

**FAMILY LANGUAGE POLICY IN BILINGUAL FINNISH AND SWEDISH
FAMILIES IN FINLAND**

Austin Huhta

Master's Thesis

Applied Linguistics

Department of Language and
Communication Studies

University of Jyväskylä

Fall 2020

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

Faculty Humanities and Social Sciences	Department Department of Language and Communication Studies
Author Austin Huhta	
Title Family Language Policy in Bilingual Finnish and Swedish Families in Finland	
Subject Applied Language Studies	Level Master's Thesis
Month and year December 2020	Number of pages 30
Abstract <p>In Finland families are only allowed to choose one language for their child to be the child's L1 even if the family is bilingual. With both Finnish and Swedish being national languages of Finland this thesis looked into which language a family chose, why they chose it, and how they helped their child maintain it. Looking at their perspective on this can allow us to get further insight into family language policy in Finland. The research method used here is a case study, with semi-structured interviews for the data collection and interpretive phenomenological analysis for the data analysis. This thesis interviewed a bilingual family with a Finn and a Swedish Swede and their one child. It found that while their initial language choice was Swedish, that their family language policy was dynamic. Over time the child was switched from Swedish medium education to Finnish medium education; however, at home multiple family language policies worked together to help maintain his Swedish language skills. The findings demonstrated that the right combination of family language policies and more formal educational settings can work together to help children grow up to be bilingual even if the minority language is mainly used at home. It is recommended that future research in this area continues to expand the number of research participants, and also uses more research participants from different backgrounds.</p>	
Keywords: Finnish, Swedish, Bilingual, Family Language Policy, Language Maintenance	
Depository University of Jyväskylä	
Additional information	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 Introduction	1
2 Literature Review	3
2.1 Language Ideology.....	3
2.1.1 Language Policy and Planning.....	5
2.1.2 Family Language Policy and Maintenance.....	6
2.2 The Swedish Language in Finland.....	8
2.2.1 Finland’s Bilingual Language Policies	8
2.2.2 Swedish Education in Finland.....	10
2.2.3 Family Language Policy and Bilingual Families in Finland.....	11
3 Methodology	14
3.1 Research Method	14
3.2 Research Questions.....	15
3.3 Data Analysis	16
4 Life in a Finnish and Swedish Household	17
4.1 Family Background.....	17
4.2 Early Childhood and Choice.....	19
4.3 Language Practice.....	19
4.4 Language Development and Attitudes.....	21
5 Discussion	23
5.1 Language Choice and Background	23
5.2 Factors and Influences	24
5.3 Maintenance of the Languages	25
5.4 Attitudes.....	27
6 Conclusion	29
References	31

1 Introduction

This thesis is a case study of an interview with a Swedish speaking parent from Sweden in a bilingual Finnish and Swedish family in Finland. In Finland two languages are recognized as national languages, Finnish and Swedish, but there is not an equal number of speakers between the two languages. Swedish speakers in Finland are minority speakers making up about 5% of the population (Laatoma & Nuolijärvi, 2002). This could have an impact on how they need to interact with both national languages if they want their children to be bilingual. The interviewee was asked questions about family language policy that they chose to use when raising their children and also their choices for their child's first language when interacting with the Finnish government and attending school. This case study will look at both the motivations and actions behind the family's choices.

The aim of this case study is to explore the reasons behind language choices in a bilingual family in Finland, and how they work with their child to maintain both languages. The case study is relevant to the fields of language acquisition, language ideology, language policy and family language planning particularly for bilingual families of national languages. This topic was chosen because of my interest in both language policy, and how it affects people's lives, and in how the national languages of Finland both coexist under Finland's national language policies. The information in this case study could be of use for researchers in the future who are looking into similar situations in Finland in the future.

This case study looks at the motivations and choices of a bilingual Finnish and Swedish family in Finland. They were asked about their choices, why they made them, how did they realize their choices and what caused them to make these choices. The following research questions were asked:

RQ1: Which language, Finnish or Swedish, did they choose to be their child's L1 when interacting with the Finnish government?

RQ2: Why did they choose that language over the other one? What influenced that decision?

RQ3: How did they help their child maintain both languages?

The position of the Swedish language in Finland means that while Swedish is equal to Finnish at the level of government policy, at the local level, the needs of Swedish speakers cannot always be met. There is an issue of Swedish speakers being unable to get service in Swedish in many parts of Finland, and this problem only gets worse the further you are from the Swedish speaking areas of Finland (Salo, 2012). Not having access to Swedish education or services or long-term prospects could hamper or deter the desire to pass Swedish on or make it prominent, and this thesis aims to see if these negative factors had an influence on family language choices and management. The gap in research here is that while bilingual Finnish and Swedish families in Finland have been interviewed in the past, these interviews did not generally focus on their choice of language for their children by the parents.

The literature review of this case study first starts by looking at language ideology, and then it works further into the field by narrowing down ideology to policy and from policy as a whole to language policies that influence and are created by families specifically. The second part of the literature review looks at the status of Swedish in Finland and how that could impact decisions made by families raising their children bilingually. The research questions are answered through qualitative analysis in the form of a semi structured interview, and then that interview was transcribed and analyzed through interpretive phenomenological analysis to understand their reasons, motivations and choices. The interview will be compared and contrasted with the literature review, and then finally the whole case study will be concluded.

2 Literature Review

This literature review is split into two major sections that are important for the context needed to discuss language choice in Finland. The first section deals with language ideology, and how it influences people. Then it moves on to describe language policy and family language policy specifically, and how they affect people on both a state level and community level. The second section will detail the status of the Swedish language in Finland, from how it is distributed, to its status in Finland and how it is taught and perceived within the country.

2.1 Language Ideology

Language ideology as a concept touches every aspect of our lives, and has profound effects on how we live our lives, and on how we view languages. Ricento (2006) explains that language ideology is the combination of both social and cultural values that people have about languages in their society and how these languages are used. Shohamy (2006) has similar ideas about how language ideology is based on values and beliefs people have; however, they also focus more on how language ideology is closely connected to politics, and that it is used to create groups of speakers which are assigned value. Curdt-Christiansen (2009) discusses how language ideology reflects how society views the worth of a language and how that leads to policies related to these beliefs. The main take away between these three views of language ideology is that society places value, prestige and other judgments onto languages, and then this leads to policy being created related to these ideas. An example of how Shohamy's understanding of language policy is relevant to the topic of this thesis as the creation of different groups based on languages and the values that surround them is relevant to the situation of Swedish in Finland. Swedish is a national language alongside Finnish, but with Finnish being the more widespread language in the country (Laatoma & Nuolijärvi, 2002), it has more utility throughout Finland and leaves Swedish in a separate group. However, for this thesis I feel that Ricento's description of language ideology is more useful for answering these research questions. Ricento (2006) describes how a nation state creates a monolingual ideology, which he refers to as monoglot ideology. This idea is particularly relevant to Finland as the way Finland handles its bilingual identity is by maintaining two monolingual systems. Boyd and Palviainen (2015) describe an idea called Taxell's paradox where monolingual institutions help foster bilingualism, while the opposite creates monolingualism. Finland maintains its dual national languages by keeping two

separate monolingual identities for them and catering to both of them. This is why I will be focusing on Ricento explanation of language ideology. This thesis focuses on this terminology of monoglot- and monolingualism in this research context; however, not all nations are monoglot. Ricento (2006) explains monoglot-ideology by splitting it into three ways that it affects languages; The first way it affects languages is by creating a hierarchy of which languages and which local dialects of languages are allowed to be used in various aspects of people's lives. In Finland this mostly refers to Finnish and Swedish languages being acceptable throughout the country for most situations. This does change from region to region as some places have far fewer Swedish speakers or none at all, but Swedish is still relevant in education in those areas. Sami and other indigenous languages also have status in Finland, but they are not relevant to this thesis. The second way monoglot ideology affects us is by creating identities that people use; this is often done by nations using a language to identity those that it considers members, and that these identities are most often created and maintained by the states themselves (Ricento, 2006). In Finland, Finnish is used by the government to help create an identity to rally Finns around as a group, and Finland Swedish is used to unify the Swedish speaking population of Finland, particularly by the Swedish Party. The third and final way he discusses how monoglot ideology influences language is through codified versions of a language; an example of this would be a standardized form of a language (Ricento, 2006). Finland Swedish is not the standardized form of Swedish and is instead a localized dialect.

All 3 of these aspects of monoglot ideology are important when looking at Swedish in Finland. The first point is that while Swedish is a national language in Finland there are many areas where Swedish usage is either impossible or avoided in Finland. The second point of creating identities is relevant to Finland as Finland Swedish has some notable differences from Standard Swedish in Sweden, thus creating a distinct community from both Finns and Swedish Swedes. The third point also has some implications with how Swedish is viewed in Finland as the Finnish variety is distinct from the academic standard of Sweden, however, this point is the least important to for the scope of this paper as the participant is from Sweden and does not have the same experiences as a Finnish Swede. All of these points will be further elaborated on in section 2.2.

2.1.1 Language Policy and Planning

Language ideology is how people value and view the languages around them, and language policy is how people affect the languages in their lives. This can be done through official, legal, and documented ways, and it can also be done through more implied and subtle ways. Johnson (2013) provides a definition of language policy which describes it is a system where both laws and other more subtle means affect the form of languages, how people learn languages and how language is utilized. Shohamy (2006) looks at language policy as more of a battle that takes place between governing bodies and their efforts to control the language space; these policies can be crafted into simple things like language tests to create de facto rules that were never agreed upon. Shohamy has some excellent philosophical views on language policy and how it fits into a battle for control. In Finland this can be seen in language tests and other places. However, the less philosophical definitions of how language policy can be explained that Johnson (2013) gives feel like a better fit for this thesis. Johnson (2013) elaborates on how language policy can be subdivided into 4 different types of policies that are further split into pairs of contrasting policy designs. The first two types of policy he mentions are top-down and bottom-up policies. Top down policies are policies which are made by larger entities with more power and authority, such as governments, that are used to affect and direct policies (Johnson, 2013). These policies come from the top (government) and their effects move down to everyone. Bottom-up policies are made by smaller more local communities or groups who are designing policies that are more directly applicable to their own lives (Johnson, 2013). These policies start at the bottom (locally) and their effects move up to have greater effects on society. The second set of policy types are overt and covert policies. Overt policies are clearly stated in official speeches or texts, and they are easy to recognize (Johnson, 2013). Covert policies are hidden or implied often within more explicit policies (Johnson, 2013). The third set of policies relate to official documentation with explicit policies that are recorded in some way, and implicit policies which exist regardless of whether or not there is official documentation that supports it (Johnson, 2013). The final set of policy types are de jure and de facto policies. De jure policies are official in the legal system of a society, while de facto policies exist without any enshrined legal standing (Johnson, 2013). These policy types can have a wide array of effects on people whether it be governments creating policies to protect endangered languages or expand the influence of national languages or helping local communities determine how they use the languages present in their lives. For this

thesis the bottom-up style of language policies is particularly relevant as my thesis is looking into family language policy in Finland. Officially documented policies and other policies created from a higher authority such as the Finnish government are important, and they do have an impact on the choices made in families; however, they are not the direct focus of this paper.

Language policy and language planning are heavily intertwined to such an intense degree that it is difficult to figure out whether or not planning affects policy or policy affects planning (Ricento, 2006). Ricento explains how language policy and planning work together to help achieve the desired outcomes that the people creating these plans and policies want. Plans can be created for many reasons such as protecting endangered languages, determining which languages should be nationalized and then how they should be taught in the public education systems, and even plans on how to standardize or reform languages. Ricento (2006) details 3 types of language planning frameworks; status planning, acquisition planning and corpus planning. Status planning deals with policies and plans which have plans to revitalize or maintain languages through policies that relate to nationalizing or standardizing languages (Ricento, 2006). This framework of LPP (language policy and planning) is not relevant to this study as Swedish already had been standardized and made one of the national languages of Finland over a century ago, and as such its status has already long been entrenched. Corpus planning is related to policies which help to create policies that affect language purity, style or reform the language (Ricento, 2006). This framework is not going to be looked at in this thesis as looking at the form and stylistic choices of Swedish is completely outside the scope of this thesis. The last framework is acquisition planning which has policies and plans dedicated to teaching people languages and giving people the resources to learn them while encouraging them to learn them (Ricento, 2006). This framework will be important to the scope of this thesis as I am looking into the reasons and ways that families chose the languages their children will be acquiring as a second language by determining which language, Finnish or Swedish, is going to be their first language.

2.1.2 Family Language Policy and Maintenance

Family language policy as a narrower area of the field has a profound impact on all our lives. Family language policy as defined by King et al. (2008) is planning within a family for language used at home which is split into three choices the parents make in regards to the child's language

development: which languages they use with their children, which styles they use in different situations, and how the children are taught the languages. They also mention that it is important for the parents of the children to take an active role in the planning for the development of their children's languages because without active participation from the parents the children will struggle to maintain more than one language, although it is not the only factor that plays a role in bilingual language development in children (King et al. 2008). Curdt-Christiansen and Lanza (2018) describe family language policy as language choice and maintenance that is done by the guardians of the children. The major aspect of family language policy that should be focused on here is that parents control the how children learn and what languages their children will learn. Since parents helping their children maintain their languages is important it is important to understand what language maintenance is. Curdt-Christiansen and Lanza (2018) define language maintenance as direct parent action that helps create the environment needed for language development. There are a few different types of language maintenance approaches which are often used by families. One approach is called 'one parent, one language' where the parents only speak one of their languages each to their children so the child will get practice in both languages all the time when at home (Curdt-Christiansen and Lanza, 2018). Another approach is called 'one language on certain days' where families switch what language is used at home on different days (Curdt-Christiansen & Lanza, 2018). Another approach they mention is 'minority language only at home' where families only use the minority language of their community at home. (Curdt-Christiansen & Lanza, 2018).

Family language policy is important when it comes to helping children achieve multilingualism, but it is not the only factor that is relevant. Slavkov (2016) observed how a combination of family language policy for one language and sending the children to study in the other language had a significant effect on their chances of becoming bilingual. This is necessary to note for how bilingual Swedish and Finnish families approach the language education of their children as it would be up to the family to ensure that the children are using the language that they are not being taught in at their school, if they want to give their children the best chances of being bilingual in the future. Smith-Christmas et al. (2019) looked at a few families including a Finnish and Swedish speaking in Finland, and the mother spoke about how she is usually the one to speak Finnish with her children, who go to Swedish medium school; however, the mother also

makes an effort to speak Swedish with her children in some institutional spaces as it is still the minority language of Finland even if education is possible there.

2.2 The Swedish Language in Finland

Swedish is one of the two national languages of Finland, and it is spoken by around 300,000 people in the country, and it is mainly spoken in the regions of Ostrobothnia, Åboland, Åland and Nyland all of which are all located on or off the coast of Western Finland (Laatoma & Nuolijärvi, 2002). The Finland Swedish dialect is somewhat distinct from the Swedish spoken in Sweden; however, they are not considered to be different languages (Norrby et al., 2015). One of the biggest issues Finnish Swedish speakers face today is that in regions where Finland is the majority language, it can be difficult for Swedish speakers to receive service or help in Swedish as there are not enough people to fill those positions who have the necessary language skills to accommodate all their needs (Salo 2012). Swedish gained a permanent presence in Finland in the 12th century as Swedes colonized the areas of Finland closest to Sweden; Sweden then lost Finland to Russia in the 1800s, and at the same time the population of Finnish speakers has continued to grow, heavily dwarfing the already small population of Swedish speakers in Finland (Laatoma & Nuolijärvi, 2002). It is because of Sweden's diminished influence on Finland and its small population of speakers that I do not look at the colonial influence that Swedish has now as it is not relevant to my thesis, especially in Finland today.

2.2.1 Finland's Bilingual Language Policies

The official status of Finnish and Swedish in Finland is that they are both equally national languages under the law in Finland ;Swedish speakers in Finland can expect that they are able to and will receive information such as tax documents and official announcements from the government in Swedish without having to ask for these materials, and they also have the right to interact with government institutions in Swedish (Salo, 2012). In the areas of Finland where Swedish speakers have a notable presence this system works to their advantage; however, while the system sounds good on paper it has a glaring flaw. Many areas in Finland do not have enough Swedish speakers to provide adequate service in Swedish, and this does leave Finnish Swedes in situations where it might be more advantageous for them to switch to Finnish to speed up processes in courts or other institutions as processing issues in Swedish can take far more time than in Finnish (Salo, 2012). In Finland there exists legislation that assigns a language to all

citizens of the country; this registry only allows for one language to be considered the individual's native language, and the parents are the ones who make the decision for their child (Palviainen & Bergoth, 2018). These details are important to remember as knowing that their children may struggle when getting services from the government could cause people to focus on choosing Finnish as their child's native language to help give them that edge in the long term. The language registry not only determines how the government interacts with someone, but also determines which language track one follows for school; however, one positive aspect of this is that the language one chooses can be changed at any time easily (Palviainen & Bergoth, 2018). This policy is a top-down, overt, officially recorded and de jure as it was officially signed into legislation by the Finnish government. The impact it has on people is also strong as it determines which language one will be educated in for most of their early life. Due to the fact that services in Swedish can be less common in many parts of Finland, including education, it might be that parents could just choose the easier option for their child to go to school in. There is a benefit though as if a family moves to an area with more Swedish speakers, they could easily transfer their child to a Swedish school. In Finland, Swedish is required for students to study for a minimum of at least 3 years; however, Finnish speakers are far less motivated to study Swedish, and it gives them more negative attitudes towards it as well (Hult & Pietikainen, 2014). This combination of factors, Swedish not only being less common in much of Finland and Finns being reluctant to study it, means that while the recognition of Swedish as a joint national language with Finnish is beneficial in theory, it doesn't always work out in the favor of Swedish speakers. This can be looked at from the perspective of a bilingual Finnish Swedish family who would have multiple reasons to choose Finnish, as their child could gain other advantages from having Finnish be their dominant language, they'll even still get to study Swedish in school.

When it comes to the languages within Finland there is a hierarchy with Finnish and Swedish at the top, followed by a few minority languages that are considered native to Finland such as Sami and FSL, and then all other languages at the bottom (Nikula et al., 2012). They continue to explain that when referring to immigrants in Finland they say it is important for them to study Finnish and Swedish, however, when national language policy talks about Finnish and Swedish there is a clear hierarchy between the two where Finnish is often placed at the top (Nikula et al., 2012). Swedish is often talked about in ways that emphasize the need to protect and ensure Swedish education, but Finnish is never brought up in this context, as they imply it is an

unmarked assumed study language within Finland that does not need to be brought up like Swedish does (Nikula et al., 2012).

Ihalainen and Saarinen (2015) examined language legislation in Finland, and they demonstrated that while Finland recognizes Swedish as a national language, debates often show that Swedish is viewed or referred to as a minority language unofficially. In particular the Language Act of 2004 was portrayed as something to protect the language of the minority, which was referencing Swedish, and the debates also led to discussions on whether or not the bill was giving Swedish preferential treatment that would add costs to the majority language group of Finnish (Ihalainen & Saarinen, 2015). They continued to explain that the debates and the legislation themselves placed Swedish above other languages such as Sami, making it clear that it would not be treated as a small cultural group language, but as a full secondary national language (Ihalainen & Saarinen, 2015).

This information is important to keep in mind when thinking about bilingual family language policy as it could play a role and impact choices made by families when determining which language they choose to make their child's primary language. While Swedish is a national language, it is viewed as a minority language and the government has taken steps to provide some level of protection for it. Swedish being referred to as a minority language in public debate is something that this thesis will pay attention to when looking at how families maintain and prioritize Finnish and Swedish.

2.2.2 Swedish Education in Finland

In Finland education of both Finnish and Swedish speaking children is usually kept separate. Boyd and Palviainen (2015) discuss how Finnish and Swedish medium schools are separate entities, and there has been recent ongoing debate in Finland as to whether or not more bilingual schools should be created. The lack of bilingual schools could be seen as less of an issue for the Swedish speakers when it comes to learning Finnish as they are often surrounded by it; however, it is an issue for Finnish speakers as it doesn't help foster an environment that helps them learn Swedish. They explain that Finland's decision to keep Finnish and Swedish separate in this way is called Taxell's paradox, where monolingual institutions lead to bilingualism while bilingual institutions lead to monolingualism, and this is the reason that many institutions, but particularly education, within Finland are separate, as it is seen as a way to protect Swedish from being

pushed out by Finnish (Boyd & Palviainen, 2015). This is another issue that is important to the topic of this thesis as while a small number of bilingual immersion schools exist, generally Finnish and Swedish are kept separate in Finland's schools, and that has an effect on how well students on each side learn the languages.

In Finnish schools Swedish is portrayed more as a foreign language from Sweden than as a national language of Finland; the classrooms that they observed in their data often featured both visual material such as maps showing Finnish in Finland and Swedish in Sweden along with learning materials that talk about people mainly visiting or living in places such as Sweden, Göteborg and Åland (Halonen et al., 2015). It is interesting that Swedish is taught in this manner in Finland as there is no de jure law saying that it needs to be presented this way. It actually seems counterintuitive to regularly have the school system present one of Finland's national languages in a way that makes it feel foreign. The curriculum of Swedish in Finland has a tendency to portray Swedish as a foreign language even in areas such as Helsinki where there is a large population of Swedish speakers, the curriculum is still designed to make Swedish more foreign, which can have an impact on how the students look at it (Halonen et al., 2015). In some parts of Finland, Swedish speakers are far enough away that you could argue that its presence is more akin to a foreign language for those students. This does raise some interesting questions about the reason for making Swedish look foreign even in Swedish areas, but the chapter did not answer that question outside speculation. This is relevant to this thesis though as how Swedish would be taught to students who are in Finnish schools may have an influence on these bilingual families to make different decisions on whether or not they would prefer Swedish to be the primary language of their child or not.

2.2.3 Family Language Policy and Bilingual Families in Finland

Lojander-Visapää (2008) examined the situation of Swedish in the Finnish school system and observed that the number of Swedish speakers attending schools is not diminishing, which is good for Swedish in the long term. Parents in Finland who have the relevant languages can choose whether or not their children will be monolingually Finnish or Swedish or bilingual in both, and one of the most important ways they do this is by choosing the language their children are using in schools. There is however an issue with that as the language parents choose for their child affects their school language (Palviainen & Bergoth, 2018). If parents don't live the right

part of Finland, it could be difficult for them to give their child the social environment they need to develop both languages equally. The way this connects into the thesis is that while it is easy for families to pick which of the two languages, or both, that they want to focus on their child developing, but it can be difficult for them to place them into schooling mediums where their child can be socialized in either language that they want for a variety of reasons. This means that the parents might have to put in more effort to get the child the school language they want or they may focus more on the child having easier social interactions.

One form of family language policy often used in bilingual families is called One Person One Language, where parents usually speak one language, most often their native language, to their child, and thus help them maintain both languages (Curdt-Christiansen & Lanza, 2018). Palviainen and Boyd (2013) discovered that families often, who were usually monolingual speakers or at least raised monolingually in their primary language, defaulted to a one person one language policy without making conscious plans or efforts to. The way families enacted this policy would make it covert and de facto as the lack of planning with no official statement from them that they were doing this until they were asked about it (Palviainen & Boyd, 2013). The overall situation was dynamic though as the families did not always keep it that way one hundred percent when aspects of their life changed. The way this relates back to my thesis is how families need to be active in maintaining their children's language, but that there are ways in which people are readily equipped to naturally start teaching their children through one person one language. The dynamic aspects of how they taught their children Finnish and Swedish is relevant as well because it is important focus on how family language policy may shift throughout the life of their children as their family's life changes.

Palviainen and Bergoth (2018) discovered that it is common for families in Finland to feel that bilingualism is something you are born with, and that cannot be changed as you grow; language ideologies of these families often made being bi- or multilingual into something that cannot be changed, as most of the people or children who were identified as bilingual in the interviews were people who had been raised in environments with more than one language. Some of the interviewees also talked about the importance of being raised in the culture, and how that also affected you being bilingual (Palviainen & Bergoth, 2018). The reason this is relevant to this thesis is because families who want their children to be bi- or multilingual could

possibly hold similar beliefs, and thus it would be necessary for them to choose to actively make their children bilingual. The cultural aspect of being bilingual would also be crucial to examine as there would be a difference between having a Finnish Swede or a Swede when it comes to raising a child bilingually in Finland.

Hult and Pietikainen (2014) showed that there are some negative views towards Swedish in Finland as many refer to it as forced Swedish when it comes to the obligatory Swedish subject in school, feel that it is a barrier for students wanting to learn other languages. Salo (2012) also discussed how students can often be either entirely unmotivated or possibly even verbally aggressive towards their teachers. Finns having negative attitudes towards Swedish may cause Swedish speakers to be more defensive or shy when it comes to using their language. A potential fear of how they may be treated for speaking Swedish could deter people from wanting to use or improve their skills over time. This will be important to pay attention to in how bilingual families feel other people's attitudes towards them are with regards to Swedish as their personal feelings on how they are treated for using Swedish could have some serious implications.

3 Methodology

The methodology section for this thesis is split into three parts. The first section will describe the methods used for this research, and the reasons for choosing them. The second part will restate the research questions, the goal of this thesis, and the ethical considerations for this thesis. The third section will look at how the data will be analyzed.

3.1 Research Method

The method of research being done for this thesis is an instrumental case study with data collected from a semi-structured qualitative interview. Case studies as defined by Harling (2012) are “a holistic inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its natural setting” (p. 1); however, Harling is not the only author who describes a case study in this way. Other researchers such as Creswell et al. (2007) and Yin (2003) also define case studies in similar ways; alongside them is Yazan (2015) who defines plenty of interpretations of case studies, including Yin’s. A case study works well with my thesis as I can use it to look at this specific situation of Swedish and Finnish bilingual families in Finland, and it helps me to get a closer perspective to the situation by getting information directly from someone who has lived this experience. In particular I am using the type of case study that Harling (2012) defines as an instrumental case study, “The instrumental case study is done to provide a general understanding of a phenomenon using a particular case” (p. 2). This type of case study fits with my thesis’ goal to look at how a normal family views this situation, and helps broaden our understanding of this topic, especially because looking at a Swedish Swede’s perspective is not as common when looking at bilingual families in Finland. I examined how Smith-Christmas et al. (2019) used case studies to observe three bilingual families in three different places, the Netherlands, Scotland, and Finland; they used this method as three separate case studies that they compared, to look at similarities and differences between the participant’s lives and how they tried to maintain their children’s languages. The way they used case studies in their research is similar to how I wanted to approach my thesis topic; therefore, I decided this would be the right method to use for my own work. One major difference between my study and theirs is that I only have one subject that I interviewed; however, the method they used of looking at these families to gain better insight into language maintenance still fits very well with my own thesis topic and is why I chose to use similar methods here.

I conducted a semi-structured interview to collect my data. A semi-structured interview is when the researcher has more open-ended questions pre prepared so that the interviewee is able to more freely respond to questions and elaborate on their thoughts (McIntosh & Morse, 2015; Newcomer et al., 2015). This type of interview structure was a perfect fit for this thesis as it allowed me to give the interviewee plenty of room to elaborate on her thoughts, while still directing her towards information that I wanted to know specifically. One issue that should be noted with the research I have done here is that I only have one subject for my data. So, while the information that I got from my interview subject is useful and interesting, the sample size is small, and if I had more time to do this research a much larger collection of subjects would help flesh out the findings of this thesis.

3.2 Research Questions

The purpose of my research is to better understand the reasons and motivations behind language choice and maintenance for the child in a bilingual Finnish and Swedish family in Finland. Since, Finland only allows parents to choose one L1 for their child and this L1 determines how the government interacts with them and what kind of language medium schools they should attend (Palviainen & Bergoth, 2018), this policy has long-term effects on individuals as it determines their education language through de jure government legislation. Due to the effect this policy can have on choices that affect the entire future of individuals; it is my goal to obtain a greater understanding of the motivations of this family. I will also be looking at how they help their children maintain both Finnish and Swedish, if they do. This research was done by interviewing a Swedish speaker from Sweden who married a Finnish speaker. They live in a Finnish language dominated area of Finland with their child. I chose to interview this person as they not only fit the basic criteria of a Finnish and Swedish speaking family, but also because as a Swede, they have a unique outlook on raising children in a Swedish speaking environment in Finland from the Finnish Swedes.

The interview was recorded and the data of the interviewee was anonymized afterwards. The interviewee gave their permission to be interviewed and recorded through a consent form, and this was also reconfirmed verbally before the recording started. The interviewee also has the right to withdraw their consent if they choose to. The interviewee was also sent a privacy notice before the interview alongside the consent form. The data from the interview was anonymized as

much as possible. No specific names or careers are given, and the closest to naming specific areas where they currently or have lived is just naming Finland and Sweden.

The questions asked during the interview were based around my research questions stated in the introduction section. The first research question about the language they chose for their child was also expanded to ask them more about their own personal language background. What languages did they grow up with, and what languages were they using at home before they had their child. The second research question which asked about their motivations for choosing Finnish or Swedish was expanded to ask them more specifically what factors: economic, cultural, pragmatic, influenced their choice if anything did. The third research question related to how they potentially help their child maintain their language. This question was expanded to allow a greater understanding of various aspects of how they worked with their child to maintain their languages. They were asked: if their child regularly interacts with family from both countries, what language medium schools do they attend and do they have media they can consume in both languages. I also asked them how they feel about their child's language skills and if aspects of their lives changed that made helping their child more difficult. We also briefly discussed how her child's attitudes towards Swedish and how Finns view it could affect his opinion of the language.

3.3 Data Analysis

The method of data analysis that I chose for this thesis is interpretive phenomenological analysis. Interpretive phenomenological analysis is a method of data analysis that looks at the experiences and perspectives of the individual or individuals whose data is collected in a study (Larkin et al., 2006; Smith & Shinebourne, 2012). This type of data analysis emphasizes not just understanding and regurgitating what the research participants have said, but to really look at what they are saying and interpret more than just the base level descriptions of their experiences (Smith & Shinebourne, 2012). This type of analysis fits this thesis well as my data collection and research methodology has focused on getting as much information and experience out of my research participant as possible. I collected data from my participant on this topic because I wanted to understand their perspective and thoughts about living in a bilingual Finnish and Swedish family in Finland, and by analyzing this data by not only observing the descriptive level of what she said, but also attempting to interpret more meaning from her experiences could

provide greater insight into this phenomenon. An important drawback to consider here about using this method of data analysis is that it is more difficult to come to generalizations from my results; however, the sample size of my data is small enough that it was never my goal to do that based on the data I found.

4 Life in a Finnish and Swedish Household

The interview subject currently lives in Finland, in a region where Swedish speakers are not prevalent. She lives with her husband and their only son. She is from Sweden and is a native Swedish speaker. Her husband is from Finland and is a native Finnish speaker. When they met, she and her husband's only language in common was not Finnish or Swedish, but English. Both of them learned the other's language as an adult. Their child is around the age of 13 and has knowledge of Finnish, Swedish, and English.

4.1 Family Background

The interviewee first detailed her upbringing and how she met her husband. She was born in Sweden and grew up in a monolingual environment. She learned languages while she was growing up; however, it was important for her to mention that she had never really thought of Finland or Finnish during that time. She attended a university in Sweden, and after she received her Ph.D., she got a grant to come to university in Finland. It was after this started that she met her husband. Initially, their only common language was English. Her husband knew a little Swedish because of the Finnish school system, and over time he started trying to improve his language skills with her. So, he asked her to start only speaking Swedish with him on some days. Eventually it reached a point where their home language became Swedish instead of English. She mentioned that she has learned some Finnish, but that his Swedish is better than her Finnish. To this day they continue to use Swedish as their home language over both English and Finnish. A few years after they met and got married, they had their son.

One detail I think is interesting to illuminate at when she described her early life with her husband is how interested in learning Swedish he was. This would indirectly show that he is not only open minded, but also that he is patient and persistent. She did not mention that there was an effort from either one of them to force the other to learn their language, but he wanted to share that with her and was willing to put the time and effort in to learning Swedish no matter how bad

he initially was at it. She also mentioned that her background was monolingual, and that her husband's was too. This is information that should be observed carefully too, because even though she did language related studies in college, neither one of them had the context of what it was like to grow up in a bi- or multilingual household, and that would be something they would have to figure out for themselves.

4.2 Early Childhood and Choice

The interviewee made it known that she and her husband did not really have to think or consider anything to choose their child's language. They both knew English, but that was neither of their native languages. Her husband spoke Finnish, but she did not. Both of them spoke Swedish however, and that made it feel like the natural choice to give him at the time. So, she spoke only Swedish to her child while her husband only spoke Finnish to him. They still spoke Swedish to each other though, so that still gave the home more Swedish speaking. She also mentioned that they spent a lot of time around her husband's family who could either only speak Finnish or also knew English. Then came the time when her son was old enough to go to daycare. They sent him to a Swedish speaking daycare in the part of Finland where they live. However, they did not live close to the daycare, so it was up to her husband to drive him there as he was the only one with a license. Overtime they bought a house, and realized it would be a lot of effort to take him to the Swedish daycare every day. They also considered if it would be better for him to go to the school closer to him, so he would also be closer to the kids that he went to school with. This led them to actually switch him from a Swedish medium daycare to a Finnish one, and he has been in Finnish medium education closer to his home ever since.

The language situation they had made their choice of language nonexistent as it just felt natural for them to pick Swedish; however, something she did not focus on is that they both had a lot of persistence and tenacity to send him to the Swedish daycare for the first few years. They did not need to send him there. There were schools that were Finnish medium closer to them that they could have sent him to, and they could have just worked on giving him lots of Swedish practice at home. However, they were both willing to do the extra work needed to drive him to the other part of the city for Swedish daycare. It was only when it became even more difficult to get there, and they thought about how he would not have as many friends nearby that they finally decided to switch him to a Finnish medium daycare.

4.3 Language Practice

The interviewee discussed many ways that her son gets practice in not just Swedish, but also in Finnish and English. According to her he does a lot on the computer including playing games, and when he does that, he uses all 3 languages with other people regularly, although he mostly

gets English practice there. She then continued to explain how he gets Finnish practice on his football team, where she also practices her Finnish. She discussed how his home environment is predominantly Swedish. His parents speak Swedish together, he speaks Swedish with his mom, and he speaks Finnish with his dad. She emphasized that she felt it was good for him to see his dad speak Swedish regularly, that it gives him a role model to look up to when it comes to Swedish. She talked about how social media and programs like Skype allow him to easily communicate with her family in Sweden, which gives him even more opportunities to speak Swedish. He also talks with her at home regularly, and then even text each other through WhatsApp often in Swedish. She remarked that he does not need to use Swedish on WhatsApp, but they just do anyway. She mentioned that she felt if he was an only child it may have been much harder for her to have all this time to talk, and communicate with him. So, she feels that has also been beneficial to his learning.

His home life is just brimming with Swedish, while not being the only language he hears on a regular basis. Both she and her husband put in effort to give him the environment needed to get lots of exposure and practice with Swedish, regardless of whether or not they are doing it consciously. But she clearly takes great interest in his life, and interacts with him, and her husband's efforts to learn Swedish earlier have paid off by giving him even more exposure too.

Her son currently goes to a Finnish medium school, and as such his Finnish skills are his strongest. However, at the school he has recently started taking his mandatory Swedish courses as all students are required to. She feels that the course is a little too easy for him most likely, but she said that the teachers give him various extra projects to help him get more practice with his more advanced skills. He is even given opportunities by his teacher to be a co teacher in class sometimes, which she thinks is possibly a confidence booster for him. She explained how he is not in the heritage language courses even though he is entitled to be in one. The process of getting all the pieces together to make it happen just seemed to be too much for them, and when he took the courses, he did not like the class so they just kept him out of the heritage courses.

While giving him the opportunity to take a more dedicated Swedish course would obviously benefit him, the two of them listening to what he wants is also important. Making him take a Swedish course or class that he did not really like may have had a negative effect on him.

Allowing him to have input into how he learns and interacts with his languages is probably a huge benefit for him when it comes to learning.

4.4 Language Development and Attitudes

One question I asked her was how she feels his skills are in Finnish and Swedish. She explained that Finnish was definitely his best language, but that his Swedish is quite good. He makes minor mistakes here and there, and because he has not been in school for Swedish much, he does not really know how to read and write Swedish well. On top of this she has tried to unsuccessfully get him to start reading more, but unfortunately that has not worked out too well. She also discussed how she felt about the availability of Swedish medium education for children here in Finland. She felt that in the Finnish medium cities you are not always lucky enough to have resources available to you. However, if you are willing to work hard for it, she is confident you can find the resources in non-Swedish speaking cities to educate your child. She also said that being a Swedish Swede her perspective on this might be a little different from a Finland Swede's.

The family had the option to use the Swedish medium schools, but in the end decided it would be better for him to be socialized closer to home. This wound up working out well for them as the language policies they had in place at home had a strong effect on him learning both languages in the end. It helps that they consider what he wants in these situations quite often. They decided to let him go to school closer to home to be closer to friends, and they could do things like try to make him read and write in Swedish more often. However, it seems they usually choose what will help him be happier and more comfortable.

Finally, I asked her if she had experience with being treated poorly or differently for speaking Swedish, and if the Finns' aversion to Swedish may have an impact on her son. She said that one thing that really changes her perspective on this is that she is from Sweden and not a Finnish Swede, so people do not tend to treat her negatively, and in fact are often curious about her Swedish. She talked about various stereotypes and jokes made at Swedes and Swedish, and mentioned that she has heard her son talking about these online while playing games. However, she does not think he has any issues related to being Swedish speaking. She did wonder though if now that his classmates are starting to learn Swedish, if their attitudes towards him might start to change if they struggle with the language. She specifically brought up an example of the teacher

telling her about how when it came to recent test scores in his Swedish class that while some students were doing well, many of them also did poorly, and that this might start to change their attitudes towards Swedish as it frustrates them more.

Her mentioning that because she is from Sweden, people tend to be more positive towards her when it comes to Swedish might have some interesting implications. She talked about Sweden being a 'big brother' to Finland, and maybe this alongside the more foreign way that Swedish tends to be portrayed in Finland could mean the general attitudes around their Swedish are more positive. Rather than being part of the Finnish Swede minority, being from Sweden and his Swedish being Sweden Swedish might mean that he generally avoids more of the negative experiences that Swedish speakers can experience in Finland.

Overall, this is a bilingual Finnish and Swedish family with some differing qualities from the Finnish Swede community, but they have still successfully helped create an environment to help their son become bilingual in both languages. Their child started out in Swedish medium schooling, but was switched into Finnish schools early on. This did not hinder his Swedish development though as the family language policies present in his home helped his Swedish flourish. Alongside these factors, he has many different avenues with which to practice both his languages, and thanks to the positive influence from his parents and his current lack of negative experiences with Swedish he shows no signs of stopping.

5 Discussion

This discussion will focus on examining the information obtained from the interview and considering the interpretations and implications of what was discovered. The comparison of the data I collected from my interview and the literature review will be split into three sections based on each of my research questions. There is also a fourth section which is related to motivations of the family, but is not itself a research question. The first section will look at my first research question: which language was chosen as their child's L1, Finnish or Swedish. It will also look at the language background of the parents. The second section will feature my second research question: what factors influenced their decision to choose that language? The third section will cover my third research question: how do they help maintain their child's languages? In particular it will be looking at the kinds of family language policy they use, and the effects of education. The final section will cover how language perceptions might affect their child's attitude towards Swedish based on potential negative attitudes or opinions coming from people around them.

5.1 Language Choice and Background

A primary factor to note when it comes to this interviewee is that she is not from Finland, and instead is a Swede. As described by Ricento (2006), one of the ways language ideology influences people is by facilitating the creation of identities, often spurred on by a nation state. In this case she has a Sweden Swedish speaker identity as opposed to a Finnish Swedish speaker identity. This means that her perspectives are going to be very different when compared to Finnish Swedes, and it has an impact on how she interacts with the world around her. When she met her husband, the only language they had in common with each other was English. His native language was Finnish. However, over time he made a greater effort to learn Swedish, and this eventually became the language they used together at home. Due to the fact that Swedish was the only language that they had in common that was one of their mother tongues, it seemed logical for them to choose Swedish as their child's L1 because it was just the most obvious choice for them. This was not a completely permanent choice though, as eventually they decided the effort required to take him to a Swedish medium daycare was more than it was worth, and they switched him into Finnish medium education. Salo (2012) discussed how it can be difficult for Swedish speakers in Finland to receive services in Finland sometimes as there just not always

enough people available to do the work, especially outside a Swedish speaking area. This does not mean that they or other families cannot or will not seek out an education in Swedish for their children, but it can act as a deterrent if other aspects of their life cause it to become more effort than it is worth.

5.2 Factors and Influences

Now one factor the interviewee made clear during the session was that there was not much of a decision-making process when they chose the L1 of their child. They simply chose the language that made the most sense to them without really thinking about it. However, there are some major details to note with their choices and decisions they made in his early life. First is that as interpreted from the interview, they put in a large amount of effort in the beginning to ensure he could get an education in Swedish. Parents taking an active role in the development of their child's languages is an important factor in their long-term development (King et al., 2008). They both had a lot of passion and tenacity to make a strong effort to keep taking him to the Swedish medium daycare in the beginning, but later on they decided it might be better for him to have his social and school life centered much closer to home. As he got older and it became more impractical for them to continue to take him to the Swedish medium daycare due to changes in their lives, they made a decision to change aspects of his language education. Palviainen and Boyd (2013) explained that life changes cause family language policies to be dynamic to suit the needs of the family when parts of their lives undergo change. The changing circumstances in their lives led to a shift in what medium he was schooled in, but he still continues to get practice in Swedish at home. Consequently, his parents focusing on his social needs and their personal needs turned out to be a winning strategy for them in the end. Lojander-Visapää (2008) discussed how the socialization language of children is up to their parents and the final decision, about which language that will be, is can be influenced by many different factors such as economic, social or cultural ones. In this particular instance there were two elements that had the largest impact. The first were his social circumstances, wanting their child to be at a school closer to his home so he could also be closer to his friends. The second factor that changed their situation was economic, as them moving to another part of the city made it even more difficult for them to continue to bring him to the Swedish medium daycare.

5.3 Maintenance of the Languages

The family language policies used by the interviewee's family are quite interesting as there are two types that I recognized in my data that are in use in their household. The first type of family language policy used in their home is 'one parent, one language' which is defined by Curdt-Christiansen and Lanza (2018) as when two parents use a different language each when speaking to their child. In their home the mother speaks Swedish with their son, and her husband speaks Finnish with him. Johnson (2013) gave descriptions of the different ways in which language policy is often categorized, in particular the types of policy used in this family are de facto, implicit, bottom-up, and slightly overt. They are implicit because there was never any official documentation of it by the family; it is just what they do. It is also de facto because there is no 'law' or rule set to dictate the policies. The policies are bottom-up as they affect the family from the lowest levels. Finally, the policies are overt, but mostly because they aren't being hidden, so they cannot be covert. The policies at use in this family formed naturally without much planning on their part. The fact that 'one parent, one language' family language policy was created without any effort is something that Palviainen and Boyd (2013) explained as there seems to be a natural tendency for families to settle into that type of policy without much forethought. 'One parent, one language' family language policy is not the only type of language policy that is used in this family however. Another type of family language policy I also noticed was the 'minority language only at home' policy. Curdt-Christiansen and Lanza (2018) describe this policy as when the minority language of the area a family is living in is dominant at home. However, while this policy is dominant within the family, it is not being completely applied to everyone in their household. This is due to the fact that the husband often uses Finnish with their son. However, because the son uses Swedish with his mother and his parents use it with each other, a large amount of the language input he receives when he is at home comes from Swedish instead of Finnish. The interviewee also made no mention as to whether or not her son and husband speak Swedish together, and while I would assume based on her statements that a lot of their conversations are in Finnish, I would not be surprised to learn that they do speak it together sometimes considering how prevalent it is at home. Swedish is definitely a minority language in Finland when compared to Finnish (Ihalainen & Saarinen, 2015; Latomaa & Nuolijärvi, 2002; Nikula et al., 2012). This would mean that their home environment fits the definition of the 'minority language only at home' policy. These two family language policies work in tandem to

give their child more practice in Swedish in particular, since he no longer attends a Swedish medium school. There are some minor drawbacks to getting the majority of his Swedish practice at home with his family, but overall, the interviewee said that his Swedish skills are very good. So, it seems that this set up has worked well for his language development and maintenance in his life.

The language that the interviewee's child has been immersed in has changed throughout their life. In the beginning, his parents sent him to a Swedish medium daycare for a few years. This daycare was one of the few located in their region of Finland for Swedish speaking children. Unfortunately, there are not many schools around Finland that allow for simultaneous teaching in both Swedish and Finnish (Boyd & Palviainen, 2015). There eventually came a time where they decided it was better for them to switch him to a Finnish daycare. This allowed him to attend a school closer to their home which made their situation more manageable. Now that he is older and has been attending Finnish medium schooling for the majority of his life, the interviewee says that his Finnish is quite clearly his strongest language. His Swedish has not suffered during these years though, as the family language policies set up at home have allowed him to be fluent when he is speaking it to others. He has recently started taking the mandatory Swedish courses for Finnish speakers in his school, and while this is good as the interviewee mentioned that his reading and writing in Swedish are not well developed yet, it comes with some issues of its own. The interviewee explained how the Swedish classes are meant for students who speak little to no Swedish at all, and while his teachers do give him extra work to compensate, he is still in a beginner's class. There are some positives for his situation though. Halonen et al. (2015) observed that the Finnish education system often portrays Swedish as if it was a foreign language restricted to Åland and Sweden. However, this has the potential to benefit him. The interviewee mentioned how the teachers often ask him to give pronunciation examples and to be the co teacher in his class sometimes, and this most likely has to do with the fact that he does not just speak Swedish, but Sweden Swedish specifically. The interviewee felt that this was probably a boost for his confidence, so, the classes might be a bit easy, but they could also help him in other aspects of his life.

The education and family language policy environment that the interviewee's son has in his life right now will have a strong impact on his future when it comes to him being bilingual.

Slavkov (2016) demonstrated that an equal amount of effort towards family language policy for one language and a formal education in the other greatly increases the chance of children becoming bilingual. His family utilizing two different family language policies, ‘one parent, one language’ and ‘minority language only at home’ gives him the necessary practice to maintain his Swedish, and him attending Finnish medium schools helps him strengthen his Finnish. All of this and the interviewee’s testimony show that he’s already achieved bilingualism.

There are other ways outside of school that the interviewee’s son also practices and learns both Finnish and Swedish. The interviewee mentioned how her son was involved in a Finnish football team, and this is also how she practices her Finnish. It is interesting to see their languages reverse in this public context. It is similar to an example provided by Smith-Christmas et al. (2019) where a woman spoke Finnish at home with her children, but when going out and interacting with institutions in Finland she switched to Swedish alongside them. This situation has the languages reversed though as the interviewee uses Swedish as her home language with her child, but then switches to Finnish in this particular public setting alongside him. His usage of social media to communicate with his mother’s family in Sweden and then physically seeing his father’s family here in Finland gives him a more elaborate version of the ‘one parent, one language’ policy, perhaps it should be called ‘one family, one language.’ There is also the way that his gaming affects his language development. His time spent online playing game and interacting with social media allows him to have some personal ways for him to use the both his languages that are not just interacting with his family.

5.4 Attitudes

The way people view a language or associate with it can have an impact on how people approach or use it, whether it is thought of highly or considered lesser (Spolsky, 2007). The interviewee made it clear that she personally has never had people treat her or react negatively to her because of her being a Swedish speaker. She also explained that her son as far as she knows has never been bullied or treated poorly in school for being bilingual in Swedish. As shown by Salo (2012), there can be a very negative and unmotivated attitude towards the Swedish language by students. This coupled with Swedish also often being referred to as ‘forced Swedish’ by people in Finland (Hult & Pietikainen, 2014), and you have some factors that might warp his perspective of Swedish. The interviewee noted that while he is certainly aware of stereotypes

towards Swedes, she does not think that it bothers him too much. She also felt that seeing his father regularly use Swedish at home helps give him a good role model to look to for that. She then explained that while his classmates have not been negative towards Swedish as far as she knows for now, that they may start to have more negative attitudes surface now that they are in these Swedish classes. She mentioned that Finns are often more curious or interested in her ability to speak Swedish. This has led me to wonder if it is possible that by not being directly apart of the Finnish Swede minority if that insulates them from some of the negative attitudes towards Swedish that Finns can have. They would actually be foreign in this case as opposed to part of the specific minority group that is Finnish Swedes. This might be an area to look into more and do further research in.

6 Conclusion

This conclusion is split into five sections. The first section looks back on the research questions, and answers them with the findings of this thesis and the implications this has. The second part is a reflection on the research methods chosen for this thesis. The third part talks about how it contributes to the field. The fourth part talks about some of the limitations of this study. Finally, the fifth part gives recommendations for future research.

The goal of this thesis was to look at the language choice within a bilingual Finnish and Swedish family in Finland. They were not only asked about which language they chose for their child as their L1, but also why they chose that and how they helped them maintain it. The interview with the subject of this case study found that while they chose Swedish, the situation was more complicated than that. Swedish was chosen by them as it was the obvious choice being their common language; however, over time it was simpler for them to send their child to be schooled in Finnish medium schools rather than Swedish ones. The family language policies they informally created at home, ‘one parent, one language’ and ‘minority language only at home,’ allowed for his Swedish skills to develop somewhat reasonably well alongside his Finnish that he was formally being socialized in at school. The findings here demonstrate that with the right family language policies being used at home, and parents who genuinely care about their child’s language development, it is extremely likely that their children will grow up to be bilingual in both their parents’ languages.

The research method of a case study was chosen for this thesis because the small sample size would fit well within the framework of this method. A semi-structured interview was chosen to be the method of data collection because this allowed me to ask my interviewee more open-ended questions that would give me more of their personal perspective of this context. Finally, interpretive phenomenological analysis was used to analyze the data because the entire point of this study was to look into the motivations and reasons behind choices made about these languages, and so interpreting their perspectives on this phenomenon worked well for the questions being asked by this thesis.

One of the aims of this thesis was to look at what I felt was a bit of gap in why Finnish or Swedish was chosen in families specifically. Another goal was to expand the perspectives available for bilingual Swedish and Finnish families here in Finland. There has been work done

on this before, but this thesis expands that by providing even more perspectives into this specific phenomenon.

There are a few main limitations when it comes to this thesis that are imperative to pay attention to. The first one is the sample size of this thesis. I only interviewed one person and made it a case study, and while case studies can reveal useful information, there is no way that this thesis can be applied to wide groups of individuals as it focuses on one family in particular. The interview subject is also another limiting factor. The interviewee is a Swedish Swede and not a Finnish Swede so that limits the possible perspectives that can be analyzed within this context. There is also the fact that only one member of the family was interviewed, and so the perspectives of the father for instance are left out or given from the mother's perspective.

For future research there are a few ways that this thesis could be expanded upon. The first way is to get a larger pool of interview subjects to get data from. The interview pool could be more diverse, for instance, by interviewing both Swedish Swedes and Finnish Swedes. Multiple family members could also be interviewed instead of only one. Increasing the number of interviews while also diversifying the people who are interviewed would be the best course of action to improve future research into this phenomenon.

References

- Boyd, S., & Palviainen, Å. (2015). Building Walls or Bridges? A Language Ideological Debate About Bilingual Schools in Finland. In M. Halonen, P. Ihalainen, & T. Saarinen (Authors), *Language policies in Finland and Sweden: Interdisciplinary and multi-sited comparisons* (pp. 57-89). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Creswell, J. W., Hanson, W. E., Clark Plano, V. L., & Morales, A. (2007). Qualitative research designs: Selection and implementation. *The counseling psychologist*, 35(2), 236-264.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2009). Invisible and visible language planning: Ideological factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant families in Quebec. *Language policy*, 8(4), 351-375.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L., & Lanza, E. (2018). Language management in multilingual families: Efforts, measures and challenges. *Multilingua*, 37(2), 123-130.
- Halonen, M., Nikula, T., Saarinen, T., & Tarnanen, M. (2015). 'Listen, there'll Be a pause After Each question': A Swedish lesson as a Nexus for Multi-sited language Education policies. In M. Halonen, P. Ihalainen, & T. Saarinen (Authors), *Language policies in Finland and Sweden: Interdisciplinary and multi-sited comparisons* (pp. 220-244). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Harling, K. (2012). An overview of case study. Available at SSRN 2141476.
- Hult, F. M., & Pietikainen, S. (2014). Shaping discourses of multilingualism through a language ideological debate: The case of Swedish in Finland. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 13(1), 1-20.
- Ihalainen, P., & Saarinen, T. (2015). Constructing 'language' in language policy Discourse: Finnish and Swedish legislative processes in the 2000s. In M. Halonen, P. Ihalainen, & T. Saarinen (Authors), *Language policies in Finland and Sweden: Interdisciplinary and multi-sited comparisons* (pp. 29-56). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Johnson, D. C. (2013). What is language policy? In *Language policy* (pp. 3-25). Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: New York, NY.

- King, K. A., Fogle, L., & Logan-Terry, A. (2008). Family Language Policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2(5), 907-922. doi:10.1111/j.1749-818x.2008.00076.x
- Larkin, M., Watts, S., & Clifton, E. (2006). Giving voice and making sense in interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 102-120.
- Latomaa, S., & Nuolijärvi, P. (2002). The language situation in finland. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 3(2), 95-202. doi:10.1080/14664200208668040
- Lojander-Visapää, C. (2008). New bilingualism in the bilingual finnish context. *Europäisches Journal Für Minderheitenfragen*, 1(2), 109-118. doi:10.1007/s12241-008-0014-z
- McIntosh, M. J., & Morse, J. M. (2015). Situating and constructing diversity in semi-structured interviews. *Global qualitative nursing research*, 2, 2333393615597674.
- Newcomer, K. E., Hatry, H. P., & Wholey, J. S. (2015). Conducting semi-structured interviews. *Handbook of practical program evaluation*, 492.
- Nikula, T., T. S., Pöyhönen, S., & Kangasvieri, T. (2012). Linguistic Diversity as a Problem and a Resource — Multilingualism in European and Finnish Policy Documents. In J. Blommaert, S. Leppänen, P. Pahta, & T. Räisänen (Authors), *Dangerous multilingualism: Northern perspectives on order, purity and normality* (pp. 41-66). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Norrby, C., Wide, C., Lindström, J., & Nilsson, J. (2015). Interpersonal relationships in medical consultations. Comparing Sweden Swedish and Finland Swedish address practices. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 84, 121-138.
- Palviainen, Å, & Bergroth, M. (2018). Parental discourses of language ideology and linguistic identity in multilingual finland. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 15(3), 262-275. doi:10.1080/14790718.2018.1477108
- Palviainen, Å, & Boyd, S. (2013). Unity in discourse, diversity in practice: The one person one language policy in bilingual families Springer Netherlands. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-7753-8_10 Retrieved from https://search.datacite.org/works/10.1007/978-94-007-7753-8_10

- Ricento, T. (Ed.). (2006). *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=238355>
- Salo, O. (2012). Finland's Official Bilingualism - a Bed of Roses or of Procrustes. In J. Blommaert, S. Leppänen, P. Pahta, & T. Räisänen (Authors), *Dangerous multilingualism: Northern perspectives on order, purity and normality* (pp. 25-40). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shohamy, E. G. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. Psychology Press.
- Slavkov, N. (2016). Family language policy and school language choice: Pathways to bilingualism and multilingualism in a Canadian context. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14(4), 378-400. doi:10.1080/14790718.2016.1229319
- Smith, J. A., & Shinebourne, P. (2012). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis*. American Psychological Association.
- Smith-Christmas, C., Bergroth, M., & Bezcioglu-Göktolga, I. (2019). A kind of success story: Family language policy in three different sociopolitical contexts. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 13(2), 88-101.
- Spolsky, B. (2007). Towards a theory of language policy. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (WPEL)*, 22(1), 1.
- Yazan, B. (2015). Three approaches to case study methods in education: Yin, Merriam, and Stake. *The qualitative report*, 20(2), 134-152.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. *Politics of Education Association Bulletin*.