

1 Diverse Discourses in Time and Space: Historical, Discourse Analytical and Ethnographic Approaches to Multi-sited Language Policy Discourse

Mia Halonen, Pasi Ihalainen and
Taina Saarinen

Politics and policies are essentially multi-sited by nature, taking place, being constructed, contested and reproduced on different horizontally and vertically linked levels simultaneously and in different times and places. The current volume of original studies focuses on language policy discourses analysed at the methodological crossroads of cultural and political history and the history of ideas, ethnology, ethnography, language policy studies and sociolinguistics. It demonstrates how a multidisciplinary approach to multi-sited language policy discourses – and to policy discourses at large – enables us to better analyse and grasp their multiple dimensions and to overcome some current methodological challenges in various disciplines. Policy analyses of the suggested kind can, we argue, bring the various disciplines together in terms of methodology.

Motivated by experiences in comparative and transnational historical research and language policy research, this volume addresses the following general questions: Firstly, what kinds of new methodological options are opened for various fields of scholarship by the suggested multidisciplinary analysis of multi-sited language policy discourses from a comparative perspective? This theme is elaborated on in the theoretical and methodological sections of this introduction based on various case studies. Secondly, how have language policies been discursively constructed in Finland and Sweden,

and which factors explain the differences that are discernible? And thirdly, what is the role of transnational interaction in the field of language policy discourses crossing boundaries?

As far as language researchers are concerned, among whom discourse analytical approaches to language policies have been long established, this volume is intended to increase awareness of the continuous presence of past experiences, remembrance and constructions of the past – that is, the ideological use of interpretations of the past in political arguments, or history politics – in contemporary language policy debates. This entails awareness of history and language being inseparably linked both through topical continuity and in everyday practices. This also requires a clarification of the concept of ‘context’, which is treated somewhat differently in our disciplinary frameworks. In language studies, it has been customary either to understand context in broad terms, as referring to the various features of the societal situation, or more narrowly, as the properties of the immediate linguistic action itself (see for instance Duranti & Goodwin, 1992). For Blommaert (2001), in turn, context is really about normalised power and hegemony. In this volume we understand context as something that is in constant dialogical interchange with the phenomena under scrutiny and thus inseparable from them (van Dijk, 2008).

In the field of history, the concept of context is generally understood in even broader terms. For most historians interested in linguistic action, potential contexts outside of an (intentional) speech act or communicative interaction are infinite, and it is seen as the very duty of a historian to determine which ones were in each case most relevant to contemporaries in the creation of meaning. These contexts may consist of linguistic conventions and related debates but also of political, social, cultural, intellectual and generic (etc.) structures and factors (Hyrkkänen, 2002; Skinner, 2002).

Among historians, on the other hand, an increased awareness of the multi-sitedness and multilayeredness of past political discourses helps them to appreciate the parallel analysis of a rich variety of sources from the point of view of active uses of language as engagements in discursive processes. It also helps, as we shall demonstrate below, to overcome methodological distinctions between the history of action and events, on the one hand, and that of discourses, on the other, or distinctions between the study of macro-level semantic change at a community level and micro-level historical pragmatics at an individual level. Instead of challenging alternative approaches to historical research with postmodern theories, we simply advocate the application of up-to-date approaches to the analysis of policy discourse developed within language research to linguistically oriented historical research as well. Their application should be easy to accept for

the growing number of historians who recognise the constructed nature of political, social and cultural conceptions. We thus wish to encourage historians of ideas, politics and culture to proceed to further stages of linguistic turns that have already renewed much of historians' methodological arsenal since the emergence of the first applications of John Austin's speech act theory – originally presented in *How to do Things with Words* (1962) – in the late 1960s, most notably by Quentin Skinner (1969). Linguistically oriented historical research continues to have a lot to learn from language studies; we just need to move on from the application of and debate on theories that had already been established by the 1970s and to update methodologies with empirically oriented analyses in the applied language studies of the 2010s. For historians this may mean, as we shall show, the adoption of an understanding of politics essentially as a discursive process. In addition to analysing multi-sited policy discourses, this update can mean experimenting in the spirit of detailed textual analyses with carefully contextualised ethnographic data instead of the more conventional study of extensive source corpora. It may also mean exploring the applicability of the concept of the 'historical body' to historical research (discussed under 'Methodological and Empirical Motivation', below).

This volume thus provides language and language policy researchers, historians and ethnologists, among other scholars, with theoretical, methodological and empirical tools for understanding political phenomena that are historically, politically and linguistically diverse. We want to carry further the several linguistic turns in the human sciences that have been following each other since the 1960s, radicalising the methodological implications of the linguistic, discursive, spatial and mobility turns not only for language policy studies but also for historical and ethnological research through a methodologically ambitious multidisciplinary research project. The multiple and interconnected data, foci, theories and methods in this volume illustrate the multi-sited nature of policy discourses. Yet we aim to test, comment on and discuss the initial hypothesis and its methodological implications further.

As the national contexts for our empirical studies we have chosen Finland and Sweden and the respective statuses of Finnish and Swedish, and, in relation to these, minority languages – indigenous, migrant and other languages brought to the scene by globalisation, such as English – in the two Scandinavian/Nordic countries since the mid-19th century. These countries have shared a long, entangled history since the Middle Ages but are currently very different as far as language policies are concerned. One of our starting points is that the official majority language of each state has an official (national or minority) language status in the other: Swedish in

Finland since medieval times and Finnish in Sweden since the 2000s. These two national cases, when analysed through the approaches of language policy studies, comparative and transnational historical research of political discourse, and ethnology – all motivated by an awareness of the essentially multi-sited nature of policy discourse – can contribute to a broader understanding of the nature and formation of language policies. While the focus in most contributions is on contemporary language policy discourses (i.e. since the 1950s), such discourses are consistently situated in the long-term historical language policy trajectories of the two culturally closely related and thus exceptionally comparable countries.

While the current volume concentrates on the Nordic welfare nation states of Sweden and Finland, the relevance of focusing on multi-sited language policy discourse is by no means limited to that geographical context: similar policy trends can be seen in all globalising Western countries, as the ‘mobility turn’ brought about by new kinds of flows of ideas and matter and reflexivities (as ‘globalisation’ is defined by Lash & Urry, 1994) calls for new methodological approaches to policy analysis that go beyond the understanding of policy as the relationships between policy structures (see Ball, 2012). This growing awareness of interconnectedness of policy discourses has potential implications for the analysis of past societies as well, though not to the same extent as in an age of accelerating globalisation. The methodological applications and some findings from empirical research will be of interest well beyond the Nordic context, for instance to those concerned with updates of the methodology of the linguistically and culturally oriented ‘new’ political history and the themes of nationalism and minorities.

Sweden and Finland in Historical Comparison

Sweden as a kingdom was formed in the late Middle Ages out of the kingdoms of Svea and Göta and simultaneously incorporated the western provinces of what is now known as Finland. Latin remained dominant in the Catholic Church in Sweden until the Lutheran Reformation of the 16th century and in academic life well into the 18th century. In the days of its Baltic empire, in the 17th century, Sweden was a multicultural and multi-lingual realm, but one governed mainly in Swedish, something that the honour of a great power demanded. German was used by burghers in towns and especially in the Baltic and German provinces, and the nobility and the court might speak French, but Sweden experienced a gradual vernacularisation of its religious, academic, economic and political life. The bureaucratic use of Swedish was an administrative, political and judicial necessity rather

than a sign of deliberate linguistic discrimination. It allowed a variety of dialects of Swedish and Finnish to survive, even though the dominance of Finnish among the common people in the eastern half of the realm was sometimes seen as a problem and Swedification as a solution (Junila *et al.*, 2006; Kuvaja *et al.*, 2007; Vilkuna, 2013).

By the 19th century, after the loss of the empire, the Swedish language had become dominant on all levels of society; the realm was in fact one of the most uniform ones in Europe, not only in terms of ethnicity, culture and religion but also in terms of language. Minority languages such as Sámi (an indigenous language) and Finnish (in central and northern Sweden and as a migrant language especially in larger cities) remained marginal in the geographic area known as Sweden after 1809. Roma people had entered the Swedish realm from the 17th century onwards, and foreign Protestants and Jews were officially allowed to stay without refraining from the practice of their religion only from the early and late 18th century onwards, respectively. Also, the former Danish provinces were linguistically integrated into Sweden. The considerable size of the Finnish-speaking majority in the eastern half of the realm (up to 22% of the total population of the Swedish realm at the beginning of the 19th century; Kuvaja *et al.*, 2007: 33) had forced the Swedish authorities to facilitate the use of Finnish to some extent in communication with Finnish-speaking subjects in ecclesiastical, legal and administrative matters, but Swedish unquestionably remained the dominant language and the language of administration in the multi-ethnic early modern Swedish realm.

The loss of Finland and its inclusion in the Russian empire as an autonomous Grand Duchy in 1809 as well as the loss of the German provinces made Sweden proper all the more uniform in terms of language. Basic education was conducted monolingually in Swedish. Well into the 20th century, Sweden was a country of emigration; modest numbers of immigrants to Sweden and historical linguistic minorities were effectively assimilated. Only from the 1940s onwards, when increasing immigration of Finns, linked with the creation of a Nordic labour market in the 1950s, began to transform the language realities in Sweden, were there any pressures in the field of language policies, and they were subsequently changed only very gradually.

Finland as an administrative and cultural entity took shape as a consequence of the Swedish domination of the western provinces of the country from the 12th century on. Swedish rule involved the immigration of Swedes to the western and southern coasts of the country and to the south-western archipelago. Finnish western provinces were closely integrated into Sweden proper ecclesiastically, politically, economically and culturally, but the

eastern provinces to a lesser extent, from the 17th century onwards. The elites in all areas of society in Finland were Swedish-speakers throughout the early modern period, having moved from Sweden, or having come from Swedish-speaking families living in Finland, or having changed language from Finnish to Swedish in the public sphere as a consequence of participation in higher education (mainly in the case of the clergy). The Lutheran Reformation replaced Latin with the vernacular in religious life, and as this aspect of the Reformation was imposed on the Swedish realm the use of the Finnish language was extended to religious texts and church services from the 1540s onwards. While Finnish, despite being the language of over 80% of the population in Finland, remained entirely marginal in education and administration, it was used by the clergy, who took care not only of the spiritual but also the political education of Finnish-speakers by reading aloud official announcements of the Swedish Crown in the pulpit, for instance. In Finnish historiography centred on the nation-state, the 17th and 18th centuries have traditionally been viewed as ones of uniformity policies undermining the status of the Finnish language. On the other hand, the Finns were probably integrated into the (political) culture of the Swedish realm more efficiently than any corresponding linguistic minority into a dominant culture in early modern Europe, with the Swedish Church teaching the same values in Finnish in Finland, Finnish-speaking peasantry having their representatives at the Swedish diets in Stockholm, and the loyalty of the common people to the Swedish King being almost unconditional in times of Russian occupation during the 18th century.

When Sweden lost Finland to Russia in 1809 and Finland became an autonomous Grand Duchy, the Swedish constitution, laws, privileges and the Lutheran religion were continuously in force. The country continued in practice to be administered by Swedish-speaking bureaucrats. The early 19th century, however, saw the rise of the German-type national romanticism in Finland, which increased interest in the Finnish language also among the Swedish-speaking intellectuals. These Fennomans wished to record, construct and demonstrate the great cultural past of the Finnish nation to the world, with projects such as the publication of the Finnish epic *The Kalevala* (1835), and sought to recruit the Finnish-speaking masses to the defence of the Swedish inheritance in Finland against any changes in Finnish autonomy that might have been introduced by Imperial Russia (including the possible use and teaching of the Russian language).

The Russian authorities, for their part, welcomed this strengthening of the status of Finnish in education and administration as a guard against any possible Swedish attempts to regain Finland, as well as against the Sweden-oriented (Svecoman) opinion of the Swedish-speaking old elite. From the

early 1860s onwards, language legislation gradually began to improve the status of the majority language, for instance through the introduction of Finnish-language teacher education, by making Finnish for the first time a language used by the authorities outside the church, and by allowing a regulated degree of public debate in the language. The written language was also consciously developed by academics to better fulfil the criteria of a ‘civilised’ language.

The rise of Finnish was rapid and led to the growth of the Fennomans movement as well as to the formation of a Svecoman party. Language strife ensued in various sectors of society, including at the Imperial Alexander University in Helsinki. In the meantime, the popularity of the Russian language suffered from so-called Russification measures, including the introduction of obligatory Russian studies in grammar schools at the beginning of the 20th century. By the time of Finnish independence, in 1917, the proportion of Swedish-speakers was about 13% and in decline, as a consequence of members of the elite shifting their language and names to Finnish. The very small Russian-speaking minority either left the country after the declaration of independence or was largely assimilated within the other two language groups.

The republican constitution and the Language Act of 1922 aimed to solve the confrontation between Finnish and Swedish language groups by declaring the country officially bilingual, with two ‘national’ languages, as stated in the republican Constitution of 1919. This, according to Lindgren and Huss (2007: 211–213), was not necessarily a compromise but a win-win situation for both, as the Fennomans gained the political and social emancipation of Finnish, and the Svecomans reached their goal of Swedish becoming a national instead of a minority language.

While the Swedish-speakers have retained their legal right to services in Swedish in the era of independence, in practice the Finnish language has become increasingly dominant in all areas of life, and the proportion of Swedish-speakers has dropped to around 5.4% of the total population (see Chapter 3 in this volume for details). Language disputes have occurred every now and then: the representatives of the Swedish-speakers tend to appeal to the constitutional principle of equality when defending the status quo; much of the political elite defends the adopted language policy line; and some Finnish nationalists and populists call for the removal of the equality between the languages and the teaching of Swedish as an obligatory language. Swedish is seen either as an essential link to Scandinavia, with which most Finns wish to identify themselves, or as a historical relic which enjoys undeserved privileges and steals time from the study of other languages such as English at school (Ihalainen *et al.*, 2011a). For popular

constructions of Finnish national identity, contrasts with Sweden and the rejection of the Swedish historical dominance of the country continue to be self-evident, despite the obvious centrality of the Swedish legacy in Finnish culture in most areas of life (see Paunonen, 2006: 20–22).

These intertwined histories are also reflected in shared stereotypes of and attitudes towards ‘us’ and ‘them’: Finland Finns, Finland Swedes, Sweden Swedes and Sweden Finns seem to perceive themselves and each other in many ways simultaneously as both similar and different (Liebkind *et al.*, 2006). This mixture of nation building and historical struggles for the linguistic and social rights of the majority on the one hand and language ideologies on the other – including historical contrasts with Swedish and Russian cultures – is one of the reasons for the complicated nature of language policy questions in Finland (Huumo *et al.*, 2004; Similä, 2006).

In the European context, Sweden and Finland (and to some extent Russia), with their highly entangled histories in various areas but especially in the field of languages (see Junila *et al.*, 2006: 472), constitute a case deserving attention. Equally comparable cases in the rest of Europe are not many, the Netherlands and Belgium providing an example of a different kind. But there are also many developments that are shared by language policy trends in these Nordic countries and elsewhere. A great deal of the discourse on globalisation is focused on the increasingly dominant role of English(es) in various contexts. While this volume does not allow an in-depth treatment of the dominance of English as a language policy motivator, there is no denying the centrality of English also in the Nordic language policy scene. Studying the two related yet different national cases side by side, and contrasting them with the Russian case, makes visible some noteworthy diversities in language policy discourses.

Language Policies and Language Ideologies in a Nordic Context

Recent sociological studies on cultural and social diversification emphasise the role of language in post-industrial networked societies, characterised by (super)diversified (Vertovec, 2007) forms of immigration as well as new communication and information technologies (Castells, 2000). In the linguistic context, ‘superdiversity’ refers to the kind of sociolinguistic makeover seen in globalisation processes, in terms of both quantity (an increasing number of immigrant languages present in the Western world) and quality (languages being used in various ways) (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Blommaert *et al.*, 2012; Creese & Blackledge, 2010). The diversity in

the societies of the 21st century has complicated even more both the understanding of the complex relation between languages and the study of the policies and ideologies involved. The 'old' practices of doing language policy do not seem to function anymore. However, in the light of the chapters in this volume, it is possible to argue that diversity has always been there but our awareness of it has increased with the introduction of the concept of superdiversity.

Globalisation, with its implications of intercultural linguistic contact and communication, and the knowledge economy and knowledge society composed of the informational and cultural contents of immaterial labour (Williams, 2010) are highly language-intensive phenomena, although 'language' as such often appears invisible in the analysis of them (see for instance Saarinen, 2012, on the invisibility of language in the internationalisation of higher education). However, separate languages are invariably grouped and hierarchised in an effort to cope better with the superdiverse realities of modern societies. In fact, our focus on two legislatively controlled languages, Finnish and Swedish, is one indication of this. The European Union provides an exemplary case of this hierarchisation, in its official division of languages into 'official', 'indigenous regional and minority languages' and 'other' languages spoken in the Union. In addition to this official stratification, an unofficial ordering of European Union languages into 'our', 'national', 'foreign', 'additional' and dozens of other categories exemplifies the need to organise languages in hierarchical categories, indicating not only a need to understand their variety but also a need to control and govern the increasing linguistic diversity, implying ultimately that some categories of multilingualism are more valuable than others (Nikula *et al.*, 2012).

Language policies are intertwined with language ideologies (see Shohamy, 2006). They meet in the interest in the boundaries between languages and the mechanisms giving rise to and maintaining them. As Gal and Woolard put (1995: 130) it: 'Language ideologies are cultural conceptions of the nature, form and purpose of language, and of communicative behaviour as an enactment of a collective order'. Language policies and ideologies have been extensively studied and reported on, for example in volumes edited by Blommaert (1999), Duchêne and Heller (2007), Heller (2007) and Kroskrity (2000). In these studies, language political debates, often characterised by struggle (e.g. Pujolar, 2007; Stroud, 2007), have been examined in a broader European context, for example in Corsica with a focus on Corsican and French (Jaffe, 1999), in Catalonia with a focus on Catalan and Spanish (DiGiacomo, 1999) and in Switzerland with a focus on Rhaeto-Romantsch, French, German and Italian (Watts, 1999). In Europe, language ideologies

have also been studied in Hungary and Romania and the Banat, focusing on Hungarian, German and Romanian (Gal, 2011; Laihonen, 2009).

In Nordic contexts, minorities have been much studied in terms of the complex language political situation of the whole North Calotte, with struggles between and within languages such as Norwegian, Kven, Swedish, Meänkieli, Finnish, Russian and Sámi (e.g. Laihiala-Kankainen & Pietikäinen, 2010; Pietikäinen *et al.*, 2010). Language planning and policies in Finland and Sweden have also occasionally been compared to those in Hungary (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2005).

One interesting point of comparison with the situation in Finland can be found in Belgium, where French continued to be the dominant language of the upper classes till the late 19th century, but Dutch has since been increasingly used in various areas of life. The proportions of the speakers of the two languages have always been more equal and bilingualism may be a more practical reality in Brussels than in Helsinki, but the two linguistic areas are at the same time separate to a higher degree than is the case with the Swedish-speakers in most local communities in Finland (Witte & Van Velthoven, 2010). The Swiss case is less comparable, in that different cantons tend to be rather more monolingual in their use of German, French or Italian. Outside of Europe, much attention has been paid to the situation in Canada and the struggle between French and English (e.g. Heller, 1999). The case of Quebec is more regional than the others, though it does resemble the case of Finland Swedish in that the French-speaking population emerged as a consequence of early modern colonisation and the loss of the colony to Britain in 1763.

While the Finnish case has often been presented as a model one in guaranteeing the rights of the minority language, the approaches adopted in this volume may actually deconstruct such a belief, by bringing up problems related to discourses of nation-state building. In the same way, our analysis may show how the Swedish monolingual discourse on democracy has not always considered the linguistic rights of minorities and that the increasing awareness of the multilingual nature of Sweden is actually a very recent development. An extremely important predecessor to this volume is provided by the project *Kahden puolen Pohjanlahtea* (Interaction across the Gulf of Bothnia), which resulted in an extensive anthology covering the entire joint history of Finland and Sweden (for an overview, see Junila & Westin, 2006). The main difference, in addition to the size of the project, is that the focus of this volume is more on novel theoretical, empirical and methodological attempts to inspire various disciplines to enter into more explicit dialogue with each other.

Theoretical Motivation

This volume is interdisciplinary in the sense that its authors have come out of their comfort zones in various scholarly fields and joined forces to develop language policy research and the analysis of political discourse in general on a comparative and multidisciplinary basis. The very novelty of the volume is in challenging historians, ethnologists and language (policy) researchers to rethink their premises and methodological approaches. These fields also share an inherent interest in policy, though from quite different perspectives, having previously focused either on macro-level or on micro-level cases only or having avoided addressing political questions explicitly in their analyses of the micro-level situations of everyday life – even though these situations can in fact be highly political and interconnected with other levels of multi-sited policy discourse.

We are confident, on the one hand, that such an interdisciplinary venture encourages updates to the methodologies of political history and the history of ideas, so that the most recent linguistic approaches to the analysis of policy discourses are seen as directly applicable to the analysis of past political discourses as well – in addition to the methodologies of the historical semantics and historical pragmatics of the 1960s and 1970s, which have long and successfully been applied in the field of conceptual history (see for instance the work of Michael Freeden, Jörn Leonhard, Bo Lindberg, Kari Palonen, Willibald Steinmetz and Wyger Velema, among others). On the other hand, we wish to (re)introduce language studies to a historically sensitive view of time and an awareness of larger and long-term social contexts.

The challenge of multi-sitedness may, furthermore, mean for all the involved disciplines the application of a more multidimensional view of traditional micro and macro scales. While ethnographically oriented language research (linguistic anthropology) has adopted this multidimensional view (see for instance the work of Monica Heller, Jan Blommaert, Susan Gal and Angela Creese, among others), and while the work of the above-mentioned researchers has important language policy implications, ethnographic approaches with an explicit focus on language policy are still only just emerging (see e.g. McCarty, 2011) and lack methodological robustness. Additionally, while we have seen a growing interest in the phenomenon of multi-sitedness in ethnography (see Coleman & von Hellermann, 2011; Marcus, 1995), we have not witnessed a similar development within language policy studies. Also, historical research would benefit from the adoption of the notion of multi-sitedness of past policy discourses, as it would eliminate unnecessary

hierarchies of research topics and disagreements on whether macro- or micro-level phenomena should be analysed.

This is not to say that we would be pioneers in introducing historical perspectives to language policy studies nor in using for example the concept of discourse in historical studies. This has long been done in sociolinguistics and critical discourse analysis (see Blommaert, 1999: 5), and more recently for example by Fairclough (2006) and Blommaert (1999, 2010), and in the history of ideas by representatives of the Cambridge school of contextualist history of political thought, such as Skinner (1969, 2002) and Pocock (1973, 2009), as well as Koselleck (1972, 2006) as the formulator of the German *Begriffsgeschichte*. Sociolinguists such as Blommaert (1999: 6–8) and Heller (2011: 40) have applied especially historian Braudel's notion of *longue durée* (1980 [1958]), the varying length (in time) of phenomena, and argue that this is intrinsic to all observations made about language.

However, despite these innovations applied in sociolinguistics, ethnography and linguistic anthropology, language policy studies have largely remained focused on policy structures (see e.g. Kaplan & Baldauf, 2005). In historical research as well, especially in the Nordic countries, structural explanations and the application of social scientific theories have been prominent for quite some time, and linguistic approaches to the past have until recently remained rather marginal (see, however, the above-mentioned conceptual historians and Ihalainen *et al.*, 2011b).

In the sometimes unhelpfully confrontational methodological debate between mainstream political and social historians on the one hand and historians of ideas and political cultures on the other, the former have frequently accused the latter of giving up the proper analysis of events and structures or the application of social scientific theories to history and going for 'postmodernist' or outright 'Marxist' theories of social constructivism, where 'a mere discourse' and not action is analysed (for an extreme case, see Marwick, 2001). In this volume, we draw a clear distinction between the frequently non-empirical, historically uninformed and purely theorising applications of postmodernist theories and the empirical use of the productive analytical tools provided by present-day language studies to historians of all fields but especially to those of political thought, discourse and cultures. We propose ways to overcome the gap between the study of political action and political discourse in historical research. Methodological impulses for a renewal in historical research do not need to originate merely from social sciences; they can also originate from language research. History is, after all, a discipline that initially emerged as a branch of philology rather than of social sciences.

We approach multi-sitedness by starting from globalisation, which, while not a new phenomenon as such, has since the 1980s led to an increasing awareness of other phenomena that may have implications for the study of both past and present political discourse. Not only linguistics but also political history and the history of ideas have been affected by a transnational turn (Haupt & Kocka, 2004) and the related concept of superdiversity. These turns have led to a growing interest in phenomena that have not been limited to nation-states in the traditional sense but that have clearly crossed national boundaries through transfers and interaction, and that have evolved not only as increased mobility but also as diversified modes and means of interaction. Drawing again on Blommaert (2007, 2010) and his concept of ‘sociolinguistics of globalisation’, we can say that all the different chapters in this volume are about globalisation, whether the focus is on clergymen in the 19th-century Finnish countryside creating new spelling practices for names and at the same time developing the orthography of the Finnish language, on the activism for language rights in Sweden in the 1960s or on a Swedish-language classroom interaction in a Finnish city in the 2010s: all these examples are characterised by the existence of long and short trajectories in time and in place, tracing both backwards and forwards in time – and, in addition, to simultaneous events in other places.

Conceptualisations of globalisation have been characterised by network theories, as in Blommaert’s (2010: 1) argument that globalisation does not mean that the world has become a village but rather a network of villages. Pennycook (2010) radicalised this idea further with the premise that everything is, in the end, happening locally, in some place, at some time. While the points made by Blommaert and Pennycook expand our understanding of language policy not merely as a macro-level phenomenon, applying their notions uncritically runs the risk of merely replacing macro-level (or structural) explanations with micro-level (or actor) ones, while missing the interconnected, networked and fluid contacts (or ‘friction’; Tsing, 2005) producing and produced by these actors and structures. Our case studies rather demonstrate the essentially multi-sited nature of all political discourse in that it characteristically takes place simultaneously at different but interconnected fora and that both macro-level structures and micro-level actors play a role in the discursive processes of politics. Therefore, every scholar, even when focusing on political discourse as action in a particular context, needs to be aware of and pay attention to other networked discourses that move in time and space (for an example of connections between parliamentary and media debates since the 18th century, see Ihalainen, 2010, 2013). A historian might also call this ‘contextualisation’.

In the fields of the history of ideas and political discourse, historians have, since the 1960s, been increasingly ‘language researchers’ of a self-educated kind. After all, the most that remains for reconstructing and analysing the concepts, conceptions, opinions and attitudes of past actors is the language they used, as recorded in historical sources. Historians of ideas are language researchers of a very practical kind, in that their research interests have selectively focused on such past language uses that appear politically and socially relevant. The methodologies of such scholars may have been motivated by Austin’s speech act theory or by traditional historical semantics rather than by the more recent linguistic strategies of policy analysis applied in this volume. It is important to make these linguistically oriented approaches adopted by a considerable number of historians of political culture and discourse explicit to language researchers, and also to update these methodologies through an increased awareness of the implications of the later stages of linguistic turns for the analysis of past political discourse.

Such a cross-fertilisation between historical and language research is facilitated by the radically increased interest in politics among language researchers – rather than in the ‘mere’ questions of philology, autonomous linguistics, literature and textual analysis – which has brought them closer to what the ‘new’ political history (after the linguistic and cultural turns) finds interesting. Likewise, ethnologists often discuss such themes of everyday life and remembrance that appear to be highly political to the ‘new’ political history – interested in politics as a phenomenon reaching well beyond international relations, governments and parliaments, to the level of the everyday experiences of individuals. A shared interest in language policy discourse, in particular, can bring these three fields of research together methodologically.

Language policy is, after all, often history politics where the remembrance of past experiences by communities and individuals (historical bodies) play a fundamental role. Selected language policy lines are often legitimated by communities and individuals with selected interpretations of the (language policy) past as one form of discursive operationalisation (Saarinen, 2008). Recognising this central historical and remembrance-related feature of language policy discourse makes cooperation between language policy researchers, historical researchers and ethnological researchers not only easier but actually essential for the understanding of language policies.

Methodological and Empirical Motivation

Language studies, ethnology, and historical research (especially new political history, i.e. the history of political cultures, discourses and concepts) are all currently experiencing a spatial turn. Research is expanding from the linguistic, rhetorical and communicative turns towards combining the concepts of time, space and movement (Hult, 2010). Our conception of multi-sitedness has its roots in this spatial turn. It means not only that the various occasions of discourses on policies are happening ‘at the same time, in various places’ but also that various historical trajectories are coming together, merging as a nexus, at some space and time.

The concept of ‘nexus’ is adopted from Scollon and Scollon (2004); we are, however, not doing nexus analysis but are inspired by the idea of a ‘point of coming together’. In the cases presented in the volume, the nexus points vary from official gala banquet speeches and a newspaper debate to onomastic histories as instantiations of language policy. The concept of ‘historical body’ is especially applicable to capturing the impact and the possible motivations of the various agents in our empirical cases: ethno-activists, parliamentarians, commuting politicians, clergymen, newspaper editors, teachers and pupils, or Finnish immigrants in Sweden in their everyday activities. We believe that the concept of historical body will be of interest to historians as well, especially for those working on transnational history, as it focuses on the role of individuals as agents, by taking into account the simultaneity and reflexivity of all of their psycho-physical experiences and ongoing actions. These agents have often created very concrete links between two or more national discourses.

Some of the chapters focus more on the upper-level or macro-level structures of society, while others focus on more carefully contextualised micro-level situations. All the contributions do, however, address to some extent the vertical interaction between the macro and micro levels, and/or the horizontal interaction between different policy sectors. This is one of the motivations for the term ‘multi-sited’ in the subtitle of this volume. These levels are not exclusive but overlapping and multi-scalar: what is a macro-level question or analytical concept in one situation might be a micro-level concept in another – and vice versa (cf. Blommaert & Rampton, 2011.) This is also captured well in the metaphor of ‘rhizomes’ by Deleuze and Guattari (1987), where ‘happenings’ or ‘occasions’ are seen as simultaneous, multi-sited and interconnected. Just like in nexus analysis, also in rhizo-analysis there is some point in the large picture through which all the occasions go or in which they come together.

Both nexus analysis and rhizo-analysis are essentially ethnographic, like Marcus's (1995) multi-sited ethnography, which shares the same main idea of tracking and mapping as many possible explaining facts as possible. We share the idea of these frameworks but we are not applying any of the methods of analysis as such, because we include themes and foci in history in which, for example, 'engaging the activity' (Scollon & Scollon, 2004: 153–154) is simply impossible. For example, analysing the bodily experiences of migrants not speaking the majority language could be seen not only as a micro-level analysis concerning an individual but also as a macro-level embodiment of migration policy. What brings the different levels together is Massey's concept of space-time (e.g. 1992, 1999, 2005), where the global, local and the various times are brought together into interaction with each other: time and space create, maintain and are dependent on each other.

In fact, a central methodological challenge for all the disciplines involved has been to include in the analysis the integration and critique of dichotomies such as the analysis of macro and micro, discourses and practices, structures and agents, ideals and realities, and so on. We argue that these relationships are not either top-down or bottom-up, or rhizomatically networked, but a combination of different kinds of dynamics, consisting of 'historically specific geographies of social relations' (Jessop *et al.*, 2008: 392). This means that the applications and outcomes of legislation on the national level affect everyday life, which in turn affects the discourses and legislation processes, shown for example in classroom interaction. Policy is formulated through the use of language and involvement in discourse at all levels. Language users are, in other words, agents of change rather than merely implementers of the decision on the normative level.

The data used in this volume are various and multiple, and come from various sources and instances in history. With this combination of varied data we aim to address the issue of multi-sitedness, simultaneousness and rhizomaticity of historical-linguistic events and their relations. This also means that we do not view our data as hierarchical; rather, we focus on what Stephen Ball (2012) has named 'heterarchies', or the dynamic contacts and changes in policies. Rather than presenting a particular kind of normative data-set on language policies (such as official policy documentation or macro-level decision-maker opinions), we present our data in the different cases as illustrative of the multiple and multi-sited nature of our topic.

Overview of the Chapters in the Volume

The volume consists of three parts. Part 1, Theoretical and Methodological Introduction, presents historical and contemporary background

to language policies as interdisciplinary, multi-sited and layered. Part 2, *Language Policies in Parliaments, Legislation and the Media*, contains four chapters, which take a top-down perspective on policy. The chapters address larger (macro-level) national political issues, but also show how these questions are brought into public debate by policy actors varying from parliamentary representatives to the discussants on internet forums. Part 3, *Individuals as Constructors and Reflectors of Language Policies*, takes a bottom-up approach to the exploration of the relations of policies, starting from individual actors and micro-level situations, discussing how larger policy constructions and discourses are construed by these actors and in these situations. The volume is concluded by an epilogue which ties together the various theoretical, methodological and empirical themes into a synthesis of the volume's contribution to language policy research.

In the first chapter of Part 2, Pasi Ihalainen and Taina Saarinen focus comparatively on the contemporary situations in Finland and Sweden by analysing multi-sited discursive processes related to the preparation of language legislation in the two countries in the period 1998–2009, on the basis of parliamentary debates, legislation and government programmes. In addition to contemporary national debates, they consider historical trajectories and transnational interaction in the formation of language policies. The authors analyse the nature of policy discourse constructing 'language', 'national' and 'minority', through the analytical empirical concept of 'discursive operationalizations' (Saarinen, 2008: 725), focusing also on how the roles of the various political actors are discursively constructed. The empirical analysis demonstrates how policies typically consist of multi-sited and interconnected historical trajectories in which the language policy actors reinforce and reformulate policies in interaction with each other and the political process. The authors show, for instance, that while the Finnish language policy discourse on the level of legislation and parliamentary debates focuses on attempts to construct a discursive consensus on the premises of constitutional bilingualism, the Swedish debate demonstrates a need to promote Sweden as a champion of democracy and societal access. Immigration and integration policies do not seem to have significantly challenged established language policies. However, these policies continue to be gradually reformulated discursively, especially through the use of history in political argumentation.

Sally Boyd and Åsa Palviainen continue the topic (Chapter 3) by discussing the discrepancies between the political and legislative legitimation of bilingualism on the one hand and the reality of monolingual schooling on the other in the recent Finnish debate about bilingual schools. The debate has as its backdrop the historical practice of separating education for the

two language groups in a bilingual country. They analyse the newly revived newspaper discussions on the possibility of (Finnish–Swedish) bilingual schools in Finland, contrasting the common macro-political goal of Finland being a bilingual country with the micro-level debates on how this goal should be achieved for Finnish schoolchildren. It seems that while the different discourses concerning bilingual schools – which tend to recycle and modify arguments and concepts in previous discussions – might remain intact in the future, Boyd and Palviainen predict that the goals concerning Swedish language education among Finnish-speakers will diversify. They suggest that the separate ideological discourses of preservationism and idealism tended to converge during the debate and have led to some new visions for education. The chapter makes a particular contribution to the methodology of analysing historically evolving political discourses, their historical trajectories, and the role of individual participants as historical bodies and political actors in them.

In Chapter 4, Mika Lähteenmäki and Sari Pöyhönen reflect on the paradoxical position of Russian in Finnish language policy discourses and legislation, suggesting an analogy with the status of Finnish in Sweden and contrasting it with that of Swedish in Finland. This leads them to address the political use of history in language policy discourse, more particularly concerning the ‘grand narrative’ of Finnishness in relation to the Swedish and Russian languages. As a result of the entangled history and the strong position of the Swedish language in Finnish legislation, Swedish appears as the measure of all discourses concerning languages in Finland. The Russian linguistic minority in Finland, in contrast, has been denied all special linguistic rights – mainly for historical reasons that have rarely been explicated. Based on their analysis of Finnish and European legislation, policy documentation and statistics, Lähteenmäki and Pöyhönen foresee a growing polarisation and increasing tensions in the language policy discourses concerning Russian in Finland. Furthermore, they show how radically different can be the political and ideological agendas and the conception of the relationship between language, individual and society of the different participants in the multi-sited language policy discourse representing and conceptualising Russian in Finland within the Council of Europe, the Finnish government and the Russian Federation. At the same time, they provide an up-to-date analysis of present-day official language policy and its implications for domestic and foreign policy in the Russian Federation.

In Chapter 5, Jarmo Lainio discusses the prestige and position of Sweden Finnish in the potentially ambivalent situation of Sweden, which is on the one hand understood as monolingually Swedish, and on the other as a champion of societal access and tolerance. He first analyses the historical

position of Finnish as a minority language, spoken both by a historical minority and by more recent migrants in Sweden. He then takes up the legislation from the 1960s and the values and attitudes towards Swedish Finnish. Based on Lainio's analysis of the historical trajectories of Finnish in Sweden, it seems that Sweden is at a crossroads when it comes to societal multilingualism and its implications for different policy sectors. The egalitarian ideals of the 'people's home' and the welfare state, the traditionally hegemonic position of Swedish, and the recent challenges brought about by waves of immigration meet in educational contexts where, as Lainio suggests, the earlier overt assimilation has turned covert.

Part 3 begins with Sofia Kotilainen's contribution (Chapter 6), which investigates the roles of individuals as micro-level policy actors. She analyses the practical implementation of language legislation at the local level in the context of late-19th-century Finland – a country where positions on language policy frequently became ideological dividers. As an empirically oriented historian, she makes use of the notions of multi-sited policy discourse, language ideologies, and the nexus of linguistic interaction. She also discusses the significance of the concept of historical body for the historical analysis of social action. She investigates the extent to which rural people themselves were activated to speak for their linguistic rights and how the clergy responsible for local administration took care of this on their behalf. She examines how the change in the administrative language and at the same time in the literacy skills of the common people affected the spelling of Finnish personal names, and discovers how the political views of individual actors in a power position at the local level directly affected the pace of language policy change and linguistic practices.

Various language political agents are studied by Mats Wickström (Chapter 7), who, as a historian, applies the notion of multi-sited language policy discourse and the analytical concept of historical body to a more conventional type of analysis of past political speech acts and connected meanings within the contextualist history of political thought. He analyses the agency, active role and perspective of minority speakers as policy actors in the process of obtaining legal rights for education in their mother tongue. He shows how language education can become politicised in public discourse, especially as concerns the question of collective identity, and demonstrates how these debates still affect language policy discourses in both Sweden and Finland. Simultaneously, he shows how concepts originating from scientific discourse, such as, in his case, the concept of semilingualism, are introduced and rooted in political debates.

Hanna Snellman (Chapter 8) offers a view on post-war female migrants in Europe analysed by means of European ethnology. She brings together the

general policies and practices of Swedish society and everyday experiences of migrant Finnish women in Sweden, showing how profoundly language competence, and especially lack of it, is embodied in the life of migrant linguistic minorities. Starting from an in-depth ethnological ethnography of very concrete and physical experiences of interviewees, she discusses them in relation to the education policies, labour markets and general ideals of Swedish society, thus depicting the policy implications and reflections of the individuals' experiences. She also discusses how these experiences have formed the historical bodies of the migrant women and how they became political activists, at least at grassroots level, in their respective ethnic groups and in their own lives.

Mia Halonen, Tarja Nikula, Taina Saarinen and Mirja Tarnanen conclude Part 3 (Chapter 9) by analysing interactions in a language (Swedish) teaching classroom in Finland today as the nexus of various policies and their historical trajectories. They suggest that there is an inherent interconnectedness of policies at state level and grassroots practices, each being constitutive of the other, and they explore the extent to which different policies-in-action converge or diverge in their directions when enacted in and through classroom activities. A particularly interesting construction in their data is that of bypassing the common history of the two countries, thus defamiliarising Swedish and constructing it as 'foreign' in the Finnish context by using Sweden as the point of reference and also discursively construing the Åland Islands as 'foreign'. The authors offer an empirical alternative view to the dominant top-down/bottom-up and micro-macro discourses by demonstrating the simultaneous and rhizomatic nature of policies at various levels. A methodological innovation is their showing how various policies materialise in a single micro-level situation, thus making the multi-sited nature of policy empirically and physically visible.

Muiris Ó Laoire's epilogue concludes the volume with a contextualisation of the volume's contribution to language policy research and its challenges. Ó Laoire stresses the significance of taking into account historical trajectories as well as contemporary contexts, with carefully designed multi-sited methodologies, in order to make visible ideologies and policies which may otherwise remain unseen. He concludes by stressing the value of ethnographic methodologies and interdisciplinary approaches in constructing and deconstructing language policies in the 21st century.

Acknowledgement

Part of this chapter is based on Academy of Finland project no. 138287.

References

- Austin, J.L. (1962) *How to do Things with Words. The William James Lectures Delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. James O. Urmson (ed.). London: Clarendon Press.
- Ball, S. (2012) *Global Education Inc.: New Policy Networks and the Neo-liberal Imaginary*. London: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. (ed.) (1999) *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Blommaert, J. (2001) Context is/as critique. *Critique of Anthropology* 21 (1), 13–21.
- Blommaert, J. (2007) Sociolinguistic scales. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4 (1), 1–19.
- Blommaert, J. (2010) *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. and Rampton, B. (2011) Language and superdiversity. *Diversities* 13 (2), 1–22.
- Blommaert, J., Leppänen, S. and Spotti, M. (2012) Endangering multilingualism. In J. Blommaert et al. (eds) *Dangerous Multilingualism* (pp. 1–21). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Braudel, F. (1980 [based on texts from 1958 on]) *On History*. Trans. S. Matthews. London: Weinfeld and Nicholson.
- Castells, M. (2000) *The Rise of the Network Society* (2nd edn). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Coleman, S. and von Hellermann, P. (eds) (2011) *Multi-sited Ethnography: Problems and Possibilities in the Translocation of Research Methods*. New York: Routledge.
- Creese, A. and Blackledge, A. (2010) Towards sociolinguistics of superdiversity. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft* 13 (4), 549–572.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Athlone Press.
- DiGiacomo, S.M. (1999) Language ideological debates in an Olympic city: Barcelona 1992–1996. In J. Blommaert (ed.) *Language Ideological Debates* (pp. 105–142). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Duchêne, A. and Heller, M. (eds) (2007) *Discourses of Endangerment: Ideology and Interest in the Defence of Languages*. London: Continuum.
- Duranti, A. and Goodwin, C. (eds) (1992) *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2006) *Language and Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- Gal, S. (2011) Polyglot nationalism. Alternative perspectives on language in 19th century Hungary. *Language & Society* 136, 31–53.
- Gal, S. and Woolard, K.A. (1995) Constructing languages and publics: Authority and representation. *Pragmatics* 5 (2), 129–138.
- Haupt, H.-G. and Kocka, J. (2004) Comparative history: Methods, aims, problems. In D. Cohen and M. O'Connor (eds) *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective* (pp. 23–40). New York: Routledge.
- Heller, M. (1999) Heated language in a cold climate. In J. Blommaert (ed.) *Language Ideological Debates* (pp. 143–170). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, M. (ed.) (2007) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Heller, M. (2011) Critical ethnographic sociolinguistics. In M. Heller (ed.) *Paths to Post-Nationalism: A Critical Ethnography of Language and Identity* (pp. 31–51). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hult, F. (2010) Analysis of language policy discourses across the scales of space and time. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 202, 7–24.

- Huumo, K., Laitinen, L. and Paloposki, O. (eds) (2004) *Yhteistä kieltä tekemässä. Näkökulmia suomen kirjakielen kehitykseen 1800-luvulla*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Hyrkkänen, M. (2002) *Aatehistorian mieli*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Ihalainen, P. (2010) *Agents of the People: Democracy and Popular Sovereignty in British and Swedish Parliamentary and Public Debates, 1734–1800*. Leiden: Brill Academic.
- Ihalainen, P. (2013) Parlamentsdebatten und der Aufstieg ausserparlamentarischer Medien im späten 18. Jahrhundert: Schweden, Grossbritannien und die Niederlande. In J. Feuchter and J. Helmuth (eds) *Parlamentarische Versammlungen und Öffentlichkeiten vom Mittelalter bis in die Moderne: Räume – Reden – Bilder* (pp. 97–113). Berlin: Kommission für Geschichte des Parlamentarismus.
- Ihalainen, P., Saarinen, T., Nikula, T. and Pöyhönen, S. (2011a) Aika kielipolitiikassa. Päivälehtien nettikeskustelujen historiakäsitysten analyysi, *Kasvatus & Aika* 3/2011. Online at http://www.kasvatus-ja-aika.fi/dokumentit/aika_kielipolitiikas_sapaivalehtien_netikeskustelujen_historiakäsitysten_analyysi_1809111021.pdf.
- Ihalainen, P., Bregnsbo, M., Sennefelt, K. and Winton, P. (eds) (2011b) *Scandinavia in the Age of Revolution: Nordic Political Cultures, 1740–1820*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Jaffe, A. (1999) Locating power: Corsican translators and their critics. In J. Blommaert (ed.) *Language Ideological Debates* (pp. 39–66). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jessop, B., Brennan, N. and Jones, M. (2008) Theorizing sociospatial relations. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26, 389–401.
- Junila, M. and Westin, C. (eds) (2006) *Svenskt i Finland – finskt i Sverige*. Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Junila, M., Sandlund, T. and Westin, C. (2006) Epilog. In M. Junila and C. Westin (eds) *Svenskt i Finland – finskt i Sverige. Vol. 2: Mellan majoriteter och minoriteter* (pp. 471–488). Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Kaplan, R.B. and Baldauf, R.B., Jr (eds) (2005) *Language Planning and Policy in Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Koselleck, R. (1972) Einleitung. In R. Koselleck, W. Conze and O. Brunner (eds) *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Vol. 1: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland* (pp. xvi–xvii). Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- Koselleck, R. (2006) *Begriffsgeschichten*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Kroskrity, P.V. (ed.) (2000) *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Kuvaja, C., Rantanen, A. and Villstrand, N.E. (2007) Språk, självbild och kommunikation i Finland 1750–1850. In O. Kangas and H. Kangasharju (eds) *Svenskt i Finland – finskt i Sverige. Vol. 4: Ordens makt och maktens ord* (pp. 33–114). Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Laihiala-Kankainen, S. and Pietikäinen, S. (2010) Contexts and consequences of language ideologies: The case of indigenous Sámi languages in Inari and Lovozero. In M. Lähteenmäki and M. Vanhala-Aniszewski (eds) *Language Ideologies in Transition: Multilingualism in Russia and Finland* (pp. 57–78). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Laihonen, P. (2009) *Language Ideologies in the Romanian Banat. Analysis of Interviews and Academic Writings among the Hungarians and Germans*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University Press.
- Lash, S. and Urry, J. (1994) *Economies of Signs and Spaces*. London: Sage.
- Liebkind, K., Nyström, S., Honkanummi, E. and Lange, A. (2006) Svenskt och finskt som minoritet och majoritet. In M. Junila and C. Westin (eds) *Svenskt i Finland – finskt i Sverige. Vol. 2: Mellan majoriteter och minoriteter* (pp. 359–379). Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.

- Lindgren, A.-R. and Huss, L. (2007) Antingen – eller eller både – och? Språklig emancipation i Finland och Sverige. In O. Kangas and H. Kangasharju (eds) *Svenskt i Finland – finskt i Sverige. Vol. 4: Ordens makt och maktens ord* (pp. 187–216). Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Marcus, G. (1995) Ethnography in/of the world system: The emergence of multi-sited ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24, 95–117.
- Marwick, A. (2001) *The New Nature of History: Knowledge, Evidence, Language*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Massey, D. (1992) Politics and space-time. *New Left Review* 196, 65–84.
- Massey, D. (1999) Imagining globalisation: Power-geometries of time-space. In A. Brah, M.J. Hickman and M. Mac an Ghaill (eds) *Global Futures: Migration, Environment and Globalization* (pp. 27–44). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Massey, D. (2005) *For Space*. London: Sage.
- McCarty, T. (ed.) (2011) *Ethnography and Language Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Nikula, T., Saarinen, T., Pöyhönen, S. and Kangasvieri, T. (2012) Linguistic diversity as a problem and a resource – Multilingualism in European and Finnish policy documents. In J. Blommaert, S. Leppänen, P. Pahta and T. Räisänen (eds) *Dangerous Multilingualism: Northern Perspectives on Order, Purity and Normality* (pp. 41–66). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Paunonen, H. (1980) *Finskan i Helsingfors. Helsingfors två språk. Rapport 1*. Helsinki: Helsingfors universitet.
- Paunonen, H. (2006) Vähemmistökielestä varioivaksi valtakieleksi. In K. Juusela and K. Nisula (eds) *Helsinki kieliyhteisönä* (pp. 13–99). Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen ja kotimaisen kirjallisuuden laitos.
- Pennycook, A. (2010) *Language as a Local Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Pietikäinen, S., Huss, L., Laihiala-Kankainen, S., Aikio-Puoskari, U. and Lane, P. (2010) Regulating multilingualism in the North Calotte: The case of Kven, Meänkieli and Sámi languages. *Acta Borealia* 27 (1), 1–23.
- Pocock, J.G.A. (1973) Verbalizing a political act: Towards a politics of speech. *Political Theory* 1 (1), 27–45.
- Pocock, J.G.A. (2009) *Political Thought and History: Essays on Theory and Method*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pujolar, J. (2007) Bilingualism and the nation-state in the post-national era. In M. Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach* (pp. 71–95). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Saarinen, T. (2008) Position of text and discourse analysis in higher education policy research. *Studies in Higher Education* 33 (6), 719–728.
- Saarinen, T. (2012) Internationalization of Finnish higher education – Is language an issue? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 216, 157–173.
- Scollon, R. and Scollon, S.W. (2004) *Nexus Analysis: Discourse and the Emerging Internet*. London: Routledge.
- Shohamy, E. (2006) *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Similä, M. (2006) Att 'glömma' och att minnas: finskt och svenskt i finska och svenska historieböcker. In M. Junila and C. Westin (eds) *Svenskt i Finland – finskt i Sverige. Vol. 2: Mellan majoriteter och minoriteter* (pp. 189–211). Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Skinner, Q. (1969) Meaning and understanding in the history of ideas. *History and Theory* 8 (1), 3–53.
- Skinner, Q. (2002) *Visions of Politics. Vol. I: Regarding Method*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Stroud, C. (2007) Bilingualism: Colonialism and postcolonialism. In M. Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach* (pp. 25–49). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tsing, A. (2005) *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton, MA: Princeton University Press.
- van Dijk, T. (2008) *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vertovec, S. (2007) Superdiversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30 (6), 1024–1054.
- Vilkuna, K.H.J. (2013) Die schwedische Reichskultur und Finnland 1500–1800. In A. Halmesvirta (ed.) *Land unter dem Nordlicht – Eine Kulturgeschichte Finnlands*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Watts, R.J. (1999) The ideology of dialect in Switzerland. In J. Blommaert (ed.) *Language Ideological Debates* (pp. 67–104). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Williams, G. (2010) *Knowledge Economy, Language and Culture*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Witte, E. and Van Velthoven, H. (2010) *Strijden om taal: De Belgische taalkwestie in historisch perspectief*. Kapellen: Uitgeverij Pelckmans.