Negotiations of immigrants' cultural citizenship in discussions among majority members and immigrants in Finland

Abstract

In this paper we analyze how cultural citizenship is discursively constructed and negotiated in discussions about integration of immigrants' among Finnish majority members and different immigrant groups in Finland. We found two distinct patterns of talking about rights and responsibilities of immigrants. In the first, conforming to mainstream culture was treated as the responsibility of immigrants and an ideal form of integration in Finland. Conversely, in the second, conformity as a norm was actively challenged while minority rights were emphasized. Both patterns were frequently found in the discussions with Finnish majority members, whereas argumentation in the immigrant groups typically drew from one of the patterns. While Estonian- and Russian-speaking immigrants often talked in favor of conformity to the mainstream, especially in the public sphere, Somali-speaking participants challenged and rejected such demands. Both patterns navigate the ideological dilemma around rights and responsibilities. Our findings suggest that both supporting conformity to the mainstream as well as challenging this norm may function as a way of becoming a citizen. Implications of the results for group relations and equal cultural citizenship are discussed.

Key words: citizenship, cultural citizenship, discursive analysis, immigrants, majority

Over the past few years, research has called for the study of citizenship from new perspectives. In the field of social psychology, citizenship is now conceptualized "as an active and reflective process occurring between members of a community" (Stevenson, Hopkins, Luyt, Dixon, 2015, p. 193). This means, that instead of laws, rules and regulations related to citizenship, research can focus on lay theories or everyday understandings of citizenship. Gibson and Hamilton (2011) for instance, highlight the importance of studying "the ways in which social actors themselves construct the memberships, rights and responsibilities associated with citizenship, and, above all, what they treat as competent and legitimate polity membership" (p. 229). While this constructionist approach has proved useful in broadening the scope of citizenship studies, it has tended to focus on studying the understandings and perspectives of either local majority populations (e.g. Gibson, 2015) or those of the immigrants or other minority members (e.g. Hopkins & Blackwood, 2011). In line with Hopkins and Kahani-Hopkins (2006) and Bowskill, Lyons and Coyle (2007), we think it is vitally important to consider both minority and majority perspectives when studying intergroup relations, such as the negotiations of citizenship. Therefore, in this paper, we analyze how cultural citizenship is negotiated in the discussions about integration of immigrants among Finnish majority members as well as members of different immigrant groups in Finland.

Our research adds to social psychological understanding of intergroup relations and minority rights in a multicultural context. More specifically, it contributes to the ongoing discussions in social and political psychology that concern recognition, participation and exclusion as aspects of citizenship (see e.g. Stevenson, Dixon, Hopkins, & Luyt, 2015). This research also has a political orientation: it aims at showing and challenging social inequalities present in the negotiations of citizenship. Our research, thus, also makes a contribution to the tradition of critical (social) psychology, which focuses on the subtle discursive mechanisms

of constructing and reproducing power relations (Burr, 1995; Stevenson, Dixon, et al., 2015).

Aspects of citizenship

Condor (2011) has noted that "citizenship is a multi-faceted and hotly contested concept that eludes precise definition" (p. 193). Current definitions often refer to Marshall's (1950) seminal considerations of citizenship as "a claim to be accepted as full members of the society" (p. 6). Citizenship is, thus, often defined as a membership in a political and geographical community (e.g., Bloemraad, Korteweg, & Yurdakul, 2008), "competent membership in a polity" (Isin & Wood, 1999, p. 4) or as a "status of individuals in relation to a political unit" as Olson (2008, p. 40) puts it. Olson (2008) also divides citizenship into areas of membership, identity, rights, and participation. Bloemraad et al. (2008) make a somewhat similar distinction, dividing citizenship in dimensions of legal status, rights, participation, and a sense of belonging in a society.

Isin and Turner (2002) have stated that "citizenship must also be defined as a social process through which individuals and social groups engage in claiming, expanding or losing rights" (p. 4) and that recent approaches to citizenship often take interest in "norms, practices, meanings, and identities" (p. 4). Departing from the common idea of citizenship as a membership, Isin (2008; 2009) has discussed citizenship and its modes and forms of conduct as objects of struggle, developing an idea of "acts of citizenship", which he defines as "those deeds by which actors constitute themselves (and others) as subjects of rights" (2009, p. 371).

Current social psychological citizenship studies often focus on the politics of recognition and related debates on multiculturalism and minority rights (Stevenson, Hopkins, et al., 2015). As Hopkins and Blackwood (2011) state: "conceptualization of citizenship has been broadened in recent years to address previously un-theorized issues concerning group identities and how their recognition is implicated in people's abilities to participate in the

public sphere" (p. 215). Within political and social psychology, these and other aspects of citizenship have been studied in recent years by adopting a discursive or rhetorical approach. For instance, Andreouli and Dashtipour (2013) used rhetorical psychology to analyze how people applying for British citizenship can be constructed as "deserving" and "undeserving", and "good" and "bad". Gibson and Hamilton (2011) also drew on the principles of rhetorical psychology in their analysis on constructions of polity membership in young people's discussions in Northern England.

In the context of immigration, citizenship negotiations often deal with cultural issues, such as the cultural rights of citizens or cultural conditions of citizenship. The term "cultural citizenship" is frequently used to refer to these cultural aspects of citizenship, although there does not seem to be a consensus on the definition of the term (Wang, 2013). Summing up some common trends, Wang (2013) distinguishes between two main approaches to cultural citizenship, following to a large extent the distinction made earlier by Delanty (2002). The first approach draws from political theory and is concerned with cultural differences, diversity, multicultural politics, and minority rights, e.g., the right to maintain and display cultural identities that differ from the mainstream. The second approach is more sociological and mainly concerns participation and cultural competence, examining for instance, cultural democratization and the cultural resources needed for participation. Both approaches are concerned with diversity but in different ways. While the first approach focuses on ethnic minorities, the second approach is interested in all kinds of group difference. (Delanty, 2002; Wang, 2013.) As the context of our study is immigration, the first aspect of cultural citizenship, with its focus on minority rights, is particularly relevant for our paper. A recent Finnish study by Horsti and Pellander (2015) is one example of discursive research on cultural citizenship of immigrants. In their study, Horsti and Pellander analyzed the discursive constructions of cultural citizenship in the Finnish political and media debates on

family migration and showed how the "discourse of care" played an important role in defining who is defined as belonging.

Current social psychological research treats citizenship as relationally and collectively constructed and negotiated (e.g. Stevenson, Hopkins, et al., 2015). In line with this approach, we believe that claiming membership in the Finnish polity and achieving cultural citizenship should be approached as an ongoing interactional process and action in which lay people, including migrants themselves, play an active role. Therefore, to complement previous research such as the studies by Andreouli and Dashtipour (2013), Gibson and Hamilton (2011) and Horsti and Pellander (2015), we have included the perspectives of both the majority and immigrants in our discursive study on negotiations of cultural citizenship. The results will be discussed in relation to critical psychological and social psychological research on citizenship and immigration.

In this study, we use the term "citizenship" when referring to membership in the Finnish polity and society in general sense. The concept of "cultural citizenship" is employed to analyze more specifically the cultural aspects of that membership, including how the relationship of minority and mainstream cultures, identities, and related rights and responsibilities are constructed and negotiated in talk.

Context of the study

The current study was conducted in Helsinki, the capital of Finland. The history of migration to Finland is short, as the country turned from a country of emigration into an immigrant receiving country only in the 1990s. Even though the number of newcomers is growing fast, currently Finland has one of the smallest immigrant populations in Europe. Foreign language-speakers comprise 5.3 percent of the whole population, with 27 percent

living in the capital area (Statistics Finland, 2014). In 2013, the largest immigrant groups were Russian-, Estonian-, and Somali-speakers.

According to the Multiculturalism Policy Index (2010), Finland is one the most multiculturalist countries in Europe when it comes to protecting minority rights. Finland also scored high in the European comparison of integration policies (Migrant Integration Policy Index 2015, p. 108), especially in enabling immigrants' political participation. Policies do not, however, always coincide with actual integration or participation. For instance, immigrant voter turnout in Finland is considerably lower than among that of majority Finns (Harinen, Haverinen, Kananen, & Ronkainen, 2013). Moreover, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (2013) has brought up the discrimination and racism that Russian- and Somali-speaking populations face in Finland. In a study on Finns' attitudes towards immigrants (Jaakkola, 2009), these two groups were found to be in the bottom of the ethnic hierarchy in Finland. According to Jaakkola, cultural similarity and the wealth of the country of origin are the most important factors according to which immigrants are evaluated, with highly educated immigrants from Western countries being at the top.

The position of immigrants in relation to the majority is also influenced by the ways in which the majority group is defined. The findings of a recent discursive analysis on the boundaries of national belonging (Mähönen, Varjonen, Prindiville, Arnold, & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2015) reveal that Finnish ancestry and language are used as markers of Finnishness, which makes it difficult, if not impossible, for immigrants to become recognized as full and equal members of society.

Method

Our data consists of seven focus group discussions (Table 1) that were held in Helsinki in 2014–2015. We invited people who identified with the Finnish majority, and

Somali-, Russian-, or Estonian-speaking immigrants to participate in discussions on "multicultural Finland". The participants were recruited by advertising the discussions in public notice boards (grocery stores, libraries, etc.) and in (social) media, by inviting people in person at events organized by the Russian- and Somali-speaking communities in Helsinki and in public resident facilities maintained by city of Helsinki as well as via our social contacts. In terms of socio-economic background, our sample is very diverse, as the focus groups were held in areas that have significant differences in income and education levels. The youngest participants were in their 20s and the oldest in their 80s.

The discussions were semi-structured and held in Finnish. We presented the participants with six prompts, which were statements concerning multiculturalism, cultural diversity, and intergroup relations, and urged participants to evaluate and discuss the prompts, while we would take part in the discussion as little as possible.

The participants were informed about the aims of our study and the anonymity of participation. The discussions were audiotaped with the participants' consent and transcribed verbatim. When translating the extracts, we aimed at maintaining the style and formulations of the original Finnish texts as much as possible.

Table 1
Focus group participants.

	Participants	N (females)
FG1	Majority Finns	9 (4)
FG2	Majority Finns	4 (3)
FG3	Majority Finns	4 (3)
FG4	Russian-speaking immigrants	8 (8)
FG5	Estonian-speaking immigrants	3 (3)
FG6	Somali-speaking immigrants	4 (2)
FG7	Somali-speaking immigrants	2 (2)

Analytic approach

Isin (2009) has stated that "what constitutes citizenship and its appropriate modes and forms of conduct are always objects of struggle" (p. 372). Our discursive analysis consisted of examining the discussions concerning integration of immigrants, and immigrants' rights and responsibilities in particular, as negotiations of cultural citizenship. Following general principles of discursive analysis, the interview talk was analyzed "as accounts that justify or criticize certain types of behaviour" and "reinforce or undermine certain policies and practices," as Kirkwood, McKinlay and McVittie (2015, pp. 3–4) put it.

The discursive approach employed in our analysis draws from discursive psychology (e.g. Edwards & Potter, 1992) as well as rhetorical psychology (e.g. Billig, 1996). The action orientation of language and talk is one of the key ideas adopted from discursive psychology. In line with the rhetorical approach taken by Gibson and Hamilton (2011), our analysis is concerned with both the local as well as ideological or political functions of rhetorical strategies used. Wetherell's (1998) idea, that patterns of talk found in interviews are not only context specific but also reflect broader cultural resources, such as common-places and ideological themes (see Wetherell, 2003; Gibson & Hamilton, 2011) is, thus, an important

starting point for our analysis.

We also employ the concept of "ideological dilemmas" in our analysis of cultural citizenship. This concept was introduced by Billig et al. (1988) to refer to the idea of ideologies containing contradictory and oppositional themes and arguments. By ideologies Billig et al. (1988) refer to both formal intellectual traditions and everyday common-sense thinking. Andreouli and Dashtipour (2013) desbribe ideological dilemmas as "sources that people draw on to make arguments". In the field of citizenship studies, the concept of ideological dilemma has previously been employed, for instance, in the above-mentioned studies by Gibson and Hamilton (2011) and Andreouli and Dashtipour (2013).

In the sense that our analytical interest is focused on the fine detail of social interaction, such as management of stake and interest (Edwards & Potter, 1992) as well as the broader cultural resources used, our analytical approach could also be seen as representing a "synthetic" approach (see Wetherell & Edley, 1999). The main emphasis of the analysis is not, however, on linguistic constructions but on the implications and consequences of different descriptions for cultural citizenship. Constructions built in language may be used to define group boundaries in various ways, to include and exclude certain people and groups, and have direct consequences for possibilities of belonging and participating. Therefore, as Gibson and Hamilton (2011) have argued, actions accomplished in talk, i.e., ways in which different groups are talked about, have important implications for citizenship. The discursive approach, thus, provides fruitful insight into the struggles and negotiations of citizenship. The five extracts discussed in the analysis can be seen as negotiations of different and contested versions of cultural citizenship that are available for immigrants in Finland.

Analysis and Results

The five extracts presented in the analysis were chosen to exemplify the variety of orientations towards immigrants' rights and responsibilities with different implications for cultural citizenship. "Rights/duties" has been named as one of the common ideological dilemmas of citizenship (Di Masso, 2015, p. 68). In our data, talk on immigrants' rights and responsibilities often concerned issues of maintaining and displaying one's own culture, religion and identity, and, conversely, conforming to mainstream society and adopting the majority identity.

The vast majority of this talk in our data revolved around the phrase "When in Rome, do as the Romans do" which was one of the prompts used. Interestingly, participants referred to this phrase in many focus groups before it was mentioned by the moderator, and also later, in the context of other prompts—which points towards the central role of this phrase in the (Finnish-language) discourse on immigration. As the discussion around this phrase in our data turned out to provide an interesting window into negotiations on citizenship, for the purpose of this paper in our analysis we have focused on data where this phrase was used either by the moderator as one of the prompts or by participants themselves. It is worth noting, that although used and understood similarly to English-language version "When in Rome, do as the Romans do", the Finnish equivalent to the phrase translates approximately as "In a country, according to that country's way", meaning: "When in a certain country, act according to that country's way of acting". This phrase is frequently used in everyday conversations as well as political debates and it has a common sense status.

The first extract is from FG5, a discussion among Estonian-speaking immigrants. On lines 1–2 the moderator introduces the prompt "When in Rome do as the Romans do" and refers to an earlier point in this discussion where the phrase itself had not been used but the participants had together highlighted the importance of abiding by the Finnish rules and laws, and respecting Finns. Transcript conventions are explained in Appendix 1.

Extract 1. Taken-for-granted conformity: Local culture comes first.

1	MOD:	*The next statement is, this came up already, when in Rome do as*
2		*the Romans do.*
3	Kaja:	*Hmm we talked about this too already*
4	Ruut:	*This we have gone through ((laughter))*
5	Kaja:	*Next. ((laughter)) I think we all agree that this is how it is- or*
6		*should be. One has to respect local customs and (.) like when one*
7		*goes to the country in question then, like first of all you respect*
8		*those local laws and cultures and then on the side you maintain*
9		*your own identity.*

On lines 5-9 Kaja acts as a spokesperson of the whole group by building consensus (”I think we all agree”) in supporting the statement before elaborating once more what “doing as the Romans do” means: respecting local customs, laws, and culture. The statement is unconditionally accepted and immigrants are positioned as having to, first and foremost, accept majority’s way of life. Respecting local customs is presented as the primary obligation (“first of all”) while maintaining “your own identity” can happen “on the side”. This addition is interesting because it implies that local laws and culture and immigrants’ identity are two separate, incompatible entities and that, out of these, the former must be prioritized. In a study employing the concept of interpretative repertoire (which after Edley, 2001, refers to “relatively coherent ways of talking about objects and events in the world” p. 198), this kind of talk in which immigrants are portrayed as humble and polite in relation to their hosts is named as the “interpretative repertoire of polite guests” (Nortio, Varjonen, Mähönen, &

Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2016; see also Rosello, 2001, for discussion of immigrants as guests). Adopting this repertoire could be seen as a way to construct an identity of "a good immigrant" for the speaker.

Kaja's account in Extract 1 is constructed around the ideological dilemma of rights versus responsibilities. When talking about how immigrants should integrate, the participants of our study very often drew on the two opposing themes of this dilemma: the principle of maintaining one's own culture and the principle of conforming to the mainstream. Especially Russian- and Estonian-speaking immigrants often expressed their support for, and commitment to, conforming to the majority's way of life in public, treating it as a natural and self-evident norm for immigrants, while the practices of one's own culture were constructed as confined to the private sphere. One example of this can be found in the focus group discussion with Russian-speaking immigrants (FG4), in which one participant stated, "We are, like, here like everyone else but at home we practice our own." Here, similarly to Extract 1, priority is given to mainstream culture, while immigrants' own culture was presented as secondary and maintaining it is constructed as the sole responsibility of migrants requiring no support from the mainstream society.

The public–private distinction itself is commonplace in both everyday and theoretical discussions regarding immigration and minority rights (see e.g. Bourhis, Moise, Perreault, & Senecal, 1997 for distinction between public and private values). In their study, Gibson and Hamilton (2011) also found that when talking about immigration to UK, young people in Northern England referred to "a commonsense assumption that public culture should be 'British', with 'other' cultural practices being treated as essentially a private matter" (p. 239). These ideas of confining cultures of migrants' to the private sphere may be seen to draw on "liberal nationalist conception of passive multiculturalism" (Bloemraad et al. 2008, p. 161).

Contrary to the study by Gibson and Hamilton (2011), which focuses predominantly

on majority members' views on immigrants (see also Antonsich, 2012), in our study it was not so much majority members but some of the immigrant participants who emphasized the importance of majority culture over minority cultures. In practice, a stance that confines immigrant cultures to the private sphere, with primacy given to mainstream culture, excludes the possibility of cultural citizenship in the sense that Pakulski (1997) suggests, namely, the "right to be 'different', to re-value stigmatised identities, to embrace openly and legitimately hitherto marginalised lifestyles and to propagate them without hindrance" (p. 83).

Although both immigrants and majority group members often treated the cultural maintanence of immigrants as acceptable at least to some extent, the next extract represents the only instance in our data in which cultural citizenship, understood as stressing the importance of minority rights (e.g. Kymlicka & Norman, 2000; Pakulski, 1997), is explicitly supported. This extract comes from FG3, which was held with Finnish university students.

Extract 2. The right to maintain one's own religion

1	MOD:	*(…) The next statement is When in Rome, do as the*
2		*Romans do.*
3	Liina:	*Well in one sense I think yes that holds true in a way that*
4		*there are certain laws in Finland that one must follow and*
5		*they can be different laws than some immigrants have for*
6		*instance in their home countries but then again the way I*
7		*see it is that everyone should have the right to ((maintain))*
8		*their own religion for example that one can pray in the*
9		*midst of the workday if the religion really demands or that*

10 *it could be arranged that there would be possibilities to*

11 *like really like if some person – I'm not religious at all but*

12 *if someone is – (s)he has grown up in a culture in which*

13 *religion is really important and then they would say here*

14 *that "yeah you can't use the clothes appropriate in your*

15 *religion" or "you can't pray in the midst of the workday"*

16 *or something like this, then I think that would be quite*

17 *outrageous because in the end it is such a big part of that*

18 *person, like a bit two-sided thing*

Also Liina, in Extract 2, negotiates between the two poles of the "rights versus responsibilities" or "heritage maintanence versus mainstream conformity" dilemma. Her account starts with the statement concerning the importance of following the law. Similar arguments were often put forward in connection to the "When in Rome" prompt. Abiding by the local law and custom has been found to be one key criterion according to which new citizens are evaluated in lay theories of citizenship (Gibson & Hamilton, 2011; Stevenson, Hopkins, et al., 2015). However, in our data there were also two instances (in FG3, among students representing the majority and in FG6, among Somali-speakers), where obeying the law as a responsibility of immigrants was challenged by referring to reciprocity: "one cannot say that an immigrant should be absolutely strict with the law because the majority of the Finns, for instance in traffic, really aren't ((either))" as one participant in FG3 stated.

In Extract 2, the majority, or mainstream society in general, is positioned as obliged to not only accept and respect immigrants' needs, but also to actively support their cultural practices. The argument is backed up by giving a concrete example on how immigrants' religious practices could be supported, i.e., "arranging" the possibilities for praying during

the working day.

Looking at this extract from the point of view of speaker-identities, this account functions to construct Liina an identity of a liberal, open-minded person. The disclaimer "I'm not religious at all" (line 11) functions as a stake inoculation (Potter, 1996), which allows the speaker to present herself as promoting the interests of others while also distancing herself from the category of immigrants, who are portrayed as being defined by their religion by using expressions such as "if the religion really demands" (line 9) and "it ((religion)) is such a big part of that person" (lines 17–18).

In our focus group discussions among majority Finns, participants did not often explicitly comment on immigrants' rights to maintain their culture or traditions. When the issue was brought up, immigrants' rights were usually supported, but on the condition that it would not bother the majority or require them to change. Extract 3 represents this typical way of talking about cultural maintenance. In this extract Liina (FG3) continues the discussion on the "When in Rome" prompt already discussed in the previous extract.

Extract 3. The limits of the right to maintain one's own culture

1	Liina:	*Although I think everyone should be able to practice that*
2		*religion and so forth (.) ((maintain their)) own cultural*
3		*habits but, in a way, to a certain point like, can ((the*
4		*minority)) then like, expect the majority to jump when they*
5		*say jump[1], because of that, because of that ((laughter)) or*
6		*like demand special benefits.*

[1] In the Finnish version verb "hyppyyttää" (to make someone jump) is used, roughly equivalent to expression "when A says 'jump', B jumps".

Here Liina is taking a stand on the hypothetical scenario in which the minority would start telling the majority what to do or how to be. She constructs the majority's role regarding immigrants' cultural maintenance in a very different manner compared to Extract 2. Liina begins her account with a lengthy concession (Potter, 1996) in lines 1–3, which may in part refer to her previous statement on the importance of supporting minority rights (Extract 2). In the current account, immigrants' rights to maintain and practice their religion and culture are presented as limited. The assumption that majority would behave according to wishes or demands of minorities on their request is presented as unreasonable and ridiculous in the form of a rhetorical question (lines 3–6), thus constructing status differences between the majority and minorities as natural. Interestingly, looking at Extracts 2 and 3 together, the religion of immigrants seems like a more powerful "subject" than migrants themselves when it comes to negotiating the extent of minority rights and defining what can be reasonably expected from minorities and the majority.

Liina's account in Extract 3 also utilizes the ideological dilemma of rights and responsibilities. As Billig et al. (1988, p. 22) have noted, the conflicting themes in dilemmatic talk sometimes come up in unequal expressions which function as a particular rhetorical strategy. In Extract 3 acknowledgement of minority rights allows the emphasis be put on the responsibility to conform. Contrary to the previous two extracts, conformity to the mainstream is not articulated as behaving similarly to the majority but as making sure one does not put a burden to the majority. In this sense it resembles the way Modood (2011) has described assimilation: "the newcomers do little to disturb the society they are settling in and become as much like their new compatriots as possible" (p. 43).

Extract 4 is from FG1 with majority Finns, and it features a lengthy stretch of speaker Kalevi's talk in which he recounts an encounter with his neighbours, a family from Somalia.

The episode took place during Finnish midsummer festivities in their apartment building's yard. In the first part of the story (omitted here), Kalevi talks about how he went to talk to the family in the yard and invited them to join the festivities and how they said they preferred to observe the festivities from a distance after being told that all the drinks on offer contain alcohol. Then he continues:

Extract 4. Conformity as becoming "very good Finns"

1	Kalevi:	*...then I asked them if they are going to move when, note*
2		*that I was talking Finnish with them all the time, if they*
3		*are going to move, well, to Somalia after the situation in*
4		*Somalia gets more peaceful. So they said that definitely*
5		*not. They have received Finnish nationality, they are*
6		*Finnish and they want to become very good Finns. "We*
7		*follow the Finnish customs as far as we can within the*
8		*limits of our religion." And, well, in my opinion that was*
9		*damn well said. No matter what colour they are, they are*
10		*Finnish. [Others: mmm] This was my opinion.*

Following local customs is offered here as a practical example of the proverb "When in Rome" and evaluated very positively. It is also equalled with the will to become "very good Finns". Kalevi's remark about having used Finnish in his communication with the Somali family, as well as his report on the Somali family stating that they are "definitely not" moving back to Somalia, can be interpreted in this context as further signs of their loyalty and commitment towards Finland. In Kalevi's account, all of these features—namely, language

proficiency, willingness to stay in Finland and the aim to become "very good Finns" by following Finnish customs, and official Finnish citizenship—contribute to assigning a Finnish identity for the family with Somali background.

Kalevi explicitly dismisses skin colour as a potential obstacle for Finnishness, therefore challenging a commonplace version of Finnishness only accessible for white people. Non-mainstream religion is not treated as problematic either—in this account it is what one does (following local customs and showing one's commitment towards the host country and trying to become a good citizen) which grants and determines one's membership as a Finn.

Kalevi, too, draws on both the idea of heritage maintanence as a right and mainstream conformity as a responsibility of immigrants in his evaluation of the "When in Rome" prompt. But compared to previous extracts, in this account the relationship between these two potentially contradictory ideas is somewhat harmonious. In Kalevi's account, achieving cultural citizenship is constructed as possible by speaking Finnish (line 2) and following customs, while simultaneously maintaining one's cultural background, in this case religion (lines 6–8), also in public. The last aspect is in line with the idea of citizenship as defined by Kymlicka and Norman (2000) who emphasize the importance of recognizing the "distinctive identities and needs of ethnocultural groups" (p. 2). At the same time, Kalevi's account could also be taken as an example of the "earned citizenship discourse", which according to Andreouli and Dashtipour (2013) involves an expectation for migrants to be committed to their new home country.

Out of our focus groups arranged with immigrants, Somali-speaking participants were the only ones to explicitly question or challenge the idea that immigrants should conform to the mainstream way of life. Extract 5 is from FG7 in which the Finnish equivalent of the phrase "When in Rome" brought along a lively discussion by two female participants. Unlike Russian- and Estonian-speaking participants, participants from Somalia in both groups (FG6

and FG7) oriented to the statement as something they hear or might hear people say. So, instead of treating the phrase primarily as some abstract idea that can be (dis)agreed with, participants in these groups treated it as something used in interaction, usually against them or other immigrants.

In FG7, prior to Extract 5, participants also questioned the premises of the statement itself, challenging the existence of "specific ways" in any country. Similarly to many other participants (as seen in Extracts 1 and 2), these participants acknowledged that laws must be followed. It is after this concession that Amran begins to discuss and question other behavioral expectations faced by immigrants and whether she could or should become Finnish. Similarly to Extract 4 the "When in Rome" phrase and expectations of immigrants' behavior are discussed in relation to adopting a Finnish identity but with very different conclusions.

Extract 5. The right to maintain one's identity: Challenging exclusionary cultural citizenship

1	Amran:	*(...) in my opinion there is nothing else ((except the laws))*
2		*one should follow in order to be* <u>*Finnish*</u>*. Because one can*
3		*never be Finnish. Of course I will always be a Somali, even*
4		*though I am a citizen of Finland and so forth and I live*
5		*here and of course I will live here also in the future, but I*
6		*will always be me, I can not change and I do not try to*
7		*change myself, I am what I am ((2 unclear sentences*
8		*omitted))*
9	MOD 1:	*Do you mean that Finns think that you should become*

10 *Finnish?*

11 Amran: *Yeah, if I want to be here. But they say that you can not be*

12 *in a country in that country's ways*[2]*, so go to your own*

13 *country, there you can be in that country's ways.*

14 MOD 2: *So that is not even possible (...)*

15 Amran: *(...) they ((Finns)) do not like believe that it is possible (...)*

16 *where one has like not been born, for instance here in*

17 *Finland they think that one can not study and like get by*

18 *and live, as oneself, as an ordinary person, like. So one*

19 *does not however have to be Finnish to get by.*

Contrary to Extract 4, in this extract being a Finnish citizen, being accepted as an equal member of society, and having a Finnish identity are treated as three clearly distinct things. Becoming Finnish in the sense of adopting a Finnish identity is not presented as a viable option or a welcomed goal for Amran; it is constructed as impossible scenario. This is presented both as the speaker's own view, "I will always be me, I can not change and I do not try to change myself," (lines 5–7) and as being due to Finns excluding her by referring to the "When in Rome" phrase and using it to define Amran as an outsider, who should go to her "own country" (lines 11–13). In this account, Finland appears to be reserved for Finns only, and immigrants—at least those with Somali background—are not seen as able to become Finns. As Somalis are in this account described through a Finnish gaze as not belonging in Finland, achieving equal membership in Finnish society is also presented as impossible without giving up one's cultural background.

[2] Reference to the Finnish version of "When in Rome, do as the Romans do".

Amran does, however, challenge this exclusionary practice: it is Finns' opinion that one should be Finnish to manage in Finland, and not her opinion. She also states that she will always live in Finland, which further highlights the difference between the views of Finns and those of her own. And although the language used on lines 15–19 is not totally clear, the last sentence "one does not however have to be Finnish to get by" seems to function as a conclusion of Amran's personal opinion. It is interesting to note that she is challenging and resisting the demand of conformity by adopting the footing of an individual (on lines 1–7 in particular), a strategy used also by other Somali-speakers in FG6 and FG7, while the Estonian and Russian-speaking immigrants in our data often treated conformity to the mainstream as a group-level concern and duty (see e.g. Extract 1).

The relationship between maintaining one's cultural background and conforming to the mainstream is constructed here as a powerful tension between a fundamental right to be oneself and an unreasonable expectation of turning into another person. Overall, Extract 5 and in particular Amran's final conclusion, which refutes the idea of Finnishness being a necessary condition to manage in Finland, could be seen as claiming the right to be in Finland and to live as an ordinary citizen the way one is, with no responsibility to assimilate or change. In this way the account could be seen to claim cultural citizenship in the sense that Stevenson (2010, p. 289) writes:

> Cultural citizenship is the struggle for a democratic society that enables a diversity of citizens to lead relatively meaningful lives, that respects the formation of complex hybrid identities, offers them the protection of the social state and grants them the access to a critical education that seeks to explore the possibility of living in a future free from domination and oppression.

Discussion

We will now sum up our findings concerning the talk on rights and responsibilities of immigrants and consider their implications for immigrants' polity membership and cultural citizenship in Finland. We will also consider the limitations of our study.

The ways in which our participants talked about integration and the rights and the responsibilities of immigrants could be seen to make up two distinct patterns. In the first, conforming to the mainstream culture was supported and presented as a responsibility of immigrants. In the second, conformity as a norm was actively challenged and minority rights were emphasized. Both patterns were frequently found in the discussions with the Finnish majority members, whereas the argumentation in the immigrant groups was typically drawn from one of the patterns. While Estonian- and Russian-speaking immigrants often talked in favour of conformity to the mainstream especially in the public sphere, Somali-speaking participants challenged and rejected demands of conformity.

Both supporting and challenging conformity were rhetorically constructed by drawing on both poles of the ideological dilemma of rights and responsibilities. This was typically done by employing one theme or idea as a concession, "so that the evocation of one value will ease the expression of the contrasting one" as Billig et al. (1988, p. 22) describe this rhetorical strategy. (For example, see Extract 3.)

Next, we will consider the implications of these two distinct discourses for cultural citizenship. In the majority Finns' discussions, presenting minority rights as limited and conditional (Extract 3) serves the purpose of maintaining the status quo of intergroup relations; it, thus, also protects the dominant position of the majority. For minority members, talking about public conformity as a responsibility of immigrants could be seen as a way of avoiding conflict of interests between the majority and minority; therefore, it may facilitate being seen as a full and competent polity member. Interestingly, the responsibility to conform

to mainstream ways of behaving was strongly challenged in the discussions of the Somali-speaking immigrants and occasionally in those of majority participants. Arguing for the right to display religious identities (Extract 2 and Extract 4 by majority members) and demanding to be recognized as a competent social actor without identifying as a Finn (Extract 5 from Somali-speaking participant) promote equal cultural citizenship and make way for a more inclusive Finnish polity membership than pro-conformity rhetoric. Overall, the two patterns of talking about immigrants' rights and responsibilities found in our analysis coincide with Isin's (2009) two ways of becoming a citizen: "becoming a citizen means either adopting modes and forms of being an insider (assimilation, integration, incorporation) or challenging these modes and forms and thereby transforming them (identification, differentiation, recognition)" (p. 372).

In Western societies, numerical majority groups are typically at the top of the societal ethnic hierarchy and have a socially dominant position (e.g. Hagendoorn, 1995), allowing them to control, to large extent, their own fate and that of outgroups. We can therefore assume, that, compared to immigrants, it is easier for majority Finns to discursively challenge public conformity as a norm. Speaking for minority rights (as seen especially in Extract 2) also allows majority members to present themselves as tolerant and open-minded without risking their dominant position.

But how should we interpret the finding that orientations toward minority rights and responsibilities were clearly divided between different immigrant groups? For immigrants of Somali background—being a visible minority in Finland and (in most cases) practicing a non-mainstream religion (Islam)—conforming to the mainstream probably presents a bigger challenge as compared to immigrants of Estonian and Russian background, who might more easily "pass" as members of the majority (see Colic-Peisker, 2005, for discussion on the meaning of whiteness as 'invisibility' allowing inclusion). In this sense, fighting against the

conformity norm may be a more viable way towards equal cultural citizenship for immigrants of Somali background. In a previous study, young Muslims, particularly those from North and East Africa, have been noted to have difficulties in identifying themselves as Finnish, which may stem from the incompatibility of the culturally available representations of being Finnish and elements of Muslim identity (Pauha & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2013). Interestingly for our research, in his recent study, Pauha (2015) found that young Finnish Muslims skillfully negotiate their ways through discourses that define "proper" Finnishness and Muslimness, producing active citizenship and agency for themselves as well as for their Muslim peers, for instance, by selectively challenging the traditionally used standards of "good Muslimness".

Before concluding, let us consider some of the limitations of this study. First, the focus group interviews were moderated by the first two authors, researchers who represent majority Finns and academia. The data is, thus, collected in particular circumstances in which the power relations between the majority group and immigrants, as well as university researchers and lay people may have played a role in what the participants perceived to be appropriate for them to say. However, this did not seem to prevent participants from voicing also critical evaluations. As we have demonstrated, the negotiations of cultural citizenship included active challenging of dominant or commonplace assumptions concerning the rights and responsibilities of immigrants, e.g., the demand to conform to the mainstream way of life. The fact that our sample is restricted to the most diverse city in Finland could be seen as another limitation. It is, therefore, the task for future research to analyze the negotiations of cultural citizenship in rural areas with less ethno-cultural diversity.

To conclude, in our data, claims for the type of cultural citizenship, which is concerned with the importance of cultural differences and minority rights at the group level (Pakulski, 1997; Wang, 2013), were very rare and basically limited to Extract 2 which came from the majority Finns' focus group (FG3). Moreover, constructing conforming to the

mainstream ways of behaving in public as a responsibility of migrants, works to *oppose* or resist equal cultural citizenship by denying the need for any public recognition or cultural rights. It also positions immigrants as subordinate citizens compared to the majority members. Finally, presenting cultural conforming as the duty of immigrants, as opposed to talking about integration as a social process demanding both majority members and immigrants to adjust and change (as conceptualized e.g. by Berry, 2001), functions to produce the local majority culture and people as homogenous, stable entities and, thus, draws boundaries between "us" and "them".

The discourse stressing immigrants' responsibility to conform is highly problematic and incompatible with equal cultural citizenship. Therefore, it is important to challenge explicit and implicit requirements of assimilation in order to make space for a more inclusive cultural citizenship, which would allow for the recognition of and respect for cultural diversity while simultaneously positioning immigrants as equal participants in Finnish society. The kind of persistent and systematic dissecting and questioning of the "When in Rome" mantra, done especially by the Somali-speaking participants in our research, is a step in the right direction.

Appendix 1. Transcription Conventions

(.)	Short pause of less than one second
(2)	Pause measured to the nearest second
Underlined	Emphasis
[overlap]	Overlapping speech
?	Unidentified speaker
((comments))	Comments from the transcriber

References

Andreouli, E., & Dashtipour, P. (2013). British citizenship and the 'other': An analysis of the earned citizenship discourse. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 24,* 100–110. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/casp.2154

Antonsich, M. (2012). Exploring the demands of assimilation among white ethnic majorities in Western Europe. *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies, 38,* 59–76. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2012.640015

Berry, J. W. (2001). A Psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 615–631. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00231

Billig, M. (1996). *Arguing and thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology* (2nd edition). Cambrigde: Cambridge University Press.

Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D., & Radley, A. (1988). *Ideological dilemmas: A social psychology of everyday thinking.* London: Sage.

Bloemraad, I., Korteweg, A., & Yurdakul, G. (2008). Citizenship and immigration: multiculturalism, assimilation, and challenges to the nation-state. *Annual Review of Sociology, 34,* 153–179. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.34.040507.134608

Bourhis, R. Y., Moise, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senecal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International journal of psychology*, *32,* 369–386. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/002075997400629

Bowskill, M., Lyons, E., & Coyle, A. (2007). The rhetoric of acculturation: When integration means assimilation. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 46,* 793–813. http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/014466607X182771

Burr, V. (1995). *An Introduction to social constructionism.* London: Routledge.

Colic-Peisker, V. (2005). 'At least you're the right colour': Identity and social inclusion of Bosnian refugees in Australia. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 31*, 615–638. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13691830500109720

Condor, S. (2011). Towards a social psychology of citizenship? Introduction to the Special Issue. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 21,* 193–201. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/casp.1089

Delanty, G. (2002). Two conceptions of cultural citizenship: A review of recent literature on culture and citizenship. *The Global Review of Ethnopolitics*, *1*, 60–66. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14718800208405106

Di Masso, A. (2015). Micropolitics of public space: On the contested limits of citizenship as a locational practice. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 3*(2), 63–83. http://dx.doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v3i2.322

Edley, N. (2001). Analysing masculinity: Interpretative repertoires, ideological dilemmas and subject positions. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 189–228). London: Sage.

Edwards, D. & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive Psychology.* London: Sage.

European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (2013). ECRI report on Finland. Retrieved from https://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/ecri/Country-by-country/Finland/FIN-CbC-IV-2013-019-ENG.pdf

Gibson, S. (2015). Constructions of 'the Polish' in Northern England: Findings from a qualitative interview study. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 3*(2), 43–62. http://dx.doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v3i2.414

Gibson, S., & Hamilton, L. (2011). The rhetorical construction of polity membership: Identity, culture and citizenship in young people's discussions of immigration in Northern England. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 21,* 228–242. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/casp.1087

Hagendoorn, L. (1995). Intergroup biases in multiple group systems: The perception of ethnic hierarchies. *European Review of Social Psychology, 6,* 199–228. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14792779443000058

Harinen, P., Haverinen, V. S., Kananen, M., & Ronkainen, J. (2013). Contexts of diaspora citizenship: Citizenship and civic integration of Somalis in Finland and the United States. *Bildhaan: An International Journal of Somali Studies, 13,* 80–101. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/bildhaan/vol13/iss1/8

Hopkins, N., & Blackwood, L. (2011). Everyday citizenship: Identity and recognition. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 21*, 215–227. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/casp.1088

Hopkins, N., & Kahani-Hopkins, V. (2006). Minority group members' theories of intergroup contact: A case study of British Muslims' conceptualizations of 'Islamophobia' and social change. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 4,* 245–264. http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/014466605X48583

Horsti, K., & Pellander, S. (2015). Conditions of cultural citizenship: intersections of gender, race and age in public debates on family migration. *Citizenship Studies*, 19, 1–17. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2015.1008998

Isin, E. F. (2008). Theorizing acts of citizenship. In E.F. Isin, and F.M. Nielsen (Eds.), *Acts of Citizenship* (pp. 15–43). London: Zed Books,

Isin, E. F. (2009). Citizenship in flux: the figure of the activist citizen. *Subjectivity, 29,* 367–388. http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/sub.2009.25

Isin, E. F. & Turner, B. S. (2002). Citizenship studies: an introduction. In E. F. Isin & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (pp. 1–10). London: Sage.

Isin, E. F., & Wood, P. K. (1999). *Citizenship and Identity*. London: Sage.

Jaakkola, M. (2009). Maahanmuuttajat suomalaisten näkökulmasta. Asennemuutokset 1987–2007 [Immigrants from a Finnish point of view. Attitude changes 1987–2007]. Tutkimuksia 1 [Studies 1], Helsinki: City of Helsinki Urban Facts.

Kirkwood, S., McKinlay, A., & McVittie, C. (2015). 'He's a cracking wee geezer from Pakistan': Lay accounts of refugee integration failure and success in Scotland. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 28,* 1–20. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jrs/feu003

Kymlicka W. & Norman, W. (2000). Citizenship in culturally diverse societies: Issues, contexts, concepts. In W. Kymlicka & W. Norman (Eds.). *Citizenship in diverse societies* (pp. 1–41). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Migrant Integration Policy Index 2015. Huddleston, T., Bilgili, Ö., Joki, A.-L., & Vankova, Z. (2015). Retrieved from http://www.mipex.eu

Modood, T. (2011). Multiculturalism, Ethnicity and Integration: Some Contemporary Challenges. In T. Modood & J. Salt (Eds.), *Global Migration, Ethnicity and Britishness* (pp. 40–62). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Multiculturalism Policy Index. (2010). Retrieved from http://www.queensu.ca/mcp/.

Mähönen, T. A., Varjonen, S., Prindiville, N., Arnold, L., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2015). Boundaries of national belonging in Ingrian Finnish return migration. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, *5*, 126–134. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/njmr-2015-0016

Nortio, E., Varjonen, S., Mähönen, T. A., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. *Interpretative repertoires of multiculturalism in discussions of immigrants and majority group members in Finland.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Olson, E. (2008). The origins of European citizenship in the first two decades of European integration. *Journal of European Public Policy, 15,* 40–57. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13501760701702157

Pakulski, J. (1997). Cultural citizenship. *Citizenship Studies, 1*, 73–86. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13621029708420648

Pauha, T. (2015). Ambassadors of faith. *Journal of Religion in Europe*, *8*, 73–100. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/18748929-00801005

Pauha, T., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2013). "Don't ever convert to a Finn" Young Muslims writing about Finnishness. *Diaconia*, *4*, 172–193. http://dx.doi.org/10.13109/diac.2013.4.2.172

Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction.* London: Sage.

Rosello, M. (2001). *Postcolonial hospitality: The immigrant as guest.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Statistics Finland (2014). Largest Groups by Native Language in 1993, 2003, and 2013. Retrieved 19.12.2015 from: http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/2013/vaerak_2013_2014-03-21_kuv_002_en.html

Stevenson, C., Dixon, J., Hopkins, N., & Luyt, R. (2015). The social psychology of citizenship, participation and social exclusion: Introduction to the special thematic section. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 3*(2), 1–19. http://dx.doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v3i2.579

Stevenson, C., Hopkins, N., Luyt, R., & Dixon, J. (2015). The social psychology of citizenship: Engagement with citizenship studies and future research. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 3*(2), 192–210. http://dx.doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v3i2.581

Stevenson, N. (2010). Cultural citizenship, education and democracy: redefining the good society. *Citizenship Studies, 14,* 275–292. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13621021003731823

Wang, L.-J. (2013). Towards cultural citizenship? Cultural rights and cultural policy in Taiwan. *Citizenship Studies, 17,* 92–110. DOI:10.1080/13621025.2012.716213

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and Interpretative Repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in Dialogue. *Discourse & Society, 9,* 387–412. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0957926598009003005

Wetherell, M. (2003). Racism and the analysis of cultural resources in interviews. In H. van den Berg, M. Wetherell, & H. Houtkoop-Steenstra (Eds.), *Analyzing race talk: Multidisciplinary approaches to the interview.* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wetherell, M. & Edley, N. (1999) Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: Imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practices, *Feminism and Psychology, 9,* 335–356.