



# Managing Differences, Showing (Dis)affiliations: Language Contacts Through the Eyes of the Inhabitants of a Village in Finnish Lapland

*Kaarina Hippi*

## 2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the linguistic experiences of inhabitants in a small Northern Finnish village (henceforth referred to as Village N) which is a dynamic multilingual context with its own specificities (cf. Pietikäinen, 2018): The national languages of Finland and Norway feature prominently, and the village's location in historical Saami land (Sápmi) also has

---

K. Hippi (✉)

Research Unit for Languages and Literature, University of Oulu, Oulu, Finland  
e-mail: [kaarina.hippi@helsinki.fi](mailto:kaarina.hippi@helsinki.fi)

Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies, University of Helsinki,  
Helsinki, Finland

Language Studies, Tampere University, Tampere, Finland

© The Author(s) 2023

M. Frick et al. (eds.), *Language Contacts and Discourses in the Far North*, Arctic Encounters,

[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-42979-8\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-42979-8_2)

an effect on the multilingualism present there. Tourism has a strong influence in the area and is a source of employment for the locals. Norwegian is frequently heard, as the citizens of the neighbouring country form the largest distinct group of visitors in the area; they typically own or rent cottages or set up caravans there. In addition, depending on the season, Village N receives visitors from various other countries. The inhabitants have various temporary contacts with visitors or at least make observations on them from afar. As the local population is small, visitors are a significant part of this locality. The speakers are themselves mobile: They visit different places during their holidays, and some of them have resided in many places within the country. Thus, questions of im/mobility arise in different ways (cf. Horner & Dailey-O’Cain, 2019).

The focus is on experiences of languages and attitudes on them, co-constructed with the interviewer in thematic interviews on linguistic life stories. The approach of linguistic experiences and practices while taking interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee into account aims to gain new insight into linguistic atmospheres. There are seven informants, all of whom have Finnish as their strongest language, even though North Saami is the other mother tongue of one. Their linguistic repertoires include various other linguistic resources, or specific bits of languages and varieties, for example, Norwegian, Swedish, and English (cf. Blommaert & Dong, 2013). The study discusses their personal experiences that are connected to certain places and times; their language contacts in the village as well as in their larger networks outside it currently and in the past have an effect on their linguistic views.

The interviewees in this study have one main language, Finnish; however, other languages play different roles in their everyday life. Research on linguistic biographies has mainly been interested in people who are easily categorised as multilingual, that is, those who use many languages in their everyday life, for example due to their multi-ethnic family background (cf. Busch, 2017b, p. 47). However, seeing heteroglossia, illustrated by stratification and many voices, in any ‘language’ (Bakhtin, 1981) blurs the boundary between so-called multilingual and monolingual speakers: Linguistic diversity is the reality for all, and it is relevant to also take dialects into account, as will be done in this study. Naturally, when speakers struggle with understanding, linguistic boundaries are especially relevant and visible. This is the case in the borderland where the informants live. In the study, multilingualism is seen as practice-based, shedding light not only on ‘how human beings manage

the differences between the languages they use' (Li Wei, 2018, p. 18), but also on how they perceive the differences they hear. In this chapter, I study linguistic contacts in the light of personal trajectories that illustrate 'not just individual situated experiences, but more broadly, life in globalized modernity, with its multiple self-contradictions, conflicts and fragmentations', as Codó (2018, p. 15) puts it.

This study discusses how residents of the village describe the languages in their life. This is examined through the experiences on languages mentioned in the interviews, and through detecting the interviewees' personal stance (affiliation and disaffiliation) in their interactions with the interviewer who presents questions and provides certain categories. Individual life trajectories, the sociolinguistic circumstances of a shared place of residence, and personal relationships intertwine in linguistic biographies. The analysis of individual speakers helps to reveal connections to ideologies and the linguistic atmosphere on a societal level. The affective stance as constructed in interviews can be stronger or weaker, and it reflects the emotional experiences of the speakers in their linguistic life story. Thus, the study combines micro-level means to express (dis)affiliation in interaction and the experiences of one's life history; this discussion illustrates how the stances to languages are experienced and negotiated. This kind of approach sheds light on the context and roots of the language attitudes and shows their direct connectedness to everyday life (cf. Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain 2017, p. 10).

The research questions are as follows:

- What kind of overall affiliations to languages can be found?
- How do the interviewees construct their affiliations towards languages in the interview interaction as their attitudes are analysed in detail?

## 2.2 LANGUAGE BIOGRAPHIES, ATTITUDES, AND AFFECTIVE ORIENTATION IN INTERACTION

Language can be seen as both local and trans-local, and various spatio-temporal frames interact with one another and are activated in a situation (Blommaert & Dong, 2013). The research setting of mobile inhabitants residing in a small Northern village highlights this perspective. Speakers have different levels of access to linguistic resources, and those resources

in their repertoires are learnt during specific phases in one's life and in specific contexts (Blommaert & Backus, 2013). Here, linguistic repertoire is seen as situated and affective, and it is examined not from the outside but through individual experiences; the lived experience of language (*Spracherleben*, Busch, 2015b) is a crucial point of study (see also Codó, 2018). Linguistic experience is not neutral as it is connected to emotional experiences (Busch 2015a, p. 277). Busch states that the emotionally loaded experience is often neglected because so much of the focus is on linguistic competences. However, when speaking of competence, there is also an affective and biographical side present that I will focus on. According to Busch (2015b, p. 14), the absences are also relevant, and they might become visible as gaps, threats, or desires. Affect has been studied especially in language learning, though overall, as Kalaja et al. (2017, pp. 229–230) state, the interplay between beliefs and emotions has only recently begun to be studied in applied linguistics. Language anxiety has been discussed in the context of language learning, but other emotions less so at present (Scotson, 2020, p. 46).

In the language biographical approach, linguistic practices are seen as part of individual life trajectories and discourses that are bound to a certain place and time (Busch, 2017b). Thus, the lived experience mediates between discourses on language and language repertoire (Busch 2015a, 2017b, p. 53). The basic aspects of linguistic experiences are, as delineated by Busch (2015a, p. 277), the relationship between self-perception and perception by others, belonging and not belonging, and the question of power and powerlessness. These experiences are bound to ideologies that lie behind how we perceive ourselves and others as speakers—that is, ideologies lead to attitudes (Busch, 2017b, p. 54), and linguistic ideologies are used to construct affiliations and exclusion (Busch, 2017a, p. 348).

In detecting the links between attitudes and ideologies, interactional analysis is helpful (König et al., 2015; see also Spotti & Blommaert, 2016). Through analysing attitudes in interaction (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2017), I discuss one's relationship with languages, and as this deals with evaluation, positions, and alignment, the concept of stance is particularly useful (ibid.; DuBois, 2007). Thus, attitudes comprise affects and emotions. Sociolinguistically, individual histories of repertoires can be seen as crucial in interpreting a speaker's positions or stances on languages. In stancetaking, 'affective display can do the work of evaluation, self-presentation, and positioning' (Jaffe, 2009a). For instance, in

a Corsican school, the stance towards different languages was detected as language choice: Teachers attributed authorship and competence to students through their linguistic behaviour (Jaffe, 2009b).

In the current study, besides the contents that express the interviewees' direct opinions on languages, I explore the interactional co-construction of perceptions and experiences on languages in interviews, for example how the interviewee interprets the questions and how the interviewer's choices might affect the responses (cf. Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2011, pp. 92–93). This interactional approach allows 'analysts to get closer to understanding the position of language attitudes in everyday life, because it is through interaction that they are enacted, contested, and transmitted' (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2017, p. 10). In addition, I take into consideration language sociological questions, as the linguistic reality in a small location in the Far North is the main framework for the people studied. Studying a small locality offers an interesting window to understand how the local space is negotiated (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2011, p. 92). This can help to raise awareness about power relations and language ideologies as well as unravel pre-established categories as the speakers bring forth their own, sometimes unexpected views and practices (cf. Busch, 2017b, pp. 55–56).

## 2.3 DATA AND METHODS

In the following, I will introduce the informants and elaborate on some features of their linguistic repertoire (2.3.1). After that, I will present the methods used in the study (2.3.2).

### 2.3.1 *Data Collection, Informants, and Their Languages Briefly*

The study includes seven informants who have been interviewed in 2018 as part of the project A Hundred Finnish linguistic life stories (Hippi et al., 2020). This project involved collecting linguistic biographies in interviews that had a set of questions aimed at finding out the interviewees' ideas about the languages around them. The author of this chapter has, together with another researcher, collected all the interviews studied in this chapter. All of the informants (or their guardians in the case of children) have given their informed consent to participate in the research. Their background information is presented in Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1** Informants

<i>Code<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Education/work history</i>	<i>Places of residence</i>	<i>Languages</i>	<i>Duration of interview</i>
M1930'	Higher education	Eastern Finland; from 1956 Helsinki & Southern Finland; from 2002 Village N	Finnish, English, Swedish, German	1:34:51
M1950'	Matriculation exam, border controller, retired; temporary jobs in tourist business	Lapland, couple of places; from 1990–1996 Rovaniemi; from 1983–1990 and from 1996 Village N	Finnish, English, Swedish, Norwegian	1:00:51
F1950'	Service industry	This municipality; from 1978 Village N	Finnish, English, Norwegian, Swedish	00:11:50 + 1:01:39
F1960'	Vocational school	This municipality; from 1992 Village N; from 2011 second place of living in another Northern village	Finnish, Saami, <sup>2</sup> English	57: 57 + 06:34
F2000'	5th grade, elementary school	Northern Finland; Thailand (1 year); Village N (1.5 years)	Finnish, English, Swedish, Norwegian	53:36
M2000'	5th grade, elementary school	Village N	Finnish, English, (Russian, Saami)	42:11
F2010'	1st grade, elementary school	Village N	Finnish, Norwegian, Swedish	01:01:10

<sup>1</sup> M indicates male, F female, and numerals indicate the decade of birth. The codes apply to the current study.

<sup>2</sup> In the background information sheet and also in the interviews, North Saami is referred to as 'Saami', with no further specification.

As seen in Table 2.1, the interviewees have varying backgrounds and lengths of stay in Village N. Languages are listed here as they were in the background information sheet, translated from Finnish. The sheet contained a field titled *Mother tongue/tongues and other knowledge of languages*, and it was up to the interviewee how they interpreted it. Some informants—especially children—have also listed languages in which they only knew couple of words. Thus, it must be kept in mind that the languages listed here have different meanings according to the speaker. Evaluating competencies is not static; rather, it shifts depending on the discourse activated (Djuraeva & Catedral, 2020, p. 281). For some informants, the interviewer filled out the information sheet on their behalf after asking for their answers; these answers could later be revisited by the interviewer in the actual interview. In the interview, there were different questions on languages, such as *When and how have you learned those languages you know?* (cf. background information sheet) and *Which languages do you hear and use at your work?* Finnish is the first language of all the informants, which is consistently visible from Table 2.1: It is the first in the list for everybody.

The Norwegian language is a self-evident part of this location; every interviewee talks about Norwegian visitors and the Norwegian language. Four informants mention Norwegian as part of their linguistic repertoire. They also report in the actual interview that they use Norwegian in some way or other. M1930' does not list Norwegian as one of his languages despite being able to read in it (see Table 2.1 and Sect. 2.4.2). M2000' and F1960' only report hearing spoken Norwegian in their daily lives.

English is marked as part of the repertoire of all but the youngest informant. Swedish is mentioned as one of the languages of five informants (everyone except F1960' and M2000'); it is a compulsory language for all in the Finnish school curriculum. Saami is mentioned by two informants, F1960' and M2000'. I will use two languages of M2000', Russian and Saami, as a brief example of how the role of the languages listed in Table 2.1 is unravelled in the interview. M2000' has listed Saami and Russian as his languages, albeit in parentheses. He expresses in the interview that he knows 'some words of Saami' and 'some words of Russian'. However, unlike Saami, Russian seems to hold a special significance for him; this is explained by his important connections to his uncle's place in Eastern Finland, as he goes there during his holidays and plans to move there as an adult. He talks about his uncle's employees there as 'our' (*meijän*) berry pickers, showing also in this way a close connection

to a place that is far away from his permanent locality. For M2000', these languages have connections to different places: Saami represents Northern Lapland and Russian Eastern Finland.

The four languages chosen for analysis in the following subsections—Finnish, Norwegian, Saami, and English—were featured most prominently in the informants' language repertoires; everybody talks about them. The variation within these languages is also made relevant in the interviews; it is part of the multilingualism that the informants experience. Other languages were also mentioned in the interviews: Swedish comes up when talking about Norwegian, and Russian, German, Spanish, and Japanese are languages some participants mention having some kind of personal interest in. Due to space limitations, these details are not examined more closely here.

### 2.3.2 *Approach*

I analyse descriptions of language use that reveal the participants' relationship with the different languages in their life within an interactional sociolinguistic framework (Bailey, 2015), defining relationship as attitudes displaying emotional stance, affiliation, and disaffiliation. I will discuss how the participants' contacts with their linguistic resources are interpreted in relation to their societal situation and linguistic biographies (cf. Busch, 2017a) that can be seen as their social and cultural itineraries (Blommaert & Backus, 2013). I provide glimpses into the informants' experiences, descriptions for a wider context, and an overall picture that elaborates on the informants' varying positions to the languages mentioned in the study.

I use the concept of affective stance that can be seen as contextualisation: It hints at how a speaker's position is to be interpreted by the other interlocutor (i.e., in the interview situation), and contextualisation cues are resources for that (Gumperz, 1982; Jaffe, 2009a). The informants construct their stances while telling stories and discussing the topics with the interviewers, who are outsiders in this village. As ideologies are seen to have a strong impact on personal attitudes (Busch, 2017a), this approach is informed by research on language ideologies (Woolard, 2020).

The interactional-level discussion in this chapter complements its content-level observations (cf. Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2017, p. 6). Besides, when analysing the extracts, interactional and content-level analysis are intertwined with and cannot be separated from each other. The



extracts in each subsection illustrate how the stances on language use are constructed in interaction (Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain, 2011): for example, who initiates the naming of a certain language or topic and what kind of affective stance is constructed in a given interview situation (expressing affiliation/disaffiliation in particular). Thus, besides propositional content, a sequential organisation can reveal further details and the complexities of one’s relationships to languages (cf. Liebscher & Dailey-O’Cain, 2011). This kind of approach that examines reported linguistic experiences while taking interaction into account aims to gain deeper insight into the linguistic attitudes and language contacts of the individuals; affiliations are not static but instead constructed and negotiated in interactions on the basis of personal experiences.

## 2.4 MULTILEVEL, PERSONAL, AND CONTEXT–BOUND RELATIONSHIPS TO LANGUAGES

In the following subsections, I will first deal with the Finnish language and its use (2.4.1). Secondly, I will move into analysing the experiences of Norwegian (2.4.2). In the third subsection (2.4.3), the focus is on Saami, the heritage language in the area, and the last analysis subsection (2.4.4) discusses the attitudes and challenges of using globally widespread English from a Northern point of view.

### 2.4.1 *Variation and Local Identification—Finnish*

In the following, I briefly outline the informants’ views on the dialectal variety of Finnish they claim to have. The use of Finnish dialects has connections to the interviewees’ affiliations and desires as Finnish speakers and highlights their heterogeneous linguistic trajectories and their belonging to the place. For example, it has been shown in a study of Finnish Tornio Valley residents how the speakers’ feelings of being an insider or outsider have a connection to the use of a local dialect feature (Vaattovaara, 2009): Strong local identification is connected with the wide use of this feature.

The informants have different orientations to their current place of living. M1930’, who does not feel connected to the place, mentions that he does not need to modify his speech to accommodate the locals. He is not enthusiastic about living in the village but has a relationship that keeps him there. M1950’ has roots elsewhere, and he describes himself to

be very flexible in his language use: He easily acquires his interlocutors' way of speaking, including some old local dialect words. On the other hand, F1950' thinks that the village is the best place in the world, and she tells that she does not vary her local way of speaking. Elsewhere in Lapland, she has noticed the difference between her own dialect and ways of speaking there. These positions align with Vaattovaara's (2009, p. 154) findings where the young people who identified strongly with their home area denied abandoning their dialect, whereas those who identified weakly with their home area reported varying their speech and abandoning their dialect in certain situations.

Two of the schoolchildren have strong connections elsewhere in Finland: F2000' has been living in the village with her family for 1.5 years, and their stay seems to be temporary, whereas M2000' has strong ties elsewhere and plans to move away upon reaching adulthood. F2000' says that she received comments on her way of speaking when she arrived at this locality. M2000' tells that his speech is 'mixed' and he has acquired variants from elsewhere, for example from newcomers to the local school. His older brother teases him for using the southern variants of personal pronouns (*mä* instead of *mie*). He also makes observations on the language used in Eastern Finland and mentions his uncle's friend's dialect as hard to understand. M2000' and F2000' recognise that regional variation is a reason for the comments they have received, and that their use of these variants is connected to their personal language contacts. The youngest of the interviewees does not say much about her dialect and describes it as 'ordinary' (*tavallinen*).

All interviewees acknowledge the local way of speaking—broadly understood—somehow and reflect on their relationship with the local language practices, which they either align themselves to or distance themselves from depending on their personal history (cf. Busch, 2017a, p. 342). A closer examination of Extract (1) from an interview reveals how F1960' brings forth her way of speaking in interaction. F1960' identifies her speech as the local dialect (presumably encompassing the municipality).

(1)

- 01 Int: ootkos sitte ite kiinnittäny omaan puhetapaasi, joskus huomiota, että,  
**have you paid attention to your own way of speaking, that,**  
 02 niinku just tähän, miten, puhut (.) suomea tai sitten (.)  
**I mean, how do you speak (.) Finnish or then (.)**

- 03 jopa (.) niin kun, puhut saamea tai (.) mu-, englantia  
**even (.) I mean, speak Sámi or (.) ot-, English**
- 04 että (.) o- onk- (.) onks sulle tullu mieleen jotain,  
**that (.) h- ha- (.) has something crossed your mind,**
- 05 F1960': no tietenki että (.) kyllähän mie puhun nin, eri lailla, mun murrehan  
 on  
**of course that (.) I do speak like, in a different way, because my dialect is**
- 06 aivan erilainen ku esimerkiks täällä ko- (.) koska täällähän on paljon  
 niinku,  
**totally different than for example here be- (.) because here there are a lot of so to speak**
- 07 mualta tulleita (.) joil on, sanotaanko mitä äjos mie sanoisin  
 semmonen,  
**those who have come from elsewhere (.) who have, let's say what if I were to say such**
- 08 kirjakielen, suomi, ja mullahan on sitte ihan niinku,  
**iterary Finnish, and I do have then I mean,**
- 09 Int: joo,  
 yes,
- 10 F1960': semmonen, tämän perän murre, että (.) siinä josku sit ettei ne  
 kaikkia  
**such a, dialect of this corner, that (.) in it sometimes then they do not**
- 11 sanoja ymmärrä,  
**understand all of the words,**

The interviewer asks about the interviewee's way of speaking in Finnish, but also mentions Saami and English, which are not touched on in F1960's reply as she concentrates on her Finnish. The formulation of the question is careful; the interviewer reformulates it but does not use the word dialect (*murre*), which the interviewee initiates herself (l. 4). The interviewer asks a polar question to which, in the interview context, denial is an expected reply in addition to confirmation (l. 4, 'has something crossed your mind'). However, F1960' starts immediately explaining the difference in her dialect, and her stance on the issue comes up clearly through different means in her assessment (VISK § 667). She expresses certainty by using the enclitic particle *-han* and the modal particle *tietenkin* 'of course' (l. 5), which frames the information as self-evident (VISK § 1608). In addition, she uses the intensity qualifier *aivan* (VISK § 664, 'totally', l. 6), expressing the totality of the difference. This description shows how she sees her position when speaking Finnish: She,

as a speaker of ‘the dialect of this corner’ (l. 10), is in the minority, as many people she is in contact with are from elsewhere in Finland (l. 6–7); therefore, the difference between herself as a local language user and ‘them’ is clear. After the extract she specifies that she means the visitors to Village N. They speak ‘standard literary Finnish’ (l. 8), and they do not always understand the words she uses (l. 10). In particular, her language creates a communication barrier between herself and others, not the other way round. She brings forth the difference emphatically as a relevant part of her linguistic reality, and it also proves in practice how standard language and non-standard varieties exist alongside each other and a named language is not ‘one’—speakers navigate with these differences that are not faded; on the contrary, they are made clearly meaningful (cf. Walsh, 2021).

#### 2.4.2 *Interest and Resistance—Norwegian*

In the following subsection, I will discuss and show in more detail how the informants describe their relationship with Norwegian. Every interviewee mentions that they sometimes visit Norway; crossing the border does not require any documents. Two informants report having attended Norwegian courses: M1950’ as part of his work as a border controller, and F2000’ at school. However, F2000’ underlines that participation in the clubs being organised is her main focus, not a special desire to know this language. This comment can be seen in relation to the small size of the village: There are only scarce activities, and an active person would need to also take part in those that they would not otherwise have chosen. Despite this, F2000’ lists Norwegian as one of her languages (see Table 2.1 in Sect. 2.3.1), which highlights the meaning of surroundings in one’s repertoire.

The only shop in the area is mentioned as a central location, and typically it is the place where one hears Norwegian. F2000’ expresses that especially on the weekends, the local shop is ‘flooded with Norwegians’ (*tulvii norjalaisia*). In the following example, M1930’ describes his observations on Norwegian, linking his experiences to the shop. He has lived in a Swedish-speaking area in Finland, and like many Finns, he has learnt Swedish at school, but this background fact does not seem to help him in understanding spoken Norwegian. He describes this language barrier and difference in the following Extract (2):

- (2)
- 01 Int: mitä y-, kieliä täällä ylipäätään kuulee täällä Kylä N:ssä, jos ajattelet  
**what e- languages here one overall hears here in Village N, if you think about**
- 02 ihan tämmöstä sun, normaalia arkea ni,  
**just this kind of your, normal life so,**
- 03 (0.3)
- 04 Int: suomi, englanti, mut mitäs muuta.  
**Finnish, English, but what else.**
- 05 M1930': no enhän mä kuule kun, siis jos mä oon ko- tuolla, kylällä ni mä kuulen  
**well I don't hear anything else, I mean if I'm there in the village so I hear**
- 06 Int: m.
- 07 suomea.  
**Finnish.**
- 08 Int: joo.  
**yeah.**
- 09 (0.4)
- 10 Int: entäs si-,  
**what a-**
- 11 M1930': sit mä kuulen norjaa.  
**then I hear Norwegian.**
- 12 Int: joo.  
**yeah.**
- 13 M1930': sis norjaa mä kuulen paljon.  
**I mean Norwegian I hear a lot.**
- 14 Int: joo.  
**yeah.**
- 15 M1930': ja mä en ymmärrä sitä sanaakaan.  
**and I don't understand a word of it.**
- 16 Int: ↑aijaa. ei ruotsin pohjalta onnistu.  
**↑alright. on the basis of Swedish not possible.**
- 17 M1930': ei. ja sit mä kysyin, tuolta yhdeltä, ruotsinkieliseltä professorilta  
**no. and then I asked, one, Swedish speaking professor**
- 18 tuolta, mt. just näillä eläke-, y, lounailla niin tuota että,  
**over there, mt. just on these pensioners' lunches so,**
- 19 nii se sano että e on iha ymmärrettävää. että,  
**he said that it's totally understandable. that,**
- 20 Pohjois-Norjassa puhuttu norjan kieli eroaa niin paljon kirjakiielestä,  
**the Norwegian spoken in North Norway differs so much from literary language,**
- 21 Int: mhm?
- 22 M1930': että, yy yy sitä ei ymmärrä.  
**that, yy yy you don't understand it.**

- 23 Int: joo.  
yeah.
- 24 M1930': kun kaikki sanoo et kylähä sinun pitäa ymmärtää sitä norjaa  
because everybody says that you should understand Norwegian
- 25 ku sä oot (.) ruotsia (.) paahtanu kaheksan vuotta t(h)u(h)ol, .hh  
as you have learned Swedish for eight years over the(h)re(h)
- 26 Int: joo  
yes.
- 27 M1930': oppikoulussa niin tuota, #eeee# ei, ei mä en ymmärrä mitään  
at school well #eeee# no, no I do not understand anything
- 28 mitä ne puhuu tuolla kaupassa.  
that they are saying over there in the shop.
- 29 Int: joo.  
yes.
- 30 M1930': mä kysyin noilta kauppatyöiltä ja -pojilta et miten te ymmärrätte  
mitä toi  
I asked those shop girls and boys, how do you understand  
what that
- 31 sanoo.  
[person] is saying.
- 32 Int: no,  
well,
- 33 M1930': (--)
- 34 Int: mitä ne sano.  
what did they say.
- 35 M1930': no sitä vaan jotenki oppii et ne kysyy yleensä samoja asioita.  
well one just somehow learns as they usually ask the same  
things
- 36 Int: nii nii,  
yes yes,
- 37 M1930': hhh
- 38 Int: jo(h)o(h).  
y(h)es(h).

First, the interviewer asks about languages M1930' hears in his everyday life (l. 1–2). The question is formulated first in general terms ('one hears'), and then it is directed more personally ('if you think about – your normal life?'). The interviewee does not respond immediately, and the interviewer gives Finnish and English as self-evident examples before hinting that there must be something else ('what else?', l. 4). M1930' first mentions hearing only Finnish, and the interviewer starts a new question in overlap with him. The interviewer leaves her question unfinished as M1930' announces that he hears Norwegian. He continues the topic

with the new information that he does not understand a word of it (l. 15). The interviewer responds to this self-initiated declaration with slight surprise by first producing the particle *aijaa* (l. 16), which orients to the newsworthiness of the prior talk (cf. Koivisto, 2015, p. 370). This is also highlighted by its higher onset that can be seen to express special interest (Koivisto, 2015, p. 370; Thompson et al., 2015, p. 67). As an immediate continuation, she also makes a clarification containing the assumption that knowledge of Swedish would be helpful (l. 16). M1930' responds in overlap, which gives his answer more weight, and then he uses an authority's voice to prove that understanding Norwegian in the North is not possible on the basis of Swedish (l. 17–22). After this, M1930' repeats the interviewer's assumption, with slight amusement, that he should understand Norwegian on the basis of his knowledge of Swedish as they are related languages, and states that 'everybody' regards this kind of benefit as self-evident (l. 24). Thus, the voice of a professional contrasts with this, and 'everybody' seems to refer to a common opinion. The assumption reflects how languages are categorised and how their actual understandability is overestimated through the generalisation, not taking into account the variability of the named languages—as discussed in Sect. 2.4.1, understandability is also not self-evident between Finnish dialects. In some cases, Norwegian can be easily comprehensible if one has a knowledge of Swedish. M1930' disproves the assumption on the basis of his own experience while visiting the shop, and he underlines the view that the knowledge of Swedish is useless in understanding Norwegian: He repeats the non-understanding, making it clear categorically (l. 27).

However, he continues to report his experiences and unravel the challenge of how other Finnish-speaking people understand Norwegian. He had asked the staff about the issue and received the explanation that they learnt to get along as a context-bound practice: Customers tend to ask similar questions. This can be seen as a 'truncated repertoire' (Blommaert & Backus, 2013): Certain bits of the language are enough in the specific context, and the speakers are not necessarily competent speakers of Norwegian in any other area. Elsewhere M1930' gives an example of himself using Norwegian: He sometimes reads a Norwegian newspaper and understands the written variety that is used in it, and in that case, his previous experience with Swedish seems useful. In addition to M1930', three other informants compare Norwegian to Swedish, commenting especially on their comprehension of it.

How languages are tied to practical situations, and how linguistic resources are seen differently depending on context, is illustrated also by F2010'. When talking about her experiences in the shop, F2010' expresses her indifference towards Norwegian frankly: 'let them speak what they want'. Contrary to M1930', she does not show special interest in Norwegian; she does not state any assumptions regarding its potential understandability, and this can be seen to be connected to her young age. However, in the following Extract (3), F2010' shows interest towards the Norwegian language in another context: when she needs it during her visits to Norway.

(3)

- 01 Int: onks siellä, kuulee-, kuuleeko siellä sitten paljon sitten sitä norjaa  
ja, hh.  
**is there, hear- does one then hear a lot of Norwegian there  
and, hh.**
- 02 F2010': joo,  
**yes,**
- 03 Int: joo.  
**yes.**
- 04 F2010': ja jos mul on jotain asiaa norjalaisille, ku mä en hirveesti sitä,  
osaa  
**and if I have something to say to the Norwegians, as I don't  
know much**
- 05 sitä norjaa,  
**Norwegian,**
- 06 niin, ku, mun kaveri Alina voi kääntää sen(h) hhm,  
**I mean my friend Alina can translate it(h) hhm,**
- 07 Int: ↑ai[jaa.  
**↑oh yeah.**
- 08 F2010': niinku se on puol norjalainen ja se osaa, todella hyvin norjaa,  
**because she's half Norwegian and she knows Norwegian  
really well,**
- 09 Int: ↑okei  
**↑okay**
- 10 F2010': se on mulle opettanu sitä?  
**she's taught me it?**

The interviewer's question (l. 1) about hearing Norwegian while visiting Norway gets an affirmative reply (l. 2). F2010' immediately continues to provide more information on her language use there. While filling in her languages in the background information sheet (see Table 2.1 in Sect. 2.3.1), F2010' reports Norwegian as one of the



languages she knows; however, here in the interview, she admits that she does not know a lot in practice (l. 4). This evaluation is produced as an argument for why she needs her friend ‘to translate’ Norwegian for her (l. 4–6). Here, the interviewer produces, in a manner similar to that in the previous Extract (2), the particle *aijaa*, which here also underlines the newsworthiness of the statement and in addition functions as a go-ahead particle without any further elements. F2010’ continues partly in overlap to explain why her friend is able to help: She is half Norwegian. The interviewer receipts this again with marked pitch (↑*okei*, l. 9), thus constructing an impression that the information is of particular relevance. F2010’ adds that her friend has also taught her Norwegian, so the benefit is not restricted to getting by in the language; F2010’ also shows an interest in using the language herself. Elsewhere she emphasises that they do not have any formal language lessons but the friends teach them, which is in line with Lilja’s (2018, p. 206) findings on young adult immigrants who expressed that language learning happened through using the language in practice and friends were a crucial part of it. F2010’ is in the 1st grade at the moment of the interview, which naturally affects her experiences: Language lessons have not yet begun as a part of the school curriculum. It becomes clear that Norwegian is a natural part of everyday life, and involvement is a joint endeavour that is adjusted according to one’s needs.

F1950’, who uses Norwegian at work, describes how her situation has changed, saying that she nowadays understands Norwegian better than Swedish, whereas ten years ago it would have been ‘absolutely’ the other way round; this is due to her practical encounters with the language. She describes Norwegian as obligatory in the locality (*tässä niink(ö), kylä N:ssä on nyt tieteenki pakkoki osata sitä norjan kieltä*, ‘here in Village N, of course one must know the Norwegian language’), and this might refer to her own occupation in tourist services. Despite her knowledge of Norwegian, she provides a more critical aspect to this language. In the following Extract (4), she expresses her views on Norwegians and their language use. The interview was conducted outside the locality.

(4)

- 01 Int:           minkälaisia tilanteita ne sitte, on, miten paljon, sitä norjaa sitte  
**what kind of situations are they then, how often, do you speak**  
 02           tulee puhuttuu esimerkiks tuolla Kylä N:ssä että o-, onks ne  
**Norwegian for example there in Village N, are they**

- 03 semmosia niinku ohimeneviä,  
**like passing by,**
- 04 F1950': no sillon ku oli sitte sitte on sit taas semmosia norjalaisia (jo-),  
**well at the time there were these Norwegians**
- 05 joita tuntee tietää niin niitten kans sitte vähä enemmän puhuthaan,  
**whom one knows so with them you speak a bit more,**
- 06 Int: joo,  
**yeah,**
- 07 F1950': mene- melkeen se on sitte sitä (hommaa) ja semmosta,  
**it's mostly like [for] (business) and stuff,**
- 08 (0.7)
- 09 F1950': mitä työn (.) puolesta tullee,  
**for work that [Norwegian] ends up being,**
- 10 Int: joo,  
**yeah,**
- 11 F1950': puhuttua.  
**spoken.**
- 12 Int: kyllä.  
**yes.**
- 13 (0.6)
- 14 F1950': ja (.) sitte monesti tulee myöskin semmonen asia ko,  
**and then often also such a thing happens when,**
- 15 Int: (-)
- 16 (0.2)
- 17 F1950': tai, itte, ihan tietosestikki et e,  
**or, myself, just consciously,**
- 18 (0.6)
- 19 F1950': haluan olla että en ymmärrä (kuka), joku norjalainen joka pittää  
**that I pretend not to understand (who), some Norwegian who considers it**
- 20 ihan itsestäänselvänä että totta kai te ymmärrätte no,  
**self-evident that of course you understand (like),**
- 21 Int: nii?  
**yes?**
- 22 F1950': .hhh meitä kun me tulhaan tänne,  
**us when we come here,**
- 23 (1.0)
- 24 Int: joo?  
**yeah?**
- 25 F1950': niin (.) me olhaan nyt Suomessa puhukaa nyt suomea, .hhh  
**yes, we are now in Finland, now speak Finnish, .hhh**

The interviewer's question (l. 1–3) concerns the situation where F1950' uses Norwegian, as it has already become clear that this language is part of her repertoire. F1950' describes speaking more Norwegian with

the more familiar visitors to the village (l. 4–5). She begins by using the past tense, but in Line 5 generalises this in the present tense and current situations. She proceeds to describe her stance on the use of Norwegian which challenges its role as a common resource: She sometimes pretends that she does not understand the language (l. 19). F1950' produces the turn as a continuation of her reply to the use of Norwegian, and as this contrasting and disaffiliating stance is produced when it is not expected (i.e., the interviewer has not asked about avoiding languages), it has even more weight. The topic has already been answered, but as the interviewer does not move on to another question, F1950' continues after a brief silence (l. 13). She uses the expression *tietoisesti* 'consciously' (l. 17) to show her determination and displays irritation that the Norwegians assume that everyone speaks Norwegian even though they are in Finland. This is, of course, a very local phenomenon, and in this village the existence of the shop can be seen to be highly dependent on visitors from Norway, a situation also mentioned by F1960'. F1950' seems to wish that visitors would orient to the national borders and have a greater awareness of being on foreign ground ('yes, we are now in Finland, now speak Finnish', l. 25), and this reflects a nation state and national language ideology (cf. Shohamy, 2006). This ideology extends to concern frequent visitors, not only inhabitants of the country. Using a 2nd person address form, directed to the visitors (*pubukaa*, 'speak'), is one way for F1950' to underline her stance with a strict and demanding tone. In F1950's opinion, requesting Norwegian-speaking service is somehow invasive, leading her to strike back. F1950's defensive attitude becomes evident also after this extract as she continues to criticise the visitors' adherence to the Norwegian time zone that is one hour behind Finland. Thus, the question about encounters in which the interviewee uses Norwegian leads to the interviewee-initiated disclosure that she does not always want to use Norwegian as well as a complaint about the undesirable attitude of the visitors. The disaffiliation of F1950' is not connected to a lack of resources as she gets by well in Norwegian, but her attitude is bound to the negative value that she ascribes to Norwegian due to its users (cf. Busch, 2017a).

### 2.4.3 *From Observations to the Desire to Be More Involved—Saami*

In addition to Norwegian, Saami as a local heritage language is commented on by all interviewees. As with the background sheet (see

Sect. 2.3.1), both the interviewers and interviewees use the term ‘Saami’ with no specification when talking about North Saami in the interviews. Following this, I will also use only Saami here even though there are many Saami languages. With the exception of two informants, F1950’ and F1960’, Saami seems to be a remote but also self-evident part of the surroundings that the informants can hear or notice. Two of the children mention having learnt some of it at school, and one of them (M2000’) mentions it as one of the languages he knows (see Sect. 2.3.1). Saami-ness has gained a new kind of ‘peripheral cool’, and Saami languages are gaining new domains and users (Pietikäinen et al., 2016, p. 13). However, the questions about Saami ownership are complicated and also reflected in the data. F1950’ does not mention Saami when filling in the background information sheet but reveals in the interview that this language has been familiar to her somehow; her attitudes reflect the sensitive relations between the Saami and the other local people.

The change in attitudes becomes visible through F1960’, whose parents chose not to speak Saami at home and who was teased at school because of her background. The lived experience of the language caused the family to stop speaking their heritage language (cf. Busch, 2017a, p. 353). However, the situation has changed as the linguistic atmosphere has improved. In Extract (5), when discussing the use of Norwegian, F1960’ describes Saami to be a more relevant language for her as her relatives in Norway are speakers of it. The example reveals again how assumptions on languages are handled and sheds light on the complexities of language attitudes.

(5)

- 01 Int: ja tota, onks sulla ollu mu- **m**uita kieliä mitä oisit halunnu oppii  
**and well, have you had ot- other languages that you would have**  
**liked to learn**
- 02 tai miten tää norjan kieli täällä esimerkiks ni, (.) o- onks sitä,  
**or how about this Norwegian language here for instance so, (.)**  
**i- is it,**
- 03 (0.4)
- 04 Int: miten su (.) siellä (.) [sukulaiset,  
**how yo- (.) there (.) relatives,**
- 05 F1960’: [no meillähän (.) niin no (.) s, (.)  
**well, we have (.) so well (.) r, (.)**
- 06 ne minun sukulaiset  
**those relatives of mine**
- 07 mitä nyt siellä Norjassa on niin ne on kaikki saamenkielisiä,

- 08 Int:                    **who are there in Norway they are all speakers of Sámi,**  
 okci (.) niinpä (.) joo,  
**okay (.) oh yes (.) yeah,**
- 09 F1960':                sitte (.) jotku? tietenk tai ymmärtääki suomen,  
**then (.) some? of course or understand Finnish**
- 10                        mutta meil on niinku pääasiassa saamenkielisiä,  
**but we have like mainly speakers of Saami,**
- 11 Int:                    nii justii et  
**exactly so they**
- 12                        he saamea sitte heidän kanssaan myös hjoo,  
*[speak]* **Saami then with them also yeah,**
- 13 F1960':                nii (.) joo,  
**yes (.) yeah,**
- 14                        (0.8)
- 15 Int:                    joo,  
**yes,**
- 16                        (0.5)
- 17 F1960':                tai he puhuu saamea mie vastaan *£*suomeks*£*,  
**or they speak Sámi I respond in *£*Finnish*£***
- 18 Int:                    *£*ai↑jaa ↑vai niin*£* (.) nii et sillee su-  
**alright ↑okay↑ (.) so like that**
- 19 F1960':                [hmm. hmh
- 20 Int:                    silleehän se käy [ihan ku,  
**like that it goes like**
- 21 F1960':                [*£*nii-i,*£*  
**yes**
- 22                        (0.4)
- 23 Int:                    hyvin sitte päinsä,  
**it goes well then**
- 24 F1960':                [mm

The interviewer asks F1960' which languages she would like to learn and suggests Norwegian as an example. After a small pause, the interviewer begins to reformulate her question, referring to the interviewee's relatives (l. 4). F1960' begins to reply in overlap and explains that her relatives who live in Norway are speakers of Saami (l. 5–6). This way, Norwegian is relegated to the background, and Saami, her heritage language, is elevated as the more relevant language in the discussion. F1960' clarifies that some of her relatives understand Finnish, which is her strongest language, but then she returns to the fact that they are mainly Saami speakers (l. 9). The interviewer affiliates and displays understanding: First she talks about 'they', excluding F1960' (l. 10, *he saamea sitten*, 'they Saami then'), but then she reformulates her reply to include

the interviewee in the group of Saami speakers as well (l. 11, *heidän kanssaan myös hjo*, ‘with them also, yeah’). In the beginning of the overlapping reply, the particle chain *nii justii*, ‘exactly’ displays strong alignment with the previous information, but the turn is also an independent claim (cf. Vatanen, 2017): The interviewer interprets the fact that F1960’s relatives are Saami speakers to also lead to Saami-language (only) conversations, which turns out to be incorrect. An ideology of one language in one situation can be seen here, and mixing languages is seen as unexpected. In addition, this is reminiscent of a situation in the past, for example, from the Kven community when parents changed their language to Norwegian but their children in many cases acquired passive competence in Kven and could understand it well while they themselves spoke Norwegian (Bull et al., 2021, p. 11).

First, F1960’ agrees with the assumption (l. 12), but as the interviewer does not continue with her questioning, F1960’ utilises the opportunity to correct the earlier misunderstanding of the matter: She clarifies that she responds in Finnish while her relatives speak Saami (l. 16). This turn functions as a revelation or self-disclosure; the information is designed as being volunteered, and it is not expected in the run of talk (Antaki et al., 2005) as F1960’ has already confirmed the previous information (l. 12). This calls for evaluation: In which light does this new, seemingly unexpected information present the interviewee now? The knowledge of languages is in this context highly sensitive: Not only is the oppression of the Saami languages in the past well known, but so are the questions of authenticity, as knowledge of Saami has been seen as evidence of genuine Saaminess (cf. Pietikäinen, 2018). The receptive multilingualism described above opens up different aspects of language practices: On the one hand, both parties can speak their stronger language as they are able to understand the other (this has been reported as one practice in the case of Saami; see Pietikäinen, 2018, p. 186), and in this respect F1960’ has equal status with her relatives in Norway. On the other hand, she reveals that contrary to the expectation (l. 11), she does not speak Saami herself, which can evoke a sense of inferiority in her. In a later part of the interview, she tells that she would rather know Saami than Finnish, and furthermore, she explains how her nieces and nephews ‘force’ her to use Saami herself.

How the interviewee and interviewer treat the revelation on Line 16 can be interpreted in the light of these personal preferences and circumstances, and it inevitably adds an aspect of delicacy and even sorrow about

the language loss to the interpretation. F1960' begins to smile during her turn (l. 16). The interviewer receipts the information as newsworthy with a marked pitch and smiling as well (l. 17; cf. Koivisto, 2015, Example 3). The interviewee laughs slightly at the same time (l. 18) and continues affiliating with a smiley voice (l. 20, *£nii-i,£*). The shared affective stance functions as a way to soften the information conveyed and strengthens the view that this way of behaving is acceptable as well, and that the interviewee has not misled the interviewer.

#### 2.4.4 *Getting Along—English and Other Resources*

All interviewees mention English in their interview; their knowledge of it varies from a couple of words to having a strong command of the language. F2000' sometimes speaks English with her friend 'just for fun' and uses it with her mother when she wants to say something that her younger siblings cannot understand. M2000' likes to watch English-language programmes on television, whereas the youngest interviewee F2010' says she does not watch television in English because the subtitles in Finnish go by too fast for her to read.

For the adults in the study, English is used in different work contexts. F1960' describes her use of English as compulsory with the visitors to the place where she works, but she indicates that English is not easy or even pleasant for her. Thus, she has a rather different stance to English in comparison to Saami in that even though Saami is not easy for her, it is nevertheless a language that she would like to know better. For their part, M1950' and F1950' acknowledge the strong role of English: Although they know Norwegian, they sometimes use English with the Norwegians they meet.

M1930', who is retired, speaks English willingly in a professional context, but when taking a broader perspective, he sees it as a threat and undesired resource like F1950' (cf. Leppänen et al., 2011). According to M1930', the reason for giving English names to the cafés is because 'we want to please tourists'; he hints that the use of Finnish should be promoted in the naming of companies, and tourists could learn the meanings of the Finnish words used. F1950', on her part, wonders why Finnish people are ashamed of using their own language. Thus, this again illustrates how views on languages vary depending on context.

Finally, I explore an example that challenges the assumption that English is always a sufficient resource for communicating with foreigners.

M1950' describes such an encounter in Extract (6). Before that, he has told that his German knowledge is not good enough to communicate with tourists, and English is more useful. Then he continues to describe that sometimes even English is not sufficient and focuses on a specific case involving a French couple with whom he has been in contact.

(6)

- 01 M1950': mutta kyllä nyt on paljon tavannu sellat et niinku Ranskasta  
**but I have indeed met many such [people] that such [people]**  
 02 tulee semmonen niin niillä se englannin kielen  
**come from like France so they have hardly any English**  
 03 taitokaa oikee mitää että,  
**skills that**  
 04 Int: mhyhh .h  
 05 M1950': se on vaikia niinku tehdä että,  
**it is difficult I mean to do that**  
 06 Int: joo. joo.  
**yes. yes.**  
 07 (0.4).  
 08 M1950': no tässä oltiin nyt, y- yks pariskun- nuorempiki paruskunta ni  
**well now we had here, o- one coup-, younger couple and**  
 09 eei.  
**no.**  
 10 (0.3)  
 11 ei niitten kans pystyny ei niille (.) voinu mittään oikeen.  
**one couldn't [communicate] with them, for them, one**  
**could do nothing really,**  
 12 Int: no mites te toimitte sitte.  
**well how did you act then.**  
*m1950' points the cell phone at the table*  
 13 M1950': no sitte onneksi ku (me olim niin) kuskina niin,  
**well then fortunately as (we were) the chauffeur so,**  
 14 tuo Helena oli ja (.) niin seh h,  
**that Helena was and so h h**  
 15 (0.5)  
*m1950' points the cell phone*  
 16 Google-kääntäjälä. .hhh  
**with Google Translate.**  
 17 Int: ↑no ni.  
**alright.**  
 18 M1950': hehe .hh  
 19 Int: ootko ite käyttäny sitä Google-kään[täjää].  
**have you used Google Translate yourself.**  
 20 M1950': oon mie jotaki sanoja hakenu sitte  
**I have looked up some words then**



- 21 mutta en ole täällä niinku a-,  
**but I haven't here I mean**
- 22 Int: joo,  
**yes,**
- 23 M1950': (tai), ne puhu tuossa niinkö laitto ja sitte ne käänsi sen,  
**(or) they talked over there like they put [in the word] and then they translated it,**
- 24 (0.4)
- 25 M1950': ja näytti näin tuolla niinku kahvilassaki Norja- Ruot- Norjan  
**and showed [the text] like this over there also in the café in Norway- Swed- in Norway**
- 26 Int: justi,  
**ok,**
- 27 M1950': puolella oltiin ni,  
**we were so,**
- 28 (0.3)
- 29 Int: joo.  
**yes.**
- 30 (0.2)
- 31 M1950': eikä muuten (sano-) saanu sitä asiaa läpi sitte n(h)uille,  
**and didn't otherwise (say) manage to get through to them**
- 32 Int: no mut silläkö te sit pärjäsitte sit kuitenkin. joo.  
**well but was it what you then got by with anyway. yes.**
- 33 M1950': ↑joo. se meni ihan hyvin  
**yes, it went quite well**
- 34 sitte °he°.  
**then °he°.**
- 35 Int: joo.  
**yes.**

M1950' underlines the difficulties with language (l. 11) and describes how a lack of common resources first hindered communication with French tourists—even though they were young, an understanding could not be reached in English. However, the other Finnish person who was there on the trip began to use Google Translate. She is presented as an innovator who saved the difficult situation. M1950' displays special attention to the communication via machine, which can be seen in how he produces the noun. He gives a brief pause and points to the cell phone on the table (l. 15) before uttering Google Translate, and laughs shortly after the interviewer responds with the particle chain *no ni* ('alright', l. 17). The interviewer's response signals acceptance, and M1950's responding laughter is a resource to describe his stance to the invention and the method of communication in the reported situation. Thus, they both

construct this information as newsworthy and positive: A difficult situation found a new direction, as the interaction was enacted using machine translation. The interviewer continues to inquire whether M1950' himself has used this kind of translation method. He admits to having looked up individual words but returns to the specific occasion where he followed the conversation via Google Translate from the side. He describes the actual event, how talking required visual showing of the phone, and again, how this was the only solution to be understood (l. 31). With the interviewer's question about getting along (l. 32), M1950' does not only affiliate to it but also evaluates the encounter as good, thus upgrading the interviewer's assumption of the situation. He highlights the positive aspect of this kind of communication, and his use of a higher pitch ( $\uparrow joo$ ) also adds emphasis to his statement. After this extract, the interviewer summarises the episode by concluding that necessity forces one to find new solutions, and M1950' aligns with it, but he still continues describing the vocabulary of the tourists and underlining that they did not reach any understanding in English. This way, English as the easiest solution is downgraded and the interviewee underlines that the common linguistic resources were successfully found elsewhere than turning to English. Even though not knowing English seems to be an obstacle to getting along and a cause for amazement, M1950' shows a positive stance to new technology as a solution to understanding problems.

## 2.5 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This study has shown how residents of a Northern location describe their relationship with the languages that have become relevant to them during their social and cultural itinerary (Blommaert & Backus, 2013). This was studied by exploring their attitudes and affective stances while describing their experiences in an interview. All of the informants describe their relationship with Finnish, Norwegian, Saami, and English, and in particular their involvement with them that revealed affiliation and disaffiliation. Each subsection provides examples and descriptions that illustrate the variety of stances between participants, but it is also shown how affiliation varies according to the context. The personal experiences are bound to wider historical and ideological factors such as borders of languages, the status of national languages, the oppression of the Saami languages, and current global trends of English as a lingua franca. The varying ages of the participants were naturally visible in their experiences. The interactional

analysis conducted showed how values ascribed to languages and language practices revealed subtle nuances and how assumptions were challenged, and the stances were clearly bound to the personal experiences of the informants.

First of all, the participants' descriptions of using Finnish and its dialects revealed something about their relationship with the locality. They all had Finnish as their strongest language but varying linguistic backgrounds that affected their relationship to the local way of speaking. In the case of the adults, those who did not identify so strongly with the place expressed less orientation to using the 'local' dialect (cf. Vaattovaara, 2009). Among the children, two of them had received comments on their way of speaking in certain situations, and they made it clear that this was due to their personal history and contacts with speakers of different regional backgrounds. On the interactional level, the dialectal differences were presented as clearly separating the speaker from other Finnish speakers she met in her work.

The presence of Norwegian is typical of this locality. Many of the informants have used it themselves in some way, be it by attending courses, reading the newspapers, or communicating with Norwegian speakers with the help of a friend as an interpreter. Differences within a language (between its varieties) become explicit through one's own experiences, and the assumption about the possibility to understand Norwegian on the basis of Swedish was questioned. Practical encounters proved to increase interest in one's language use. One interviewee shows distance and irritation regarding the self-evident role of the language in the village and connects her evaluation to the people and their character.

Saami was a heritage language for F1960', even though negative experiences in the past had caused partial language loss, but others discussed it as part of their surroundings, recognising or knowing some words of it. On an interactional level, it has been shown how this complex relationship is reflected and negotiated and the desires and reality contrast. The use of receptive multilingualism was presented as an unexpected means for communication, and its characteristics as self-disclosure marked it as a delicate issue. The historical background and speaker's life story strengthen this interpretation. However, the interviewer shows acceptance of the description.

English was portrayed to be a practical and also personally important resource for communication, but in addition it was despised as an overly

self-evident resource threatening Finnish, and it evoked unpleasant feelings of being forced to use it. In the interactional analysis, an example was shown that dealt with a case where English proved to be insufficient. Machine translation was presented as a functional solution that not only helped the speakers to get by but was also even satisfying. The occasion was portrayed in interaction as a special innovation.

The nuances of language contacts were negotiated in micro-level interactions. When language choices other than those first assumed or asked are brought up in interviews, they are worth considering and might indicate that the language holds special importance in the personal trajectory of the informant. This is also the implication if an interviewee presents an independent claim, for example if, sequentially, (s)he has already answered the question but still adds new information, or if (s)he resists the interviewer's assumption. Differences were highlighted in this way.

In addition, contradictions in the informants' descriptions draw attention to the specific situation in question. The difference between one's own use of a language and one's passive knowledge or observations of a language was sometimes visible, for example in the case of Norwegian (hearing the language in the shop vs. having a friend as an interpreter; not understanding the spoken variety but being able to read) and English (using it in a professional context vs. evaluating its use in public in comparison to Finnish). It is worth keeping in mind that in interviews, it is expected that the assessments of the interviewee are not dealt with disapproval, but the interviewer is assumed to encourage the informant to speak. However, sometimes the reactions of the interviewer (e.g., using a certain pitch, exclamations) reveal that certain information is especially interesting, newsworthy, and valuable.

In the study, stances on languages were constructed in interaction, and they were also interpreted through personal experiences. They were shown to contain varying levels of affectivity. In their relationships to languages, the interviewees emphasised aspects that were important to them and expressed interest, rejection, but also self-evidence or surprisingness. Distance and affiliation towards the same named language varied, and the interactional analysis combined with the content analysis proved to be fruitful in showing the complexities of language attitudes and in understanding what determines them (cf. Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2017).

**Acknowledgements and Funding** I would like to thank the LinBo group and the participants of a COACT data session, as well as all co-authors and editors of this volume for their valuable comments and suggestions. This study was funded by the Academy of Finland project Linguistic and Bodily Involvement in Multicultural Interactions (under Grant no. 324060). Many thanks also to the Hundred Finnish life stories project and its interviewees.

## REFERENCES

- Antaki, C., Barnes, R., & Leudar, I. (2005). Self-disclosure as a situated interactional practice. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44, 181–199.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. University of Texas Press.
- Bailey, B. (2015). Interactional sociolinguistics. In K. Tracey, C. Ilie, & T. Sandel (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of language and social interaction*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Blommaert, J., & Backus, A. (2013). Superdiverse repertoires and the individual. In I. de Saint-Georges & J. J. Weber (Eds.), *Multilingualism and multimodality: Current challenges for educational studies* (pp. 11–32). Springer.
- Blommaert, J., & Dong, J. (2013). Language and movement in space. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *The handbook of language and globalization* (pp. 366–385). Wiley Blackwell.
- Bull, T., Huss, L., & Lindgren, A.-R. (2021). Language shift and language (re)vitalisation: The roles played by women and men in Northern Fennoscandia. *Multilingua*, ahead of press.
- Busch, B. (2015a). “Without language, everything is chaos and confusion...” Corporal-emotional linguistic experience and the linguistic repertoire. In U. M. Lüdtke (Ed.), *Emotion in language: Theory – research – application* (pp. 273–288). John Benjamins.
- Busch, B. (2015b). *Linguistic repertoire and Spracherleben, the lived experience of language*. Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies 148, 1–16. [https://heteroglossia.net/fileadmin/user\\_upload/publication/WP148\\_Busch\\_2015\\_Linguistic\\_repertoire\\_and\\_Spracherleben-libre.pdf](https://heteroglossia.net/fileadmin/user_upload/publication/WP148_Busch_2015_Linguistic_repertoire_and_Spracherleben-libre.pdf)
- Busch, B. (2017a). Expanding the notion of the linguistic repertoire: On the concept of Spracherleben—The lived experience of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 38(3), 340–358.
- Busch, B. (2017b). Biographical approaches to research in multilingual settings: Exploring linguistic repertoires. In M. Martin-Jones & D. Martin (Eds.), *Researching multilingualism: Critical and ethnographic approaches* (pp. 46–59). Routledge.

- Codó, E. (2018). Lifestyle residents in Barcelona: A biographical perspective on linguistic repertoires, identity narrative and transnational mobility. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 250, 11–34.
- Djuraeva, M., & Catedral, L. (2020). Habitus and imagined ideals: Attending to (un)consciousness in discourses of (non)nativeness. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 14(3), 270–285.
- DuBois, J. W. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction* (pp. 139–182). John Benjamins.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hippi, K., Lappalainen, H., & Nuolijärvi, P. (2020). Sata suomalaista kielellistä elämäkertaa hankkeena ja aineistona [Hundred Finnish linguistic life stories as a project and as data]. In K. Hippi, H. Lappalainen, & P. Nuolijärvi (Eds.), *Suomalaisten kielellistä elämää: Sata suomalaista kielellistä elämäkertaa -hankkeen satoa* [The Linguistic life of Finns: Fruits of the project ‘Hundred Finnish linguistic life stories’] (pp. 11–50). Finnish Literature Society.
- Horner, K., & Dailey-O’Cain, J. (2019). *Multilingualism, (im)mobility and spaces of belonging*. Multilingual Matters.
- Jaffe, A. (2009a). *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives*. Oxford University Press.
- Jaffe, A. (2009b). Stance in a Corsican school: Institutional and ideological orders and the production of bilingual subjects. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 119–145). Oxford University Press.
- Kalaja, P., Barcelos, A. M. F., & Aro, M. (2017). Revisiting research on learner beliefs: Looking back and looking forward. In P. Garrett & J. M. Cots (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language awareness* (pp. 222–237). Routledge.
- Koivisto, A. (2015). Dealing with ambiguities in informings: Finnish *aijaa* as a “Neutral” news receipt. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 48(4), 365–387.
- König, K., Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O’Cain, J. (2015). A comparison of heritage language ideologies in interaction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 19(4), 484–510.
- Leppänen, S., Pitkänen-Huhta, A., Nikula, T., Kytölä, S., Törmäkangas, T., Nissinen, K., Kääntä, L., Räisänen, T., Laitinen, M., Pahta, P., Koskela, H., Lähdesmäki, S., & Jousmäki, H. (2011). *National survey on the English language in Finland: Uses, meanings and attitudes* (Studies in Variation, Contacts and Change in English). <https://varieng.helsinki.fi/series/volumes/05/evarieng-vol5.pdf>
- Li Wei. (2018). Linguistic (super)diversity, post-multilingualism and translanguaging moments. In A. Creese & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language and superdiversity: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 16–29). Routledge.

- Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O’Cain, J. (2011). Language attitudes, migrant identities and space. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 212, 91–133. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2011.048>
- Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O’Cain, J. (2017). Contextualizing language attitudes: An interactional perspective. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 11(9), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12250>
- Lilja, N. (2018). “Mä opin sitä kadulla kavereitten kanssa” – suomen kielen käyttöön ja oppimiseen liittyviä kategorisointeja maahanmuuttajanuorten haastattelupuheessa [“I learnt it on the street with my friends” – Categorisations related to Finnish language use and learning among interviews of immigrant youth]. *Puhe ja kieli*, 38(4), 203–225. <https://doi.org/10.23997/pk.69270>
- Pietikäinen, S., Jaffe, A., Kelly-Holmes, H., & Coupland, N. (2016). *Sociolinguistics from the periphery: Small languages in new contexts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pietikäinen, S. (2018). Investing in indigenous multilingualism in the Arctic. *Language & Communication*, 62, 184–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lancom.2018.05.001>
- Scotson, M. (2020). *Korkeakoulutetut kotoutujat suomen kielen käyttäjinä: toimijuus, tunteet ja käsitykset* [Highly educated immigrants as language users: Agency, emotions and perceptions]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Jyväskylä.
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. Routledge.
- Spotti, M., & Blommaert, J. (2016). Bilingualism, multilingualism, globalization, and superdiversity: Toward sociolinguistic repertoires. In O. García, N. Flores, & M. Spotti (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language and society*. Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, S., Fox, B., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2015). *Grammar in everyday talk: Building responsive actions*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139381154>
- Vaattovaara, J. (2009). *Meän tapa puhua: Tornionlaakso pellolaisnuorten subjektiivisena paikkana ja murrealueena* [Our way to speak: Tornio Valley as a subjective place and dialect area of youth in Pello]. Doctoral dissertation. Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies, University of Helsinki. Finnish Literature Society.
- Vatanen, A. (2014). *Responding in overlap: Agency, epistemicity and social action in conversation*. Doctoral dissertation. Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies, University of Helsinki.
- Walsh, O. (2021). Introduction: In the shadow of the standard: Standard language ideology and attitudes towards ‘non-standard’ varieties and usages. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 42(9). <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1813146>