

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

**CULTURAL IDENTITY OF BILINGUALS
IN FINLAND**

**Subjective experiences
of English-Finnish -speaking bilinguals**

A Pro Gradu Thesis

by

Mia Tornikoski

**Department of English
1999**

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA
ENGLANNIN KIELEN LAITOS
ICIR

Mia Tornikoski

CULTURAL IDENTITY OF BILINGUALS IN FINLAND

Subjective experiences of English-Finnish -speaking bilinguals

Pro-gradu -työ

Englantilainen filologia

Joulukuu 1999

88 sivua + 2 liitettä

Tutkielman tarkoituksena on selvittää kulttuurin ja kielen vaikutusta englantia ja suomea puhuvien kaksikielisten identiteettiin ja nähdä, voidaanko heidän yhteydessään puhua kulttuuri-identiteetistä. Tutkielmaa varten on haastateltu kahdeksaa Jyväskylän alueella asunutta, englantia äidinkielenään puhuvaa henkilöä, jotka puhuvat myös suomea. Tutkielmassa vastataan kysymykseen, onko haastateltavilla selkeä kulttuuri-identiteetti. Koska kyseessä on tapaustutkimus, tutkielma on lähinnä kuvaileva.

Tutkielmassa ilmeni, että vaikka kulttuuri ja kieli vaikuttivat jokaiseen haastateltavaan, heistä vain kahdella oli selkeä kulttuuri-identiteetti, mutta muiden identiteettiin vaikuttivat eniten henkilökohtaiset asiat, kuten persoonallisuus, perhe ja uskonto. Kaksikielisten identiteetti on muuttumassa yhä henkilökohtaisemmaksi ja erilaistuvaksi, ja se tulee olemaan yhä vähemmän riippuvainen kulttuurista tai kielestä.

Asiasanat: bilingualism, biculturalism, cultural identity, post-modern identity.

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 2 KEY CONCEPTS OF THE STUDY | 3 |
| 2.1 Language | 3 |
| 2.2 Culture | 3 |
| 2.3 Identity | 5 |
| 3 BILINGUALISM | 7 |
| 3.1 Roots of bilingualism and biculturalism | 8 |
| 3.2 Views on bilingualism | 9 |
| 3.3 Studies on bilingualism | 10 |
| 3.4 Attributes of bilingualism | 12 |
| 3.5 Degree of bilingualism | 14 |
| 4 BICULTURALISM | 15 |
| 4.1 Definitions of biculturalism | 15 |
| 4.2 Attitudes towards biculturalism and bilingualism | 16 |
| 5 CULTURAL IDENTITY | 18 |
| 5.1 Definition of cultural identity | 18 |
| 5.2 Construction of cultural identity | 19 |
| 5.2.1 Ethnicity and nationality | 21 |
| 5.2.2 Language and identity | 22 |
| 5.3 Intercultural identity | 23 |
| 5.4 Acculturation | 25 |
| 5.5 Ways of adapting to a new culture | 26 |
| 5.6 Maintenance of cultural identity | 29 |
| 6 THE PRESENT STUDY | 31 |
| 6.1 The method | 32 |
| 6.2 Experiences of the subjects | 34 |
| 6.2.1 Subject F1 | 35 |
| 6.2.2 Subject M1 | 37 |
| 6.2.3 Subject F2 | 41 |
| 6.2.4 Subject F3 | 46 |
| 6.2.5 Subject M2 | 52 |
| 6.2.6 Subject F4 | 55 |
| 6.2.7 Subject F5 | 59 |
| 6.2.8 Subject F6 | 63 |
| 6.3 Summary and discussion | 66 |
| 6.3.1 Bilingualism | 66 |
| 6.3.2 Biculturalism | 71 |
| 6.3.3 Cultural identity | 77 |
| 6.3.4 Discrimination | 81 |
| 7 CONCLUSION | 82 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 85 |
| APPENDIX 1 | 89 |
| APPENDIX 2 | 90 |

1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to find out about the lives of bilingual people. The concept of 'bilingual' used in this study equals the term Grosjean (1982), among other researchers uses, that of a functional bilingual. A more detailed definition is presented in chapter 3.5, but for now, suffice to say that in this context, it means someone who can and will function in two languages in his or her everyday life. This definition is contradictory to some views, which claim that the only 'true bilingual' is the one with the native-like ability in both or all of the languages. This study does not support such a view.

This study aims at finding out the views of bilinguals themselves, about their bilingualism, biculturalism and cultural identities. The subjects of this study were also encouraged to describe their lives and how language, culture and attitudes affected their thoughts and actions. I also wanted the subjects to voice their opinions about their lives in Finland, which might differ from the experiences of other minorities in Finland such as the Somali or the Russians, who seem to be contemporarily 'popularised' minorities. I believe that the views of other, more unnoticeable minorities should also be heard.

In addition to finding out about the bilinguals' everyday lives, this study aims at exploring their cultural identity. It starts with the assumption that each bilingual, having lived in a particular culture, cannot but be affected by the culture of that particular country. The question, then, is whether the culture has a profound effect on a person's identity, and whether that particular person thinks of his or her identity to be dependent on a particular culture.

Identity is seen as composed of many different aspects in this study, one of which is the cultural side of identity. The purpose of this study is to find out how important and strong the subjects consider their cultural identity to be, compared to other features of their identities. I particularly wanted the bilinguals to give a subjective view on how they experience their identities and what their conceptions of themselves are.

I decided to study bilinguals who spoke English as their native tongue, and who had, at the minimum, a functional command in Finnish. This choice was made mainly because my main subject is English philology and I had conducted a minor study on Finnish-English -speaking bilinguals before. In order to study their acculturation and views about the Finnish society, I needed subjects who had lived in their native countries before moving to Finland. This arrangement was made in order to find out about their opinions about the Finnish culture, compared to other cultures.

I believe in getting the best and most trustworthy information from the subjects themselves. I wanted them to give information that was personal and subjective. Therefore, I chose interview as a method of finding data for this research. I had conducted the previous study using questionnaires but found that they gave incomplete and unsatisfactory answers. Conducting an interview, allows the researcher to intervene if he or she finds it necessary to gain more thorough information and ask the interviewees to elaborate their answers, if need be. I also wanted to let the subjects voice their own opinions on the issues and find out what they really thought.

In what follows, I will first clarify the main concepts used in this study: language, culture, identity, and then, more explicitly, bilingualism, biculturalism and cultural identity. The main concepts are also explained by presenting the theoretical background of this study, that is, what other studies have shown on the topics.

The empirical part of the study will begin by explaining the reasoning behind the topic, and will then move on to describe the method. After presenting the method, I will move on to present the abridged versions of the interviews of the subjects. This will be followed by a discussion of the results of this study and relating them to the relevant literature.

2 KEY CONCEPTS OF THE STUDY

Before going more deeply into the topic of this study, some of the key concepts need explanation. The most important concepts in this study are language, culture and identity. These elements are interrelated with each other, which will be delineated in the course of the theoretical part of the study.

2.1 Language

Hamers and Blanc (1989:60-61) point out that language is the main element of communication. It expresses the social unity of a community sharing the same language. Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:46-47) acknowledge that, while uniting people, language can also separate them. Those who do not know the language are hopelessly left out of the commonly shared context. They also see that one must know the language if he or she wants to be a part of that particular culture. However, they also remind us of the fact that just knowing the language is not enough, but one still needs to know more about the ways of using the language (Seelye and Wasilewski 1996:54).

Although the first language that we use is usually called the 'mother tongue', some researchers prefer the term 'first language', or 'the language of a community', as Romaine (1995:19-20) mentions. She also presents, a finding which is slightly surprising: people might not be the most fluent with the language they have first learned; that is, they may master some other language better.

2.2 Culture

Hamers and Blanc (1989:116) describe the connection between language and culture as follows:

Language is a component of culture; language is a product of culture, transmitted from one generation to the next in the socialisation process, it also moulds culture, that is to say, our cultural representations are

shaped by language. It is the main tool for the internalisation of culture by the individual.

The concept of language is extended by Porter and Samovar (1996:184-185) from a mere set of symbols and uniform meanings to a way for peoples to express their history, culture and value systems. They also ascertain that language and culture could not be separated, because the way people express themselves verbally or non-verbally, is dependent on their culture.

Collier and Thomas (1988:102-103) define culture as "a historically transmitted system of symbols, meanings and norms". Another way to see culture is to go from this macro level to the smaller components of culture. These smaller components are sometimes called subcultures. Among the different markers of cultures are, for example, ethnicity or geography (Finnish-Finland), gender (female) or profession (nurse). These apply just as long as these features are salient and common to all the people. (see also Collier 1996:38-39.)

Culture is a fundamental part of human existence, as Kim (1995:176) states. It includes the values, attitudes and behaviours that affect a person's life everyday. Collier (1996:37), in turn, sees the communication that links people together, as the heart of a culture. She also emphasises the fact that changes in culture do not come only from inside the culture, but that it is affected by other cultures as well (Collier 1996:39).

The important aspects of culture can be summarised as follows: "Culture is learned, it is transmissible, dynamic, selective, ethnocentric and the facets of culture are interrelated" (Porter and Samovar 1996:13). As pointed out above (Seelye and Wasilewski 1996:54), knowing the language is still not enough to gain an insight to a culture, although it is an absolute prerequisite for successful communication.

An argument presented by Barlund (1996:28) claims that one has to know about and internalise the norms and values of the social system he or she is involved in, in order to be able to function as a part of that system. He concludes by saying that, if this kind of state is not achieved, a person will stay an outsider in a culture, no matter how long his or her residency in that country is.

According to Friedman's concept of cultures (1994:89.), the view of used in this study is the culture of ethnic identity. The definition of this kind of culture is that the people of the same culture have common language, blood and descent. Social identity is not seen as a decisive factor in this case.

2.3 Identity

There are many different identities one can choose from, depending on different situations. One can identify oneself as a woman, a daughter, a teacher etc., which are all different identities, all in the same person. These identities are mostly social, i.e. how one is seen as a part of a given society.

There is, of course, the subjective sense of self; the conscious feeling of 'who I am', but that is a matter of psychology and will not be discussed in this study. The main concern of this study is to find out about the cultural identity of the bilinguals studied. Cultural identity is used to describe the ethnic or national group identity of people, which will be discussed later on.

Identity as an entity is composed of parts of history, geography, biology etc., as Castells (1997:7) formulates it. He continues to say that it is the responsibility of each individual to process the materials he or she has been given, to fit his or her personal needs. People are also likely to identify with people they consider having good qualities, and disassociate with people who possess values not acceptable to them, as reported by Weinreich (1983:170).

Many researchers suggest that difference is the key element in building an identity. Woodward (1997:39,47) relates subjectivity and difference in defining the person's identity. A person has to observe a difference between him- or herself and the others. One also has to identify with a group with which he or she observes him- or herself to have similarities. (see also Selmer 1988:47-48, Brück 1988:79, and Hall 1996:4.)

Hall (1996:4) also argues that identity is no longer a tight, unified concept, but rather fragmented and forever changing. His view is supported by Grossberg (1996:89), who emphasises the multiplicity of identities a person has, and the way identities are unstable and temporary.

The unique characteristics each person possesses create an identity, which should fill the requirements concerning reputation, honour, dignity, and self worth, that are held important in any given society, as Greenwood (1994:107) proposes. One also wants other people to see these good characteristics in him- or herself.

Language is also a means to convey an identity. People communicate through language what kind of person they are. Collier (1996:39-40) states that identities are revealed through communication between people. She also claims that our sense of identity depends on the situation and the people we are communicating with in a particular instance.

Dividing identity into three components can extend the concept even more. The components Collier (1996:42-43.) presents are affective component, cognitive component and behavioural component. The affective component entails that one cannot talk about identity without attaching some feelings or emotions to it. Those feelings and emotions, however, change from one situation to the other. The cognitive component includes the beliefs one has about identities, which then form a core that symbolises the self. The behavioural component of identity is about the actions people take or do not take.

Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:104) claim that many of a person's values come from his or her social environment. They also say that relationships with others influence the self of a person as long as he or she remains in contact with those people in the society (Seelye and Wasilewski 1996:110). Hamers and Blanc (1989:119), in turn, see that when the identification of a certain group with similar linguistic or cultural patterns becomes salient, it will be used by people to categorise that group as a whole.

Many researchers, like Collier (1996:43), maintain that identities are communicated. Therefore, sometimes identities differ in intensity and

salience, depending on the situation. The change in intensity occurs when people communicate and define their own identity with a differing force. The change in salience is observable when, for instance for a teacher, being a spouse may be more important in some situations than in others. (Collier and Thomas 1988:114.)

Identities differ also in their scope, how broad and generalizable they are, as Collier and Thomas (1988:113) argue. For example, a person's nationality is very broad in scope, which means that the same identity can be avowed to many people. Contrary to this, personality is very narrow in scope and is applicable only to this specific person.

Many researchers have also commented on the existence of modern, or as some say post-modern identity. A person possessing this kind of an identity sees him- or herself as an independent whole, not relating to any particular society, as Friedman (1994:95) portrays. (see also Bauman 1996:24-32.) The concept will be discussed later on in chapter 5.3.

I will separate the concepts of social identity and cultural identity for the purposes of this study. Social identity is what defines where a person is situated in his or her own society. Such an identity can be that of a woman or a mother, for example. In this study, cultural identity will refer to the identity of people as seen through comparison with other cultures. A division of the concepts is offered in chapter 5.1.

3 BILINGUALISM

One of the key elements of this study is, naturally, bilingualism because the subjects of the study are bilinguals, and because I will try to get to the concepts of biculturalism and cultural identity through the thoughts and opinions of bilinguals. Therefore it is important to know what kind of a phenomenon bilingualism is and what its different qualities are.

Adler (1977:11) acknowledges the importance of being familiar with more than one language and culture by saying: "For I cannot repeat often

enough that the knowledge of another language changes the cultural background of the individual permanently; he is a different person from what he was before he acquired the other language."

3.1 The roots of bilingualism and biculturalism

The movement of peoples has always been the main reason for bilingualism and biculturalism. Grosjean (1982:30-36) describes how necessary it was to communicate with the native people after immigrating to a new settlement. Military invasion and colonisation are other reasons for the necessity of making contact with new people. Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:12-13) support Grosjean's view by mentioning an example from the past: Alexander the Great arranged his soldiers to marry some Persian brides to strengthen his conquest in 324 BC. He probably realised that children with mixed heritages, as the products of mixed marriages were the best way to ensure the strength and continuity of a culture.

Grosjean (1982:30-36) adds to the above trade and commerce as some important factors in the spread of bilingualism and biculturalism. He also mentions nationalism and political federalism, of which the best example is Britain's expansion policy in India, where the English language, was preferred at the cost of the native languages. Education, culture and urbanisation are also mentioned as reasons for becoming bilingual or bicultural. The knowledge of more than one language became important in the past century especially in England. Adler (1977:34) claims that in the 19th century and even in the beginning of the 20th century, Englishmen did not see it worth while to learn other languages, because England ruled a great part of the world anyway. Later on, as commerce and business became more important and the imperial power of England was weakened, they acknowledged the necessity to know more than one language.

Bilingualism and biculturalism are bound together with communication by Porter and Samovar (1996:5) when they list some reasons for better communication between people. Improvements in transportation, developments in communication technology, globalisation of the

economy and changes in immigration patterns all promote communication, but they can also be seen as promoting bilingualism and biculturalism.

3.2 Views on bilingualism

Definitions of bilingualism are many and varied. There probably is not a single definition that is preferred by all researchers. Bloomfield (as quoted by Baetens Beardsmore 1986:1) presented one of the earliest requirements for bilingualism in 1935.

In...cases where...perfect foreign-language learning is not accompanied by loss of the native language, it results in bilingualism, native-like control of two languages... Of course one cannot define a degree of perfection at which a good foreign speaker becomes bilingual: the distinction is relative.

In modern times, the requirements have become more flexible and less is demanded of bilinguals. The views of today vary from the maximalist view which is exactly the same as Bloomfield's i.e. native-like ability in the second language, to the minimalist view of only understanding the language, not necessarily being able to either read or write in it. (see e.g. Baetens Beardsmore 1986:15-16 and Adler 1977:6.) For example, Grosjean (1982:232) points out that if only those people with native-like fluency are called bilinguals, a great majority of people would be left out. People who would be left out are those who use both (or all) of their languages regularly in everyday activities, but do not possess the native-like abilities. Strictly speaking, they cannot be called monolinguals either.

Hornby (1977:3) defines bilingualism clearly by saying that " a person must have the ability to use two different languages". He does not set limits to how competent a bilingual should be. "Using" languages can mean many different things (see chapter 3.5). Hornby continues by saying that the best way to handle all the different definitions would be to acknowledge that bilingualism is not a single "all-or-none property", but a characteristic varying from one individual to another.

Hamers and Blanc (1989:7) also criticise the earliest definitions by saying that they are mostly concentrated on the level of proficiency in the languages, while completely ignoring the non-linguistic properties that are common and natural for all communication, same in every language. Adler (1977:6) supports their view by questioning the right for judgement by others, of what should be the 'right' amount of language knowledge and competence. He says that there are no possibilities to evaluate it, because bilingualism itself cannot be defined perfectly.

Those who see the native-like ability as the only definition of bilingualism are criticised by Adler (1977:10), who says that even the natives themselves do not speak their mother tongue equally well. He also argues that dialects, slang and jargon are languages inside a language and should not therefore be forgotten.

3.3 Studies on bilingualism

The field of bilingualism has been studied since the 19th century. Most of the studies and much of the research have concentrated on the effects of bilingualism on bilingual people. A great amount of these have been involved in finding out how bilingualism affects the level of intelligence of the bilinguals when compared to that of monolinguals. The earliest studies found that the intelligence level of the bilinguals was lower than of the monolinguals, whereas studies conducted from the 1960s onwards see advantages in being bilingual.

Baker (1988:10-18) describes the different periods of research in the field of bilingualism. The first one is called the period of detrimental effects and ranges from 1800 to 1960. In this period, the researchers believed that the intelligence of the monolinguals was superior to that of the bilinguals, because they believed that bilingualism impairs the intellectual capacity of a person. The intelligence tests in this period were carried out in the bilingual's (usually an immigrant) weaker language, were concerned with the cultural issues of the country of immigration and the translations on the native language of the immigrants were poor.

A period of neutral effects overlaps the other periods. During this period, the social class of the subjects was finally taken into account in the studies. The researchers believed that bilingualism was not necessarily good or bad. From the 1960s onwards, the researchers began to see the beneficial effects of bilingualism. This third period was called the period of additive effects. The testing methods of the researchers were advanced, different factors of human behaviour were better taken into account and the results showed that bilingualism had positive effects on intelligence.

Romaine (1995:108-111) accuses poor design and lack of valuable conclusions for the failures of the earlier studies. She also criticises those studies for negative effects because they did not consider the unequal social status of the children who were the subjects. She claims that in most of the studies, the bilinguals were chosen from the lower social classes and they were compared with monolinguals from the higher social classes. Moreover, the bilinguals were not balanced in both of the languages, but more dominant in one of the languages. (Romaine 1995:117.)

Some people would like to see bilingualism and intelligence correlating, but Adler (1977:25) argues that they have nothing in common. He does not say that a bilingual is more intelligent than a monolingual or vice versa, but that intelligence is an independent phenomenon. Einstein, for example, who is known for his intelligence, never learned English, although he lived in the USA for many years. On the other hand, Adler says that many insignificant people could be very good at several languages. However, even if the correlation between bilingualism and intelligence (from the point of view of IQ) has been proven to be non-existent, there are many advantages in being a bilingual, as shown in different studies.

Probably the most far-reaching effect of bilingualism is the fact that bilingual people seem to have more positive attitudes towards different cultures and languages (Arnberg 1989:30). Hansegård (1968:70) also supports the positive effects and claims that because the bilingual is usually also bicultural, he or she is able to distinguish the different variations in cultures and in languages people use and benefit from them in his or her own sets of values.

Another important skill the bilingual children have is the ability to act as translators from early on. Grosjean (1982:200-201) proves this by saying that the children are used to being in between two cultures and two languages and acting as a liaison. These children usually help people in situations like these, because they realise that without their interpretation, a person might be left out of the conversation. According to Romaine (1995:114), this ease of interpreting is due to the child's ability to be more aware of the communicative needs of people, because he or she is able to "de-centralise" him- or herself from the situation, and therefore observe it objectively.

From a linguistic point of view, the bilingual child has two different language systems which to draw on. This helps him or her to adapt to using different languages and widening his or her scope of thinking. (Seelye and Wasilewski 1996:51.) Grosjean (1982:221-223) in turn, argues that bilingual children are more sensitive to the differences between languages, are more able to learn new languages and seem to be more motivated at school than their monolingual classmates are. Their thinking abilities also seem to be more diverse. Another advantage, presented by Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:51-52) is in the bilingual child's ability to play with words, because he or she knows the different meanings of the words. They also identified an ability to greater social sensitivity, which has been the advantage side in most of the studies.

3.4 Attributes of bilingualism

The attributes usually related to bilingualism are diglossia, code switching, interference and borrowing. Hornby (1977:6) defines diglossia and bilingualism by saying that "diglossia is a characteristic of societies or social groups, whereas bilingualism is a character of individuals". He defines it further by saying that it means "those situations in which two or more languages are used differently within a single geographic region" (Hornby 1977:6). In short, diglossia is a situation in society, where two or more languages prevail and one of the languages has a more desirable status, compared with others. (see e.g. Baetens Beardsmore 1986:38-39, Hornby 1977:6-7). A commonly used division between two

contemporaneous languages is to divide them into a higher and lower variant. For example, Standard German is the high variant in Switzerland, whereas Swiss German is the lower variant. (Grosjean 1982:131.) Grosjean (1982:19-20) also claims that the language which is of lower status, is the one with the most borrowed items.

Another marker of bilingualism is called code switching, which some regard as separate, but close to code mixing, although some researchers like Baetens Beardsmore (1986:49) do not make a distinction between them. Code-mixing means that bilinguals vary the language they use inside the same sentence, or in code-switching use a different language in the next (see e.g. Arnberg 1989:27, Meisel 1989:14). Romaine (1995:121) sees the use of code-switching as a stylistic phenomenon, which is used mainly for discourse purposes, rather than because of the structure of the sentences. Romaine (1995:143) disputes the common belief that bilinguals use code-switching to avoid certain structures and sayings they do not know. Rather, she says that code-switching is actually used when the speakers know and use regularly both of their languages. She goes on to say that "code-switching is a mode of bilingual performance which allows the bilingual to display his or her full communicative competence"(1995:173).

Another very noticeable phenomenon connected to bilingualism is called interference. Interference occurs, according to researchers, most noticeably at the phonological level (Romaine 1995:53-55). That is, the foreign intonation and accent of speech reveals the bilingual. When interference occurs at the pragmatic level, there is a possibility of getting confused during communication. Baetens Beardsmore (1986:75) reflects on the difference between code-switching and interference and says that internal linguistic factors are the basis of interference, whereas extra-linguistic factors are responsible for code-switching.

Communicative competence is an important factor, in addition to language, and the lack of it is obvious in situations when one is saying or doing what is appropriate in one culture, but in another culture it is not. One example could be the word 'please', which is required in the English-speaking world in some instances, but the corresponding Finnish expression is not used in our culture.

3.5 Degree of bilingualism

There are many definitions on who exactly is bilingual, as was mentioned in chapter 2, where also the minimalist and maximalist points of view were presented. These views could alternatively be called receptive and productive bilingualism respectively (see e.g. Baetens Beardsmore 1986:17-19). The receptive bilingual is only able to understand the written or spoken form of the language, but not able to produce it him- or herself. In this connection, one has to consider the illiterate population of the world; according to the maximalist view, they would not even be classified as monolinguals, because they are unable to write the language (Baetens Beardsmore 1986:18-19). To contrast receptive bilingualism, the term productive bilingualism is used in connection with people who, in addition to understanding the language, are also able to produce it themselves. It is not to say that these people are equally good in every part of the language. (Baetens Beardsmore 1986:18-19.)

Another important distinction is between dominant and balanced bilingualism, as Hamers and Blanc (1989:8) divide them. Dominant bilingualism means that one of the person's languages is dominant over the other, whereas a balanced bilingual is equally good in both of the languages, in all its domains. Grosjean (1982:235) reminds us of the fact that the case of a balanced bilingual is so rare that rather than being called a norm, it is actually the exception. He argues that most of the world's bilinguals are of the dominant kind. Adler (1977:29) also thinks that it is quite extraordinary that a person masters two or more languages equally well. There are many different internal and external factors affecting the mastery of a language. For example, work, friends or society may pose different demands for knowing a language.

The view of bilingualism used in this study was, as previously mentioned, the term 'functional bilingualism'. Grosjean defines functional bilingualism as: "the regular use of two languages" or "fluency in two languages" (Grosjean 1982:230). He does not mention proficiency in the language as a criterion, because he thinks it does not play a big role in bilingualism. (see e.g. Baetens Beardsmore 1986:15-17.)

The last case concerning the degree of bilingualism is that of semilingualism, which is used of a person who is learning two languages, but has only half the knowledge of both of them. This can also, as Romaine (1995:264) says, be called balanced bilingualism, only equally low knowledge of both of the languages. Hansegård (1968:51) argues that semilingualism may lead to the impoverishment of a person's emotional life because he or she might not be able to express him- or herself in any language.

4 BICULTURALISM

When the concept of culture is widened from concerning ethnic culture only, one can see that there are many cultures to which a person can belong concurrently, and we can thus say that every person is multicultural, in a way. These other cultures are mostly social, e.g. family, friends, and work, but they are not the topic of this study. The terms 'bicultural' and 'multicultural' will be used interchangeably in this study, both meaning that a person is influenced by two or more cultures.

Labelling people as belonging to only one culture limits and excludes these people from parts of the societies, as argued by Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:69-70). They also acknowledge that the culture of a child will always be different from the one of the parents, particularly with those parents who are of mixed ethnicity (1996:17).

4.1 Definitions of biculturalism

For some researchers, like Sahaf (1994:2), the word 'bilingualism' entails the concept of biculturalism, at least to some extent. He also says that this is true especially in education, where these two concepts must be considered to be connected, in order to help the children to adapt. However, although bilingualism and biculturalism are often linked together, they may also be separate. Hornby (1977:5) contends that not all bilinguals are bicultural, because they can also be monocultural. A

supportive view to Hornby's is offered by Baetens Beardsmore (1986:23-24), who remarks that it is quite easy to acquire a language without attaching any cultural markers belonging to that language. Therefore, although one knows the language, he or she still does not know how to use the language properly.

Many researchers, like Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:140), have established the fact that the most critical part in becoming acquainted with another culture is first to learn the language of that culture. Trenholm and Jensen (1992:371) support this view and claim that the language is the main means to convey the culture's values and beliefs. Ideally, as Seelye and Wasilewski (1996: 1) describe it, when crossing the national border, people change the norms to which they have previously compared people's actions and, in turn, gain new perspectives from another culture. Besides the socio-economic and environmental conditions, which change a culture, it is affected by other cultures as well, as Collier (1996:29) reminds us.

The definition of 'bicultural' offered by Hamers and Blanc (1989:11) states that a person who is bicultural identifies positively with both of the cultural groups speaking his or her languages, and that those groups see that particular person as a member of their groups. It is quite possible for a person to still function in a society, even without knowing all of its cultural values. Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:128) say it is because the multicultural societies usually accept the presence of different values. They also say that it is easy for a multicultural person to accommodate his or her behaviour at the surface to fit the values of the society.

4.2 Attitudes towards biculturalism and bilingualism

Attitudes are an important part of a person's idea of him- or herself, which can be either his or her own, or those of other people. Attitudes are particularly clear when it comes to different nationalities and languages. Therefore they affect especially bilingual and bicultural people. The attitudes towards people can be divided into intolerance, tolerance and appreciation, which is the three-dimensional model developed by Baldwin and Hecht (1995:65). Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:49-50)

describe the time when poor and uneducated people were bilingual and were looked down upon. However, when bilingualism was associated with cosmopolitans, well-to-do people, it was seen as something better. (see also Romaine 1995:242-247)

When there are more than one language present in a culture, one of them has to be the disfavoured one, as Romaine (1995:xiv) says. There are findings from many studies, which Hamers and Blanc (1989:129) present, which have shown that the positive or negative evaluations of individuals and groups are based on the language or the variety of it they speak. Grosjean (1982:117) adds that attitudes towards languages are connected with the attitudes towards its users. Hamers and Blanc (1989:130-133) make an important distinction between a foreign accent and a regional one. They say that it has been reported that an accent that is different from the norm language is less valued. One other factor they remind us of is that non-linguistic markers of ethnicity have to be considered also, such as the colour of a person's skin.

Even just being in contact with other cultures can be a cause of conflict, as Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:76) have detected. It is especially typical for the people who have to adopt values that are not in accordance with their own values. As an example they mention the Second World War, during which many European countries experienced internal conflicts and when some people were more persecuted than others, just because of their ethnicity.

What is most unfortunate about negative attitudes is that they may spread among the minority group itself and become a part of their perception of self. Parents may even deny children their native language, if it is different from the majority one. (Romaine 1995:288-289.) Grosjean (1982:120), in turn, claims that it is possible that the minority people therefore think even less of themselves than the others do.

The paradox facing many multicultural people is that they want to get inside the new culture they are living in, but it is made impossible by other people in that culture who still see them as outsiders. Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:143-44) see the positive side of this in that this kind of exclusion provides them with a greater flexibility in their behaviour. The

multilinguals are not subject to the same norms that govern the actions of natives in their culture.

Bilingualism could also be seen from a global perspective, as Romaine (1995:8) does. She observes that, in most of the speech communities in the world, more than one language is used. Therefore multilingualism could be called rather the norm and monolingualism would be considered a special case in most of the speech communities. Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:86) ascertain that it is just these monocultural people who suffer from "limited perspectives and cultural deprivation".

5 CULTURAL IDENTITY

Identity is usually defined with the help of the society around oneself and in the case of cultural identity, a person identifies with a group of culturally similar people and sees people with different traits as those not to identify with.

One has to remember that there are many subcultures even inside one society, so that social identity could also be related to the cultural one. However, this study is concerned with the cultural identity, otherwise labelled as ethnic identity or national identity, which is characteristic to those bilinguals who speak a different language and come from a culture other than the majority of the society.

5.1 Definitions of cultural identity

The division between social and cultural identity is well presented by Hamers and Blanc (1989:116-117), who say that when social identity is considered, people define themselves in their own societies. They compare themselves with the people within the same society, whereas in order to find out about one's cultural identity, one has to go outside his or her own culture, to a different society.

A definition offered by Trenholm and Jensen (1992:115) states that social identity is dependent upon the social roles a person takes. They say about cultural identity that some subgroups influence people's identities very much, whereas others affect them only slightly, whether the group is a social or a cultural one (Trenholm and Jensen 1992:368). Friedman (1994:238), in turn, sees cultural identity as a part of the global transformations in the world, where a social identity is transformed with the help of acknowledged cultural characteristics.

Identities consist of, first of all, core symbols, which are on the deepest level of identities. They express the deeper values and understandings a culture holds about the world and the universe, and of a person's place in that universe. The core also includes a picture of the society around a person, and the label a culture will have, such as 'Finnish'. Norms of appropriate behaviour are also based in the core, as well as the moral standards. The cultural group has to accept the person's behaviour as being in accordance to its shared norms and values before he or she can be given an identity in that group. (Collier 1996:41.)

In Collier's words, cultural identity is the character of the communication of a particular group that is identifiable in certain situations (1996:39). This is when a group of people behaves according to the norms and beliefs set by the group. Carbaugh (1990:2) adds that it is important to notice that a cultural identity is mostly a shared one. It enables people to find some common ground which to refer to when communicating with those inside or outside one's own culture.

5.2 Construction of cultural identity

Hamers and Blanc (1989:119) claim that a group's cultural identity would become salient if that group were seen as having similar cultural features and the members of that group use those as categorisations of themselves. The importance of difference, as well as similarity, was commented above (chapter 2.3).

Identity development is dynamic and can change throughout the person's life, because of new events, as Hamers and Blanc (1989:121) point out. A

person's identity has to keep up with the constant changes in the culture. Singer (1998:5) also remarks on the influence of other people on one's own cultural identity, especially those of the parents.

Cultural identity is seen as developing through people identifying with a group with which they have the same behaviour and value systems, as stated by Collier and Thomas (1988:113). They also think that an important aspect of cultural identity is that it can be transmitted across generations and also to someone just getting into the culture, for the first time. Collier (1996:39-40) states that once the group has a common history and starts transmitting the values, norms, and symbols to others, they can see themselves as having a cultural identity.

The personal feeling of one's identity is emphasised by Haarmann (1999:61), who says that the strength of a person's identity depends on the extent to which he or she is able to contrast him- or herself and the others. The person also has to find a balance between him- or herself as an individual, and the group he or she is a part of. Lanehart (1999:212), on her part, sees the experiences with different social contexts, like family, culture, and friends, throughout a person's life as very important to a person's construction of identity. She sees that these social networks thus formed shape the identities people choose to take. The intensity with which people define their identities changes sometimes. As Collier and Thomas (1988:114) say identity is formed when comparing oneself with one's own group, as well as comparing oneself to an outside group. Therefore, it is likely that at different stages of life, a person may identify with different groups.

Many researchers, such as Collier (1996:44) have seen that a person can have many cultural identities, which are apparent in different situations and change accordingly. She asserts that therefore one could not make any claims about stereotypes on particular cultures, for example. Carbaugh (1990:168) claimed that identities, social and cultural, are formed mostly because of social reasons and "structuring norms and forms".

5.2.1 Ethnicity and nationality

Ethnicity is usually and most visibly seen as equal to race (see e.g. Seelye and Wasilewski 1996:38-40). Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:30) also say that because a person is a mixture of many ethnicities, he or she could choose with which one to identify.

Edwards (1985:8) calls ethnicity an “involuntary state in which members share common socialisation practices or culture”. He continues by saying that if people want ethnicity to prevail, there have to be some ties to the past and present of the culture and they have to be connected to each other. He also asserts that in order to preserve ethnicity, the ethnic group has to possess common visible characteristics, such as language or religion (Edwards 1985:10).

Since the world has been divided to nations, every person belongs to some nation and quite often identifies him- or herself with that nation, as Edwards (1985:11) notes. Therefore, especially in intercultural contacts, nationality is a very clear way of identification. Nationalism can be clearly related to cultural identity, the way Featherstone (1995:89) sees it. He believes that national cultures, which appeared at the same time as states were formed, were the product of "cultural specialists" who created common traditions to unify the nation in times of crisis. Gilroy (1997:305-306) makes the same claim and sees that it has been especially true with the fascist movements, when a cultural identity, which is a diverse, changing phenomenon, was moulded to a clean-cut and tidy unified trait. The same can also be seen in some other movements, like different religions, where this unity is harnessed to the use of the movement, at the expense of individuality.

Seelye and Wasilewski also present some criticism against the basic belief of nations (1996:28-29). They criticise the division and claim that nationality is only created for the purposes of political advancement and many times this division into nations has been done at the cost of ethnicity and with disregard of ethnic boundaries.

Nationalism as an ideology is seen by Edwards (1985:37) as a “non-rational phenomenon”, and he claims that some think of it even as irrational. Nationalism as an ideology can present a danger and has many

times been the cause for wars (see e.g. Seelye and Wasilewski 1996:31, Edwards 1985:44.) Edwards (1985:5) proposes that there is a close link between ethnicity and nationalism concerning cultural identity. In fact, he sees nationalism as an “extension of ethnicity”. Edwards (1985:10-11) presents a circle of nationality and ethnicity, i.e. “nationalism as self-aware ethnicity, ethnicity as a state of pre-nationalism, nationalism as organised ethnocultural solidarity”. He also reminds us of the important, but often ignored fact that all people are members of ethnic groups; ethnicity cannot be only used to describe minority people. (Edwards 1985:6.)

5.2.2 Language and identity

A commonly held belief is that language is one of the most essential markers of cultural identity, especially because of its communicative functions for transmitting the traditions of a particular culture. Language is also seen as a part of a person's cultural identification, as Lanehart (1999:212) sees it. In addition, Haarmann (1999:61) sees ethnicity as the most important framework for constructing an identity. Moreover, he thinks that language is the most important means to carry out the construction (1999:63). (see also Bourhis & Marshall 1999:248.) Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:48) also stress the importance of a shared language joining people together under a shared identity. They also claim that language builds boundaries between people, as well as bringing them together, because it is seen central to their identity (Seelye and Wasilewski 1996:55).

Edwards (1985:111) claims that even if a clear marker of ethnicity, such as language, lost its communicative function (e.g. Latin), it would still remain as a symbolic marker of ethnicity or group identity (e.g. Catholic Church). Edwards therefore distinguishes the symbolic and communicative functions of language. This distinction also applies to public and private markers of ethnic identity. Privately, language can still remain as the symbolic marker of identity, even though it already has disappeared from common use.

However, as much as language is awarded to be the most important marker and means of creating an identity, there are still some who dispute this belief. Such a view is offered by Liebkind (1999:144), who is on the

same lines with Edwards (1985), but also argues that "Although language can be the most significant criterion of social identification, it is not the only one, not necessarily the most significant one". Again, another view of the topic is presented by Fishman (1999:450), who refers to the problems of the modern identity and says: "Only language could evoke a sense of continuity in the midst of modernity's constant discontinuity, of community in the midst of its constant influx of strangers".

5.3 Intercultural identity

There are some people to whom Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:54-55) refer as 'monoculturals', people who are members of one culture only and who may view multicultural people as having an "impure" or "false" identity, because their identities have not been defined clearly. This brings out problems for the multicultural, because one has to belong to some "socially established category".

The process of forming an intercultural identity can be seen, as Kim (1996:443-444) presents it, as the way in which a person settles in a culture, and then starts a process of change, creating his or her new personal culture. He or she combines different elements of different cultures to a single identity. Kim sees this kind of worldview very beneficial in that it enables a person to entertain diverse features of the world in his or her mind and thus create a "unique world view". However, children of mixed-cultural parents have difficulties in deciding what culture to identify with. As Lambert (1977:20) says, it is difficult for those children to identify with their parents. They see that they are different from their parents, but still understand them and have features from both of the cultures. It is therefore obvious that the identity of mixed-cultural children cannot be exactly the same as that of their parents. However, Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:17-19) acknowledge the importance of family in the process of creating multicultural identity, but they say that it is not enough to anchor the person's identity. Sahaf (1994:214), on the other hand, found in his study that family was not very important in creating a child's identity.

However, some contradictory views to the above have been presented. According to De Vos (1983:147), both the peer group and the person's intimate family help create the development of ethnic identity, but also the cognitive and conceptual patterns, as well as the behavioural patterns in social situations.

A person settling in a new culture must be aware of the fact that changes in their identity continue as long as they are engaged in the sociocultural environment, in which they continuously interact. (Kim 1995:173.) This applies whether or not their peer group or family relations influence them.

A new concept of 'post-modern identity' has emerged in today's world, as a result of the mass movements of people across national boundaries, better technologies enabling faster communication, and globalisation, as remarked by Gilroy (1997: 303). (see also Friedman 1994:95-117.) Bauman (1996:24-32) describes four different distinctions of multicultural people as having a post-modern identity. The first type of person is labelled pilgrim. Pilgrims believe that identity building in today's world is not to be cherished, but rather avoided. This kind of people do not want to get attached or stuck with some label, or tied only to one fixed idea of an identity. The second type of multicultural person is called a vagabond. This kind of people move from one place to another, freely, without home. When things or people get boring, they see that it is time to change place. These people do not feel that they belong anywhere.

The third type of multicultural person is called a tourist. Tourists want to experience everything new and exciting, and live life to their own amusement. However, they need to have a place where they are safe and feel at home. These people do not seem to be a part of anything, because they are not even satisfied at being home. The fourth type of multicultural person is called a player, because the world is a game for this person. He or she takes risks and thinks that the person who knows the rules, or has no rules at all, is the winner.

Woodward's view of post-modern identity is a cautious one. She says that scattering people around the world creates identities, which can be

situated in many different places. She claims that this kind of a new identity could be "both unsettled and unsettling". (Woodward (1997:17.)

5.4 Acculturation

Berry et al. (1986:291) characterise behaviour to be influenced by the culture one belongs to, but also by other cultures from outside. This phenomenon is labelled acculturation. They continue by saying that some parts of the culture may be altered, whereas some others may not change to the same extent (1986:297). Adaptation is a part of acculturation and vice versa.

There are different stages of acculturation at which an immigrant can find him- or herself. These are described by Skutnabb-Kangas (1988:237-239), who sees segregation as the first stage. Segregation is either voluntary, i.e. the person wants to be close to his or her compatriots and is afraid of being in contact with people from the majority culture. Segregation can, however, be forced upon the immigrant for social, political or economic reasons by the majority culture. At this stage, the person is usually competent in his or her own culture and language, but not in the new one. Therefore, some are even opposed to the majority culture.

Skutnabb-Kangas calls the second stage "functional adaptation". At this stage, the person already knows some of the new language and knows about some institutions of the new society. In some situations, he or she is also able to act according to the behaviour required by the new culture. The person is also aware of the differences of the new culture, in comparison to his or her own culture, and can see the typical features of this new one.

The next stage Skutnabb-Kangas presents is called 'acculturation'. At this stage, the person already knows how to behave like a native of the new culture. The knowledge about the structure of the new society is also widening. The person will also start to accept some norms and values from the new culture and is able to compare these with the ones from his or her old culture. A person in this stage also becomes aware of the good

and bad features of the new society and could start valuing more the features of his or her old culture.

The fourth stage, according to Skutnabb-Kangas is called integration. This stage is reached when the person still emphasises the features from his or her own culture but has also accepted the norms and values of the new culture, even if they were in conflict with the old ones. The new values will not, of course, replace the old ones. This kind of person feels solidarity to both of the cultures, which, in Skutnabb-Kangas's opinion, is the start of the kind of a person the world today needs. (Skutnabb-Kangas 1988:239.)

Some people see that a person who has integrated him- or herself in a culture is "truly bicultural", as Liebkind (1999:142) notes. She continues to say that an integrated person is able to choose the elements he or she wishes to retain from the heritage of his or her original culture, which to adopt from the new culture, and to acquire the cultural skills which then enable the person to integrate into the society around him or her. According to Liebkind (1999:142), if this does not entail the abandonment of the person's native language, the result is a bilingual person with bicultural identity.

Edwards (1985:105-106.) remarks that the most common stages of acculturation are the variable degrees of assimilation and accommodation, which are, for most people, the reasonable and likely stages to be chosen. He says that this way, the person could be a member of the dominant society and the old culture as well. He does not see separatism, marginality or segregation as a common choice, but rather one of few people, a stage that lasts only for a while.

5.5 Ways of adapting to a new culture

A list of factors which influence the success of adaptation to a new culture, is presented by Kim (1996:409-411). According to her, the environment plays an important part, including the way a stranger is welcomed into the society, whether it is friendly or hostile, or something in-between. Other important factors to be considered are the differences

or similarities between the two cultures in contact and the status of the person in both of the cultures; whether he or she is equally accepted in the new culture. Linked with this are the economic, social and political standings of the person in the cultures. Racial and ethnic prejudices also affect on the success of adaptation.

Other factors Kim lists are, for one, that the person might feel pressured to make a choice between changing or keeping his or her own culture. The pressure comes from both inside his or her own culture and also from the new culture. Another key factor is the strength of that person's ethnic group; how well they are able to survive in the new culture. Kim (1996:411-414) also presents some personal characteristics affecting adaptation. She sees the person's predisposition as an important factor. Adaptation is easier if the person is prepared for the difficulties that may arise and has realistic expectations of the culture. It is also helpful if the person is open and positive towards new things and is strong enough to handle the possible difficulties of adaptation. She also says that because adaptation is all about communication, the interpersonal skills of the person adapting are very critical.

Factors that may make communication difficult in the new culture are presented by Barna (1996:373). One of these is that the person thinks that there are only similarities between the cultures. He or she is then being too optimistic and does not take into account all the differences that there are bound to be. He or she may also misinterpret differences in the meanings of languages and act inappropriately in a speech situation. Some other factors that Barna (1996:374-76) mentions are misinterpretations of the non-verbal communication of people, for example, how to use personal distance while communicating. It is also important that the person does not evaluate the new culture too closely, i.e. approve or disapprove its different dimensions. The person's ability to cope with stress is also crucial.

The concept of personal communicative competence developed by Kim (1996:407-408), makes a division between cognitive and affective components in adaptation. The cognitive component is what a person knows about the language and culture of the new society. The affective component is the ability to communicate on a more personal and

meaningful level. Social communication, on the other hand, consists of communication activities in the society. These are interpersonal communication and mass communication. The latter is especially important in the beginning of adaptation, when the person has not yet established relationships with others.

A case of total integration is also possible, as is suggested by Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:18). They confirm that it is possible to acculturate oneself to only one culture. They state that there are some instances of some multicultural people having given up their original culture and adapted to a whole new culture. When a person adapts to a culture, it brings about many lasting changes also inside the person. These changes continue as long as the person is influenced by and is a part of a particular culture. The successful adaptation to the society becomes apparent when the person's communication systems are equal to the ones of the natives. (Kim 1995:173-180.)

Trenholm and Jensen (1992:384-385) list the characteristics they think are important in helping a person to accommodate to a new culture. The person should be "open-minded, tolerant, outgoing, and have good self-esteem, self-confidence, persistence and flexibility". They see that the reward these people get from the acculturation process is acquiring intercultural identity.

There are different dimensions of acculturating, which Hamers and Blanc (1989:11) present. The first is a bicultural dimension, which means that a bilingual person identifies him- or herself with two cultural groups speaking the same languages that he or she speaks. He or she is also recognised as a member of both of those groups. A monocultural bilingual identifies him- or herself only with one of the groups. The third case is an acculturated bilingual, who abandons his or her native culture and becomes a member of the other culture only. The fourth case is that of a deculturated bilingual. This is the kind of a person, who gives up his or her native identity, but also fails to adopt the identity of the other language group. (Hamers and Blanc 1986:11.)

Adler (1977:39) claims that it is impossible for a person to adopt all the different values, attitudes and interests of the new culture, which will

result in an overflow of cultural influences. He then says that some bilinguals would therefore become "culturally monoglots" i.e. monocultural. Romaine (1995:315), on the other hand, reports of cases where a person feels left out of the society and has therefore difficulties in defining his or her identity. She states that the feeling of not being part of either of the cultures can be particularly distressing.

The difficulties mentioned above have been labelled as acculturation stress or culture shock and people have found that it is possible to go through them without losing anything of value. (see e.g. Baetens Beardsmore 1986:163.) Barna (1996:376-77) calls culture shock appropriately "a state of dis-ease". Baetens Beardsmore (1986:153-54) suggests another name for this phenomenon of stress: anomie, which he describes as a feeling of disorientation, anxiety and isolation from the society. The stress is caused by the different demands from both communities, with which the person is unable to deal.

Culture shock and stress can cause many effects, which Trenholm and Jensen (1992:379) mention. The severest effects felt by other people in the society are irritability and hostility towards them and the new society. The more personal effects mentioned include feelings of dissatisfaction, helplessness and lowered self-esteem, which may result in social isolation and finally a strong need to return home. Trenholm and Jensen also claim that the person can become even physically ill and stress could also result in insomnia and depression (Trenholm and Jensen 1992:379).

5.6 Maintenance of cultural identity

Since cultural identity is seen, by most researchers, as consisting of linguistic and cultural features, it is natural that in order to maintain cultural identity, a person has to maintain his or her language and culture (cf. Laneheart 1999:212). Language and culture are seen as forming a union in this study, because language affects a person's culture, and culture and language together affect a person's identity.

Identities are very fragile and they are vulnerable to outside pressures, as maintained by Lambert (1977:19). The importance of language to an identity may not always be the crucial feature for maintaining the

identity, as Hamers and Blanc (1989:126) point out. A person may identify weakly to the language of his or her cultural group, therefore not considering his cultural identity to be dependent on language. As a consequence, he or she may see the dominant group in the society as a more vital and superior one and thus decide to adopt the identity of the second culture. When the person knows both of the languages well enough, such a move becomes easier inside a society.

There are also 'socio-political factors' as Edwards (1985:93) mentions, which may cause many people to stop using their native language. The native language may be seen as inferior in the majority culture and therefore advancement in the society could be hindered. This, in turn, changes also identity. While identity changes with the death of a language, identity itself does not disappear, although the language does.

Motivation is the most essential element for maintaining identities, as seen by Baker (1988:142). It is clearer when adults are concerned. Children are still mostly identifying themselves through their parents and it is therefore the motivation of the parents to maintain also the language of the children and make them keep that part of their cultural identity. Lambert (1977:23) notes that becoming bilingual or bicultural does not mean that such a person loses his or her identity.

It is difficult for a parent to keep the child aware of the features of their native culture, under the pressure from the language of the majority in the society, as recognised by Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:47). Romaine (1995:236-237) sees parents' realisation about the importance of bilingualism as the most important factor for successful raising of a bilingual child. Romaine also sees the importance of the attitudes of the school towards linguistic and cultural diversity as one of the factors affecting the identity formation. Parents may also have to fight against the child's wishes of becoming like all of his or her friends, because children would not want to differ from their friends.

Maintaining identity in adulthood should be a more simple issue, because adults are already seen to recognise their own values and what they consider important. Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:47) found the residence of one's loved ones in another country as an important motivational force

in identifying with another culture, because one wants to maintain contacts with these people and a part of this is to learn the languages they speak.

Language maintenance is not clearly an emotional factor, as Romaine (1995:43) sees it. She claims that “identification with a language and positive attitudes towards it do not guarantee its maintenance”. The situation in Ireland is a good example: English is the dominant language, in spite of the antipathy some feel towards the English people.

The attitude of the dominant society is also an important factor contributing to the maintenance of identities. Sahaf (1994:214) found in his study that the longer the people had stayed in the resident country, the less need they saw to preserve their native language and culture and study it at school. This is not solely due to the pressures from the dominant culture, but also to the personal desires of these immigrants. They may have wanted to be like their friends at school and not to ‘stand out’ in the group.

Change and transition are natural events of life for most of the people, as asserted by Edwards (1985:97). He emphasises that change does not have to mean the end of the cultural continuity. On the contrary, he sees the changes in group identity as positive ones, for it guarantees that the culture will survive and evolve together with the group. “The essence of group identity is individual identity and the essence of individual identity, ultimately, is survival, personal security and well being” (Edwards 1985:98).

6. THE PRESENT STUDY

A person's identity is, by its nature, forever changing, which Hedge (1998:38) reminds us of. There are several traits to these identities, with which a person has to juggle. Therefore, this study aims to delineate the different traits of identities that were presented by the subjects.

6.1 The method

For the purposes of this study, 8 bilingual people were interviewed on their ideas of their cultural basis and identity. Therefore, the definition of who is bilingual suitable for this study, is based on the concept of functional bilingualism (see chapter 3.5).

For reasons of limiting the group of potential subjects, I decided to choose subjects whose mother tongue was English and who were also able to speak Finnish, i.e. had a certain degree of bilingualism. Most of the subjects were immigrants born in the USA, but some were born elsewhere. The background of the subjects will be explained in chapter 6.2.

The subjects include 2 males and 6 females. The number of males and females is not even because I did not see that there would be any noteworthy differences between sexes. The only differences that may emerge are of personal character, not related to sex. Therefore, it was possible not to differentiate the sexes at all in this study, but for reasons of clarity it was done.

To evaluate the subject's abilities in the Finnish language, in particular, they were placed on the scale called 'The Framework of the National Foreign Language Certificate' (Yleiset kielitutkinnot) used for the description of a person's language profile. This scale varies from 1, which marks basic linguistic ability, to 8, which indicates the level of an 'advanced' speaker. The subjects were then asked to rate themselves according to the scale. The language used in the scale was Finnish, because the intention was to find out how well they know Finnish. The scale is presented in appendix 1.

The interviews were conducted in the autumn of 1997 and spring of 1998. The place of the interviews varied according to the wishes of the subjects. Some took place in their homes, others at work, or in the premises of the university library. The subjects were also able to choose the language they wanted to speak in the interview. This also showed which of the languages they thought was their strongest one.

The subjects were first asked to give their background, the length of their stay in Finland, and the languages they mastered. The interview questions were semi-structured, that is, they were not totally open, nor closely structured (vs. 'teemahaastattelu'). An interview framework was used but the questions varied in order, some were not asked at all, and new questions emerged from the answers the interviewees gave. A framework of the interviews is given in appendix 2, but as a framework it was subject to change during different interviews.

The reason behind the choice of semi-structured approach was that I wanted to give the subjects the chance to inflict their personal experiences, regardless of whether I had come up with a question dealing with the particular situation. The structure of the interview was formulated to control the interview, so that I would find out all that I wanted, and not to let the interview spread out too much.

The interviews were first audiotaped, and then the answers were transcribed. An abridged version of each interview will be presented in chapter 6.2. The interviews were analysed qualitatively, with the categorisations emerging from the interviews themselves. The interview framework (appendix 2) in itself defined the main thematic categorisations: bilingualism, biculturalism and cultural identity, which are shown in the sub-titles of this study.

The three main thematic categories were then divided into sub-categories, according to similar or, in some cases, variant responses by the subjects. The sub-categories, for example, in the similarities between cultures were 'values', 'behaviour', and 'other'. The categorisations were made according to e.g. abstract concepts like 'values', as F2 mentions: "If you think about...let's say basic values in a way that children should go to school and boys and girls are treated basically the same..." or 'concrete' concepts like behavioural, as M2 mentions: "...in England you can also say things without actually say in direct ways, but you can be more direct , but in both cultures you can say things more directly and it's definitely meant", or miscellaneous concepts like 'other' as M1 says: "Also the use of technology". Each interview was treated as a case, and the eight cases

were then compared to see what common and different topics arouse from them.

In what follows, the interviews will firstly be presented by describing each of them (6.2), secondly, their commonalties and differences will be presented (6.3.), together with previous research on the topics. Finally, the implications of this study will be discussed in the conclusion.

6.2 Experiences of the subjects

From the choice of the type of interview, follows that the answers the subjects gave were different and variable, which also shows in the presentation of the interviews. The questions given to subjects varied, so that some questions were not presented at all to some subjects, whereas other questions produced comments and further questions not taken up in other interviews. The lengths of the interviews varied greatly, as did the circumstances in particular interviews.

For example, the interview with M2 was affected by the fact that he was in a hurry to get to a football practice, which meant that the interview was done in haste and it was condensed. The situation with F4 was that she was interviewed at her home, where she had to look after two dogs and a 6-month old baby. She seemed a bit tired and worn out, so she gave, understandably, quite short answers. The personal characteristics of the subjects, like talkativeness, also played a role in the differences in the interviews. These factors attributed to the variety in answers, which is also notable in the sub-headlines used in this study.

I have coded the subjects, using F for females, M for males and the numbers after the letter to distinguish the different subjects. As such, the numbers do not show any important differentiation. Their respective backgrounds will be presented, but their common denominators are that they represent people with academic background, who are aged between 20 and 35.

I will first present each of the subjects with their answers to the questions in the interview and after presenting all of them, I will summarise their joint characteristics and discuss the results.

6.2.1 Subject F1

Background. Subject F1 is born in Finland; her mother is Finnish and father British. She has lived all her life in Finland, with occasional visits to England. She describes her abilities in both Finnish and English with the highest rate (8) on the scale (presented in Appendix 1).

Bilingualism. F1 considers herself definitely bilingual and, naturally, because of her equal ability in the two languages, defines bilingualism as a native-like ability in both languages.

Advantages. For F1, bilingualism presents more advantages than disadvantages. The advantages are operating with two languages, which in turn enriches the language in general, awareness of different ways of saying things, the easiness of travel, switching between languages and the ease of language education in school.

Disadvantages. As disadvantages, she mentions having some unusual sayings, which others do not understand, forgetting words, and inability to come up with ready explanations to some things. There are also some concepts in only one language, which she says are difficult, if not impossible, to express in another language. However, she does not really consider the latter as a real disadvantage.

Her family of mixed cultures, friends, work, television and literature are among the things which will help F1 to maintain her languages. If she was to move to England, Finnish would become her personal, intimate language, thus maintaining the ability to speak it even without the support of the environment.

Biculturalism. On the question of biculturalism, she sees herself more a bilingual than bicultural, mostly because she has never lived in England, although her father is English. The personal traits in F1, which she considers are acquired from English culture are the habit of praising people, which is not typical in the Finnish culture and it has caused some

bewilderment and unease in Finland. Another feature of English culture in her, is the ease of closeness.

As an advantage of biculturalism, she sees the expanding knowledge and understanding of other cultures. She has also found many good friends from people with similar backgrounds as hers; other bilinguals. She thinks they are much easier to talk to and have similar thoughts to hers. As a disadvantage to both bilingualism and biculturalism, she mentions the way she was harassed at primary school because of her foreign name and background.

Role between cultures. F1 finds herself sometimes explaining the cultural differences to foreigners visiting Finland. Most often she has to remind other immigrant Finns of the wonders of their home country. The explanation she offers is that there are different ways to behave and act and one should not expect everything to be the same as in other countries.

Stereotypes. She has heard the English considering the Finns as sulky, 'no talk, no kissing' -kind of people. The English also think that Finns are straightforward and honest. The Finns see the English as more sociable, talkative, and open. This is sometimes felt as shallowness by Finns.

Finnishness in F1 shows in her being sulky, which means that she does not speak if she has nothing to say, which sometimes makes her English relatives wonder if something is wrong. However, when she changes the language into English, she says she instantly becomes more talkative and sociable.

Misunderstandings. She finds the Finnish openness and straightforwardness to be a taboo in England. She has also found that one should speak indirectly in England, or people think he or she is rude. Looking someone in the eyes while talking to them, makes the English think the person as arrogant, threatening, and proud.

Other taboos in the English culture are some swearwords, which are constantly used in popular media, and do not have very strong connotations in Finland. When one employs them in England, he or she is found poorly educated and embarrassed. Using politically or socially

correct words is very difficult if one has not lived in the culture where those words are used. She has no problems fitting into the English culture, although there are some things in the society she does not like, but they do not present any problems for her.

Cultural Identity. F1 is now in terms with her double identity and the cultural sides of her, but before she found it very difficult and there was even a time when she refused to speak English at all. The bullying at school also caused her to wonder if it was worth the trouble. However, at some stage, she began to accept the different sides of herself. She says that the Finnish side is still stronger in her, due to living in Finland.

Cultural traits. The sociable side of the English has penetrated to her Finnish life. She feels herself more confident when she speaks English in Finland, because she knows that she speaks it better than most Finns, which gives her much-needed self-confidence. Both the sides of her identity are very important for F1. She has lived in Finland all her life, but the English part of her is very important to her. She has a British passport, which, in her opinion, emphasises her Englishness, which she would not want to lose. It is much easier to travel with a British passport than a Finnish one, because people seem much more polite to a person with a British passport.

Attitudes. She thinks that multiculturalism should be taught to children from the primary levels of education. She also emphasises that tolerance should not be shown only towards foreigners, but all people, handicapped etc. She also thinks that changing attitudes is a long process, the change happens in generations and more contact with different people brings more understanding.

6.2.2 Subject M1

Background. M1 is from the United States and by the time of the interview, he had been living in Finland for about six years. Both his parents are American and he is married to a Finnish woman. They have one child. He evaluated his abilities in the Finnish language on the basic level (1-3 on the scale of 8).

Bilingualism. M1 thinks he is a bilingual if its definition is "the most basic level of all". His Finnish is more of a functional language and not as important as other aspects of communication (non-verbal etc.). He has noticed that there is a requirement for "hyper-correctness" in both languages, in the society in general. He feels he does not fit into such an absolute category.

Language use. At work, he uses Finnish, but when socialising, his friends usually make the choice, because he has acquaintances among the speakers of both languages. He has found that he prefers English when abstract concepts are the topic. He speaks mostly English at work, but he uses Finnish with people from e.g. maintenance, because he thinks that using English could arouse some negative feelings. This is possible, as people have told him he speaks Finnish well enough.

He uses the Finnish language in running errands, especially when interacting with law officials, as his example illustrates. "I was in this office where you go to pay this parking ..sakko...and so I had gotten one of these, but I knew I shouldn't have gotten it. So, I went to argue with it. And before me, there was this one man, one foreign guy and he was arguing strongly, he was using all kind of foul swearwords: 'see this is bullshit, this is fucking robbery, you guys are doing this to harass foreigners'. And I was there and thought, oh, God, I would never be successful arguing this, unless I started nicely with Finnish. Of course, this guy had an interpreter; he couldn't speak Finnish so well. And immediately when it was my turn, I waited a few minutes and I became very calmly and spoke my most polite Finnish. This is my case and I would like to be excused from paying this. And I did."

M1 values the members of her Finnish wife's family very much, and therefore speaks Finnish with them. His wife speaks Finnish to their son, and he wants to understand it. He emphasises the fact that knowing Finnish is very important, when one lives in Finland, to successfully interact with people.

Disadvantages. As a disadvantage, he mentions the discrimination he has found in many shops and banks, for example. In questions of payment, some shopkeepers begin by asking what nationality he is. M1 is then

immediately on the alert. He proves he has the means for the purchase, but if they still persist, he threatens to go to another store, where his money is valued, and finally, if need be, cancels the purchase. He does this for a principle, because he knows he would be accepted as an American.

He would rather use Finnish in official situations, if asked, because the programme then runs much smoother, faster, and more efficiently. Speaking Finnish is not a problem to him, because if he does not understand the topics in the meetings, he therefore has nothing to say about them.

Biculturalism. The most important culture for M1 is still Alaskan, because he spent a great deal of his life there and he is attached to it. The next important culture is the American, but with a Finnish touch. He still notices that there are some Finnish characteristics in him, due to the long marriage to a Finn and all the Finnish friends and the society around him, but one cannot point out what is Finnish and what is American in him.

He used to be working long hours in the USA, and thought that Finns were lazy, when they came to work even 30 minutes late. He then realised that the people used this half an hour in the morning, for example, to take children to school, a behaviour which he now has adopted.

Similarities. In his opinion, the Americans and Finns are quite similar in that they are very independent, which is one character he values in his wife, and that people in both cultures also use the newest technology. He sees both the Finnish and American cultures as strict, honest, and straightforward, which has furthered his efforts to adapt into the Finnish culture.

Differences. The lack of communication with the management at work is very difficult to adapt to in Finland. In the USA one always knows if he or she has done good work, but in Finland, the only way you know you have done well is if your contract is renewed. He thinks that if he learned to interpret facial expressions, he would learn to know Finns better. Another work-related phenomenon he has noticed in Finland is that one

should not be proud of one's achievements, for example, if one has been promoted at work, one is supposed to play it down and absolutely not to show it. In the USA, if one has done well, one also shows it.

Role between cultures. He has sometimes acted as a mediator with foreign students coming to Finland, which suits him well, because he knows the Finnish side of the culture and can also relate to foreigners. It is quite usual for foreign students to behave as in their native culture, which is very unfortunate. They have to be made to see that some adapting is necessary.

Expectations and cultural influence. The Finns often expect him to behave in a certain way in the initial contact, but later they take him as he is. People in the USA expect him to behave the American way, such as stop and talk to strangers, which he does not do in Finland. He has always been silent by nature, so the silent trait of the Finns was not a major change in his life.

Stereotypes. It is very typical for the Finns to be very concerned about what other people think of them, which is quite contrary to the USA. Finland is also seen as a very technologised country. Despite the fact that the Finns are proud of their international and intercultural contacts, M1 claims that foreigners could provide valuable information about their cultures for example, to companies acquiring new investments in other countries, but their help is not recognised in Finland.

Family culture. M1's family is a kind of a culture of its own. For example, M1's son was cheering in the latest Olympic games with a Finnish flag in one hand, and a flag of the USA in the other. The friends of the family are also very similar because they also have mixed cultures, which makes adaptation easier. His own family in the USA is culturally also very mixed, which, according to him, made it very easy for his wife to fit in.

Cultural Identity. His integration into the Finnish society, is as deep as is possible for an American who has been living in Finland. He explains that he has two kinds of operating systems, one in Finnish and one in the English language. He compares them to differences in computer system,

like the difference between Windows and Mac -environments. His Finnish is less efficient, but for him, and others, adequate.

Characterisation. The roles of a father and a husband are closest to M1. Family, in itself, is a very important form of identification for him. Nationality is not as great a part in his identity as the family. When asked to think about it in national-cultural terms, he would define himself as "an expatriate, a national living in a different country". He greatly appreciates being able to work in both countries, which means that he can choose where he lives and works.

Cultural traits. Culturally, M1 is a very typical representative of the American culture, although he thinks the Finnish effect is unavoidable when he is married to a Finn and living in the Finnish society. He says his professional culture is also American, which is very confusing in the Finnish working environment.

Language and identity. Language affects his identity, in a way that it allows a person to be him- or herself. Language to him is an important way of identification. His wife is very comfortable using both languages, but he says that his Finnish jokes, for example, do not come very naturally. Speaking Finnish makes him feel part of a group of people in Finland. However, if he feels he is forced to speak Finnish, the American in him refuses to do so. He wants to make the choice between languages himself.

6.2.3 Subject F2

Background. F2 was born in the USA and by the time of the interview had lived in Finland for eight years. She is married to a German, who also lives in Finland. Her Finnish skills are on the advanced level 8, on the scale of 1-8. The languages she speaks are Finnish and English. She has also begun to learn some German.

Bilingualism. She thinks that living in Finland is made easier by knowing the language of the society. She thinks that it is very unfortunate if one has to rely on a translator or interpreter, because she claims that only ten to twenty per cent of information will be mediated in translation.

Advantages. She has learnt to look at things differently and she thinks that monolinguals are in a poorer position than bilinguals, because they can only look at the world through their own culture, through only one value system. She does not see any particular disadvantages in being bilingual.

Language loss. The years she has spent in Finland have made it difficult to settle in the USA again. She has adopted the different cultural skills, but, in addition, her work as an English teacher makes her produce the same mistakes her students make in their English. Vocabulary and spelling are the two areas in which she has noticed the greatest loss.

Reactions to English. The Finns seem to react to her speaking English and therefore treat her differently than others, which is why F2 tries to downplay her Americanness and avoid English as much as possible, to fit in. When she speaks Finnish, people complement her on how well she speaks and how wonderful that is. A negative side to the reactions is that some people see her as a "free English lesson", which she firmly refuses to be.

Language use. At home, she speaks mostly English with her German husband. They also speak some Finnish, especially on the phone. She speaks English at school with her students, but mostly, outside the work and home, she speaks Finnish.

Biculturalism. Now that F2 has been living in Finland for eight years, the Finnish culture has affected her and it has become "a major part" in her life. The loss of the American characteristics has not been purposeful nor has she become anti-American. She still looks at matters from an American perspective, although the influences of the cultures are quite equal.

Changes. A certain change is apparent in her, when she visits the USA. Each time she returns there, she notices more and more changes in herself, towards the Finnish customs and behaviour. Her relatives have also commented about them, but she still does not think that the Finnish side of her would become stronger than the American side.

Family culture. She and her husband seem to have their own culture, although there are many cultural differences between the spouses, like the way the Germans consider family life very private and there is not much discussion among the family, unlike F2. Her husband is also very systematic and punctual, whereas she is quite the opposite, which can be a characteristic of their respective cultures or that of their personality.

Language and children. They have not children yet, but they plan to have some. They would like to raise them bilingual, and the ideal would be that the children learn English and German at home, and Finnish at school and elsewhere. She is not sure, however, how it would work in practice. One difficulty is that her husband speaks very little German now in Finland, and she says it might be difficult for him to start over again.

Similarities. The longer she stays in Finland, the more similarities she notices between Finland and the USA. The different life in Finland is not so much of a shock to her anymore as it was when she first came here. She reminds us of the fact that Finland is called 'the most Americanised country in Europe', which means that it will be very easy for the Americans to settle. On a deeper level, the basic values, such as schooling, equality between the sexes, equality at work, and the appreciation of family life are similar in both cultures.

Differences. One major difference she has found between Finland and the USA is the attitudes towards strangers. In Finland the attitudes are not as friendly as in the USA. In the USA, one is supposed to say hello to people one passes on the streets, if not very crowded. People expect one to acknowledge their presence, whereas in Finland, one says hello only if people know each other. This aspect of the Finnish culture has affected F2, because she never stops to talk to strange people which, however, she is expected to do in the USA. She claims that it is a forced social custom in the USA.

Reactions to English. She finds that Finns react very differently to foreigners than Americans do. She argues that no matter how long one has been in Finland and how well one speaks the language, one can never become a Finn. The USA, on the other hand, is a melting pot of many different cultures, which makes adaptation easier. In Finland, a foreigner

is always seen as different from the others. To her, this is sometimes only positive, as she has never been treated negatively. Sometimes, however, this speciality may feel like a burden, if one desires to become a part of the Finnish culture.

She claims that the difference between natives and foreigners is always felt in Finland, even if it was not conscious. A friend of F2 once said that she almost forgot that she was an American. She took it as a compliment. Therefore, she adds that "maybe it's possible someday for a foreigner to melt in the Finnish society".

Role between cultures. She sometimes sees herself as a cultural interpreter and says that in order to act as such, one has to experience the kind of cultural misunderstandings, before one can explain them to someone else. She always tries to explain things as neutrally as she can, without taking any sides.

Cultural traits. A common cultural trait foreigners see the Finns have is their silence, which she has noticed in herself also. She was always considered a shy and quiet person in the USA, but in Finland people say, to her amusement, that she talks a lot. The reason for this is, she says, that people look at her differently, depending on the cultures they come from and what people in that culture expect.

Entry problems. The most common problem for people entering a new culture is that they think that everything should be explained through their own, native cultures, even though the matter has nothing to do with it.

Her entry to the Finnish society was little problematic as well. "When I was eating lunch with these other Finnish students and they'd get up and they'd go and not say anything...and I thought that they were going to get coffee and come back...and so I waited at the table and they weren't coming back, they didn't even say goodbye...Once again, are they mad at me?" Later, she found they were not angry at her.

She got over the first shock when she realised that she would not learn anything if she did not know the language. She did not want to feel like

an outsider, and not know what people expected of her. If she did not know something, she just had to ask someone.

Expectations. As an American in Finland, F2 is expected to lead conversations and fill the long pauses that might come up. However, when she wants to adapt to a Finnish situation, she tries to change her actions to correspond what is expected of the Finns. Sometimes, it seems that it is better to be ignorant of the Finnish customs and show that one is a foreigner. Once her husband was stopped by a policeman who said that he had been driving over the speed limit. He should have known that the winter limits were in force at that time. He appealed to his foreignness and the fact that he did not know any Finnish.

Stereotypes. Sometimes, people seem to expect from F2 and her husband behaviour which they do not find comfortable. One stereotype is that the Americans are fond of arranging parties, having expensive cars, and if one does not fulfil the ideal, people feel somehow disappointed.

She is often asked the question; why she came to Finland, which seems negative to her. She believes that Finnish self-esteem might be a little weak, and that Finns want assurance that it is good to live in Finland. In the USA, people are sure that the USA is the best place to live in and are not afraid to say it.

Acculturation. She thinks that she would never melt into the Finnish culture, and she stresses the fact that it is not, necessarily, her own choice. She is always thought 'special' and it seems that people will never forget that she is a foreigner, although people do not think, at first, that she is a foreigner. Only when she starts speaking Finnish, people understand that she is not a native Finn. Her view of looking at both cultures has not changed in any way. There are different ways of doing things, not good or bad. However, she has found some things in the American culture that she now criticises when she has seen that things could be done differently.

Cultural Identity. For the reasons of practicality and for avoiding long explanations of her background, she would first define herself as an American, but her family is still the most important one for her identity.

She was brought up in an American culture, but she says that it was her upbringing and not the culture that affected her the most. Being an American is not so important, because she now lives in Finland. She sees herself as "a watered-down version of an American" with an international aspect: living in Finland, and having a German husband.

In the small town she currently lives in, she is always made to feel like an outsider. It first bothered her that she was being watched all the time, in the small town she lives in. As a result, she has become more critical of her own behaviour in public. People are bound to watch and gossip about a foreigner in such a small town.

Language and identity. She feels herself more confident in speaking English, maybe because she can express herself better in the language. She uses Finnish in connection with the Finnish culture, because there are many things that she can better explain through Finnish words and concepts, which are a part of the life she now has.

Attitude change. Finns should have more everyday contacts with the foreigners in their society and the foreigners should be "brought down" for people to acquaint themselves with. Student exchanges, travelling, and learning to be more confident in languages are also good ways to diminish the strangeness of foreign cultures. It is much easier for the Americans to make contact with foreigners, because they are more confident in talking to them, although their language abilities are a little worse. She has noticed that the negative side of the Finns is that they want to be too perfect in their foreign languages before speaking.

6.2.4 Subject F3

Background. F3 was born in Pakistan. Her father is Pakistani and her mother is Finnish. She grew up in Kuwait and went to a British school there. English is her mother tongue and she also knows French, Finnish and a little Spanish and Arabic. She rated her skills in Finnish at the intermediate level (4-5) on the scale from 1-8. She had been living in Finland for 9 years, at the time of the interview.

Bilingualism. She thinks she might be called a bilingual, although she does not speak Finnish as well as she speaks English; she is not as

proficient in both. Knowing another language is always positive, especially living in Europe. She says that "language opens one up to another culture and to many different people". One will feel quite isolated in Finland, if one does not know the language, which she sees also as a negative point in living in Finland.

Advantages and disadvantages. Knowing more languages also widens one's worldview, and therefore develops oneself as a person, bilingualism also enlarges one's view of all other cultures, and broadens one's mind. It is impossible to be narrow-minded, because with the knowledge of another language comes knowledge of another culture. F3 has also heard people say that bilinguals are more intelligent than others. Not having strong, emotional roots in either of the languages or cultures, could be problematic for some bilinguals, because it could result in an uncertainty or a lack of identity.

Language loss and use. F3 has a group of English-speaking friends who help each other by pointing out each other's mistakes. She thinks that language deterioration is a great pity, and she has noticed that the greatest loss occurs in the vocabulary. She is very conscious of which language she uses in a particular situation. From the beginning, she had a strong motivation to learn to speak Finnish, which meant that she also learnt the language quickly. She speaks Finnish only with those who do not know English, as well as in running errands, with her Finnish relatives, and with some students.

There are some things she cannot express in Finnish, because her knowledge of Finnish is too limited. Still, she uses Finnish when speaking about sensitive things, because she does not want anyone to get too close, and she is also afraid that when she speaks English, she is unaware of how much she reveals of herself. She has not noticed that language affects her behaviour, because she tries to bring in her own personality. She assumes a kind of a role when she speaks Finnish and is also much more conscious of herself and her use of language.

Biculturalism. Biculturalism has always been very obvious in her family, because her parents were of different nationalities, and they lived in a country which was not a home country for either of them. She has

been aware of different cultures all her life and she, as well as her siblings, has tried to assemble all the best traits of each culture.

The reason why F3 favours the British culture, more than the Pakistani or the Finnish ones, can be attributed to the fact that neither of her parents were particularly attached to their respective home countries, and therefore put her into a British school in Kuwait, which left its traces in her. She feels quite comfortable being such a mixture.

Cultural traits. When she goes abroad, she feels very Finnish, but she starts to laugh more, be noisier and begins to see the funny side of things, which she is unable to do, in Finland. Even though Finns have a very serious outlook on life, she is always happy to come back. It is a relief for her, however, to visit English-speaking countries, where she can understand everything people say. It is important for her to be surrounded by people who know English. Finnish, for her, is a more social and functional language, used for communication in everyday life.

The Finnishness in her demonstrates itself as quietness, not speaking until spoken to, and not saying things out loud. Even when she speaks English, she uses some small Finnish words, which she thinks are much better at expressing some things. She is not aware of that herself, but her family jokingly accuses her for being Finnish.

One particular feature of Finnishness she has noticed is that she does not look people in the eyes. She always thought it was purely a Finnish thing, but when she noticed her sister, who lives in the USA, doing that, she asked her why she did it. Her sister explained that it was not allowed in Kuwait, where they spent their childhood, for a woman to walk alone in the streets, let alone look a man in the eyes. One was immediately labelled as someone with a bad reputation.

F3 does not say 'hello' to people in the streets anymore and she is ashamed to admit that sometimes she just nods at them. She was used to hugging among her family, but a positive side in Finland was that friends hug each other. This kind of closeness came as a surprise to her, in a country with long distances between places and people.

Role between cultures. Her usual role is being a mediator, as a figure of authority with the foreign students. She tries to encourage the students to learn Finnish, although it seems that some students do not even want to learn Finnish. She tries to see to it that no one is left out of the conversation; if someone does not understand what is said, she will translate it. The main indicator of non-successful adaptation, according to her, is that the person does not even want to know about the language and culture. She will offer an explanation about cultural differences only if someone seems to have a problem with it, otherwise, one must accept what is coming.

To her dismay, F3 sometimes finds herself thinking that things in Finland should be done the way she was used to at home, which is opposite to all that she believes. She also finds it frustrating that the Finns are not prepared to take any risks. She has found this in her students in the language classes, when they are afraid of making mistakes. She believes that one will never learn if one is not prepared to make mistakes and learn from them.

Entry problems. The main reason for her frustration was when she could not say what she wanted to say, because she did not know any Finnish. Sometimes, she was very hurt when her attempts to get close to people were rejected. Interacting with the Finns became easier when her knowledge of the culture increased and she was able to get close Finnish friends and discuss the problems with them.

The basic rule she had to learn, during adaptation was that there were different ways of doing things and that therefore one should always allow the benefit of a doubt on both sides. She thinks that the teenagers today are very different from what they once were. They seem to be more ready to talk to foreigners. Sometimes she finds herself thinking: "You're a Finn, you're not supposed to do that!"

Misunderstandings. She always thought that she would not have many situations with misunderstandings in Finland, because she is direct in what she says, as she thought the Finns also are. However, she was proved to be wrong when she once translated into Finnish what she wanted to say in English, it made the words sound harsher than she meant

to. Non-verbal communication and the way the Finns use silence are the two communicational means of the Finns she still does not understand.

Acculturation. She has learnt to tone down the strong and aggressive side of her. She has also found that if one offends Finns somehow, they will let the person know about it only later on, whereas F3 says it immediately, if she feels offended. Sometimes, for this reason, she does not realise that she has offended someone quite unintentionally.

Cultural base of behaviour. At the time F3 resided in Kuwait, 60% of the people were foreigners and her family mostly associated with them. Her own close-knit family is a culture in itself, with the mixture of cultures, due to these different cultural influences in their lives. Her siblings have each selected traits from the surface level of their different cultural influences, which they think suit them the best. For example, her sister, who is 5 years older than F3 and is married to an American, has chosen the Pakistani side. She likes to wear bright colours, and heavy make-up, for example.

Expectations. Finnish people are always happily surprised when they find that she speaks Finnish. They seem to think that it is good if she is ready to use Finnish and also learn it. In her church, she speaks mostly Finnish. There are so few foreigners in her church that the people do not know what to expect of her. They are very careful not to tell jokes, which might offend her, or say anything she might not understand. She prefers the Finnish language in formal situations and tries to be silent and not talk very much, because she does not want to be the one who is expected to "break the ice" as a foreigner.

Cultural Identity. She has often thought of herself as a "citizen of the world", not just of one culture or nation. A few years ago, she found Christianity and she learnt to think of herself as a "citizen of Heaven". She thinks that the best things of all the cultures she knows are combined in her and she sees her family as something that bridges cultural gaps. She and her whole family used to feel marginalized everywhere they went. She is not a total foreigner in Finland, but even though she knows Finnish and is living here, others still do not consider her Finnish, which causes her emotional anxiety.

She feels most comfortable and accepted in her church, but also at the language centre, where she works, because there are so many other foreigners working there. When she is with the Finns, she is much quieter and she tones down her behaviour. However, when she is with foreigners, she becomes noisier, and more extrovert, because she knows that they accept her behaviour.

Characterisation. She characterises herself mostly as a "seeker", because she is "looking all the time" and trying to understand the reasons behind her behaviour. Her place in the world is where God wants to use her. Her cultural identity, is not as strong as it used to be, now that she has found Christianity, which is her guide in life. She sees that all Christians are the same, without cultural differences.

Relating. She relates mainly to English-speaking Christians, because she feels most at home with them. She always tries to be herself, regardless of the language she uses or the cultural traits. Her personality has the strongest influence on her behaviour. She is very conscious of her behaviour when speaking Finnish in order not to offend or create misunderstandings.

Language and identity. Language affects her identity in some ways. F3 describes herself as a chameleon, switching between cultural settings. She likes switching from one language to another when talking to other bilinguals. She sees that a bilingual has no limitations when it comes to language and switching between languages is a great way to express solidarity among the group.

She is more aware of her Finnish identity when abroad, but when teaching English classes, she finds herself more aware of the English side in her. She tries to sharpen her British accent when she is with Americans, and soften it, when she is with other people. Her Pakistani father speaks with a British accent and when F3 has been to England, people asked her, which part of England she comes from. Some people, however, notice by her looks that she is not a native Brit, which used to be very painful for her before the differences in skin colour were accepted in the society.

Attitudes. She thinks that people should not make generalisations about people in different cultures. Finns think of Finland as a "modern, progressive country". To contrast this view, she thinks that they have, unfortunately, regressed to discrimination. The more foreigners there are in the society, the better will the mutual understanding be, in her opinion. She also thinks that the foreigners should also try to adapt, to socialise, and learn the language.

She thinks that foreigners should not receive any special privileges in Finland. Foreigners should also remember that they are considered to be the ambassadors of their country and should therefore avoid bad publicity. F3 has the authority to say this, because her "foot is in both camps".

6.2.5 Subject M2

Background. M2 was born in England. He had been living in Finland for five years, at the time of the interview, and is married to a Finnish woman. He evaluated his Finnish skills on the highest level of 8, on the scale of 1-8.

Bilingualism. The advantages in bilingualism are in the ease of working in Finland and getting along in the Finnish culture. He sees that his mother tongue (English) has been strongly influenced by Finnish, which does not pose a problem in the linguistic sense, but more socially. For example, when he goes back to England, the slight slips he makes, create a wall between him and his old friends, which is a great disadvantage.

Language loss. He is a little concerned with his mother tongue deteriorating, because he would like to keep it on the same level as it always was. However, he does not see that there would never be a great deficit in his abilities, because he would still be able to maintain an adequate level.

Language use. At home, he speaks only English with his wife, because they want their son to be bilingual. There are, however, many instances where code-switching takes place. The tactic they use in teaching their

son is that his wife speaks Finnish and he speaks English to their son. English is their common language at home, because their son gets enough Finnish influence from the Finnish environment. Otherwise, he uses Finnish, outside home, because it is polite to speak Finnish and it is also the easiest to use as a functional language.

He has noticed that Finns seem to appreciate it when someone has gone into the trouble of learning their language. He has also noticed that he is better treated when he speaks Finnish in tourist resorts than if he speaks English. However, He finds it very annoying that often on daily errands, when he starts to speak Finnish, he is answered back in English.

Biculturalism. He claims that a new culture cannot but effect the person living in that culture. Although he thinks he would fit in well in the Finnish culture, some extremists would treat him differently, if they found out he was English, despite his language abilities and behaviour. He argues that he "can be as Finnish as others born in Finland". He says he is able to behave like a Finn, but he does not want to, because there are many drawbacks in the Finnish culture, like living according to the bad stereotypes there are about Finns.

Cultural influences. He sees Finns as the stereotypical quiet and silent people. First he wondered about it, but later on he began to understand the social function of silence in Finnish communication. He does not show the same kind of behaviour in England, but he has got comments on his "creaky" voice when speaking in public. He has noticed this kind of tone in the voices of Finns when they are distressed, and he has found himself doing the same.

Advantages. He believes that knowing two cultures, in this case the Finnish one prevents him from making some mistakes, which would not be respectful to the Finns. Knowing the customs, he cannot offend anyone. It makes him also fit better in different situations and he can, therefore, feel more relaxed. Knowing the Finnish culture has a great effect on how people interact with him. He also thinks that it is a richness to have knowledge of other cultures than just your own.

Similarities and differences. He thinks that both Finns and English are very reserved toward strangers. They are also loyal to their friends and say directly what they mean, and then actually mean it. The attitude towards women and children, as well as the division of labour at home is different. Computer technology is better developed in Finland and more people have access to the new technologies. The frequency of under-aged drinking in Finland shocks him. It would not be tolerated so well in England, as it seems to be in Finland. He has been ashamed when his friends have come over to Finland and seen the drunken people on the streets.

M2 is also used to saying 'hello' to strangers, especially elderly people, but in Finland that is not done. Greeting in England does not entail long conversations but shows politeness. He has noticed that Finns sometimes say hello to people, and sometimes do not, which is why he thinks it is best if he did not say hello to anyone. It also seems to be a sin to look at a Finn in the eyes when passing in the street. One should look to the sky or his or her watch. This kind of behaviour is something he does not like in the Finnish culture, but he is trying to come into terms with it.

Role between cultures. Explaining particular characteristics of the Finnish culture, like why they should take their shoes off when coming into a house, has mainly been his role in intercultural encounters. He has found himself sometimes defending Finnish and English habits, depending on the listener. However, under-age drinking is something he has not been able to explain, much less defend.

Entry difficulties. When he first came to Finland, there was a difficult adjusting period, when he wanted to organise their family life the English way, with wife staying at home and husband being the main breadwinner until children grow up. It took some time for his wife to adjust to the roles he required, but she eventually agreed to it. Language and especially non-verbal communication still present some problems for him in his everyday life. One thing he finds confusing is the level of how much one is allowed to argue with someone. In Finland, a disagreement is seen as an attack on the person, whereas in England it is just a matter of exchanging opinions.

Family culture. Their family culture is mostly Finnish, because of his wife and the fact that they live in Finland, and the holiday celebrations depend on the country where they happen to be. They still try to bring some features from one culture to the other, when they visit their respective parents during the holidays.

Cultural Identity. M2 argues strongly that his cultural identity is English, and he does not see the Finnish side of the culture affecting him. Culturally, his identity might be a combination of the English and Finnish sides, but the sides are separate rather than one whole unity. However, his identity is not as strong culturally, as personally. His personal identity is not related to any culture, because he sees himself as more bilingual than bicultural. The core self of his personal identity, rather than any culture, affects the most on his behaviour.

He has also found that people project stereotypes on him, of what the English should be like. They seem to be very surprised if there are some deviations to their expectations, e.g. drinking coffee instead of tea. He maintains that "stereotypes don't go deep enough, to tell you what English people are like".

6.2.6 Subject F4

Background. F4 was born in the USA and she is married to a Finn. By the time of the interview, she had lived in Finland for nine years. Her abilities in the Finnish language are at the lower intermediate level (2-3).

Bilingualism. She sees herself as a bilingual, to a degree, as she says. Her definition is that a person is bilingual when he or she can cope with both languages. She criticises those who think that only those people would be called bilingual who speak the languages perfectly. For her, to be able to function in the society with the particular language, is enough.

Advantages and disadvantages. She has found it very useful to know the Finnish language, because she can now understand what people say behind her back. She also thinks that knowing the language spoken in the society is mandatory for survival. It is also important, for her, to try to understand the thoughts beyond the language. She thinks that understanding the thoughts behind people's actions is useful. The only

downside she can think of in being a bilingual in her own situation is that she is sometimes unable to say what she really wants to, because she is unable to say it in Finnish.

Language loss. When she first came to Finland, she was afraid of losing her English, but when she understood that one really can never lose his or her native language, she gave up her resistance of the Finnish language. She speaks English with her husband and child at home, and there is enough literature and TV shows in English, to keep up with the language.

Language use. She confesses that she sometimes bullies people with her English as a way to show her superiority, if she feels that she is on a disadvantage otherwise. It also makes her angry that people respond to her in English, although she tries to conduct her daily errands in Finnish.

Reactions to English. When she first came to Finland, people were very interested in her speaking English. At the time it seemed to be something new, but today it is quite common. It is a necessity for Finnish people to speak English, to be able to communicate with foreigners. Usually, when people are trying to be nice and speak English, she finds it a bit tiresome if they are slow and do not know the language well enough. In such cases she would prefer using Finnish, because it would be easier for her counterparts. It is harder for her to express her feelings in Finnish, than it is in English. The good friends she has have been bold enough to go beyond the language barrier.

Language and children. She has decided to raise their children bilingual and she has studied the field and decided that the best method would be for her to speak English and her husband to speak Finnish to the child. The language choice also depends greatly on where they are going to settle after leaving Finland.

Biculturalism. F4's three cultures include the American, the Finnish and the one in-between. In her opinion, it is impossible for someone living in another country to have just one culture. Most of the time, she finds herself in the in-between part, which is due to the effect of her marriage

to a Finn. With her marriage, she has been able to accept the Finnish side of her culture.

Family culture. Her home is governed by the rules of the American culture: the visitor's right to the freedom of being herself, doing as she pleases. The different cultures and languages show even in their two dogs. It has been a reason for amazement for many people to notice that one dog reacts to Finnish words and the other to English ones. She describes the cultures in her Finnish family: "This household is two family barriers clashing and sometimes it's not a pretty sight". The cultural conflicts in her family have mostly been brought about by differences of opinion on child rearing.

Differences. She thinks that it is easier to pick out the differences between the cultures than the similarities, because American and Finnish cultures are so different. One major difference is bringing up children. Physical punishment seems to be quite typical for the American way of raising children, and she was very surprised to see that there is another way to do it. She feels more comfortable with the Finnish way of non-physical punishment.

Expectations. F4's family in the USA is expecting her to represent their country while living abroad. She says that her mother is too old and stuck in her ways to never understand the Finnish culture, which seems to her very retarded and poor. Most of her experience comes from the time she first visited Finland and the stores were not well supplied with all the goods she was used to in the USA. Her mother was also very upset when she could not be understood in her own language, but now the younger generation speaks good English. F4 believes that Finland has also become much more westernised and is very proud of the good-willed nature of the Finns.

Entry problems. Her first months in Finland were very frustrating for her, because she did not know the language at all, and therefore could not understand anyone. When she later learnt the language, it became much easier for her to settle in the Finnish culture. She has never been very sociable, which might be the reason why she felt left out of the society.

Cultural celebrations. Her neighbourhood is used to her organising for the children the American celebration of Halloween. She also puts out Christmas lights about a month before Christmas, because she thinks the winter is so cold and dark. She has noticed that not long after she put on the lights, the neighbours started gradually doing it, too. She is also the last one to take the lights off. She also thinks that the Finnish Christmas is very boring, because everything is dark and there is not such a celebration of lights and marketing as in the USA.

Acculturation. She feels that she stands out in the Finnish culture, because her manners and behaviour are so distinctly American. Her laughter is one of the telltale signs of her foreignness. Finns seem to think that she must be either very drunk or crazy to laugh the way she does.

Stereotypes. Some people have said that they thought she was like some stereotype they had, but were surprised to find that she was not, after all. She has heard that people find the Americans loud, inconsiderate, and standing out in the crowd. The equivalent stereotypes for Finns are that they are always drunk when abroad. She says that she is not a typical American herself, because she has learned to tone down her behaviour and voice.

Cultural Identity. F4 says that her actions are based more on her personal beliefs and values than to those of any culture. She stresses that she will always be an American at heart, as well as in her passport, but culture is not such a strong denominator in her life anyway. She has such a strong personality that people will characterise her by it rather than by the language she speaks. She manifests her personality clearly, so that is the first thing people notice about her.

When asked again about her identity, she takes back her words about the emphasis on the non-cultural identity, and turns to the American culture as a way of identifying herself, rather than what she previously said. Her ambiguous characterisations originate from the fact that she feels that she must emphasise being American, now that she lives in Finland. If she was to live in the USA, she would probably find her personality as the most important factor attributing to her identity.

The Finnish influence in her manifests itself in the fact that she is much more patient and polite in Finland than she would be in the USA, which is due to her Finnish husband's great influence on her. Language affects her identity in the way that the words come out harsher in Finnish than she meant them to.

6.2.7 Subject F5

Background. F5 was born in the USA to an American mother and a Nigerian father. When her parents got divorced when she was a little girl, her mother moved to Finland with her. By the time of the interview, she had been in Finland for 17 years and is now married to a Finn. She evaluated her abilities in both Finnish and English on the highest level of 8 on the scale from 1-8.

Bilingualism. The possibility for fluent communication, the easiness of travel, the ability to read different kinds of literature, and a greater variety of imagination, humour, and different ways of expression are among the advantages of being bilingual. The greatest disadvantage for her is that she feels that she is only semilingual. The level of teaching English in her school in Finland was so low that she is afraid she is not fully fluent in either of the languages, but especially in English. A downside is also that, although she knows Finnish very well, she has not got the same kind of roots in the language that other people in Finland have.

Language loss. Her mother's English began to deteriorate when she had spent some time in Finland and F5 has noticed the same in herself. Her vocabulary is starting to disappear: she forgets words. Her English is not as fluent as it once was and although she writes good academic English, for Finnish standards, it would never be good enough in the USA. She is also afraid that this is as good as her English is ever going to get.

Language use. She uses English at home with her husband, her mother, and with most of her friends. They use code-switching among friends quite often. She also uses English if she is, for some reason, mad at someone, which is a way of making a difference between her and the person she is angry at. Her intuition tells her when to use Finnish. However, she mostly uses Finnish in formal occasions and in running

different errands. She also likes to curse in Finnish in the USA, because no one understands it there.

Biculturalism. When in the USA, she emphasises her Finnishness, but when she comes to Finland, she also behaves more like a Finn than an American. She thinks that she is culturally 100% Finnish, and not American at all. She has been more influenced by the Finnish society around her than by her mother's American influence alone. She feels very foreign when she is in the USA. However, she can also feel very comfortable or uncomfortable in Finland. She can be both proud and ashamed of traits in both cultures, but her greatest deficit is that she does not have deep enough roots in any one place she could relate to.

F5 claims to be much more than just bicultural. She says that the media and travelling can influence a person very much, because one can get plenty of new information from these sources. To her, it seems impossible that someone can claim to be monocultural. She still feels the most comfortable in the Finnish culture, but cannot forget that she is also influenced by the American and Nigerian cultures, and also by her religion.

Similarities and differences. She thinks that there are many similarities in between the Finnish and the American culture, but they are expressed in different ways, like the American equivalent for saunas are the baths. The basic values, like family and work are quite the same in the two countries, as well as nature. People in both cultures also believe in 'a higher force', i.e. they are religious.

Differences. She mentions the habit of the Americans to be very friendly to all people, whereas Finns only say friendly things if they mean it. The Finnish quietness is also a problem in the USA, where it is interpreted as very impolite. Small talk, which is still quite unfamiliar to the majority of Finns, is seen almost as an obligation in the USA. These differences are mainly communicational, but her American friends have noticed how close the houses are built to each other in Finland, whereas it is considered very important in the USA for people to have big backyards and a lot of space of their own.

Role between cultures. She has sometimes acted as a mediator to explain cultural differences. It seems to her that people sometimes do not even want to try to understand cultural differences. Her family in the USA is an example of this kind of difficult people, because they expect F5 to be American like her mother and cannot understand that she is more of a Finn than an American.

Family culture. Her family life with her husband is very Finnish, in the way that American culture does not play any role in it. She has been raised in a Finnish environment and it shows in her everyday choices. However, she emphasises that it is mostly their personal characteristics that shape their home life. She has had a long time to fit into the Finnish culture.

Entry problems. When she first came to Finland, she was very young and she found it hardest to leave her grandmother in the USA. The Finnish language seemed very difficult to understand and everything was new to her. She has the same feeling today when she travels abroad to a place where people do not speak English.

The fact that she felt mentally ill in the beginning affected her so much that she became also physically very ill. It was not until her fourth year in Finland, when she finally felt she would fit in. By that time she had made friends and was in a school that seemed much better than the one in the USA. She had to reshape herself from an American to fit into the Finnish culture. In 1991 it was still a little strange to see foreigners in Finland, especially when F5 had a darker skin than others. However, she has found that things have changed a lot these days, because more foreigners are living in Finland.

Expectations. She has found that people are delighted with the fact that she speaks Finnish fluently. She feels that people accept her better, and she has noticed that because of her skin colour people are twice as charmed at her bothering to learn Finnish. To her dismay, it seems that Finnish employers still prefer Finns, which has meant that it has been difficult for her to find work in Finland.

She does not know what people expect of her in the Finnish culture, but she believes that she meets the expectations they might have. At least in the way that she is very Finnish, except for her looks. She believes people expect her to think and live the way they are used to and also use the same speaking pattern. Americans seem to be surprised at her being critical sometimes, like she sees Finns to be.

Stereotypes. Some Americans seem to think that the Finns are all "barbaric, vodka-drinking perverts, who like to run naked and whip one another and have free sex all the time". Americans say that the only reason why anyone should come to Finland is to see "when the sun shines for 24 hours a day, all summer long".

Americans, on the other hand, are seen by Finns as: "selfish, money-oriented lawyers driving around in Rolls Royces, only eat hamburgers, and are megalomaniacs. They are also very urbanised and therefore out of touch with the nature". F5 wants to emphasise that these are only the most extreme views she has heard. She thinks that these kinds of stereotypes are brought about because of jealousy toward the other culture, to which she sees no reason.

Cultural Identity. She is very aware of her Finnish side when she speaks Finnish. She says it is because she is so close to the Finnish culture. It is much easier for her to notice how she relates more to the Finnish culture when she speaks Finnish. It is not the same with her English, because the American culture feels so distant that she feels more comfortable using Finnish.

Language and identity. Her humour and imagination are very different, depending on the culture and the language she uses. The Finnish sarcasm has found the way into her American side of humour as well. She also expresses herself quite differently, depending on the language she uses. When she has friends over from the USA, she feels a little lost with them, because they seem so different from her. One major difference she has noticed is that they are much more talkative than even she is. However, she has also found some difference between people from the East and West Coast of Finland, which means that one does not have to go abroad to notice such differences.

Relating. She mostly relates to her religion, which is the most important factor to her identification. Everything else in her life is less important.

6.2.8 Subject F6

Background. F6's mother is Danish and her father Finnish-Swedish. She had been living in Finland for a few years, by the time of the interview, studying Finnish. She evaluated her Finnish skills to be at the intermediate level (3-4), on the scale from 1-8. She was born in Italy and went to a kindergarten when she was three years old, and to an International school in Milan, where the language of education was English.

Bilingualism. F6's mother spoke English to her when she was younger, to help her at school. Her languages are Danish, from her mother's side; English from the kindergarten and school; and Swedish from her father's side. All her children's books were English, which helped her greatly in the language. A friend of hers once said that the books one reads as a child shape one as he or she gets older, which therefore has also had an effect on F6.

Advantages and disadvantages. Speaking more than one language enables her to function and interact with more people than those who know only one language. Learning new languages is also much easier when one already has a basis in several languages. She also thinks that bilingual people are more tolerant and open-minded. She cannot see any disadvantages in knowing more languages than just one.

Language loss. She's afraid of losing her Finnish skills, which is why she wants to speak Finnish all the time while in Finland and tries not to associate with foreign people who do not know Finnish. English is another language she is worried about losing, because she does not use it normally anymore, living in Denmark, which is why she would like to go to England for a longer period of time. She knows that she will gain back her skills in Italian and German also, if she stayed in those countries for some time.

Language use. She uses her Danish mostly with her Danish friends, but there are also some friends who she can speak English or Swedish with. She is used to code-switching and code-mixing languages with her friends and family. She speaks Swedish to her father and Danish to her mother. She remembered that it used to be difficult to know what language to speak to both of them, because there were so many languages to choose from.

Biculturalism. She sees that there are many differences between cultures. One thing she has noticed is connected with the Danish and Finnish Christmas traditions: much more paper decorations are made in Denmark. Christmas dinner with the family consists of food from Finland, England and Denmark, which is unlike a typical Danish Christmas dinner. The interview was done just before Christmas, which caused the subject to remember Christmas traditions, such as the similarities of the four advent candles, the smell of mandarins, and paper decorations. She also remembers well the English Christmas carols from her childhood.

Role between cultures. She has acted as a mediator between the cultures in one occasion when she was returning from Denmark to Finland and the plane to Jyväskylä was late. She saw some people from Denmark and England, who were distressed, because they did not understand the information from the loudspeakers. She could help them because the information was only given in Finnish and she explained to them what had been said, to each in their own language.

Entry problems. She has never experienced any difficulties in interacting with the Finns in the Finnish culture. She claims that the Finns have always been very positive towards her, which may be because she interacts with people who are culturally aware. Only in the earlier times, when settling in Finland, when she did not know the language she had difficulties with administration, like registering at the university. Everything became much easier when she learnt to speak Finnish.

Attitudes. People in Finland still notice her foreignness because of her accent, although she looks very Finnish. However, it has become harder to notice now that her pitch and intonation are also more accommodated.

She has also found that if she speaks a little faster, people cannot notice the accent so much. She is very tired of people always asking her where she is from. One can understand that, because her background is so difficult and long to explain.

Stereotypes. Finns drink a lot and they are very silent, both characterisations F6 has found to be true. She does not drink herself, but sees silence as a way of connecting to people and she is very comfortable with that. She says that she has experienced the Finns very ready to communicate with strangers. The few experiences she has had of Finns communicating with strangers, has lead her to believe that no matter what people say of the Finns, they are not so quiet as people want to stereotype them to be.

Cultural identity. She is multicultural and, indeed, says that she cannot really name any one culture that has affected her. She feels very comfortable in Finland and she might like to move to Finland in the future. She has never had any difficulties fitting in.

She has an ambiguous attitude towards people who are very clear of their 'fatherland' and 'mother tongue'. On one hand, she is intolerant with them, but on the other hand she is a little envious, because they have roots which she thinks she lacks. She does not understand clear-cut categorisations and opinions, or ideas about 'fatherland' that people have. This may be because she envies people who have clear identities and know where they belong. Roots are something she would like to have.

Relating. She is mostly related to her family, i.e. her parents, whom she mostly identifies with. She has many friends all over the world, but she still thinks that her parents as the most important factors in her life. Because her parents are from different cultures, she feels that she is a mixture of both of her parents' cultures.

Characterisation. She sees herself as a cosmopolitan, without any strong base in any of the cultures or countries. She compared herself to the Finns who have strong bonds to the country and the land, which she never feels. It could be considered unfortunate, but she herself is comfortable with it.

F6 has different functions for each language, and she thinks about different matters in each of them. For example, she uses English when she thinks and talks about emotional things. She says that her identity does not change with the change of language at all. She is so strongly aware of what she is as a multicultural person that her identity seems very strong.

6.3. Summary and discussion

In this chapter, I will present a summary of the key points of the study and discuss each of them, combining the subjects' answers with what other researchers have found about these key points and what this study has revealed.

6.3.1 Bilingualism

The personal estimations of the subjects on their degree of bilingualism varied greatly, from the basic to a native-like level, as was to be expected. The subjects were chosen according to my own view on bilingualism. As was mentioned above, in chapter 3.5, the view taken in this study is that of functional bilingualism, i.e. a person who is able to function in both of the languages in a non-native environment. All of the subjects met this requirement, some even surpassed it. All subjects, therefore, saw themselves more or less bilingual, when having a native-like competence in both of the languages was not required. The definitions of the subjects themselves of what bilingualism is varied from basic to native-like abilities.

A common belief regarding bilingualism is that one should have to be born into a mixed-ethnic family and acquire both of the languages in childhood, in order to be called a true bilingual. Earlier on, in this study, contrary views by different researchers were presented. However, in this study, F1 was the only one to be born into an English and Finnish speaking family in Finland, and she regarded herself as mastering both languages. Still, she was not the only one with equally good skills in both languages.

F2, who was born and raised in the USA in an American family and moved to Finland in her twenties, considered herself equally good in both Finnish and English. F5 considered herself also equally good in both languages, although she was born in the USA to an American woman and a Nigerian man and moved to Finland at the age of seven. As this example shows, one could claim that the two languages do not need to be acquired in childhood for a person to be regarded as bilingual, even when referring to native-like abilities. The only major difference that researchers have found between people who have become bilingual at an early age and those who have become bilingual later is in pronunciation.

Advantages. Researchers have also found mostly advantages in being bilingual, which could, however, be due to efforts in making bilingualism appreciated and respected, compared to the inferior state assigned to it by earlier research. The advantages Arnberg has found in her studies are greater self-confidence, ability to communicate with another language, a wider basis for thinking and experiencing, a chance to enjoy the yieldings of two cultures, and a positive attitude towards people with different cultural backgrounds (Arnberg 1989:41). Hansegård (1968:70) emphasises the knowledge of two cultures, brought about by the knowledge of two languages. He finds that it is possible for a bilingual to notice different nuances of matters in the world and thus apply them to his or her own values.

The subjects of this study found that there were mostly advantages in being bilingual. Overall, it made them feel surer of themselves, particularly concerning their linguistic abilities, which helped them in other languages as well. They also found resilience in their thoughts and attitudes and were favourably inclined towards different people and cultures. Some of the subjects saw that the most obvious advantage came from the knowledge of two linguistic systems, which enriches the use of both languages and makes expressions in both languages more divergent.

Apart from linguistic advantages, many subjects saw the advantages on the societal side of bilingualism. Knowing different languages enables people using them to interact and function in society and communicate with people about topics they find interesting. Many subjects also

thought that in order to be able to live in a society, one should learn its language because it makes the adaptation process so much easier.

In the area labelled 'intelligence', the advantages seen by the subjects are even more numerous. Most of the subjects saw that their overall thinking and attitudes towards new ideas and people were widened because of knowing more than one language. Using two or more languages was also seen as promoting one's overall intelligence. The results of earlier research on the effects of bilingualism on intelligence are contradictory, at best, however, most research seems to support the view that bilinguals are not more intelligent than monolinguals, but that the differences are between individuals. (For further discussion, see Adler 1977:25, Grosjean 1982:221, Arnberg 1989:23.) F6 summed up the positive influence of bilingualism on a person's thinking by saying that it makes one more tolerant and open-minded.

Bilingualism was also seen to open people to new cultures and also promote better understanding of their native cultures. One important way to get accustomed to a new culture was seen to be, for example, through its literature and travelling.

Disadvantages. Researchers, as well as the subjects in this study, have downplayed the disadvantages of bilingualism. The greatest disadvantages the subjects found were the deterioration of their native language, not being good enough in the second language, discrimination, and having no roots in the language. Research has also shown that it is perfectly natural, for an otherwise competent bilingual to sometimes suffer from momentary mental blockages, when the person cannot suddenly find the appropriate terms, as Baetens Beardsmore (1986:8) reports. He continues that this kind of blockage is possible in either of the languages.

Some subjects had also experienced discrimination in the Finnish society, because they do not speak the same way as the majority in the society does, but with a distinctly foreign accent. The powerful influence of language or dialect people speak is known to affect to other's attitudes about that person, as Padilla (1999:113-114) reports. He goes on to say

that some people think that the immigrants are taking an advantage of the society, in demanding services in their own mother tongue.

The subjects were each more or less afraid of losing their abilities in their native languages. For example, the fear of losing her native language made F4 to refuse to learn Finnish. Later on, when she realised that she really could never lose her native language, she started to learn Finnish. F5, in turn, claimed that she feels she is semilingual, which, according to previous research is not true (cf. chapter 3.5). However, she seems to be overly critical of herself, but as Hansegård (1968:51) reminds us, semilingualism can lead to deficiencies in emotional experiences, which F5 might be afraid of.

Language deterioration is a problem many bilinguals have experienced, as this study shows. Dorian (1999:34) claims that if one loses his or her native language, to whatever degree, it is much more difficult to recover than other markers of identity. She emphasises particularly the loss of cultural values, which are carried by the native language.

The subjects of this study who had children, or were planning to have them, were all determined to raise their children as bilinguals. The most popular method among them seemed to be the one parent-one language - method, which has been recommended by most researchers. The only exception was M2, who thought their child would learn enough Finnish from the society around him or her, so both him and his Finnish wife spoke English to the child.

Reactions to English. Most of the subjects found that Finnish people were very glad to see that a person they regarded as non-native had gone into the trouble of learning the difficult Finnish language. The subjects also reported that they got much better treated when speaking Finnish, and it was also easier to get accepted by Finns. They thus showed respect and understanding to the Finns, by speaking only Finnish when running errands in the city. They reported that they did not want to show off by speaking English. Quite probably, they were well aware of the fact that they would get better served when speaking Finnish.

Some subjects had experienced negative reactions to speaking English, such as discrimination, which is one of the reasons the subjects try to avoid speaking English in public. Some subjects saw the negative effect of speaking English to be that some people would see them as "free English lessons", which they refused to be. Other reasons include not wanting to be treated differently from others and some thought that they would get better treatment if they spoke Finnish. A very common reason for speaking Finnish was simply to show consideration to Finns. Sometimes it is useful to pretend not to know the language. It is quite common that when a person is known to be a foreigner, he or she is not expected to behave like a native, and therefore has more freedom in his or her actions and behaviour.

Language use. All of the subjects used Finnish when running errands in the city and at work, but as a whole, all the subjects used both languages every day. They also had friends with whom they were able to speak both languages, which was seen as a positive way to practice the use of the non-native language.

It was interesting to notice that some of the subjects used their English to get an upper hand over some Finnish-speaking natives. This usually happened when the subjects felt that they were in a submissive position in relation to the interlocutor, and wanted to repair that. They also used English, when they felt angry and wanted to master the situation. English was also used by some subjects in order to make a difference between themselves and the people they were speaking with. Other reasons many subjects mentioned for using English was in situations where they were unable to express themselves in Finnish.

To the dismay of the subjects, there are people, who insisted on speaking English, while the subjects themselves were trying to conduct their business in Finnish. The Finns do try to be nice, but the subjects felt their efforts to learn the language were not appreciated. Some found it particularly frustrating when they spoke Finnish in shops and people replied in English.

Usually, the language the bilinguals choose comes naturally, without extra effort. Grosjean (1982:130-141) describes some situations in which

a conscious choice is made. It can be made depending on the participants in the conversation, when the attention is on language proficiency. Some other examples given by Grosjean also mentioned by the subjects in this study, were choices according to kinship, intimacy and power relation. One could also see the influence of subconscious outside pressure in that every subject used Finnish while running errands.

Other reasons for choosing a particular language come from situational factors, according to Grosjean (1982). Obviously, the presence of a monolingual is an important factor in showing consideration, as well as the degree of intimacy and formality. One more reason affecting the choice is content-based; i.e. which language is better for the topic and vocabulary.

The last reason Grosjean mentions for choosing the language, is the function of interaction. This describes the way many of the subjects in this study used English to raise their status in a particular situation, or that some used it to create social distance, or for excluding or including people. Solidarity within a group speaking the same language(s) was mentioned by the subjects as one reason to choose a different language from that used by others. Code-switching and code-mixing were also among the distinct uses of languages. In this study, F4 also used English for requesting or commanding (bullying), which was also presented by Grosjean. (Grosjean 1982: 130-141.)

6.3.2 Biculturalism

All subjects in this study saw themselves as bilingual, but fewer saw themselves as bicultural. There are no clear requirements for who is or is not bicultural, as there are for bilingualism, which makes it a bit harder to define who is bicultural and who is not. However, all of the subjects demonstrated some effect of this non-native culture in them, which suggests that they were affected by the two cultures, which is why this research was conducted in order to see how great the cultural influence was on them. Some of the subjects were more influenced by it than others.

Advantages. Most of the advantages the researchers see in biculturalism are in the area of intelligence. Skutnabb-Kangas (1988:191) sees that the

greatest advantage is in understanding other cultures, followed by respect for them. She also believes that knowing about other cultures helps people to understand their own culture better. The advantage Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:53) believe in is that bicultural people, while they have the talent of shifting perspectives, are also able to have more perspective on different things. They also believe that bicultural people can see things as more diverse and even as opposites. Therefore, they are able to illustrate these diversities and opposites also to monocultural people (Seelye and Wasilewski 1996:67).

Some of the advantages the subjects found in biculturalism are similar to the advantages of bilingualism, e.g. that biculturalism widens a person's thinking abilities. Other reasons included realising that there are different ways of doing things, but not necessarily better ways. The knowledge of different cultures is also seen as a positive side of biculturalism. M2 expressed the feeling which was probably in most of the subjects' minds when saying that the advantage of being bicultural is that one does not offend other people.

Disadvantages. F1, who grew up in Finland suffered from bullying at school, because of her different background, which is still a sore memory for her. A great disadvantage for some others was that they did not have deep enough roots in either of the cultures, which could lead to problems of identity, at some point in life. The concept of 'post-modern identity' (cf. chapter 5.3), demonstrates that this kind of rootlessness is becoming ever more common.

Similarities and differences. All the subjects noticed different kinds of similarities and differences between the Finnish culture and their respective cultures. Their notions varied greatly. Most Americans mentioned valuing home, family and religion as the biggest similarities between Finnish and American cultures. One of them (F3) even claimed that Finland is said to be the 'most Americanised country in Europe'.

Some subjects in this study had noticed that Finns often ask the question: "Why did you come to Finland when you could have gone anywhere else?". The subjects say that this kind of behaviour is very different from the behaviour in other cultures they are familiar with. Another big

difference among the countries is what one subject (F2) had noticed was that she would never be accepted to the Finnish culture, no matter how well she spoke the language of fitted in. The situation is different in the USA where foreigners are better welcomed in the society. For two of the subjects (M2 and F4), the family values, such as differences in child rearing and family relationships, are those which have not been replaced by the Finnish ones. Skutnabb-Kangas (1988:234) notes that family values is, indeed, the area most resistant to acculturation.

Finns seem to behave very differently towards strangers in their everyday lives than the Americans or the English do, as was commented by the subjects. The main difference in the behaviour of the Finns that the subjects had noticed is the non-existence of communication with people passing on the streets. The Finns only seem to greet those people they know. M2 has solved the problem by not greeting anyone.

Role between cultures. The task most bicultural or bilingual people face these days is acting as a mediator between the two or more cultures in contact. Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:140) call this task "building bridges between the cultures". They see that the knowledge of the language, as well as the knowledge of the culture are crucial in these situations. They also say that bilingual and bicultural people thus create a culture of their own.

In this study, the subjects who had acted as mediators between different cultures had tried to introduce the view that people should not evaluate the Finnish culture according to what they are used to in their native cultures. The subjects also tried to emphasise the good sides of the Finnish culture. Most subjects had also tried to explain the differences in the Finnish culture, and the reasons behind them, which they felt were important to understand, in order to fit in the society better. Most of them found it very useful if there was someone to explain the differences to them, when they were first settling in Finland.

According to researchers it is unavoidable that people view a new culture from the perspective of their native one. Singer (1998:3) notes that the groups which a person has been raised in affect one greatly, and therefore

it is only natural to observe a new culture through the eyes of a person's native culture, which, however, can be hazardous sometimes.

Acculturation. The subjects were asked if they had found any difficulties in entering the Finnish culture and society. All subjects, except F6 had experienced some kind of difficulties in entering the culture. Even F1 confessed having some identity problems. For most of the subjects, language presented the biggest problems while entering. Most of the subjects had experienced that inadequate knowledge of the language was the first and the most difficult thing.

All subjects, except F1 and F6, had trouble understanding the Finnish mentality, and some had even experienced rejection from the Finns, which caused obvious discomfort. They all said that the situation had become better in the recent years, because it seems that the younger generation of Finns is more tolerant and open-minded towards foreigners. Today, as many of the subjects mentioned, the Finns are very happy to find that a foreigner has gone through the trouble of learning the difficult Finnish language. The positive result of that is that it influences people's attitudes towards foreigners very favourably.

It was very difficult for F5 to leave her relatives, particularly her grandmother, to the USA, because she was so young when she moved to Finland. She therefore experienced some acculturation stress also, which later on, even lead to physical symptoms. The symptoms F5 described, were common enough to be known to researchers, such as Trenholm and Jensen (1992:379), who list insomnia, depression and other physical illnesses as possible effects of acculturation stress. The psychological symptoms they list include helplessness, social isolation and the need to return home, which all apply to F5.

F4 found it difficult to gain new friends, because she was not particularly sociable. The problem of not being sociable enough has also been recognised as one of the obstacles of acculturation. Trenholm and Jensen (1992:384) list open-mindedness, tolerance and outgoingness as ways to an easier adaptation to a new culture. After the initial obstacles in adaptation are conquered and some time has passed, during which a person has learnt how to cope in the new environment, his or her

psychological health is seen to improve and the process finally leads to an intercultural identity and a sense of belonging. (Trenholm and Jensen 1992:385).

Misunderstandings. Most of the misunderstandings the subjects have experienced in the Finnish culture have been communicational, particularly non-verbal communication, such as silence and body language, has caused problems. Another example is the way people do not stop and talk to others when passing in the streets, which was first quite hard for the subjects to understand. Small talk, which is very common and almost a coerced practice in the USA, is virtually non-existent in Finland, which presents many problems for communication in other countries.

On the behavioural side, one subject (F1) has found that even though people in Finland do not look each other in the eyes, it is not accepted in England either, contrary to what one might think. Contrary to this, some of the subjects also claimed that they had difficulties in getting used to not looking people in the eyes in Finland, when it was so common in cultures they came from. I do not know if it is just a myth that people look each other in the eyes everywhere else except in Finland, but it is such a strong belief that it might be hard to refute. Some subjects have also experienced that Finns expect them to behave in the way they had thought people from particular cultures behave. When the subjects did not correspond to these expectations, Finns seemed very surprised, even in such small matters as drinking coffee instead of tea.

Barna (1996:373-375) presents some hindrances against a successful acculturation. One of them being that the cause for misunderstandings may lay in language differences, like those described above. Other critical errors suggested by Barna include the very common assumption that all cultures are basically similar, a mistake which was also found in the experiences of the subjects in this study. One should not either approve or disapprove of matters in different cultures. Two subjects (F4 and F5) had had some problems with their American families, who seem to see the Finnish culture as having more negative sides. This kind of evaluation makes it hard to get to know the culture. (Barna 1996:373-375).

Expectations. The expectations the subjects had experienced varied also greatly, but one was common to some of them: most of them had noticed that in Finland people expected them to behave in a stereotypical manner, and were surprised to find that they did not. Most of the subjects have found that Finns have great expectations of what foreigners should be like. In order to learn not to treat the representatives of other cultures as stereotypical, people should do as Collier (1996:44) suggests and remember that the identities are not stable but change continuously and are largely dependent on personal characteristics.

Some subjects remarked that people in their home countries expected them not to have changed at all by the influence of another culture, no matter how long their residence in that country. This was particularly felt by F5, who did not feel that she was at all part of the American society, although people there wanted to see her as an American.

Stereotypes. As to stereotypes, the most common feature describing the Finns seemed to be their drinking, whether at home or abroad. This particular behaviour is very visible and might, therefore, be considered the most common stereotype of the Finns.

The subjects were not directly asked about stereotypes, but were asked what they thought a typical American, Finn, Englishman etc. was like. This was done to avoid any negative influences that the choice of words might cause. However, all the subjects used the word 'stereotype' in their answers. In most cases, it seemed that the stereotypes they presented were quite extreme, as some of them also admitted. Finns were seen as sulky, no talk-no kiss -kind of people, but also as honest and straightforward.

The subjects also mentioned stereotypes of the English and the Americans. The English were seen as sociable, open, and talkative, but still a bit shallow, direct and loyal to friends. The stereotypes about Americans were that they were very strict and straightforward and they were expected to organise big parties and drive around in fancy cars. Some people have typecasted the Americans as loud and inconsiderate.

6.3.3 Cultural Identity

The majority of the subjects, naturally, felt most influenced by their native culture, except F5, who was quite young when she moved to Finland. Most of the subjects said that their native culture has the greatest influence on their personality. For F1 and F5, the Finnish side was the most powerful one, because they had grown up in Finland. However, all subjects admitted that Finnish culture had left some marks in their personality, mostly because they had lived in Finland for such a long time. Many subjects also said that their friends and family have had a great effect on them.

For example, F6 saw herself as such a mixture of cultures that she could not name any particular culture's influence on her. She said she is so multicultural that she would almost call herself cosmopolitan. The definition offered by Friedman (1994:245) states that a cosmopolitan is "moving between continents and ways of life, ... an identity that may strive to encompass all this variation and apparent mixture may emerge. ... an insecure modernism without roots". This kind of a categorisation clearly identifies F6 as a true cosmopolitan. A 'cosmopolitan' could also be regarded as an emerging trend for many people, who possess a post-modern identity (cf. chapter 5.3).

The biggest effects of Finnishness the subjects noticed about themselves, were the quietness and their silent side. Some of them said that silence was in their nature anyway, so it could not be considered an influence of the Finnish culture. An interesting topic for a study would be to find out whether it is easier for foreigners, who are silent in their nature, to accommodate themselves into the Finnish culture, than it is for the more talkative ones. Another interesting question would also be whether these silent types are the ones who seek their way to Finland.

Another common habit of the Finns they saw in themselves was that they did not greet anyone on the streets, even when they went back to their native cultures, where they were supposed to do that. This behaviour created some misunderstandings in their lives, when they visited their home country.

Integrating into the Finnish society. As mentioned above, all of the subjects were more or less adapted in the Finnish society at least, as well as could be expected from a non-native. Only F4 claimed that she stands out in the Finnish society, mostly because of her behaviour and loudness.

F2 was the only one who claimed to have had some trouble in integrating into the Finnish society. She seemed to want to become a part of the society, but claimed that she felt that barriers were built against her, which prevented her becoming a member of the society. Not being integrated in the Finnish society was, therefore, not her own choice. Another subject (M2) agreed with this, to some degree, and said that there are some extremist people who will never see foreigners as Finns. However, he has been well accepted at his work and has no complaints.

Even though F2 wants to be seen as a part of the Finnish community, she is still viewed as an outsider. A common feature of a society, which applies to Finland as well is identified by Adler (1977:37). He says that even if a bilingual spoke the language grammatically and semantically correct, the person would soon be recognised as a foreigner and treated accordingly. The problem of not fitting in seems to be an acknowledged problem, as Seelye and Wasilewski (1996: 54) comment. They say that even though a bilingual would qualify for the linguistic traits described by Adler (1977), he or she would still be regarded as "not without impurity", and many would regard him or her as false. However, there is a bright side to it: according to Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:144), this kind of an attitude allows people greater freedom of action, because they are not expected to behave the same way as other people in the society.

The problem of treating foreigners differently could be a characteristic of a small town, where everyone knows each other and every person is monitored by others. This kind of small-town mentality was only shown in the case of one subject, but not in the cases of others, who lived in Jyväskylä. Jyväskylä, although not being a very big city compared even nationally, still possesses ethnically more varied population than many smaller towns. A future area of research could be to find out how the attitudes of big and small towns differ in welcoming foreigners.

The subjects were first asked to characterise themselves in a way they would tell others what or who they were (see chapter 6.3). Only one of the subjects answered by defining her culture, and that was for practical reasons, in order to avoid long and complicated explanation on her background. Some characterisations concerned family, and some religion. This question was thought to separate the cultural aspect from the personal identity, if the subjects saw it necessary to do so. Everyone was given a chance to characterise him- or herself with the word that most described them.

Some said that their families were the most important ones for characterising them and that their family culture was unlike any other family, and therefore constituted a culture in itself. They were thus also most influenced by it. The identities of two subjects (M2 and F4) were, in this connection, purely personal, with culture having very little effect on it. However, subsequently F4 contradicted her previous answer and said that the cultural identity was still the stronger one.

The subjects were also asked directly what they thought the composition of their cultural identity would be, and some even gave percentages as answers. All the subjects replied having some kind of a cultural/ethnic identity, which was affected by both native and Finnish culture. Two subjects (F1 and F6) saw themselves mostly in cultural terms, whereas only one subject (M2) thought that his personality affected his identity more than any culture. Most of the subjects, however, saw that Finnish influence was unavoidable, when living in Finland.

Two subjects (F3 and F5) saw themselves mostly identifying through their respective religions. It is clear that for everyone, some groups are more important to their personal identification and behaviour than others. Singer (1998: 79-83) claims that the trend today seems to be moving away from group identification towards one's own, personal desires. He also says that the context of the situation is the dominant factor determining the identity used. Many of the subjects therefore indicated a wide variety of identities important to them. The personal identity comes into the picture, according to Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:116), in times when existing roles are not applicable anymore, and the only choice for a person is to play oneself, convincingly enough. The importance of church

and religion, compared with the importance of other subgroups, to many of the subjects could also be explained, as Trenholm and Jensen (1992:368) say, by the fact that some subgroups are simply more important to people than others and therefore have the greatest effect on the person.

Two subjects (F5 and F6) mentioned that they almost envied the monocultural Finns, because they had roots were to belong to, whereas F5 and F6 felt they did not. Featherstone (1995:142-143) recognises this feeling and says that the concept of 'national identity' emphasises the concepts of 'fatherland', 'roots' and so on, and that some people might feel themselves excluded of it. Featherstone also says that a homeland used to be a place where people could return to, after spending time away. He claims that the modern times have abolished this idea of home and replaced it with homelessness, as a concept characteristic to multicultural people.

Language and identity. The subjects saw that their identities did not change with the change of the language they used. However, most of them could notice a difference in their thoughts or behaviour, when changing the language. They still adapted themselves to the Finnish language, some by trying to fulfil what was expected of them. F3 and F4 have found that when they translate something from English to Finnish, the words come out sounding much harsher than what they meant. This can be attributed, according to Baetens Beardsmore (1986:23-24) to the ignorance of the cultural attributes accompanying the language. In such a case, it is easy to confuse the listener.

F3 said that language affects her identity, which she changes like a chameleon, according to what the situation requires. She also experiences solidarity with people with whom she can switch between languages. Solidarity was experienced with other subjects as well, as a common bond with the people speaking the same language. As Singer (1998:7) points out, language makes communication much easier among people speaking the same language, and it excludes those who do not. That way it strengthens the feelings of belonging.

6.3.4 Discrimination

Most of the subjects in this study had experienced more or less severe discrimination in Finland. Some felt they were not totally accepted in the society, or had difficulties in finding work. Some had experienced discrimination in running their errands.

The subjects were asked what could be done to change the situation. Some of them thought that people should avoid generalisations and stereotyping and that the more foreigners came to Finland, the better understanding it would create. Haarmann (1999:73), on the other hand, sees that this kind of an 'overdose' of foreignness is not a favourable option, because so much depends on each person's communicational flexibility and openness for cultural diversity. (see also Featherstone 1995:89.) Some subjects also believed in people to people contact to provide better understanding. Travel, student exchange programmes, and becoming more confident in English, are some of the factors that were seen to affect a positive change. However, foreigners were not relieved from the responsibility of contributing to the process. For example, F3 said that they should not receive any kinds of special privileges. Foreigners should also remember that they are their ambassadors of their countries and behave accordingly.

Baker (1988:114) sees that people's attitudes are modified by experience, and that such an attitude change is essential for peaceful co-existence. Seelye and Wasilewski (1996:68) see cultural exchange as the basis for the survival of the human species. Even though the modern identities are seen as fragile and uncertain, there is still hope for the appreciation of ethnic identity, as Haarmann (1999:74) suggests. He says that in the future, "ethnic identity can be a source of cultural enrichment, which can assume a significant role in balancing self-esteem and the recognition of others in interethnic relations". Finally, it is not only the different cultures, which are, in each case, prone to discrimination. M2 wants to remind us of something he had just realised himself of his own native culture; that is, "The English treat their women terribly".

7 CONCLUSION

Cultural identity is becoming an important issue in today's world, when more and more people are moving from one country to another, whether it is after work, family, or other reasons. The idea of a monocultural nation is becoming ever more rare with the influx of immigrants which is why all nations should try to find ways to accommodate their new inhabitants into the society. This study does not claim to have the answers to different questions which arise from such situations, but is more of a view to the lives of some foreign inhabitants in Finland.

This study aimed at answering the question of cultural identity, but it was not as easy as expected. It seemed that most of the subjects had not really thought about it, which made getting the answers quite difficult. The reasons behind this fact might be that although the English-speaking people in Finland are clearly a minority, they are scattered, do not seem to have close bonds between each other, and they seem to have no organised events or celebrations, compared to other, more visible minorities. In addition to this, their cultural backgrounds seem to be so varied that it is difficult to unify them only with language or ethnicity.

Moreover, it seems that a common threat to culture, discrimination or desire to gain a better status in the majority society bring unity, which are matters that the subjects in this study had not encountered. In addition to this, the English language is quite valued, at least among the majority of people in Finland. This could be the reason why the subjects did not experience any kind of threat against their language which, if experienced, might have created stronger cohesiveness in defence of their native language. English is a world language which extends its influence through the media to every Finnish home which means that most of Finns already know the language and are glad to get a chance to practice it.

All of the subjects were more or less well-to-do, and had jobs and good education, which must make it easier to adjust in the new society. Indeed, the subjects seemed to like their lives in Finland, each for his or her own,

particular reasons. One major factor must have been that they were accepted as a part of the Finnish society.

The cultural or ethnic identity did not, seem to be a major factor in their lives, compared to other aspects. The fact therefore emerged that they seemed not to think of themselves as a coherent group, but as individuals, who, seemingly, did not have culturally or identitywise much in common. More consistent results, in my opinion, would be achieved if research were conducted among the Somali, for example, who seem to have a close-knit group identity.

The respective identities for these subjects emerged in different situations, depending on which side of identity seemed best to fit the particular situation. One could also think of these identities as roles which people choose to play in different situations. The effect of culture, however, showed itself in each of the subjects, but these characteristics did not profoundly affect their identities which was contrary to what this study was set to prove. In other words, their cultural identities were not very strong, although they all claimed to have one.

One could say that only two of the subjects looked at themselves in cultural terms, namely F1 and F6. Their background is similar; they are children of mixed cultural marriages, but so is F3, who did not present a strong cultural identity, which is difficult to explain. F3 said that she used to be quite aware of the cultural side of her identity before she became a Christian, after which she mostly identified with that religion. It could be interesting to find out, if religion is a stronger denominator than culture, in questions of identity. Research could also be carried out on the children of the different subjects interviewed for this study and see how their views have changed, compared to the views of their parents.

The discrimination that some of the subjects faced was still on a small-scale, compared to some publicised cases in Finland. Reasons behind this phenomenon could be many. Some of them might be that the looks of most of the subjects did not differ from the looks of Finns and most of them had jobs and good education, which meant that they did not live off the social welfare system. A survey could be made to see what Finns

really think of people like the subjects in this study, if they notice them at all in their everyday lives.

What some of the subjects, and the researcher, would like to remind people of is the diversity and multiplicity of non-native people in Finland, who could be valuable in giving expert information to those who need it, concerning business in and relations to a particular country. It seems that people do not know how to best co-operate with such people here in Finland.

This study seemed to open more questions than it answered. Some of the future areas of research were mentioned above, like the relation of religion to cultural identity, the effect of the size of the community in cases of adaptation, and the question whether some characteristics in their personalities help foreigners to adapt. It could also be interesting to study the theory of post-modern identity. As a positive side of this study, it opened a view to the lives of these particular people. It is clear that the results could not be generalised to concern others, because this was a case study of these eight English-Finnish -speaking bilingual people.

There is not much research directed at the same phenomenon this study did, and therefore points of comparison were harder to find. A lot of research was done on coherent minority groups, but this was a study about an incoherent cultural group, which clearly affected the results. Because this group was culturally so disconnected, they showed more concern with their own lives and personal values.

Identities are never stable, but always changing, which many researchers have already proved. This study also came to the same conclusion. The main finding of this study, was that the cultural identity of the subjects varied greatly in its intensity, strength and importance. Some researchers, as quoted in chapter 6.3.3, have commented on the fact that the identity of bilingual people in the future will become more varied and ever more personal, which this study could be seen to prove.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, Max K. 1977. *Collective and individual bilingualism - a sociolinguistic study*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Hamburg.
- Arnberg, Lenore 1989. *Tavoitteena kaksikielisyys*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Baetens Beardsmore, Hugo 1986. *Bilingualism: basic principles*. 2nd edition. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, Colin 1988. *Key issues in bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baldwin, John R. and Michael L. Hecht 1995. The layered perspective of cultural (in) tolerances- the roots of a multidisciplinary approach in Richard L. Wiseman (ed.), *Intercultural communication theory*, Thousand Oaks: Sage, 59-91.
- Barlund, Dean C. 1996. Communication in a global village, in Larry A. Samovar and Richard E. Porter (eds.), *Intercultural communication: a reader*. 8th edition. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 27-36.
- Barna, Laray M. 1996. Stumbling blocks of intercultural communication, in Samovar and Porter (eds.) 1996, 370-379.
- Bauman, Zygmunt 1996. From pilgrim to tourist- or a short history of identity, in Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay (eds.), *Questions of cultural identity*, London: Sage, 18-36.
- Berry, John W., Joseph E. Trimble and L. Olmedo Esteban 1986, Assessment of acculturation, in Walter J. Lonner and John W. Berry (eds.), *Field methods in cross-cultural research*, Beverly Hills: Sage, 291-325.
- Bourhis, Richard Y. and David E. Marshall 1999, The United States and Canada, in Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*, New York: Oxford University Press, 244-266.
- Brück, Ulla 1988, Identity, local community and local identity, in Lauri Honko (ed.), *Tradition and cultural identity*, Turku: The Royal Adolphus Academy, Uppsala and the Nordic Institute of Folklore, 77-93.
- Carbaugh, Donal 1990, Culture talking about itself, in Donal Carbaugh (ed.), *Cultural communication and intercultural contact*, New Jersey: Erlbaum, 1-9.

- Castells, Manuel 1997. *The power of identity*. Massachusetts: Blackwell, Malden.
- Collier, Mary Jane 1996. Cultural identity and intercultural communication, in Samovar and Porter (eds.) 1996, 36-44.
- Collier, Mary Jane and Milt Thomas 1988, Cultural identity: an interpretive perspective, in Young Yun Kim and William B Gudykunst (eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication*, Newbury Park: Sage. 99-120.
- De Vos, George 1983, Ethnic identity and minority status: some psycho-cultural considerations, in Anita Jacobson-Widding (ed.), *Identity: personal and socio-cultural*, Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International. 135-158.
- Edwards, John (1985) 1988. *Language, society and identity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Featherstone, Mike 1995. *Undoing culture- globalization, postmodernism and identity*. London: Sage.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1999, Concluding comments, in Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*, New York: Oxford university press, 444-454.
- Friedman, Jonathan 1994. *Cultural identity and global process*. London: Sage.
- Gilroy, Paul 1997, Diaspora and the detours of identity, in Kathryn Woodward (ed.), *Identity and difference*, London: Sage, 299-346.
- Greenwood, John D. 1994. *Realism, identity and emotion*. London: Sage.
- Grosjean, Francois 1982. *Life with two languages. An introduction to bilingualism*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Grossberg, Lawrence 1996, Identity and cultural studies- Is that all there is?, in Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay (eds.), *Questions of cultural identity*, London: Sage. 87-107.
- Haarmann, Harald 1999, History, in Fishman (ed.), 1999, 60-76.
- Hall, Stuart 1996, Introduction: Who needs 'identity', in Hall and du Gay (eds.) 1996, 1-17.
- Hamers, Josiane F. and Michel H. A. Blanc 1989. *Bilinguality and bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hansegård, Nils Erik 1968. *Kaksikielisiä vai puolikielisiä?*. Vaasa: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Hedge, Radha S. 1998, Swinging the trapeze- the negotiation of identity among Asian Indian Immigrant Women in the United States, in

- Dolores V. Tanno and Alberto Gonzáles (eds.), *Communication and identity across cultures*, Thousand Oaks: Sage, 34-55.
- Hornby, Peter A. 1977, Bilingualism: an introduction and overview, in Peter A. Hornby (ed.), *Bilingualism. Psychological, social, and educational implications*. London: Academic Press, 1-13.
- Kim, Young Yun 1995, Cross-cultural adaptation- an integrative theory, in Richard L. Wiseman (ed.), *Intercultural communication theory*, Thousand Oaks: Sage, 170-193.
- Kim, Young Yun 1996, Intercultural personhood: an integration of Eastern and Western perspectives, in Samovar and Porter (eds.) 1996, 434-447.
- Meisel, Jürgen, M. 1989, Early differentiation of languages in bilingual children, in Kenneth Hyldenstam and Loraine K. Obler (eds.), *Bilingualism across the lifespan. aspects of acquisition, maturity, and loss*, Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. 13-40.
- Lambert, Wallace E. 1977, The effects of bilingualism on the individual cognitive and sociocultural consequences, in Hornby (ed.) 1977, 15-27.
- Lanehart, Sonja L. 1999, African American Vernacular English, in Fishman (ed.), 1999, 211-225.
- Liebkind, Karmela 1999, Social psychology, in Fishman (ed.) 1999, 140-151.
- Porter, Richard E. and Larry A. Samovar 1996, An introduction to intercultural communication, in Samovar and Porter (eds.), 5-26.
- Romaine, Suzanne 1995. *Bilingualism*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sahaf, Ali Reza 1994. *Language, identity and social behaviour: a sociocultural approach to the study of the concept "will" on the effectiveness of the "how's" and "why's" of bilingualism*. Linköping: Linköping University.
- Seelye H. Ned and Jacqueline Howell Wasilewski 1996. *Between cultures. Developing self-identity in a world of diversity*. Lincolnwood: NTC Publishing Group.
- Selmer, Jorgen 1988, "Cultural groups" and the study of life-styles and cultural identity, in Lauri Honko (ed.) 1988. 47-77.
- Singer, Marshall R. 1998. *Perception and identity in intercultural communication*. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove apunaan Ilka Kangas ja Kea Kangas 1988. *Vähemmistö, kieli ja rasismi*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

- Trenholm, Sarah and Arthur Jensen 1992. *Interpersonal communication*.
2nd edition. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Weinreich, Peter 1983, Psychodynamics of personal and social identity,
in Jacobson-Widding (ed.) 1983, 159-185.
- Woodward, Kathryn 1997, Concepts of identity and difference, in
Woodward (ed.) 7-62.

APPENDIX 1

YLEISET KIELITUTKINNOT

TAITOTASOKUVAUKSET

- 8** Viestii tehokkaasti, luontevasti ja vivahteikkaasti vaativissakin suullisissa ja kirjallisissa kielenkäyttötilanteissa. Kielenkäyttö muistuttaa enimmäkseen syntyperäisen taitoa. Vain eri sävyjen välittäminen tai idiomien käyttäminen voi joskus tuottaa vaikeuksia.
- 7** Viestii kohtalaisen tehokkaasti ja luontevasti vaativissakin suullisissa ja kirjallisissa kielenkäyttötilanteissa. Kieli on monipuolista ja sujuvaa. Vähäiset epätarkkuudet ja muiden kielten vaikutus eivät ole häiritseviä. Ymmärtää vaivatta vaativiakin aihepiirejä käsiteltävää kieltä.
- 6** Viestii luontevasti tavallisissa kielenkäyttötilanteissa. Myös sosiaalisesti ja sisällöllisesti vaativissa tilanteissa selviytyy tyydyttävästi. Muiden kielten vaikutusta ja muuta ilmaisun epätarkkuutta esiintyy, mutta se häiritsee harvoin viestintää. Vaativia aihepiirejä käsiteltäessä joutuu joskus turvautumaan toistopyyntöihin tai sanakirjaan.
- 5** Selviytyy tavallisesti suullisissa ja kirjallisissa kielenkäyttötilanteissa melko luontevasti ja vaivattomasti sekä työssä että vapaa-aikana. Hallitsee kielen perusrakenteet ja keskeisen sanaston, ja joutuu vain harvoin turvautumaan toistopyyntöihin tai sanakirjaan. Muiden kielten vaikutus ja muu ilmaisun epätarkkuus rajoittavat viestintää vain joskus.
- 4** Selviytyy tavallisissa suullisissa ja kirjallisissa kielenkäyttötilanteissa kohtalaisen hyvin sekä työssä että vapaa-aikana. Muiden kielten vaikutus kielenkäyttöön voi olla tuntuva. Sujuvuus ja sanaston ja kieliopin hallinta ovat jo suhteellisen hyviä, mutta mahdollisesti keskenään eri tasoisia. Ymmärtääkseen esimerkiksi lehtiartikkelin tai muun tavallisen tekstin pääasiat tarvitsee vain joskus sanakirjaa.
- 3** Kielitaito riittää tavallisimmin suullisissa ja kirjallisissa käytännön tilanteissa selviämiseen, mutta uudet tilanteet aiheuttavat vaikeuksia. Ymmärtää vaivatta hidasta ja selkeää puhetta ja saa yleensä selvää helpon tekstin, esimerkiksi lyhyen lehti uutisen pääasioista.
- 2** Kielitaito riittää yksinkertaisissa tutuissa suullisissa ja kirjallisissa rutiinitilanteissa selviämiseen. Saa ainakin sanakirjan avulla selvän yksinkertaisista viesteistä. Uusissa tilanteissa syntyy kuitenkin usein ymmärtämisongelmia ja väärinkäsityksiä.
- 1** Kielitaito riittää muutamista yksinkertaisimmista suullisista ja kirjallisista viestintätilanteista selviämiseen. Ymmärtää tuttua asiaa käsittelevästä viestistä tai keskustelusta jotakin, ainakin aihepiirin. Tuntee jonkin verran kielen perusrakenteita ja -sanastoa.

APPENDIX 2**Interview Questions (Framework)**Bilingualism

Advantages/disadvantages of being bilingual?

Are you sometimes afraid of losing your native language?

How do you use your different languages and with which people?

Are there different ways / situations / people you use your languages with?

How have the languages you speak affected to ways people see you?

- Do you think people categorise you more by language / personality / behaviour?

Biculturalism

Advantages / disadvantages?

What differences have you noticed between the two cultures?

Similarities?

Have you been between the two cultures sometimes? What is your role? (mediator), How did you act?

Have you experienced any difficulties in Finnish culture? What kind, why, how did you manage?

Which culture do you base your ways of behaviour / actions / norms on?

Describe an event you felt misunderstood in? How managed? Failures in communication?

Have you become more aware of the positive sides of your native culture when in Finland?

How do cultures show in your family?

Cultural conflicts in family life?

Cultural identity

Which groups do you feel socially belonging to?

Do you feel like 'fitting in' or 'standing out' in the Finnish culture?

How do you categorise yourself? (family, nationality, else) How do you think of yourself?

How do you think of yourself related to others (family, friends, work, culture)?

Where do you think you belong in the society? (how do you measure it, what's important)

What is the real YOU? Does it show in everyday interaction?
Do you act as people expect you to? What expectations have you noticed they have?
Do you somehow emphasise your identity of either culture? How?
How do you think your identity is composed of, culturally?
How much language affects your identity? (does it change with language?)
Does this make you feel more like a part of either culture?

Representatives

Have you heard of any typical representatives mentioned of either culture? What?
Are you a typical representative of your culture(s)?