

Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Helsinki
Finland

WHAT IS IT GOOD FOR?

A SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY ON THE FINNISH
LAY DISCOURSE OF MULTICULTURALISM

Emma Nortio

ACADEMIC DISSERTATION

To be presented, with the permission of the Faculty of Social Sciences of
the University of Helsinki, for public examination in room 4,
Metsätalo, on June 3rd 2020, at 12 noon.

Helsinki 2020

Publications of the Faculty of Social Sciences 142 (2020)
Social Psychology

Supervised by

Professor Inga Jasinskaja-Lahti
University of Helsinki

Docent Tuuli Anna Renvik
University of Helsinki

Reviewed by

Proferssor Kevin Durrheim
University of KwaZulu-Natal

Associate Professor Gavan Titley
Maynooth University

Opponent

Professor Stephen Gibson
Heriot-Watt University

© Emma Nortio

Cover picture: Tuukka Teponoja

Distribution and sales:
Unigrafia Bookstore
<http://shop.unigrafia.fi/>

ISBN 978-951-51-3437-0 (print)
ISBN 978-951-51-3438-7 (online)
ISSN 2343-237X (print)
ISSN 2343-274 (online)

Unigrafia
Helsinki 2020

ABSTRACT

Social psychological research on multiculturalism has demonstrated its potential to promote ethnic equality and reduce interethnic conflicts in society. However, it has also shown that ethnocultural majorities tend to support multiculturalism less than minorities. This result has been explained through the majority members' uneasiness, which is related to minorities' claims for cultural maintenance. While the dilemmas of multiculturalism—especially in regard to politics, policies and ideology—have been widely discussed in social psychological and social scientific research, there has been a limited interest in studying the accounts of those who live multiculturalism in their everyday lives.

In this research, I focus on multiculturalism as a *lived ideology*. I argue that understanding the ways in which multiculturalism is oriented in the lay discourse could shed more light on its potential to promote harmonious intergroup relations. To foster this understanding, this research examines the lay discourse of multiculturalism in Finland, a country that ranks as one of the world's most policy-wise multicultural societies, which concurrently is witnessing the mainstreaming of anti-multiculturalism and xenophobic political discourses. More specifically, this research asks, what kinds of discursive tools and resources do ordinary people living in Finland use to account for multiculturalism. In other words, how they construct, negotiate, and manage ethnocultural diversity and intergroup relations in their talk.

This study consists of four sub-studies, all of which draw from discursive social psychological approaches stemming from social constructionism. Study I analyses focus groups held among majority Finns; Studies II and III analyse focus group discussions held among minority and majority Finns; and Study IV combines frame analytic and discursive psychological perspectives to examine the accounts of multiculturalism in a popular online forum.

Study I focuses on the ways in which majority Finns argue for and against multiculturalism, as operationalised in a widely-used attitude measure, the Multicultural Ideology Scale (Berry & Kalin, 1995). As a result, cultural essentialism and nationalism were found to serve as argumentative resources for the majority participants to (re)produce two constructions of multiculturalism: diversity as a problem, and diversity as a resource. The participants also constructed positive accounts of cultural maintenance by discussing culture as roots. Study II widens the scope to minority and majority discourses, and reports four interpretative repertoires of multiculturalism used in constructing critical accounts of multiculturalism. Interpretative repertoires of *Polite guests* and *Securing the majority culture* functioned to justify the unequal status between the majority and immigrants. With the repertoires of *Stigmatising multiculturalism* and *Individualism*, the participants criticised the treatment of people as representatives of social

categories. In Study III, the analytic focus zooms in on the negotiations of cultural citizenship, i.e. the ways in which majority and minority participants accounted for immigrants' possibilities to become equally recognised members of Finnish society. These accounts were found to evolve around an ideological dilemma of immigrants' rights and responsibilities, i.e. cultural maintenance and cultural assimilation. Conforming to mainstream society was often constructed as the ideal path for immigrants to gain cultural citizenship. However, accounts contesting this norm also functioned as a way to claim immigrants' cultural citizenship. Study IV complements previous analyses by examining the social media discourse of multiculturalism in the wake of the so-called refugee crisis. The analysis focussed on how an act of anti-multiculturalist political persuasion was framed in a popular online discussion forum, and how multiculturalism was discursively constructed within the friction of different framings. As a result, the study demonstrated the meaning-making processes which normalise anti-immigration political rhetoric in social media.

This dissertation contributes to social psychological research of multiculturalism in four ways. First, by analysing minority and majority discourses together, it shows how they are intertwined instead of contradictory. Second, it demonstrates the central role that justifying hierarchical relations between the majority and immigrants plays in the lay discourse of multiculturalism. Third, by examining the interplay between political, media, and the lay discourse online, it exemplifies how negotiations of multiculturalism are situated in wider political and cultural discourses. Finally, by employing a discursive approach, this research shows the complexities and dilemmatic aspects of the lay discourse of multiculturalism. More specifically, these complexities relate to three discursive constructions of multiculturalism and their functions. The first construction, threatening multiculturalism, served to represent majority and immigrants as essentially different groups and to justify their inequality. The second construction, valuable multiculturalism, enabled accounts celebrating diversity, and served as a tool to demonstrate a speaker's open-mindedness. Third, the construction of limiting multiculturalism enabled the criticising of the essentialist and hierarchical categorisations of "us" and "them", and the claiming of immigrants' cultural citizenship.

Through these contributions, this research highlights the value of, and further need for, social psychological analyses that take into the account the situated and reciprocal nature of the ways in which multiculturalism is evaluated, and that see multiculturalism as an ideology that can be used in the struggle for power and recognition, not only among minorities, but also among the majority.

TIIVISTELMÄ

Tässä väitöskirjatutkimuksessa tarkastellaan sitä, millaisena ilmiönä Suomessa asuvat ihmiset arvioivat monikulttuurisuutta. Tutkimuksella on kaksi lähtökohtaa. Ensimmäinen lähtökohta on sosiaalipsykologisen asennetutkimuksen havainto siitä, että valtaväestöä edustavat ihmiset kannattavat monikulttuurisuutta maahanmuuttajia vähemmän. Toinen lähtökohta on akateemisessa ja yhteiskunnallisessa keskustelussa monikulttuurisuuden kriisistä.

Monikulttuurisuuteen liittyviä ristiriitoja on tutkittu sosiaalitieteissä paljon, mutta nämä analyysit keskittyvät usein poliittiseen retoriikkaan, mediakeskusteluihin tai lakien ja käytäntöjen vertailuun. Tämä tutkimus vastaa tarpeeseen ymmärtää paremmin tavallisten ihmisten monikulttuurisuudelle antamia merkityksiä ja monikulttuurisuuden arviointiin liittyviä neuvotteluja.

Tutkimuksessa monikulttuurisuutta tarkastellaan diskursiivisen psykologian näkökulmasta. Tämä tarkoittaa sitä, että virallisten määritelmien sijaan analyysi kohdistuu niihin arkijärkisiin, usein itsestäänselvyksinä pidettyihin perusteluihin ja puhetapoihin, joita käytetään, kun keskustellaan monikulttuurisuudesta. Tämä lähestymistapa avaa mahdollisuuden tarkastella monikulttuurisuutta monimutkaisena ja ristiriitaisena *ellettynä ideologiana*, jonka avulla voidaan ottaa kantaa ryhmien välisiin suhteisiin, etniseen ja kulttuuriseen moninaisuuteen sekä maahanmuuttoon liittyviin kysymyksiin.

Väitöskirjassa on neljä osatutkimusta. Ensimmäisen osatutkimuksen aineisto koostuu kyselystä ja ryhmäkeskusteluista, jotka kerättiin enemmistösuomalaisien keskuudessa. Toisen ja kolmannen osatutkimuksen aineisto koostuu ryhmäkeskusteluista, jotka pidettiin enemmistösuomalaisiksi tai suurimpien maahanmuuttajaryhmien jäseniksi itsensä lukevien ihmisten parissa. Näissä tutkimuksissa osallistujat arvioivat heille esitettyjä monikulttuurisuutta kuvaavia väittämiä ja keskustelivat niistä. Neljännen osatutkimuksen aineisto koostuu Suomi24-sivuston keskusteluista, jotka käsittelivät kansanedustajan sosiaalisessa mediassa julkaisemaa monikulttuurisuuden vastaista julistusta.

Tutkimuksen tulokset voidaan tiivistää kolmeen monikulttuurisuuskonstruktion, eli tapaan merkityksellistää monikulttuurisuus ja arvioida sitä. Ensimmäinen konstruktion on monikulttuurisuus uhkana valtaväestölle ja sen elämäntavalle. Puhe uhkaavasta monikulttuurisuudesta korosti valtaväestön ja maahanmuuttajien erilaisuutta ja mahdollisti maahanmuuttajien yksipuolisen sopeutumisen vaatimukset. Toinen konstruktion on arvokkaan monikulttuurisuuden konstruktion, joka mahdollisti kulttuurisen moninaisuuden arvottamisen yhteiskuntaa rikastuttavana asiana. Kolmannen konstruktion, rajoittavan

monikulttuurisuuden avulla puolestaan kritisoitiin jakoa ”meihin” ja ”muihin” ja vaadittiin maahanmuuttajille mahdollisuutta tasa-arvoiseen yhteiskunnan jäsenyyteen.

Näiden monikulttuurisuuden merkityksellistämistapojen lisäksi tämä tutkimus edistää monikulttuurisuuden sosiaalipsykologista tutkimusta kolmella tavalla. Ensinnäkin, tutkimus kyseenalaistaa aiemmin vallalla olleen käsityksen siitä, että enemmistö ja maahanmuuttajat lähtökohtaisesti eroavat toisistaan monikulttuurisuuden arvioimisen suhteen. Toiseksi, tutkimus osoittaa, että enemmistön ja vähemmistön välisen valtahierarkian oikeuttaminen on suomalaisen monikulttuurisuusdiskurssin kulmakivi. Kolmanneksi, tutkimus tuo esiin, että neuvottelut monikulttuurisuudesta ovat aina sidoksissa sosiaaliseen kontekstiinsa ja että erityisesti verkkokeskustelut syntyvät vuorovaikutteisesti poliittisten ja mediakeskustelujen kanssa.

Tutkimus osoittaa monikulttuurisuuden ristiriitaisuuden tunnustavien ja sitä kriittisesti tarkastelevien sosiaalipsykologisten analyysien tarpeellisuuden. Tutkimus myös viitoittaa tietä tuleville analyyseille monikulttuurisuudesta ideologiana, jota voidaan käyttää välineenä vallasta ja tunnustuksesta neuvoteltaessa.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I started this research project in May 2014 and during these years, I have managed to surround myself with inspiring colleagues, supportive friends and a loving family. I would like to write a book about each of you to show my appreciation, but after writing this thesis, I think I'll settle for a condensed version.

Firstly, I would like to thank everyone who gave their time and shared their thoughts about multiculturalism in the focus group discussions me and my colleagues organised. I learned a lot from each of you and appreciate your openness and courage to talk to a bunch of strangers about such a complex societal issue.

The second round of acknowledgements goes to my brilliant supervisors Professor Inga Jasinskaja-Lahti and Docent Tuuli Anna Renvik. I started working with you as an undergraduate student and from the first day, you made me feel like I was an important part of the research community. Both of you were an essential inspiration for me when I started thinking about becoming a researcher. Working with you has truly been a pleasure. Inga, thank you your creativity, your broadmindedness and your skill to immediately spot the most relevant issues in any piece of research, especially mine. Thank you for the countless times you've assured me that I can do this, you were right. Tuuli Anna, thank you for always seeing potential in my work and for coming up with exciting ideas on how to make it even better. Without you borrowing me the *dissertation tarsier* (a toy animal that watched over me when writing the summary), I might still be drafting the theory chapter.

I am very grateful to Professor Kevin Durrheim and Associate Professor Gavan Titley who were in charge of the preliminary examination of my dissertation. Your work has been an important inspiration for this research and receiving encouraging and constructive feedback from both of you was an important milestone in this process. Professor Stephen Gibson, thank you for agreeing to act as my opponent. I was very excited (and a bit nervous) to hear that I will get a chance to discuss my work with you.

I would like to thank two especially important colleagues, Sirkku Varjonen and Miira Niska with whom I had a pleasure to collaborate during this project. Sirkku, thank you for being my academic big sister and a friend. I learned a lot from you about interviewing, discourse analysis and academic writing, just to mention some academic skills. I've enjoyed our collaboration and I'm glad we will continue working together! Miira, thank you for your essential contribution to Study IV, not to mention all the inspiring discussions we've had over a coffee or a beer. I'm very glad we got to work together.

Next, I would like to express my gratitude to the Academy of Finland, the Kone Foundation and the Urban Research and Statistics Unit at Helsinki City Executive Office for funding this research. You made this project possible. I

would also like to thank two people that made this thesis significantly more enjoyable for the readers. Katie Lenanton, thank you for proof-reading and editing the summary part of this thesis. (Let me state for the record that Katie did not revise the acknowledgements.) Tuukka Teponoja, thank you for designing the cover picture. I really enjoyed working with you both.

Then it is time to thank the academic community within which this research was done: the discipline of Social Psychology at the University of Helsinki and the research group called ESSO (Social Psychologists studying Ethnic Relations). During this project, the ESSO group was led by Inga Jasinskaja-Lahti, Tuuli Anna Renvik and Professor Karmela Liebkind. Karmela, thank you for your valuable comments for all my papers and presentations. My long-term colleagues and friends at the ESSO group Göksu Celikkol, Viivi Eskelinen, Viivi Mäkinen, Teemu Pauha, Katarina Pettersson, Elina Turjanmaa, thank you for your support and for making conference trips much more fun! Elina, thank you for suggesting me to join the board of ETMU (the Society for the Study of Ethnic Relations and International Migration). It was a pleasure to co-edit the Liikkeessä yli rajojen blog with you and to share the joy and agony of writing the PhD summary. Viivi E., thank you for being an excellent office-mate during the last months of this project. Hopefully this is just a beginning of our friendship. Katarina, one of the most valuable things this project has given me is your friendship. Thank you for everything.

Professor Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman was the head of discipline when I started this project. Anna-Maija, thank you for all the encouragement and advice you've given me in post-graduate seminars and in more informal settings. I would also like to thank Professor Klaus Helkama, for sharing your enthusiasm for social psychology with me and all the students. Associate Professor Nelli Hankonen, thank you for organising and chairing the Social Psychology Research Seminars that were (and hopefully will be) a platform for social psychologists based in University of Helsinki to present their research and teaching and to have inspiring discussions. My dear past and present colleagues Matthias Aulbach, Marguerite Beattie, Jose Cañada, Jennifer De Paola, Jesse Haapoja, Eemeli Hakoköngäs, Janne Kaltiainen, Keegan Knittle, Johanna Kronstedt, Jenni Savonen, Satu Venäläinen, and others, thank you for your great company at Unicafe lunches, coffee breaks and discipline beers. Marleena Vornanen, my former office-mate, thank you for the lovely posters that still decorate these walls, the office workout sessions and for your company. I would also like to thank Professor Jussi Pakkasvirta for inspiring discussions on Suomi24.

Another group that has been an inspiration for me during this process is the Puhekupla team: Pinja Hahtola, Niina Hosiasluoma, Sanna Rynänen, Jenni Urpilainen and Sirkku Varjonen. This collaboration between researchers and artists has truly rocked my world. It has challenged me to reflect upon many interactional, professional and personal traits and processes that I'd taken for granted. This group has been a safe and accepting

environment to go through these things and I'm very happy and proud of what we've accomplished together. Thank you.

Then it is time to thank all the people outside of work who have been there for me during this project. My dear "Girls in Finland": Fati Deyab, Leena Häkkinen, Jaana Kouvalainen, Leena Taskinen and Julia Tuomioja, you've been an essential part of my life for quarter of a century and I'd be completely lost without you. Thank you for everything. Maija Bergström, thank you for sharing one important transition phase with me and for coming up with Troolari and all the related plans. Elina Kutramoinen, thank you for the hundreds of inspiring lunch discussions we've had since 2006, and for your friendship.

Then it's time to thank my family. Uua Nortio, Kati & Velimatti Tuohimaa, Lotta & Ilkka Nokso-Koivisto, Susse Monni, Sari Monni and my grandparents Kati & Antti Monni, thank you for your love, support and encouragement! I would also like to thank Liisa, Asko and Sini Munukka as well as Juuso Hirvonen for all the nice discussions we've had over delicious dinners!

The Nortio family, it's hard to put in words what your love and support mean to me. You've guided me through the difficulties in both my personal and professional life and you've been there to celebrate with me whenever there was even a smallest reason to do so. My mom Päivi, thank you for your kindness and wisdom, and for always having tissues. You're a true moomin mamma and my hero. My dad Jukka, thank you for your encouragement and inspiration. I hope to have inherited at least some of your curiosity and optimism. My sister Jenni, you're amazing, what else can I say! Even as a new mom you've been planning my karonkka like a boss. I love you so much. My brother-in-law Joonas, thank you for your peculiar jokes, the best pancakes in the world, and all the interesting discussions we've had. Your support means a lot to me and I'm so happy you're part of the family. My dear goddaughter Linnea, you've only been here for a few weeks and you've already brought so much joy to our lives. Thank you for that.

Lastly, I would like to thank my partner Jouni. When we met, I think I told you that I'm just about to finish my thesis. Well, it took another three and a half years but you've been patient. Thank you for that and for making me feel like I can do anything. With you, I'm home. I love you and I can't wait for all the adventures we have ahead of us.

Helsinki, March 2020
Emma Nortio

CONTENTS

Abstract.....	3
Tiivistelmä	5
Acknowledgements.....	7
Contents.....	10
List of original publications.....	12
Abbreviations.....	13
1 Introduction.....	14
2 Context.....	17
3 Philosophical and social scientific approaches to multiculturalism	20
3.1 Multiculturalism as political philosophy.....	20
3.2 The crisis of multiculturalism.....	22
4 Social psychological approaches to Multiculturalism.....	24
4.1 Multiculturalism in acculturation research.....	24
4.2 Multiculturalism and social identities.....	27
4.3 Intergroup relations in discourse	28
4.3.1 Negotiations of identity and belonging among minorities..	31
4.3.2 Majority members' justifications for inequalities	35
4.3.3 Lay discourse of intergroup relations online.....	40
4.3.4 The political and media discourse of multiculturalism and intergroup relations	42
4.3.5 study the lay discourse of multiculturalism: aims and research question.....	43
5 Material and methods.....	46
5.1 Materials	47
5.1.1 Study I	47

5.1.2	Studies II and III.....	48
5.1.3	Study IV.....	50
5.2	Methods of analysis	51
5.2.1	Study I: Qualitative attitude approach	52
5.2.2	Studies II and III: Critical discursive psychology	53
5.2.3	Study IV: Frame analysis	54
6	Findings	56
6.1	Nationalism and cultural essentialism as argumentative resources when discussing multiculturalism	56
6.2	Discursive patterns used by minority and majority members to normalise and criticise hierarchical intergroup relations.....	59
6.3	The Ideological dilemma of conformity versus maintenance in negotiations of cultural citizenship	61
6.4	Debating multiculturalism online: the lay discourse in the nexus of political and media discourses	62
7	Discussion.....	66
7.1	Three constructions of multiculturalism.....	66
7.2	Reflecting upon limitations of data and procedures	71
7.3	Ethical considerations	74
7.4	Future research	77
7.5	Practical implications	78
7.6	Concluding remarks.....	78
	References	80

LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

This thesis is based on the following publications:

- I Nortio, E., Renvik, T.A., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I (10.1.2020). “As a native person, why should I adapt?” A multimethod approach to majority Finns’ attitudes towards multiculturalism. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* (Advance online publication).

- II Nortio, E., Varjonen, S., Mähönen, T. A., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2016). Interpretative Repertoires of Multiculturalism-Supporting and Challenging Hierarchical Intergroup Relations. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology* 4(2), 623 - 645.

- III Varjonen, S., Nortio, E., Mähönen, T. A., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2018). Negotiations of immigrants’ cultural citizenship in discussions among majority members and immigrants in Finland. *Qualitative Psychology*, 5(1), 85–98.

- IV Nortio, E., Niska, M., Renvik, T. A., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (23.1.2020). “The nightmare of multiculturalism” Interpreting and deploying anti-immigration rhetoric in social media. *New Media & Society* (Advance online publication).

The publications are referred to in the text by their roman numerals.

The original articles are reprinted here with the kind permission from the copyright holders American Psychological Association (Study III), and Sage (Study IV). Articles I and II were published under CC BY license.

ABBREVIATIONS

CDP	Critical discursive psychology
DP	Discursive psychology
FNPC	Frame of normal political conduct
FHS	Frame of hate speech
FP	the Finns Party (Perussuomalaiset)
MCP	Multicultural Policy Index
MIPEX	Migrant Integration Policy Index
MIS	Multicultural ideology scale
QAA	Qualitative attitude approach

1 INTRODUCTION

“Multiculturalism is not a good thing for a person who is regarded as multicultural. But multiculturalism serves the Finns who apply for funds, who work, who come up with some multicultural projects. It is these kinds of Finns that it serves.”

In the period between April 2014 and February 2015, people living in Helsinki were invited to take part in focus group discussions concerning multiculturalism in Finland. These discussions form one of the data sets analysed in the present research. The aforementioned quote captures how one of the participants, let's call him Abdi, responded to the statement, “Multiculturalism is a good thing”.

The reason I chose Abdi's comment to start the introduction of this thesis is that it contains a critique towards multiculturalism as benefiting only the members of the majority. Abdi's formulation is in stark contrast with normative multiculturalism, an ideology highlighting the recognition and endorsement of ethnocultural diversity (cf. Taylor, 1992; see also Berry, 2011). While the explicit aim of normative multiculturalism is to ensure equality between members of minority and majority groups, and the focus is especially on the rights and wellbeing of minority members (Kymlicka, 1995, 2010), Abdi constructs it as serving the majority, “the Finns”. More specifically, he argues that instead of benefiting those labelled as multicultural, i.e. the targets of multiculturalist practices and policies, multiculturalism serves those Finns who have made it their profession to implement and disseminate those practices.

What gave Abdi grounds to make such a critical statement? Are there other ways to argue for and against multiculturalism? While social psychological research demonstrates that majority members perceive multiculturalism to serve only minorities, Abdi argues the opposite. This provides grounds to ask, for whom is multiculturalism good for, and whom does it serve?

Abdi's comment is only one example of the various ways in which the participants of the focus group discussions evaluated multiculturalism, a topic that has also generated heated debates outside the context of this research. Societal debates on Finnish multiculturalism erupted in late July 2015, approximately one year after Abdi took part in the focus group discussion, when an MP representing the populist, anti-immigration Finns Party (FP; in Finnish Perussuomalaiset, of which the literal translation would be the basic Finns), joined the loud choir of European politicians declaring the failure of multiculturalism. In his widely circulated Facebook post, the MP called on Finns to join him in a fight against “the nightmare of multiculturalism”. In

response to this declaration, on 28 July 2015, 15,000 people marched in Helsinki to show their support for multicultural Finland.

The organisation and success of the demonstration showed that heated societal debates about multiculturalism had extended from the mainstream media into everyday discussions, and that multiculturalism was a relevant issue for many. This was also evident in social media, in which competing interpretations of multiculturalism, immigration, and the rhetoric of the FP fuelled intense discussions.

The aforementioned societal and political developments are not confined to Finland, nor do they occur in a vacuum. The rise of political movements with explicit anti-immigration and anti-multiculturalist agendas, and the accompanying circulation of a crisis of discourse widely examined in the social sciences (e.g. Lentin & Titley, 2011; Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010) highlight that multiculturalism is a controversial issue. Many political philosophers have debated the potential and the ramifications of multicultural ideology, and the basing of policies upon it (e.g. Benhabib, 2002; Kymlicka, 1995; Parekh, 2006; Taylor, 1992; Young, 2010). While some see multiculturalism as a way to secure human rights and freedom for the inhabitants of diverse societies (Kymlicka, 2010), others see it as a way to justify cultural racism (Kundnani, 2012).

Empirical social scientific studies on multiculturalism, for one, often focus on comparing policies implemented in different national contexts and discussing their consequences. In his review of such literature, Koopmans (2013) paints a picture of a complex set of factors and trajectories that should be taken into account when making such comparisons, and the mixed effects that multicultural policies have for immigrants and societies receiving immigrants. For instance, Koopmans argues that while accessible citizenship procedures increase immigrants' active participation in society, some multicultural policies might lead to lower language proficiency.

To develop an integrative understanding of the success or failure of any political ideology, it should also be examined from the perspective of those governed by that ideology. Social psychology has a long tradition of studying the lay evaluations of multiculturalism. In this field of research, multiculturalism is often approached as an ideology or an attitude that has the potential to improve relations between the majority and immigrants, and create favourable conditions for equal and harmonious intergroup relations (for discussions, see, e.g. Berry, 2011; Verkuyten, 2007). Regardless of the significant contributions mainstream social psychology has made in understandings of the dynamics of attitudes towards multiculturalism, I argue that its potential to address the so-called crisis of multiculturalism is limited.

With this research project, I aim to complement previous studies on multiculturalism by exploring how ordinary people living in Finland make sense of multiculturalism, and how they use it to account for ethnocultural diversity and intergroup relations. In other words, the focus of the present research is on examining the participants' own orientations, instead of their

inner attitudes towards multiculturalism as it is defined by researchers. By combining different social constructionist and discursive psychological approaches, I aim to explore and discuss the tensions and controversies that are drawn upon in the lay discourse of multiculturalism, and consider how they are intertwined with the shared societal and political discourses.

This thesis proceeds from presenting the societal context of the study in Chapter 2, to the discussion of its theoretical background. Chapter 3 discusses philosophical and social scientific discussions of multiculturalism, and Chapter 4 focuses on social psychological approaches. In Chapter 5, I will present the materials and methods used in this study, and Chapter 6 focuses on the findings. Finally, in Chapter 7 I will discuss the findings and consider what kinds of conclusions can be made regarding the lay discourse of multiculturalism in Finland.

2 CONTEXT

When describing a country in terms of multiculturalism, one can discuss demographics, policies, and public discourse (cf. Bloemraad & Wright, 2014). In this section, I will provide an overview of Finnish multiculturalism from these perspectives.

In discussing Finland as an immigrant receiving society in relation to international migration, it is customary to mention that until the beginning of the 1990s, it was a country of emigration (Martikainen, Saari, & Korkiasaari, 2013). Finland is often also described as a country with one of the smallest immigrant populations in Europe. During this research project, the proportion of the population not having one of the official languages of Finland—Finnish, Swedish or Sami—as a mother tongue has risen from 5.3 percent (Official Statistics of Finland, 2013) to 7.3 percent, with the foreign-language population concentrated in the capital region (Official Statistics of Finland, 2018). In the beginning of this project, the largest immigrant groups were Russian- Estonian- and Somali-speakers (Official Statistics of Finland, 2013), but currently Arabic-speakers are the third largest group (Official Statistics of Finland, 2018).

In order to evaluate Finnish multiculturalism in terms of public policies, one can turn to different instruments that enable the comparison of policies managing ethnocultural diversity, integration, and minority rights. The Multiculturalism Policy Index (MCP; Banting & Kymlicka, n.d.) monitors policies related to the rights of minorities, as divided into three categories: indigenous minorities, national minorities, and immigrants. According to MCP, Finland evolved during two decades; from 1990 to 2010 it transformed from a country of nonexistent multiculturalism into a country of “strong multiculturalism”, referring to the endorsement of multiculturalism on a state-level, and the implementation of public policies aiming to ensure the recognition, support, and accommodation of ethnocultural diversity. The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX; Huddleston, Bilgili, Joki, & Vankova, 2015), for instance, ranks Finland as fourth out of 69 countries in relation to favourable integration policies, and concludes that Finland has “slightly favourable policies on equal opportunities for immigrants”.

Based on the aforementioned statistics and policy comparisons, one could consider Finland as a model student of multiculturalism: a novice when it comes to managing immigration, but already among countries ranking high in terms of implementing beneficial policies. While there are good grounds for this view, there is another story relating to the ways in which multiculturalism and ethnocultural diversity are interwoven as a part of Finnish national identity and public discourses. Discussing these “weaves” or discourses requires a recalibration in the way multiculturalism is approached, and that is why the next couple of sentences take us from discussing the Finnish context

to slightly more theoretical considerations. When discussing multiculturalism in terms of population or policies, it is often approached as a fact, as something that can be identified and more or less objectively examined, as long as certain criteria (an adequate amount of immigrants or other minorities, or the presence of specific kinds of policies) are met. However, when discussing multiculturalism as a discourse, it is no longer seen as a phenomenon “out there”, but as something that is socially constructed and used to assign meaning to the objects and events of the social world (e.g. Burr, 2003). To give empirical examples of such an analytic approach and to return to the Finnish context, I will discuss studies that address multiculturalism in Finland as public discourse.

The discourse of multiculturalism has been examined as constitutive of the discourse of Finnishness, in the sense that it provides a reference point, a way to construct the national ingroup through national and ethnic others (Horsti, 2005; Tuori, 2007). One example of how multiculturalism provides a tool to construct such intergroup relations is a study analyzing how the tension between multiculturalism and gender equality—another discursive tool to construct boundaries of belonging in Finland (Menard, 2016)—was negotiated in a project aiming to ‘integrate’ migrant women. In demonstrating and discussing the discursive interplay between multiculturalism as something coming to Finland from the outside, and gender equality as an inherently Finnish feature, Tuori (2007) argues that multiculturalism serves as marker for difference and hierarchies, as a signifier of who is “a Finn” without question, and who has to make efforts to change oneself in order to belong.

Another discourse often used to make sense of Finnish multiculturalism is the narrative of national homogeneity (Keskinen, Skaptadóttir, & Toivanen, 2019), which describes a nation in the process of profound change due to “increasing diversity”. While the change in migration patterns and volumes to Finland are a well-documented fact (e.g. Martikainen et al., 2013), it is essential to consider what is done when these facts are constructed as a narrative, and to whom this narrative serves. For instance, the narrative of homogeneity neglects and denies the histories of diversity and colonial complicity (Keskinen, Tuori, Irni, & Mulinari, 2009), and selectively refers to past and present racialised power relations that shape Finnish society. This narrative has been fuelled by far right anti-immigration movements in Finland and elsewhere.

To continue with multiculturalism in Finnish society, recent political trajectories need to be considered. The rise of the anti-immigration political movement in Finland can be traced to municipal elections held in 2008, during which the FP started their “triumphal march” (Horsti & Nikunen, 2013; see also Pyrhönen, 2015). Since 2008, the party has been able to steer the discussion on migration through using an exclusionary welfare nationalist discourse, which portrays immigration and its resulting ethnocultural diversity as a threat for the welfare state and its (white Finnish) inhabitants (Pyrhönen, 2015). Social psychological analyses on the discursive strategies

used by the FP have shown that not only are immigrants constructed as the other, but their political adversaries and those Finns who support multiculturalism and immigrants are also othered (Sakki & Pettersson, 2016). Another reason for the appeal of this anti-immigration, nationalist political discourse is that for a long time, it was framed as rational and honest “immigration critique” (Keskinen, Rastas, & Tuori, 2009), enabling Finns to finally address the problems related to immigration. Several scholars have also discussed the decisive role of social media in the rise of the FP and the Finnish anti-immigration movement (Nikunen, 2015; Pettersson & Sakki, 2017; Pyrhönen, 2015), as it has provided channels for disseminating their message of demanding stricter immigration policies and better protection of Finland from “the perils of multiculturalism”.

The rise of the anti-immigration political discourse has had ramifications for the ways in which immigration and multiculturalism are evaluated among ordinary people living in Finland. The European Social Survey generated in the Spring of 2014 suggests that while Finns in general report rather neutral attitudes towards immigration (Avonius & Kestilä-Kekkonen, 2018), the voters of the FP reported more support for assimilationist, threat-oriented and racist statements than others. Thus, the rise of the anti-immigration movement also gave rise to the discourse of polarisation, through which immigration and multiculturalism are portrayed as complex and dilemmatic topics that divide Finns into supporters and opponents. Even though there are indications of a slight trend towards more positive evaluations of immigration (especially work-based immigration), perceptions of polarised opinions and hate-speech are also increasing (Haavisto, 2019).

The success of the FP and the mainstreaming of anti-immigration discourse has naturally had ramifications on the lives of those categorised as immigrants or members of ethnic or cultural minorities. According to a recent survey reporting the experiences of discrimination and racism among people of African descent in the EU, Finland ranked as the country with the highest levels of harassment and violence (European Union & Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2018). Another survey conducted among several immigrant minority groups in Finland revealed that while it was common for immigrants to see themselves a part of Finnish society, the majority of respondents also reported experiences of discrimination and inequality (Pitkänen, Saukkonen, & Westinen, 2019).

To conclude, this research examines the lay discourse of multiculturalism in a context where the rise of the political anti-immigration discourse shapes the ways in which immigration and ethnocultural diversity are discussed. In this context, multiculturalism as a concept and as a multifaceted social phenomenon is one of the core questions within heated societal and everyday debates, thus, making it an especially fruitful topic for a discursive social psychological analysis.

3 PHILOSOPHICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC APPROACHES TO MULTICULTURALISM

As noted in the previous section, multiculturalism can be approached from various angles and using different levels of analysis, ranging from individual attitudes to societal policies. Multiculturalism has also been studied in various disciplines and from different theoretical perspectives. Thus, it has become a norm in social scientific discussions of multiculturalism to start an article or a book chapter by stating the conceptual confusion related to the term. In order to tackle this confusion, the aim of this chapter is to map the philosophical underpinnings of multiculturalism as an object of social scientific examination. However, while this chapter highlights certain tensions and dimensions within the academic discourse of multiculturalism, my aim is not to present these discussions with all their nuances, nor do I claim that this is a comprehensive presentation of them. On the contrary, the purpose for this brief overview is to provide a background for the discussion on Chapter 4's social psychology of multiculturalism.

3.1 MULTICULTURALISM AS POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

While the discussion of multiculturalism as a political philosophy is rooted in many traditions ranging from liberalism to post-colonialism, it is commonly accepted to be a philosophy that contests the idea of cultural neutrality, or “colour-blindness” as a guiding principle for managing ethnocultural diversity (Bloemraad & Wright, 2014; see also Rattan & Ambady, 2013). However, there are different normative and theoretical perspectives on multiculturalism, and one way to structure them is a matrix formed by two cross-cutting dimensions suggested by Saukkonen (2007). The first dimension concerns the primary units of the society (individual vs. collective) and the role of the state in relation to ethnocultural diversity (leftist vs. right-wing). The leftist versions of multiculturalism consider that the role of the state is to ensure equality and justice, while the right-wing approaches understand that the state should secure the freedom of individuals and communities.

Saukkonen (2007) calls the collectivist leftist version paternalistic collectivism, stressing the value of strong and equal ethnocultural communities and the role of the state in supporting these. The collectivist right-wing version is called multiculturalism¹. This version of multiculturalism sees ethnocultural diversity as valuable in itself, but promotes a rather limited role for the state in supporting it. The individualist and right-wing version is

¹ In Finnish *multikulturalismi*, as opposed to *monikulttuurisuus* (multiculturalism).

called paternalistic individualism, which accentuates individual freedom and takes a neutral stance towards ethnocultural diversity, thus, bearing resemblance to colour-blindness. The individualist leftist version is multicultural individualism that, according to Saukkonen (2007), is the most dominant variant of liberal multicultural theories. Multicultural individualism prioritises individual autonomy, but understands that without recognising and supporting ethnocultural diversity, securing the wellbeing of members of minority groups would not be possible.

Before continuing the discussion by using the classics of multiculturalism—i.e. Charles Taylor, Bhikhu Parekh and Will Kymlicka—within the frame of Saukkonen’s matrix, it should be noted that the matrix is not without limitations. For instance, it does not consider how historical and political contexts influence the different theoretical approaches, nor how epistemological assumptions guide these discussions. However, it enables discussing the ways in which key figures of multicultural theory are related to each other and, thus, provides a concise, albeit superficial view on the tensions within the social scientific discourse of multiculturalism.

One of the seminal texts in the philosophy of multiculturalism is Taylor’s essay (1992) on a politics of recognition, in which he argues that recognition of different cultures and identities is essential in order to ensure the wellbeing of individuals and harmony between groups. This argument would place Taylor as a multicultural individualist in Saukkonen’s matrix, as according to him, multiculturalism stresses the uniqueness of different cultures and contests the ideal of universal human dignity based on common humanity and sameness, i.e. colour-blindness:

With the politics of equal dignity, what is established is meant to be universally the same, an identical basket of rights and immunities; with the politics of difference, what we are asked to recognize is the unique identity of this individual or group, their distinctness from everyone else. (Taylor, 1992 p. 38)

According to Saukkonen (2007), Kymlicka (1995, 2010) is another multicultural individualist who also places minority rights in the centre of multiculturalism. In explicitly drawing from liberalism, Kymlicka stresses individual rights and freedom as a guiding principle for organising relations between ethnocultural groups. Kymlicka’s normative framework for multicultural policies (1995) is a rather detailed set of principles concerning those targeted with multicultural policies (national minorities and immigrants), and the claims that can be made within multicultural politics (individual/collective).

As mentioned, the third classic of multicultural philosophy is Parekh (2006), whom Saukkonen (2007) labels as a multiculturalist, i.e. as a collectivist and right-wing theorist. For Parekh, multiculturalism is a “perspective on human life” (2006 p. 336) with three principles: human beings are culturally embedded, cultures are relational, i.e. needing dialogue with

other cultures to understand themselves, and cultures evolve as a result of internal dynamics and external influences.

The work of these three scholars and the whole philosophical discussion on multiculturalism takes a normative approach. In other words, this discussion is concerned with how should ethnocultural diversity be managed in a society. From the perspective of the present dissertation, it is important to briefly consider two influential critiques of normative multiculturalism, which are especially relevant to my research.

Seyla Benhabib (2002) criticises Kymlicka and Taylor for their views on cultures and cultural preservation, arguing that instead of considering cultural differences as essential, objective, and static features of social groups, attention should be paid to the discursive and narrative constructions of cultures, cultural difference, and cultural unity. In a similar vein, Iris Marion Young (2010) criticises the politics of difference (i.e. multiculturalism) for treating social groups as static and isolated wholes that dictate the parameters of their members' identities, and argues for a relational and constructed nature of social groups and their identities. She also argues that rather than enabling recognition and mutual wellbeing, multiculturalism accentuates difference and undermines solidarity. In line with Young and Benhabib, in this research I employ a relational and discursive perspective to studying the situated ways in which people living in Finland negotiate multiculturalism.

3.2 THE CRISIS OF MULTICULTURALISM

While the aforementioned normative, philosophical literature has mostly stressed multiculturalism as a way to ensure minority rights and the harmonious coexistence of different ethnocultural groups, it would be an understatement to say that multiculturalism has also been criticised. Conversely, the discourse of the crisis of multiculturalism has dominated both public and academic discussions for decades, and has been raised through both theoretical and empirical examinations.

Scholars contributing to both normative, philosophical discussions on multiculturalism as well as to empirical research, are united in their addressing of the “death” (Kundnani, 2002), “backlash” (Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010), “crises” (Lentin & Titley, 2011) or “rise and fall” (Kymlicka, 2010) of multiculturalism. The academic discourse of crisis extends to all the aforementioned fields of multiculturalism: philosophy, public policy, and public discourse. The philosophical critique deals with the ramifications of multicultural theory, addressing, for instance, its cultural essentialist connotations (e.g. Barry, 2002; Benhabib, 2002) and its contribution to cultural racism (Kundnani, 2012; Malik, 2013).

Given that many leading politicians have declared that multicultural policies have failed, the crisis has been widely examined on the level of policies (e.g. Bloemraad & Wright, 2014; Hooghe & de Vroome, 2015; Joppke, 2004;

Koopmans, 2013). In this field of research, the crisis discourse often serves as a starting point for empirical analysis. In other words, the discussions concerning the failure(s) of multiculturalism are used as justifications for studying multicultural policies and their consequences.

However, research on the public discourse of the crisis of multiculturalism focuses on the ways in which this alleged crisis is constructed, justified, and disseminated. For instance, in their analysis of this discourse in several European countries, Lentin and Titley (2011) showed that the crisis discourse has served anti-immigration and nationalist political movements in mainstreaming and sanitising their message. In approaching multiculturalism as “a discursive space within which fundamental socio-political questions are implicated and fomented”, Lentin and Titley (2011 p. 24) offer an empirical account of the ways in which the discourse of the crisis of multiculturalism is harnessed to justify hierarchies between majorities and immigrants, along with exclusionary migration and integration policies.

This line of research is especially relevant to my work for two reasons. First, one could assume that the long discussion on the crisis of multiculturalism has reached the general public and passed into the lay discourse as well. Another reason is that while social psychologists have voiced a need to study the crisis of multiculturalism (Howarth & Andreouli, n.d.), I argue that more social psychological research is needed to properly understand the ramifications of this crisis discourse for everyday intergroup relations. With this research, I aim to contribute to this academic discussion on (the crisis of) multiculturalism by examining what kinds of discursive purposes it serves for ordinary people living in Finland.

4 SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO MULTICULTURALISM

The social scientific discussions of multiculturalism reveal that it is a term and an ideology evoking controversies in academic discussions. Considering these theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of multiculturalism is important when examining the discourse of multiculturalism and its crisis. However, in order to fully understand its success or failure, it is essential to study how multiculturalism is received and evaluated among those who are affected by it in their everyday lives, that is, the ordinary people living as majority or minority group members in more or less diverse societies.

In this chapter, I will discuss social psychological research that has focussed on studying the ways in which ordinary people evaluate multiculturalism. This work can be divided into two branches that stem from different meta-theoretical traditions in social psychology. One is informed by a substantialist, cognitive tradition which is concerned with attitudes towards multiculturalism (for discussion, see e.g. Berry, 2011; Verkuyten, 2007). This mainstream social psychological research draws from acculturation theory (Berry, 1974, 1997) and/or the social identity approach (e.g. Verkuyten, 2005a) and it has significantly increased understandings of the (lack of) support for multiculturalism. This research has articulated the social, cognitive, and situational factors affecting attitudes towards multiculturalism, and it has shown that these attitudes also have ramifications for intergroup relations.

The other tradition's most dominant influence is social constructionism (e.g. Burr, 2003); it examines the dynamic, socially situated meaning-making processes that come into play when accounting for questions related to intergroup relations. While this field of research has a long tradition of studying the dynamics of the language of racism, nationalism, and immigrant integration, multiculturalism has not been a topic of many studies (but see Verkuyten, 2004). With this research, I aim to contribute to the understanding of the discursive dynamics of multiculturalism. In order to justify this contribution, an overview of the previous social psychological research of multiculturalism from both branches is required.

4.1 MULTICULTURALISM IN ACCULTURATION RESEARCH

One of the most well-known formulations of multiculturalism relevant for social psychological research can be found in acculturation theory (e.g. Berry, 1974, 2001). The term acculturation refers to the changes resulting from first-hand contact of groups representing different cultures (Redfield, Linton, &

Herskovits, 1936). According to acculturation theory, multiculturalism is one of the most important factors that enables the success of such contact. In acculturation theory, multiculturalism refers to attitudes held among the majority group members towards minorities' cultural maintenance and contact with the majority, as well as the general appreciation of cultural diversity in a society (Berry, 2016). Thus, the role of multiculturalism in acculturation theory is to tie together individual level attitudes and societal level ideologies. To further elaborate upon this role, I will discuss acculturation theory in more detail.

In order to examine the changes resulting from intergroup contact, acculturation theory proposes a typology of strategies that minority members can employ in intercultural encounters, and to face the majority's expectations regarding minorities' acculturation (Berry, 1997). Acculturation strategies held by members of the minority group are revealed by examining their endorsement of cultural maintenance and intergroup contact. As a result, one of the four alternative, mutually exclusive strategies is chosen: marginalisation, assimilation, integration, and separation. When neither the maintenance of one's cultural heritage nor contact with the majority group is endorsed, marginalisation is the preferred strategy. When maintenance is not endorsed but contact is, assimilation is the chosen strategy. When both cultural maintenance and contact are endorsed, integration is preferred. And lastly, when maintenance is endorsed and contact is not, separation is the preferred acculturation strategy (Berry, 1997, 2001). The acculturation expectations held by the majority are equivalent to the aforementioned acculturation strategies: exclusion happens when the majority expects the minority to prefer marginalisation, melting pot refers to the majority's expectation of assimilation, segregation expectation corresponds to separation, and multiculturalism corresponds to integration (Berry, 2001).

Adopting an integration strategy has generally been thought to lead to successful acculturation (e.g., Sam & Berry, 2010). However, Liebkind (2001) noted that while Berry's model emphasises intergroup contact, acculturation has also been conceptualised as culture adoption and identification. Following these different conceptualisations, Snauwaert and colleagues (2003) found that while minority members endorsed integration in terms of intergroup contact, when it came to identification with the majority or adopting the culture of the majority, separation was the preferred strategy. This finding suggests that cultural maintenance and identification are more problematic dimensions of integration than intergroup contact.

However, it is not only the perceptions of the minority or majority that play a role in successfully accommodating diversity, but the extent to which acculturation strategies and expectations meet (Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault, & Senécal, 1997; Piontkowski, Rohmann, & Florack, 2002). The concordance model of acculturation (Piontkowski et al., 2002) specified the consequences of (mis)match between minority and majority perceptions. It suggested that when the strategies match completely (e.g. both groups prefer integration),

then acculturation is consensual. When strategies are incompatible in terms of one of the two dimensions or acculturation, i.e. cultural maintenance or intergroup contact (e.g. majority prefers assimilation and minority prefers integration), acculturation is problematic. Finally, if the majority and minority prefer strategies differing on both dimensions (e.g. assimilation vs. separation) acculturation is defined as conflictual. The concordance model of acculturation also suggested that as a result of problematic or conflictual acculturation strategies and expectations, perceptions of intergroup threat may increase (Piontkowski et al., 2002).

The picture becomes even more complex when approaching acculturation as a phenomenon evolving as a result of individual and group level attitudes, as well as societal level integration policies. The interactive acculturation model (Bourhis et al., 1997) addresses the majority's acculturation expectations as reflecting society's integration policies. In this model, multiculturalism is seen as a policy that ensures and enables a minority's right to maintain their cultural identity and traditions, and is thus adopted by state institutions regulating immigration and integration (e.g. Berry, 2016) to align the principles of multiculturalism with a liberal political philosophy (Kymlicka, 1995). The interactive acculturation model proposes that the majority members' endorsement of immigrants' integration implies a state level adoption of multiculturalism. In acknowledging the pivotal role of societal context, this model specified how multiculturalism can be studied as an ideology that brings together the societal and individual levels of analysis in examining immigrant integration (cf. Doise, 1986).

To sum up, acculturation theory refers to multiculturalism being an ideology that enables mutual integration; at its core are positive attitudes towards intergroup contact and minorities' cultural maintenance. It assumes that with the support and acceptance of multiculturalism ideology, the minority groups have a chance to integrate without losing their cultural heritage, and the majority population has a chance to create the ideal circumstances for harmonious intergroup relations to develop (van de Vijver, Breugelmans, & Schalk-Soekar, 2008). Following this notion, acculturation theory defines support for multiculturalism as a "general and fundamental view that cultural diversity is good for a society and for its individual members" (Berry, 2011, p. 2.9). This definition also guides the way in which it is operationalised in the Multicultural ideology scale (MIS; Berry & Kalin, 1995). The scale contains ten items addressing the benefits of cultural diversity and immigrants' cultural maintenance (see Table 1 on p. 57). Regardless of revisions and extensions—such as the multicultural attitude scale (Breugelmans & van de Vijver, 2004) and the majority integration efforts scale (Phelps, Eilertsen, Türken, & Ommundsen, 2011)—the MIS has been widely used to measure support for multiculturalism in different national contexts, e.g. in Australia (Dandy & Pe-Pua, 2010), Canada (e.g. Berry & Kalin, 1995; Scott & Safdar, 2017), Finland (Mähönen, Brylka, & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2014),

the Netherlands (e.g. Arends-Tóth & Vijver, 2003), and the United States (Ryan, Casas, & Thompson, 2010).

4.2 MULTICULTURALISM AND SOCIAL IDENTITIES

In line with acculturation research, social psychological studies on intergroup relations approach multiculturalism as both an individual level attitude and a societal level ideology that endorses ethnocultural diversity and equality between minority and majority members, thus aiming to ensure an inclusive and safe environment for all members of society (e.g. Verkuyten, 2007). Both acculturation theory and social psychological research see the support for multiculturalism and integration as essential in striving for harmonious intergroup relations and inclusive societies. However, several studies have shown that minority group members support multiculturalism more than majority members (e.g. Arends-Tóth & Vijver, 2003; Berry & Kalin, 1995; Dandy & Pe-Pua, 2010; Verkuyten, 2005a). In order to explain this finding, it is essential to consider the role of social identities in evaluating multiculturalism.

Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) states that an individual's identity is fundamentally affected by the groups they identify with, and in order to maintain a positive identity, they strive to compare their ingroups with outgroups in a positive manner. The theory also suggests that this striving forms the basis for the dynamics of intergroup relations. The multiculturalism hypothesis (Verkuyten, 2005a) suggests that for minority group members, multiculturalism provides a source of positive social identity, and an ideological framework for policies promoting the value and maintenance of their cultural traditions, whereas majority group members can perceive multiculturalism as a threat. This hypothesis has yielded empirical support in studies using surveys and experimental designs (Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011; Verkuyten, 2009; Wolsko, Park, & Judd, 2006).

The recognition of different identities was already proposed as a cornerstone of multiculturalism in one of the seminal texts that discuss the rationale for multicultural ideology and politics (Taylor, 1992). The centrality of identity recognition was also highlighted in the aforementioned study by Snauwaert and colleagues (2003), implying that when integration is conceptualised as identifying with the majority, minority members endorse it less. Identity can thus be seen as being one of the central tensions between minority and majority groups' views on how ethnocultural diversity should be managed.

Acculturation theory suggests that in order to create harmonious intergroup relations, the majority and minority should adopt compatible acculturation attitudes and endorse integration (Piontkowski et al., 2002). The research on intergroup relations stemming from social identity theory suggests that it is not just positive attitudes, but also inclusive identities that

are needed to successfully accommodate diversity. The common ingroup identity model (e.g. Dovidio, Gaertner, & Saguy, 2009) suggests that altering the representation of two separate groups (i.e. minority and majority) so that different ethnocultural subgroups can maintain their identities within a common and singular superordinate ingroup, reduces prejudice and improves mutual attitudes. However, benevolent attempts to create such inclusive identities can also hamper minorities' perceptions of inequality and attempts to act against it (Dovidio, Gaertner, Ufkes, Saguy, & Pearson, 2016).

To conclude, acculturation research and the social psychology of intergroup relations have provided important knowledge concerning attitudes towards multiculturalism and the factors explaining its support. In the aforementioned studies, multiculturalism is often seen as enabling mutual recognition and acceptance, and thus becomes a panacea for intergroup conflict and inequality. While its ramifications—such as highlighting group differences and stressing group identities at the expense of individual identities—are recognised and also to some extent examined (Verkuyten, 2007), the political and social scientific discussions addressing the “crisis of multiculturalism” have to a large extent remained unconnected with mainstream social psychological research.

I argue that the reason why the social psychology of multiculturalism has not been able to fully tackle the “crisis of multiculturalism” is that it relies on definitions and operationalisations drawing from normative multiculturalism (Kymlicka, 1995; Taylor, 1992); these are formulated by researchers, and neglect the complex ways in which people make sense of the concept (cf. Chirkov, 2009; Howarth & Andreouli, n.d.). While social scientific literature has discussed the dilemmas of multiculturalism and the ways in which it is intertwined with anti-immigration discourse, these dilemmatic aspects are not incorporated into the analytic tools used by social psychologists. In addition, while the importance of social context is acknowledged in this research, its role often remains vague and sometimes nonexistent in empirical studies. Thus, in order to widen the scope of analysis and to tap into the controversies, dilemmas, and tensions related to complex social constructions such as multicultural ideology, an analytic approach is required that sees evaluation as a socially situated process, and allows for its complexity and ambiguity.

4.3 INTERGROUP RELATIONS IN DISCOURSE

As discussed in the previous chapter, the “official” definition of multiculturalism—as well as its consequences—have been contested in the social scientific literature of multiculturalism. Thus, despite its seemingly clear and coherent content and purpose, multiculturalism, like all ideologies, contains tensions and contradictory elements. Billig and colleagues (1988) call these tensions ideological dilemmas, and argue that in order to understand and analyse the dilemmatic aspects of an ideology, analytic focus should be

directed into the ways in which the ideology is manifested and contested in everyday life, especially in everyday discourse. The target of this kind of a focus, for one, can be called lived ideology. Following the theoretisation of Billig and colleagues (1988), I argue that examining lived multiculturalism is vital for understanding the successes and failures of multicultural ideology, and that in order to examine multiculturalism as a lived ideology, the focus of analysis should be on the ways in which people themselves construct its meanings, and use it to make sense of the social world.

The focus on the ways in which people orient themselves towards questions related to multiculturalism—such as identities, belonging, and inequality—has guided a vast and diverse field of research on intergroup relations. The interest to study the everyday ways of making sense of intergroup relations has a strong connection with the (critical) discursive (social) psychological tradition (e.g. Edley, 2001; Edwards & Potter, 1992; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Wetherell, 1998), which is a versatile field of research in itself. However, there are also studies examining intergroup relations from the aforementioned perspective that are not placed under the wide umbrella of this discursive tradition. In contrast, the studies in this field represent various theoretical and methodological approaches ranging from the discursive approach (Bowskill, Lyons, & Coyle, 2007; Lyons, Madden, Chamberlain, & Carr, 2010) to social representations theory (Andreouli, 2013; Howarth, Wagner, Magnusson, & Sammut, 2014), while some studies are merely described as "qualitative" (Antonsich, 2012).

However, I argue that two significant commonalities tie together the studies that will be discussed next. The first feature is the critical stance towards mainstream social psychological research on intergroup relations that characterises studies addressing identities (e.g. Merino & Tileagă, 2011; Varjonen, Arnold, & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2013; Verkuyten & de Wolf, 2002), attitudes (Verkuyten, 2004), acculturation (e.g. Anjum, McVittie, & McKinlay, 2018; Bowskill et al., 2007; Chirkov, 2009; Howarth et al., 2014; Sapountzis, 2013), as well as racism and prejudice (e.g. Augoustinos & Every, 2007; Durrheim, Greener, & Whitehead, 2015; Goodman & Rowe, 2014; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). The critique voiced in this literature—which will be elaborated upon in the following sections—typically presents mainstream research as offering a static and de-contextualised account of the dynamics of intergroup relations. The second feature is the aforementioned interest in the ways in which people orient themselves towards diversity and intergroup relations, often resulting in the use of qualitative methodologies to examine social texts and talk (e.g. Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

Thus, in order to map the relevant research for the present research endeavour, I shall discuss qualitative studies addressing different aspects of intergroup relations, e.g. identity negotiations in the context of migration; accounts of ethnocultural diversity and different ways to manage this diversity; and the language of race and prejudice. To be able to address this multifaceted field of research, from now on I will discuss it under the label of

critical, qualitative research on intergroup relations. However, in choosing this widely used label “critical”, I do not wish to suggest that mainstream social psychological research on intergroup relations would be uncritical, nor do I take a stand on any kind of ranking of these different traditions within social psychology. In contrast, I argue that acknowledging the differences between these approaches is essential in order to create a dialogue and enable the development of social psychological research on intergroup relations.

To elaborate upon the critical qualitative approach, let us continue with a short metatheoretical note. Compared to the mainstream social psychological perspective, the critical qualitative approach to intergroup relations and multiculturalism requires an analyst to consider an epistemological shift when approaching the research topic. This manoeuvre is similar to the one taken in Chapter 2, when considering multiculturalism as public discourse. A social psychological illustration of this shift is offered by Bowskill, Lyons and Coyle (2007), who employ a critical approach to acculturation, arguing for a critical qualitative (in their case discursive) approach to acculturation through examining “global patterns of acculturation discourses as they are rhetorically configured to accomplish a variety of action-orientated, micro-level social actions” (p. 796, emphasis in original). In other words, in focussing on how social processes and social categories are constructed in interaction, and how these constructions can be used to build the social world in different ways, this shift refers to employing a social constructionist instead of realist approach (Burr, 2003). While most of the studies discussed in the following sections (as well as the present study) align with social constructionism, there are some in which the metatheoretical perspective is not explicated (e.g. Antonsich, 2012), or that align with the realist perspective, but employ the critical qualitative approach (Hopkins & Blackwood, 2011).

To return to the critical qualitative social psychology of intergroup relations, I will next discuss a classic study in the field, namely Billig’s Banal nationalism (1995). In the context of immigration, social groups are often defined in relation to national categories, and Banal nationalism demonstrates the subtle and often taken-for-granted ways in which the national “we” is reproduced, and how this banal nationalism operates as one of the most pervasive resources in making sense of the social world. The concept of banal nationalism is relevant to this research and the discussions it aims to contribute to, because it highlights the relational nature of national (as well as ethnic and cultural) categories. In other words, it entails that the flagging of the national “us” also flags “them” (Billig, 1995), and that when mobilising the idea of the nation, those placed in its margins and those not involved in it are also of concern. Thus, considering the relationship between (banal) nationalism and multiculturalism enables exploring multiculturalism as a lived ideology involving dilemmatic dynamics (Howarth, 2016), and expanding the scope of analysis from different ways to manage ethnocultural diversity to questions of equal belonging and participation in society. This is why this research also examines the negotiations of cultural citizenship, i.e.,

the aspects of membership in a society based on minority rights and diversity recognition (Wang, 2013).

Returning to the structure of the literature review, it should be noted that the main emphasis is on studies examining the lay discourse, by which I refer to the talk and texts produced by “ordinary people”, i.e. not migration scholars, politicians, or others claiming a professional position in relation to migration or ethnocultural diversity. Concerning the concept of discourse, in this research, it is used in a broad and inclusive sense to describe all social interaction, talk and texts (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). In social constructionist research, discourse often refers to patterns of talk used to represent objects and events of the social world (Burr, 2003). In this research, however, discourse refers to a similar terrain of interaction that social psychologists examine as, for example, political discourse (e.g. Capdevila & Callaghan, 2008; Every & Augoustinos, 2008).

In a mainstream social psychology of intergroup relations, the “ordinary people” are often divided into categories of “majority” and “immigrants”, or other “ethnocultural minorities”. In contrast, the perspective employed in the majority of critical qualitative studies of intergroup relations treats all categories as socially constructed, and this is also my starting point. However, using this division when structuring previous critical qualitative research on intergroup relations enables me to discuss possibilities of argumentation to those people labelled as members of minorities or majorities. This brings to the fore that even though social categories are essential for conducting mainstream or critical research on intergroup relations, these categories have consequences for lived realities of intergroup relations. Thus maintaining a critical stance towards them is important. I will first discuss research conducted among minority populations, and then go through research examining majority populations’ acculturation discourses. In addition, as the lay discourse is socially situated and intertwined with public discourses (Wetherell, 1998), at the end of the chapter, research on the political and media discourse of intergroup relations is also discussed.

4.3.1 NEGOTIATIONS OF IDENTITY AND BELONGING AMONG MINORITIES

Before discussing the literature examining how minority members construct and negotiate their identities and belonging, a few words need to be said about the concept of identity. Having brought up the need for epistemological consideration when moving from discussing mainstream realist research to that of social constructionist studies, I now extend these considerations to the concept of identity, resulting in a shifting analytic approach. While the mainstream social psychological definition of identity concerns an individual’s sense of self as a member of an ethnic or national group, the social constructionist and discursive approaches would conceptualise identities as discursive phenomena that are actively constructed in talk and texts (e.g. Burr,

2003; Liebkind, Mähönen, Varjonen, & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2016). In other words, when examining ethnic or national identities from the social constructionist perspective, the focus is on negotiations instead of, for example, identification. The studies I will soon discuss are important for my research, because in order to understand the discursive dynamics of multiculturalism, it is essential to consider the interactional processes and cultural resources that are used to construct, justify, and challenge identities as well as intergroup boundaries.

The process of migration can be seen as forcing immigrants to oscillate between their "culture of origin" and the "new culture" to which the dimension of cultural maintenance vs. cultural adoption of acculturation theory refers. In order to shed light on how immigrants make sense of this dimension, Verkuyten and de Wolf (2002) examined the ways in which Chinese people living in the Netherlands accounted for their ethnic identities. As the authors employed the discursive perspective, identities were examined as socially constructed accounts serving different rhetorical and argumentative functions (Verkuyten & de Wolf, 2002).

The authors identified three ways of talking about one's ethnic identity: "being", "feeling", and "doing". In descriptions of "being" Chinese, ethnic identity was constructed as determined in birth, as a matter of biology and ancestry. "Feeling" Chinese or Dutch referred to interpretations of ethnic identity as a more flexible construction, allowing for change and flexibility. "Doing" Chinese or Dutch, for one, referred to accounts in which ethnic or national identity was accomplished by possessing skills, such as speaking the language. The identity negotiations of Verkuyten and de Wolf's (2002) analysis highlight the variable resources that can be used to account for one's ethnic identity, and imply that these strategies can be used to draw more or less permeable boundaries between identities.

In a similar vein, but in the context of a non-migrant ethnic minority, Merino and Tileagă (2011) examined how young Chileans representing the Mapuche minority talked about their identities. Their discursive analysis highlighted the tension between declarative claims of identity (e.g. "I am a Mapuche") and claims of a "deeper", felt sense of identity when constructing an ethnic minority identity. According to the authors, this finding shows that claiming emotional attachment to the minority identity differs from merely categorising oneself as a member of the minority. Claiming a minority identity sometimes also required the participants to reconcile personal characteristics with characteristics attached to the minority group by mainstream society. The authors saw these tensions are revealing of the moral orderings related to ethnic categories, some of which are more straightforward and consensual, while others are more controversial.

The centrality of the social context in minority identity construction is further demonstrated in a study by Varjonen, Arnold and Jasinskaja-Lahti (2013), in which they examined minority ethnic identity constructions in the course of migration processes to Finland. The authors analysed the ways in

which Ingrian Finnish people—i.e. ethnic returning migrants who are seen to belong to the Finnish ethnic majority—constructed their identities before and after migration. Their findings partly paralleled those of Verkuyten and de Wolf in terms of identity constructions being drawn from biology (cf. "being") and socialisation (cf. "feeling"). However, Varjonen and colleagues (2013) contributed to the understanding of minority identity negotiations in two ways. First, by pointing out that while negotiating identities, the participants also constructed allegiances or antagonisms between themselves and the majority Finns. In other words, identity negotiations were intertwined with accounts of intergroup relations. Second, the study showed the relational nature of identity negotiations, i.e. that accounting for ethnic identities changed after migration: the participants no longer claimed, nor even referred to their Finnish identity. The authors suggested that this finding indicates how inaccessible the category of "Finns" is, even for an immigrant who could claim ethnic Finnish identity. Constructing an identity in the context of migration, thus, is a negotiation of access that can be denied by the majority and/or mainstream society (cf. Bélanger & Verkuyten, 2010).

Both aforementioned studies reveal that minority identity negotiations can be seen as a discursive space in which people oscillate between claiming their minority position and membership in mainstream society. This is also seen in the ways in which minorities with migration backgrounds account for their acculturation process and (the lack of) belonging in society.

Andreouli (2013) examined identity and acculturation negotiations among naturalised citizens in the UK. Her analysis shows that the participants' immigration background and encounters with naturalisation processes allowed them to reflect both the benefits and challenges of acculturation to British society. The benefits of acculturation were discussed as relating to the opportunities that British society can offer, for instance in terms of employment, freedom, or personal development. However, "the British way of life" (e.g. drinking and "flirting") was often presented as conflicting with one's personal values, thus representing a threat to one's identity. The study also demonstrated that when it comes to naturalised citizens' identity negotiations, it is not only the tension between the "old" and "new" culture, but also different identities (e.g. sexual orientation) that are accounted for in relation to the minority position and/or migration process.

Most of the aforementioned studies examined the negotiations of identity and belonging in the context of migration. However, these negotiations extend beyond this context. Howarth, Wagner, Magnusson, and Sammut (2014) demonstrated that the balancing between cultural maintenance and cultural contact is not limited to those having had first-hand experiences of migration. They examined focus group discussions held among British mixed heritage families, who took part in art workshops exploring identity, culture, and intercultural encounters. Three pairs of oppositional themes were identified that enabled the participants to negotiate their identities and cultural backgrounds: cultural maintenance versus cultural contact, identity as

inclusion versus identity as exclusion, and institutionalised ideologies versus agency. While these themes can be seen to bear resemblance to acculturation strategies, instead of identifying an appropriate strategy for each participant or each comment, the focus of this analysis was in the ways in which identities, family relations, and the participants' positions in British society were negotiated through these tensions. Howarth and colleagues' (2014) study demonstrated that questions regarding the extent of acceptable cultural maintenance, the possibility of claiming British identity, and the societal and institutional exclusion are relevant when claiming the right to live in a society as a recognised and fully-participating member; they can also serve the purpose of accounting for family relations.

However, as these negotiations are socially situated, it is important to note that the possibilities to claim membership in a society vary greatly depending on institutional and societal circumstances. One of the most regulated and vulnerable positions in this regard is that of an asylum seeker. Goodman, Burke, Liebling and Zasada (2014) studied the ways in which UK asylum seekers talk about their experiences of this process, and focussed on how they managed the dilemma of making complaints about their treatment in the UK coupled with the requirement to appear as a "grateful migrant" whose claim for asylum is well-grounded. By directing their criticism towards the asylum system rather than British citizens, and by downplaying their experiences of unhappiness, the participants justified their right to stay in the UK (Goodman et al., 2014).

Another minority group that has been marginalised in many European societies is Muslim immigrants. Hopkins and Blackwood (2011) analysed British Muslim's accounts of everyday encounters from the perspective of everyday citizenship, i.e. the perspective that examines how belonging and identity are negotiated. The accounts of being a target of labelling and stereotypes analysed by Hopkins and Blackwood (2011) showed that the everyday citizenship negotiated by British Muslims was often exclusive and restricting. In a similar vein, Anjum, McVittie and Mckinlay (2018) examined how Muslim immigrants in the UK accounted for their lives as immigrants, and how they talked about acculturation. The authors argue that the interaction situation played a significant role in the constructions of acculturation descriptions. When asked to choose between assimilation and separation, participants often offered "trouble-telling" accounts that highlighted difficulties related to assimilation. In contrast, when being able to account for their acculturation freely and on their own terms, the participants highlighted certain aspects of their lives—such as being free and interacting with mainstream society—as successful acculturation. While the participants often brought up the difficulties related to being a Muslim immigrant in Britain, they also constructed descriptions of integration and active citizenship. However, in contrast to acculturation theory's definition of integration as a reciprocal process, in participants' descriptions, immigrants'

own efforts were seen as central to their successful integrating into society (Anjum et al., 2018).

The aforementioned studies highlight the situated and dynamic nature of identity negotiations and accounting processes used by people who were approached and labelled by researchers as members of immigrant or other ethnocultural minority groups. Regardless of the diversity of participants, there are remarkable similarities between the results. All the studies highlight the varying ways in which minority members account for their identities and intergroup relations, despite being limited to one interview situation (Anjum et al., 2018). This finding stresses the need to study evaluations of intergroup relations as dynamic, situated processes of meaning-making.

These studies also emphasise the dominant role that mainstream society and the majority hold when demarcating the ways in which minority members can make sense of their position. This is demonstrated throughout the studies, from the results highlighting the sensitivities related to accounting for a minority identity in Chile (Merino & Tileagă, 2011), to the findings on the oscillating between criticising the asylum-seeking process and justifying one's asylum claim in the UK (Goodman et al., 2014).

The demands and expectations set for minority groups by mainstream society seem to play a dominant role in the ways in which minority members account for their identities and their lives. For multiculturalism, this is a worrisome conclusion that stresses the need to study the ways in which those who can claim a majority position make sense of intergroup relations.

4.3.2 MAJORITY MEMBERS' JUSTIFICATIONS FOR INEQUALITIES

The previous section focussed on the ways in which immigrants and members of other minorities negotiate and justify their belonging to and position in society. As will soon be discussed, the majority discourse of intergroup relations is about constructing, negotiating, and justifying the boundaries between "us" and "them". Previous studies examining this have focussed on the discourses of prejudice and racism; the construction of national identities and citizenship; and the ways in which majority members account for immigration, diversity, and intergroup relations. The items on this list are not mutually exclusive, clear-cut research fields, but rather general themes that often overlap in critical qualitative studies of intergroup relations conducted among majorities.

Wetherell and Potter's (1992) book *Mapping the language of racism* is a classic study of the majority discourse of intergroup relations, and a seminal work in the field of discursive social psychological research of intergroup relations. It is a thorough analysis on the ways in which white New Zealanders legitimate inequality and oppression with seemingly liberal arguments drawing from the country's colonialist history. Using the tools of discourse analysis, the authors demonstrate how ethnic categories and their relations are constructed as hierarchical, while avoiding accusations of racism, and

while presenting oneself as an open-minded and rational person. This study showed how the discourse that explicitly embraces tolerance and open-mindedness can draw on intergroup hierarchies and portrayals of minorities as inferior compared to the dominant group. The connections between the discourse of tolerance to hierarchical and exclusive constructions of intergroup relations have also been demonstrated in an analysis of the public discourse concerning diversity in Belgium (Blommaert & Verschueren, 1998). Despite the fact that *Mapping the language of racism* (Wetherell & Potter, 1992) examined the majority discourse decades ago, its message remains topical: studying the nuances and complexities of the ways in which members of the majority justify or contest inequalities (and their dominant position) can reveal important cultural and societal dynamics that enable the oppression of minorities, and make inequality seem like a natural state of affairs.

In their review of the research done on the language of race and prejudice, Augoustinos and Every (2007) note that the use of liberal arguments in rationalising the marginalisation of minorities is a pervasive pattern within the majority discourse of race. The authors also list other discursive tools used to justify discriminatory arguments. Namely, the denial of prejudice (see Billig, 1988 for the norm against prejudice; and van Dijk, 1992 for the denial of racism); presenting one's views as rational reflections of the world; positive self and negative other presentation; as well as discursive deracialisation (Augoustinos & Every, 2007; also e.g. Goodman & Burke, 2011). The construction of hierarchical intergroup relations has also been found to rely on essentialist arguments (Verkuyten, 2003) that enable and justify categorising people into distinct ethnic and/or cultural groups.

Understanding the discourse of race and prejudice is important when examining the majority discourse of intergroup relations, because the ways in which majority members can justify hierarchies and inequalities can be subtle and complex. However, in order to even better understand the variability and the nuances of the lay discourse of intergroup relations among members of the majority groups, the scope needs to be widened to touch upon issues ranging from acculturation, assimilation, and multiculturalism, to national identities and national belonging.

In the beginning of this section, I suggested that multiculturalism should be studied as a lived ideology involving dilemmatic dimensions, and that it should be examined in relation to (banal) nationalism (see also Howarth, 2016). Indeed, the relationship between talking about the nation and talking about diversity and minorities has been found to be dilemmatic, as national identity constructions can be explicitly inclusive and celebrate diversity while drawing on the idea of virtuous and normative national homogeneity (Condor, 2006). Similar to the language of race, talking about the nation has been found to be a sensitive issue among majority members, requiring them to do discursive work to avoid appearing xenophobic (Condor, 2000).

However, recent research has also pointed towards less dilemmatic aspects of national identity talk in demonstrating that national identity constructions

can function as discursive tools for majority members to justify the exclusion of immigrants from the national ingroup. This is exemplified in the study of Lyons, Madden, Chamberlain and Carr (2010), in which young adults' immigration talk in New Zealand (NZ) was examined. The authors identified four ways in which nationalist rhetoric was used to position NZ as threatened by immigration. Firstly, NZ was constructed as having its own identity and culture; as "one society" with distinct, defining features (e.g. safe, beautiful, and small in terms of population). Constructing NZ this way enabled the participants to talk about immigration as a threat, and endorse immigrants' assimilation. NZ was also talked about as "English-speaking" and "NZ-looking" (a reference to white New Zealanders). Both these constructions were used to mark certain people as different from "the New Zealanders". The arguments in which appearance was referred to often included disclaimers ("I'm not racist, but...") to manage the speaker's identity. Finally, the NZ economy was constructed as "needing help", which functioned to construct NZ as benefiting from immigration, and to cast doubt over the presence of those immigrants who are unemployed, i.e. not contributing to the NZ economy.

Lyons and colleagues' (2010) study demonstrated how discussions of immigration provide a space for the use of exclusionist and hierarchical constructions of national identity, and in line with Augoustinos and Every (2007), they argue that nationalist arguments can be used to justify and sanitise racist discourse. Indeed, nationalism provides a powerful resource for majority members to talk about immigration, and assimilation talk in particular draws from nationalist discourse (Lyons et al., 2010).

In a similar vein, Gibson and Hamilton (2011) examined the constructions of identity, culture, and citizenship in young adults' immigration discussions in the UK. Their analysis revealed that the negotiation of citizenship and immigration relied on the construction of the nation as being able to accommodate diversity, as long as it was confined to the private sphere. While the participants explicitly contested assimilation and exclusion based on "race", they subtly constructed them as legitimate options to accommodate immigrants. Legitimising hierarchical relationships between the majority and immigrants—and constructing one-way assimilation as the most rational model to accommodate immigrants—has also been found to dominate the majority discourse of intergroup relations (Sapountzis, 2013) within Greece. In regard to assimilation talk, Verkuyten (2005b) similarly found two distinct patterns of talk, i.e. interpretative repertoires, that Dutch majority members used to account for immigration and immigrants' rights. One was "personal choice", referring to voluntary migration which was used to justify demands of immigrants' assimilation. Another interpretative repertoire was "lack of choice", referring to involuntary migration, i.e. asylum seekers and refugees, which was used to emphasise the majority's role to help immigrants integrate.

The aforementioned studies bring up the pervasive role of assimilation talk in the lay discourse among majorities in different national contexts; this enables the constructing and justifying of inequality between the majority and

immigrants. According to Gibson (2011), the negotiation of membership in a society evolves around the dilemma of one's rights and responsibilities. The extent to which one can be seen as making an effort can be used to account for this dilemma. However when it comes to immigration, this individualistic repertoire of effortfulness can be contested to demarcate a boundary between "our people" and "immigrants" (Gibson, 2011).

Antonsich (2012) argues that this is a result of a shift from "multiculturalism to assimilation", echoed in the public discourse, and investigated in the academic discourse. In his study, Antonsich set out to examine the ways in which members of the majority groups in different European countries (Finland, France, Italy, United Kingdom) demand immigrants' assimilation when talking about immigration, assimilation and multiculturalism. As a result, seven performative "dimensions" were identified that constituted the demands of assimilation: knowing (history, language and culture of the majority); participating (and contributing to society); accepting, respecting, and appreciating the mainstream way of life; behaving (i.e. conforming to and reproducing the practices and norms of mainstream society at least in public); and feeling (identifying with and being loyal to the majority group, culture and society).

The dimensions depict the variety of demands that the majority can make of immigrants, i.e. they should not be interpreted as an exhaustive list of tasks expected of immigrants. According to Antonsich, some dimensions of the demands (e.g. "knowing") were more viable for immigrants to realise, and when used to account for their acculturation, could be seen to indicate a less exclusionist construction of a society compared to those dimensions that demanded immigrants make a more profound change (e.g. "feeling").

Concerning the ways in which the majority can discursively set the terms and conditions for immigrants to become accepted, Andreouli and Dashtipour (2014) argue that the "earned citizenship discourse" enables the demarcating of those worthy of full membership in society. The division between those who have earned their citizenship and those who have not is based on the extent to which an immigrant contributes to society, and how grateful they feel towards mainstream society and members of the majority (Andreouli & Dashtipour, 2014). To conclude, the demands examined in the aforementioned studies bring up the variability of the all-encompassing tasks immigrants are expected to perform, in order to be accepted as full members of society, or, in other words, claim cultural citizenship.

Previous research on the discourse of intergroup relations paints a gloomy picture of the ways in which the majorities in different contexts account for intergroup relations. While containing some dilemmatic elements—such as the discursive work people do to appear rational, tolerant and open-minded (e.g. Augoustinos & Every, 2007; Blommaert & Verschueren, 1998; Wetherell & Potter, 1992)—the lay discourse of intergroup relations among the majority can be seen to draw on (banal) nationalism (Billig, 1995; also Gibson & Hamilton, 2011; Lyons et al., 2010) that enables justifying the dominant

position of the majority alongside intergroup inequalities (Skey, 2010). Thus, previous critical qualitative research can shed some light on the dynamics of the “crisis of multiculturalism” discourse in everyday life through showing that the majority discourse seems to be fuelled by exclusionary argumentation and the justification of intergroup hierarchies—a stark contradiction of the premises of normative multiculturalism.

However, one could argue that in order to study the lay discourse of multiculturalism, talk on multiculturalism—not on, for example, national identities or asylum seekers—should be examined. While the present study aims to fill that gap, there is one study that has examined the majority discourse of multiculturalism prior to this research.

Verkuyten (2004) studied Dutch majority members’ everyday ways of thinking about multiculturalism. In line with the critical approach outlined earlier, the focus of that study was on the ways in which the participants oriented themselves towards multiculturalism and the meanings they provided for it (rather than responding to definitions formulated by researchers). Verkuyten first examined written arguments given to support and oppose multiculturalism, and then conducted an interview study in which participants were encouraged to talk about The Netherlands “becoming more multicultural”, and the implications of multiculturalism.

Two interpretations of multiculturalism were identified: one presenting diversity as interesting and exciting, and the other stressing problems and threats. Both of these interpretations were used interchangeably, making it impossible to categorise participants in terms of their stance towards multiculturalism. Rather, the participants oscillated between the two interpretations. Positive evaluations of multiculturalism often served as disclaimers which were voiced before negative comments to shield the speaker against accusations of prejudice. A negative interpretation of multiculturalism, for one, was often used to justify assimilation demands and bolster Dutch culture. Verkuyten (2004) points out that examining thinking as arguments, as opposed to cognitive attitudes, allows for identifying the contradictory and dilemmatic ways in which people evaluate multiculturalism. Considering those tensions in relation to the social scientific discussions on multiculturalism presented in Chapter 3, one could argue that the controversies of the academic and public discussions are, thus, also accounted for in the vernacular among the majority.

Despite the aforementioned contributions to the discussion on the lay discourse of multiculturalism, important questions remain unanswered. What ideological resources are drawn upon when constructing evaluations of multiculturalism? How do minority members construct accounts of multiculturalism? What roles do inequality and power relations play in the majority and minorities’ discourse of multiculturalism, as an ideology formulated to fight intergroup hierarchies? With this research, I aim to tackle these questions. In order to consider the lay discourse as it unfolds across different forums, one more question needs to be posed: what is the role of

social media and other online contexts in the lay discourse of multiculturalism?

4.3.3 LAY DISCOURSE OF INTERGROUP RELATIONS ONLINE

Social media has profoundly changed the way individuals can engage with society by enabling new forms of citizen participation and political deliberation (e.g. Mossberger, Tolbert, & McNeal, 2008; Neumann, Bimber, & Hindman, 2011; Papacharissi, 2008), for example, via increasing access to information (Gil De Zúñiga, Puig-I-Abril, & Rojas, 2009), and enabling online political deliberation (Valenzuela, Kim, & Gil de Zuniga, 2012). It can be broadly defined as an online space that evolves as a result of the content generated by users, and that relies on this user-generated content in creating an online community (McCay-Peet & Quan-Haase, 2017). Thus, in inviting ordinary citizens to share their views, social media has also become a significant platform for negotiations of intergroup boundaries and intergroup relations.

Social media has not only changed the ways in which individual citizens can participate in society and politics, but also the ways in which political movements operate. As social media has become one of the dominant sites for political debate (Alvares & Dahlgren, 2016), it has played a crucial role in the rise of political anti-immigration movements, for example in the UK (Atton, 2006) and France (Bratten, 2005), as well as in Finland and Sweden (Pettersson & Sakki, 2017).

While enabling the dissemination and negotiation of racism, social media also offers a space for minorities to construct their identities and belonging (Parker & Song, 2006), and likewise, religious communities (Pauha, 2017). The online sphere has also been shown to enable minority communities to negotiate the dilemmas of multicultural politics (Siapera, 2006). In these studies, social media is often examined as a space that allows for contesting the dominant discourses of multiculturalism, immigration, and ethnic and cultural diversity, and thus, it enables minorities to mobilise and participate in society in new ways. However, the same potential of online environments has also been utilised by anti-immigration and nationalist movements (e.g. Pettersson & Sakki, 2017).

In sum, social media enables both harmonious and conflictual intergroup relations to develop in a society. It does so not only by providing a space for deliberation, but also through shaping discourse. Titley (2014) argues that in order to understand contemporary racist discourse, it is essential to pay attention to the affordances of social media platforms—for instance, to the kinds of content they invite, and the ways in which that content is circulated. This notion is important to consider, as it stresses that the wider virtual, societal, and political contexts should not be overlooked, especially when the focus is on social media discourse.

Concerning lay and societal discussions, social media is often portrayed as an increasingly polarised and polarising context. The results of recent research point in two directions. Some researchers suggest that virtual environments increase homophily, which is the tendency to only interact with like-minded individuals (Boutyline & Willer, 2016). However, social media has also been found to increase interaction among people with opposing views (Stromer-Galley, Bryant, & Bimber, 2015; Wojcieszak & Mutz, 2009). In order to examine polarisation in real-life, non-experimental social media settings, Nelimarkka, Laaksonen and Semaan (2018) analysed the discussions of two Finnish Facebook groups—an anti-racist and an anti-immigration group. They found that the discussions within these groups were polarised in two senses: in terms of the links shared in the discussions, and in terms of the discussions themselves. Even in the rare occasions when the same link was shared in these groups, the ways in which it was commented upon showed polarisation. With their analysis, Nelimarkka and colleagues (2018) demonstrate that in order to better understand polarisation online, it is crucial to study the dynamics of the discussions qualitatively.

Social media has been argued to be an especially interesting context for qualitative discursive research, because it enables the examination of so-called natural data—discourse not prompted by researchers (e.g. Giles, 2016; Jowett, 2015; Lamerichs & Te Molder, 2003). However, following Goodman and Speer’s (2017) criticism concerning the categorisation of data as “natural” or “contrived”, I would argue that all kinds of data are always processed by an analyst, and thus these categories can be contested (see section 7.1.1 for further discussion). Notwithstanding this discussion, qualitative research on social media is important because social media is becoming an increasingly important space for communication, especially about intergroup relations (Burke & Rowe, 2015).

Following the research agenda set by Wetherell and Potter (1992), subsequent research has examined the ways in which people negotiate racism online (e.g. Durrheim et al., 2015; Goodman & Rowe, 2014), and how racist behaviour is justified or contested (Faulkner & Bliuc, 2016). This research showed that online environments allow and invite explicit formulations of racism and prejudice in discussion forums of extremist hate groups (Billig, 2001), as well as in the comment sections of mainstream media sites (Hughey & Daniels, 2013), thus giving grounds to argue that the norm against prejudice (Billig, 1988) is absent from online discourse. However, more recent research has also shown the presence of this norm in the subtle and ambivalent ways in which online discussion participants orient themselves towards questions related to race and racism (Goodman & Rowe, 2014), or the ways in which discourse is deracialised through avoiding the topic (Durrheim et al., 2015).

To conclude, previous research has shown the potential of social media to develop democratic societies and improve citizen participation. However, there are also signs of increasing polarisation and intergroup conflict in online environments. As a result of these complex and contradictory dynamics and

combined with the dominant role social media now plays in everyday life, it is crucial to examine the ways in which citizens deliberate political issues online. While seeing social media as an intersection of the public and private spheres (cf. Papacharissi, 2008), the lay discourse online should also be studied and situated in a wider discursive landscape that is intertwined with political and public discourses (Wetherell, 1998).

4.3.4 THE POLITICAL AND MEDIA DISCOURSE OF MULTICULTURALISM AND INTERGROUP RELATIONS

As discussed in the previous chapter, the political discourse regarding the failure of multiculturalism is well documented and examined in social sciences (e.g. Bloemraad & Wright, 2014; Joppke, 2004; Lentin & Titley, 2011; Meer & Modood, 2014; Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010). Research has pointed out the confusion related to the term (e.g. Bloemraad & Wright, 2014; Modood, 2014), and some scholars have argued that it has been misunderstood among scholars and politicians (Kymlicka, 2012) when compared to its “official”, social scientific definition. Instead of aiming to compare public discourse to official definitions of multiculturalism, social scientific research has focussed on the ways in which intergroup relations and diversity—and multiculturalism in particular—are constructed in political and societal debates.

Previous research on the public and political discourse of intergroup relations has to a large extent focussed on the discourse of populist and anti-immigration movements, as well as on the dynamics of the race discourse within societal discussions. This focus is well grounded, as the political anti-immigration discourse has been found to become more mainstream (Sakki & Pettersson, 2018; Wodak, 2015), even steering the discussion on immigration and the accommodation of diversity (Horsti & Nikunen, 2013). Wetherell and Potter’s study (1992) already demonstrated that the lay discourse is tightly intertwined with the political and historical discourses. Thus, in this section, previous research on the political and media discourse of multiculturalism and intergroup relations is discussed.

The norm against prejudice has been brought up in earlier sections related to the lay majority discourse and social media discourse. Relating it to political race talk, previous literature has examined how denials of racism occur while concurrently justifying more restrictive asylum policies in the UK (e.g. Capdevila & Callaghan, 2008; Goodman, 2010; Goodman & Johnson, 2013). These studies brought to light the various strategies used by the far right (Goodman & Johnson, 2013) and mainstream parties (Capdevila & Callaghan, 2008) to manage accusations of racism, including appealing to common sense and rationality (cf. Augoustinos & Every, 2007; Wetherell & Potter, 1992); comparing themselves to more extremist parties; claiming to act on behalf of minorities; and accusing minorities of prejudice. In their analysis of the anti-immigration political discourse in Finland and Sweden, Sakki and Pettersson (2016) showed that in addition to opposing immigrants and multiculturalism,

anti-immigration politicians constructed the advocates of less restrictive immigration politics and immigrants' rights as "inner enemies".

Political anti-immigration discourse, thus, draws on various contrasts between "us" and "them", and is also fuelled by negotiations of racism (Durrheim et al., 2018), which means that the accusations of racism targeted towards anti-immigration movements can be mobilised by those movements to attract followers. This is important to note, because it highlights that the rise of the anti-immigration movements is a process involving those active in the movements, but also their critics and the general public.

While it is important to examine the ways in which exclusionary and derogatory discourse is justified and disseminated in societal debates, there is also another side to this coin. Political discourse of intergroup relations can also be about demanding solidarity towards immigrants. Kirkwood (2017) examined the humanisation discourse that allowed British politicians to evoke a moral responsibility to help refugees. However, regardless of the benevolent aim to help people in a vulnerable position, the discourse of common humanity still allowed the differentiation between "economic migrants" and "genuine refugees" (Kirkwood, 2017).

Finally, regarding the media discourse of intergroup relations, previous research points towards complex dynamics of both promoting diversity and justifying inequality. In a discursive analysis of British media discourse concerning cultural diversity and integration, Bowskill, Lyons and Coyle (2007) demonstrated that despite the explicit endorsement of mutual integration, an "assimilationist undertone" to the discourse functioned to present the mainstream society and the national majority as the norm to which minorities should aim to adjust. In a similar vein, Fortier (2005) argues that explicit support for multiculturalism in the public discourse can function to safeguard the nation against accusations of racism. Her analysis on the public debate concerning multiculturalism in Britain reveals that celebrating the diversity of the nation requires the construction of a minority other, and likewise the construction of tolerance requires the construction of a prejudiced other. Thus, in line with aforementioned studies examining the lay discourse of intergroup relations among the majority (e.g. Wetherell & Potter, 1992), Bowskill and colleagues' and Fortier's studies also highlight that critical examinations of the discourse of integration, tolerance, and multiculturalism can reveal constructions that justify intergroup hierarchies.

4.3.5 STUDY THE LAY DISCOURSE OF MULTICULTURALISM: AIMS AND RESEARCH QUESTION

Multiculturalism has been offered as a solution for problems and conflicts arising in diverse societies (e.g. Berry, 2011; Kymlicka, 2012). However, while it has been seen to enable the construction of inclusive national identities (Bloemraad & Wright, 2014; Dovidio et al., 2009), critical scholars have argued that by concealing inequalities and essentialising minorities,

multiculturalism fuels racist discourse (e.g. Blommaert & Verschueren, 1998; Kundnani, 2012). The academic discourse of multiculturalism, thus, can be characterised as dilemmatic (cf. Billig et al., 1988).

The tensions of multiculturalism are not confined to academic discourse. While public statements by politicians regarding the "death of multiculturalism" have become so mainstream that they no longer even need to be spelled out, the dilemmas also manifest among the lay population. Social psychological research has pointed out the pitfalls of multiculturalism by showing that majorities tend to support multiculturalism less than minorities (e.g. Arends-Tóth & Vijver, 2003; Verkuyten, 2005a), and that questions related to minority identity recognition are especially sensitive when it comes to the attitudes and perceptions held by majorities and minorities (Snauwaert et al., 2003). Critical qualitative and discursive research focussing on the ways in which identities, integration, and belonging in society are constructed, has demonstrated the various discursive strategies used in the minorities' struggle for recognition, and the majorities' justification for the present, hierarchical intergroup relations.

I argue that examining multiculturalism from the perspectives of lived ideology (Billig et al., 1988) and discursive psychology (e.g. Potter, 1996; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Wetherell, 1998) enables focussing on the tensions and complexities of the ways in which ordinary people living in Finland make sense of multiculturalism. Studying the lay discourse is essential, because in its everyday, commonsensical argumentation, shared ways of making sense of intergroup relations (that are often treated as self-evident) are revealed. This analytic focus also enables disclosing the discursive dynamics available in a given social context, as well as shedding light on the logics that are used to account for the success or failure of multiculturalism. However, it is important to note that the lay discourse is not a self-contained sphere of talk and texts evolving in isolation from political and academic discourses. In contrast, intellectual ideologies are shaped by lived ideologies and vice versa (Billig et al., 1988, Durrheim, Quayle & Dixon, 2016). Thus, by applying the discursive and rhetorical perspective to multiculturalism, this research also aims to critically reflect upon the premises of the social psychology of multiculturalism.

As a lived ideology, multiculturalism evolves through interacting with its societal, cultural and historical context. While critical discursive research has pointed out the dilemmatic tensions of multiculturalism as it is used in contemporary political discourse (e.g. Lentin & Titley, 2011), the crisis of multiculturalism discourse has mainly resulted in scholars looking for different alternatives for multiculturalism, such as interculturalism (e.g. Verkuyten, Yogeewaran, Mepham, & Sprong, 2019). However, as a term, multiculturalism is already a part of the ways in which people construct their own and others' relations to intergroup relations and ethnocultural diversity. I argue that in order to take a step forward from examining whether

multiculturalism is in crisis or not, it is essential to study its use in the lay discourse.

With this research, I aim to contribute to the fields of discursive psychology of intergroup relations, and mainstream social psychology of multiculturalism, by examining the construction and negotiation of multiculturalism among majority and minority members in Finland, a context where multiculturalism encompasses significant controversies as regards to national identity and diversity. In order to make such a contribution, I will tap into the situated, reciprocal negotiations of multiculturalism. Thus, the general aim of this research can be compressed into the following question:

How is multiculturalism discursively configured as an object of evaluation and negotiation, and used as a tool to construct, negotiate, and manage intergroup relations in the Finnish lay discourse?

A more specific research question related to this aim is formulated for each of the four substudies:

1. How is multiculturalism constructed as an object of positive and negative evaluation in the discourse of majority Finns? (Study I)
2. How do minority and majority Finns account for ethnic and cultural diversity, and managing intergroup relations? (Study II)
3. How do minority and majority Finns construct and negotiate immigrants' cultural citizenship in focus group discussions about multiculturalism? (Study III)
4. What kinds of functions does a multiculturalism discourse serve in social media?
 - 4a. How is an anti-multiculturalist political act interpreted, contested, and supported online, in the nexus of lay, political, and media discourse?
 - 4b. What are the discursive functions of the different interpretations offered for the anti-multiculturalist political act, and for multiculturalism? (Study IV)

5 MATERIAL AND METHODS

This research draws on diverse sets of materials that involve evaluation and argumentation about the so-called lay people. Before describing the data and methods in more detail, there are two questions related to the data that I would like to address. The first is my choice to use the label lay discourse to describe the object of the analysis, and the second is the use of focus group discussions as data for this discursive research.

The aim of this research is to study multiculturalism as a lived ideology, instead of an intellectual ideology (Billig et al., 1988). Instead of examining normative multiculturalism as it formulated and defined by philosophers and social scientists, this aim entails focussing on how “ordinary” people orient themselves towards, and make sense of, multiculturalism. This is what I refer to as the lay discourse in this research. However, while leaning on the division between lived and intellectual ideologies, one has to be wary of extending it to people or discourses. Thus, even though the participants were explicitly invited to the focus group discussions as “ordinary people living in Finland”, and even though the online discussion forum explicitly invites everyone to participate, I acknowledge that the boundaries of the category “lay” are negotiable and dynamic, and that such categories can be seen as discursive tools that enable the participants of an interview situation to form interpretations of that situation (cf. Sarangi, 2003), as well as position themselves and others in relation to the topics of discussion.

Focus groups, or group interviews, are a widely used method of data-generation when studying the lay discourse (for examples of empirical studies using focus groups, see e.g. Gibson & Hamilton, 2011; Lyons et al., 2010; Varjonen et al., 2013; Verkuyten, 2004). Given interviews are one of the predominant ways of data-generation in qualitative social psychological studies, it is useful to be aware of discussions concerning the pitfalls of using interview data for a discursive analysis (e.g. Potter & Hepburn, 2012). These critical accounts often deal with the researchers’ lack of consideration or reflection of an interview situation as a specific form of institutional interaction (Puchta & Potter, 2004). However, critical reflection should be an important part of any research project, not merely those analysing interactions produced in an interview setting. In this research, I reflect on both the focus groups, and online discussion data and methods in section 7.1.1. (p. 61-63).

5.1 MATERIALS

In this section, I will present the materials analysed in the studies. Studies I–III examined focus group discussions among majority and minority Finns, and Study IV focussed on discussion threads of a popular online forum.

All the studies are a result of collaboration. Study I was authored by myself, Tuuli Anna Renvik and Inga Jasinskaja-Lahti. Studies II and III were authored by Sirkku Varjonen and the authors of Study I. Study IV was authored by Miira Niska and the authors of Study I. Thus, when discussing the materials and procedures of these studies, I will use the pronoun “we”.

5.1.1 STUDY I

Study I was a multimethod project in which we examined majority Finns’ evaluations of multiculturalism as operationalized in the Multicultural Ideology Scale (MIS; Berry & Kalin, 1995), via a survey and in a focus group setting.

The survey data were collected in the summer of 2012 among a nation-wide sample of 1,000 Finnish majority members living in Finland. The respondents were identified as Finns based on their mother tongue and country of birth, and randomly sampled by the Population Register. The final criterion for the survey participants was their self-reported identification as ethnic Finns. The response rate was 33.4 %, resulting in a final sample of 334 participants. The mean age of the final sample of participants was 45.9 years ($SD = 13.54$); their ages ranged between 19 and 65 years.

As a part of this questionnaire, participants were asked to complete the MIS scale consisting of 10 items presented in Table 1 (p. 57), using a five-point Likert scale (1 strongly disagree – 3 do not agree nor disagree – 5 strongly agree, $\alpha = .89$). The survey respondents were also asked if they wished to take part in an interview study concerning the same topic.

The qualitative data was generated in May 2013 by conducting two focus group discussions, in which the participants were encouraged to evaluate and discuss seven statements from the MIS presented in Table 1 (indicated by asterisks). The criteria for participating in the focus group discussions were that the participants identified as majority Finns, and that they lived in the Helsinki metropolitan area. Seven out of the 15 people living in the Helsinki region replied to our invitation letter. In the end, three participants were recruited this way (two in the first discussion and one in the second). The rest were contacted by snowball sampling through the first author’s social network. The first focus group consisted of three participants and the second of four participants. The participants—who did not know each other beforehand—were rather homogeneous in terms of their socio-economic background. They were all active in the labour market, except one participant in the first discussion who had recently retired. Their age range was 38–63.

5.1.2 STUDIES II AND III

A new set of focus group discussions was generated in order to expand our focus from majority Finns to encompass those identifying with one of the three biggest immigrant groups in Finland at the time, i.e. Russian, Estonian, or Somali speakers. Studies II and III draw on this data that consists of seven focus group discussions held in Helsinki between April 2014 and February 2015.

In order to invite people from various backgrounds, we used different strategies to reach potential participants—through Facebook and public notice boards, for example in libraries and grocery stores, as well as by visiting different events and participating in a radio show. The advertisements for all participants—including the non-native Finnish speakers—were written in Finnish in order to reach potential participants who were fluent enough to have discussions in Finnish. We also explicitly mentioned in the advertisement that the discussion would be held in Finnish.

Altogether 17 majority Finns and 17 immigrants living in Helsinki took part in these discussions. We organised three groups with the members of the Finnish majority, as well as separate groups with Russian-speaking and Estonian-speaking participants, and two with Somali-speaking participants. We welcomed everyone willing to take part in the discussion. Each group is described in detail below.

Discussion 1 with majority Finnish participants ($n = 9$) was held in a resident facility in a neighbourhood with a low socio-economic status (Vilkama, Lönnqvist, Väliniemi-Laurson, & Tuominen, 2014). The participants were all regulars, members, or staff of this place, and they knew each other at least on a first name basis. The group was diverse in terms of age, with the youngest participant being in his twenties, and the oldest in his nineties. Throughout the course of the discussion, some participants left while others joined late. Four of the nine participants were present for the entire discussion.

Discussion 2 with majority Finnish participants ($n = 4$) was organised in a resident facility of one of the wealthiest areas of Helsinki. Two of the participants indicated knowing each other beforehand. This group was rather homogeneous in terms of age; all the participants were in their fifties or sixties.

Discussion 3 with majority Finnish participants ($n = 4$) was held in the premises of the University of Helsinki. The participants were students of the University of Helsinki, and they were all in their twenties. They were recruited via mailing lists and by visiting courses.

Discussion 4 with Russian-speaking minority participants ($n = 8$) was organised in the premises of a foundation related to the Russian-speaking minority in Finland. The participants were recruited by visiting events of the foundation, sending invitations to our contacts via Facebook, and by advertising the research during an interview for the Russian language radio station Sputnik. The participants were from their twenties to their sixties. Two of the participants brought up that they knew each other beforehand.

Discussion 5 with Estonian-speaking minority participants (n = 3) was organised in the premises of the University of Helsinki. The participants were recruited using contact information obtained during a survey study conducted by the research team earlier that year. The participants were of working age, all in their thirties or forties.

Discussion 6 with Somali-speaking minority participants (n = 4) was organised in an office of an NGO that works in the social and healthcare sector to promote gender equality and the integration of immigrants. One of the participants who was contacted by the fourth author, invited the other participants.

Discussion 7 with Somali-speaking minority participants (n = 2) was organised in a culture centre maintained by the City of Helsinki. Both participants were spontaneously recruited on the spot, because all the participants who had earlier signed up for the discussion failed to arrive. The participants were friends, both in their twenties.

All participants were informed that participating in the study was voluntary and anonymous. The study was introduced to the participants as being about multicultural Finland, and especially about their own thoughts and experiences, instead of factual knowledge on the subject. The moderators (myself and Sirkku Varjonen) adopted a fairly passive role and mainly joined in the discussions to introduce the prompts, to encourage the participants to share their views or to ask for clarifications.

To apply the qualitative approach to attitudes (see e.g. Peltola & Vesala, 2013; Pyysiäinen & Vesala, 2013) soon discussed in section 5.2.1, the moderators did not define multiculturalism to the participants, but used prompts to produce rich commentary on the topic, and to create comparability between different focus groups. The moderators showed the participants of each focus group four to five prompts, one at a time, and encouraged participants to respond to and freely discuss the prompts. The interview guide included the following prompts:

1. Multiculturalism is a good thing.
2. When in Rome, do as the Romans do.
3. Finns should accept that Finnish society consists of groups with different cultural backgrounds.
4. Finns have different attitudes towards immigrants from different countries.
5. What do you think about other immigrants in Finland? (Only minority participants were asked to comment on this prompt.)

The prompts were chosen to facilitate discussions concerning multiculturalism, intergroup relations, and diversity in Finland. The first prompt was phrased as generically as possible: the aim was to enable

participants to produce general evaluations and descriptions of multiculturalism. The second prompt was chosen because it is very frequently used in public discourse on immigration and ethnic diversity in Finland among politicians, media, and lay people alike. The third prompt was picked from the MIS (Berry & Kalin, 1995) to elicit discussions on the adaptation of majority group members (cf. the notion of mutual, reciprocal acculturation, Berry, 2005). The last two prompts were formulated to facilitate discussions concerning ethnic hierarchies prevailing in Finnish intergroup contexts (see Section 2). Discussions were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim.

5.1.3 STUDY IV

With Study IV, we aimed to adopt a new perspective when exploring the ways in which people orient themselves towards, and make sense of, multiculturalism. While the data-generation of Studies I–III relied on the discussions prompted by the researchers—and to some extent leaned on the definition of multiculturalism that we offered the participants—with Study IV, we wanted to study the discourse that was not prompted, interfered with, or moderated by us.

Thus, we chose Suomi24 (Finland24 in English), which is one of the most popular online discussion forums in Finland, as the site of Study IV. Suomi24 was established in 2001, and ever since, it has invited people to discuss “any topic freely” (“Keskustele vapaasti aiheesta kuin aiheesta!” in Finnish). Currently, the forum is divided into 21 thematic discussion areas that involve a wide array of topics, ranging from health and illness, to science and technology. The discussion area regarding societal issues is one of the most popular, in terms of the amount of comments (Lagus, Ruckenstein, Pantzar, & Ylisiurua, 2016) it garners.

The discussions are public and open for anyone to read and participate in. One can post comments on already active threads, or start a new thread, in which case the writer has to choose the discussion area, come up with a title, and start the thread with a comment. This can be done anonymously or by using a nickname. There are explicit rules of discussion that forbid posting insulting material, and discussions are moderated.

One of the reasons for choosing Suomi24 as the site of Study IV, was that as a result of a collaborative project between a group of social scientists and Aller, a commercial media company that owns the site (for a discussion of this project in English, see Pakkasvirta, 2018), all the discussions were brought into a database that facilitates their analysis with different analytic tools. One of these tools is KORP (Borin, Forsberg, & Roxendal, 2012), an interface that enables making keyword searches from the data. In order to narrow down the data that in May 2015 consisted of 54.3 million comments, we chose to focus on the threads posted in the “Society” discussion area. In order to identify the

relevant discussions for our research interest, we used multiculturalism² as a keyword for the Korp search. The result of this search was that in July 2015 there was a clear increase in the use of the word in Suomi24. In July 25th, Olli Immonen, an MP representing the FP, wrote and published a Facebook post in which he called on Finns to join him in a fight against “the nightmare of multiculturalism”. In Study IV, we analyse this discussion, or more specifically, the 21 discussion threads that were started immediately after Immonen published his post.

5.2 METHODS OF ANALYSIS

The analytic perspective employed in this research is that of discursive psychology (DP), which draws from social constructionist epistemology to stress the socially and historically situated nature of knowledge; the socially constructed nature of the events, situations, and categories of the social world; and language and interaction as primary targets of analyses (Burr, 2003). DP arose in the 1980s as a critical movement within psychology that sought to contest the dominance of experimental designs and quantitative methodologies, as well as the use of psychology students as research subjects (e.g. Tileagă & Stokoe, 2016). It has since developed into a diverse field of approaches advocating the examination of “social texts”, which refers both to the study material which is often in textual form (i.e. discussion transcripts and online discussions, but also newspaper articles, blog texts etc.), as well as their context-bound nature (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). It is, thus, noteworthy that DP is not merely an analytic approach, but it also makes theoretical claims.

These claims can be condensed into three principles (Potter, 2007; also e.g. Tileagă & Stokoe, 2016). The first principle is that language is approached as action-oriented, which means that instead of treating it as a means to get information about people’s attitudes or feelings, language is the object of analysis. The second principle is to consider the situated nature of language use, which is often achieved through referring to the immediate interactions of a situation, for example, turn-taking in a conversation, or the wider social context in which interactions takes place, such as the institutional versus the everyday context. The third principle is to treat both language and interaction as constructed—of shared resources, such as categories, commonplaces, and interpretative repertoires—and as constructive, in that they enable people to formulate versions of the world through descriptions and accounts (see also Wetherell, 2003). Thus, while people are seen as active users of language who

² In Finnish, multiculturalism is *monikulttuurisuus* of which we used the stem *monikulttuuri** in the search.

construct their realities through interaction, they are also limited by using only those shared resources that are available to them.

While these general principles guide all of the analyses of this research, there are three specific approaches that align with these principles and that were used to answer the research questions of this research: the qualitative attitude approach (QAA), critical discursive psychology (CPD), and frame analysis (FA).

5.2.1 STUDY I: QUALITATIVE ATTITUDE APPROACH

The analysis of the focus group discussions of Study I followed the principles and practical guidelines of the QAA (Vesala & Rantanen, 2007). The approach aligns with the basic principles of DP, and also draws from rhetorical social psychology (Billig, 1996) to study attitudes as evaluative practices that enable taking positions and positioning others in the social world. While there are influential accounts within DP that refute the study of attitudes in the field (Potter, 1998), others have argued that instead of abandoning the concept, its definition and scope should be widened to touch upon the discursive and rhetorical nature of attitudes (Rantanen & Vesala, 1999; Wiggins, 2016). In QAA, attitudes are conceptualised as communicative acts through which an object is evaluated on a dimension by a subject (Vesala & Rantanen, 2007 p. 39).

The premise of the QAA is that thinking and interaction are inherently argumentative, evolving through tensions between two opposing arguments (Billig, 1996); the aim of this approach is to study these tensions. While making theoretical claims, the QAA also outlines guidelines for data-generation and for the analytic procedure. When generating discussion data to be analysed from this perspective, participants are often asked to comment upon prompts relevant for the topic. In the case of Study I, the prompts were the seven statements chosen from the MIS (Berry & Kalin, 1995) that I presented in section 4.1.

The analytic procedure is divided into two phases. The first phase is to structure the data according to the variation of evaluative stances and their justifications. In other words, the first step of analysis is to identify the stances taken in response to each prompt, and categorise them, for example into positive, negative, and reserved evaluations. The second phase is to move beyond the prompts and identify recurring patterns regarding the objects, subjects, and the dimensions of evaluation. In other words, this phase requires identifying similarities and differences from the data, and interpreting them from the perspective of attitudes outlined above. The interpretative analysis is continued by interpreting the data with other analytic tools (Vesala & Rantanen, 2007). In Study I, the second round of interpretative reading of the data aimed to identify the resources of argumentation—the often taken-for-granted, socially shared assumptions that enabled the participants to justify their stances (cf. Billig, 1996).

5.2.2 STUDIES II AND III: CRITICAL DISCURSIVE PSYCHOLOGY

The analysis of Studies II and III proceeded from carefully reading the discussion transcripts, to the interpretative phase, in which we used two key concepts of critical discursive psychology (CDP; e.g. S. Taylor, 2001; Wetherell, 1998; Wetherell & Edley, 1999): interpretative repertoires and ideological dilemmas. Before going into detail about these tools, let us briefly discuss the perspective of CDP in relation to the wider field of DP.

CDP is an analytic approach that can be seen as akin to but diverging from DP, in that it considers all discourse as intertwined with their societal, cultural, and historical context (Edley, 2001; Wetherell, 1998). It aims to examine discourse on both macro and micro levels of interaction, which is why it has also been called a synthetic approach (Wetherell, 1998; Wetherell & Edley, 1999) to studying discourse. CDP focuses on examining recurring patterns of talk, the tensions between those patterns, and the ways in which they allow speakers to position themselves in relation to the social world as products of historically- and culturally-formed discursive resources. In other words, CDP examines “the paradoxical relationship that exists between discourse and the speaking subject” (S. Taylor, 2001 p. 190). In order to examine that relationship, an analyst can employ the concepts of interpretative repertoires and ideological dilemmas.

The concept of interpretative repertoire was first used as an analytic tool to structure the ways in which scientists’ talk about their work (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984). It was introduced to social psychology by Potter and Wetherell (1987). Interpretative repertoires can be characterised as recurring patterns of talk that are part of culturally-shared common sense, and can be used to account for and organise phenomena of the social world (Potter & Wetherell, 1987; S. Taylor, 2001). They are discursive resources, such as figures of speech and metaphors that a speaker can employ to build descriptions, arguments, and evaluations of events and objects (van den Berg, 2003; Wetherell & Potter, 1992).

The concept of ideological dilemma was originally coined by Billig and his colleagues (1988) to develop an approach to study lived ideologies—“the society’s way of life” (p. 27)—or the common sense that guides the ways in which people go about their lives. In contrast to intellectual ideologies that are often thought of as coherent and systematic products of professional thinkers, lived ideologies contain tensions and contradictions that make them inherently dilemmatic (Billig et al., 1988). In short, ideological dilemmas reveal those tensions.

By interpreting the data using both of these concepts, an analyst can tap into both the coherence and contradictions of discourse. While interpretative repertoires enable the mapping of similarities and differences of the data so as to organise them into coherent wholes, the analyst can use ideological dilemmas to tackle the contradictory and fragmented elements of discourse. However, despite these different functions, both concepts aim to tap into the cultural logic used to make sense of the social world. In other words, instead

of examining only the immediate interaction situation, both interpretative repertoires and ideological dilemmas postulate that interaction and argumentation are always a part of wider cultural, historical, and societal settings. They thus offer two perspectives on the lay discourse as situated in both micro and macro contexts.

5.2.3 STUDY IV: FRAME ANALYSIS

In Study IV, the discursive approach is complemented by a frame analytic reading of online discussions. Frame analysis (FA; Goffman, 1974) has been interpreted in different ways aligning with both cognitive and communicative theorisations (Denzin, Keller, & Goffman, 1981; Gonos, 1977; Peräkylä, 1990; Snow, 2004). In order to maintain coherence with the discursive approach, we draw from the ethnomethodological interpretation of FA, which understands frames as culturally embedded resources for making sense of situations, organising experiences, and interpreting the social world (Peräkylä, 1990). Following this conceptualisation, the concept of the frame resembles that of interpretative repertoires (Niska, 2015). However, in examining the ways in which different interpretations of an act or action are produced, frame analysis provides an apt approach because it offers analytic tools for a detailed analysis of the meaning-making processes used to answer the question: “what is it that is going on” (Goffman, 1974 p. 8), as well as concepts to examine the dynamics between different answers to this question.

For the purpose of Study IV, three analytic tools of FA were employed to examine the dynamics between different frames. The first tool is the conceptualisation of primary and secondary frames that enables distinguishing between giving meaning to previously meaningless aspects of social reality (primary frame), and altering those meanings by re-framing (secondary frame) (Goffman, 1974 p. 21). For example, when a politician writes an anti-multiculturalist statement on social media, a primary frame could be to interpret it as an act of political persuasion or mobilisation. However, this interpretation could be contested by re-framing the act as a joke.

The second concept used in Study IV is regrounding, which refers to altering the framing of an action by appealing to the motives for an act. An example of regrounding would be to re-frame the aforementioned act of political persuasion as a stunt, the aim of which is to divert attention away from something else that is going on. In other words, by regrounding an act, its meaning is subtly altered from how it was previously framed by invoking the reasons for that act.

The third concept, frame dispute, refers to participants of a situation accusing others of misframing—the intentional or unintentional use of incorrect frames. It is important to note that with discursive analysis, the notion of a “correct” frame is bracketed; the analyst does not take a stance on such an issue, however, accusations of misframing can be analysed as rhetorical moves that can serve different interactional functions.

To conclude, the three approaches that are used to complement the DP perspective in this research offer different ways to approach social texts. Importantly, however, they all align with the social constructionist approach employed in this study. QAA offers an analytic strategy to examine the evaluative practices and patterns of argumentation used to make sense of multiculturalism. CDP enables focussing on recurring patterns of talk, as well as the controversial elements of the lay discourse of multiculturalism. The CDP orientation to studying discourse as socially situated is employed in all the studies of this project. FA, for one, permits the examining of dynamics between different interpretations offered for social action.

One way to sum up these analytic procedures as well as the theoretical and methodological approaches is to state that the analyses of all the studies started with careful reading of the data, and proceeded with preliminary coding that allowed the analyst(s) to identify the recurring patterns of argumentation—the similarities and differences in the data. The analysis was completed via interpretative reading, in which theoretical concepts were used to examine the data to answer the research questions.

6 FINDINGS

In order to examine the lay discourse of multiculturalism in Finland, this research examined focus group and online discussions from different analytic perspectives, all aligning with the principles of discursive psychology. While the analytic procedures and the results of these analyses are reported in detail in the separate articles (Studies I-IV), in this chapter, I summarise the main findings of each study.

6.1 NATIONALISM AND CULTURAL ESSENTIALISM AS ARGUMENTATIVE RESOURCES WHEN DISCUSSING MULTICULTURALISM

The research project started with an examination of evaluations of multiculturalism prompted by a widely used definition of multiculturalism, the MIS (Berry & Kalin, 1995). In this study, I explored two kinds of data sets that were both generated among people identifying as majority Finns. First, I conducted a descriptive examination of the evaluations of multiculturalism gathered in a survey. In the qualitative analysis of focus group discussions, I then employed QAA to examine how multiculturalism was discursively constructed as an object of positive and negative evaluation. In other words, the objective for the qualitative analysis was informed by the examination of the survey data.

Both of these data sets were analysed by focusing on interaction, so as not to reveal participants' cognitive attitudes towards multiculturalism, but to examine their negotiations of multiculturalism. Our purpose was to examine participants' evaluation practices when commenting on the statements in a survey, and the meanings assigned to multiculturalism when discussing it in a focus group.

As discussed in section 5.1.1, the participants evaluated the MIS items on a five-point Likert scale, in which option 1 marked strong disagreement, option 3 marked a neutral stance, and 5 marked strong agreement with the statement. The survey responses were descriptively analysed by focussing on the response frequencies of each statement in these response alternatives see (Table 1). This examination revealed that most of the items were predominantly evaluated by using the midpoints (2–4) of the scale, indicating either disinterest, ambiguities or difficulties to take a stance on the items. We interpreted this finding as indicating complexities and tensions related to multiculturalism, which thus required a qualitative analysis of the ways in which people evaluate the term. We then invited participants of the survey, as well as others defining themselves as “Finns”, to discuss multiculturalism in a focus group setting.

Table 1. *Items of the MIS with their response frequencies, means and standard deviations..*

	N	M	SD	Strogly disagree (1) (%)	Strongly agree (5) (%)
1. Finns should accept that Finnish society consists of different ethnic groups.*	334	3.96	1.09	4.2	35.8
2. Ethnic minorities should be helped in preserving their cultural heritage in Finland.*	332	3.32	1.23	9.6	17.1
3. It is best for Finland if all people forget their different ethnic and cultural backgrounds as soon as possible.*	334	2.18	1.10	33.4	3.3
4. A society that has a variety of different ethnic and cultural groups is more able to tackle new problems as they occur.*	333	3.03	1.14	12.3	8.4
5. The unity of Finland is weakened by people of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds sticking to their old ways.*	334	3.04	1.21	10.7	12.8
6. If people of different ethnic and cultural origins want to keep their own culture, they should keep it to themselves.	334	2.62	1.22	19.8	9.0

The focus group discussions were analysed by using the QAA (see section 5.2.1), enabling the detailed examination of argumentations. As a result of the first phase of analysis, we identified two objects of evaluation—cultural

diversity and cultural maintenance—that were both evaluated negatively and positively. As a result of the interpretative reading, we identified two argumentative resources that enabled the construction of these attitude objects: cultural essentialism and nationalism.

When evaluating cultural diversity, the participants mainly drew on cultural essentialist argumentation (Verkuyten, 2003), which is based on an idea that culture profoundly defines people, and, thus, people from different cultures are inherently different. In our data, cultural essentialism was used to argue that as a result of migration, there are people in Finland who are essentially different than the majority Finns in terms of values and practices. This difference was mostly evaluated as causing problems, but also as a resource from which Finns and Finnish society can benefit.

Essentialist arguments have been found to provide justifications for arguing for and against minority rights (Verkuyten, 2003), and this was also the case in this data. The second attitude object, cultural maintenance, was identified on the basis of recurring references that the participants made to culture as roots, which provide a sense of belonging and origin for all human beings. In these accounts, essentialist arguments were used to posit that “we” majority Finns should allow immigrant cultural maintenance in order to ensure their wellbeing.

While cultural essentialism enabled the participants to construct differences between themselves and immigrants, nationalist argumentation enabled them to construct the majority as the norm against which immigrants are compared. In particular, certain comments—in which cultural diversity and cultural maintenance were evaluated as problems, and immigrants’ assimilation was demanded—were justified by the natural and self-evident priority of the “native people” over immigrants.

While revealing the multifaceted and contradictory ways in which multiculturalism was evaluated, Study I showed that both negative and positive evaluations of multiculturalism can draw from cultural essentialist argumentation, and that even when voicing positive stances towards multiculturalism, the hierarchical relations between majority and immigrants were often treated as a self-evident state of affairs. Multiculturalism, thus, was seen to offer the majority members a tool to justify both their dominant position and the unequal status quo.

In addition to identifying the resources of argumentation used in evaluating multiculturalism, Study I also commented on the ramifications of analysing attitudes towards multiculturalism by using a survey design. While acknowledging that there are important insights that such studies can offer, we argued that their potential to capture the controversial and ambiguous nature of the evaluation process is limited.

6.2 DISCURSIVE PATTERNS USED BY MINORITY AND MAJORITY MEMBERS TO NORMALISE AND CRITICISE HIERARCHICAL INTERGROUP RELATIONS

In Study II, the scope was broadened to examine how multiculturalism was discursively constructed and accounted for in focus group discussions among majority and minority Finns. In the analysis, the concept of interpretative repertoire was employed to identify the recurring patterns of talk in focus group discussions of multiculturalism. More specifically, the focus was on the stretches of talk in which the participants addressed the ways in which intergroup relations and ethnocultural diversity should be managed in Finland—that is, the question to which multicultural ideology provides one answer. In these accounts, the participants discussed how immigrants and the majority should encounter and treat each other, as well as the rights and responsibilities assigned to different groups. As a result, four interpretative repertoires of multiculturalism were identified.

We named the first repertoire as the repertoire of polite guests. It evolved around the proverb, ‘when in Rome, do as the Romans do’, and was used to present as problematic traditions and practices that differ from those of the majority, especially if enacted in public. Emphasised within this repertoire was the immigrant’s responsibility to show respect towards their hosts (i.e. majority Finns), and to assimilate to the majority society.

When using this repertoire, it was typical for the participants to emphasise that migration is voluntary, and to present assimilation as the preferred way of organising relations between immigrants and the majority. Similarly, Verkuyten’s (2005b) research on Dutch majority members’ immigration talk showed that stressing the migrant’s personal choice of migrating was related to supporting assimilation.

In contrast to the repertoire of polite guests which emphasised the importance of immigrants’ assimilation, the second interpretative repertoire—the repertoire of securing the majority culture—was used to account for whether and to what extent the majority should accommodate minority cultures. This was typically employed by either referring to the importance of protecting Finnish traditions, or by emphasising that the Finns are entitled to maintain their way of life. Multiculturalism and diversity were, thus, oriented towards posing a threat for the majority.

Previous research on the lay discourse has demonstrated that among majority populations, multiculturalism is often discussed as a threat (Lyons et al., 2010; Verkuyten, 2004). These repertoires align with the threat talk. Interestingly, in our data it was not only majority members, but also Russian- and Estonian- speaking minority members who emphasised the importance of protecting the majority culture. One explanation could be that for immigrants, this repertoire serves to show solidarity towards the hosts and distance themselves from more stigmatised immigrant groups.

The third interpretative repertoire was named the repertoire of stigmatising multiculturalism. It was used to criticise multicultural ideology and multiculturalist practices as exposing immigrants to essentialising treatment and othering in institutional and everyday encounters. This repertoire was only used by minority participants, and it enabled them to claim the right to choose the services one needs, instead of immigrants being offered services targeted for them by default. It also allowed the minority Finnish participants to abandon the position of a powerless subject facing multicultural procedures and practices, and to present themselves as actors capable of criticising those practices. The repertoire of stigmatising multiculturalism also brought to the fore when discussing how well-intentioned multiculturalist practices (which are supposed to benefit immigrants) can in practice maintain hierarchical relations and inequalities between the majority and immigrants.

The fourth repertoire—the repertoire of individualism—allowed the participants to construct a universal ideal or a guideline to treat people in general as individuals, instead of representatives of different groups or categories. The repertoire of individualism was used in discussions among the majority as well as immigrants. It evolved around the idea of encountering “a person as a person”, and in the discussions, different variants of this idea were used, such as “it is the people that count” (discussion 5), “every person has their own personality” (discussion 1), and “people are individuals” (discussion 7).

Similar to the repertoire of stigmatising multiculturalism, the repertoire of individualism was used to resist treating people as representatives of groups or categories, as well as to oppose multiculturalism. Despite these similarities, the two repertoires were separated based on different discursive tools and vocabulary, as well as their different focus. The repertoire of individualism was used to construct an ideal of how people should generally orient themselves towards others as individuals, instead of criticising specific practices or politics, which was the case in the repertoire of stigmatising multiculturalism.

The four interpretative repertoires I identified from the data can be formed into two pairs. Repertoires of polite guests and securing the majority culture both address intergroup relations as inherently hierarchical, placing immigrants in an unmistakably subordinate position compared to the majority Finns. In this sense, these repertoires align with the results of Study I in revealing how multiculturalism was harnessed to protect the majority, instead of ensuring the minority’s rights, and recognising their ethnic and cultural diversity. The repertoires of stigmatising multiculturalism and individualism were used to criticise multiculturalism and related practices in a different way, as forcing immigrants into a narrowly defined role, and treating them only as representatives of their ethnic, cultural, or religious groups. The four repertoires can also be seen to contradict or criticize the tenets of the so-called official definition of multiculturalism—the acceptance of and support for ethnocultural diversity.

6.3 THE IDEOLOGICAL DILEMMA OF CONFORMITY VERSUS MAINTENANCE IN NEGOTIATIONS OF CULTURAL CITIZENSHIP

As Study II showed, the negotiations around who can be considered a full member of a society are central to the ways in which majority and minority members make sense of multiculturalism. In Study III, the analysis of the focus group data examined in Study II was continued by focussing on the negotiations of cultural citizenship, i.e. the ways in which minority and majority Finns accounted for immigrants' possibilities to become members of Finnish society. In this study, cultural citizenship was approached as referring to the ways in which participation in society and claims for its full membership are accommodated through cultural diversity (Hopkins & Blackwood, 2011; Wang, 2013). Given that the normative multiculturalism of philosophical discussions defines the recognition and acceptance of ethnic and cultural diversity as a path to equal participation and belonging (e.g. Kymlicka, 1995; Taylor, 1992), negotiations of cultural citizenship are at its heart.

In the analysis, the focus was on the stretches of talk discussing the proverb, "when in Rome, do as the Romans do". While this was one of the prompts used in the interviews, it was also often brought up by the participants before it was introduced to them. By focussing on these parts of the data, this study elaborates on the controversial aspects related to the interpretative repertoires of polite guests and securing the majority culture identified in Study II.

The negotiation concerning immigrants' possibilities of becoming full members of Finnish society evolved around the ideological dilemma between conformity versus maintenance, that is, the question of whether it is possible to maintain and promote traditions, practices, or identities different from the majority, and become recognized as a full member of society. While comments that both supported and opposed conformity as an ideal way to claim cultural citizenship were identified and examined, the comments supporting demands for conformity were more typical in the data. Conformity-supporting comments were also a part of the interpretative repertoires of polite guests and securing the majority culture in presenting "Finnish" culture and traditions as the norm immigrants should respect and abide by.

The results show that supporting and challenging conformity served different functions, depending on whether the speaker could claim a majority position or not. For majority Finns, supporting immigrants' conformity as a way to become a member of Finnish society, served to justify the groups' own dominant position. Challenging conformity, for one, was seen to allow the presenting of oneself as non-prejudiced and tolerant (Andreouli & Dashtipour, 2014). For minority Finns, claiming that conformity, especially in public spaces, is an immigrants' responsibility, and enables aligning with the majority and playing the part of "a good immigrant" (cf. Andreouli & Dashtipour, 2014).

Even though negotiations of cultural citizenship did not significantly differ between majority and minority groups, the argumentation of participants identifying as members of the Somali community stood out from the rest of the data. Participants with a Somali background were the only ones constructing cultural citizenship in Finland as exclusively ascribed to native Finns. We argued that while conformity-supporting arguments enabled immigrants with Russian or Estonian backgrounds to align with the majority, and even avoid being labelled as an immigrant, this was not the case for immigrants with Somali background. For a racialised and marginalised minority, challenging the demands of conformity could be a more feasible way towards cultural citizenship.

A comment made by a participant called Amran was an example of the versatile negotiations of cultural citizenship within the data (see section 7.5). In her account, regardless of constructing Finnish cultural citizenship as impossible for her to obtain as a Somali, Amran claims a right to get by, live, and study while being herself and not having to change. While Amran's comment resonates with interpretative repertoires of stigmatizing multiculturalism and individualism, we regarded this strong, unapologetic account as a call for equal, inclusive cultural citizenship.

Approaching multiculturalism from the perspective of cultural citizenship enables sketching new aspects to the ways in which it can be used to account for intergroup relations. Based on the results of this study, cultural citizenship claims highlight that while full membership and participation are evaluated as important for immigrants, there is a tension between who can define their terms and conditions. Balancing between demands to conform (i.e. demands of assimilation) and the right not to conform reveals the power of the majority to dictate the boundaries of immigrants' belonging and participation to society. These boundaries support or hinder immigrants' possibilities for action, and in this way, have ramifications for hierarchies not only between the majority and immigrants, but also between different immigrant groups.

6.4 DEBATING MULTICULTURALISM ONLINE: THE LAY DISCOURSE IN THE NEXUS OF POLITICAL AND MEDIA DISCOURSES

Study IV aimed to complement the perspective on the lay discourse of multiculturalism obtained from Studies I–III by moving away from face to face interaction, to an online environment. The previous studies examined the accounts of multiculturalism constructed in an interview situation as a response to prompts provided by researchers. In this study, the focus is on the discourse prompted by an act of anti-multiculturalist political mobilisation. By focussing on the social media context and on a specific societal discussion, the aim was to explore the interplay between public and lay discourses, and to

contribute to the discussion on the relationship between the multiculturalism and political anti-immigration discourses (e.g. Lentin & Titley, 2011).

The focus of the analysis was on the ways in which users of Suomi24, took part in a heated societal debate which evolved around an anti-multiculturalist Facebook post written by Olli Immonen, an MP the FP. In this post, Immonen called multiculturalism a nightmare, and invited the Finns to fight against it. By combining frame analytic and a DP approaches, the meaning-making processes emerging in Suomi24 were examined as situated in their societal context.

The analysis showed that the discourse of Suomi24 evolved in interaction with the mainstream media discussion widely condemning Immonen's act. With frame analysis, we examined how the participants entered this debate and identified a frame dispute between two conflicting framings for Immonen's act: the frame of hate speech (FHS), and the frame of normal political conduct (FNPC). With the FHS, Immonen's act of writing and publishing the anti-multiculturalist post was interpreted as being motivated by racism. With the FNPC, this interpretation was contested. While both framings were identified in Suomi24, FNPC was more dominant in the data. A typical way to participate in this Suomi24 debate was to argue that Immonen's act was not motivated by racism or anti-immigrant sentiments—as claimed by those framing it as hate speech—but as normal, acceptable behaviour for a politician.

While framing Immonen's act as normal political conduct, the participants offered different interpretations for Immonen's act, including specifying its motives. In frame analysis, these interpretations are approached as a form of subtly altering a frame, and called regroundings. Identifying the regroundings enabled us to examine the nuances of the meaning-making processes in the data.

Two regroundings of the FNPC were identified. With one, Immonen's act was seen as serving the interests of the Finnish nation, and with the other, the act was seen as serving the FP. By regrounding Immonen's act as serving the interests of the Finnish nation, multiculturalism was constructed as a threat, and the proponents of multiculturalism as irrational and naïve. The regrounding of Immonen's act as serving the FP revealed that while FNPC was typically used to normalise Immonen's anti-multiculturalist act and construct multiculturalism as a threat for Finns, this was not always the case. In contrast, using FNPC, and regrounding Immonen's act as serving the interests of the FP, enabled participants to present Immonen's act as a strategic political move, and distance it from the anti-immigration motive.

The discursive analysis, for one, revealed that the discourse of Suomi24 drew heavily on the rhetoric of the anti-immigration movement in Finland. With FNPC, Immonen was often presented as an exemplary politician who has the courage to speak out about the perils of multiculturalism, despite the taboo against it upheld by the "tolerants" or the "flowerhat aunties". Thus, in line with earlier research on the political rhetoric of the FP (Sakki & Pettersson,

2016), the construction of multiculturalism as a threat was intertwined with the discursive othering of the proponents of multiculturalism, and the opponents of anti-immigration politics. By discursively constructing the “tolerants” as irrational people aiming to silence the rational discussion on multiculturalism, the discourse of the anti-immigration movement was normalised and legitimated.

Study IV demonstrated that the discourse of multiculturalism in Suomi24 evolved in relation to the mainstream media discourse and the anti-immigration discourse. While previous research has shown that anti-immigration movements have been able to steer the societal discussion on immigration in Finland (Horsti & Nikunen, 2013), this analysis reveals the dynamics between opposing framings for anti-immigration political persuasion, and the meaning-making processes that enable normalising and mainstreaming the anti-immigration discourse.

Study IV underlines the importance of studying the online discourse of multiculturalism. The increasing significance of social media in political, and everyday lives have been extensively discussed in the social sciences (e.g. Mazzoleni, 2008; McCay-Peet & Quan-Haase, 2017; Mossberger et al., 2008; Papacharissi, 2008). The results of this study align with these discussions, and provide further evidence about the ways in which online discourse is embedded in and intertwined with societal debates. Thus, based on these findings, I argue that understanding the dynamics of the online discourse of multiculturalism is essential in order to make sense of multiculturalism as a lived and intellectual ideology offline.

In comparison to the focus group data, the online discussions were more aggressive, and contained explicit and extremely dehumanising characterisations of immigrants. This speaks of the absence of the norm against prejudice, discussed in previous research on online discourses (Billig, 1988; Goodman & Rowe, 2014). However, even though the dominant pattern of talk in Suomi24 discussions on multiculturalism constructed it as a threat for Finns and justified Immonen’s act, there were also comments challenging this talk, for example with the FHS. In other words, the results also point towards the potential for social media to act as a space for political deliberation (cf. Siaperä, 2006).

Study IV strengthens the argument Studies I and II posit of multiculturalism being a tool to construct opposition between immigrants and majority members, and takes this further. The findings show that not only is multiculturalism used to justify intergroup hierarchies or the primacy of the majority, but it is a powerful discursive tool in political anti-immigrant mobilisation, and that the negotiations of multiculturalism serve to spread the political anti-immigration discourse to the lay discussions. It should also be noted that even though this analysis was confined to online discussions, considering their wider social context shows that the debate concerning multiculturalism escalated in a protest against racism and anti-immigration

discourse. Multiculturalism, thus, can also ignite collective action to support minority rights and equality.

7 DISCUSSION

This research examined the lay discourse of multiculturalism among majority and minority group members in Finland. Instead of trying to find out whether multiculturalism has failed or whether it flourishes in Finland, the aim of this research was to explore multiculturalism as a discursive tool that can serve various purposes when discussing immigration and ethnocultural diversity. More specifically, my aim was to study how multiculturalism was discursively configured as an object of evaluation and negotiation, and how it was used to construct, negotiate, and manage intergroup relations. This research interest entails that multiculturalism was examined both as a term and as a discursive phenomenon. Thus, while I analysed the meanings attached to multiculturalism and the ways in which the participants of the studies made sense of multiculturalism as a term, my analytic interest extended beyond those meanings to the cultural resources drawn upon when accounting for multiculturalism, its functions, and the socially situated nature of those accounts.

With this final chapter, I aim to tie together the results of Studies I–IV to clarify my answer to the aforementioned general research question of this thesis. I will also critically reflect upon the limitations and ethical issues of this research. Finally, I will offer my suggestions for future research and practical implications, before ending with brief concluding remarks regarding the future of multiculturalism.

7.1 THREE CONSTRUCTIONS OF MULTICULTURALISM

Due to the discursive nature of this research project and the aim to approach multiculturalism as a lived ideology (Billig et al., 1988), I was interested in the ways in which participants oriented themselves towards the concept of multiculturalism, how they made sense of it, and how they used it to account for intergroup relations. As will be discussed, the constructions of multiculturalism used and negotiated in the data do not necessarily depict multiculturalism as is customary in political philosophy (e.g. Kymlicka, 1995; Taylor, 1992) or social psychology (e.g. Berry, 2011; Verkuyten, 2007), that is, as an ideology with related practices that aim to recognise and offer support for cultural diversity. In fact, with the word multiculturalism, the participants often referred to either demographic ethnocultural diversity in general, or more specifically to immigrants—Muslims or Somalis—and the only comments addressing normative multiculturalism then criticised it for cultural essentialism. This finding calls into question the role of normative multiculturalism in the discourse of ordinary minority and majority Finns. Furthermore, this study highlights the dilemmatic aspects of multiculturalism,

and thus suggests that making claims about its success or failure requires critical examinations of the meanings attached to it.

In order to reflect the findings of the four studies together and to clarify my answer to the general aim of this research, let us first consider how multiculturalism was discursively configured as an object of evaluation and negotiation. To do this, I name three constructions of multiculturalism that were used in the discussions analysed in this research. The first construction is multiculturalism as a threat for the majority lifestyle, culture, and institutions. The second construction is valuable multiculturalism, and the third is limiting multiculturalism. While I acknowledge that these constructions in themselves are not surprising nor novel (see e.g. Verkuyten, 2004), I hope to be able to highlight the contributions of this research by discussing the constructions of multiculturalism as serving different discursive functions, and as revealing the cultural logics that enable negotiating and managing intergroup relations in the lay discourse. By discussing these constructions, their functions, and the shared cultural resources enabling them, I also hope to demonstrate the interplay between the minority and majority discourses of intergroup relations.

In his analysis of Dutch majority members' discussions on multiculturalism, Verkuyten (2004) identified positive and negative constructions of multiculturalism. The negative constructions often relied on the language of threat concerning the majority identity and culture. The construction of multiculturalism as a threat, thus, is not a new finding. In the present research, the threat construction was used when the participants of the focus groups made comments that were categorised as negative evaluations of cultural diversity (Study I), as the interpretative repertoires of polite guests or securing the majority culture (Study II), or as forming a pattern of talk favoring immigrants' conformity (Study III). The threat construction also dominated the online discussions in which overtly racist and derogatory descriptions of immigrants were voiced to support and normalise anti-multiculturalist political persuasions (Study IV).

In other words, the threat construction enabled the participants to (re)produce the construction of ethnocultural diversity and immigrants' cultural maintenance as a threat for the majority, that could then be managed by demanding immigrants' assimilation (also Antonsich, 2012; Bowskill et al., 2007; Lyons et al., 2010). It was used to justify the hierarchical relations between the majority and immigrants, and the exclusionary constructions of Finnish cultural citizenship. Needless to say, this construction was also used to oppose immigration, and position the maintenance of traditions, practices, or identities constructed as different from (or even opposing) the majority to be a threat. Study IV demonstrated that threat construction was mobilised to advance and normalise the anti-immigration political agenda in social media discussions on multiculturalism.

Surprisingly, the threat construction was also widely used by minority participants, for whom this talk enabled aligning oneself with the majority,

conforming to the role of a “good immigrant”, and claiming cultural citizenship. While previous research has shown that the majority plays a role in minority identity construction (Merino & Tileagă, 2011; Varjonen et al., 2013) this finding shows that the ways in which immigrants can negotiate their position in society and their relations to the majority are also tightly intertwined with the majority discourse.

However, there is another function of threat construction, namely that it enabled the participants to represent reality (cf. Potter, 1996), or more specifically, the state of intergroup relations in Finland. The threat construction was often used in accounts that were discursively manufactured as neutral and rational descriptions of intergroup relations. By using different discursive devices—such as disclaimers, details, and witnesses—the participants of my research constructed their accounts as rational descriptions or a reality in which increasing immigration causes the majority Finns to worry about their culture and identity, and to prepare to defend their “way of life”. Verkuyten (2004) also noticed that even though the negative construction of multiculturalism was used to bring up emotions (such as fear or anxiety), the worried comments were often discursively configured as rational and objective accounts of the world. The online and offline discussions on multiculturalism, thus, provided the research participants with a discursive space in which they could account for the (problematic) relations between the majority and immigrants.

The participants also accounted for multiculturalism as a positive thing. The construction of valuable multiculturalism was identified and discussed in Study I, which reported on majority Finns’ positive evaluations of cultural diversity and cultural maintenance. The positive evaluations of cultural diversity resemble the results of Verkuyten’s study in the sense that multiculturalism was evaluated as making society “more interesting” due to increasing cultural diversity. In this pattern of talk, cultural diversity is presented as something that the majority members can learn from, as long as they are willing to open their eyes and let go of their prejudices (cf. Verkuyten, 2004). However, this construction also enabled the presenting of immigrants as passive carriers of difference, instead of active or equal societal actors who could make claims and demand change.

The positive evaluations of cultural maintenance, for one, drew on a “culture as roots” rhetoric that was used to argue for the universal importance of cultural maintenance, and didn’t apply only to immigrants and other minorities, but also to the majority. As this rhetoric was regarded as demonstrating commonalities between majority Finns and immigrants, it could have been interpreted as functioning to construct intergroup solidarity (e.g. Kirkwood, 2017). However, in Study I, this pattern of talk was interpreted as drawing from intergroup hierarchies, as it bore a resemblance to the interpretative repertoire of culture fostering identified by Wetherell and Potter (1988), who studied the majority discourse in 1980s New Zealand. Like the repertoire of culture fostering, the “culture as roots” rhetoric also constructed

minorities' cultural maintenance as something that can happen as a gesture of goodwill, or as solidarity amongst the majority.

Drawing from these two patterns of talk, the construction of valuable multiculturalism aligns with the idea of a politics of recognition, in the sense that cultural difference is seen as valuable and worth maintaining (Taylor, 1992). However, it also draws from cultural essentialism (Verkuyten, 2003) and hierarchical relations between the majority and immigrants. It is important to note that valuable multiculturalism was only used in the discussions held among the majority. This is noteworthy because it underlines the absence of the the main tenet of normative multiculturalism—to ensure equal participation and citizenship through recognition of minority rights—in the participants' discourse. While valuable multiculturalism enabled the majority speakers to present themselves as open-minded people, it was not used to call for immigrants' rights to cultural maintenance. Instead, the construction of limiting multiculturalism was used to challenge cultural essentialism and assimilation demands.

The construction of limiting multiculturalism can be identified in Study II in the interpretative repertoire of stigmatising multiculturalism, and in Study III in the way cultural citizenship was claimed by challenging the demands of conformity. This construction of multiculturalism can be seen as a critique of multicultural ideology and practices as formulated in the normative philosophical work of Kymlicka (1995) and Taylor (1992), both of whom argue for the recognition of cultural difference. With the construction of limiting multiculturalism, the minority participants of Studies II and III contested the politics and practices of recognition, and claimed a right to decide whether or not they were to be treated as “multicultural people”. While this construction echoes the critique of multiculturalism as essentialising cultural difference (cf. Barry, 2002; Benhabib, 2002), it can also be seen as a way of claiming an inclusive citizenship (Bloemraad, 2015; Sindic, 2011) that would equally accommodate majority and minority members. Ironically, it was the critique towards normative multiculturalism that allowed the minority participants to call for equal recognition and rights.

Thus, in the discussions examined in this study, three constructions of multiculturalism were used to account for intergroup relations, of which only one construction—valuable multiculturalism—aligns with the premises of normative multiculturalism. However, as a result of critical examination, its value in promoting multiculturalism as outlined in political philosophy (Kymlicka, 1995, 2012) or in social psychology (Berry, 2011; Verkuyten, 2007) can also be questioned. Does this mean that multiculturalism has failed in Finland? That it has been rejected among the majority and immigrants? I cannot make such a claim in this research project, because I did not seek to examine the state of multicultural ideology in Finland. I did not study practices or policies based on multiculturalism, nor did I examine the inner, cognitive attitudes that ordinary people living in Finland might hold towards it. Instead, this research sought to study the shared ways of making sense of

multiculturalism—in practical terms, ethnocultural diversity, immigration, and intergroup relations in Finland. It thus focussed on the social contexts in which these online and offline discussions took place, and the ways in which people in these contexts use the shared discursive resources available to them to make sense of multiculturalism.

Instead of stating the failure of multiculturalism, I argue for the success of the crisis of multiculturalism discourse. This discourse enables contesting intergroup solidarity, equality and human rights. It is intertwined with anti-immigration political rhetoric and it has been so widely disseminated in the political and media discourse that it has grown strong roots in the discourse of intergroup relations (Lentin & Titley, 2011). The success of this discourse shows in the results of this research according to which the main function of multiculturalism is to justify the dominant position of the majority and to safeguard it against the threat of diversity. Thus, I argue that the crisis of multiculturalism discourse has become part of the cultural repository, or the common sense used to account for intergroup relations and diversity.

However, lived multiculturalism has nuances. It is not just talk about a threat or crisis. What needs to be considered are the other functions of multiculturalism talk, such as it serving as a tool for constructing the identity of an open-minded person. As discussed above, the construction of valuable multiculturalism that was only used among the majority participants of Study I, enabled positive accounts of multiculturalism. The pattern of talk regarding “culture as roots” particularly enabled the taking of a position as a benevolent majority member who is willing to allow immigrants to maintain at least some parts of “their culture”. However, this did not stop the participants from expressing a worry over losing “the Finnish identity” in the face of increasing immigration. This observation highlights the value of discursive social psychological studies on complex and dilemmatic issues, like multiculturalism. In moving the analytic attention away from the attitudes or behaviours of the individual, this analytic perspective allows the examination of the ways in which the political and cultural intertwine with the personal, for example how commonplace arguments drawing from anti-immigration political rhetoric become a part of how people account for their stances on multiculturalism.

In this research, the interplay between the political and lay discourse is most clearly shown in Study IV. The ways in which anti-immigration political rhetoric was circulated and normalised online by framing it as normal political conduct, show the discourse of a crisis of multiculturalism in action. The meaning-making processes normalising anti-multiculturalist political rhetoric show how it becomes a part of the cultural repertoire used to make sense of immigration and ethnocultural diversity in the lay discourse. Moreover, due to the affordances of social media, ordinary people now have a direct channel to publicly address the political elite (cf. Papacharissi, 2008). Thus, if a politician writes an anti-multiculturalist Facebook post on a Saturday night, not only can there be hundreds of comments praising and lambasting it by Sunday

morning, those comments can also set the agenda of public discussion on the topic. This is why studying the discursive dynamics of social media discussions is important. However, as noted, the crisis discourse was not confined to the online sphere. The rise of anti-immigration politics manifests itself also in the focus group data in the form of the previously discussed construction of threatening multiculturalism.

A counterpart for this discourse can be found in the construction of limiting multiculturalism, that has a focal point in critical multiculturalist stances that share common ground with anti-racist and feminist political movements (Lentin & Titley, 2011). The participants of this research used the construction of limiting multiculturalism to claim a right to participate in society equal to those members who do not have to assimilate in order to belong. While this construction was rather rarely used by minority participants, and even less among the majority, it shows that critical perspectives towards seemingly tolerant practices and policies can guide a multiculturalism that is more sensitive to the needs of those it is supposed to serve.

To conclude, despite its seemingly coherent definition (e.g. Kymlicka, 2010; Verkuyten, 2007), multiculturalism is an inherently dilemmatic ideology. Siapera (2006) has argued that in normative philosophical literature, multiculturalism revolves around three dilemmas, i.e. essentialism versus fluidity of identities, universalism versus particularism in dealing with diversity, and recognition versus redistribution when trying to accommodate difference within equality. As discussed, these dilemmas resonate with the constructions of multiculturalism identified in this study.

Some scholars have suggested that due to the “crisis of multiculturalism”, new approaches to managing ethnocultural diversity and intergroup relations should be explored, and that interculturalism is one such approach (e.g. Verkuyten et al., 2019). Interculturalism is offered as a complementary approach to multiculturalism because, unlike multiculturalism, it incorporates the components of dialogue, unity, and identity in a flexible manner (Verkuyten et al., 2019). Indeed, it is important to critically assess how intergroup relations are managed so as to develop better approaches for the future. However, as the results of this study demonstrate, those components are already a part of the discourse of multiculturalism. Identifying them only requires that its dilemmatic aspects are examined. With this research, I hope to have advanced an analytic approach to studying intergroup relations that would allow for tensions, inconsistency, and complexity.

7.2 REFLECTING UPON LIMITATIONS OF DATA AND PROCEDURES

This research consists of three studies examining focus group discussions, and one study examining online discussions. In this section, I first discuss Studies I – III, in which focus group discussions were analysed. This reflection

revolves around three issues: focus group discussions as data, the design of the studies, and the operationalisation of multiculturalism. As regards to Study IV, I will discuss the method of data-generation, as well as online data as a topic of discursive investigation.

As discussed in Chapter 5 (p. 38), focus group discussions can be regarded as an institutional interaction in which the participants are invited to speak from a specific position to researchers who have decided upon the topic, and who moderate the situation (Puchta & Potter, 2004). This critical perspective to data generated through focus groups—or any form of interview—is often used to define the so-called natural data as more fitting for discursive analysis (e.g. Potter, 2003). However, as discussed in section 4.3.3, the division of data into categories of natural and contrived can be questioned, as all interactions go through certain procedures before becoming “data”. Thus, rather than seeing these categories as irrefutable characteristics of different data sets, they should be seen as analytic tools that enable critical reflections on the relationship between the analyst and the research material (Goodman & Speer, 2017). Furthermore, interview materials can be approached as a joint production of the analysts and participants, revealing the cultural resources used to make sense of the social world (Wetherell, 2003).

Even though the use of focus groups as a method for data-generation can be justified, there are two issues related to the design of the studies that need further reflection. The first issue is that all the discussions were held in Helsinki, and among people living in Helsinki. The strong focus on the capital city can be seen as a limitation of Studies I – III, because while migration research often focuses on urban environments that are—or are rapidly becoming—ethnoculturally diverse, scholars have pointed out the need to study the dynamics of diversity in rural areas too (Kananen & Sotkasiira, 2015). It is possible that the ways to orient oneself towards multiculturalism, or make sense of it, are different in rural contexts compared to larger cities. However, as the results of this study indicate, negotiations of multiculturalism draw from widely shared cultural resources that extend beyond immediate interactional contexts, and even travel across national boundaries.

The second issue relates to the critique against cultural essentialism voiced by some of the participants of Studies II – III. As discussed in section 5.1.2, the participants were invited based on their self-categorisation as members one of the following groups: majority Finns, Russian-speaking immigrants, Estonian-speaking immigrants or Somali-speaking immigrants. In the analyses, the three latter categories often merged into one: minority or immigrants. The participants often asked the moderators of these discussions (myself and Sirku Varjonen) to justify this division, and several participants expressed their willingness to discuss multiculturalism together with members of different groups. In hindsight, I both question and defend our decision to divide the participants into majority and minority groups.

Social scientific theory on multiculturalism is built on the division of people into representatives of the majority and minority (or minorities). This division

has also guided social psychological research on multiculturalism that has shown it has ramifications for the ways in which multiculturalism is perceived and evaluated (e.g. Arends-Tóth & Vijver, 2003; Berry & Kalin, 1995; Verkuyten, 2009). However, examining people as representatives of minorities or majorities can lead to simplified research designs that cannot capture the role of intersectional, cross-cutting inequalities in diverse societies, for example, or the different ways in which people relate to diversity. As one of our aims was to contribute to previous social psychological research with a discursive perspective, we decided to follow this widely used design, while being mindful of the importance of critically reflecting upon the social categories we used. While being critical towards this division, it should be noted that in their essentialism and simplicity, these categories also have consequences as people become labelled as representatives of different groups. This is the reason why it is important to examine these categories and the social processes through which they are produced. I hope that the reflexive approach towards social categories employed in this research shows in the analyses. While having made this division, we invited our participants to discuss it, and also brought their critiques into the analysis in the form of interpretative repertoires of individualism and stigmatising multiculturalism.

The third point of reflection concerns the operationalisation of multiculturalism in Studies I – III. The focus group participants discussed statements that were picked from the MIS, and from public discussions on the topic. The participants were thus offered a definition of normative multiculturalism, which can be criticised for its rather abstract operationalisation. For instance, instead of asking the respondent to consider concrete instances of everyday life—such as speaking with a doctor whose clothing reveals that they belong to a minority—the respondent is asked to evaluate if “ethnic minorities should be helped in preserving their cultural heritage”. While the abstract formulation of the items is justified on the grounds that the scale should be applicable across contexts in order to make cross-cultural comparisons, their intersections with everyday life remain rather weak. However, as noted, the focus group setting enabled the participants to freely question and contemplate the items, and the use of the MIS (Berry & Kalin, 1995) enabled this research to address and contribute to mainstream social and acculturation psychology understandings of multiculturalism.

Study IV differed from Studies I-III in terms of data. Instead of focus group discussions, it examined discussion threads of a popular online forum. As discussed in section 5.1.3, the data were selected as a result of a search of the word *multicult**. This search enabled us to examine the temporal appearance of the word, and identify the increase in its use in the summer of 2015. While I acknowledge that doing a keyword search is not a particularly discursive approach for generating data, this search enabled us to consider the wider dynamics of the forum, and to situate the final data set in its virtual context. However, I also acknowledge that there can be very different forum

discussions concerning multiculturalism, integration, and immigration that were left outside of our scope as a result of choosing this particular method.

The virtual environment offers countless possibilities to analyse lay discussions. For a discourse analyst, this is both an opportunity and a challenge (e.g. Hughey & Daniels, 2013; Jowett, 2015). On the one hand, finding interesting and rich material to analyse is rather easy. On the other hand, the affordances of online interaction challenge researchers interested in discourse. In addition to spamming or trolling, the online discourse of multiculturalism was more aggressive and explicitly derogatory compared to the focus groups, which points towards the absence of the norm against prejudice (Billig, 1988; Goodman & Rowe, 2014). This can cause the researcher analytic and emotional obstacles.

7.3 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The standard ethical concerns in social psychology research touch upon data-generation, and questions around informed consent, participant anonymity, and the participants' possibility to contact the researchers (see e.g. American Psychological Association, 2003; British Psychological Society, 2014). In addition to these concerns, I will next discuss the ethical issues related to the background of this research, and the dissemination of its results.

Regarding ethical concerns related to data-generation, the ethical guidelines of the American Psychological Association (2003) and the British Psychological Society (2014) were followed. When organising the focus group discussions, we carefully described and discussed the aims of the study with the participants, and gave them our contact information. When reporting the results, all participants were given pseudonyms to protect their anonymity. However, it was impossible to ensure the informed consent of the participants of the online discussions analysed in Study IV. Even though the owner of Suomi24 at the time of data generation, a media company called Aller, has agreed that the discussions can be used via the KORP interface for research purposes (Lagus et al., 2016), it is likely that the participants of the Suomi24 discussions had no knowledge of such a possibility when they posted their comments to the forum. The Suomi24 instructions for discussion participants do mention the possibility that the discussions are used as research materials, but this mention is not easy to find, unless one specifically looks for it. However, one could argue that the participants of Suomi24 know that the discussions themselves are public, given one of the purposes of the site is to enable anyone to participate (cf. Jowett, 2015). In order to protect the anonymity of the participants when reporting the results, we did not mention their nicknames. We also argue that as the comments are translated from Finnish into English, it makes it more difficult to search for the original post.

The topic of this dissertation can be considered to be sensitive in the sense that it touches upon inequalities and divisions that create, maintain, and

justify restrictions, threats—and in the most extreme cases—danger for people categorised as immigrants. This requires careful consideration of the relationship between the researcher and the research participants, especially my position in relation to the minority participants. Wahlbeck (2008) argues that when doing research with marginalised groups, the researcher is responsible for representations that are constructed about these groups, and how this becomes embedded in the research. In Finland, immigrants with Somali or Russian backgrounds can be regarded as marginalised or vulnerable groups whose members—or those regarded as members of those groups—can experience severe discrimination and harassment. Such experiences were also a part of how the minority participants accounted for intergroup relations in Finland, and thus, were reported in the articles. However, as discussed in the previous section, some of the participants also actively resisted being positioned as representatives of marginalised groups needing recognition, and I hope that this critical voice is also recognisable in the results.

To reflect upon the background of this research project, I could write at length about my personal history, identity, and social position. I could write about my upbringing, or how I came to recognise my position in society as a white, highly educated person with white, Finnish-speaking ancestors—a person whose Finnishness no one has ever questioned. I acknowledge that these experiences put me in a privileged position in the academic field and in wider society. However, in line with Emirbayer and Desmond (2012), I argue that what requires critical reflection beyond my personal history and identity is my scholarly background. Emirbayer and Desmond (2012) encourage researchers working on race and other social divisions to critically reflect upon the “disciplinary unconscious”—the common sense, shared beliefs, and self-evidence of one’s intellectual context. This list bears a resemblance to the analytic principles of discursive psychology. Thus, in the case of this research, the discursive gaze is focussed on social psychology.

In drawing from anti-essentialist and social constructionist perspectives, discursive psychology has an inherently critical orientation towards social categories, power, and knowledge (e.g. Burr, 2003; Wetherell, 2003), and thus it requires such reflections throughout the analytic process. However, there are also critical and reflexive accounts within the mainstream social psychology of intergroup relations that can guide a critical reflection of the “social psychological unconscious”. In their article, Ferguson, Branscombe, and Reynolds (2019) argue that the social psychological research field of intergroup relations is profoundly shaped by shared conceptions of who is regarded as belonging to “us” and “them”. According to the authors, these dynamic boundaries between in- and outgroups have guided researchers’ choices concerning which groups are studied, and which remain outside of the scope of social psychological inquiry. In order to overcome such “biases”, researchers should actively broaden the representation of groups considered as relevant targets for research (Ferguson et al., 2019). Remaining critical towards choices concerning the targets of research is indeed an important

guideline, regardless of whether one aims to overcome “biases” or not. As discussed in the previous section, I acknowledge the ramifications and limitations that arise due to the choice of target groups for this study.

Lastly, I would like to discuss the ethical concerns related to the analytic processes and the dissemination of results. What distinguishes a scientific reading from a lay reading of social texts is the use of analytic tools, and the critical examination of the interpretations made by using those tools. In this research, we used established tools for conducting discursive analyses (e.g. interpretative repertoires). The patterns of talk we identified in the four studies were a result of a collective effort that included the authors of the articles, and their anonymous reviewers, all of whom critically assessed these results. To make the analytic process transparent, we offered the readers of the articles quotes from the data, and carefully described the processes themselves. All these are standard steps that any researcher takes to ensure the ethical delivery of their results to the academic community.

Taking these steps, however, does not change the fact that the results are researchers’ interpretations of rich interaction material, and that the analytic process forces the analyst to make choices regarding what is included in the analysis and what is left out. Furthermore, as the research questions and the focus of the analysis evolve during the analytic process, it is impossible to know in the data-generation phase what the research will specifically touch upon when it is published. To illustrate my argument, let us consider the focus group data analysed in Studies II and III. There were comments in the data forcefully challenging the Finnish anti-immigration movement, as well as critical accounts of increasing racism in Finland. However, as a result of the focus of the studies, most of these comments were left out of the final stages of analysis. For a discourse analyst, this is a natural part of the process, but it is not self-evident for someone not familiar with this analytic approach.

Due to the aforementioned particularities of the analytic process of DP, it is possible that the participants of a discursive research process—especially one that touches upon a controversial topic such as multiculturalism—would contest the results. For the same reason, there is also a risk of misinterpreting the results when disseminating them to a wider audience. Being mindful about how to talk about discursive research to the “lay” audiences stresses the need to spell out that (critical) discursive analysis is not about examining individual participants’ views, but shared resources of argumentation:

Indeed, ideological analysis (...), or any form of “critical” discursive analysis, involves an evaluation of discourse. It puts that discourse in a broader context. This ideological critique is not intended to be “ad hominem”. It is directed at the broader political climate, the organization of society, and the discursive resources available to its members, not at the individual speaker. It is a political rather than psychological critique. (Wetherell, 2003, p. 23)

7.4 FUTURE RESEARCH

With this project, I sought to examine the lay discourse of multiculturalism, referring to the ways in which ordinary Finns make sense of, negotiate, and manage intergroup relations; I claimed that this is the way to study multiculturalism as a lived ideology (Billig et al., 1988). However, by applying the idea of banal nationalism (Billig, 1995) to everyday multiculturalism, Howarth (2016) argues for research that would focus analytic attention to the ways in which majority and minorities already engage in mutual, reciprocal dialogue; that would recognise the interplay between multiculturalism and nationalism; and would see its potential to give rise to critical nationalism. According to Howarth, critical nationalism refers to a sense of commitment to a society that is inclusive and anti-essentialist.

Following Howarth's thought, in outlining the promising avenues for future research on multiculturalism, I would emphasise the importance of studying the dialogues and practices that already exist in society. Jensen's (2016) ethnographic study on social relations in a diverse neighbourhood in Copenhagen is an inspiring example of such an analysis. In approaching trust and social cohesion from the residents' perspective, Jensen's study reveals that contact with neighbours was not evaluated as an issue of trust or safety, but rather by using a more practical set of notions, such as sharing space.

I argue that the social psychology of intergroup relations could benefit from the use of ethnography, because as Jensen's study reveals, it requires critical reflections on the assumptions behind analytic concepts and their interrelations. As ethnography can be used to study embodied social practices and "the impact of grand social forces on the everyday level" (Adler & Adler, 1987), it would be especially suited to examining lived and everyday multiculturalism, or any ideology. With such methods, the division of people into representatives of minority or majority can also be overcome, as the focus is on the categories and identities that are brought up in the course of the everyday lives of the research participants.

Another promising direction for future research on multiculturalism is social media and its intersections with the public and lay discourses. While there is a myriad of studies examining racist and anti-immigration discourse online, more research is needed on social media and other online spaces inviting critical multiculturalist (cf. Lentin & Titley, 2011) or critical nationalist (Howarth, 2016) discourses and mobilisations (Parker & Song, 2006; Siaperä, 2006). A Finnish multimedia site, *Brown Girls* (Ruskeat Tytöt in Finnish), is an example of such a site. Since its establishment in 2017, the site has successfully challenged the normative whiteness of the Finnish public discourse, and would deserve the attention of social scientists.

7.5 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The aim of the social psychology of intergroup relations is to provide tools and insights that can be used to prevent intergroup conflicts, and increase equality and harmonious relations between different groups in a society. As I regard the present research to be a part of this research field, it is time to assess the ways in which this study can contribute to such an aim.

Some scholars argue that due to its social constructionist stance, discursive research should not make recommendations for practice (Taylor, 2001). However, this stance can be contested. According to Wetherell's (2003) argument quoted on p. 58, critical discursive analysis aims to comment on the organisation of a society and its ideological underpinnings. In line with this thought, I argue that the critique towards multiculturalism brought forward in this research can in itself have practical consequences (Taylor, 2001). Furthermore, as explicitly stated in Study III, this research had a political orientation. In showing immigrants' struggles related to claiming full membership in Finnish society, it aimed to reveal often taken-for-granted hierarchies between the majority and the immigrants and to challenge them. This latter aim also applied to Studies I-IV.

Thus, instead of making straightforward recommendations for policies and practices, I especially urge researchers and practitioners who use the term multiculturalism in their work to reflect upon its meaning. A good start would be to think about Abdi's comment, presented in the introduction of this thesis, and to reflect on how it resonates with the role that multiculturalism serves in one's own work or other spheres of life. This reflection can be elaborated with the following questions (cf. Ruskeat Tytöt, 2019):

When you use the term multiculturalism, does it refer to people? And if it does, why should those people be labelled as multicultural?

When you use the term multiculturalism, does it refer to an ideology or practices stemming from that ideology? If it does, what is accomplished with them? Do they increase the chances for equal opportunities of those in a minoritised position?

Thus, in order to contemplate the successes and failures of multiculturalism, I argue that it is essential to establish a conceptual common ground, and critically reflect on the ends that multiculturalism serves for those willing to take part in such contemplations.

7.6 CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the title of this research, I ask, what is multiculturalism good for. This research has shown that as a term, multiculturalism enables reflections

concerning the state of intergroup relations, as well as one's position in relation to ethnocultural diversity and different ways to manage it. As a discourse, multiculturalism was found to predominantly draw on essentialist and nationalist notions, and was used to justify hierarchical intergroup relations. This was most obvious in the ways in which the discourse of a crisis of multiculturalism was mobilised to justify and disseminate anti-immigration political rhetoric in social media. However, the celebratory accounts of ethnocultural diversity were also found to draw upon essentialism and nationalism. While it should be noted that not all positive talk about multiculturalism should be deemed problematic, this research encourages critical reflection and the examination of the multiculturalism discourse, be it celebratory or not.

Despite these gloomy conclusions, I argue that multiculturalism has not failed, nor should it be buried. Instead, the potential of a multiculturalism discourse that supports the development of harmonious intergroup relations lies in acknowledging the critique of multiculturalism as an ideology and practices. I argue that the critique brought forward in the form of limiting multiculturalism paves the way for inclusive and equal citizenship. I cannot think of a more elegant example of the potential of a multiculturalism discourse, than the comment made by Amran, one of the focus group participants, when claiming a right for equal participation without having to conform, or change oneself:

Of course I will always be a Somali, even though I am a citizen of Finland and so forth, and I live here, and of course I will live here also in the future, but I will always be me, I cannot change, and I do not try to change myself, I am what I am.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1987). The Past and the Future of Ethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 16(1), 4–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241687161001>
- Alvares, C., & Dahlgren, P. (2016). Populism, extremism and media: Mapping an uncertain terrain. *European Journal of Communication*, 31(1), 46–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323115614485>
- Andreouli, E. (2013). Identity and acculturation: The case of naturalised citizens in Britain. *Culture & Psychology*, 19(2), 165–183. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X13478984>
- Andreouli, E., & Dashtipour, P. (2014). British Citizenship and the ‘Other’: An Analysis of the Earned Citizenship Discourse. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 24(2), 100–110. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2154>
- Anjum, S., McVittie, C., & McKinlay, A. (2018). It is not quite cricket: Muslim immigrants’ accounts of integration into UK society: Integration into UK society. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 48(1), O1–O14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2280>
- Antonsich, M. (2012). Exploring the Demands of Assimilation among White Ethnic Majorities in Western Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38(1), 59–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2012.640015>
- Arends-Tóth, J., & Vijver, F. J. R. V. D. (2003). Multiculturalism and acculturation: views of Dutch and Turkish-Dutch: Multiculturalism and acculturation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33(2), 249–266. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.143>
- Atton, C. (2006). Far-right media on the internet: culture, discourse and power. *New Media & Society*, 8(4), 573–587. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444806065653>
- Augoustinos, M., & Every, D. (2007). The Language of “Race” and Prejudice: A Discourse of Denial, Reason, and Liberal-Practical Politics. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 26(2), 123–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X07300075>
- Avonius, M., & Kestilä-Kekkonen, E. (2018). Suomalaisten multiliset ja kirjavat maahanmuuttoasenteet. *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka*, 83, 84–95.
- Banting, K., & Kymlicka, W. (n.d.). *Multiculturalism policy index*. Retrieved from <https://www.queensu.ca/mcp/>
- Barry, B. M. (2002). *Culture and equality: an egalitarian critique of multiculturalism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bélanger, E., & Verkuyten, M. (2010). Hyphenated Identities and Acculturation: Second-Generation Chinese of Canada and The Netherlands. *Identity*, 10(3), 141–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2010.495906>
- Benhabib, S. (2002). *The claims of culture: equality and diversity in the global era*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Berry, J. W. (1974). Psychological aspects of cultural pluralism: Unity and identity reconsidered. *Culture Learning*, 2, 17–22.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology*, 46(1), 5–34.

- Berry, J. W. (2001). A Psychology of Immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3), 615–631. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00231>
- Berry, J. W. (2016). Diversity and equity. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, 23(3), 413–430. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CCSM-03-2016-0085>
- Berry, J. W., & Kalin, R. (1995). Multicultural and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview of the 1991 National Survey. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, 27(3), 301–320. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0008-400X.27.3.301>
- Berry, John W. (2011). Integration and multiculturalism: Ways towards social solidarity. *Papers on Social Representations*, 20(1), 2.1–2.21.
- Billig, M. (1988). The notion of ‘prejudice’: Some rhetorical and ideological aspects. *Text - Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 8(1–2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1988.8.1-2.91>
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. Longon: Sage.
- Billig, M. (1996). *Arguing and thinking: a rhetorical approach to social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Paris: Editions de la Maison des sciences de l’homme.
- Billig, M. (2001). Humour and Hatred: The Racist Jokes of the Ku Klux Klan. *Discourse&Society*, 12(3), 267–289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926501012003001>
- Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D., & Radley, A. (1988). *Ideological dilemmas: A social psychology of everyday thinking*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Bloemraad, I. (2015). Theorizing and Analyzing Citizenship in Multicultural Societies. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 56(4), 591–606. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tsq.12095>
- Bloemraad, I., & Wright, M. (2014). “Utter Failure” or Unity out of Diversity? Debating and Evaluating Policies of Multiculturalism. *International Migration Review*, 48(1_suppl), 292–334. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imre.12135>
- Blommaert, J., & Verschueren, J. (1998). *Debating diversity: analysing the discourse of tolerance*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from <http://www.ebrary.com>
- Borin, L., Forsberg, M., & Roxendal, J. (2012). Korp-the corpus infrastructure of Språkbanken. *LREC*, 474–478. Retrieved from <https://spraakbanken.gu.se/eng/publikationer/korp-%E2%80%93corpus-infrastructure-spr%C3%A5kbanken>
- Bourhis, R. Y., Moïse, L. C., Perreault, S., & Sénécal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, 32(6), 369–386.
- Boutyline, A., & Willer, R. (2016). The Social Structure of Political Echo Chambers: Variation in Ideological Homophily in Online Networks. *Political Psychology* 38(3), 551–569.
- Bowskill, M., Lyons, E., & Coyle, A. (2007). The rhetoric of acculturation: When integration means assimilation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46(4), 793–813. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466607X182771>
- Bratten, L. C. (2005). Online zealotry: la France du peuple virtuel. *New Media & Society*, 7(4), 517–532. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444805054116>

- Breugelmans, S. M., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2004). Antecedents and Components of Majority Attitudes toward Multiculturalism in the Netherlands. *Applied Psychology, 53*(3), 400–422. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2004.00177.x>
- Burke, S., & Rowe, L. (2015). The Benefits of Using Discourse Analysis in Online Data. *The Qualitative Methods in Psychology Section Bulletin, 19*(Spring 2015).
- Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism* (2nd ed). London: Routledge.
- Capdevila, R., & Callaghan, J. E. (2008). 'It's not racist. It's common sense'. A critical analysis of political discourse around asylum and immigration in the UK. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 18*(1), 1–16.
- Chirkov, V. (2009). Critical psychology of acculturation: What do we study and how do we study it, when we investigate acculturation? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 33*(2), 94–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.12.004>
- Condor, S. (2000). Pride and Prejudice: Identity Management in English People's Talk about 'this Country'. *Discourse & Society, 11*(2), 175–205. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926500011002003>
- Condor, S. (2006). Temporality and collectivity: Diversity, history and the rhetorical construction of national entitativity. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 45*(4), 657–682. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466605X82341>
- Dandy, J., & Pe-Pua, R. (2010). Attitudes to multiculturalism, immigration and cultural diversity: Comparison of dominant and non-dominant groups in three Australian states. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 34*(1), 34–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2009.10.003>
- Denzin, N. K., Keller, C. M., & Goffman, E. (1981). Frame Analysis Reconsidered. *Contemporary Sociology, 10*(1), 52–60. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2067803>
- Doise, W. (1986). *Levels of explanation in social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Saguy, T. (2009). Commonality and the Complexity of "We": Social Attitudes and Social Change. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 13*(1), 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868308326751>
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Ufkes, E. G., Saguy, T., & Pearson, A. R. (2016). Included but Invisible? Subtle Bias, Common Identity, and the Darker Side of "We": Subtle Bias, Common Identity, and the Darker Side of "We." *Social Issues and Policy Review, 10*(1), 6–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12017>
- Durrheim, K., Greener, R., & Whitehead, K. A. (2015). Race trouble: Attending to race and racism in online interaction. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 54*(1), 84–99. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12070>
- Durrheim, K., Okuyan, M., Twali, M. S., García-Sánchez, E., Pereira, A., Portice, J. S., ... Keil, T. F. (2018). How racism discourse can mobilize right-wing populism: The construction of identity and alliance in reactions to UKIP's Brexit "Breaking Point" campaign. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 28*(6), 385–405. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2347>
- Durrheim, K., Quayle, M., & Dixon, J. (2016) The struggle for the nature of "prejudice": "Prejudice" expression as identity performance. *Political Psychology 37*(1), 17–35.

- 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).
- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive Psychology*. London: Sage.
- European Union, & Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2018). *Second European Union minorities and discrimination survey: being black in the EU*. Retrieved from <http://dx.publications.europa.eu/10.2811/791339>
- Every, D., & Augoustinos, M. (2008). Constructions of Australia in pro- and anti-asylum seeker political discourse. *Nations and Nationalism*, 14(3), 562–580. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8129.2008.00356.x>
- Faulkner, N., & Bliuc, A.-M. (2016). ‘It’s okay to be racist’: moral disengagement in online discussions of racist incidents in Australia. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39(14), 2545–2563. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2016.1171370>
- Fortier, A.-M. (2005). Pride politics and multiculturalist citizenship. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(3), 559–578. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0141987042000337885>
- Gibson, S. (2011) Dilemmas of citizenship: Young people’s conceptions of un/employment rights and responsibilities. *British Journal of Psychology* 50, 450–468. DOI:10.1348/014466610X520113
- 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(3), 228–242. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.1087>
- Gil De Zúñiga, H., Puig-I-Abril, E., & Rojas, H. (2009). Weblogs, traditional sources online and political participation: an assessment of how the internet is changing the political environment. *New Media & Society*, 11(4), 553–574. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444809102960>
- Gilbert, G. N., & Mulkay, M. J. (1984). *Opening Pandora’s box: a sociological analysis of scientists’ discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giles, D. C. (2016). Observing real-world groups in the virtual field: The analysis of online discussion. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 55(3), 484–498. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12139>
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: an essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gonos, G. (1977). “ Situation ” versus “ Frame ”: The “ Interactionist ” and the “ Structuralist ” Analyses of Everyday Life. *American Sociological Review*, 854–867.
- Goodman, S. (2010). “It’s Not Racist To Impose Limits On Immigration”: Constructing The Boundaries Of Racism In The Asylum And Immigration Debate. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*, 4(1), 1–17.
- Goodman, S., & Burke, S. (2011). Discursive deracialization in talk about asylum seeking. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 21(2), 111–123. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.1065>
- Goodman, S., Burke, S., Liebling, H., & Zasada, D. (2014). ‘I’M NOT HAPPY, BUT I’M OK’: How asylum seekers manage talk about difficulties in their host country. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 11(1), 19–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2013.836114>

- Goodman, S., & Johnson, A. J. (2013). Strategies used by the far right to counter accusations of racism. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*, 6(2), 97–113.
- Goodman, S., & Rowe, L. (2014). 'Maybe it is prejudice ... but it is NOT racism': Negotiating racism in discussion forums about Gypsies. *Discourse & Society*, 25(1), 32–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926513508856>
- Goodman, S., & Speer, S. (2017). Natural and contrived data. In *Discursive psychology: classic and contemporary issues* (pp. 57–69). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Haavisto, I. (2019). Härmä sulaa. Suomalaisten maahanmuuttoasenteet pehmenevät, mutta muutos on hidask. [Finns' immigration attitudes become softer but the change is slow.]Eva-analyysi (No. 68). Retrieved from: https://www.eva.fi/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/eva_analyysi_no_68-1.pdf
- Hooghe, M., & de Vroome, T. (2015). How Does the Majority Public React to Multiculturalist Policies? A Comparative Analysis of European Countries. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(6), 747–768. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764214566499>
- Hopkins, N., & Blackwood, L. (2011). Everyday citizenship: Identity and recognition. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 21(3), 215–227. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.1088>
- Horsti, K. (2005). *Vierauden rajat: monikulttuurisuus ja turvapaikanhakijat journalismissa* [The boundaries of otherness: multiculturalism and asylum seekers in journalism]. Tampere: Tampere University Press: TAJU [distrib.].
- Horsti, K., & Nikunen, K. (2013). The ethics of hospitality in changing journalism: A response to the rise of the anti-immigrant movement in Finnish media publicity. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 16(4), 489–504. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549413491718>
- Howarth, C. (2016). Everyday multiculturalism as critical nationalism. In C. Howarth & E. Andreouli (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Everyday Politics* (pp. 44–58). Routledge.
- Howarth, C., & Andreouli, E. (n.d.). 'Has multiculturalism failed?' *The importance of lay knowledge and everyday practice*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Caroline_Howarth/publication/265275514_'Has_multiculturalism_failed'_The_importance_of_lay_knowledge_and_everyday_practice/links/5591235508ae15962d8c8085.pdf
- Howarth, C., Wagner, W., Magnusson, N., & Sammut, G. (2014). "It's Only Other People Who Make Me Feel Black": Acculturation, Identity, and Agency in a Multicultural Community: Acculturation, Identity, and Agency. *Political Psychology*, 35(1), 81–95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12020>
- Huddleston, T., Bilgili, O., Joki, A.-L., & Vankova, Z. (2015). *Migrant Integration Policy Index*. Barcelona/Brussels: CIDOB and MPG.
- Hughey, M. W., & Daniels, J. (2013). Racist comments at online news sites: a methodological dilemma for discourse analysis. *Media, Culture & Society*, 35(3), 332–347.
- Jensen, T. G. (2016). Neither Trust Nor Distrust. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 6(1), 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.1515/njmr-2016-0009>

- Joppke, C. (2004). The retreat of multiculturalism in the liberal state: theory and policy. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 55(2), 237–257. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2004.00017.x>
- Jowett, A. (2015). A case for using online discussion forums in critical psychological research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12(3), 287–297.
- Kananen, M., & Sotkasiira, T. (2015). “They’re here and we’re going to have to do the best we can”: Integration of Somali immigrants in Lieksa and Fort Morgan. In E. K. Heikkilä, A. Kostianen, J. Leinonen, & I. Söderling (Eds.), *Migration Studies C 24 / Histories 4. PARTICIPATION, INTEGRATION, AND RECOGNITION: Changing Pathways to Immigrant Incorporation*. Turku: Institute of migration.
- Keskinen, S., Rastas, A., & Tuori, S. (2009). Johdanto: Suomalainen maahanmuuttokeskustelu tienhaarassa. [Introduction: The Finnish discussion on immigration at a crossroads.]. In S. Keskinen, A. Rastas, & S. Tuori (Eds.), *En ole rasisti, mutta... - Maahanmuutosta, monikulttuurisuudesta ja kritiikistä*. [I’m not a racist, but... - On immigration, multiculturalism and critique.]. Tampere: Vastapaino & Nuorisotutkimusverkosto.
- Keskinen, S., Skaptadóttir, U. D., & Toivanen, M. (2019). Narrations of homogeneity, waning welfare states, and the politics of solidarity. In S. Keskinen, U. D. Skaptadóttir, & M. Toivanen (Eds.), *Undoing homogeneity in the Nordic region: migration, difference and the politics of solidarity*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Keskinen, S., Tuori, S., Irni, S., & Mulinari, D. (2009). *Complying with colonialism: gender, race and ethnicity in the Nordic region*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781315573212>
- Kirkwood, S. (2017). The Humanisation of Refugees: A Discourse Analysis of UK Parliamentary Debates on the European Refugee ‘Crisis’: The humanisation of refugees. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 27(2), 115–125. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2298>
- Koopmans, R. (2013). Multiculturalism and Immigration: A Contested Field in Cross-National Comparison. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 39(1), 147–169. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071312-145630>
- Kundnani, A. (2002). The Death of Multiculturalism. *Race & Class*, 43(4), 67–72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030639680204300406>
- Kundnani, A. (2012). Multiculturalism and its discontents: Left, Right and liberal. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 15(2), 155–166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549411432027>
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/0198290918.001.0001>
- Kymlicka, W. (2010). The rise and fall of multiculturalism? New debates on inclusion and accommodation in diverse societies.. *International Social Science Journal*, 61(199), 97–112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2451.2010.01750.x>
- Kymlicka, W. (2012). *Multiculturalism: Success, failure, and the future*. Washington D.C.: Migration Policy Institute.
- Lagus, K. H., Ruckenstein, M. S., Pantzar, M., & Ylisiurua, M. J. (2016). *Suomi24: Muodonantoa aineistolle*. Kuluttajatutkimuskeskus, Valtiotieteellisen tiedekunnan julkaisuja 2016:10. Helsinki: Unigrafia.

- Lamerichs, J., & Te Molder, H. F. (2003). Computer-mediated communication: From a cognitive to a discursive model. *New Media & Society*, 5(4), 451–473.
- Lentin, A., & Titley, G. (2011). *The crises of multiculturalism: racism in a neoliberal age*. London: Zed Books.
- Liebkind, K. (2001). Acculturation. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.) *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup relations* (pp. 386–406). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Liebkind, K., Mähönen, T. A., Varjonen, S., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2016). Acculturation and identity. In D. L. Sam & Berry (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Acculturation Psychology* (2nd ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316219218>
- Lyons, A. C., Madden, H., Chamberlain, K., & Carr, S. (2010). ‘It’s not really us discriminating against immigrants, it’s more telling people how to fit in’: Constructing the nation in immigration talk in New Zealand. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 21(1), 14–27. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.1051>
- Mähönen, T. A., Brylka, A., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2014). Perceived ethnic superiority and immigrants’ attitudes towards multiculturalism and the national majority. *International Journal of Psychology*, 49(4), 318–322. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12048>
- Malik, K. (2013). *Multiculturalism and its discontents: rethinking diversity after 9/11*. Calcutta: Seagull Books.
- Martikainen, T., Saari, M., & Korkiasaari, J. (2013). Kansainväliset muuttoliikkeet ja Suomi [International migration and Finland]. In T. Martikainen, P. Saukkonen, & M. Säävälä, *Muuttajat: kansainvälinen muuttoliike ja suomalainen yhteiskunta [Migrants: International migration and Finnish Society]*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Mazzoleni, G. (2008). Populism and the Media. In D. Abertazzi & D. McDonnel (Eds.), *Twenty-First Century Populism* (pp. 49–64). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McCay-Peet, L., & Quan-Haase, A. (2017). What is social media and what questions can social media research help us answer. In L. Sloan & A. Quan-Haase (Eds.) *The SAGE handbook of social media research methods*. London: Sage.
- Meer, N., & Modood, T. (2014). Cosmopolitanism and integrationism: is British multiculturalism a ‘Zombie category’? *Identities*, 21(6), 658–674. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2013.875028>
- Menard, R. (2016). Doing equality and difference: Representation and alignment in Finnish identification. *Text & Talk*, 36(6). <https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2016-0032>
- Merino, M.-E., & Tileagă, C. (2011). The construction of ethnic minority identity: A discursive psychological approach to ethnic self-definition in action. *Discourse & Society*, 22(1), 86–101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926510382834>
- Modood, T. (2014). Understanding ‘Death of Multiculturalism’ discourse means understanding multiculturalism. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 9(3), 201–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2014.934254>
- Mossberger, K., Tolbert, C. J., & McNeal, R. S. (2008). *Digital citizenship: the internet, society, and participation*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Nelimarkka, M., Laaksonen, S.-M., & Semaan, B. (2018). Social Media Is Polarized, Social Media Is Polarized: Towards a New Design Agenda for

- Mitigating Polarization. *Proceedings of the 2018 on Designing Interactive Systems Conference 2018 - DIS '18*, 957–970.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3196709.3196764>
- Neumann, W. R., Bimber, B., & Hindman, M. (2011). The Internet and the four dimensions of citizenship. In G. Edwards, L. Jacobs & R. Shapiro (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of American public opinion and the media*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nikunen, K. (2015). Politics of Irony as the Emerging Sensibility of the Anti-immigrant Debate. In R. Andreassen & K. Vitus (Eds.), *Affectivity and race: Studies from Nordic contexts* (pp. 21–42). Farnham: Ashgate.
- Niska, M. (2015). *Who is serving whom?: An agency-for perspective on enterprise promotion in rural Finland* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Helsinki, Faculty of Social Sciences.
- Official Statistics of Finland*. (2013). Population structure [e-publication]. Retrieved from Statistics Finland website:
http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/2013/vaerak_2013_2014-03-21_tie_001_en.html?ad=notif
- Official Statistics of Finland*. (2018). Population structure [e-publication] [Annual review]. Retrieved from Statistics Finland website:
https://www.tilastokeskus.fi/til/vaerak/2018/02/vaerak_2018_02_2019-06-19_tie_001_en.html
- Pakkasvirta, J. (2018). Latin American Stereotypes in Finnish Social Media. *Iberoamericana – Nordic Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 47(1), 94–107. <https://doi.org/10.16993/iberoamericana.428>
- Papacharissi, Z. (2008). The virtual sphere 2.0. In A. Chadwick & p. Howard (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Internet Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Parekh, B. C. (2006). *Rethinking multiculturalism: cultural diversity and political theory* (2nd ed). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Parker, D., & Song, M. (2006). New Ethnicities Online: Reflexive Racialisation and the Internet. *The Sociological Review*, 54(3), 575–594. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2006.00630.x>
- Pauha, T. (2017). Praying for One Umma: Rhetorical Construction of a Global Islamic Community in the Facebook Prayers of Young Finnish Muslims. *Temenos-Nordic Journal of Comparative Religion*, 53(1), 55–84.
- Peräkylä, A. (1990). *Kuoleman monet kasvot: identiteettien tuottaminen kuolevan potilaan hoidossa* [The many faces of death]. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Pettersson, K., & Sakki, I. (2017). Pray for the fatherland! Discursive and digital strategies at play in nationalist political blogging. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 14(3), 315–349. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2017.1290177>
- Phelps, J. M., Eilertsen, D. E., Türken, S., & Ommundsen, R. (2011). Integrating immigrant minorities: Developing a scale to measure majority members' attitudes toward their own proactive efforts: Majority integration efforts. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 52(4), 404–410. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2011.00876.x>
- Piontkowski, U., Rohmann, A., & Florack, A. (2002). Concordance of Acculturation Attitudes and Perceived Threat. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 5(3), 221–232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430202005003003>

- Pitkänen, V., Saukkonen, P., & Westinen, J. (2019). *Ollako vai eikö olla? Tutkimus viiden kieliryhmän kiinnittymisestä Suomeen*. [To be or not to be? A study on the adhesion of five language groups into Finland.] (No. 5). Helsinki: e2 tutkimus.
- Plaut, V. C., Garnett, F. G., Buffardi, L. E., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2011). "What about me?" Perceptions of exclusion and Whites' reactions to multiculturalism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 337–353. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022832>
- Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. London: Sage.
- Potter, J. (1998). Discursive Social Psychology: From Attitudes to Evaluative Practices. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 9(1), 233–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14792779843000090>
- Potter, J. (2003). Discursive Psychology: Between Method and Paradigm. *Discourse & Society*, 14(6), 783–794. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265030146005>
- Potter, J. (2007). Editor's introduction. Volume III: discursive psychology. In J. Potter (Ed.), *Discourse and psychology*. London: Sage.
- Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2012). Eight challenges for interview researchers. In J. F. Gubrium, J. A. Holstein, A. B. Marvasti, & McKinney (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of interview research: the complexity of the craft* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Puchta, C., & Potter, J. (2004). *Focus group practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Pyrhönen, N. (2015). *The True Colors of Finnish Welfare Nationalism; Consolidation of Neo-Populist Advocacy as a Resonant Collective Identity through Mobilization of Exclusionary Narratives of Blue-and-White Solidarity*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Swedish School of Social Science.
- Rantanen, T., & Vesala, K. M. (1999). Soveltuuko asenteen käsite myös laadulliseen tutkimukseen? [Is the concept of attitude suitable for qualitative research]. *Psykologia*, 1999(5–6), 343–348.
- Rattan, A., & Ambady, N. (2013). Diversity ideologies and intergroup relations: An examination of colorblindness and multiculturalism: Diversity ideologies and intergroup relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43(1), 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.1892>
- Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. J. (1936). Memorandum for the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist*, 38(1), 149–152.
- Ruskeat Tytöt. (2019). *Oletko tekemässä antirasistista projektia?* [Are you planning an anti-racist project?]. Retrieved October 9, 2019, from <https://www.ruskeattytot.fi/rtmedia/https://www.ruskeattytotfi/rtmedia/oletkotekemassaantirasististaprojektia?rq=antirasistinen%20projekti>
- Ryan, C. S., Casas, J. F., & Thompson, B. K. (2010). Interethnic Ideology, Intergroup Perceptions, and Cultural Orientation. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66(1), 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01631.x>
- Sakki, I., & Pettersson, K. (2016). Discursive constructions of otherness in populist radical right political blogs. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 46(2), 156–170. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2142>
- Sakki, I., & Pettersson, K. (2018). Managing stake and accountability in Prime Ministers' accounts of the "refugee crisis": A longitudinal analysis.

- Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 28(6), 406–429.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2358>
- Sam, D. L., & Berry, J. W. (2010). Acculturation: When Individuals and Groups of Different Cultural Backgrounds Meet. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(4), 472–481.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610373075>
- Sapountzis, A. (2013). Dominant group members talk about the acculturation of immigrants in Greece: Who is in charge of the acculturation process? *Hellenic Journal of Psychology*, 10(1), 24–46.
- Sarangi, S. (2003). Institutional, professional, and lifeworld frames in interview talk. In H. van den Berg, M. Wetherell & H. Houtkoop-Steenstra (Eds.) *Analyzing race talk - Multidisciplinary perspectives on the research interview* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saukkonen, P. (2007). *Politiikka monikulttuurisessa yhteiskunnassa* [Politics in multicultural society]. Helsinki: WSOY Oppimateriaalit.
- Scott, C., & Safdar, S. (2017). Threat and Prejudice against Syrian Refugees in Canada: Assessing the Moderating Effects of Multiculturalism, Interculturalism, and Assimilation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 60, 28–39.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2017.06.003>
- Siapera, E. (2006). Multiculturalism online: the internet and the dilemmas of multicultural politics. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9(1), 5–24.
- Sindic, D. (2011). Psychological citizenship and national identity. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 21(3), 202–214.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.1093>
- Skey, M. (2010). ‘A sense of where you belong in the world’: national belonging, ontological security and the status of the ethnic majority in England: Sense of belonging in England. *Nations and Nationalism*, 16(4), 715–733. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8129.2009.00428.x>
- Snauwaert, B., Soenens, B., Vanbeselaere, N., & Boen, F. (2003). When Integration Does Not Necessarily Imply Integration: Different Conceptualizations of Acculturation Orientations Lead to Different Classifications. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34(2), 231–239.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022102250250>
- Snow, D. A. (2004). Framing processes, ideology, and discursive fields. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements* (pp. 380–412). Malden: Blackwell.
- Stromer-Galley, J., Bryant, L., & Bimber, B. (2015). Context and Medium Matter: Expressing Disagreements Online and Face-to-Face in Political Deliberations. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 11(1).
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In G. W. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Taylor, C. (1992). The politics of recognition. In A. Gutman (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition* (pp. 25–73). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, S. (2001). Evaluating and applying discourse analytic research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 311–331).
- Tileagă, C., & Stokoe, E. (2016). Introduction: the evolution of discursive psychology: From classic to contemporary themes. In C. Tileagă & E. Stokoe (Eds.), *Discursive psychology: classic and contemporary issues*. Hove, East Sussex ; New York, NY: Routledge.

- Titley, G. (2014). No apologies for cross-posting: European trans-media space and the digital circuitries of racism. *Crossings: Journal of Migration and Culture* 5(1), 41–55. doi: 10.1386/cjmc.5.1.41_1
- Tuori, S. (2007). Cooking Nation: Gender Equality and Multiculturalism as Nation-Building Discourses. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 14(1), 21–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506807072315>
- Valenzuela, S., Kim, Y., & Gil de Zuniga, H. (2012). Social Networks that Matter: Exploring the Role of Political Discussion for Online Political Participation. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 24(2), 163–184. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edro37>
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., Breugelmans, S. M., & Schalk-Soekar, S. R. G. (2008). Multiculturalism: Construct validity and stability. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32(2), 93–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2007.11.001>
- van den Berg, H. (2003). Contradictions in interview discourse. In H. van den Berg, M. Wetherell, & H. Houtkoop-Steenstra (Eds.), *Analyzing race talk - Multidisciplinary approaches to the interview* (pp. 119–137). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1992). Discourse and the Denial of Racism. *Discourse & Society*, 3(1), 87–118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926592003001005>
- Varjonen, S., Arnold, L., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2013). 'We're Finns here, and Russians there': A longitudinal study on ethnic identity construction in the context of ethnic migration. *Discourse & Society*, 24(1), 110–134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926512463632>
- Verkuyten, M. (2003). Discourses about ethnic group (de-)essentialism: Oppressive and progressive aspects. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(3), 371–391. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466603322438215>
- Verkuyten, M. (2004). Everyday Ways of Thinking about Multiculturalism. *Ethnicities*, 4(1), 53–74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796804040328>
- Verkuyten, M. (2005a). Ethnic Group Identification and Group Evaluation Among Minority and Majority Groups: Testing the Multiculturalism Hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(1), 121–138. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.121>
- Verkuyten, M. (2005b). Immigration discourses and their impact on multiculturalism: A discursive and experimental study. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(2), 223–240. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466604X23482>
- Verkuyten, M. (2007). Social Psychology and Multiculturalism. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1(1), 280–297. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00011.x>
- Verkuyten, M. (2009). Self-esteem and multiculturalism: An examination among ethnic minority and majority groups in the Netherlands. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43(3), 419–427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.01.013>
- Verkuyten, M., & de Wolf, A. (2002). Being, Feeling and Doing: Discourses and Ethnic Self-Definitions among Minority Group Members. *Culture & Psychology*, 8(4), 371–399. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X0284001>
- Verkuyten, M., Yogeewaran, K., Mepham, K., & Sprong, S. (11.9.2019). Interculturalism: A new diversity ideology with interrelated components of dialogue, unity, and identity flexibility. *European Journal of Social Psychology* (Advance online publication). <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2628>

- Vertovec, S., & Wessendorf, S. (Eds.). (2010). *Multiculturalism backlash: European discourses, policies and practices*. Routledge.
- Vesala, K. M., & Rantanen, T. (2007). Laadullinen asennetutkimus: lähtökohtia, periaatteita, mahdollisuuksia [Qualitative attitude approach: starting points, principles and possibilities]. In K. M. Vesala & T. Rantanen (Eds.), *Argumentaatio ja tulkinta - Laadullisen asennetutkimuksen lähestymistapa* [Argumentation and interpretation - A qualitative approach to studying attitudes]. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Vilkama, K., Lönnqvist, H., Väliniemi-Laurson, J., & Tuominen, M. (2014). *Erilaistuva pääkaupunkiseutu: sosioekonomiset erot alueittain 2002-2012* [Differentiating Helsinki region: Socioeconomic spatial segregation 2002 - 2012]. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupungin tietokeskus.
- Wang, L.-J. (2013). Towards cultural citizenship? Cultural rights and cultural policy in Taiwan. *Citizenship Studies*, 17(1), 92–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2012.716213>
- Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and Interpretative Repertoires: Conversation Analysis and Post-Structuralism in Dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, 9(3), 387–412. <https://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 perspectives on the research interview* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wetherell, M., & Edley, N. (1999). Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: Imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practices. *Feminism & Psychology*, 9(3), 335–356.
- Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1988). Discourse analysis and the identification of interpretative repertoires. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Analyzing everyday explanation: A casebook of methods*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wiggins, S. (2016). From Loughborough with love: How discursive psychology rocked the heart of social psychology's love affair with attitudes. In C. Tileagă & E. Stokoe (Eds.), *Discursive psychology: classic and contemporary issues*. Hove, East Sussex ; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wodak, R. (2015). *The politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean*. London: Sage.
- Wojcieszak, M. E., & Mutz, D. C. (2009). Online groups and political discourse: Do online discussion spaces facilitate exposure to political disagreement? *Journal of Communication*, 59(1), 40–56.
- Wolsko, C., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2006). Considering the Tower of Babel: Correlates of Assimilation and Multiculturalism among Ethnic Minority and Majority Groups in the United States. *Social Justice Research*, 19(3), 277–306. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-006-0014-8>
- Young, I. M. (2010). *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.