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Abstract.

This study is a master’s thesis which investigates the relationship between the Finnish native population and the Finnish immigrant population by using an experimental research method called the imitation game. The material has been gathered in two separate “nationhood” imitation game events in Helsinki during 2015 with 28 participants in total. The central theoretical concept used for the analysis of the imitation game data is interactional expertise – a concept aimed to reveal how different social groups come to understand and recognize each other (Collins & Evans, 2013). By using an ethnomethodological perspective, interactional expertise has been further argued to include a group member’s ability to form an epistemic, experiential and categorical correspondence with a social group (Arminen & Simonen, 2015).

The focus of this thesis is twofolded: a) by investigating how native Finns distinguish themselves from Finnish immigrants, it aims to shed light on the process of inclusion and exclusion between the native Finnish population and the Finnish immigrant population. It will also critically assess the notion of “Finnish immigrants” as a social group by reviewing their ability to distinguish fellow Finnish immigrants from native Finns. And b) this is a methodological study which aims to assess and develop the analytical tools and typologies provided by previous imitation game research.
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1. Introduction

In spring 2015, as I was trying to find a topic for my thesis, the Finnish public debate regarding immigrants had rekindled. Notable Finnish politicians would utter statements such as “That kind of immigration policy I do not accept, in which people are not taught values, for example women must be respected. You should not rape” (MTV3, news article, 09.04.2015). It was apparent to me that in the public discussion there was an ongoing categorization of the Finnish immigrants as a homogeneous category and that it was somehow closely tied with the categorization of the Finnish national identity. Many argue that immigrants have been assigned the role of the “Other” in the national narratives and that the immigrant or the “Other” has become instrumental in the redefinition of national identities (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001, Shanahan, 1999, Keskinen et al. 2009).

Inspired by a course on an experimental research method held at the University of Helsinki in autumn 2015, I chose to study the native Finnish and Finnish immigrant relationships using the *Imitation Game* method. It is a method in which research participants, through computer mediated conversation, act as members of their own social group, as well as pretend to be members of the opposite group. Simultaneously, the participants attempt to identify group members from the pretending non-group members. The method has been used to investigate interactional expertise – a concept developed alongside the development of the imitation game method, by Harry Collins and his team at the Cardiff University. Interactional expertise is a certain type of knowledge, which enables non-group members to successfully imitate group-members in an imitation game environment (Collins & Evans, 2013, Collins & Evans, 2015).

Previous imitation game studies include, gender (female/male), sexuality (homosexual/heterosexual), vision (blind/sighted) and hearing (deaf/perfect pitch) (Collins & Evans, 2013). With interactional expertise Collins sought to measure the open- or closed character of different social groups. The more successful the imitation, the more open the group under study is. Difficulties in imitating, on the other hand, is a sign of the closed
character of the group. Thus, interactional expertise seeks to explore the phenomenon of social inclusion and exclusion in society (Collins & Evans, 2015).

Ilkka Arminen and Mika Simonen at the University of Helsinki have further developed the concept by focusing on the interactional methods that constitute interactional expertise (Arminen & Simonen, 2015). Using an ethnomethodological approach, Arminen and Simonen and I, argue that interactional expertise is the ability to form an epistemic, experiential and categorical congruence with group members (Arminen et al. 2016). In this thesis I analyse two different “nationhood” imitation games played in Helsinki in 2015 with 28 participants in total. The participants classified themselves as having either an immigrant background or a Finnish background. The focus of this thesis is two folded. On the one hand, I will, by exploring how native Finns distinguish themselves from Finnish immigrants, shed light on the process of inclusion and exclusion between the native Finnish population and the Finnish immigrant population. I will also critically assess the notion of “Finnish immigrants” as a social group by reviewing their ability to distinguish fellow Finnish immigrants from native Finns. On the other hand, it is a methodological research in which, I will discuss and review the imitation game as a research method, as well as the analytical tools provided for it in previous research (Arminen & Simonen, 2015, Collins & Evans, 2015).

Chapter two is a short revision of contemporary migration literature. I will discuss the basic concepts within the field (integration, nation and assimilation) and cover the larger theoretical frameworks (ethnic boundaries, post-colonialism and the cognitive perspective) that are relevant for this study. Chapter three is a thorough presentation of the imitation game method. I have positioned it early in this thesis, as it is necessary as a basis for the theoretical discussion regarding how to interpret the imitation game data in the following chapter. In chapter four will present the social constructivist perspective as presented by Berger & Luckmann in their work “The Social Construction of Reality” (Berger & Luckmann, 1971). I will especially discuss the notions subjective reality vis a vis objective reality in relation to the conceptualization of interactional expertise by Collins and Evans (2002, 2004, 2013, 2015). I will also present the ethnomethodological tradition by drawing upon writings by Harold Garfinkel (1984) John Heritage (1984), Harvey Sacks (1979) and David Silverman (1998). The presentation of the ethnomethodological tradition serves as a basis for the
understanding of the analytical approach of Arminen & Simonen (2015) for analysing the imitation game data.

In chapter five I will revise the organization and execution of the two nationhood imitation game events organized for this thesis and the material which they generated. In chapter six I have analysed the quantitative data by using the analytical tools provided by Collins and Evans (2013). I will demonstrate the results of the nationhood imitation games and compare them with the results of previous imitation game research.

Chapter seven is the main analysis of this thesis. By using the analytical tools developed by Arminen & Simonen (2015), I will argue how interactional expertise includes not only the ability of a non-group member to pretend to be a member of the opposite group, but also the ability of a group member to recognize and identify an imitator from a non-imitator. I will show how the native Finns’ and Finnish immigrants’ ability to recognize group members from non-group members is based on three dimensions: a) Epistemic correspondence and its granularity, b) experimental depth and identification, and c) categorical alignment. Other methods include: reviewing the language and scanning for exaggerations and stereotypes. I will argue that the dissimilar use of these dimensions and methods sheds light upon the dissimilarities in the character of the social groups under study. Finally, by drawing upon the theory presented in chapter four, I will argue for adding a new category to the typology provided by Arminen & Simonen (2015), as well as suggest a deeper understanding of the distinctions among the already existing typology.

In the conclusions I will further discuss the results from both the quantitative and qualitative analysis. I will position the findings of this research among previous research in migration studies, as well as discuss the findings against the backdrop of a rekindled and polarized political environment regarding immigrants in Finland. Additionally, I will review the imitation game as a method for studying phenomenon related to nationalism, immigration and integration. Finally, I will show how the imitation game method and the analytical tools developed alongside of it, can be used to study the groupness (Brubaker 2004) of the categories proposed by the researcher for the imitation game experiment.
2. Migration literature

Migration studies is a cross-disciplinary field with research that spans within the conceptual frameworks of a broad spectrum of different scientific fields. It is also segmented within the fields according to different schools of thought. Migration studies is also inherently global and comparative in the sense that the units of study are global movements of people and empirical studies are done locally within the framework of nationalities. This has led to a large quantity of comparative studies among countries, cities and peoples. Migration studies include topics such as transnationality (Schiller, 2010), gender (Donato et al. 2006), labour and care work (Williams, F. (2010), nationalism, race and ethnicity (Brubaker, 2009, Alba, 1997, Crul & Schneider, 2010, Jacobson, 1997, Bloemraad et al., 2008) and it has been claimed that the field encompasses such a vast number of research that summarizing it is more than a challenging task (Favell, 2008, Brubaker, 2009). In this chapter I will not try to summarize the field in its entirety, however, I will try to present as best as I can the sociological paradigm to which my research question belongs to, and thereby participate in the relevant scientific debate. The presentation of the field will be done by discussing the relevant conceptualization and its respective empirical research. The objects of study are native Finns and Finnish immigrants. Therefore, I will present the scientific debate regarding the definitions of the Nation and national identity, as well as the discussion regarding integration and assimilation.

2.1 Immigrant, Assimilation and Integration.

The grammatical definition of an immigrant is “A person who comes to live permanently in a foreign country.” (Oxford dictionary, 14.03.2016). The political technical definition of an immigrant is a person living in a country without being a citizen of the hosting nation. However, national statistics can also define immigrants as people who have another mother
tongue, or have a foreign-born mother (Rapo, 2011). Assimilation and integration attend to the problematization of the encounter between immigrants and host populations. The difference between them is not always clear and they are not entirely separated, as assimilation can be regarded as a certain manner or type of integration. However, the debate regarding assimilation and integration illustrates an informal divide between European and North American migration literature, both reflecting the differences in the historical, social and political context (Bloemraad et al. 2008). Assimilation has been defined as “… the decline, and as its endpoint, the disappearance of an ethnic/racial distinction and the cultural and social differences that express it” (Alba, 1997, p. 863). The implicit idea is that immigrants arriving to the US are on the path of economic, social and cultural integration and will sooner or later inevitably become a part of the American mainstream population. Therefore, the problematization and analytical focus has been to inspect which social, economic and cultural factors hinder, or promote this process and the cultural assimilation has been regarded as an inevitable consequence of the success of these factors (Bloemraad et al. 2008). In other words, if assimilation is to be viewed as a process with a beginning and an end, immigrants would be standing on one end of the process and the host population on the other, waiting for the immigrants to arrive and be fully integrated and form a part of the majority population. A major critique of assimilation theory is that its underlying premise is supportive of an Anglo-centric discourse where distinct cultural features of minorities are to be discarded in order to integrate with the dominant majority (Bloemraad et al. 2008). However, other definitions include “Becoming similar, in some respect, to some reference population” (Brubaker 2004, p. 129). Therefore, assimilation theory does not overlook the possibility of the majority population going towards the immigrants, assimilating some features of the minority population. However, it does generally imply an abandonment of difference (Alba, 1997).

European theories on integration on the other hand, tend to focus on a multiculturalist discourse, meaning integration into society without abandoning difference and instead, adding to the cultural and ethnic plurality. A common definition of integration is ‘the ability to participate fully in economic, social, cultural and political activities, without having to relinquish one's own distinct ethnocultural identity and culture’ (Valtonen 2004, p. 73). More attention is given to the State’s role in the integration process and the immigrant’s
political integration as politically active minorities (Bloemraad et al. 2008, Crul & Schneider, 2010). The debate regarding integration and assimilation illustrates that being an immigrant or a member of the hosting nation’s community is far more complex than merely having, or not having formal citizenship.

It is common to refer to immigrants as 1\textsuperscript{st} generation and 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation immigrants. 1\textsuperscript{st} generation immigrants are foreign born adults who have moved to another country, and 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation immigrants are the children of those immigrants (Crul & Schneider, 2010). This conceptualization is commonly used for measuring the level of integration and follows the implicit notion of assimilation in which each generation ought to be one step closer than the previous, to fully integrate with the hosting population. Maurice Crul and Jens Schneider (2010) have used the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation distinction to measure different levels of integration comparatively in eight different European cities. With the \textit{comparative integration context theory} they argue that the different levels of integration in the European countries is strongly influenced by the local institutional context. Differences in institutional arrangements in the labour market, in education, housing, religion and legislation influence the level of integration among the 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation immigrants. Additionally, local attitudes and public debate regarding immigrants, influence the feeling of belonging and cultural participation among immigrants (Crul & Schneider, 2010). They also problematize the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation typology by arguing that especially in large European cities, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation immigrants form a considerable part of the local population and are sometimes more local than the natives, who have spent their lives coming and going from the city (Crul & Schneider, 2010).

2.2 The Nation and the National Identity

The definitions of immigrants, integration and assimilation are based on the implicit premise of existing nation states and a common national identity among the host population. There is no common understanding or definition of nations or national identities within the social scientific debate (Jacobson, 1997). Some argue that the use of nations as a premise for the analysis of modern social organization, consolidate the position of nation states as natural state of affairs, and therefore question the use of nations as a basis for analysis all together.
Benedict Anderson’s (1983) argument that nations are *imagined communities* is a commonly accepted general conceptualization of nations and national identities. Anderson argues that the, at times very powerful, sense of communion among the populace within geopolitical borders is *imagined*, due to the fact that even the smallest nation has a population big enough to make it impossible for each member to know each other, have met each other, or even heard of each other. It is a historical analysis which regards the nation and the national identity as creations of the bourgeoisie, as a means to maintain or gain material resources (Anderson, 1983). Through a comparative historical analysis he demonstrated how, among others, South American nations and the respective national identities were conjured in the midst of emerging economic class interests among the local bourgeoisie to detach from the European imperial powers. National romanticism is an essential part in the process, as it forms the cultural symbolic material upon which to manifest a nation-wide sense of, and common image of, communion (Anderson, 1983).

A similar historical analysis is that of Ernest Gellner, who regarded nationalism as a consequence of industrialization and urbanization (Gellner, 1983). Gellner argued that nationalism legitimized the new political and economic system which was brought by the shift from an agrarian feudal society to a modern industrialised society (Gellner, 1983). Michael Billig (1995) argued that having a national identity means to, apart from being situated physically, socially and legally within a geopolitical area, to be situated emotionally within a homeland and to have internalized ways of thinking about nationhood and other nations. He coined the concept “Banal nationalism” which attends to how national identities, and the shared sense of belonging which they entail, are built and maintained by everyday representations of the nation through cultural means (Billig, 1995). These definitions explain the emergence and maintenance of national identities on a macro-level. The important break was to perceive nationalities as social constructions and not as essentialized common cultural traits or ancestries embodied by the local populations.

2.3 Ethnicity & Ethnic Boundaries

Nations and nationalities are closely related to ethnicities. Consequently, the Nation has been defined as “a self-aware ethnic group” (Connor, 1978, p. 388). A common
anthropological approach describes ethnic groups as aggregates of people who are biologically self-perpetuating, share a common culture and make up a field of distinct communication and interaction (Naroll et al., 1964). This approach perceives ethnic groups as fixed entities that are essentially different and exclusive of one another. Within this framework, Finns could perhaps be regarded as an ethnic group, with their own language and distinct traditions. The Finnish immigrants on the other hand, include an array of different ethnicities and accordingly cannot be defined as a unit of analysis within this framework.

By drawing on Fredrik Barths notion on boundaries, nations have been defined as collectivities in which the boundaries of the group, together with the symbols and meanings entailed with membership in the national community, are continuously negotiated and redefined by individuals and subgroups both within and outside the national community (Vadher & Barrett, 2009). Fredrik Barth (1970) shifted the focus from inspecting the inner constitution and workings of the ethnic group, to the symbolic boundaries between them. Barth’s main argument was that ethnic groups do not emerge from social exclusion of one another but on the contrary, through the interaction with one another, creating distinctions between us and them. Ethnic groups are then perceived as categories to which actors identify themselves with and ascribe to others. Ethnicity is no longer seen as a static units embodied by a group of actors, but rather as a process in which ethnic categorisation is the defining and ultimate bases of the existence of ethnic groups and relations (Barth, 1970).

Boundary making between ethnic groups is generally seen as a two-sided process, in which different groups actively negotiate and define themselves through the “other” (Baubock, 1994, Lamont, 2002). Majority-minority relationships entail a different variant of inter-ethnic relationships. So called Pariah groups are groups that are mainly maintained by an excluding majority host population and emerge when a pre-established cultural contrast is brought into a pre-established social system. Pariah groups are actively excluded by the host population but have not developed internally enough to be regarded as qualified ethnic groups (Barth, 1970).

By focusing on boundaries, the problem regarding whether Finns or Finnish immigrants are a group or how to define them becomes less relevant. Barth argued that the relevance of
ethnicities is determined by whether or not they form boundaries that channel patterns of interaction in consequential ways (Barth, 1970).

In migration literature boundaries have been associated with the process of integration, assimilation, inclusion and exclusion. In a comparative analysis, Richard Alba (2005) typified boundaries into *blurred boundaries* and *bright boundaries* in order to explain how local contextual differences affect the process of assimilation and exclusion among 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation immigrants between Mexican minorities in the United States, Maghrebins in France and Turks in Germany. Bright boundaries are boundaries which have clear terms of membership. Blurred boundaries on the other hand, have ambiguous terms of membership, meaning that the position within or outside the boundary is unclear for some sets of individuals. These individuals appear to be simultaneously members of more than one group, or shift between the boundaries depending on the context. Therefore, blurred boundaries allow individuals to identify themselves with both the ethnic minority and the mainstream population. Citizenship is generally a bright boundary as its terms of membership are based on whether or not the individuals have formal citizenship or not (Alba, 2005).

The study has an institutional perspective and asks if the difference in assimilation can be explained according to whether or not the institutionalized boundaries of citizenship, religion, language and race are bright or blurred in the different national contexts. A specific conclusion was that the Mexican situation in the United States was characterized by blurred boundaries with the exception of race, meaning that the American mainstream population has a clear boundary that excludes phenotypical traits ascribed to the Mexican category (Alba, 2005).

Jessica Jacobson (1997) made a qualitative study about how the boundaries of Britishness are interpreted and managed by young British Pakistani adults. Through interviews, Jacobson found that there are several different boundaries of national identification that operate in the imagination of the British Pakistanis. Jacobson organized the boundaries expressed by the participants in to three categories; Civic boundary, racial boundary and cultural boundary. Civic boundary refers to British citizenship, racial boundary refers to an ancestral British bloodline, and cultural boundary attends to the distinctions made based on culture, values and lifestyle. The focus of the study was to see which components of the British identity are exclusive and which are inclusive to differences. Civic and racial
boundaries are relatively straight forward, whereas the cultural boundary is not clearly defined. It refers to matters which distinguish a Briton from the non-Britons, such as knowledge of British food, clothing, popular culture and traditions. The cultural boundary differs also from the other boundaries in that its content and meaning constantly changes depending on the context.

Another similar study was done by Kiren Vadher and Martyn Barrett (Vadher, 2009) who interviewed British Pakistani and Indian young adults. They further developed Jacobson’s classification of boundaries by adding three more categories. Instrumental boundary attends to the individual’s inclusion within services organized by the state or the community. Cultural boundary was further divided into three separate categories; Historical, lifestyle, and multicultural boundaries. Historical boundary includes the use of historical narratives. Lifestyle boundaries are closely related to Billig’s notion of banal nationalism (1995), where choice of film, music and dressing make them more, or less British. The multicultural boundary attends to the idea of a multicultural Britishness; a national identity which includes and embraces different modes of life.

The typology works as a tool to conceptualize Britishness and see how the respondents position themselves according to it either as members or outsiders. The authors concluded that the manner by which the participants think about Britishness and their inclusion or exclusion, is far more complex and multi-layered than what the conceptualization permits. The use of boundaries is fluid and context-dependent. One finding was that the multicultural boundary had the capacity to nullify all the other boundaries. By drawing on the multicultural discourse, other exclusionary boundaries were eliminated at a psychological level. It was also a comparative study and showed the integration of Pakistanis is more restricted than the Indians’ due to their Muslim heritage and identity (Vadher, 2009).

2.4 The Post-colonial Perspective and the Immigrant “Other”

The Muslim identity has been considered crucial to the reception and attitude towards immigrants in the European host countries (Zolberg, 1999). In a macro analysis of the
cultural dimension of the presence of immigrants in contemporary western societies, Aristide Zolberg and Long Litt Woon (1999) argue that religion still plays an important role in the construction and maintenance of the European identity. Despite of their apparent heterogeneity, immigrants are essentialized as dangerous strangers in the eyes of the hosting populations and the reluctance of European institutions to incorporate and facilitate Islam on pair with the Christian institutions, maintains the dividing line between the European identity and the immigrant “Other”. The “Othering” of immigrants in Europe is argued to be caused by the revival of the *Oriental* subject in the wake of elevated attention given to Islamic extremism in the 1970s (Zolberg 1999).

The illustration of The Orient as constituting the “Other” to the European or Western identity was first introduced by the post-colonial theoriest Edward Said. In a historical analysis, Said (1978) analyzed the cultural material produced in Europe about the Orient and explained postcolonial society and the mechanisms of power within it. It is a theory influenced by Marxism and post-structuralism and utilizes concepts such as cultural hegemony and discourse to explain the significance of language and symbolism in social relationships. Said used the concept of the “Other” to explain the relationship between Europe and the Orient during the cultural colonization of the Orient in the 18th century. He asserts that in order for dominant groups to become truly dominant and to legitimize their dominance over another social category, the “Other” must be created as an inferior category. The central argument is, that the Orient was created as a cultural counterpart for Europe, therefore creating the two subjects; Europe and the “Other”. This mechanism took its modern character through the European academia called “Orientalism”, which included all the arts and sciences dedicated to describe and explain the rather vague geographic region we call “the Orient” (Said, 1978).

The Orient confirms itself as a social construction in the similarity, continuity and consistency of the ideas that cling to the geographical space that is usually referred as the Orient. The Orient is not passively reflected through institutions and cultural works, nor is it a vague collection of research. It is a distribution of a constellation of coherent ideas which represent a certain type of geopolitical consciousness – a consciousness where the world is laid out in two opposites; the West and the “Other” (Said, 1978).
Said (1978) argues that the creation and the definition of the Orient, also created and defined Europe in a dualistic manner as it’s opposite. In this relationship the Orient is the same as “not-Europe”. The Orient did not only take part in the establishment and enforcement of the European cultural hegemony, it was in fact fundamental for the creation of the Western subject. As the Orient represented ideas such as, spiritualism, backwardness, fascism, patriarchy, mysticism and irrationality, Europe represented the opposite; science, modernity, civilization, rationality, freedom and democracy. The “Othering” of the Orient was therefore also a process where all the heterogeneity of the Orient was homogenized under just one set of symbols. Meaning that all the particularities, ways of life and ideas within a geographical area were gathered below just one set of ideas containing the aforementioned constellation of ideas.

The post-colonial theoretical framework has been utilized for studying immigration in the Nordic countries as well (Keskinen et al. 2009). Jaana Vuori (2009) analyzed guide material given to immigrants arriving to Finland. Vuori argued that the guidebooks reflect the image which Finnish institutions have about immigrants and by drawing on the notion of the “Other”, the image is argued to mirror the Finnish identity construction in a consequential way. The analysis showed that connections and associations are made between topics such as individuals, violence and gender. Insinuating on the generalized idea that men with an immigrant background are prone to domestic violence. Vuori calls this an “illuminating example of colonial and racist imagination which reproduces the “Other”.” (Vuori, 2009 p. 210).

The guidebooks contain gendered models of representing immigrants and Finns. Women are talked about in reference to the elderly and children, deriving from the logic of women as being natural caretakers. The institutional approach to the identity construction of Finns and immigrants show how gender-equality within Finnish society and welfare-system are strongly emphasized and works as a dividing line between the Finn and the “Other”. Immigrants are perceived as arriving from a pre-modern society and are therefore considered as students of equality instead of active agents aspiring to it and defining it, as the political multiculturalist discourse would suggest (Vuori, 2009). By presenting immigrants as having a traditional gender and family system, the immigrant is placed behind the Finn within the discursive view of human development as a trajectory from pre-
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modernity to modernity. Therefore, immigrant culture is thought to be in a different timeline from the Finnish culture (Vuori, 2009). Said argues that modernity as a concept is fundamental for understanding the colonizing process. History and time is depicted as a naturalized grand narrative of humanity - a linear development from the traditional to modernity. By being a hegemonic power, the West asserts what modernity constitutes and that modernity is something the West has already achieved, and something that others ought to strive for. In this setup the traditional or pre-modern subjects are placed in a hierarchical order below the Western one (Said, 1978).

Nanna Brink Larsen (2009) analyzed conversations among social workers and immigrant mothers. The purpose of the discussions was to improve the education of migrant children. Larsen found that the “Orientalized Other” was projected in the communication and ideas among the social workers. The opinions and ideas were based on internalized constructions of “how things are” in the Middle-east, instead of on what the immigrant mothers were actually saying. Larsen refers to the western epistemological hegemony, in that the knowledge produced by a western academic is superior to the experiences of the “Other”. The concept institutional nationalism, explores the welfare states role in producing and reproducing the national identity and its relationship to the minorities. Larsen argues that the institutional nationalism is especially problematic in the Nordic countries. The institutions work under the national banner and can thereby outline the national moral and cultural discourse. The state institutions self-legitimize their own activities, and the universal ideals projected by the welfare state does not always leave space for different modes of life and ideas, again as is propagated by the political multicultural discourse (Larsen, 2009)

Suvi Keskinen (2009) made a narrative analysis of an “honour-related murder” as presented in Finnish media. Keskinen argues that the media representations of the murder was a space where the meanings of race, ethnicity, religion and gender were negotiated. The narrative was based upon the juxtaposed categorizations of the Swede and the “Other”. Honour-related murder was established as a connotation, one among many others, for the “Other”. The main finding was the use of emotions in the production of discourse. The emotions attached to the stories reproduced and enforced the notion of the “Other” alongside with “Swedishness” (Keskinen, 2009).
The post-colonial research done on immigration within the Nordic region uses material produced by hegemonic institutions. Vuori (2009) analyzed guide-material produced within Finnish social institutions, Larsen (2009) analyzed media representations and Keskinen (2009) analyzed discussions among social workers. The post-colonial perspective suggests that the immigrant subject is socially constructed, not by the immigrants themselves, but by the relevant hegemonic power. The framework of *us* and the “Other” allows the categorization of an ethnically and culturally heterogeneous set of people and thereby also permits an analysis of the relationship between the majority population and the ensemble of ethnicities which constitutes the immigrant category. The theory on boundaries on the other hand, is closely knit with the notion of ethnicity. Few studies have been made which do not include two separate sets of people with some common ethnic or cultural characteristic with which to negotiate their identity and position. This is also the weakness of post-colonial theory as it leaves out the immigrants own identity negotiations. The strength of the post-colonial perspective lies in critically revealing the mechanisms of power and how the mesh of socially constructed perceptions that current discourse has on both the immigrant subject and the national subject is represented and projected through hegemonic institutions. However, it doesn’t prove instrumental for analyzing how the socially constructed subjects manifest themselves among the population or how it is reflected within everyday interaction.

2.5 The Cognitive Perspective

Rogers Brubaker (2004) argues that boundary studies have stalled in the recent years in the sense that boundaries have already proven themselves and hardly produce new knowledge. The criticism is based on the “groupist” idiom within boundary research. Thinking in groups is something inherent both in everyday life and social scientific literature. By taking distance from groups and by separating the categories to which they are ascribed, the unit of analysis is no longer the group or the boundaries which encloses it, but the categories themselves as detached entities (Brubaker, 2004). From a cognitive perspective, ethnicity and nationhood are not constituted by groups or identities, but rather as elements which form our interpretation of reality (Brubaker, 2009). Instead of conceptualizing the social world as an
ensemble of different national, racial, ethnic or sexual groups, the cognitive perspective addresses the mental processes that make us interpret the social world within the frames of national, racial, ethnical or sexual discourse (Brubaker, 2004). Brubaker et al. (Brubaker et al. 2006) analysed how nationalism and ethnicity is reflected in the everyday life of people in the Transylvanian city of Cluj. They demonstrated how ethnicity and nationalism, as articulated in public debate through objectified symbols, was expressed in peoples’ common-sense knowledge, and reproduced in private conversations. The researchers focused on when and in what situations ethnic or nationalistic categories were invoked. Although nationalist rhetoric and discourse as propagated by public institutions was largely absent in the interviews, ethnicity and nationalism remained a strong influence in shaping their daily experience.

The cognitive perspective permits the researcher to take distance from the notion of a group and avoid the question of whether or not the object of study is a group or not. It relieves the researcher from the uncomfortable position to run the risk of creating the object which she or he intends to investigate. The social categories Finn and immigrant exist as words used by members of society, and the cognitive perspective attends to how they affect the way members of society interpret the reality in which they live in.

Ethnomethodology is a branch within the cognitive perspective and focuses on how members of society draw upon social categories when doing social life (Brubaker, 2009). It highlights how members of society use categories and interactional methods when interpreting and reproducing the social world. Instead of attempting to prove that nations or national identities exist as social constructs, or that they constitute a part of our everyday experience, the ethnomethodological perspective aims to reveal how members of society actively draw, or do not draw upon them when interpreting action, events or descriptions as well as when providing descriptions of action and events. Most of the research presented in this chapter have studied how institutional arrangements and institutionalized boundaries make a distinction between the hosting population and an ethnicized immigrant population and thereby provide the basis for the process of exclusion and inclusion. The post-colonial perspective suggests that the immigrant subject is socially constructed, not by the immigrants themselves, but by the relevant hegemonic power. The framework of us and the “Other” allows the categorization of an ethnically and culturally
heterogeneous set of people and thereby also permits an analysis of the relationship between the majority population and the ensemble of ethnicities which would constitute the immigrant category. The theory on boundaries on the other hand, is closely knit with the notion of ethnicity. Few studies have been made which do not include two separate sets of people with some common ethnic or cultural characteristic with which to negotiate their identity and position. This is also the weakness of post-colonial theory as it leaves out the immigrants own identity negotiations. The strength of the post-colonial perspective lies in critically revealing the mechanisms of power and how the mesh of socially constructed perceptions that current discourse has on both the immigrant subject and the national subject is represented and projected through hegemonic institutions. However, it doesn’t prove instrumental for analyzing how the socially constructed subjects manifest themselves among the population or how it is reflected within everyday interaction.

The perspective adopted in this research falls under what Brubaker calls the “cognitive perspective” which, by analysing the objects of study as social constructs, attends to how they take place in the minds of members of society and shape their ways of understanding difference in society. In chapter four the social constructionist and ethnomethodological perspective will be further discussed in relation with the research method used in this research. The following chapter is a revision of the imitation game method.

3. The Imitation Game

The imitation game is an experimental research method developed by Collins and his team at the Cardiff University (Collins & Evans, 2013). The idea originates from an old parlor game where a group of people attempt to imitate and identify each other through written conversation without seeing each other face to face. Alan Turing, famous for his contributions in the computer sciences, and recently also as the protagonist and inspiration for a popular film called the Imitation Game, was inspired by the game and developed the so-called Turing Test, which was intended to serve as an indicator of artificial intelligence. If
a computer was able to imitate a human being so well as to make it impossible for a person to, through typed conversation distinguish a computer from another person, the Turing test was passed (Turing, 1950).

The Turing test was further developed by Collins et al. (2013) to serve social scientific purposes. It follows the same idea in that it provides an environment where participants communicate with one another through typed questions and answers, without knowing the identity of one another. Instead of testing whether or not a computer can successfully imitate a human being, the imitation game tests if and how a non-group member is able to imitate a member of a target group through typed text so well as to make it impossible for a member of the target group to distinguish between a member of his or her own group from a non-group member.

The imitation game model has been developed alongside with theorization and conceptualization of different forms of expertise (Collins, 2002, Collins & Evans, 2013, Collins et al. 2015). The theory will be discussed in depth in chapter four, but at this point a short summary is necessary in order to illustrate the social dynamics that is regarded as being at play between the groups in the imitation game setting, and consequently how the groups are set-up and categorized. There are always two groups playing against each other in imitation game experiments and they are essentially distinguished by being experts or non-experts of a specific target group or field. Commonly there is only one target group under study. Collins et al. (2013) made imitation game experiments between the blind and the sighted and between homosexuals and heterosexuals. In an imitation game organized by Arminen and Simonen the target group was “active-Christians” and therefore divided the participants into active-Christians and non-religious. In all of these games one of the groups were regarded as experts and the other as non-experts or “everyone else” in reference to the expertise that the proposed target groups entail. The gender imitation game organized by Collins et al. divided the participants according to gender and in this case, men were considered experts at whatever expertise manhood entails and women were considered experts in whatever expertise womanhood entails. Whether there are one or two target
groups has further implications for the analysis of the imitation game data, but for the moment it is enough to acknowledge that although a target group is loosely associated to the notion of a social group and being an expert entails group membership, the categorization of the groups for the imitation game is not based on the notion of a social group per se, but rather on the knowledge which constitutes the expertise, that the researchers proposed target groups do or do not have.

![Imitation Game environment](image)

An imitation game consists of three participants, a judge, a pretender and a non-pretender. The judge has target expertise and asks questions with which she or he thinks might reveal single out the target group member from the non-group member. The pretender will pretend to have target expertise and answers the judge’s questions as if he or she was a member of the target group. The non-pretender has target expertise and responds to the judge’s questions genuinely. Upon receiving the respondents’ answers, the judge evaluates them and decides which one is from a member of the same target group and which one is not.

3.1 The Imitation Game Event

In practice, two groups are recruited by the researcher to communicate with one another via computers at what I have baptized as an imitation game event. The participants arrive at the same time and date to a room equipped with computers. Upon arriving, each participant is given an individual code with which to login to the program. When all the participants have logged in, the program randomly assigns each participant with two respondents; a pretender and a non-pretender. Consequently, each participant plays as the judge of his or her own imitation game, as a pretender in the imitation game of a judge from
the opposite group, and as a non-pretender in the imitation game of a judge from the same group. The participants are allowed to ask as many questions as they want about whichever topic they find relevant. Usually the judges ask three to eight questions until they are confident of which respondent is the pretender and which is the non-pretender.

The game is played via computers in real-time. When the game starts each participant begins by asking a question and by giving a motivation for why the specific question was asked. The given interface examples are only in the Finnish language. The questions and answers are made up by me and added to the original blank interface in order to illustrate clearer how the game might proceed.

When a question and motivation is given, the participant moves forward to one of the two other pages by clicking the green or red button and proceeds by answering a question which any of the two assigned judges has asked.
In the example above the participant will answer genuinely as a non-pretender. In the following example the participant will *pretend* to be a part of the same group as the judge and attempt to answer as she or he thinks that a member of the other group would answer.

When the two randomly assigned respondents have responded to the judge’s question, he or she may look at the answers and based on the content of the answers, determine which answer is written by the pretender and which by the non-pretender.
Additionally, the judge’s tasks include to evaluate the choice made from a scale of 1 to 4 and also motivate his or her decision. The game ends when each player has asked so many questions that they are confident about which of the respondents is a Pretender and which a Non-Pretender. At this point a final evaluation ensues:
The Imitation Game generates several different types of both quantitative and qualitative data: the questions asked by Judges; the answers provided by the respondents; the decision of each Judge as to who is who; a measure of each Judge’s confidence about his or her decision on a four point scale; and the reason given by each Judge for their decision. The judges’ decisions, confidences and reasons are recorded after each question-and-answer turn and a separate final judgement/reason is collected to evaluate the dialog as a whole. In addition, it is possible to create more data by doing second, third and fourth stage experiments, in which the researcher chooses excerpts from the existing data and has a bigger sample population answer and evaluate the dialogue, as had been done by Arminen.
& Simonen (2015) in the religious imitation game experiments. Finally, it is also possible to ask participants to complete surveys before and/or after the experiment in order to compliment the Imitation Game data with demographic information. The following chapter outlines the theoretical framework used in this thesis to interpret the social interaction within the imitation game environment.

4. Theoretical Perspective

Alan Turing (1950) developed the imitation game in an effort to see whether a computer could imitate a human being so well as to make it impossible for another person to distinguish the computer from a person. This is sociologically an interesting question as it draws attention to the common human experience and how it is shared in society. In this chapter I will explore the notion of intersubjectivity from a social constructivist perspective (Berger & Luckmann, 1971) and from an ethnomethodological perspective (Garfinkel, 1984, Heritage, 1984, Sacks, 1998). I will argue that the imitation game tests the intersubjectivity as presented by the aforementioned authors. In a way, the imitation game experiment attends to the question of if, and to what extent we share the same experience of reality with our fellow men and women. By reviewing Professor Collin’s concept interactional expertise, I will present how the imitation game has been used as a tool to test the notion of interactional expertise and to measure the open or closed character of social groups. I will then discuss the problematics of applying the concept to a wider societal context as a way to explain how it is possible for members with different realities to understand each other. By drawing upon the notions subjective reality and objective reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1971), I will argue that by changing the conceptual premise laid out by Collins et al. (2002, 2013, 2015), interactional expertise can in fact, be used in a wider context.

I will present Arminen & Simonens (2015) analysis on the imitation game material and how it, by taking an ethnomethodological approach, can reveal the different ways by which members of society share their experiences and distinguish one another by the use of different methods of interaction.
Throughout the chapter, I will discuss the possibilities of the imitation game as a method, and the applicability of the aforementioned analytical approaches for investigating the relationship of the native Finnish community and Finnish immigrant community, and how it might illuminate the ways by which native Finns and Finnish immigrant distinguish themselves from one another.

4.1. Imitation Game - Measuring Intersubjectivity

In the imitation game experiment, individuals communicate with one another via written text without seeing each other face to face. The participants are gathered and divided by the researcher in two groups. Based on written communication, participants then attempt to recognize the group-membership of the other participants. Participants also try to imitate the other group, making it more challenging than just asking “are you x or y?”. The participants’ capacity to distinguish a group member from a non-group member, and to imitate and produce similar utterings as a non-group member, attends to the notion of intersubjectivity – to what extent do individuals and groups experience and share the same reality?

In this chapter the imitation game will be presented as an intersubjectivity test and I will discuss how different analytical approaches designed to analyse the imitation game data (Collins & Evans, 2013, Arminen & Simonen, 2015) attend to the notion of intersubjectivity. Hopefully, the discussion will illuminate the question of shared or non-shared realities among communities in society, and enable an analysis of the relationship between the native Finnish community and the Finnish immigrant community based on data generated in an imitation game experiment.

4.2. Sociology of knowledge

Berger & Luckmann define intersubjectivity as a *congruence of subjective realities* (Berger & Luckmann, 1971, p. 149). The individual attains its own subjective reality by going through two stages of socialization. The first stage, primary socialization, is characterized by a realization of the *generalized other* – a synonym to society at large. It is a process in which
the individual locates itself in society, becomes a member of society and begins taking part in society. Without the realization of the generalized other, the individual can locate him or herself only according to the concrete significant others, such as family and friends for example. The generalized other is everyone the individual knows exist, but does not know personally. Through the realization of the generalized other, the member’s subjective identity stabilizes and doesn’t change by each encounter (Berger & Luckmann 1971). Taking myself as an example, during my primary socialization I would have first realized that I was part of a family unit and positioned myself as the youngest brother of four. My first realization of a generalized other, might have been the realization that I was a boy like all the rest of the boys in the world, which was in various ways different from being a girl. Then, I could have realized I was a Finn, which was different from all the Russians I didn’t know personally, but who my grandfather always talked about. At this point I had taken a position in society and at the same time, in a dialectic process, partaking in the construction of it. The same position would be the angle from which I experience the empirical environment as a subjective reality, which is different from my brothers’, girls’ or the Russians’ angle.

During the second socialization the member is placed within the division of labour where, his or her subjective reality moulds according to the stock of knowledge available to the specific position that the individual has located itself. It is the division of labour which has produced the institutions in society among which, the individual orientates itself. The different positions are characterized by roles (Berger & Luckmann, 1971). Roles and the necessary stock of knowledge can be more apparent (ex. gravitational wave physicist) but the gravitational wave physicist is also a male or a female, Christian or Muslim, native Finn or Finnish immigrant and so forth. Berger & Luckmanns theory is based on dialectics and therefore emphasize that these roles are both necessary for- and a function of the bigger institutional context. Institutions both produce and are reproduced by roles and it is through roles that institutions are embodied in the individual experience. Some roles are parts of institutions that withhold knowledge that is not available to all, forming sub-universes of meaning. Sub-universes of meaning are generally competing with each other over the interpretation of the empirical environment (Berger & Luckmann, 1971). The field of gravitational wave physics can be regarded as a sub-universe of meaning as the knowledge
is not widely available in society as well as it competes with other scientific fields for the correct interpretation of the empirical environment.

The availability of the social stock of knowledge is defined by the position a member takes in the structure of society. However, as the human cognitive capabilities are restricted, the member’s acquisition of knowledge is also governed by a pragmatic motive (Berger & Luckmann, 1971). The pragmatic motive is based on the assumption that it is impossible for the individual member of society to acquire and integrate all the knowledge required in his or her daily affairs, however, most members know from who and from where the information can be withdrawn. This is what Berger & Luckmann (1971) call recipe knowledge. For a lawyer it can be too time consuming to learn how to fix a broken car, but the lawyer will most probably know where to go in order to fix it. The same goes for the repairman when in need of legal help. So recipe knowledge is the knowledge of about who has the knowledge that we need.

Socialization is an ongoing process and subjective realities may change even dramatically during a member’s lifetime, but generally the foundation of a member’s subjective reality, (embodied during the first socialization) is more or less static and maintained through reality maintenance. Normal everyday conversation is one of the procedures which maintains the taken for granted subjective reality. Through conversation about the weather, politics, family and occupation a members taken for granted reality is reaffirmed and in a dialectic process the institutional reality is reproduced (Berger & Luckmann, 1971).

So the members subjective reality is socially constructed and a product of the acquired knowledge from the socially available stock of knowledge. The authors write descriptively that “the reality of everyday life always appears as a zone of lucidity behind which there is a background of darkness” (Berger & Luckmann, 1971, p.31). The zones of lucidity are comprised by the total mass of stock of knowledge acquired by the individual. The ethnomethodologist John Heritage (Heritage, 1984) presents another analogy in which the member’s everyday reality is like the knowledge of a city. Generally a city dwellers knowledge of a city is detailed and clear around her or his own apartment. She or he probably knows quite well the area around the work place and around the possible hobbies as well. The area of commute is also known but not as detailed as the before mentioned locations. Then the rest of the city, where the member has no business, is perceived as an
unknown area, a vague and blurry undefined mass. In other words, the city consists of the sum total of categorizations of social life whereas the citizen can only know certain parts of it. The question of intersubjectivity would then be if, and to what extent different citizens of the city share the same knowledge of the city. My answer would be that no two persons can share exactly the same subjective reality for the simple reason that we cannot share our physical bodies, which are in themselves subject to typification and categorization. However, some members have more similar experiences than others depending on their position in the social structure and therefore, it can be argued that despite the heterogeneity of the categories, the native Finns and Finnish immigrants might have distinctive ways of experiencing the respective categories based on their shared position within our outside the categories. In the imitation game, judges try to distinguish imitators from non-imitators by reflecting whether or not the answers to their questions reflect what they would expect from a member with similar experiences. Therefore it can be argued that the imitation game is measuring to what extent the subjective realities of the judge and the respondents correspond to each other.

The notion of intersubjectivity among individual members of society and the difference in subjective realities caused by different positions in the socially typified world, raises the question of how two individuals with different subjective realities come to understand each other and more importantly, how they are able to reproduce each other’s reality and be able to convincingly imitate one another in an imitation game setting. Professor Harry Collins’ and Robert Evans’ (2002, 2004, 2013, 2015) answer to this would be that it is through interactional expertise.

4.2.1. Interactional expertise

Interactional expertise is a form of tacit knowledge, that professor Harry Collins faced after various degrees of involvement as a sociologist in different fields of specialization. After a prolonged exposure to the field of gravitational wave physics, Collins was able to discuss gravitational wave physics with the experts within the field so fluently, that the distinction between expert and non-expert became ambiguous. Collins developed the concept interactional expertise to distinguish the type of knowledge which is clearly different from
practical expertise. It is based on the distinction between formal propositional knowledge and embodied skill. The idea is that a person can for example learn to speak about bicycle riding convincingly without knowing how to do it in practice (Collins & Evans, 2015).

The concept has its roots in science studies as an attempt to bring attention to the different types of expert knowledges both within and especially outside scientific communities (Collins & Evans, 2002). It is based on the distinction between social and individual embodiment theses. The individual embodiment theses implies that an individual may with sufficient linguistic exposure, learn the language of a community without sharing the same physical experiences. The social embodiment thesis implies that if the physical experience of the individual becomes dominant in the community, over time the language of the community changes accordingly (Collins, 2004). Berger & Luckmann (1971) make a similar distinction between knowledge and action when explaining the institutionalization of action and the development of corresponding roles in society. By taking the institution of hunting as an example, they assert that no part of the institutionalization of hunting can exist without the particular knowledge that has been socially produced and objectivated in relation to the activity.

Interactional expertise highlights the fact that being able to speak the language of a community is a social skill that is different from being able to practice the corresponding activities (Collins & Evans, 2002, Collins, 2004, Collins & Evans, 2015). In the case of hunting, the interactional expert would be capable of conversing about hunting with a group of hunters without having any practical experience of the activity. In the same manner, being able to practice an activity does not necessarily translate into being able to speak the same language. This would imply that the practical knowledge of hunting is not enough to appear as a member of any particular group of hunters. A hunter might be able to converse fluently about hunting within the own tribe, but in the neighbouring tribe the language generated in respect to hunting may be entirely different. This is clear when the neighbouring tribe speaks another language or dialect, but even within the same language there might be very different discursive ways of speaking about the same activity. Bluntly, the difference can be articulated as knowing about something, and knowing how something ought to be experienced and talked about.
Even though the concept has its origins in the interest about the character of specialist knowledge and expert groups, Collins suggests that the notion of interactional expertise can be extended to include a wider understanding of society. **Ubiquitous interactional expertise** refers to how different social groups in the general population can come to understand each other without sharing the same practices (Collins & Evans, 2015). Collins et al. (2002, 2004, 2015) have further developed studies about expertise to identify the different types of expertise one can have in a specialist field. With the concepts interactional expertise, **contributory expertise, referred expertise, translation and discrimination** they aim to reveal the flow of knowledge between different actors in society. However, the focus is on expert or “specialist” knowledge and their intention is to create understanding about the relationship between the political decision making and the knowledge among the civic community and expert communities. This conceptualization is not helpful in my study about the relationship between the Finnish national community and the Finnish immigrant community. The earlier mentioned ubiquitous expertise has far more potential for my research, but it seems that it has been laid to rest for the moment and consequently the concept is left rather vague.

4.2.2. Subjective reality determined by practical experience?

Ubiquitous expertise would be at play every time two members have an understanding without sharing the same practical experience (Collins & Evans, 2015). Collins & Evans acknowledge the risk of mixing interactional expertise with language as a whole, but argue that ubiquitous expertise has to do with delivering practical understandings of the other without requiring that the practices of the other to be practiced (Collins & Evans, 2015). If I were to use this conceptualization in the analysis of the interaction between the native Finns and Finnish immigrants in the imitation game data, the underlying assumption would be that the native Finns or the Finnish immigrants, or both, have a shared practical experience which the other does not have, and that the success or failure of their imitation attempts is the result of the ubiquitous interactional expertise they have of one another’s shared practical experience.
It remains rather unclear how *practical experience* is defined in terms of larger communities. It is easier to understand in the imitation game experiments which Collins & Evans (2013) set up between a group of visually impaired and a group with perfect vision. Hence, referred to as “proof of concept” imitation games (Collins & Evans, 2013, p. 3). The respective groups’ practical experience of their surroundings is collectively different from one another due to physiological sensory differences. The same applies (certainly to a lesser extent) to women and men as women and men differ physiologically from one another. It is also safe to say that gravitational wave physicists have a different practical experience with reference to their area of expertise than non-experts. However, when it comes to larger and more abstract communities, such as nationalities or religions, the notion of practical experience turns out difficult to apply. Members of the respective communities do not necessarily differ physiologically, or in their daily practical experiences, between the communities more than they do within the communities. Could the differences in practical experience among members of society be equated with the differences in subjective realities created by the heterogeneity of the acquired stock of knowledge of each member as a result of the different positions taken by them among the institutions of society as argued by Berger & Luckmann (1971)?

Secondly, Collins defines interactional expertise as a member’s ability to understand and reproduce experiences of something which he or she does not have practical experience of (Collins & Evans, 2015). In an imitation game setting, the underlying assumption is that the judge and the imitator do not share the same practical experience of whatever is asked, and the outcome of an imitation attempt would be measured by the imitator’s interactional expertise. If the imitator has had sufficient linguistic exposure to the subject matter, he or she ought to, according to the individual embodiment thesis, be able to produce an uttering similar to what the judge would expect from his or her fellow members. Consequently, the judge would be convinced that the respondent shares the same practical experiences as he or she and is a member of the same community. However, is it not possible that a hunter might have the same practical experience of hunting as hunters from another village, but nevertheless be detected in an imitation game by how he or she experiences the action and therefore, communicates about it in a different way? Even though the actual activity is exactly the same, the institution of hunting and the corresponding roles might differ based
on different categorizations and typifications between the villages. In the village A, hunting might enjoy a high social status charging the activity and the corresponding roles with pride and glory. In village B, hunting might be regarded as a necessary evil, charging it with guilt and shame. Therefore, the way they experience and talk about hunting, differ although the activity and the practical experience stay the same. The same problematic can be applied to the context of the native Finnish community and the Finnish immigrant community - Is it not possible that the members of the Finnish immigrant community and members of the native Finnish community share the same practical experience in their daily lives, but experience it and, therefore talk about it, in a different way because their subjective reality differs according to how they’ve been categorized and positioned differently in Finnish society?

Here I would like to suggest an addition to the notion of practical expertise, making it more applicable for studying larger communities within society. Firstly, the notion of practical experience ought to move from a biologically and empirically determined experience of the natural world, to a socially constructed subjective experience of the natural world as presented by Berger & Luckmann (1971, p.147). The subjective experience of hunting is not defined by the action of hunting itself, it is defined by the symbolic universe surrounding the institution of hunting. Berger & Luckmann argue that in a process called sedimentation, the experiences of a few become the experience of the whole community. Sedimented experiences are objectified subjective experiences, in other words, objective realities that members of a community experience as real, even though they have never experienced it themselves. By taking the hunting community as an example, they argue that even though only one, or a handful of hunters have gone through the experience of being attacked by a bear, the experience can be so powerful that the stories which are then afterwards told, can have a real effect on the whole community for generations to come, including those who don’t even participate in the action of hunting. The imminent threat of a bear attack, or the glory of surviving one, would become a part of the common experience within the community, even though most of the members would never have had the practical experience of it themselves. The bear threat has become a part of the community’s shared objective reality. Translating the process of sedimentation to the conceptual framework of interactional expertise, one could say that through sedimentation, the practical experiences of a few, become the practical experiences of the many. The implication is that, the
individual’s practical experience is defined by the social reality by which he or she is surrounded, instead of the individual’s biological body or action. I am arguing that the practical experience is rather based on the symbolic universe than the empirical natural world.

Secondly, practical experience, which I have in the previous paragraph defined in terms of the notion of objective reality as presented by Berger & Luckmann, is constituted by the position one is given in society. If the hunting has for example been delegated within the community based on gender, the non-hunting gender might experience the threat of a bear attack differently. Instead of brushing up his or her bear hunting capabilities, she or he might start looking for these capabilities when choosing a partner to which hunting has been delegated. In other words, a member’s practical experience is not defined by pure action. Rather, the member experiences action according to the social position which he or she has been given. As also argued before, no two persons can share the same subjective experience of the objective reality simply due to not having shared the same body. However, as society is notoriously effective at categorizing our fellow men and women, a sense of common experience based on the categories can be admitted. Hence, the individual’s practical experience of the socially constructed natural world is constituted by the complex array of social categories to which the individual’s body is ascribed.

Consequently, we are all experts of our own subjective experience of the socially constructed reality. I will illustrate this by moving away from the hunter gatherer society, towards an undetermined future with cloning technology. If there was a second I, a technologically constructed clone with the same cognitive configuration which I have acquired through socialization, I believe that I could better distinguish an imitator from my cloned self than the next person. Even if I wasn’t allowed to make questions about personal memories or hypothetical skeletons in my closet, I believe that I could distinguish myself easily, even though the other participant was the person who knows me best. As a reminder of the starting point of this conversation, a distinction between an interactional expert and a real expert ought to be made. In this case, the interactional expert, would be a person which has been sufficiently exposed to me as to be able to perceive reality as I and reproduce it as I. A real expert, would be no one but myself and my clone. But to be less rigorous, a real expert could also be a person which I know, or do not know, who has a body that has been
ascribed with a similar ensemble of categories as mine has, and live in a socially constructed reality most similar to mine. The real difference, is that the interactional expert does not have the same practical experience as I, whereas the real expert would have by having gone through life in similar circumstances. However, interactional expertise is not meant for explaining or describing the entirety of an individual’s subjective reality. Rather, it is designed to explain and study fields of expertise. This can be done by breaking down my practical experience, which is constituted by the ensemble of all the categories by which my body has through socialization been ascribed, and focusing on only one of the categories. By focusing on just one of the categories, be it based on gender, ethnicity, nationality, age, sexual orientation, occupation and so forth, I am unlike before not a globally leading expert, but just a normal expert among all the others that have been ascribed the same category.

By basing the concept of interactional expertise on the notion of practical experience as having performed the same action or experienced the same empirical natural world, Collins et al. (2015) exclude the differentiation in the experience of reality caused by socially constructed sedimented experiences, as well as the differentiation in experience caused by the different ensemble of categories to which members’ bodies are ascribed. Based on the notion of practical experience, it is difficult to argue that members of different communities have different ways of experiencing reality, as they participate in the same objective reality and their daily lives may be regarded as entirely similar. By translating the notion of practical experience to the notion of subjective reality as presented by Berger & Luckmann (1971), I have explained how the concept of expertise can be used to study how difference may take place and be articulated between larger communities (meaning a crowd of bodies ascribed with a certain category) in society.

4.2.3 Interactional expertise and social integration

In their work the Social Construction of Reality, Berger & Luckmann (1971) were interested not only in the content and character of knowledge in society, but also in the distribution of knowledge. The distribution and availability of the so called social stock of knowledge, meaning the accumulated knowledge within society, defines human experience and lies in the heart of social organization and stratification. Interactional expertise may be regarded
as a certain type of knowledge and therefore, follow the same laws of distribution and availability. The ability of members from different communities to imitate each other may be viewed as a study about the distribution of the community specific interactional expertise among members of society. Collins & Evans (2013) further state that the ability to imitate a member of a different community, sheds light to the open or closed character of the respective community. Therefore it can be used as a measure of socio-cultural difference and integration. By now the imitation game has been used to explore the notion of interactional expertise in the context of blindness and colour-blindness, gravitational wave physics, religion and sexuality. They were both quantitative and qualitative studies focusing on how well the groups were able to successfully imitate each other. Low interactional expertise of a target group would mean failed imitation attempts, which in turn indicates on the closedness of the target group. In tests where the imitation attempts were successful, it was concluded that the target group has an open character and the language of the community was well distributed in the larger society (Collins & Evans, 2013).

Analytically there are two different configurations in imitation games. The assumption is that minority groups (such as active-Christians, the blind and homosexuals) have access to the knowledge bound to the opposing majorities (non-religious, the sighted and heterosexuals) and although lacking perhaps in practical experience, they ought to have interactional expertise due to having been submerged in the realities of the respective groups. Consequently, imitation games where the judges are from the majority group, the minority pretenders are expected to be capable of imitating successfully and in the long run the judges’ evaluations will tend towards chance. These imitation games are so-called chance conditions. On the other hand, if the participants pretending are not expected to have the relevant target expertise, the judges should be able to identify the pretenders. This would be the case when heterosexuals, non-religious and sighted attempt to imitate the opposing minorities. These type of imitation games are called identify conditions.

Collins & Evans (2013) discussed Du Bois’ notion of the American Blacks’ “double consciousness”. Double consciousness refers to how Black Americans could see their own lives from two perspectives: their own African identity and the discriminatory perspective of White America. This enabled the Black Americans to correctly assume the point of view of a White American and reproduce the white American reality. The ability to reproduce the
practice-language of White America, without access to the practical experience of the dominant community, is according to Collins & Evans (2013) due to the interactional expertise which Black Americans have gained through linguistic immersion in the American society.

A similar dynamic may be tested and inspected between the Finnish immigrants and the majority native Finnish culture. The imitation game experiment encourages Finnish immigrants to reproduce native Finnish discourse and vice versa. By reviewing how successful the imitation attempts are on both sides, it is possible to reveal the differences in the social distribution of interactional expertise and therefore possible differences in the understanding each group has of the corresponding categories. Hence, I argue that the imitation game, together with the notion of interactional expertise can be used to review the relationship between Finnish immigrants and native Finns from a knowledge perspective and the level of cultural integration of Finnish immigrants into the Finnish dominant culture.

4.3. Ethnomethodological interpretation

Ethnomethodological studies analyze how members make sense, objectify and make accountable every-day life through internalized methods and procedures (Garfinkel, 1967). Harold Garfinkel proposed that social structure can be best revealed by inspecting everyday interaction and experience. Instead of dictating social action, norms and institutions are engaged within everyday interaction, cooperatively produced and reproduced by all the parties involved and the the social meaning of an uttering, event or action, is not defined in social isolation, but rather derives from the interactional activity where the speakers or the listeners or both, define it together (Heritage, 1984).

Harold Garfinkel’s theory on ethnomethodology was heavily influenced by Alfred Schutz who presented the question of intersubjectivity as: how is it possible that two actors share similar experiences of the social/natural world and how is it that they can share them with one another (Heritage, 1984, p. 55)? The first question attends to the issue of how individuals can experience the empirical environment in similar ways, and the second to how the specific shared experience of the empirical environment is communicated between members of society. Berger & Luckmann (1971) attended the first question through the
theory of knowledge. A relative congruence of subjective realities is achieved in society by means of socialization into a typified social structure that amounts to the social stock of knowledge. Additionally, they considered that the subjective reality is communicated by language - experience sedimented by objectification and anonymization. Collins and Evans (2015) answer to the second question is interactional expertise - a certain type of knowledge which enables us to communicate our practical experiences regardless of whether or not we share the same practical experience.

Ethnomethodology follows the same sociological discourse as Berger & Luckmanns theory in that reality is perceived as being socially constructed. The member sees a typified world through the acquired stock of knowledge. However, Garfinkel argues that social constructs are relative and open ended and that they are ultimately defined locally and temporally. The focus lies in the range of methods and procedures by means of which members of society make sense of, and act on the empirical circumstances in which they find themselves (Heritage, 1984). It addresses both questions in a similar way; actors can share similar experiences of reality and are able to share them by means of different internalized methods and resources. The world does not appear to members as fixed type constructs, it is by the use of type constructs that members interpret the surroundings and constantly create the world in their everyday lives. Therefore, Garfinkel does not think that members are living their daily lives within the social world, they are rather doing the social world when living their daily lives. Harvey Sacks developed Garfinkel’s thought and emphasized that social sciences should not categorize social life, rather it should investigate the categories used by members when doing social life. Ethnomethodology is dedicated to reveal and explain the different methods by which members of society do social life (Silverman, 1998).

4.3.1 Reality seen through the documentary method of interpretation

Harold Garfinkel baptized the manner by which members interpret their surroundings as a consistent, taken-for-granted natural world as the documentary method of interpretation. While working with American juries for a longer period of time, he noticed that even though the members of the jury would come to different conclusions, social action was interpreted
by similar underlying methods of interpretation. When faced with a social action, for example the death of an older man, the jury would interpret it by reflecting on the most plausible explanations. The actor making the action is not interpreted as merely a biological mass, but as a fellow member of society with motives and goals, and the action is interpreted accordingly. It is a procedure in which each member of the jury searches for a socially defined homologous pattern among a vast variety of differences (Heritage 1984). When doing a documentary about a phenomenon there is an unlimited amount of angles both temporally and spatially to represent it, but there still exists an underlying “right” pattern which to follow when doing documentaries. In the case of the older man who had passed away, the jury would make sense of the phenomenon by reflecting on whether or not it has been a suicide. Here the jury might draw from socially determined categories and reflect upon whether or not the man was lonely, depressed or indebted – factors that are easily associated with older men living by themselves. Ethnomethodologist Harvey Sacks called the procedure by which members interpret their surroundings as the machinery and explained how members of society scan for ordinary ways of looking at things in their daily lives. It works as a relevancy constraint in a way that all abnormal representations of social action are discarded as irrelevant. By analysing recordings from a suicide hotline, he discovered that both the suicidal caller and the suicide hotline worker, utilized similar social categories, charged with certain attributes and qualities, when interpreting and evaluating suicidal tendencies (Silverman, 1998).

4.3.2. Normative order

Sacks emphasizes that the machinery does not spew out products but rather, members use the machinery when doing social life. In this sense, rather than constituting action, the normative order gives a framework for action (Silverman, 1998). This interpretation was borrowed from Garfinkel who demonstrated this by analysing the institution of greeting. When faced with a greeting, the usual, normative response would be to greet back. However, there is always the option not to greet back. If a member decides not to answer a greeting, the other party will immediately try to determine a plausible explanation to the abnormality through the documentary method of interpretation. Therefore, by choosing not
to greet back, the member will be held accountable for his or her action. If a member
decides to diverge from normative behaviour, the decision is based on a reflective process
in which he or she is aware of how it might be interpreted and the ensuing consequences.
The actor reflects upon the different choices and their respective outcomes and by doing so
they act in a manner which reflects the normative order (Heritage, 1984).

4.3.3. Intersubjectivity – a collaborative procedure

As stated before, the empirical environment is experienced by members of society through
methods and procedures- a process called the documentary method of interpretation.
Garfinkel argues that descriptions of social action are interpreted no differently from social
action itself. When faced with a description, the listener is faced with an open ended
uttering with a vast array of possible meanings. But when hearing the uttering or gesture,
the member will interpret it and narrow down the possible meanings by using the resources
and methods acquired through socialization. The listener will take into account who is
speaking, where, when, what is being accomplished by it, what are the motives, what
considerations and so forth (Heritage, 1984). The process can be illustrated as follows: A
member is asked when his or her birthday is. The reaction and answer to the uttering will
depend on at least two contextual factors; the previous relationship of the involved
members and on how close to the birthday they are. If the speaker is an acquaintance or a
friend, an answer like “13th of September 1989” would probably be interpreted as odd.
However, had the uttering party been a police officer, medical doctor or social security
worker, there would be nothing odd about the answer. Words are not static signifiers and
the meanings of utterings are always contextually bound and defined locally and temporally.
Hearers actively conceptualize and speakers rely them to do just that. Consequently, social
life is done in a collaborative manner through interaction among members of society.

However, if the speaker is the listener’s mother, and the date is very soon, the listener
might assume that the speaker can’t remember which date it is at that moment, and will
answer by saying “on Friday”. If the speaker and the listener do not have a close
relationship, the speaker might assume that the speaker does not know the date and will
therefore answer “13th of September”. If this same answer were given to a mother, she
might consider the answer strange, or perhaps even feel offended and answer “of course I know which date it is!” An ethnomethodological analysis of a dialog like this might then reveal something about the ceremony of birthdays and its relationship to the normative character of mother and child relationships. Garfinkel argues that members’ reactions to abnormal behaviour were telling about the normative order behind every day interaction. He organized so called breaching experiments, in which students were asked to behave abnormally in everyday situations and report on the reactions by which they were confronted (Heritage, 1984).

4.3.4. Successful Imitation - Mastery of natural language

As noted before, isolated social actions and descriptions are loose ended and contain a vast array of possible meanings. However, within interaction they are interpreted by other members through the documentary method of interpretation which takes into account temporal, spatial and contextual factors. An actor’s capacity to recognize and produce the correct representation of everyday life and to understand an uttering correctly out of unlimited options is considered a mastery of the natural language (Heritage, 1984). Garfinkel and Sacks add that an actor’s membership within a society or a collective entails the mastering of the respective natural language (Silverman, 1998).

Returning to my research interest, the mastery of natural language may prove helpful in analysing the relationship between the native Finnish community and the Finnish immigrant community. Mere grammatical differences can be enough for members of a community to distinguish “us” from “them”. But the mastery of natural language transcends mere linguistic differences and attends to the ability to pick out the right meaning out of an unlimited amount of meanings and then present it in the right way out of an unlimited amount of ways. In the imitation game setting, for the respondent to master the natural language of the judge, he or she ought to a) have the ability to interpret the question in a correct way and b), produce an answer which corresponds to the judges own experience to the matter. In other words, based on the ethnomethodological notions of documentary method of interpretation and mastery of natural language, in order to pass an imitation
game test the respondent should be able to “hear” the questions correctly, experience the subject matter correctly, and then utter it correctly.

The mastery of natural language is similar to Collins definition of interactional expertise in two ways; a) Both concepts are concerned with how members are able to share their respective subjective realities and b) it is considered as a skill or attribute by which actors can determine whether or not someone is a member of the same community. However, the analytical approach is slightly different as it sees the dialog as a collaborative event and focuses on the different methods and resources in doing everyday life used by both parties. In an analysis of the imitation game data, an ethnomethodological approach focuses then on revealing the methods which participants use to distinguish experts from non-experts.

4.3.5. Corresponding Machineries

The Imitation Game gives an opportunity to see how actors use category-bound knowledge in interaction (Arminen & Simonen, 2015). Arminen & Simonen from the University of Helsinki organized an Imitation Game between “active Christians” and “non-religious”. They did a qualitative and a quantitative analysis of the material. The quantitative analysis used the notion of interactional expertise and explored the open and closed character of the groups under study. In the qualitative analysis their objective was to show how differences between groups become meaningful as a basis for cultural and societal differentiation. The qualitative analysis is an extension on the concept of interactional expertise developed by Collins et al. (2013) and shows how interactional expertise is constructed within interaction through the ability to form an epistemic-, experiential and categorical congruence with group members (Arminen et al. 2016). The theoretical framework of this method comes from the ethnomethodological tradition, and aspires to reveal the methodological basis for interactional expertise (Arminen & Simonen, 2015). The meaning of an uttering is seen as cooperatively defined by both speaker and listener through different methods. The methods are the result of a reflective thinking process based on the utilization of the stock of knowledge acquired by each member, and to the spatial and relational context of the action (Heritage 1984). In a similar manner group members draw on the same set of knowledge, experiences, and categorical identifications. Inversely, incongruences in knowledge,
experiences, and categorical identifications form the criteria for exclusion (Arminen et al. 2016)

Their analysis showed, among other things, that the active Christians were better at distinguishing imitators largely due to having an epistemic pool of knowledge in the form of theological concepts to create test questions from (Arminen & Simonen, 2015). Epistemic correspondence refers to how two actors’ knowledge of a certain matter correspond to each other. They found that participants would judge an answer by how well it corresponded with their own knowledge of the matter at hand. Moreover, the amount of detail, or granularity of an answer, influenced the judgements made by the participants. The epistemic correspondence is arguably close connected to the notion of the social distribution of stock of knowledge and objective realities (Berger & Luckmann 1971). The judges assume that certain knowledge is not available to members outside their community. Going back to the Turing test, I would argue that epistemic correspondence could occur between a member of society and a computer. Solely based on my own experience using the google search engine, a computer program might especially after gathering information about the user be able to interpret a question correctly, withdraw information and reproduce it.

Experience based correspondence refers to how well a person can relate to the experience of another. This differs from epistemic correspondence as it is about how their experiences correspond, instead of how their knowledge correspond to a certain matter. They found that the experience based correspondence is stronger and more convincing for the judge than the epistemic correspondence. Even if there was a lack of epistemic correspondence, meaning that a judge deemed a respondent having conflicting information about a subject matter, he or she was convinced that they belonged to the same group because he or she could identify himself or herself with the respondent’s experiences (Arminen & Simonen, 2015). This would reflect the notion of mastering the same natural language. As stated before, the mastery of a natural language is the capacity to recognize and produce the right descriptive representations of social life. In order to create an experience based correspondence, both parties would arguably need to share the same natural language over the particular subject matter.
Categorical correspondence refers to how actors identify one another based on how well their perception of social categories correspond to each other. Arminen & Simonen found that it occurred in the material a re-categorization of the two initial categories (active Christian and non-religious) into new ones. They found two reasons for this. Firstly, the participants needed to make sense of conflicting information by assigning the respondent a new category, for example “Knowledgeable non-Christian” instead of “active Christian”. Secondly, they utilized new categories such as “Atheist” and “Christian” in their questions as strategies to identify their respondents based on their categorical correspondence to the new categories. Categorical correspondence is harder to define along the same lines as the previous correspondences. My interpretation is that it is an even more ethnomethodological approach to the data and investigates further how the participants utilize different categories as tools in order to make sense of the utterings and distinguish members from non-members.

Sacks developed tools to analyze the use of categories in everyday interaction that he would call *membership categorization devices*. His perspective on social life was that there is a machinery behind everything members can see and do, and it is this machinery that we ought to look for in the data. His approach to data was highly empirical and emphasized the idea that instead of looking for the data to fit into scientific categories, researchers ought to look at the categories used by members themselves. As stated before, it is by the use of different methods and categorizations that members interpret their surroundings. Membership categorization devices focuses on the characteristics of membership categories. Sacks argues that members experience the Other and themselves through social categories. Furthermore any person who is a case of a category is seen as a member of a category, and what’s known about that category is known about them (Silverman, 1998).

Certain activities are ascribed to certain communities and through the use of membership categories, a large class of action is made understandable in the everyday lives of members of society. These are category bound activities and follow the notion of “certain people do such things”. In the imitation game data, the researcher may reveal which activities are ascribed to the respective membership categories. Membership categories are generally included in different collections. Collections have rules of application and contain certain rules. By scrutinizing the use of categories one can get a glimpse at the underlying
intersubjective machinery which members use to interpret their surroundings and separate “us” from “them”.

Harvey Sacks (1979) wrote in “Hotrodder: a revolutionary category” about how categories are used to include and exclude group members. Sacks argued that teenagers that formed a sub-culture revolving cars used the category “Hotrodder”, in order to shift the description of themselves into a category that they administer and enforce themselves. Adults or other individuals outside the group don’t have sufficient knowledge to use the category properly. Sacks sees categories as tools for control and power in social life. This finding has implications for the way knowledge is available in society. It brings also the notion of power into the equation which is rather absent in the ethnomethodology as presented by Harold Garfinkel.

4.4. The Imitation Game Data and “Natural interaction”

As noted before, Harvey Sacks proposed that the social sciences should not use categories to describe social life as members but rather describe the categories used by members. Consequently he argued that any analysis that aims to describe the way members do social life, ought to be done on naturally occurring interaction. The problem is that any data contrived through traditional research methods such as interviews or focus groups, is heavily defined by the context, namely the researcher – participant dynamic. Garfinkel argues that this type of data ought to be analyzed as they are - as researcher – participant interaction and the results should not be light handedly applied to society at large. Consequently, sociological research which aims to study social action ought to be studying ‘naturally occurring interaction’ (Heritage 1984).

Harvey Sacks stresses the fact that interviews generate categories instead of exploring how they are naturally deployed in action, meaning that in interviews researchers ask questions about their research subjects and then study the categories that members use. They are not investigating the categories by looking at the activities in which they are ‘naturally’ employed. So instead of studying the categories themselves, Garfinkel and Sacks seek to describe the methods which persons use in doing social life (Silverman, 1998).
It goes without saying, that the interaction among the participants in the Imitation game setting is not what Garfinkel or Sacks would call ‘naturally occurring interaction’. However, it differs from traditional research methods as the researcher is almost, if not entirely absent from the interaction between the participants during the experiment itself. In practice, the factors interfering with the naturally occurring interaction are a) the topic and participants chosen by the researcher and b) the established interactional rules of the game.

In setting up the game, the researcher has chosen the subject by choosing the target expertise. By doing this, the researcher runs the risk of generating the categories instead of looking how they are naturally deployed in action as argued by Sacks. However, the moment the game starts the participants interact freely within the technical rules of the game, trying to figure out the group-membership of their opponents with the use of interactional methods. After this the researchers only interference in the interaction is her or his physical presence in the room, although the participants’ knowledge of the context - a social research experiment, does enter the realm of reflective thought, consequently affecting their action.

There is the option of playing it safe and frame the research question and results so as to merely be relevant for the imitation game environment. However, I argue that the findings can be applied more freely to social life in general - the methods used by the participants within the Imitation game environment are not created when the game starts, they are the same methods which the participants have acquired through socialization and that they use in their daily lives when doing social life as members of society. The imitation game event may be regarded as an event in which the already acquired methods of interaction are put to a different use than in normal every day interaction. Therefore the findings in the Imitation game data are applicable to the broader society outside the Imitation game setting as methods which members use to do social life, and more specifically, as methods which members use to interpret, produce and reproduce the target expertise presented by the researcher.

5. The Nationhood Imitation Game Event
The data for this research was gathered through two separate imitation game events organized at the University of Helsinki in May and December of 2015. I did the recruitment, organized funding reserved computer equipped locales. Tiina Airaksinen, at Otavan Opisto, assisted in the recruitment by inviting 4 students from Otavan Opisto to participate in the second imitation game event, as well as assisting in the practical arrangements of the event itself. Mika Simonen, researcher at the University of Helsinki, was responsible of executing the technical arrangements in cooperation with Collins research team at the Cardiff University. The online imitation game software was run by the Cardiff University and the data was gathered was stored on their servers.

The recruitment for imitation game events is rather challenging. The event itself can take up to three hours and all the participants are required to be in the same place at the same time. Moreover, the imitation game requires that both groups are of a similar size in order to work. I began the recruitment two weeks before the events were to take place. The recruitment was done by email messaging, Facebook messaging, face to face encounters in public spaces and by spreading out flyers in the surrounding areas of the University. In order to increase the chances of finding participants, the University of Helsinki supported by funding two cinema tickets for each participant.

Apart from all the practical information, the recruitment message stated that, the topic of the imitation game is immigrancy and Finnishness, and therefore the two social groups in the game are Finns and immigrants. Therefore we are recruiting as players people that have either an immigrant background, or a Finnish background”. A copy of the recruitment message can be found in the index. I used more or less the same recruitment message with all contacts, slightly changing the topic in attempts to attract more attention. In the end I contacted about 40 associations, public persons, Facebook groups and pages. Facebook turned out to be an extremely valuable resource. Through Facebook it was easy to find and reach a large quantity of people from different backgrounds.
The University of Helsinki online recruitment form “elomake” was very helpful. In the form I asked the participants to give the following information: Name, age, gender, contact information, occupation, mother tongue and elaboration on immigrant or Finnish background.

5.1. Native Finns and Finnish Immigrants

I baptized the groups playing the imitation game as “native Finns” and “Finnish immigrants”. The participants were asked to sign up for the experiment as a members of either group based on whether they have a Finnish background or an immigrant background. The criteria “Finnish background” and “immigrant background” does leave space for interpretation by the participants themselves. One of the participants described in the recruitment form her Finnish background as follows:

“My parents are the offspring of small farming families far away in Kainuu, from my grandparents back you find a little coast-Finns and a little Russian, that’s about it... a very typical Finn should I say.”

“Porukat on pienviljelijäperheiden kasvatteja kaukaa Kainuusta, mitä nyt isovanhempien takaa löytyy vähän rannikkosuomalaista ja vähän venäläistä, että semmonen tausta se... hyvin tyyppilinen suomalainen sanoisinko.”

The participant had signed up as a native Finn and although she was clearly aware of having partly an immigrant background, she did not express any problem with identifying with the group. In general there were no objections with identifying with the native Finn category. The immigrant category was questioned once before starting the experiment by a member of the native Finnish group by asking: “how should we imitate an immigrant when
immigrants can be from all around the world”. I responded by suggesting that the participant try to think of a typical immigrant and try to imitate that which comes to mind first.

I was not interested in narrowing down the immigrant category to encompass a certain ethnic or national population, as is usually done in migration studies (Jacobson, 1997, Alba, 2005, Bloemraad, 2008, Crul & Schneider, 2010, Vadher, 2009) as my interest lies in exploring the notion of immigrancy by itself as well as how it together with the native Finn category is experienced and used by members of the Finnish society and see whether there is a common Finnish immigrant experience and how the difference between the Finn and the immigrant become relevant for the making of difference.

Another defining criteria was the decision to have the imitation game played in the Finnish language. The main reason was that I assumed that the ability to speak the Finnish language entails a certain extent of integration to the Finnish society and culture. The research question frames the research interest to include members of Finnish society. I do not claim that knowing the Finnish language would be a defining criteria of membership in Finnish society. However, I will act on the assumption that the Finnish language increases the amount of influence which Finnish culture has on any given individual, and in the hopes of recruiting a sample which represents Finnish society I decided to have the imitation game event organized and played in the Finnish language. Had the experiment been organized in English I hypothesized that it might have given room to a population that is outside of the Finnish culture and discourse and therefore resemble more of a foreigner that is oblivious to the symbolic universe surrounding the categories native Finn and “Maahanmuuttaja” (Finnish word for immigrant).

5.2 The Final Turnouts

Being an experimental research method, the imitation game events did not proceed without hick-ups. Regarding the first event, although there was a large amount of people signed up to the game, unfortunately everyone did not show up. The final turnout was 9 native Finns and 5 Finnish immigrants. Because the groups need to be of similar size, the overlapping Finns had to be sent back home.
Due to technical problems associated with how the program randomly assigns each participant with respondents and judges, together with the fact that some of the participants had to leave after logging in due to disparate group sizes, the initiation of the experiment took time. For future imitation game experiments I would recommend that the researcher logs in the participants only after each participant has arrived.

Additionally, there was a problem with the final evaluation feature in the imitation game program. For some reason two of the participants were not able to proceed to the final evaluation. Without knowing any better, they kept asking questions although they already thought that they knew who the pretender and non-pretender was. This is why the data lacks two final judgements and also contains a handful of rather silly questions.

The final turnout for the first event was not as big as I had hoped for. Although the internet recruitment seemed to have a great reach (facebook pages and groups and email lists) it didn’t seem to be so effective. It could be that the visibility of posts on Facebook is lesser than imagined or that contact persons failed to pass forward my message to their email contact lists, or a combination of both. Even though the reach is significantly lesser in face to face recruitment, it was quite effective. I would say that a third of the participants came through face to face recruitment. That being said, I think that a more “aggressive” face to face recruitment method would have been more fruitful.

The total turnout of the second imitation game event, organized in December 2015, was 18. This time there were also four participants that didn’t show up, but I had learned from my previous mistake and had up to five reserve participants waiting to fill in for absentees. In order to speed up the initiation of the experiment, we had logged in each computer to the system beforehand. Unfortunately about 45 minutes into the experiment, it became apparent that one of the participants was sitting by a computer logged on as the opposite group. This means that one of the native Finns was logged in to the system as a Finnish
immigrant and vice versa. As it always takes a while to initiate a new game, and we estimated that it would not affect the dialogue significantly, we decided together with Mika Simonen to continue the game as it was, and inform the participants after the game of what had happened. The hick-up affected five different imitation games in a rather interesting way.

1. The Finnish immigrant judge received one answer from each group. However, the native Finn was being sincere and the immigrant was pretending to be a native Finn.
2. The Finnish judge received both answers from the same group (native Finns). One native Finn pretending to be an immigrant and the other being sincere.
3. The native Finnish judge received both answers from the same group (Finnish immigrants). One Finnish immigrant pretending to be a native Finn and the other being sincere.
4. The immigrant judge received both answers from the same group. One native Finn pretending to be a Finnish immigrant and one native Finn being sincere.
5. The native Finnish judge received both answers from the same group (Finnish immigrants). One immigrant pretending to be a native Finn and the other being sincere.

The dialogue generated by the hick-up has been presented by Mika Simonen and discussed at the Annual Sociology Conference at the University of Jyväskylä. Simonen argues that it has enabled a so called “zero-level” research result, to which other imitation game research results may be compared. In addition it has generated a Garfinkelian breaching test environment as mentioned in the previous chapter. Mika Simonen argued that the participants used rules and normalizations in order to maintain the normative categorization of the social groups given by the imitation game instructions (Annual Sociology Conference, 2016). Unfortunately a further analysis of this particular material does not fall under the scope of this research.

In the following chapter I will analyze the quantitative data generated by both nationhood imitation game events. By using the analytical tools and previous results provided by Collins
and his team (2013), I will present how the native Finns and Finnish immigrants performed in the nationhood imitation game and compare it to previous imitation game experiments. By relating the results with the notion of interactional expertise I will review the open or closed character of the native Finns and Finnish immigrants as well as scrutinize the assumption of native Finns and Finnish immigrants as social groups constituted by a specific group-bound expertise.

6. Quantitative analysis

The sample is quite heterogeneous in terms of traditional demographic figures. Of the 28 participants in total, 13 are men and 15 are women. The age varies between 19 and 52 years. The average age among the Finnish immigrants is 22 years and among the native Finns 27 years. A clear majority of the participants are students. The Finnish immigrants speak 11 different mother tongues: Persian, Afar, Estonian, Albanian, Dari, Somali, Spanish, Kurdish, Ukrainian, Portuguese and Hindi. According to statistics provided by Statistics Finland, six of them, Estonian, Somali, Kurdish, Persian, Spanish and Albanian are among the 15 most common foreign language mother tongues in Finland (Statistics Finland, 2015). The biggest language group, Russian is not present in the sample. Among the native Finnish group, the mother tongues are Finnish and Swedish. About 3 out of 5 of the Finnish immigrants are 1st generation immigrants and the rest 2nd generation immigrants. Out of the 1st generation immigrants, about half of them have moved to Finland at a very young age.

As noted before, Collins et al. (2013) argued that the imitation game method and an analysis of the interactional expertise sheds light on the closed or open character of different groups in society. The underlying assumption is that membership within a target group entails a certain type of expertise in the form of practical experience which non-group members do not have. However, non-group members may acquire sufficient interactional expertise by simply being in contact with the target group, and in an imitation game environment be able
to imitate a member of the target group without having the actual practical experience
which entails membership in the target group.

The analysis has been based on a categorization of the groups into experts and non-experts
within a target field. Based on this categorization the imitation games are assumed to be
configured as either identify conditions or chance conditions. In identify conditions the
judge has target expertise and the pretender is a non-target group member pretending to
be a member of the target group. In chance conditions the judge has no target expertise and
the pretender, who is a member of the target group, pretends to not to be a member of the
target group. The judges’ success in identifying the pretenders is measured by the amount
of correct guesses. By subtracting the incorrect guesses from the correct guesses and
dividing the difference by the sum total of both correct and incorrect guesses, an
identification ratio is generated. The identification ratio is a measure of how easily the
pretending non-group members were revealed and consequently how closed the target
group is from the rest of the population (Collins et al. 2013).

The chance ratio is generated in the same way as the identification ratio by subtracting the
incorrect guesses from the correct guesses and dividing the difference by the sum total of
both correct and incorrect guesses. The chance imitation games are assumed to tend
toward chance in the long run and the chance ratio has been used to compare with the
results from the identify conditions, giving an effect size which measures how much easier it
is to pretend to belong to the target group than to pretend to not belong to the target
group. The effect size is gained by subtracting the chance ratio from the identification ratio.

The identify-and-chance condition distinction is based on a research setting in which only
one of the groups is under study. Therefore the other group is merely regarded as “non-
members” of the target group and consequently in chance conditions, the target group
member pretends not to be a member of the target group, instead of pretending to be a
member of another group. However, in this research there are two groups under study, the
native Finns and the Finnish immigrants. The assumption is that both groups entail a particular field of expertise and therefore there are no chance conditions assumed. When pretending, the Finnish immigrants do not simply pretend non-immigrants, they pretend to be Finns. In a similar way, native Finns do not pretend to be “non-native Finns”, they pretend to be Finnish immigrants.

The total amount of questions in the data and consequently the total amount of guesses is 193. 90 guesses and questions made by the native Finnish judges and 103 made by the Finnish immigrant judges. The amount is relatively small and therefore I do not claim that they are statistically viable indicators of the respective groups’ closed or open character. Nevertheless I have decided to present the results here, simply because the data is available and it would be a shame not to use it. It demonstrates to the reader the potential of the imitation game as a research method and perhaps gives an idea of how the results might look like in a bigger data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Native Finns</th>
<th>Finnish-Immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification ratio:</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect size:</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The native Finns had it slightly easier to identify their group members than the Finnish immigrants. Based on Collins' notion of interactional expertise, this would indicate that the reality of native Finns is more closed than that of the Finnish immigrants. However, the data doesn't tell if, regardless of the groups' closed or open character, the Finnish immigrants might have fewer methods and resources than the native Finns by which they can identify the group members from pretenders. The research results produced by Collins and his team, are presented slightly differently. The emphasis is on only one target group and the other group can be seen figured in the chance ratio. The results show that both the native Finnish and the Finnish-immigrant groups imitated each other more successfully, and are therefore more open to each other than that of the Colour blind, deaf, blind, homosexuals and the religious. However, the native Finns and the Finnish immigrants had less success in imitating each other than each one of the chance imitation games presented by Collins.

![Table: Imitation game results (Collins & Evans, 2013)](image)

Both the Finnish-immigrants and the native Finns had it more difficult to imitate each other than women and men in the gender imitation games. Collins et al (2013) interpret the results of the gender game as insinuating how open and available the worlds of men and women are to both groups, enabling both groups to acquire interactional expertise which, makes it easy to imitate one another in an imitation game environment.
The quantitative data is far from perfect. At times, by reviewing the participants’ motivations to their guesses, it would seem that they have meant to pick one of the answers as a non-pretenders answer, but have for some unknown reason chosen the other. I did try to clean it up by registering the judgement as correct or incorrect based on my own interpretation of the judges motivations, but in the end this couldn’t be done in a fair and “objective” manner. Additionally, out of all the different factors upon which especially the native-Finnish judges made their guesses, language was the most common one. A handful of the Finnish immigrants failed their imitation attempts based on language skills, which would mean that, had both groups had similar language skills, the difference between identification ratios between the two groups is even smaller.

By drawing upon the notion of interactional expertise, Collins argues that the identification ratio reveals the relevant groups’ open or closed character (Collins, 2013). With the exception of the gender imitation game the results show that the native-Finnish and the Finnish immigrant groups are more open to each other than all the targets groups under study by Collins, but more closed than all the respective majority populations. This suggests that a) being a native Finn and a Finnish immigrant entails a distinct practical experience which is more identifiable than that of mere chance conditions.

Ilkka Arminen (2016) questions Collins approach in that it assumes that all the groups have consequent methods through which they can identify interactional expertise, and how it does not take into account how the differences might be explained by differences between the methods and resources which the groups have to distinguish group members from non-group members. Instead of indicating how much interactional expertise non-group members have of a target group, the varying identifying ratios may be explained by how groups differ from each other based on the difference in the shared methods and resources upon which groups distinguish themselves from the Other. In the next chapter I will inspect the different methods and resources by which the participants in the nationhood imitation game perceive and interpret difference between the native Finns and Finnish immigrants.
7. Qualitative Analysis

The presentation of the material will follow the structure below:

Judgement confidence = Judges confidence in judgement from 1 to 4 (1=unsure 4=sure)

1 JUDGE = Question asked by judge
2A RESPONDENT = Respondent A
2B RESPONDENT = Respondent B
3 JUDGE = Judge’s reason for her or his judgement
4 JUDGE = Judge’s intention with the question

I have translated the data from Finnish to English and will present the material in both languages.

7.1. Language

In sociolinguistics, language has been closely associated with the notions of social stratification and social class (Labov, 2006). Throughout the material both native Finn and Finnish immigrant judges would evaluate the descriptions given by the respondents based on linguistic differences. Low language skills were associated with the Finnish immigrant group and advanced language skills with the native-Finnish group. Thus, language played a significant role in the process of identifying pretenders from non-pretenders. A further analysis of how linguistic difference takes place and is identified by participants in the material, does not fall under the scope of interest in this thesis. However, examples of this phenomenon can be found further down the analysis in examples 8, 9 and 14.

7.2. Stereotypes and Exaggerations

Before starting the experiment, the participants are given a hand-out (see appendix 1a), in which they are specifically advised not to rely on stereotypes or generalizations when communicating with one another. Arminen & Simonens (2015) study found that when answers are too general or stereotypical, they can give away an imitation attempt. The following examples are parts of a native-Finnish imitation game. Example 1a. is the fourth question made by the judge.
The judge asked if the respondents think that Finland is the best country in the world and expected to get such a “straight” answer from the non-pretender that the pretender would be revealed. The first respondent said no and the second yes. The judge expresses that one of the respondents has answered thoroughly and broadly to all the questions, and that the other is “trying to be more than what she or he really is”. The example resembles a “trick question”. Arminen & Simonen (2015) found that judges would make trick questions, meaning false presuppositions, and expect a group member to deny them and a non-group
member to accept them false presupposition, and consequently identify the pretender from
the non-pretender based on this strategy. Example 1b. is the judge’s final evaluation based
on all the questions and answers.

Example 1B. Native-Finnish Judge. Last judgement. Confidence 3 (uid=4580)

-- Reason: Based on the content of the answers. The first respondent* tried in my opinion to
be too Finnish and praise Finland too much, although I believe that things aren’t according
to him/her as he/she had reasoned. Based on these reasons I believe I know who the
pretender is.

Reason: Vastausten sisällön perusteella. Ensimmäinen vastaaja* yritti mielestäni olla liian
suomalainen ja kehui suomea liikaa, vaikka uskon että asiat eivät hänellä mielestään ole niin
kuin perusteli. Näillä perustein uskon tietäväni kuka teeskentelijä on.

* The responses are arranged differently for the judge here. The “The first respondent” here is the second
respondent in the previous example (Example 1a).

The example illustrates how the judge has distinguished the pretender largely based on how
he or she has exaggerated her or his Finnishness and praised Finland too much. The same
method of distinguishing a pretender form a non-pretender based on “trying too much” is
used by both groups under study. The following example is the final evaluation by a Finnish
immigrant judge.

Example 2. Finnish immigrant judge. Last judgement. Confidence 2 (uid=4581)

-- Reason: My evaluation is that respondent number 1. is the member of my group, that is,
also an immigrant. I deduce this based on both the content and the form of the answers.
Respondent number 1 has not tried to decorate his or her answers, but rather answered
each time shortly and concisely. I suppose that a pretender would answer longer, because
the own point and appearance would be for him or her more important to bring out. So as a
pretender I pick respondent number 2. This can be a little contradictory, because the
respondent has in two of her or his answers brought out directly that she or he would be an
immigrant. I compare it with my own answers in the game: I did not as an immigrant bring
out directly my immigrancy. I did not say directly the name of my home-country. However I
was honest – just as honest as a world-citizen who has lived in Finland her or his whole life
could be. On the other hand respondent number 1. was also very few-worded, which made
it difficult for me to make any evaluations of him or her. It could well be that, she or he is
the Finn, which pretends to be an immigrant. Perhaps she or he shows her or his stereotype
of an immigrant by being few-worded. Or perhaps he or she is unsure of how to answer

The judge expresses that one of the respondents always answered shortly and concisely, and that he or she expects from a pretender to do the opposite, to try too much by decorating the answers. The judge’s reasoning is that a member of the target group would not need emphasize his or her group membership. This same phenomenon can be seen in example 2B as well. However, the judge expresses doubt over the decision by saying that the second respondent might have answered according to his or her stereotype of an immigrant: by being few-worded. This shows how the judge scrutinizes the answers by taking into account whether or not they might be exaggerating or reproducing stereotypical images of the target group.

The method of looking for stereotypes is demonstrated further down as well in another example (10A) where, a native Finnish judge distinguishes the imitator for using “Finnish brands” instead of drawing upon a “spiritual side”. Looking for exaggerations and stereotypes is just one of the many methods used by participants when trying to distinguish group members from non-group members. Later on in the analysis it will become apparent how, the success of an imitation attempt by a member of either group amounts to a challenging task as it involves producing responses that avoid all the signs the judges are
scanning for by drawing upon the different methods and resources of interpreting difference.

7.3. Epistemic Correspondence

Epistemic correspondence refers to the way actors differentiate members of the same community from outsiders based on how well their knowledge of a certain subject matter correspond with their own. The following example demonstrates a so-called Test-question. Test questions are characterized by having relatively clear “right” and “wrong” answers.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 JUDGE:</th>
<th>What are the meanings of the words Runni, Amma and Sesse? Where in Finland are these type of words used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2A RESPONDENT:</td>
<td>I don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B RESPONDENT:</td>
<td>With Sesse it is meant a dog. The others I unfortunately don’t know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 JUDGE:</td>
<td>One of these three could perhaps even know, in this case the other respondent knew one, the other none.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 JUDGE:</td>
<td>This can be a difficult question even for a native Finn and at least no-one will ask the same.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The native-Finnish judge asked if the respondents knew a set of uncommon Finnish words and the non-imitator knew only one of them. Even though the results were as the judge had anticipated; The Finn being more knowledgeable than the immigrant, the judge remains unconvinced. There is an epistemic correspondence but, the judge expresses doubt by saying that an imitator as well could perhaps know the answer. The findings support
Arminen & Simonens results in that evaluations based on the epistemic correspondence of questions and answers, tend to amounts to a low confidence level among the judges.

When evaluating the answers given to epistemic questions, judges tend to base their evaluations on the amount of detail given by the respondents. This supports Arminen & Simonens notion of *epistemic granularity*. Epistemic granularity aims to encapsulate the phenomenon in which participants make epistemic questions and assume that group members will be able to provide more detail regarding the subject than non-group members. The notion of epistemic granularity is demonstrated in the dialogue between the following participants.


1 JUDGE: How and with whom do you spend midsummer?
2A RESPONDENT: Celebrate it with my girlfriend and her family 😊
2B RESPONDENT: With the family at the summerhouse, going to the sauna, eating and making midsummer spells. We also burn a bonfire.
3 JUDGE: Again number one has more detail, when number two has almost none. There is also a difference in the language. In number one there is constantly a slightly better Finnish.
4 JUDGE: Similar with the question about Christmas celebrations, one of the two respondents’ answers reveals suspicion regarding to the amount of detail about the traditions.

1 JUDGE: Miten ja kenen kanssa vietät Juhannusta?
2B RESPONDENT: tyttöystävän kanssa vietän ja hänen perheen kanssa :) 
4 JUDGE: Sama kuin joulun vieton kysymyksessä, jommankumman vastauksessa paljastuu epäilyjä yksityiskohdista perinteisiin liittyen.

Again, the judge asked about how the participants celebrate midsummer. Apart from the linguistic differences, the judge (4) seeks for detail in the answers. This means that the judge is aware that there are more than one correct answer, but believes that the group-member can be revealed by the amount of detail given. Even though both answers are correct, it is
the granularity of the answer together with linguistic differences which convinces the judge which respondent is a Finn.

The same type of Test-questions were made by Finnish immigrants as well:

**Example 5. Finnish immigrant judge. Judgement confidence – (uid=4581)**

| 1 JUDGE: Are Muslims allowed to eat chewing gum during Ramadan? |
| 2A RESPONDENT: I don’t know, as I am not a believer of Islam. My own background is from France. |
| 2B RESPONDENT: No. |
| 3 JUDGE: The judgement is rather risky. Both respondents can belong to the same group as I. In my opinion the answer “I’m not Muslim, because I’m from France” is however quite transparent – if I were to pretend, I would answer exactly like this. Both could have google the answer. The choice of words and clear conciseness of the first answer makes me suspect that she or he is a Finn. The immigrant did not need to prove anything in the answer: “No”-answer is enough. |
| 4 JUDGE: The question is complicated because during the Ramadan fasting you’re not allowed to eat or drink anything. But you don’t really eat chewing gum. You only chew it. But you are not allowed to eat it. I suppose, that a Finnish pretender could fall into this little trap. |

| 1 JUDGE: Saavatko muslimit syödä purkkaa Ramadan-paaston aikana? |
| 2A RESPONDENT: En tiedä, sillä en ole islaminuskoinen. Oma taustani on Ranskasta. |
| 2B RESPONDENT: Ei |

The judge asked a question regarding an Islamic custom and assumed that a Finnish respondent would not be knowledgeable enough to be able to pay attention to the different
ways of interpreting the issue. Neither one of the respondents answered as the judge had anticipated. However, the judge distinguished the pretender by using the earlier mentioned method of looking for exaggerations – “the immigrant did not need to prove anything: “No” answer is enough”. The confidence rating is for some reason missing from the data, but the judge’s expresses uncertainty over the judgement.

The example demonstrates how the judge, by assuming that the Finnish immigrant group would be more knowledgeable about Islamic customs than the native-Finnish group, has a preconception about the epistemic differences between the two groups. This is the only example in the material in which, a Finnish immigrant judge has assumed a common epistemic pool shared among the Finnish immigrant group and attempts to reveal the identity of the respondents based on this assumption. All the other test-questions made by Finnish immigrants, are based on the assumption that the native Finns share a common epistemic pool, and therefore in order to identify their group member they ask about things that native Finns would know and Finnish immigrants perhaps not:

**Example 6. Finnish immigrant questions and intentions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UID</th>
<th>Judgement confidence</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4589</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JUDGE 1: Where does Santa clause live?</td>
<td>JUDGE 4: Because Finns like Santa clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3977</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JUDGE 1: When is the Finnish Independence Day?</td>
<td>JUDGE 4: Perhaps based on this question I can reveal who is a non-pretender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3975</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>JUDGE 1: When is midsummer?</td>
<td>JUDGE 4: Common information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UID</th>
<th>Judgement confidence</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4589</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 JUDGE: Missä joulupukki asuu?</td>
<td>4 JUDGE: koska suomalaiset tykkävät joulupukki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3977</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples 2a to 2c illustrate how the respondents use a method of finding difference based on the assumption that native Finns and Finnish immigrants are distinguished by having a different epistemic status in relation to the questions asked. Apart from example 2B, the Finnish immigrants did not assume a common epistemic pool among the Finnish immigrants. However, they did rely on the same method. But instead of assuming that their group members would be more knowledgeable about expertise related to Finnish immigrants, they assumed, just like the native Finns had assumed, that their group members would be less knowledgeable about expertise connected to the native Finns. Therefore, in these cases the Finnish immigrant imitation games resemble more chance condition configurations, as did the non-religious imitation games presented by Arminen & Simonen (2015), in that the participants locate themselves in reference to the epistemic status set by the target group (native Finns) as knowing (experts), or un-knowing (non-experts). This means that the native-Finnish pretenders needed to pretend to not be members of the native Finnish group (non-experts), instead of pretending to be members of the Finnish immigrant group (experts).

Arminens & Simonens study (2015) showed that the active Christians had it easier to distinguish each other due to having a theological discussion as a common pool of knowledge, which the non-religious did not have, to draw upon and make questions. The Finnish-immigrants also seem to lack this type of common group-bound knowledge, making it more challenging to come up with questions. Nevertheless, the quantitative analysis suggests that the Finnish immigrant group in fact, does identify group members more effectively than in any of the chance condition imitation games studied by Collins et al. (Collins & Evans, 2013). The material indicates that a common strategy among the Finnish immigrants was to look for common experiences towards matters that are known to both groups.
7.4. Experiential Correspondence

In the previous chapter I have demonstrated how judges seek to distinguish group members from non-group members by creating questions that measure the respondents’ epistemic resources. The judge then identifies the group member based on how the answer corresponds to the judges’ preconceptions of the group’s shared epistemic resources. The analysis suggests that although this strategy was widely used by both native Finns and Finnish immigrants, the Finnish immigrants created questions that resembled more chance conditions than identify conditions, insinuating at a lack of a common pool of knowledge to draw upon and create questions. Additionally, I have presented how the judges from both groups identify pretenders by scanning the answers for exaggerations and stereotypes.

In this chapter I will show how both native-Finnish and Finnish immigrant judges seek to distinguish group members from non-group members by creating questions that attend to assumed shared experiences and identify group members from non-group members based on the congruence or incongruence of experiences.

Lacking a common culture, the Finnish immigrant group have focused on asking about the respondents’ experiences of things that are known to both groups. The following example demonstrates how a Finnish immigrant judge identifies a group member by relating to a common experience to all: the first day of school.


1 JUDGE: Do you remember how your first day at school was (when you were 7 years old)? Tell me.

2A RESPONDENT: I was 6 years old. My mother brought me I was quite nervous. I had many siblings, but they are all younger so I was alone in school. I remember that I would have preferred to stay at home with my family.

2B RESPONDENT: I remember somewhat. My father brought me that day to school. I had new clothes, a pencil case, pencils and a backpack. I recognized a few friends from the same pre-school with their parents on the school yard. We of course chatted nervously. My father could not really speak Finnish at that point, so he mainly smiled to the other parents and answered like “sure” and “yes”. Then the bell rang. We first-graders were to form a line in front of the schools outer door, from which our teachers would come and pick us up. In school I sat next to a boy, because there were no other seats available. I remember that this boy would later become the most popular boy in class who everyone liked. Then I guess we
were distributed papers in which we were to write our own name and lay it on the table. More than this I don’t think I can remember.

3 JUDGE: Based on the text: The father could not really speak Finnish at that time, so he mainly smiled and answered like “sure” and “yes”. The other answer was too cliché, that she or he was 6 years with lots of siblings and alone in school etc. Additionally, new clothes are an important thing on the first day of school for immigrants, I think, at least for me, to a child you must buy new beautiful school clothes!

4 JUDGE: I believe Finns celebrate 1.9 in a different way than foreigners (that is, Finns don’t do anything special then)

1 JUDGE: Muistatko millainen oli ensimmäinen koulupäiväsi (kun olit 7v)? Kerro.

2A RESPONDENT: Olin 6 vuotias. Äiti vei minut olin hieman jännittynyt. Minulla on monta sisarusta, mutta kaikki ovat nuorempia niin olin yksin koulussa. Muistan että olisin mieluummin jäänyt kotiin perheeni kanssa.


3 JUDGE: Tekstin perusteella: Isä ei oikein osannut Suomea silloin, joten hän lähinnä hymyili muille vanhemmille ja vastasi tyyliin "joo" ja "kyllä". Toinen vastaus oli liian kliseetä, että oli 6v ja mona sisarusta ja yksin koulussa jne. Lisäksi, uudet vaatteet on tärkeää jutut ensimmäisellä koulupäivällä maahanmuttajille, minusta, minulle varmasti oli, lapselle täyttö osta uudet kauniit kouluväitteet!

4 JUDGE: Minusta suomalaiset juhlivat 1.9 erilaisella tavalla kun ulkomaalaiset (eli suomalaiset eivät tee mitään erikoista silloin)

The judge motivates the question by stating that foreigners celebrate the first day of school differently than Finns. This indicates that the judge assumes that although members of both groups have experienced the first day of school, the experience is differs according to group membership. Apart from revealing the pretender through the earlier mentioned method of finding stereotypes and exaggerations, the judge expresses that she or he was convinced by the story of the father not knowing Finnish, and that she or he could relate with the importance of having new clothes. The example illustrates how the judge distinguished a
group member by how their Finnish immigrant experience of an experience which is common to both groups, correspond to each other.

The same method of looking for corresponding experiences was used by both groups. However, again the native-Finnish group had a common culture upon which they could generate questions. In the following example, the judge has a Finnish background and asks two different questions referring to a Finnish traditional midsummer festivity called “Juhannus”.


| 1 JUDGE: When do you celebrate the Finnish **Juhannus** and what belongs essentially to its celebration? |
| 2A RESPONDENT: Juhannus is celebrated 20.06-21.06. Drinking, barbequing, spending time with friends and family belongs to juhannus. |
| 2B RESPONDENT: Juhannus is celebrated in mid-June. To its celebrations include togetherness with family or friends and good food. The majority of Finns are at that time in the country side enjoying (hopefully) the good weather. |
| 3 JUDGE: The style of writing. Although I expected from both a deeper answer about the making of the bath whisk and the Juhannus-bonfire. The person whom I think is real, told additionally that midsummer is spent in the country side. |
| 4 JUDGE: Finns learn this tradition already as a child and I think only a Finn can give in his answer for ex. the juhannus-magics and making the bath whisk as alternatives, I would think. |

| 1 JUDGE: Milloin vietetään suomalaista juhannusta ja mitä se juhlimiseen olennaisesti kuuluu? |
| 2A RESPONDENT: Juhannus Vietetään 20.06-21.06. Juomista, grillimista, ystävien ja perhen kanssa oleminen kuuluu juhannukseen |
| 3 JUDGE: Kirjoitusasusta. Tosin odotin molemmilta syvällisempää vastausta vihdan teosta ja kokosta ym. Henkilö jonka uskon olevan aito, kertoi vielä lisäksi että juhannusta vietetään maalla. |
| 4 JUDGE: Suomalaiset oppivat tämän perinteen lapsena jo ja luulen että vain suomalainen voi antaa vastauksessa esim. juhannustaitat ja vihdan teon vaihtoehdoksi, luulisin. |
In this dialogue, the judge brings forth a Finnish national tradition as a subject matter and makes A) a test-question about when the festivities occur and B) a question about what essentially belongs to the festivities. The judge (4) motivates his or her intentions by saying that Finns learn the answer to the question already in their youth and that only Finns can include to the answer the same things as he or she - implying that, the answer that the judge is looking for, cannot be known to a person who is not a member of the native-Finnish group.

Respondent 2A responds by telling the exact dates for the celebration and 3 different activities. Respondent 2B writes a more vague time for the celebration but includes where it is spent and what expectations there are for the festivities. In the end, the judgement was based on linguistic differences. However, based on the content, the judge is unsure about who is imitating and was hoping for more depth in the answers. This is also why I have decided to categorize this dialogue under the concept of experiential correspondence, instead of epistemic correspondence. As stated earlier in the analysis, Arminen & Simonen (2015) found that the granularity of an answer affected whether or not the answers were convincing. However, I cannot say if the lack of “depth” implies purely on a lack of epistemic detail, or if the judge is expressing a lack of experiential correspondence - that the judge sees that both answers are correct and detailed, but simply has a different perspective on, and experience of the matter. Here perhaps a new theoretical concept could be useful – Experiential depth. Experiential depth would include what respondents usually refer to as “depth” in their reflections. Whereas epistemic granularity refers to the amount of information and facts or thoroughness of an uttering, experiential depth would attend to a congruence of perspectives on the subject at hand.

The following example illustrates how, although the answers are few worded, the judge perceives “depth” in one of the respondents answers and can relate to it, demonstrating a correspondence between the judges experience towards “Finnishness” and the description given by the respondent.

Example 9A. Native-Finnish Judge. Judgement confidence: 3 (uid=3976)

| 1 JUDGE: What things in your opinion summarizes Finnishness? Name at least 4 things. | }
The Judge raised Finnishness as a topic and asked the respondents to summarize it in at least four things. This type of question invites the respondent to give his or her interpretation or experience, of the subject at hand. The judge’s intention also illustrates how he or she assumed that another Finn would perceive Finnishness in a similar way, and thereby respond in a way which is more or less similar as he or she would.

The Finnish respondent’s choice of words in describing the national character corresponded with the judge’s in a way that the judge perceived it as “spiritual” and “dug from deep inside”. Here, even though the word count is very low, the judge can strongly relate to the answer. The judge states that a Finn can find this knowledge from inside of him or herself, implying that the answer is not something one can look up on the outside, but rather something from the inside. The experiential correspondence is further emphasized later in the next final evaluation (9B).

The next example is the final evaluation from the same native-Finnish judge as the previous example. The example illustrates how *the mastery of a natural language* (Heritage, 1984) as discussed in chapter four is at play in the imitation game environment.

**Example 9B. Native-Finnish Judge. Judgement correct. Confidence 3 (uid=3976)**
Reason: The one that had constantly the answers I was looking for, perhaps more said in a Finnish way. It felt like I had with the chosen non-imitator a bigger connection than with the other.

Reason: Sen, kummalla oli jatkuvasti hakemiani vastauksia, jotenkin ehkä suomalaiseen tapaan sanottunakin enemmän. Tuntui että valitsemani ei-teeskentelijän kanssa oli joku isompi yhteys kuin tämän toisen.

The judge expresses that the respondent had constantly the answers that he or she was looking for. This demonstrates how it is not enough to know a correct answer to a question, but rather, it is about identifying the relevant meaning of the question and reproducing the answer which the judge is looking for. Even a simple question can have many different answers, and the example indicates that the judge expects from members of the same group to know which of the many answers he or she is looking for. Garfinkel and Sacks emphasized how descriptions are open-ended, and that the mastery of a natural language, which entails group belonging, is the capacity to produce and recognize the correct representation of everyday life out of a vast array of possible representations (Silverman, 1998). Having the answers that the judge is looking for seems to encapsulate this phenomenon. It highlights how group members are expected to experience a similar sequence of an event, action or description presented by the judge, and be able to reproduce this experience in a more or less similar way as the judge expects that a member of the same group would.

Here, a parallel can be drawn to the notion of interactional expertise and the earlier argument about its proposed link to the theory of subjective realities as presented by Berger & Luckmann. Whereas experiential correspondence attends to the correspondence of subjective realities, epistemic correspondence seems to attend to the correspondence of sedimented objective meanings, in other words, objective realities. Epistemic correspondence requires that there exists a common pool of group-bound knowledge, or culture which the judge can tap into and generate questions, whereas experiential correspondence requires that there exists a similar way of interpreting and experiencing events, actions or descriptions, which the judge can tap into. Therefore, in order to gain experiential correspondence a non-group member would need a significant degree of
cultural immersion which enables him or her to put him or herself into the others position and see, and describe the event as she or he would. Epistemic correspondence on the other hand, demands only that the non-group member has access to certain community-specific knowledge, without needing to acquire the others outlook. An interactional expert, as measured by successful imitations in the imitation game environment, would have needed to learn both the objective and subjective realities of the target group.

This perspective attends to the character of the target group in question. Some groups might be characterized by having a large epistemological pool, such as professions. These groups are to a certain extent constituted by, and share a similar objective reality in the form of academic knowledge. Whereas target groups, such as the blind would be more characterized by sharing a similar subjective experience of the more general objective everyday reality. Thus, as argued before, the difference between and the character of the two target groups, native Finns and Finnish immigrants, can be explored by how they identify their fellow group members based on either having common experiences or common group bound knowledge.

The following examples (10A to 10H) present a game where a Finnish judge had considerable difficulties in revealing the respondents’ identities. The example is rather lengthy, but nevertheless necessary in order to illustrate how a relative congruence of subjective realities may look like.

7.5 Successful imitation

**Example 10A. Native-Finnish Judge. Judgement confidence 1 (uid=4594)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDGE: What does Finland’s independence mean to you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2A RESPONDENT: Freedom, the possibility to realize oneself, a common Finnish heritage, of which we can be proud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B RESPONDENT: For me it is important that Finland is an independent state. You don’t take it so much for granted, as the independence has at times been at stake. Independence means freedom to decide on your own about matters which occur within the borders of the state.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unfortunately due to an unknown reason, the judge’s intention is not in the data.
Respondent 2A is a Finnish immigrant pretending to be a native Finn and respondent 2B is a native Finn answering genuinely. The same order applies to all the examples in this chapter.
The judge relied on a gut-feeling when distinguishing the pretender from the non-pretender. The confidence of the judgment is the lowest possible, suggesting that the expressed “mututuntuma” is for a lack of a better reason instead of an unknown conviction.
In the following dialogue, the judge expresses more clearly the difficulty in distinguishing the imitator from the non-imitator.

**Example 10B. Native-Finnish Judge. Judgement confidence 1 (uid=4594)**

1 JUDGE: What is your favorite food and why?

2A RESPONDENT: I eat everything, but I like fish the most. It is a diverse raw material, with which it is easy to prepare different foods.

2B RESPONDENT: Good and high-quality bread and fatty cheese.

3 JUDGE: By no means. Both answers could just as well be by a member of my group.

4 JUDGE: Food illustrates often people’s culture and affections by it.

1 JUDGE: Mikä on sinun lempiruokasi ja miksi?

2A RESPONDENT: Syöän kaikkea, mutta eniten pidän kalasta. Se on monipuolinen raaka-aine, josta on helppo valmistaa eri ruokia.

2B RESPONDENT: Hyvä laadukas leipä ja rasvainen juusto
Here, although the respondents answered by naming entirely different foods, the judge could not make any distinction regarding the identities of the respondents. The judge also expressed that both answers could be given by a group-member, highlighting that both answers were equally Finnish instead of equally non-Finnish. The indecisiveness means that neither of the answers fell into the already mentioned traps of being too stereotypical, too exaggerated, having too little or too much detail, lacking depth, or simply not being what the judge was looking for. It seems that, although the content of both answers is entirely different, they share a certain common character which the judge was looking for. From this dialogue alone, it is difficult to say how both answers were regarded as convincingly Finnish. Perhaps it is the attitudes towards the food, the combinations of food and the meanings given to it, one highlighting Fish as a good raw material for further preparation, and the other the quality of bread and type of cheese. However, the material supports the notion that both respondents masters the natural language of the respondent, which means among other things, the ability to produce a description which holds apart from the correct content, also the correct form.

The following example illustrates how the judge takes into account the already mentioned method of looking for exaggerations.

**Example 10C. Native-Finnish Judge. Judgement confidence 1 (uid=4594)**

1 JUDGE: Are family and relatives important to you, please elaborate why this is, or isn’t?
2A RESPONDENT: Yes they are. My family is small and for me it is important that, we are actively in contact with each other.
2B RESPONDENT: I have very close ties with my family and relatives. My family and my relatives from the sides of both my parents are a good-humored lot, so you willingly spend time with them. My circle of friends is a pretty homogeneous bunch of people with regards to age, interests and so forth, so being with the family it is refreshing to get to talk with different kinds of people.
3 JUDGE: Here I motivate my judgement more on the form of the answer. But I am not totally sure, it could be that the answer which I think is from my own group, tries perhaps to seem really Finnish but perhaps isn’t. So after thinking for a moment, I am not so sure about my answer.
4 JUDGE: I believe it is easy for me to notice if someone is lying or not.
1 JUDGE: Onko perhe ja sukulaiset sinulle tärkeitä, perustele mielellään miksi näin on tai ei ole?
2A RESPONDENT: Ovat. Sukuni on pieni ja minulle on tärkeää, että pidämme aktiivisesti yhteyttä toisiimme.
2B RESPONDENT: Minulla on todella läheiset välit perheeseeni ja sukulaisiini. Perheeni ja kummankin vanhempani puoleinen suku ovat todella huumorintajuista sakkia, joten heidän kanssaan viettää mielellään aikaa. Ystäväpiirini on melko homogeestä porukkaa iältään, kiinnostuksenkohteiltaan ym, joten suvun kanssa ollessa on virkistävää päästä juttelemaan erilaisten tyyppeen kanssa.
3 JUDGE: Tässä perustelen arvioitini enemmän vastauksen muotoon. En kyllä ole aivan varma, sinäänsä vastaus jonka luulen olevani minun ryhmästäni yrittää ehkä vaikuttaa todella suomalaiselta mutta ehkä ei kuitenkaan ole sitä. Joten mietittyäni hetken en olekaan niin varma vastauksestani.
4 JUDGE: Uskon että minun on helppo huomata jos joku valehtelee. Initially the judge deemed one of the respondents as trying to seem really Finnish, demonstrating the method by which the judge scans the answers for exaggerations as presented earlier in the analysis. However, after further reflection it was not convincing enough.

In the following question, the judge expresses that because both respondents seem really Finnish, she or he wants to get beneath the surface. This is similar to a previous example (9A), where the judge expressed that there are some things that only a Finn can dig up from deep inside. Perhaps it can be viewed as an attempt to find certain experiential depth, which the judge assumes that only a member of the native-Finns might have.

Example 10D. Native-Finnish Judge. Judgement confidence 2 (uid=4594)

1 JUDGE: What does Finnishness mean to you?
2A RESPONDENT: Finnishness means the possibility to live in a welfare-state, to enjoy clean nature and to educate oneself.
2B RESPONDENT: Difficult question! For me Finnishness means perhaps that, I live in a country where, you take quite good care of everyone and you value education.
3 JUDGE: I am still not sure, and I am again of the opinion that both answers describe Finnishness. For some reason I still lean towards the first answer, maybe because it also speaks about nature which is dear to me.
4 JUDGE: I feel like both the imitator and non-imitator are really Finnish, at least like from the outside. So I would like to get beneath the surface.

1 JUDGE: Mitä suomalaisuus tarkoittaa sinulle?
2A RESPONDENT: Suomalaisuus tarkoittaa mahdollisuutta elää hyvinvointivaltiossa, nauttia puhtaasta luonnosta ja kouluttautua.
2B RESPONDENT: Vaikea kysymys! Minulle suomalaisuus tarkoittaa ehkä sitä, että elän maassa, missä on pidetään melko hyvin kaikista huolta ja arvostetaan koulutusta.
3 JUDGE: En vieläkään ole varma, ja olen taas sitä mieltä että molemmat vastaukset kuvailvat suomalaisuutta. Jostain syystä kallistun kuitenkin ensimmäiseen vastaukseen, ehkä siksi että siinä puhutaan myös luonnosta mikä on minulle tärkeää.

The example demonstrates how the judge’s ultimate decision is made based on how the answer correlates to the judges own personal experience on the matter - insinuating at a congruence of individual experiences, instead of a congruence of shared collective experiences. The following example is from a different judge and demonstrates the same phenomenon.

Example 10E. Native-Finnish Judge. Judgement confidence 4 (uid=4592)

1 JUDGE: Do you enjoy living in Finland and why/why not?
2A RESPONDENT: Yes I do. Here lives the family, relatives and friends. During winters I long away from Finland, as I don’t like the continuing dark weather and the slush. Finland is although Finland. I could not permanently move away from here.
2B RESPONDENT: I do most of the time. Winters can be tough and gloomy. But I do love my home country, and although I have studied abroad and will probably be working abroad, it is always very nice to come back to home-Finland! At the same time, I love spending time at the summer cottage
3 JUDGE: Summer cottage is also important to me and I have also lived abroad myself.
4 JUDGE: It is for me an important and interesting question.

1 JUDGE: Viihdytkö Suomessa ja miksi/miksi ei?

3 JUDGE: Mökki on minullekin tärkeä ja olen itsekin asunut ulkomailla

4 JUDGE: On minulle tärkeä ja kiinnostava kysymys.

Both responses have a remarkably similar language and attitude. Both mentioned good things and bad things (winter), both could imagine being somewhere else but in the end, both ended with a positive attitude. The final decision was based on having the same personal affection towards the summer house, which is a distinguishing feature of Finnish leisure culture, and having the same experience of living abroad. In other words, the judge based the decision on correlating personal perspectives, perhaps showing how it is the combination of a common native-Finnish experience together with other personal experiences which result in a stronger experiential correspondence.

The following example is similar to example 10B in that the content of the answers is very different from one another, but still the judge cannot pinpoint the pretender or non-pretender.

Example 10F. Native-Finnish Judge. Judgement confidence 2 (uid=4594)

1 JUDGE: What do you believe in?

2A RESPONDENT: I believe in justice and order. I believe in that, everyone has the possibility to fulfill oneself and ones dreams.

2B RESPONDENT: The question seems to refer to religion. I don’t really think about faith. I belong to the church, but religion has no role in my life

3 JUDGE: I don’t know.

4 JUDGE: Religion or believing in something tells a lot about a human

1 JUDGE: Mihin sinä uskot?

2A RESPONDENT: Uskon oikeuteen ja järjestykseen. Uskon siihen, että jokaisella pitää olla mahdollisuus toteuttaa itseään ja omia unelmiaan.

Remarkably, both answers attended to one of the two intentions expressed by the judge. One of the answers attends to religion, and the other attends to believing in something. This emphasizes how the respondents knew what the judge was looking for. The material does not tell whether the judge thought she or he knew which respondent was an imitator albeit without reason, or if the judge simply does not know which one is which.

The following example is the last question before the final evaluation. Now the judge expresses already before getting the answers that this will be the last and deciding question before making the final judgement.

Example 10G. Native-Finnish Judge. Judgement confidence 1 (uid=4594)

1 JUDGE: What did you do last Sunday?
2A RESPONDENT: I spent the Independence Day together with my family. We watched a little at the Castel Ball and baked gingerbread.
2B RESPONDENT: I was with my parents’ in Tampere. We visited my granny and grandpa and made food. We came in the afternoon by train back to Helsinki. In the evening we watched Linnan juhlia and ordered pizza.
3 JUDGE: I can’t reason as none of the answers is more, or less Finnish.
4 JUDGE: I believe this is a decisive question.

Both answers were quite similar in content. Both mention family, food, and the Castle Ball. The Castle Ball is a popular event closely tied to Finnish history and nationalism. If we were
to assume that the judge knew about this event, we could consider it partly a test-question in that, not mentioning this event would have been a wrong answer and might have ended in exposure as an imitator. However, this was not the case, and the judge expressed that none of the answers were more Finnish or less Finnish. The following example is the final evaluation made by the judge based on all the previous questions and answers.

Example 10H. Native-Finnish Judge. Last judgement. Confidence 2 (uid= 4594)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason:</th>
<th>The final judgement was really difficult as all the answers indicated on Finnishness. So I make my decision more or less with a gut-feeling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Reason: | Lopullinen päätös oli todella vaikea sillä kaikki vastaukset viittasivat suomalaisuuteen. Teen siis päätökseni aika lailla mututuntumalla. |

At the last judgement, each question and respective answers are displayed in a table form, making it easier for the judge to make a final evaluation. Nevertheless, the judge could not distinguish the native Finn from the Finnish immigrant. This was also the case at each individual question and respective answers presented before. This is the only case in the material in which the judge has remained without any idea of the respondents’ identities after an entire dialogue. Usually, instead of being as oblivious as before the dialogue, the judges are at least under the impression that one of the respondents is imitating, whether the evaluation is correct or not. At this point of the analysis, I checked the identities of each participant. It appeared that even though the imitator had an immigrant background, as required for the role, one of her parents has a Finnish background. Moreover, each participant in the dialogue were female university students.

In the theory chapter I argued that, the individual’s practical experience of the socially constructed natural world is constituted by the complex array of social categories to which the individual’s body is ascribed. Accordingly, each member is a leading expert in the reality as filtered through the ensemble of categorizations to which her or his body is ascribed. At the same time each member is also an expert in the reality as filtered through each individual category. Considering that one of the imitator’s parents is Finnish, she cannot be recognized as an interactional expert in the Finnish reality, but rather a genuine expert. This applies also to the immigrant reality, making her a double expert in the imitation game event.
The participants’ gender and occupation are here relevant as theoretically, the more similar ensemble of categories two or more members share, the more similar their reality of everyday life is. This would reflect in the imitation game as a dialogue where the judge constantly receives answers which he or she is looking for. This was best demonstrated in example 10F where, the respondents attended specifically to each one of the judges expressed intentions. This imitation game is the only case where the judge has remained after the entire dialogue without any without any impression of who is who. In example 10E I briefly introduced how I considered that there was more of a correspondence of personal experiences than Finnish immigrant experiences. By personal experiences I mean that there is, apart from a correspondence of native-Finnish or Finnish immigrant realities, a correspondence of any of the other experiences constituted by the other categories that the participants’ bodies are ascribed with. My interpretation is that the Finnish or Finnish immigrant experience is intertwined with all the other experiences and categories to which the individual’s body is ascribed, making the native Finnish and Finnish immigrant reality merely a nuance of the entire reality of everyday life. Consequently, a stronger experiential correspondence is achieved when the ensembles meet, instead of when only Finnishness or Finnish immigrancy meet - and distinguishing a native Finn from a Finnish immigrant or vice versa, is about distinguishing the nuance which each category gives to the individual subjective experience. In addition, distinguishing a non-pretender from a pretender in the imitation game, may at times have less to do with recognizing a group member form a non-group member, and more to do with recognizing a familiar individual experience which has less to do with the target groups set up by the researcher than any of the other categories outside the imitation game setting.

The following example demonstrates how the aforementioned double expert responded as a non-pretender to a judge with an immigrant background.

**Example 12A. Finnish immigrant judge. Judgement confidence: 3 (uid=4577)**

1 JUDGE: Tell me about a situation (if there is any), in which you have thought that Finnish society does not accept you as a Finn?

2A RESPONDENT: When I have offered help for example in carrying shopping bags.
2B RESPONDENT: Situations in which some stranger has asked a lot about my background, or commented on my Finnish language skills. So the type of situations in which, I have automatically been classified as an immigrant, without information about my past.

3 JUDGE: The answer is longer and more profound. I can relate to this answer well. On the other hand, the other answer is also profound, but my group member would indeed answer rambling away, because the situations are many and not just one.

4 JUDGE: I would like long answers to this question. I think that it is possible to answer to if you have an immigrant background.

---

1 JUDGE: Kerro sellaisesta tilanteesta (jos on ollut), jolloin olet ajatellut ettei Suomalainen yhteiskunta hyväksy sinua suomalaiseksi?

2A RESPONDENT: Tilanteet, joissa joku tuntematon on kysellyt paljon taustastani tai kommentoinut Suomen kielen taitoani. Eli sellaiset tilanteet, joissa minut on automaattisesti luokiteltu maahanmuuttajaksi ilman tietoja taustastani.

2B RESPONDENT: Kun olen tarjonnut apuani vaikkapa kauppakassien kantamiseksi

3 JUDGE: Vastaus on pidempi ja syvällisempi. Voin samaistua tähän vastaukseen hyvin. Toisaalta toinenkin vastaus on syvällinen, mutta ryhmämäni jäsen vastaisi kyllä jaaritellen, koska tilanteita on paljon eikä vain yhtä.

4 JUDGE: Haluaisin pitkiä vastauksia tähän kysymykseen. Koen, että siihen on mahdollista vastata jos on maahanmuuttaja taustainen

---

The judge thought that only an immigrant can give a long answer to the question. Respondent 2b is the double expert and gave a longer answer, which the judge was also looking for. This is also an example where there is a clear connection with the judge’s intention, answers given by the respondents and evaluation made by the judge.

In the following example the judge invites the respondents to reflect upon the relation between the Finnish character and those with the same background as the respondent.

**Example 12B. Finnish immigrant judge. Judgement confidence: 3 (uid=4577)**

1 JUDGE: Describe to me native Finns in relation to persons with the same background as you?

2A RESPONDENT: Native Finns are more sober-minded and serious than we are.

2B RESPONDENT: Native Finns are quieter and reserved. Finns are strict with their boundaries and it is difficult to get a contact with them. Africans relate to each other openly
and even strangers can take contact with you, also here in Finland. On the other hand I appreciate that Finns are sincere and that things happen as they are agreed upon.

3 JUDGE: I figure that respondent 2 is a non-pretender. His/her answer is more profound than the 1. respondent’s. The first respondent seems true on the other hand, but it doesn’t have the same nuance as the answer number 2 has.

4 JUDGE: I presume that the pretender’s description can be superficial.

---

1 JUDGE: Kuvaile minulle kantasuomalaisia suhteessa oman taustaisiisi ihmisiin?

2A RESPONDENT: Kantasuomalaiset ovat vakavamielisempiä ja totisempia kuin me


4 JUDGE: Oletan, että kuvailu voi olla teeskentelijällä pinnalista.

The intention and reasons are familiar from before. The judge expresses that one of the answers is more profound, supporting the notion of experiential depth. Here, the judge also states in his or her own words that one of the answers doesn’t have the same nuance as the other one has, further demonstrating how the Finnish and immigrant categories give a nuance in the individual everyday life. Understandably, the Finnish immigrant judge was also unsure about the respondents’ identities in the final evaluation:


**Reason:** I can relate to this person better. His/her answers are profound. On the other hand, I also feel that respondent 2. could be a member of my group, and respondent 2 a pretender, because I can relate to him/her.

**Judge:** Pystyn samaistumaan tähän henkilöön paremmin. Hänen vastauksensa ovat syvällisiä. Toisaalta koen, että työs vastaaja 2. on voisi olla ryhmäni jäsen, ja vastaaja 2. teeskentelijä, koska häneneen voi samaistua,

So far I have shown how the participants in the imitation game identify their fellow group members by establishing either an epistemic correspondence or experiential
correspondence by asking questions and interpreting the respective answers. The judge identifies either an experiential or epistemic correspondence through different interactional methods that include: reviewing the language, scanning for exaggerations or stereotypes and assessing the epistemic granularity or experiential depth of the descriptions. Moreover, I further explored the notion of experiential correspondence and interactional expertise by presenting a game where a judge remained convinced that both respondents could be members of the same group. In the following chapter I will demonstrate another type of interactional method used by judges that is slightly different from the aforementioned.

7.6 Categorical Correspondence

Categorical correspondence as a concept investigates a different type of phenomenon than epistemic and experiential correspondence. Whereas epistemic and experiential correspondence are intended to categorize two different methodological dimensions that judges use to identify a group member, categorical correspondence explores how judges use different social categories as a resource for interpreting the interaction within the imitation game setting. Experiential correspondence and epistemic correspondence are meant to be mutually excluding, whereas categorical correspondence seems to take place within spheres of either or both dimensions.

The following example illustrates how a Finnish immigrant judge interprets the answers given and distinguishes the pretender from the non-pretender by relating the answers to different and more specific categories than the initial categories given by the imitation game setting.

Example 13A. Finnish immigrant judge. Judgement confidence 3 (uid=3977)

1 JUDGE: What kind is your daily routine?
2A RESPONDENT: It differs a lot as I do short-term jobs, at times part-time work. The day includes frequently though walking outside, being with friends and family, going to the grocery store and too much work.
2B RESPONDENT: Just normal. I go to work. I come back. Cook food for the family.
3 JUDGE: The respondent has in my opinion an immigrant background and I think it sounds like an immigrant family mother’s daily routine.

4 JUDGE: I think it helps to understand who belongs to what group.

1 JUDGE: Minkälainen on sinun päivärutiini?


3 JUDGE: Vaastaaja on mielestäni maahanmuuttaja taustainen koska mielestäni kuulostaa maahanmuuttaja perhen äidin päivärutiniltä

4 JUDGE: luulen se autta ymmärtämään mihin ryhmän kuka kuuluu

The judge asks the respondents to tell about their personal daily activities. Both respondents answered in a similar way, naming different activities with the exception of 2A commenting about having too much work. The judge expresses that one of the answers sounds like an immigrant family mother’s routine. Here, the judge has brought forth a new, gendered and familiarized category in order to better distinguish and pinpoint the non-imitator. Harvey Sacks developed the concept *membership categorization device* in order to find out how members go about choosing among the available sets of categories for grasping their empirical surroundings. Some categories such as the different members of the family and the gendered categories are among the first categories that a child learns via socialization. The categories enable members of society to interpret action in the sense that some categories do “such things” whereas others do not (Silverman 1999).

Playing as a judge requires, among other things, the ability to manage different more or less abstract categories and relate them with the descriptions given. The categories “Maahanmuuttaja” and “native Finn” might be too abstract and general to be assigned to either description given by the respondents, and the judge might have resolved this by lowering it to a more familiar or specific category.

In the following example the judge utilized another category in order to distinguish the pretender from the non-pretender.

Example 13B. Finnish immigrant judge. Judgement confidence 3 (uid=3977)
1 JUDGE: Do you have songs that you have listened to especially a lot lately? What is it?

2A RESPONDENT: Salil eka, salil vika: Musta barbaari (song: artist), I’m very bad at remembering the names of songs and bands. But that’s my gym-song. And all the songs of yelawolf (artist). I like rap.

2B RESPONDENT: I listen to different music. I don’t want to name a list.

3 JUDGE: Sounds like a young immigrant male!

4 JUDGE: From the music style I can perhaps evaluate.

The judge assigned the non-pretender the category “young immigrant male”. Again, it seems that in order to pinpoint the identity of the respondents, the judge needs to summon a more specific category than the original ones. The category is very different from the previous one, which also explains to why the judgement is wrong. In the next example the judge utilizes again the previous “immigrant mother” category.

Example 13C. Finnish immigrant judge. Judgement confidence 4 (uid=3977)

1 JUDGE: What is your future dream?

2a RESPONDENT: Be happy, safe and successful. And also that me and my relatives are healthy

2b RESPONDENT: That the children get into a good university, and after that work. I hope that they have a good life.

3 JUDGE: Immigrant mother whose dream is her children’s happiness.

4 JUDGE: I don’t know.

1 JUDGE: Mikä on tulevaisuuden unelmasi?

2A RESPONDENT: Olla onnellinen, turvassa ja menestynyt. Sekä että minä ja lähiseiset terveitä.
28 RESPONDENT: Lapset saisivat hyvää yliopistoa ja sen jalken töitä. Toivon että heillä on hyvää elämää.

3 JUDGE: Maahanmuuttaja äiti joka hänen unlera on lasten onnelisuus

4 JUDGE: en tiedä

Again, the stated reason for the question was “I don’t know”, once more demonstrating the difficulty that the Finnish immigrant participants had in finding relevant questions. However, in the end the judge was confident about his or her evaluation and concluded that the non-pretender was an “immigrant mother”.

The judge juggled between two different categories, “young immigrant male” and “immigrant mother”. A similar juggling of various different categories can be seen in the following example in which a Finnish judge makes a final evaluation of the imitation game dialogue.


Reason: Starting from the beginning I was of the opinion that number 1 does not pretend to be a Finn and belongs to the same group as I. But at the same time I had this strange feeling that number 2 pretends to be a foreigner, that it would be a bit exaggerated, or perhaps he or she would have moved to Finland just recently, although the writing skills and experience would refer to a longer stay. But if I were to choose between these two, then number 2 is an immigrant. This was really clear, but the respondent’s answers appeared at times the other way around as can be seen for example in the question where answer one was: “I own schools, I don’t study”, which confused me, but now when I see all the answers it is very clear. But at the same time respondent 1. could be an immigrant who’s stayed in Finland a longer time. However the final decision is that the person from my group, meaning non-immigrant is then number 1, non-pretender.

Reason: Alusta alkaen olin sitä mieltä, ettei numero 1 teeskentele olevansa suomalainen, vaan on ja siis kuuluu samaan ryhmään kuin minä. Mutta samalla minulla oli sellainen outo fiilis että numero 2 teeskentelee olevansa ulkomaalainen, että olisi hieman väritettyä, ellei sitten ole juuri muuttanut Suomeen oikeasti, joskin kirjoitustaito ja kokemukset viittaavat pitempi aikaiseen oleskeluun. Mutta jos näistä pitäisi todeta niin numero 2 on maahanmuuttaja. Tämä oli aivan selvää, mutta vastatessa näiden vastaajien vastaukset menivät välillä väärin päin kuten tuo kysymys näkyi että vastaus 1. olisi ollut tuo "Minä omistan kouluja, minä en opiskele", joka sitten hämäsi, mutta kuten näen nämä vastaukset niin tässä aivan selvää. Mutta samalla tuo vastaja 1. voisi olla myös pitempään maassa asunut maahanmuuttaja. Loppupäätös kuitenkin että jos minun kanssa samaa ryhmää eli ei maahanmuuttaja, niin sitten 1 on ei-teeskentelijä.
Here the judge has been confronted with conflicting or confusing answers and thereby divided the immigrant category into two: “recently arrived immigrant” and “an immigrant who’s stayed in Finland a longer time”. This division is made based on “writing skills” and “experience”. Thus, the judge expresses a fluid immigrant category where the amount of time spent in Finland translates into writing skills and experience. The judge also expresses that the non-imitator could be an immigrant as well, albeit an immigrant who’s stayed in Finland for a longer time and therefore acquired the necessary writing skills and “experience” needed to appear as a Finn. With the new categories the judge seems to intend to explain the abnormality and maintain his or her already established interpretation of the categories given by the research setting. This is very similar with the case presented by Arminen & Simonen (2015) where active Christians would redefine a “non-religious” person as “non-religious person acquainted with Christian teachings”. A similar re-categorization of the native Finn does not appear in the material suggesting that the native Finn is a more clearly defined category which proves enough to explain the descriptions given by the respondents. The examples also demonstrate the ethnomethodological basis of social interaction in that rather than demanding members to speak or hear in a certain way, culture manifests itself in members as inference making machines (Silverman, 2006). Meaning that members produce and interpret utterings in a reflective manner, employing different methods and categories through which they formulate and reformulate the meanings of activities and identities.

8. Conclusions

Previous migration literature has studied the process of exclusion and inclusion within the theoretical framework of boundaries. Ethnic groups are regarded as constituted by the institutionalized boundaries that lie between them and other ethnic groups (Barth, 1970). Research has shown how different institutionalized ethnic boundaries define the group membership of individuals within national environments (Bauböck, 1994, Alba, 2005, Wimmer, 2008). Although, interview-based research (Jacobson, 1997, Vadher, 2009) has shown how members of different ethnic communities can locate themselves inside or
outside of different ethnic boundaries depending on the context and the rigidity of the boundary itself. In this study I have aimed to show how these boundaries are maintained within interaction by group members who recognize other group members from non-group members by identifying an epistemic-, experiential-, or categorical congruence or incongruence. However, the boundary perspective is hopelessly attached to the notion of ethnicities, making it difficult to apply for any other unit of analysis which is not defined by clear institutionalized boundaries, for instance, the Finnish immigrants.

The concept the “Other” within the post-colonial perspective explicitly attends to how heterogeneous populations are homogenized by dominant groups under just one subject in a process which produces and reproduces both the dominant subject and the “Other” (Said, 1978). Earlier studies have shown how the immigrant is being constructed by dominant groups within institutional settings in the Nordic countries (Keskinen et al. 2009). Whereas the postcolonial perspective focuses on power relations in society and how social constructions are produced and maintained from above, this study has focused on how the “Other” takes place within social interaction through internalized methods of making distinctions between group members and non-group members.

In previous imitation game research, the groups have been categorized as experts or non-experts in relation to a certain target expertise. Thus the imitation game experiment has been assumed to produce two different imitation game configurations: chance conditions and identify conditions. In identify conditions, the non-target group member tries to imitate the target group members and in chance conditions, the target group member tries to imitate not to be a part of the target group. Therefore the groups that have played as judges in chance conditions have been regarded as merely “not members of the target group”. Consequently the chance condition imitation games have been assumed to encapsulate conditions in which the judges do not represent any particular group and therefore have no common expertise which they can tap into when trying to identify the respondents.

Since the beginning of this research, I had been interested in exploring both categories; the “Finnish-immigrants” and the “native Finns”, and see how and when they become meaningful in the everyday lives of the members of Finnish society. Therefore I did not set up the imitation game experiment based on a premise of having only one target group present, but rather two separate target groups. The results from the quantitative analysis
indicate that neither imitation game simulated chance conditions. Both groups had it more
difficult to imitate one another than any of the chance conditions imitation games
presented by Arminen & Simonen (2015) or Collins et al. (2013). This means that both
groups were relatively successful in identifying their group members. The fact that both
imitation games simulated identify conditions provided the basis for further interpretation
of quantitative results and for further qualitative analysis.

Collins et al. used the identify ratios to measure the closed or open character of the target
groups. The theoretical premise is that non-group members would need interactional
expertise in order to imitate the target group members, and the lack of interactional
expertise would be shown as a high identify ratio, which in turn sheds light on the closed or
open character of the group. Both groups under study are, except for the gender imitation
games, more open than any of the target groups presented in previous research, but more
closed than any of the chance condition imitation games. I find it remarkable that it is more
difficult for a native Finn and a Finnish immigrant to imitate each other than it is for a blind
man to imitate a sighted man. On the same note, the nationhood imitation games
resembled the most the gender imitation games, in that there was only a small difference in
the identification ratios between the groups. Therefore there can be no proven relationship
of “double consciousness” between the groups. Double consciousness refers to a majority-
minority relationship in which one of the two is an expert in both worlds, whereas the other
is not (Collins & Evans, 2013). However, as stated before, for various reasons the
quantitative material is not enough for making any statistically reliable conclusions.
Nevertheless the results did give direction for further qualitative analysis.

Whereas Collins et al. (2013) interpret the identification ratio to represent the amount of
interactional expertise among the non-target group members, Arminen & Simonen (2016)
argue that the identification ratio represents, apart from the interactional expertise among
non-target group members, the resources and methods which the target group members
have at hand for identifying their fellow group members. Therefore interactional expertise is
not assumed to be embodied only by the non-group member, but rather it takes place in the
relationship between the two, meaning that the non-group member’s knowledge of the
target expertise is only one approximation, and the group member’s ability to interpret
distinctions and identify fellow group members is another. In the qualitative analysis I
explored the various methods used by the participants when identifying group members from non-group members. I reviewed how native Finns and Finnish immigrants interpret difference and distinguish each other through different interactional methods. These methods include: a) reviewing the language and scanning for exaggerations and stereotypes, b) seeking for epistemic correspondence and granularity c) looking for experiential correspondence and depth d) seeking for categorical correspondence.

The findings show how both groups reviewed the language and identified group members from group members by associating lower language skills with Finnish immigrants and more advanced language skills with native Finns. The results can be explained by the fact that some of the Finnish immigrants have another mother tongue than Finnish, which is also an assumed factor by both groups. Unfortunately the low language skills among some of the members of the Finnish immigrant group, resulted in a shallow dialogue. In order to have a rich material, the imitation game experiment requires from the participants the ability to reflect upon the descriptions given and to express these reflections through written text. I was aware of this risk when choosing to organize the imitation game event in the Finnish language. Nevertheless, for further research, I would not recommend to attempt to fix this by choosing to have the imitation game played in the English language for example. The data shows how judges would distinguish group members by the “depth” expressed by a certain choice of words. By choosing to play the imitation game in the second language of the participants, I fear that this aspect of the dialogue would be left out.

Scanning the descriptions for stereotypes and exaggerations was commonly used by both groups in a similar way. The analysis of the epistemic-, experiential-, and categorical correspondence resulted in a number of different findings. On the one hand, it shed light on the character of the native Finns and Finnish immigrants as social groups. On the other hand the analysis resulted in a further outlining of the concepts and a deeper theoretical understanding of the interaction that takes place in the imitation game environment.

Both Finnish immigrants and native Finns made epistemic and experiential questions when trying to identify their group members. The findings support Arminen & Simonens (2015) study, in that when making epistemic questions, the participants would look for detail and base their evaluations on the granularity of the answer. However, the participants also looked for “depth” in the answers, which was at times difficult to categorize under the same
concept of epistemic granularity. Sometimes the choice of words would be more convincing for the judge than the amount of detail. Therefore I decided to add experiential depth to the typology, which would encapsulate the phenomenon in which judges sought for, and would identify group members based on having experienced depth in the answers instead of the amount of detail in the answers.

Although both groups made epistemic questions, all the epistemic questions made by the Finnish immigrant judges (except for example 4) made the Finnish immigrant imitation games resemble more chance condition configurations than identification condition configurations. Instead of asking about something common to their group, the Finnish immigrant judges asked questions relating to the native-Finnish culture, assuming that their own group members would be revealed as non-experts instead of experts. The findings support previous research (Arminen & Simonen, 2015) in that in chance conditions, judges lack a common epistemic pool from which they can generate questions. The native Finnish group on the other hand, had a broad spectrum of target expertise from which they could draw questions, assuming that the Finnish immigrants would not be able to answer similarly as a group member. Thus, the method of identifying group members based on an epistemic correspondence was far more characteristic for the native Finns than the Finnish immigrants.

However, the identification ratio drawn from the quantitative analysis suggested that the Finnish immigrant imitation games resembled more identification conditions than chance conditions. The analysis of the experiential correspondence demonstrated how Finnish immigrants would instead of relying on a common pool of epistemic knowledge, rely on the methods of seeking for common experiences as well as seeking for categorical correspondence when identifying group members. Although they do not seem to share a common culture upon which to generate questions, it appears that they could distinguish group members from non-group members by probing on the respondents’ experiences towards matters that are known to both groups. The native Finns relied on this method as well, but differed in that they could ask about the respondents’ experience towards matters that are specific to the native-Finnish culture.

The analysis of the categorical correspondence revealed two things. Firstly, the given “Finnish immigrant” category was reformulated into more specific categories in order for
the judge to better distinguish a group member from a non-group member. Secondly the Finnish immigrant category was reformulated in order for a judge to make better sense of the descriptions given, and maintain an already established pre-conception of the Finnish immigrant category.

Arminen & Simonen suggested in a presentation given at the Annual Sociology Conference (2016) that the imitation game method can be used to study the difference between real and constructed groups. They argued that whereas real groups, such as active-Christians and native Finns could rely on epistemic and experiential questions to identify group members, constructed groups would need to rely on reformulations of the categories at play in the imitation game environment. My analysis suggests that the Finnish immigrant group could generally not make epistemic questions, and at times had to rely on reformulations of the given Finnish immigrant category. Nonetheless, the material shows that even though the Finnish immigrants did not have a common culture from which they could generate questions, they could generate experiential questions and identify group members based on an assumed common experiences towards matters, usually associated with normal everyday life.

I explained this phenomenon by further conceptualizing epistemic-, and experiential correspondence by drawing upon the theoretical discussion in chapter 4. I argued that epistemic correspondence attends to the congruence of objective realities and that experiential correspondence attends to the congruence of subjective realities as defined by Berger & Luckmann (1971). Therefore, I argued that the Finnish immigrants share a common experience simply due to the fact that they are categorized as Finnish immigrants within Finnish society, which in turn provides a certain nuance to the experience and interpretation of everyday life. I demonstrated how a congruence of subjective realities looks like in an imitation game environment with an example in which a native-Finnish judge was unable to make any informed judgement regarding which of the respondents is a group member and which is not.

Even though the material supports Arminen & Simonen's (2015) results in that epistemic correspondence is less convincing and appears to be merely a first step towards interactional expertise, the distinction between epistemic-, and experiential correspondence does shed light upon the different characteristics of the groups. Certain
communities might be characterized by having a large pool of epistemic knowledge which can be either easy or difficult to gain access to as a non-group member. Simultaneously this type of community can have less “shared experiences” which means that there is necessarily not as much experiential correspondence between the members of the community, and therefore group members are more distinguishable based on the correspondence of group-bound knowledge. Whereas professions such as lawyers, medical doctors and gravitational physicists can be good examples of communities with a high amount of epistemic correspondence, categories such as gender, ethnicity, nationality and race can have more experientially based correspondence.

I also mentioned a thin red line which runs through the material suggesting that sometimes the identifications of non-pretenders is more based on a correspondence of personal experiences, rather than assumed common experiences among group members. It seems as if the ability to appear as a non-pretender in the imitation game environment includes the ability to produce a personal and genuine account. I would suggest that further analysis of the different methods of identification of group members in imitation game environments, should take this phenomenon into account.

The analysis of the nationhood material has revealed the differences in the inner constitution of the groups native Finns and Finnish immigrants. The native Finns can be characterized as real groups as defined by Arminen & Simonen (2016). The Finnish immigrant group on the other hand, appears to be somewhere in between. They are able to formulate questions which attend to a common Finnish immigrant experience but are unable to formulate questions which attend to a supposed common Finnish immigrant group bound knowledge. In my opinion the definition groupness as presented by Brubaker (2004), explains the Finnish immigrant phenomenon better. Groupness views groups as processes attached to their respective categories, instead of as fixed static units. Consequently the Finnish immigrants as a category might be on its way of becoming a real group as defined by Arminen & Simonen (2016).

The common interest within migration literature is to explore and reveal of the process of integration and assimilation between the hosting populations and immigrant populations. I believe that this study has shown the potential of the imitation game as a method for increasing understanding of how different groups interpret difference and distinguish group
members from non-group members within the Finnish national community. In recent times, there has been a polarization of understandings towards the presence of an immigrant population within Finnish society. Apart from increasing the understanding of the relationship between the hosting population and immigrant population, the imitation game could be used for increasing the understanding of the polarization between pro-, and anti-immigration proponents within the hosting population. Additionally, the imitation game could also be used to increase the understanding between social groups in a more popular format. In 2015, I participated in a project which aimed to, together with social scientific research, develop the imitation game into a television format. The idea was to, in an entertaining way, show how, among other categories, “the native Finn” and the “Finnish immigrant” is interpreted by the Finnish people and consequently, increase the understanding of, and empathy towards one another in a national environment which is getting more polarized by the day. Unfortunately the project did not get funding last year. Hopefully the findings of this thesis will apart from add to the development of the imitation game as a research method and add to the scientific discussion regarding immigration in Finland, demonstrate the potential of the imitation game as a method for exploring the process of exclusion and inclusion, and aid any further attempts of getting funding for new similar projects.
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TULE MUKAAN PELAAAMAN IMITAATIOPELIÄ PALKKIOTA VASTAAN!


Osallistumisen maanantain peliin kestää kaksi tuntia ja pelaamisesta saa palkkioksi kaksi elokuvalippua. Imitaatiopeliä pelataan maanantaina 18.5 klo 17.00. Paikkana toimii Helsingin yliopiston Oppimiskeskuksen Aleksandrian (Fabianinkatu 26/28) tietokoneluokka K130.

Imitaatiopelin aiheena on maahanmuuttaja sekä suomalaisuus ja näin ollen pelin kaksi eri sosiaalista ryhmää ovat maahanmuuttajat ja kantasuomalaiset. Etsimme pelaajiksi siis henkilöitä jotka ovat joko maahanmuuttajataustaisia tai suomalaistaustaisia. Tarkoituksena on asettua toisen sosiaalisen ryhmän asemaan ja pyrkiä olemaan kuin he, ei rakentaa karikatyyrejä tai stereotypioita. Peli pelataan suomen kielellä.

Peli on järjestetty myös aiakaisemminkin muilla teemoilla kuten sukupuoli, poliitiikka, seksuaalisuus, etnisyyys ja ammattilaisuus. Pelin tarkemmat ohjeet annetaan ilmoittautumisen myötä sekä paikan päällä.

ILMOITTAUTUMINEN PELAAJAKSI E-LOMAKKEEN KAUTTA:

https://elomake.helsinki.fi/lomakkeet/60983/lomake.html