence of play most often uses elements from both languages. Role-play as a situation is suitable for studying language alternation and code-switching because it is an in-group driven activity. The language alternation and code-switching which appears in role-play situations is discussed in light of theories advocating dividing code and language, viewing language choice as one of a cluster of codes used in role-play. I argue the children observed for this study have layers of codes to use. I discuss the language codes *North Sámi*, *Norwegian* and *bilingual*, which the children use in the role-play setting; the main codes used are *directory utterances*, *role utterances*, *magical utterances* and *out-of-play-utterances*.

Introduction

The children in the Sámi kindergarten in my study alternate between their languages North Sámi and Norwegian when role-playing. Role-play is a context which entails rules for language use, in my study it is a bilingual setting; a free, relatively unsupervised and uninterrupted play situation in a bilingual group of children. This article aims to show how language alternation and code-switching are arranged and ordered according to the role-play codes *directory utterances*, *role utterances*, *magical utterances* and *out-of-play-utterances*. These utterance types are codes transduced with a certain set of linguistic features, clusters of codes or cues, so as to be decoded by the receiver in the context of role-play. These codes can be linguistic features such as language, variety/dialect, prosodic traits or pitch.

Over the last 15 years, several studies on role-play and bilingualism have been published, many influenced by ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis (CA); Peter Auer's approach to bilingual conversation has been particularly influential (e.g. Auer, 1984, 1998). Some studies are linguistics-oriented, focusing on language and languages as systems

---

[1] "Kindergarten" is used differently in different nations, I use it in a Scandinavian tradition based on the original German term "Kindergarten" created by Friedrich Fröbel. The Norwegian "barnehage" ("children's garden") is a loan translation from German "Kindergarten" and closer to the original idea by Fröbel than the US tradition.

(Cromdal, 2000; Guldal, 1997; Halmari and Smith, 1994); others are more influenced by social anthropology, and focus on language and identity (Garcia-Sanchez, 2010; Kyratzis, 2010; Paugh, 2005). Common ground for both perspectives is the study of interaction and the participants' own categories; according to Auer, the difference lies in the interpretation of interactions, whether as part of a smaller or larger social system. A meso-level is identified in studies focusing on peer socialization and the importance of the children's own culture as premise setters of bilingual practices in the in-group (Garcia-Sanchez, 2010; Kyratzis, 2010; Paugh, 2005). Role-play is often a side-theme in these works, accompanying a main focus on language and communication theories (e.g. Guldal, 1997) or identity (e.g. Paugh, 2005). My study places the linguistic perspective on a meso-level, arguing that role-play is a significant trigger and premise-setter for communication and language use.

This study uses the terms *code-switching* and *language alternation*, but it is not self-evident what they entail. In research on language contact and bilingualism, language alternation has traditionally been used interchangeably with code-switching (Myers-Scotton, 1993b). More recent research argues for a division of language and code in bilingual conversation (Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998b). One reason for dividing them is meaning: for a code to be salient in an interaction, it must carry meaning that can and will be decoded by the receiver (Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998a; Lévi-Strauss, Jakobson, and Voegelin, 1953). An important task in the study of code-switching is identifying which code the switch is from. Gafaranga argues that earlier research on bilingualism has a monolingual bias in that it takes monolingualism to be the "normal" language choice. Instead, he proposes a bilingual perspective, where "bilingual medium" can be a code, a "language" distinct from the two linguistic languages/varieties the individual uses (Gafaranga, 2007; Gafaranga and Torras, 2002). This article argues that language and code are distinct; Norwegian and North Sámi are each only elements within a cluster of codes or cues that together convey a code, like the utterance-types of role-play.

Role-play as context is important because it is play: the children want to be involved. My observations suggest there are rules in role-play for how to use the languages at the children's command, and the communicative codes operate in clusters of cues that provide sufficient information to enable decoding even with one cue missing. For the outsider there may or may not be a recognizable pattern, but the children seem to accept a large variety of language choice and language varieties, perhaps due to their experience of

varied language use in their daily environment. I aim to show how bilingualism works in communication: it is a functional system. I aim with this project to expand the understanding of "doing being"[2] bilingual, or being Sámi and/or Norwegian.

The Sámi kindergarten[3]

The Sámi kindergarten is located in a predominantly Norwegian-speaking town in Finnmark, northern Norway, although historically the region has been more Sámi[4] and Kven/Finnish. The kindergarten is a private institution owned by a Sámi organisation. The aim of the institution is to strengthen Sámi identity, language and culture. The everyday language of the kindergarten is Sámi, but a bilingual alternative is available for Sámi children who speak little Sámi. When I started this project, the kindergarten had two Sámi-only groups – one for 1-3 year olds, and one for 3-6 year olds – and one bilingual group for 3-6 year olds.

I did my fieldwork in a kindergarten group of three to six year-olds, in which the children were bilingual and where the pre-school teacher and kindergarten assistants spoke only Sámi to them. The group consisted of 16 children aged between three and six years old; two assistants and a pre-school teacher were in charge of the group; the teacher is the pedagogical leader of the group, having the relevant qualifications[5], while the two assistants have varying backgrounds. However, the mother tongue of all three staff is Sámi, but they also spoke fluent Norwegian on a daily basis. It is worth noting that while many of the staff spoke Sámi and Norwegian (which they have spoken since they were children), they still viewed themselves as being 'monolingual' Sámi. This may perhaps be understood in relation to the context of mono- vs. bilingualism in the kindergarten. For instance, in the one to three year old group in the kindergarten, the teacher and assistants spoke only Sámi to the children, treating them as Sámi speakers, or rather potential Sámi speakers, no matter which home language the children had.

Most children have quite similar backgrounds. For instance, many children have parents actively concerned with Sámi issues, both political and linguistic ones, which I believe is an important factor in their linguistic

---

[2] From Auer (1984:7) inspired by Harvey Sacks's "interactionalization".

[3] The kindergarten must remain anonymous for reasons of professional ethics, so I do not refer to the actual kindergarten where I did my fieldwork.

[4] I use the term Sámi to refer to the language North Sámi henceforth.

[5] This is in accordance with rules and regulations for staff in Norwegian kindergartens.

environment. However, it must be pointed out that the community, neighbourhood, and town are dominated by Norwegian speakers.

Participants: the children playing role-play

In the following, I will provide a description of Anna, aged four years and three months, and Piera, aged four years and five months. I will also provide examples from the play sequences in which these two children are involved. For research-ethical reasons, their names are pseudonyms. Sámi is Piera's main home language. He lives with his mother and two older brothers, and all speak Sámi at home. Anna uses both Sámi and Norwegian at home. She lives with her Sámi-speaking father and Norwegian-speaking mother (who also has some knowledge of Sámi), and two younger siblings. Anna speaks Norwegian with her mother and Sámi with her father; however, both parents are very attentive of her speaking Sámi when playing with other Sámi-speaking children, and they often arrange for play groups in Sámi in their home by inviting friends from the kindergarten. Both have good skills in role-play in both languages as will be demonstrated in the examples.

To give an idea of the complex language environment the children live in, I have made a schematic overview of some factors:

Anna
•Sámi in kindergarten
•Sámi with father (and his family)
•Sámi with/from mother (little)
•Sámi in the Sámi community
•Norwegian with mother
•Norwegian with/from father
•Norwegian in the community

Piera
•Sámi in kindergarten
•Sámi with mother (and her family)
•Sámi with brothers
•Sámi in the Sámi community
•Norwegian with/from brothers
•Norwegian with/from mother
•Norwegian in the community

These different channels of linguistic input are of course also more complex: for example, the Sámi used in the kindergarten includes different North Sámi dialects from both adults and other children. It is difficult to draw an exact picture of linguistic input, other than that it is complex. This is important to take into account when studying the language used by bilingual children, both on grammatical and interactional levels.

Ethical considerations

My research focuses on how bilingual children use their languages. To answer this question, I wanted to study the children in real-life situations, in their everyday lives. One such bilingual arena is the Sámi kindergarten, with a large group of children using both Norwegian and Sámi as an in-group praxis. The kindergarten as an institution welcomed and assisted

with my project, as did the children and their parents. I was fortunate to be included and accepted by most of the children, and thus able to gather material for my project in a way that was approved by the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD)[6].

The NSD system helps to ensure the research ethics of the project are appropriate, but there are many ethical considerations to review before and during field work and analysis. One consideration involved weighing ethics against technology: I chose to use a very visible camera on tripod, moving it around with me and/or the children. This may not have given the perfect quality of material, but I felt reassured they knew they were being filmed, and experienced the presence of the camera. Of course, my presence together with the camera influenced the situation, but the effort I made to adhere to their everyday rhythm of the kindergarten arguably makes these observations acceptable as "real" interactions which occur outside the laboratory or testing settings. It should also be noted that the children interpreted my and the camera's presence as Norwegian: the children spoke to me in Norwegian, and one of the boys spoke to the camera in Norwegian as well.

Ethics is important in general when interacting with others. I've had to explicate my views of people, of children and of the Sámi people during this project. The children were informed that they had the power to decide whether they wanted to be filmed or not, a power they used if I denied them access to my field notebook (which consequently has more drawings and random letters than field notes written by me). Another consequence of this power is that I have less or no footage of the ones who would not let me film or played with someone who would not let me film. Still, I feel it is more important to empower the children in their lives than to achieve the "perfect" material. The issue of empowering the "objects" of research has far too often been ignored in research on the Sámi (Gaski, 2000; Grenersen, 2002; Myrvoll, 2002), on children (Cannella and Viruru, 2004; Rogers and Evans, 2008) and probably in general when we look at elitism and research (Toulmin, 2001:100-101). I modelled my research methods on "The least adult role" (Rogers and Evans, 2008:47), in order to distance myself from the adult role of teacher or assistant in the kindergarten. This means I was not normative in linguistic choices, and I tried to be less authoritative and avoid comforting or mediating in conflicts.

---

[6] Norsk Samfunnsvitenskapelig Datatjeneste, http://www.nsd.uib.no/index.html

Methodology

Conversation Analysis (CA) developed out of the work of Harvey Sacks. It examines languages as social action, and takes this to be systematically ordered and organized (Auer, 1998; Sidnell, 2010; Wooffitt, 2005). Method, organization and analysis in this tradition follow the seminal article by Sacks, Schlegoff and Jefferson (1974): "A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation". It argues the material is important, requiring accurate transcriptions of "naturally occurring interactions", like filming role-play in the everyday life of the kindergarten. Role-play is the "speech exchange system" (Sacks et al. 1974:696) I study. The focus is on speech production and turn-taking organization as a system (Sacks, et al., 1974; Wooffitt, 2005) with a turn-constructional and a turn-allocation component; these in turn offer a number of choices in taking and allocating turns, involving "techniques" either to give the other participant(s) an opportunity to take a turn, or to take a turn (self-selected or selected). Auer (1984) uses principles of CA to analyse bilingualism and bilingual language practice, and more recent research follows some of these principles (Gafaranga, 2007; Wei, 1998) of "*a model for turn-taking in conversation […] characterized as locally managed, party administered, interactionally controlled, and sensitive to recipient design*" (Sacks et al. 1974:696). With this view and method of analysis, bilingual conversation is basically conversation, and the use of languages another communicative code (Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998b) or register variation (Halmari and Smith, 1994).

The material consists of 39 films of individual play-sequences edited from the raw material. The films vary in length from 0:50 to 36:50 minutes, the latter being the total length of the type of tapes I used when recording. The choice of situations, i.e. periods of free play in the kindergarten, is important in relation to how the material was collected. In this context, it may be said that the material is quite "free", i.e. it was not always easy to transcribe: the sound was not always of a good quality, and sometimes the microphone was over-sensitive, recording even sounds some distance from the situation being filmed. Another problem is that the images do not always show the children playing that can be heard on the soundtrack; this was because I did not move the camera a lot when the children were playing. Transcribing children at play is challenging: Even though they communicate well with each other in the specific situation, it is not always coherent or reasonable to an observer. And of course the key issue for this study is to examine how the children use elements from two language systems. Overlaps and differences can make transcribing a subjective interpretation. Some of the uncertainties in this were overcome or

minimized by having help in listening to the recordings. I owe great thanks to the Sámi transcriber who helped with this task, both with regards to the transcriptions and the discussions.

When transcribing, I diverted from the more exact system developed by Gail Jefferson (Wooffitt, 2005:11), focusing more on readability. In each case I considered respelling, consistency and the use of more exact phonetic signs in relation to readability (Jaffe, 2006), and often ended up with a pragmatic and more readable choice, using approximate standard Norwegian and North Sámi orthography. I use different fonts to visualize the different languages and language-varieties, elements from CA-tradition, such as, "^" to indicate raised pitch, "(.)" for pauses and "()" for inaudible elements. The numbers in front of the names in the examples indicate turn-number in the play-sequence.

The communicative codes of role-play

Role-play is more than interaction and colloquium, it is also theatre (Guss, 2011; Høigård, 2006; Lillemyr, 2011; Øksnes, 2010), although without a script; it is narrative created through dialogue. For this account, I will refer to some of the key elements of role-play that I consider to be important in contextualizing. Role-play is a narrative created through interaction and conversation; there is no one "owner" of a story, and there is hardly any straight-line through the narrative, but rather a movement to-and-fro that constitutes play in Gadamer's terms (Gadamer, 2004). This to-and-fro movement perhaps also reflects the mode of language-use in bilingual settings, and, as I will show below, there are examples of how the context of play, or more specifically role-play, provides a context or framework for language praxis, but no straight-line through the story with one mode or plot. Recent play research (Guss, 2011; Øksnes, 2010) refers also to Bakhtin with regards to interpreting play or role-play as being in the spirit of carnival: *"of incomplete form and ambiguous meanings"* (Guss, 2011:16). Studying role-play amongst children it is often observed that children test-out the "rules of reality", using some of them, while manipulating others in an unpredictable manner, but not so unpredictable to prevent participation in the role-play.

Viewing role-play as theatre shows how the rules of role-play provide contextualization cues to how to use language varieties and how to understand them. Theatre concerns production, and Guss compares dramatic role-play to the professional dramatization:

> *In my research, children's functions in play-drama can be fruitfully compared to those of a dramatist, actor, director, stage designer, light-designer, props-person, costume designer, dresser,*

> *choreographer – dancer, sound designer, composer – musician.*
> *(Guss, 2011:115)*

In the sequence I have chosen for this article, the roles of dramatist, actor (although projected on to a doll or a figure), director and stage designer, props-person, choreographer and prompter may all be identified. Important for these different roles are the codes that are associated with the different roles of theatre production; these codes are often clearly audible, and often appear in a cluster of contextualization cues, as the definition of different utterances above shows.

Language is very important, or even necessary, for role-play. To be good at role-play, you also need to be good at language, and you have to use and understand the relevant meta-language and meta-communication as well, which is central to Bateson's much-cited "A Theory of Play and Fantasy" (Bateson, 1976 [1955]) and "The Message 'This Is Play'" (Bateson, 1982 [1956]). In role-play, everyday meta-language can be made more explicit, where the role-character's thoughts and movements are realized in words as well. Meta-communication in this context involves, for instance, exchanging signals that can mean "this is play", often made explicit with words such as, "like" and Sámi: "makkaš".

Role-play is form and order as well as chaos and carnival, and at least three[7] distinguishable types of utterances representing levels of reality or presence/presentation are easily observable (Høigård, 2006:82) and provide cues to the understanding of language choice as well as the level of reality.

Role-utterances

These are utterances the children use in character (Guss (2011) refers to these as *in-character utterances*), when they are playing their roles. The cluster of cues to these utterances I call *play-voice*, and consist of raised pitch of voice in addition to the use of verbs in present tense. Most examples in my material are also spoken by the children in what could be described as an interpretation of "standard" Norwegian, or perhaps a caricature of the dialect of the capital city.

Assuming the role, they use lines and the lines are said using a play-voice; that is, they change the tone of their voices, marked in the transcript with ^, and they also change to the present tense, marked with *italics*, such as in example 3:

(3)

---

[7] A fourth may involve leaving the situation altogether, signalling "this is not play, this is you and me in real life".

14.　　Anna　　^*Åh, nei det er dragehule!*
　　　　　　　　{^Oh, no it is a dragon's den!}

How much the children use role utterances varies; the character's lines may be referred to in a more indirect way as well. The dominant way of expressing role-utterances was with the following cluster of cues/codes: raised pitch, the use of present tense and using a "caricature" of a Norwegian dialect. All these cues add up to a play-voice. In addition, there were of course cues of movement and the use of glances (eye-contact between the children).

Directory utterances

These are utterances about the role and the context of the role-play. The children decide who plays which roles, what they will do or say, or they describe or explain the time, place and environment: the context of the role-play. With language they create a play-context, and sometimes these kinds of utterances are the only ones used in role-play. Typically these utterances are made in a local language variety or dialect, and the verbs are in past tense, most often preterite, or composite forms of future tenses with preterite.

In the beginning of role-play the participants set the scene; they decide what to play, which artefacts to use and the place. They decide on roles, which one to have what, and to be what, such as in utterance 1-4 in "Dragons and Castle":

(1)

1. Piera　Ja da **lei** mu dinga.
　　　　　{And this here **was** my stuff}

2. Anna　(0.4) Jo (.) ja dá **lei** mu heasta.
　　　　　{ (0.4) Yes, (.) and here **was** my horse}

3. Piera　(0.3) Ja da **lei** mu sávza fas.
　　　　　{(0.3) and this **was** my sheep again.}

4. Anna　(0.7) Nå guokte heastta mis **ledje** (.) Dát **galggai** duos **leam[en** ()
　　　　　{(0.7) Now we had two horses. (.) This **should** there **b[e** ()}

We see here the typical trait of using the past tense (shown in bold) in directory utterances, and they use a local variety of Sámi. The sentences are simple in form, and they almost copy each other; but the sentences are well formed. They make themselves understood and understand the situation of starting up a role-play and creating the environment, and can act accordingly. This part of play is setting the scene and probably sets them

both in the play-reality, creating a context of both material and immaterial features. Another feature of this stage of role-play is deciding which characters to play.

When they are satisfied, or finished negotiating terms and creating the context, or the role-play decides it is time (Gadamer, 2010), they start the acting, the role-play, and they then assume the roles they have chosen by physical activities most often accompanied by directions, such as in utterance 12 of Dragons and Castle:

(2)

    12.   Anna   Jo, ja dát **manai** doh() deike bajas.
                       {Yes, and this one **went** the(re) up here.}

This is part of directory utterances as well, and as mentioned above, these kinds of utterances could be the only ones in a sequence of role-play, and always dominate. It should be noted again that the children use past tense in organizing play or giving directions: they are telling a story.

Magical utterances

These are utterances where the children verbalize what is done or happening in the game, like "eat, eat" when a role-character eats, and a typical "walk, walk" when the doll is walking. The magic of these utterances is that the word creates what it denotes; action comes into being by naming it. Magical utterances are in the infinite present, setting them apart from the ongoing action, and with varying pitch, but often normal pitch, not raised, even if it is in-character. Høigård describes the often singing or chanting voice of these utterances, either monotonous or two tones with falling third interval in the final tone (Høigård, 2006:83).

The third kind of utterance is in some sort of in between position: it is clearly part of the characters acting, but it is of course context-describing as well. Magical utterances, that is, words that by saying them result in action, such as the words underlined in (4) below, are treated a bit differently than role utterances, and a bit different than directory utterances. This difference in how the children perceive magical utterances can be reflected in how they say them, in an almost chanting way, repeating the verb two or three times so as to show ongoing action.

(4)

    34.   Piera   *It* go don *hálit* diekkara? ()^Åh, *jeg vil* dit *gå*, <u>spise, spise</u>
                                                                            ()
                    {*Don't* you *want* that? () ^Oh, I *want* to *go* there, <u>eat, eat</u> ()}

In examples (1)-(4) we see not only the different utterances and levels of reality of role-play, and how these children master that, we see how the children use their languages – or rather their bilingualism - according to the rules and organisation of role-play. Sámi is coded in Times New Roman, Norwegian in `Comic`. The use of both languages, of language alternation, is unmarked, that is: the children do not make a point of language shift and both children use the same kind of language alternation at large.

Language alternation and code-switching in role-play

In the following discussion and analysis I explain my position on language and code. This is largely based on analysing the children's interactions, but the terms and mode of analysis are influenced by Auer (e.g. 1984, 1998), Gafaranga (e.g. 2002, 2007) and Alvarez-Cáccamo (1998a, 1998b). These again draw on terms developed within communication/information theory (arising out of the work of Roman Jakobson) and CA.

Language alternation and bilingualism

Defining bilingualism can be difficult or even impossible when you start to define it in accordance with degree or proficiency: when is it enough to be called a bilingual? Before I started field-work, I spoke to the employees of the kindergarten about my project, and they stated clearly that I should observe a group of children whom they classified as proficient in both languages. What did they base their recommendation on? Of course they based it on what they had observed, and they had observed the use of both languages. With this premise for my fieldwork, I adopted Auer's definition of bilingualism:

> … bilingualism is no longer regarded as 'something inside the speakers' heads', i.e., a mental ability, but as a displayed feature of participants' everyday linguistic behaviour. You cannot be bilingual in your head, you have to use two or more languages 'on stage', in interaction, to show others that and how you can use them. (Auer 1984: 7)

The "stage" metaphor is even more apt when it comes to the role-play material, but the definition goes deeper than that. Bilingual is, in Auer's understanding, not something you "are", but something you "do". This aspect was agreed upon by several of the adults of the Sámi kindergarten as well: they viewed themselves as being monolingual Sámi, but of course they spoke both Sámi and Norwegian, i.e. "doing being" bilingual (Auer, 1984:7). I will thus not characterize the children as being Sámi and/or Norwegian bilinguals. I mean instead that they employ their two languages, and my project is to analyze the way they use their languages in role-play.

Their "bilingualism becomes a visible interactional and social fact" (Auer, 2011:460), but I do not analyse it as an identity.

Another way to view bilingualism is to abandon monolingualism as a starting point. Is there a chance "bilingual" children actually have three "languages"? Gafaranga (2000, 2007) takes an interesting bilingual perspective, proposing the term "medium of conversation" rather than language. The medium of the bilingual children's play may thus be Sámi, Norwegian or bilingual; more often than not, using the term "bilingual medium" for the mode of their use of their languages could explain single occurrences of language alternation. "Bilingual medium" has some similarities to Myers-Scotton's (1993b) "code-switching as unmarked choice", but differs in its interpretation of language as a code.

Language alternation and code-switching

My main focus is on the situations where the children use both languages in alternation. As noted above, traditionally language alternation (switching) is synonymous with code-switching (Myers-Scotton, 1993b), with language being viewed as the code. In one respect Auer is within this paradigm, but he claims that code-switching is one kind of language alternation (see Auer 1984:7), recognizing that when there is language alternation, there is usually a cluster of cues involved (Auer, 1984; Gafaranga, 2007). Indeed, researchers like Alvarez-Cáccamo advocate viewing language and code separately (Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998b). This view is supported by research on bilingual children at play which uses the term *register variation* for code-switching (Halmari and Smith, 1994).

One issue in discussing whether a language switch is a code-switch is to look at how important the language is compared to the other codes. Is language a defining cue? Is it a cue signifying otherness? What if we were to remove language as a factor: would the intention still be understood? For instance, are there other communicative cues present that makes language switch superfluous? For my project this is an interesting discussion especially in the case of role utterance vs. directory utterance. There is very often language switch in these instances, but is that the defining factor? I want to use Alvarez-Cáccamo's (1998b) four types of switching to discuss code-switching and language alternation. His categorization is inspired by Jakobson and communication theories (Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998a, 1998b; Jakobson, 1980; Jakobson, Fant, and Halle, 1969 [1952]).

1. Switching of communicative codes with language alternation (Gumperz' "situational switching")

2. Not-switching with language alternation (most of conversational "code-switching styles")

3. Not-switching without language alternation (short utterances in monolingual speech)

4. Switching of codes without language alternation (where the same variety is used across an activity boundary) (Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998b:38)

As an overall situation, the bilingual praxis is an alloy of languages:

[M]any cases of what is known as fluent "conversational code-switching" (whether "intrasentential" or "intersentential") can be envisioned, at the structural level, as an alloy of two or more speech varieties, which signals a number of situational and local intentions through a number of codes. At the situational level, prosody, lexis and grammar fuse in variable proportions into a single amalgam whose overall communicative effect is to index the situation type and/or the group's social identity. (Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998b:39)

I will use these notions not for identity-signals, but for the communicative codes of role-play, but I recognize the play-codes as an in-group code for this bilingual group of children.

The "overall order" is also important for Gafaranga's (2007) view on code-switching. The "identity"-factor tied to/indexed by language variety or use that researchers such as Myers-Scotton (1993b) and Alvarez-Cáccamo (1998b) describe appears less plausible than a perspective which sees language alternation more as part of the interaction and tied to the order of the conversation, just as role-play as situation seems to provide cues for the children for how to use language and languages. This is more in line with Gafaranga's view of the orderliness of language alternation (or code-switching), where language alternation and code-switching are part of the overall order of the interaction or conversation.

The use of different languages is likely to be one of the cues – as in situations such as the switch from one language to another when giving directions and lines – which organize the role-play. This is important because it means that it is not language alone which is the code-switch; there are other cues as well, although language has a ritualized function in organizing role-play. Preference-related code-switches occur as well, sometimes because the children cannot find the right word, or they somehow change language in the course of the role-play without (seemingly to an observer) meaning to change the situation – they simply switch languages. The pattern of code-switching and the way they treat it in interaction, especially the interactional situations of role-play, may be

code-switching as the unmarked choice for the interaction or situation (Myers-Scotton 1993), but it appears that this is due to bilingualism rather than the different languages per se.

The term "medium" is Gafaranga's answer to this. He proposes to see each praxis as a medium, in a system where bilingual language users could either use any monolingual medium available to them, or, if the situation was right[8], use a *bilingual medium*:

> [C]odeswitching is, not any occurrence of two languages within the same conversation, but rather any instance of deviance from current medium which is not oriented to (by participants themselves) as requiring any repair"(Gafaranga and Torras, 2002:1).

This position is a useful adjunct to Alvarez-Cáccamo's proposal to distinguish between language and communicative code, and to argue that bilingual-medium conversation may have code-switching with or without language alternation. It is important to define which code is in use before claiming that code-switching has occurred (Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998b), and there are several levels of codes. Role-play includes codes belonging to role-play as situation and language-related codes. It is clear that (free) role-play as a situation in the Sámi kindergarten can be a bilingual situation, and that the medium could be bilingual as an overall order. But how do the children use their languages within a bilingual system? What codes do they use to communicate?

Analysis of language alternation and code-switching in "Dragons and Castle"

The material that I present in the following is from a single sequence of role-play which I have named "Dragons and Castle". I have chosen this sequence because I wanted to show how a single interaction can vary in language use and choice. This sequence of role-play shows Anna and Piera totally absorbed in their play. The play-sequence, "Dragons and Castle", was the only sequence I filmed with the two of them playing exclusively with each other. Still, their play-mode suggested that they may have played together often before. They are situated in the main room of their group's part of the kindergarten, a place where people often walk past; it is not secluded at all. During the sequence there are thus many different voices and noises on the tape, and it is difficult to hear what they are saying at times. However, in the midst of this cacophony of voices and actions, they manage to keep their attention on the role-play and each other; in other

---

[8] In defining a "right" situation, Gafaranga and others appear to go back to Myers-Scotton's premises for code-switching as the unmarked choice.

words, an example of intense interaction between two children! Most of the interaction may be said to represent a perfect example of turn-taking and mutual understanding, of seemingly seamless change from one language to another, of brilliance in the use of codes and the rules of role-play. Only one utterance during the five minutes of the sequence I filmed is directed at another child, and this was to reject the third party from joining them in their play.

Filming of the role-play started at 9:57 a.m. and lasted 5 minutes 42 seconds; the role play had begun a little while before. As mentioned above, it has two participants, Anna and Piera; being just two children, meant that the turn-taking system was more straightforward. Kindergarten assistants had arranged the play material (i.e. a castle and a selection of small figures) there during a period of free play, and Anna and Piera were the first children to sit down to play with it (they chose it for the period of free play). In this analysis take you through the sequence of role play chronologically, but with short excerpts/examples that show a variety of language choices within the role play, with monolingual stretches perhaps being as significant for a discussion of bilingualism as places with language alternation.

Monolingual stretches: not switching without language alternation

(5)

1. Piera Ja da **lei** mu dinga.
{And this here **was** my stuff}

2. Anna (0.4) Jo (.) ja dá **lei** mu heasta.
{ (0.4) Yes, (.) and here **was** my horse}

3. Piera (0.3) Ja da **lei** mu sávza fas.
{(0.3) and this **was** my sheep again.}

4. Anna (0.7) Nå guokte heastta mis **ledje** (.) Dát **galggai** duos **leam[en** ()
{ (0.7) Now we **had** two horses. |(.) This **should** there **b[e** ()}

In this sequence we see how the children master turn-taking; they master and use the rules of role-play, and they master the use of Sámi in the context of the Sámi kindergarten. This could be the norm, the expected choice, of a social interaction in this context. They use "gazes" to organize turn taking, paying close attention to each other; they latch on to their turns together building the conversational sequence. Following the rules of role-play, they are now setting the scene, and they use preterite to do so. We see how they use sentences that are quite similar, so alignment might also be at work, mimicking each other in the interaction. As mentioned above, they

pay close attention to each other, shown by their glances at each other, and the fact that they lean towards each other. When each has finished his/her turn, he/she waits, shown by pauses and body language, as they lean back. There is minimal overlap in the end of utterance 4, but the other turns show the children giving each other ample room to answer, and I read this as turn allocation by the speaker: they want the other to speak.

These four utterances are a monolingual stretch in a bilingual situation. This represents non-switching of codes without language alternation, within the system of communicative codes. None of the turns or utterances demand any other type of action, and neither does the play. Linguistically we could look at "otherness" in Anna's use of "nå" ("now") in example (5) utterance 4, but I will look at similarities with the Sámi "na" ("now"), as well as Sámi dialect users using the originally Norwegian "nå" as a regular feature. The long-term language contact has made its mark on both Norwegian and Sámi dialects in the area. A discussion of the non-switches without language alternation is made more complex by the long-term language contact situation, and of course the problem of single word switches/loanwords.

"Otherness" might be experienced when using elements from the other language, such as the following possible correction from Piera in response to Anna's utterance with Norwegian elements:

(6)

16 A4.3 De **komte** dragen.
　　　　　　{Then **came** the dragon.}

17 P3.4 De **bođii** dat () Gos *lea* dragene...
　　　　　　{Then **came** that one () Where *are* the dragons?}

Piera's repetition of the verb and structure could be read as a correction of the "base language", a repair of deviance (Gafaranga, 2000, 2007; Sacks et al., 1974). When Anna is using the Norwegian verb in past tense with weak conjugation, a common child-language trait, Piera's repetition consists of the Sámi past tense, which then could be read as the default choice. But as we see, he is not correcting the Norwegian definite of "dragon". This then, from use and interpretation by the language users, is acceptable as "Sámi" in these surroundings, with Norwegian inflection both in the singular and plural. "Drage" (see example (6)) is the only lemma both in Sámi and Norwegian for the phenomenon "dragon"; I will not focus on the discussion of integration and use of morphological systems from the different languages in relation to which language it "is". The phenomenon of single word "switches" with full morphology is discussed in the literature on bilingualism (e.g. Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Poplack et al., 1988;

Romaine, 1989). For this discussion it is not treated as deviance, which could be interpreted as the "base language" being a bilingual medium, although contradicted if the verb is repaired. The treatment of "other language elements" is not straightforward, and it is in the participants' orientation towards it we can see what status it has in the interaction.

Code-switching with language alternation: role and directory utterances

The next example (7) is further along in the play sequence. Here we see how Piera reacts to Anna's (perceived?) proposal for action in the narrative. In Piera's utterance 13, we see how he reacts to her action in the directory utterance 12. In this excerpt we get to see their bilingual competence more clearly. When switching from organizing play to the role-utterances in the role-play (with the doll speaking), Piera switches to Norwegian in utterance 13. The Norwegian line is produced in what I call "play voice", which for us up north[9] means a variety which comes close to the dialect of the capital city, or rather an interpretation of it. Play voice, then, is a rendition of so-called "standard Norwegian". The switch between direction and line is marked by language shift and a shift of tone. There is a slight pause between these different units of the utterance; this could be a dramatic pause or that Piera in fact had to think about what to say. The linguistic pause is not necessarily accompanied by a pause in action: the doll is doing something, namely walking towards another doll.

(7)

12.	Anna	Jo, ja dát **manai** doh… deike bajas.
		{Yes, and this one **went** the () up here.}
13.	Piera	Ja **bođii**… ^Ǎh, vennen min (.) hei vennen^ ()
		{and s/he **came**… ^oh my friend (.) hello friend () }
14.	Anna	^Ǎh, nei det *er* dragehule!
		{oh, no it *is* dragon's den!}
15.	Piera	^Dragehule (.) Au
		{^Dragon's den (.) Ouch}

The line of Piera's doll is not easy to transcribe because of noise on the tape, and it is not complete. To get the fuller picture of the communicative codes at play, we will look at the line relating to Anna's doll, which is a complete sentence. The verb is now in present tense; it is Norwegian and in play-voice. The second unit of Piera's utterance is also in play-voice, the codes being south-eastern Norwegian dialect traits and raised pitch.

---

[9] And in fact in all parts of Norway, I have come to understand, except perhaps the capital and the nearby dialectal areas.

Knowing the tense of the verb is just knowing one of the communicative codes; we see that the role utterance is marked with a cluster of cues, linguistic language being one of them. But can we say that the language is the code-switch in these cases, or is it the variety of language, high pitch, etc. denoting direct speech by the role character that is the code? I will present such a case as example (6) in having code-switching with language alternation, where the codes that switch are the codes of directory utterances and role-play utterances; the switch between Sámi and Norwegian is not as important, and may not carry any meaning in relation to code-switching; it is language alternation that co-occurs with code-switching between directory utterance and line.

One way to treat lines in role-play is also as reported speech, the same way it would be in monolingual speech. The discussion in Gafaranga (2007) shows a probable way of describing the kind of code-switching we see in role-play. I will not account for the full discussion here, merely point to a few arguments that I see relevant for role-play utterances. Reporting of direct speech can be seen as *demonstrations*, they are differentiated from what is really going on (Clark and Gerrig, 1990; Gafaranga, 2007:157-164; Goffman, 1974). The linguistic signs such as raised pitch and prosody, convey that role-utterances are *non-serious actions*. Demonstrations are performed as part of serious activities, but their function is to *signal otherness*, they have clear boundaries (Gafaranga, 2007, p. 159). For role-play utterances the picture may be clearer when the children play with dolls: they voice the voice of the doll, at the same time as the doll is speaking the child demonstrates what it is saying. Direct speech reporting also contains the "frame shift" and "change of "footing" from Goffman's (1974) frame analysis, which is quite clear in the changing of reality in the switch between role utterance and directory utterance. But why use the additional language switch when there are so many other codes present? Role-play cues are the same in monolingual play, save the additional language. I am not sure of the meaning, or even function, of language alternation for these cases, but this is a striking feature in these children's role-play, and also demonstrated in other studies (Halmari and Smith, 1994). This is code-switching *with* language alternation.

Code-switching with or without language alternation

The last part of the role-play, shown in example (8), shows more of the unpredictability of play. I have used different fonts and outlines to show the different uses of language:

> **Past tense in bold**
>
> *Present tense in italics*

Sámi local variety in Times

Norwegian play-voice in Comic

Norwegian local variety in Calibri

When reading it is important to bear in mind that the children do not hesitate or speak about or look surprised at any of these language choices. Before this selection starts, they have again been involved in organizing play in Sámi.

(8)

45.	Piera	Dal dat **geahčai** dakko (.) Da **lei** lássa.
		{Now it **saw** here (.) It **was** lock. }
46.	Anna	Dát dat **bođii** (.) Dat **bođii** geahččat (.) ()
		{This **it** came (.) It **came** to see (.) ()}
47.	Piera	^Hei! *Er* du bestevenn?
		{^Hi! Are you best friend?}
48.	Anna	^Ja
		{^Yes}
49.	Piera	Å prinsessen **reddet** de.
		{And the princess saved them.}
50.	Anna	Jeg **gådde** å redde prinsessene (.) Å liksom det **brenna** her.
		{I **goed** to save the princesses (.) (And[10]) like it **burned** here.}
51.	Piera	<u>Åh brenn</u>! *Å må gå* opp.
		{Oh burn! (And) *must go* up.}
52.	Anna	^Jeg *kan kile* vannet. Du *ordne.*
		{^I *can tickle* the water. You *fix.*}
53.	Piera	Dos **lei** dolla ja dies **lei** čahci dan nuppis.
		{It **had** fire and it **had** water the other one. }
54.	Anna	Amma buohkat *sáhtet* ().
		{Right, everybody *can* ()}

It may be helpful to analyze this somewhat chaotic patterning from a CA and sequential perspective, reading two and two turns together: this results in greater "order", in Gafaranga's terms. In 45 and 46 they are speaking Sámi and using past tense. This is monolingual speech exchange in a pair, where Piera has suggested a move (45) and Anna follows with her

---

[10] Translation of Norwegian /å/ is ambivalent in some cases, hence the translation in brackets. Most probably it is the conjugative "og", English "and", but it could be exclamative "å!", like English "oh!" See also utterance 51 regarding translation choice.

"answer". They are both using the same codes. Anna is following Piera in this action, her doll following his.

In turn 47 Piera is uttering a line from the doll, starting with greeting, the pair-first of an adjacency pair (Sacks, et al., 1974), but not allowing time for Anna to answer, producing a question in the next unit of the utterance, also a pair-first, requiring Anna to answer. Anna's doll is answering in 48, her role utterance completing the second unit of Piera's turn, but it is a minimal response. Both turn 47 and 48 are in Norwegian, Piera's is the only line with a verb, and he uses present tense. They both use play-voice with the cluster of cues of raised pitch, "non-local" and Norwegian. This pair of turns has no language alternation and no code-switching. Although it is of course a code-switch from the two previous turns, it again has no code-switch from the overall pattern of role-play, where directory utterances are delivered in Sámi and role-utterances in Norwegian. In this excerpt Piera is taking the lead or deciding for the turn-pairs.

Anna's turn (48) does not require any response, the next speaker has to self-select. When the role-play continues in Norwegian in 49 and 50, Piera has self-selected for turn 49 and Anna responds and elaborates with two units in her turn (50), where she self-selects after the first unit and a brief pause, at the transfer-relevance place. These utterances are clearly about giving directions, not lines, and we see the communicative cues past tense and local variety, but not the language choice of previous organizing. So, in self-selecting turn, Piera has chosen to make an unusual language choice for the order of the role-play as a whole. I take this instance of code-switch (between role-utterance in turn 47 and 48 and directory utterance in 49 and 50) or non-code-switch (the language is Norwegian in turn 47-52) to be indicative of the actual medium (or the codes) of the bilingual role-play. The fact that the role-play can continue in style (mode) without language as a communicative code, seems to defend a view of bilingual role-play being just that: in "bilingual", or in a "bilingual medium". What we see is that Sámi is sometimes used as code for directory utterances, while local variety and past tense are always used as codes for directory utterances. Or is the cluster of cues just to ensure understanding of intended meaning even if one cue should be taken away? I have not looked at examples where everything breaks down because of "wrong" tense in directory utterances.

Analysing turn-by-turn provides an answer concerning orderliness, but there are of course the questions of which language or medium is used, and how to understand bilingualism. Perhaps the previous turn governs the next, and sometimes the language choice lingers while the type of utterance does not? Does this mean that they know which language they are

speaking, and that it matters? Or does it simply not matter at all? This appears plausible given the following: when they again turn to the role-play medium for turns 51-53, and Anna signals "out-of-play" in turn 54 with local Sámi variety and present tense. Piera's turn 51 is perhaps ambiguous, but I translate it as a first unit being a magical utterance (underlined), and a second unit that may well be a more complex magical utterance, that lacks "play-voice" but contains present tense. Turn 51 is a reply to Anna's turn 50, and in a different code, shown in choice of tempus. Turns 49 and 50 are embedded in Norwegian, but it is not Norwegian as a code, but rather part of a play-voice cluster of codes. It may be that the Norwegian of play-voice is perceived to be very different, like another language, from the local variety of Norwegian; at a minimum, they are certainly different codes.

Conclusion

Role-play as context offers cues for understanding language use in a bilingual setting in a Sámi kindergarten. Although there appear to be rules in role-play for how the children use the languages they command, the situation is still open to any form of language choice, and the communicative codes operate in clusters of cues that give sufficient information to continue a role-play. In the cases where the language choices may not conform, role-play as context is important because it is play: the children want to stay involved. For the outsider it may or may not be a recognizable pattern, but it is certainly a mode. The bilingual children of this kindergarten, in the role-play observed, seem to accept a large variety of language choice and language varieties. This may be due to their experience of varied language use in their daily environment. They may not translate a specific pattern of language use from their environment or influence from parents and teachers in their role-play, but this may simply indicate a desire to use all of one's resources both in producing and interpreting utterances.

Literature

Alvarez-Cáccamo, Celso. 1998a. *Codes*. Paper presented at the AAA98, Philadelphia. http://www.udc.es/dep/lx/cac/aaa1998/alvarez-caccamo.htm

Alvarez-Cáccamo, Celso. 1998b. 'From 'switching code' to 'code-switching': Towards a reconceptualisation of communicative codes', in Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, interaction and identity*, Routledge, London, 29-50.

Auer, Peter. 1984. *Bilingual conversation*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Auer, Peter. 1998. '"Bilingual conversation" revisited,' in Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, interaction adn Identity*, Routledge, London/New York, 1-24.

Auer, Peter. 2011. 'Code-switching/mixing,' in Ruth Wodak, Barbara Johnstone & Paul Kerswil (eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, Sage, Los Angeles,

London, 460-478.Bateson, Gregory. 1976 [1955]. 'A theory of Play and Fantasy,' in A. Jolly and K. Sylva J.S. Bruner (ed.), *Play. Its role in development and evolution*, Harmondsworth : Penguin, 117-129.

Bateson, Gregory. 1982 [1956]. 'The Message "This Is Play",' in R.E. Herron & Brian Sutton-Smith (eds.), *Child's Play*, Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, Malabar, Florida.

Cannella, Gaile Sloan, and Radhika Viruru. 2004. *Childhood and postcolonization: power, education and contemporary practice*. RoutledgeFalmer, London.

Clark, H. H., and R. J. Gerrig. 1990. 'Quotations as demonstrations'. *Language* 66.4, 764-805. doi: 10.2307/414729

Cromdal, Jakob. 2000. *Code-switching for all practical purposes: bilingual organization of children's play.* Phd-thesis,Institutionen för Tema, Linköpings Universitet, Linköping.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 2004. *Truth and method*. Continuum, London.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 2010. *Sannhet og metode: grunntrekk i en filosofisk hermeneutikk*. Pax, Oslo.

Gafaranga, Joseph. 2000. 'Medium repair vs. other-language repair: Telling the medium of a bilingual conversation.' *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4.3, 327-350. doi: 10.1177/13670069000040030301

Gafaranga, Joseph. 2007. *Talk in two languages*. Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills.

Gafaranga, Joseph, and Maria-Carme Torras. 2002. 'Interactional otherness: Towards a redefinition of codeswitching.' *International Journal of Bilingualism* 6.1, 1-22. doi: 10.1177/13670069020060010101

Garcia-Sanchez, I. M. 2010. 'Serious games: Code-switching and gendered identities in Moroccan immigrant girls' pretend play.' *Pragmatics* 20.4, 523-555.

Gaski, Lina. 2000. *"Hundre prosent lapp?": lokale diskurser om etnisitet i markebydene i Evenes og Skånland*. Sámi instituhtta and Sámi dutkamiid guovddáš, Universitetet i Tromsø, Guovdageaidnu [Kautokeino].

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Grenersen, Geir. 2002. *Ved forskningens grenser: historien om et forskningspro[s]jekt i det samiske Nord-Norge*. Spartacus, Oslo.

Guldal, Tale Margrethe. 1997. *Three children, two languages: the role of code selection in organizing conversation.* Phd-thesis, Department of Applied Linguistics/Department of English, Faculty of Arts, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim.

Guss, Faith Gabrielle. 2011. 'Meeting at the crossroads. Postmodern pedagogy greets children's aesthetic play-culture,' in Sue Rogers (ed.), *Rethinking play and Pedagogy in early Childhood Education. Concepts, contexts and cultures*, Routledge, London and New York, 112-125.

Halmari, H., and W. Smith. 1994. 'Code-switching and Register Shift – Evidence from Finnish-English Child Bilingual Conversation.' *Journal of Pragmatics* 21.4, 427-445. doi: 10.1016/0378-2166(94)90013-2

Høigård, Anne. 2006. *Barns språkutvikling: muntlig og skriftlig*. Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.

Jaffe, Alexandra. 2006. 'Transcription in practice: nonstandard orthography.' *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 3.2.

Jakobson, Roman. 1980. *The framework of language*. University of Michigan, East Lansing, Mich.

Jakobson, Roman, C. Gunnar M. Fant, and Morris Halle. 1969 [1952]. *Preliminaries to speech analysis*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Kyratzis, A. 2010. 'Latina girls' peer play interactions in a bilingual Spanish-English US preschool: Heteroglossia, frame-shifting and language ideology.' *Pragmatics* 20.4, 557-586.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude, Roman Jakobson, and C. F. Voegelin. 1953. *Results of the conference of anthropologists and linguists* (Vol. 19(2:2)1953). University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Lillemyr, Ole Fredrik. 2011. *Lek, opplevelse, læring: i barnehage og skole.* Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993a. *Duelling languages: grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993b. *Social motivations for codeswitching: evidence from Africa*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Myrvoll, Marit. 2002. 'Knocking on heaven's door.*' Samisk forskning og forskningsetikk*, De nasjonale forskningsetiske komiteer, Oslo, 45-55.

Paugh, Amy L. 2005. 'Multilingual play: Children's code-switching, role play, and agency i Dominica, West Indies.' *Language in Society* 34, 63-86.

Poplack, S., D. Sankoff, and C. Miller. 1988. 'The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation.' *Linguistics* 26.1, 47-104. doi: 10.1515/ling.1988.26.1.47

Rogers, Sue, and Julie Evans. 2008. *Inside role play in early childhood education: researching young children's perspectives*. Routledge, London.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1989. *Bilingualism*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schlegoff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. 'A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation.' *Language* 50.4, 39.

Sidnell, Jack. 2010. *Conversation analysis: an introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell, Malden, Mass.

Toulmin, Stephen. 2001. *Return to reason*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Wei, Li. 1998. 'The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching,' in Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, interaction and identity*, Routledge, London, 156-179.

Wooffitt, Robin. 2005. *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: a comparative and critical introduction*. SAGE, London.

Øksnes, Maria. 2010. *Lekens flertydighet: om barns lek i en institusjonalisert barndom*. Cappelen Damm, Oslo.