

**Family Language Policy: A Qualitative Case Study on the Implicit and Explicit
Practices in a Finnish Multilingual Family**

Hanna Kumpulainen

MA Thesis

Degree Programme for Language Teaching and Learning

School of Languages and Translation Studies

Faculty of Humanities University of Turku February 2020

*The originality of this thesis has been checked in accordance with the University of Turku
quality assurance system using the Turnitin OriginalityCheck service.*

TURUN YLIOPISTO

Kieli- ja käännöstieteiden laitos/Humanistinen tiedekunta

KUMPULAINEN, HANNA:

Family language policy: a qualitative case study on the explicit and implicit practices of a Finnish multilingual family

Tutkielma, 58 s., 11 liites.

Englannin kieli, oppimisen ja opettamisen opintopolku

Helmikuu 2020

The present study is a qualitative case study on a Finnish multilingual family's implicit and explicit family language policy, and the factors that have affected its formation. The purpose of the study is to shed light on the research in the fields of sociolinguistics and family language policy by examining implicit data in addition to the explicit data. Only recently the importance of implicit material has been acknowledged in both fields. The implicit data refers to the family members' 'invisible', natural speech practices, whereas explicit data refers to the manner in which the family members describe their speech practices themselves.

The participant family of the study lives in the Southern Finland. Three languages are spoken in the family: Finnish, English and Portuguese. The family members include a Finnish mother, a Brazilian father and their two sons. The study was conducted by examining the family's recorded spontaneous conversations, as well as interviewing the family members at their home. The following research questions were established for the study: 1. What kind of language practices occur in the everyday interaction of the family? 2. How do the family members describe the FLP and what kind of ideologies have affected its formation? and 3. How does the implicit language policy correspond to the explicit one?. The data was analyzed taking into account Bernard Spolsky's (2004) theory on the three interrelated components of language policy: practice, ideology and management.

According to the analysis, the family's speech practices follow an OPOL strategy – thus, the children speak a different language with each parent. Comparison of the interview and recorded conversations demonstrated that the family's implicit and explicit language policies correspond to each other. Examining the language ideologies revealed positive attitudes towards both multilingualism and the family's languages. English was considered the most prestigious language, which had affected the formation of the family language policy significantly. The effect of the parents' attitude on the family language policy is in keeping with the findings of previous studies: the more positive views a parent has on the concept of multilingualism, the more probable it is for them to raise their children multilingual. Since the present study is a case study, its findings cannot be generalized. In order to gain results that offer a broader insight into family language policy in Finnish families, more families should be included in the study.

Keywords multilingualism, multilingual family, language policy

Table of Contents

Abstract

Abbreviations

1 Introduction	1
2 Theoretical background.....	5
2.1 Multilingual Family.....	5
2.2 Language Policy	7
2.3 Spolsky’s Theory of the Three Components of LP	9
2.3.1 Internal and External Factors Affecting a FLP	10
2.4 Language Strategy.....	11
2.5 Family Language Policy – the Field	13
2.5.1 An Overview – Previous Studies and Development in the FLP Field	14
2.5.2 FLP in Finland.....	16
2.5.3 Researching FLP	18
3 Methodology and Data	21
3.1 The Participant Family	21
3.2 The Recordings	23
3.3 The Interview	24
4 Analysis and Discussion.....	27
4.1 Constructing the FLP	27
4.1.1 Speech Practices.....	27
4.1.2 Language Strategy and Code Switching	31
4.2 Language Ideology	36
4.2.1 The Ideologies Affecting the FLP.....	37
4.2.2 Language Management	43
4.3 Comparing the Implicit and Explicit Speech Practices	46
5 Conclusion.....	51
6 Bibliography.....	54
Appendix 1 - The Instructions for the Participant Family	
Appendix 2 - Interview Themes	
Appendix 3 - Transcription Conventions (from Gumperz & Berenz, 1993)	
Appendix 4 – Finnish Summary	

Abbreviations

LP – Language Policy

FLP – Family Language Policy

L2 – Second Language

OPOL – One Parent One Language

MLAH – Minority Language at Home

OSF – Official Statistics Finland

1 Introduction

The world around us has been changing rapidly during the latest decades – globalization has brought countries, people and cultures together in an unprecedented manner. While more and more people move in between countries, the advantage of having multilingual skills has become widely recognized and important (Doyle 145, 2013; Bhatia and Ritchie 1, 2004). For most of the world's population, multilingualism has become a normal part of their everyday lives (Quay and Montanari 2018, 544). According to Ortega (2019, 24), there are 195 nations and approximately 7000 documented languages in the world, which demonstrates the prevalence of multilingualism. One significant factor and result of the people's mobilization are multilingual families. Hundreds of thousands of children are nowadays born in some other country than their country of origin (Martikainen, Saukkonen ja Säävälä 2015, 13). A multilingual family might encounter challenges regarding the cultural and linguistic upbringing of their children, in case they are located in a strange environment. The present study is interested in studying these challenges from the perspective of language policy (LP), and is a case study on a Finnish multilingual family. I belong to a multilingual family myself – raising multilingual children provides me with knowledge and understanding of a multilingual family's life in the Finnish context.

In Finland, multilingualism is a common phenomenon, since the country has two national languages: Finnish and Swedish. In addition to the official languages of the country, other language groups, such as the indigenous group Sámi and the Roma, are acknowledged by the Constitution of Finland (Palviainen and Bergroth 2018, 262). Finland is also largely influenced by globalization, and the number of multilingual families is accelerating (Official Statistics Finland 2019a). A hundred years ago, the remote and scarcely populated Finland hardly inhabited any immigrants (Martikainen, Saukkonen ja Säävälä 2015, 14). Yet, after becoming a welfare state, people started to enter the country after love, family, studies, work, or as refugees (ibid.). In 2010 the total amount of immigrants living in Finland accounted for approximately 3,1-4,6 % out of the entire Finnish population (Martikainen, Saari and Korkiasaari 2015, 38) and in 2018 the quantity had already risen to 7,1%. These figures demonstrate that the amount of immigrants in Finland has almost doubled during the latest years. Based on this fact one could presume that the amount of multilingual families in Finland has, or will, grow in a similar manner, as the immigrants might start families in their new home country.

In the ever-growing multilingual environment more and more interest arises in the studies of multilingual families and children. This is because the family is an important domain to be studied, since the family and its norms provide the base for a child's socialization, and development of their language(s). Yet, the family is largely affected by the society surrounding them, and therefore cannot be studied in isolation from its environment (Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 421). One recently established field that covers studies regarding families and their surroundings' effect on their languages is family language policy (FLP). FLP has as its fundamental focus the different individual and societal factors that affect a multilingual child's language acquisition. According to Schwartz and Verschik (2013, 2), families should be taken into account if a community wants to create successful language policies that also serve for individuals. The present study attempts to respond to this need by shedding light on the formation and maintenance of the LP of a Finnish-Brazilian family.

The participant family, which the present thesis focuses on, lives in Finland and includes four members: the parents and two children (an infant and a three-year-old). The data for the present study consist of an interview (the explicit data) with the family, as well as recordings of spontaneous conversations between the family members (the implicit data). The data will be analyzed taking into account the following research questions:

1. What kind of language practices occur in the everyday interaction of the family?
2. How do the family members describe the FLP and what kind of ideologies have affected its formation?
3. How does the implicit language policy correspond to the explicit one?

The purpose of the first research question is to examine the FLP through the families' speech practices (e.g. who speaks which language to whom, does code switching occur, and do the practices follow a certain strategy). For observing the speech practices, only implicit data, thus the conversation recordings, will be used. Oftentimes families do not follow their explicit language policy the manner they believe they do, and therefore it is important to study implicit language policies as well (Haque 2011). In the literature of the field, the importance of studying implicit speech practices is highlighted (e.g. Schiffman 2002, 2; Spolsky 2004, 11; Shohamy 2006, 51; Schwartz 2008, 415). Through the second research question I aim to study the family members' ideologies about their languages, and the manner in which they affect the language practices of the family. Analyzing the second research question, the explicit data (the interview) will be observed. The purpose of the third research question is to compare the implicit and

explicit speech practices of the families – thus, whether the LP that the parents describe in the interview corresponds to the speech practices present in the family conversation. The analysis of the current study will be conducted using Spolsky’s (2004) theory of the three principal components of language policy (ideology, practice and management), which have, according to Moin et al. (2013, 54), lately been arousing worldwide interest in the FLP studies.

The current study is conducted in an intimate family domain, and the data offers an insight into the speech practices of the family, as well as how the ideologies and attitudes, together with the surrounding community, affect those practices. Indeed, Haque claims that unless both macro and micro levels are included in the LP and FLP research, “[i]t is hard to constitute a proper framework for understanding the mechanisms of language policy, language practice, and language transmission” (2011, 50). Thus, the key to understanding the micro level FLP is observing the ‘invisible’ speech practices that occur in the everyday family communication. According to Curdt-Christiansen (2013b, 279), the FLP field lacks research on exactly these types of “face-to-face interactions” – such as the family conversations. The current study responds to this need exactly by not only conducting an interview with the family, but also examining their spontaneous, informal conversations.

In addition to studying implicit data, the current study contributes to the field of FLP by providing information on children as the active co-constructors of a FLP. Much remains to be explored when it comes to pre-school aged children and their role in the making of the FLP (Palviainen and Boyd 2013, 245). Because of this gap, interviews with the family’s children included are placed more and more importance on in the field (Schwartz and Verschik 2013, 7). In the present study, both the family’s children are below school-age. Yet, since the family’s younger child is an infant, only his three-year-old brother’s views can be considered in the interview.

The sections of the paper will proceed in the following manner. At first, the theoretical background for the study will be presented. It will start by defining the key terms and topics (e.g. multilingual family, family language policy, language strategy) for the current study. After that, the previous research that has been conducted in the field of FLP will be presented, taking into account both international and Finnish contexts. After introducing the theoretical background, the methods of the study will be discussed and the participants of the study will be presented. The fourth section of the paper consists of analysis, and discussion of the findings.

The last section of the paper concludes the study and it will be followed by references and appendices.

2 Theoretical Background

In this section, I will begin by discussing some key terms (such as ‘family’ and ‘multilingualism’) that are related to the present study. After that, language policy and family language policy will be discussed, and Spolsky’s (2004) theory regarding language policy will be presented. The topic of the following section is language strategy, also including discussion about code switching. Next, the previous research of the FLP field will be presented briefly, first in an international context and secondly in the Finnish context. Last, the research methodology of the field will be discussed more closely, concentrating on a qualitative interview.

2.1 Multilingual Family

I want to start by defining what the term ‘*family*’ means in my study, since the word may have different connotations for people in different cultures. In (socio)linguistic studies, ‘family’ can be referred to as, for example, ‘a speech community’ (Spolsky 2004, 40) or a ‘social unit’ (Lanza 2007, 46; Säävälä 2015, 102; Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 420). Yet, for the purpose of the current study these type of definitions are too broad, since they can also refer to quite large groups of people. Summarizing Official Statistics Finland’s (2019b) definition, a family can be described as a couple with or without children, living in the same household (including single-parents). OSF’s definition is adequate to the concept of family in the current study, since the participant family in question consists of a couple living with their two children.

In academic literature, a common definition of a *multilingual* person is usually the following: a person who uses two or more languages in their everyday lives (e.g. Butler 2012, 110; Quay and Montanari 2018, 544). The same definition is sometimes used about *bilingual* persons as well (e.g. De Houwer 2018, 325; Grosjean 2010, 4; Lanza 2007, 45). In the recently published *Cambridge Handbook of Bilingualism*, De Houwer and Ortega (2018, 3-4) acknowledge the fact that their approach to bilingualism actually resembles what others might call multilingualism. Even though multilingualism is a more complex phenomenon than bilingualism, the two also share many similarities - at least in comparison to *monolingualism* (speaking only one language) (Quay and Montanari 2018, 556-560). In the current study, I will use Lanza’s (2007, 45) simple definitions when referring to bi- and multilingualism: a bilingual person speaks two languages, and a multilingual person speaks more than two. The participants

of the current study include both bi- and multilinguals, and therefore both terms will be used in the study. Furthermore, studies on both bi- and multilingual families will be discussed throughout the text.

Like the above paragraph demonstrated, academics have encountered several issues trying to define bi- and multilingualism, since the use of the terms can vary to a great extent (Butler and Hakuta 2004, 114). Besides the amount of languages spoken, other issues might arise when determining whether a person is bi- or multilingual. For example, some claim that a bilingual person should have a native-like competence his or her languages, yet, others think that it is enough to produce comprehensible utterances in merely one of the languages (which would even include early-stage L2-learners as bilinguals). The above examples demonstrate how to define multilingualism according to language *fluency*. As regarding to the present study, I agree with Grosjean's (2010, 11) view on how it is easier to emphasize language *use* (instead of, for example, fluency or age of acquisition) when determining a multilingual person.

In a similar manner as a multilingual person, it is possible to describe a *multilingual family*: in a multilingual family more than two languages belong to the family's linguistic repertoire (Lanza 2007, 45). I consider the family of the current study to be a multilingual one, since in addition to speaking their mother tongues, the parents use a third language, English, as their common home language. Thus, at least three languages appear in the family's everyday life. Such issues as how fluently the languages should be spoken arise in the academic literature while describing a multilingual family, however, they are not taken into further consideration in the current study.

In a family, where several languages are spoken, the languages can be divided into one *majority* language, and one or several *minority languages*. A majority language refers to the language that is more dominant or more vastly used in the family, whereas a minority language is less utilized (Barron-Hauwaert 2011, 39). Usually the majority language is the one that is used in the community where the family lives, and the minority language can be linked to either one or both of the parents. In bilingual families, children usually choose to speak in the majority language with each other - Barron-Hauwaert (2011) found out in her study that 2/3 of the bilingual families' siblings preferred communicating among themselves in the majority language of the country of residence. De Houwer (2009) acquired similar results in her study: many bilingually raised children never start speaking both their languages, instead, they tend to opt the language that is dominant in their environment, thus the majority language.

It is rare for multilinguals to be equally competent in all their languages – according to De Houwer (2018, 342), only 25% of bilingual families manage to raise their children fluent in all the languages of the family. One of the reasons affecting the unsuccessful language acquisition is the fact that multilinguals do not usually need to command all their languages equally well, since they use their languages in different contexts, for different purposes and with different people (Mäntylä, Pietikäinen and Dufva 2009, 28). Mäntylä, Pietikäinen and Dufva (ibid.) describe a multilingual person's languages as resources, which are utilized depending on, for example, their situation and location. Usually parents who desire for their child to become equally fluent in all the family's languages, are obliged to form some kind of a *language policy* in order to support the child's language acquisition. The term 'language policy' will be discussed in the following section (2.2).

2.2 Language Policy

Language policy (LP) can be described as a set of rules made by a speech community (Spolsky 2004, 40) in order to control language use. Language policies exist all around us - nations, cities, organizations, schools, workplaces, neighborhoods and families are all possible domains for forming language policies. For example, a language policy can be recorded in a country's constitution or law, stating one or more official languages for the country. The fact that in Finland immigrant students are entitled to classes in their mother tongue (Finnish National Board of Education 2010, 8) is another example of language policy. Even individuals have 'personal language policies', depending on their preferences of language use (Schwartz and Verschik 2013, 4; Spolsky 2004, 10). For example, one might avoid swearing, if they feel like it is not an appropriate manner to speak. All parts of language, such as pronunciation and grammar, or which style of speaking to use in different situations, are possible components of a language policy (Spolsky 2004, 9).

A language policy can be *explicit* or *implicit*. Some researchers use the terms *overt* and *covert*, respectively (e.g. Shohamy 2006, Schiffman 2002). Explicit (overt) language policies refer to those that are usually written and formally documented (Spolsky 2004, 11), whereas implicit (covert) policies are unstated and usually seen in the actual practices of a speech community. Even if a language policy is explicitly written, it does not mean that it is appropriately executed (Schiffman 2002, 3). For example, a speech community could be promised by law the right to have education for their children in a certain language, yet, the lack of resources could make it

impossible to realize. In addition, explicit policies do not always reflect truthfully the way languages are actually spoken in a community. A written policy indeed works as “the probability relation of the form” (Spolsky 2004, 41), thus makes it more probable for the implicit language use to follow the explicit conventions, but the reality might actually be different.

Migrating families usually have to make a policy regarding which language should be learned, which language should be maintained and, for example, which language shall be used in and out of home (Hirsch and Lee 2018, 883). In addition, a family might need to consider which language shall be spoken with relatives, and which language shall be taught to children (Shohamy 2006, 48). A language policy formed within a family is referred to as *family language policy* (FLP). Quay and Montanari define FLP as “conscious planning of language use in the family based on parental language goals, attitudes, or intentions” (2018, 551). In addition to multilingual families, monolingual families (in which only one language is used in everyday communication) can also have some kind of a language policy. It can include, for example, rules about what kind of language use is good or bad.

In the same manner as language policies on national or institutional levels can be explicit or implicit, language policies in a family domain are that as well. In this study, I compare the explicitness and implicitness of a multilingual family’s language policy, even though they do not have an official document stating one. According to Curdt-Christiansen, an explicit FLP refers to “observable efforts made by adults and their conscious involvement and investment in providing linguistic conditions and context for language learning and literacy development” (2018, 420). Therefore, in the current study, the manner in which the family members describe their language use in the interview can be considered as an explicit language policy. The implicit FLP, on the other hand, refers to the language practices that a family realizes (ibid.). The audio tapes that were recorded for the present study provide information about the implicit language policy, thus, how the family speaks in reality. Several scholars in the field (e.g. Schiffman 2002, 2; Spolsky 2004, 11; Shohamy 2006, 51; Schwartz 2008, 415) acknowledge the fact that the explicit and implicit language policies do not always correspond to each other. Therefore, when studying a language policy at any level, it is crucial to take both implicit and explicit policies into account.

2.3 Spolsky's Theory of the Three Components of LP

Bernard Spolsky's (2004) theoretical model of the three interrelated components of language policy is one of the main influences of the studies in the field of FLP (Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 421). The three components, based on which a LP is formed, are *practices*, *ideology* and *management*. Language practices refer to the conscious and unconscious decisions about speaking languages, varying from the use of sounds, words and grammar to the conventions of appropriate language use in specific situations. Language ideology determines how a speech community wants to execute the language practices, and is formed by beliefs and attitudes about different languages. Not only does language ideology affect practices, but it is also connected to language management. Language management refers to the way an authority tries to modify or influence language practices, simultaneously imposing its own ideologies about correct language use. Language management is also linked to the efforts made trying to maintain a language. Implementing a law about language or parents punishing their children for swearing are examples of language management. In Finland, multilingual families' parents choose their children's official mother tongue for the language registration system, which can also be viewed as an example of language management.

One purpose of the present study is to observe the language ideology of the family. Out of Spolsky's (2004) three components, language ideology is quite fundamental - without ideologies and beliefs about language, language policies would hardly exist (Palviainen and Bergroth 2018, 264). Curdt-Christiansen (2013b, 277) describes language ideology as "the underlying force", which affects the parents' decision on what should be included in their language policy. Language ideology can also be described as "the set of behaviors, assumptions, cultural forms, prejudices, folk belief systems, attitudes, stereotypes, ways of thinking about language, and religio-historical circumstances associated with a particular language" (Schiffman 2002, 6). Indeed, the different rules and norms that work within a family are based on the family members' ideologies. Parents or other 'managers' within a family try to manage the language use according to the norms. Different language practices occur because there are different ideologies about the way people want to speak. Every individual has their own personal beliefs and attitudes about what type of speech is desirable or undesirable, and usually belongs to a speech community that shares at least some of them.

2.3.1 Internal and External Factors Affecting a FLP

A FLP is shaped by both *internal* and *external* forces, which carry their own sets of beliefs within them (Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 422). Internal forces refer to, for example, the different values that multilinguals associate with their languages, and how they act upon these values inside a family. The values and feelings that multilingual family members have regarding their languages are, to a large extent, shaped by interacting with the surrounding community and being exposed to its ideologies (Harding and Riley 1986, 76-77; Ridanpää 2018, 189; Protassova 2018, 103). The surroundings and its affective influence can be regarded as an external force molding a multilingual person's language ideology. Internal and external forces and their impact on language ideology determine the direction of a family's LP. Naturally, parents who value their mother tongues will more likely want to raise their children bilingual (Harding and Riley 1986, 74). On the other hand, having negative attitudes might cause a parent reject the idea of passing the language on to the children, or invest less effort in exposing the children to the language (*ibid.*). In addition, affectionate relationships to the relatives living in the parents' or one of the parent's home country can help forming ideologies that are supportive of including a heritage language in the FLP (*cf.* Guardado and Becker 2014; McCabe 2016).

Another factor that influences FLP is the family members' opinions about multilingualism itself. Usually speaking several languages is considered beneficial: for example, the Finnish-Russian families in Moin et al.'s study (2013) found multilingual skills a great asset. Barron-Hauwaert (2004) noticed in her study on nearly 100 bilingual families that the majority of the parents found bilingualism completely free of disadvantages. Also Grosjean (2010, 102) reports that 67% of the trilinguals in his study thought that there are not any disadvantages to knowing several languages. All in all, several studies suggest that parents have very positive associations related to bilingualism and raising bilingual children (*cf.* Piller 2002, Caldas 2006, King and Fogle 2006, Palviainen and Boyd 2013). One of such studies was conducted by Mäntylä, Pietikäinen and Dufva (2009). They studied a Finnish-English family living in Finland. The parents of the family demonstrated that they value multilingualism and find it important to raise their children bilingual. The English-speaking father of the family therefore tried to use Finnish as much as possible, even though it was his second language and he could have used English (since Finns, generally speaking, are quite fluent in English).

In all societies, languages are hierarchically ordered according to their status (Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 430; Fuller 2018, 122). Often minority languages inside the majority culture

suffer from the lack of prestige (May 2006, 257). This usually leads to minority languages becoming so-called sentimental languages that are used at home, when talking to friends and family, whereas the majority language is recognized as the language of school and work (providing social and economic mobility) and therefore enjoys a hierarchically more valued position in the society (May 2006, 263). The described phenomenon leads to language shift and loss of heritage languages, when the minority community slowly gives in. According to Protassova (2018, 103), parents who speak a minority language usually struggle to maintain it, and their children rarely become balanced bilinguals.

The relative status of multilingual families' languages determines whether they find the society's ideologies supportive when forming their FLP. According to Curdt-Christiansen (2018, 429), the decision-making on FLP is strongly related to language prestige and language status. High prestige 'world languages', such as English, are better valued than low prestige languages, or mainstream language varieties (Chevrot and Ghimenton 2018, 518). In Finland, English enjoys a prestigious status and is an important language in the working life (Haque 2011, 55). The importance of English shows on the educational level as well: comprehensive school students in Finland must choose at least one foreign language to study, which is practically always English (Palviainen and Bergroth 2018, 263). The knowledge of English is considered an asset and even a necessity (Mäntylä, Pietikäinen and Dufva 2009, 34), and the overall attitudes to English are positive in Finland - the language is found important in the globalizing country (cf. Leppänen et al. 2011). Mäkelä and Posti (2018) studied Finnish language attitudes in their MA thesis, in which 413 persons (from different backgrounds and parts of Finland) filled out a questionnaire. The results revealed that most Finns consider English very important, useful and practical. English was also thought to be more practical than Finnish. In Leppänen et al.'s (2011) similar study, conducted almost ten years earlier on a larger group (including 1495 persons), the majority of the participants found English quite or very important.

2.4 Language Strategy

Family language strategy is a term that should not be used interchangeably with FLP. Barron-Hauwaert defines the term as "the description of family language organization" (2011, 39). According to her definition, a family language strategy describes, among other things, which language is spoken between each family member. In this manner, a language strategy

corresponds to Spolsky's (2004) definition about language practice, which is one component of a LP. In academic literature, there are both scientific studies and parent oriented guides regarding the strategies which concern a child's bilingual upbringing (Palviainen and Boyd 2013, 223). The most common types of language strategies are differently classified and named, depending on the author. In the current study, I will refer to *one parent one language* (OPOL) strategy, also known as the *one person one language* strategy. In the OPOL strategy the children are expected to use a different language with each parent. The languages in question are normally the parents' mother tongues. In Barron-Hauwaert's (2011) study on bilingual families the OPOL strategy proved to be the most popular approach, since 40% of all the families chose to follow it. Palviainen and Boyd (2013, 226), and Grosjean (2010, 208) also recognize the strategy as the most familiar one among bilingual families. As to trilingual families, the OPOL strategy has been successful in families where neither of the parents speak the majority language of the country in which they are residing (cf. De Houwer 2004; Braun and Cline 2014). In addition to the OPOL strategy, various other strategies exist. One popular strategy, for example, is referred to as the *minority language at home* (MLAH) strategy. In this strategy, both parents speak the family's minority language at home exclusively. De Houwer's study (2007) indicated that MLAH strategy is the most effective one in producing balanced bilinguals – the OPOL strategy was not always effective among the participant families.

The balance between the majority and minority languages spoken in a family is one factor affecting which language strategy they choose (Barron-Hauwaert 2004, 29). For example, in certain contexts a child's acquisition of the minority language might be threatened if the input of that language comes from one person only. It is not uncommon for a multilingual family to change the already chosen strategy, in fact, according to Barron-Hauwaert's study (2004, 184) there is a trend towards adapting the strategy over time in the OPOL families. The change might be initiated by, for example, moving from one country to another so that the majority/minority language balance changes, or having more children to the family, who react to the already existing strategy differently (Palviainen and Boyd 2013, 223).

By choosing the OPOL strategy, many parents aim at teaching the children to speak only one language at a time. Nevertheless, as Barron-Hauwaert (2004) noticed in her study, usually both the children and parents of the OPOL families mix the family's languages to some extent. Mixing the languages is normal for very young children, since they might still be incapable of separating the languages from each other (Barron-Hauwaert 2004, 11). Yet, even as young as two-year-olds can consciously adjust their language use depending on the context (Reyes 2004,

79). The earliest studies on language mixing misinterpreted the switches of the language as bilinguals' lack of competence in either one or both of the languages (Cantone 2007, 54). However, more recent studies (e.g. Reyes 2004) have proved that code switching is a complex skill which develops gradually when children grow up. Indeed, older children and adults can use language mixing for different communicative purposes. For example, in the presence of other bilinguals mixing can be used as a tool to freely express oneself in both languages (Harding and Riley 1986, 57), to mark group identity (Grosjean 2010, 54) or to bond within the family (Moin et al. 2013, 77; Barron-Hauwaert 2004, 13). This kind of language mixing is usually referred to as *code switching* - it is a skill that requires proficiency in both languages and takes time to develop (Barron-Hauwaert 2004, 12). Therefore, mixing languages, even in OPOL families, should be seen as a positive matter instead of a negative one (Barron-Hauwaert 2004, 193).

When code switching, a bilingual person may sometimes utter a word, a phrase or a sentence in some other language than the base language of the conversation (Grosjean 2010, 52). The type of code switching that occurs within the boundaries of a sentence is known as *intrasentential* code switching, whereas switching that occurs between sentences is known as *intersentential* code switching (MacSwan 2004, 283; Cantone 2007, 57). Even if the children in the OPOL families would already be able to control their use of intrasentential code switches, they usually have to code switch intersententially as they move between one language to another while talking with both the parents. Indeed, Yamamoto (2001) noticed in his study that following the OPOL strategy strictly inside a family is quite exceptional. Accordingly, Palviainen and Boyd (2013, 226) argue that it might even be impossible to purely produce the OPOL strategy. In between families different opinions on whether code switching is acceptable or not might occur. Dewaele and Wei (2013) found out in their study, via a large multinational online survey, that persons working or living in linguistically diverse surroundings felt more positive about mixing languages.

2.5 Family Language Policy – the Field

This section concentrates on the FLP field and its research. In the first subsection (2.5.1), a brief overview of the field's history and previously conducted studies will be provided. Discussion of the future direction of the field will also be included. In the following subsection (2.5.2), FLP research in the Finnish context will be discussed. The last subsection (2.5.3) presents the

most common methods in the FLP field, focusing especially on a qualitative interview. The section also discusses the benefits and possible shortcomings that researching children might subsume.

2.5.1 An Overview – Previous Studies and Development in the FLP Field

My thesis contributes to the recently formed field of family language policy (FLP). The field's research is interested in families' language practices and management, and how these affect the families' language transmission from generation to another, as well as the language skills their children obtain (Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 436). FLP is a multidisciplinary field of studies that has its roots in the fields of language policy and child language acquisition. According to King and Fogle (2016), there are gaps in the research of both fields. In the field of LP, the previous studies have focused on the 'macro-level' of LP, which refers to studying how ideologies and attitudes affect LP's formation in public and institutional domains. Yet, there is need for 'micro-level' studies as well, which focus on more intimate domains, such as the LPs that occur in family settings, and concentrate on interactional patterns between the family members. The field of child language acquisition also lacks knowledge on, for example, how children become balanced bilinguals and micro-analyses including child-caretaker interaction. The field of FLP seeks to bridge the gaps between the field of language policy and research on child language acquisition (Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 420). The present study tries to fill some of the mentioned gaps, since it takes place in a very intimate (family) domain, and it describes the family's interaction in detail.

The interdisciplinary field of FLP is currently a part of sociolinguistics. There are two main theories that operate in the background of the field: language socialization and Spolsky's theoretical model (Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 421). Spolsky's theoretical model, concerning the three interrelated components of LP, was already discussed in the section 2.3. The *socialization theory*, on the other hand, refers to the way children acquire social and cultural knowledge interacting with their environment (including language learning and use) (Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 421; Maccoby 2014, 3). According to Curdt-Christiansen, these two theories combined offer "theoretical understanding of the dynamic relationship between FLP and its wider sociolinguistic and sociocultural contexts" (2018, 421). In other words, FLPs do not exist in isolation from the cultures surrounding families, instead, families interact with their environment and vice versa.

Certain themes have contributed to the studies of the field. Researchers have been interested in finding out why some languages are viewed more precious than others, how parents view bilingualism, and which factors, such as literacy environment and parents' efforts, promote a child becoming a balanced bilingual (Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 428). The earliest studies in the field of FLP mainly focused on Western middle-class bilingual families, and the parents' views and strategies on raising their children as balanced bilinguals (cf. De Houwer 1990, Lanza 1997, Piller 2002, Okita 2002). Most of the studies focused on families with two high-status European languages. Findings suggested that parents have, in general, strongly positive associations related to bilingualism and raising bilingual children (cf. Piller 2002, Caldas 2006, King and Fogle 2006).

Recently in the field there has been a shift of interest from Western middle-class families to families that are in a greater danger of losing their mother tongues, such as migrant families, and families of indigenous or (socioculturally and socioeconomically) marginalized speech communities (Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 425). The previously understudied minority groups are gaining more interest in the field, and research is focusing on the attitudes and different values that affect the language shift and the loss of heritage languages, thus, the language ideology. An example of studying the preservation an endangered language is the study conducted by Smith-Christmas (2016). She studied a family of three generations in the Isle of Skye, Scotland. In her 8-year-long ethnographic study Smith-Christmas found out, through observing the family's interactions and conducting interviews, that the children preferred speaking English to speaking Gaelic despite the adults' efforts. The preference of English was partly due to different ideologies related to the languages: Gaelic was associated with authority and "grannie", whereas English was considered relaxed and cool. Ó hÍfearnáin (2013) conducted a similar study in the Southwestern Ireland. The participant families of the study fought against the pressure that English was causing to the transmitting of Irish to their children.

One of the current aims of the FLP field is to understand the different societal, ideological and personal factors that affect parents' decisions on planning and managing their family's languages (King and Fogle 2016, 2). As has already been mentioned, FLP is no longer merely viewed as an intimate family matter, instead, it is considered a dynamic system that interacts with its environment. Therefore, researchers in the field are interested in finding links between LPs at home, school and the society (Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 428). Or in other words, the manner in which a family's environment (the macro-level) interacts with the family members (the micro-level), and how the relationships between these parties influence the decisions the

parents form about their FLPs. For example, several studies in the field have already demonstrated that the external pressure from educational or national LPs can indeed affect negatively the preservation of minority cultures' heritage language(s). In Norway, the official Norwegianisation policy of the 1970's caused an ethnic minority group, Kven, to stop using their language with their children (Lane 2010). Kven now brings feelings of shame and inferiority to its speakers, and parents prefer the majority language, Norwegian, in order for their children to succeed better in life (ibid.). Similar results were found in Wei, Saravanan and Ng's (1997) study on a Chinese community living in Singapore. Curdt-Christiansen (2014) study demonstrated that Chinese parents (also living in Singapore) feel like it is necessary to teach their children English, even at the cost of their mother tongue, because of the fact that in a competitive society a good command of English holds a significant position.

The future studies of the field might concentrate more on children's views and roles as the constructors of the FLP (Curdt-Christiansen 2013a, 5). Children have a voice of their own, and might either accept or deny their care-givers' decisions on how to use their languages (Bergroth 2016, 1; Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 431). In addition to studying how children impact the FLP, scholars are currently also interested in studying the manner in which the FLP shows in the everyday conversations of a family, and what kind of language input parents offer to their children (Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 431). Exploring language ideology might also continue in the future studies of the field, especially examining the links between the environment and its impact on the parents (King and Fogle 2016, 3). According to King and Fogle (ibid.), there is also an urgent need in the field of FLP to study how new technologies affect the transmission of the heritage language to the following generations - for example, between family members who live far from each other.

2.5.2 FLP in Finland

As to researching FLP in Finland, not many studies have been conducted. Bilingualism, on the other hand, has been vastly studied, since Finland is a bilingual country (Finnish and Swedish being the official languages – in addition to Sámi, an indigenous language which is spoken by approximately 10.000 persons). Researchers have been interested in, for example, studying minority groups, language attitudes, teaching languages and language policy, and have focused on individuals or communities, rather than families (Mäntylä, Pietikäinen and Dufva 2009, 27). The participant families of these studies have mostly been Finnish-Swedish bilingual families.

According to Mäntylä, Pietikäinen, and Dufva (ibid.), multilingual families still remain understudied in Finland. In the following paragraphs I will discuss some FLP studies that have been conducted in Finland by the present date.

One example of a study on a Finnish-Swedish bilingual family is the one of Palviainen and Boyd (2013). Three families participated in the study. The study's aim was to understand and describe the manner in which the FLP is co-constructed by its members, and to compare the FLPs between the families. The families had made both conscious and unconscious choices regarding the children's linguistic upbringing. The conscious choices included, for example, choosing Swedish daycare and school for supporting the children's language development. The unconscious choices included, for example, realizing the OPOL strategy in the family, which had come naturally to the parents (even though they were themselves raised in monolingual families). Another example of a study on Finnish-Swedish bilingual families is that of Sjöberg (2016), who studied language strategies and language choices of five families living in Finland. Two of the families had chosen to raise their children monolingual (thus, they had chosen either Finnish or Swedish and left the other language out) and three had decided to raise the children bilingual. According to the results of the study, the monolingual families regretted their choice, and the bilingual families were extremely happy about their children's abilities of speaking two languages. They thought the language competence would be beneficial in the children's lives in their future education and work contexts, for example. The study also indicates that following an OPOL strategy consistently is important for successful language development.

Smith-Christmas, Bergroth and Bezcioglu-Göktolga (2019) conducted an ethnographic large-scale project on FLPs formed to support a minority language in a family. Their study included parents from three different countries, one of them being Finland. The Finnish family in question was a Finnish-Swedish bilingual one. The study concentrated on the fact that successful FLPs should not always be measured by how fluently a child speaks their languages. For example, in the study's Finnish family, the most important objective of their FLP was to defend the children's right to speak their minority language, Swedish, and therefore the Finnish-speaking mother tried to promote the language by speaking Swedish especially in institutional contexts (even if she could have used Finnish in those situations).

After Finnish-Swedish speaking bilingual families the second largest bilingual group in Finland is Finnish-Russian families (OSF 2017). Some studies about the FLP of Russian-Finnish families have been conducted: for example, Moin et al. (2013) studied Finnish-Russian

bilingual families and the parents' language ideologies. The study based its analysis on Spolsky's (2004) theory about the three principal components of language policy. The main aim of the study was to observe the link between the families' backgrounds and whether they had opted (Finnish-Russian) bilingual education for their children. According to the results of the study, the parents of the bilingual families thought that bilingual education in Finland is supported and encouraged, and multilingual skills in general were seen as a great asset. Protassova (2018) also studied Finnish-Russian families (in a project that also included French-Russian and German-Russian families). Her study concentrated on FLP and multilingual education, and the manner in which the families transmit Russian to the following generations, as well as maintain the language. Among the findings was the notion that most of the parents placed more importance on the learning of the majority language, Finnish, over Russian. Yet, they felt that the transmission of the Russian language is also important, and should not be neglected.

Some studies regarding multilingual families have also been conducted in the Finnish context, two of which will be discussed next. Haque (2011) studied the FLP of a multilingual family living in Finland. The everyday languages of the family were Urdu, Hindi, English and Finnish. The father of the family valued the teaching of English even over the mother tongues of the parents (Urdu and Hindi). The mother felt that mother tongue is such a significant part of one's identity that learning it is more important than learning English. Although the parents had had different opinions about the importance of English, they had managed to form a FLP that pleased them both. The family might return to India, which is one factor affecting the teaching of English to their children. Another example on studying a multilingual family is that of Palviainen and Bergroth (2018), who examined three multilingual families and their language identities. At least Finnish, Swedish and English were spoken in the families. The findings revealed that despite the diverse language capabilities the parents possessed, they strongly felt that they are monolingual instead of multilingual. Feelings related to a monolingual identity were due to the fact that the parents thought that a multilingual person is born to a multilingual family, and languages that are learnt formally do not make one multilingual.

2.5.3 Researching FLP

There is a great variety of methodological tools to be used in the research of the FLP field (Schwartz 2010, 185). Usually the methods applied are qualitative, yet, researchers have begun

to combine both qualitative and quantitative methods in the same studies (ibid.) Using multiple research methods is becoming more popular in the field, since it is necessary in order to reveal the processes that affect a family's decision of transitioning their languages to the children (ibid.). According to Schwartz (2010, 185) the most common method in the field is an in-depth, semi-structured interview. In addition to interviewing, observation is commonly applied to FLP studies (Hirsch and Lee 2018, 889). In the present study, interviewing and recording have been chosen as methods. In my opinion, applying these both methods provide more reliable data, in comparison to, for example, questionnaires. Sometimes questionnaires, filled in by parents, might offer contradictory statements when compared to the family's actual speech practices (Haque 2011, 51). This could be, for example, due to feelings of guilt and shame felt by the parents about the speech habits of the family (ibid.). Implicit material (recordings or videotapes), in addition to explicit material (questionnaires or interviews), in the studies of FLP is important, since explicit material may not always represent the reality.

Most studies in the FLP field have focused on parents and their manners of creating a language policy in the family (Schwartz 2010, 186). Yet, as was discussed previously in the section 2.5.1, researchers have begun to acknowledge the fact that children act as the co-constructors of the FLP (Bergroth 2016, 6). As a part of the socialization process, children become accustomed to their family's culture, norms and values, and they might either accept them, or reject them (Bergroth 2016, 1). The present study also takes into account the participant family's (three-year-old) child as one of the FLP's creators, and he is included in the interview. A three-year-old is capable of observing their environment, understanding different persons' perspectives, linking a certain person or situation to using a certain language and behaving accordingly to the situation (Bergroth 2016, 2). Little children develop fast in their cognitive skills, however, they still lack learning all the rules of interplay (ibid.). That is why interviewing a young child for a study can be challenging, but not impossible.

The present study intends to place value on the views of the participant family's child. Indeed, research on children's beliefs and opinions provide a counterbalance to the weight of adults' (and the environment's) opinions (Almér 2015, 161). Yet, according to Almér (2015, 162), a researcher should be cautious about what is interpreted as a child's opinion. Children's views are usually heavily affected by their parents' ideologies. On the other hand, Schwartz (2010, 186) points out that interviewing children helps to reduce the *halo-effect*, meaning that children might be more honest in their statements since they do not feel like pleasing the researcher. While interviewing children, it is important to step out of a researcher's role, and act playfully

and less adult-like – thus, take on the so-called “auntie-mode” (Almér 2015, 162). Auntie-mode helps to outbalance the power relationship between the child and the researcher, and might be beneficial for creating trust between them (ibid.). Subsequently, trust helps the child to share their feelings and opinions. In Almér’s study (2015), she noticed that three-year-old children were able to make their voices heard when a mutual confidence had been established, there was a connection between them, they shared a common code and there was some content to be shared together. While conducting the interview of the present study, the above-mentioned matters were taken into account in order to establish trust between me and the family’s child. More on the interview can be read in the following section (3), which presents the methodology of the current study.

3 Methodology and Data

The present study is a qualitative case study that aims at examining the language policy of a multilingual family living in Finland. The qualitative nature of the study can be observed via the methods used; a narrative approach to interviewing was chosen in order to obtain information on the participants' lived experiences on raising multilingual children. In addition to interviewing, the participants recorded their naturally occurring interaction. The interview will be referred to as the explicit data, since the participants have the possibility to express their views explicitly. The recordings of the family conversations will be referred to as the implicit data, since the purpose of the data is to observe the family's speech practices as they occur naturally.

Three research questions were established for the current study:

1. What kind of language practices occur in the everyday interaction of the family?
2. How do the family members describe the FLP and what kind of ideologies have affected its formation?
3. How does the implicit language policy correspond to the explicit one?

Firstly, through the first research question, I aim to describe the FLP mainly by examining the speech practices of the family. Only implicit data will be used during the analysis of the first research question. Secondly, using the explicit data, I aim at examining which beliefs and attitudes towards the languages and their use in the family have led to the formation of the FLP, and whether the FLP has changed over time. Thirdly, I want to compare the explicit and implicit FLPs of the participant family and examine if they correspond to each other. The third phase of the analysis is important, since often the practices do not correspond to the statements that have been made about FLPs (Haque 2011, 51).

3.1 The Participant Family

The participant family of the current study consist of a 30-year-old mother, a 29-year-old father, a three-year-old son and a newborn. From this point on, I will refer to the family members and other persons appearing in the data using pseudonyms, in order to protect the family's privacy. The mother will be called Sara, the father will be called Carlos, the older son will be called

Lucas and the infant will be called Jonah. The family also has a nanny, who will be referred to as Francisca. The family lives currently in Southern Finland. The parents moved to Finland four years ago. Before that, they lived in Australia for a year. The parents met each other while traveling, and during that time Sara was living in Finland and Carlos was living in Australia. When they were living in Australia together, they started to expect their first child and decided to move to Finland.

The family is multilingual: their languages are Finnish, English and Portuguese. Carlos was born in Brazil, therefore, his mother tongue is Portuguese. He moved to New Zealand at the age of 15, where he acquired English naturalistically. Later on he moved to Australia, where he continued using English as the main language of communication. Nowadays Carlos mostly speaks English, and Portuguese only occasionally when, for example, talking to his father who lives in Brazil. He understands some Finnish, but does not speak it much. Carlos prefers speaking English to speaking his mother tongue, Portuguese, since speaking English feels more natural to him – he became accustomed to using the language during the 14 years that he lived in English-speaking countries. In the interview Carlos states that he is a hundred percent fluent in Portuguese, since it is his native language, and continues by saying “and I guess in English also”, which means that he finds his English language skills very advanced, even though he acquired the language as L2.

The mother, Sara, is Finnish and Finnish is her mother tongue. She also speaks English, which she learned formally at school during childhood years. Sara studied in an English oriented class during the 7th-9th grades (approximately 13-15 years old), where English was used more than in regular classrooms. During the time when Sara lived in Australia with Carlos, her English skills were enhanced. Sara uses Finnish with her own family (parents and relatives) and friends. Even though Sara has an English oriented background, she describes her English skills “not a hundred percent”. Thus, she believes she manages well in English, yet, does not feel like a completely fluent speaker of the language (in contrast to Carlos). In addition to Finnish and English, Sara understands some Portuguese. She has acquired some words and utterances by listening, not through formal learning.

The son of the family, Lucas, has been raised bilingual from birth. He speaks Finnish with the mother and English with the father, which has lead him to acquire the languages in a balanced manner. His baby brother, Jonah, does not talk yet, but will be raised bilingual. Lucas can already separate his languages and the different contexts in which to use his languages. During

the interview, Lucas told that he can speak “papain kieltä” (=father’s language, *papai* means dad in Portuguese), äidin kieltä (=mother’s language, *äiti* means mother in Finnish), and “Franciscan kieltä” (=Francisca’s language). Francisca speaks Portuguese, thus, Portuguese is the language that Lucas is referring to. Lucas also refers to Finnish as “mikä-kieli” (=the what language) and to English as “what-kieli” (=the what language). In other words, he relates the interrogative form of ‘what’ to each parent and the language he uses with them.

3.2 The Recordings

The implicit data for the study were gathered during the year 2019. First, the family recorded their spontaneous speech between all the family members. The parents were given the option of using a recorder, but they chose to record with their phones. The parents were instructed to make the recordings as long as possible, and during an occasion of their choice. The research instructions for the family are visible in the Appendix 1. All family members were asked to be present for the recordings. The parents knew that the study concerned their languages and speaking, yet, I had not given any exact information, such as the topic being FLP. Providing the parents with detailed information on the study might have caused them to modify their speech during the recording. The aim was to obtain as natural and freely spoken material as possible, since I wanted to be able to hear the family’s interaction as it appears in real life. Therefore, the family recorded the tapes without me being there, since my presence might have caused the family members to pay attention to their speech. It could be argued that the recorder itself made the family members feel conscious about their speaking, yet, in my view it might not be the case for the particular family: the fact that one of the tapes had to be excluded since the family members forgot that they were recording (and discussed private matters) proves that they forgot the existence of the recorder.

The recordings vary in their length and content. The first tape was recorded in May and its duration is 18 minutes 37 seconds. The family members are sitting at the dinner table, eating and conversing. The second tape was recorded in September and accounts for 20 minutes 49 seconds, and the setting is similar to the first tape. The third tape was recorded in September and the duration is 3 minutes 35 seconds. In this recording the family is dining at a restaurant and playing a board game. In the fourth tape the family is dining at a restaurant again, this time only conversing. The tape was recorded in September and its duration is 24 minutes 16 seconds. The fifth tape, which was recorded in September and accounts for 10 minutes and 20 seconds,

includes a conversation of the participant family and their friends planning a vacation together. Permission to use the recorded material was asked from all the participants. The sixth tape was recorded in September and the duration is 4 minutes 12 seconds. In this tape the family members are conversing in the living room and Carlos is playing with Lucas. The total duration of all the recorded material is 81 minutes 90 seconds. I am aware of the fact that many of the recordings are quite short. One might argue that the length of the recordings reduces the conversations' spontaneity. Obviously, it is a possibility - yet, in my view, the fact that one of the tapes had to be excluded because the participants forgot that they were recording proves that the conversations were most probably quite natural and spontaneous. Furthermore, family life can be pretty hectic (which I happen to know since I am a mother of two myself), and conversations with little children do not usually last long. It is understandable that the longest tapes included dinner table conversations, since those probably account for the longest conversations in family life. The overall length of the recorded data could have been longer as well, yet, in my opinion it is sufficient for the purposes of the current study, which is to use the recordings for observing the language practices only.

After receiving the audio tapes, I listened to two of them and made notes, since I wanted to get acquainted with the speech practices of the family before planning the interview. Having conducted the interview, I listened to the tapes several more times and transcribed the parts which I found beneficial for further analyzing. Since the focus of the current study is in the speech practices and language ideology instead of linguistic traits, I did not find transcribing the entire data necessary. In the transcription, some of the Gumperz and Berenz's (1993) transcription conventions were used (see Appendix 3). The conventions helped me, for example, to mark pauses with more clarity. Some of the transcribed utterances are used as examples in the analysis and discussion section (4). The Finnish utterances occurring in the examples of the analysis section are translated, italicized, and the translations are presented inside square brackets. The names and any other information that might reveal the family members' identities have been changed or modified. Prior to collecting the data the family was informed that they will remain anonymous in the study.

3.3 The Interview

After the family had recorded the audio tapes, I conducted an interview in order to familiarize myself with their language background and language ideologies – thus, in order to collect the

explicit data. The total length of the recorded interview is 43 minutes 28 seconds. The interview was planned taking into account the qualitative nature of the study and took place at the participant family's home in September 2019. According to Wengraf (2001, 80), before conducting an interview one should do some background research. Thus, when one is designing a qualitative interview, they should first "build on a theory-and-knowledge base" (ibid.) in order to make the interview valid. Wengraf's condition was fulfilled by the fact that I had previously conducted a BA thesis on the same topic as in the present study. In my BA thesis I studied a Finnish-English speaking family's FLP. Since the thesis functioned in the role of a pilot study to the current one, I was able to improve the original interview questions. The questions for the present study are visible in the Appendix 2. Another manner in which Wengraf's condition was fulfilled is the fact that I familiarized myself thoroughly with the topic (FLP) of the study, the different theories (e.g. Spolsky 2004) and previous research (see section 2.5) prior to conducting the interview. Furthermore, I studied different interview methods, and chose the most suitable one for the current study. The interview method will be discussed later in the present section. Wengraf (2001, 192) suggests that while designing an interview, some pre-interview material might help the interviewer to prepare better for the occasion. Since I received the audio recordings before conducting the interview, I was able to become acquainted with the family's speech practices and what I might want to ask during the interview.

The interview questions were not too strictly preplanned, since I did not know the family well beforehand. Therefore, I had to generate more questions along the interview, while getting to know the family. Since the interview questions did not follow an exact plan, they were *semi-structured*. Wengraf describes a semi-structured interview in the following manner: "Semi-structured depth-interviewing has a characteristic pattern of a small number of prepared interviewer-questions followed by further questions improvised to follow-up the interviewee's response to the original question" (2000, 199). Besides being semi-structured, the questions were mostly *open-ended* as well – thus, they did not require a yes or no -answer. According to Wengraf (2000, 79), while formulating interview questions, one should move from topics to questions, and then from preliminary questions to more detailed ones. When I was designing the interview questions, I first thought about general topics to which I wanted to find answers (e.g. Spolsky's three components of LP), and then formulated the actual questions based on the topics. Naturally, I took the research questions into account in the process, since they are also related to Spolsky's theory. The research questions are presented above in the current section (3), and Spolsky's theory (2004) is discussed in the section 2.3.

The current study's interview method was based on the *narrative approach* of interviewing. In the narrative approach, according to Hollway and Jefferson, "the researcher's responsibility is to be a good listener and the interviewee is a story-teller rather than a respondent" (2000, 31). Wengraf, on the other hand, describes narrative interviewing as "[a]n interview design that focuses on the elicitation and provocation of storytelling [...]"(2000, 111). By leaving room for narration, the interviewees most probably, consciously or subconsciously, emphasize the matters that have the most value to them (Wengraf 2000, 116). In other words, the narrative interviewing method helps in providing an insight to the ideologies that lie under the FLP, which would be difficult to do in a direct interview. Since a primary focus in the present study is in language ideology, the fact that the narrative method helps to discover those ideologies was a key factor why it was chosen for the interview. In order to succeed in a narrative interview, one should listen to the answers "in an unhurried, alerted state", process them, and not rush through the questions (Wengraf 2000, 198).

Based on the above mentioned facts, I tried to maintain the atmosphere relaxed during the interview. I spend some time, approximately 30 minutes, with the family before turning on the recorder and starting to interview them, and it hopefully helped to create some trust between us. The present study considers the family's three-year-old son as one of the constructors of the FLP, and therefore he was included in the interview, since I wanted to offer him a possibility to express his views. I attempted to obtain reliable answers from the child, and therefore took on the auntie-mode while interviewing him (the auntie-mode was discussed in the section 2.5.3). I also tried to give attention to the child as much as to the parents, focusing on enabling the narrative to flow freely.

4 Analysis and Discussion

In the current section I will analyze the data taking into account Spolsky's (2004) three interrelated components of language policy. Firstly, in the subsection 4.1, I will examine the language practices of the participant family. Only the implicit data, thus the recordings of the family's naturally occurring conversations, will be taken into account in that section. Secondly, in the following subsection (4.2), I will examine the language ideology of the family. This will be done by observing the explicit data, which is the interview. Thirdly, in the subsection 4.3, I will compare the implicit and explicit language policies of the family. Language management will be examined in the sections 4.2 and 4.3 as well. Examples from the data will be provided throughout the analysis, and the findings will be discussed simultaneously.

4.1 Constructing the FLP

In this section I aim at responding to the first research question: What kind of language practices occur in the everyday interaction of the family? Thus, I will be examining what languages are spoken in the family and with whom, which language strategy occurs in the family, and whether anyone code switches (in this order). Since Jonah does not speak yet, he will not be discussed separately in this section. The speech practices of the family will be demonstrated through examples from the recordings of spontaneous speech between the family members, thus, taking into account the implicit data only. It is, in my opinion, a more reliable way of describing a language policy than using only explicit data. As was discussed in the section 2.2, in several publications of the FLP field (cf. Schiffman 2002, 2; Spolsky 2004, 11; Shohamy 2006, 51; Schwartz 2008, 415; Curdt-Christiansen 2013b, 279) the need for implicit data is emphasized.

4.1.1 Speech Practices

Carlos speaks English with all the family members. He occasionally switches to Finnish and uses a Portuguese nickname (which will be discussed further later in the following section 4.1.2). Even though Carlos communicates mainly in English, it becomes clear that he can also understand some Finnish, since he sometimes answers in English to a Finnish utterance. Such occasions are visible in the examples (1) and (2) below:

- (1) **Sara:** Pitäiskö sun ottaa toi paita pois, sillain et sä saat kädet...
 [Should you take your shirt off, so that you get your hands...]
Carlos: Oh yeah 'cause you're gonna get your *Spiderman-puku* wet and dirty. It's the hands. [Spiderman-puku=Spiderman costume]
Lucas: I don't want it.
- (2) **Sara:** Noin Lucas nyt on näitä meiän kesäkurpitsoja meiän tuolta... Ota tosta. Minkä palan sä haluat? Ton? Ne on tosi hyviä.
 [Alright Lucas now we have these zucchinis from there from our... Take it. Which one do you want? That one? They are really good.]
Lucas: Ei kiitos mä en tarvii. [No thanks I don't need one.]
Sara: Maistetaan yks. [Let's try one.]
Carlos: It's from the garden man, okay, *kato*, take the fork off, take them by your hand like this. Put the fork away. Take them like this and then bite it like this. A little bit hot but you can manage. Use both hands. Okay... That's the one.
 [kato=look]
Lucas: Aow... aow, aow.
Carlos: Look at how *papai* does it. [papai=daddy]
Sara: Laita se siihen odottamaan ja syö riisiä välillä.
 [Let it wait there and have some rice in the meantime.]

In the example (1) Sara starts talking to Lucas in Finnish, and Carlos takes part in the conversation (in English), thus, he has clearly understood Sara's utterance. The same applies to example (2), in which Carlos takes part in Sara and Lucas's ongoing Finnish conversation. Besides replying directly to Finnish utterances, Carlos also demonstrates his understanding of Finnish by participating in the Finnish conversations by, for example, confirming ("Mm-hum") to something that was said.

Sara converses in both Finnish and English – she speaks Finnish to the children and English to Carlos. Even though the conversation is going on in English between Carlos and Lucas, she speaks Finnish when addressing her son, as in the example (3):

- (3) **Lucas:** (...) normal *Spiderman-puku* need. [Spiderman-puku=Spiderman costume]
Sara: Hm? Mitä? [Mitä=What]
Lucas: Ihan- ihan vaan normaali Spiderman-puku!
 [Just- just the normal Spiderman costume!]
Sara: Niin, niin mitä siitä? Se on siel sun kaapissa.
 [Yea, what about that? It's there in your closet.]
Lucas: Niin. Se on mun kaapissa. [Right. It's in my closet.]
Carlos: And then you have your *Batman-puku*. [Batman-puku=Batman costume]
Lucas: Then my Batman-puku.
Carlos: What's your favorite clothes?
Lucas: Mm. Black Spiderman clothes.
Carlos: Okay.

In the example (3), Sara asks Lucas for clarification in Finnish (“Hm? Mitä?”) after Lucas has asked a question in English. Even though Sara clearly aims at speaking only Finnish to Lucas (and Jonah), it seems like she can also modify her speech habits depending on the situation. During two of the conversations, Sara talked to Lucas in English. The occasions are presented in the examples (4) and (5) below:

- (4) **Lucas:** *Äiti, äiti*, I don’t see any big ball. [Äiti=mother]
Sara: You don’t see any big ball?
Lucas: No.
Sara: Hm, where?
Lucas: No. Th- they’re *loppunu!* [No. We have run out of them!]
Sara: Hm?
Lucas: Joku kävelee. [Somebody’s walking.]
Sara: Missä? [Where?]
Lucas: No tossa tiellä. [Well there on the road.]
Sara: Nii sä et nää niitä? [So you can’t see them?]
- (5) **Sara:** *Yea Lucas tell papai who is who.* Muistaksä ku sä sanoit et ku- et kuka on kuka? [papai=daddy] [Remember when you said wh- who is who?]
Lucas: Kuka on? [Who is?]
Sara: Nii noista. [Yea from those.]
Lucas: Kuka on kuka. [Who is who.]
Sara: Nii kuka sä olit? [Yea who were you?]

In the example (4), Lucas first addresses his mother in Finnish (“Äiti, äiti”), and then switches to English. This time, instead of replying in Finnish, Sara chooses to answer in English as well. After three turns, Lucas switches back to Finnish in the middle of a sentence (“Th- they’re loppunu”). Since Sara is used to speaking both English and Finnish at home, it is possible that she finds speaking English natural, even with Lucas, when the whole family is present. Another example of this is the example (5), in which Sara first addresses Lucas in English, and then repeats the message in Finnish right after. However, since at that time Lucas was working on a puzzle together with Carlos, it is possible that even if Sara is speaking to Lucas, she actually meant to direct the utterance to Carlos as well and assure that he takes part in the conversation.

Lucas speaks Finnish to Sara and English to Carlos quite consistently (e.g. see example 3). Lucas does not speak to Jonah in the data (and Jonah does not speak yet), therefore, no conclusions can be made regarding the speech practices between the siblings. As was already discussed above, during only one occasion in the data Lucas uttered in English to his mother, even though he usually seems to speak Finnish when talking to her. Since Lucas soon switched back to Finnish, one could assume that speaking English to the mother was not a conscious act, thus, it might have happened by accident. As was discussed in the section 2.4, it is normal for young children to mix their languages when they are still not capable of separating them from

each other. Even though Lucas has recently started to separate his languages, it is possible that he might still make mistakes at times.

In addition to the example (4), where Lucas accidentally speaks English to his mother, another occasion where he deviates from the normal pattern occurs in the data. It is presented in the following extract:

- (6) **Carlos:** Maybe the *dinosaurus*? [dinosaurus=dinosaur]
Lucas: Koputtaako se? [Does it knock?]
Sara: Dinosaurus? Mm-hm. [The dinosaur? Mm-hum.]
Lucas: Nii. [Right.]
Carlos: Go there fight it!
Lucas: Mihi- mihin päi mä mee? [Wh- Where should I go?]
Carlos: What?
Lucas: Mihin päi mä mee? Mihin päi? [Where should I go? Where?]
Sara: Tuliks se ääni saunasta? [Did that sound come from the sauna?]

In the example (6) Lucas asks a question from Carlos in Finnish (“Mihi- mihin päin mä mee?”), which makes Carlos ask for clarification (“What?”). Despite Carlos’s intentions of signaling that he did not understand the question, Lucas repeats the question in Finnish. Yet, since the data only consists of audio and not video, it is impossible to say in certainty whether the question was actually aimed at Carlos, or if Lucas intended to speak with Sara. If Lucas was looking at Sara, trying to direct the utterance at her, the use of Finnish makes sense.

The fact that Lucas has such a consistent manner of using English with Carlos and Finnish with Sara, mixing the languages rarely, indicates that Lucas has understood that he speaks two separate languages. As was mentioned in the section 2.4, even as young as two-year-olds can consciously adjust their language depending on the context (cf. Reyes 2004, 79), and in this case the context would be speaking English with Carlos and Finnish with Sara. Yet, sometimes Lucas seems to struggle with expressing himself in English, and he then switches to Finnish. An example of such occasion is provided below:

- (7) **Carlos:** Then I thought about tomorrow-
Lucas: Wh- when Alex take that. When Alex was taking the fish and the the the the the... *Sit Alexille tuli pipi*. [Then Alex got hurt.]
Carlos: Ahh yeah! Yea but you can see Alex caught a really big fish today. *Kato*. Really big fish! [Kato=Look]

In the example (7) Lucas tries to explain that a friend of Carlos, Alex, got hurt during a fishing trip. He starts to stutter, and then finishes the sentence in Finnish. It seems that this particular switch of language was conducted consciously, not by mistake, and due to incompetence in

English. Although Lucas can already communicate well in English, it seems that his Finnish is stronger, since he resorts to the language when encountering problems in expressing himself. The fact that Lucas is more fluent in Finnish is no surprise taking into account former research (discussed in the section 2.1), according to which bilingually raised children usually prefer speaking the majority language of the environment (cf. De Houwer 2009). Yet, another (and in my opinion, more probable) factor explaining Lucas's better skills in Finnish is the fact that he spends more time with Sara (when Carlos is working), and attends a Finnish daycare.

4.1.2 Language Strategy and Code Switching

As already stated, there is consistency in the speech practices of the family: most of the time, each parent speaks one language to the children and vice versa. Observing the speaking patterns of the family, it becomes clear that the family follows an OPOL (one-parent-one-language) strategy, which was discussed in the section 2.4. Even if the OPOL strategy seems to dominate the speech practices of the family in the recordings, some exceptions to the strategy occur: the examples (4), (5) and (6) in the section above present occasions where family members address each other in languages which they would usually not use with that particular person. Yet, as already mentioned in the section 2.3, according to the findings in Barron-Hauwaert's (2004) and Yamamoto's (2001) studies, it is not unusual that the OPOL families deviate from the OPOL strategy. Similarly, Palviainen and Boyd (2013) doubted whether it is even possible to follow the OPOL strategy without switching languages sometimes. Therefore, in the light of earlier research, the exceptions that occur in the family's conversations seem to be normal for all multilingual families following the OPOL strategy. The OPOL strategy will be returned to later in the current section.

Even though the family follows an OPOL strategy, they occasionally mix their languages. As was discussed in the section 2.4, mixing (or switching) languages inside or in between sentences is called code switching, which is an intentionally applied linguistic resource for multilingual persons. It is notable that all the members in the participant family of the current study code switch, since the examples (1-6) already provide many instances in the family's conversations where code switching occurs. In the following paragraphs, these instances will be discussed further, and other code switches that occurred in the data will be presented.

Carlos code switches more frequently in comparison to the other family members. His switches occur mostly in Finnish, embedded in English sentences – thus, they are intersentential. The

examples (1) and (3) in the section 4.1.1 demonstrate intersentential code switches: Carlos talks about *Spiderman-puku* and *Batman-puku*, instead of using the word costume. In fact, it seems that the use of the word *puku* (=costume) has become a habit in the family, since the example (3) shows that Lucas has learned to use the switch in a similar manner as his father.

Additional one-word code switches appear in Carlos's speech as well: in the examples (2) and (7) he says *kato* instead of look, and in the example (6) he uses *dinosaurus* instead of dinosaur. During the conversations at the dinner table Carlos also repeated *pure* (=chew) several times, asking Lucas to chew his food. Another one-word code switches that occur are *nonni* (=all right), also visible in the example (14), *joo* (=yes), visible in the example (10), and *mies* (=man), visible in the example (8) below this paragraph. The example (2) presents an occasion where Carlos refers to himself as *papai*, which means daddy in Portuguese. 'Papai' is the only Portuguese word to appear in Carlos's speech. In addition to Carlos, Sara and Lucas call him 'papai' as well (e.g. Sara in the example 5). The word therefore functions as a nickname in the family's conversations.

Another nickname that appears frequently in the family members' speech is *äiti* (=mom), referring to Sara (visible in the examples 8, 10 and 11 below). It is interesting to notice that the nicknames of Sara and Carlos ('papai', 'äiti') come from the mother tongue of each. It is possible that the parents have wanted to name themselves in their mother tongue, using the same name they called their parents while growing up, which would make the nickname more affectionate for them. Naming oneself after their own parent could create a deeper emotional bond with one's children.

In addition to one-word code switches, Carlos also produces longer intrasentential switches. These are presented in the examples (8), (9), (10) and (11) below:

(8) **Carlos:** Jonazzio Jonazzio what is up in there little *mies* you just wanna join the dinner table hey. Oh I don't know... You just wanted to go to your favorite place which is *äiti's syli*. [*mies*=man, *äiti's syli*=mom's lap]

(9) **Carlos:** Jonah is very *hassu poika*! [Jonah is a very funny boy!]

(10) **Sara:** Lucas maista yks semmone kesäkurpitsa nyt ku niist tuli vaiks kuin hyvii.
[Lucas try some of the the zucchini 'cause they turned out really good.]

Carlos: Yea cause we grew them in our own garden.

Sara: Sä oot ite niit kasvattanu. [You have grown them yourself.]

Carlos: *Joo* let's taste them. [*Joo*=Yea]

Sara: Se maistuu ihan ku kurkku mut se on paljon parempaa siin on öljyy ja se on grillattu. [It tastes just like cucumber but it's much better, there's oil on it and it's been grilled.]

Carlos: We just take one bite and see if we like... *Katso äiti*, really good stuff from Lucas. [Katso äiti=Look, mom]

Sara: Tykkäsiks? [Did you like it?]

(11) **Carlos:** Hey Lucas, don't kick *äiti*. [äiti=mom]

Sara: Lucas m-mm. Lopeta. [Lopeta=Stop]

Lucas: Sä potkasit mua. [Well you kicked me.]

Carlos: Lucas. *Kato, papai*. Hey. Lucas. That's not *kiltti poika*. (...) *kiltti poika*.

Then stop kicking right now. [Kato=Look, papai=daddy, *kiltti poika*=a good boy]

In the example (8), Carlos mentions *äiti's syli* (=mom's lap) while talking to his youngest son, Jonah. The following example (9) presents another situation where Carlos is talking to Jonah, telling him that he is *hassu poika* (=a funny boy). The code switch occurring in the example (11) is similar to (9), since this time Carlos is referring to Lucas as *kiltti poika* (=a good boy). These code switches, in my opinion, function in an idiomatic manner – therefore, it might have been natural for Carlos to use these expressions as word chunks. In the example (10), Carlos utters *Katso äiti* (=Look mom), when Lucas finally tries the zucchini. *Katso* is a longer version of the already mentioned *kato*, thus the meaning of the words is the same. Since the participant family lives in Finland, it might be natural for Carlos to repeat some often occurring short expressions in Finnish. Even though the family mainly uses English at home, their other language is Finnish, and embedding Finnish words into the English sentences could actually reflect the integration of the family's combined cultures. Combining the two cultures via code switching would be in keeping with what was discussed in the section 2.4: code switching can be used as a tool to freely express oneself in their languages (Harding and Riley 1986, 57), to mark group identity (Grosjean 2010, 54) and to bond within the family (Moin et al. 2013, 77; Barron-Hauwaert 2004, 13). Sara also demonstrated such functions via her code switches, and they will be discussed next.

In addition to referring to Carlos as *papai*, Sara produces other code switches in the data. She mostly code switches intrasententially, however, one intersentential switch appears in the data as well (the example 5). The additional code switches are presented in the following examples (12) and (13).

(12) **Sara:** Did you see Jonah's *tutti* somewhere? [tutti=pacifier]

Carlos: I wasn't looking for it.

(13) **Sara:** Kohta Lucas suihkuaika, huomen.. huomen on taas *kindy*-päivä.

[Lucas, it is time to take a shower soon, tomorrow.. tomorrow you have *kindy* again.]

In the example (12) Sara uses the word *tutti* instead of pacifier, when she is talking to Carlos in English. It is possible that the family has a habit of using the Finnish expression for pacifier, since Carlos does not react to the expression in any manner (for example, by repeating the word in English) – yet, it is impossible to draw any conclusions without examples of the other family members using the word. The same applies to the other code switch that Sara produces in the example (13). She uses the English word *kindy*, referring to kindergarten, instead of the Finnish equivalent (*päiväkoti*). The word ‘kindy’ is probably used as a habit in the family, since it appears in other contexts in the data as well. As was discussed earlier in this section, continuously code switching these types of certain words, and including them as such in the family’s linguistic repertoire, could be a sign of demonstrating group identity, as well as bonding as a family. ‘Tutti’ and ‘kindy’ are also easier to utter than their longer forms, which could be one explanation for the choice of using them.

Lucas produces both intra- and intersentential code switches. As was discussed in the section 2.4, it is normal for children in the OPOL-families to code switch intersententially when they move between their parents’ languages. The intersentential switches of the examples (4) and (7), which were discussed in the previous subsection, already presented occasions where Lucas deviated from the OPOL strategy. Considering the fact that Lucas constantly balances between two languages, and switches the code depending on the person he is speaking to, it seems surprising how little he deviates from the OPOL strategy. In my opinion, switching between his languages fluently is another proof of the fact that Lucas has already developed a capability to separate the different contexts in which to use them.

In addition to the intersentential code switches that were discussed earlier, Lucas produced one more in the recorded conversations, and it will be presented next:

- (14) **Carlos:** Do you want a little bit of this sauce on the pasta and then we eat the pasta?
Sara: Mmm!
Lucas: Yes!
Sara: Lihapullakastiketta. [Meatball sauce.]
Lucas: A little bit more. Äiti, mä haluan kaikki. (Minä) *open*. And they’re open. [A little bit more. Mom, I want it all. (I) *open*. And they’re open.]
Carlos: Yeah okay they’re open and that’s all of it.
Lucas: Finished!
Carlos: Nonni! [Alright!]

In the example (14) Lucas begins to speak in English, and then switches to Finnish when addressing his mother (“Äiti, mä haluan kaikki.”). As has already been mentioned, Lucas speaks to Sara in Finnish, and therefore changing the code to Finnish in this occasion is natural.

He then continues speaking in English, which might feel odd at first, yet, he is probably aiming his speech at Carlos at this point since Carlos is the one to reply to him. Since the data consist of audio and not video, it is impossible to say with certainty to whom the speech is directed at.

In addition to the intersentential code switches, Lucas also produced intrasentential switches in the data. In the previous subsection (4.1.1), two such code switches were already presented in the examples (3) and (4). In the example (4) Lucas states “No. Th- they’re *loppunu*”, code switching at the end of the sentence. It is possible that he did not know the word in English and therefore used the Finnish one. In the example (3) Lucas talks about his costumes, using the Finnish expressions *Spiderman-puku* and *Batman-puku*, embedded in English utterances (*Spiderman-puku* also appears in a Finnish utterance in the same example). All the family members use the same expressions and it seems like their use has become a habit for the entire family. As was discussed in the section 2.4, Reyes (2004) found out in her study on school children’s code switching that it is a complex skill that children develop as a part of their communicative competence. It could be argued that Lucas’s manner of referring to the costumes in Finnish is a skill that he acquired following his parents’ example.

Another intrasentential code switch that appeared in Lucas’s speech will be presented in the following example:

- (15) **Lucas:** Mi- missä mun *meatballs* on? [Wh- where are my meatballs?]
Sara: Ne on tulossa. [They’re coming.]
Carlos: They’re coming.

In the example (15) Lucas uses the English word *meatballs* in a Finnish sentence. Since he knows the Finnish equivalent of the word as well, it is probable that in this example the code switch is a demonstration of his language skills. As was discussed in the section 2.4, code switching becomes intentional when children grow up (Barron-Hauwaert 2004, 12) and can also be used as a tool to freely express oneself (Harding and Riley 1986, 57). It is therefore possible that Lucas is beginning to explore the different functions that he can realize through code switching now that he can already separate his languages and different contexts of usage.

All in all, the family members seem to have both similar and different manners of code switching. Carlos produces, as was discussed, mostly intrasentential code switches that include mostly one-word switches in Finnish, embedded in English sentences. He also appears to produce longer, two-word switches that function in an idiomatic manner as word chunks. In addition to the Finnish code switches, Carlos switches a certain Portuguese word, which is ‘papai’ (=daddy). The entire family refers to Carlos using this switch, thus, it functions as a

nickname. Another nickname the family members share is 'äiti' (=mother) and it is used when speaking of Sara. As for Sara's code switching, she mostly produces intrasentential one-word switches in both Finnish and English. At times, Sara also seems to code switch intersententially, since one such occasion appeared in the data. Lucas's code switches were both intra- and intersentential. Since Lucas and Sara are the family members who constantly switch between languages, it is understandable that their switches vary more than Carlos's. Especially Lucas, having been bilingual from birth, seems to be learning the rules by which to apply his languages in different contexts and in varying manners. Yet, as was discussed previously, Lucas is still quite young, and some of the switches occur due to incompetency, especially in English (which seems to be his weaker language at the moment).

4.2 Language Ideology

In this section, taking into account Spolsky's theory on language policy (2004), I will examine the ideologies that lie behind the language policy of the family. In other words: which ideas, attitudes, beliefs and feelings the family members have about their languages, and how these feelings have led them to form a certain kind of FLP. Since the parents are the original creators of the FLP, the current section mainly focuses on their views. Yet, Lucas's statements from the interview have also been included. The second research question of the thesis will be answered to in the current section: How do the family members describe the FLP and what kind of ideologies have affected its formation? In order to examine the ideology, merely the (explicit) interview data will be used, since the implicit data does not provide sufficiently information for an in-depth analysis. The family members do not state the ideological factors behind their FLP directly in the interview, and therefore the conclusions will be drawn along the lines of what is said and examples of some of these utterances will be presented. In addition, language management will be viewed as a part of the present section, since it is affected by the parents' ideology.

The section consists of two subsections. In the first subsection (4.2.1), I will discuss the different matters that have affected the FLP of the participant family. First, I will present the factors that have affected the parents' decision to speak certain languages in their family. Next, I will discuss the beliefs that the parents relate to their languages and multilingualism. In the following subsection (4.2.2), I will discuss Lucas's language acquisition and the measures that the parents have taken in order to teach him the languages successfully, thus, the language

management of the family. In addition, the feelings that the parents have about code switching in their family will be discussed.

4.2.1 The Ideologies Affecting the FLP

(16) **Carlos:** I pray to god that he learns.

The example (16) is drawn from the end of the interview with the participant family, when Carlos talks about teaching English to Jonah. In my opinion, the example summarizes well how important it is to Carlos that his children acquire English. During the interview, it becomes clear that Carlos and Sara desire to succeed in teaching the children their languages, and raising them as multilinguals. In their family, Sara and Carlos have made an elementary decision regarding their FLP, which is including both Finnish and English in the family's linguistic repertoire, and becoming a multilingual family. Different factors have affected the parents' decision about which languages to choose to be taught to the children, and they will be discussed next.

Firstly, the parents resorted to parental guides. Before the children were born to the participant family, Carlos and Sara spent time and effort pondering which languages should be spoken in the family and taught to the children. Carlos states that they read "a book or two" about raising multilingual children. Based on the books' guidance, the parents thought that since the teaching of Portuguese would depend entirely on Carlos (all his Portuguese-speaking relatives live at a far distance, for example, in Brazil and Australia), it would be too hard to teach Lucas the language. In addition, Sara states that it would have been too complicated for Carlos to speak two different languages at home, since she does not speak Portuguese, only English. The parents were also afraid that Lucas would become confused trying to learn three languages, and not acquire any of them properly.

Secondly, different problems, related to the parents' language competence, affected the decision of choosing the family's languages. Carlos felt like speaking Portuguese does not feel natural to him anymore. After living abroad in English-speaking countries for 14 years, he became accustomed to using English as his main language. Sara had read that one should choose their mother tongue to teach to the children, in order to be able to express oneself "more richly", and therefore she was concerned about Carlos's willingness to speak English instead of Portuguese. Yet, according to Carlos, he expresses himself more fluently in English, and might even struggle sometimes when speaking Portuguese with the relatives. Although English is not

Carlos's mother tongue, he feels like he has acquired it nearly perfectly and has zero problems in expressing himself.

The parents had also discussed the possibility of speaking only Finnish at home. Since Carlos does not speak much Finnish, the parents soon came to the conclusion that speaking only Finnish might be a bad idea. They were afraid that Carlos's accent would affect Lucas's Finnish pronunciation, for example. They decided that Sara would speak Finnish with Lucas (instead of English), in order to prevent the possible shortcomings that Sara's language competence in English could cause in his language acquisition. In the interview, the following was stated about the matter:

(17) **Carlos:** It was kinda pretty obvious because I can only speak to him in English anyways. And obviously she was.. you know, her English not being 100% so the choice was to use Finnish so pretty obvious decision maybe (...).

In addition, Carlos and Sara spoke only English to each other before the children were born, and therefore they felt natural continuing with the same home language. They also wanted to be able to communicate together as a family in one language, and English would work better for that purpose.

The third factor affecting which languages to choose for the family was that Carlos and Sara felt like teaching the children three languages would be too time consuming. Since the successful language acquisition is the parents' main priority, they were afraid that teaching three languages simultaneously might lead to worse results in language learning. In the interview, Carlos pointed out that a parent must teach their children "twenty other things a day", thus, he felt that if they were to speak three languages to Lucas, they might not have the time to teach them properly. Carlos and Sara, therefore, decided to teach their children two languages and make sure that they learn them well.

Lastly, the parents were afraid that if they chose to speak Finnish and Portuguese at home, Lucas would not learn English, which they thought was a more important language to learn than Portuguese. As was discussed in the section 2.3, the feelings that people have about their languages, which are also influenced by the ideologies from the society, affect a great deal how much value people place on them. In the case of the present study's family, these ideologies have been so powerful that they have made the parents choose English over Carlos's mother tongue. In the interview, the parents describe the importance of English in the following manner:

- (18) **Sara:** Yea English is just so important to know English.
Carlos: Yeah.
Sara: Like in their world.. especially like everything is in English.. it's going to be.
Carlos: Yeah.
Sara: So it's really good that they don't have that problem anymore to learn if they already know it and they can you know, can focus on, I don't know.. learning Portuguese in school.
Carlos Or French =or=
Sara: =and= Spanish.

In the extract (18) Carlos and Sara express how they think English will continue to take over the world due to globalization. Another aspect that they highlight is that to them learning English is an essential skill which everyone has to master. The parents seem content about the fact that their children will know English already in a young age, and can focus on learning other subjects at school (e.g. French). Curdt-Christiansen's study (2014), discussed in the section 2.5, presented similar findings: the participant families of the study felt like teaching English is a necessity in the competitive society, even if it harms the teaching of one's mother tongue. The families in Wei, Saravanan and Ng's (1997) and in Lane's (2010) studies (discussed in the section 2.5.2) also felt like English is an important language to know if one desires to be successful in life. Research findings have been similar in the Finnish context as well, for example in Haque's (2011) study on an Indian multilingual family (discussed in section 2.5), in which the father of the family favored English over the family's other native languages because he thought that it would be more beneficial for the children in the future.

As was discussed in the section 2.3, language prestige and language status influence the formation of a FLP – and high prestige languages, such as English, are indeed better valued, which then makes them a more natural choice to choose for one's family. In Finland, English enjoys a prestigious status, and is considered an important language in the working life, as well as in the educational context. Leppänen et al.'s study (2011) and Mäkelä and Posti's study (2018; discussed in the section 2.3) demonstrated that most Finns consider the English language very important. Carlos and Sara express similar thoughts on English as in these studies. In the example (19) below, Sara mentions that in her opinion, English is “obviously [...] the most important language in the world”. The participant family of the present study is a case in point about how much language status can affect a family's language policy. Since the parents seem to place such a high value to the English language, it is understandable that they prioritize it over Portuguese.

- (19) **Sara:** Yea I think yea En- English is obviously like the most important language in the world I guess, so.. yeah.
Carlos: The Finnish language is a little bit useless maybe but.. if you're gonna live

here it's.. essential to have.. Yea I think it's a good, a good language. Cause when you know English it's like a good base for many other languages.. and when you learn Finnish there's nothing in the world that you can't do.

The example (19) also demonstrates that Carlos finds Finnish important and “useless” at the same time. He thinks that in Finland one should know how to speak Finnish in order to succeed better – as he states in the example, there are no limits for a person in Finland when they speak both English and Finnish. However, when he thinks about Finnish as a language, he finds it useless, since it will not benefit one outside Finland. Carlos also mentions in the interview that he has enrolled at a Finnish course, in order to master the language. He also felt that even if he acquired English naturalistically, Finnish is too difficult for him to acquire, thus he needs formal teaching. Mäntylä, Pietikäinen and Dufva's study (2009) conducted on a Finnish multilingual family presents a similar situation: the foreign father of the family wanted to try and speak as much Finnish as possible (although he knew that in Finland one can manage almost everywhere using English), since the family had decided to reside in Finland.

As was discussed in the section 2.3, in addition to the feelings that family members have about their languages, the thoughts they have about multilingualism in general also affect the formation of the FLP. Overall, the participant family seems to have positive feelings related to multilingualism, including Lucas - he finds the ability of speaking several languages fun. According to Carlos, they consider themselves a multilingual family that includes bilingual persons. Thus, there are several languages spoken by different family members, so that everyone is fluent in two of them, or as in Carlos's words: “as a family, maybe we are multilingual.. because there's three languages coming out of us, so...”. As was discussed in the section 2.3, several studies have shown that usually parents do have positive feelings about bilingualism and raising bilingual children (e.g. Piller 2002; Caldas 2006; King and Fogle 2006; Mäntylä, Pietikäinen and Dufva 2009; Palviainen and Boyd 2013). Since Finland is a multilingual country, one could argue that the environment itself is supportive of speaking several languages.

Furthermore, Carlos does not think there are any disadvantages in being multilingual. This is what is stated in the interview:

(20) **Carlos:** Well I certainly don't think there's any disadvantages. Well it would have been if you had taken longer to speak all together, I guess that would be a disadvantage.

As can be viewed in the example (20), Carlos thinks that the only disadvantage in multilingualism could be a delay in one's language development. The family has had no issues

with Lucas's acquisition rate, though. The parents' opinions are in keeping with those of the parents in Barron-Hauwaert's study (2004), discussed in the section 2.3, who thought that bilingualism has no disadvantages to it at all. The majority (67%) of the trilinguals in Grosjean's (2010) study also reported similar feelings.

The parents feel differently about learning additional languages. Sara finds the ability to speak several languages an asset, whereas Carlos believes that there is no need to master other languages besides English. The following was discussed in the interview:

(21) **Carlos:** I think speaking the two languages of course is necessary and.. and.. but it's not.. I mean.. doesn't change anything. I think actually learning other languages is a little bit of a waste of time.

Sara: Well not from.. Well I think differently from that like I feel that you know, you have like the power, it's like a knowledge.

Carlos: =Sure=

Sara: =When= you know when you master another language, so like I would love them to speak a third language still. It would be a really big advantage to be a politician, or anyone like a normal...

As can be observed from the example (21), Sara considers the ability of speaking several languages an asset, and feels positive about the possibility of her children learning more languages in the future. She mentions that knowing languages gives one power, and relates language competency to people in powerful positions (e.g. politicians). Sara's thoughts are in keeping with those of the Finnish-Russian families that were studied by Moin et al. (2013), discussed in the section 2.3, who believed that multilingual skills are a great asset in Finland. Carlos, on the other hand, feels like knowing English and Finnish is enough for their children, and thinks that they would be wasting their time learning additional languages. Carlos also tells in the interview that in his opinion, the same energy that goes to learning additional languages could be invested in learning other, more beneficial skills.

Even though the parents were quite sure about choosing Finnish and English as their family's languages, they have had some doubts afterwards. For example, Carlos states in the interview that he somehow regrets not choosing Portuguese as the everyday language. He states the matter in the following manner in the interview:

(22) **Carlos:** To be fair I didn't really think it through well enough because if I would have spoken to them in Portuguese, I guess... (...) I guess these guys would eventually learn English anyways (...). Now that I'm thinking it might not be the worst thing if I had taught him Portuguese.

As can be viewed in the example (22), Carlos believes that Lucas would have learned English eventually at school, and therefore it might have been more beneficial to teach him Portuguese,

since in that manner he would have ended up learning at least three languages. The parents in Sjöberg's study (2016; discussed in the section 2.5.2) expressed similar feelings as Carlos, regretting about not including the other language to their children's linguistic repertoire.

Mom thinks that the Finnish school system offers high quality instruction in teaching English, and that is why Finnish children become such fluent English speakers. Similarly positive attitudes towards the Finnish school system were expressed by the parents in Moin et al.'s study (2013), which was discussed in the section 2.4. Carlos and Sara believe that Lucas might have become a fluent English speaker even if they had not chosen to raise him in English. Nevertheless, Carlos and Sara are happy with the family's language choices and Lucas's language competence. Carlos is content about the fact that Lucas has acquired English well, and guesses that eventually he might have lost interest in Portuguese anyway.

All in all, the parents state that they are happy with the way Lucas has acquired his languages. They are impressed about the fact that Lucas speaks two languages since they do not know any other child that would. This is what the parents discussed in the interview:

(23) **Carlos:** I'm actually quite impressed.. the way he's learned. Yea. Because.. I mean of course I did not know what to expect, but the fact that he speaks both languages, I'm.. quite impressed. Yea we got that right so far.

Sara: It's like so amazing like to see 'cause I've never of course seen like a little kid speaking two languages like that, like he just switches.

Carlos tells in the example (23) that they have "got that right so far", which demonstrates that he feels like they have succeeded in the teaching of the languages. According to Sara, they have not seen fluently bilingual children before – which is no surprise taking into account what was discussed in the section 2.1 about only 25% of bilingual families managing to raise their children fluent bilinguals (cf. De Houwer 2018). The Finnish-Swedish bilingual families in Sjöberg's study (2016; discussed in the section 2.5.2) were equally enthusiastic about their children's language competence and the ability to speak several languages.

Indeed, the parents seem rather surprised about Lucas's successful acquisition of the languages. Carlos states that the success is due to consistency in the speech practices of the family: the parents try to avoid mixing languages, and Carlos speaks English as much as possible, whereas Sara converses in Finnish. Different language strategies were discussed in the section 2.4. Although the MLAH strategy is the most effective one when raising fluently speaking bilinguals, the OPOL strategy can also work: the results in Sjöberg's study (2016; discussed in the section 2.5) on Finnish-Swedish bilingual families suggest that consistency is a key factor in order for children to become fluent in both their languages. Besides, English is vastly used

in the Finnish society (e.g. on the television and radio), thus, even though it is the minority language of the family, it does not hold such a minority position in the society surrounding the family. In Finland, several people think that English should even become an official language of the country (cf. Mäkilä and Posti's study 2018, discussed in the section 2.3), which indicates the language's popularity and vast use in Finland. Since the parents are so happy with their FLP and its success, they state that they feel like it is not necessary to make any changes to it, and will raise Jonah according to the same policy.

4.2.2 Language Management

According to Sara and Carlos, Lucas has recently begun to distinguish his languages. They describe his abilities in the following manner in the interview:

- (24) **Sara:** He was one.. yea he was once last week just like just for fun, like let's joke in papai's language, so he like finds it really weird to speak with me in English.
- (25) **Carlos:** If I tell him you know like uh.. like, like go and tell äiti where's my socks, then he already translates in his own mind and then he goes there and asks in Finnish, he doesn't even ask in English, even if I ask him to ask.. in English, so he translates it in his own head and goes and speaks to äiti only in Finnish.. and then with me vice versa.

The examples (24) and (25) are also a demonstration of Lucas's successful language acquisition and the parents' ability to stay consistent with their languages. It seems like Lucas has strongly related Finnish to Sara and English to Carlos, as was intended. In the interview, Lucas also expressed his ability of understanding the difference between the two languages: for example, Lucas mentioned that he speaks "millai sääki puhut" (= like you do), when talking to me. I started the interview by speaking Finnish with Lucas, thus, he quickly noticed that we speak the same language. Later on, I switched to English and started talking to Carlos, and Lucas pointed out "sää puhut ihan ku papai" (=you talk just like papai) - he registered the switch of the language and my language capabilities. He also mentioned that his mother speaks similarly as I do (when I was speaking Finnish with him), which can also be viewed in the following example (26) where Lucas describes how he speaks with his friends.

- (26) **Lucas:** Mm.. mä puhun ihan ku äiti. (...) Mun äiti puhuu.. mun kaverit puhuu et 'mitä' kans. (...) Joo eli 'mitä' mun äiti puhuu kans. Joo se puhuu ihan ku sää puhut kans. [Mm.. I speak just like mom. (...) My mom speaks.. my friends speak like 'what', too. (...) Yea so 'what' my mom speaks, too. Yea she speaks just like you do, too.]

As can be observed in the example (26), Lucas refers to Finnish as the 'mitä' (=what) language, and tells that it is the language that he speaks with his friends. Lucas also relates the 'mitä'

language to Sara by saying that he speaks it with his mother. In addition, Lucas mentions during the interview that his father speaks the ‘what’ language, when he goes fishing with his friend. Thus, even though Lucas does not know the languages by their official names, he has invented personal names for each language and can, in addition, relate the usage of the languages to certain persons and situations.

As Carlos and Sara stated, they try to stay as consistent as possible when speaking with the children. Therefore, they have agreed to avoid language mixing in the family. Yet, the parents acknowledge the fact that sometimes they mix their languages – when not knowing a certain word in the other language, for example. They both claim that in these occasions their mixing is intentional and does not happen by accident. Sara mentions an example of a word that they mix regularly, which is ‘kindy’ (referring to kindergarten). As was discussed before (in the sections 2.4 and 4.1.2), it is extremely rare for bilingual families to realize the OPOL strategy without occasional code switching. In addition, it is normal for multilingual persons to mix their languages for a functional purpose – which in the case of the present study’s family, could be the mutual use of the word ‘kindy’.

According to Carlos, Lucas also switches languages. This is what he stated about Lucas’s language mixing in the interview:

(27) **Carlos:** Mixing does not bother me, ‘cause he is gonna learn all the words eventually and he’s not gonna mix anymore.

The example (27) demonstrates Carlos’s feelings about language mixing. Lucas’s mixing does not bother him, and therefore he feels no need to correct him when he mixes. Yet, it also seems like Carlos considers language mixing as something negative that should eventually disappear from Lucas’s speech. Sara too states in the interview that she has always considered language mixing a flaw, thinking that it occurs due to poor language competence.

In addition to consistency in their speech practices, the parents try to ensure the children’s successful language acquisition in other manners as well. Since Carlos speaks the minority language of the family, they have tried to increase the input of English by showing Lucas cartoons in English and reading him English books. Besides teaching the children Finnish and English, Carlos and Sara have taken some measures to get the children acquainted with Portuguese. The family has recently hired a Brazilian nanny, who has taught Lucas some Portuguese words, such as colors and numbers, and songs. In addition, Lucas likes to listen to Skype-conversations between Carlos and his Brazilian relatives, and is eager to repeat words and phrases in Portuguese.

Although Portuguese is not the language that was opted for the everyday use in the family, the parents find it important that their children learn about the Brazilian culture. This is how Sara commented on the matter in the interview:

(28) **Sara:** Yea we've been thinking that maybe you know the language isn't the thing what we wanna even teach from Brazil, because it's so much more like the football and the.. they have like the food and everything else you know the culture, yea, not the language maybe. You know.. of course Portuguese would be really cool to know.

The example (28) demonstrates that Sara wants the children to familiarize themselves with the Brazilian culture via, for example, eating Brazilian food or following football, which is popular in Brazil. The family also immerses the children in the Brazilian culture by traveling in the country.

To summarize, several ideological factors have affected the formation of the participant family's FLP. As was discussed in the beginning of the subsection 4.2.1, the parents started planning the FLP prior to the birth of their first child. When deciding upon how many languages to speak with the child, the parents resorted to parental guides. According to the guidance offered by the books, they chose to speak two languages (instead of three) with the child. In addition, such factors as time issues and the parents' linguistic competence affected the decision. Even though Portuguese is the father's mother tongue, he found speaking English with his son to feel more natural to him due to the long period of time that he used English as his everyday language. Finnish, on the other hand, was opted because of the Finnish-speaking environment and the fact that it is the mother's native language. Ideologies related to language prestige seem to have affected the FLP as well: English is valued over the other languages by the parents. The parents think that English is by far the most important language in the world, and knowing English can benefit their children in both educational and occupational contexts. The prestige that the father relates to Finnish is quite low, since he thought that Finnish is a useless language outside Finland. Yet, he recognizes the language's importance in the Finnish context, and is determined to become a fluent speaker of Finnish.

The ideologies that the family members have regarding multilingualism in general are positive: the parents feel like there are no disadvantages to being multilingual. As to learning additional languages in the future, the parents are divided in their opinions. The mother believes that knowing several languages is an asset, whereas the father suggests that one should invest their time in something more practical than language learning. Even though Carlos thinks that his children need not learn additional languages, he seems to regret not having taught Portuguese

to them - after all, it is his mother tongue, and the children in Finland are taught English at school from a very young age on. Nevertheless, the parents feel happy about their FLP and have no intentions to make changes to it. Their priority seems to have been the first born child's successful language acquisition in both his languages and they have achieved that. The parents believe that the key to the success lies in consistency – as was discussed in the (current) section 4.2.2 regarding language management, the parents try and stay as consistent as possible when speaking with the children, and avoid language mixing. One ideology that seems to lie behind the avoidance of code switching is the fact that the parents find it a flaw and something that should be omitted from the children's speech. Yet, have not explicitly corrected their firstborn child's language mixing, since they recognize the fact that they occasionally mix themselves as well. Another manner to support the children's language learning has been offering them books and cartoons in the family's minority language, English. In addition to supporting the English upbringing, the parents want to teach the children Portuguese and familiarize them with the Brazilian culture – in order to achieve that the parents have, for example, hired a Brazilian nanny.

4.3 Comparing the Implicit and Explicit Speech Practices

In this subsection I will compare the family's explicit and implicit language policies. Thus, the section seeks to answer the third research question of the thesis: How does the implicit language policy correspond to the explicit one? My aim is therefore to examine whether the speech practices that the parents describe themselves in the interview equate to the ones that were discussed in the section 4.1. Examples from both the implicit and explicit data will be presented. Comparing the implicit and explicit data is important, since the language practices do not always correspond to the explicit statements that parents give about their FLPs (Haque 2011, 51). The section will start by observing the correspondence of the speech practices of the family. Next, the parents' statements on the family's language mixing will be compared to the code switching that occurred in the implicit data, starting from Carlos, moving on to Sara and finally examining Lucas. After that, the parents' statements on their language management will be discussed and compared to how they appeared in the implicit data.

In the interview the parents described speech practices that resemble the OPOL strategy: Carlos speaks English to the children, whereas Sara speaks Finnish to the children. To Carlos Sara speaks English, and English can be used as the language of communication when the entire

family is together. Lucas states in the interview that he speaks English (“papain kieli”, or “what-language”) with Carlos and Finnish (“äidin kieli” or “mitä-language”) with Sara. These explicit speech practices that the family members describe do mostly equate to the implicit ones that were examined in the section 4.1. Some exceptional utterances that did not follow the OPOL strategy were examined in that section, and the fact that these exceptions exist corresponds to what was said about mixing up the languages. Some examples of what was said about language mixing in the interview will be discussed next.

(29) **Carlos:** Well I don't mix it.. accidentally. I might mix it on purpose when there's one word like *puku*. Yea I think. But then like I don't think too much about it, you know. Like I don't see it like as a negative either.. like when he speaks two languages. Because I know that eventually he's gonna know all the words.. (...) It's fine by me either way.

In the example (29) Carlos talks about his and Lucas's code switching. He tells that he does not mix languages intentionally, however, he sometimes code switches on purpose when using certain words, such as ‘puku’. The examples (1) and (3) in the section 4.1 demonstrate that Carlos is indeed aware of how he uses the word, thus, his statement corresponds to the practice. Some other code switches that Carlos produced were discussed in the same section (e.g. *dinosaurus, joo, hassu/kiltti poika, pure*) and they equate to Carlos's statement about switching certain words only.

Carlos also states in the interview that he does not speak Portuguese. Nevertheless, there was one Portuguese word in the implicit data that the entire family used: *papai*. Yet, as was discussed in the section 4.1, the particular switch functions as a (nick) name. I do not consider using this word as a name to be an example of the type of code switching that Carlos is referring to, thus, I consider his statement of not speaking Portuguese to be true. Carlos also says in the example (29) that he is not bothered by Lucas's code switching and that he does not think about it too much. Reading this example, one could conclude that Carlos feels no need to manage Lucas's language use by correcting his speech when he code switches. This also equates to the language practices of the family, in which no corrective speech by the parents appeared. Next, we will turn to Sara's comments on the family's code switching:

(30) **Sara:** Some words we have like I also say like *kindy*, it's kindergarten, we all use this word *kindy* but.. for him but uh.. yea we don't mix. If I don't know some word then I say it in Finnish and he usually knows it.

The example (30) demonstrates that Sara thinks similarly as Carlos about code switching in the family. In the interview Sara states that she does not mix her languages, unless there is a word

in English that she does not know or cannot remember. For example, in the section 4.1 the example (12) displays Sara using the word *tutti*. Possibly, Sara does not remember what the English equivalent is, yet, I would suggest that ‘tutti’ is another word that the family has simply chosen to use as a code switch, since it is easier to say than ‘pacifier’. The word is, after all, usually quite common in families with little children, and in that light the fact that Sara would not know what the word for a pacifier is in English seems unlikely. There is another word that the family switches intentionally. According to Sara, all family members refer to kindergarten as *kindy*. As the example (13) in the section 4.1 presents, the word indeed appears in Sara’s speech, and ‘kindy’ was also used several other occasions in the implicit data. Yet, ‘kindy’ was not used by the other family members – for example, in the example (31) below, Carlos talks about kindergarten instead of ‘kindy’. Even though the implicit data of the current study indicates that Sara’s statement was incorrect, in my opinion it is possible that Carlos, too, uses the word ‘kindy’ sometimes in the family’s every day conversations – the overall length of the implicit data was, after all, quite short.

Taking the above mentioned examples into account it seems like Sara’s explicit statements correspond to the speech practices. Yet, in the section 4.1 two examples were discussed, which do not correspond to what Sara said in the interview: the examples (4) and (5) demonstrated situations in which Sara spoke to Lucas in English. Thus, one could argue that Sara’s statements about speaking only Finnish to Lucas mostly, but not entirely, follow the actual practices. However, since Sara and Carlos also talked about English being the family’s common language, I conclude that Sara’s English utterances to Lucas do not deviate from what she stated about their language practices at the interview.

Sara and Carlos have also noticed Lucas’s code switching, and the following example (31) presents an extract from their discussion on the matter:

(31) **Carlos:** (...) [b]ecause he is not as proficient in English as he is in Finnish. So especially if there’s something happening in kindergarten or something, you know.. They probably have, you know, silly words for stuff.. there like.. he will then he will then use both. You know, like where’s my *Spiderman-puku*, you know things like that, so he definitely mixes them. But then it’s also partly my fault, because when I ask him I us- use the same like ‘where’s the *Spiderman-puku*’ but uh he does mix them a little bit. Like if he needs.. if he can’t find the word then he goes to Finnish.. on that word if he knows.. and then vice versa. (...) Uh it doesn’t bother me because eventually he’s gonna learn all the words and then he’s not gonna mix anymore.

In the example (31) Carlos relates Lucas's code switching to situations where he lacks competence in English (“[...] he is not as proficient in English as he is in Finnish”). This corresponds to the example (7) that was discussed in the section 4.1, where Lucas needs to switch to Finnish in the middle of the sentence when not knowing how to proceed in English. Carlos also talks about the manner the family members use the word ‘Spiderman-puku’ and how Lucas has copied this habit from him. The example (3) in the section 4.1 demonstrates that Lucas indeed uses the word in similarly as Carlos. The examples (4) and (14) from the section 4.1 present three occasions where Lucas code switched by other reasons than incompetence, which is exactly not in keeping with what Carlos says in the example (31). However, as was discussed in the section 4.1, these situations are not clear with respect to, for example, to whom Lucas's speech is directed at. In addition, when the entire family is conversing and Lucas constantly switches languages in between Sara and Carlos, it is understandable that sometimes he speaks ‘the wrong language’ by accident (the example 6 of the section 4.1 also demonstrates such an occasion). In this light, I would not stress these incidents too strongly, and therefore in my opinion Carlos and Sara are able to describe Lucas's speech practices accordingly, as well as Lucas himself.

As was stated in the section 4.2, Carlos and Sara try to stay consistent when speaking with their children, and considering the implicit data this indeed seems to be the case. In the former section Carlos and Sara also expressed their desire for the children to learn Finnish and English, and said that they are trying to support their language acquisition in different manners. The conversations from the implicit data support this view as well, as can be observed from the following example (32):

- (32) **Sara** (to Lucas): Onk ne viikset? *Moustache*? [Is it a moustache? Moustache?]
 (...)
Carlos: Now if you are going to go outside and it's raining and then you have something that you hold like this so you don't get wet what's the name?
Lucas: Umbrella.
Sara and Carlos: Yeeaaa!
Carlos: Very good man, it's an umbrella.
Sara: Hyvä Lucas! [Well done, Lucas!]
Carlos: I didn't know you knew the word.
Sara: Muistaksä sen äitin kielellä? [Do you remember it in mom's language?]
Lucas: Sateenvarjo. [Umbrella.]
Sara: Joo, sateenvarjo. [Yes, umbrella.]
Carlos: Woow!

In the example (32), at first it seems like that Sara produces a code switch when she says ‘moustache’. Sara appears to be teaching Lucas – the family is playing a board game in which

one needs to explain a word and others try to guess it. This particular example was not included among the ones deviating from the OPOL strategy in the section 4.1, since in my opinion the example (32) describes a different situation because of the language teaching. Sara code switches with the purpose of explaining Lucas the word ‘moustache’, repeating it both in Finnish and English. The example (32) is also a demonstration of the family’s language management, showcasing how exactly Carlos and Sara try their best to ensure the children’s language acquisition, and make an effort teaching the languages simultaneously.

All in all, the implicit data almost entirely correspond to the explicit data. The family members follow an OPOL strategy, occasionally code switching intentionally or unintentionally. As was discussed in the section 2.4, code switching is a normal phenomenon in multilingual families and it would probably have been abnormal if no switching had appeared in the family’s conversations. Funnily enough, the family has included certain code switches in their family’s linguistic repertoire, and Lucas has learned these switches from the parents’ language usage. Sara and Carlos also made some statements regarding the family’s language management, which correspond to the practices. For example, they state that Lucas’s code switching does not bother them, and do not try to correct Lucas when he switches. Instead, the parents try to ensure the language acquisition by staying consistent and encouraging, and the implicit data supports their statements in this regard as well.

5 Conclusion

In this qualitative case study I examined a Finnish multilingual family's FLP and the different factors that have affected its formation. In the analysis I took into account Spolsky's (2004) theory about the three interrelated components that form a language policy: practices, ideology and management. Firstly, I wanted to examine the family's language practices using recorded (implicit) data that included various conversations between the family members. The examination of the implicit data revealed speech practices corresponding to the OPOL strategy. Some exceptional utterances that deviated from the OPOL strategy, or included code switching, were discussed. The analysis of the implicit data revealed that the family's three-year-old son can already separate his home languages (Finnish and English) from each other, and apply them according to a certain context. He also seemed to have begun code switching intentionally, which is a linguistic resource that multilingual children develop gradually (cf. Reyes 2004). In addition, particular parts of the family conversations indicated that the child's ability to speak the majority language (Finnish) is slightly stronger than his ability to speak the minority language (English), which is understandable, since children of multilingual families usually prefer to communicate in the majority language of their environment (cf. De Houwer 2009).

Secondly, I wanted to examine the effects of language ideologies on the family's LP. In order to do this, I conducted an interview with the family. Unlike most of the interviews in the FLP field, the family's children took part in the interview and the three-year-old child was given an opportunity to express his views. At the interview, the family members expressed positive attitudes towards their languages, as well as multilingualism in general. These positive ideologies have affected the parents' choice of wanting to teach their children several languages. The finding is similar to the results of previous studies on FLP: the more parents value their mother tongues and the more positive the beliefs they have about multilingualism in general, the greater is the probability that they choose a multilingual upbringing (cf. Piller 2002; Barron-Hauwaert 2004; Caldas 2006; King and Fogle 2006; Mäntylä, Pietikäinen and Dufva 2009; Grosjean 2010; Palviainen and Boyd 2013). The parents thought that there are no disadvantages to multilingualism at all, unless it affects the learning rate of the languages. According to the findings of Barron-Hauwaert's (2004) and Grosjean's (2010) studies, most of the multilingual families relate only advantages to multilingualism.

While examining the ideologies related to the family's three languages, it was noted that the parents have remarkably positive feelings regarding English, in comparison to Finnish and Portuguese. Even though the father's mother tongue is Portuguese, the parents preferred him to speak English to the children instead. Several factors affected the decision, one of them being the fact that the parents find English to be the most important language in the world, both in educational and occupational contexts. Previous studies conducted both abroad (e.g. Curdt-Christiansen 2014) and in Finland (e.g. Haque 2011) indicate similar situations, in which English is considered so important that parents might even prefer it over their mother tongues. Quite recently conducted Mäkelä and Posti's (2018) study also highlighted the Finnish population's extremely favorable attitude regarding English, which I found to prove that the English-supporting environment is one of the factor behind the participant family's language choice.

Language management of the family was also examined and discussed. The parents have supported the teaching of the children's minority language, English, by reading them books and watching cartoons in English. Another manner in which the parents have supported the language acquisition is staying consistent while speaking with the children. In the light of previously conducted studies, consistency seems to be a key factor in OPOL families as for the success in raising balanced bilinguals (cf. e.g. Sjöberg 2016). The interview revealed the parents' relaxed attitude towards managing their child's code switching. Even though the parents feel no need to correct their child when he mixes his languages, they have, nevertheless, some negative thoughts associated to the mixing. For example, the father thought that language mixing is something that should not occur once the child grows older, and the mother thought that language mixing is a flaw in a child's linguistic development. Overall, the parents were satisfied with their child's language acquisition this far, and felt no need to change the already existing FLP in any manner.

In the third phase of the analysis, I wanted to compare the implicit and explicit language policies of the family and see if they correspond to each other, since the language practices do not always correspond to the explicit statements that parents give about their FLPs. Both the family conversation and the interview recordings were examined and the parents' statements were almost entirely found coherent with the implicit speech practices. Only few instances that did not correspond were found in the data, concerning some family member speaking in a different manner than what had been stated in the interview. For example, the mother stated that she only speaks Finnish to the child, yet, she occasionally spoke English instead. However, these

instances were so few that they were not found significant in the manner that they would have distorted the parents' explicit LP. In effect, the fact that the participant family did not follow the OPOL strategy without mixing their languages at times is a normal phenomenon in multilingual families, and similar to the findings from earlier studies on multilingual families following an OPOL strategy (cf. Yamamoto 2001; Barron-Hauwaert 2004; Palviainen and Boyd 2013).

The present study is a case study and therefore its findings cannot be generalized. The possible shortcomings of the study can be found in the size of the participant family and the age of the family's children. One of the aims of the current study was to observe how all the family members, not only parents, co-construct the FLP. However, the analysis was quite heavily based on the parents' views, since the three-year-old child was not old enough to discuss the interview's topics in much detail, and the infant was not old enough to speak at all. Therefore, in order to gain a richer view of the role of a family's children in the formation of a FLP, studying a family with older children, as well as more children, could be more beneficial. For example, it would be interesting to observe which language siblings speak among themselves in a multilingual family, and what kind of impact this might have on their FLP. Furthermore, in order to gain more generalizable information, several families should be included in the study. Only recently the field of FLP has started to place more importance on the studies of families who speak minority languages in a society. Studies including families who speak minority languages could indeed provide results that are more significant on a national level, when planning educational language policies.

Since the current study wanted to observe a FLP on the micro-level and provide a detailed analysis on the different factors affecting the FLP, using video-tape instead of audio-tape could also have been more fruitful. As was noted during the analysis, several occasions in the family conversations remained unclear when not being able to see, for example, to whom the speech was directed at, or the facial expressions and gestures of the speakers. Therefore, videotaping could provide a researcher with a more reliable data. However, recorded audio was sufficient for the purpose and scope of the current study, and the lack of videoed material is not considered to have affected the findings of the study significantly. On their behalf the findings contribute to the field of FLP by shedding light on not only the explicit language policy of a multilingual family, but also the often lacking implicit one. In Finland, such FLP studies comparing both implicit and explicit data are only few, which highlights the importance of the present study even more.

6 Bibliography

- Almér, Elin. 2015. "Where Communication Flows, Languages Swim Freely: Developing Fieldwork Methods for Investigating Preschool Children's Language Beliefs". In *Kielen oppimisen virtauksia - Flows of Language Learning – AfinLAn vuosikirja 2015, Suomen soveltavan kielitieteen yhdistyksen julkaisuja 73* [The yearbook of AfinLA 2015, publications of the Finnish association for applied linguistics], edited by Teppo Jakonen, Juha Jalkanen, Terhi Paakkinen and Minna Suni, 159-171. Jyväskylä, Finland: Suomen soveltavan kielitieteen yhdistys [The Finnish association for applied linguistics].
- Ammon, Ulrich. 2010. "World Languages: Trends and Futures". In *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*, edited by Nicolas Coupland, 101–122. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Barron-Hauwaert, Susanne. 2004. *Language Strategies for Bilingual Families: The OneParentOne-Language Approach*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Limited. ProQuest Ebrary.
- . 2011. *Bilingual Siblings: Language Use in Families*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters Limited. ProQuest Ebrary.
- Bergroth, Mari. 2016. "Kaksikielisten lasten kielipoliittinen toimijuus päiväkodissa ja kotona" [The Bilingual Children's Role in the Formation of Language Policy]. *Kieli, koulutus ja yhteiskunta* [Language, education and society] 7, no. 5. Accessed 28 November 2019. <https://www.kieliverkosto.fi/fi/journals/kieli-koulutus-ja-yhteiskunta-lokakuu-2016/kaksikielisten-lasten-kielipoliittinen-toimijuus-paivakodissa-ja-kotona>.
- Bhatia, Tej K., and William C. Ritchie eds. 2004. "Introduction". In *The Handbook of Bilingualism*, 1-6. Malden: Blackwell.
- Braun, Andreas and Tony Cline. 2014. *Language Strategies for Trilingual Families: Parents' Perspectives*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Caldas, Stephen J. 2006. *Raising Bilingual-biliterate Children in Monolingual Cultures*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Chevrot, Jean-Pierre and Anna Ghimenton. 2018. "Bilingualism and Bidialectalism". In *The Cambridge Handbook of Bilingualism*, edited by Annick De Houwer and Lourdes Ortega, 510-523. Cambridge University Press.
- Curdt-Christiansen, Xiao Lan. 2013a. "Family Language Policy: Sociopolitical Reality Versus Linguistic Continuity". *Language Policy* 12, no. 1: 1–7.
- . 2013b. "Negotiating Family Language Policy: Doing Homework". In *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction*, edited by Mila Schwartz and Anna Verschik, 277-295. Dordrecht and New York: Springer.
- . 2014. "Is Learning Chinese at Odds With Learning English?". In *Learning Chinese in Diasporic Communities: Many Pathways to Being Chinese*, edited by Xiao Lan Curdt-Christiansen and Andy Hancock, 35-58. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- . 2018. "Family Language Policy". In *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning*, edited by James W. Tollefson and Miguel Pérez-Milans. Oxford University Press.

- De Houwer, Annick. 2009. *Bilingual First Language Acquisition*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- . 2018. “Language Choice in Bilingual Interaction”. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Bilingualism*, edited by Annick De Houwer and Lourdes Ortega, 324-348. Cambridge University Press.
- De Houwer, Annick and Lourdes Ortega eds. 2018. “Introduction: Learning, Using, and Unlearning More than One Language”. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Bilingualism*, edited by Annick De Houwer and Lourdes Ortega, 1-12. Cambridge University Press.
- Dewaele, Jean-Marc and Li Wei. 2013. “Attitudes Towards Code-switching Among Adult Mono- and Multilingual Language Users”. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development* 35, no. 3: 235–251.
- Doyle, Colm. 2013. “To Make the Root Stronger: Language Policies and Experiences of Successful Multilingual Intermarried Families with Adolescent Children in Tallinn”. In *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction*, edited by Mila Schwartz and Anna Verschik, 145-175. Dodrecht and New York: Springer.
- Fuller, Janet M. 2018. “Ideologies of Language, Bilingualism, and Multilingualism”. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Bilingualism*, edited by Annick De Houwer and Lourdes Ortega, 119-134. Cambridge University Press.
- Grosjean, Francois. 2010. *Bilingual: Life and Reality*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: Harvard University Press.
- Guardado, Martin and Ava Becker. 2014. “‘Glued to the Family’: The Role of Familism in Heritage Language Development Strategies”. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 27, no. 2: 163–181.
- Gumperz, John. J. and Norine Berenz. 1993. “Transcribing Conversational Exchanges”. In *Talking Data*, edited by Jane A. Edwards and Martin D. Lampert, 91–122. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Haque, Shahzaman. 2011. “Migrant Family Language Practices and Language Policies in Finland”. In *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies* 5, no. 1: 49–64. Accessed 3 January 2020. <https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/27266>.
- Harding, Edith and Philip Riley. 1986. *The Bilingual Family: A Handbook for Parents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hirsch, Tijana and Jin Sook Lee. 2018. “Understanding the Complexities of Transnational Family Language Policy”. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 39, no. 10: 882-894.
- Hollway, Wendy, and Tony Jefferson. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research Differently – Free Association, Narrative and the Interview Method*. London: SAGE.
- King, Kendall. A. 2016. “Language Policy, Multilingual Encounters, and Transnational Families”. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 37, no 7: 726–733.
- King, Kendall. A., and Lyn Wright Fogle. 2006. “Bilingual Parenting as Good Parenting: Parents’ Perspectives on Family Language Policy for Additive Bilinguals”. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 9, no. 6: 695–712.

- . 2016. “Family Language Policy”. In *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education. Encyclopedia of Language and Education (3rd edition)*, edited by Teresa McCarthy and Stephen May, 1-13. Springer, Cham. Accessed 2 January 2020. http://www.aubreyloganterry.net/uploads/7/1/7/5/71755411/family_language_policy.pdf.
- Lane, Pia. 2010. “‘We Did What We Thought Was Best for Our Children’: A Nexus Analysis of Language Shift in a Kvan Community”. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2010, no. 202: 63–78.
- Lanza, Elizabeth. 2007. “Multilingualism and the Family”. In *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication*, edited by Peter Auer and Li Wei, 45-67. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Leppänen, Sirpa, Pitkänen-Huhta, Anne, Nikula, Tarja, Kytölä, Samu, Törmäkangas, Timo, Nissinen, Kari, Kääntä, Leila, Räisänen, Tiina, Laitinen, Mikko, Pahta, Päivi, Koskela, Heidi, Lähdesmäki, Salla and Henna Jousmäki. 2011. ”National Survey on the English Language in Finland: Uses, Meanings and Attitudes”. *Varieng* 5. Accessed 2 January 2020. Available at: <http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/05>.
- Maccoby, Eleanor E. 2014. “Historical Overview of Socialization Research and Theory”. In *Handbook of Socialization – Theory and Research*, edited by Joan E. Grusec and Paul D. Hastings, 3-34. New York and London: The Guilford Press.
- MacSwan, Jeff. 2004. “Code Switching and Grammatical Theory”. In *The Handbook of Bilingualism*, edited by Tej K. Bhatia and William C. Ritchie, 283-311. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- McCabe, Marta. 2016. “Transnationalism and Language Maintenance: Czech and Slovak as Heritage Languages in the Southeastern United States”. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2016, no. 238: 169–191.
- Martikainen, Tuomas, Saukkonen, Pasi and Minna Säävälä. 2015. “Johdanto: Suomi muuttuu, kun Suomeen muutetaan” [Introduction: Finland changes, when people move to Finland]. In *Muuttajat, kansainvälinen muuttoliike ja suomalainen yhteiskunta* [Movers, international migration and the Finnish society], edited by Tuomas Martikainen, Pasi Saukkonen and Minna Säävälä, 13-15. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Martikainen, Tuomas, Saari, Matti and Jouni Korkiasaari. 2015. ”Kansainväliset muuttoliikkeet ja Suomi” [International migrations and Finland]. In *Muuttajat, kansainvälinen muuttoliike ja suomalainen yhteiskunta* [Movers, international migration and the Finnish society], edited by Tuomas Martikainen, Pasi Saukkonen and Minna Säävälä, 13-15. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- May, Stephen. 2006. “Language Policy and Minority Rights”. In *An Introduction to Language Policy – Theory and Method*, edited by Thomas Ricento, 255-272. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Moin, Victor, Ekaterina Protassova, Valeria Lukkari, and Mila Schwartz. 2013. “The Role of Family Background in Early Bilingual Education: The Finnish-Russian Experience”. In *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction*, edited by Mila Schwartz and Anna Verschik, 52-82. Dordrecht and New York: Springer.
- Mäkelä, Jarkko and Tuomas Posti. 2018. “Language Attitudes in Multilingual Finland: A Survey Study on Finnish Language Attitudes”. MA thesis, University of Jyväskylä.

- Mäntylä, Katja, Sari Pietikäinen, and Hannele Dufva. 2009. "Languages Around the Clock: Researching Multilingualism in Families". *Puhe ja kieli* [Speech and language] 29, no 1: 27–37. Accessed 1 September 2019. <http://ojs.tsv.fi/index.php/pk/article/viewFile/4791/4489>.
- Official Statistics Finland. 2017. http://www.stat.fi/til/perh/2017/02/perh_2017_02_2018-12-0. Accessed 23 September 2019.
- Official Statistics Finland. 2019a. <https://www.stat.fi/tup/maahanmuutto/muuttoliike.html>. Accessed 30 August 2019.
- Official Statistics Finland. 2019b. <https://www.stat.fi/meta/kas/perhe.html>. Accessed 30 August 2019.
- Okita, Toshie. 2002. *Impact: Studies in Language and Society. Invisible Work: Bilingualism, Language Choice and Childrearing in Intermarried Families*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ortega, Lourdes. 2019. "SLA and the Study of Equitable Multilingualism". *The Modern Language Journal* 103, no. S1: 23-38.
- Palviainen, Åsa, and Sally Boyd. 2013. "Unity in Discourse, Diversity in Practice: The One Person One Language Policy in Bilingual Families". In *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction*, edited by Mila Schwartz and Anna Verschik, 223-248. Dordrecht and New York: Springer.
- Palviainen, Åsa, and Mari Bergroth. 2018. "Parental Discourses of Language Ideology and Linguistic Identity in Multilingual Finland". *International Journal of Multilingualism* 15, no. 3, 262-275.
- Piller, Ingrid. 2002. *Bilingual Couples Talk: The Discursive Construction of Hybridity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Protassova, Ekaterina. 2018. "Multilingual Education and Family Language Policy". *International Journal of Multilingual Education*, no. 11: 102-111.
- Quay, Suzanne and Simone Montanari. 2018. "Bilingualism and Multilingualism". In *The Cambridge Handbook of Bilingualism*, edited by Annick De Houwer and Lourdes Ortega, 544-560. Cambridge University Press.
- Reyes, Iliana. 2004. "Functions of Code Switching in Schoolchildren's Conversations". *Bilingual Research Journal* 28, no. 1: 77-98.
- Schiffman, Harold. 2002. *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Schwartz, Mila. 2008. "Exploring the Relationship between Family Language Policy and Heritage Language Knowledge Among Second Generation Russian–Jewish Immigrants in Israel". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 29, no. 5: 400-418.
- Schwartz, Mila, and Anna Verschik eds. 2013. *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction*. Dordrecht and New York: Springer.
- Shohamy, Elana. 2006. *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. New York: Routledge.
- Sjöberg, Sannina. 2016. "Kaksikielisten vanhempien kielivalinnat" [Bilingual parents' language choices]. *Kieli, koulutus ja yhteiskunta* [Language, education and society] 7, no.

5. Accessed 4 January 2020. <https://www.kieliverkosto.fi/fi/journals/kieli-koulutus-ja-yhteiskunta-lokakuu-2016/kaksikielisten-vanhempien-kielivalinnat>.
- Smith-Christmas, Cassie. 2015. *Family Language Policy: Maintaining an Endangered Language at Home*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. Accessed 2 May 2019. EBL.
- Smith-Christmas, Cassie, Bergroth, Mari and Irem Bezciöglu-Göktolga. 2019. "A Kind of Success Story: Family Language Policy in Three Different Sociopolitical Contexts". *International Multilingual Research Journal* 13 no. 2: 88-101.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 2004. *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wei, Li, Saravanan, Vanithamani and Ng Lee Hoon, Julia. 1997. "Language Shift in the Teochew Community in Singapore: A Family Domain Analysis." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 18, no. 5: 364–384.
- Wengraf, Tom. 2001. *Qualitative Research Interviewing: Biographic Narrative and Semi-Structured Methods*. London: SAGE.
- Yamamoto, Masayo. 2001. *Language Use in Interlingual Families: A Japanese-English SocioLinguistic Study*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Limited.

Appendix 1

The Instructions for the Participant Family

The following instructions were originally written in Finnish.

The subject of my study is the language use in multilingual families. Participating in the study will not require much of your time. At first, you are supposed to record your conversations when all of the family members are present, and after that I will interview you. As to the recordings of your speech, I would like the recorded material to be as long as possible. It is fine if you record several conversations instead of one long one. The aim is for you to feel relaxed and speak as naturally as possible, therefore, there is no need to force the conversation. You can record when you are, for example, having dinner, hanging out in the living room or playing with your child – just turn on the recorder and act normally. Obviously, it would be good to have the recorder nearby in order for me to hear the conversation. I would like to have a minimum length of 45 minutes for the recordings combined. I have few example apps for mobile phone that you can use for recording, or if you prefer a recorder, I will provide you with one. I can bring the recorder to your house if needed. If you choose to record with your phone, you can use the app to send me the recording via Facebook, for example. I might add extracts of the recorded conversations to the thesis, yet, nothing that might reveal your identity. Your family will remain anonymous in the study.

The interview will last approximately 30 minutes to 1 hour, depending on how the conversation proceeds. I will conduct the interview in order to get a better understanding of the languages you speak, for example, where you have learned your languages and why you use the languages in your family the way you do. The objective is to talk about your family's languages in a relaxed atmosphere. We can have the interview at your house or any location of your choice. I prefer to have your entire family present for the interview, yet, if it is not possible, I will only interview you parents. If it is okay with you, I would like to ask your child a few questions as well, for example, while playing with him.

Appendix 2

Interview Themes

Family Background

1. How old are you?
2. What languages do you speak in your family and where have you learned them? How would you evaluate your language competence?
3. Which language did you speak with each other before having children? Has the situation changed after having them?
4. Tell me about your moving history.

Language Practices

5. Which language does each of you use with the children?
6. Does your child speak the appropriate language consistently with you?
7. Which language is spoken when the entire family is together?
8. Which language is spoken in the relatives' presence here in Finland and abroad?

Explicit Language Policy

9. What kind of decisions have you made about the way languages shall be used at your home?
10. What are these decisions based on?
- (11. If you have not made any specific rules on language use at home, what do you think has led your family to use the language the way it does?)
12. Have the norms of language usage at your home changed over time?
13. If they have, did you consciously enforce these changes or do you think they happened automatically?
14. How do you feel about the way the children have learned both the languages and use them at home?

Language Ideology

15. Do you consider your family bi- or multilingual? Why?
16. What do you think about multilingualism – are there some advantages or disadvantages?
17. What do you think about the language combination that your children are learning, does it have positive or negative aspects in it?

18. How important it is to you that your children learn multiple languages?

Language Management

19. What kind of means have you used to ensure that the children learn both the languages?

20. If your child mixes his languages, how do you feel about it?

21. Will the infant be raised multilingual as well, or will some changes be made regarding the manner in which the older brother was raised?

Questions for the child (to be asked during the interview or all at once while playing with him)

21. Which language do you speak with mom? And with dad? And with your friends?

22. What do you think about Finnish? What do you think about English?

23. How do you feel about speaking many languages?

Appendix 3

Transcription Conventions (from Gumperz & Berenz, 1993)

..	Pauses of less than .5 second
...	Pauses greater than .5 second
()	Unintelligible speech
(they)	A good guess at an unclear word
##	Use of hatchmarks when when extratextual information needed included within the text (e.g., R: did you ask E #surname# to come?)
=	To indicate overlap and latching of speakers' utterances (e.g. L: so you understand = the requirements = G: = yeah, I under = stand them/)

Appendix 4: Finnish Summary

Tämän kvalitatiivisen tutkielman tarkoitus oli tarkastella suomalaisen monikielisen perheen näkyvää ja piilevää kielipolitiikkaa, sekä sen muotoutumiseen vaikuttavia tekijöitä. Tutkielman avulla halutaan tuoda lisätietoa sosiolingvistiikan ja perhepolitiikan tieteenhaarojen tutkimukselle, joissa on vasta viimeisinä vuosina tunnistettu myös piilevän kielipolitiikan tarkastelemisen tärkeys tutkimusten yhteydessä. Piilevällä kielipolitiikalla viitataan tässä tutkimuksessa siihen, millä tavalla perheenjäsenet puhuvat ja käyttävät kieltä keskustellessaan keskenään, kun taas näkyvällä kielipolitiikalla viitataan siihen, millä tavalla perheenjäsenet itse kuvailevat perheen kielikäytäntöjä. Perheiden kielipolitiikan tutkiminen on tärkeää, sillä perheet ovat jatkuvassa vuorovaikutuksessa muun yhteiskunnan kanssa, ja toimivan kielipolitiikan aikaansaamiseksi, myös perheet tulisi ottaa huomioon (Schwartz ja Verschik 2013, 2). Tässä tiivistelmässä avataan aluksi tutkimukseen liittyviä olennaisia käsitteitä ja teoriapohjaa. Tämän jälkeen käydään läpi perhekielipolitiikan tieteenalan keskeisiä tutkimuksia sekä Suomessa, että ulkomailla. Seuraavaksi kerrotaan tutkimuksen osallistujista, tutkimuksessa käytetyistä menetelmistä ja aineistosta. Lopuksi käydään läpi analyysistä saadut keskeisimmät tutkimustulokset.

Teoreettinen viitekehys

Sosiolingvistiikassa käsitteeseen perhe viitataan eri tavoin, esimerkiksi Spolskyn (2004, 40) tapaan 'puheyhteisönä' (speech community) tai Lanza'n (2007, 46) tapaan 'sosiaalisena yksikkönä' (social unit). Tässä tutkimuksessa perheeseen viitattiin konkreettisemmin, ja käsitteellä perhe tarkoitettiin samassa taloudessa asuvaa paria, joilla on tai ei ole lapsia. Alan kirjallisuudessa monikielisyys on myös määritelty hieman eri tavoin kirjailijasta riippuen. Yleisimmin monikielinen henkilö määritellään ihmiseksi, joka arjessaan käyttää useampaa kuin kahta kieltä (esim. Butler 2012, 110; Quay and Montanari 2018, 544). Tosin, samaa määritelmää käytetään myös kaksikielisestä henkilöstä (esim. De Houwer 2018, 325; Grosjean 2010, 4; Lanza 2007, 45). Vaikkakin monikielisyys on ilmiönä kompleksisempi, on moni- ja kaksikielisyys paljon samaa ja siksi niiden määritelmätkin menevät jonkin verran päällekkäin (Quay and Montanari 2018, 556-560). Tässä tutkimuksessa monikielisellä henkilöllä tarkoitetaan ihmistä, joka puhuu useampaa kuin kahta kieltä, ja kaksikielisellä henkilöllä viitataan ihmiseen, joka puhuu vain kahta kieltä. Monikielisellä perheellä tarkoitetaan vastaavasti perhettä, jossa puhutaan useampaa kuin kahta kieltä.

Monikielisen perheen kielet jaotellaan yleensä enemmistö- ja vähemmistökieliin (majority and minority languages). Enemmistökieli on perheessä eniten puhuttu kieli – siihen voidaan tosin viitata myös perheen asuinpaikan kielenä (Barron-Hauwaert 2011, 39). Vähemmistökielillä viitataan perheessä vähemmän puhuttuun kieleen tai kieliin (ibid.). Läheskään aina lapset eivät opi perheen kaikkia kieliä yhtä hyvin – vain 25% kaksikielisten perheiden lapsista puhuivat molempia kieliään sujuvasti (ks. De Houwer 2018). Usein vanhemmat miettivät keinoja, joilla voivat varmistaa lasten kielenoppimisen perheen kaikilla kielillä, ja silloin he saattavat tietoisesti tai tiedostamattaan luoda perheelle kielipolitiikan (language policy).

Kielipolitiikka tarkoittaa sääntöjä, jotka on muodostettu kielen kontrolloimista varten (Spolsky 2004, 40). Kielipolitiikkaa toteutetaan yhteiskunnan eri tasoilla aina lainsäädännöstä yksilöiden henkilökohtaisiin mieltymyksiin kielenkäyttöä koskien. Kielipolitiikka voi olla joko näkyvää (explicit), kuten lakeihin kirjatut säännöt, tai piilevää (implicit). Piilevä kielipolitiikka tarkoittaa tiedostamattomia sääntöjä, tai tapaa, jolla kielipolitiikka oikeasti toteutuu. Yhteiskunnassa piilevä kielipolitiikka ei aina toimi siten, kuten näkyvän kielipolitiikan mukaan on kirjattu. Perhekielipolitiikka (family language policy) viittaa nimenomaan perheessä luotuihin sääntöihin perheen kielen- tai kielten käytöstä. Poliitiikka voi olla vanhemmista lähtöisin, mutta siihen voivat vaikuttaa myös muut perheenjäsenet. Monikieliset perheet kielipolitiikkaansa pohtiessaan miettivät esimerkiksi sitä, mitä kieltä puhutaan kotona ja kodin ulkopuolella (Hirsch and Lee 2018, 883) ja sitä, mitä kieltä puhutaan sukulaisten ja ystävien kanssa (Shohamy 2006, 48).

Ehkä tunnetuimman kielipolitiikkaan liittyvän teorian on luonut Bernard Spolsky (2004). Kyseinen viitekehys toimii tämänkin tutkimuksen analyysin pohjana. Spolskyn teoriassa kielipolitiikka jaetaan kolmeen osa-alueeseen: kielikäytänteihin (language practice), ideologiaan (ideology) ja kielisuunnitteluun (language management). Kielikäytänteillä viitataan tiedostettuihin ja tiedostamattomiin tapoihin, jotka liittyvät kielten puhumiseen. Ideologia tarkoittaa erilaisia uskomuksia ja asenteita, jotka vaikuttavat kielikäytänteisiin. Kielisuunnittelu puolestaan tarkoittaa keinoja, joiden avulla auktoriteetti yrittää muokata kielikäytänteitä tai vaikuttaa niihin, samalla toimien omien kieliin liittyvien ideologioiden mukaisesti. Ideologiaa voidaankin pitää pohjana kaikelle kielipolitiikalle, sillä ilman ideologioita ihmisillä ei olisi mielikuvia siitä, millä tavalla kieliä tulisi heidän mielestään käyttää. Ideologiat voivat liittyä esimerkiksi henkilön tuntemuksiin eri kielistä ja omista kielistään, ja siihen millä tavalla muu yhteiskunta suhtautuu niihin. Jos vaikkapa monikielisen perheen vanhemmat arvostavat omia kieliään, he todennäköisesti haluavat opettaa molemmat

kielet lapsilleen (Harding and Riley 1986, 74). Monikielisen perheen kielipolitiikkaan voi vaikuttaa myös monikielisyteen itsessään liittyvät ideologiat, sekä perheen kielten hierarkkinen status yhteiskunnassa.

Kielistrategia terminä liittyy perhekielipolitiikkaan, mutta sitä ei tulisi sekoittaa kielipolitiikan termin kanssa. Kielistrategia tarkoittaa käytännössä sitä, mitä kieltä lapsi puhuu perheessä kunkin vanhemman kanssa (Barron-Hauwaert 2011, 39). OPOL (one parent one language), eli yksi vanhempi yksi kieli, on suosituin kielistrategia monikielisissä perheissä (ks. esim. Grosjean 2010, Barron-Hauwaert 2011, Palviainen ja Boyd 2013). OPOL -strategiassa lapsi puhuu siis kummankin vanhemman kanssa eri kieltä. Parhaiten lapsi oppii kuitenkin puhumaan kaikkia kieliään MLAH (minority language at home) -strategian avulla, jolloin lapsen kotona puhutaan pelkästään vähemmistökieltä ja lapsi oppii enemmistökielen kodin ulkopuolella (esim. De Houwer 2007). Vaikkakin OPOL -strategiaa noudattavissa perheissä pyritään usein puhumaan järjestelmällisesti vain yhtä kieltä kerrallaan, on tavallista, että kieliä joskus sekoitetaan keskenään. Ilmiötä kutsutaan myös koodinvaihdoksi (code switching). Koodinvaihtoa voi tapahtua lauseiden sisällä (intrasentential switching) tai lauseiden välissä (intersentential switching).

Perhekielipolitiikan tutkimus

Tämä tutkimus kuuluu perhekielipolitiikan (family language policy) tieteenalan piiriin, joka on myös osa sosiolingvistiikan tieteenalaa. Perhekielipolitiikka juontaa juurensa kielipolitiikan (language policy) sekä lasten kielen oppimisen (child language acquisition) tieteenaloista. Alalla tutkitaan erityisesti perheiden kielikäytänteitä, kielisuunnittelua ja kielten siirtymistä sukupolvelta toiselle. Aikaisimmat alan tutkimukset keskittyivät lähinnä länsimaisiin perheisiin, joissa puhuttiin yleisiä, eurooppalaisia kieliä (esim. De Houwer 1990, Lanza 1997, Piller 2002, Okita 2002). Tällöin oltiin kiinnostuneita vanhempien strategioista kaksikielisten lasten kasvattamisessa. Sittemmin alalla on kiinnostuttu enemmän vähemmistökieliä puhuvista perheistä, jotka ovat vaarassa menettää kielensä enemmistökielten vuoksi (Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 425). Tällä hetkellä perhekielipolitiikan alan tutkimuksissa halutaan erityisesti ymmärtää erilaisia ideologioita kielten jatkumisen taustalla. Nykyään tiedostetaan, että perheet ovat jatkuvassa vuorovaikutuksessa ympäristönsä ja muun yhteiskunnan kanssa, ja halutaan löytää yhteyksiä kodin, koulun ja yhteiskunnan välillä (Curdt-Christiansen 2018, 428). Curdt-

Christiansenin (2013a, 5) mukaan tulevaisuudessa alan tutkimuksissa otetaan paremmin huomioon myös lasten rooli perheen kielipolitiikan muodostumisessa.

Suomessa kaksikielisiä perheitä on tutkittu runsaasti, mutta monikielisiä perheitä vähemmän (Mäntylä, Pietikäinen ja Dufva 2009, 27). Suomalais-ruotsalaisten perheiden kielipolitiikkaa ovat tutkineet muun muassa Palviainen ja Boyd (2013), Sjöberg (2016) sekä Smith-Christmas, Bergroth ja Bezcioglu-Göktolga (2019). Suomalais-venäläisiä perheitä ovat puolestaan tutkineet Moin ym. (2013) ja Protassova (2018). Monikielisiä perheitä ja heidän kielipolitiikkaansa on tutkinut muun muassa Haque (2011) sekä Palviainen ja Bergroth (2018).

Osallistujat ja aineisto

Tutkittava perhe asuu Etelä-Suomessa. Perheessä puhutaan kolmea kieltä: suomea, englantia sekä portugalia. Perheeseen kuuluvat suomalainen äiti, brasilialainen isä ja heidän kaksi poikaansa (3-vuotias sekä vauva). Tutkielma toteutettiin perheen nauhoittamien spontaanien keskustelujen, sekä heidän kotonaan tehdyn, nauhoitetun haastattelun avulla. Tutkielmassa käytettiin apuna kolmea tutkimuskysymystä: 1. Millainen kielipolitiikka on läsnä perheen jokapäiväisessä kommunikaatiossa? 2. Mitkä vanhempien uskomukset ja ideologiat ovat vaikuttaneet kielipolitiikkaan ja kuinka he itse kuvailevat perheen kielipolitiikkaa? 3. Millä tavalla perheen piilevä ja näkyvä kielipolitiikka vastaavat toisiaan? Ensimmäisen tutkimuskysymyksen kautta on haluttu tutkia perheen kielikäytänteitä, esimerkiksi sitä, kuka puhuu mitään kieltä kenen kanssa. Tämän tutkimuskysymyksen tarkastelussa on analyysissä käytetty ainoastaan keskustelunauhoituksia. Toisen tutkimuskysymyksen avulla on tarkasteltu millaiset asenteet ja uskomukset ovat vaikuttaneet perheen kielipolitiikan muotoutumiseen, ja sitä, onko kielipolitiikka muuttunut ajan myötä. Kolmannen tutkimuskysymyksen kautta vertailtiin perheen piilevää ja näkyvää kielipolitiikkaa, toisin sanoen sitä, vastaavatko perheen haastattelussa kertomat kielikäytänteet niitä, jotka esiintyvät nauhoituksissa.

Ennen haastattelua perhe nauhoitti keskustelujaan yhteensä 81 minuutin 90 sekunnin verran. Nauhoilla keskustelua käytiin erilaisissa tilanteissa, muun muassa kotona, ystävien kanssa, sekä ravintolassa. Kun perhe oli lähettänyt nauhoitukset minulle, suunnittelin haastattelun. Erilaisten haastattelumenetelmien joukosta valikoitui keskusteleva haastattelu (narrative approach), jonka tarkoitus on jättää tilaa haastateltavan tarinankerronnalle. Haastattelukysymykset olivat täten avoimia, jonka myötä haastateltavan perheen toivottiin alitajuisesti korostavan heille tärkeitä

ideologioita keskustelun myötä. Kvalitatiivinen, osittain strukturoitu haastattelu on yleensäkin perhekielipolitiikan alan käytetyin menetelmä (Schwartz 2010, 85).

Myös perheen vanhempi lapsi haluttiin ottaa huomioon tutkimuksessa ja erityisesti haastattelussa. Lapsen haastattelu ei kuitenkaan ole täysin yksioikoista – tutkijan on otettava huomioon se, että (pienen) lapsen mielipiteisiin vaikuttaa yleensä vahvasti hänen vanhemmistaan saamansa malli. Toisaalta, sädekehä-efektin (halo-effect) ansiosta lapsi saattaa puhua totuudenmukaisemmin tutkijalle, kuin vanhemmat (Schwartz 2010, 186). Joka tapauksessa, lasta haastateltaessa tutkijan on tärkeä muistaa leikinomainen kanssakäyminen, jotta lapselle tulisi turvallinen ja luottavainen olo ja tämä pystyisi ilmaisemaan itseään vapaammin (Almér 2015, 162). Tästä syystä, ennen haastattelun aloitusta vietin aikaa perheen kotona tutustuen heihin, ja leikkien lapsen kanssa. Haastattelu pidettiin perheen kotona, ja kesti yhteensä 42 minuuttia 28 sekuntia. Sekä keskustelunauhoituksista, että haastattelusta litteroitiin tärkeimmät osat analyysia varten.

Keskeisimmät tutkimustulokset

Analyysin perusteella huomattiin, että perheen puhekäytännöt seuraavat ns. OPOL-strategiaa. Tämän strategian mukaan perheen lapset puhuvat kummankin vanhemman kanssa eri kieltä. Keskustelunauhoituksissa oli kuitenkin muutama kohta, joissa OPOL -strategiaa ei seurattu – kyseessä oli tällöin koodinvaihtotilanteet, jotka ovat tavallisia OPOL -perheissä (Yamamoto 2001; Palviainen ja Boyd 2013). Perheenjäsenet jakavat koodinvaihtotapansa, mutta heillä on myös omanlaisiaan tapoja vaihdella kieliään puheessa. Perheen isän koodinvaihdot ovat pääasiassa lauseen sisällä tapahtuvia, yhden sanan mittaisia vaihtoja englannista suomeen. Isän puheessa esiintyy myös kahden sanan mittaisia koodinvaihtoja, jotka toimivat idiomaattiseen tapaan – hän esimerkiksi lapsille puhuessaan sanoo 'hassu poika' ja 'kiltti poika', aina sanaryhmittymän adjektiivivaikuttajien vaihtaen. Suomenkielisten koodinvaihtojen lisäksi isä käyttää yhtä portugalinkielistä sanaa: 'papai' (=isä). Sana toimii ikään kuin lempinimenä, sillä koko perhe viittaa isään käyttäen samaa sanaa portugaliksi.

Perheessä esiintyy myös toinen kaikkien käyttämä lempinimi, joka on 'äiti', ja sillä viitataan perheen äitiin. Äidin koodinvaihdot ovat pääasiassa lauseen sisäisiä, yhden sanan mittaisia vaihtoja sekä suomeksi, että englanniksi. Äidin puheessa esiintyi kerran myös lauseiden välinen koodinvaihto, joten hän todennäköisesti käyttää myös tätä keinoa puheessaan. Perheen kolmevuotiaan lapsen koodinvaihdot olivat sekä lauseen sisäisiä, että lauseen välisiä. Koska

perheen äiti ja lapsi vaihtavat kieltä suomen ja englannin välillä puheessaan jatkuvasti, on ymmärrettävää, että heidän koodinvaihtonsa ovat monipuolisempia, kuin pelkästään englantia puhuvan isän. Perheen lapsi vaikuttaa jo alkaneen oppia erilaiset kontekstit ja tavat, joilla käyttää kaikkia kieliään. Hän osaa esimerkiksi käyttää säännöllisesti englantia isänsä, ja suomea äitinsä kanssa. Hän on myös kopioinut isältään tietynlaisia koodinvaihtoja, kuten vaikkapa ilmaisen 'Spiderman-puku'. Lapsi on tosin vielä hyvin nuori, ja sen takia osa koodinvaihtoista johtuu myös hänen heikommasta kielitaidostaan englannissa.

Useat eri ideologiat ovat vaikuttaneet tutkittavan perheen kielipolitiikan muotoutumiseen. Ennen ensimmäisen lapsen syntymää vanhemmat lukivat monikielisille perheille suunnattuja oppaita, ja lukemansa mukaan päättivät puhua lapselle kahta kieltä kolmen sijaan. Vanhemmat pelkäsivät muun muassa, että kolmen kielen opettelu hämmäntäisi lasta, eikä tämä oppisi mitään kielistään sujuvasti. Lisäksi vanhemmat arvelivat kolmen kielen opettamisen vievän liikaa aikaa. Myös vanhempien tuntemukset kielitaidostaan vaikuttivat päätökseen lapselle puhuttavista kielistä. Portugalia äidinkielenään puhuva isä halusi puhua lapselle englantia portugalilain sijaan, koska kokee puhuvansa englantia sujuvammin. Toiseksi lapselle puhuttavaksi kieleksi valikoitui suomi, koska se on lapsen äidin sekä ympäristön kieli. Ideologiat liittyen kieliin ja niiden arvokkuuteen ovat myös vaikuttaneet olennaisesti perheen kielipolitiikkaan. Englanti valikoitui lapselle puhuttavaksi kieleksi myös siksi, että vanhemmat kokevat sen olevan kaikista tärkein kieli koko maailmassa, ja uskovat englanninkielentaidosta olevan hyötyä lapselle sekä koulu-, että työmaailmassa. Isä ei pidä suomea arvokkaana kielenä itsessään, mutta hänen mielestään on kuitenkin hyödyllistä osata puhua suomea Suomessa – tästä syystä isä aikoo myöskin opetella sujuvaksi suomen puhujaksi.

Monikielisyyteen liittyvät ideologiat ovat perheessä pääosin positiivisia, sillä vanhempien mielestä monikielisyydestä on vain hyötyä. Vanhemmat ovat tosin eri mieltä sen suhteen, kannattaako heidän lastensa opiskella lisää kieliä tulevaisuudessa. Äidin mielestä usean kielen osaaminen on hyödyllistä, kun taas isän mielestä kieltenopiskeluun käytetyn ajan voisi käyttää johonkin käytännöllisempään. Kaiken kaikkiaan vanhemmat ovat tyytyväisiä muodostamaansa kielipolitiikkaan, eivätkä aio muuttaa sitä tulevaisuudessa. Tärkeintä vanhemmille oli kielipolitiikkaa miettiessä se, että lapset oppisivat puhumaan sujuvasti molempia kieliään, ja esikoisen kohdalla tämä on käynyt toteen. Vanhemmat uskovat, että johdonmukaisuus on tärkein onnistumista selittävä tekijä: vanhemmat puhuvat mahdollisimman johdonmukaisesti lapsille omalla kielellään, välttäen koodinvaihtoa. Koodinvaihdon vähyys vanhempien puheessa johtuu myös siitä, että vanhemmilla on selvästi negatiivisia mielikuvia siihen liittyen

– koodinvaihto nähdään vikana, ja se pitäisi saada kitkettyä lasten puheesta pois ajan myötä. Vanhemmat kuitenkin tiedostavat vaihtelevansa välillä eri kielten välillä itsekin, eivätkä ole siksi korjanneet lapsensa puheessa esiintyvää kieltenvaihtelua. Johdonmukaisena pysymisen lisäksi vanhemmat ovat koittaneet tukea lastensa kieltenoppimista myös katsomalla piirrettyjä englanniksi, sekä lukemalla heille englanniksi satuja. Vanhemmat haluavat lasten tutustuvan myös brasilialaiseen kulttuuriin ja opettaa heille hieman portugaliakin – tästä syystä perheeseen on palkattu brasilialainen lastenhoitaja. Analyysin viimeisessä vaiheessa, vertailtaessa haastattelua ja keskustelunauhoituksia, huomattiin perheen piilevän ja näkyvän kielipolitiikan vastaavat toisiaan.