

CONSTRUCTING FAMILY LANGUAGE POLICY
A Case-study on bilingual family language policy

Bachelor's thesis
Sanna-Kaisa Viljamaa

University of Jyväskylä
Department of Languages
English
10 April 2012

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Sanna-Kaisa Viljamaa	
Työn nimi – Title CONSTRUCTING FAMILY LANGUAGE POLICY A case-study on bilingual family language policy	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti	Työn laji – Level Kandidaatin tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Huhtikuu 2012	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 26 sivua
Tiivistelmä – Abstract <p>Tutkielman tarkoituksena oli tarkastella kaksikielisten perheiden kielipolitiikkaan vaikuttavia tekijöitä. Tiedetään, että kaksikielisten perheiden vanhempien kielikäytännöllä on suuri vaikutus lapsen kielelliselle kehitykselle; useat tutkimukset ovat osoittaneet, että perheen kielipolitiikalla on merkittävä vaikutus siihen, tuleeeko lapsesta kaksikielinen vai ei. Sen vuoksi on mielekästä tutkia millaisia ratkaisuja kaksikieliset perheet tekevät kielikäytäntönsä suhteen, ja mitkä tekijät ovat olleet vaikuttamassa näihin ratkaisuihin. Tämän tutkielman tavoitteena oli omalta osaltaan olla lisäämässä tietämystä näistä tekijöistä.</p> <p>Vaikka kaksikielisistä perheistä on olemassa paljon tutkimusta, on tutkimus kuitenkin usein keskittynyt ns. keskivertoperheisiin, joissa on kaksi vanhempaa ja kaksi lasta. Keski-ikäisistä poikkeavia perheitä on tutkittu vähän. Koska tunsin muutamia kaksikielisiä perheitä, joissa lapsiluku on suurempi kuin kaksi, tartuin aiheeseen siitä näkökulmasta, josko perheen koko ja sisarusten määrä olisi yksi tekijä, jolla on vaikutusta perheen kielikäytäntönsä suhteen. Tähän tutkimukseen osallistuneissa kahdessa perheessä oli molemmissa seitsemän lasta. Perheet asuivat Suomessa ja niissä puhuttiin sekä suomea että englantia. Tutkimus toteutettiin haastattelemalla perheiden vanhempia.</p> <p>Tutkimustulokset osoittivat, että vanhempien kieli-ideologialla on suuri merkitys perheen kielipolitiikan muodostumisessa. Samankaltaisuudet ja eroavaisuudet näiden kahden perheen kielikäytännöissä linkittyivät selkeästi samankaltaisuuksiin ja eroavaisuuksiin perheiden kielikäytännöissä. Molemmissa perheissä oli huomattu myös perheen lapsiluvun kasvun vaikutuksia kielikäytäntönsä suhteen; tutkimustulokset antoivat viitteitä siitä, että isommissa perheissä vanhemmat joutuvat tekemään kompromisseja kielikäytännöissä ajanpuutteen vuoksi. Samoin oli huomattu valtiokielen aseman vahvistuneen perheissä lasten lukumäärän lisääntyessä, millä oli myös ollut kielikäytäntönsä muuttava vaikutus.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords kaksikielisyys, perheen kielipolitiikka, perheen koko – bilingualism, family language policy, family size	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository	
Muita tietoja – Additional information	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION.....	3
2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	4
2.1 BILINGUAL FAMILY	4
2.2 LANGUAGE POLICY	5
2.3 CONSTRUCTING AND SHAPING THE FLP	6
2.3.1 PARENTAL LANGUAGE USE AND IDEOLOGY	7
2.3.2 CHILDREN AND LANGUAGE PRACTICES	8
3 THE PRESENT STUDY	9
3.1 RESEARCH QUESTION	9
3.2 DATA AND METHODS	10
3.3 PARTICIPANTS.....	11
4 ANALYSIS	12
4.1 DESCRIBING THE FLP	12
4.2 FACTORS	14
4.2.1 PARENTS' LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY	14
4.2.2 CHILDREN AND PRACTICES	21
5 CONCLUSION	24
6 BIBLIOGRAPHY	25
7 APPENDIX 1: THE INTERVIEW THEMES	26

1 INTRODUCTION

Bilingualism is an area that has intrigued researchers and laymen for several decades already, and the interest in the topic shows no signs of decreasing - on the contrary, bilingualism seems to be all the more current in the globalizing world as an increasing number of people encounter bilingual or multilingual situations and live in such environments. For example, in Finland, the number of families in which at least one parent has non-Finnish origins has increased in twenty years from 12 493 (1990) to 60 537 (2009) according to OSF (2009). However, growing up in a bilingual family does not automatically mean that one becomes a bilingual individual. Factors that affect child's bilingual development (or non-development) are among the widely studied topics in this area. Many studies have shown that parents' language use at home is a very significant factor affecting a child's bilingualism (e.g. De Houwer, 2007). This circumstance then evokes the question of how parents decide on their language use at home and which factors influence the formation of a family language policy. The present study aims to contribute to the research on the factors that influence the choices of language use and the construction of a language policy in a bilingual family.

When reading studies and publications on bilingual families, one can easily notice that in most of the research, the participants are mostly 'average' two-parent families having one or two children. This trend to concentrate on small families is remarked on also in the recent publication by Barron-Hauwaert (2011:16): she perceives the research on bilingualism to lack studies on siblings and larger bilingual families. As I personally know several bilingual families that have more than two children, I became interested in the subject of studying larger bilingual families. Furthermore, as sociolinguistic studies have shown that the role of the child cannot be regarded as passive in the choices of family language use and that parents and children negotiate the family language use together (Tuominen, 1999; Lanza, 2004), it appeared meaningful to observe the family language policy and its formation in larger bilingual families. The present study is a case-study on the language policy of two such families. The aim of this study is to shed light, on the one hand, on the factors that affect parents' decisions on family language use, and on the other hand, on the impact that children might have on the family language use.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

According to Yamamoto (2001:4), previous studies on bilingualism and bilingual families can be defined as belonging either to linguistic or sociolinguistic traditions. The linguistic tradition is mainly interested in the acquisition and use of two languages at the level of different linguistic features, such as phonology or morphology, whereas the sociolinguistic tradition is generally interested in social aspects that influence bilingual acquisition and language use (Yamamoto 2001:4). Aspects studied in the sociolinguistic tradition include, for example, parents' and siblings' language use or the status of a language in a society.

As the objective of the present study is to shed light on the factors that affect the language policy in a bilingual family, this study falls in the category of sociolinguistic tradition. This section will first overview some key concepts of the sociolinguistic tradition relevant for this study. After that, previous studies on bilingual family language policy will be discussed.

2.1 BILINGUAL FAMILY

The concept of *family*, when used in an academic context, requires defining, as it is a term that can be used for very different meanings: just to begin with, there are one-parent and two-parent families, nuclear, extended and blended families. The definition of the concept varies according to the definer and the context. In this paper, the term *family* is used in the sense that OSF (Official Statistics of Finland) uses it: a married or cohabiting couple or persons in a registered partnership form a family with or without children in the same household, as well as either of the parents living together with his or her children (OSF 2012). Furthermore, relating to the concept of language policy, a family is defined as a unit of society: a speech community that has, like all speech communities, its own language policy or policies (Spolsky 2004).

Bilingual is also a concept that requires a definition, and of which there are at least as many understandings as of the concept of family. In everyday language, a bilingual individual is often described simply as 'speaking two languages'. However, this definition leaves unclear quite many variables, such as the speaker's fluency in each language, the possible dominance of either language, and the frequency and the domains of use in each language. Similarly, a bilingual family can be described simply as a family 'in which two languages are spoken'. Barron-Hauwaert (2004:x) elaborates on this a little by saying that in a bilingual family at least two different languages (or dialects) are spoken, and it may have elements from at least two cultures. Still, this definition does not say anything about the

bilingualism of the individuals in the family, nor does it say anything about the use of the languages, about the quantity or the frequency in either language. At the very minimum, the concept of a bilingual family indicates that at least one family member actively uses (speaks) another language than some other member in the family and that at least one other member uses that other language at least passively (understands it) so that the language can be and is used regularly in communication between family members.

2.2 LANGUAGE POLICY

All speech communities have a language policy or policies (Spolsky 2004). Certain concepts necessary in examining those policies are discussed next. A family being also a speech community, the same concepts can be applied in studying *family language policy* (FLP).

According to Shohamy (2006), a speech community can have *explicit* or *implicit language policies* or both. Explicit policies are those that are stated e.g. in laws and documents, whereas implicit policies are those that must be observed and derived from the actual language practices of a community (Shohamy 2006:50). Furthermore, examining the language policy on both implicit and explicit levels may reveal different policies in a speech community, as the policies at the two levels do not always correspond to each other (ibid.). This study concentrates on the explicit language policy of a bilingual family, and the most useful means to obtain information on this is by interviewing the parents. Families seldom have official documents stating their language policy, but views expressed in an interview can be regarded as a form of explicit policy statement. However, if a more comprehensive understanding of a family's language policy were to be attained, the implicit language policy should also be examined.

Spolsky (2004:5) divides language policy into three components: language practices, language ideology, and language management. The first component, *language practices*, he defines as the more or less conscious selections that a member of a community makes in regards to words, sounds, grammar or language in every speech act (2004:9). In a bilingual family, an easily observable practice is the choices of language that parents and children make in communication with each other. The second component, *language ideology*, Spolsky (2004:14) defines as the ideas and beliefs that the members of a speech community have and share about language and language use: what is appropriate and inappropriate language use, which languages or varieties have prestige. Finally, he defines *language management* as explicit statements about appropriate language use or the acts with an intention to manipulate the language use by authorities (2004:10). Such authorities can be for

example a teacher in school or a parent in a bilingual family. Furthermore, these three components have an interactional relationship: ideology shapes practices and management, but, likewise, practices and management can shape ideology (Spolsky 2004:14).

In the literature on bilingual families, the concept of *language strategy* is often used alongside or instead of language policy and the two concepts (partially) overlap. Barron-Hauwaert defines language strategy as the “description of family language organization”, meaning the knowledge about the language(s) that parents use with each other and with their children, the language(s) siblings speak among themselves, and whether languages are mixed or used separately one at a time (2011:39). In this sense, the concept of language strategy corresponds to the concept of language practice above by Spolsky (2004). Even though language strategy is sometimes used interchangeably with language policy, in this paper, language strategy refers solely to the actual language practices in a bilingual family, whereas language policy is understood to be a broader perspective to family language use, including beliefs and ideas behind the practices.

2.3 CONSTRUCTING AND SHAPING THE FLP

Family language policy has been regarded by many as an important factor influencing the bilingual development of a child. Many studies show that language practices, especially parental language use, have an effect on a child’s language acquisition and use. For example, Döpke (1992a) and Hoffmann (1985) emphasize the influence of the quantity and quality of parental language use on the development of a bilingual child. De Houwer (2007), in her study on 1,889 families, gives convincing evidence for the influence of parental input patterns on the child’s language use. The results of her study show that in families where both parents speak the minority language (the non-majority language used in the family) with their children, the percentage of child minority language use is the highest. Accordingly, when the amount of parental majority language use (the use of the language of the society) increases, the amount of children minority language use decreases. As the importance of family language practices on a child’s bilingual development has become evident, the reasons behind those practices have gained interest: what then determines the language choices made in the family?

Naturally, in examining the language policy of a family, the role of parents and their language ideology is emphasized as it is the parents who initially establish that language policy. However, the role of children cannot be disregarded: they also are members of the speech community (family) and therefore have their role in shaping the policy. Next, factors

that have been found to influence family language policy will be discussed, first concentrating on parents and then on children.

2.3.1 PARENTAL LANGUAGE USE AND IDEOLOGY

Following Spolsky's theory on language policy (2004), family language choices are influenced by ideas and beliefs about language - by the language ideology. In other words, the beliefs that the members of a speech community have generally about language and in particular about their own language are the basis on which language policy is grounded (Schiffman 1996). Language specific beliefs are the ideas on the value of the language and its status in the society as well as attitudes towards the culture it represents. These beliefs are considered important factors influencing the family language use: if parents value their own language, they are more likely to promote it for their children (Harding and Riley 1986). The beliefs about language in general, in relation to bilingual family language policy, include attitudes towards bilingualism and language mixing, as well as ideas on how languages are best acquired and on the role of parents in the acquisition, which are, according to De Houwer (1999), clearly linked to the language strategies that parents adopt with their children. If, for example, parents believe language mixing to be improper language use or a sign of confusion in language acquisition, they are not likely to mix the languages themselves or to encourage their children to do so. However, the language ideology of parents has to have its basis on something; how are these beliefs then formed?

Sources for language ideology can be categorized into macro and micro factors (Curdt-Christiansen 2009). Macro factors are the society level contexts or conditions that provide sources for ideology and therefore affect language policy decision (Curdt-Christiansen 2009:355). These contexts are, according to Spolsky (2004) and Curdt-Christiansen (2009), sociolinguistic, cultural, economic and political conditions — in other words communicative, cultural, instrumental and political values associated and ascribed to a language in a society. For the present study, these contexts are the values associated with English and Finnish languages in the Finnish society, as the two families participating in the study speak the two languages and live in Finland. As a family is a unit of society, a speech community within a larger speech community, these macro level contexts affect a family as well. Micro factors, in turn, are the experiences and the knowledge that parents have on language learning and bilingualism, parents' own educational background, as well as their expectations for their children in regards to education and bilingual development (Curdt-Christiansen 2009). A study on parents' perspectives on FLP for *additive bilingualism*

(monolingual parents raising bilingual children) by King and Fogle (2006) clearly indicates that parents' initial decisions on language policy are based mainly on their own experiences with language learning, bilingualism and biculturalism. The study shows that parents' experiences influence not only the choices of language but also the pedagogical approaches to language learning that parents adopt with their children. Other sources were used as well, but they had a more supportive role: expert advice and the media were used selectively to support the decisions, and relatives and friends were often mentioned as "a negative point of comparison", in other words, to define the kind of policy the parents did not want to have in their family (King and Fogle 2006:703).

2.3.2 CHILDREN AND LANGUAGE PRACTICES

Parents often make the initial, more or less explicit and conscious decisions on the family language practices (based on their own language ideology) about the time the first child is born. But nothing is stable: the family lives on and situations change, there may be more children or a move to another country. The initial practices may need to be adapted to better suit the new conditions. These changes in practices may then modify the ideology upon which the language policy is grounded (Spolsky 2004): if, for example, a practice is over time found inefficient or inadequate, the idea behind that practice can be re-evaluated and a new practice applied. It seems that changes in practices and the role of children in shaping the FLP go hand in hand.

Tuominen (1999) and Lanza (2004) argue, based on their research, that family language practices are interactively constructed and that children do have an effect on them. The effect can be direct in the sense that a child openly opposes or deliberately attempts to change the family language practices, for example by refusing to speak one of the languages. Tuominen (1999), in her study on eighteen immigrant families in the US, found that in every family the children had at some point or other challenged the family language practices set by parents. Tuominen even suggests that in many families it is the children who decide the home language. She argues that in immigrant families where parents' educational and socioeconomic statuses are low, children are more likely to gain control over the home language use as parents have to compromise in decision making due to the lack of time and other resources. In contrast, parents who are fluent both in minority and majority languages and are more well-off have better possibilities to set and stand behind their decisions on the practices. Even if children would not have such a profound impact on the family language practices, as in the cases described by Tuominen, they can still influence the FLP in more

indirect ways. For example, when a child brings home a friend who does not speak the minority language spoken in the family, it may result in a situation where the language practices need to be altered in order to maintain fluency in communication.

In the present study, it is set as a hypothesis that the indirect influence that children have on the FLP is even stronger in larger families. Having more children in a family brings forth factors which cannot be found in one-child families and which parents are not necessarily able to anticipate when making the initial decisions on family language policy. Firstly, it has been found that siblings often tend to use the majority language among themselves, which may benefit especially younger siblings in acquiring the majority language, but if the use of majority language increases at the cost of exposure to the minority language, the minority language acquisition may be at risk (Hoffmann, 1985). Secondly, having more children to share time with, means that younger siblings may have less one-to-one time with their parents. This may lead to reduced exposure to the minority language for younger siblings in comparison to older siblings (Döpke, 1992a). Thirdly, parents have an opportunity to re-evaluate their language practices when deciding whether to continue in the same way with the second or later children. Barron-Hauwaert, in her study on families having two or more children, found that in one-third of the families the language strategy had changed over time, and the two major reasons mentioned were a move to another country and unsuccessful experiences with the first child (2011:43). An objective for this paper is to investigate whether these factors - sibling language, time issue and a possibility to re-evaluate - are among those that appear to influence the language policy of a family.

3 THE PRESENT STUDY

3.1 RESEARCH QUESTION

The present case study aims to examine how two bilingual families have come to establish a family language policy and what aspects might have influenced this process and, therefore, the policy. The research question, thus, is:

How is the explicit family language policy constructed in a bilingual family?

I will attempt to find an answer to this primary question through two subquestions, which are:

- 1) What language policies do parents describe in the two families?*
- 2) What are the factors that influence the family language policy?*

Through the first subquestion, I aim to examine what is the language policy of the family and how parents themselves describe and explain it. This information will be drawn from the interviews with the parents of the two families and will mainly concern their explicit statements about the language policy. Through the second subquestion, I hope to find which ideas, beliefs, attitudes, experiences and changes in the family life have affected the present language policy of the two families. This information will be as well drawn from the interviews, but will probably include drawing conclusions from more implicit information.

In the present study there are two contexts which are believed to be significant to the family language policy formation and which also make this study unique from previous studies. The first context is the high status and prestige of English language in the Finnish society; the two participating families have the language combination of Finnish and English and they live in the Finnish society. The second context is the larger size of the families; both families have seven children. There is little previous research on larger bilingual families and no studies on such families with this language combination.

3.2 DATA AND METHODS

The data for the present study was gathered in December 2011 and January 2012 by interviewing the parents of two bilingual families. The interviews were semi-structured, i.e. they had a focus and several themes chosen by the interviewer instead of fixed questions or structure (see Appendix 1 for explanation of themes). This method was chosen in order to give the parents a possibility to express freely the matters that seemed most relevant and important in regards to the language use in their family. The method also enabled new themes and topics to emerge during the interviews.

Both interviews took about one and a half hour, had a conversational tone and were conducted at the interviewees' homes. In the first interview, the mother was present for the whole time and the father at the beginning and the end of the interview. In the second interview, both parents were present for the whole time. The interviewees were given a possibility to choose the language of the interview; the first interview was in Finnish and the second in English. Due to this, the extracts from the first interview are in the analysis both in English and in Finnish, whereas the extracts from the second interview are only in English. The interviews were recorded, and some notes were taken during the sessions. The recordings were then transcribed, reviewed and coded according to the themes and issues that emerged.

3.3 PARTICIPANTS

Table1. Participants

	FATHER	MOTHER	CHILDREN (years)
FAMILY 1 (F1)	Nationality: USA Speaks: English , Finnish Education: EFL ¹ teacher	Nationality: Finnish Speaks: Finnish , English Education: Music teacher	GIRL 11 BOY 10 GIRL 9 GIRL 7 BOY 5 BOY 3 BOY 7 months
FAMILY 2 (F2)	Nationality: Finnish Speaks: Finnish , English Education: Warrant officer	Nationality: USA Speaks: English , Finnish Education: Licensed practical nurse	BOY 14 BOY 13 GIRL 11 BOY 9 BOY 7 BOY 4 GIRL 9 months

F1: The father of the family (*Father1*) is originally from the US but has been living in Finland for 15 years. He named English as his native language, but he also speaks fluent Finnish. His family has Finnish roots and some Finnish language was used at home in his childhood. The mother of the family (*Mother1*) is originally from Finland and has Finnish as her native language. She speaks fluent English. All the children have been born in Finland and they go to Finnish schools (if old enough). Children learn both languages simultaneously. According to the parents, children speak both English and Finnish (i.e. are active bilinguals), with a little more fluency in Finnish.

F2: The father of the family (*Father2*) is originally from Finland, has Finnish as his native language and is fluent in English. The mother of the family (*Mother2*) is originally from the US. She is fluent in both languages, but English is her native language. She has been living in Finland for about 16 years. All the children have been born in Finland and go to Finnish schools (if old enough). According to the parents, children learn to speak English a little earlier than Finnish and they speak both languages (i.e. are active bilinguals).

¹English as a Foreign Language

4 ANALYSIS

4.1 DESCRIBING THE FLP

The two families described quite different language strategies. Despite their fairly similar profiles (two-parent, seven children, Finnish-English speaking, living in Finland), they have adopted different language strategies and the process of establishing them has been different too. However, similarities can be found for example in the way the mothers use the non-native language and in the siblings' language use. The table below shows a rough outline of the family language use. The practices are then discussed in more detail.

Table 2. Outline of practices

	FAMILY 1	FAMILY 2
Between parents	Both languages	English
Mother - children	Finnish	English
Father - children	English	English
Between siblings	Both languages	Both languages
When the whole family is together	Both languages	Both languages
Are language used separately or mixed	Separately	Separately and some mixing
Strategy	OPOL	Minority-language-at-home

F1 explained practices that would be named as OPOL (One-parent-one-language) strategy in many books and studies concerning bilingual families (see e.g. Döpke 1992a; Barron-Hauwaert 2004; Grosjean 2010). Parents speak both languages together but slightly more English than Finnish. To their children, parents speak only their native language and the children are expected to answer in the language the parent speaks. Especially the father is very consistent on this:

Father1: Then to the children I speak only English.

Mother1: In that Father1 is very constant. That he doesn't understand if they speak Finnish to him.

Father1: Sitten lapsille mä puhun vaan englantia.

Mother1: Siinä Father1 on ihan hirveen jämäkkä. Että se ei ymmärrä jos ne puhuu sille suomea.

The father speaks only English to the children and may pretend not to understand Finnish in order to get the children to speak English with him.

F2 explained language practices that can be named as Minority-language-at-home strategy (Barron-Hauwaert 2011) or Home-outside-the-home strategy (Grosjean 2010). The home language is English: the parents speak English together and to their children. The children speak English to their parents, even though, according to the parents, they may sometimes try to speak Finnish, but eventually they switch back to English. Finnish is acquired mostly outside the home (at school, with Finnish relatives, with friends).

In both families, exceptions to the strategy were described. Firstly, the mothers in both families sometimes use their non-native language in situations where more authority is needed. *Mother1* explained that English has “the authority of the father tongue” and is thus more effective in some situations. *Mother2* explained that at some point she used to speak Finnish to the children whenever she got angry with them, because, the language not being her mother tongue, it did not feel as serious or as bad as being angry in English. For both mothers, using the non-native language therefore seems to function as a sort of ‘effect’ language. Secondly, in F2, the parents used to translate Finnish books into English when reading for their children, but nowadays *Father2* reads for them also in Finnish.

The sibling language in both families is mostly Finnish, but children speak English together as well. The parents regarded the choice of language as depending a lot on the majority language of the country: the sibling language in Finland is mainly Finnish, but when the families visit America, it changes mostly to English. This parents’ observation on siblings’ tendency to use the majority language together supports the findings in Hoffmann’s (1985) study. In F2, the choice of language is also dependent on the age of the sibling: the older siblings usually speak English to the youngest until he or she is three or four years old. According to *Mother2*, however, there has been lately a change in that practice and the older siblings have started to speak Finnish to the youngest child (9 months) already.

Due to the different strategies adopted, the dominant language in the presence of the whole family is different in the two families. In F1, the language with the whole family is for the most part Finnish. However, for example at supper, the father may ask every child to tell what he or she has done during the day, in order to elicit discussion in English and to make the children talk about their life and thoughts in English. In F2, the language in the presence of the whole family is mainly English, as it is the home language. The siblings may, however, use Finnish among themselves in the presence of the parents as well.

The practices regarding the mixing of languages in the two families are also quite different. In F1, the languages are used separately: the parents do not mix the languages and the children are not encouraged to mix them either. According to *Father1*, most of the

Finnish words, such as ‘sauna’ or ‘pulla’ are usually translated into English in order to avoid any language mixing. In F2, on the contrary, both parents and children may sometimes mix the languages, which they considered acceptable, even though their principle is to use the languages separately.

The processes of establishing the family language policy in the two families have not been similar either. The language practices in F1 were explicitly discussed around the time the first child was born, whereas, in F2, parents “never decided”: they continued to speak their “home language” (English) and discussed the language practices explicitly only after they felt their practices were questioned by other people. The decision on the FLP in the first place therefore seems to have been more conscious in F1 than in F2, which implies that there may also be differences in the factors that have influenced these decisions.

Observing the family language practices already reveals certain attitudes that have directed the language choices in the families. These attitudes and other factors that can be seen to have influenced the family language policy will be discussed next.

4.2 FACTORS

Mapping the language use patterns shows that the present language policies of the two families are quite different and that the routes to these policies have been different as well. They share, however, an elementary aspect: both families have decided to have two languages (and cultures) in their families and to raise their children bilingual. Behind these similarities and differences in language practices can be found similarities and differences in the parental language beliefs and attitudes. Furthermore, some influence on the FLP can be observed from the children’s part.

This section will first discuss the findings on the parental language beliefs and their effects on the FLP. After that, the findings on the effects of the family size and the number of children on the FLP will be discussed.

4.2.1 PARENTS’ LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY

The elementary decision of having two languages in the family and of raising the children bilingual is related to two elementary language beliefs and attitudes: the (specific language) beliefs on English and the (general language) beliefs on bilingualism. Observing the views expressed in the interviews reveals that the parents of the two families shared fairly similar language specific beliefs towards English: both families had positive attitudes towards

the language and considered it important that the children learn to speak it. Firstly, the communicative value of English was regarded high: the language is needed when travelling to America and it enables communication with the American relatives. It is also valued because of its worldwide use.

Mother1: But yeah, I think that if we never visited America that they would be like it's a little annoying, a little like a burden, but then when they always remember that why it is quite reasonable that we. And indeed it is not just the language but the whole culture. And then all the relatives there, that if they didn't know English then they wouldn't really.

Mother1: Mutta nii, mä luulen että jos ei me koskaan käytäis Amerikassa niin ne ois että vähä silleen ärsyttävä, vähä tommonen rasite, mutta sitteku ne aina muistaa sen että miks se on ihan järkevää että meillä. Ja tosiaan se että se ei oo pelkästään se kieli vaan se on se koko kulttuuri. Ja sit se koko suku siellä, että jos ne ei osais englantia niin eipä ne hirveesti.

Mother2: Well it's definitely easy to have English as our other language.

Father2: Because everybody understands English.

Using English when visiting America and with relatives was considered a great motivation for the children to learn and to use the language. Furthermore, the status of the language as a lingua franca was considered an advantage. Secondly, the cultural and symbolic values associated with English were positive. In both families it was considered important that the children learn to know both cultures of the family:

Father2: I think it's important that we are bilingual and that we've two cultures in our family, that when they go there, that they can actually get in to the American culture, and live and learn that part of where our family came from

The children were wanted to be raised not only bilingual but also bicultural. According to *Father1*, knowing the language gives “an insider view” to the culture. Furthermore, the status of English and the culture it represents was regarded as neutral or positive:

Father2: And English doesn't have any negative

Mother2: connotations, yeah, like Turkish

Father2: Turkish would probably have somewhat negative

Thirdly, the instrumental or economic value of English was considered high. English was thought to provide possibilities and to be beneficial for the children in the future. *Father2* explained how he himself had benefited at work because of knowing the language, and therefore believed it to be beneficial for the children as well. F2 also emphasized the benefit of learning another language already in childhood: as English is “easy at school” for the children, it allows them to learn a third language there. F1 considered English useful especially in comparison to some other languages:

Mother1: It is such a great bonus. Really, yes. I don't know if it would feel different if it was some minority language or some. I've a big brother who's married to an Estonian woman and they haven't spoken, or she hasn't spoken Estonian to their children. But [he/she] said that it is even so that Finnish and Estonian are such close cognate

languages that it is so difficult to keep them separate. And that there isn't that kind of use of, if you speak Estonian, that it doesn't take you very far. Unlike English.

Mother1: Onhan se siis niin iso bonus. Todella, joo. En tiää oisko niinku erilainen olo jos se ois joku vähemmistökieli joku. Mullon veli joka on virolaisen naisen kans naimisissa, ja ne ei oo puhunu tai se ei oo puhunu eestiä niille lapsille. Mutta se sano että siinä on jopa semmonenki että suomi ku ja eesti on niin lähekkäiset sukulaiskielet niin se on niin vaikea pitää ne erillään. Ja just se että siitä ei oo niin semmosta hyötyä, niinku, että jos osaat viroa niin se ei sua hirveen pitkälle kannu. Toisin kuin englanti.

As *Mother1* expresses here, English is thought to be more useful than “some minority language” such as Estonian. Fourthly, it is considered helpful and valuable that the Finnish national and educational language policy supports learning languages in general and learning English in particular. Especially this was expressed in F2:

Mother2: Everybody knows or, or, they understand that they're speaking English or we automatically get the studies in school

Mother2: Well I just see that they are so lucky that they have the opportunity to study other languages. I never got that, if, think if in America at third grade you could start another language, like they have to start learning English in third grade, and in fifth grade you can start learning yet even another language. I just feel it's such a richness that we need to take advantage of this opportunity.

The Finnish society and its language policy were considered favorable towards learning the English language. This is also reflected in the FLP: both families explained that there is no real need to put the children to an English school or kindergarten; the language environment and the input provided by the family and the English lessons in the Finnish school were considered sufficient. Observing parental attitudes towards English on these four levels reveals that the language is highly valued in the two families. In the family language policy, this has resulted in the primary decision of having two languages in the family. This is in accordance with Harding and Riley's (1986) view that parents' positive attitude towards their own language is an elementary factor that inspires parents to pass on the language for the next generation.

Behind these language specific beliefs of the two families can be found both macro and micro level factors: the Finnish society and parents' own experiences. The attitudes towards English that parents expressed are analogous with the beliefs and attitudes towards English in the Finnish society as revealed in a research by Leppänen *et al* (2009): in general, attitudes towards English in Finnish society are positive and functional; English is considered useful in the globalizing world and it is not believed to be a threat to the Finnish language or culture. As these beliefs are analogous with each other, it can be suggested that the macro level context of Finnish society has provided sources for parental language ideology in the two families. However, personal sources can be seen to have influenced

parental attitudes as well. *Father2* mentions his own experiences at work and how knowing English has benefited him. *Mother2* appreciates the opportunities that Finnish society provides in language learning at school because she lacked those opportunities when growing up in America. *Mother1* mentions the experience of her relative as a point of comparison to emphasize the instrumental value of English. This supports Curdt-Christiansen's (2009) view that both micro and macro level factors influence the parental language ideology.

In addition to the shared language specific beliefs on English, the two families also share a positive attitude towards bilingualism. Bilingualism was considered beneficial and not a threat to the linguistic development of the children. This has resulted in the decision to raise their children bilingual. The parents expressed an appreciation for learning and knowing languages:

Father1: Well I have also studied that subject, but I think that still maybe, I would have perhaps anyway, or because language skills in general are a close and important matter to me, so it would have felt bad if I hadn't provided my children also with

Father1: Niin siis olen myös opiskellut sitä asiaa, mutta luulen että ehkä silti, olisin ehkä siltikin, tai koska kielitaito ylipäättään on minulle läheinen ja tärkeä asia, niin olisi tuntunut pahalta jos en olisi lapsilleni niinku myös tarjonnut]

Mother2: But I mean language, whatever it is, I think it makes your life so much richer and you start to see

Father2: Not the language itself but the language opens you ...doors, you study the culture and the people and the, it's like a key to the new culture.

Mother2: Yeah, it is. But it's also, it can be fun, it can be, you can, like French, like you start finding connections between languages. - - And in some languages you can say a certain thing so much more exactly than you can in another language. So that just makes, if you can understand and know those things, it makes it wonderful, you know.

The parents regarded learning and knowing languages in itself as valuable. The language was seen as a way to understand other cultures and their people. Knowing another language was considered to provide one with more diverse and exact ways to express oneself. This supports the view of De Houwer (1999) that another elementary factor affecting the decision to raise the children bilingual is a positive attitude towards bilingualism.

Even though both families value language learning, the ideas and beliefs about the process and methods of language learning and acquisition differ somewhat. This is reflected in the language practices and in the pedagogical approaches that parents adopt with their children (De Houwer 1999). Both families regard mistakes in the language as a normal part of language development, but the reactions and corrections to them differ in some aspects. In F1, if children do not know a word in English or use a Finnish word instead, communicative strategies are taught:

Mother1: In my opinion you quite well often ask for some word if they don't know the word in English, that at least with a paraphrase they would get it.

Father1: Well that can be also because I'm a teacher, because I strongly promote also in my teaching that you don't need to know everything in advance in order to be able to manage things, that you can say certain things in many ways. So I want the children to understand that even if they don't know what is a bread-, a toaster, that they would still be able to explain what is done with it.

Mother1: Mun mielestä sää aika hyvin monesti penäät sitä jotakin sanaa jos ne ei tiää jotain sanaa englanniksi, että vaikka edes kiertoilmauksella sais sen.

Father1: No se taas voi johtua myös siitä että olen opettaja, koska mä vahvasti kannatan opetuksessakin sitä, ettei tarvi kaikkee valmiiksi osata, jotta pystyy hoitamaan asioitaan, että voi sanoa monella tavalla tiettyjä asioita. Että mä haluan lasten tajuavan sen että vaikkei ne tiedä mikä nyt ois leipä-, leivänpaahdinta, niin ne silti osaa selittää mitä sillä laitteella tehdään.

Children are taught to paraphrase and to explain the same thing in other words. This is, as the father himself explains, a teacher-like approach to language learning, influenced by father's education. In F2, the approach is less teacher-like and emphasizes more the acquisition aspect:

Interviewer: So what do you do when she speaks like that?

Mother2: I try to just pick out all the Finn words, and then

Father2: And then you'll find the

Mother2: And figure out what they are in English

Father2: And we have been really surprised how strong the environment, effect that environment and that the school has on the kids.

Mother2: For speaking

Father2: Yeah, he's four and he has a friend in the neighbourhood and he knows pretty much, he is almost equal in the Finn, to his peers.

Here, the effect of the environment is emphasized. Both parents of F2 have their own experiences of second language acquisition: the mother learned Finnish “by hearing it and speaking it” when she was babysitting in Finland; the father had studied English at school, but considered himself “poor in English” before he went to America for a summer, where he acquired the language “pretty quickly”. These personal experiences may have resulted to an attitude and an approach that is more inclined to acquisition than learning. Furthermore, even inside the F2, there can be observed an opposition of a “native-language-speaker” and a “second-language-speaker”:

Father2: But at one point I noticed that I actually I was more of the language person in our family, like they would use English and say the wrong like, what were the things,

like when I have ate, I would always, I'd be the one correcting that when I have eaten
Mother2: And I'd say oh it doesn't matter, that's the way all Americans say, I have ate, it doesn't matter. Because that's the way they say it, it's not right you know, 'cause even I say it sometimes. So he knows his grammar, and at least I know it's some plus-kvam-per-kvi-kvi, whatever it is, because Finns know that but Americans don't know those things, yeah.

F: So even the kids now they sometimes they joke, when someone makes the mistake, they say, oh when I have ate, then some other kid will correct that when I have seven.

The mother is observing the English language use from a point of view of a native speaker, who knows “the rules”, but does not always abide to them, whereas father is observing the

language use from the point of view of a learner, who “knows his grammar” and tries to abide to it. These experiences and positions are then reflected in the way they react to the mistakes in children’s language use.

The most distinct difference in general language beliefs and attitudes between the two families is in the attitudes towards language mixing. This also is clearly reflected to the language practices: to the parental language use and to the reactions of parents to the child language use (children’s language mixing). In F1, parents do not mix languages and children too are encouraged not to mix them.

Mother1: In my opinion it has been very systematic, and then Father1 is such a language freak that he doesn’t indeed. And then people speak a little, or our friends too, a sort of mixed language so that the word that happens to come most easily then it comes in that language and so. So he doesn’t approve to that.

Mother1: On ollu mun mielestä ihan systemaattista. ja sit Father1 vielä ku se on tommonen kielifriikki niin se ei tosiaan. Sit jonku verran ihmiset puhuu semmosta, tai siis meidänki kaverit, sellasta sekakieltä vähä, että se sana mikä nyt helpoiten tulee niin se tulee sillä kielellä ja muuten niinkö. Nii se ei suostu niinkö semmoseen.

Father1: There’s one thing that makes you wonder, that if there are some strongly Finnish phenomena so are they said in Finnish or forcibly in English. I think that when you speak English then you speak English, that if you start to do it so that some words [are] in Finnish, then it may be that it too becomes a habit, or always what you just can’t come up in English then you say it in Finnish - - but that the whole kind of phrase or how is it called would be in English, so that even there they [the children] won’t get the experience that sometimes Finnish and then again English.

Father1: Siinä on yks asia mikä pohdituttaa, eli että jos on vahvasti jotain suomalaisia ilmiöitä niin että kutsutaanko niitä suomenkielellä vai väkisin englanninkielellä. Mäoon sitä mieltä että sitten kun englantia puhutaan niin sit puhutaan englantia, että jos alkaa tehdä sillä tavalla että joku sana suomeksi niin voi olla että siitäkin tulee tapa, tai aina mitä ei just silloin keksi niinkuenglanniks niin sit sanotaan suomeks - - vaan et se koko niinku puheenparsi tai miten nyt sanotaankaan ois englantia, että siinäkään ei tuu sitä kokemusta heille että välillä suomea sit taas englantia,

Language mixing was regarded as a negative habit. *Father1* thought the whole utterance should be in one language: culture related words, too, such as ‘sauna’, were translated into English. Behind this strongly opposing attitude towards language mixing can be seen father’s language education and personal experiences. Firstly, *Father1*’s status as a “language person”, i.e. his knowledge on language learning and teaching, was mentioned. Secondly, *Father1* explained that at his childhood home, some Finnish words were used: for example, children were given “puudua” (porridge). This he explained to be a language practice that he did not want to continue in his own family. Furthermore, friends were mentioned as a negative point of comparison.

However, using English structures and words in Finnish utterances was not regarded as serious. The parents explained how spending a summer in America affects the children's language use:

Mother1: Truly, when we come back to Finland they are a little like uhmm uhmm, really a little like

Father1: They either really search for the words, that mum how do I say this and that in Finnish or then they use the structures of English language in Finnish, for example that onks mun pakko ottaa suihkua. ("do I really have to take a shower", whereas Finnish structure would be: "to go to shower")

Mother1: And my sisters have laughed at how they, when they have been very little, these our children, that they always come that mum come and find my this and that, it is so optimistic American, they find when Finns search. That kind of amusing, maybe they sort of speak in Finnish and really say some things like in a little funny way

Mother1: Oikeesti, ku me tullaan suomeen niin ne on vähän niinku et uhmm uhmm, oikeesti vähän niinku

Father1: Ne joko ihan hakee sanoja, etäitimiten sanotaan suomeksi sitä tai tätä tai sit ne käyttää englannin kielen rakenteita suomen kielessä, esimerkiksi et onks mun pakko ottaa suihkua.

Mother1: Ja mun siskot on nauranut sitä ihan näitten ku nää on ollu ihan pieniä nää meidän lapset ku nää menee aina että äiti tuu löytämään mun se ja tämä ja tuo, tuo on niin optimistinen amerikkalainen, ne löytää ku suomalaiset etsii. Semmosia huvittavia, varmaan ne niinku puhuu suomeksi oikeesti sanoo jotain asioita tuollai vähän hassusti

Mixing English with Finnish was considered merely as "amusing". This might be a reflection of the fact that the children's Finnish is so strong that English is not considered a threat to it, whereas English, which was described to be a little less fluent than their Finnish, is considered to need some protection.

In F2, the attitude towards language mixing is considerably more lenient and both parents and children mix languages sometimes. The parents explained that children may mix the languages especially when talking about school, where nearly everything happens and is communicated in Finnish. *Mother2* explained her reactions to that and her thoughts on language mixing in general:

Interviewer: So what do you do when she speaks like that?

Mother2: I try to just pick out all the Finn words, and then

Father2: And then you'll find the

Mother2: And figure out what they are in English, it depends on what the situation is and are we in a rush and should I just let it go or, or you know it depends - -

Interviewer: So okay, in general you'll try to find the words in English?

Mother2: Yeah, in general, yeah. That's like, like a periaate, whatever that is in English.

Father2: Principle.

Mother2: See, and there I go, even for me, because I haven't been around English, there are certain words that will come in my head more easily in Finn and it's just hard to get them in English, but anyways, that's a principle that we try to stick to.

Interviewer: What's your like opinion on that, mixing the languages, using the words of the other language?

Mother2: I think it's a richness. Because I think that some things are so cultural, like the word makkara and it's so much a part of the culture and sauna and pulla, and that I think that if you

Father2: But even the Americans use the word sauna and pulla

Using one language at a time was explained to be a principle, which is sometimes ignored both by the parents and the children, depending on the situation (in rush, if one has not got “the energy to”). Certain words were regarded as “so cultural” that it is fine to use them as such in the other language. Mixing the language was regarded as “richness” and “playing with the language”. Language mixing was explained to be a consequence of “not being around English”, which again emphasizes the effect of the environment on the language use. It is thus suggested that the parents’ own language acquisition experiences may have affected the attitudes towards mixing.

4.2.2 CHILDREN AND PRACTICES

Both families explained that their practices had been successful. Thus, the parents had no need to make fundamental changes to language practices or to modify the language ideology due to unsuccessful experiences.

Father1: And I have been thinking that too, as we have a large family and many children, that how does it influence that there are like in many, children in many different ages, like I mean or I've been thinking that if for example the eldest children if they had learned less well so would I've had a greater need somehow to teach or train the next children. But as there have been no difficulties at all it has been somehow easy to assume...

Father1: Ja oon mäe sitäkin pohtinut just ku on iso perhe monta lasta, et miten se vaikuttaa että on niinku monessa monta eri ikäistä lasta, niinku tarkoitan että tai siis olen ajatellut että jos vaikka vanhimmat lapset jos ne ois vaikka nihkeemmin oppinu niin oisko mulla ollut suurempi tarve sitten seuraavia jotenkin vielä enemmän kouluttaa ja treenata jotenki. Mutta just kun ei oo ollu mitään vaikeuksia niin on ollu jotenkin helppo olettaa...

Mother2: And I think that she's been doing fine. And all the kinds have done just fine with the languages.

As there had been no problems and the children were regarded as being capable of communicating in both languages, the parents expressed no need for re-evaluation. *Father1* explained, however, that in case of older children not having learned to speak the languages sufficiently there might have been some changes to the family language policy. This supports the findings in Barron-Hauwaert's (2011) study that successful experiences with the first child(ren) indicate continuity in the practices, whereas unsuccessful experiences indicate changes.

The parents have also been able to stand behind their language practices even though there has been some negotiation and rebelling in both families from the children's part.

Mother1: Well one child tries, [he/she] is very lazy to speak English, all the time trying to, like tries to cheek Father1 in Finnish, but...

Mother1: No yks lapsi yrittää, se on hirveen laiska puhumaan englantia, se koko ajan yrittää niinkö, Father1lleki yrittää aukoa suomeksi, mutta...

Mother2: I guess I'll have to say that in general maybe they all go through their own phase but when we just stick with trying to keep what we've been doing, they eventually come back to what we're doing.

In both families, children have at some point tried to rebel against the rules of language use, but, according to the parents, it has not led to changes in the practices. The children therefore have not had a direct effect on the parental language use or on the child-parent language use in either of the families.

However, in F2, there can be observed an instance of parental language management on sibling language use which children have challenged, negotiated and changed.

Mother2: Usually to the youngest one they speak English, and that's one thing that I tell them, I say, please speak English, until the youngest one starts to speak back in Finnish, because then it's kind of like a done deal, because you can't be, we can't control it anymore. But the older one speak to the youngest one, who isn't speaking it. I really would like that they speak in English too, and Girl 11 has been speaking a lot of Finn to her, you know oo voi että sää oot niin ihana, tule tänne, and that type of stuff and I think it feels more natural for her, to speak in Finn like that but I try and have the work at speaking in English

Mother: But they speak Finn among themselves. And then the, usually to the youngest one, they'll speak English, but now just recently, I would say that within the past, maybe half a year, they've started speaking Finnish with [the youngest]. So it's been around, usually until the youngest one is like three or four then they start to speak Finnish with them. When the youngest one starts to speak Finnish back, at least.

In this case, there has been a change in language use initiated by the children regardless of the parents' attempt to manage the sibling language. This is a clear example of what Tuominen (1999) and Lanza (2004) call interactive construction of family language practices. However, in spite of this one instance of direct influence, the effect that children have had on language practices in these two families has been mostly indirect, in other words, due to the growth of family size.

Both families explained slight changes in their family language practices which are due to the fact that there are more children and the situation has changed in the family. The parents had noticed a time related change: there is less time to share with the whole

family together and the pace of life has become busier now that the children are older.

Father2 explained a change in the way family spends time together:

Father2: Like we were out of, you know back then we were doing a lot of stuff with our family. Now our kids are gone more during the day with their friends and their, picking up more of language, plus the school.

As the family spends less time together, the children get less input in English. This has led to a reduced exposure to the minority language (English), in the way that Döpke (1992a) predicts it. However, not only the children's exposure to the minority language is affected by the time issue, but the language practices are influenced as well. *Father1* explained a change in his own language use:

Father1: But maybe that there are more children and then older children and there are more all kinds of things to do and a little busier life, which causes, which I don't quite like but which is an outcome of the rhythm of life, that if a child explains something in Finnish and if it is something that is related to me or that we'll go by my car or something, I may in a way join the conversation or interfere or react to that, of course in English, but however so that I've taken the information from the Finnish speech. And I'm always aware that it'd be nice if there was time that I'd now ask to say the same in English but if we just then don't have the time, but it's not a kind of change or child-specific in a way but just if we're in a hurry.

Father1: Mutta ehkä se että on enemmän lapsia ja sitte vanhempia lapsia ja on enemmän kaikenlaista menoa ja vähän kiireempi elämä, mikä aiheuttaa sen, siis mistä en ihan tykkää mutta mikä on tän elämänrytmin tuotos, niin jos lapsi selittää jotain suomeksi ja jos se on asia joka liittyy minuun taikka että lähetään mun kyydillä tai jotain, mä saatan tavallaan niinku tulla mukaan keskusteluun taikka puuttua siihen tai reagoida siihen, toki englanniksi, mutta silti silleen että mä oon niinku ottanu sen asian siitä suomenkielisestä puheesta. Ja mä aina tiedostan sen että ois kiva jos ois vaikka aikaa et mä nyt pyytäisin että sanoisit tän saman englanniksi mut jos ei just sillon ehi, mut se ei oo sillain sellaista muutosta tai lapsikohtaista sillä tavalla mutta vaan että jos on kiire.

As *Father1* here explains, nowadays he may join in a conversation with the children without asking to explain what was said first in English, in other words, by taking the information from the Finnish utterance, which he did not do earlier. This he explains to be due to the fact that the pace of life has become busier with more and older children, which has resulted in compromising in the practices.

Consequently, having less time for the minority language and being obliged to compromise in the previous language practices, the effect of the majority language and the environment is reinforced. Both families had remarked the effect of the environment to the sibling language use. Especially the effect was seen in F2 where the children acquire English before Finnish: the younger siblings began to speak Finnish earlier than the older siblings did.

Mother2: Probably though what has changed for the children is the fact that, is the fact that they, the younger children, have heard Finnish more in the home than the older siblings (Father2: from their siblings, yeah), the older boys. I think all of them have started to, yeah each one has learned Finn, or more Finnish, or started to speak more Finnish earlier because they've heard it from their older siblings, whereas the oldest

boys when they were young it took them longer to express themselves in Finnish, even though they understood. But that's due to the fact that the kids, it's been the children's language.

The fact that the younger children acquired Finnish earlier, because the older siblings spoke the majority language and therefore the exposure to the majority language was stronger for each younger sibling, had then had an effect on the family language practices in F2.

Father2: Well they've hear me read books in Finn.

Mother2: Yeah that's one thing that you won't do really is translate the books into English, 'cause that's something that I'll do when I read Finn books I'll translate it into English.

Father2: Well I have translated them when they were little but now I just read them in Finn, because the two oldest boys wouldn't have understand, understood Finn that well, when (Mother2: when they were real little) but now the kids understand Finn so I've read some Finn books, but that that I think that's fine.

Mother2: Yeah I think so too, I mean I don't always jaksa to translate anymore, it's too tiring, so but we have both books in Finn and English so they get both of them, you know.

Parents have changed the practice of translating Finnish books into English because the younger siblings understand Finnish earlier than the older siblings did when they were little. This, in turn, increases the exposure of younger siblings to the majority language.

5 CONCLUSION

The aim of the present study was to shed light on the factors that influence the construction of a family language policy in a larger bilingual family. The findings of this study support previous research on family language policy: the FLP is affected to a great extent by the language ideology of the parents (the beliefs and attitudes that the parents have on their own language(s) and on languages in general). Both case-families expressed a very positive attitude towards the English language and towards bilingualism, which had resulted in the elementary decisions of having two languages in the families and raising the children bilingual. The most significant differences in language beliefs were found in attitudes towards language learning and language mixing, which were then reflected in the different practices and different pedagogical approaches on how to raise the children bilingual. Both macro and micro factors were observed to influence and to provide sources for the parental language ideology.

The findings of this study also support previous research on the effects that children have on FLP: some influence on the language practices of the families was found from the children's part. However, this effect was mainly indirect, in the sense that children themselves had not initiated the change (except in one instance), but that the effect was due to the fact the family had become larger and the children had become older. In both families, the

practices had changed slightly over time, and the findings suggest that the reasons for the changes had been the lack of time for the minority language due to the growth of the family size, as well as the reinforced influence of the majority language and the environment in the family, which had made the parents to compromise in the previous language practices.

The present study is a case-study and its findings cannot be generalized. The weakness of the study is its limited data and, therefore, the fairly superficial information on the families' language policies: to gain a more comprehensive understanding on the practices and to be able to produce a more in-depth analysis of the ideologies behind, the implicit language policies should be examined and further interviewing would be needed. However, the present study implies that having more children may bring forth factors that that can affect the bilingual development of a child. Further research on larger bilingual families should be conducted in order to understand these effects better.

6 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barron-Hauwaert, S. (2004). *Language Strategies for Bilingual Families: The One-Parent-One-Language Approach*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Limited.
- Barron-Hauwaert, S. (2011). *Bilingual Siblings: Language Use in Families*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Curdt-Christiansen, XL. (2009). Invisible and visible language planning: ideological factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant policies in Quebec. *Language Policy* 8 (4), 351-375.
- De Houwer, A. (1999). Environmental factors in early bilingual development: The role of parental beliefs and attitudes. In G. Extra & L. Verhoeven (eds.) (1999), *Bilingualism and migration*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 75–95.
- De Houwer, A. (2007). Parental language input patterns and children's bilingual use. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 28, 411-424.
- Döpke, S. (1992a). *One Parent One Language: An Interactional Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Grojean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and Reality*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press.
- Harding, E. and Riley, P. (1986). *The Bilingual Family: A Handbook for Parents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoffmann, C. (1985). Language acquisition in two trilingual children. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6, 479-495.
- King, K. and L. Fogle.(2006). Bilingual Parenting as Good Parenting: Parents' Perspectives on Family Language Policy for Additive Bilingualism. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 9 (6), 695-712.

- Lanza, E. (2004). *Language Mixing in Infant Bilingualism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leppänen, S. et al. (2009). *National survey on the English language in Finland: Uses, meanings and attitudes*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Schiffman, H. (1996). *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. London: Routledge
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. New York: Routledge.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Official Statistics of Finland (OSF). (2009). Families. Annual Review 2009. 2. Only two per cent of families are foreign-language speakers.
[online]. http://www.stat.fi/til/perh/2009/02/perh_2009_02_2010-11-30_kat_002_en.html. (8 Oct 2011).
- Tuominen, A. (1999). Who decides the home language? A look at multilingual families. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 140 (1), 59-76.
- Yamamoto, M. (2001). *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 30 : Language Use in Interlingual Families : A Japanese-English Sociolinguistic Study*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Limited.

7 APPENDIX 1: THE INTERVIEW THEMES

At the beginning of the interviews, the parents were asked to describe the language use (practices) in their family (who speaks which languages, with whom). Specific questions were made to investigate language use in five different situations: 1) parents with each other 2) parent-child language use 3) siblings among themselves 4) language use when the whole family is present, and 5) language use in the presence of someone who does not speak or understand English (for example small children's friends). During the interview, three main themes were discussed: A) the process of coming to have the language practices in the family (who decided, when and how), the advantages and disadvantages of the practices B) the variation in the language practices: whether there had been any change over time in the practices and whether there is any variation in parental language according to a child C) the advantages and disadvantages of bilingualism, English language and language mixing.