

DISCURSIVE STUDY OF ATTITUDES TOWARDS ENGLISH AND
FINNISH

Master's Thesis
Heidi Pirskanen

University of Jyväskylä
Department of Languages
English
May 2014

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Heidi Pirskanen	
Työn nimi – Title Discursive study of attitudes towards English and Finnish	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti	Työn laji – Level Pro Gradu -tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Toukokuu 2014	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 84 + 2 liitettä
<p>Tiivistelmä – Abstract</p> <p>Kieliasenteet ovat kiinnostaneet soveltavan kielitieteen tutkijoita paljon, ja niitä on tutkittu erilaisia menetelmiä käyttäen jo vuosikymmeniä. Perinteisemmät tutkimusmenetelmät, kuten esimerkiksi matched guise -tekniikka, ovat edelleen suosittuja vaikka niiden rinnalle onkin noussut uusia tutkimusmenetelmiä. Uusista menetelmistä erityisesti diskurssianalyysiä on sovellettu jonkin verran myös kieliasenteiden tutkimiseen. Diskurssianalyysin myötä myös tapa ymmärtää kieliasenteiden luonne on muuttunut. Kun aiemmin asenteet nähtiin melko pysyvinä päänsisäisinä kokonaisuuksina, nykyään ne ymmärretään enemmänkin tilanteesta riippuvaisina konstruktioina, joita voidaan luoda erilaisia tulkintarepertuaareja käyttämällä. Tämän tutkimuksen tavoitteena oli selvittää millaisia tulkintarepertuaareja suomalaiset englannin opiskelijat käyttävät kuvaillessaan englantia ja suomea. Tutkimuksen tavoitteena oli myös kartoittaa, miten näitä repertuaareja käytetään ja muuttuuko niiden käyttö ajan myötä.</p> <p>Tutkimuksen aineisto kerättiin vuosina 2005 ja 2010 osana Noviiisista ekspertiksi -projektia. Jyväskylän yliopiston englannin opiskelijat (N=120) vastasivat kyselyyn osana Opi oppimaan vieraita kieliä -kurssia vuonna 2005 ja samoista opiskelijoista koostuva ryhmä (N=38) vastasi osittain samoista kysymyksistä koostuvaan online-kyselyyn vuonna 2010. Kyselyyn vastattiin suomeksi. Näistä kyselyistä tätä tutkimusta varten valittiin 7 kohtaa tarkempaa analyysiä varten, 3 vuodelta 2005 ja 4 vuodelta 2010.</p> <p>Aineistosta pystyttiin tunnistamaan neljä eri repertuaaria, jotka nimettiin aiempia kieliasennetutkimuksia kunnioittaen seuraavasti: läheinen – etäinen repertuaari, kaunis – ruma repertuaari, paikallinen – globaali repertuaari ja helppo – vaikea repertuaari. Jokainen repertuaari käsitettiin jatkumona, jonka kaksi ääripäätä olivat toisilleen vastakkaiset. Kaikkia neljää repertuaaria käytettiin molemmista kielistä puhuttaessa, mutta erojakin oli havaittavissa käyttötavoissa. Yleisesti ottaen toista ääripäätä käytettiin suomen kielestä puhumiseen ja toista ääripäätä englannista puhumiseen.</p> <p>Repertuaarien käytössä ei ilmennyt suuria eroja vuosien 2005 ja 2010 välillä. Joitain uusia piirteitä kuitenkin ilmeni, huomattavimpana työelämän mukaantulo ja kielen välineellinen arvo.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords Language attitudes, interpretative repertoires, discourse analysis, Finnish, English	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository Kielten laitos	
Muita tietoja - Additional information	

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	7
2. Theoretical background	9
2.1 Attitudes: A brief history	9
2.1.1 Definition of an attitude	9
2.1.2 Structure of an attitude	11
2.1.3 Attitudes as learned dispositions	13
2.1.4 Attitudes in change	15
2.1.5 Language attitudes	16
2.2 Research on language attitudes: different approaches	18
2.2.1 Mainstream research	18
2.2.2 Problems with mainstream research	24
2.2.3 Discourse analytic approach to language attitude study	25
2.2.4 Guidelines for studying discourse	29
2.3 Research on language attitudes in Finland	31
2.3.1 Language attitude research especially relevant to the present study	37
3. Present study	40
3.1 Aims of the present study	40
3.2 Data and participants	42
3.3 Method, coding and analysis	46
4. Findings: interpretative repertoires identified	50
4.1 The close – distant repertoire	51
4.2 The beautiful – ugly repertoire	55
4.3 The local – global repertoire	60
4.4 The easy – difficult repertoire	65
4.5 Comparisons between 2005 and 2010	69
5. Discussion	76
5.1 Summary of the present study	76
5.2 Findings of the present study compared to previous research	79
5.3 Validation of the present study	82
5.4 Conclusion	83
Bibliography	85
Appendix 1: 2005 questionnaire and instructions	89
Appendix 2: 2010 questionnaire and instructions	91

1 INTRODUCTION

Without a doubt, English is nowadays one of the most widely spread and spoken languages. Its position as a worldwide *lingua franca* originates from the times of the British Empire and the rise of America after the Second World War. Many companies choose to use English as their language of communication. English is one of the most popular foreign languages taught in schools in Europe. Advertisements bombard English slogans and phrases non-stop on TV, magazines, newspapers and billboards. Television programs, films, books and music produced in English are readily available almost everywhere.

This constant onslaught of English has prompted mixed reactions around the world. While most agree that having at least a basic knowledge of English is important, some have become worried that smaller languages will become endangered due to English dominance. This has been the case also in Finland.

Finland has two official languages, Finnish and Swedish. Although these two languages are fairly stable and prestigious in Finland or other Nordic countries, they have relatively few speakers on a global scale. Perhaps it is because of this that the Finnish education system has paid special attention to teaching Finnish children foreign languages. From early on Finnish schools have provided students with the opportunity to learn languages such as German, French and English in addition to Swedish and Finnish. During the last few decades, English has gained more and more prominence and nowadays one could say that all Finnish children are taught at least the most basic English skills at some point of their schooling.

Whilst most agree that having basic skills in English is good, a growing number of Finns are worried about their language. Nowadays it is not entirely uncommon to see letters-to-the-editor in Finnish newspapers arguing that English is ruining the Finnish language, whether it is a worry for the Finnish vocabulary and the growing number of words borrowed from English or for the Finnish grammar and the use of anglicisms. Some have even gone as far as to say that Finland now has three official languages: Finnish, Swedish and English.

Recent studies focusing on Finns and languages in Finland have shown that the Finnish national identity is still closely connected with language, as it has been from the earliest stages of national awakening. Finns are proud, and some even fiercely protective, of Finnish. This, however, does not mean that Finns would have an all-around negative attitude towards other languages. In fact, most studies focusing on the language attitudes of Finns have found that Finns generally are positively interested in other languages. Indeed, Finns are generally rational in the sense that they see the usefulness of Finnish on the global level and understand that in order to be able to take part in the current globalizing world, they need other languages besides Finnish or Swedish.

The present study has a keen interest in language attitudes, especially those held by Finnish university students of English towards the Finnish and English languages. The purpose of the present study is to identify the types of interpretative repertoires that students of English draw upon when discussing English and Finnish. Interpretative repertoires are seen as building blocks of discourse that can be used to construct attitudes. A discourse analysis of a set of sentence completion tasks that the participants filled in twice during their studies, once in 2005 and once in 2010, was conducted in order to achieve an understanding of the repertoires. The data was gathered as part of a larger research project, *From novice to expert*, in the University of Jyväskylä.

The present study has been organised so that first the key concepts, relevant theories and previous research will be reviewed. This is then followed by introducing the present study and discussing its aims, participants, data and methodology. The results of the present study will then be reported. Finally, the validity of the present study will be discussed and some last conclusions will be drawn.

2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

This chapter will introduce concepts and theories that are particularly relevant for the present study. First the concept of attitudes will be examined on a general level, followed by a more detailed look at language attitudes specifically. Next, a brief review of different approaches doing research on language attitudes will be presented, where special attention will be paid on the discourse analytic approach. This part will also review various studies on language attitudes. Finally, several language attitude studies conducted in Finland will be reviewed.

2.1 Attitudes: A brief history

The topic of attitudes has been an interest for many researchers in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics. Although research on attitudes is traditionally associated with psychology, attitude research is also prominent in fields such as applied linguistics, politics and pedagogy. This interest in attitudes not only shows in the academic context but also in our everyday lives through media. Newspapers and TV programs report every now and then on the changes in the attitude atmosphere. Guides on leadership and workplace management often emphasise the importance of attitudes. The keen interest in attitudes, whether academic or non-academic, is mostly based on the assumption that by understanding the underlying attitudes people have, it is possible to predict their behaviour.

This section will first introduce various definitions for the term *attitude*. This will be followed by a description of the way attitudes have traditionally been regarded: the view of attitude structure as well as the acquisition and change of attitudes will be examined. Lastly the concept of *language attitudes* will be introduced.

2.1.1 Definition of an attitude

It seems that there are quite a few definitions for the term *attitude*: some with heavy emphasis on a specific point, some with no emphasis at all, some broad, and some narrow. Allport (1954, as quoted in Garrett 2010: 19) defined an attitude as "a learned disposition to think, feel and behave toward a person or object in a particular way".

Sarnoff (1970, as quoted in Garrett 2010: 20) on the other hand defined an attitude as "a disposition to react favourably or unfavourably to a class of objects". The first of the definitions includes the idea that attitudes do not only show in the way people feel about things, but also in the way they think and act. It also includes the idea that attitudes are something that we learn. Sarnoff's definition includes the idea of positivity and negativity. So, a person's attitude is a learned way of reacting to an object, and it can be situated somewhere between the two extremes of being negative or positive. This sort of a definition for an attitude can also be called a mentalist definition. Attitudes are seen as mental entities that reside somewhere in a person's mind and only come into view through action. Attitudes can thus be studied, for example, through interviews or questionnaires.

Another, more recent definition of an attitude is given by Crano and Prislin (2006: 347), who state that "an attitude represents an evaluative integration of cognitions and affects experienced in relation to an object. Attitudes are the evaluative judgements that integrate and summarize these cognitive/affective reactions". In addition, they mention that attitudes may fluctuate from weak to strong, which in turn causes variation in their persistence and resistance, and the consistency between attitudes and behaviour. This definition essentially encompasses the same ideas as those given by Allport and Sarnoff.

According to Palermino et al. (1984: 179) the definitions of an attitude mentioned above fail to express that attitudes always exist within a certain context. Thus attitudes are not static entities but rather dependent of the situation they are expressed in. It is impossible for an object to be permanently branded as something positive or negative. Palermino et al. stress that attitudes should rather be seen as the relationship between the person holding the attitude and the attitude object: a relationship that is always dependent of the context.

The context-dependency of attitudes is emphasised especially by Potter and Wetherell (1987). They question the mentalist view of attitudes and propose that instead a constructionist view of attitudes should be adopted. Potter and Wetherell note (1987: 35) that, as everyday life shows, people often express attitudes which conflict with one another. Thus it proves problematic to try to define what the actual underlying attitude even is. Potter and Wetherell suggest that instead of trying to achieve some all-

encompassing understanding which would explain all these conflicting attitudes, the focus should be on how, when and why those specific attitudes are expressed. According to Potter and Wetherell (1987: 33-34) discourse is always constructive in nature, meaning that accounts of events and objects are used to construct reality. This construction also always serves a purpose. Thus, relating back to attitudes, the interest should be in discovering how attitudes are constructed linguistically, what occasions attitudes are expressed on and what the purpose of expressing the attitudes, through the linguistic means that are made use of, is.

Palermino et al. and Potter and Wetherell are not the only ones to support the idea of attitudes as social constructions. Eiser (1987: 1-2) also argues that an attitude "is both a subjective experience and a social product, and the expression of attitude is a social act", also stating that to understand attitudes, scientists should focus more on the way they are affected by interpersonal processes, as opposed to intrapersonal processes.

This study does not abandon the mentalist view of attitudes altogether but combines it with the social constructionist view. Attitudes are seen as context-dependent relationships, positive or negative, between the attitude object and the person, that manifest themselves in social interaction. They are inherently discursive in nature, as they are learned in social situations and most commonly expressed through language.

2.1.2 Structure of an attitude

As attitudes have traditionally been seen as mental and abstract constructs, it has been somewhat difficult to try to conceptualise them in a clear way. Nevertheless, even today it is widely accepted that attitudes have three components: cognition, affect and behaviour (see, for example, Garrett 2010: 23, Baker 1992: 12, Eiser 1987: 12, Edwards 1982: 20).

The cognitive aspect of an attitude basically involves the beliefs and thoughts an individual has about the attitude object. For example, a Finnish person might have a negative attitude to Swedish and thus think that it is not useful to have mandatory Swedish lessons at school. The affective aspect of an attitude, on the other hand, involves the basic feelings an individual has about the attitude object. The Finnish

person with the negative attitude to Swedish might hate, fear or feel anxious when thinking of Swedish. Baker (1992: 12) notes that it is important to remember that the cognitive and affective aspects are not always in correlation. One might have a favourable belief about something but still secretly have negative feelings about the very same thing. Lastly, the behavioral aspect of attitudes relates to the readiness to act upon these thoughts and feelings. The Finn with the negative attitude to Swedish might, for example, protest and actively try to affect Finnish language policies by sending letters to politicians.

Edwards (1982: 20) notes that this triangular model of seeing an attitude occasionally causes confusion in the terminology. He says that the concept of belief, in particular, is often mixed up with the broader concept of attitude, especially so in the domain of language attitude research. It is good to remember that although a person may have a positive belief about an attitude object, he or she may simultaneously have negative feelings about it, and vice versa. In addition, Edwards notes that attitudes and the observable behaviour are not always in agreement, but in fact a person may act in a completely opposite manner than what their attitudes might suggest.

Cognition, affect and behaviour can all be measured, as suggested by Rosenberg and Hovland (1960). All three aspects manifest themselves in verbal statements, which are fairly easy to study. That is probably the reason why attitude research seems to favour questionnaires and interviews. The cognitive aspect can also manifest itself in perceptual responses and the affective aspect in sympathetic nervous responses, such as quickened heart rate. The behavioral aspect, on the other hand, manifests itself in overt actions.

This model of the three different components of which an attitude is formed has dominated the field for decades. For example, the older articles and books reviewed for this study accept it without really bringing up any contrasting views. Garrett (2010: 23), however, reminds that some studies done recently question the paradigm. These studies have raised the idea that cognition, affect and behaviour should not be single-mindedly equated with attitudes but instead can be seen more as a cause or a trigger for the said attitude. Crano and Prislin (2006: 350) also state that the status of behaviour is especially ambiguous. It may be seen as the cause but also the consequence of an

attitude, depending on the situation. The inconsistency between attitudes and behaviour mentioned earlier (Edwards 1982: 20) may yet find an explanation as the new information gathered can be applied to the old model of attitude structure.

2.1.3 Attitudes as learned dispositions

As stated above, attitudes are dispositions we learn. They are learned in many different ways (Crano and Prislin 2006: 347, Garrett 2010: 22). Allport (1935) lists some common ways to form attitudes. Firstly, Allport states that attitudes are formed by combining great amounts of personal experiences together. This means that people are born without any types of attitudes and that they start formulating different attitudes towards various things little by little while growing up. But, looked from another point of view, it could also be argued that people are born with only two basic attitudes, positive or negative, and that as they grow and acquire more experience they start to divide these two basic attitudes to finer ones. A completely different cause for attitudes is having a single dramatic experience which has such a big impact on the individual that a new attitude is born. Lastly, attitudes can also be acquired ready-made from parents, peers or teachers. Children may, for example, detect the disapproval in parents' voices when they talk about a certain topic. Later on, when children get their own experiences concerning the topic, they simply make the experience fit the already existing attitude.

The ways to form attitudes listed above are all in fact different ways of learning. Garrett (2010) has put these different ways into two categories: our personal experiences and our social environment. Basically, all the other ways listed by Allport can be put into the category of personal experience save for the last one, which falls under that of social environment. Garret also states that learning can be observational or instrumental. Observational learning means that we observe the way other people act and how their actions affect the world around us and learn from this. Instrumental learning means that we notice the consequences attitudes have and how they are rewarded. It is also important to note that the learning can be either conscious or unconscious (Crano and Prislin 2006: 347).

Eiser (1987: 18-16) argues that not only are attitudes *per se* learned from others but the behavioral manifestations of attitudes are also learned through social interaction. As we grow up we see our parents, teachers, peers and other people we meet react to and talk about different things in different ways. By inspecting and witnessing these situations, we learn suitable ways to express attitudes.

An example of how language attitudes particularly may be learned is presented by Garrett (2010: 22). Researchers have found that some language attitudes are established early on in our lives. For example, Day (1982: 117) states that children as young as 1 – 2 years already show signs of having language attitudes. Day sums up several studies that were interested in finding what kinds of attitudes children have towards the standard or majority variety and a regional or minority variety of a language. The studies indicated that younger children usually have favourable attitudes towards their own way of speaking, whether they are part of the majority or minority, although they recognise the status and prestige of the standard variety. As they age and enter school, their attitudes towards the majority variety become more and more favourable and the socioeconomical status and prestige of it become more important. From studies such as these reviewed by Day it has been deduced that teachers and parents have an impact on the formation of language attitudes. They are figures of authority in a child's life and may consciously or unconsciously show signs of approval when a child expresses attitudes they themselves have.

Finally, it is worth noting that although attitude researchers generally have been inclined to think that attitudes are always learned and never hereditary, recent studies have suggested that some attitudes might in fact be influenced by genetic factors. Tesser (1993) lists several studies that concentrated on this aspect. One of these studies was conducted by Rushton et al. (1986: 1192-1198) in which it was found that some broad attitudes such as altruism and aggression are somewhat hereditary. Later on Tesser (1993: 130) mentions that some studies suggest that even such specific attitudes as those towards drinking alcohol are genetically influenced.

However, as Garrett (2010: 22) states that there is no evidence that genetic factors have any influence on language attitudes, this subject, although interesting, will not be discussed more thoroughly in this study.

2.1.4 Attitudes in change

As can be seen in our everyday lives, attitudes are not static or permanent. They, like any mental construct, can change and vary in the course of our lives. It is a layman's knowledge that young people may have very strict opinions about and attitudes towards certain phenomena but that usually these attitudes and opinions change as people mature. A Finnish teenager might, if we continue with the earlier example of Swedish language in Finland, have a very negative attitude towards Swedish and studying it but as an adult may be more tolerant.

Earlier attitudes were seen more durable and more resistant to change (Allport 1935, Garret 2010). Allport (1935), for example, says that although attitudes can change through the course of a lifetime, it is uncommon and that the attitudes we have as children and youngsters usually persist, unless a serious event takes place and causes the attitude to be modified. Nowadays attitudes are seen more as flexible and adaptable (see for example Baker 1992; Garret 2010).

If the structure of an attitude discussed earlier is taken into account, it is fairly easy to see why attitudes may change with time. As one experiences new things, meets new people and acquires new information, the cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects might change, thus resulting in change in an attitude. The social and discursive nature of attitudes also places them in a position where they are susceptible to change. As Baker states (1992: 99-101), attitudes may also change because there is a reward offered or because retaining an attitude would cause unnecessary anxiety, embarrassment or insecurity or because the way a person perceives himself or herself changes or because he or she has encountered new information which alters their attitude.

Crano and Prislin (2006: 348-350) emphasise that the mechanisms for attitude change are not always the same as for attitude construction, although they are sometimes thought to be interchangeable. As discussed earlier, attitude formation can be either conscious or unconscious. Crano and Prislin (2006: 348) state that many studies conducted on attitudes indicate that attitude change, however, is not likely to happen

unconsciously. They reviewed a plethora of studies on the subject, and came to the conclusion that for a change to occur, mere unconscious conditioning is not enough. They state that earlier the model for attitude change was fairly simple: attitudes change when the new information presented and processed is convincing enough. Presently, a more complex model reigns. If a person is fully able and properly motivated, their attitudes will change if the information presented is logical and well put. If the information is illogical and poorly presented, it will not result in attitude change. In other words, they will process the information based on its primary characteristics. On the other hand, if a person is not fully able and motivated to process the information, he or she will use secondary characteristics such as its source as the basis for their evaluation. This results in skipping the more complex thought processes. If attitude change occurs after this type of superficial processing, it is far more unstable and unlikely to affect behaviour.

2.1.5 Language attitudes

Earlier some different definitions of the term *attitude* were discussed. Now a closer look will be taken on *language attitudes*.

When the phrase *language attitude* is used, one might think that it refers to an attitude to a language. This is true to some extent, although it is only one facet of the matter. According to Baker (1992: 29) the term language attitude serves more as "an umbrella term". Baker has an extensive list of features that all are encompassed in the broader term of language attitude. His list includes attitudes to different dialects, speech styles, language variation, learning a new language, language lessons, minority languages, language preferences and the uses of certain languages, to mention a few. Day (1982: 116-117) argues that language attitudes should be seen as part of communicative competence. He says that communicative competence, which means the ability to use a language in an understandable manner, does not merely consist of information about grammatical rules and vocabulary but also of social knowledge of how to best take part in discussions, which language attitudes are part of. Edwards (1982: 21) reminds that it is important to remember that when language attitudes are measured, the results generally only reflect the way people perceive the social status of languages, dialects, their speakers and so forth. They do not reflect any intrinsic qualities of beauty or

superiority of any language. In fact, he states that there is no proof that such inherent qualities even exist nor that they could be measured on some universal binary scale.

For example, Edwards (1982: 25) sums the findings of a number of language attitude studies that concentrated on different English varieties or accents in British and Irish contexts. From these studies it became clear that people have a tendency to link status and competence with the so-called standard accent or variety, meaning received pronunciation, or BBC English, whether they themselves spoke it or not. Regional accents or varieties, in contrast, are more commonly connected with trustworthiness and attractiveness. These findings obviously have nothing to do with the accents or varieties *per se* but more with the way they are seen socially. Indeed, as Edwards (1982: 26-27) says, the attitudes towards different varieties are likely to change if the social context in which they are observed changes.

In the context of language attitudes, the questions posed by Potter and Wetherell (1987: 35), mentioned earlier in this chapter, prove to be quite interesting. Instead of trying to discover what types of attitudes this group of people has towards that language or this language variety, it is far more interesting to study how the attitudes are expressed and what is achieved by their expression.

Language attitudes have an impact on our everyday lives and this might be one of the major factors why so many linguists and social psychologists have been interested in doing research on them. For example, a politician with a positive attitude towards a minority language can have a tremendous impact on the vitality of that minority language. If the minority language is taught in schools and funds are given to its preservation, it may well survive and flourish.

English, with its unique status as the language for international communication, has been a favourite of language attitude researchers everywhere since the early years. For example, in his short review of language attitude studies that used the matched-guise technique, Edwards (1982: 22-23) has no trouble finding studies that concentrate on the English language and its varieties. Another favourite of researchers is the educational context of language attitudes. The vast majority of the studies reviewed for this study and those encountered while doing background research, but not included because of

their irrelevance, were connected to the school environment in one way or another. One reason for this might be the fact that obtaining data from students is fairly straightforward as, for example, questionnaires can be filled in during class time and the tasks students complete during regular lessons can also be used for research. Another reason, as Edwards (1982: 27) also notes, might be that people from all backgrounds and speakers of all language varieties go to school and thus schools are an excellent environment for observing language attitudes. The context of education is also important because of the power teachers hold in our societies. By encouraging the use of a certain variety of language or judging students based on their way of speaking, they promote language attitudes that may have a big impact on not only the lives of their students but also the society on the whole.

2.2 Research on language attitudes: different approaches

The previous section focused on attitudes on a general level. In this section different approaches to studying language attitudes will be reviewed. The traditional mainstream approaches will be introduced first followed by the contemporary approaches to language attitude research. For each approach, some examples of studies conducted will be reviewed.

2.2.1 Mainstream research

The traditional methods used in language attitude research can be crudely divided into three categories: societal treatment studies, direct approaches and indirect approaches (Garrett 2010: 37). In this section these approaches will be looked at more closely and also some relevant research making use of these different methods will be reviewed.

Societal treatment studies observe the treatment different languages, language varieties or language speakers get in societies. In this category there is a lot of variation in the methods used and the themes studied. Included in this category are, for example, observational and ethnographic studies, and studies on the use of a dialect in novels and language use in advertisements. It may be because of this diversity that these studies usually do not get as much attention as the other studies on language attitudes, although, as Garrett states (2010: 142), they are just as important.

A large amount of societal treatment studies have been conducted on language use in advertisements. Adverts are all around us in abundance and thus provide a good source for data. It is also usual for adverts to make use of different languages and sometimes dialects. These multilingual advertisements convey a lot of information about the different values and qualities different languages, or sometimes on a smaller scale dialects, have or are assumed to have in societies. Attitudes to these values and qualities of different languages are supposed to act as the guiding force when consumers make decisions.

A study by Haarmann (1984: 101-121) is a good example of these studies on languages in advertisements. His study looked at the different ethnocultural stereotypes the Japanese have on other ethnic groups and how they were displayed in Japanese advertisements.

Haarmann found that languages such as English and French were used in order to appeal to Japanese consumers. English was used in adverts for cars, televisions, alcoholic drinks and sportswear and it was associated with qualities such as practicality, reliability, confidence, high quality and international appreciation. French on the other hand was used to advertise for example watches, tasty foods, handbags, perfumes and home furnishings. It was associated with elegance, refined taste, charm, attractiveness and sophistication. English and French were the most frequently used languages, although other ones such as Italian and German were used, too. Sometimes the whole advert was mainly in a foreign language with some Japanese mixed in, but more discreet methods such as the use of background music or setting were also used to create the same associations. Haarmann argues (1984: 108) that although these stereotypes are not negative, their usage still has some problems. Ethnocultural and social stereotypes about gender are often closely linked in these advertisements and thus attitudes towards different genders may be negatively influenced.

As the name already implies the methods falling under **the direct approach** category base themselves on the assumption that language attitudes can be best studied with straightforward measures. As Garrett (2010: 39) states, one of the most straightforward ways is asking people simple questions about their attitudes toward languages. The

subjects can either be interviewed or the researchers can formulate a questionnaire for them to fill in.

There is a plethora of studies on language attitudes that fall under this category. MacKinnon (2013: 1-18) reviews three large-scale surveys that mapped the opinions and attitudes of Scots towards Gaelic in 1981, 2003 and 2011. The 1981 survey was conducted by MacKinnon himself. The 2003 survey was commissioned by BBC and Bòrd na Gàidhlig and the most recent 2011 by the Gaelic and Scots Language Unit of the Scottish Government and Bòrd na Gàidhlig. MacKinnon notes that although there is variation in the questions these surveys asked their participants and the aspects they emphasised, some general conclusions can be drawn when comparing the three. MacKinnon's own study had over a thousand participants living in Scotland who were asked to answer a set of sixteen questions orally. To give some examples, the questions asked the participants if they thought that the Gaelic language was important to the Scottish people and if Gaelic speakers should be allowed to use Gaelic when dealing with public authorities. They could choose from a ready set of answers, ranging from strong disagreement to strong agreement. The researcher's wrote down their responses and grouped them into different categories. The results of the study were fairly positive. Sometimes Gaelic was even strongly supported. Attitudes varied depending on where the respondent lived: the most positive attitudes were found in the Western Isles. Women also had more favourable attitudes towards Gaelic than men. Speaking Gaelic or having a Gaelic-speaking relative was also a positively correlating factor. MacKinnon (2013: 7-17) briefly compares the other two surveys to his own study. Comparing the similar questions of the 2003 survey to those of the 1981 survey, it could be concluded that over 22 years attitudes towards the Gaelic language have changed slightly and become more positive, although MacKinnon also says that because the latter survey differs slightly from that of his own, one should not make too much of the conclusions. The 2011 survey also supports the conclusion that the attitudes towards Gaelic have improved at least somewhat from those of 1981, although, once again, one should not jump to any bigger conclusions about this.

A study conducted by Friedrich (2000: 215-223) on Brazilian people's attitudes towards the English language is one example where direct methods were used to gather data. A questionnaire was given to randomly chosen students at a language school in São Paulo.

This language school offered courses in English on basic, intermediate and advanced levels. The students came from different areas of the city, had varying backgrounds and levels of their English skills. Most of them had studied English for four years or less and used four to ten hours a week for studying. Most of them were male and had a Bachelor's Degree or similar education. The majority of the participants were also employed at the time they answered the questionnaire.

The questionnaire had questions about the participants' views on different English varieties and the status of English as a *lingua franca*. The results suggest that all participants identified either American or British English as the variety they themselves were studying. There were, in fact, no other varieties named at all. The one they regarded as more prestigious was the American variety. Of the participants, 26% regarded both American and British varieties as equally prestigious. Friedrich suggests that the preference of American English over British might be because of its familiarity and that the tendency to regard both as equal might be caused by the fact that in the eyes of an EFL learner, all native Englishes sound prestigious. The primary focus, in their eyes, is on knowing English. The vast majority of the respondents wanted to learn American English as well, although they regarded British English easier to understand. English was also seen as a *lingua franca* by all of the participants and they would like to keep on learning it even if it were not.

The participants were also asked what it meant to know a language and what knowing English meant for them personally and in general. For the first of these questions the ability to speak fluently was emphasised in the answers. English skills were closely connected with better job opportunities, intelligence and status. Friedrich noticed that especially those respondents with lower English skills tended to associate English with intelligence and status. The respondents also felt that with better English skills they could impress their employers and would be able to travel and take part in other activities they now felt were out of their reach.

When the participants were asked about their aims and goals, most wanted to achieve fluency, some even wanted to become "native-like". Of those whose aim was fluent English skills, be they "native-like" or not, the majority thought that it could be achieved in only three or four years. This, as Friedrich claims, seems slightly

unreasonable and will undoubtedly cause some disappointments, which in turn might be the reason why the advanced courses offered at the language school are not as popular as the basic ones. At the time the survey was done, most of the participants said they enjoyed studying English. Friedrich also noticed that 80% of those who claimed not to like English, were older than 31. Lastly, when asked who was responsible for their learning, the majority answered that they themselves held the responsibility. However, the teacher was still thought to be a big contributor. Based on her results and those of other researchers, Friedrich suggests that Brazil needs to fully re-evaluate the way English is taught in Brazilian schools.

Indirect methods in language attitude research, as opposed to direct methods, are more discreet. The techniques that fall into the category of indirect methods are usually different guise techniques, the most important of which is the matched-guise technique.

The *matched-guise technique* was developed by Lambert et al. in 1960. They wanted to study the attitudes held by French speaking and English speaking Canadians in Montreal. They were interested in the way they perceived each other. They did not want to use a simple questionnaire asking the respondents directly what their attitudes towards each other were because they wanted to see what their private opinions truly were. A straight-forward questionnaire might have triggered the respondents to answer in a socially acceptable way. From this starting point the matched-guise technique was born.

The matched-guise technique is based on the assumption that different languages, dialects or speech styles are categorised differently and that different attributes are given to these categories. So, using Lambert and his colleagues' original study as an example, the French speaking Canadian voice will be associated with different attributes than the English speaking Canadian voice. Using people who are bilingual in the required languages and asking them to read a neutral text out loud on a tape, the respondents are then tricked into believing that one bilingual speaker is actually two monolingual speakers. This is done by inserting other recordings in between the bilingual speaker's two recordings and making sure it seems as if all the recordings have come from different individuals. Speech rate, pitch and other such features are kept as constant as possible in all the recordings. By these kinds of methods it is thought that the

respondents' reactions are based only on the different social expectations that arise from different language cues. The respondents are then asked to listen to the recordings and judge the different speakers' sincerity, intelligence and other such traits on ready-made rating scales.

Lambert et al.'s respondents were French speaking and English speaking Canadian students who were asked to listen and rate French Canadian and English Canadian guises. Lambert's group found that both ethnic groups rated the English speaking guises more favourably. The French speaking Canadians actually reacted more favourably to the English guises than the English speaking ones.

The importance of Lambert's original study using the matched-guise technique is undisputed. Giles and Billing (2004: 119) list several reasons why the study is indeed so important for the study of language attitudes. Firstly, the study introduced a new and "elegant" method for doing language attitude research, the matched-guise technique. It also introduced a set of traits labelled under the categories of *status* and *solidarity*, which are still used today. Secondly, it gave the linguistic community new information about language attitudes. Other researchers have afterwards followed Lambert's example and adopted the research method into their own studies. For example, the effect of variables such as age and gender have later on been researched in this context.

After Lambert there have been many other studies using the same or a very similar method (Giles and Billing 2004, Garrett 2010, Edwards 1982). For example, Zhang and Hu (2008: 342–347) studied the attitudes towards British English, American English and Australian English held by Chinese students. Their hypothesis was that the more familiar the students were with the language variety, the higher their regard for it would be. The students listened to three recordings: one for each variety of English. The recordings were read by native speakers and found on George Mason University's speech accent archive. The students listened to the recordings and filled in a questionnaire about the speakers' language-related, person-related and potential teaching qualities. They were also asked to identify whether the speakers were natives and where they came from. After the participants had listened to the recordings and answered the questionnaire, they were all interviewed briefly about what they thought of the study and how they regarded British, American and Australian varieties of English.

Zhang and Hu found that in general the students' attitudes were positive towards British and American Englishes. The attitude towards Australian English was more negative. To briefly summarise, British and American Englishes were regarded positively whereas the Australian variety was regarded negatively on the language-related qualities of *comfortableness*, *naturalness* and *being nice to listen to*. For the three other language-related qualities all varieties were regarded positively. The person-related qualities of British and American Englishes were also thought to be positive while Australian English got positive scores for only two items on the questionnaire, *education* and *sincerity*. British and American varieties of English were also regarded positively for the teaching-related qualities, whereas, not surprisingly, Australian English was not. The students were also asked to name the different varieties of English, and while they managed to correctly identify the British and American varieties, they had significant trouble in identifying the Australian accent correctly. It was usually confused with a British accent.

Zhang and Hu note that the question about understandability was an interesting one. It appears that the students did not have trouble understanding any of the varieties, as all of them got similar scores. Therefore it is not likely that the negative views on Australian English were caused by the students not understanding it. Zhang and Hu also found it interesting that the students' answers to the questions about education and intelligence seemed to reflect the stereotype the Chinese have of both skilled non-native and native speakers of English. Apparently people with good English skills are thought to be more educated and intelligent, and the students' answers clearly showed this, too.

2.2.2 Problems with mainstream research

Garrett (2010: 43-46) lists some problems connected with the mainstream approaches to studying language attitudes. Most of these problematic issues can arise especially when using the direct approaches but the indirect methods are not completely invulnerable to them either.

The first problem emerges from the way questions are phrased. Questions might, for example, use strongly loaded words, ask the respondent to think of an entirely

hypothetical situation or be a combination of two or more questions. According to Garrett, predicting behaviour and actual attitudes from answers prompted by these kinds of questions is extremely difficult. The case with loaded questions is that it might lead the respondents into answering in a certain manner, no matter what their real opinions on the topic may be. Questions on hypothetical situations, on the other hand, might prompt answers that would prove to be untrue in real situations. Thirdly, asking a question that in reality consists of more questions than one, sometimes causes the answer to be ambiguous. Problems arise also from the way people answer the questions, no matter how well formulated they might be. Garrett mentions that it has been found that, in general, respondents are more inclined to answer questions in a manner that presents themselves in a favourable light, or is in some other manner acceptable socially. Respondents also tend to favour answering in a compliant way, no matter what the question is. Finally, according to Garrett, some problems might also arise from the innate traits of the researchers themselves. For example, it has been found that in some cases, the sex or ethnicity of the researcher affected the respondents' answers.

Additionally, Garrett mentions that the way societal treatment studies are conducted differs from the other mainstream approaches and thus the problem with them is a bit different. Some researchers see them as inferior to, say, the matched-guise technique. Because of their nature, societal treatment studies are thought to lack the precision of more statistical methods. It is also thought that their results are not as easy to generalize as the results of studies using different approaches.

2.2.3 Discourse analytic approach to language attitude study

The developments in psychology, especially the rise of discursive psychology, are important for contemporary language attitude research and thus a brief overview will be provided on the matter.

In the 1990s a new orientation, discursive psychology, emerged from the old psychological paradigm (Harré and Gillett 1994, Edwards and Potter 1992). Before, experimental psychology had reigned supreme for decades. It was rooted on the belief that it was not possible to study the mind as such, and that because of this, psychology should concentrate on doing research on the visible human behaviour prompted by

controlled external stimuli. The relation between the two was seen as the only worthy subject for psychological research. Later, the experimental school was replaced by cognitive psychology, in what Harré and Gillett call "the first cognitive revolution" (1994). This "revolution" was partly based on the development of computers and computing sciences. Cognitive psychology retained the earlier experimental methodology but its focus was on the mental processes of the human brain. Brains were seen as organic computers, so to say, processing information on set mechanisms and rules. These processes were thought to be impossible to observe in a straightforward manner, so the only way to actually study them was to focus on behaviour. Behaviour, it was thought, would reflect these underlying processes. Hypotheses were formulated and experiments designed to find proof for them.

From these starting points, discursive psychology grew. Harré and Gillett (1994: 18) go as far as to call the rise of discursive psychology the second cognitive revolution. Essentially, discursive psychology sees psychological phenomena, such as memory, emotion or attitudes, from a discursive point of view. Or, as Potter and Edwards phrased it (1992: 2): "the focus of discursive psychology is the action orientation of talk and writing". It is important to understand that for discursive psychology, behaviour and discourse are not the manifestations of some underlying mental activity, as in the former paradigm (Edwards and Potter 1992: 2; Harré and Gillett 1994: 27). Discourse and behaviour are studied as they occur and mindful of the context in which they occur. The psychological phenomena are seen as being constructed and meaningful in the situations in which they are brought forth.

All this relates back to language attitudes. As discussed earlier, the way in which attitudes are seen, has changed quite a bit. For example, according to Harré and Gillett (1994: 22), attitudes should not be regarded as stable mental entities that cause people to behave in a certain manner but rather they should be thought of as something that is actualized in situations where people express judgement, make decisions or perform actions. For the study of language attitudes this means that instead of going around asking people about their language attitudes or trying to study them in some other manner, the focus should be on inspecting when and how language attitudes come forth in real situations, and what is achieved by this.

The discourse analytic approach to studying language attitudes has introduced new terminology to the field of linguistics: the concept of *interpretative repertoires*, alternatively known as *linguistic repertoires*. The phrase *interpretative repertoires* is not as known as old and familiar concepts of linguistics like morpheme, although it is not a new invention either. In fact, it dates back to the 1980s (for example, Gilbert and Mulkey: 1984; Potter and Wetherell: 1987). This section will explain the concept and its use.

Potter and Wetherell define the interpretative repertoire (1987: 138) as "a lexicon or register of terms and metaphors drawn upon to characterize and evaluate actions or events". They also state that the concept of interpretative repertoires originates from the discourse analytic studies conducted in the 1980s and that it can be seen as a response to and a variation of Moscovici's theory of social representations. Moscovici began his work as early as in the 1960s. In one of his later articles on the matter Moscovici (1988: 214) defines social representations as mental models that help people understand the world. They are used to categorize people and explain different social phenomena. Social representations exist in texts and other forms of discourse, as well as in people's heads and thus enable scientists to study the social representations of societies long gone by. Moscovici (1988: 214) uses drug use as an example to illustrate how reality is constructed through social representations: drug use can be seen as a genetical trait or symptom of growing up in a broken family, for example. The way it is seen then affects the way drug use and drug users are treated in society. Social representations are born when scientific knowledge gets passed around in interactions of the masses and evolves into something simpler. Moscovici (1988: 215-216) emphasises that all people take part in this by simply interacting with others.

Potter and Wetherell (1987: 142), although recognising the importance of Moscovici's theory, also criticise it and point out some problems with it. According to them, problems arise when the theory meets practice. The first problems emerge when the relationship between groups and representations is examined. The theory suggests that groups are created by their shared representations. Potter and Wetherell point out that the theory provides no clear way of differentiating one representation from another, making empirical studies thus difficult. When empirical studies on social representations are conducted the researchers tend to choose very homogenous groups

and then examine their representations. If groups are defined by their representations and representations are classified through groups, one just ends up with a very ambiguous situation that resembles circular reasoning quite a bit. The second problematic issue concerns consensus (Potter and Wetherell 1987: 144). Consensus is again only assumed beforehand in empirical studies and variation is often lost, sometimes seemingly on purpose. There are also practical problems, as often seems to be the case, when studying something that cannot be observed directly. As social representations can only be observed through discourse, Potter and Wetherell (1987: 145) question how researchers can differentiate between language and the actual phenomena they are trying to study. This leads straight back to the concept of interpretative repertoires. They suggest that the theory of interpretative repertoires has the advantage that it was constructed in analytical practice and thus it avoids the pitfalls of the theory of social representations. For example, the last problem is avoided by concentrating on discourse and not trying to use it only as a medium to reach something else.

One of the fundamental discourse analyses making use of interpretative repertoires focused on scientific discourse and the way scientists talk about their own research as opposed to research by other scientists. This study was conducted by Gilbert and Mulkey (1984). They studied the interpretative repertoires that scientists studying biochemistry used in their published articles, letters, other similar written documents and interviews. This way they could look at how the repertoires differed in formal and informal situations. It is also important to note that all the data concerned the same events and beliefs. Their results suggested that two different repertoires were used: the empiristic repertoire and the contingent repertoire. The empiristic repertoire was used in the published articles and other sort of formal situations, but also in the informal interviews. The contingent repertoire, in contrast, was used only in the informal situations. Basically, the scientists used the empiristic repertoire when discussing their own work. This repertoire emphasised the scientific process of studying data and then formulating a theory based on it. It used only little, if any at all, mentions of the author and used the basic impersonal and neutral style of scientific writing. The contingent repertoire was often used in the interviews when talking about another scientist's work that the speaker did not agree with. It emphasised that scientific research is affected by personal characteristics, social ties and commitments that have little to do with actual

science. The erroneous ways of others were described using this repertoire. On the occasion when these two repertoires were used in the same context, a specific device that Gilbert and Mulkay named the *truth will out*, was used to account for the clash between the two different repertoires. If faced with the question of what the point of any scientific research is, if it can so easily be affected with factors that have nothing to do with it, the scientists used the device and said that although this may be the case now, eventually the truth will come out.

2.2.4 Guidelines for studying discourse

Potter and Wetherell (1987: 158-176) list some general guidelines for studying discourse. First, one has to formulate a clear research question. It is obvious that in discourse analysis the research questions can vary greatly, but that the focus will always be on the text or speech itself. Discourse, in itself, is an interesting medium and not solely a means to an end. In language attitude research, one might, for example, be interested in what different language attitudes expressed in newspaper articles are trying to achieve. Are positive attitudes towards a minority language expressed in order to affect politicians and get more money for the preservation of the minority language? Or are they expressed for some other purpose?

Secondly, the researcher has to choose the material he or she will be studying. When doing discourse analysis, the size of the sample can vary considerably, and as Potter and Wetherell (1987: 161) note, using a smaller sample, sometimes as small as only one text, does not necessarily mean that the study is doomed to fail. Occasionally, it is the wise choice as discourse analysis can be a very time-consuming research method and a bigger corpus of data does not automatically make the results any more valid. For example, in the context of language attitude studies, the researcher can easily study how attitudes are constructed and what they are trying to achieve by using a smaller sample. He or she does not necessarily need to study and analyse hundreds of different newspaper articles but can concentrate on a select few.

Next, the researcher has to collect the materials they will be studying. It is worth noting that usually the data used for a discourse analytic study already exists in some form and does not require the researcher's interaction with the participants. Thus the collection of

data is often fairly easy and straightforward. Potter and Wetherell (1987: 161-163) state that the advantage of using this type of pre-existing material is in its authenticity. After all, natural texts and speech often include elements which might have been left out in controlled interviews or questionnaires, either because of the way the interaction is structured or because the respondent feels that a controlled situation calls for controlled answers. Continuing with the earlier example, the researcher interested in language attitudes expressed in newspapers, would undoubtedly collect different newspaper articles to study authentic discourse. It would indeed be quite illogical to try to study the topic using some other type of data. Despite the advantage of authenticity of natural texts and speech, Potter and Wetherell still regard interviews and similar methods as an excellent way of procuring data, and encourage other researchers to use data gathered from both natural sources and interview, for example. Lack of coherence in the answers provided by interviews is sometimes regarded problematic but Potter and Wetherell (1987: 163-165) remind that for discourse analysts variability in the interviewees' answers is not a bad thing but it is in fact embraced. If the researcher uses recorded interviews or records of natural speech, the next step is making a transcript for analysis. A good transcription requires both time and skill, but is worth the trouble. If the researcher uses written texts, they can proceed straight to coding the data into smaller pieces that are easier to manage and analyse. It is important to remember that coding is only a tool to make the actual analysis easier and thus it should include as much material as possible. Even cases that might seem unimportant or not related to anything should be included, as they might provide important information later on.

After completing all the previous tasks, one can finally move on to analysing the data. Potter and Wetherell (1987: 168) emphasise that for discourse analysis there are no pre-existing directions of how the analysis should be conducted. However, common procedures do exist: finding patterns in the data, forming hypotheses about the tasks they perform and finding linguistic evidence to support one's theory. Patterns will only emerge from the data after meticulously reading it time after time. In the beginning one might have many false starts before any significant and systematic patterns arise. It is important to remember that not only do patterns appear in the form of similarities, but that sometimes they emerge in the form of differences. Again, the earlier example of a researcher would proceed with his or her research with reading and re-reading the

newspaper articles chosen before and try to distinguish different functions through language use.

When conducting any form of research, it is extremely important for the researcher to validate their study, especially their results and conclusions. In the case of discourse analysis, this is particularly important because of the nature of the approach. Potter and Wetherell (1987: 169) instruct to employ several techniques to bring validation to one's study. Coherence between the analysis and data is especially crucial. Making claims that are not supported by the data or leaving many gaps in one's explanations are likely to make the analysis appear incomplete and unreliable. One should also consider the application of one's findings. How do they relate to the real world around us? Potter and Wetherell (1987: 174-175) say that sometimes discourse analysis is under criticism over the notion that it has little to do with the real world. This is obviously not the case, as the way the world is perceived relies greatly on different forms of discourse. Thus, understanding how different discourses shape our perception of the world indeed does have practical applications. The researcher studying language attitudes in newspaper articles might, for example, argue that as newspapers are widely read, the attitudes expressed in them affect the general public and thus it is important to inspect what the attitudes expressed are trying to achieve.

In the last stage of the process of studying discourse, the researcher should naturally present their study, usually through writing a report on it. Potter and Wetherell (1987: 172-174) do not give any clear steps which to follow to achieve this but note that discourse analytic papers usually have a longer analysis section and include many examples to back up the analysis. The report on the functions of different language attitudes in newspapers would probably include numerous relevant examples from the newspaper articles chosen for the study.

2.3 Research on language attitudes in Finland

In Finland, language attitudes have been studied to some extent. Finnish education system puts heavy emphasis on Swedish, the second official language in Finland, and English, so most studies focus on these two languages. In this section six Finnish studies on language attitudes will be reviewed. The first four studies were chosen to

introduce Finnish language attitude studies with varying focuses and methods. The last two studies reviewed share some aspects with the present study and were included because of that. The oldest of the reviewed studies are from 1997 and the newest from 2010. Most studies focused only on attitudes towards English but a study focusing on attitudes towards several languages was included as well to show some variety. The studies also varied in the methods they used and the aspects they emphasised.

The first study is that of Pihko (1997). She studied how well Finnish upper secondary school students understood several different native and non-native pronunciation varieties of English. Although her focus was not solely on attitudinal judgement of the said pronunciation varieties, the study does provide some information on the subjects' attitudes, too.

In Pihko's study (1997: 17-24), intelligibility is understood as a socio-psycho-linguistic phenomenon. In other words, intelligibility is seen to be affected by three components: the linguistic component which includes, for example, phonetic and syntactic features, the psycholinguistic component including different knowledge systems, and lastly the sociolinguistic component featuring interpersonal factors such as attitudes. The relevance of Pihko's study for the present study lies especially in the sociolinguistic side of the phenomenon.

The data was gathered from approximately 300 Finnish upper secondary school students. They did a partial dictation listening comprehension test. The subjects listened to tapes recorded in different English varieties and filled in the missing gaps in their transcripts of the speech. Pihko used nine different English varieties in the partial dictation test. Five of these were native varieties, one was an ESL variety and three were EFL varieties. Three of the native varieties were the types of standard varieties that are commonly used in educational contexts in Finland: slowly paced British English, fast paced British English and general American English. The other native varieties were colloquial British English and Midwestern American English. The ESL variety was Gambian English and the EFL varieties used were Finnish English, German English and Ethiopian English. The recordings were partially similar to those used in matched-guise studies, a research method which in the present study was discussed in section 2.2.1. The students also filled in two questionnaires. The first questionnaire asked questions

about their background information and the second questionnaire asked them to assess their performance in the partial dictation test. Pihko's study had other parts in addition to the ones mentioned above, but their relevance to the present study is minimal and thus they are not focused on in this review.

The results showed that the Finnish students understood the slow British and German Englishes best. These were followed by the colloquial British, general American and Finnish Englishes. Next came the fast British and Ethiopian Englishes. The least intelligible ones were the Gambian and Midwest American Englishes. For the purposes of the present study, the students own evaluations of the intelligibility of the different English varieties are of specific interest, as their evaluations can be seen as a reflection of their attitudes towards these English varieties. Basically, the students held the native varieties in the highest regard. Although the Midwest American English was one of the least intelligible ones, the students' attitudes towards it were fairly favourable. The appreciation of the native varieties was mainly expressed indirectly through the evaluations of the non-native varieties. The results showed that the students viewed the native varieties as models for "good" English, as the non-native varieties were described as being "strange" and "bad".

The second study reviewed is that of Haapea (1999). The study focused on the language attitudes Finnish adolescents have towards different varieties of English and the speakers of these different varieties. Haapea used the matched-guise technique to find out if Finnish youngsters had differing attitudes towards different varieties of English and their speakers. She also wanted to find out if the aspect of nativeness affected the attitudes. Thus her study owes a lot to Lambert et al. and their research on language attitudes (see section 2.2.1 of the present study).

Haapea collected data from 210 Finns who were at the time the data was collected either in a sixth form college or a vocational school. The subjects listened to four short recordings of people reading out loud a text and then answered a questionnaire formulated by the researcher. Two of the recorded speakers were native (American and British) and two were non-native (African and Finnish). The questionnaire had two sections: the first section had personal questions, for example, those of age and sex,

whereas the second section had the actual evaluative questions on the speech samples. The results were analysed using different quantitative methods.

Haapea learned that all students had a more favourable attitude towards the native speakers and their accents. The evaluation of the American speaker was the most positive, followed by the British speaker. The Finnish and African speakers were evaluated more negatively. This means that the attitude the students had towards their own accent, the Finnish accent, was unfavourable. On a different note, Haapea also discovered that females and sixth formers tended to react more favourably towards the speakers and their accents whereas males and students of vocational schools had a more negative attitude. Haapea suggests that the attitudes present in her findings may be because the Finnish school system uses mainly the Standard American and Standard British Englishes as the models for correctness.

The third study inspected here was conducted by Kansikas (2002). Kansikas studied the different attitudes Finnish students had towards several different languages, including but not limited to languages such as English, Spanish, Russian and Finnish. She was also interested in finding out if there was any difference in the way males and females regarded the different languages. Special attention was given to English and Swedish, as these languages are studied in all of Finland, and all the students had studied them at some point of their lives. Her study relies heavily on that of Kashkin (2001, as quoted in Kansikas 2002) in Russia that was very similarly constructed and was used as a model for Kansikas' study.

The data was collected by means of a questionnaire from 70 Finnish sixth formers and it was analysed using both quantitative and qualitative methods. The questionnaire was based on that of Kashkin (2001, as quoted in Kansikas 2002). The questionnaire had two different assignments. The first task had ten different statements with adjective superlatives (such as ... *is the most beautiful language*) and the students were asked to fill in what language they thought matched the statement. In the second task they were asked to fill in what they thought certain languages selected by the researcher were like and what they were suited for. Some personal information such as sex and grades in English and Swedish were also asked.

Shortly put, the students regarded the different languages thus: French was the most beautiful language; Russian was the ugliest and the most difficult language; English was the most precise, the easiest and the richest language; Swedish was the poorest language; Estonian was the funniest language; German the most serious and the most correct language (Kansikas 2002: 64). Some statements had more variety in the answers and sometimes a language that was deemed *the most ... language* was closely followed by several other popular languages. From the students' answers to the second part of the questionnaire it became clear that English was regarded as nice, easy and ordinary and it was thought to be suited for TV, international events and everyone. Russian was thought to be difficult, ugly and stupid and it was viewed suitable for Russians. German was also viewed as difficult but also nice. It was seen as suitable for detective series and Central Europe. Estonian was regarded similar to Finnish, funny and nice and it was seen suitable for Estonians. French was seen as difficult, but also beautiful and romantic and it was thought to be suitable for romantic films, France, literature and music. Finnish was associated with positive adjectives such as beautiful, nice and lovely. It was regarded as suitable for Finns and Finland. Adjectives describing Swedish were rather mixed: it was thought to be nice but also stupid and obscure. Swedish was seen as suitable for Swedes and Sweden. The last of the languages, Spanish, was viewed as interesting, passionate and temperamental and it was thought to be suitable for Spain and travelling.

Kansikas also found that the students' grades in English and Swedish had some influence on the way they described these two languages. For example, both students with lower and higher grades in English regarded English as an easy language but students with lower grades in Swedish had a more negative view on it: Swedish was thought to be difficult.

The fourth study reviewed is also one of the most recent ones in Finland. It was conducted by Leppänen et al. (2009). It is also one of the biggest studies encountered while reviewing different Finnish studies on language attitudes. Leppänen et al. did a large quantitative survey on Finns and English, covering topics such as roles and functions of English, and attitudes, values and emotions concerning English. The study is part of a bigger collaboration project conducted in the universities of Helsinki and Jyväskylä. The study shared some elements with that of Preisler (2003) but the main

difference between the earlier study and that of Leppänen et al. is its scope. Leppänen et al.'s aim was to study the relationship between the English language and Finnish people on a national level, whereas the previous study by Preisler and other similar ones have usually concentrated on smaller groups and not on the whole population of a specific nation.

The survey was conducted in 2007 together with Tilastokeskus. Over a thousand Finns answered a set of 42 questions which mapped their thoughts on English and its position in Finland and seven questions about their background information. The actual research questions of the survey were grouped into six thematically different groups: languages in the respondents' lives, English in the respondents' lives, learning English and English skills, use of English, English and the respondents' mother tongues, and the future of English. The answers were analysed quantitatively using the SSPS and SAS programs.

The results were published in 2009. Leppänen et al. found that most Finns regard themselves as monolingual. Although they are regularly in contact with other languages, such as English, and use it in their lives, they seemed to equate bilingualism or multilingualism with native-like linguistic competence. The results also showed that English is an important language for Finnish people, more so than Swedish. English was a familiar language for Finns and attitudes towards English were favourable and positive. In addition, Finns appreciated other languages than English as well and thought it important to know languages other than English. The Finns assessed their own English skills as fairly good, although the results showed that they also found room for improvement. Most commonly English was used in leisure-related situations, although its use was prominent in work-place environments, too. Young people used English more frequently than older people. Finnish people did not see codeswitching in a negative light but claimed to understand English words and phrases mixed with Finnish well, and a great amount of Finns admitted to codeswitching themselves in informal situations. The final area of focus for the survey was English in the future. Finns thought that although Finnish would keep its status as the most important language in Finland, English would become more prominent with time.

Leppänen et al. note that the issue with monolingual identity vs. bilingual identity is an interesting one. As stated above, although the English skills of Finnish people are

generally good, at least according to their own assessments, their attitudes towards English are favourable and they are in contact with English regularly, they still do not regard themselves as bilinguals. Leppänen et al. speculate that this might be partly caused by the fact that the Finnish national identity has traditionally been very closely connected with the Finnish language and identifying themselves as monolinguals is used to strengthen their Finnish identity, consciously or unconsciously.

2.3.1 Language attitude research especially relevant to the present study

In this section two studies conducted in Finland on language attitudes will be looked at more closely. These two particular studies are very relevant to the present study as one of them shares the same understanding of attitudes and the other one the same data with the present study.

The first study was conducted by Hyrkstedt (1997). In this study, a discourse analytic method was used to find out what types of attitudes Finnish college students had to the English language. The study adopted a social constructionist view of an attitude and used interpretative repertoires as a tool for analysis.

In Hyrkstedt's study a group of students was asked to write a reply to a Letter-to-the-Editor, which Hyrkstedt had formulated based on real articles and letters published in actual newspapers in Finland. The letter expressed a concern that Finnish was losing its vitality to English and that the English skills of Finns were not good. It also suggested that a good method for preserving the Finnish language would be to make new laws. Hyrkstedt studied the students' replies using a discourse analytic method and identifying the interpretative repertoires used in the replies. The study relies heavily on Potter and Wetherell (1987).

Hyrkstedt identified two basic attitudes, negative and positive, in the letters. The positive attitude meant that the writer agreed with the statements in the Letter-to-the-Editor, meaning that the writer felt that English was indeed a threat to Finnish. Those holding a negative attitude, in contrast, disagreed with the arguments presented in the letter and did not think of English as a threat to Finnish. The two attitudes were supported by using several different interpretative repertoires.

In the replies with a positive attitude, four different interpretative repertoires could be identified. These were the separatist repertoire, the national-romanticist repertoire, the fatalist repertoire and the realist repertoire. In the replies with a negative attitude, on the other hand, three different repertoires were found: the empiricist repertoire, the nationalist repertoire and the rationalist repertoire (Hyrkstedt 1997: 50). Of all these repertoires, the separatist repertoire was used the most (with 17 instances) and the realist repertoire the least (with 7 instances). The repertoires used by those who agreed with the arguments presented by the Letter-to-the-Editor relied more on appealing to the reader's emotions and values. The repertoires used in replies disagreeing with the Letter-to-the-Editor, in contrast, emphasized rationality and common sense (Hyrkstedt 1997: 82).

The second study reviewed is that of Petrow (2010). Petrow was interested in finding out what kinds of attitudes Finnish future professionals of English had towards the English language, although some interest was also placed on how English compares to Finnish in the subjects' minds. She notes (2010: 19) that the study conducted by Jenkins (2007) bears similarities to that of her own.

The data for the study was collected from Finnish university students of English during 2005 and 2006 using a questionnaire. It is part of a larger research project called *From Novice to Expert* conducted in Jyväskylä University. In the questionnaire the students were asked several open ended questions about their opinions and feelings concerning the English and Finnish languages (for example: *In my opinion, English is ...* or *In my opinion, English sounds ...*). Petrow used four of the questions for her study and analysed the answers the students had given using both qualitative and quantitative methods by grouping similar adjectives, noun phrases and verbs together. This practice was adopted from Jenkins' study (2007).

The results suggest that Finnish future experts of English have a positive attitude towards English. Their attitude towards Finnish was notably more negative than towards English. Thus, they had a higher regard for English than their own mother tongue. Petrow's findings can be contrasted with those of Pihko (1997), Haapea (1999) and Kansikas (2002) and Leppänen et al. (2009). Pihko and Haapea noted that Finnish

students tended to evaluate their own accent of English negatively. In Kansikas' and Leppänen et al.'s studies it became clear that Finns have a generally favourable attitude towards the English language. In this context, Petrow's findings interlock with previous research seamlessly.

3 PRESENT STUDY

Now that some key features of the theoretical background for the present study have been introduced and relevant studies reviewed, it is time to shift the focus from the works of others on the present study at hand. The aim of this section is to introduce the present study. First, the aims of the present study will be presented. Next, the data and participants will be introduced. Lastly, a brief presentation of methodology, coding and the analysis process will be given.

In the section that introduces the data used in the present study, the English text is speckled with some Finnish. This is because the data was gathered by the means of a questionnaire which was in Finnish. When examples from the actual data appear, the original answer is placed first, followed by the code of the student and the year from which the example is from. The translation is placed below the original.

As general guidelines for doing discourse analysis were already discussed earlier in section 2.2.4, the methodology section will not repeat the same advice all over again but makes references to section 2.2.4 when necessary.

3.1 Aims of the present study

As the Finnish studies on language attitudes reviewed in section 2.3 and 2.3.1 revealed, it could be generalised that in Finland the attitude towards the English language is a favourable one. The study by Petrow (2010) also indicates that the attitudes towards English held by Finnish students of English are also generally positive. Finnish students see English even more positively than Finnish, their own mother tongue.

As previous research has already tackled the underlying attitudes of Finns from a more mentalist angle, the present study approaches the topic of attitudes from a discourse analytic perspective, as suggested by Potter and Wetherell (1987) and later adopted by Hyrkstedt (1997) in the Finnish context. This means that the interest of the present study is in the way attitudes are constructed in discourse. Thus the focus of the present study lies in the interpretative repertoires used to express language attitudes. Consequently, the interpretative repertoire is the basic analytic unit of the present study.

Although the discourse analytic approach to attitudes is not new and the interpretative repertoire was already introduced in the 1980s, discourse analytic studies on language attitudes that use the interpretative repertoire as their unit of analysis are few and far between. In fact, the study by Hyrkstedt (1997) was just about the only one encountered while reviewing previous language attitude research for the present study. Studies that would focus on comparing how the repertoires change when constructing attitudes towards different languages and how the repertoires change with time are next to none. Essentially, comparative studies have not been done. This lack of comparative research is the main motivation for the present study.

The motivation for the present study discussed above reflects straight on the aims of the present study. In general terms the aims of the present study have a time-wise longitudinal aspect as well as a diagonal one between two different languages. The main idea is to first identify and then compare the interpretative repertoires. Thus, more specifically, the present study has four aims. The first one is to identify what types of interpretative repertoires Finnish students of English use when discussing English. The second aim is similar to the first one, to find out what types of interpretative repertoires are used when the language discussed is Finnish. What types of linguistic features are used? What purposes do the different repertoires serve? The third aim is to compare the repertoires used in these two contexts. Are there any similarities or only differences between the repertoires? The fourth aim is to examine whether the time spent studying English at university level has had any effect on the interpretative repertoires used in these two contexts. Have there been any changes in the repertoires the students used when discussing English in 2010 when compared to those the students used in 2005? Are there similar changes in repertoires used to talk about Finnish in 2010?

So, to summarise, the aims of the present study are the following:

- Identify what types of interpretative repertoires are used when discussing English and when discussing Finnish
- Compare the repertoires used when discussing the two languages to see if there are any similarities or differences
- Examine whether time has had an effect on the repertoires used when discussing the two languages

These aims are accomplished by analysing and comparing data that was collected already in 2005 and 2010 for another research project but was made available for the present study in 2014. The data was collected by two separate questionnaires. Both questionnaires were very similar and thus the students completed almost all the tasks chosen for analysis twice. They were open-ended sentence completion tasks where the students were asked to write about their opinions on Finnish and English in Finnish. An extra open-ended question was also included from the 2010 questionnaire. Thus it is not only possible to compare the general repertoires used but also to make direct comparisons between the students' answers in 2005 and 2010.

Additionally, it is good to note at this point that, as pointed out by Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Wetherell and Potter (1988), discourse analysis is a qualitative approach to language attitude research. Consequently, the present study will not try to decipher any sort of quantitative results from the data, as these types of quantitative aims are best suited for other methods of analysis.

3.2 Data and participants

The data used in the present study was originally gathered as a part of the *From Novice to Expert* research project housed in Jyväskylä University (see https://www.jyu.fi/hum/laitokset/kielet/oppiaineet_kls/englanti/research/projects/noveks2011 for more information). The aim of the research project was to study beliefs and attitudes held by students of English. A large amount of diverse data was gathered for the project between 2005 and 2010. The participants answered different questionnaires several times, made drawings and wrote autobiographies about themselves as language learners and also formulated their own teaching philosophies. Because the data was gathered during several years, it was also possible to study how the beliefs and attitudes developed during the course of the participants' studies.

The present study makes use of the data gathered by means of questionnaires in the beginning and end of the research project. The participants (N=120) were students of English who answered a questionnaire in the beginning of their studies, during their first academic year in autumn 2005 or spring 2006. The students attended a mandatory

course, *Learning to Learn Foreign Languages*, where the questionnaire was incorporated into one of the lessons as an exercise. In 2010 a smaller amount of the same students (N=38) answered a similar questionnaire online. As one can observe from the numbers, the latter questionnaire did not get as many answers as the first one, possibly because answering it was not obligatory in any way but depended more on the students' own enthusiasm. Nevertheless, there were enough participants to make at least some general comparisons between the first and the second questionnaires possible. As the identities of the participants were also known, it was possible to make comparisons between the repertoires used by certain individuals in 2005 and in 2010.

The first questionnaire had seven open-ended sentence completion tasks (see appendix 1). The participants were asked to fill in their opinions about several themes. For example, they were asked to complete the sentence *Kun puhun englantia, tunnen itseni...* (*When I speak in English, I feel...*). The second questionnaire had fourteen questions (see appendix 2), of which seven were the same open-ended sentence completion tasks as in the first questionnaire. In addition, open-ended questions were asked. For example, the students were asked to reflect on their experiences and answer briefly question number three: *Miten englannin taitosi on kehittynyt yliopistossa: mitkä puolet kielitaidossasi ovat kehittyneet ja miten olet niitä kehittänyt?* (*How have your English skills developed while studying at the university: what aspects of your linguistic abilities have developed and how have you developed them?*).

From the 2005 and the 2010 questionnaires, the following three open-ended sentence completion tasks were chosen for analysis: *Englannin kieli on minusta...* (*In my opinion, the English language is...*), *Suomen kieli on minusta...* (*In my opinion, the Finnish language is...*) and *Verrattuna suomen kieleen englanti on minusta...* (*In my opinion, when compared with the Finnish language, English is...*). From the 2010 questionnaire, the following question was also chosen for analysis: *Mitä englannin kieli merkitsee sinulle tänä päivänä, nyt kun olet yliopisto-opintojesi loppuvaiheessa tai jo valmistunut?* (*What does the English language mean to you today, now that you are almost finished with your studies or have already graduated?*). These specific items were chosen for analysis because they focused on the participants' general opinions about English and Finnish and were thus best suited for analysing the repertoires used when discussing the two languages on a more general level. The other sentence

completion tasks had a slightly different focus, as did the other open-ended questions of the final questionnaire, and were not included in the analysis for this reason. The task where students were asked to compare English to Finnish was thought to show how the participants manage the diverse repertoires when they are asked to compare the two languages.

This data was chosen for the present study for several reasons. First of all, the open-ended sentence completion tasks are a suitable method for studying interpretative repertoires when the topic in question is language attitudes. The nature of the questionnaire and the situation in which it was answered places the data somewhere in between authentic and artificial. Although the data was gathered by means of a questionnaire, which traditionally has been seen as a controlled and somewhat artificial way of gathering data, the classroom environment and situation in which the questionnaire was filled in made it more authentic than what it might have been, had the context been different. The fact that the questionnaire used open-ended sentence completion tasks gave the participants the freedom to answer just as they pleased. Their answers ranged from only a few words to lengthier expositions, which implies that this freedom was indeed used. For example, when the students were asked to complete the sentence *Suomen kieli on minusta...* (*In my opinion, the Finnish language is...*) in 2005, the student in example 1 answered with only one word, whereas the student in example 2 wrote a longer explanation.

- (1) ainutlaatuista. (F68, 2005)
incomparable.
- (2) pieni ja pikkuruinen mutta juuri minun kieleni! Kun on kauan aikaa matkalla eikä kuule suomen kieltä, sitä tulee jo kova ikävä. Sitten kun sitä kuulee niin tuntuu kotoisalta. Suomi on kaunis kieli. Sanastoltaan hauska. Suomi on vaikea kieli, mutta on mukavaa kun ei itse huomaa sen olevan vaikea kieli... (F120, 2005)
small and tiny but just my language! When you travel for a long time and can't hear Finnish, you start to miss it a lot. Then when you hear it, you start to feel like home. Finnish is a beautiful language. Has a funny vocabulary. Finnish is a difficult language but it's nice when you yourself can't notice that it's difficult...

Additionally, compared to multiple-choice questions, this format prompts more creative use of language. On the other hand, analysing over a hundred longer essays about the same topics might have proven quite difficult and time-consuming. Having the participants complete sentences instead of just asking them to write about their opinions concerning English and Finnish also somewhat eliminates the so-called “fear of a blank page” which might have affected the amount of answers received, had the participants

been asked to write longer essays. The reason for using for using this type of pre-existing data is that it enables analysing whether time affects the repertoires used. Having data from 2005 and 2010 makes it possible for the present study to compare the repertoires used in 2005 with those used in 2010. Had the data been collected only shortly prior to studying it, this type of longitudinal approach would have been impossible.

As is emphasised in Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Wetherell and Potter (1988), this type of research is always highly context sensitive and the results depend on the data used. Thus it is good to remember to keep the findings of the present study in proportion with the context of the data. Undoubtedly, the results will not be generalisable to students of other subjects in other countries, or to the general Finnish population, but this in fact is not even the aim of this type of research. As Tuomi and Sarajärvi (2003: 27) note, one could say that essentially, qualitative research aims to gain a more profound and deeper knowledge of the subject. The aim is not to explain but to understand. They say that especially on the scientific fields that focus on studying people, such as psychology or sociology, emphasising with the motivations, opinions, thoughts and the mental state of the subjects is crucial. Eskola and Suoranta (2005: 16) also emphasise the importance of giving voice to the people who are being studied. Their viewpoint is very much relevant and the researcher should not dismiss it. This is, to some extent, what has been done in the present study as well. The personal voice of the participants is important, and thus all results will be presented alongside actual extracts from the data. This will hopefully help let the students' voices shine through.

The participants (N=120) were all students of English at Jyväskylä University when data gathering began in 2005. English was either the major subject or the minor subject of the participants. Most of the participants who studied English as their major subject had been accepted into the teacher training programme at the beginning of their studies. The majority of the participants were women. All students except two spoke Finnish as their mother tongue. The two non-Finnish speaking students had English and Swedish as their mother tongues. The vast majority of the participants (N=38) who also answered the final questionnaire in 2010 were still students at Jyväskylä University, although three of them had already graduated. Although the number of students participating in the latter questionnaire was smaller, there were no significant changes in their

backgrounds, meaning that the ratios of males and females and other such matters staid the same. As the present study does not focus on factors such as sex or age and does not try to gain quantitative results, exact numbers and percentages are not of importance and thus will not be discussed in greater length here.

3.3 Method, coding and analysis

As stated above, the present study makes use of a discourse analytic approach. The idea for using this approach came from various sources, most important of which were Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Hyrkstedt (1997). This method was chosen because while it is certainly not a new approach to language attitude studies, it has not been used that frequently either. Focusing on discourse and how language attitudes are constructed also helps to avoid some of the problematic issues that arise from the use of more traditional methods (see section 2.2.2). For example, Potter and Wetherell (1987: 35) mention as the interest is in the discourse itself and not in the attitudes thought to be hiding behind it, one can evade the problematic issue of whether the attitudes constructed through discourse are indeed the real and actual ones under inspection, or whether the people expressing them just want to give the researcher a certain impression of themselves.

This methodology has not only been used by Hyrkstedt (1997) in Finland. In fact, several more recent studies exist: those by Heikkinen (1999), Isomöttönen (2003) and Keski-Heiska (2009). Although they do not share the same topic of language attitudes as Hyrkstedt and the present study, they all used the interpretative unit as the unit of analysis and the English language as the focus of their study. An additional common feature for these three studies was that they all used learner autobiographies as their data. Heikkinen (1999) studied the way failure and success in English are attributed in discourse. This was done by studying ten different autobiographies written by university students of English. Five different repertoires were identified: the individualistic, the naturalistic, the efficiency, the institutional and the fatalistic repertoire. The naturalistic repertoire was most often used to explain success and the responsibility for the success was in this repertoire given to possibilities in communication. Failure, in contrast, was explained most often with the institutional repertoire and the responsibility for results lied in the institutional learning environment. Isomöttönen (2003) was interested in finding out how students who have troubles with hearing regarded their failures and

successes in their English studies. The general focus of the study by Isomöttönen is thus similar to that of Heikkinen. Isomöttönen studied eleven autobiographies written by hard-of-hearing students. She identified ten different repertoires that were used when the students wrote about their successes or failures. The first five repertoires, the auditory, the environmental, the special learner, the responsibility and the specialist, regarded hearing as fundamental for learning English and were most often used when talking about failures. The remaining five repertoires, the talent, the chance, the effort, the school and the naturalistic repertoire regarded hearing as not so important in learning English and were used when the students wrote about their successes. The most recent study was conducted by Keski-Heiska (2009) was done using the interpretative repertoire as the analytic unit to study how students of English remembered their former teachers. This study was done using the data collected for the *From Novice to Expert* project. Keski-Heiska did not make use of the same questionnaires which were used in the study by Petrow (2010) and in the present study, but instead she examined the autobiographies written by the participants in 2005. Keski-Heiska was able to identify seven different interpretative repertoires used when remembering teachers: the terror, the routine, the evaluation, the progress, the responsibility, the incompetence and the off-stage repertoires. Her chapter on methodology (2009: 44-48) was used as an inspiration for the present study.

As suggested by Potter and Wetherell (1987) and discussed earlier in section 2.4.2, the data was first sorted into four large tables in order to make the analysis easier. The first table had one row for each individual student and two separate columns for the first sentence completion task (*In my opinion, the English language is...*) from the 2005 and the 2010 questionnaires. The other tables for the other two sentence completion tasks (*In my opinion, the Finnish language is...* and *In my opinion, when compared with the Finnish language, English is...*) were organised in a similar manner. The answers to question 14 (*What does the English language mean to you today, now that you are almost finished with your studies or have already graduated?*) from the 2010 questionnaire were also placed in a separate table. The reason for grouping the answers in this manner was to facilitate the analysis process. When all answers to the same task were in the same file, it was far easier to focus on the common features in the answers for that specific task. Additionally, by placing the same tasks from different years next to each other, comparing the answers written by the same individual became easier. All

the answers were copied and then pasted in the tables from separate files and in this stage, nothing was left out.

The guidelines given by Potter and Wetherell (1987) and discussed earlier in section 2.4.2 were used as a starting point for the analysis. But, as noted in the same section, no clear-cut instructions for identifying the interpretative repertoires exist. For example, this means that there is no pre-existing list of phrases that would always indicate the use of a particular repertoire in every possible imaginable context. However, Wetherell and Potter (1988: 172) give some clues of what to look for when identifying interpretative repertoires. They urge to search for certain key words and expressions as well as grammatical and stylistic similarities, as according to them, a particular interpretative repertoire is always characterised by a limited set of these. The coded data of the present study was thus read and re-read carefully numerous times. To facilitate the analysis process further, the coded tables were printed out and similar linguistic or thematic features were highlighted with different colours. Although this might seem slightly non-academic, it helped in the initial process of identifying different repertoires and their features, by acting as a visual aid. Some participants were left out in this stage, as with closer inspection it became clear that they had not completed all the relevant tasks or answered all the relevant questions in the questionnaires. After highlighting common features and disqualifying some participants, the individual students were given codenames, according to their gender and placement on the table, to separate them from one another and avoid using their real names later on when giving examples in this written report. This was done to protect the participants' privacy. After studying the common features closely and identifying the various and most frequently used interpretative repertoires based on those features, the next logical thing to do was to hypothesise about the purposes the particular repertoires serve. Wetherell and Potter (1988: 170) note that the functions of specific repertoires are not necessarily visible straight from the data, as the functions might well be unconscious and not known to the users themselves. Thus an essential part of discourse analysis is to formulate hypotheses about what purposes the different repertoires might serve. Lastly, the repertoires used in the Finnish and the English context were examined to find out whether there were any differences or similarities between them. The repertoires used in 2005 and 2010 were also compared in this manner to see if any trends could be identified.

This chapter has briefly introduced the methodology and other relevant matters concerning the present study. Next, the actual findings will be discussed in more length.

4 FINDINGS: INTERPRETATIVE REPERTOIRES IDENTIFIED

In this chapter, the results of the present study will be reported. Each individual repertoire that was identified will be first introduced in their own sections, with examples of common features. These descriptions will also include notes on how the repertoires were used to discuss Finnish and English. Finally, a comparison between the repertoires used in 2005 and in 2010 will be made. Discussion on how the results of the present study can be linked with previous research is saved for the next chapter.

Examples are numbered and presented so that the Finnish original comes first, followed by the code for the student and the year from which the answer is from. The English translation is placed beneath the original. Although the translation is included, the analysis was naturally done on the original answers because a translation can never carry all the nuances and connotations of the original. Analysis was done first and the translations later. As most of the answers were quite short, the translated version was placed right next to the Finnish original, to make the reading of this report as convenient and easy as possible. All examples that are relevant for illustrating a particular repertoire appear in the beginning of their respective sections. This was done because most examples were useful when discussing diverse features that characterised the repertoires and thus the placement seemed a logical choice. This way it is possible to get an overview of the diverse ways the repertoire manifested in before going further and delving more deeply into the actual analysis of the examples.

Before moving on to introducing and discussing the different interpretative repertoires the basis for the categorisation is explained. When reading the data and analysing the answers given by the students, it became clear that there were two different ways in which the different repertoires could be seen. They could be seen as continuums operating around two extremes or the extremities could be seen on their own, as standing on their own. This means that, for example, in the instances where some students praised Finnish for its beauty and others described it as an ugly language, these two ways of talking about Finnish could be understood as expressions of the same repertoire or as two contrasting repertoires. A decision was made to represent the repertoires in the former manner. This was done as an acknowledgement of the traditional evaluative dimensions of language attitude studies used, for example, by

Lambert et al. (1960) and discussed by Ryan et al. (1982) and Giles and Ryan (1982). It is interesting to note at this point that this type of representation resulted in differences in the ways the repertoires were used. For example, sometimes only one end of the spectrum would be used to describe Finnish and the other to describe English.

Shortly put, four different repertoires were identified. They were named so that the name reflects the idea of a polarised continuum. The repertoires are the close – distant repertoire, the beautiful – ugly repertoire, the local – global repertoire and the easy – difficult repertoire.

4.1 The close – distant repertoire

One of the first repertoires identified was named *the close – distant repertoire*. This repertoire operates on a spectrum that indicates that the language in question is experienced as either close or distant. This repertoire was characterised by certain word choices and grammatical elements as well as thematic features that created a feeling that the language in question is in one way or another emotionally close and attached to or distant from and detached of the student. Although the repertoire includes both ends of the spectrum, they were not used in similar ways. Finnish was hardly ever experienced as something distant whereas English was seen as such by some students. For the most part, though, the students described Finnish and English as parts of themselves, mother tongues, as being familiar, safe and important, sometimes even self-evident. They were the languages of emotions, thoughts and self-expression. Essentially, English and Finnish were languages of their own, close and dear.

As noted earlier, each section in this chapter will start with examples. The following examples are from the *Suomen kieli on minusta... (In my opinion, the Finnish language is...)* sentence completion task.

- (3) tärkeä koska se on äidinkieleni (F5, 2005)
important because it is my mother tongue
- (4) –Tärkeä osa identiteettiäni. (F38, 2005)
–An important part of my identity.
- (5) tuttua ja turvallista, itsestäänselvää, kieli, jolla pääasiassa ilmaisen itseäni,– (F20, 2005)
familiar and safe, self-evident, the language with which I mainly express myself,–
- (6) Just paras. (M87, 2005)
Simply the best.
- (7) tunteiden kieli (F115, 2005)
the language of emotions

- (8) liian itsestään selvä, jotta sitä voisi analysoida tarkemmin, selkeästi oma kieli. (F98, 2005)
too self-evident that it could be analysed in more detail, clearly a language of my own.

The next four examples illustrate how the sentence *Englannin kieli on minusta...* (*In my opinion, the English language is...*) was completed.

- (9) –vahvin vieras kieleni, –mieluisin kieleni– (F20, 2005)
–my strongest foreign language, –the language most pleasant for me–
(10) –Huomaan hyvin usein ajattelevani englannin kielellä, joten siitä on tullut tavallaan
“kaksoiskieleni”. (F41, 2005)
–I very often notice thinking in English, so in a sense it has become my “double language”.
(11) –Se on suuri osa identiteettiäni. Usein sanonkin, että englanti on kuin toinen äidinkieli minulle.
Ajattelen englanniksi. (F62, 2005)
–It is a big part of my identity. I often even say that English is like a second mother tongue for
me. I think in English.
(12) kiehtova aihe, jossa haluan kehittää itseäni.– (F97, 2005)
an intriguing subject in which I want to improve myself.–

The last examples in this section illustrate how the sentence *Verrattuna suomen kieleen, englanti on minusta...* (*In my opinion, when compared with the Finnish language, English is...*) was completed.

- (13) kieli jolla on helpompi ilmaista itseään ja ajatuksiaan (F114, 2005)
a language with which it is easier to express yourself and your thoughts
(14) Englannista on tullut minulle tärkeä osa jokapäiväistä elämää– (F61, 2005)
English has become an important part of daily life for me–
(15) – etäisempi (F110, 2005)
– more distant
(16) – Englanti on myös vieraampi. (F120, 2005)
– English is also more unfamiliar.

As the examples 3 and 11 above show, the expression *äidinkieli* (*mother tongue*) appears in both cases, when discussing both Finnish and English. Using this expression is more obvious when discussing the Finnish language, as Finnish indeed was the mother tongue of most of the students. Example 3 shows use of this particular expression when discussing Finnish. When discussing English, the choice to use this type of expression, on the other hand, is quite interesting. The claim that English has a similar status as their mother tongue, indicates that the students using this repertoire have taken English so close to their hearts that it resides somewhere right next to their real mother tongue. As example 11 shows, the student describes English as being like *toinen äidinkieli* (*a second mother tongue*) for her. This sort of feeling of bilingualism was expressed frequently in similar terms as having two mother tongues or as in example 10, where the student calls English “*kaksoiskieleni*” (“*my double language*”).

Another common expression that the students used was that the language in question was, essentially, an integral *osa* (*part*) of themselves or their identity. In numerous cases, the students describe either Finnish or English or, in some cases, both as a part of themselves. The use of this expression can be seen in example 4, when the students wrote about Finnish. The way it was used when discussing English can be seen in examples 11 and 14. The word *identiteetti* (*identity*) is often paired with this expression. Personal pronouns, such as *minua* (*me*) and *itseäni* (*myself*) referring to the student himself or herself were also used with this expression. In example 14, the student says that for her English has become *tärkeä osa jokapäiväistä elämää* (*an important part of daily life*).

Another common feature that characterised this close - distant repertoire is illustrated in examples 3 and 10, for example. In these examples, in the original Finnish versions when referring to Finnish and English, the students use the first person singular possessive suffix (as possession is indicated with different suffixes in Finnish) to further strengthen their claim to the language under discussion. In example 3 the student says that Finnish is *äidinkieleni* (*my mother tongue*) and in example 10 the student calls English “*kaksoiskieleni*” (“*my double language*”). This shows that the feeling of being close to English or Finnish is not only expressed through word choices but also grammatically. English or Finnish are not only mother tongues in general but essentially theirs. The use of this grammatical element can also be seen in examples 4 and 9. In example 4, the student says that Finnish is an important part of *identiteettiäni* (*my identity*). Finnish is not just a part of the Finnish identity in general but an important part of the student's own identity. In example 9 the student mentions English as *vahvin vieras kieleni* (*my strongest foreign language*). She also writes that English was *mieluisin kieleni* (*the most pleasant language for me*). Although it does not show in the translation, she again uses the possessive suffix in the original Finnish version. Another way of indicating ownership can be seen in example 8. In this case, the student uses the Finnish word *oma* (*own*), stating that Finnish is her *oma kieli* (*own language*).

This repertoire was also characterised by the use of certain adjectives. It is good to note at this point that some of the same adjectives were also used in the other repertoires and thus the key factor is the way the adjectives are combined with other words. For example, the adjective *tärkeä* (*important*) was used in several repertoires. In the case of

the close – distant repertoire, it was paired up with words and expressions such as *äidinkieli* (*mother tongue*) and *osa identiteettiäni* (*part of my identity*), as in examples 3 and 4. In example 6, the student only says that Finnish is *paras* (*the best*). Adjectives *tuttu* (*familiar*) and *turvallinen* (*safe*) were only used in this repertoire, and their use can be seen in example 5. The adjective *rakas* (*dear*) was also used, illustrated in example 4. Other similar adjectives indicating a deep emotional involvement also appeared in the participants' answers. This sense of emotional attachment also conveys the feeling of closeness. Some students even described Finnish as *itsestäänselvä* (*self-evident*), as shown in examples 5 and 8! This adjective might seem to have a slightly negative connotation but when analysing the answer more closely, it becomes clear that Finnish is seen as a sort of a default language, becoming thus self-evident, and that the student finds it difficult to analyse her relationship with Finnish in greater detail because of this. This, again, conveys the central idea of Finnish being close to the respondent.

Adjectives were also used to indicate distance from the language in question. In examples 15 and 16 English is described as being *etäisempi* (*more distant*) or *vieraampi* (*more unfamiliar*). These types of adjectives create a sense of detachment. For these two students, English does not occupy the same space as Finnish but it is experienced as something more distant. In these examples the use of comparative form of the adjectives is explained by the way the sentence completion task was constructed.

Another way the sense of distance was expressed can be seen in example 12. The student describes English as *kiehtova aihe* (*an intriguing subject*) she wants to improve herself in. This expression creates the feeling that English is not an integral part of her like it was for some other students, but a separate entity that merely attracts her. She also notes that she wants to improve her skills in the subject. Her way of talking about English is very different from, for example, that used by the student in example 11. Another student used a very similar way to express detachment from English. She described English as *kaukainen vielä, mutta kiinnostava* (*still remote, but interesting*). This student also expresses an interest in English, while at the same time keeping her distance by stating that English feels still quite remote. Another student described English as *pakollinen taito jokaiselle nykymailmassa* (*an obligatory skill for everyone in the modern world*). This again clearly distances the student himself from English. English is merely a skill that everyone needs to have.

This idea of language as a sort of a tool to be taken out and used when needed also appeared in the Finnish context at times but not nearly as often as in the English context. One student wrote that for her Finnish was *hyvä pohja (a good foundation)* for studying other languages, such as Japanese. Interestingly, only one of the two students who did not speak Finnish as their mother tongue admitted not having any strong feelings for Finnish in general. She wrote that she found the task difficult as *minulla ei ole kauhean vahvoja tunteita suomen kieltä kohtaan (I don't have very strong feelings about the Finnish language)*. Although first it seemed that the student just avoided completing the task and answering altogether, with further analysis it became clear that this type of dodging the question in fact distanced her from the language in question as well. Thus her short answer fell into this repertoire after all.

An interesting theme that appeared often in the students' answers about the Finnish language but never in the answers about the English language was that of *ylpeys (pride)*. The students often wrote that they felt *ylpeä (proud)* of their mother tongue, Finnish. One student, for example, wrote that Finnish was *kieli, jonka hallitsemisesta voi olla ylpeä (a language one can be proud of mastering)*. Another one wrote that Finnish was her mother tongue and that *olen ylpeä siitä (I am proud of it)*.

Lastly, this repertoire was characterised by phrases which carried the thematic idea that the language discussed was especially suitable for self-expression, thoughts and emotions. In example 5, the student describes Finnish as the language she feels she mainly uses for self-expression. In example 7 Finnish is described as *tunteiden kieli (a language of emotions)*. English, in examples 10, 11 and 13 English is also described as a language that the students think with or express themselves with.

4.2 The beautiful – ugly repertoire

Another prominent repertoire that could be identified in the data was *the beautiful – ugly repertoire*. As the name already suggests, this repertoire operates on the aesthetic continuum. On one end of this continuum is the idea that the language in question is aesthetically pleasing, beautiful and pretty. On the other is the idea that the language in question is aesthetically unpleasant, and, quite frankly, ugly. The use of these types of

adjectives was, quite predictably, one of the main features that characterised this repertoire. This repertoire was used in both cases, when talking about English and Finnish. There was a difference in the use, though, as with a closer inspection it became clear that English was hardly ever described as aesthetically unpleasant. Finnish, in contrast, was described using the whole continuum of the repertoire.

The next examples illustrate how the students completed the sentence *Suomen kieli on minusta...* (*In my opinion, the Finnish language is...*).

- (17) kauniimpi ja hienempi kieli kuin usein annetaan ymmärtää. (M35, 2005)
a more beautiful and finer language than what is usually believed.
- (18) ...kaunis kieli, rikaskin.– (F37, 2005)
...a beautiful language, even rich.–
- (19) hienon kuuloinen kieli– (M67, 2005)
a fine-sounding language–
- (20) kaunis kieli, joka valitettavasti alkaa mm. nuorison keskuudessa “menettää muotoaan” englannin vaikutuksesta.– (F96, 2005)
a beautiful language which unfortunately is, for example amongst youngsters, starting to “lose its form” because of English influence.–
- (21) yksitoikkoisen kuuloista ja töksähtelevää. (F89, 2005)
monotonous-sounding and crisp.
- (22) aika ruma kieli, jos rehellisiä ollaan, mutta kun sitä on puhunut 20 vuotta (tai 19), siihen on tietenkin tottunut, ja jo pikkulapsesta lähtien tietenkin. (F102, 2005)
quite an ugly language, if being honest, but when you have spoken it for 20 years (or 19), you're naturally used to it, and already ever since childhood, naturally.
- (23) melko laahaava ja rumalta kuulostava kieli. (F105, 2005)
quite a dragging and ugly-sounding language.

The following are examples of how the sentence *Englannin kieli on minusta...* (*In my opinion, the English language is...*) was finished.

- (24) kauniin kuuloista sekä ihanan säännönmukaista. (F8, 2005)
beautiful-sounding and additionally wonderfully regular.
- (25) hieno kieli (F26, 2005)
a fine language
- (26) kaunista. Se kuulostaa ihanalta ja se saa minut haluamaan oppia sitä enemmän.– (F47, 2005)
beautiful. It sounds lovely and that causes me to want to learn more of it.–
- (27) usein paremman kuuloista kuin suomen kieli. (F93, 2005)
often better-sounding than the Finnish language.
- (28) rikas, runollinen, vivahteikas, voimakas, kaunis, tunteikas (F110, 2005)
rich, poetic, nuanced, powerful, beautiful, emotional

The next five examples illustrate how *Verrattuna suomen kieleen, englanti on minusta...* (*In my opinion, when compared with the Finnish language, English is...*) was completed.

- (29) –Esim. laulujen sanoissa suomeksi asia kuulostaisi naiivilta ja typerältä, mutta englanniksi ihan sopivalta. Englannin kieli saa asiat kuulostamaan paremmilta (mutta joskus myös kuluneemmilta, esim: I love you.) (F1, 2005)
–For example, in song lyrics something might sound naïve and stupid in Finnish but in English it sounds pretty appropriate. The English language makes things sound better (but sometimes also triter, for example: I love you.)

- (30) säännönmukaisempaa ja kauniimman kuuloista. (F8, 2005)
more regular and more beautiful-sounding.
- (31) paremman kuuloista mutta ei tärkeämpää. (F26, 2005)
better-sounding but not more important.
- (32) jollakin tavalla “sujuvampi” kieli. Yhtä kaunis, rakenteeltaan erilainen, mutta hyvin kaunis kieli. (F41, 2005)
somehow a more “fluent” language. Just as beautiful, differently structured, but a very beautiful language.
- (33) todella erilaista, laulavaisempaa, mutta ei välttämättä kauniimpaa. (F108, 2005)
very different, more sing-song-y, but not necessarily more beautiful.

As mentioned above, one of the main characteristics of this repertoire was the use of adjectives. English and Finnish were both described as *kaunis* (*beautiful*) and *hieno* (*fine*). This can be seen in examples 17 and 18 when the language discussed was Finnish and in examples 25 and 26 when the language was English. English prompted quite creative use of adjectives as illustrated in example 28. The student lists six different adjectives to describe how she sees English: for her, English is not only beautiful but also *vivahteikas* (*nuanced*), *runollinen* (*poetic*), *rikas* (*rich*), *voimakas* (*powerful*) and *tunteellinen* (*emotional*). Although on their own some of these adjectives could be understood in a different manner, here grouped together they all appear to describe various aesthetic aspects of English. English is also described as *ihana* (*lovely*) and even *parempi* (*better*) than Finnish as in examples 26 and 27.

English was also described as “*sujuvaa*” (“*fluent*”) as in example 32. This adjective clearly describes the way English sounds. It is interesting to note that Finnish is described in a totally opposite manner in examples 21 and 23. One student describes Finnish as *töksähtelevä* (*crisp*) and the other one as *laahaava* (*dragging*), which again clearly describe the way Finnish sounds. Although these examples do not come from the same student, it is an interesting difference nevertheless. Another similar adjective was *laulava* (*sing-song-y*) used in example 33. The student compares English to Finnish, and says that English sounds more sing-song-y but not necessarily more beautiful.

English was not the only language that prompted creativity in the use of adjectives. Many of the adjectives that appear in the examples above in descriptions about English were also used to describe Finnish. Finnish, too, was described as fluent, rich and lovely. *Värikäs* (*colourful*) and *voimakas* (*strong*) were also used. Finnish was additionally a *hauska* (*funny*) language with *hassunkurinen* (*an amusingly funny*) vocabulary. One student praised *ilmaisuvoima* (*the power of expression*) of Finnish and

used the Origin of Iron from the Kalevala as an example of this power. By mentioning the Kalevala, the student immediately creates an association with the mythic and ancient qualities of the Finnish language. Another student noted that in the hands of a skilled writer Finnish could be used to create *kertakaikkisen hienoa tekstiä* (*completely marvellous text*).

In this repertoire, adjectives were often combined with words that had something to do with sounds. As discussed earlier, sometimes the adjectives themselves carried a connection with the auditory world, such as *sing-song-y*. Sometimes other words were combined with the adjectives. This is the case in examples 19, 21 and 23, for example. In these examples, Finnish is described as *hienon kuuloinen* (*fine-sounding*), *monotonisen kuuloista* (*monotonous-sounding*) and *ruman kuuloista* (*ugly-sounding*). In examples 30 and 31, English is described in a similar manner, as *kauniin kuuloista* (*beautiful-sounding*) and *paremman kuuloista* (*better-sounding*). In example 26, the student says that English *kuulostaa ihanalta* (*sounds lovely*) and that this makes her want to learn more English. In example 29, a similar sentence structure is used. The student states that English *saa asiat kuulostamaan paremmilta* (*makes things sound better*). The student further emphasises her point by giving examples. She says that song lyrics, for example, sound better in English than in Finnish. Something that in Finnish would sound naïve sounds just right in English. However, the student also comments that sometimes English makes things sound *kuluneemmilta* (*triter*).

Occasionally, as shown in examples 31, 32 and 33, the students do not want to pick a clear side even when they were asked to compare English to Finnish. In example 32, the student says that she finds both English and Finnish just as beautiful. Different, yes, but beautiful nonetheless. In examples 31 and 33, the students make comparisons, but then state that although English sounds *paremmalta* (*better*) or is *laulavaisempaa* (*more sing-song-y*) it does not mean that English would also be *tärkeämpi* (*more important*) or *kauniimpi* (*more beautiful*).

As stated previously, it became clear from the data that the Finnish language prompted more mixed assessments from the students. The students used the whole spectrum of adjectives connected with the repertoire. However, English also elicited some use of adjectives with not-so-positive connotations. This is illustrated in example 29. Although

the student states that English makes things sound better, for example, in song lyrics, she also notes that sometimes this means that some phrases sound *trite* or *over-used* or *clichéd* (*kuluneelta*). She even gives an example of a phrase she finds as such: *I love you*.

An interesting device that was used in this repertoire but also in others was when the students took a position of a language expert as in example 20. The student begins by saying that Finnish is beautiful and then continues to assess the state of the Finnish language at the moment, which according to her is unfortunate because Finnish “*menettää muotoaan*” (“*is losing its form*”) because of the influence of English. Appearing as a language expert gives her earlier statement of opinion, the beauty of the Finnish language, also strength and makes it appear more convincing. Potter (1996: 133) talks about category entitlement, which basically means that by implying that one belongs into a certain category of people, language experts in this context, one's statements also sound more convincing if the topic discussed is somehow related to the field of expertise of that group. In certain contexts, just by indicating of belonging to a certain category, or group, the need to elaborate one's knowledge or where it came from disappears. For example, a doctor is assumed to know matters of health and medicine and therefore, for example, when making a diagnosis, a doctor has no need to further explain his or her knowledge. People simply assume that because he or she is categorised as a doctor, his or her knowledge of health and medicine is right. Here, in example 20, the student places herself in the category of language experts by using jargon typically connected with linguistics. Phrases such as “*menettää muotoaan*” (“*lose its form*”) and have *vaikutus* (*an influence on*) could easily appear in a book of linguistics. In example 30, the student describes English as *säännönmukaisempaa* (*more regular*) than Finnish. Use of this type of an adjective in a sentence comparing English with Finnish again gives the impression that the student is familiar with the grammatical structures of both languages and is in the position to compare them. Thus her later assessment that English is also more beautiful than Finnish sounds more convincing.

In example 22, the student also uses an interesting rhetoric device. The student says that *if being honest* (*jos rehellisiä ollaan*), Finnish is quite an ugly language. This type of interjection creates a feeling that she does not really have anything against Finnish *per se* but now that the topic came up, she has to be honest and say that she finds Finnish

quite ugly. This could be interpreted as a sort of disclaimer. As Wetherell and Potter (1988: 176) note, disclaimers are typically used when the speaker knows he or she is about to say something which might sound insensitive and evoke strong opposition from the listeners to rebut possible unfavourable assessments of his or her character. Here, the student appeals to the reader's sense of justice. Honesty, especially in Finland, is thought to be one of the greatest virtues and thus saying that she is just being honest makes her earlier statement appear less insensitive and more like she is just telling the truth. The interjection is slightly difficult to translate as it appears in the original text and thus it is also interesting to note that although the translation is somewhat lacking in this aspect, the student uses the passive form in the Finnish original. The translation is slightly off (a better translation would be *honestly*) but it was chosen because it is an attempt to convey this grammatical form. Instead of saying *if I'm being honest (jos olen rehellinen)* and using the first person singular to indicate that it is indeed she who is being honest here, she uses the passive form *ollaan*. She then continues by saying that since one has been using it for such a long time, one has also gotten used to it. Here again, the student is obviously talking about herself, although she does not specifically use the proper pronouns and verb forms to indicate it, but instead once more distances herself from what is being said by opting to use more impersonal language.

4.3 The local – global repertoire

The local – global repertoire was identified early on during the analysis process. This repertoire operates between the two extremes of locality and internationality. On one end, there is the idea that the language in question is somehow exclusive, private and local. The language may be seen as useful but only in limited contexts and situations. On the other end of the spectrum is the idea that the language in question is somehow universal. It is used in many situations, by many people and is perceived suitable for such use. The repertoire was characterised by certain word choices, metaphors and thematic ideas. Some rhetoric devices were also used.

The following examples illustrate how the sentence *Suomen kieli on minusta...* (*In my opinion, the Finnish language is...*) was completed.

(34)hyvin poikkeuksellista muihin kieliin verrattuna.– (F8, 2005)
very extraordinary compared to other languages.–

(35)erikoinen ja ehkä vähän outokin kieli. Se on myös ainutlaatuinen kieli. (F114, 2005)

- an unusual and maybe slightly odd language. It is also a unique language.
- (36) ainutlaatuinen, sillä se on niin erilainen muihin Euroopan kieliin verrattuna. (F119, 2005)
unique because it is so different compared to other European languages.
- (37) –a different language among other languages of the world. (F3, 2005)
–erilainen kieli maailman kielten joukossa.
- (38) tärkeä asia suomalaisille (F21, 2005)
an important thing for Finns.
- (39) difficult to understand for others than Finns.– (F108, 2005)
vaikeaselkoista muille kuin suomalaisille.–
- (40) erityinen, harvinainen, tärkeä (suomalaisille) (F49, 2005)
special, rare, important (for the Finns)
- (41) harvinainen ja pieni, mutta silti tärkeä. (F55, 2005)
rare and small but still important.
- (42) –Erialaista kuin englannin kieli.– (F93, 2005)
–Different than the English language.–
- (43) –Monet eivät sitä kuitenkaan osaa eivätkä varmaan pidä hyödyllisenä koska suomea puhutaan vain Suomessa. (F13, 2005)
–Many people can't speak it though, and probably don't think it is useful because Finnish is spoken only in Finland.
- (44) on kieli, joka on eksoottinen– (M27, 2005)
is a language that is exotic–

The next seven examples show how the students completed the sentence *Englannin kieli on minusta... (In my opinion, the English language is...)*.

- (45) –muodostumassa yleiskieleksi ympäri maailmaa. (F7, 2005)
–becoming the standard language around the world.
- (46) hyödyllisimpiä maailman kielistä– (F12, 2005)
one of the most useful language of the languages of the world–
- (47) avain maailmaan, kansainvälinen ja monipuolinen (erilainen eri puolilla maailmaa) (F14, 2005)
a key to the world, international and versatile (different in different parts of the world)
- (48) yleishyödyllinen kieli, jota ilman ei nykyään kovin hyvin pärjää. Englanti on kuitenkin siinä mielessä yliarvostettua, että yhtä hyvin “maailman kielenä” voisi olla mikä muu tahansa kieli. (F19, 2005)
a generally useful language that one can't manage very well without today. However, English is over-rated in the sense that just as well “the language of the world” could be any other language.
- (49) –avain kulttuurien väliseen kommunikaatioon ja maailmaan. (F91, 2005)
–a key to the intercultural communication and to the world.
- (50) opittavissa oleva kieli, maailman ja vallan kieli. (F36, 2005)
a language that is possible to learn, the language of the world and power.
- (51) kansainvälisen kommunikaation väline– (F46, 2005)
a tool for international communication–

The last examples of this section are all answers to the sentence *Verrattuna suomen kieleen, englanti on minusta... (In my opinion, when compared to the Finnish language, English is...)*.

- (52) luonnollisesti kansainvälisempää (F33, 2005)
naturally more international
- (53) –tehokas apuväline eri kansalaisten kanssa kommunikointiin. (F34, 2005)
–an effective aid for communicating with different citizens.
- (54) –universaalimpi kieli. (F47, 2005)
–a more universal language.
- (55) kansainvälisempää ja sen osaaminen koko maailman mittakaavassa on huomattavasti suomea tärkeämpää. (M67, 2005)
more international and being able to use it is on a global scale far more important than being able to use Finnish.

- (56) kansainvälisissä yhteyksissä hyödyllisempää ja arvostetumpaa. Kotimaassamme suomi on meille yhä syystä tai toisesta tärkeää. (M95, 2005)
 in the international contacts more useful and more esteemed. In our home country, Finnish is still important for us, for one reason or another.
- (57) mahdollisuus saada kontakti mahdollisimman moneen ihmiseen. (F115, 2005)
 a possibility to get a connection with as many people as possible.
- (58) –Suuri ja kansainvälinen kieli. (F78, 2005)
 –A big and an international language.

This repertoire was used when the students wrote about both Finnish and English. The idea of locality and exclusivity was, however, expressed only when discussing Finnish. English, in contrast, was seen solely as a global language. The division between the two languages was very strict and the languages were never described using the other end of the continuum.

A very common occurring feature of this repertoire, when used to express locality, was the use of adjectives that carried the connotation of exceptionality. Finnish was described as *poikkeuksellista* (*extraordinary*), *ainutlaatuista* (*unique*), *originaali* (*original*), *eksoottinen* (*exotic*) and *persoonallinen* (*individual*). Examples 34, 35 and 44 illustrate the use of some of these adjectives. All these adjectives carry the idea that Finnish is fundamentally different from other languages, understandable and natural only in Finland. The other end of the spectrum, the idea of internationality, was expressed by using adjectives such as *kansainvälinen* (*international*), *universaali* (*universal*) and *monipuolinen* (*versatile*). Examples 47 and 54 show how these adjectives were used in the students' answers. These adjectives all carry the idea that English is not confined by geography, certain situations or nationalities, but is free from the restrictions that other, smaller languages like Finnish face.

Adjectives connected with size were used also. Finnish was seen as *pieni* (*small*) language whereas English was seen as *iso* (*big*). Examples 41 and 58 illustrate this. Other types of words connected with amount and size were also used. One student, for example, noted that Finnish is *hyvin harvan ihmisen äidinkieli maailmanlaajuisesti katsottuna* (*the mother tongue of only a few people from a global point of view*). Another student stated that she saw Finnish as *hyödyllinen kieltenpuhujien määrän ollessa pieni* (*useful because the number of people who speak it is small*). One student, when discussing English, said that English was *suuresta määrästä puhujia koostuva kieli* (*a language that consists of a great number of speakers*). Another student claimed

that English was expressive *johtuen suurelta osin sen laajasta levinneisyydestä (mainly because of its wide spread)*.

English was very often described as *hyödyllinen (useful)*, *tarpeellinen (necessary)* and *pakollinen (obligatory)*. One student, for example, described English as a “*must*” in today's world. Another said that English was *kieli jota tarvitsee päivittäin (a language that one needs every day)*. This type of pragmaticism was very common in the students' answers. These adjectives were often connected with words such as *kommunikaatio (communication)* or *maailma (world)*. Mentions of the usefulness of English in the media and travel were also made. Finnish was also occasionally described as useful but in a completely different way. Finnish was mostly seen useful in Finland and when communicating with Finnish people. This reflects the national-romantic idea of one nation connected with one language, the national language. As noted earlier, one student described Finnish as a useful language because so few people speak it. This reflects the idea that because Finnish is so exclusive and has only a few speakers, those speakers have an advantage when speakers of other languages need to use Finnish for one reason or another. In example 43, the student says that not many people can speak Finnish or see it as a useful language, as it is only spoken in Finland. The rhetoric behind this statement is interesting. When discussing fact construction, Potter (1996: 158-162) notes that statements can be made more convincing by appealing to general consensus and corroboration, which means that many different people confirm and agree with the statement. In example 43, the student is clearly doing this by reporting what *monet (many people)* cannot do and what they think. The student, though, softens her statement by adding the word *varmaan (probably)* in the sentence. In an overview of diverse rhetoric means, Kakkuri-Knuutila (2002: 256) states that these types of expressions are used to shelter oneself from critique by weakening the actual factual argument. Thus, in example 43, even if the reader does not agree with the student, she still does not lose face because she never claimed anything as a fact.

English was often described as a *lingua franca* whereas Finnish was described as *salakieli (a secret language)*. This again reflects the idea that English is the universal default language of the world whereas Finnish is an exclusive little secret club that only a few people are part of. Sometimes the students expressed critical views on the status of English as a *lingua franca*. For example, in example 48, the student says that English

is somewhat over-rated because the “language of the world” could just as well be any other language in the world. One student expressed the concern that English was *uhka kaikille maailman kielille* (a threat to all the languages in the world). Another said that English was *ehkä liiankin suvereeni* (maybe a bit too sovereign) and that other languages were left in its shadow. English was also thought to be *liiankin dominoivaa* (too dominating) at the expense of other languages. Finnish, in contrast, was described as *uhanalainen* (endangered). The term *vähemmistökieli* (minority language) was also used, although Finnish in Finland is obviously not a minority language and also on a global scale its status is fairly stable at the moment. One student wrote that Finnish is a *vaalimisen arvoinen kieli* (language worthy of being cherished).

The theme of *kommunikaatio* (communication) was very common in this repertoire, reflecting, for example, the terminology discussed in the paragraphs above. English was seen as a *lingua franca*, a language very suitable for international communication. Because of this status, English was seen as useful. Finnish, in contrast, was seen as a language only suitable for communicating with other Finns. Example 57 illustrates this theme. The student says that English is a possibility to connect with as many people as possible. In example 39, the student states that Finnish is difficult to understand for all others except Finns, thus implying that Finnish is suitable for communicating with only a limited number of people. One student states that Finnish is *luonnollinen kommunikointikieli suomalaisten kesken* (natural language of communication between Finns) but that English *tarjoaa paremman mahdollisuuden kansainvälisiin kontakteihin* (provides a better opportunity for international contacts).

The repertoire was also characterised by making comparisons. Adjectives were used in the comparative or superlative forms and other types of comparisons were also made. Some of the comparisons can be explained by the phrasing of the sentence the students needed to complete but not all. For example, examples 34, 36 and 42 show how Finnish was often compared with other languages, even when the phrasing of the sentence did not clearly prompt the students to do this. In example 34, the student says that Finnish is *hyvin poikkeuksellista muihin kieliin verrattuna* (very extraordinary compared to other languages). In example 36 the student compares Finnish to other European languages and states that Finnish is unique when compared to them. In example 42 the student says that Finnish is different from English. Here it is interesting to note that the student

compares Finnish to English although there is no prompt to do so, as in the other task that specifically instructed the students to compare Finnish and English. Example 46 shows how a superlative form of an adjective was used when comparing English to other languages. English is one of the most useful languages in the whole world, according to the student who wrote example 46. Examples 52, 54, 55 and 56 illustrate how the comparative forms of adjectives were used when the sentence itself was structured in a way that encouraged it. In example 52, for example, the student says that English is *luonnollisesti kansainvälisempää* (*naturally more international*).

Another interesting feature of this repertoire was the use of metaphors. In fact, this was the only repertoire that was characterised by them. In examples 47 and 49 English is described as *avain* (*a key*). The students see English as a key which will open the doors of the world and international communication for them. One student described English as *avain kansainvälisiin portteihin* (*a key to the international gates*). Sometimes the students did not use the actual word but described English as a language that *avaa monia mahdollisuuksia* (*opens many possibilities*). Even without using the word *key* here, the main idea is the same. English is again seen as something that will open the world and all its wonders for the student. In a way, it seems that the students using this metaphor saw themselves in a confined space with locked gates and English as the key to the outside world. This correlates with the thematic idea that was often expressed in this repertoire that English was useful for travel and seeing the world. English was also described as *väline* (*a tool*) and *apuväline* (*an aid*) for communication, as noted earlier.

4.4 The difficult – easy repertoire

As the name already suggests, *the easy – difficult repertoire* operates on a spectrum between the ideas that a language can be easy or difficult, either as such or to learn. The difficulty or ease may be manifested in various aspects of the language, for example in spelling or pronunciation. This repertoire was characterised by word choices and thematic elements. Category entitlement, the rhetorical device introduced earlier in section 4.2, was used in a similar manner to argue the students' opinions.

The next examples are all endings for the sentence *Suomen kieli on minusta...* (*In my opinion, the Finnish language is...*).

- (59) –helppoa, –loogista. (F1, 2005)
–easy, –logical.
- (60) –Se on hankalampaa opiskella kuin englantia mutta silti helppo kieli käytännössä, kun sitä kerran osaa puhua. (F9, 2005)
–It's more difficult to learn than English but still an easy language in practice, once you learn to speak it.
- (61) helppoa puhua, mutta monimutkaista opiskella ja kirjoittaa.
easy to speak but complicated to learn and write. (F16, 2005)
- (62) –Kieliopiltaan monimutkainen. (F71, 2005)
–Complicated in its grammar.
- (63) haastavaa ja aina löytyy uutta opittavaa. (F106, 2005)
challenging and one always finds new things to learn.
- (64) monimutkainen ja täynnä poikkeuksia. (F118, 2005)
complicated and full of exceptions.

The following six examples illustrate how the students completed the sentence *Englannin kieli on minusta...* (*In my opinion, the English language is...*).

- (65) rakenteiltaan ja ääntämiseltään melko helppoa.– (F3, 2005)
fairly easy in its structure and pronunciation.–
- (66) –Sitä on helppo oppia ja puhua. (F6, 2005)
–It is easy to learn and speak.
- (67) helposti omaksuttava kieli. Se ei ole mielestäni kamalan vaikea ääntää eikä kielioppikaan ole niin monimutkainen kuin eräissä muissa kielissä. (F32, 2005)
an easily acquirable language. In my opinion it is not awfully difficult to pronounce and the grammar is not as complicated as in certain other languages.
- (68) laaja-alaista. Tuntuu että opittavaa on todella paljon. Englanti on vaikeaaakin – tuntuu etten koskaan tiedä ja osaa tarpeeksi. (F37, 2005)
broad. It feels like there is very much to learn. English is difficult too – it feels like I never know enough.
- (69) –Perus englantia on helppo oppia, mutta haastettakin löytyy, jos asettaa vaatimuksensa korkealle. (F71, 2005)
–Basic English is easy to learn but challenges are also to be found if one raises one's expectations high enough.
- (70) muihin kielisiin verrattuna helppo kieli, jota olen oppinut paljon muuallakin kuin koulussa. Englannin kielessä on vaikea kielioppi, mutta koska sen kanssa on joutunut niin paljon tekemisiin, niin kieli on jotenkin automatisoitunut ja kielioppisääntöjä ei tarvitse miettiä. (F81, 2005)
an easy language compared to other foreign languages and one that I have learned a lot outside of school as well. The English language has a difficult grammar but because you have been in contact with it so much, the language has somehow automatised and there is no need to think of grammar rules.

The last four examples of this section are the students' answers to the sentence *Verrattuna suomen kieleen, englantia on minusta...* (*In my opinion, when compared with the Finnish language, English is...*).

- (71) kieliopin kannalta helpompaa oppia. Säännöt ovat selkeämpiä kuin suomessa. (F16, 2005)
relative to grammar, it's easier to learn. The rules are clearer than in Finnish.
- (72) yksinkertaisempaa. Suomen kielioppi esimerkiksi on hankalampaa kuin englannin. (F24, 2005)
simpler. The Finnish grammar is, for example, harder than the English grammar.
- (73) jossain määrin helpompaa (ei taivutuksia, yhdyssanoja, yms.) ja jossain määrin vaikeampaa (iänikuiset poikkeuksien poikkeukset, joita kuitenkin ennemmin tai myöhemmin jossain vaiheessa opintoja kysytään esim. jo pelkästään pääsykokeissa ennen tätä kevättä - ei jaksa opetella ulkoa - ne voisi oppia käytännössä - voivat lannistaa oppijaa). (F48, 2005)
easier in some degree (no declensions, compounds etc) and more difficult in some degree (the constant exceptions of exceptions that sooner or later will be asked at some stage of your studies,

for example already in the entrance exams before this spring - can't be bothered to learn by heart
 - they could be learned in practice - can discourage the learner).
 (74) kieliopillisesti helpompaa mutta ääntämykseltään vaikeampaa. (M86, 2005)
 grammatically easier but more difficult in pronunciation.

Interestingly, both Finnish and English were seen as difficult and easy. Differences often lay in the point of view from which the languages were described. Finnish was commonly described as difficult from the perspective of foreigners trying to learn it, whereas English was seen as an easier language for non-native speakers to learn. When the students described Finnish as easy they often mentioned understanding that this was likely because they spoke it as their mother tongue. English, in contrast, was seen as a difficult language if one was trying to reach a native-like level of proficiency. English was also seen as difficult to speak, write or learn from the students' personal perspective.

One of the clearest characterising element of this repertoire was the use of adjectives *helppo* (*easy*) and *vaikea* (*difficult*). Indeed, this feature was so prominent that the repertoire was named after it. The use of these two adjectives can be seen in examples 59 and 60 when discussing Finnish, and in example 70 in the English case. In example 59 the student only lists adjectives to describe Finnish, one of which is *easy*. In example 60 the student contrasts two elements, learning and practical usage. According to her, learning Finnish is difficult but using it in practice is easy, once it has been learned. In example 70 the student is writing about English. She first says that English is easy when compared to other foreign languages and then continues by saying that English grammar is difficult. These adjectives were often used to describe either the language on a more general level or the students' personal experiences of learning or using the language. These two manners can be seen in examples 65 and 68, both of which deal with English. In example 65 the student describes how she finds English but her assessment is on a general level. In the latter example, though, another student describes how she personally feels about learning English. This difference is reflected in the way their answers are constructed. In example 65, the student says that English is fairly easy in its structure and pronunciation. This is a fairly impersonal description as it lacks words and other expressions that would indicate that the student personally feels this way, although obviously it is her own opinion as it is her who wrote it in the first place. It could be seen as a factual statement because of the impersonal style. In example 68 the student, however, states that she personally feels that she never knows enough after

saying that she finds English difficult. She uses the verbs *tietää* and *osata* (which both can be translated as *know*) in the first person singular form, which relates the whole statement back to herself.

Other types of adjectives that were commonly used also reflected the idea of ease or difficulty. *Looginen* (*logical*), *monimutkainen* (*complicated*), *haastava* (*challenging*), *yksinkertainen* (*simple*), *hankala* (*hard*) and *selkeä* (*clear*) are just some examples of the adjectives the students used to describe English and Finnish. Examples 64 and 72 illustrate the use of a few of these adjectives. Adjectives such as *clear* and *logical* carry the implication that the ease or difficulty of the language is not only in the way the individual perceives it but ingrained more deeply and possibly even caused by the language itself. After all, a logical and clear language is thought to be easier than a complicated and unclear language. These types of adjectives were often used to describe grammar and its rules.

Linguistic terminology and jargon were used in this repertoire more frequently than in any other repertoire identified. Terminology such as *kielioppi* (*grammar*), *kielitaito* (*language skills*), *sanasto* (*vocabulary*), *rakenne* (*structure*), *taivutus* (here it is not exactly clear whether the student means the *declension* of nouns or the *conjugation* of verbs), *fonetiikka* (*phonetics*) and *ääntäminen* (*pronunciation*) were used to specify the aspects of a language the students found either difficult or easy. In example 73, the student says that English has *poikkeuksien poikkeukset* (*exceptions of exceptions*), an expression that is commonly used in language lessons in Finland by language teachers.

As has probably already become evident from the examples, a common occurring theme was language learning and acquisition. Example 70 illustrates how this theme was reflected in the students' answers. The student writes how, compared to other foreign languages, English has been an easy language for her to learn and her learning English has not been confined just to the classroom environment but she has learned a lot of English outside school as well. Then she continues by saying that although English grammar is difficult, it has become so automatised that she no longer needs to think of the grammar rules. As one can notice, the student uses vocabulary connected with learning in her whole answer. *Koulu* (*school*), *oppia* (*to learn*), *kielioppi* (*grammar*) and *kielioppisääntöjä* (*grammatical rules*) are all words that can be connected with learning.

Another student wrote that she would never want to study Finnish because she had *huonoja kokemuksia koulun äidinkielen tunneilta* (*bad experiences from Finnish lessons in school*). In example 67 the student describes English as a language that is easy to acquire and then continues by further explaining her opinion about English. As the student in example 70 already said, the classroom environment is not the only place to learn languages. One can learn them in a formal setting or in a more informal context. In example 67, the same idea is visible in the use of the word *omaksuttava* (*acquirable*), which carries the connotation of a more natural and unstructured way of learning, such as what happens in the informal contexts. Example 70 is also a case where the student takes on the role of a language expert, which, again, is reflected in the word choices and their implications. Firstly, the original word choices imply that the student is at least somewhat familiar with the theory of second-language acquisition and linguistics in general. This gives her assessment further strength in the eyes of the reader. Secondly, it is implied that the student not only knows about language learning, but also has knowledge about linguistics in general and is therefore someone whose opinion the reader can trust.

4.5 Comparisons between 2005 and 2010

In this section, comparisons between the students' answers in 2005 and in 2010 will be made. It became clear from early on that all the repertoires that were identified from the data collected in 2005 could also be found in the data collected in 2010. Thus, no changes in the general use of the repertoires could be found. However, on an individual level changes were evident and there were new characterising elements for some repertoires that could not be found in the 2005 data. Additionally, some of the same features were used in a more eloquent manner. In this section, the examples will not be listed in the beginning of the section as previously, but appear in the text when the points they are relevant to are discussed and explained. The reason for this is simple: the examples in this section are only relevant to one point at a time, unlike previously when one example could be used to illustrate several points.

As explained above in section 4.1, in 2005 the close – distant repertoire was characterised by terminology, grammar and thematic elements. Words such as *äidinkieli* (*mother tongue*), *identiteetti* (*identity*), *rakas* (*dear*) and *etäinen* (*distant*) were used to

indicate emotional attachment or detachment. Possessive suffixes indicating ownership were used as well. The theme of pride and Finnish or English as a means of self-expression, thinking and feeling also appeared in the students' answers. Section 4.2 illustrated how the beautiful – ugly repertoire was characterised by certain adjectives, thematic features and rhetoric elements. For example, *kaunis* (*beautiful*) and *töksähtelevä* (*crisp*) were used to describe Finnish. Words connected with the world of sounds appeared frequently, and category entitlement was occasionally used to give more strength to an argument. In section 4.3 the local – global repertoire was examined in more detail. The local end of the spectrum was characterised by words such as *eksoottinen* (*exotic*) and *harvinainen* (*rare*) and the global end by *kansainvälinen* (*international*) and *universaali* (*universal*). Communication was an important thematic element and *avain* (*key*) metaphors were used. The last repertoire, illustrated in section 4.4 and called the easy – difficult repertoire, operated on the spectrum between the two ends of easy and difficult. It was again characterised by certain words as well as the commonly occurring theme of learning. The students using this repertoire often used linguistic terminology and took the role of a language expert, who assessed the objective difficulty or ease of a language.

The same features and trends could also be found in the way the four different repertoires were used in 2010. However, on the individual level, some students showed eloquence they had previously not expressed or overall change in the repertoire(s) used to discuss the two languages. Next a few examples of the most interesting cases will be described.

The following examples are the continuation for the sentence *In my opinion, the Finnish language is...*

- (75) Rikasta. Ainutlaatuista. Syvällisesti tarkoittavaa. Hiljaista... (F22, 2005)
Rich. Extraordinary. Deeply meaning. Silent...
- (76) osa minua itseäni, syvää olemustani, se edustaa vielä suurempaa osaa minua kuin englannin kieli (jos vertaan). (F22, 2010)
a part of myself, my deep being, it embodies an even greater part of me than the English language (if I compare).

The following ones continue the sentence *In my opinion, the English language is...*

- (77) kommunikoitua varten... helppoa oppia... yhdistää ihmisiä eri kielialueilta... (F22, 2005)
for communication... easy to learn... connecting people from different linguistic areas...
- (78) osa minua itseäni, en ajattele sitä enää erityisesti kielenä/pääaineena tai muuna itseni ulkopuolisena asiana. (F22, 2010)

a part of myself, I don't think of it anymore as specifically a language/major subject or other thing detached from myself.

The examples above all come from the same student. As one can notice, during the five-year time she has been studying English the way she thinks about English and Finnish has changed, resulting in the change of repertoires used. When the student writes about Finnish in 2005, she uses both the beautiful – ugly repertoire by choosing to describe Finnish as *rikasta (rich)* and *hiljaista (silent)* and the local – global repertoire by using the word *ainutlaatuista (unique)*. The expression *syvällisesti tarkoittavaa (deeply meaning)* is slightly unclear but could be understood as a description of the aesthetic quality of Finnish. Finnish is deep as opposed to superficial. However, in 2010, she uses the close – distant repertoire and states that Finnish for her is a part of herself, *syvää olemustani (my deep being)*. In this case, it is clear that the expression *my deep being* refers to the fundamental nature of the student, her profound essence.

When she discusses English in 2005, she uses again two repertoires, the local – global and the easy – difficult repertoires, as illustrated in her use of the phrases *kommunikointia varten (for communication)* and *helppoa oppia (easy to learn)*. In 2010 she resorts to using the close – distant repertoire again. English has become a part of herself and she no longer sees it as something *itseni ulkopuolisena asiana (detached from myself)*.

Not only is the change in the repertoires used interesting, but also the fact that the student uses the close end of the close – distant spectrum when discussing both Finnish and English. The linguistic feature she uses is also similar, as she describes both languages as *osa (a part)* of herself. This might prove to be problematic but, as can be seen from example 76, the student notices the possible questionable element in her answers herself and states that if she compares the two, Finnish is an even greater part of her than English. This creates a hierarchy between the languages and enables thus the use of the same repertoire in both cases by eliminating the possible contradiction in her statements.

For the question that could be found only in the 2010 questionnaire, *What does English mean to you?*, the same student answered in the following manner:

- (79) Se on lisäksi että osa arkista minua, se on ammatillinen väline, joka laajentaa työnsaantimahdollisuuksiani, avaa ovia lähteä asumaan/elämään ulkomaille ja on erikoisosaamisalueeni, jonka käyttämisestä pidän. (F22, 2010)
 In addition to being a part of the everyday me, it is a professional tool which broadens my opportunities for getting a job, opens doors for going to live abroad and is my special area of expertise I enjoy using.

As this question was not in the original 2005 questionnaire, it thus provides interesting new viewpoints to the repertoires used and the features that characterise them. As we can see, the student recognises that earlier she described English as something close and attached to her as she once again uses the same linguistic feature by saying that English is a part of her. However, now she continues and says that in addition, English is also a professional tool which broadens her opportunities in the job market and is her special area of expertise. This sounds very utilitaristic and pragmatic when compared to the emotional closeness her earlier answer and the beginning of her current answer carried. She also says that English *avaa ovia lähteä asumaan/elämään ulkomaille (opens doors for going to live abroad)*. This part of her answer clearly uses the local – global repertoire as illustrated by the use of the key metaphor and the term *ulkomaille (abroad)*.

In fact example 79 illustrates one of the biggest new element that arose from the 2010 questionnaire. Especially in the answers to the open-ended question 14, the theme of employment and the idea of English as a professional tool appeared very frequently. This feature was seen as an indicator of distance, as while English was still important for the students, its importance came from the way it could be used to get a job and not from emotional attachment. Additionally, the importance was still very personal for the students as it was directly connected with their own lives. Because of this aspect of personal interest, it was not the same type of importance as in the local – global repertoire, where English was seen as an important means of communication for the whole world. Consequently, this new feature was seen as a characteristic of the close – distant repertoire.

Again, problems could arise from using the two contrasting ends of the close – distant repertoire to describe the same language, which in example 79 is English. The student seems to notice this herself, and uses the expression *sen lisäksi (additionally)*. Using this expression indicates that for her English has multiple meanings. On the one hand

English is an integral part of her but then again, on the other hand, from a professional point of view, English is also *ammattillinen väline (a professional tool)*.

Another new feature became evident from the way the students responded to the open-ended question 14. The following examples illustrate this.

- (80) Pysin ylläpitämään ja parantamaan kielitaitoani vielä nyt opintojen loppumisen jälkeenkin, sillä en halua unohtaa jo osaamiani asioita. (F1, 2010)
I aim to maintain and improve my language skills also now after my studies because I don't want to forget things I already know.
- (81) Yliopiston jälkeen kyllä tuntuu fiksummalta. Kirjoitustyyli on ainakin parantunut ja erilaisten tekstien kirjoittaminen ja kääntäminen menee nyt paremmin kuin aikaisemmin. (F9, 2010)
After university I feel smarter. Writing style has improved and writing and translating different texts is better than before.

Both these examples map the personal experiences and thoughts that the students have about their own English skills. Most answers expressed a new confidence in their English skills and an appreciation for them, too. As one can see from example 80, the student tells that she plans to continue improving her English skills. In example 81, the student states that she feels smarter after her university studies and then gives examples of the areas where she feels she has improved. Unlike previously, when these types of personal assessments were connected with the idea of English either being easy or difficult and how the students' skills reflected against this background, here the students never even mentioned the aspect of difficulty or ease.

Indeed, the assessment of improved writing skills in example 81 was reflected in the way the students used language in their answers in 2010. Whilst in 2005 answers commonly were quite brief and list-like, in 2010 the students used more complicated expressions to describe their relationships with the languages. The following examples illustrate this shift.

The answers one student wrote for *Englanti on minusta...* (*In my opinion, the English language is...*) can be seen below.

- (82) käytännöllistä, helppoa, sujuvaa. (M17, 2005)
practical, easy, fluent.
- (83) Kiehtova orgaaninen konstrukti, jota on mukava osata ja jonka oppimista on mukava ohjata. (M17, 2010)
An intriguing organic construct that is nice to know how to use and the learning of which is pleasant to guide.

As one can see from the examples above, in 2005 the student only listed three adjectives to describe English. In 2010, however, the student's answer is lengthier as well as more complex in its structure. He says that English is *kiehtova orgaaninen konstrukti* (*an intriguing organic construct*) which compared to the earlier list of three adjectives sounds much more elegant, sophisticated and academic. The phrase *orgaaninen konstrukti* (*organic construct*) especially sounds like it could be taken straight from an academic book of linguistics. Using this expression shows a similar type of confidence in his skills, which was also shown in example 81.

Occasionally the answers to the 2010 questionnaire were much shorter than for the 2005 questionnaire. One explanation for this is that in 2010 the students answered the questionnaire on their own time. This may have resulted in them answering quickly and briefly. For example, in 2005 one student wrote quite a lengthy answer to describe what English was for her saying that English was *hyödyllinen kieli, "maailman kieli" länsimaissa, hauskaa, tarpeeksi johdonmukaista* (*a useful language, "language of the world" in the Western countries, fun, logical enough*). In 2010 she only states that English is *välttämättömyys* (*a necessity*).

Another example of this shift can be found in the characterising feature of the close – distant repertoire. As explained earlier in section 4.1, one common feature of this repertoire was the expression *a part of* something. In 2005 the students described English as well as Finnish as parts of themselves or their identities. The next example illustrates how this same structure was used in 2010.

- (84) Englannin kieli on jollain tavalla kuin näkymätön kolmas käsivarsi. Se on luonnollinen osa minua, joka kulkee aina mukana– (F14, 2010)
The English language is somehow like an invisible third arm. It is a natural part of myself, that I carry along always–

As one can see, in example 84 the student takes this metaphor of English as a part of herself to a new level by comparing it to an invisible third arm and continuing that it is a natural part of herself that she always carries along. Although this student did not use the close – distant repertoire and this expression in 2005, it is possible to compare her answer to those used by the others in 2005. Her answer is much longer and more carefully constructed than those given by the students in 2005. When in 2005 the students commonly only briefly stated that English or Finnish was a part of themselves,

in this example the student creates a more complicated metaphor of English as a body part. This again shows improvement in self-expression and use of language.

Now that the different repertoires which arose from the data have been reported and comparisons between those used in 2005 and in 2010 have been made, it is time to move to the next chapter, which will include discussion of the findings and validation for the present study

5 DISCUSSION

In this chapter the results of the present study will be summarised and discussed while taking previous research on language attitudes in consideration. There will also be a discussion about the validity of the present study. Lastly, some final thoughts on the present study will be discussed.

5.1 Summary of present study

As explained in section 3.1 the present study aimed to identify the types of interpretative repertoires used when students of English were discussing Finnish and English. Another point of interest was to see what purpose these repertoires served and if any changes in the repertoires used could be seen when comparing the answers of 2005 to those of 2010. Chapter 3 also detailed how the data for the present study was gathered and what the participants of the present study were like. The participants answered a questionnaire in 2005 (N=120) and in 2010 (N=38). From the two questionnaires, seven questions were chosen for further analysis. The analysis was completed according to the guidelines provided by Potter and Wetherell (1987). From the data, four interpretative repertoires could be identified. Their characteristic features are summarised in table 1.

Table 1. A summary of the characteristics of repertoires

Name of the repertoire	Characterising features
The close – distant repertoire	Use of adjectives and nouns Possessive forms A part of -expression Theme of self-expression Theme of pride
The beautiful – ugly repertoire	Use of adjectives Sound -related terminology
The local – global repertoire	Use of adjectives and nouns Linguistic terminology Comparisons between Finnish and other languages

	Key -metaphors Theme of communication
The easy – difficult repertoire	Use of adjectives and nouns Linguistic terminology Recounting personal experiences Theme of learning

Firstly, the main features of the close – distant repertoire were the following: use of adjectives and nouns, possessive grammatical forms, the expression *a part of* and the themes of self-expression and pride. The beautiful – ugly repertoire was characterised by the use of certain adjectives and terminology related to sounds. The local – global repertoire was characterised again by the use of certain adjectives and nouns as well as the use of linguistic terminology, comparisons between the Finnish language and other languages, using key -metaphors and the theme of communication. Finally, the main features of the easy – difficult repertoire included the use of adjectives and nouns, the use of linguistic terminology, recounting personal experiences, and lastly, the theme of learning.

The rhetorical devices the students used to support their opinions were category entitlement, and consensus and corroboration, as named by Potter (1996). They also used disclaimers and weakening of the factual argument to shelter themselves from critique when they expressed questionable opinions.

When analysing the data, it became clear that even in short answers, the students could use several of the interpretative repertoires. In fact, it was very common for them to resort to using several repertoires in their answers. In the following example, the student is discussing English.

(85) Maaailman kieli, jolla tulee toimeen melko monessa paikassa. Sitä on tarpeellista osata ja mielellään vielä hyvinkin. Se on myös kaunis kieli. (F116, 2005)
the language of the world that with which one can get by in many places. It's important to know and preferably well too. It is also a beautiful language.

As one can see, in example 85 the student makes use of two different repertoires: the local – global repertoire and the beautiful – ugly repertoire. She starts by noting that

English is the language of the world and that it is useful in many places and then comments on the need to be able to use English well. The first two sentences are constructed using the global end of the local – global repertoire, as the word choices and expressions indicate. The last sentence, however, concentrates on the aesthetic qualities of English. The word *kaunis* (*beautiful*) indicates that the beautiful – ugly repertoire is used here. If the whole answer is inspected, though, it is clear that these two different repertoires are used to discuss English in a favourable manner. Positive aspects of the language are highlighted by using two different repertoires. It seems that the student wants to emphasise the different aspects of the English language. English is not only useful but also beautiful.

All the repertoires were used to discuss both Finnish and English but this is likely explained by the way the repertoires were chosen to be seen. As mentioned in chapter 4, all repertoires were seen as polarised spectrums instead of grouping the different extremities as repertoires of their own. Thus the differences between how Finnish and English lay in the way the repertoires were used, meaning that the repertoires were used in a manner where Finnish was often described using only one end of the whole spectrum and English by using the other, opposing end. The close – distant repertoire was used in a way that made both languages seem close but also in a way that made English seem distant. The students who used the beautiful – ugly repertoire described both languages beautiful but some also saw Finnish as an ugly language. The division between the two languages was very clear when the local – global repertoire was used. Finnish was discussed only by using expressions connected with locality and English was constructed to be a universal *lingua franca*. The easy – difficult repertoire was used in a way that made both languages appear easy and difficult. However, Finnish was seen as difficult for foreigners to learn and easy for the students themselves to speak, whereas English was thought to be an easy language to learn at least on the most basic of levels. Acquiring a native-like proficiency in English was seen as a difficult task for those learning the language. English was also experienced as a personally difficult language.

When the data collected in 2005 and the data collected in 2010 were compared, it became clear that the way the repertoires were used had not changed in any significant

manner when the whole group was inspected. However, there were differences on the individual level. Additionally, the theme of work and professional life emerged and was seen as a new feature of the close – distant repertoire. The students also showed a new confidence in their skills and evaluation of them in their answers. These skills manifested themselves also in their answers, as some of the original features identified in the 2005 data were used in a more sophisticated manner.

5.2 Findings of the present study compared to previous research

The previous chapter concentrated only on illustrating the use of the different repertoires but did not give any points on how they relate to previous research. The next paragraphs will tackle this and contrast the repertoires identified in the present study with previous research.

In the case of the close – distant repertoire one may remember that one of the characterising features was the thematic idea that Finnish or English or both were a suitable means for self-expression, thinking and emotions. The idea that all people have a language which is most closely connected with their basic emotional or cognitive processes is very common and persistent in the non-scientific world. This idea possibly has its origins in the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and the psychological models behind cognitive therapy. As discussed earlier in section 2.2.3, Moscovici (1988) suggested that these types of social representations, or layman's knowledge, are born when actual scientific knowledge gets diluted by the masses. The close – distant repertoire clearly draws on this commonplace that one's language of cognition, emotions and self-expression is the language one is the closest with.

Another point that sprang forth from the answers where the close – distant repertoire was used was that of bilingualism. The students who felt an emotional connection with English often described themselves as bilinguals or used other expressions to convey the same idea, for example, the expression *toinen äidinkieli* (*a second mother tongue*). The study by Leppänen et al. (2009) discussed in section 2.3 indicated that although Finns have good English skills they still do not feel like bilinguals. This, at least to some extent, seems not to be the case with the students of English, possibly because their contact with the language is far more intense than that of an average Finn. Their

position as future experts of the English language who have studied the matters of bi- and multilingualism might also affect this matter. The fact that their English skills are also above average is also presumably a factor that affects their confidence. This is probably the case especially in 2010, when the students expressed a confidence in their English skills as well as used the term *kaksikielinen* (*bilingual*) to describe themselves. It is also very probable that the understanding the students have of language and language skills has developed during their university studies. For example, the students may understand bilingualism in a way that no longer requires native-like language skills and learning the two languages already from birth.

The next interesting point to contrast with previous research arose in the answers making use of the local – global repertoire. As was explained in section 4.3, it was quite common to express a critical opinion of the *lingua franca* status of English and what it could mean for smaller languages, such as Finnish. Finnish, on the other hand, was seen as something in need of protection and there was a clear concern expressed over the future of the Finnish language. The contrast between these two ways of discussing English and Finnish, criticising English while expressing a worry over Finnish, is an intriguing one, as it seems to align with the results of Hyrkstedt (1997). The repertoires Hyrkstedt identified that supported the argument that Finnish was losing its vitality to English have similar, although not exactly the same, features as the instances of the local – global repertoire where criticism on the status of English as a *lingua franca* were expressed. For example, in Hyrkstedt's national-romanticist repertoire (1997: 54-56), expressions such as cherishing the Finnish language were used. The expression *vaalia* (*cherish*) also appeared in the data analysed for the present study. As Hyrkstedt's study had a different starting point, it is understandable that the results are not all comparable to those of the present study. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy to mention that there are some similarities between the findings of the two studies.

It is also an interesting similarity that in Kansikas' study (2002), reviewed in section 2.3, Finnish was described as suitable for Finns and Finland, whereas English was seen as suitable for everyone. If these results are contrasted with those of the present study, it is easy to notice that there is some similarity in the expressions used in the local – global repertoire. After all, the students often described English as a language for

everyone, while Finnish was seen as something useful only in Finland or when communicating with other Finns.

When analysing the same data collected in 2005, Petrow (2010) concluded that the students had a more favourable attitude towards English than Finnish. If one contrasts Petrow's results with those of the present study, the point of interest will undoubtedly be how the way the interpretative repertoires are used reflects on the language attitudes towards Finnish and English. This relates straight back to one of the aims of the present study, which was to see what purpose the different repertoires serve. In the context of Petrow's study and, more generally, language attitudes, it can be argued that the purpose is related to the expression of either a favourable attitude or an unfavourable attitude. As Wetherell and Potter explain (1988: 172), interpretative repertoires are used to construct actions and cognitive processes, amongst other things. The conclusion that in this context the four interpretative repertoires are used to construct attitudes seems, thus, fairly reasonable.

If we examine the beautiful – ugly repertoire, for example, the use of the more positively charged end of the spectrum can be seen to reflect a positive attitude towards the language it was used to describe. The more negatively charged end of the continuum, in contrast, can be seen to reflect an unfavourable attitude towards the language under scrutiny. However, not all the instances where the beautiful – ugly repertoire was used can be placed neatly in either end of the aesthetic dimension, but fall somewhere in between the two opposing ends. These types of instances can be seen as a reluctance to show any kind of attitude or as a lack of a clearly definable attitude. Potter and Wetherell (1987: 33) note that the way a person speaks or writes reflects the way he or she wants to present himself or herself. The reluctance to show a clearly positive or a clearly negative attitude may stem from the desire to present oneself as a neutral and objective person.

In regard of the longitudinal aspect of the present study, it could be said that no clear shift in the general use of interpretative repertoires could be found. The only differences in the use could be found on the individual level. At this point it is good to remember, that unfortunately the 2010 questionnaire did not get as many answers as the 2005 questionnaire, which may be one explanation for the results.

5.3 Validation of the present study

As briefly discussed in section 2.2.4, Potter and Wetherell (1987: 169-172) emphasise the importance of validating one's study when using the discourse analytic approach. They also present four aspects that can be inspected to validate a discourse analytic study. These are coherence, participants' orientation, new problems and fruitfulness and the present study will be examined in relation to these aspects, as suggested by the guidelines.

Coherence is linked directly to the process of writing the actual report of the study. It is important that all results are presented in a clear and coherent manner, and that the reasoning process can be inspected. This has been done in the present study by describing the analytical process in section 3.3 and writing out the reasoning behind analysis of the data in each section of chapter 4 presenting the repertoires that were identified. Taking the participants' orientation in consideration means that the analyst needs to consider how the participants themselves see their statements, consistent or inconsistent. In the present study, the case where a student would use the end signifying emotional involvement and attachment of the close – distant repertoire to describe both Finnish and English and create a hierarchy between the two languages can be seen as an example of this, as the student himself or herself recognised the possible contradiction in the statements and neatly evaded it. Plenty of examples were included in the chapter describing the four different repertoires. This was done to support the reasoning process and give the possibility to inspect the original data to see if the reasoning was indeed valid. A third reason was to include the participants' voice in the present study. This also reflects the qualitative orientation of the present study where an understanding of the phenomena is pursued. Discourse analytic tradition also encourages the inclusion of examples to support and illustrate the points that are made by the analyst.

When new problems arise in the analysis process it is important to include them and try to find a solution for them. The example of creating a hierarchy between Finnish and English can be again used as an example of this. Using the same repertoire in the same manner to discuss two different languages created a problem and this was then solved by creating a hierarchy between the two by using comparative forms of adjectives.

Usually there are also problems which may not find a solution and these problems create a good starting point for further research.

The last aspect, fruitfulness, is not only relevant to discourse analysis, but all scientific research. All research aims to gain new knowledge or understanding of the world and thus the results of all research must be inspected in this regard. The value of the present study lies in the fact that apart from Hyrkstedt's study (1997), there has been next to no research in Finland, or elsewhere, on how interpretative repertoires are used when constructing language attitudes. Longitudinal studies on the matter are also virtually non-existent. The results of the present study shed some light on these matters and provide an adequate starting point for further research. As the present study explores only the interpretative repertoires used in a certain context by a relatively homogenous group of participants, it would indeed be interesting to see what types of interpretative repertoires could be identified in other contexts. Also, as the present study had a slight lack in data from the latter questionnaire, a study focusing solely on the longitudinal aspect would provide further information on the interpretative repertoires and language attitudes.

All in all, the present study managed to reach its aims adequately. Four different repertoires could be identified and their use mapped. As the participants were students of English and were aiming to become teachers and other types of language experts, the results deepen the current understanding of how future language professionals in Finland see English and Finnish. This information can be used, for example, to gain a more profound understanding of the attitudes of teachers and then applied to educational contexts to improve Finnish language education.

5.4 Conclusion

The present study grew from an interest in language attitudes. From this vague starting point it was decided that the focus of the present study would be on how language attitudes are constructed through the use of interpretative repertoires. Potter and Wetherell (1987) acted as the main inspiration for the present study, as did the study of Hyrkstedt (1997).

It is clear that whilst having its own strengths, the present study also has its weaknesses. Both were briefly touched upon in section 5.3 which discussed the validation of the present study. One of the main strengths of the present study lies indeed in the fact that in relation to language attitudes, and especially language attitudes towards Finnish and English, not much research has been conducted that would also focus on how the attitudes are constructed. Because a study on language attitudes making use of the same data as in the present study had already been made by Petrow (2010), the present study could continue from where Petrow's study ended and thus broaden the understanding of language attitudes. Petrow's findings also support those of the present study. One of the major weaknesses of the present study lies in the lack of answers the 2010 questionnaire got. Had all the original participants answered the questionnaire, other changes could have possibly been identified. Now, only a glimpse to the changes in the interpretative repertoires is available. This, however, provides a number of possibilities for further research.

In addition to a more central focus on the changes caused by time, further research could address the aspects not covered in the present study. For example, sex, age or orientation of studies was not taken into account in the present study and inspecting whether these factors have any effect on the interpretative repertoires the participants use would be an interesting starting point for new research. Research on the topic could also focus the interpretative repertoires used by other groups and compare those to the repertoires identified in the present study. For example, future research could concentrate on the repertoires used by university students of other languages or on those used by language teachers and other language experts. It might also be interesting to see what types of repertoires are used to construct attitudes to Swedish, the second official language in Finland. Other type of data could also be used. For example, Potter and Wetherell (1987) recommend using interviews as data. Autobiographies might also provide an excellent pool of data, as in the study of Keski-Heiska (2009). Future research could also concentrate on the interpretative repertoires used in social media about languages by average, non-academic people. After all, blogs and forums provide an abundance of authentic material for research

Bibliography

- Allport, G.W. (1935). Attitudes. In C. Murchison (ed.), *Handbook of social psychology*. Worcester: Clark University Press, 798–844.
- Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Crano, W.D. and Prislin, R. (2006). Attitudes and persuasion. *Annual Review of Psychology* [online] 57, 345–374. <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.19004>
- Day, R. (1982). Children's attitudes towards language. In E.B. Ryan and H. Giles (eds.), *Attitudes towards language variation. Social and applied contexts*. London: Edward Arnold, 116–131.
- Edwards, D. and Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage.
- Edwards, J. (1982). Language attitudes and their implications among English speakers. In E.B. Ryan and H. Giles (eds.), *Attitudes towards language variation. Social and applied contexts*. London: Edward Arnold, 20–33.
- Eiser, J.R. (1987). *The expression of attitude*. New York: Springer.
- Eskola, J. and Suoranta, J. (2005). *Johdatus laadulliseen tutkimukseen*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Friedrich, P. (2000). English in Brazil: functions and attitudes. *World Englishes* 19, 215–223.
- Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gilbert, G.N. and Mulkay, M. (1984). *Opening Pandora's box. A sociological analysis of scientists' discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Giles, H. and Billings, A. (2004). Assessing language attitudes: speaker evaluation studies. In A. Davies and C. Elder (eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 187–209.
- Giles, H. and Ryan, E.B. (1982). Prolegomena for developing a social psychology theory of language attitudes. In E.B. Ryan and H. Giles (eds.), *Attitudes towards language variation. Social and applied contexts*. London: Edward Arnold, 208–223.
- Haapea, R. (1999). *Attitudes towards varieties of the English language and their speakers held by Finnish students*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of English. <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/>

- 123456789/7379/1845.pdf?sequence=1
- Haarmann, H. (1984). The role of ethnocultural stereotypes and foreign languages in Japanese commercials. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 50, 101–121.
- Harré, R. and Gillett, G. (1994). *The discursive mind*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Heikkinen, A. (1999). *A discourse analysis of success and failure accounts in learning English as a foreign language*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of English. <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/7394/1570.pdf?sequence=1>
- Hyrkstedt, I. (1997). "*Oma kieli mansikka, muu kieli mustikka*": *discourse-analytic study of attitudes towards English in Finland*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of English. <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/7265/276.pdf?Sequence=1>.
- Isomöttönen, A. (2003). *A discursive study of hard-of-hearing learners' explanations of failure and success in learning English as a foreign language*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages. <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/7284/G0000417.pdf?sequence=1>
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca. Attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kakkuri-Knuutila, M-L. (2002). Retoriikka. In M-L. Kakkuri-Knuutila (ed.), *Argumentti ja kritiikki. Lukemisen, keskustelun ja vaikuttamisen taidot*. Tampere: Gaudeamus, 233–270.
- Kansikas, M. (2002). "*As many men, so many minds*": *a study on attitudes towards foreign languages in Finland*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages. <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/7346/minkan.pdf?sequence=1>
- Keski-Heiska, A-M. (2009). *English teacher as constructed in the language learning autobiographies written by university students: a discursive study*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages. https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/21726/URN_NBN_fi_jyu-200908253850.pdf?sequence=1
- Lambert, W.E., Hodgson, R.C., Gardner, R.C. and Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 60, 44–51.

- Leppänen, S., Pitkänen-Huhta, A., Nikula, T., Kytölä, S., Törmäkangas, T., Nissinen, K., Kääntä, L., Virkkula, T., Laitinen, M., Pahta, P., Koskela, H., Lähdesmäki, S. and Jousmäki, H. (2009). *Kansallinen kyselytutkimus englannin kielestä Suomessa. Käyttö, merkitys ja asenteet*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University.
- MacKinnon, K. (2013). Public attitudes to Gaelic: a comparison of surveys undertaken in 1981, 2003 and 2011. In J. Cruickshank and R. McColl Millar (eds.), *After the storm: papers from the forum for research on the languages of Scotland and Ulster triennial meeting, Aberdeen 2012* [online]. Aberdeen: Forum for Research on the Languages of Scotland and Ireland, 1-18. <http://www.abdn.ac.uk/pfrlsu/uploads/files/MacKinnon,%20Public%20Attitudes%20to%20Gaelic.pdf> (18 March, 2014)
- Moscovici, S. (1988). Notes towards a description of social representations. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 18, 211-250.
- Palermينو, M., Langer, E. and McGillis, D. (1984). Attitudes and attitude change: mindlessness – mindfulness perspective. In R.J. Eiser (ed.), *Attitudinal judgement*. New York: Springer, 179–196.
- Petrow, E. (2010). *English and Finnish compared – attitudes held by future experts and teachers of English*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages. <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/25513/URN%3aNBN%3afi%3ajyu-201010263014.pdf?sequence=1>
- Pihko, M-K. (1997). *"His English souded strange": The intelligibility of native and non-native English pronunciation to Finnish learners of English*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University.
- Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality. Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. London: Sage.
- Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology. Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Preisler, B. (2003). English in Danish and the Danes' English. *The International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 159, 109–126.
- Rosenberg, M. and Hovland, C. (1960). Cognitive, affective and behavioral components of attitudes. In M. Rosenberg and C. Hovland (eds.), *Attitude organization and change: an analysis of consistency among attitude components*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1–14.
- Rushton, J.P., Fulker, D.W., Neale, M.C., David, K.B. and Eysenk, H.J. (1986).

- Altruism and aggression: the heritability of individual differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 50, 1192–1198
- Ryan, E.B., Giles, H. and Sebastian, R.J. (1982). An integrative perspective for the study of attitudes toward language variation. In E.B. Ryan and H. Giles (eds.), *Attitudes towards language variation. Social and applied contexts*. London: Edward Arnold, 1–19.
- Tesser, A. (1993). The importance of heritability in psychological research: the case of attitudes. *Psychological Review* 100, 129–142.
- Tuomi, J. and Sarajärvi, A. (2003). *Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi*. Helsinki: Tammi.
- Wetherell, M. and Potter, J. (1988). Discourse analysis and the identification of interpretative repertoires. In C. Antaki (ed.), *Analysing everyday explanation. A casebook of methods*. London: Sage, 168–183.
- Zhang, W. and Hu, G. (2008). Research note: second language learners' attitudes towards English varieties. *Language Awareness* 17, 342–347.

APPENDIX 1 2005 questionnaire and instructions

Nimi: _____

Täydennä. Jos vastaustila ei riitä, voit jatkaa sivun toiselle puolelle.

1. *Englannin* kieli on minusta ...2. *Suomen* kieli on minusta ...

3. Englannin kieli kuulostaa minusta ...

4. Englannin oppiminen tuntuu minusta ...

5. Kun *puhun* englantia, tunnen itseni ...6. Kun *kirjoitan* englanniksi, tunnen itseni ...

7. Verrattuna suomen kieleen, englanti on minusta ...

TUTKIMUSPROJEKTI "Noviisista ekspertiksi"
Kielten laitos / englanti, SOLKI ja OKL 2005

Aineistoa saa käyttää nimettömänä tutkimustarkoituksiin.

Kyllä

Ei

Päiväys:

Allekirjoitus: _____

APPENDIX 2 2010 questionnaire and instructions

TUTKIMUSPROJEKTI "Noviisista ekspertiksi"
Kielten laitos / englanti ja SOLKI 2010

Noviisista ekspertiksi on Jyväskylän yliopiston kielten laitoksen ja Soveltavan kielentutkimuksen keskuksen (SOLKIN) projekti, ja meitä kiinnostaa englannin kielen opiskelijoiden **kasvu kielenoppijasta kieliasiantuntijaksi** ja sen mukaiseen tietämykseen ja ymmärrykseen kielistä, niiden rakenteesta ja käytöstä sekä oppimisesta että opettamisesta.

Olet ollut jo aiemmin projektin tutkimushenkilönä. Arvostaisimme, jos jatkaisit vielä yhteistyötä kanssamme. Projekti on pitkäikäisyydessään ainutlaatuinen, mutta se ei ole sitä ilman panostasi!

.Pyytäisimme siksi sinua vielä täyttämään tämän kyselyn (löytyy linkin takaa). Kysymme myös joitain henkilökohtaisia tietoja mutta käsittelemme ne luottamuksellisesti, ts. vastaajien nimet, jne. pysyvät vain meidän tutkijoiden tietona ja tulokset raportoidaan nimettöminä.

Lisätietoja projektista antaa tarvittaessa: **Paula Kalaja**, kielten laitos / englanti, paula.kalaja@jyu.fi.

Palauttaisitko viikon sisään?

Vastaamalla kyselyyn (kysymyksiä 1-14, taustatietoja loput) ja palauttamalla sen annat samalla luvan aineiston käyttöön nimettömänä tutkimustarkoituksiin *Noviisista ekspertiksi*-projektissa.

Kiitämme näin jo etukäteen yhteistyöstä! Ja toivotamme hyvää jatkoa!

Paula Kalaja
Riikka Alanen
Hannele Dufva

Täydennä alkuun taustatietosi.

Nimi (etu- ja sukunimi): _____

Olen syntynyt vuonna 19 ____ .

Olen: mies nainen

Olen suoravalttu opettajakoulutukseen: kyllä en

Olen suorittanut pedagogiset aineopinnot: kyllä en

Englannin kieli on minulle: pääaine sivuaine

Äidinkieleni on: suomi muu, mikä? _____

Yliopisto-opinnot: opiskelen vielä olen jo valmistunut

Tehtäviä on neljä.

Tehtävä 1. Kouluajoistasi on jo kulunut muutama vuosi. Kun nyt ajattelet asiaa, kerro lyhyesti omin sanoin ...

- a) Mitä asioita opit mielestäsi englannista koulussa (peruskoulussa ja lukiossa)?
- b) Milla tavoin opit mielestäsi parhaiten englantia koulussa (peruskoulussa ja lukiossa)?

Tehtävä 2. Olet opiskellut englantia yliopistossa lähes viisi vuotta. Kerro lyhyesti omin sanoin ...

- a) Miten englannin taitosi on kehittynyt yliopistossa: *mitkä* puolet kielitaidossasi ovat kehittyneet ja *miten* olet niitä kehittänyt?
- b) Mitkä asiat eivät englannin taidossasi ole mielestäsi yliopistossa kehittyneet?
- c) Miten olet kehittänyt englannin taitoasi yliopiston ulkopuolella?
- d) Miten kuvailisit nykyistä englannin kielen taitoasi? Millaisia asioita haluaisit mahdollisesti oppia vielä lisää/paremmiin?

Tehtävä 3. Täydennä.

1. Englannin kieli on minusta ...
2. Suomen kieli on minusta ...
3. Englannin kieli kuulostaa minusta ...
4. Englannin oppiminen tuntuu minusta ...
5. Kun puhun englantia, tunnen itseni ...

6. Kun kirjoitan englanniksi, tunnen itseni ...
7. Verrattuna suomen kieleen englanti on minusta ...

Tehtävä 4. Kerro lyhyesti.

Mitä englannin kieli merkitsee sinulle tänä päivänä, nyt kun olet yliopisto-opintojesi loppuvaiheessa tai jo valmistunut?

Tehtävä 3. Kerro lyhyesti *omin sanoin*.

a) Olet aloittelemassa yliopisto-opintoja. Mitkä ovat nyt *tavoitteesi* englannin kielen taidon suhteen?

Tarkista vielä, että vastasit **kaikkiin** kysymyksiin.

Jos vielä haluat, kerro oliko kysymyksiin vastaaminen helppoa/vaikeaa? Muuta mieleen tullutta?

Aineistoa saa käyttää nimettömänä tutkimustarkoituksiin. Kyllä

Ei

Päiväys:

Allekirjoitus: _____