LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AGAINST NORM CHANGE: A CASE STUDY OF THE ORTHOGRAPHIC NORM OF FINNISH *O(i)ttA*-VERBS AND LANGUAGE PROFESSIONALS' UNWILLINGNESS TO CHANGE IT

Henni Pajunen
University of Turku, FI
helypa@utu.fi

Abstract. This study investigates why language professionals of the standard Finnish language are unwilling to change a known problematic orthographic norm and how their arguments are based on overt and covert conceptions of standard language. It also analyzes how dominant language ideologies, namely standard language ideology (SLI) and linguistic purism, form the bases of these conceptions. The study is based on a qualitative survey, and it explores the metalanguage of the answers to one open-ended question using content analysis.

The concepts of language are presented as conceptual metaphors. The analysis reveals six concepts that represent a particular ideological notion belonging to purism, SLI, or both. The respondents conceptualize language as value judgments and through functions and social connotations. Some concepts are based on non-linguistic but emotionally powerful values, others on usability or language's ability to serve as a marker of status or social bonds. The study highlights the deep impact of language ideologies.

Keywords: norms, language change, metalanguage, metaphors, language planning, language ideologies

DOI: https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2023.14.1.03

1. Introduction

Although it is natural for language to change, change or variation in standard language is often regarded as decay, loss, or corruption (Aitchison 2001: 16–19). Spelling reforms or even small orthographic changes are often not successful and are widely debated (Fishman

1977). For example, in 1937 the Finnish Language Board issued a recommendation that the word *haltija* should be used when referring to 'a person who is in control or in possession of something' or 'a mythological creature in the nature or at home, fairy, elf, etc.'. Despite this, the general belief among language users was that when referring to a mythological creature, the correct form was *haltia* without the letter *j*. The ambiguity and debate surrounding issue persisted until 2013 when the Board decided to allow the use of the word *haltia* when referring to a mythological creature. (Maamies 2013)

This demonstrates that there is a notion of a standard written language with norms that should be adhered to; this is to be expected given that the paradigm of linguistics and language teaching has culturally and historically focused on this standard written language (e.g. Dufva et al. 2011; Linell 1982). These notions and ideas, beliefs, views of, on, and about language form ideologies that concretely affect how language does or does not change.

There is a common presumption that the Finnish language changes slowly (e.g. Jauhiainen 2016; Vaarala 2021: 28) which is true if change is characterized as a conscious human intervention, i.e., language planning directed at standard written Finnish. Most changes in the written standard in the 2000s have been orthographic in nature: of the 26 recommendations presented by the Finnish Language Board, an expert body and an authority on questions relating to the Finnish language, 15 were related to an orthographic issue (Institute for the Languages of Finland 2022). Such recommendations are *simplifications* of pre-existing grammar (Kiparsky 1968: 174) and permissive in nature, often allowing more variation into the written standard. From the point of view of language planning, the reaction of language users to language change is valuable knowledge, as it usually determines how a change is either accepted or rejected – does the change reflect the demands, dynamics, and needs of the language community (Sidgi 2021)? Language planning alternatives that resemble the values and beliefs of the language community are more likely to succeed than alternatives which conflict with them (Cooper 1990: 184); a factor that has been observed in research on language standardization (e.g. Coluzzi 2017; Rutten et al. 2020).

This article focuses on the orthographic norm[1] of *O(i)ttA*-verbs which has been seen as an example of an absurdly codified, failed language norm by linguists (Leino 1989: 569; Rintala 1992: 59). The first known attempt to codify the norm took place in the 1860s, and it was followed by a tumultuous linguistic discussion in the early 1900s during which many different factions debated how the verbs should be written and various norm suggestions were proposed. The current norm is a compromise decision between the two writing forms. The last time the norm was discussed was in 1953 when the then official language planning body gave instructions on the spelling of still problematic verbs. (Kolehmainen 2014: 202–213) The norm applies to three-syllable verbs with an *o/ö* or *oi/öi* in the second syllable. The spelling of an *O(i)ttA*-verb is mainly determined by its etymology: if the verb's root word ends in *a/ä*, the verb is written with an *i*, and if it ends in *o/ö*, the verb is written without an *i*, e.g., *kirja* 'book' > *kirjoittaa* 'write', *korko* 'heel' > *korottaa* 'heighten'. It should also be noted that the root words with *a/ä* change to *o/ö* before *i*. However, the rule has many exceptions, for example in cases where the verb does not have a root or the root is unclear (Maamies 2000).

Although some linguists think that in hindsight, a single spelling would have been the preferable choice (e.g. Pulkkinen 1972: 54; Leino 1989: 569) and that the spelling of some verbs continues to be a problem in language use (Maamies 2000), the norm remains unchanged. It should also be noted that in spoken language *OittA*-verbs are often pronounced without an *i*, e.g. /kirjottaa/ (e.g. Lehtonen 2015; Nuolijärvi 1986: 82–83), especially in the dialects of Häme, Southwestern, and Savo (VISK § 24; Kettunen 1940: 205–206). For aforementioned reasons, it appears that there are seeming justifications for changes to the norm, which was the observation that drew my attention to the norm as an object of study. However, the answers of the language professionals to my questionnaire, on which this article is based and which is further expounded in the third chapter, revealed that a slight majority of the respondents (56 %) do not support changing the norm. Even those who

---

1   I use the term *norm* to refer to institutionally codified standard language norms which are linguistic-political agreements and have been created intentionally by language planning organizations. These are rules of grammar that asses the acceptability of linguistic expressions (Kolehmainen 2014: 19) and are often prescriptive (Rintala 1992: 50).

described it as difficult, illogical, and linguistically challenging gave reasons for maintaining the standard. From this result the following question arose: why is this the case in a situation where similar changes have already been made, the norm itself is described as difficult, and a single spelling would have produced a more straightforward solution?

The answer to this lies in the overt and covert, often non-linguistic, conceptions of standard language that reside in the language professionals' arguments against changing the norm of *O(i)ttA*-verbs. On further analysis, these conceptions reflect dominant language ideologies (LIs), namely *standard language ideology* (SLI) and *linguistic purism*. I consider these concepts as an intermediate stage between the micro level, i.e., the metalanguage of the language professionals' arguments, and the macro level, i.e., the multifaceted, dynamic LIs. The aim of this article is to investigate why standard Finnish language professionals are unwilling to change the norm of *O(i)ttA*-verbs by analyzing the overt and covert concepts of language present in their arguments. Previous research into the perception of actual and potential language change is scarce and has focused on the experience of non-linguists. It has noted that there is a mixed attitude towards language change, but one common thread in the results is a puristic view of change as a deterioration or an impoverishment. (See Keisu 2014; Hämäläinen 2017; Korhonen & Lappalainen 2015.)

This article seeks to examine how linguist and non-linguist language professionals view norm change in the standard language and aims to further expound on the link between LIs, especially purism and SLI, and the conceptions of language. As the defining principle in the field of language ideology research is that LIs concretely shape both linguistic and social structures (Woolard 2020), this article examines how dominant LIs form the bases of the concepts. Therefore, if named and isolated, the concepts can be used as a tool to examine how LIs prevent norm change in the standard written language – both inside and outside of the Finnish sociolinguistic context. This way the concepts may also be utilized by language planning factions to study how future language changes could be implemented.

2. Language ideologies and dominant language ideologies in Finland

Although the definition of LIs vary slightly between approaches, they are best understood as being common cultural and socially shared, morally and culturally loaded beliefs, as well as representations, and concepts of the nature, structure, and use of language (Irvine 1989: 255). They assign language to identities, institutions, and social values. They are rarely homogeneous and monolithic; there can be multiple, even contradictory, ideologies in effect at one time. (Woolard 2020) LIs are a product of and deeply intertwined with each language's society and history (Blommaert 1999). This historical dimension and dialectal nature – how LIs mediate between language use and social organization – is the core of their importance.

Prevalent LIs in Finland, as in most European hegemonic institutions (Langer & Nesse 2012: 616), are purism and SLI (Kalliokoski et al. 2018: 480, 482; Nordlund 2018: 573–574). Although its definitions vary, purism is best defined by examining its goals. George Thomas (1991: 12) explains purism as the aim to preserve a language or a language form from all undesirable elements or to purge such elements from it. Thomas's definition includes both foreign and domestic elements, such as influences from foreign languages, domestic dialects, and other non-standard variants. The goal of puristic activities is to achieve a "pure" language by excluding or including certain linguistic features. However, the notion of what is "pure" and thereby good language is subjective, which, in turn, makes the notion of what is "impure" relative. Thus, purity cannot be conceived as a real property of language (see Langer & Nesse 2012: 610) and ultimately becomes an unattainable ideal.

Recognizing purism in action can be achieved by closely examining arguments used against undesired linguistic elements or language change. Almost paradoxically, purism is usually less concerned with creating a pure language and is instead a social commentary on perceived declining standards (Langer & Nesse 2012: 611). Andreas Gardt (2001; also Pfalzgraf 2009) has categorized four principal discourses that justify and convey puristic thought. They concern linguistic structure, ideology, pedagogy, and metalinguistic considerations, such

as taste and style. The discourses usually overlap, but distinguishing between them is a way to provide a means of understanding long-held and recurring beliefs about language.

Purism (*puhdaskielisyys* in Finnish) as an ideology has a long and well-established history in Finnish language planning and teaching, and it is deeply entrenched in nationalism (Rintala 1998: 54). Despite modern Finnish language planning (*kielenhuolto*) being rooted in different principles (Hiidenmaa 2006) and the "destandardization-process" seen in many Northern European standard languages and speech communities now allowing a wider variation of socially acceptable language use (Langer & Nesse 2012: 612), puristic views still persist (e.g. Leinonen 2006).

SLI according to Rosina Lippi-Green (2012: 68) is the belief that a nation-state has a non-varying and uniformly consistent, perfect form of language. The background assumption is that this language form is or should be shared by all of its users. As is the case with purism, standard language should not be understood as any specific language but as an abstraction, "a set of abstract norms", that actual language use conforms to some extent (Milroy & Milroy 2012: 19). These norms have been codified during the language's standardization process, the aim of which is a language's uniformity that achieves functional efficiency. Thus, uniformity becomes a property of the standard language that is not only constructed but also imposed by the state and dominant institutions, which, in turn, gives it legitimacy. (Milroy 2001: 531, 534.) However, because languages are not fixed systems by nature, invariance must be maintained and protected.

SLI carries firm beliefs of correctness and common sense, the notion that there is a "canonical" form of language that cannot be unchallenged and is naturalized (Milroy 2001: 535). The standard also has an established prestige, especially as the language of the educated (Lippi-Green 2012: 59). Therefore, there are prejudices and presuppositions against those that do not use the language form according to its norms. This is why SLI is inherently an ideology of power and privilege. The standard ideologies of small Nordic languages also carry firm notions of nativeness when compared to more international and pluricentric languages (Bylin & Tingsell 2022).

SLI is a prevalent ideology in standard language cultures; in Finland its effects can be seen on many levels of society, from nurse–patient meetings in family clinics (Iikkanen 2019) to the national language strategy (Tallroth 2012) and from ordinary language users' attitudes about annoying words (Koistinen 2018) to editorial staffs' thoughts about language mistakes (Saviniemi 2015).

In the history of standard written Finnish (*yleiskieli*), purism and SLI are deeply intertwined due to its standardization process. After the formation of the written Finnish language in the 1540s, purism has had a major role in Finnish language planning. For example, E. N. Setälä (1921) has examined the characteristics of different historic stances of Finnish language planning, which are all puristic in nature (also Kolehmainen 2014: 29). When nationalism and a national revival arrived in Finland in the early 1800s, it initiated the reform of written Finnish in earnest. The goal of the reform was to make Finnish a language of governance, become standardized, with purism influencing the norms of the standard (Rintala 1998: 54; Nordlund 2004: 293) by affecting what linguistic features were included in the standard and what were excluded. This national-puristic ideological nature of language planning only started to change in the 1950s after standard Finnish was almost completely standardized (Kolehmainen 2014: 24) and language planning took a descriptive turn, emphasizing variation, non-standard forms, and the social context of language use (Hiidenmaa 2006).

Therefore, as the focus of this article is the orthographic norm of the standard language, the presence of purism and SLI is to be expected in the data. Lastly, I would suggest that these ideologies should not be thought of as monolithic epistemes or opposites but rather as sets of influence, an Euler diagram of sorts, that overlap on some topics and perspectives and show the relationships between the sets. The connections between these sets are dynamic, and they intertwine, showing commonalities on some matters while being distinct on others.

3. Data and method

This article is based on an online questionnaire (see Appendix 1) that was conducted between December 2018 and January 2019. It was shared on the email lists of language professionals and through professional

social media communities.[2] The questionnaire was qualitative, and its main purpose was to gather information about the reception of the norm of *O(i)ttA*-verbs among language professionals. Additionally, the survey outlined if/how they maintain their Finnish language skills. The questionnaire's target group were language professionals, people who work daily with the standard written Finnish and are in the language industry and therefore have a better viewpoint concerning problems in the standard language. I anticipated receiving answers from both linguists, those who have academic linguistic training, and non-linguists, those who do not but who practice linguistics professionally. Previous research has shown that the language attitudes of non-linguists are much more diverse (e.g. Saviniemi 2015: 289; Tommola 2003: 70–71) than the linguist/non-linguist binary would suggest. In the aforementioned binary the linguist's understanding of language tends to consider variation and change while a non-linguist's view is static and prescriptive (Preston 2004: 90; Vaattovaara 2009: 30–31).

The language professionals who answered the survey (N = 335) were mostly teachers and lecturers (111) or translators (109). The remaining participants (115) consisted of a diverse group of language professionals, e.g., communication experts and designers, proof-readers, journalists, authors, and content producers, i.e., non-linguists.

As mentioned earlier, one of the main findings of the questionnaire was that most of the respondents (56 %) were not in favor of changing the norm. Comparably, only 17 % supported norm change, 13 % took no position, and the remaining (14 %) did not provide a response suitable for analysis. In this article, I will focus on the answers given to one open-ended question: "Official language planning has not interfered with the orthographic norm [of *O(i)ttA*-verbs] since the 1950s. Do you think the norm should be changed? Why/why not?"

Although as naturalized doxa that rarely rise to discursive consciousness LIs can be implicit and hard to detect, however, they can be discovered in metalanguage (Woolard 1998: 9). Nancy Niedzielski

---

2   The questionnaire was distributed to the email lists of the Finnish Association of Translators and Interpreters, the Union of Journalists in Finland and Konteksti (literary translators' email list). It was also shared on Facebook groups of language professionals where discussion centers on language issues and research. These were Kielitiede, Käännöstiede, and Äidinkielen opettajain epävirallinen ryhmä.

and Dennis Preston (2010) divide metalanguage into two forms: *Metalanguage 1* is language about actual language, for example about language forms, features, and manners of speaking, and *metalanguage 2* contains latent cultural and social beliefs, values, and perceptions about language. This article focuses on both to form LIs. Niedzielski and Preston (2010: 314) state that metalanguage 2 can be accessed applying methods that emphasize content. Therefore, I used content analysis to analyze the metalanguage of the answers given to the open-ended question. As ultimately, content analysis reveals both immediate and inferable information about the producers of the analyzed text (Pietilä 1976: 4, 22–23).

I used a three-step analysis model (Tuomi & Sarajärvi 2018: 122–127), in which the original data goes through a process of reduction, grouping, and abstraction to create a new concise form from which conclusions are made. In the first step, I read through the data and extracted all the metalinguistic expressions that included the respondents' overtly stated or covert social beliefs, values, and perceptions about language and language use. These expressions are usually the length of one sentence. After reducing all irrelevant information from the expressions, I grouped them into different subcategories based on themes, similarities, and differences. Further categorization of the subcategories started to form distinct concepts about language. Figure 1 (p. 90) is an example of the analysis process.

I have presented the language conceptions in my data as conceptual metaphors which can be used to present or refer one concept, the target domain, in terms of another concept, the source domain (Lakoff & Johnsson 1980). Previous language ideology research has suggested that language constructions are based on conceptual metaphors which are derived from the content of ideological discourses on language (Watts 2011: 17; Jacobs & Hüning 2022). Metaphors have been used in research about language attitudes in order to analyze how language is conceptualized and to describe societal aspects of language (e.g. Mäntynen 2003; Varis 2012). The use of conceptual metaphors as an analytical tool works well with content analysis, as both focus on conceptualization and schemata based on individual observations, as well as on combining and categorizing these observations.

The analysis formed six different cognitive metaphors that describe language as physically oriented conceptual metaphors or as social

practice. The former include: LANGUAGE IS AESTHETICS / DAMAGEABLE / A DIFFICULT SYSTEM / A TOOL, and the latter: LANGUAGE IS A MARKER OF INTELLECT AND DILIGENCE / COMMON SENSE. These results partly align with previous research on metaphors for language, namely Raphael Berthele's research (2002; 2008) on mental and metaphorical folk models of language. The physically oriented metaphors in my data reflect two out of three mental models in Berthele's (2002) article, LANGUAGE IS AN ARTEFACT / ANIMATE OBJECT. Berthele has later explored aspects of social categorization, linguistic features being essential features of a group or community, through the metaphor LANGUAGE IS A BOND, which is a close relative of the social practice metaphors in my data. As Berthele notes (2008: 302), language as the target domain is difficult to conceptualize, which is why discussion around issues of language policy and planning are usually dependent on cognitive operations that link it to more immediate domains. Metaphors connect ideologies to language (Brunstad 2003: 59), which is why I use them to express ideologies and the methods of thinking behind complex phenomena or concepts.

Original answer	Reduction (metalanguage expressions)	Sub-category (theme)	Super-category (conception-metaphor)	Main ideology
No need [to change the norm], a native speaker can tell the correct form without the rule. 'Ei tarvitse, natiivi puhuja erottaa oikean muodon ilman sääntöä.'	A native speaker knows the correct form without the rule.	Native speakers know the standard.	LANGUAGE IS COMMON SENSE	SLI
I think the norm is good and produces beautiful language. 'Sääntö on mielestäni hyvä ja tuottaa kaunista kieltä.'	The rule is good and produces beautiful language.	Norm produces beautiful/ good/clear language.	LANGUAGE IS AESTHETICS	Purism

Figure 1. An example of the content analysis of metalanguage.

4. Language conceptions against norm change –
from purism to SLI

The analysis revealed six concepts of language that most clearly represent a particular ideological notion belonging to purism, SLI, or both. However, I do not claim that these are the only LIs present in the responses. Given that language ideology studies have named LIs differently or have not chosen to name them at all, there are signs of other possible LIs in the responses. For example, the conception that LANGUAGE IS A TOOL could be understood as a representation of instrumental ideology (Kunnas 2006: 234) instead of SLI and LANGUAGE IS COMMON SENSE could be construed as being drawn from the "one language, one nation" ideology (Piller 2015). I focus on purism and SLI given their importance in Finnish language planning. I present the respondents' conceptions starting from those that most clearly represent purism to those that are based on SLI. Because the concepts themselves are abstractions made from metalinguistic expressions, I use examples from the data to show nuances and implications which might otherwise go unobserved.

When arguing against norm change, the respondents often introduce particular lines of arguments about the (perceived) nature of language to justify their stance. The concepts where this is the center of argumentation tend to lean more towards notions of purism and overlap with popular puristic discourses. The concept that most clearly represents purism is LANGUAGE IS AESTHETICS. The main idea behind this concept is that language is an entity with perceptible aesthetic value. The respondents argue that the norm of *O(i)ttA*-verbs should not be changed because it creates *beautiful* language and brings *pleasing variation* to it (1–2). Giving aesthetic value to a specific writing form is not new for the norm. During its standardization process in the early 1900s, *OittA*-verbs were perceived as poetic and beautiful and *OttA*-verbs as commonplace but practical and more vernacular (Tunkelo 1902: 11–12).

(1)   *Sääntö on mielestäni hyvä ja tuottaa kaunista kieltä.*
         'I think the norm is good and produces beautiful language.'

(2)   *Ei* [tulisi muuttaa sääntöä]*, koska nykyinen sääntö tuo kieleen miellyttävää vaihtelua.*
         'No [the rule shouldn't be changed] because the current rule brings pleasant variation to language.'

The general opinion of the respondents was also that the norm of *O(i)ttA*-verbs is *selkeä* 'clear' (3). The adjective can be used to mean something that is see-through or something that is easy to understand. The ideal of clear language carries in it a presumption that clear text is understandable (Mäntynen 2003: 144–145). For the respondents, clear language is a virtue that does not need to be justified. The aesthetic features of language are associated with almost moral emotions: good language is clear.

(3)   *Minusta ei ole tarvetta* [muuttaa sääntöä]*, sääntö on selkeä ja ymmär-rettävä, täysin luonteva.*
        'I don't think there is a need [to change the rule], the rule is clear and understandable, completely natural.'

The respondents considered aesthetics as a property of language, which is also something that can be lost or damaged by corrupting influences. As Thomas (1991: 12) notes, it is quintessential for practitioners of purism to view some elements of language as undesirable. In addition, the notion that language can be damaged is a fundamental presupposition for any puristic activity (Langer & Nesse 2012: 208). In the concept LANGUAGE IS DAMAGEABLE these undesirable elements are identified as writing forms that differ from the norm. In examples (4–6) the respondents describe deviations from the norm as *bad*, *wrong*, or *incorrect* and appeal to sensory perceptions to further support their opinions (see Mäntynen 2003).

(4)   *Toisaalta i:n jättäminen pois näyttää omasta mielestäni pahalta kirjoite-tussa yleiskielessä.*
        'Leaving i out would look, in my opinion, bad in the written standard language.'

(5)   *Jommastakummasta muodosta luopuminen ei ole hyvä eikä mahdollinen ratkaisu. Jokainen ratkaisu tuottaisi vääränkuuloisia verbejä.*
        'Abandoning either form is neither a good nor a possible solution. Any solution would produce wrong-sounding verbs.'

(6)   [--] *moni varmaankin kokisi virheellisen kuuloisiksi esimerkiksi muodot "kirjoittaa" (kuulostaa puhekieliseltä) ja "tiedoittaa" (kuulostaa hyper-korrektilta).*
        '[--] many people would, for example, probably find the forms "kirjottaa" (sounds colloquial) and "tiedoittaa" (sounds hyper-correct) incorrect-sounding.'

The use of non-normative forms in *O(i)ttA*-verbs are conceptualized as a force that taints and corrupts the standard language. This is exemplified in (7–8) in which the choice of verbs *kärsiä* 'suffer' and *kajota* 'violate' create an impression that language is an entity susceptible to damage, capable of feeling pain, or being the subject to unauthorized force or even violence. This kind of personification also suggests that language is not merely an idea. Neil Bermel (2007: 274–275) notes that by assigning human qualities to language it acquires rights of its own and changing them would be almost immoral (also see LANGUAGE IS A HUMAN BEING, Watts 2011: 12). In fact, in the history of Fennistics, the Finnish language has been often personified as *Kieletär*, a feminine spirit of the Finnish language (e.g. Nordlund 2004: 313). Thus, the respondents argue that the norm of *O(i)ttA*-verbs should not be changed, because it would damage language, especially its aesthetics.

(7) *Ei tule muuttaa* [sääntöä]. *Kielen vaihtelevuus kärsii. Esimerkiksi "kunniottaa"*[3] *ei ole mistään kotoisin.*
'[The norm] should not be changed. Language variability suffers. For example, "kunniottaa" is not at all good.'

(8) *Sääntöön puuttuminen tarkoittaisi kai samalla myös sanojen kirjoitus-asuun kajoamista, ja ajatus tuntuu vieraalta.*
'Interfering with the rule would probably also mean violating the spelling of words, and the idea feels strange.'

The discourse on metalinguistic considerations in Gardt (2001) concerns criticism of stylistic, rhetoric, or for aesthetic reasons and relates to the LANGUAGE IS AESTHETICS/DAMAGEABLE concepts. The discourse openly indicates that purism can be a matter of individual taste, once more highlighting that the ideology is not so much concerned with the goal of an idealized language but is rather a commentary on what the standard ought to be. By relying on emotional values and attributing organic characteristics to the norm and language, such as beauty and goodness, an emotionally loaded but compelling case can be made against norm change without necessarily having to engage in complicated or objective arguments (see Langer & Nesse 2012: 617).

---

3   The normative form is *kunnioittaa* 'honor', which is not an *OittA*-verb as it is four syllables long.

This is acknowledged in example (9) in which the respondent laments that their arguments against norm change are based on subjective experiences which they consider not "enough" for a professional.

(9)   *Jos i:n jättäisi pois sanoista, joissa se nyt on, niistä tulisi liian puhe-
       kielisiä – jos taas lisäisi i:n sanoihin, joissa se nyt ei ole, niistä tulee
       liian kiemuraisia. Siispä oma kielikorvani ja tottumus perustelevat, että
       ei tarvetta muuttaa – huono perustelu, tiedän. Kai ammattilaisella pitäisi
       olla muutakin sanottavaa.*
       'If *i* is left out of words where it is now, they would become too col-
       loquial – if *i* is added to words where it is not now, they would become
       too convoluted. So, based on my own intuitive sense of language and
       habits, there is no need for a change – poor reasoning, I know. I suppose
       a professional should have something else to say.'

Perhaps to combat the perceived insufficient argumentative force of subjective emotionally based reactions, the respondents use examples and sensory perceptions as tools to support their stance against norm change. Anne Mäntynen (2003: 151, 154) in her thesis about the use of rhetoric in language columns written by Finnish language professionals specifies that when examples of some linguistic phenomena are used in a text, they can serve as empirical arguments to support the text's main claim. In examples (5–6) the respondents argue against norm change and use imagined examples of non-normative uses of *O(i)ttA*-verbs to point out how *wrong* or *incorrect* they sound compared to the standard. Moreover, when the respondents provide non-normative forms and intentionally violate the norm, its existence becomes evident (Mäki-lähde, Leppänen & Itkonen 2019: 6).

In addition, the examples are usually presented as auditory or visual observations. Mäntynen (2003: 154) notes that this creates an impression of their veracity – that they are true examples of actual language use. Another verb used by the respondents to describe non-normative writing forms of *O(i)ttA*-verbs is *tuntua* 'feel' which in this context can mean 'create a sensory impression or sensation' or 'cause a perceptual impression or feeling' (Kielitoimiston sanakirja 2022). The verb can be used in an evaluative sense, and it has a cognitive-emotional element to it (Pajunen 2001: 331–332, also Mäntynen 2003: 159–161), which further emphasizes the subjectivity of the sensations (10).

(10)   *Vaikka sanon "kirjottaa", tuntuisi väärältä kirjoittaa verbi ilman i:tä.*
       'Although I say "kirjottaa", I would feel wrong writing the verb without
       an *i*.'

This reaffirms that linguists and non-linguist professionals are not
able to be purely objective as regards standard language and not immune
to dominant ideologies about language. As James Milroy (2001: 245)
notes, it is not a surprise that social evaluations may affect what is be-
lieved to be objective internal linguistic description, as language in use
is necessarily a social phenomenon.

The concepts LANGUAGE IS AESTHETICS/DAMAGEABLE are based on
Berthele's LANGUAGE IS AN ANIMATE OBJECT metaphor because of their
human-like attributes and organic characteristics. But another important
background metaphor is LANGUAGE IS RAW MATERIAL which is the driving
force behind all forms of linguistic purism. The metaphor's assumption
is that language has a high value if it remains pure. Its negligent use
makes it mixed and impure, therefore, less valuable. (Berthele 2002: 38.)

Structural uniformity and its importance are the focus of the Saussure-
esque conception that LANGUAGE IS A DIFFICULT SYSTEM. It conceptualizes
language as a planned structural system where the rules of grammar and
norms are its essential building blocks. This echoes Berthele's (2002:
34) LANGUAGE IS A PHYSICAL STRUCTURE metaphor and accentuates that
language, similarly to a building, is made of components. In (11) the
respondent argues that because the norm of *O(i)ttA*-verbs still reflects
these unchanged *structures* of language, a change is not necessary.

(11)   *Ei tarvitse, sillä sen kielen rakenteet, joihon* [sic, joihin] *sääntö perustuu,*
       eivät sinänsä ole muuttuneet.
       'There is no need [to change the norm], because the language's structures
       which the rule is based on have not per se changed.'

At the center of the concept is a prescriptive, standard grammar that
remains unquestioned and idealized. Grammar, whether prescriptive or
descriptive, is not a neutral description of language, but rather has been
formed on the basis of some linguistic theory, and is ultimately a series
of interpretations that limit, select, and censor language usage (Dufva
et al. 2011). The respondents view that the difficulty and illogicality of
grammar is not only expected but also integral to language (12–13).

(12) *Se* [normin selkeyttäminen] *ei kuitenkaan ole mielestäni täysin vält-*
tämätöntä, sillä säännöt, joskus ne vähän hankalatkin, kuuluvat mieles-
täni kieleen.
'However, it [clarifying the norm] is not completaly necessary because
rules, even the bit difficult ones, belong to language.'

(13) *Kieli ei ole matematiikkaa: siinä kuuluukin olla poikkeuksia, epäloogi-*
suuksia ja monimutkaisia ilmiöitä.
'Language is not mathematics: it is supposed to have exceptions, illogi-
calities, and complex phenomena.'

The conception that LANGUAGE IS A DIFFICULT SYSTEM views gram-
mar rules and linguistic norms similar to laws. They are simply accepted
as a fact that has to be so (see ORTHOGRAPHIC RULES ARE LAWS, Bermel
2007: 275). Another key point is that the concept mirrors a historical
Fennistic, grammatical-etymological puristic stance according to which
language has "laws" that show what is correct and incorrect language
(Setälä 1921: 71). Similarly to Gardt's (2001) puristic, structural dis-
course the concept assumes that language has a state of purity in which
the linguistic system is perfectly balanced. A modification or change
might damage it.

While the last three conceptions expressed by the respondents have
conceptualized language as a physical being, as an animate object
(aesthetics, damageable, raw material) or an artefact (system, building),
LANGUAGE IS A STATUS OF INTELLECT AND DILIGENCE highlights the
social aspects of language. At the heart of this concept is the belief that
the skillful use and knowledge of written standard language is a measure
of achievement and an indication of intellectual and educational status
(see Linell 1982: 19). Although the Finnish standard language can-
not be described as the language of the intelligentsia, as it was in the
late 1800s, due to the prevalence of an equal and inclusive education
system (Koivusalo 1979: 217), some respondents do correlate standard
language skills with other positive features (cf. Lappalainen 1999).
Language thus becomes a measure of achievement that allows entry
to a closed-off community, e.g., culture, nation, or group. Thus, cer-
tain linguistic features of the standard, in this case the norm-compliant
use of *O(i)ttA*-verbs, can be seen as essential properties of a certain
social group (Berthele 2008: 5). The STATUS OF INTELLECT AND DILI-
GENCE concept is based on the LANGUAGE IS A BOND metaphor, which

Berthele (2008) uses to indicate national unity. Instead of nationality, the respondents' conception refers to group-membership – a group of educated, linguistically inclined and meticulous people (14).

(14)   *Vastasin edellisellä sivulla* [kyselyssä]*, ettei tarvitse muuttaa* [normia]*,*
       ehkä lähinnä siksi että tällainen säännön tarkkuus viehättää minua.
       Me kieli-ihmiset todennäköisesti poikkeamme valtaväestöstä siinä, että
       saamme nostalgista mielihyvää pikkutarkasta pilkunviilaamisesta.
       'I replied on the previous page [of the survey] that there is no need
       to change [the norm], perhaps mainly because the precision of the rule
       appeals to me. We linguaphiles are probably different from the general
       population in that we derive nostalgic pleasure from meticulously
       scrutinizing grammar.'

    Standard language, on a sociolinguistic level, has a community-creating function which can also be used to exclude people from the community (Langer & Nesse 2012: 611). The conception that LANGUAGE IS A STATUS OF INTELLECT AND DILIGENCE relies more on the excluding function. The respondents argue that language should not be changed due to others' lack of effort (15) and that it is normal that only a minority of the population know the norms (16). Strong suppositions about the character of those that do not have a command of the standard language are made: they are viewed as not intelligent enough to learn the standard (17), and are thus excluded from the high-status group.

(15)   *Ei koko kieltä voi muuttaa 5-vuotiaan tasolle vaikkei osa porukasta sitä*
       vaivaudu oppimaan.
       'You can't change the whole language to the level of a 5-year-old just
       because some people don't bother to learn it.'

(16)   *On ihan normaali tilanne, että osa väestöstä hallitsee kirjakielen nor-*
       mit paremmin kuin enemmistö. Ennemmin pitäisi puuttua horjumisen
       oikeaan syyhyn, kirjakielisen rekisterin liian heikkoon tuntemukseen.
       'It is quite a normal situation that part of the population has a better com-
       mand of the norms of the written language than the majority. Rather, the
       real cause of the problem should be tackled: insufficient knowledge of
       the literary register.'

(17)   *Ei sääntöjä tarvitse ihmisten tyhmistymisen vuoksi muuttaa.*
       '[There is] no need to change the rules just because people have become
       more stupid.'

The respondents accord high prestige to the standard language. Linguistic prestige itself is indexical, which is attributed to language by its users and is not an actual property of language. It is used to evaluate the perceived socio-economic status, in this case, the education level and literacy skill of language users. (Milroy 2001: 532–533) Therefore, a change in the standard language could be understood as a threat to the group or group identity, as it would also affect the language form's perceived status as a marker of intellect. Similarly, by Norman Fairclough's (1992: 201) definition of *democratization*, the removal of inequalities and asymmetries from people's discursive and linguistic rights, duties, and values, *O(i)ttA*-verbs' norm can be understood as asymmetry's covert marker of power. Thus, changing the norm would be part of language's democratization, namely *colloquialization* (Farrelly & Seoane 2012: 393), which has been one of the leading principles of Finnish language planning in recent decades (see Kolehmainen 2014: 46–51).

Identifying language change as a threat corresponds with Thomas' (1991: 78–79) definition of elitist purism in which the standard's prestige has to be defended from democratization. So, while language can be wielded to establish social boundaries and privilege, it can also be viewed as a fragile construct in need of protection. This is also an idea proposed by SLI (Lippi-Green 2012: 68). I would place the LANGUAGE IS A STATUS OF INTELLECT AND DILIGENCE concept in the middle of the intersection between the of spheres of purism and SLI, as its core beliefs are held in both ideologies.

While previous concepts have conceptualized language through value-judgments, attributes, or social connotations, the conception that LANGUAGE IS A TOOL places importance on its functionality. It conveys an idea that written language has a specific function and goal: to be a tool of communication that is accessible for all language users. The appraised functionality of language is based on its *usability* which is a quality attribute that is related to an evaluation of a tool in a given situation. It is used to assess how well a system and its functions can be used to their designed purpose. (Nielsen 1993) As a concept, usability has been adopted into linguistics through technical instructions (Suominen 2019: 60). Because language can be metaphorically thought of as a tool of communication between people, usability in the case of language expresses how well it succeeds in this task. Usability can be evaluated through learnability, efficiency, memorability, errors, and

(user) satisfaction, and these factors can also be applied in the examination of language. (Pilke 2003: 166–168)

The respondents feel that the norm of *O(i)ttA*-verbs or its misuse *rarely* causes actual problems in language use (16–17). This is correct given that there are few *O(i)ttA*-verbs that have a parallel form without an *i* or with an *i* that has a different meaning, for example, *heloittaa* 'furnish with fittings' – *helottaa* 'shine' and *sanottaa* 'make someone say something' – *sanoittaa* 'lyricize' (Iisa, Oittinen & Piehl 2012: 226). However, some parallel forms are much rarer in standard language (*heloittaa*, *sanottaa*).

(16)   *[Normi] Aiheuttaa harvoin todellisia ongelmia, ellei sitten keksimällä keksi mahdollisia väärinymmärrysmahdollisuuksia hajottaa/hajoittaa (voisiko jälkimmäisen virheellisen muodon sekoittaa sanaan hajauttaa?)*
'[The norm] Rarely causes any real problems, unless you come up with possible misunderstandings of *hajottaa/hajoittaa* 'break' [the latter is the non-normative form] (could the latter, incorrect, form be confused with *hajauttaa* ['decentralize']?)'

(17)   *Aika harvoin säännön laiminlyömisestä kai tulee ymmärrysongelmia.*
'There are very rarely problems of understanding when the rule is ignored, I suppose.'

Instead, the experience of the respondents is that there are more chronic and other more significant spelling problems in language. Problems that affect comprehensibility are seen as much more worrisome (18). Comprehensibility is indeed one of the measures of text usability (also readability and glanceability, Suominen 2019: 59).

(18)   *Näen niin harvoin näitä verbejä väärin kirjoitettuina, etten ole ajatellut niiden olevan erityisen ongelmallisia. Paljon enemmän näkee ymmärtämistä vaikeuttavia virheitä, kuten yhdyssanavirheitä.*
'I so rarely see these verbs misspelled that I haven't thought of them as particularly problematic. You see much more errors that hinder understanding, such as compound word errors.'

The respondents also note that problems, such as not remembering the norm fully or not knowing a specific verb's normative spelling, can be quickly solved with the help of modern technology, such as proofreading

programs or online dictionaries (19). The implementation of tool-assisted sources also plays into the metaphor of language as a tool.

(19) *Käytännössä asia ei kuitenkaan ole mikään ongelma, koska kielen-huoltotietoa on nykyään niin hyvin saatavilla. Kotuksen sähköisistä lähteistä kirjoitusasun tarkistaminen käy nopeasti, kun tiedonhaun rutiinit ovat tehokkaat.*
'In practice, however, this is not a problem, because language planning information is so readily available these days. Checking the spelling from Kotus' [a shortened name for the Institute for the Languages of Finland] electronic sources is quick if one's information retrieval routines are efficient.'

The respondents consider norm change fundamentally negative and damaging precisely because of how it would affect the functionality of language. They mostly fear that a change would further complicate the current situation (20). In (21) a respondent has even derived a made-up verb to demonstrate how norm change might cause problems. Changing an established norm is a recognized risk, which is why linguists have not supported changing the norm in the past (Maamies 2000).

(20) *Ei* [tule muuttaa normia]*, ihmiset voivat mennä entistä enemmän sekaisin.*
'No [the norm shouldn't be changed], people can get even more confused.'

(21) *i:tön muoto voi aiheuttaa joissakin tapauksissa tulkintavirheitäkin (esim. kukka > kukostaa), vähintäänkin hämmennystä.*
'The form without an *i* can in some cases also cause interpretation errors (e.g., *kukka* 'flower' > *kukostaa* 'to equip with roosters'[4]), or at least confusion.'

LANGUAGE IS A TOOL mirrors a core notion of SLI: communication. The sociolinguistic ideal of SLI is a situation in which all members of a language community have an accessible, common language variety for practical purposes (Paffey 2014: 48). Thus, as long as language functions as a tool of communication without major problems, a norm change is not necessary as it might compromise the ease of communication.

---

4 Normally *kukka > kukoistaa* 'bloom', but the respondent has formed a possible *OttA*-verb by using *kukko* 'rooster' as the root.

The conception that LANGUAGE IS COMMON SENSE presents standard language as something naturalized and not a product of a thorough human-led standardization process. The respondents examined the norm through the concept of linguistic intuition and judge the norm on how well it reflects their own linguistic competence. In (22–23) the respondents describe how the norm is almost inconsequential to them because they know it automatically. Milroy states that common sense arguments about standard language are vastly powerful. If standard language is portrayed as or perceived to be "common sense", any debate against it becomes redundant. (Milroy 2001: 536) If everybody knows how *O(i)ttA*-verbs are written, why should the norm be changed? To the respondents, non-normative forms of *O(i)ttA*-verbs are both unacceptable and ungrammatical (see Fitzgerald 2010: 129–130).

(22)   *Tämä tulee itselläkin ihan selkärangasta, vaikken varsinaista muisti-*
       sääntöä/ohjetta muistanut.
       'I know this automatically, even though I didn't remember the actual
       rule/guide.'

(23)   [--] *suurin osa* [verbeistä] *tulee sanottua/kirjoitettua luontaisen kieli-*
       korvan mukaan joka tapauksessa oikein [--].
       '[--] most [of the verbs] will be said/spelled correctly according to the
       natural intuition anyway [--].'

The use of body-part metaphors, (22) *tulee selkärangasta* (literally 'comes from the spine') and (23) *kielikorva* (literally 'language ear'), highlights the innateness of the norm. This brings the discussion to the status of the native speaker. In (24) the respondent comments that the norm of *O(i)ttA*-verbs is unimportant to them *because* they are a native speaker of Finnish: their intuitive knowledge is identical to the prescriptive, standard grammar. In this sense, the norm can be considered a native-speaker norm (Jodaei 2021). Thus, it is part of the standard language culture to know it. Given that there is a growing number of non-native Finnish speakers to whom the norm may not be innate, the standard Finnish's objective of being a shared language for all is challenged. First, this conception renders non-native speakers, speakers of non-standard varieties, and second-language learners, invisible, and second, it perpetuates the idea of native speaker expertise which has been contested (e.g. Mahboob 2005). More importantly, there are no

native writers (Hackert 2012) nor native standard language speakers. Standard language competence is obtained externally through education, grammar books, and school. (Milroy 2001: 537)

(24) *En tiedä, kuinka merkityksellinen sääntö loppujen lopuksi on. Itsekin olen pärjännyt hyvin ilman sitä, koska useimmat sanat ovat sellaisia, että äidinkielinen puhuja tietää, miten ne kirjoitetaan eikä tunge sekaan ylimääräisiä kirjaimia.*
'I don't know how relevant the rule is in the end. I've managed fine without it myself, because most words are such that a native speaker knows how to spell them and doesn't cram in extra letters.'

LANGUAGE IS COMMON SENSE excludes a part of the language community. It is a stark contrast to the democratizing force behind modern language planning, and it can sustain unequal power relationships (see Fairclough 1989: 84, 1992: 201). Nativeness is an ideological factor that has great influence over the production and interpretation of language norms, as it functions as the border marker of acceptable language variation (Bylin & Tingsell 2022). There is an assumption that native speakers have linguistic authority and ownership of the standard language which is a problematic consequence of the perpetuation of SLI (León 2018: 46). The lack of native speaker status in small Nordic languages may also lead to exclusion from the national identity (Bylin & Tingsell 2022).[5]

5. Conclusions

This article has analyzed six different conceptions of language that form the basis of arguments by language professionals against changing the norm of *O(i)ttA*-verbs. They reflect how the respondents understand standard language to be or ought to be: through value-judgments, attributes, functions, and social connotations. The conceptions of language also show how the abstract influences of SLI and purism are perpetuated. Three conclusions can be drawn from the analysis.

---

5   For example, in spoken Finnish conformity to the written standard by keeping the end-*i* in diphthongs at the end of non-initial syllables, such as in *OittA*-verbs, is associated with "foreignness" (Lehtonen 2015: 120).

First, the concepts that fall mainly on the side of purism associate standard language with values (LANGUAGE IS AESTHETIC/DAMAGEABLE). The respondents consider aesthetics an important and constitutive property of the standard language, and the act of changing language, even by a single orthographic norm, would negatively affect these absolute values and is viewed almost as morally wrong. Language purism is, after all, emotional content that is driven by social factors (Čičin-Šain 2019: 179). Much value is also put on the perceived structure of language and the importance of established grammar, as seen in the concept LANGUAGE IS A DIFFICULT SYSTEM.

Second, norm change is opposed because of how it could affect the standard language's function. The concept LANGUAGE IS A TOOL appraises language through its usability. Therefore, as long as the norm of *O(i)ttA*-verbs does not noticeably affect the usability of the standard, the norm does not warrant change. This reflects SLI's notion of a shared, accessible language which makes the respondents very careful about challenging the status quo.

Third, language can serve as a marker of status, social bonds, or nativeness. It enables people to unite based on linguistic affiliations. The respondents view a skillful command of the standard language as a sign of being educated, well-read, and hard-working. This is in line with puristic discourses. If this skill is understood as common sense and attributed to native speakers only, it bolsters the problematic notion maintained by SLI that standard language is owned by its native speakers and only attainable by them. Changing the standard would then affect the identity of these groups or the groups themselves. While the concept LANGUAGE IS A STATUS OF INTELLECT AND DILIGENCE indicates an awareness of the perceived high prestige of standard language and is actively restrictive, LANGUAGE IS COMMON SENSE seems unaware of its ability to create barriers between language users.

The conceptions of language seem to reaffirm prior observations about the primary motivations of language planning. Robert Cooper (1990: 35) has argued that language planning is carried out primarily for the purposes of nonlinguistic ends, such as national integration, political control, and the creation of new elites. It is thus not surprising that the language professionals' arguments against language planning actions that would change a language norm are not so much related to linguistic and literary reasons but instead based on nonlinguistic, societal reasons.

Lastly, how might these conceptions about language and their relation to prevalent LIs be utilized in language planning? While discussing this it must be reinstated that the focus of this article has been an orthographic norm – which, although, has been named as an example of a failed norm, is still considered difficult by linguists, and is not a common feature in spoken language. However, its misuse does not lead to large problems in meaning or understanding. Thus, the following determinations might be applicable to orthographic changes, not necessarily to syntactic, lexical, and others. I would suggest that conceptions of language can be used to map the social (and language) ideological context in which norm change is envisaged.

Value-judgments are subjective and difficult to consider when planning a conscious intervention in language. However, as orthographic systems carry significant historical, cultural, and political meanings (Woolard & Schieffelin 1994: 65), values about them are based on powerful emotional and ideological arguments that shape discursive practices. Thus, it would be amiss to exclude these judgements from considerations altogether. Discerning what kind of values attributed to standard language are most wide-spread or influential could serve as a guide.

From a functional point of view, language change occurs according to the needs of its users. If a more simplified norm is not needed because the usability of standard language is sufficient, then a change need not happen. However, the social dimension must be considered. The question then would be, who are the users of the standard language? Is norm change opposed by the social elite or native speakers?

In Finland, the standard language is characterized by the Institute for the Languages of Finland as a *shared* language for *all*, meaning that there is a deep relationship between language and society – it is learnt together and used together. By contrast, this article has suggested that there are commonly held beliefs that defy this view. For example, the common-sense narrative of standard language and SLI are instrumental in constructing and maintaining unequal power structures. Ideologies are most effective when they are least visible and when they remain as background assumptions (Fairclough 1989: 85). If language users were to become aware that common sense as an aspect of standard language upholds inequalities, it would cease to be common sense and thus may cease to function as an aspect of SLI.

Therefore, more attention should be given to LIs whose abstract influences pervade linguistics and affect concrete language-related choices and actions, including language change. In addition, the conceptions and LIs of language professionals in support of norm change are the subject of further research. Language planning is never non-ideological or value-neutral, and covert influences should be recognized and openly acknowledged. Otherwise, conducive norm changes might not be achievable.

References

Aitchison, Jean. 2001. *Language change: progress or decay?* 3rd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511809866.

Bermel, Neil. 2007. *Linguistic authority, language ideology, and metaphor. The Czech orthography wars*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197662.

Berthele, Raphael. 2002. Attitudes and mental model of language: On the cognitive foundation of sociolinguistic practice. *Målbryting* 6. 25–66. https://doi.org/10.7557/17.4752.

Berthele, Raphael. 2008. A nation is a territory with one culture and one language. In Gitte Kristiansen & René Dirven (eds.), *Cognitive sociolinguistics. Language variation, cultural models, social systems*, 301–332. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110199154.3.301.

Blommaert, Jan (ed.). 1999. *Language ideological debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brunstad, Endre. 2003. Standard language and linguistic purism. *Sociolinguistica* 17(1). 52–70. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110245226.52.

Bylin, Maria & Sofia Tingsell. 2022. The native speaker: a border marker of the standard, the nation, and variation. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 23(3). 254–274. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2021.1965741.

Coluzzi, Paolo. 2017. Language planning for Malay in Malaysia: A case of failure or success? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2017(244). 17–38. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2016-0055.

Cooper, Robert. 1990. *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620812.

Čičin-Šain, Višnja. 2019. *Metaphors of language. A discursive and experimental analysis of the role of metaphor in the construction of national languages: The case of Croatian and Serbian*. Oslo: University of Oslo. PhD thesis.

Dufva, Hannele, Minna Suni, Mari Aro & Olli-Pekka Salo. 2011. Languages as objects of learning. Language learning as a case of multilingualism. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies* 5(1). 109–124.

Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Farrelly, Michael & Elena Seoane. 2012. Democratization. In Elizabeth Close Traugott & Terttu Nevalainen (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of the history of English*, 392–401. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199922765.013.0033.

Fishman, Joshua A. (ed.). 1977. *Advances in the creation and revision of writing systems*. The Hague: Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110807097-001.

Fitzgerald, Gareth. 2010. Linguistic intuitions. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 61(1). 123–160. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjps/axp014.

Gardt, Andreas. 2001. Das Fremde und das Eigene. Versuch einer Systematik des Fremdwortbegriffs in der deutschen Sprachgeschichte. In Gerhard Stickel (ed.), *Neues und Fremdes im deutschen Wortschatz. Aktueller lexikalischer Wandel*, 30–58. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110622669-004.

Hackert, Sophie. 2012. *The emergence of the English native speaker.* Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614511052.

Hiidenmaa, Pirjo. 2006. Kielenhuollon muuttunut maisema. *Kielikello* 3/2006. https://www.kielikello.fi/-/kielenhuollon-muuttunut-maisema (20 January, 2023).

Hämäläinen, Tytti. 2017. *Maallikot kieltä kuvaamassa: kielen muutoksen diskurssit ja kieli-ideologiat kielenkäyttäjien puheessa*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto. MA thesis.

Iikkanen, Päivi. 2019. ELF and migrant categorization at family clinics in Finland. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 8(1). 97–123. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2019-2006.

Iisa, Katariina, Hannu Oittinen & Aino Piehl. 2012. *Kielenhuollon käsikirja*. 7th edn. Helsinki: Suomen Yrityskirjat.

Institute for the Languages of Finland. 2022. https://www.kotus.fi/ohjeet/suomen_kielen_lautakunnan_suosituksia/suositukset (6 July, 2022).

Irvine, Judith T. 1989. When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy. *American Ethnologist* 16(2). 248–267. https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1989.16.2.02a00040.

Jakobs, Marlena & Matthias Hüning. 2022. Scholars and their metaphors: on Language Making in linguistics. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 274. 29–50. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2021-0017.

Jauhiainen, Ilkka. 2016. Mikael Jungner ehdottaa valtavia muutoksia kielioppiin: "Suomen kieli on taakka", kielitieteilijät kummissaan. *Talouselämä*, 12.12.2016. https://www.talouselama.fi/uutiset/mikael-jungner-ehdottaa-valtavia-muutoksia-kielioppiin-suomen-kieli-on-taakka-kielitieteilijat-kummissaan/0da0298e-b03c-3b89-a4cb-16a369a814ab (18 January, 2023).

Jodaei, Hojjat. 2021. Native Speaker Norms and Teaching English to Non-Natives: History and Research. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies* 9(3). 1–14.

Kalliokoski, Jyrki, Anne Mäntynen & Taru Nordlund. 2018. Suomentamisen ideologiat ja normit. *Virittäjä* 122(4). 477–492. https://doi.org/10.23982/vir.76565.

Keisu, Krista. 2014. *Miten muutoksesta puhutaan. Analyysi kielen muutoksen kielellistämisestä ja argumentoinnista suomi24.fi- ja basso.fi-verkkosivustojen keskusteluissa*. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. MA thesis.

Kettunen, Lauri. 1940. *Suomen murteet III A. Murrekartasto*. Helsinki: SKS.

Kielitoimiston sanakirja. 2022. Tuntua. Kotimaisten kielten keskus. https://www.kieli-toimistonsanakirja.fi/#/tuntua?searchMode=all (18 January, 2023).

Kiparsky, Paul. 1968. Linguistic universals and linguistic change. In Emmon Bach and Robert T. Harris (eds.), *Universals in linguistic theory*, 170–202. New York: Holt, Ronehart and Winston.

Koistinen, Emma. *Ärsyttävyyden kieli-ideologisuus – purismi ja standardi-ideologia ärsyttävien sanojen ja sanontojen taustalla.* Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. MA thesis.

Koivusalo, Esko. 1979. Mitä on yleiskieli? *Virittäjä* 83(3). 216–222.

Kolehmainen, Taru. 2014. *Kielenhuollon juurilla. Suomen kielen ohjailun historiaa*. Helsinki: SKS.

Korhonen, Riitta & Hanna Lappalainen. 2013. Kieli muuttuu – rikkautta vai rappiota? *Kielikello* 3/2013. https://www.kielikello.fi/-/kieli-muuttuu-rikkautta-vai-rappiota- (13 July, 2022).

Kunnas, Niina 2006. Yksi, kaksi vai monta kirjakieltä? Vienankarjalaisten kanta kirja-kielidebaattiin. *Virittäjä* 110(2). 229–247.

Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langer, Nils & Agnete Nesse. 2012. Linguistic purism. In Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy & Juan Camilo Conde-Silvestre (eds.), *The handbook of historical sociolinguistics*, 607–625. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118257227.ch33.

Lappalainen, Hanna. 1999. Young adults and the functions of the standard. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 12. 63–86.

Lehtonen, Heini. 2015. Sano vai sanoi – mitä merkitystä on on yhdellä *i*:llä? Jälkita-vujen i-loppuisen diftongin sosiaalinen indeksisyys monietnistyvässä Helsingissä. In Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Anu Rouhikoski & Heini Lehtonen (eds.), *Helsingissä puhuttavat suomet*, 84–124. Helsinki: SKS.

Leino, Pentti. 1989: Kirjakieli – puutarha vai kansallispuisto? *Virittäjä* 93(4). 554–571.

Leinonen, Jaana. 2006. Kielenhuoltoasenteissa eroja. *Kielikello* 4/2006. https://www.kielikello.fi/-/kielenhuoltoasenteissa-eroja (13 July, 2022).

León, Maredil. 2018. Standard language ideologies, world Englishes, and English language teaching: An overview. *Journal of Second Language Acquisition and Teaching* 25. 44–62.

Linell, Per. 1982. *The written language bias in linguistics*. Linköping: University of Linköping.

Lippi-Green, Rosina. 2012. *English with an accent. Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States*. 2 edn. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203348802.

Maamies, Sari. 2000. Tiedotuksia ja ilmoituksia – eräs oikeinkirjoituksen ikuisuusky-symys. *Kielikello* 1/2000. https://www.kielikello.fi/-/tiedotuksia-ja-ilmoituksia-eras-oikeinkirjoituksen-ikuisuuskysymys (29 July, 2022).

Maamies, Sari. 2013. Haltija ja haltia. *Kielikello* 4/2013. https://www.kielikello.fi/-/haltija-ja-haltia (23 June, 2023).

Mahboob, Ahmar. 2005. Beyond the native speaker in TESOL. In Syed Zafar (eds.), *Culture, context, & communication*, 60–93. Abu Dhabi: Center of Excellence for Applied Research and Training & The Military Language Institute.

Milroy, James. 2001. Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5(4). 530–555. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00163.

Milroy, James & Lesley Milroy. 2012. *Authority in language. Investigating standard English*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203124666.

Mäkilähde, Aleksi, Ville Leppänen & Esa Itkonen. 2019. Basic concepts and contextualisation. In Aleksi Mäkilähde, Ville Leppänen & Esa Itkonen (eds.), *Normativity in language and linguistics*, 1–28. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Mäntynen, Anne. 2003. *Miten kielestä kerrotaan. Kielijuttujen retoriikkaa*. Helsinki: SKS. PhD thesis.

Niedzielski, Nancy & Dennis Preston. 2010. *Folk linguistics*. New edn. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-92299-4_25.

Nielsen, Jacob. 1993. *Usability engineering*. San Francisco, CA: Morgan Kaufmann. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-052029-2.50007-3.

Nordlund, Taru. 2004. Arat taimet ja ankarat puutarhurit – 1800-luvun lopun kielikeskustelun metaforat ja kieli-ideologiat. In Katja Huumo, Lea Laitinen & Outi Paloposki (eds.), *Yhteistä kieltä tekemässä*, 286–322. Helsinki: SKS.

Nordlund, Taru. 2018. Kääntäjien kirjeenvaihto, suomentamisen normit ja kieli-ideologiat 1800-luvun lopun Suomessa. *Virittäjä* 122(4). 561–585. https://doi.org/10.23982/vir.60536.

Nuolijärvi, Pirkko. 1986. *Kolmannen sukupolven kieli. Helsinkiin muuttaneiden suurten ikäluokkien eteläpohjalaisten ja pohjoissavolaisten kielellinen sopeutuminen*. Helsinki: SKS. PhD thesis.

Paffey, Darren. 2014. *Language ideologies and the globalization of 'standard' Spanish*. London: Boomsbury.

Pajunen, Anni. 2001. *Argumenttirakenne. Asiaintilojen luokitus ja verbien käyttäytyminen suomen kielessä*. Helsinki: SKS.

Pfalgraf, Falco. 2009. Linguistic purism in the history of the German language. In Geraldine Horan, Nils Langer & Sheila Watts (eds.), *Landmarks in the history of the German language*, 137–168. Oxford: Peter Lang.

Pietilä, Veikko. 1976. *Sisällön erittely*. 2nd edn. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Pilke, Nina. 2003. Käytettävyys ja kielitaito. In Merja Koskela & Nina Pilke (eds.), *Kieli ja asiantuntijuus. AFinLAn vuosikirja 2003*, 159–176. Jyväskylä: AFinLA.

Piller, Ingrid. 2015. Language ideologies. In Karen Tracy, Cornelia Ilie & Todd Sandel (eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*. John Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118611463.wbielsi140.

Preston, Dennis. 2004. Folk metalanguage. In Adam Jaworski, Nikolas Coupland & Dariusz Galasinski (eds.), *Metalanguage: social and ideological perspectives*, 75–101. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110907377.75.

Pulkkinen, Paavo. 1972. *Nykysuomen kehitys. Katsaus 1800- ja 1900-luvun kirjakieleen sekä tekstinäytteitä*. Helsinki: SKS.

Rintala, Päivi. 1992. Suomen kirjakielen normeista. *Sananjalka* 34(1). 47–68. https://doi.org/10.30673/sja.86541.

Rintala, Päivi. 1998. Kielikäsitys ja kielenohjailu. *Sananjalka* 40(1). 47–66. https://doi. org/10.30673/sja.86596.

Rutten, Gijsbert, Andreas Krogull & Bob Schoemaker. 2020. Implementation and acceptance of national language policy: the case of Dutch (1750–1850). *Language Policy* 19. 259–279. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-019-09527-y.

Saviniemi, Maija. 2015. *On noloa, jos ammattilaiset tekevät tökeröitä kielioppivirheitä: toimitushenkilökunnan kielenhuoltotiedot, -käytännöt ja -diskurssit*. Oulu: Oulun yliopisto. PhD thesis.

Setälä, Emil Nestor. 1921. *Kielentutkimus ja oikeakielisyys*. Helsinki: Otava.

Sidgi, Lina Fathi Sidig. 2021. The process of changing everyday language: how society changes words. *International Journal of Language, Literature and Culture* 1(2). 13–20. http://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijllc.1.2.2.

Suominen, Riitta. 2019. *Virkatekstin käytettävyys. Pöytäkirjasta verkkotekstiksi ja sosiaalisen median päivitykseksi*. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto. PhD thesis.

Tallroth, Paulina. 2012. *Kansalliskielistrategia. Valtioneuvoston periaatepäätös*. Helsinki: Valtioneuvoston kanslia.

Thomas, George. 1991. *Linguistic purism*. London: Longman.

Tommola, Hannu. 2003. Kieliammattilaiset ja maallikot oikeakielisyysuudistusten kourissa. In Merja Koskela & Nina Pilke (eds.), *Kieli ja asiantuntijuus. AFinLan vuosikirja 2003*, 55–73. Jyväskylä: AFinLA.

Tunkelo, Emil Aukusti. 1902. Kirjoittaa vai kirjottaa, kirjoitus vai kirjotus? Toimituksen loppulausunto. *Virittäjä* 6(1). 11–12.

Tuomi, Jouni & Anneli Sajavaara. 2018. *Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi*. Revised edn. Helsinki: Tammi.

Vaarala, Noora. 2021. Me ei osata enää suomea. *HS Teema. Suomen kieli*. 5/2021. 18–29.

Vaattovaara, Johanna. 2009. *Meän tapa puhua. Tornionlaakso pellolaisnuorten subjektiivisena paikkana ja murrealueena*. Helsinki: SKS. Phd thesis.

Varis, Markku. 2012. *Kielikäsitys yläkoulun äidinkielen oppikirjoissa*. Oulu: Oulun yliopisto. PhD thesis.

VISK = Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen & Irja Alho. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: SKS. https://kaino. kotus.fi/visk/etusivu.php.

Watts, Richard J. 2011. *Language myths and the history of English*. New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195327601.001.0001.

Woolard, Kathryn A. 1998. Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard & Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideologies: practice and theory*, 3–47. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Woolard, Kathryn A. 2020. Language ideology. In James Stanlaw (ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology*. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786093. iela0217.

Woolard, Kathryn A. & Bambi. B. Schieffelin. 1994. Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23. 55–82. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.23.100194.000415.

Kokkuvõte. Henni Pajunen: Normingu muutmisega seotud keele-ideloogiad: soome keele *O(i)ttA*-tegusõnade ortograafianormingu juhtumi-uuring ja keeleprofessionaalide soovimatus normingut muuta. See artikkel uurib, miks soome keeleprofessionaalid ei soovi laialt tuntud problemaatilise ortograafianormingu muutmist ja kuidas nende argumendid põhinevad avalikel ja varjatud arusaamadel normitud keelest. Samuti analüüsib artikkel, kuidas peamised keelelised ideoloogiad – standardkeeleideoloogia ja purism – on nende arusaamade aluseks. Artikkel põhineb kvalitatiivsel uuringul ja selles käsitletakse sisuanalüüsi abil ühele avatud küsimusele antud vastuste meta-keelt. Keelega seotud mõisted on esitatud mõistemetafooridena. Analüüsis tõuseb esile kuus mõistet, mis esindavad purismi, standardkeeleideoloogiat või mõlemat. Küsitlusele vastajad mõtestavad keelt väärtushinnangutena ning seda keele funktsioonide ja sotsiaalsete konnotatsioonide kaudu. Mõned kontsept-sioonid põhinevad mittekeelelistel, kuid emotsionaalselt tugevatel väärtustel, teised kasutatavusel või keele võimel olla staatuse või sotsiaalsete sidemete markeriks. Uurimus tõstab esile keeleideoloogiate tugeva mõju.

Märksõnad: normingud, keelemuutus, metakeel, metafoorid, keelekorraldus, keeleideoloogiad

Appendix 1. Questionnaire for language professionals of the standard Finnish language.

Kysely kielinormista

Seuraava kysely käsittelee suomen kielen normin vastaanottoa kielen ja viestinnän ammattilaisten keskuudessa sekä heidän kielenhuoltotapojaan.

1. Mikä on ammattisi?

_____

_____

2. Mistä tarkistat oikeinkirjoitus- tai kielioppisäännön? Voi valita yhden tai useamman vaihtoehdon.

- ☐ Internetistä.
- ☐ Kielioppaasta tai -opista.
- ☐ Sanakirjasta.
- ☐ Kollegalta.
- ☐ Ystävältä/tuttavalta.
- ☐ Muualta, mistä?

3. Ylläpidätkö suomen kielen taitojasi, erityisesti oikeinkirjoituksen taitojasi?

- ☐ Kyllä.
- ☐ En.

4. Miten ylläpidät suomen kielen taitoasi? Voit valita yhden tai useamman vaihtoehdon.

- ☐ Kertaan kielioppisääntöjä muulloinkin kuin tarpeen tullen.
- ☐ Seuraan Kotimaisten kielten keskuksen antamia suosituksia.
- ☐ Luen aiheeseen liittyvää kirjallisuutta.
- ☐ Teen aiheeseen liittyviä testejä.
- ☐ Muuten, miten?

5. Miksi et ylläpidä suomen kielen taitoasi? Voi valita yhden tai useamman vaihtoehdon.

☐ Koen, että kielitaitoni on kyllin hyvä.
☐ Koen, että taitoni kertaantuvat opiskelun/työn yhteydessä.
☐ Koulussa oppimani kieliopit pätevät yhä.
☐ Minulla ei ole aikaa kieliopin kertaamiseen.
☐ Muu syy, mikä?

6. Oletko entuudestaan tietoinen -*OittA*- ja -*OttA*-verbien ("tta-verbit", "o(i)ttaverbit") oikeinkirjoitussäännöstä?

○ Kyllä.
○ En.

7. Kuvaile, mitä muistat tai tiedät -*OittA*- ja -*OttA*-verbien oikeinkirjoitussäännöstä.

_____

_____

_____

8. Mistä olet oppinut/muistat oikeinkirjoitussäännön? Voit valita yhden tai useamman vaihtoehdon.

☐ Koulusta.
☐ Kielioppaasta tai -opista.
☐ Internetistä.
☐ Kollegalta.
☐ Kielenhuoltoa käsittelevästä lehdestä, kuten Virittäjästä tai Kielikellosta.
☐ Muualta, mistä?

9. Miksi koet oikeinkirjoitussäännön olevan sinulle tuntematon? Voi valita yhden tai useamman vaihtoehdon.

☐ Sääntö ei ole painunut mieleeni kouluajaltani.
☐ Sääntö ei ole tullut esille kieliopissa tai -oppaissa.
☐ Sääntöä ei ole mainittu kielenhuoltoa käsittelevässä kirjallisuudessa.
☐ Sääntö ei ole tullut esille ammattiini liittyen.
☐ Muu syy, mikä?

Taustoitus -*OittA*- ja -*OttA*- verbien oikeinkirjoitussäännöstä

Oikeinkirjoitussääntö koskee kolmitavuisia, *ttA*-päätteisiä verbejä, joiden toisessa tavussa on *O*- tai *Oi*-aines. Esimerkiksi *kirjoittaa*, *helpottaa* ja *häämöttää*. Oikeinkirjoitussäännössä kyse on siitä, mitkä verbit tulee kirjoittaa *i*:llisinä ja mitkä *i*:ttöminä. Eli onko oikea kirjoitusasu *kirjoittaa* vai *kirjottaa*, *helpoittaa* vai *helpottaa*? Verbien kirjoitusasu määräytyy tavallisesti kantasanan mukaan. Kantasanalla tarkoitetaan sitä sanaa, josta verbi on johdettu eli muodostettu.

Nykyinen pääsääntö lyhyesti

Jos verbin kantasana on *a-/ä*-loppuinen, tulee verbi kirjoittaa *i*:llisenä, esimerkiksi *kirja > kirjoittaa*. Jos taas verbin kantasana on *o-/ö*-loppuinen, tulee verbi kirjoittaa *i*:ttömänä, esimerkiksi *helppo > helpottaa*.

Lisäksi lisäsääntöjä

Jos verbi on johdettavissa sekä *a-/ä*- että *o-/ö*-loppuisesta kantasanasta, tulee verbi kirjoittaa *i*:ttömänä, esimerkiksi *hajo-ta* ja *haja- > hajottaa*. Jos verbin kantasana on epäselvä tai sitä on mahdotonta selvittää, tulee verbi kirjoittaa *i*:ttömänä, esimerkiksi *odottaa*. Jos kyseessä on deskriptiivinen eli kuvaileva verbi, tulee verbi kirjoittaa *i*:ttömänä, esimerkiksi *hohottaa*, *kuumottaa*, *tuijottaa*. Deskriptiivisillä -*OttA*-verbeillä ei ole kantasanaa.

Lisäksi on verbejä, joiden tyylisävy vaikuttaa niiden kirjoitusasuun. Esimerkiksi vanhahtavat ja juhlalliset verbit tulee kirjoittaa *i*:llisinä, esimerkiksi *armoittaa* ja *innoittaa*.

10. Aikaisemmin vastasit, että -*OittA*- ja -*OttA*-verbien oikeinkirjoitussääntö on sinulle tuntematon. Nyt kun sääntö on esitelty tarkemmin, muistatko kuulleesi siitä aiemmin?

☐ Kyllä.
☐ En.

11. Ota kantaa seuraaviin väittämiin.

	Samaa mieltä	Osittain samaa mieltä.	En eri enkä samaa mieltä.	Osittain eri mieltä.	Eri mieltä.	En osaa sanoa.
Oikeinkirjoitussääntö on vaikeasti muistettava.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Verbien oikeinkirjoitussääntö on helppo opettaa.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Oikeinkirjoitussääntö on hakala.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Nykyistä oikeinkirjoitussääntöä tulisi muuttaa.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Verbien oikeinkirjoitusasu aiheuttaa ongelmia jokapäiväisessä kielenkäytössäni.	○	○	○	○	○	○

12. Mikä mielestäsi tekee säännöstä hankalan? Jos sääntö ei aiheuta sinulle ongelmia, miksi koet, että kielenhuoltajat luonnehtivat sen 2000-luvulla ongelmaksi?

_____
_____
_____

13. Virallinen kielenhuolto ei ole puuttunut oikeinkirjoitussääntöön 1950-luvun jälkeen. Tulisiko mielestäsi sääntöön puuttua? Miksi/miksi ei?

_____
_____
_____

14. Onko verbien oikeinkirjoitus aiheuttanut sinulle ongelmia?

○ Kyllä.
○ Ei.
○ En osaa sanoa / en ole huomannut.

15. Oletko työssäsi kohdannut verbien oikeinkirjoitusongelman??

◯ Kyllä, usein.
◯ Kyllä, harvoin.
◯ En.

16. Jos sinun on pitänyt tarkistaa *-OittA-* tai *-OttA-*verbin oikeinkirjoitusasu, mistä olet sen tarkistanut?

□ Kieliopista tai -oppaasta. Voit nimetä kyseisen teoksen/kirjailijan:
□ Sanakirjasta. Voit nimetä kyseisen teoksen:
□ Verbien oikeinkirjoituslistasta (esimerkiksi Kielikellosta).
□ Internetistä, mistä?
□ Kollegalta.
□ Google-haulla.
□ Muualta, mistä?
□ Minun ei ole pitänyt tarkistaa kirjoitusasua.