

**PERCEPTIONS ON THE USE OF ENGLISH AS A LIN-  
GUA FRANCA AT HOME: MULTILINGUAL FAMILIES  
IN FINLAND AND NORWAY**

Louisa Gühr  
Master's Thesis  
Master in Language, Globalization and  
Intercultural Communication  
Department of Language and  
Communication Studies  
University of Jyväskylä  
Spring 2021

# UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

Faculty Humanities and Social Sciences	Department Department of Language and Communication Studies
Author Louisa Gühr	
Title Perceptions on the use of English as a lingua franca at home: multilingual families in Finland and in Norway	
Subject Language, Globalization and Intercultural Communication	Level Master's Thesis
Month and year May 2021	Number of pages 65 + 6 Appendices
<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <p>This study investigates the use of English as a lingua franca (ELF) in the context of four multilingual families from two Nordic countries: Finland and Norway. These families make use of ELF in their family interactions. ELF has been extensively researched in different social contexts, and yet, it has been researched surprisingly little in the context of multilingual family interaction (for exceptions, see e.g. Soler &amp; Zabrodskaia, 2017; Pietikäinen, 2017). The aim of this study is to answer to how the research participants see the role of ELF in their family interactions and how, according to them, their use of ELF has changed over time in their family interactions. The data set consists of part of the interview data that was collected during 2018 for the research project "<i>Linguistic Constellations of Lingua Franca Families - A Longitudinal Inquiry into the Development of Multilingual Practices</i>" led by Dr Kaisa S. Pietikäinen. The selected data is made up of four semi-structured interviews with the parents of four multilingual families that make use of ELF in their family interactions. The data was qualitatively analysed through a thematic-based narrative research method – phenomenography. In the analysis, six phenomena were found: 1. the use of ELF in multilingual families over time; 2. the use of ELF in multilingual family interactions; 3. the use of ELF between parents in multilingual families; 4. ELF as a linguistic support for learning to speak other languages present in the context of multilingual families; 5. ELF as a tool for communicating with extended family members in the context of multilingual families; and 6. ELF as a hindering factor when learning other languages in the context of multilingual families. This study shows that the use of ELF in multilingual families is in constant change and development. The participants do not use ELF in isolation in their family interactions, but rather in a way in which all the languages that the family members share are somewhat intertwined. One could say that ELF used in multilingual families is a language of its own in each of the multilingual families that exist out there and that their use cannot be strictly defined since each family might have a variety of language identities, beliefs and practices that make their use of ELF in their family unique. My findings could serve as a tool to better understand the linguistic and interpersonal realities of multilingual families that use ELF. I hope that this thesis and possible future research will help to shed light on the way in which ELF is present in multilingual families for diverse amount of time and in diversely creative ways.</p>	
<p><b>Keywords</b></p> <p>English as a lingua franca, multilingual family, transnational family, multilingualism, language identity, language ideology, code switching, translanguaging, Englishes in the world</p>	
Depository University of Jyväskylä	
Additional information	

## TABLES

<a href="#">TABLE 1</a>	<a href="#">Family 1: family members and their language proficiency.....</a>	<a href="#">32</a>
<a href="#">TABLE 2</a>	<a href="#">Family 2: family members and their language proficiency.....</a>	<a href="#">33</a>
<a href="#">TABLE 3</a>	<a href="#">Family 3: family members and their language proficiency.....</a>	<a href="#">34</a>
<a href="#">TABLE 4</a>	<a href="#">Family 4: family members and their language proficiency.....</a>	<a href="#">35</a>
<a href="#">TABLE 5</a>	<a href="#">Phenomenon 1: The use of ELF in multilingual families over time.....</a>	<a href="#">40</a>
<a href="#">TABLE 6</a>	<a href="#">Phenomenon 2: The use of ELF in multilingual family interactions.....</a>	<a href="#">44</a>
<a href="#">TABLE 7</a>	<a href="#">Phenomenon 3: The use of ELF between parents in multilingual families.....</a>	<a href="#">48</a>
<a href="#">TABLE 8</a>	<a href="#">Phenomenon 4: ELF as a linguistic support for learning to speak other languages present in the context of multilingual families.....</a>	<a href="#">49</a>
<a href="#">TABLE 9</a>	<a href="#">Phenomenon 5: ELF as a tool for communicating with extended family members in the context of multilingual families.....</a>	<a href="#">51</a>
<a href="#">TABLE 10</a>	<a href="#">Phenomenon 6: ELF as a hindering factor when learning other lan- guages in the context of multilingual families.....</a>	<a href="#">53</a>

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of abbreviations .....	1
1. INTRODUCTION .....	2
2. ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA .....	7
2.1. English as a global language .....	7
2.2. English as a global lingua franca .....	9
3. MULTILINGUAL FAMILIES .....	13
3.1. Defining multilingualism .....	13
3.2. Defining multilingual family .....	14
3.3. Family language policy .....	16
3.4. Language ideologies .....	19
3.4.1. Language beliefs.....	20
3.4.2. Language identity .....	21
3.4.3. Language practices in different domains in the family context .....	22
4. METHODOLOGY.....	26
4.1. Research aim .....	26
4.2. Qualitative research.....	27
4.3. Narrative research.....	28
4.3.1. Phenomenography .....	28
4.4. Data .....	29
4.4.1. Data collection.....	30
4.4.2. Data set.....	31
4.4.3. Description of the participants .....	31
4.5. Data analysis.....	36
5. FINDINGS .....	40
6. DISCUSSION.....	55
REFERENCES.....	66
APPENDICES.....	73

## List of abbreviations

---

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
CCL	common corporate language
CS	code switching
EFL	English as a foreign language
EIL	English as an international language
ELF	English as a lingua franca
ELFA	English as an academic lingua franca
EMI	English mediated instruction
FLP	family language policy
HL	heritage language
L1	first language
L2	second language
LFC	Lingua Franca Core
ml@h	Minority Language at Home
OP2L	One Parent-Two Languages
OPOL	One Parent-One Language

# 1. INTRODUCTION

English as a lingua franca (ELF) refers to a communicative act in which English is used between persons who have different first languages (Seidlhofer, 2005). The focus of this thesis is on multilingual families who make use of ELF within their family interactions.

ELF has been extensively researched in different social contexts, and yet, it has been researched surprisingly little in the context of multilingual family interaction (for exceptions, see e.g. Soler & Zabrodska, 2017; Pietikäinen, 2017). These days it is not unusual that more than one language is present in the everyday interactions of certain families. This is a clear consequence of the translocation of entire families, or families in which one or more members make a transnational move, meaning that they translocate from one country to another (Hirsch, 2018). English as a lingua franca might be used by those family members that do not have any other common or preferred language to communicate in. An example for this would be a conversation that an Italian spouse would have with his Norwegian mother-in-law, or even with his Norwegian spouse. This would be the case if neither spoke each other's first language, nor had any other second language in common. It could also be the case that they would not feel competent enough in any of the possible alternative languages that they could choose as their language of interaction. However, in all these cases, English would possibly be the only common language that they would have, and therefore, the language in which they would most likely communicate, at least in early stages of their relationship.

The aim of this thesis is to explore how multilingual families may perceive the role of ELF in their family interactions. The research participants of this thesis live in two Nordic countries, Finland and Norway. The reason for choosing research participants from these two countries was merely due to circumstantial geographical reasons. While there might be numerous different types of multilingual family settings, for the purpose of this study I have set the following criteria for inclusion: I am interested in families as groups of persons consisting of two adults in a romantic relationship with at least one common child. When it comes to multilingual families, I am especially interested in families in which a multiplicity of languages is spoken on a regular basis, excluding those families where English is spoken as a first language (L1). I will not include as part of this study multilingual families in which English is spoken as L1 because I am interested in multilingual families that use English as a lingua franca, and whose ELF users have different L1s than English (e.g. Finnish, Norwegian, German, Dutch, etc.).

Having more than one language at home, or in one's everyday interactions, can be perceived and defined differently by different generations, or even family members of the same generation: two family members with similar language compe-

tences might identify themselves as either monolingual, bilingual or even multilingual (Hua & Wei, 2016). Hua and Wei (2016) insist that matters related to family language remain underexplored, and that there can be an enormous difference in the way that sociocultural activities are performed within families with one, or many, transnational members. Exploring how multilingual families that use ELF identify their language practices and their relationship towards ELF counts, as per today, as a greatly underexplored phenomenon. ELF has been explored thoroughly in a great extent of contexts such as in workplace communication (e.g., Gritsenko, 2016; Mulken, 2015), business situations (e.g., Komori Glatz, 2018; Wu, 2013) and academia (e.g., Björkman, 2011; Tsou, 2014), at the same time somehow the context of romantic or family-life relationships clearly remains underresearched (see, however, Pietikäinen, 2014, 2017a, 2017b, 2018a, 2018b).

While multilingual families' language practices have been researched substantially (see e.g., Kang, 2013; Curdt-Christiansen & Morgia, 2018), research into multilingual families where ELF is used is surprisingly scarce. There seems to be an assumption that persons in romantic relationships and families will be making use of their first language, their spouse's first language, or the dominant language of the society that they are living in. This expectation ignores the fact that they might not be able to communicate in any of those languages at first, and that even after learning each other's L1s they might still prefer to stick to a lingua franca or a multilingual language practice (Pietikäinen, 2017b). Given the preponderance of English as L2 in the constantly globalizing world, this is an assumption that should be challenged.

Language choices within the family context are not a straightforward matter, there is no way of telling what family language policy (FLP) should ideally be used in each family setting. This question has surely come up in countless transnational families' language negotiations during several decades. At some point a decision has to be made, and generally, especially when their child(ren) is/are still too young to speak for themselves, it is the caregivers who choose the language(s) that they want their child(ren) to grow up being exposed to and using, sometimes even unconsciously. This decision is normally influenced by the caregiver's own experience with language learning and their sense of linguistic identity (King, 2006).

The caregiver's perception of how important a specific language is, and how much the child will actually need the language in question, plays a big role when negotiating FLP (Seals, 2018). An example for this phenomenon is the study by Nursidi (2019) that highlights the importance of the parents' language ideologies when it comes to choosing the language(s) spoken at home. In his study, he introduces the case of Indonesia, where some migrant intermarried families chose to raise their children monolingually, although these children could have also been raised bilingually, speaking at least one of their parents' languages plus Indonesian. According

to Nursidi's findings, the families that chose to raise their child(ren) monolingually did this due to the social and economic status that Indonesian has in comparison to the minority language(s) that one or both parents spoke. In contrast to Nursidi's study, Laakso, Sarhima, Åkermark and Toivanen (2016) demonstrate in their book the importance of maintaining minority languages, and the implications and recommendations to maintaining language diversity in Europe.

Some families' decisions are at times also influenced by language ideologies endorsed by society such as the value of reaching a certain proficiency in English versus learning, improving or maintaining their heritage language (HL) (see Seo, 2017 for more). The concept of HL reflects the idea of a language that is spoken in a context where the speakers are considered to be of a linguistic minority versus the majority language(s) spoken in that specific societal context (Valdés, 2005). A similar phenomenon happens with the application of the One Parent-One Language (OPOL) approach (Döpke, 1992), which will be further explained in section 3.2. According to the findings of a study involving 38 bilingual and multilingual families (Paradowski & Bator, 2018), this approach is widely believed to be one of the most efficient language policies for supporting multilingual families' efforts on maintaining a certain set of languages within the family setting. In practice, for the families involved in their study, this method turned out to be insufficient or not strictly necessary for the maintenance of the set of languages they were aiming to maintain. What is clear is that although some models can be perceived as commonly effective and satisfactory in some families, it is not possible to name a single method that works equally effectively for any multilingual family (Paradowski & Bator, 2018).

Language practices at home within transnational families have been studied to a great extent at a societal macro-level. On the micro-level there have been studies focusing on, for instance, HL maintenance and beliefs related to it (see e.g., Canagarajah, 2013; Zhang, 2012); bilingual and multilingual practices within transnational families (see e.g., Souto-Manning, 2016; Takeuchi, 2016); different FLP models in practice (see e.g., Kopeliovich, 2010; Pillai, 2014); and other numerous studies on a similar line of research. However, rarely have studies in this line of research focused primarily, on a so-called micro-level, on the phenomenon of the use of ELF within transnational families. Taking a closer look at these transnational families and their use of ELF could provide a clearer picture of how the linguistic practices in this family model work in practice. The present micro-level study provides a more detailed overview on the views of how, within the family context, conversation and general language dynamics work, with special attention on how ELF is perceived by these multilingual families. As mentioned before, I have not been able to find substantial research material addressing this concrete topic, with the exception of Pietikäinen's (2017a and 2017b) and Soler and Zabrodska's (2017) work.

Pietikäinen (2017a) focuses in her dissertation on the interaction, identity and language practices of couples that use ELF. In her findings, she outlines that ELF couples base their interaction on translanguaging practices, from which they eventually develop a multilingual couple's shared code. In practice this means that these couples' linguistic practices are based on the combination of the languages of their shared linguistic repertoire, including the use of ELF. Translanguaging is known as the multilingual language practice where different linguistic codes – linguistic structures or vocabulary from different languages – are being used, simultaneously or sequentially, within the same communicative act (Wei, 2011).

Pietikäinen (2017a) reports that the ELF couples who took part in her study did not have significant nor frequent – out of the mundane – problems of misunderstanding each other. They made use of code switching (CS) frequently, yet this did not affect their mutual understanding since they both had developed a shared repertoire of languages and/or words and expressions that made the CS appear as something natural and not at all communication-hindering, but rather supported the fluency of the communication. Pietikäinen suggests that the couple's shared code could be identified as a *multilingua franca* (see Jenkins, 2015), since many languages are involved and not only English. In her findings, Pietikäinen also discusses the perception of couples linguistically identifying their spouses as English speakers. The relationship of languages with identity is a difficult topic for couples that have based their relationship on a lingua franca, especially when this lingua franca is neither's first language. Pietikäinen reports in reference to this that the couples that took part in her study specifically stated how difficult it would be not to speak English to each other, on account of having constructed their relationship in that language.

As we can hereby see, ELF has not been studied focusing primarily on the context of multilingual family interaction. With this thesis I aim to help fill in this gap. I am going to work with couple interviews of families with children. These couples are speakers of different L1s, and during these interviews they talk about their family interaction and their use of English within their interaction. For the purpose of this study I am focusing on the following research questions:

RQ1: How do the participants see the role of ELF in their family interactions?

RQ2: According to the participants, how has the use of ELF changed over time in their family interactions?

I feel especially connected to this research topic because I myself am in a relationship in which I use ELF with my partner and I have always found it fascinating and rather special how the languages that we have in our shared language repertoire merge in a harmonious and almost unconscious way when we interact with each other. When I started to look into this phenomenon I realised that I could not find

any substantial literature or older studies referring directly to this phenomenon. I found this really surprising and it was not until I got in contact with the director of a research project that was focusing on ELF at the University of Helsinki, and that a number of researchers referred me to other researchers, that I ended up being referred to Dr Kaisa S. Pietikäinen and to her highly relevant work in this research area. It was essential for the development of this thesis to reach out to Dr Kaisa S. Pietikäinen. I am enormously grateful for having been granted the opportunity to analyse different data sets that were collected by her a few years before and that were previously not analysed nor reported.

This being said, I want to draw on how this thesis is structured. First, I will start by describing how English is perceived both as a global language and as a global lingua franca. Next, I will define multilingualism, multilingual families, their possible language practices and their language ideologies. When I have addressed these points, I will go into the methodological aspects of this thesis and then I will conclude with the presentation of my findings and a final discussion.

## 2. ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA

### 2.1. English as a global language

For decades English has been in an indisputable position categorised as a global language (Crystal, 2003). Nowadays, it still maintains its steady growth as a global language (Stoios, 2019). The term English as a lingua franca (ELF) reflects the fact that actually only one fourth of English speakers in the world speak this language as their first language (L1) (e.g. United Kingdom, United States of America, Australia, etc.). This means that the majority of English speakers in the world are not L1 speakers of English. This leaves out three quarters of English speakers who use English as an additional language, serving them as a way of communicating with each other. This happens due to the fact that these people do not share the same L1 and use English as their common foreign language for the purpose of communicating (Seidlhofer, 2005).

Kachru (1985) describes the expansion and uses of Englishes in the world in three concentric circles: the 'inner circle', the 'outer—or extended— circle' and the 'expanding circle'. The 'inner circle' refers to the speakers of English who use English as their L1, such as the USA, UK, Australia and New Zealand. The 'outer—or extended— circle' refers to those speakers who have been using English since the early expansion of English and the institutionalisation of the English language in their respective territories. This institutionalisation happens due to linguistic, political and sociocultural priorities established by countries such as Nigeria, Zambia, Singapore and India (Kachru, 1985). The third and last circle, the 'expanding circle', is the one that does not have any colonisation history from the inner circle, it is based on the idea that English is used as an international or universal language by most of the world, including countries enormously populated such as China, Russia and Indonesia, this last circle is the one that keeps English as a global language (Kachru, 1985). Mauranen (2018) establishes, building onto Kachru's concentric circles, that the 'inner circle' of English has been developing distinctively in a multilingual manner and that the 'outer circle' countries have never settled for a monolingual English approach and have therefore been keeping English as an additional language to the, in many cases, already multilingual countries.

Differently than Kachru (1985), De Swaan (2001) developed a linguistic hierarchy pyramid to better highlight the position of English in the world. De Swaan (2010) explains that English has gained in the world a position of "hypercentral" language due to being the language of communication for people that speak different L1s, and do not have any other language in common. For De Swaan (2001) the hierarchy goes, from top to bottom, as follows: hypercentral language (English) > super-

central languages> central languages> peripheral languages. De Swaan (2010) describes as “supercentral” about a dozen of languages that serve the same purpose (e.g., Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, German, Spanish, etc.), these serve for long distance and international communication. However, if a speaker of any “supercentral” language would enhance in communication with another “supercentral” speaker, most likely they will start communicating with each other making use of the “hypercentral” language, English. This is how English is placed in such a “hypercentralised” position in the world (De Swaan, 2010). The “central” languages are represented by about a hundred of languages and the ‘peripheral’ languages by the rest of existing languages (98%) of the world’s languages (De Swaan, 2001).

Another supporting perspective to English being a global language is Seidhofer's (2005) who defines English as an international language (EIL) that started its basic expansion through linguistic imperialism and colonization. Apart from L1 speakers carrying their language with them during the different colonization periods (e.g. early settlers that went to eastern Canada and United States), many speaker communities across the globe started to incorporate English to their language repertoire as an additional beneficial second language. Seidhofer (2005) talks about two different kinds of EIL: the localized EIL kind, where people use the language as their national majority language, hence their L1 (e.g. Australia or United Kingdom); and the globalized EIL where people use English as either an additional language to their national majority language(s) (e.g. Nigeria or Singapore) or where people use English as a foreign language (e.g. Norway or Pakistan). In the case of Nigeria and Singapore, which count as globalized EIL countries, their use equals the expanded use of English as a lingua franca. On the other hand, countries that use English as a foreign language—such as Norway and Pakistan—represent the majority of users of English in contrast to the total number of L1 speakers of English. In Kachru (1985) these countries would be categorised into the “expanding circle” and in De Swaan these countries would be categorised as “central”. This last group of nations would not be considered to use English as a lingua franca, but rather as a foreign language.

The use of English has been increasing also in Nordic societies steadily, due to the establishment of numerous educational policies, migration and international mobility, situations in which English plays a main role (Coats, 2019). In Finland for instance, where the official languages are Finnish and Swedish, it is considered that around 70% of its adult population is able to speak a high-level English (EF English Proficiency Index, 2020). In Norway there has been a notably increased use of English present in the fields of education, business situations and on intra-national and international levels (Rindal, 2014).

## 2.2. English as a global lingua franca

English covers multitudinous social and economic positions throughout the world, including long-established and institutionalised ways of approaching the English language. English exists not only as part of a certain country's national language(s), but also both as a foreign language and as a lingua franca. Nowadays we are moving on from the English as a foreign/second language paradigm towards the ELF paradigm (Prodomou, 2007). As mentioned by Prodomou (2007), English as a foreign and second language has been conceptualised as a variation of the standard English (SE), which is represented by a small minority of the total of English speakers in the world, instead of placing the focus on the majority of speakers, which are the ones that use English as a second or foreign language, hence also ELF users. This conceptualisation moves towards the conception that all English speakers in the world are equally valuable and important (Prodomou, 2007).

ELF has been playing a major role in the means of communicating between international and multinational businesses throughout the world because its use aims to represent a neutral language that none of the parties should ideally have a significant advantage on (Franceschi, 2017a). Nowadays, it is increasingly more common that institutions adopt English as their common corporate language (CCL). This means that these international organisations use ELF, not only for international communications, but also as their internal workplace communication. International and multinational organisations adopt English as their CCL despite of not being allocated in a national majority English language speaking country (Swift, 2011).

English is used globally as a lingua franca in a manifold of situations and throughout every social class. It is the language not only for business, but also for education, economics and technology (Zoghor, 2018). When it comes to its use in education, Mauranen (2010) refers to it as English as an academic lingua franca (ELFA). In the academic setting the same idea that was mentioned before persists, the majority of users of English in the academic setting is overrepresented by non L1 speakers of English, leaving the English L1 speakers as a minority. Therefore, Mauranen (2010) defends that it is not surprising that the ELFA users have moved on from the common perception that a "correct English" would be the equivalent of the one that a L1 educated English speaker would use. Mauranen (2010) insists that it would in fact be enough to use as a guideline the basic general clearness and effectiveness that would be relatable for the vast majority of readers – which are the not L1 English speakers – rather than to adapt to a minority of readers – the L1 English speakers (Mauranen, 2010). This same perception can be applied to multilingual families who make use of ELF within their family interactions. This phenomenon is still clearly understudied and the way in which ELF is perceived and used by these multilingual families is still somewhat unclear. However, there is a reason to believe

that although there is not much research done addressing the setting in which this phenomenon develops, there are still many multilingual families who make use of ELF within their family interactions (see e.g., Soler & Zabrodskaia, 2017; Pietikäinen, 2017).

It is commonly recognised that speakers of a certain language might develop a sense of identity towards the use of that language, the use of ELF is no exception. One of the most resonated phenomena is the sense of “nativeness” that ELF users perceive and attribute to their way of using ELF. This often happens in the form of an ELF speaker who self-assess themselves pointing out their level of “nativeness” of English, typically signalling their “non-nativeness” (Franceschi, 2017b). The concept of “native-speakerism”, as defined by Holliday (2006), has been carrying a social advantageous meaning with it ever since the expansion of English throughout the world. Holliday’s (2006) basic argument is that the concept of “native” is a mere social construct that is used to represent the false preconception that “native” would mean “better” than “non-native”. This idea is clearly exemplified in the global English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching market, where “native” teachers are commonly perceived as better than “non-native” teachers just because they are “native” speakers of English. Holliday (2006) suggests that more appreciation to “non-native” teaching should be given, as this would entail that teachers would be keeping their cultural and linguistic experience and be therefore able to inculcate a more realistic version of the English that those students would potentially be exposed to, adapting also to a more modern and cosmopolitan present.

The awareness of “native-speakerism” influences also other social domains such as the academic world. Canagarajah (2018) describes how international researchers in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) try to move away from the conception of having to master the English language by following its strict grammatical rules and its “native speaker” ideals, towards the appreciation of nonverbal elements that highlight the competence of the researcher in question. Canagarajah (2018) exemplifies with this study how “native-speakerism” and perception of academic competence in the fields of STEM intervene. Even so, the “native speaker” paradigm is a phenomenon that continuously keeps coming up when ELF speakers enhance in communication. To avoid its value-loaded meaning academics have started to refer to it putting the term in inverted commas or avoiding to use it by substituting it with other terms that represent the same concept such as: L1 English speaker (Holliday, 2006). It might as well be the case in multilingual families that use ELF, that the use of English is restricted in some way, for instance when parents would address their child(ren), because they would think that they lack a “native-like proficiency” in English to teach them the language. Clearly there might be numerous reasons for parents not to speak a certain language to their child(ren). However, the awareness of ‘native-speakerism’ can surely be one of them.

When assessing the main goal of ELF as a global lingua franca, which is mutual understanding, Jenkins' (2015) proposal of a *Lingua Franca Core* (LFC) represents in the best of ways the intelligibility problems that might arise when ELF is used by not English L1 speakers in different settings. Jenkins' (2015) LFC was developed from the idea of collecting a set of combinations and prosodics that were proven to lead to misunderstandings or even intelligibility when not used accordingly. Jenkins (2015) insists that she did not create LFC to exclude those items that were "non-core" because they were not under the LFC recollection, but rather that that small number of items of the LFC would serve as an additional help for those who would find them useful. This repertoire of LFC lead to the conclusion that accommodation skills might in some cases be essential to reach a complete understanding of the other ELF speaker, taking into account that the ELF practices of an individual can and is, in some cases, linked to their L1 pronunciation, and therefore a cause of intelligibility (Jenkins, 2015).

Kuteeva (2020) revisits how the use of English as a global lingua franca and its proficiency, is perceived by students in an English mediated instruction (EMI) at an EMI program from a Swedish international university (for more see Kuteeva, 2019). As a result of this study apart from the conceptualisation on standard English and common translingual practices, Kuteeva (2020) asked the students of this program to conceptualise their experience of being part of an EMI program, with special attention to their perception on the role of ELF. As a result, Kuteeva (2020) discovered that the experiences of the students that took part of the study were varying within a range of different strategies commonly used in ELF interactions. These reports included exemplification, clarification, repetition and rephrasing (Kuteeva, 2020). The strategies that these students used in that specific ELF context can easily be transferred to other ELF contexts such as the context of ELF in family situations. In Kuteeva's (2020) study, some of the students stated that they had no problems communicating with other ELF users and that whenever they used ELF, a supporting environment was created in which peers supported one another assisting each other for instance by filling in linguistics gaps for each other. I could imagine that in other ELF situations, such as ELF in the family context, such support would be provided by other family members even to the point that they would help filling linguistic gaps by using other languages of their shared multilingual repertoire. Opposite to the positive experience that students reported towards EMI (Kuteeva, 2020), other students in the same study disclosed that their experience had been rather negative due to the fact that their communication goal was not successful on account of a clear disparity in the proficiency of the English language. In multilingual families this could also happen when, for instance, a family member attempts to communicate with another family member using a set of languages from their language repertoire that does not completely go along with the languages or language proficiency that the other family member has in their language repertoire i.e. by, for instance, making use of translingual or metrolingual practices (see section [3.1](#), fourth paragraph).

The use of ELF is not only present in specific academic or work-situations that require its use as mentioned before. As I am aiming to highlight with this study, ELF is also present in the family context of numerous multilingual families. Due to globalisation, there is an increasing number of transnational and multilingual families all over the world. The case of Finland and Norway is no exception, yet the phenomenon of the use of ELF at home is clearly still understudied. It is the case of those families in which the HL of the spouses is different, where most commonly they end up using English by default. The use of English can become therefore, the lingua franca for the spouses, or in some cases, a kind of transitioning-language when one, or even both spouses, are in the learning process of each other's HL. In the Routledge handbook of English as a Lingua Franca (Jenkins, Baker & Dewey, 2017) great insights into the ELF paradigm are brought up. In this work, there is a conceptualisation of the use of ELF in connection with different dialects (Mauranen, 2017). This is referring to those languages that in connection with English—when used as a lingua franca— develop a kind of mixed dialect that reminds of the L1 of the speaker due to its similarities in pronunciation, grammatical order, lexical choices or even something as simple as word order in a sentence to their L1 when using ELF. This phenomenon can and has been given creative names such as Spanglish, Swinglish, Manglish and so forth. For the purpose of this thesis, a certain set of multilingual families, which will be described later on (see section 4.4.3), have been selected. These families are characterised by their linguistics practices and the presence of ELF within certain family interactions, they might serve as a great example of how other languages along with ELF form together a certain set of language practices within the family setting. Mauranen (2017), decided to name this occurrences 'similects'. These so called similects are not subjective to any specific generation, age range, gender or any physical location. Its use can appear completely unconsciously in any given situation. Its use can also turn up when an ELF user purposely wants to draw on a certain dialect making use of English as a lingua franca. In my eyes, Kuteeva's (2020) findings describe a similar phenomenon, whilst the students in Kuteeva (2020) are helping each other out filling in linguistic gaps for each other and creating a supportive environment, Mauranen's (2017) definition of "similects" describes as well a supportive environment where linguistic gaps could potentially be filled in by the speakers themselves and where, as well as in Kuteeva (2020), creative mixing would be supported rather than criticised.

As it may have become clear, ELF is not a neutral concept. ELF has been defined in various ways throughout time (see e.g., Jenkins 2015; Mauranen, 2018). For the purpose of this study, I will use ELF in a descriptive way. In this thesis I understand and look at ELF from an objective point of view where ELF is perceived as a mere communication tool between speakers that have different L1s and use English as a foreign language. The participants of this study will talk about how the role of ELF is present in their family interactions.

### 3. MULTILINGUAL FAMILIES

The way that many families incorporate a certain set of languages to their everyday interactions brings along a really interesting setting in which a multiplicity of languages are present. In multilingual families a great range of diverse linguistic practices may be present, which might include different family language policies that are backed up, most of the times, by different language beliefs and ideologies. In the case of ELF, as well as in any other multilingual family situation, these practices may occur in an unconscious and unplanned way.

#### 3.1. Defining multilingualism

As described by Aronin (2012), multilingualism is a broad term that has been defined in various ways, which has turned it into a rather difficult concept to grasp at once. In order to be able to imagine a multilingual context, I would like to draw on the concept of heteroglossia, which represents the idea of having at the same time different signs or codes of speech which intervene in one same communicative act (Ivanov, 1999). Bakhtin's conception of heteroglossia mentioned by Purkarthofer (2018) supports that a heteroglossic moment happens when different voices, languages and discourses meet in a somewhat harmonious way. These heteroglossia moments allow multilingual encounters to happen, and these encounters are normally interjectionally constructed and situation-dependent. They happen in social spaces where the linguistic features of the communication components allow for communication to flow, using a multiplicity of languages that support the construction of shared meanings. These encounters bring up a whole set of features that relate directly to the relative status on the languages used, power relationships, "nativespeaker-ness" and, as a result, the different access to linguistic resources that are presented by the communication components in the communicative situation in question.

One of the factors that often plays a role when trying to define multilingualism is the frequency and intensity in which a certain set of languages are used. Drawing the line between different levels of proficiency is what makes it so laborious for individuals to decide whether a language should be added to their linguistic repertoire or not. A person that uses a language once a year when they are traveling and only knows how to do small talk or ask for directions cannot possibly consider that language as equally as proficient as a language that they use as an additional language on a daily basis in, for instance, family situations, international business situations, or it even being their HL. The above mentioned perceptions are just a few of numerous popular discourses that exist about multilingualism.

Researchers like Lüdi (2013) voice that today we actively move towards the understanding that a person might as well be considered multilingual even though they might be differently proficient in different settings in the languages that they count as part of their linguistic repertoire up to the point that they might even creatively mix those languages in a fluid manner, i.e. translanguaging (for more see Wei, 2011). In fact, nowadays researchers in applied linguistics have moved away from the strict conception that in order to be considered a multilingual person you have to be equally proficient in every possible domain in all the languages that you count as part of your linguistic repertoire. As for this thesis, multilingualism in the family context will be interpreted as the regular practice, exposure and/or understanding of a multiplicity of languages that are present in a certain family's life.

### **3.2. Defining multilingual family**

Different family settings allow for different scenarios of creative language practices such as the following: translanguaging, where different languages are combined (Karpava et al., 2019); metrolingualism, where rules and boundaries such as grammar in different languages are overcome (Pennycook & Otsuju, 2015); lingua receptiva (LaRa), where interlocutors use different languages when addressing each other but they still understand each other without needing any other lingua franca to support their communication (Rehbein, Ten Thije & Verschik, 2012); or plurilingual repertoires, in which the interlocutors creatively adapt and consciously incorporate the languages in their plurilinguistic repertoires to their interaction taking into consideration the linguistic repertoire of other interlocutors (Lüdi, 2018). These different multilingual scenarios challenge the very notion of language as a closed and fixed system that should not be altered, leaving room for these multilingual settings which are jointly constructed through shared meanings that are extracted from the shared linguistic repertoires that the speakers might have in common.

Before going into more detail about possible multilingual family settings, I would like to draw on Edwards' (2002) comment on multilingualism: "Multilingualism is a powerful fact of life around the world, a circumstance arising, at the simplest level, from the need to communicate across speech communities" (Edward, 2002, p.1). Edward's comment on multilingualism portrays the way languages, and their different uses, are constantly and increasingly spreading throughout the world. The practice of multilingualism can be identified in different forms: it can be in the shape of speakers of an indigenous minority language that incorporate the majority language(s) of their region, in one way or another, to their linguistic repertoire; immigrants that speak their HL(s) and the local language(s) in a creative and harmonious way; or simply speakers with a certain set of HL(s) that end up learning a second, third or even fourth language to enrich their language repertoire and to open up more room for multilingual creativity in their use of languages. The last form of mul-

tilingualism mentioned, is commonly practiced because a certain set of languages are considered to be able to open doors for social or economical opportunities (Malak, 1997). Furthermore, there are situations where persons are growing up in settings where more than one language is spoken or even situations in which they have no other option but to learn those additional languages because of, for instance, colonisation.

The multilingual environment that I am addressing in this thesis is the setting of multilingual families and their family language practices. A commonly expanded conception about multilingual family practices is that the languages used should be treated carefully and with the active preconception of having to always use only “one language at a time”. Gorter (2011) advocates that multilingual practices can work as a facilitating factor when using them in different communication situations where all the parties participating in the interaction can successfully understand the language repertoire in question. Gorter (2011) finds it natural that multilingual persons would use a multiplicity of languages in contexts where they would know that their other multilingual peers would understand them. This phenomenon of ‘natural language mixing’ occurs in multilingual family situations in a constant both conscious and unconscious manner. Hua and Wei (2016) mention this phenomenon in the context of the findings of their study on three multilingual and transnational Chinese families living in Britain. The mother in one of those families directly stated, supporting Gorter’s argument, that the language mixing does not concern her. She pointed out that she would just say whatever came to her mind, without paying close attention to her language choices. She in fact concludes explaining that she feels that the mixing of languages supports the language maintenance of their children.

Regarding the concept of *multilingual family*, I would like to clarify that as for this thesis I am counting as multilingual families those families in which a multiplicity of languages are present, in one way or another, in their everyday family interactions. I am especially interested in families with children because I consider that once children are added to the family equation a total reconceptualisation of language practices and language beliefs are likely to appear. Furthermore, I consider children’s agency to play a big role when it comes to negotiating the different family language policies. Nowadays, it is more and more common for families to share this multilingual space in their homes. Each language spoken in a family is, most commonly, spoken for a specific reason (Flores, Gürel & Putnam, 2020). These reasons might be related, for example, to the fact that the language in question is the HL of a –or several– family members and they intend to keep that language alive within their family context. Wang (2011) highlights the importance of incorporating early enough, especially on children’s linguistic development, multilingual and multimedia literacy so that the language(s) in question can be maintained successfully. In the case of ELF, as I mentioned before, there have not been many studies done on what effects

its use might have on a family's identity and their linguistic development, as well as the personal and/or linguistic development of individual family members.

Studies on multilingualism in families and studies on happenings in multilingual families have been done extensively addressing key matters in this same line of research such as the following: the transnationality of multilingual families, these studies have focused on the relationships that multilingual families hold across national, political, social, and cultural borders (see e.g., Schiller, Basch & Blanc-Szanton, 1992); parental expectations towards languages in transnational families (see e.g., Purkarthofer, 2018; Chen, Kennedy & Zhou, 2012); multilingual family language policies (see e.g., Purkarthofer & Guri Bordal, 2019; Smith-Christmas, 2014); language use and language agency in transnational families (see e.g., Obojksa & Purkarthofer, 2018; Curdt-Christiansen, & Wang, 2018); multilingual competences and family language practices in multilingual families (see e.g., Duarte, Gogolin, Klinder & Schnoor, 2014; Hua & Wei, 2016).

Considering the existing research on multilingualism in families it is safe to say that the way of approaching a specific language, within the family's interactions, can be directly related to the family's perceptions on languages. Their language perception might be influenced by personal, cultural and/or political factors (Lanza, 2018). Family members might also have different language competencies, and their shared practices are then a result of language negotiation. These different perceptions and competencies link to the aspirations and challenges that every family member faces towards language practices in general, and the use of ELF in the multilingual family context in particular.

### **3.3. Family language policy**

Family Language Policy (FLP) can be defined as the sum of the individual family members' language beliefs and their language use in practice and, at the same time, the automatic relationship between these beliefs and their actual shared practices as a family, which are impacted by the wider community (King, 2008). The language ideologies prevalent in the society can impact greatly on the chosen family language policy, as some would prefer to use at home, for instance, only the prestigious standardised form of a certain language (e.g. British or American English) because of the prestige of speaking in a so-called "close to native" manner, instead of any of its non-standardised variations (Spolsky, 2012). A highly relevant perspective of FLP in multilingual families is the way that the parents address their respective—if not the same—HL, not only in their homes, but also outside of them. The ways in which the language(s) that want to be maintained are activated through extracurricular activities, or other opportunities to support them, are a key factor to maintaining them within the family's linguistic repertoire (Kayam, 2014).

In the past decade, research on FLP has seen a greater focus on the diverse types of families that are being created (King, 2013). Due to globalization many different family settings are created constantly, roughly we can divide their intake on languages in two categories: on the one hand, those languages that these families are taking into consideration when negotiating FLP, and on the other hand, those that end up being neglected. Apart from the choice – when there is any – of whether to maintain or not some languages, it is important to understand what a language can represent or make one feel. One’s first language can be the key to defining one’s inner sense of self and their identity, as well as a tool to communicate with certain family members. The choice of neglecting or not, ones HL can be accompanied by the dramatic decision of having had to emigrate for political, economic or educational reasons to a place where a different language is spoken. This phenomenon carries with it emotional involvement that leads to a potential need of language shifting, and eventually, to a convenient FLP application (Tannenbaum, 2012).

There are increasingly more studies developing theories and approaches to FLPs (see e.g., King, 2008; Spolsky, 2012; Kayam, 2014). At the moment, the most studied strategy in FLP has been the *One-Person-One-Language* approach (OPOL), which in practice means that each parent speaks a different language to the child(ren) than the other, this language typically being their HL or another chosen strong language of their language repertoire, meaning that at least two languages are present in the regular family interactions (King, 2010). This approach can be at times challenged, for instance, there might be cases in which the child(ren) might address their parents in a language that the parents would understand but that the parents have purposely chosen not to speak to them in order to “leave room” for another language such as for instance the HL that they want their child(ren) to learn. In these cases the parent would need to consciously decide between pushing their child towards speaking the HL that they are trying to impart on them and therefore either pretend that they do not understand them or ask them to address them in the HL, or then simply allow for the translanguaging to happen. The OPOL approach can also be challenged when considering whether a parent should speak other languages in front of their child(ren) or not. There are other approaches similar to OPOL in which for example both parents speak both languages, or approaches in which a paid caretaker supports the language(s) in question (King, 2010). OPOL has proved to be the most commonly used FLP by multilingual families (see e.g., Soler & Zabrodska, 2017; Van Mensel, 2018). In certain family settings it is the case that one of the parents speaks a majority language (the language used in the society that the family is living in), and the other a minority language (a language that is not used by the society that the family is living in). In these cases, studies have shown how important it is for the majority-language parent to support the minority-language parent, not only for the mere sake of making the OPOL approach more effective, but also to

avoid potential linguistic-related conflicts and to keep a healthy atmosphere within the family setting (Venables, 2014).

The OPOL is considered to be an important approach especially for families whose intention is to maintain a minority language in situations where there is no external societal support towards that language (Döpke, 1998). Döpke (1998) points out that there has been a great deal of criticism towards this approach regarding its artificial nature. OPOL is claimed to hinder fluent conversation within a multilingual family when, for instance, one of the parents does not speak the L1 of the other as good—or at all (Döpke, 1998). The OPOL approach bases its ideology in the ideal situation that both parents would stick to using only their own L1 when being around their child(ren) (Venables, 2014). However, if the case would be that the parents, as mentioned by Döpke (1998), do not speak each other language(s) well—or at all, it could imply that ELF would be present in family interactions. If this would be the case OPOL's ideology, which recommends that the parent who speaks the majority language would support the parent that speaks the minority language, could easily be challenged by multilingual families who make use of ELF within their family interactions because there would be a risk that the parents would be using ELF in situations where the minority language that might need an extra support could have been used instead.

The motives behind the decision of a family adopting a certain set of FLPs can be manifold. With this study I analyse the FLPs that multilingual families have incorporated to their everyday lives focusing on those families in which English is being used, to some extent, as a lingua franca. The decision of adopting a certain FLP might happen in an entirely unconscious manner. It might often be the case that families, against their previous hopes or expectations, would end up adopting a set of FLPs that are not necessarily linked to either one of the parents' HLs. Most commonly, in these cases, it is likely that the FLPs will be linked directly to the predominant language(s) of the cultural and societal setting that this family is embedded in (King, 2008). This decision can frequently be strongly influenced by the children's preferences in using that specific language (e.g., Tuominen, 1999; Soler & Zabrodska, 2017). However, I will be focusing on families in which the parents do not share the same HL, nor any other language which they would master good enough to communicate in, other than English. This being the case, English would be their lingua franca, at least at first. In these specific cases English starts to develop an important role in the families' language repertoire and an even more important role in their language practices as a family. The use of English and its development might see a bigger change when children are born to the family, and so would then also do their FLPs.

The language practices that multilingual families adopt vary, as mentioned before, depending on uncountable factors. However, something that all multilingual

families have in common is, as introduced by Van Mensel (2018), their *familylect*, which in practice represent the different language choices and negotiations of the family in question and how these languages, in a somewhat harmonious way, work out together. Van Mensel (2018) explains that multilingual families develop a multilingual familylect that becomes, to some extent, regular and if analysed closely enough, also predictable. Pietikäinen (2017a) discusses quite a similar phenomenon in her study, where she refers to the mixed use of a set of languages that are part of a certain family's linguistic repertoire. Pietikäinen (2017a) illustrates this use, when combined with English, as a variation of ELF. Instead of presenting this use as ELF she suggests the concept of *multilingua franca*, as introduced by Jenkins (2015). Within Van Mensel's (2018) multilingual familylect we can be sure to encounter shared language practices that are unique to any multilingual family. These practices could therefore be named differently in all the possible varying cases. The distinct language practices could be perceived as conscious and unconscious language practices adopted by multilingual families. Each familylect is subjective to certain experiences that the family in question has gone through, experiences such as living in a certain demographic placement, migrating to a new demographic placement, the possibly different language repertoires of the family members, a change in the members of a family, etc. The familylect of a multilingual family is indeed unique to each multilingual family. Gordon (2009) understands the familylect as the way of presenting that what we also find in society, dialects, but in the family context setting, where there is extreme intertextuality between the family members and numerous family specific frames are negotiated surrounding their perception of their shared linguistic and cultural identity as a family.

In multilingual families, as I have mentioned before, a kind of *multilingua franca* (Jenkins, 2015) can emerge, different *familylects* (Van Mensel, 2018) can unfold as well as popular approaches such as OPOL can be adopted (Soler & Zabrodska, 2017). However, there are plenty of different family settings that might not only develop these conceptualisations or adopt an approach such as OPOL, but instead other approaches such as the following can emerge: the practice of *Minority Language at Home* (ml@h) (Slavkov, 2017); the practice of *One Parent-Two Languages* (OP2L), where both parents speak each other's HL at home (Ruiz, 2017); or the *Mixed System* introduced by Ruiz (2017), in which one parent speaks the minority language, and the other parent speaks both their own HL and the minority language at home.

### **3.4. Language ideologies**

In multilingual families, as well as in any family setting, the language ideologies that a certain family hold, undoubtedly play a defining role in the language practices that they will end up adopting as a family (Oriyama, 2016), and therefore help shape their FLP. According to König (2015) language ideologies are understood to be the

mental representation of a socially created set of linguistic habits and interaction that are associated to a specific group in society. These socially created linguistic ideologies can fluctuate through the lenses of different societies, values and norms (König, 2015).

### 3.4.1. Language beliefs

The recollection of a certain family's set of language beliefs makes up their language ideologies as a family. The practices that a family adopt are normally based on different family constructions, their social-linguistic needs and their language beliefs. An example for this behaviour is the three ELF multilingual families that Soler and Zabrodskaja (2017) describe in their work.

In their paper, Soler and Zabrodskaja (2017) introduce three Hispano-Estonian couples who confirm that their shared family language is English. Through a qualitative interview-conducted study, they were able to conclude that these three couples changed their attitudes, beliefs and practices towards languages depending on external factors. These factors were related to the presence of their kid(s), the presence of their friends or other extended family members, and the couple's linguistic development, in which case one, or both spouses, learned to some extent the HL of the other. The last factor allowed them to create a kind of "shared language", which was recognised as a result of mixing the multiple languages that they had on their shared repertoire.

One of the Hispano-Estonian families stated to be afraid of linguistically confusing their child if they kept on mixing languages in front of them. As a result of this worry, this family planned on taking on the OPOL approach as a way out of possibly linguistically confusing their child. By contrast, another one of these three couples stated that when their first child came along they consciously implemented the use of Spanish at home, e.g. they actively tried to speak less English and more their respective HLs: Spanish and Estonian, Estonian being the local language. In this case, they reported having changed their family language practices because they believed that it would be more beneficial for their child to learn their parents' HL by applying the OPOL approach. They applied this approach with a twist, knowingly that they would generate a setting that could potentially also result in the child mixing the languages that are used at home. They were aware of this possibly happening because they stated that they were applying the OPOL approach in a flexible manner were sentences, expressions or single words from one, or more, of the other languages were mixed in the same sentence, by the same person. This phenomenon is commonly known as *code-switching* (for more see García et al., 2018) or, presented in a more positive light, *translanguaging* (for more see Wei, 2011).

The third family in Soler and Zabrodskaja (2017) reported to actively have tried to stick to their own HL. However, they also admitted to mixing languages during

mundane everyday family interactions. It is interesting to see how the different language beliefs of the parents made in each family a change, in one way or another, in their language practices as a family. In all three multilingual families presented by Soler and Zabrodskaja (2017), it was mentioned that there existed a conscious effort of not mixing the three languages that were present in their everyday interactions (English, Spanish and Estonian) and also to fully adopt the OPOL approach with the kids. However, the parents of these families admitted to actively mix those languages that are part of their shared “family language repertoire”, even to the extent that they would use each other’s HL in given situations, which goes against the fundamentals of OPOL. This linguistic paradox happens to be, to some extent, quite similar in the case of these three families. However, there are uncountable cases of different family environments that allow different settings to happen and different beliefs to emerge.

A contrasting example to the language beliefs described by the families in Soler and Zabrodskaja (2017) is Purkarthofer’s perspective on language beliefs and FLP, as cited in King and Lanza (2019, p.720), where he explains that there are family settings in which the choice of language(s) is left open for the child to decide, meaning that the parents do not impose any language(s) over the child, but rather let the choice up to an imaginary future scenario where the child would end up making their own choice. Adopting this attitude towards language learning and FLP, in which the parents let the child decide for themselves, would entail that the parents are influencing the language development of the child with their language choices when addressing them, but when the time would come that the child starts to speak, they would not question or try to actively influence the language choices of the child (King & Lanza, 2019). Both Purkarthofer’s argument in King and Lanza (2019, p.720) as well as Soler and Zabrodskaja’s (2017) findings support the idea that families can adopt uncountable different FLPs and that these will always be related to their own language ideologies, which in the end are the combination of the set of language beliefs that the family in question holds.

### **3.4.2. Language identity**

The language identity of a person, or a group of persons such as a family, is strongly connected to the language beliefs and language ideologies that they hold, and sequentially to their language practices. As a result of a person or families’ language beliefs and language ideologies, a certain language identity is built. This language identity is embodied by the language practices that that person or family makes use of.

It is important to address language identity in this thesis because generally the perception of different language identities and, in consequence, the language practices that a family might adopt, are correlated (King, 2010). Language identity, as reasoned in Norton (1997), is a constant that might continuously change in each per-

son as they unconsciously and/or consciously construct and negotiate it by making use of a certain language in any given context or situation. People tend to categorise themselves, and others, into different groups in society. One way of categorising people into groups is through a perceived shared language repertoire, and their language identity stems from the similarities and differences that they identify within that and other existing groups (Mok, 2010). Norton (1997) also refers to the term 'identity' as a way of conceptualising people's relationship towards all the activities that they are involved in. Norton (1997) sees these relationships as a way of expression of the core desires that people have and how they perceive them to be in a future scenario. In this way, language identity could be seen as the relationship(s) that a person, or a group of persons, have towards a language and everything that that language represents for them (i.e., for instance, their language beliefs and ideologies). How invested a speaker is and what their social and historical relationship towards that language is, connects directly to how they would identify in that language (Norton, 1997).

All in all, language identity can be perceived in different ways by different people and different societies, an example for this can be how this concept is addressed in Finland. One could say that in Finland this term is perceived, on a societal level, slightly different than in other societies because of the historical linguistic background that the concept of *language identity* carries with it in Finland. Palviainen and Bergroth (2018) argue that the concept of *language identity* in Finland is shaped, for instance, by a system of language registration that every citizen has to fill in informing the official language of their child and the language of their later school instruction. Therefore the way of approaching the concept of *language identity* is in Finland clearly historically and culturally influenced (Palviainen & Bergroth, 2018). Having to define your, and your child's HL at such an early stage through formal forms might have an influence on how one will identify and perceive languages at a later stage.

### **3.4.3. Language practices in different domains in the family context**

The language practices that a certain family might adopt can, as mentioned before, find their reasoning in the language ideologies that a family might hold and the way that this family might identify towards the languages in question.

Pietikäinen (2017b) discusses the language practices of ELF couples and how they use English as their relationships' language, which is in most of the cases intertwined with some words or expressions in one or both of the couple's L1s, assuming that none of the couple speaks English as their L1. The couples perceive the use of English, mixed with other languages from their shared couple repertoire, as a natural occurring conversation. One of the couples that were interviewed by Pietikäinen (2017b) reported that their couple's language practice seemed to stop working so efficiently when third persons were added to their conversations such as extended

family members or friends with whom they communicate in English. On some occasions, this seemed to hinder understanding because the way of using English between the couple developed to a mutual understanding due to a shared linguistic repertoire, also referred to as “couple tongue”, or as per Van Mensel's (2018) definition of *famililylect*, that third persons would not share (Pietikäinen, 2017b).

The different language practices that families may adopt vary strongly depending on socio-cultural, politic, economic or even ideological aspects. In the following paragraphs I exemplify this with three different studies that address language practices in multilingual families living in three diverse locations: Singapore (Karpava et al., 2019), Norway (Obojska, 2019) and Belgium (Van Mensel, 2018).

Although the participants of these three studies were all multilingual families with at least one family member that had migrated at some point from a different country to the country in question, each of these studies used a rather different approach to collect their data. Karpava et al. (2019) worked with observational data and conversations conducted directly with the family members, Obojska (2019) conducted semi-structured interviews, and Van Mensel (2018) analysed recordings of naturally occurring family interactions by letting the families record themselves over a period of 1-2 years together with semi-structured interviews. I found it surprising that these studies, which at first seemed to me to have significant commonalities, ended up using such a multiplicity of different approaches to collect their data. However, all these different approaches seemed to have been able to deliver valuable and valid findings to the topic of family language practices.

In all of these studies at least two or three languages are reported to be present on a daily basis in the family's interactions. It is interesting to see how the different settings allow for different languages to emerge in a somewhat harmonious way. In the case of the family of the study in Norway (Obojska, 2019), in which both parents' HL is Polish, the parents mentioned their intention of introducing both Norwegian and English to their family interactions in order to improve their fluency in those languages. However, this proposal was strongly opposed by both children, who reported that their parents had tried to introduce this language practice before, and they actively boycotted it. They wanted to keep Polish as their family's language of interaction. This was also the case in one of the families living in Belgium (Van Mensel, 2018), where the parents decided not to incorporate the local language as their family's language of interaction, but rather use the minority language, in this case Chinese, for family interactions. The case of the Polish family in Norway (Obojska, 2019) is a clear example of how the children's agency can strongly influence in the negotiation of the family language practices.

In the study of different multilingual families in Singapore (Karpava et al., 2019), the families in question had in their shared linguistic repertoire Chinese, Ma-

lay or an Indian language together with English. Karpava et al. (2019) observed that the children of these three families used a different language when interacting with their siblings, a different language when interacting with their parents and, in some cases, even different languages when interacting with extended family members. This did not happen in the two multilingual families studied in Belgium (Van Mensel, 2018), in which the different language practices seemed to follow, at least to some extent, the OPOL approach. In one of these Belgian multilingual families (Van Mensel, 2018) the children were speaking Dutch with their mother and to each other, and the father's HL with their father (Spanish). In the second of these Belgian multilingual families (Van Mensel, 2018), both parents reported that they were actively planning to use a variant of the OPOL approach, in which both of them would speak respectively their most dominant language to the kids: the mother would talk Dutch and the father Chinese. However, in situations in which the whole family would be present, the communication language would be Chinese (the mother is bilingual). Seemingly, the language practices are truly variant in each of the mentioned families. With these examples (Obojska, 2019; Van Mensel, 2018; Karpava et al., 2019) it is possible to see how external societal, as well as internal family relations, strongly influence the family language practices that a multilingual family may end up adopting.

All in all, these different studies portray how different languages can, in a somewhat harmonious way, be intertwined in the setting of multilingual families and how language is negotiated between different family members. For the study of the multilingual families in Karpava et al. (2019) the most challenging part of having such a variety of languages seemed to be the children's proficiency in the minority languages that were present in certain family settings. Opposite to Karpava et al., (2019), in Obojska (2019) the participants seemed to struggle to incorporate the local language to their family interaction as their children preferred to maintain the minority language (Polish), as their language for family interactions. In the case of the multilingual families in Van Mensel (2018), there seemed to be a rather balanced use of the languages of the families' language repertoire and no mention of struggling with neither the majority nor the minority language(s) was reported. However, the last family mentioned in Van Mensel (2018) also reported to have consciously chosen not to use any of the minority languages that the parents grew up exposed to, because they felt that the practice of these languages would not be useful in the Belgian context. These studies support the idea that each family is influenced by their own circumstances and that the language choices and proficiencies in different languages might vary strongly. There was no special mention by these families about the notion of their family members creatively mixing different codes from the languages in their language repertoire. However, it can still likely be a recurrent phenomenon in their families.

Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that language is never set in stone, as well as languages appear they might disappear too. The language practices of the families mentioned above are recent studies, yet it is possible that their language practices have changed again, and that in future, they might also experience drastic changes. In linguistics, this phenomenon is identified as transience (Lønsmann, Hazel & Haberland, 2017). This same phenomenon can be applied to family language repertoires and their language practices within the family setting. A family might be using a certain set of languages because they feel that the languages in question are important to them at a certain moment of their lives. This might change over time, meaning that those languages that they were using before, may become less relevant, or even irrelevant, thus their language practices might see a drastic change. Transience (Lønsmann, Hazel & Haberland, 2017) can also be applied to the earlier mentioned study in Finland (Palviainen & Bergroth, 2018), in which parents had to fill in a form defining which languages the L1's of their kids would be. It is fairly possible that the language(s) that the parents choose to report on these forms might end up not being relevant or even used by their kids anymore at a later stage of their lives.

## 4. METHODOLOGY

The data used in this thesis consists of interview data that was collected during 2018 for the research project “Linguistic Constellations of Lingua Franca Families - A Longitudinal Inquiry into the Development of Multilingual Practices” led by Dr Kaisa S. Pietikäinen. The interviews were originally conducted with parents of seven families in Finland, Norway, and Canada. For this thesis I decided to only analyse four out of the seven provided data sets because the other three did not match my selection criteria (i.e. I left out the interviewed family in Canada, a family that had a L1 English speaker, and a couple that did not have children at the moment of the interview). Therefore, I ended up with the data set of 4 multilingual families living both in Finland and in Norway. The best fitting method to analyse the data was chosen to be a narrative research methodology, more precisely, a phenomenographical approach (more about this in 4.3).

### 4.1. Research aim

In this thesis I aim to understand how the use of ELF may become relevant in family interactions and how, according to family members, its use may have changed over time. To find out how ELF is reported to be relevant in the family interactions, I have developed the following research question:

RQ1: How do the participants see the role of ELF in their family interactions?

What the participants report about their language practices in their multilingual family settings, will help me understand how the participants see that ELF may have been visible in their family interactions. With their accounts on their language practices and their recorded construction of narratives, I will be able to identify relevant phenomena in multilingual family interaction. As I have mentioned previously, the use of language is characterised for its transience (Lønsmann, Hazel & Haberland, 2017), meaning that it is never set in stone and that language practices might possibly change drastically over time. In connection with this, I introduce my second research question:

RQ2: According to the participants, how has the use of ELF changed over time in their family interactions?

Thanks to the participants’ accounts of their language practices, I will be able to understand how they see that the use of ELF has developed over time in their family interactions. With the narratives that they construct around this, I will possibly also be able to identify if the participants feel that their use of ELF in their family interac-

tions was rather implemented over time, or neglected. It is important to answer these questions because seemingly there is a clear research gap in the use of ELF within multilingual family's interactions and the presence of English, as a lingua franca, as a part of these multilingual family's shared linguistic repertoires that still needs to be filled. Constructing over the existing research that addresses this topic in one way or another (e.g., Soler & Zabrodska, 2017; Pietikäinen, 2017), I hope that this study will help to fill this gap.

## 4.2. Qualitative research

I chose to approach my data with a qualitative method because a quantitative approach would have been unsuitable for the purpose of this thesis. I am after deep-rooted linguistic, cultural and ideological meanings that I could not reach if I would approach the interviews with a quantitative method.

Approaching the data with a qualitative method should provide the reader with findings that provide an in-depth understanding of how ELF is reported to become relevant in family interactions and how the role of ELF is reported to develop over time. The data should serve as a reflection of the points discussed in the literature review, such as the understanding of multilingual family, multilingual family language practices and language ideologies and identity.

I aim to support my decisions with the fundamentals of a constructivist approach, which are that knowledge is constructed through the interaction of individuals and their exchange of ideas, experiences and practices (Jonassen, 1991). Constructivism is based on emergent social realities that are subjective to different perceptions and negotiations when creating new meanings of the world in which we live (Fosnot, 2005). I am interested in referential interviews, the participants of this study construct meaning of a set of phenomena in the world. I am not interested in the interview interactions but rather in the meanings that the participants express through their construction of narratives. It is important to remember that the interview questions, asked by the interviewer, have an effect on the construction of narratives of the interviewees. An interviewer basically induces the participant's construction of narratives when they are asking a specific question, which results in the interviews being constructed by both the interviewer and the participants simultaneously (Evald, Freytag & Nielsen, 2018).

### **4.3. Narrative research**

Narrative research is a rich and diverse tradition based on the storytelling of individuals through verbal and non verbal communication that constructs a meaning that is tight to a certain context and time. A narrative needs to be contextualised in order to be fully understood (Squire, 2012).

Narrative research has a long tradition as a research method in social sciences, however, despite its popularity, it is still a difficult method to work with because it offers multiple approaches to choose from and its findings can certainly feel overwhelming (Andrews et al., 2013). Narrative research is based on the stories—narratives— that the research participants tell, and the interpretation of these stories could be endless (Squire et al., 2014). Working with a multiplicity of narratives about a certain topic, for instance, allows the researcher to put the narratives of the different research participants in dialogue and create a broader meaning or interpretation of the topic in question (Andrews, 2004).

According to De Fina (2016), the manner in which narrative research is analysed can be categorised in two different groups. On the one hand, being the way that narratives are constructed and told the object of analysis. On the other hand, being the experiences, meanings and identity expressions that are told through the narratives the object of analysis (De Fina, 2016). In this thesis I am not analysing the way that the narratives are constructed, but rather, the experiences, meanings and the identity expressions that were expressed by the participants through the construction of their narratives. The constructed narratives that were chosen to be analysed in this thesis are stories and expressions that helped me answer my research questions.

#### **4.3.1. Phenomenography**

There are many research approaches and strategies that can be used in qualitative research in general, and in narrative research in particular. I have chosen to do a thematic narrative analysis, also referred to as phenomenographic narrative analysis.

A phenomenographical approach aims to describe people's conceptions of a certain phenomenon in the world (Svensson, 1997). Svensson (1997) emphasises that when a phenomenographical approach is being used, choosing the right point of focus is essential in order to find the phenomena that will help describe or identify the key element(s) that the research in question is after. One of the basic principles of phenomenography lays in describing and comparing different conceptions of a certain phenomenon and to identify different categories of descriptions that leave room for openly interpreting the collected data (Svensson, 1997). This study aims to deliver a phenomenographic and narrative research perspective in which the basis of

phenomenography described by Svensson (1997) are hoped to be met through the narratives that the research participants have constructed.

Narratives are understood in this work as the accounts that the research participants construct in the frame of a semi-structured interview. These narratives are perceived as raw material in which the research participants express their stories, thoughts, feelings and perspectives drawing on their family relations and the linguistic phenomena that surround them in their everyday lives. The constructed narratives used in this work to answer the research questions are in fact direct excerpts from the interview transcripts.

Analysing my data with this narrative phenomenographic approach helped me identify different phenomena within my data and group these in a way that I could more easily see what similarities and differences are recurrent in the four data sets that I have worked with. I believe this to be a suiting method for analysing my data set because the different phenomena that I have identified in the data are, in one way or another, present in all four interviews, which makes it rather easy to contrast them with each other and to put them in dialogue, as Andrews (2004) points out in his conceptualisation of narrative analysis.

#### **4.4. Data**

The data used in this thesis consists of part of the interview data that was collected during 2018 for the research project "*Linguistic Constellations of Lingua Franca Families - A Longitudinal Inquiry into the Development of Multilingual Practices*" led by Dr Kaisa S. Pietikäinen (from this point on referred to as 'interviewer').

The interviewer, Dr Kaisa S. Pietikäinen, visited the homes of the four families whose interviews are part of this thesis. She conducted semi-structured interviews with the parents of the families. The interviews were recorded both with voice recorders and video recording devices. I got permission to access and use the data for analysis in my thesis from both the interviewer, as the project's principal investigator, as well as from the participants. When I received consented access to these voice and video recordings, part of the data was already transcribed by a research assistant, the rest I transcribed myself later on.

As I mentioned in the introduction of section 4, I did not use all the data that was provided to me. I chose not to include a Canadian multilingual family because of its rather distant location to the rest of the families (Finland and Norway) and because of the Canadian historical ties to the English language. The second family that I chose not to include in this thesis was a family that had a member that grew up using English and I decided that I would not include to my research data families in

which there is a speaker of L1 English, but rather families that use English as a second or additional language. The last family that I chose not to include was discarded because they did not have children at the moment of the interview and my research goal is to help fill in the gap of multilingual families that use ELF in their family interactions, including children.

#### **4.4.1. Data collection**

The data was collected through interviewing and these interviews were recorded. The interviews were performed addressing directly the parents of the four families. In some families the kids were not present at all and in other families the kids were present but not actively answering the questions of the interviewer. Although the children were present in some of the interviews and mentioned several times during all of them, the interviewer was not addressing them nor expecting them to take part in the interviews. The interviews were conducted in a semi-structured way with a conversational tone. There were some recurring questions from the interviewer that were guiding the flow and direction of the conversations.

The interviewer recruited the research participants through word of mouth, social media, mailing lists of international schools, announcements on university bulletin boards, international supermarkets and in an international church. The inclusion criteria was that the participants had to have been in a relationship for over 2 years (excluding short-term relationships), living together, using mainly English between them, and self-identifying as “non-native” English speakers. To prepare for the interviews, the interviewer sent out an informed consent for the participants to sign. The research notification was approved by the Norwegian Centre for Research Data. Before the interview date, a background form was sent to the participants for them to fill in following their own criteria. This background form included questions concerning the time that the parents of the four families had been together, how long they had lived together and where, if they were married, basic information about their kids (name, age and country they were born in), language repertoire of family members and their proficiency in the mentioned languages. Both the background forms and the interviews were conducted primarily in English because English was considered the lingua franca between the participants and the interviewer. The language competencies of the interviewer during the interviews were the following: her L1 is Finnish and she speaks fluently English and Norwegian. Additionally she also understands Swedish, Spanish and French. During the interviews Finnish or Norwegian were used to some extent when initiated by the participants. However, other languages such as Dutch, German and Chinese were also recognised from the recordings.

During the interviews, the interviewer had with her a document that served her as a general guideline. In this document she had enumerated different interview questions that she wanted to be sure to cover. If any of these questions needed clari-

fication, she would still ask further questions, following a natural order (i.e. she did not follow a specific order asking the questions). Sometimes she would skip some questions if she felt that the topic had already been covered.

#### **4.4.2. Data set**

The data set consists of interviews with four multilingual families from two Nordic countries: Finland and Norway. Three of these families were living in Finland at the time of the interview and one of them in Norway. The interviews were conducted in the families' homes using a semi-structured interview approach.

The data set consists of 19 video files and five audio files with a total of nine hours and seven minutes of video recordings. The five audio files were recorded in case the video would have failed while the interviews were happening or in case that there would have been any other technological obstacles later. The names of the participants that are used in this thesis are not real names, they are pseudonyms.

For the first family, Laura and Thomas' family, five videos with a total length of 146 minutes were provided. For the second family, Chun and Nils' family, I received four videos with a total length of 118 minutes. For the third family, Päivi and Jan's family, I received six videos with a total length of 178 minutes. For the fourth family, Minna and Henrik's family, I received four videos with a total length of 125 minutes. These four families reported to have a variety of language repertoires that will further be described in section 4.4.3.

Overall it was rather easy to understand and transcribe the interviews (more about the transcription process in section 4.5) since the main language of communication was English. However, as mentioned before, some parts were in other languages that I did not master well enough to be able to fully understand and transcribe them, therefore I left those parts out of my analysis. When considered important, I asked for translation from the interviewer since she had a better mastery in the languages in questions than I did. In the appendixes the reader can find the original transcription, with changed names, of the narratives that the participants constructed during their respective interviews. These narratives were answering, in one way or another, my research questions.

#### **4.4.3. Description of the participants**

To describe the participants of the data set for this thesis, I will use as a reference the reported description that the participants have provided to the interviewer about themselves and about their families, before the interviews happened.

## Family 1: Laura and Thomas

TABLE 1 Family 1: family members and their language proficiency

The language proficiency of the family members was filled in by the parents of the family in question themselves (0 = no command, 1 = basic, 2 = intermediate, 3 = advanced):

Family 1			
Parents: Laura and Thomas	Laura and Thomas had been together for about 15 years at the time of the interview (13 of them married). They live together in Finland since 2010. Laura grew up in a Finnish-speaking environment and Thomas in a Flemish-speaking environment.		
Children: Pekka, Julia and Roope	Pekka (13)	Julia (12)	Roope (10)

		Listening comprehension	Speaking	Reading	Writing
Finnish	Laura	3	3	3	3
	Thomas	2	2	2	2
	Pekka	3	3	3	2
	Julia	3	3	3	3
	Roope	3	3	3	2
English	Laura	2	2	2	2
	Thomas	2	2	2	2
	Pekka	2	2	2	1
	Julia	1	1	1	1
	Roope	2	1	1	1
Flemish (Dutch)	Laura	2	1	2	1
	Thomas	3	3	3	3
	Pekka	2	2	1	0
	Julia	2	2	1	0
	Roope	2	1	0	0

Laura and Thomas estimated in percentages how much exposure their children have to different languages during a regular week (including at school/kindergarten, hobbies, with friends and family etc.). These were the results of their estimations:

Pekka: 70% Finnish, 20% English, 8% Flemish, 2 % Swedish.

Julia: 80% Finnish, 10% English, 8% Flemish, 2 % Swedish.

Roope: 80% Finnish, 10% English, 8% Flemish, 2 % Swedish.

Laura and Thomas estimated in percentages how much exposure their children have to different languages at home only. These were the results of their estimations:

Pekka: 65% Finnish, 20% English, 15% Flemish.

Julia: 75% Finnish, 10% English, 15% Flemish.

Roope: 75% Finnish, 10% English, 15% Flemish.

## **Family 2: Chun and Nils**

TABLE 2 Family 2: family members and their language proficiency

The language proficiency of the family members was filled in by the parents of the family in question themselves (0 = no command, 1 = basic, 2 = intermediate, 3 = advanced):

<b>Family 2</b>		
Parents: Chun and Nils	Chun and Nils had been together for about 17 years at the time of the interview (14 of them married). They live together in Norway since 2009. Chun grew up in a Chinese-speaking environment and Nils in a Norwegian-speaking environment.	
Children: John and Yngve	John (10)	Yngve (8)

		<b>Listening comprehension</b>	<b>Speaking</b>	<b>Reading</b>	<b>Writing</b>
Norwegian	Chun	2	1	1	0
	Nils	3	3	3	3
	John	3	3	3	3
	Yngve	3	3	3	3
English	Chun	3	3	3	3
	Nils	3	3	3	3
	John	2	2	2	2
	Yngve	2	2	1	1
Chinese	Chun	3	3	3	3
	Nils	0.5	0	0	0
	John	2	2	0	0
	Yngve	2	2	0	0

Chun and Nils estimated in percentages how much exposure their children have to different languages during a regular week (including at school/kindergarten, hobbies, with friends and family etc.). These were the results of their estimations:

John: 50% Norwegian, 30% English, 20% Chinese

Yngve: 40% Norwegian, 30% English, 30% Chinese

Chun and Nils estimated in percentages how much exposure their children have to different languages at home only. These were the results of their estimations:

John: 25% Norwegian, 27.5% English, 27.5% Chinese

Yngve: 12% Norwegian, 44% English, 44% Chinese

### **Family 3: Päivi and Jan**

TABLE 3 Family 3: family members and their language proficiency

The language proficiency of the family members was filled in by the parents of the family in question themselves (0 = no command, 1 = basic, 2 = intermediate, 3 = advanced):

Family 3		
Parents: Päivi and Jan	Päivi and Jan had been together for about 23 years at the time of the interview (19 of them married). They live together in Finland since 1996. Päivi grew up in a Finnish-speaking environment and Jan in a Dutch-speaking environment.	
Children: Mia and Emma	Mia (17)	Emma (15)

		Listening comprehension	Speaking	Reading	Writing
Finnish	Päivi	3	3	3	3
	Jan	2	1	2	1
	Mia	3	3	3	3
	Emma	3	3	3	3
English	Päivi	3	3	3	3
	Jan	3	3	3	3
	Mia	2	1	1	1
	Emma	3	2	2	2

Dutch	Päivi	2	1	2	1
	Jan	3	3	3	3
	Mia	2	2	2	1
	Emma	2	2	2	1

Päivi and Jan estimated in percentages how much exposure their children have to different languages during a regular week (including at school/kindergarten, hobbies, with friends and family etc.). These were the results of their estimations:

Mia: Finnish 60 %, Dutch, 20%, English 20%

Emma: Finnish 60 %, Dutch, 20%, English 20%

Päivi and Jan estimated in percentages how much exposure their children have to different languages at home only. These were the results of their estimations:

Mia: Finnish 90%, Dutch 5%, English 5%

Emma: Finnish 90%, Dutch 5%, English 5%

#### **Family 4: Minna and Henrik**

TABLE 4 Family 4: family members and their language proficiency

The language proficiency of the family members was filled in by the parents of the family in question themselves (0 = no command, 1 = basic, 2 = intermediate, 3 = advanced):

Family 4		
Parents: Minna and Henrik	Minna and Henrik had been together for about 7 years at the time of the interview (3 of them married). They live together in Finland since 2013. Minna grew up in a Finnish-speaking environment and Henrik in a German and Hungarian-speaking environment.	
Children: Elias and Felix	Elias (1)	Felix (1)

		Listening comprehension	Speaking	Reading	Writing
Finnish	Minna	3	3	3	3
	Henrik	1	0	1	0
	Elias	1	0	0	0
	Felix	1	0	0	0
English	Minna	3	3	3	3
	Henrik	3	3	3	3

German	Minna	2	2	2	1
	Henrik	3	3	3	3
	Elias	1	0	0	0
	Felix	1	0	0	0
Hungarian	Minna	0	0	1	0
	Henrik	3	3	3	3

Minna and Henrik estimated in percentages how much exposure their children have to different languages during a regular week (including at school/kindergarten, hobbies, with friends and family etc.). These were the results of their estimations:

Minna's answer: both children 60% Finnish, 30% German, 10% English

Henrik's answer: both children 72.5% Finnish, 17.5% German, 10% English

Minna and Henrik estimated in percentages how much exposure their children have to different languages at home only. These were the results of their estimations:

Minna's answer: both children 40% Finnish, 40% German, 20% English

Henrik's answer: both children 45% Finnish, 35% German, 20% English

## 4.5. Data analysis

Before being able to approach the data, I had to go through a careful transcription process. Luckily for me, the procedure was not as demanding as one would expect since a part of the interviews was already transcribed by one research assistant who followed simplified conversation analytic transcription conventions. This research assistant was asked to transcribe with as much detail as possible, focusing primarily on the answers of the participants rather than on the interviewer's back-channelling.

The parts that were left untranscribed, were later transcribed by myself following the same approach. Transcribing the data felt extremely straight forward thanks to the videos that went hand in hand with the recordings that the interviewer provided me with. The embodied interaction visible in the video recordings helped me understand better what the research participants were aiming to express. Altogether I ended up working with 187 pages of transcripts.

When I decided to start approaching the data critically, I had in front of me a paper where I had written down some keywords together with the research questions. This helped me not to get carried away and it also served as a constant reminder of the research goals that I had set for this thesis. I approached my data with

a phenomenographic narrative approach and the unit of analysis that I used were the different construction of narratives delivered by the research participants. The selected narratives were the ones that brought up relevant aspects that answered, in one way or another, one or both research questions. These constructions of narratives were analysed in the form of direct excerpts from the transcripts of the four data sets. I started going through one family's transcription at the time extracting those constructed narratives. Then, I moved along grouping all these relevant narratives into different categories.

In the beginning I was planning to collect all the constructed narratives that I found relevant from the transcripts in one single table. These narratives were intended to be matched up with the phenomena that I would have started to identify whilst going through these relevant narratives. This process was only possible once I had familiarised myself enough with the four data sets. However, I had to change my strategy quite soon because the first family had already constructed such an extensive number of relevant narratives that creating such a big table was not feasible. Instead, after having grouped and identified the main phenomena present in the interview of the first family, I continued grouping the relevant narratives from the other three data sets into the same unnamed categories that emerged after analysing the first family.

Once I had carefully grouped and regrouped the relevant constructed narratives of the four data sets, I proceeded to name the big phenomena—categories—under which the emerged groups of constructed narratives were categorised. With this in mind, I created six tables. Each table named after the phenomenon that I felt that represented best the group of constructed narratives in question. The six phenomena that I arrived at through my careful analysis were the following:

1. The use of ELF in multilingual families over time
2. The use of ELF in multilingual family interactions
3. The use of ELF between parents in multilingual families
4. ELF as a linguistic support for learning to speak other languages present in the context of multilingual families
5. ELF as a tool for communicating with extended family members in the context of multilingual families
6. ELF as a hindering factor when learning other languages in the context of multilingual families

Subsequently, I proceeded to place the constructed narratives from each family under their corresponding table – phenomena. This was visually and conceptually logical because having a quick look at the tables, one was able to identify the name of the phenomenon, which was highlighted in the first row of the table, and under it the different narratives, which additionally included, respectively on their left, the name of the family in question. Anticipating that the table would expand over an extensive number of pages, I decided to enumerate at the beginning of the document, right under the RQS, the different phenomena that were highlighted in the tables. This would later help me to categorise the narratives of the next families in a more accurate and effective way.

After having gone through the first data set, I named the different categories in a rather descriptive way. Later, these categories were renamed several times during the analysis of the other three data sets, aiming to include the phenomenon that was described by the first data set and the ones described by the other three data sets. The preliminary description of these phenomena was constantly being both expanded and narrowed down to the point that some new categories were added and other categories were merged with others, or even being deleted. Their descriptive names made it easier for me to place the narratives of the four families into only six different categories. Once I finished placing the narratives of the four data sets into these descriptive categories, I started to look into each category individually in order to find a suiting name for the phenomenon that was represented by the meaning of the narratives from each category. However, the final name that the six phenomena have now, was only reached after having written the final discussion of this thesis.

After having added the narratives of the second family to the six tables, I realised that something else had to be done to differentiate the different families, having their names on a cell next to the narratives was not enough anymore. It was not enough because some families constructed such extensive relevant narratives that were referring to a specific phenomenon that it started to become rather hard to visually identify what narratives were belonging to which family. In order to avoid confusion and to support a smooth way for me to analyse the data and for the reader to later visually understand better my thinking process, I coloured in four distinct scales of grey the cell corresponding to each family. In this way, it was easier for me to follow up on the different pieces of narratives without losing the thread as well as marking a clearer visual distinction for the reader when they are moving on to the narratives of a different family.

The six phenomena that I have developed in order to present my findings were identified by analysing and carefully going through the recollection of the constructed narratives that my data is made of. The different narratives that the participants had constructed were in the beginning rather difficult to organise, both written and in my head. However, the more narratives I managed to put together, the more reas-

During it became that the phenomena that had been emerging during the analysis were supported by the constructed narratives and that these supported the importance of enumerating these phenomena.

Not all of the phenomena were discussed in each family in the same way, that is what made the different narratives so special and unique. Two out of the six phenomena were not mentioned at all (Phenomena 5 and 6) by one family in each case; however, in each case there were still three other families that did address extensively the phenomenon in question. Furthermore, one of the six phenomena was mentioned by half of the research participants (Phenomenon 4), this being two families out of four. In this case, the nature of the phenomenon in question was rather polar, meaning that these families, by not addressing the phenomenon, already gave away something about them that made me realise that they had something in common that could potentially explain why they had not addressed it. The two families that did address Phenomenon 4, did so by constructing rather conclusive narratives. The other three phenomena – Phenomena 1,2 and 3 – were addressed with extensive and conclusive construction of narratives by all the families.

Later, I have developed a system that should make it fairly easy to find in the appendices, whilst going through the findings, the transcription of the constructed narratives that I have used for analysing my data. The six phenomena are grouped in six tables respectively (Tables 5-10). Each table is divided in four sections, one for each family that is part of this data. Additionally, each “family section” is divided in little subsections with a summarised report of what was said during the interviews. These little subsections are organised with a number in italics in the beginning of each of them. The number has three digits and each of them refers to the following: the first number refers to the phenomenon in question; the second number refers to the family in question; and the third number refers to a simple order in which the interactions of each family are enumerated. An example of this:

### 6.3.2

The 6 stands for the sixth phenomenon: ELF as a hindering factor when learning other languages in the context of multilingual families.

The 3 stands for the third family: Päivi and Jan.

The 2 stands for the second subsection of the phenomenon and family in question.

This means that the subsection 6.3.2 stands for the second interview excerpt of Päivi and Jan’s interview referring to the Phenomenon 6: ELF as a hindering factor when learning other languages in the context of multilingual families.

## 5. FINDINGS

First, I will go through the six phenomena that I identified through my analysis and their respective narratives (Tables 5-10). The six phenomena that I identified relate to different aspects of the participants' construction of narratives around their language practices. I named the six phenomena as follows:

1. The use of ELF in multilingual families over time
2. The use of ELF in multilingual family interactions
3. The use of ELF between parents in multilingual families
4. ELF as a linguistic support for learning to speak other languages present in the context of multilingual families
5. ELF as a tool for communicating with extended family members in the context of multilingual families
6. ELF as a hindering factor when learning other languages in the context of multilingual families

As mentioned earlier, for the purpose of this section, I have summarised the narratives that the participants constructed during their respective interviews. These summaries are representing the main point of what the research participants constructed around the six phenomena that I identified through carefully analysing their interviews. The actual transcription of the narratives can be found from Appendix 7. This being said, I am going to proceed now presenting the six phenomena and the respective narratives that the research participants have constructed around them.

TABLE 5                      Phenomenon 1: The use of ELF in multilingual families over time

(1) The use of ELF in multilingual families over time	
Family 1: Laura & Thomas	<p>1.1.1 Referring to the language practices as a couple, the interviewer asks Laura and Thomas about their practices. Both agree on the fact that they mix Finnish and English to a large extent. Laura claims that it depends, some periods they would talk quite a lot of Finnish and then suddenly start using more English, and some days even more Flemish and then they would switch back to English again. Thomas argues that the last couple of years there has been more Finnish and less English or Dutch in their interactions. He estimates that ninety percent of their conversations are in Finnish and that around ten percent are a mix, with words or sentences, in other languages.</p>

(1) The use of ELF in multilingual families over time	
Family 1: Laura & Thomas	1.1.2 Thomas starts looking back into the time when he and Laura first moved to Finland together and he was still learning Finnish, he tells that he was at times feeling too tired to keep practicing Finnish, so he rather wanted to switch back to English when talking to Laura. He also adds that English was the common language for him and Laura because when they met, they met in English, so it was the most logical language to use since they did not have any other common language at that point, Thomas explains.
	1.1.3 Thomas emphasises that when he did not speak Finnish that well, they would use English together. Laura expresses agreement.
	1.1.4 Thomas expands on the fact that his Finnish has become so automatic that he does not have to put an extra effort to it anymore.
	1.1.5 Laura clarifies that when she met Thomas her English was much more “crappier” than now. She adds that they probably had developed a simpler way of communicating in English with each other.
Family 2: Chun & Nils	1.2.1 Nils claims that he should have spoken more Norwegian to Chun. If this would have been the case, then he would have used less English with her, which would have made it easier for Chun to learn Norwegian, according to him. Nils also explains that using Norwegian instead of English would have resulted in an extra effort and they became lazy with the time since “it’s easy to just stick to what we know ourselves [English]”.
	1.2.2 Nils expects that he will not learn Chinese and that Chun will not learn Norwegian and that therefore, they will keep speaking English. Chun adds that for her, and as a couple, that works perfectly. However, she wishes that her Norwegian could be better to support the interactions that she might have outside of their home.
	1.2.3 Chun and Nils announce that they are going for a year abroad and they do not expect their language practices to change much. Nils claims that “nothing” will happen, that they will just keep talking English to each other and that their boys will be better at English and that potentially after that, if they were to come back to Norway, they would speak English as a family.
	1.2.4 When asking about language mixing, Chun answers that when their kids were about 1-2 years old and they just started taking, they would mix languages. She explains that in one sentence six words could be from three different languages (Norwegian, Chinese and English). However, she also adds that later on they were able to identify the differences between the languages.
	1.2.5 When asked what the role of English in their life was, Chun answers that as a couple it is the tool to communicate with each other and that her English proficiency has been greatly improved during all the years that they have been together.
Family 3: Päivi & Jan	1.3.1 Päivi explains that in the beginning of their relationship she perceived English as a kind of fun language to speak to each other.
	1.3.2 Päivi remarks that her and Jan only spoke English since the beginning and now she regrets it because she thinks that it was hindering his development in learning Finnish.
	1.3.3 Päivi explains that nowadays they speak more Finnish and less English because his Finnish skills are better. She thinks that he is developing and learning to communicate better in Finnish now than he did before.
	1.3.4 Päivi expresses her wish to change their language practice to only Finnish, excluding English. She explains that that is the reason why Jan goes to Finnish classes again.
	1.3.5 To the question of what English is in their life right now, Päivi answers that it is a way of expressing herself when needed, both at work and at home with Jan. She personally does not feel to have any relationship with English.

(1) The use of ELF in multilingual families over time	
Family 3: Päivi & Jan	1.3.6 Päivi explains that at the moment English is for her and Jan a communication tool. She claims again that she does not feel a relationship with English and that she could perfectly live without it. She also highlights that if she would not speak English, and if Jan could speak Dutch to her and she could speak Finnish to him that she wouldn't miss it.
	1.3.7 Jan explains that English is a necessity for his work and career as well as the communication with governmental bodies. He states that at least for now, English is for all practical purposes his primary language, whether he likes it or not.
	1.3.8 Päivi feels that Jan and her speaking English has not improved neither of their vocabulary or speaking fluency in English.
	1.3.9 Päivi considers English to be a foreign language for her. She also believes that the English that she uses with her husband is a "bad" English, something like a new language that they have developed together. She also highlights that there are also "native" speakers, who also speak differently.
Family 4: Minna & Henrik	1.4.1 To the question whether Minna and Henrik have seen any change in their talk for the past five or six years, Minna answers that she did. She describes how they simplify their vocabulary and even grammatical structures to the point that they would say to each other "give juice", knowingly that it is grammatically incorrect and not a complete sentence. Minna also adds that they have incorporated to their vocabulary words that do not really exist in English and she is worried that the kids will not realise that it is their own word and that it does not really exist.
	1.4.2 Henrik claims that his English is getting worse because he is not in an English environment and he is just speaking English to non native speakers. He believes that his English level is sinking because nobody around him speaks a "perfect English".
	1.4.3 Minna explains that she thinks that nowadays she speaks English in a "Finnish way" to the extent that she believes to start developing a kind of "pronunciation thing" which she did not use to have.
	1.4.4 Henrik and Minna speculate about potentially moving to an English speaking country or different speaking countries where their English might develop towards a different direction.

The research participants reported that their use of English had significantly changed in their family interactions since the moment in which the parents of each family met each other. This is not surprising since, as I mentioned before, language and language practices are in constant growth, decrease and change. Language and language practices can be in fact defined as a transience (Lønsmann, Hazel & Haberland, 2017), which in practice means that they are not something stable or tangible, but rather something ever developing, changing and adapting. All the parents of the four families stated that in the beginning of their relationship they spoke only English to each other because it was the only common language for them, and that afterwards, some of them kept this practice because it seemed to make sense since they met in that language and none of them seemed to be more proficient than the other in it. However, this practice appears to differ within the four families.

The parents in Family 1 stated that they use more and more infrequently English and increasingly more frequently the local language (Finnish). The parents in Family 3 wished to adopt a similar practice as the parents in Family 1, in which they

could eventually end up not using English at all. The perceived steady decrease of the use of English between the parents in Family 1 is directly related to the fact that the minority language speaking parent (Thomas) had learned the local language well enough. In Family 3, this was not the case, although they specifically expressed a wish for this to happen. In this case, the minority language speaking parent (Jan) does not feel comfortable enough in the local language (Finnish) and states therefore that English is his primary language of communication. The expressed wish from the parents in Family 3 to stop using ELF in any of their family interactions seems to bring about a negative attitude towards using ELF, they would rather like to speak the local language with each other.

The parents in Family 2 believe that they will keep English as one of their languages at home for a longer time. Opposite to the statements of the parents in families 1 and 3, this seems to be strongly related to the fact that the minority language speaking parent (Chun) has talked about not being able to learn the majority language (Norwegian) and Nils, at the same time, claims that he has not shown much effort or intention in learning Chun's language (Chinese) either. Therefore, while this keeps being the case, English is the only possible language for their interaction. The parents in Family 4 present a similar line of thinking as the parents in Family 2, since the minority language speaking parent (Henrik) claims not to have manifested any intention of learning the local language (Finnish) and Minna reports that her fluency in Henrik's L1 (German) is not good enough to replace it with English. They express their belief that their English proficiency is getting worse with the pass of time because they are not following strict grammatical or pronunciation rules. Similarly to the parents in Family 4, the parents in Family 3 report to believe that their interaction in English has not seen any kind of improvement over the years. The parents in Family 3 report to believe to use a "bad English" compared to the one that a "native speaker" of English would use. They evaluate their use of English comparing it to the use of English that a L1 English speaker would have. They concluded that their use of English, in comparison to the use of an L1 English speaker, is a "bad English". Their way of evaluating their use of English demonstrates how prevalent the "native speaker" ideology still is (Canagarajah, 2018). They define their language as a "new language" that they have developed together over time, this perspective resembles the notion of ELF as an open concept that is not dependent on a closed system with specific rules that are "native-speaker-like" but rather to a creative system that stems from their shared linguistic repertoire. The parents in Family 1 and 2 mentioned in this respect that their proficiency had seen an improvement through this practice, they explicitly stated that their use of ELF has improved their proficiency in English. The biggest contrast in the statements from the parents of the four families is perhaps their way of conceptualising their use of ELF, whilst some of them compare it to the way that a L1 English speaker uses English, others prefer to identify it as a language that they have developed by themselves. Additionally, the parents in Family 2 and 3 state that they see the role of English in their lives as a mere tool for com-

municating with their spouses in family situations, they do not feel any kind of ownership or relationship with their use of ELF. This might be related to the reported fact that English does not exist isolated in these families, but rather, hand in hand with other languages such as the minority language of one of the parents or the local language of the society they are living in. This perception indicates a clear step away from the misconception that the use of English needs to be similar, or live up, to the use of a L1 English speaker (Holliday, 2006).

TABLE 6 Phenomenon 2: The use of ELF in multilingual family interactions

(2) The use of ELF in multilingual family interactions	
Family 1: Laura & Thomas	2.1.1 Thomas describes that he and Laura speak Finnish together but that when some other friends are present, they might speak English and that when that happens the kids feel kind of left out and start getting bored because they do not understand what they say.
	2.1.2 Thomas explains that for a while they had an “English jar” in the kitchen because the kids would get annoyed with the fact that Laura and him were talking English and they couldn’t understand it yet. Thomas jokes about the kids being responsible for them not speaking English to each other anymore. Laura adds that it made sense to have that rule because it was not nice to be at dinner and that your parents would say something that you wouldn’t understand. Thomas also adds that it would not apply anymore since Pekka speaks so good English already. Laura adds to this last comment that Pekka sometimes forgets words in Finnish and that he therefore prefers English.
	2.1.3 Laura mentions that when there are other kids around they try not to speak any Flemish or English, but rather only Finnish so that everybody can understand.
	2.1.4 Laura looks back to a time when her and Thomas had planned that they would speak their respective L1’s to their firstborn and that the three of them would speak English to each other as a family. Thomas adds that he thinks that they made the right decision dropping English when interacting with their kids now because they would pick it up eventually either way. Additionally, he considers that they would have taught the kids a ‘wrong’ English. Laura agrees and adds that they stopped talking English with Pekka when the second child was born (Julia). Then, they kept English just between the two of them even though at some point their plan was that English would have become the language of their whole family.
	2.1.5 Laura argues that English exists in their house as a daily language. However, Thomas disagrees since in his opinion there has been a bigger input in Finnish lately although he also claims that Pekka and Roope understand and start to speak English too.
Family 2: Chun & Nils	2.2.1 To the question of what languages would be spoken during a dinner situation with the kids, Chun answers that “everything” would be used. Nils supports this argument explaining that he would speak Norwegian to the boys, as he would usually do, Chun would speak Chinese to them, and they would speak English to each other. Nils also mentions that they are happy that the kids are understanding English and sometimes even interacting themselves in English. Chun adds that she senses that when they are the four of them together, that all three language are similarly present.

(2) The use of ELF in multilingual family interactions	
Family 2: Chun & Nils	2.2.2 To the question of whether Chun and Nils thought that their children had learned English from them or if it came from somewhere else, Nils answers “yes”. Chun adds that their basic vocabulary probably comes from them and from school. Chun also highlights that when she and Nils talk, they used to think that the kids would not understand them but now, it seems to her that they did pick it up and they are able to build on what they talk. Nils finishes his argument saying that their English proficiency is probably linked to their natural curiosity and to the movies and books that they read.
Family 3: Päivi & Jan	2.3.1 Jan explains that sometimes during dinner time Päivi speaks Finnish to him and that he answers in Dutch or English.
	2.3.2 Päivi describes that it is difficult to use English with Jan because of the girls. She considers it to be a separating factor taking into consideration their linguistic interactions as a family. She believes that the use of English isolates the girls from their discussion. She also adds that when the girls are not home that they use English and that when they talk about complicated things then too. She finishes her argument stating that it is very difficult to change a common language, for anybody.
	2.3.3 Jan claims that during dinner situations English is mostly brought out. And then the languages that prevail are Finnish and Dutch.
	2.3.4 To the question of how their girls are addressed, Jan highlights that often they have to negotiate the meaning of a word and figure out the correct translation. He admits that ideally the girls would be fluent in Dutch. However, he also mentions that sometimes when Päivi is not there, they might also use English to find out a translation of something that they cannot figure out otherwise. Jan thinks that one of their girls might be better than the other in English because of the youtube videos that she watches in English.
	2.3.5 Päivi considers English to be this kind of “no-rules” language. She supposes that their children’s listening comprehension in English might be as good as Jan’s in Finnish. She thinks that their kids never really listen when she and Jan speak to each other in English. She has expressed her belief that their kids simply ignore them when they speak English because they have never been addressed by them in that language. She emphasises that they simply do not pay any attention to it when they speak it.
Family 4: Minna & Henrik	2.4.1 Minna explains that when she addresses Henrik she uses English and that when she addresses the children, then she does this in Finnish. Henrik explains that he does the same but using German instead.
	2.4.2 Minna expresses how much it bothers her that there is such an extensive use of English at home because she hopes that their children would become really proficient in German and in Finnish. Minna states that she could also speak German to the children but she rather uses Finnish because she believes that it is important that the children hear her speak her “native language”. Minna also points out that sometimes she tries to speak another language than English to Henrik, such as Finnish, but then Henrik does not even realise that she is addressing him.
	2.4.3 Minna believes that English is an obstruction in their family language repertoire because there is too much of it and not enough Finnish or German. She thinks that the sooner they could drop the use of English, the better.
	2.4.4 When asked whether Henrik and Minna thought that their children would understand English, both shook their heads. Minna draws on another ELF couple that Henrik and her know. Apparently they have heard from them that their kids complain about not being able to understand the parents when they speak to each other. Minna explains how much that surprised her because she could not understand how the children would not learn English although it is the third language in the home for that family. She believes that this could be related to the fact that the parents are not addressing the children when they use English.

(2) The use of ELF in multilingual family interactions	
Family 4: Minna & Henrik	2.4.5 Minna explains that she has heard that it is important that each parent clearly speaks one language to their children. She believes that it will not be detrimental if the children hear that the parents speak English to each other. She emphasises that it is important that the children hear Finnish from her when she is addressing them and that they only hear German from Henrik when he is addressing them. However, she highlights that she has realised that Henrik might add Finnish words to his German, or that he would even sing in English to the kids.

The parents in Family 1 reported that they mainly use the local language in family situations and not so much English anymore. In contrast, the parents in Family 2, 3 and 4 reported to still use English as their main language of communication. The parents in Family 1 highlighted that when they would use English instead of Finnish (the local language) that their kids would get bored, annoyed and feel left out because they would not understand them. The parents in Family 3 feel, similarly to the parents in Family 1, that speaking English is an isolating factor towards their children. To solve these issues, the parents in Family 1 and 3, discussed trying to avoid speaking English in front of their kids. However, if we now turn to the parents in Family 2, they reported to openly use English in front of their kids and to be happy that they understand every time more of it and that they are also able to interact in English with them. Originally, the parents in Family 1 reported to have planned to use English as the language of communication between all family members in family situations, and each parent exclusively their respective L1s—applying the OPOL strategy (Venables, 2014)—when addressing their children individually. However, the parents in Family 1, after having their second child, reported having decided to stop using English in family situations because they believed to be transmitting a “wrong” English to their kids since they were not “native” speakers of English. This belief of transmitting a “wrong” English to their kids appears to connect to the language ideologies that this specific family holds. This is closely related to the preponderant belief that L1 speakers of English are supposedly better equipped or more entitled to teach this language than English speakers that do not have English as their L1. This belief is based on the idea that non-L1 English speakers would not be able to teach, or transfer, English as good as L1 English speakers (Holliday, 2006).

Concerning the parent-child interaction, all the parents of the four families reported to similarly approach their children making use of their respective L1s, using the OPOL strategy (Venables, 2014), and with little to no use of English. However, in Family 3 the parent of the minority language (Jan) mentioned that at times he needs to incorporate English to the conversation with his children to fill linguistic gaps. The majority language parent in Family 3 (Päivi) reported to believe that their kids unconsciously do not listen to the parents when they speak English to each other because they do not feel addressed in that language. The mother in Family 4 describes a similar setting to the one highlighted by the parents in Family 3, concluding that the reason why children might not become proficient in English although it is a lan-

guage that is present in their family's home, might be that the children are not directly addressed in that language. Families 3 and 4 bring up the issue that ELF might not feel as a language that is part of their children's language repertoire because they never address them in that language, there is a bigger feeling of belonging to the conversation and intention of inclusivity of all family members when other languages are used such as the local language (Finnish in both families) or the L1 of one of the parents (German and Dutch respectively).

Additionally, the mother in Family 4 reported to be annoyed by the fact that she and her spouse are using English to such an extent because she would rather want their kids to be fluent in the local language (Finnish) and the L1 of her spouse (German). Here again, there is an expression of negative feelings towards using ELF within family interactions and a desire to instead use the minority or local language more. This fear of not reaching certain fluency in the local language or not being proficient enough in the minority language is a phenomenon that has been widely discussed by linguists for decades. This perception of ELF being a burden to learn other languages points directly to Phenomenon 6, in which I describe how some of the research participants have expressed their belief that ELF has been a hindering factor in their, or their partner's, attempt of learning the local language in the context of their multilingual families.

The majority language speaking parents in Family 3 and 4 (in both cases the mother) reported that, the sooner the use of English would be dropped in their family interactions, the better. There are three different ways in which these four families perceive the use of English in their family interactions. Family 1 does not feel that English plays such an important role in their family interactions anymore because the minority language speaking parent (Thomas) has learned the local language well enough so that all family members can communicate together in a somewhat harmonious way.

However, in families 2,3 and 4 the minority language speaking parents have reported not to have learned the local language and that therefore they keep having English as a key language within their family interactions. However, the parents in Family 3 explicitly expressed their wish to stop using ELF in their family interactions. Opposite to this, Family 2 mentioned to be happy about using ELF within their family interactions. The minority language speaking parent in Family 3 (Jan) explains that in some situations where all family members are present three languages coexist, these being Finnish, Dutch and English. A similar phenomenon is described in Family 1 and 2, where the minority language, the local language and ELF are reported by the participants to coexist harmoniously. This means that the use of ELF does not exist isolated in these families, but rather, accompanied or surrounded by other languages that are part of the family member's language repertoires.

The parents in Family 4 explained that they speak English to each other, also in front of their kids, and their respective languages when they address their children – who were not old enough to speak themselves at the time of the interviews. However, this means that in a normal dinner situation in which the parents would be talking to each other using ELF, both German and Finnish would be also present and perhaps even combined with English since the parents use those languages to address their children.

Overall, the reported use of ELF in family situations seems to decrease steadily when the parent who does not speak the local language at first, masters it well enough to interact in it. In the cases in which one of the parent does not speak the local language well enough, or at all, the use of ELF keeps being important for their family interactions.

TABLE 7 Phenomenon 3: The use of ELF between parents in multilingual families

(3) The use of ELF between parents in multilingual families	
Family 1: Laura & Thomas	3.1.1 Thomas describes that when he is speaking to Laura and he does not know a word in Finnish, that he would say the word in English or even in Flemish.
	3.1.2 Laura claims that when it is only her and Thomas that they are more likely to speak only Flemish or English. She emphasises that they, as a couple, are more likely to speak in English.
	3.1.3 Laura mentions that if they had a “real” conversation, that this would then be in English.
	3.1.4 Thomas describes how English is a common language for both of them and that since it is not either of their L1, that they do not need a lot of words for expressing themselves. He describes that there is a feeling of being on the same level when they use English.
	3.1.5 Thomas thinks that expressing his romantic feelings is easier in English because he has been reading more romantic literature in English than in Flemish and he has therefore more adequate vocabulary in English. He supports that in Finnish it would be harder to express his feelings because the vocabulary in that area is more limited for him. Laura agrees that it is always easier to switch to English in these cases because if she would switch to Finnish she would not be completely comfortable because she would not be sure if Thomas would understand her message correctly.
Family 2: Chun & Nils	3.2.1 Nils describes that his Chinese is a lot worse than Chun’s Norwegian. He supports this to be a reason why they ended up speaking English to each other. He says that they have been doing so for 17 years.
	3.2.2 Chun and Nils agree that they speak English to each other almost a hundred percent.
Family 3: Päivi & Jan	3.3.1 Päivi mentions that Jan speaks always English with her. She claims to speak 50% Finnish and 50% English to Jan, but that Jan then answers her in English.
	3.3.2 Päivi insists that she does not speak English too much. Only when Jan does not understand something.

(3) The use of ELF between parents in multilingual families	
Family 3: Päivi & Jan	3.3.3 Jan does not feel like he is addressed when Päivi addresses him in Finnish.
	3.3.4 Päivi reports that she tries to speak only Finnish with Jan. However, Jan makes her speak English, she claims.
Family 4: Minna & Henrik	3.4.1 Minna and Henrik agree that they mostly speak English to each other. Minna describes how they have tried to switch to German with different strategies that did not work out as planned. Henrik also mentions that because they met in England and English was the first language that they started speaking to each other, that the decision was kind of made for them. He also claims that English is a language in which both have a similar level of proficiency, English being the language in which nobody is stronger than the other, linguistically talking.
	3.4.2 Henrik supports that he could express his emotions to Minna both in English and German. Minna adds that she sometimes feels a kind of frustration when she cannot come up with a word and then she has to come up with different ways of trying to express herself.

The parents in Family 1 reported that the language that they use when communicating with each other depends strongly on the situation. Opposite to the parents in Family 1, the parents in Family 2 reported to have been using English with each other for already 17 years, regardless of the situation. However, similarly to the parents in Family 2, when it is only the two of them, both parents in Family 1 and 4 reported to use English with each other because it is a language in which they can both be on the same level, linguistically talking. The reports of the parents in Family 1, 2 and 4 suggest that having a similar proficiency in a certain language, English in these cases, strongly supports the decision of choosing that language as their language of interaction.

The parents in Family 3 reported to use English with each other in a different way than the parents of families 1 and 2. They reported that the majority language speaking parent (Päivi) tries to impose the local language (Finnish) over the minority language speaking parent (Jan), and that only when she realises that he does not understand, then she would switch back to English. Päivi estimated that she would speak 50% English and 50% the local language (Finnish) with Jan. However, Jan mentioned that he does not even feel addressed when Päivi addresses him in Finnish. The parents in Family 3 seem to have adopted a kind of creative translanguaging practice (Wei, 2011) where the linguistic codes, grammar and structures of both Finnish and English are merged into one. According to Päivi, the more Finnish Jan would learn, the less English they would need to use.

TABLE 8            Phenomenon 4: ELF as a linguistic support for learning to speak other languages present in the context of multilingual families

(4) ELF as a linguistic support for learning to speak other languages present in the context of multilingual families	
Family 1: Laura & Thomas	4.1.1 Thomas describes how he uses English to get his message across when he speaks Finnish. He claims to do this because he does not know the word or expression in Finnish but he still wants to get his message across.
	4.1.2 Thomas indicates that in one sentence he and Laura might use Flemish or English words if the word(s) in question would not come to their mind automatically in Finnish.
Family 2: Chun & Nils	No mention of this phenomenon.
Family 3: Päivi & Jan	4.3.1 Jan describes how he sometimes starts speaking Finnish and when he gets stuck he switches to English. He mentions that in the beginning he might still try to go back to Finnish, but as soon as the story that he is telling begins to complicate, he has to switch back to English, he claims.
	4.3.2 Jan also mentions that he tries to incorporate English words to get a story [in Finnish] across.
Family 4: Minna & Henrik	No mention of this phenomenon.

In families 1 and 3, the minority language speaking parent (the father in both cases), reported that they use English as a support to get their message across when they are attempting to tell something in the local language (Finnish). It seems to be a recurrent phenomenon that English is used as a linguistic support for speaking other languages. At least two out of these four families mentioned this phenomenon without having been asked about it. This phenomenon and the narratives of the participants imply that the less mastery of a specific language one has, the more English words or expressions are used as a support to get the desired message across. In other words, the better mastery in the language that the speaker is expressing themselves, the less they will be likely to use English as a linguistic support. This phenomenon connects directly to the phenomenon of translanguaging (Wei, 2011). The participants explain how they often have to draw on the English language and combine it with another of their diverse linguistic repertoires to address a local interactional problem and to being able to establish a shared understanding.

In families 2 and 4 there was no direct mention of this phenomenon. However, in families 1 and 3 it was the speakers of the minority language, in both cases the father (Thomas and Jan), who expressed their struggle in speaking the local language. Both Thomas and Jan reported that to overcome this struggle they relatively often make use of ELF as a kind of “escape route”. In the case of the parents in families 2 and 4, the minority language speaking parent (Chun and Henrik) clearly stated that they had no intention of learning the local language at the point of the interview.

Since Chun and Henrik reported that they were not attempting to learn their partner's L1 (the local language in both cases), they do not point to ELF as this kind of "escape route" as Thomas and Jan do. This could be seen as a reason for them not to mention this phenomenon within their respective interviews.

It seems that in these families English is used as a linguistic support for speaking other languages in the cases in which the person in question has shifted from not speaking the local language at all, to gradually speaking it more and more supporting it with English and then eventually, using every time less and less English. In Family 1 this was already expressed as a reality at the time of the interview and in Family 3 this was seen as a practice that had only recently started and was hoping to develop towards that same direction that the practice of Family 1 did.

TABLE 9 Phenomenon 5: ELF as a tool for communicating with extended family members in the context of multilingual families

(5) ELF as a tool for communicating with extended family members in the context of multilingual families	
Family 1: Laura & Thomas	5.1.1 When the interviewer asks about Thomas' parents and whether they speak any English, Thomas answers that they do speak it and even on a good level. However, when the interviewer asks about Laura's parents, she describes that her father does not speak any English. Thomas adds to that comment that he could not speak to Laura's father before he learned Finnish. Laura still adds up to that that it was difficult because her parents were not used to talking in English.
	5.1.2 Thomas mentions that his parents speak Flemish and that Pekka sometimes uses English to communicate with them but mainly Dutch, and if he would not know a word, then he would use the word in English.
Family 2: Chun & Nils	5.2.1 Both Chun and Nils agree that it is important for their children to learn Norwegian and Chinese so that they would be able to speak to their Chinese family. Chun explains that her part of the family is not able to speak any other language than Chinese, excluding therefore the possibility of communicating with them in English.
Family 3: Päivi & Jan	5.3.1 Päivi admits to speaking English to Jan's mum and that she, Jan's mother, answers her in Dutch. She also mentions using some words in Dutch when she knows them, but mainly they communicate in English.
	5.3.2 Päivi's siblings speak Finnish to Jan because Päivi told them to do so, because otherwise she claims that he will not learn Finnish. However, Jan revealed that when Päivi is not around, her sister speaks English with Jan.
Family 4: Minna & Henrik	5.4.1 Minna explains that at some point she tried to learn Hungarian so that she could integrate in the family interactions of Henrik's parents (who speak Hungarian as their L1). However, she claims that Henrik's family did not appreciate her effort in learning Hungarian and that they preferred to practice their English when talking to her instead.
	5.4.2 Henrik explains that Minna's father, who speaks Finnish as his L1, communicates with him in English.

English is expressed to be seen and used as a tool for communicating with extended family members in Families 1, 3 and 4. The parents in Family 2 referred to

this phenomenon during their interview, but only to highlight that not Nils nor their children would be able to have a conversation with Chun's parents because they did not speak English nor Norwegian. In this case, only the kids would be able to speak to their extended Chinese family because Chun made sure that they would be able to do so. The parents in Family 1 report that it is not only them using English to communicate with extended family members, but also one of their children uses it to communicate with his grandfather. However, in Family 1, the minority language speaking parent (Thomas) reported that he had to learn Finnish before he could communicate with his father-in-law because his parents-in-law were not used to speaking English. Opposite to this, in Family 4, the majority language speaking parent (Minna), reported to have made an effort to learn the L1 of her parents-in-law (Hungarian), which she reported to have resulted in not being appreciated by them because they preferred to speak English with her instead. The parents-in-law of families 1 and 3 clearly preferred to be addressed in the local language of the community in which they were living in (Finland, Finnish; and China, Chinese, respectively) and opposite to this, the parents-in-law in Family 1 agreed on using English. These preferences can easily be reasoned, in families 1 and 3 the parents-in-law preferred to speak their respective local languages because they did not feel comfortable enough speaking English. In Family 4, there was mention that Henrik uses ELF with his father-in-law, this is simply because Henrik did not speak Finnish at that point and his father-in-law did not speak German either, and in these cases, it is fairly common to use English for the purpose of mutual understanding (Jenkins, 2015). In the same family, Minna's parents-in-law did not want to speak their L1 (Hungarian) with her, although she made an effort to try to learn it, they preferred to speak English so that they could improve their skills in it. This last case, in which Minna's parents-in-law preferred to speak English rather than Hungarian reflects the perception of language hierarchy and possibly a societal influence which pushed them to believe that reaching a certain proficiency in English would provide them with a certain status (Seo, 2017).

In Family 3, the majority language speaking parent (Päivi) reported to use a mix of Jan's language (Dutch) plus English, to communicate with her mother-in-law. In the same family, the minority language speaking parent (Jan), reported to speak English with his sister-in-law, against Päivi's advice. Päivi, who is the majority language speaking parent, reported to believe that the less English would be spoken to the minority language speaking parent (Jan in this case), the quicker he would learn the local language (Finnish). Päivi and Jan reported to use language creatively, mixing both of their languages plus English when they communicate with each other and with extended family members, basically translanguaging (Wei, 2011). Päivi's attitude towards the idea of Jan speaking English to his sister-in-law supports how strong language beliefs Päivi has and what effect these beliefs actually have in Jan's reported interaction with his sister-in-law. Jan expressed explicitly that he speaks

English with his sister-in-law “when Päivi is not around”, meaning that he adapts his language practices as a reaction to Päivi’s expressed language ideologies.

TABLE 10 Phenomenon 6: ELF as a hindering factor when learning other languages in the context of multilingual families

(6) ELF as a hindering factor when learning other languages in the context of multilingual families	
Family 1: Laura & Thomas	No mention of this phenomenon.
Family 2: Chun & Nils	6.2.1 Nils claims that he should have spoken more Norwegian to Chun. If this would have been the case, then he would have used less English with her, which would have made it easier for Chun to learn Norwegian, according to him. Nils also explains that using Norwegian instead of English would have resulted in an extra effort and they became lazy with the time since “it’s easy to just stick to what we know ourselves [English]”.
Family 3: Päivi & Jan	6.3.1 Päivi thinks that it is a huge pity that Jan hasn’t learned Finnish properly yet. She claims that it is because he has been working so much in an English speaking environment. Päivi thinks that Jan doesn’t really listen actively when there is Finnish around him.
	6.3.2 Päivi explains that she tells everyone that they should not speak English to foreigners. She claims that foreigners won’t learn Finnish if they are not addressed in Finnish instead.
Family 4: Minna & Henrik	6.4.1 Henrik does not refer to their own case, but he mentions a friends couple of theirs that is constructed in the same way (a Finnish and German speaking couple). Henrik claims that this couple speaks English to each other because their generation has acquired such a good English level from education that they don’t actually need to learn the other person’s language. Henrik also states that twenty years ago, the people that emigrated to Finland learnt Finnish because they had no other option.

Both parents in Families 2 and 3 directly addressed the topic of English serving as a hindering factor in the attempt of learning the local language. The majority language speaking parent in Family 2 (the father) claimed that he should have spoken less English and more the local language (Norwegian) with his spouse. The parents in Family 3 reported a similar perspective, in which the majority language speaking parent (the mother) described how her spouses’ extensive exposure to English, both at work and home, served as a hindering factor in the process of learning the local language (Finnish). Both Nils and Päivi seem to strongly believe that their partners have not learned better, or at all, the local language because they have used ELF instead of their respective local languages (Norwegian and Finnish).

The parents in Family 1 and 4 did not refer during their interviews to the phenomenon of English serving as a hindering factor in their attempt of learning the local language. However, the parents in Family 4 reported that other ELF families that they know have not felt the need to learn the local language because they could per-

fectly cope with their everyday lives using ELF. The parents in Family 4 reported to believe that this might be an emerging phenomenon since, according to them, twenty years ago people's competence in English was not as proficient as it is nowadays and that back then people had 'no other choice' but to learn the local language. In the case of Family 1, it is possible that there was no mention of this phenomenon due to the fact that the minority language speaking parent (Thomas), had learned the local language already at the time of the interview. However, the minority language speaking parent in Family 4 (Henrik), drew on a really interesting fact. He claimed that nowadays it is harder to learn the local language not only because everyone tends to be so fluent in English that it could be used easily as the lingua franca, but also because not being able to use English pushes you towards having to learn the local language and because that used to be the case, people really 'had no other choice' but to learn the local language.

## 6. DISCUSSION

The role of ELF in family interactions has been described by the research participants in numerous ways through the narratives that they have constructed. Some participants have expressed supporting arguments towards using ELF in their family situations, while other participants have pointed to rather negative perceptions towards its use. The research participants seemed to have rather polarized opinions concerning the role of ELF in their family interactions, since the ones that expressed positive arguments towards its use barely mentioned anything negative about using it, nor vice versa. Similar conclusions can be drawn from the findings reached by Soler and Zabrodska (2017) and Pietikäinen (2017) in their studies on multilingual family settings and ELF used in the context of multilingual interactions in couples' talk. Differently to these studies, my findings give a direct insight into the perceptions on using ELF from the perspective of multilingual families.

The six phenomena that I arrived at through analysing the narratives that the participants constructed, can be seen as the key factors that helped me answer my research questions. The phenomena were the following: 1. the use of ELF in multilingual families over time; 2. the use of ELF in multilingual family interactions; 3. the use of ELF between parents in multilingual families; 4. ELF as a linguistic support for learning to speak other languages present in the context of multilingual families; 5. ELF as a tool for communicating with extended family members in the context of multilingual families; and 6. ELF as a hindering factor when learning other languages in the context of multilingual families. Before I had access to the data, and therefore, before I arrived at my 6 phenomena, I had developed the following research questions:

RQ1: How do the participants see the role of ELF in their family interactions?

RQ2: According to the participants, how has the use of ELF changed over time in their family interactions?

It is important to understand that the narratives grouped under the six phenomena in the findings section helped me answer both of my research questions by constructing the understanding that I have now of how of these families see the role of ELF and how they think that the use of ELF has changed over time in their family interactions. With my findings I have learned that the participants see the role of ELF in their family interactions in numerous ways. For instance, most of the participants started constructing their narratives with the fact that they had started to use ELF when they met because they had no other language in common that would be as ef-

fective as using ELF. However, this practice developed differently over time in each family. The use of ELF has served some of the participants as a support for learning to speak other languages that were present in the context of their families such as the local language for instance. ELF has supported them in this learning process serving them as a tool to fill in linguistic gaps in the language that they were learning to speak. This, however, has also been expressed in a negative light by some of the participants since they felt that if they had not used ELF they would have learned other languages (i.e. their partners L1 or the local language) that they were aiming to learn quicker. Additionally, ELF was presented as a language that facilitated the communication with extended family members.

An interesting aspect emerged when one participant reported how their journey with using ELF had been with their parents-in-law. The narrative constructed around this remark, shed light on Phenomenon 5: ELF used as a tool for communicating with extended family members. It seemed that the participant's parents-in-law were using the participant as an opportunity to practice their English. This is a very interesting dimension to interactions with extended family members that perhaps monolingual families do not experience at all. A kind of language learning project emerged from this need to communicate. The participant explained to have tried to learn the L1 of their parents-in-law but they still preferred to speak English instead. Possibly a societal influence had pushed the participant's parents-in-law towards reaching a certain proficiency in English, which would provide them with a certain status along with the possibilities that speaking English affords to people (Seo, 2017). This reflects the perception of a language hierarchy, in which the participant's parents-in-law considered English to be higher up than their L1.

Naturally, English is not always at the top in the imaginary language hierarchy pyramid. In contrast to the recently described participant's case, and from the perspective of phenomenography, this effectively portrays how differently the role of ELF can be constructed by different families. For instance, other research participants had framed ELF as an obstacle to learning the local language (Norwegian and Finnish respectively). The construction of narratives around this topic shed light on Phenomenon 6: ELF as a hindering factor when learning other languages in the context of multilingual families. One participant, who was the majority language speaking parent of their family, reported to believe that the less English would be spoken to the minority language speaking parent, the quicker he would learn the local language (Finnish). The majority language speaking parent of another family as well expressed his regret of not trying to speak more the local language (Norwegian) with his wife. Both families reported to strongly believe that by using less ELF they would be using more the local language of the place in which they live and that their partners would therefore be more proficient in those local languages.

In contrast to the narratives constructed around Phenomenon 6, where ELF is perceived by the participants in a rather negative light, the narratives constructed around Phenomenon 4 (ELF as a linguistic support for learning to speak other languages present in the context of multilingual families) point towards a positive feature of using ELF. Two of the research participants described how they had been using ELF as a linguistic support in the process of learning to speak other languages. In these cases, both participants had been using ELF as a kind of “escape route” to fill in their linguistic gaps of the language that they were learning to speak. This particular phenomenon describes a use of ELF from an opposite perspective to the one that previous research has highlighted before. Jenkins (2011) describes how speakers of ELF use their L1s, or other languages, to fill in linguistic gaps or to purposely signal a certain cultural or societal identity.

From the occurrence described in Jenkins (2011), one could say that the narratives constructed around Phenomenon 4 point towards a similar phenomenon. Although the participants in this research did not mention using ELF in connection to their L1 or another language in this respect, one could imagine that habitual speakers of ELF construct certain meanings to their use of English, especially since in this case the use of ELF is constructed and negotiated in family situations. These constructed meanings could possibly serve the members of a multilingual family that makes use of ELF, as a way to signalling part of their linguistic identity when speaking other languages. I am assuming that the research participants, and possibly other members of multilingual families that make use of ELF, would feel identified with their use of ELF. I believe this to be possible because when the research participants were specifically asked about their linguistic identity, most of the participants brought up English or ELF when describing their individual, couple and family's linguistic identity.

From a perspective of ownership over ELF and the perceived status of ELF versus the language that the parents of these families explain to use in their narratives, it is rather hard to describe the main idea behind the constructed narratives about their actual language practices. The conception of “nativespeakerism” (Holliday, 2006) connects here directly to the notion of trying to only speak one's L1 to their children, as one's “authentic language”, which makes it rather hard for families to feel ownership over English. Thanks to the constructed narratives around Phenomenon 2, the use of ELF in multilingual family interactions, I have been able to identify a common point for all four families. This point focused on the mention that these families described how they make use of a multiplicity of languages simultaneously, crossing linguistic borders of “national” languages and creating their own way of communicating. However, I was still able to identify rather contrasting views on the use of ELF in the narratives of the participants. For instance, one participant described how their kids felt left out of the conversation or bored if the parents interacted in English. They also described how they have had to introduce routines

such as having an “English jar” in their kitchen in which they would need to put money in if they ever spoke English in front of their children. This routine was proposed by the children of the family and it was introduced to make sure that the parents would not speak English in front of them. Opposite to this rather negative perception of using ELF in family situations, the parents in another family constructed narratives describing how their interaction in English helps their children to learn yet another language and that they are happy that they are even starting to interact in English too.

Some families constructed narratives describing their wish of having ELF present in their family life. For instance, one participant explained to have first decided that they would like to speak their respective L1s with their children and use ELF when interacting as a family (i.e. in dinner situations). They also drew on the fact that this plan changed after some time because they later decided that they did not want their children to learn a “wrong” kind of English. This change of mind and practice sheds light on Phenomenon 1 (the use of ELF in multilingual families over time). This decision of dropping ELF points towards a clear hierarchisation in which the parents’ respective L1s are valued more highly than ELF, since they are chosen to be spoken instead of ELF. The parents in the other families shared a similar view in their constructed narratives in this respect. This view clearly connects with some predominant language ideologies in which the English language is perceived as a language that should be only taught by L1 English speakers (Holliday, 2006), and not by “non-authentic” English speakers, who do not have English as their L1.

The participants explained that they felt that they would be inculcating a “wrong” English to their children by using English with them or around them. In the participants narratives, this, among other incentives, reportedly pushed these families towards the decision of trying to minimise, or even eliminate, the use of English in family situations to the fullest. This attitude towards the idea of transferring a “wrong” language seems to be tightly related to the old conception that whoever speaks English needs to live up to the established standards of the English language spoken by L1 English speakers from e.g. the USA, UK, Australia or New Zealand. This brings us back to Kachru’s (1985) description of Englishes in the world. This first mentioned group of L1 English speakers (from USA, UK, Australia or New Zealand) would be the ones that Kachru (1985) identifies as the “inner circle”. Then, there would be “outer – or extended – circle”, which refers to speakers from places which have English as an institutionalised language, with English speakers from Nigeria, Zambia, Singapore or India. And finally, the “expanding circle”, which refers to speakers from places that do not have any colonial history with English, nor have English as an institutionalised language. This last group would include English speakers from China, Russia or Indonesia, in which English is used as an international or universal language.

After carefully listening to the interviews of the families that took part in this study, if they were to be placed in one of Kachru's (1985) categories, they would not fit completely in any of them. Instead, there could be a fourth categorisation added to Kachru's (1985) Englishes in the world: the developing circle. This fourth category would be the one that makes a clear differentiating cut between the three previous categories and this one, since the speakers of this *developing circle* would be speakers of ELF in family situations that are in constant growth and change. These families are using English in a creative and ever-developing way and are not attributed to a specific group of countries. In this study, all of the families have reported that they do not make use of ELF in isolation. Instead, they move between different languages in their interactions. Therefore, ELF is embedded in a multilingual environment where a range of other languages are present and often times combined with English. This circle, the *developing circle*, points to this liberating and cosmopolitan view on ELF, in which the use of ELF is perceived as a language that makes transnational lives easier for multilingual families. Instead of a language that is stuck to the boundaries of an imagined "national language" standard (i.e. English in the USA, UK, etc.) that has perhaps nothing to do with their lives.

As a conclusion drawn from the narratives that the participants constructed, one could agree with Wei (2011), who argues that multilingual families are known for finding their ways to creatively use the languages that are at their disposal in a way that communication works for them. Nevertheless, as mentioned before, language use is never set in stone, nor a tangible variable. Languages and their use are constantly developing and changing, they are a transience (for more see Lønsmann, Hazel & Haberland, 2017). Furthermore, when one is making use of them, especially in multilingual family situations where multiple languages might be present at the same time, their development and change can see big unexpected changes over time. In the case of multilingual families, both the individual and the family language ideologies play a big role in these shifts.

For instance, the majority speaking parent of one of the families in this study constructed a narrative around the perception of actively trying to impose the local language (Finnish) over her partner when they would speak to each other, and that only when she realises that her partner does not understand what she is trying to say, then she would switch back to English. This account clearly shows that the participants are aware of the connection between language and power, and that they are able to negotiate power in their relationship through their language choices. Again, there seems to be a kind of language hierarchy in which some languages are valued more than others (Finnish—the local language—over English). Nevertheless, the idea of language hierarchy seems not to be strictly related to the language that the participants end up using. For instance, the parents of a different family constructed a narrative around the time when they met, they describe how they decided to speak English because their proficiency in their respective L1s (Finnish and German) was

not good enough to effectively communicate in—this points to the use of ELF between parents in multilingual families (Phenomenon 3). At the time of the interview, they explained that they wished to speak the minority language (German) at home instead of English, so that their children would learn better German. I found these narratives rather conflicting because the parents of this family mentioned that they would not believe that their children (who did not speak at the time of the interview) would learn English from them because they did not use a “correct and proficient” enough English, they did not address them in English and also because they reported not to make use of English in isolation but rather in a multilingual manner in which Finnish and German words and expressions would be present.

Following this conception, one would think that these parents would also not be willing to speak only German at home because one of the parents also does not speak a “correct and proficient” enough German. However, they outlined that they would rather want to speak German in family situations, which makes me think that they would like to do that to support the future language proficiency of their children in that language. Now, why would this be a problem then if English is the language that is not spoken “correctly and proficiently” enough? What social construct or belief could be making people decide to stop using a language because they are afraid that they would use it “wrong”? What does even mean that a language is “wrongly” used? Who determines what is “proficient enough” for a language to be transferred to children? If the aim of communicating a certain message and its intention is met, grammatically correct or not, then, one should be able to be happy to have achieved the basic goal of communication, which is communicating.

Answering these questions is not an easy task, there are uncountable reasons for parents or family members to include or neglect certain languages in their family interactions. One of these reasons was mentioned by the parents of a different family to the recently mentioned. They explained that they were afraid to linguistically confuse their children. This account could connect to a language ideologies that lead to older conceptualisations of language and multilingualism (King, 2006) –that languages should not be mixed because this might possibly hinder the children’s linguistic development, for instance. All of the interviewed families have constructed narratives around the fact that they do not use English in isolation, but rather a multilingual approach in which English is mixed with the L1s of one or both parents.

Similarly to the findings that Pietikäinen (2017) highlighted in her study on ELF in intercultural relationships, I have realised that translanguaging is not as simple as it might sound, these multilingual families might be able to use English and other languages at the same time, but they have to still play close attention to who they are speaking to, and who they want to include in their conversation, since one could easily introduce in their turn words or expressions from a language that not all of the family members that are present have in their respective linguistic repertoires.

Another supporting reason is the one mentioned by one of the participants, where an account that possibly indicated a power struggle was described. The majority language speaking parent described how she would try to impose the local language (Finnish) on her spouse, and in response, the spouse would argue that he does not feel addressed when this happens. This had pushed this particular couple towards using more English and less the local language with each other. However, there still seemed to be an element of power negotiation dynamic present in the constructed narratives delivered during the interviews. This apparent attitude towards the local language seems to create a bigger scope for rejecting the other's imposition of the language in question.

In a way, a similar narrative is constructed by Family 1. The parents explained how them using ELF to speak to each other in the beginning of their relationship was a factor that made their children not feel addressed, nor included, when they did so. These perceptions lead towards language choices that can result in the exclusion of some family members. In Soler and Zabrodskaia (2017), there is mention of a similar phenomenon in which the parents of one family explain that they make use of English as a "secret language" to speak in front of their children without being understood by them. In both the case described in Soler and Zabrodskaia (2017) and the ones found from the narratives that the participants in this study constructed in this respect, at least one family member is excluded of a conversation because of a language choice, which could have been done purposely as in Soler and Zabrodskaia (2017) or not. The narratives that the participants in this study have constructed around these appreciations throw light on both the use of ELF in multilingual family situations (Phenomenon 2) and on the use of ELF between parents in multilingual families (Phenomenon 3).

These findings should contribute to creating awareness about how transnational and multilingual families may make use of ELF and how this use is in constant change. ELF is a tool for communicating that, when used in multilingual family situations, is discussed as an ever-changing and transforming piece that is part of a puzzle of languages. A puzzle, whose pieces may vary for different family members. This means that those pieces that certain family members do not have in common cannot be combined. ELF is generally perceived as the piece that "fits for all". However, this piece is not necessarily the "fits for all"-piece in the puzzle of multilingual families that make use of ELF, since identity struggles and power negotiation play a big and defining role when negotiating language choice in the context of multilingual families—a role that might be perceived totally different in the language negotiation that users of ELF in other contexts such as business, education, economics or technology might experience.

More and more multilingual families are emerging in the globalising world that we are living in and, surprisingly, really little attention has been given to those multilingual families who make use of ELF in their family interactions. My study contributes to research on multilingual families in several ways. I consider my research findings to be important for councillors, educators and other influencing bodies that might issue advice, interpretations or even make decisions about multilingual children without understanding their linguistic realities. My findings could serve them as a tool to better understand the linguistic and interpersonal realities of these families and advice, help and/or enlighten them accordingly. I hope that this thesis and possible future research will help to create awareness of this particular manner in which ELF is present in uncountable multilingual families for diverse amount of time and in diversely creative ways.

One could imagine that in many cases, ELF is an essential part in the beginning of the relationship of two persons that have different L1s, as described in Soler and Zabrodskaia (2017) and Pietikäinen (2017). As for a couple, their linguistic development can be manyfold and as described by Pietikäinen (2017), they may have developed a kind of shared linguistic repertoire that might only be understood completely by the couple in question. However, when the couple become parents and a third, fourth or even fifth member is added to the family unit, the use of ELF might shift greatly – as the research participants of this thesis have described. This is directly connected to the idea that typically the parents of the families want to transfer both their L1s to their children (Gathercole et al., 2007), this was the case in the four families that were interviewed for this thesis. When this happens, inevitably, as the research participants have described in their interviews to happen, there has to be some kind of reevaluation of the family language practices.

As the findings of this thesis suggest, different scenarios are possible in multilingual families. If we would assume that multilingual families that use ELF do not mix languages, we would then say that there are only two possible scenarios. One scenario would be the one in which the parents keep using English between each other also when they are in family situations (i.e. in front of their children), and use only their respective L1s when they are addressing their children individually – making use of OPOL strategy. The other scenario would be the one in which the parents would shift to using the local or the minority language between them when they are in family situations (i.e. in front of their children), leaving ELF on a secondary level of importance, and speak their respective L1s when they address their children individually. To these two imaginary scenarios one could add the variable that either both or one of the parents decides to use a different language than their L1 (including possibly ELF) to address their children in – both individually or as a family. This last variable to these imaginary scenarios connects to how one of the research participants in this thesis described in their narrative that they wanted their family language practices to be like: they explained that before having their second child,

they wanted to speak ELF in situations where the whole family was present, and then use the parent's respective L1's to address their children individually.

However, the use of ELF in multilingual families is a transience that is in constant change and development, and the participants do not use ELF in isolation in their family interactions, but rather in a way in which all the languages that the family members share are somewhat intertwined. One could say that ELF used in multilingual families is a language of its own in each of the multilingual families that exist out there and that their use cannot be strictly defined since each family might have a variety of language identities, beliefs and practices that make their use of ELF in their multilingual family unique.

All in all, English used as a lingua franca in multilingual families is a phenomenon which clearly differentiates ELF used in other social contexts. This is because the members of a multilingual family are typically well aware of what the linguistic repertoire of their family members is like, and are therefore able to introduce words, concepts or expressions from other languages. For instance, a difference to a business situation where two parties that have just met are using ELF is that if one of them were to introduce a word from a different language, he would need to somehow double check with the other person if they understood what they meant. In this situation the speaker would then possibly need to try to find an English equivalent if the other party did not understand what they meant, or directly avoid using words or expressions in other languages. This would be significantly less likely to happen in multilingual families because they have a better awareness of what the linguistic repertoire of their family members is like. Additionally, multilingual families that use ELF possibly share in their linguistic repertoire a number of languages that they can combine and mix while using ELF almost deliberately. The basic difference between ELF in multilingual families and ELF in other social contexts lies, according to my findings, in the detailed mutual acquaintance about the other person's linguistic repertoire. As well as in its expanded use, since multilingual families that use ELF are able to incorporate words, constructions or expressions from other languages almost deliberately.

This does not mean that ELF is not possibly mixed outside of the context of multilingual families, since also good friends, coworkers or simply people who are aware of the linguistic repertoire of the person that they are speaking to can do so. What I wanted to highlight in the previous paragraph is that this phenomenon seems to be more likely to happen in multilingual family contexts—considering their acquaintance of their linguistic repertoires—rather than in other social contexts such as business situations or other mundane situations where the speakers are not acquainted with each others linguistic repertoires.

If one speaks about ELF in multilingual families, they should be aware that ELF might in fact not be used following the standardised rules of the English language. Instead, ELF is likely to be coexisting with other languages of that multilingual families' linguistic repertoire. Each family will have their own relationship with ELF. How the participants feel about following or not the standardised rules of the English language is something that since I did not conduct the interviews myself, I have not been able to ask. There is a number of questions that I might have found relevant to this topic that I could have asked if I had done the interviews myself. For future research, I would encourage and strongly recommend to further explore the use of ELF in multilingual families from also other places in the world. As I have not collected my own data, I have been restricted to the data that I had access to, which were participants from two different Nordic countries: Finland and Norway. Receiving interview data of only the parents of these multilingual families was a considerable limitation. It would have been interesting to also hear what the kids of these multilingual families had to say about their language use and feeling of identification towards ELF. Additionally, I would have liked to hear what kind of narratives the participants construct around the phenomena that I have identified in this thesis. I recommend future researchers that are interested in the role of ELF in multilingual families to look further into the development of the use of ELF over time in these families, how exactly the use of ELF affects the participants in different family situations, how do they feel about using ELF as a support to fill in linguistics gaps, how do they perceive that the role of ELF affects their relationships with extended family members and finally, how do they feel about having used ELF with their spouse of family members instead of the local language or any other language of their shared family linguistic repertoire.

Having been restricted to the data that I was given and not being able to actively participate in the data collection, stopped me from navigating the interviews towards a different direction that could have helped me answer my research questions more thoroughly. However, using already collected interview data turned out to be a rather interesting experience. As a researcher, I understand that an interview is a conversation co-constructed by the researcher and the interviewees, and that the talk of the interviewees is prompted or provoked by the specific questions that the researcher might ask.

For future research on this topic, one could consider other data types such observational data, recordings of naturally occurring family interactions, language diaries, discussions on social media about multilingual families that make use of ELF, etc. Nevertheless, although I have not been part of the data collection for this research in any way, I am happy to say that this rather than being a burden has been an enriching experience. The findings that I have made through analysing the data aligned with my personal experience using ELF in the context of multilingual families and I am fairly sure that this phenomenon happens in many other multilingual

families worldwide. It would be truly insightful to learn how different multilingual families, not only from Finland and Norway, but from around the world, make use of ELF and how they perceive this use to be present in their individual, interpersonal and family identity.

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, M., Squire, C., & Tamboukou, M. (Eds.). (2013). *Doing narrative research*. Sage, pp. 2-22. ISBN: 1446281442, 9781446281444
- Andrews, M. (2004). *The Uses of Narrative: Explorations in Sociology, Psychology, and Cultural Studies*. Transaction Publishers, pp. 102-135. ISBN: 0765808161, 9780765808165
- Aronin, L. (2012). *Multilingualism*, pp. 1-7. Retrieved from <https://jyu.finna.fi/PrimoRecord/pci.vlebooksAH26853717>
- Björkman, B. (2011). Pragmatic strategies in English as an academic lingua franca: Ways of achieving communicative effectiveness? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(4), 950-964. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.033
- Canagarajah, S. (2013). Reconstructing heritage language: Resolving dilemmas in language maintenance for sri lankan tamil migrants.(report). *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, (222), 131. Retrieved from [https://jyu.finna.fi/PrimoRecord/pci.gale\\_hrca340636856](https://jyu.finna.fi/PrimoRecord/pci.gale_hrca340636856)
- Canagarajah, S. (2018). Materializing 'Competence': Perspectives From International STEM Scholars. *Modern Language Journal*, 102(2), pp. 268-291. doi:10.1111/modl.12464
- Chen, S. H., Kennedy, M. & Zhou, Q. (2012). Parents' Expression and Discussion of Emotion in the Multilingual Family: Does Language Matter? *Perspectives on psychological science*, 7(4), pp. 365-383. doi:10.1177/1745691612447307
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* doi:10.1017/CBO9780511486999 Retrieved from [https://jyu.finna.fi/PrimoRecord/pci.cambridge\\_s10\\_1017\\_CBO9780511486999](https://jyu.finna.fi/PrimoRecord/pci.cambridge_s10_1017_CBO9780511486999)
- Coats, S. (2019). Language choice and gender in a nordic social media corpus. doi:10.1017/S0332586519000039
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. & Morgia, F. L. (2018). Managing heritage language development: Opportunities and challenges for Chinese, Italian and Pakistani Urdu-speaking families in the UK. *Multilingua*, 37(2), pp. 177-200. doi:10.1515/multi-2017-0019
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. & Wang, W. (2018). Parents as agents of multilingual education: Family language planning in China. *Language, culture, and curriculum*, 31(3), pp. 235-254. doi:10.1080/07908318.2018.1504394
- De Fina, A (2016). Narrative Analysis. In Hua, Z. (Ed.). (2016). *Research methods in intercultural communication : A practical guide*. ProQuest Ebook Central <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>.
- De Swaan, A. (2001). *Words of the World: The Global Language System* (1st ed.) Polity, pp. 17-35. ISBN-10 : 074562748X
- De Swaan, A. (2010). Language Systems. In Coupland, N. (Ed.), *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*, pp. 56-76. doi:10.1002/9781444324068 Retrieved from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/9781444324068>
- Duarte, J., Gogolin, I., Klinger, T. & Schnoor, B. (2014). Multilingual Competences and Family Language Practices. *Lili, Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik*, 44(174), pp. 66-85.
- Döpke, S. (1998). Can the principle of 'one person – one language' be disregarded as unrealistically elitist? *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21(1), pp. 41-56. doi: 10.1075/aral.21.1.03dop
- Edwards, J. (2002). An introductory overview. *Multilingualism*. p.1. ISBN: 1134810717, 9781134810710

- EF English Proficiency Index (2020). Finlandia. <https://www.ef.com.es/epi/regions/europe/finland/>
- Evald M.R., Freytag P.V., Nielsen S.L. (2018) Interviewing Like a Researcher: The Powers of Paradigms. In: Freytag P., Young L. (Eds.) Collaborative Research Design. Springer, Singapore. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5008-4\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5008-4_6)
- Flores, C., Gürel, A. & Putnam, M. (2020). Different perspectives on critical factors in heritage language development and maintenance. *Language Learning*, 70(S1), 5-14. doi:10.1111/lang.12367
- Franceschi, V. (2017a). Plurilingual resources as an asset in ELF business interactions. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 6(1), 57-81. doi:10.1515/jelf-2017-0003
- Franceschi, V. (2017b). ELF users' perceptions of their 'non-nativeness' in digital communication through English: Falling short of the target? *Altre Modernità*, 133-148. doi:10.13130/2035-7680/8307
- Fosnot, C. T. (2005). Constructivism; theory, perspectives, and practice, 2d ed. *Reference and Research Book News*, 20(3)
- García, P., Leibold, L., Buss, E., Calandruccio, L., Rodríguez, B. (2018). Code-switching in highly proficient Spanish/English bilingual adults: Impact on masked word recognition. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research (Online)*, 61(9), 1-11. doi:10.1044/2018\_JSLHR-H-17-0399
- Gathercole, V. C., Thomas, E. M., Williams, E., & Deuchar, M. (2007). Language transmission in bilingual families in Wales. *Cardiff: Welsh Language Board*.
- Gordon, C. (2009). *Making meanings, creating family: Intertextuality and framing in family interactions* doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195373820.001.0001 Retrieved from <https://jyu.finna.fi/PrimoRecord/pci.vlebooksAH24086689>
- Gorter, D. (2011). A multilingual approach: Conclusions and future perspectives: Afterword. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), pp. 442-445. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01203.x
- Gritsenko, E. (2016). English in the international workplace in russia. *World Englishes*, 35(3), pp. 440-456. doi:10.1111/weng.12211
- Hirsch, T. (2018). Understanding the complexities of transnational family language policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 39(10), 882-894. doi:10.1080/01434632.2018.1454454
- Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, 60(4), p. 385. doi:10.1093/elt/ccl030
- Hua, Z. & Wei, L. (2016). Transnational experience, aspiration and family language policy. *Journal of multilingual and multicultural development*, 37(7), pp. 655-666. doi:10.1080/01434632.2015.112792
- Ivanov, V. (1999). Heteroglossia. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 9, pp. 100-102. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43102437>
- Jenkins, J. (2011). Accommodating (to) ELF in the international university. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(4), 926-936. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.05.011>
- Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a lingua franca. *Englishes in Practice*, 2(3), 49-85. doi:10.1515/eip-2015-0003
- Jenkins, J., Baker W., & Dewey, M. (Eds.) (2017). *The routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* doi:10.4324/9781315717173 Retrieved from <https://jyu.finna.fi/PrimoRecord/pci.vlebooksAH32479516>
- Jonassen, D. (1991). Objectivism versus constructivism: Do we need a new philosophical paradigm? *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 39(3), pp. 5-14. doi:10.1007/BF02296434
- Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In Quirk, R., Widdowson H. & Cantù, Y. (Eds.),

- English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures.* (pp. 11-30). ISBN: 0521315220, 9780521315227
- Kang, H. (2013). Korean-Immigrant Parents' Support of Their American-Born Children's Development and Maintenance of the Home Language. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 41(6), pp. 431-438. doi:10.1007/s10643-012-0566-1
- Karpava, S., Ringblom N., Zabrodskaja A. (2019). Translanguaging in the Family Context: Evidence from Cyprus, Sweden and Estonia. *Vestnik Rossijskogo universiteta družby narodov. Seriâ Lingvistika*, 23(3), pp. 619-641. doi:10.22363/2312-9182-2019-23-3-619-641
- Kayam, O. (2014). Socialization of language through family language policy: A case study. *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 18(1), 53-66. doi:10.2478/plc-2014-0004
- King, K. (2006). Bilingual parenting as good parenting: Parents' perspectives on family language policy for additive bilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(6), pp. 695-712. doi:10.2167/beb362.0
- King, K. (2008). Family language policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2(5), 907-922. doi:10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00076.x
- King, K. (2010). Additive bilingualism through family language policy: Strategies, identities and interactional outcomes. *Calidoscópico*, 6(1), 5-19. doi:10.4013/5241
- King, K. (2013). Family language policy and bilingual parenting. *Language Teaching*, 46(2), 172-194. doi:10.1017/S0261444812000493
- King, K. & Lanza, E. (2019). Ideology, agency, and imagination in multilingual families: An introduction. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 23(3), 717-723. doi:10.1177/1367006916684907
- Komori-Glatz, M. (2018). Conceptualising english as a business lingua franca. *European J.of International Management*, 12(1/2), pp. 44-46. doi:10.1504/EJIM.2018.10009389
- Kopeliovich, S. (2010). Family language policy: A case study of a russian-hebrew bilingual family: Toward a theoretical framework. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 4(3), pp. 162-178. doi:10.1080/15595692.2010.490731
- Kuteeva, M. (2019). "Researching English-Medium Instruction at Swedish Universities: Developments Over the Past Decade." In *English-medium Instruction from an English as a Lingua Franca Perspective: Exploring the Higher Education Context*, edited by K. Murata, pp. 46-63. Abingdon: Routledge. ISBN: 1351184318, 978135118431.
- Kuteeva, M. (2020). Revisiting the 'E' in EMI: Students' perceptions of standard English, lingua franca and translingual practices. *Null*, 23(3), pp. 287-300. doi:10.1080/13670050.2019.1637395
- König, K. (2015). A comparison of heritage language ideologies in interaction[we would I]. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 19(4), 484-510. doi:10.1111/josl.12146
- Laakso, J., Sarhimaa, A., Åkermark, S., and Toivanen R. (2016). Towards Openly Multilingual Policies and Practices: Assessing Minority Language Maintenance Across Europe, Bristol/Buffalo, Multilingual Matters, 2016, XVI + 259 pp.; ISBN 978-1- 78309-495-0
- Lanza, E. (2018). Multilingual families: Aspirations and challenges. *International Journal of Multilingualism: Multilingual Families: Aspirations and Challenges*, 15(3), pp. 231-232. doi:10.1080/14790718.2018.1477091
- Lønsmann, D., Hazel, S., & Haberland, H. (2017). Introduction to special issue on transience: Emerging norms of language use. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 27(3), pp. 264-270. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.jyu.fi/10.1111/jola.12168>

- Lüdi, G. (2013). Receptive multilingualism as a strategy for sharing mutual linguistic resources in the workplace in a Swiss context, *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 10(2), pp. 140-158, DOI: 10.1080/14790718.2013.789520
- Lüdi, G. (2018). Bilingualism with English As a “Second Language” and/or Broad Plurilingual Repertoires: A Swiss Point of View. In: Romanowski P., Jedynak M. (Eds.) *Current Research in Bilingualism and Bilingual Education. Multilingual Education*, vol 26. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92396-3\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92396-3_9)
- Malak, J. (1997). Multilingualism. *IRAL, International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 35(3), p. 227.
- Mauranen, A. (2017). Conceptualising and positioning ELF. In Jenkins, J., Baker W., & Dewey, M. (Eds.), *The routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca*, pp. 7-24. doi:10.4324/9781315717173 Retrieved from <https://jyu.finna.fi/PrimoRecord/pci.vlebooksAH32479516>
- Mauranen, A. (2010). English as an academic lingua franca: The ELFA project. *English for Specific Purposes (New York, N.Y.)*, 29(3), pp. 183-190. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2009.10.001
- Mauranen, A. (2018). Second Language Acquisition, world Englishes, and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF. *World Englishes*, 37(1), pp. 106-119. doi:10.1111/weng.12306
- Mok, D. (2010). The Spatiality and Cost of Language Identity. *International regional science review*, 33(3), pp. 264-301. doi:10.1177/0160017610375443
- Mulken, M. J. P. van. (2015). Your language or mine? or English as a lingua franca? comparing effectiveness in English as a lingua franca and L1-L2 interactions: Implications for corporate language policies. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 36, pp. 404-422. Retrieved from <https://jyu.finna.fi/PrimoRecord/pci.narcisru:oai:repository.ubn.ru.nl:2066%2F155406>
- Nursidi, I. (2019). Monolingual development in bilingual family: Exploring parental language policy within family domain. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 6(3), pp. 219-224. doi:10.18415/ijmmu.v6i3.804
- Obojska, M. A. & Purkarthofer, J. (2018). 'And all of a sudden, it became my rescue': Language and agency in transnational families in Norway. *International journal of multilingualism*, 15(3), pp. 249-261. doi:10.1080/14790718.2018.1477103
- Obojska, M. A. (2019). 'Ikke Snakke Norsk?' -- Transnational Adolescents and Negotiations of Family Language Policy Explored through Family Interview. *Multilingua*, 38(6), p. 653. doi:10.1515/multi-2018-0058
- Oriyama, K. (2016). Community of Practice and Family Language Policy: Maintaining Heritage Japanese in Sydney--Ten Years Later. *International multilingual research journal*, 10(4), p. 289. doi:10.1080/19313152.2016.1198977
- Palviainen, A. & Bergroth, M. (2018). Parental discourses of language ideology and linguistic identity in multilingual Finland. *International journal of multilingualism*, 15(3), pp. 262-275. doi:10.1080/14790718.2018.1477108
- Paradowski, M. B. & Bator, A. (2018). Perceived effectiveness of language acquisition in the process of multilingual upbringing by parents of different nationalities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(6), pp. 647-665. doi:10.1080/13670050.2016.1203858
- Pennycook, A. & Otsuji E. (2015). Metrolingualism: Language in the city. *Routledge*. Retrieved from: <https://www.routledge.com/Metrolingualism-Language-in-the-City/Pennycook-Otsuji/p/book/9781315724225>
- Pietikäinen, K. (2014). ELF couples and automatic code-switching. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 3(1), pp. 1-26. doi:10.1515/jelf-2014-0001

- Pietikäinen, K. (2017a). English as a lingua franca in intercultural relationships. Retrieved from <https://helda.helsinki.fi/handle/10138/225905>
- Pietikäinen, K. (2017b). ELF in social contexts. In Jenkins, J., Baker W., & Dewey, M. (Eds.), *The routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (Chapter 26, pp. 321-332). doi:10.4324/9781315717173; Print ISBN: 9781138855328
- Pietikäinen, K. S. (2018a). Misunderstandings and Ensuring Understanding in Private ELF Talk. *Applied linguistics*, 39(2), p. 188. doi:10.1093/applin/amw005
- Pietikäinen, K. S. (2018b). Silence that speaks: The local inferences of withholding a response in intercultural couples' conflicts. *Journal of pragmatics*, 129, pp. 76-89. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2018.03.017
- Pillai, S. (2014). Family language policy and heritage language maintenance of Malacca Portuguese Creole. *Language & Communication*, 37(C), pp. 75-85. doi:10.1016/j.langcom.2013.12.003
- Prodromou, L. (2007). Is ELF a variety of English? *English Today*, 23(2), pp. 47-53. doi:10.1017/S0266078407002088
- Purkharthofer, J. (2018). Children's drawings as part of school language profiles: Heteroglossic realities in families and schools. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 9(2-3), pp. 201-223. doi:10.1515/applirev-2016-1063
- Purkharthofer, J. & Steien, G. B. (2019). "Prétendre comme si on connaît pas une autre langue que le swahili": Multilingual parents in Norway on change and continuity in their family language policies. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2019(255), pp. 109-131. doi:10.1515/ijsl-2018-2005
- Richardson, J. (1999). The concepts and methods of phenomenographic research. *Review of Educational Research*, 69(1), pp. 53-82. doi:10.3102/00346543069001053
- Rindal, U. (2014). Questioning English standards: Learner attitudes and L2 choices in Norway.(Report). *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 33(3-4), p. 313. doi:10.1515/multi-2014-0015
- Ruiz, A. (2017). Mixed system 1: a language strategy for bilingual families. *Estudios de lingüística inglesa aplicada*, 17, pp. 125-156. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12795/elia.2017.i17.06>
- Rehbein, J., Ten Thije, J. & Verschik, A. (2012). Lingua receptiva (LaRa) - remarks on the quintessence of receptive multilingualism. *International Journal Of Bilingualism*, 16(3), pp. 248-264. doi:10.1177/1367006911426466
- Schiller, N. G., Basch, L. & Blanc-Szanton, C. (1992). Towards a Definition of Transnationalism. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 645(1), pp. 9-14. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.1992.tb33482.x
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, 59(4), pp. 339-341. Retrieved from [https://jyu.finna.fi/PrimoRecord/pci.gale\\_ofa141979177](https://jyu.finna.fi/PrimoRecord/pci.gale_ofa141979177)
- Seals, C. A. (2018). Positive and negative identity practices in heritage language education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 15(4), 329. doi:10.1080/14790718.2017.1306065
- Seo, Y. (2017). Early Bilingual Development: Expanding Our Understanding of Family Language Policy in Heritage Language Maintenance. Retrieved from: <http://hdl.handle.net/1773/40431>
- Slavkov, N. (2017). Family language policy and school language choice: Pathways to bilingualism and multilingualism in a Canadian context. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14(4), pp. 378-400. doi:10.1080/14790718.2016.1229319
- Smith-Christmas, C. (2014). Being socialised into language shift: The impact of extended family members on family language policy. *Journal of multilingual and multicultural development*, 35(5), pp. 511-526. doi:10.1080/01434632.2014.882930

- Soler, J. & Zabrodska, A. (2017). New spaces of new speaker profiles: Exploring language ideologies in transnational multilingual families. doi:10.1017/S0047404517000367
- Souto-Manning, M. (2016). Honoring and building on the rich literacy practices of young bilingual and multilingual learners.(report)(author abstract). *The Reading Teacher*, 70(3), p. 263. doi:10.1002/trtr.1518
- Squire, C. (2012). Narratives, connections and social change, 22(1), pp. 50-68 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.22.1.04squ>
- Squire, C., Andrews, M., Davis, M., Esjn, C., Harrison, B., Hyden, L., Hyden, M (2014). *What is Narrative Research? The 'What is' Research Methods Series*. Bloomsbury Publishing, pp. 1-7. ISBN: 1849669708, 9781849669702
- Stoios, H. (2019). Review of leitner, G., A. hashim & H.G. wolf (2016) communicating with asia: The future of English as a global language. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 42(2), pp. 218-220. doi:10.1075/ara.00026.sto
- Svensson, L. (1997). Theoretical Foundations of Phenomenography. *Higher education research and development*, 16(2), pp. 159-171. doi:10.1080/0729436970160204
- Swift, J. S. (2011). Using English as the common corporate language in a german multinational. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 35(9), pp. 892-913. doi:10.1108/03090591111185574
- Takeuchi, M. (2016). Transformation of discourse: Multilingual resources and practices among filipino mothers in japan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 19(3), pp. 235-248. doi:10.1080/13670050.2014.978262
- Tsou, W. (2014). EFL and ELF college students' perceptions toward Englishes. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 3(2), pp. 363-386. doi:10.1515/jelf-2014-0021
- Tuominen, A. (1999). Who decides the home language? A look at multilingual families. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, (140), pp. 59-76. Retrieved from <https://jyu.finna.fi/PrimoRecord/pci.proquest61449138>
- Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *Tesol Quarterly*, 31(3), 409-429. Retrieved from <https://jyu.finna.fi/PrimoRecord/pci.wosA1997XZ36300003>
- Valdés, G. (2005). Bilingualism, heritage language learners, and SLA: Opportunities lost or seized? *Modern Language Journal*, 89, pp. 410-426. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005.00314.x>
- Van Mensel, L. (2018). 'Quiere koffie?' The multilingual familylect of transcultural families. *International journal of multilingualism*, 15(3), pp. 233-248. doi:10.1080/14790718.2018.1477096
- Venables, E. (2014). One-parent-one-language (OPOL) families: Is the majority language-speaking parent instrumental in the minority language development? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 17(4), pp. 429-448. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2013.816263
- Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual chinese youth in britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), pp. 1222-1235. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035
- Wu, Y. (2013). Business English as a Lingua Franca (BELF). *International education studies*, 6(10), p. 130. doi:10.5539/ies.v6n10p130
- Zhang, D. (2012). Co-ethnic network, social class, and heritage language maintenance among chinese immigrant families. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 11(3), pp. 200-223. doi:10.1080/15348458.2012.686408
- Zoghbor, W. (2018). Revisiting English as a foreign language (EFL) vs English lingua franca (ELF): The case for pronunciation. *Intellectual Discourse*, 26(2), p. 829. Retrieved from <https://jyu.finna.fi/PrimoRecord/pci.proquest2164442011>



# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX 1

TABLE 5 Phenomenon 1: The use of ELF in multilingual families over time

(1) The use of ELF in multilingual families over time	
Family 1: Laura & Thomas	<p>1.1.1 K: so u::m yeah (.) if we move into the u:m language-language practices as a couple (.) so you said that now you (.) mostly speak Finnish to each other (.) u:h but you also mix (.)</p> <p>L: =we (.) mix</p> <p>K: [yeah]</p> <p>L: I think we mix quite a lot</p> <p>K: in (.) which (.) what (.)</p> <p>L: .h h h h</p> <p>K: would you say</p> <p>L: but I think it depends a lot on like (.) sometimes we have periods we talk really lot of (.) Finnish (.) and then suddenly we start using more English (.) and then days of more Flemish (.) it (.) it switches</p> <p>T: but the last (.) couple of years we have been mainly speaking Finnish</p> <p>L: =it has been more going to Finnish</p>
	<p>1.1.2 T: .hh actually I remember in the beginning when we moved to Finland and I was (.) like I was working already .hh I didn't (.) I didn't want to speak Finnish anymore in the evening it was so tiring</p> <p>L: =no (you were too tired)= T: =[to speak Finnish]</p> <p>L: [mhm (.) mhm]</p> <p>T: like the whole day .hh that I said in the evening fuck it let's just speak English (like I can) (.) I-I don't want to anymore</p> <p>L: =yeah (.) mhm</p> <p>K: mhm</p> <p>T: yeah</p> <p>L: but apparently we've been speaking too (well) English since we have that English pot</p> <p>T: [but that] was the-the common language that we had when we met (.) so it was the most logical we didn't have any other common language</p>
	<p>1.1.3 T: but then I spoke Finnish already but not that well (.) so I guess we were mainly speaking English yeah yeah we were definitely=</p> <p>L: =definitely yes [together]</p> <p>T: =definitely together [in English]</p>
	<p>1.1.4 T: I think for-for-for a like from integration point of view it's a great thing that it becomes automatically for me to speak Finnish that it's not an effort anymore</p> <p>K: =mhm</p> <p>T: so that's u:h of course it's-it's-it's still a little bit of an effort but .h h h that it's-it's not (.) it's not that tiring (.) like it's not=</p>
	<p>1.1.5 L: =but maybe it's also cus I (.) my English (.) was (.) much (.) crappier when we met (.) it didn't feel like any problem at the Ume but we probably .hh e:::h learn to communicate in kind of (.) (simpler) way maybe if we (would speak then)</p>

(1) The use of ELF in multilingual families over time

Family 2:  
Chun & Nils

1.2.1 N: a-and it's always been like that u:hm you know ever since we started a:nd ( . )  
o-of course maybe we can say we:- that- or certainly I can say that I should have been  
better at speaking Norwegian ( . ) (and with- would make that) easier for you (.) but er  
we have just (.) er for so many years we come- we've become-become like lazy .hh it's-  
it's easy to just stick to what we know ourselves (right)=  
C: =yeah=

1.2.2 N: £hehe£ yeah (.) if it's not broken then why fix it right u:hm errrr (no) I-I mean  
( . ) it would be fantastic if I could be as good in Chinese as i am in English but I realize  
that's not gonna happen in my lifetime not-not without a significant (xxx) time which I  
don't have  
K: mhm  
N: and similar f-(.) for your case so ((addressed to Chun)) (.) I expect we're gonna  
speak English £until we .h.h.£  
C: £hehehe£  
N: (xxxx)  
C: yeah=  
N: =(right)  
C: yeah  
N: probably  
C: I mean as a couple i'm happy (.) English works perfectly fine .hh but with the out-  
side (.) I wish I could be better in Norwegian

1.2.3 N: we-we-we're going to the US in two weeks (.) now  
K: oh?  
((Nils and Chun chuckling))  
K: for  
N: (xxxxxxx)  
K: for a year  
C: =mhm  
N: =yeah  
K: a:h okay all right ( . ) so what do you expect to happen there  
N: nothing we'll just keep talking English ( . ) E-English and our boys will be better at  
English so maybe after that ( . ) if we c- when we come back here we will speak- be  
speaking English perhaps  
C: £yeah .h£  
N: as a family

1.2.4 C: if you asked the same questions in many year ago w-when they were like 1 and  
a half, 2 years >just started taking<they mixed  
K: mhm  
C: in one sentence 6 words can be 3 languages  
K: mhm  
C: and then later on they were able to identify the differences

1.2.5 K: mhm, yeah ( . ) yeah, so what's the role of English in your life?  
C: um ( . ) as a couple it's the tool to communicate of course [...] and it has been like  
the real boom between us, English (.) I-I think my English improved during all these  
years being together

Family 3:  
Päivi & Jan

1.3.1 K: has this practice changed over the years?  
P: Yes, yes, yes (.) f-for the beginning I thought that it was also kind of fun to speak  
English  
J: H.H.H (.) really?

1.3.2 P: yeah we spoke only English, that was not a favour that I did to you actually, so  
it was a mistake, but now I have been many years trying to enforce the Finnish lan-  
guage (.) so that just to um (.) get you to learn it (.) but yeah, it va-varies

(1) The use of ELF in multilingual families over time

Family 3:  
Päivi & Jan

1.3.3 P: ↑yeah, yeah (.) I think you are pushing more forward to speaking English ↑um Finnish (.) yeah (.)

1.3.4 K: so (.) um (.) would you (.) like to change the um (.) the current language practice somehow?

P: yeah, it goes (.) it comes and goes sometimes for a longer time of period (.) that is why Jan is again in a Finnish course.

K: does that mean that you want to change it (.) um from English to Finnish? Or what are you looking to...

P: ↑yeah, yeah (.) and um actually as I said (.) I am already speaking a little Finnish to him

1.3.5 K: what is the role of English in your life right now?

P: I mean I speak English with you [Jan] and with other foreigners and friends but um (.) I mean it's just a way of expressing myself when needed. (.) it is really easy for me to um (.) speak English and I don't have any so to say relationship with it

J: um yeah (.) it's a necessity for me

1.3.6 P: English for us is a communication tool (.) at least for me

J: yeah

P: in that sense It doesn't really mean anything to me (.) I don't know (.) I could perfectly live without English (.) if I didn't speak English (.) if you could speak Dutch to me and me Finnish to you and we could cope with that, I wouldn't miss it

1.3.7 J: for normal life English is a necessity for my work, my career and the communication with governmental bodies (.) [...] so yeah (.) I mean (.) English is for all practical purposes, my um (.) my primary language, yeah (.) whether I like it or not

1.3.8 P: so um (.) us speaking English has not improved our vocabulary (.) or um (.) speaking in English

1.3.9 P: I still um (.) think that English is like a-a foreign language to me (.) and people tend to say that if (.) it-it's a foreign language for both of us then we develop certain way of talking to each other (.) this "bad English" (.) this kind of new language together (.) English is still not my emotional language (.) this English that we are speaking is a weird symbiosis of languages (.) and then you have the native speakers (.) and of course they all-also speak different

(1) The use of ELF in multilingual families over time

Family 4:  
Minna &  
Henrik

1.4.1 K: so um, .tsk ( . ) but yeah, ( . ) have you noticed any kind of change, ( . ) in ( . ) the way that you ( . ) speak to each other in the last ( . ) five or six years? ( . ) like ( . ) since we: last met?=  
M: =yeah, ( . ) some at least ( . ) for example this uh ( . ) it it kind of ( . ) it started as a joke and it still is a joke, ( . ) but if an external person hears it ( . ) it's not ( . ) it doesn't sound like a joke it's like ( . ) .hhh in the beginning we would like ( . ) speak like ( . ) at least ( . ) <I>, ( . ) maybe also you: is that yeah can you pass me that thing please #or like# ( . ) could I please have #that or some#thing? ( . ) because that's the way you say in English but then, ( . ) maybe it started because my DA:D, who speaks ( . ) Finnish, ( . ) just ( . ) but he also speaks ( . ) uh ( . ) translates his Finnish to English but he: forgets all those so my dad will be: like he: doesn't mean ru:deness at all but he's like ( . ) <GIVE ME: THAT.> ( . )=  
K: =h.h.[h.  
M: =DO: THAT. ((points to the floor))  
( . )  
M: HENRIK ( . ) GO. ((points toward window))  
M: or something, ( . ) and then we found it funny, ( . ) so we started I think like saying a bit ourselves and then it stuck so now we're just like .hhh GIVE: JUICE ((points to the left)) ( . ) or something, ( . ) so, ( . ) u::h ( . ) yeah, ( . ) that's that's: one change, ( . ) we de- developed some own wo: rds, to the extent that sometimes I'm actually worried like ( . ) that does he: ( . ) I'll like I wonder if he: actually knows that this is our own word that it actually doesn't, ( . ) that it's not correct: ( . )

1.4.2 H: cos I find it a bit ( . ) silly to ( . ) call it grü:t when I speak German to them, .hhh a::h, ( . ) I think, ( . ) em ( . ) my English is getting worse because I'm not in an English environment, ( . ) so I'm just speaking English to: non ( . ) native speakers so, .hhh ( . ) erh my level of English is ( . ) sinking ( . ) with:: ( . ) because there's ( . ) let's say nobody better ( . ) around here who speaks ( . ) [perfect English

1.4.3 M: err ( . ) and maybe in English i was more like that too like more like a::h w-what would you like to do honey (blablabla) ((in high-pitched voice)) .hh err ( . ) but i think that has kind of more like even though i still s- still speak English in our relationship it's more like i speak English like the Finnish way .hh and also i have started to have like a little bit this pronunciation thing which i didn't use to ( . ) before that i might say like ( . ) let's take the boat and let's carry the boxes into the boat

1.4.4 M: unless we actually stick to speaking English in which case  
H: =and who knows maybe we move to an English speaking country or um ( . ) different speaking countries ( . ) so  
M: =um yeah

## APPENDIX 2

TABLE 6 Phenomenon 2: The use of ELF in multilingual family interactions

(2) The use of ELF in multilingual family interactions	
Family 1: Laura & Thomas	<p>2.1.1 T: =.hh and uh (.) but we speak Finnish together [with friends](.) we (.) could (.) speak English but its u:h            L: =but it's also (.) it also a bit depends because like when we have been visiting them they come here .hh we usually have the kids with us            K: mhm            L: so if we would (.) have a (.) a to intensive in English then they're kind of left out            T: =because they did-they (.) didn't (.) u:h because they wouldn't understand            L: =no they didn't but then our kids were getting bored</p>
	<p>2.1.2 L: no but i: but no but we do spend a lot of time as a family and it (.) it affects (.) that we spend            T: =yeah            L: =I think it            T: =for a while we had a: (.) we had a: an English jar in the kitchen because the kids would            L: (xxxx) ((unintelligible - points to something))            T: yeah (.) oh but we don't really use it anymore            L: =just don't use it anymore            T: the kids were annoyed with the fact that we were talking English and they couldn't understand it yet .hh            K: =mhm            T: [so they said] that they didn't want us to speak English so we had an English jar and every time we spoke English we had to put money in the jar .hh and then when the jar was filled .hh [then we (decide)]            T: the kids can decide what to do:: go to cinema or something .hh because the kids (they like)            L: =yeah (.) well yeah (.) because it's not fair (.) you are in the room then and you don't (xx)            T: =so it's actually the kids fault that we don't speak English            L: yeah (.) yeah (.) yeah            T: so we kind of got-got (.) £conditioned not to speak (.) eh English£            T: uh (.) together anymore but it made sense because it's not nice when you're a-at dinner .hh like (.) (moment) and then part-parts that doesn't understand what you're talking about            L: well yeah o-or your parents are s-saying something that you don't understand it's a bit okay=            T: =now it does-it doesn't work anymore Pekka speaks so good English but=            T: =Pekka starts (.) (speaking in English)            L: [and sometimes Pekka forgets] (.) forgets words in Finnish (.) so he prefers English=</p>
	<p>2.1.3 L: [...] I-I kind of try to avoid it then if there is other kids around (.) that we don't s-speak any Flemish or English            T: you try to avoid it then            L: yeah that we speak only (.) try to speak only in Finnish=            T: =yeah yeah yeah yeah=            L: =so-so that everybody can understand [(xx)]</p>
	<p>2.1.4 L: i think it already came (quickly earlier) (.) i (.) i remember originally (.) when Pekka was (.) (you know) our firstborn child and we had big plans how are we gonna do (.) take care of the children (.) oh those were the days we actually thought (that) (.) have some (.) good plans (.) we thought we had planned that i speak only Finnish (.) with Pekka (.) Thomas speaks only Flemish (.) and together we speak English (.) a-all of us=</p>

(2) The use of ELF in multilingual family interactions

<p>Family 1: Laura &amp; Thomas</p>	<p>K: =as a family= [...] T: that if you speak a language which anyway we spoke good English .hh but if we spoke English to Pekka we're sill learning him wrong English that it's not good to learn like a wr- .hh i don't know if it's true or not at the time i thought that the article made a lot of sense .hh and then we thought that it's maybe it's-it's also the: he'll pick up the English which he did ( . ) [like (xx)] L: [yeah] so we kind of dropped ( . ) we-we stopped talking English ( . ) with the kids ( . ) or we-or we were at the time but maybe Julia was born i don't know .hh but anyway we-we ( . ) u:h kept English just um ( . ) between two of us ( . ) even though it was the plan that it would become the language of like the whole family</p>
	<p>2.1.5 L: =in the life ( . ) but also I think English ( . ) it exists ( . ) in the house ( . ) as a ( . ) uh daily language ( . ) no we don't have a [conversation but] T: [I'm not] really sure .hh I'm not really [I think la-lately lately not-not necessarily ( . ) no] L: [(like) ( . ) lately lately ( . ) I said lately more]= T: =okay ( . ) and because Pekka maybe speaks English L: =because Pekka has been speaking and then Roope has been speaking= T: =mhm=</p>
<p>Family 2: Chun &amp; Nils</p>	<p>2.2.1 K: [...] so if you are together for example having dinner and um ( . ) and the kids are ( . ) with you ( . ) which languages would you speak to whom C: =everything N: so I would speak Norwegian to the boys and you would speak Chinese to the boys, and we would speak English in between us. And now they a-re-are g-gettig-getting (***)ish, they would chip in English so-so umm ( . ) it's really I mean there would be three different languages ( . ) at the same time. K: [mhm] yeah C: When we are four I sense it together ( . ) it's all three language, everywhere. And John starts to pick up even though he says that he doesn't understand much but he is able to pick up ( . ) and I am able to pick up when they are talking about to Nils</p> <p>2.2.2 K: do you think that the boys have learned English from you? N: ↓yes K: (xx)is all the English that they know from you or does it come from somewhere else as well? C: t-the vocabulary probably in the very beginning came from us and at school they ( . ) cause at school level one is group three one is group four, quite basic ( . ) you know ( . ) colours and animal names, I don't know ( . ) when we talked we used to think that they didn't understand but some they did pick up and continued on what we were talking (xx) N: it just em ( . ) t-their curiosity and if there is something that they don't understand they will ask so i-it is a natural ambition I would say ( . ) but it's really from us... C:=yeah N: ...a-and I guess movies and books and (xxx) C: mhm</p>
<p>Family 3: Päivi &amp; Jan</p>	<p>2.3.1 J: yeah sometimes when we are at the table ( . ) when we are all together ( . ) I think it is really often that you [Päivi] speak Finnish to me and I answer in Dutch P: yeah, or English J: yeah</p>

(2) The use of ELF in multilingual family interactions	
Family 3: Päivi & Jan	<p>2.3.2 P: but yeah it's of course (.) hard cause we also have the girls (.) It's a bit funny to separate our talk from their talk as a family  J: yeah, so that's why  P: That's why this English um (.) English to each other is kind of isolating the girls from the discussions  K: mhm (.) but of course there are times when the girls are not there  P: yeah (.) then we of course speak English, the um (.) of course the (.) most complicated things we speak of course in English (.) It's very difficult to change the common language (.) to anybody</p>
	<p>2.3.3 J: I also speak Dutch um (.) so then during those times (.) during dinner um English is brought out um (.) mostly.  K: and then it's Finnish and Dutch?  J: yeah.  K: even to each other?  J: umm yeah (.) yeah</p>
	<p>2.3.4 K: if you are one on one with um your girls, which (.) which languages to you speak?  P: well I speak Finnish and you speak Dutch  J: well that is a strange dynamic you see (.) cause if I speak, if it is the tree of us ↑then <u>they</u> speak Finnish to each other even though they know that (.) um and it's hard for them to speak Dutch to each other (.) if I am one on one with them then it's Dutch (.)  K: in what language do they reply?  J: umm, Dutch  K: Dutch  J: and them um (.) if the word cannot be found they I say um put it in Finnish and then we try to figure it out (.) but it's not ideal  K: what is ideal?  J: that I don't have to say that they cannot speak Finnish to me or um that we have to negotiate the meaning of a word or that we have to figure out the correct translation [...]  J: ...sometimes when we are in the car. without Päivi (.) when we are one on one with the girls, we might also use English to find out a translation of something that we can't figure out.  P: but the girls don't know how to speak proper English  J: [...] I think that also Mia is better than Emma because she watches more TV and more youtube videos in English.</p>
	<p>2.3.5 P: English is this kind of no-rules language. Maybe their [the girls'] listening comprehension is good but even there is something I think that it's the same as Jan's Finnish listening skills. They never listen really (.) when we speak to each other they don't really listen (.) we have this family of closing ears (.) I think that when we speak they kind of ignore the language because we never speak (.) like in the house we never speak to them in English (.) cause if there would be something that they would need to react or answer or anything (.) they don't pay any attention to it (.) now that they are watching movies they are getting there (.) and that was actually a surprise for us (.) cause we thought that they would be learning (.) because they are passively listening (.) but maybe that is a thing with children in general that they um (.) ignore it if it is not addressed directly to them (.) if it's not part of their life</p>
Family 4: Minna & Henrik	<p>2.4.1 M: when we address each other (.) English (.) and (.) then (.) yeah when i address the children Finnish  H: and i address them in German (.) as you have seen now that-that (how it) goes</p>

(2) The use of ELF in multilingual family interactions

Family 4: Minna & Henrik	<p>2.4.2 M: =yeah yeah (.) i would very much like to be i-i bothers me that they are (.) err hearing so much English (.) because (.) i would hope that they just become really really strong in German and in Finnish and that's enough then there's all the other languages that come on top .hh err (.) but i-i would like to- i kind of lament that i'm not able to say when i'm like with the children for example that i can't say to Henrik in Finnish like hey give me the milk (.) or something (.) [I]</p> <p>H: =you could rather say it in German</p> <p>M: yeah but no (.) because it's important that the children hear me speak the- my native language</p> <p>H: =mhm</p> <p>M: like when it's like this</p> <p>H: ah you could start speaking it to me mm you say can you get the mil or</p> <p>M: =yeah and i've s- i've sometimes started but then i'm just so it's (.) a bit feels frustrating it's not your fault and i don't get angry about it but it's a bit like .hh give me the milk and i talk to him and he doesn't even realize that i'm talking to him and he's just like uhuh ((mimicks confusion)) £hh (.) like (.) yeah£</p> <p>H: yeah</p> <p>2.4.3 M: yeah i think English is an obstruction in the family language (.) at the moment i mean (.) it's obstructing now because they probably learn (.) the first words and the first languages slower because (.) in here (there's) too much English (.) and not enough (.) Finnish or German (.) errr and i don't see any benefit of raising them (.) (dual-lingually) (.) they will learn English in other ways so easily (.) mm:: (.) so (.) yeah (.) i think the sooner we could drop the English the better it would be (.) for them that everything is clearer</p> <p>2.4.4 K: do you think that they understand English</p> <p>H: ((shakes head))</p> <p>M: but somehow like i-i don't know like we have this other couple like my friend S (female name) er who's Finnish and C (male name) is like Latin-American (.) er (.) and (.) their two children they complain that like (.) they get like the children don't like that they speak English to each other (.) although they do (.) er (.) so because the children don't understand it so- and i'm a bit surprised like how children don't learn it although it's like the third language in the home but .hh but maybe it's about like because there's none of this like (.) bird bird bird bird bird ((taps fingers in table for each word)) (.) happening in English</p> <p>2.4.5 M: one parent speaks clearly one language to the child that it's a m- like the way I heard is that it's not so detrimental if they hear that we speak English (.) to each other or that they hear that I speak French to someone but it's so like important that they only hear Finnish from me when i'm addressing them (.) and that they only hear er German from him when he's addressing them (.) and i really try to stick to that like if I hear sometimes he is saying something like a Finnish word or something (.) i say like no speak German or like only sing in German and I will sing in Finnish and stuff like that</p> <p>H: or I will sing in English to them</p> <p>M: yeah yeah I know I've been thinking about it mm</p> <p>H: yeah but that means just like i sing one lullaby to them in English but then I just speak actually German so (.) I heard of it as well and I err (.) I try to stick to it</p>
--------------------------------	--

## APPENDIX 3

TABLE 7 Phenomenon 3: The use of ELF between parents in multilingual families

(3) The use of ELF between parents in multilingual families	
Family 1: Laura & Thomas	3.1.1 T: =between languages when we don't know a word [...] I (.) at home I would say the word in English or in Flemish .hh
	3.1.2 L: =if we are just you and me we are more likely to speak (.) Flemish or (.) English (.) like if we go to (a bar) T: (like beer)= L: =I think we easily switch also because then (.) if we speak Flemish then not everybody else [understands] T: £well nobody understands (xxx)£ L: £so it's] kind of nice£= T: =yeah L: e:::h (.) but also I think that we are more likely to speak in English also
	3.1.3 L: but <u>if</u> we had real conversation then in um (.) English
	3.1.4 T: =(I feel like) or false memories but that we thought that because we have .hh u:h the (.) English as a as-as a common language (.) um it's both not our first language that because of that we don't necessarily need a lot of words (.) to understand what we are saying what the other one is saying so we-we .hh we-we-we had a feeling that we are on the same level (.) anyway with a [lot of]
	3.1.5 T: that I do I do yeah yeah definitely .hh and (.) I think feelings of love is easier in English (.) because hh I have been thinking about this because I have been reading .hh e:h e:h a lot of eh literature m- mainly in English I think I have read more in English than in Flemish literature .hh so I-I-I have that vocabulary for that might be might be better (.) and in-in Finnish it's the smallest so when it goes to expressing (.) ma-mainly when it goes to expressing feelings it's-it's (.) it's the most difficult in Finnish (.) because the vocabulary is more limited L: no but it's probably that if-if (.) but then (.) and if we would have a conversation about something I might most easily switch in English (.) because if I (.) I-I feel uncomfortable in Finnish because then I-I'm not sure you would understand (.) anyway what I'm really saying even if you would understand the words (.) then the words don't always (.) translate necessarily as I mean them= T: =mhm= L: =you might understand them differently if iIuse English then (.) u:h it's less likely that you understand it wrong
Family 2: Chun & Nils	3.2.1 N: so my Chinese is a lot worse than her N-Norwegian that's for sure so therefore we end up speaking English and we have done so for .hhh seventeen years
	3.2.2 K: so er if you move on to your language practices as a couple (.) u:hm (.) so what do you speak to each other as a couple in- and in what ratio C: =English a hundred percent N: we s- (.) speak English almost a hundred percent (.) yeah
Family 3: Päivi & Jan	3.3.1 P: Jan speaks basically [constantly] the same, English (.) and I speak 50% Finnish and 50% English to Jan (.) and he then answers um (.) i-in English
	3.3.2 P: I don't speak English too much (.) only when you [Jan] (.) don't understand (.) and then I have to say it in English
	3.3.3 J: the thing is (.) when she starts in Finnish (.) because then I don't know certainly that if is addressed to (.) <u>to</u> me (.) that's um the problem

(3) The use of ELF between parents in multilingual families

Family 3: Päivi & Jan	3.3.4 P: I try to speak Finnish but you [Jan] make me speak English
Family 4: Minna & Henrik	<p>3.4.1 K: uhm, (.) so you speak mostly English to each other?  H: YEP=  M: =yeah=  K: =a::nd (.) is there something else as well or, (.) in:: what ratio  M: uhm, NO we decided a few years ago? (.) uh when I was still in Lo- (.) well at least ((nods toward H)) you were still in London (.) we decided that every Tuesday's a German Tuesday or something? (.) ((shaking head)) #but it lasted maybe day# or something? &lt;it, (.) didn't (.) work? (.) now then late- &lt;actually aff- just a few weeks ago we (.) decided that &lt;well I suggested and he agreed, (.) because we were fighting so much so we- .hhh (.) I suggested like eh why don't we speak just (.) only German and Finnish, (.) u::h (.) so maybe we can fight less .hhh and that lasted maybe half a day? But we managed then to fight in German as well, so it didn't kind of work .hhh (.) u::h and now it's again so it's been somehow (.) difficult to change:: into: another, (.) uhh language, (.) &lt;I- I'm keen and I just have so &gt;many things now ongoing but&lt; (.) I'm planning to kind of (.) take a few intensive months that I (.) I just like, (.) brush up my German and I (.) I know that it only takes a few months that then we can be: kind of or at least speaking in German but, (.) I just somehow haven't done it yet, (.) maybe I'm a little bit afraid also that that if I swi- switch to German (.) he will have kind of even less incentive to learn any Finnish, because then we can just have like German as ((hand gestures)) the family language (.) completely, so .hhh maybe somehow I've been waiting that he will also want to kind of (.) o:r have resources to: (.) (xxx) Finnish (.) maybe: (.) I'm not sure (.) it might just be that I just haven't ((shaking head)) somehow, the (.) (will) now &lt;o:r maybe I'm too because in the beginning I spent some efforts on learning the Hungarian which then (.) wasn't, (.) (it) (.) didn't (.) go, (.) hhh anywhere, (.) it wasn't kind of ((shrugs)) useful .hhh so.  K: ((nodding))  M ((looks at K)): yeah.  K: ((looks at H)) what do you: (.) think about this?  H: mm:::: (.) yeah it's::: (.) well I think because we met, (.) in <u>England</u>, (.) it's kind of like the first language that we started speaking, (.) to each other. (.) so it's a little: bit (.) the choice was kind of made for us, (.) already, (.) .hhh and it's probably also language, (.) in which we have the same level of, (.) of::-u:h (skill). (.) so, (.) nobody is:: kind of like (.) stronger in English (.) than the other,=</p>
	<p>3.4.2 H: mm (.) well i could express my emotions in F-English and (.) German to Minna i guess (.) but i don't think i could express them in Fran-French (.) no i- do you mean  K: mhm how do you like kind of (.) [(xxxxxx)]  H: [i mean the languages that i use yes i can-] i can express my emotions (with)  K: mhm  H: very well  M: yeah but sometimes i feel this frustration that I-I k- like (.) mostly yeah I don't think language is the biggest obstacle in expressing my emotions (.) er (.) sometimes I have this frust- like I- like I cannot come up with a word and I err (.) and then I have to come up with different ways of trying to express it and then the moment is gone or something like (.) so (.) it does (.) create some (xx) (.) yeah</p>

## APPENDIX 4

TABLE 8 Phenomenon 4: ELF as a linguistic support for learning to speak other languages present in the context of multilingual families

(4) ELF as a linguistic support for learning to speak other languages present in the context of multilingual families	
Family 1: Laura & Thomas	<p>4.1.1 T: =yeah (.) it's-I-I guess it's the crea-creativity (.) you just want to get your message across and you use whatever methods you have or whatever vocabulary you have (.) that you think that the other one will understand .hh if you you can use signs and use-use-use you can draw something or-or</p> <p>4.4.2 T: I would say that ninety percent of our conversations are in Finnish (.) and then maybe ten percent are-are-are (.) few sentences are like we use a lot of mix (.) like words in-in one sentence (.) we can (.) use like Flemish or English words if (.) if they don't come like a-automatically but .hh</p>
Family 2: Chun & Nils	No mention of this phenomenon.
Family 3: Päivi & Jan	<p>4.3.1 J: <u>because</u> sometimes I um (.) start in Finnish but then when I get stuck I switch to English K: does it then stay in English or does it? J: yeah (.) um I think (.) um in the beginning (.) I might still try to go back to Finnish um (.) but as soon as the story begins to complicate then um (.) I have to switch back to Finnish um to English</p> <p>4.3.2 J: I also try to use English words to um (.) get a story [in Finnish] across</p>
Family 4: Minna & Henrik	No mention of this phenomenon.

## APPENDIX 5

TABLE 9 Phenomenon 5: ELF as a tool for communicating with extended family members in the context of multilingual families

(5) ELF as a tool for communicating with extended family members in the context of multilingual families	
Family 1: Laura & Thomas	<p>5.1.1 K: what about u:::h your parents (.) do the:y (.) do your parents (.) ((motions to Thomas)) speak English            T: yeah they do (.) yeah yeah they do .hh they do [they-they speak good-good English] L: yeah (.) yeah (.) but I            K: =and yours as (.) well ((motions to Laura))            L: u:h my father (.) doesn't=            T: =doesn't=            L: =doesn't=            T: =doesn't=            L: =speak English [only Finnish]            T: I couldn't speak to Laura's father before I learnt Finnish= K: =mm=            L: =yeah=            T: =I-I-I never had a direct conversation with him= L: =mhm=            T: =before I-I could speak Finnish so that was really cool when I learnt Finnish (like that) I could really talk (to) otherwise it was always like .hh it's you-you don't really have a (.) conversation when someone is-is like translating [everything]            L: [but also] but also like (.) e:h I was just thinking it the other day that (.) your parents (.) also have learnt (.) much English (.) since I moved first time to Belgium            T: yeah [for sure]            L: =it was very difficult (.) it w-not very            T: =of course=            L: =difficult but it was (.) yeah they-they were not used to °talking in English°</p>
	<p>5.1.2 K: what about (.) with (.) with your parents ((gestures to Thomas)) (.) they            T: Flemish (.) [yeah]            L: =Flemish            K: [mhm]            T: well Pekka now English actually (.) actually Pekka sometimes uses English but main [like w-w (.) like within one sentence he would use one (.)]            L: [but mainly Finnish (.) uh ((shakes head)) (.) Dutch]            T: =if he doesn't know a word he would use the word in-in English .hh=            K: =mhm=            T: =like m-mixes languages but-but .hh e:h (.) Julia and-and (.) and Roope speak Flemish=</p>

(5) ELF as a tool for communicating with extended family members in the context of multilingual families	
Family 2: Chun & Nils	<p>5.2.1 K: (0.2) mhm, yeah (0.5) so (.) is it important to you that your children learn both Norwegian and Chinese? N: [yeah] C: [yeah] N: to me it's because obviously they have (.) have to be able to speak to the other side of the (.) um my family and um (.) the family in China really can only speak Chinese so to be able to communicate to them (.) to that part is important and (xxx) with both cultures to some extent is really important to us (.) we never had any discussions about that (.) that's always taken as how it should be K: [mhm] C: [mhm] (xxx) that to read Chinese books (.) is without that ability (xx) it's a lot I think (.) and our John loves reading a lot (.) I mean (.) like this thick book, and in two days finished (.) so I think he is able to read Chinese, and understand the culture, understand what (xxx) a lot better than right now (xxx) K: mhm (0.1) do your parents understand English? C: no K: so the only possible language of communication to them is Chinese C: mhm, yeah</p>
Family 3: Päivi & Jan	<p>5.3.1 P: I speak English [to Jan's mum] and um (.) and she answers in Dutch (.) and I use some words in Dutch when I know them (.) but um she speaks really well English 5.3.2 P: I told them [Päivi's family] to speak Finnish to him [Jan] um (.) cause otherwise he won't learn it (.) but when I am not around they speak English with him [Jan]</p>
Family 4: Minna & Henrik	<p>5.4.1 K: and you started learning Hungarian (as (.) as what) M: yeah I-I started when I thought that that would kind of when I first or when I thought that I would become kind of closer to his family (.) (xx) turned out I thought it's important that I understand what's going on that I can like kind of integrate (.) and that I would kind of learn to understand his (.) the way he thinks H: [...] M: yeah but then his family er were a little bit like why are you learning Hungarian it's a useless language and they want me to kind of practice English 5.4.2 H: no i think he wanted to go out with the babies for a walk (.) that's the only thing and he was looking for his gloves and (.) you said he could take mine K: okay H: I-I think it was K: Ehe sounds very young when he speaks English hehehef M: but I remember saying (.) yeah I remember saying to somebody (take your gloves) H: but was that person speaking Finnish (.) [to Minna] K: (yes to Minna yeah (xxx) M: 0but we can listen to it like yeah K: yeah we can listen to it it's fine M: =yeah yeah yeah H: I think it K: yeah H: was E (male name) K: okay (.) (xxxxxxx) how- what is the relationship (.) to-to the people that you discuss so that i can H: yeah E (male name) is Minna's father (.) if it was him M: yeah K: okay</p>

## APPENDIX 6

TABLE 10 Phenomenon 6: ELF as a hindering factor when learning other languages in the context of multilingual families

(6) ELF as a hindering factor when learning other languages in the context of multilingual families	
Family 1: Laura & Thomas	No mention of this phenomenon.
Family 2: Chun & Nils	<p>6.2.1 N: a-and it's always been like that u:hm you know ever since we started a::nd (.) o-of course maybe we can say we:- that- or certainly i can say that i should have been better at speaking Norwegian [using less English] (.) (and with- would make that) easier for you (.) but er we have just (.) er for so many years we come- we've become-become like lazy .hh it's-it's easy to just stick to what we know ourselves English (right)=</p> <p>C: =yeah=</p> <p>N: so-so-so-so i've n-not been a big help in (.) making you learn Norwegian that's-that's not good but that's (.) that's kind of how it's become</p>
Family 3: Päivi & Jan	<p>6.3.1 P: it's um (.) a huge pity that helm (.) hasn't learned Finnish properly yet (.) cause um he has been working so much in an in an English speaking environment so (.) that is also why I um (.) decided that I am not translating for him anymore (.) it was maybe um 6 years ago when I um (.) decided to stop [...]</p> <p>P: you [Jan] do the same thing as the girls like um (.) a noise canceling headphones and you don't um really listen</p>
	<p>6.3.2 P: I um try to tell to um (.) all the people that they should try not to speak um English to foreigners (.) cause that's what we all do [...] they won't learn the language like this</p>
Family 4: Minna & Henrik	<p>6.4.1 H: they're like in their fifties so they [referring to other transnational families] they speak English no they don't speak English at home anymore but then you ((ad-dressed to Minna)) mentioned D (male name) speaks Spanish (.) my other friend J (male name) who's together with you friend L (female name) (.) again like German (.) guy Finnish woman (.) they speak English together (.) so i think now J (male name) speaks more (.) Finnish i mean he is half Finnish but doesn't speak Finnish .hh so it's like (.) errrrrr (.) i think if (y-you're thirties) like our generation people (.) actually (.) speak so good English (.) fro:m (.) their education that (.) they don't actually need to learn the other person's language</p> <p>K: yeah=</p> <p>H: =whereas if you (.) are twenty years older .hh (.) you had to learn if-if those-those guys who came here (.) twenty years ago they learnt Finnish</p>