

Swedish speech islands in Finland: A sociocultural linguistic perspective

Harry Lönnroth

University of Vaasa, Finland

Abstract

In this paper, I discuss so-called Swedish speech islands (linguistic enclaves) in Finland past and present from the point of view of sociocultural linguistics. I do this mainly by focusing on the linguistic history and present-day of the city of Tampere, today the third largest city in Finland. By “Swedish speech islands in Finland” I mean the cities of Tampere (founded 1779) and Oulu (founded 1605) and the towns of Pori (founded 1558) and Kotka (founded 1879), all officially Finnish-speaking cities and towns with a small Swedish-speaking minority (0.2–1.0 % of the population in 2008). At the end of 2008, for example, Tampere, which is the largest of these and the only one located in inland Finland, had 209,552 inhabitants, of whom 1,065 (0.5 %) reported Swedish as their first language. In addition to the four cities and towns, there are, however, some other places in Finland at times referred to as “speech islands”, mainly places with an industrial history (e.g. the town of Varkaus in Eastern Finland). In this paper, I therefore touch on this type of “speech islands” as well, although I do not consider them speech islands in the same sense. – The paper is part of the projects “Linguistic change in an industrial town. Swedishness in Tampere, 1779–2000” (2008–2010) and “Bilingualism and multicultural Finland – best practices and future challenges” (2010–2014).

Keywords: *Speech islands, Sociocultural linguistics, Bilingualism, Swedish, Finland*

Swedish in inland Finland – a lingua mortua?

The aim of this paper is to discuss so-called speech islands or linguistic enclaves in a Northern European context. Special attention is paid to Swedish speech islands in Finland past and present, an interdisciplinary topic which has attracted little attention among scholars in the Nordic countries.¹ As is well known, the national languages of Finland are Finnish and Swedish. In addition to these two languages there are official minority languages as well. For example, at the end of 2008, Finland had 5,326,314 inhabitants, of whom 4,844,047 (90.95 %) reported Finnish as their first language and 289,951 (5.44 %) Swedish (*Statistics Finland*, 2010).² A large number of Swedish-speaking Finns live in officially monolingual Finnish municipalities. As the Swedish language in inland Finland is so marginalised, one can say that the Finland-Swedes living on the speech islands often live in a “linguistic vacuum” (cf. Kuczynski, 2006, who uses the expression *linguistic lack of space*).

In Finland there are both monolingual (with either Finnish or Swedish as the official language) and bilingual (with either Finnish or Swedish majority) municipalities. It is the Swedish-speaking minority – its language, history and culture – in the officially Finnish-speaking municipalities that are in focus in this paper.³ By “Swedish speech islands in Finland” I mean Finnish-speaking places with a small Swedish-speaking minority with both historical continuity and linguistic infrastructure (Lönnroth, 2009b, p. 106). The four Finnish-speaking cities and towns that best meet these criteria are presented in Table 1 (the criteria and the concept of speech islands are discussed more in detail in Lönnroth, 2009b). However, it is important to emphasize that the concept of speech islands is not unproblematic. It must be ques-

¹ For Swedish speech islands in Finland as an object of linguistic research, see Lönnroth (2009b).

² In the same year, Lappish (Sámi) was spoken by 0.03 per cent, Russian by 0.92 per cent and “other languages” by 2.66 per cent (*Statistics Finland*, 2010).

³ By “Swedish-speaking minority” I refer here to the Finland-Swedish minority, not the Sweden-Swedish one.

tioned and specified more closely in order to form an accurate picture of the bilingual (multilingual) dimensions of the linguistic reality in Finnish society.⁴

Table 1: Swedish speech islands in Finland on 31 December 2008 (Statistics Finland, 2010)

Place	Total population (% Swedish speakers)
Tampere	209,552 (0.5 %)
Oulu	137,061 (0.2 %)
Pori	76,403 (0.5 %)
Kotka	54,694 (1.0 %)

The island metaphor

“Island” is a strong metaphor. It can lead thoughts to a total – or at least a partial – isolation: one can, for instance, speak of uninhabited islands or an archipelago. However, Swedish speech islands in Finland are not isolated, either geographically or mentally.⁵ They are places where a relatively small number of Swedish-speaking residents live among the Finnish-speaking majority (and representatives of other language groups as well). Most Swedish speakers on these “islands” are in fact bilingual with a fluent oral and written proficiency in both Swedish and Finnish. In the Finnish bilingual context it is important to recall that the places themselves, of course, are not isolated “islands”. They are geographical areas with administrative borders between municipalities. Administrative borders do not necessarily coincide with linguistic borders, as is well known from language geography. Multilingualism is closely connected with mobility of different kinds, which also shapes the linguistic structure on speech islands. It is also important to keep in mind that the Swedish-speaking element in Finland is not homogeneous.

When discussing the concept of speech islands, it is interesting to have a look at the history of linguistics and see what linguists like Ferdinand de Saussure (1857–1913) and Leonard Bloomfield (1887–1949) have written about the topic. They – like many other linguists – have not written much about speech islands. Much of the relevant discussion has in fact concentrated on the discipline of dialectology, first and foremost defining the concept of speech community.

In his *Cours de linguistique générale*, published posthumously in 1916, Ferdinand de Saussure (1983) does not explicitly mention speech island or any of its synonyms. In Part Four of his work on geographical linguistics, especially geographical diversity and its complexity (Chapter II), he discusses, among other things, the coexistence of several languages in the same place (§ 1). Saussure writes:

Usually this superimposition of languages is the result of invasion by a stronger people. But there is also colonisation, a form of peaceful penetration, as well as wandering peoples bringing their language with them. This happened in the case of the gipsies, who settled mainly in Hungary, where they have established compact communities; but a study of their language shows that they must have come from India at some unknown time in the past. In Dobrudja at the mouth of the Danube one finds a number of Tartar villages scattered here and there, small specks on the linguistic map of the region. (Saussure, 1983, p. 193)

Of interest here is the use of the word *speck*. It can be compared to the discussion by Ulla Börestam and Leena Huss (2001, p. 108), who discuss the theoretical assumption of a situation without language contact. They prefer to use the Swedish word *språkspillra*, ‘language splinter’.⁶ When Saussure writes about the causes of geographical diversity (Part IV, Chapter III), he discusses time as the essential cause (§ 1) and states:

In order to understand what happens, let us imagine theoretical conditions as simple as possible, which will allow us to identify the essential cause of territorial differentiation. Let us ask what would happen if a language spoken at one clearly delimited place – a small island, for example –

⁴ For the English definition of *speech island*, see *The Oxford English Dictionary* (1989; cf. also *linguistic enclave* and *linguistic island*). In Lönnroth (2009b) I give a critical overview of different definitions of the concept in the Swedish, Finnish, German and English tradition.

⁵ As suggested above, the Swedish speech islands in Finland are separated from the Swedish-speaking regions of Finland. Whether they belong to the concept of *Svenskfinland* is open to question: the concept can have both a geographical and an abstract dimension.

⁶ In the Swedish original: “Här får man föreställa sig en isolerad bygd, möjligen befolkad av de äldre personer som utgör resterna av en språkspillra.” (Börestam & Huss, 2001, p. 108.)

was taken by colonists to some other place, also clearly delimited – say another island. After a certain time, it will be possible to detect various differences of vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, etc. between the language of the first location (1) and the language of the second location (2). (Saussure, 1983, p. 196, cf. also p. 207)

Some twenty years later, Leonard Bloomfield (1935) touches explicitly on the concept of speech islands in his book *Language*. He does this in connection with the discussion on speech communities. Bloomfield (1935, p. 53) discusses problems connected with drawing a plain line around the borders of many a speech community, language boundaries. “This language boundary will of course not appear as a simple and fixed line between two topographically solid communities”, he argues, and continues that there “will be English-speaking settlements thrown out, in the shape of *speech-islands*, into totally Spanish surroundings, and, vice versa, Spanish speech-islands surrounded by English-speaking communities” (italics in the original). Bloomfield argues that our “language boundary, then, consists not only of a great irregular line, but also of many little closed curves around speech-islands, some of which contain only a single family or a single person”. When it comes to bilingualism and second language acquisition, according to Bloomfield (1935, p. 56), this “happens frequently in communities near a language border, or where a family lives as a speech-island, or where the parents are of different speech”. Also in the discussion on the languages of the world, Bloomfield (1935, p. 58, italics in the original) takes up the question of speech islands: “The *Continental West Germanic* dialects, as they are called in contrast with Anglo-Frisian, made a vigorous eastward expansion during the Middle Ages; to the east and southeast of the main area there are many speech-islands, especially of the High German type, such as Yiddish in Poland and Russia.” Bloomfield (1935, pp. 60–61) also discusses speech islands in connection with the Slavic language family.

The sociocultural approach to insular Swedish

As pointed out above, the approach of this paper falls within the scope of sociocultural linguistics, the study of language as a societal and cultural phenomenon. By *sociocultural linguistics* I mean “the broad interdisciplinary field concerned with the intersection of language, culture, and society” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 586). The point of departure for the way I see the study of speech islands in the Finnish context in time and space emphasizes that one really cannot study them without meticulous attention to the role culture and history have played in shaping the speech islands in question. Too often this cultural and historical dimension is neglected. Hence the concept of sociocultural linguistics has proved applicable: it deals explicitly with language, culture and society. Of course, it would also be possible to talk about sociolinguistics or the sociology of language but, as Mary Bucholtz and Kira Hall (2005, p. 608) point out, sociocultural linguistics “has the virtue of being less encumbered with a particular history of use” than sociolinguistics. Bucholtz and Hall (2008, p. 404) want to foreground the role of culture and society in linguistic research: “Our intention in using this term is thus not to stake a territorial claim, but simply to highlight an interdisciplinary coalition that is already thriving but not always recognized.”

The Swedish dimension in the linguistic multiplicity of inland Finland – a research overview

The postdoctoral researcher’s project “Linguistic change in an industrial town. Swedishness in Tampere, 1779–2000”, financed by the Academy of Finland for the period 2008–2010, has, among other things, resulted in two books (on the project, see Lönnroth, 2009a, for other publications of the project, see Lönnroth, 2009e, pp. 178–179).⁷ The first book, *Svenskt i Tammerfors. Tre undersökningar om språk och samhälle i det inre av Finland*, ‘Swedish in Tampere. Three studies on language and society in inland Finland’, is a scientific monograph (Lönnroth, 2009e). It focuses on the Swedish dimension in the city of Tampere, “Tampere Swedish”, and contains a study on language encounter in fiction, a study on the sociolinguistic biographies of elderly Finland-Swedish people in Tampere, and a study on language contact and conflict in an industrial society, i.e. a local newspaper as a language mirror mainly from the point of view of discourse studies. The second book, *Tampere kieliyhteisönä*, ‘Tampere as a Language Community’, is a scientific compilation containing articles on the languages of Tampere: Finnish, Swedish, Russian, German and “other languages” (Lönnroth, 2009f). In other words, the former book is about bilingualism, the latter about multilingualism, in the sociocultural context of inland Finland.⁸

⁷ The bibliography of Lönnroth (2009c, pp. 140–145) contains an exhaustive list of references relevant to the topic in question.

⁸ I have mainly focused on Swedish in inland Finland, especially Tampere and its environs (for a multilingual history of the city in English, see Lönnroth, 2009d).

Changing speech islands in a globalizing world – the case of Tampere, Finland

The concept of speech islands is not static and unchanging. On the contrary, it is dynamic and changing. Nowadays the problematic nature of the concept is even attended by new challenges, most of which are connected to the globalisation of the linguistic and cultural reality that people are increasingly confronted with, even on “speech islands”.

Here it is appropriate to make a distinction between so-called Swedish speech islands proper (Table 1) and other Swedish speech islands in Finland (Table 2). However, this division is not a simple one, as will be seen below. As I have stressed before, the division is mainly operational and pragmatic (e.g. Lönnroth, 2009c). To be able to address a given phenomenon with abstract concepts, one must use appropriate terms. As suggested above, two important elements are historical continuity and linguistic infrastructure. The division can be criticized, but I have found it useful for the description of the linguistic history and present-day of speech islands.

Apart from the more or less established speech islands mentioned above (“Swedish speech islands proper”), there are, however, some other places in Finland at times referred to as “speech islands”. They are mainly places with an industrial history. However, it is questionable whether it is at all relevant to consider these places “speech islands”. It is, for example, hard to find such living and vital Swedishness in these places that would make the maintenance of linguistic infrastructure possible. I refer especially to so-called svenska rum, ‘Swedish spaces’, which are of great importance for the Swedish-speaking minority. One should also keep in mind that there are many other Finnish-speaking municipalities in Finland, where the percentage of Swedish speakers is at least the same or even bigger than those given in Table 2. We are again back in the pragmatic discussion of terminological operationalisation. The distinction must be drawn somewhere.

Table 2: Other “speech islands” in Finland on 31 December 2008 (Statistics Finland, 2010)

Place	Total population (% Swedish speakers)
Jyväskylä	128,028 (0.2 %)
Kouvola (the rural industrial district Kuusankoski nowadays belongs to Kouvola)	88,436 (0.4 %)
Hyvinkää	44,987 (0.8 %)
Varkaus	23,182 (0.2 %)
Uusikaupunki	15,886 (0.5 %)
Eura (the rural industrial district Kauttua nowadays belongs to Eura)	12,576 (0.1 %)

In this chapter, I discuss the city of Tampere as a Swedish speech island in Finland. First, I give three examples of the role that the Swedish influence, in particular the Swedish capital, has played in the urban history of the city. Then, I turn to discuss the current situation of Swedish in Tampere in the light of three examples from interview data. Both discussions must – due to lack of space – be relatively short in length.

The past – memories of the Swedish language at a cotton factory

Tampere was one of the leading industrial centres in the Nordic countries during the 19th and 20th centuries. Therefore when discussing the Swedish language and culture in the urban history of Tampere, it is important to emphasize the close connection between multilingualism and industrialisation in the city’s relatively short history.

In one of the first histories of the city, published in honour of the 100th anniversary of the city in 1879, there is a table of factories and industrial plants in Tampere in 1878 (Tampereen kaupunki, 1879, pp. 59–62). According to the table, the number of Finnish people of those who were over 15 years old was 2,702. There were 16 foreign workers among those who were over 15 years old. The same history also tells about the British in Tampere back in the 1870’s. In the Finlayson cotton factory, the managers of

the artistic department had always been British, five persons in 1879. The foremen of the various divisions were almost overwhelmingly British. Many British like Lucas Cooke and John Sharples lived in Tampere for a long time and some of them had families there, too. (Tampereen kaupunki, 1879, p. 67, cf. also pp. 81–82 for the religious background of the British.)

In the following, the Finlayson cotton factory is discussed with respect to the Swedish dimension of the factory. The focus will be on the Swedish speakers, or rather the image that the Finnish-speaking workers had on the Swedish-speaking leaders.

In the book *Muistoja Finlaysonilta*, ‘Memories from the Finlayson cotton factory’, edited by Kristiina Kestinen in 2008, there are at least three interesting memories that have to do with the Swedish language and culture in the industrial life of Tampere. The first of these is written under the pseudonym “Son of a technical leader” entitled “They never took Swedish-speaking workers”. Example (1) tells about the social stratification of the factory. It is interesting that the narrator is aware of the fact that the language barrier also was a social barrier, or a class boundary, as he puts it. He also tells about his personal – decidedly negative – view on this matter. According to the narrator, one also wanted to maintain this barrier by not recruiting Swedish-speaking workers:

(1) The first language of the bookkeeping of the factory was Russian. After that the language of the bookkeeping of the factory was Swedish, so that the staff of the office had to be Swedish-speaking. My father told me that in Tampere in the factories where the circle of owners was connected with the circle of Swedish-speaking capital, there was an unwritten law that one did not take Swedish-speaking workers for the factory because they might identify themselves with the upper echelon. They did not take Swedish-speaking workers in Tampella, Verkatehdas or Finlayson. Valmet was an exception. Because it was a state factory, there might be only a few Swedish-speaking skilled workers.

This caused that in Tampere a strange parish was born. In 1950, in Christmas sermon, the priest Kurten, who also taught church history in school, said that in his parish he had 1,200 people and over half were engineers and economists. If you want to put it bluntly, the language boundary and class boundary was the same. It disgusted me. (Kestinen, 2008, pp. 123–124; translated from Finnish)⁹

Example (2) is recounted by the pseudonym “Thread transporter”. His memories are entitled “It was not much use shooting off one’s mouth”. The example is about the socio-economic background of the Swedish-speaking inhabitants and of the social contact, or the lack of it, which, according to the narrator, was a reality between the Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking layers of the city. The narrator also mentions the connection between language and occupation:

(2) When I was a schoolboy, in these wooden houses at Näsilinnankatu there lived men who spoke Swedish, engineers from the departments. They were luxury flats, they also had district heating in the 1950’s and 60’s. The children were also in their own bunches. They, too, spoke Swedish, but we came into contact with them a little. It was not much use shooting off one’s mouth. (Kestinen, 2008, p. 124; translated from Finnish)¹⁰

The last example, example (3) by the pseudonym “Messenger”, is entitled “At the head office Swedish was the main language”. The interesting word in the passage is the word *boundary* (cf. example 1). The narrator, whose memories are positive, also tells about his own use and command of Swedish. He has evidently been acutely aware of the official language policy of the factory:

(3) I remember the 1950–60’s as a valuable time. There were sharp boundaries, whether you were in the office or a worker. At the head office Swedish was the main language. I never had to use Swedish and I can’t. Documents, accounts etc. were in Swedish. The salary was paid at the

⁹ In the Finnish original: “Ensimmäinen tehtaan kirjanpitokieli oli venäjä. Sen jälkeen tehtaan kirjanpitokieli oli ruotsi, joten konttorin henkilökunnan piti olla ruotsinkielistä. Isäni kertoi, että Tampereella tehtaissa, joissa omistajapiiri liittyi ruotsinkieliseen pääomapiiriin, oli kirjoittamaton laki, että ei otettu ruotsinkielisiä työntekijöitä tehtaalle, koska he saattaisivat identifioitua yläportaan kanssa. Ruotsinkielisiä työläisiä ei otettu Tampellaan, Verkatehtaalle eikä Finlaysonille. Valmet oli poikkeus. Koska se oli valtion pulju, siellä saattoi olla jokunen ruotsinkielinen ammattimies. Tämä aiheutti, että Tampereelle syntyi ihmeellinen seurakunta. Vuonna 1950 joulusaarnassa pappi Kurten, joka myös opetti koulussa kirkkohistoriaa, sanoi, että hänellä oli seurakunnassa 1200 ihmistä ja yli puolet oli insinöörejä ja ekonomeja. Jos haluaa kärjistää, kieliraja ja luokkaraja oli sama. Se tympäisi minua.” (Kestinen, 2008, pp. 123–124.)

¹⁰ In the Finnish original: “Kun olin pikkupoika, näissä Näsilinnankadun puutaloissa asui Finlaysonin ruotsia puhuvia herroja, osastojen insinöörejä. Ne olivat luksushuoneistoja, niissä oli kaukolämpökin 1950- ja 60-luvuilla. Lapsetkin olivat omissa porukoissaan. Hekin puhuivat ruotsia, mutta jonkin verran oltiin kosketuksia [Sic!]. Paljon ei poskea kannattanut soitella.” (Kestinen, 2008, p. 124.)

pay office in cash. In December, the office people got a bonus. On Christmas Eve the people at the head office got dressed in their best festive clothes and were obliged to go and wish the factory owner "Merry Christmas" a little in the same way than at the Independence Day reception at the President's palace.

Everything was taken care of, it was warm. There were a lot of laughter and fun. Of that I have very good memories. (Kestinen, 2008, p. 124; translated from Finnish)¹¹

The present – thoughts about the Swedish language in interview data

To see what the Swedish speakers in Tampere today think of their language and culture in inland Finland, one can for example consult the data gathered from the project *Spara det finlandssvenska talet*, 'Save the Finland-Swedish speech'. In total 13 informants from Tampere were interviewed in 2005. In the following only examples from the first three are given to shed light on the current sociocultural situation of Tampere as a Swedish speech island.

In the first interview (tape number 2005: 162, length 50:06 minutes), the informant is a young woman, born in 1981 in Umeå, Sweden. However, she has grown up in Tampere, where she studies languages at university. The linguistic interest of the interview lies mainly in the way in which the informant comments on the language situation of the Swedish school of the city, the school which is the core of the Swedish-speaking community. Not surprisingly, she mentions the frequent use of mixed language at the officially Swedish-speaking school. Finnish words occur among Swedish, which is not at all unexpected when one considers the linguistic situation in the city. For this phenomenon she uses the word *SST-svenska*, 'SST-Swedish'.¹² According to the informant the Swedish language of many "Tampere Swedes" is different from the language spoken in other parts of the country. "Tampere Swedes", she argues, speak a Swedish of their own and dialectal features do not occur in their speech.

In the second interview (tape number 2005: 163, length 58:04 minutes) the informant is an elderly man, born in 1941 in Tampere, where he also has grown up and currently lives as a pensioner. He comes from a bilingual family and his own family is also bilingual. His parents spoke Finnish with each other as do the informant and his wife. Nowadays he speaks Swedish quite seldom: he thinks that his Swedish has deteriorated. From his own time at school he remembers some episodes of language conflict between the Swedish and Finnish language groups. He also mentions the growing number of children from Finnish-speaking families at the school. He comments on the minority status of Swedish in Tampere by stating that one does not go to a shop and start speaking Swedish. Outside the school, one speaks Finnish, he says. The informant has both Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking friends: for him it is quite the same which language he uses. According to the informant, the language use depends on the person and situation.

In the third interview (tape number 2005: 164, length 1:07:57 minutes) the informant is a young man born in 1984 in Tampere, where he has grown up and currently lives and studies. He comments, for example, on his own use of Swedish and Finnish. In his own view he is a realist rather than an idealist. For instance, he can appreciate if he gets service in Swedish in a shop in Tampere, but he does not necessarily expect it. Nowadays the informant speaks more Finnish than Swedish. Both languages are almost as strong for him: Swedish is the language that he uses with his parents and siblings, with his girlfriend he uses English and more and more Finnish. However, he is quite proud of his language and identity. He has always used much Finnish with his friends, also during his time at school. He thinks that the Swedish-speaking people in Tampere constitute a community of their own, he refers to it with the expression *submissive minority*.

¹¹ In the Finnish original: "Muistan 1950–60-luvun arvokkaana aikana. Oli jyrkät rajat siinä, oliko toimihenkilö vai työntekijä. Pääkonttorissa ruotsi oli pääkieli. Minä en joutunut käyttämään ruotsia enkä osaakaan sitä. Asiakirjat, kirjanpidot ym. olivat ruotsiksi. Palkka maksettiin kassalta käteen. Joulukuussa toimihenkilöt saivat ylimääräisen palkan. Jouluaattona pääkonttorilaiset pukeutuivat parhaisiin juhla-asuihinsa ja olivat velvoitettuja käymään toimittamassa vuorineuvokselle 'hyvää joulua' vähän niin kuin itsenäisyyspäivän vastaanotolla presidentin linnassa. Huolta pidettiin, oli lämminhenkistä. Paljon naurettiin ja hassuteltiin. Siitä on oikein hyvät muistot." (Kestinen, 2008, p. 124.)

¹² SST stands for the Swedish name of the school, Svenska samskolan i Tammerfors, which the three informants attended.

Future challenges – from bilingualism to multilingualism in a linguistic vacuum?

In this paper I have given a sociocultural overview of so-called Swedish speech islands in Finland past and present (“Swedish speech islands proper” and “other Swedish speech islands”). The focus has been on the multilingual history and present-day of the largest Swedish speech island in Finland, Tampere. The concept of “speech islands” is used here in order to address Swedish and Swedishness in the predominantly Finnish-speaking parts of the country and to shed light on multilingualism and language contact in Finnish society. By thoroughly scrutinizing the existing and former speech islands in Finland, it is possible to obtain additional information about Swedish and Swedishness in Finnish society past, present and future. Although one focuses on speech islands in Finland, it is, however, important to highlight the universal nature of the phenomenon, for example in the linguistic and cultural history of Europe from the Middle Ages to the 21st century (e.g. Lönnroth, 2009b, p. 109).

The text passages gathered from two types of data – memories and interviews – contain some explicit comments on language. When one looks at the examples, one can see both differences and similarities. In the older examples the distinction between language and social class in an industrial society is notable. The Swedish language was the language of many factory owners and managers (cf. monolingualism and bilingualism). In the newer examples the natural bilingualism is emphasized (cf. bilingualism and multilingualism). The language contact between the Swedish-speaking and Finnish-speaking inhabitants in the city has led to a natural use and good competence of Finnish by the Swedish speakers. Of course, here it has only been possible to scratch the surface by giving some typical examples. Therefore the sample is not representative enough in order to draw any general conclusions. However, it may be indicative.

References

- Bloomfield, L. (1935). *Language*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 585-614.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2008). All of the above: New coalitions in sociocultural linguistics. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(4), 401-431.
- Börestam, U., & Huss, L. (2001). *Språkliga möten: Tvåspråkighet och kontaktlingvistik*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Kestinen, K. (Ed.) (2008). *Muistoja Finlaysonilta*. Tampere: The Finnish Labour Museum Werstas.
- Kuczynski, A.-L. (2006). Kaksikielisenä suomalaisten keskeillä. Identifikaatioita Uudenkaupungin kielellisessä ahtaudessa. In L.-K. Moilanen & S. Sulkunen (Eds.), *Aika ja identiteetti. Katsaus yksilön ja yhteisön väliseen suhteeseen keskiajalta 2000-luvulle* (pp. 267-292). Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society.
- Lönnroth, H. (2009a). Teollisuuskaupunki kielellisenä ympäristönä – näkökulmia Tampereen ruotsinkielisyyden tutkimiseen 1700-luvulta 2000-luvulle. *Kielikuvia* 1/2009, 4–10. Retrieved 26 August, 2010, from <http://www.nykysuomenseura.org>.
- Lönnroth, H. (2009b). Det femte landskapet? Svenska språköar i Finland som objekt för språkvetenskaplig forskning. In K. M. Berg et al. (Eds.), *En färd i språket. Festskrift till Marketta Sundman på 60-årsdagen den 12 mars 2009* (pp. 98-113). Turku: University of Turku. Retrieved 15 June, 2009, from <https://oa.doria.fi/handle/10024/43995>.
- Lönnroth, H. (2009c). Suomalainen teollisuuskaupunki, ruotsalainen kielisaareke. Ruotsinkielisyys Tampereella 1700-luvulta 2000-luvulle [A Finnish Industrial City, a Swedish Speech Island. Swedishness in Tampere from the 18th Century to the 21st Century]. In H. Lönnroth (Ed.), *Tampere kieliyhteisönä* [Tampere as a Language Community] (pp. 105-145). Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society.



- Lönnroth, H. (2009d). The multilingual history of an industrial society: The case of Tampere, Finland. In A. Saxena & Å. Viberg (Eds.), *Multilingualism. Proceedings of the 23rd Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics* (pp. 226-238). Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- Lönnroth, H. (2009e). *Svenskt i Tammerfors. Tre undersökningar om språk och samhälle i det inre av Finland* [Swedish in Tampere. Three studies on language and society in inland Finland]. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Lönnroth, H. (2009f) (Ed.). *Tampere kieliyhteisönä* [Tampere as a Language Community]. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society.
- Simpson, J. A., & Weiner, E. S. C. (1989). *The Oxford English Dictionary (2nd Edition)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- De Saussure, F. (1983). *Course in general linguistics*. Translated and annotated by R. Harris. London: Duckworth.
- Spara det finlandssvenska talet*. SLS 2098. The Archives of the Swedish Language. Helsinki: The Society of Swedish Literature in Finland.
- Statistics Finland*. Retrieved 11 March, 2010, from <http://www.stat.fi/index.html>.
- Tampereen kaupunki. (1879). Muisto Sen Satavuotis-Juhlansansa Lokakuun 1:nä päivänä*. Tampere.