

Master Thesis

2015-2017

**INTEGRATION AND HEGEMONIC RELATIONSHIP OF LABOUR MARKET
INEQUALITY: AN INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRANTS/POLICY OFFICIALS
PERCEPTIONS ON IMMIGRANT'S LABOUR INCLUSION IN JYVASKYLA-
FINLAND.**



KENNEDY EBANG NJIKANG

JYVASKYLA UNIVERSITY

2015-2017

*INTEGRATION AND HEGEMONIC RELATIONSHIP OF LABOUR MARKET
INEQUALITY: AN INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRANTS/POLICY OFFICIALS
PERCEPTIONS ON IMMIGRANT'S LABOUR INCLUSION IN JYVASKYLA-FINLAND.*

NJIKANG KENNEDY EBANG

Submitted for: the MA Cultural Policy

University Of Jyvaskyla

Faculty of Social Sciences

Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy

JUNE 2017

Supervisor: Professor Pyykkönen Miikka

Co-supervisor: Dr Kivistö Hanna-Mari

Statement of authorship

I certify that this dissertation is my own work and contains no material, which has been accepted for the award of any degree or diploma in any institute, college or university. Moreover, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text of the dissertation. I also understand that under no circumstances should any part of this dissertation be published, including on the Internet, or publicly displayed without receiving written permission from the school.

Njikang kennedy Ebang

Executive Summary

A 136 pages (including references and appendices) research was undertaken title "Integration and Hegemonic Relationship of Labour Market Inequality: An Investigate immigrants/Policy Officials Perception of Immigrant Labour Inclusion in Jyväskylä-Finland", by Njikang Kennedy Ebang, as a master's thesis requirement, with political sciences as a major, in a Cultural Policy master's degree programme, Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of Jyväskylä, academic year 2015-2017. This thesis was principally supervised by Professor Pyykkönen Miikka and co-supervised by Dr Kivistö Hanna-Mari.

The aim of the research was to investigate the perceptions of immigrants (students, refugees and others) and public officials, on the value of Finnish economic integration within the broader context of immigrant-host labour relationship. Employing Gramsci theory of Hegemony, this study examined those discursive hegemonies in defining the economic and labour market importance of migration and integration, and how does such "hegemonic definitions" resonate within the views of Non-EU foreign students and other migrants. How does hegemonic labour inequality explicate when certain notions of belonging and identity resonates within labour market inclusions of Immigrants. To understand how perceptions were made, two conceptual variables (Finnish Language and Immigrant Ethnicity) were identified as instruments which influence perceptions towards labour market equality.

Datas were collected through administered semi-structured interviews with immigrants and Finns at policy level of administration in Jyväskylä. Employing rhetorical analysis on research data, result finding shows that perceptions of labour inequality were created differs within immigrant statues. It was difficult to problematized integration policies and framework as a phenomenon resulting to hegemonic labour inequality between Finns and immigrants groups in Jyväskylä-Finland. However, this study was able to ascertained that, the Finnish integration policies/framework make available certain privileges towards certain immigrant groups (refugees and family-reunion migrants) with exceptions of student immigrants; unconsciously laying a framework under which immigrant groups are unequally integrated into the Jyväskylä-Finnish labour market.

Nevertheless, on the broader scope of multicultural hegemonic encounters, this study was able to problematize that, the desire to maintain their cultural hegemony, certain dominant values (Finnish language and Finnishness in whiteness) were power phenomenon which were unconsciously and consciously employed by the dominant group (labour market institutions) to influence immigrant labour market inclusion. A situation we further conceptualised as hegemonic relationship of labour market inequalities.

The implications of the research findings were discussed.

Key Words: Hegemony, Privileges, integration, language and Ethnicity, immigrants' perceptions and Labour market inequality.

Acknowledgement

I would love to appreciate all those who contributed in one way or the other towards the realization of this dream.

My most sincere thanks goes to my supervisor, Professor Pyykkönen Miikka and Co-supervisor Dr Kivistö Hanna-Mari, for their patience, advice and guidance throughout this research work. Thank you for helping me pass through the wonders and frustrations of social science research. I am very grateful and satisfied with my work.

To all the staff in the Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, especially my lecturers at the Cultural Policy Unit. The employees of the Regional Delegation of Arts and Culture, Buea –Cameroon where I did my work placement. I am deeply grateful for all the knowledge gained. Thanks for all the encouragements and support during this two years of studies.

To my family members in Cameroon, my wife Claudette Njikand, my daughters, parents, brother and sisters, relatives and friends especially Mua Franklin. I say thank you for all your prayers, support, encouragement and Love.

KIITOS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	Page
Statement of Authorship	2
Executive Summary	3
Acknowledgement	4
Figures	
Figure 1. Percentage and Annual Change in percentage of Foreigners in Finland	42
Figure 2. Population by Language in Finland	43
Appendices	
Appendix I. Informed Consent Form	127
Appendix II. Participant Information Sheet	129
Appendix III. Interview Questions for Policy Official	131
Appendix IV. Semi-structural Interview Questions for Immigrants	133
1. INTRODUCTION	7
1.1. Research Status quo	9
1.2. Aim of the Research	11
1.3. Research Design and Questions	12
1.4. Presenting Data	14
1.5. Relevance of the Research	14
1.6. Research Limitation	15
2. GRAMSCI'S HEGEMONY AND MULTICULTURAL ENCOUNTER	17
2.1. Antonio Gramsci and Hegemony	17
2.1.1. Hegemony (Power)	18
2.2. Hegemony and the Analysis of Cultural Issues: Multiculturalism And Migrants Privilege (Labour Market Inclusion).	22
2.2.1. Dominant Culture Hegemony and Multiculturalism	23
2.2.2. Dominant Culture and Multicultural Privilege Claim-making	29

3. DESCRIPTIVE HISTORY OF FINNISH MULTICULTURALISM	34
3.1. The Rhetoric of migration as an essential human resources strategy in Europe in General and Finland in particular.	34
3.2. The Concept of Finnish Multiculturalism	41
3.3. Finnish Minority Policy Development and the Acculturation Framework	44
3.4. Rhetoric/Reality of Immigrant Labour Representation within Finnish Labour Integration	51
4. THE CENTRALITY OF KNOWLEDGE IN IDENTITY CREATION, PRESERVATION AND DOMINATION	57
4.1. Hegemonic Construction of Finnish Supremacy within Multiculturalism	57
4.2. Labour Markets Realities: Ethnicity and Linguistics of Domination	60
5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	67
5.1. Method of Data Collection	68
5.2. Method of Analyses (Rhetorical Analysis).	70
5.3. Rhetoric and its Contents: The Qualitative Meta-theoretical Presumptions Behind Rhetoric Analysis	71
5.4. Rhetorical Analysis: An Analytical Techniques	74
6. RESULT ANALYSIS	80
6.1. Integration policies/framework, Participation and Empowerment	80
6.2. Hegemonic Labour Market Inequality	86
6.3. Claim-Making, Attitudinal/Behavioural Commitment	96
7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	103
7.1. Conclusion	103
7.2. Recommendations	110
8. REFERENCE LIST	114

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

It is imperative at this stage of this study to outline the tenets under which this study draws its foundations. Recent trends in migration discourses shows issues of acculturation hotly contested and debated not just at global levels, but also at local, national and regional level. However, this study is not constructed on the discourse or question of whether individual nation, states or regional blocks should engage in a liberal or restrictive policy towards migration, but rather on what Tuori (2013) argues that the nature and cognitive content underpinning the policies in labour integration (hegemonic relationship of labour market inequality). While there are substantial empirical research on attitudes towards multiculturalism and minorities (Sniderman and Hagendoorn 2009; Fine 2012), there is considerable less research to date on actions and on patterns of majority-minority interaction (Kivisto and Wahlbeck 2013, 8).

Moreover, even though there has been numerous immigrant integration studies within the broader scope of Finland, ranging from the political potential of immigrant (Pirkkalainen et al, 2016), onward Trans-local and Transnational Mobility and Migration (Ndukwe T. C. 2016; Pekkala, S. 2003) and Integration and administrative expectations for immigrant associations (Pyykkönen, M. 2007); little has been done at municipal levels within Finland with exception to municipalities like Helsinki and Tampere (Vanhanen 2016; Tuori, S. 2013). Surrounded by the above research gaps, this study wishes to add to the existing literatures of migrant's perceptions on integration in Finland (Nordberg 2006; Olakivi 2013; Toivanen 2013; Mähönen et al 2015) Non-EU first generational migrant students in particular, refugees and other first generation migrants in Jyvaskyla. Also, focusing on an examination of their labour aspiration, as well as their perceptions on how inequality in labour market inclusion is expressed in policy and in everyday minority-majority interactions. In this research with Jyvaskyla as a case study, shall be the first such study which is done focusing on a particular- Jyvaskyla, bearing in mind the goal of improving existing policies in Jyvaskyla.

Moreover, far from those studies that have employed either trans-local and transnational (Ndukwe 2016), governmentality (Pyykkönen, 2007) and identity (Nordberg 2006) theoretical framework in study of immigration and integration. It is this research's focus to employ the theory of hegemony in explaining immigrant integration in this emerging multicultural space of Jyväskylä. Our understanding is that, though there have been research in Finland that found issue of discrimination and racism against immigrants, especially within everyday life and the labour market (Heikkilä, 2005; Ndukwe, 2015, 2016; Rastas 2009; Valtonen, 2001), none of these studies examined any of the resultant objective of these attitudes; which is to affirm the onward power domination of the host population against immigrants. We were guided by the assumption that within societal relationship, there are the politics and the political (Martin 2013, 4). Politics in this context, are those activities of administering between organised interests, developing policies and making decision on the basis of instituted relation and procedures. On the other hand, the political symbolizes those abstract frames that define for example who gets what, represented and which social groups are recognised as acceptable participants in politics or not (Martin 2013.).

As such, it is our understanding that in the daily routines of multicultural politics, the fundamental visions as well as the universal principles are to some extent characterise by claim for interest and struggle for advantage among cultures. Yet grounded by these ideas of politics and the political, is power and without undermining the relations of force in this quest for interest in this space, is a power relationship based on consensus on which choices are built (Gramsci 1971). The application of Gramsci theory of Hegemony as a power relationship framework of this study is align to those inequalities in labour interactions which immigrants are open to within this new space of multiculturalism. It was our suggestion that, issues of discrimination and racism could be better understood if the concept of power is brought into the reality of immigrant labour integration.

These perspective will accompany our understanding that Non-EU first generational migrant students and other first generation migrants, compose a mobile labour force within a global economic system. *“This is a labour force that acts and reacts in ways that emphasize, reinforce, or create cultural differentiation and separate identities. As such, global and national social fields are in part shaped by perceptions that they must keep their options open”* (Glick et al. 1992, 8) Within a growing influence of globalisation and markets

competitions, one way immigrants keep their opportunities open is to constantly translate the economic position gained in one political-economy with the political, social and economic capital in another (Ibid). What this means is that social scientist need to continually reconceptualise culture and societal relationships, something that had been done from the perspective of governance (Wolf 1982; Lloyd and Paul 2014). While studies done in the Nordic countries show immigration policies and integration have developed to be key issues in these welfare states policies (Bengtsson et al. 2010; Brochmann and Hagelund 2012), earlier research studies suggest host-immigrants relationship are still complex (Banting and Kymlicka 2006). As such, the different hegemonic context in which migrants interact with host nationals and institutions must be taken into consideration in research. We must ask whether immigrants will continue to participate within the host ideological and welfare constructions that contribute to the supremacy of the dominant classes in each nation state (Valtonen 2001).

1.1. Research Status quo

Recent trend in global world order shows the growing influence and central role of migration, visible within an unclear and complex processes of change within nation and international organisations (Castles and Mark 2009; Heywood 2014). Statistics from the United Nation Department of Economic and Social Affairs showed as of 2013 the total number of international migrant was 232 million indicating an increase of 33% compared to 2000. Interesting to note here that 59% of this migrant moved to developed countries with Europe hosting the largest especially countries like Germany, France, Spain, and the UK, while small and other nations like Finland or Portugal tended to have below average shares (United Nations 2013).

Moreover, as of 2012, there were 13.6 million migrants living in a European member states with citizenship of another European country (Eurostat 2013). It is vital to know of this number how many were non Europeans that had acquired European citizenship from another country. For Example, reports from Statistics Finland indicates Finnish citizenship was given in 2014 to 8,260 foreign citizens permanently resident in Finland. Also 15,490 persons emigrated from Finland to a foreign countries during 2014; 1,590 higher as compared to last year. As of 2015, statistics from the United Nation Department and Social Affairs and Population Division shows the total number of international migrant was 244 million

indicating an increase of 41% compared to 2000. Based on this statistics, nearly two-thirds of all international migration live in Europe (76 Million) or Asia (75 million), and in Europe they constitute 10.3 per cent of the general population. It is difficult to objectively state the motives for these emigration but there are numerous modern migration theories that explain these inter migration, and of most of these theories economic maximisation accounted for most movements (Castles and Mark 2009; Kurekova 2011). Recent trends in migration flow depicts that migration is conflict-ridden, socio-political and economically motivated.

In line with recent trends in refugees movement, one can instinctively say with a degree of certainty, that ever since the devastating effects of the global financial crisis of 2008 one thing Europe has learned is that global problems don't just end at its borders. The political turmoil in the Middle East and Africa has witnessed an increase in global flow of refugees to Europe's borders. In 2015, the number of first time asylum seekers who registered in a European Union Members states more than doubles (1 255 600) as compared to last year. Even though the number is still increasing as of date, of those who applied in 2015, Finland registered the fourth largest number of first time asylum applicants per million inhabitants which was 5 876 applicants (Eurostat news release 2016: Record number of over 1.2 million first time asylum seekers registered in 2015.).

However, despite these challenges and aligned to the huge refugee out flow from Syria, Middle East and Africa, in a broader sense the European Union and some member states have continued to push for a liberal, planned and effectively managed immigration. The liberal movements of people have equally been a hegemonic policy of the European Union under the "Schengen Free Movement". Such liberal movements, one might argue accounted for why seven European states were amongst the top 20 destination of international migrants worldwide (Russia, Germany, Great Britain, Ukraine, France, Italy, and Spain) and while 53 per cent of all international migrants in Europe originates from another country in Europe (UNDSAPD: Trends in International Migration Stock 2015.).

Nevertheless, just like previous 1945-1970s movements surrounded by the rise and fall of the guest worker system, recent global movement to Europe had equally been built on a broader rhetoric on labour demands and more immigrant integration (Hatton 2015). Yet, Berry (1992) in his study on cultural transformation and psychological acculturation, outlined the increasing role of an individual attitudes within this encounter. These attitudes,

Berry argues might result to acculturation stress which might either be positive and or negative resulting to either greater labour market inclusion/equality or exclusion/inequality. Within such dichotomy, I was tempted to question of what economic, social and political importance is it for a host nation to invest on immigration (hosting, integrating, training and citizenship) and in return is unable to hold on to these migrants as a result of emigration to another developed country for economic maximisation (employment).

In 2013 while studying in Britain, I came in contact with some migrants with Swedish, Netherland, Polish and Finnish citizenship. After some detailed conversations on their motive for migrating to Britain, they referenced employability. Moreover, two years later I moved from Britain to Finland. While studying in Jyvaskyla, people I met as friends advised me to move to Helsinki if I want to have a job to further support my expenses. Surrounded by these trends, I was forced to question whether in reality Jyvaskyla as a city in Finland, and Finland as a state in Europe or Western world is considered more by immigrants as an educational hub, rather than both educational and labour market hub. It's against the above real life experiences, background and knowledge that this research topic is built.

1.2. Aim of the Research

Guided by the above theme, this study is going to examine how hegemony (consensual power) is been construct within the labour market integration of migrants in Jyvaskyla-Finland. The objective is to explore the various ways power manifest itself within labour integration frameworks, focusing on how such power functioning resonates within the minds of immigrants in their attempt or efforts towards employment in Jyvaskyla-Finland. Implementing a theory driven empirical research method in mind, this research adopt Gramsci's theory of Hegemony in analysing immigrants vulnerability within the labour market, within an awareness of power relation in the political economy of the host nation of Finland. In this context, the Gramscian concept of hegemony simultaneously embraces the two analytically separate tools within this study research data (scopes of consent and domination), which in practice are interdependent and operates on a continuum.

The purpose, is to investigate the perceptions of Non-EU immigrant in Jyvaskyla-Finland (students, refugees and others) and public officials in Jyvaskyla, on the value of Finnish economic integration within the context of immigrant-host labour relationship. The study

examines firstly, how immigrants defines and value what constitutes economic integration policies and those tools employ to create these inclusion. Secondly, how labour market inclusion relationship resonates in the mind of these immigrants in real life situation. As such, the study start with an assumption that, just like other areas of life, within labour integration, an immigrant perception whether perception of domination or perception of consent, play an important role in determine immigrant attitudes and behaviours towards the host country (to remain resident or emigrate). This assumption was not just based on the conceptualisation that immigrant labour inclusion is just a natural phenomenon arising from socio-cultural and economic design integration policies. But also on the conceptualisation that labour market accessibility is a politically constructed phenomena, which is derived from certain consciousness towards integration policies and labour market institutions. Here, this study suggests that the concept of immigrant integration (labour inclusion) could be better understood if the concept of power is brought into the reality of immigrant labour integration.

1.3. Research Design

To effectively realise the above mentioned aims, the study is going to employ the following design. The first scope (the base line) is the theoretical framework of the research “Gramsci Hegemony”, aligning it to the analysis of multicultural encounter while focusing on the issues of: rights, privileges, perceive threat of privileges, tensions as a result of perceive failure towards assign privileges and claim-making. The second scope, addresses the definitions of the history and state of art of Finnish multiculturalism with emphasis towards immigrant labour equality and inclusion on the one hand, and on the other hand challenges resulting to inequality and exclusion. Within this scope, we did review relevant literatures (immigration, labour integration and ethnic diversity) with the purpose of providing a strong empirical secondary data for this study. It is this study understanding that, through literatures review this study is able to produce secondary empirical data’s, guiding and laying the ground work on which power unfolds and is made visible through language within immigrant-host labour markets unequal encounters.

The last scope of this research design covers both methods of primary data collection and data analysis method and the result presentation. Adopting a qualitative research paradigm, interviewing as a method for gathering primary data and rhetorical analysis, a data analyzing

tool; provide us with a framework for investigating how through the power of languages, the value of the Finnish economic integration initiatives and employment experiences, represent feeling of hegemonic labour market inequality. In contemporary public life, the questions of power and identity in the practice of political communication remain central. The issue now is, how we know we are not being manipulated by those who seek to persuade us. The answer is by employing rhetorical analysis techniques to understand how they manifest (Martin 2013.). The focus of our analysis is to examine using language, how migrant's and policy officials' knowledge of lived experiences in the labour market in Jyvaskyla expresses perceptions of hegemonic labour inequality. As such, we stated by framing a problem. Finlayson (2007, 556) argue, when using rhetorical analysis as an analytical tool, it is possible for certain phenomenon to be problematized. In this light, the study perform an investigation to ascertain if Integration as a phenomenon is being problematize as a framework which fails to redress immigrants' labour market inclusion needs, but instead re-enforces host cultural values and hegemonic labour inequality?

Concluding therefore, the focus of this design in general, within the context of power is to conceptualize events, problematize trends and phenomenon within host-migrants economic multicultural relationships. It is this study's methodological arguments that both interviewing and rhetorical analysis will outline the different individuals speaking (their voices) be they officials or immigrants in immigrant's integration power relations. As rhetoric therefore turns to focus on the uses of language (which is then in turn also related to power).

Research Questions

However, to be able to achieve the research aim and objectives, the research deems it imperative to carefully restrict the main theme of this work. This meant the formulation of research questions, which in this study is divided into two: specific research question and sub question. The general question is the main research focus, and the sub-questions lay the ground work, guiding us to effectively understand why the specific question is vital.

General Question 1. Hegemonic discourse in defining the economic and labour market importance of migration and integration, and how does such "hegemonic definitions" resonate within the views of Non-EU foreign students, other migrants and policy makers.

Sub-Question 2. Does integration policies, framework and general labour market inclusion trends offers an empowering voice to Immigrant or does it rein scribe a traditional host image?

Sub-Question 3. How does hegemonic labour inequality explicate when certain notion of belonging and identity resonates within labour market inclusions of Immigrants.

These three research questions will lead the analysis of this study's empirical data. It clarifies the research perspective and standpoint of this study.

1.4. Presenting Data.

A total of 16 participants were identified for interview, but one was rejected because he/she was employed to work on a project and was not at policy level as was initially thought. Classified within territorial demographic, participant representation ranges from Latin America, Africa, Asia and Finland (policy administrator). Immigrant's statuses included six (6) first generation students' immigrants with student resident permits and four (3) first generation immigrants with permanent status (who either came to Finland as refugees, Family reunion or student but changed to work visa). Also, three (3) immigrants working as experts within institutions integrating immigrants into Jyvaskyla were also interviewed. Lastly, at policy level, two (2) key informant administrators were interviewed, one from the Migration Service at the City of Jyvaskyla and the second from the Employment Office Jyvaskyla. Note should be made, there exist a broad differences in status between the two classes of immigrant's participants that is, students and others (refugees, family reunion and work visa). These differences in status goes beyond the title in names as stated in the classification above, but also in terms of legal rights entitlements, service provisions, delivery and access. The significant of such differences has implications in data analysis and result finding.

1.5. Research Relevance

As off the year 2017, Non-EU students applying for studies in Finland are expected to pay a tuition fee ranging from 8000 to 15,000 Euros depending on the University and study program. Align to cost of living in Finland, the introduction of tuition fee constitute another financial strength on these studies. Moreover, those migrants who are already in

Jyvaskyla/Finland, equally constitute a vital source of recruitment for Finnish universities. Surrounded by this new development, it is vital to understand not just “what” but also “how” in the mind of first generation migrants’ students and other migrants, perceptions towards integration policies/frameworks and labour market inclusions are constructed using language.

Research findings, especially if done with continuing evaluation and validation, will be submitted to relevant authorities for policy reassessments. It might go a long way to guiding/educating those authorities in Jyvaskyla in particular (City council, educational institutions and immigrant’s integration institutions) and the government in general , not just to make value judgments on the role of immigrants labour to the society, but also formulate, modify existing policies and or strategies which will encourages not just cultural and social integration, but also promotes economic inclusion of immigrants in a multicultural society like Jyvaskyla-Finland.

Secondly, research findings does not imply policy makers ignore current integration policies and programs, but ensure migrants students can compete as well as preventing them becoming concentrated in low-skilled jobs. Such a policy will not just ensure cultural and social unity but also ensure a return on investment to the municipality of Jyvaskyla. It will enable the municipality to maintain a talent pool rather than trailing them to other municipalities like Helsinki, Tampere and other Western nations like Britain, Canada and Norway. As such, policies and initiatives can be made to educate not just refugees and family-reunion immigrants, but also student immigrant’s students towards existing initiatives and effective integration in Jyvaskyla-Finland. Hence integration is not just a rhetoric towards valuable judgments of reality but a reality in itself.

Thirdly, it might go a long way in helping migrants who find themselves in a situation of cultural contact and changes. Students and other migrants can all be provided with information and assistances based on research findings.

1.6. Limitation of Study

For the fact that in political science discipline, most rhetorical analysis are often performed on pre-existing data; constitute a central limitation of this study. Adopting and performing rhetorical analysis on research corpuses gotten through personal interviews was a challenge

because of the lack of pre-existing data. Also, aligned to the limitation posed by the study research corpus, it was also my first time employing rhetorical analysis. Notwithstanding, I was opportune to receive quality supervision from my thesis supervisors on how to perform this rhetorical analysis.

CHAPTER TWO

GRAMSCI'S HEGEMONY AND MULTICULTURAL ENCOUNTER

Transformation within globalised/national political economy and or within the current world order have witnessed numerous structural changes subject to historical forces prevailing on power relations (Rebecca 2007). Here, we see how present day's relationships not just between states but also between individual subjects and classes of people are build, dating back to long historical developments (example, the colonised and the colonisers). In broad terms, power can be define as the control by members of one group over those of other groups (Van Dijk 2001, 302). Power is critical and professed as fundamental, as well as a uniting concept in politics. Within normative and empirical theories, power has aided in the formation of theoretical frameworks and in the analyses of behaviours (Fontana 2008).

It manifestation in recent global politics and economic relation depict a sense of consensus, with the objective of ensuring relationship between divers interests (Rebecca 2007, 61). Guided by the above background awareness of power, it is the focus of this thesis to adopt the concept of power within the unified structures and subjective dimensions of migrants labour integration policies and practices. Using the social science concept "power" particularly from Gramsci "hegemonic" understanding of power, we are going to investigate how power resonates as a systematic and constitutive characteristic of multicultural societal functioning, particularly within migrant's labour integration.

2.1. Antonio Gramsci and Hegemony

Hegemony as power has gained worldwide attentions in recent decades and has been popular within academic fields and public discourse (Rowse 1985; Forrest and Dunn 2006). Although it dates back to ancient Greek history, it has become a theoretical and conceptual utensils in the post war two periods through an Italian revolutionist and Marxist in the name of Antonio Gramsci (Fontana 2008). Born in 1891 in Sardinia one of Italy poorest region, his childhood experiences were surrounded with hardship as he felt; lonely, isolated and although born from a middle class family and very intelligent. Also, the poor conditions of his family prevented him from going to high school (Coutinho 2012). However, he was able to break to light when he finally completed his high school and met his elder brother who

before then, brought him closer to the Italian Socialist Party. When he finally moved to Cagliari, Sardinia's capital, he attended meetings of the local socialist movement which were regionalist and wanted Sardinia autonomy. At Cagliari, couple with his early experience of injustice at childhood (an intelligent boy who could not go to high school because of poverty while bad kids could go to school because their family were wealthy) he wrote an essay; "*The Oppressed and the Oppressor*".

Here Gramsci demonstrated his first socialist aspiration when he wrote an essay arguing war or revolution could not be a solution to social injustice, replacing one class of people in power with another class in power, because it only succeed in only abolish some aspect of injustice but on the other hand introduce others again. In this regard, he maintained social privileges and differences are just products of the society and not nature or wars can overcome them. (Coutinho 2012, 2). He won a scholarship and went to the university, joint a group called Anti-Protectionist Action and Propaganda. During this period of his youth years, his concern were how to unite the working class with the unappeased peasant working class in the South, encourage free trade and anti-capitalism ideologies. Most of Gramsci writing came in a time when there were turmoil in Europe and the world. In Russia it was during the end of an imperial era and the fall of the Tsardom, leading to the rise of Socialism and Communism. Whereas in Europe, there was the rise of other totalitarian regimes such as the Fascism and Nazism. Gramsci did not argue for a right or wrong in his theories, he rather emphasised on the fact that concepts are tools that we use to make sense of the world (Douzinas 2000). Gramsci himself stated in his prison notebooks that "*There is no clear and precise concept of what the philosophy of praxis itself actually is*" (Gramsci 1978, 431). In this light, He developed a much more complex but also deeper analysis of the world and the power structures that was dominating it.

2.1.1. Hegemony/ Set of Power Relations

Deriving it's meaning from a Greek word "Hegeisthia" which means guide or leader. In general, hegemony is seen as the supremacy of a state, social group or an individual over others (Fontana 2008). Gramsci perceptions of hegemony as power is different. Before indulging in details how Gramsci vied power through hegemony, it is vital to understand why hegemony in the first place. This study will answer the "Why Hegemony" question

based on those discussions and analyses that surrounded the periods Gramsci wrote the concept. In this case, it was a bourgeois capitalist society period where the forms of relationships involved domination and subordination, conflict, revolution and reforms. Within such a period, Fontana (2008) argue Gramsci's thoughts where developed from three central developments, in other words events and situations, namely: the debates of Marxism on the necessary and sufficient condition for revolutions; the victory of fascism; and lastly the Bolshevik revolutions in Russia.

Surrounded then by class distinctions, coupled with the poor treatments of the Southern peasants at the hands of the rich working class of the North of Italy, Gramsci was concern with how to unite the working class and the appeals peasants working in the south. Commonly referred to as the "Southern Question". Gramsci perceived a coalition between this two class of people as a solution to the proletarian revolution in Italy and for him hegemony was the strategy through which a socialist society can be achieved (Coutinho 2012, 37-41). Within these frameworks, he was forced to rethink on those prevailing concepts and theories that applied Marxism political thoughts especially power and the state. According to Marxism, the proletariat class do not have class consciousness as such could not totally effect changes in the society and state. Marxist claimed capitalism will in the end bring about its own collapse. This was because, the bourgeoisie class being in control of the means of production and representing the lead culture of the masses, alienates the proletariat class. For this reason, Marx maintained in the long run the Proletariat would rise, gain class consciousness and by revolution make changes in the society (Marx and Engels 2011). However though Gramsci aligned his views with those of Marxist theory and often viewed strongly as a Marxist, his mainstream discussions placed him as a post Marxist coupled with his more vocal Marxist positions (Ortner 2006).

In line with the Marxist views, Gramsci retains that the Bourgeoisie culture indeed is the one that is represented for the masses. However, for effective political mobilisation, common practices need to go beyond the represented bourgeoisie cultures and incorporate more comprehensive views and visions for struggles. Within such argument, Gramsci aligned his thoughts with that of Lenin which claimed that in order for Socialism to thrive in the West, it needs a dissimilar approach than that of the East. For Lenin, western capitalistic system is far more complex and it would take much longer for the proletariat to gain power (Coutinho

2012). Nevertheless, as Marxism and Leninism applied the terminology proletariat to represent the marginalised groups within the society, Gramsci use the concept subalterns to represent the same groups in the western capitalism. These groups of people, had very little or no political powers, as well as economic resources since they did not own land. For Gramsci, subalterns represent a larger group of people not just the economical marginalised, but social, political and cultural groups (Coutinho 2012).

Contrary to the revolution Marx and Lenin depicted could bring change, Gramsci advocated for a new power struggle far from a revolution as it did in Russia. Gramsci's advocated for what he term "hegemony" a concept of power and leadership. Hegemony is *"to identify the peculiar features of a historical condition, of a process; to become the protagonist of the demands of other social strata, and of the solutions to these demands, uniting around oneself these strata, allying oneself with them in the struggle against capitalism, and thus isolating capitalism itself."* (Coutinho 2012, 41). Its applicability will demand that, for the Italian working class to become the leading class, it must ensure the southern question becomes the national question. For Gramsci, to deal with the question of working-class hegemony means to deal with the question of a nation ruled by the working-class, however based on consent from those ruled.

As such, Gramsci merged his experience of the Bolsheviks in Russian and the Greek perception of Hegemony and came up with an argument. That through hegemony it was possible to understand and clarify the strength and resilience of the modern bourgeoisie society. Gramsci therefor adopted the concept of Hegemony to understand how power works and power differences in societies; as well as how power endures and persist overtime (Fontana 2008, 84). Therefore, for Gramsci, hegemony is when one group or class exercise supremacy over another group or class. This supremacy is not attained through violence or coercion, but power as an operation of a pair of opposite interactions: force and consent, violence and persuasion (Robinson 1996). These coercive force and violence mechanism Gramsci depicted in his theory of power can be in forms of the police and legislation (Coutinho 2012).

Against such knowledge, Gramsci argued the main goal of politics and political activities were to attain and maintain powers, but he added even when the working class obtain such powers; unless they abandon the bourgeois hegemony feelings, corporatist attitude, and stop

defending their group interest, can they achieve hegemony of consensus. The reason is that, they have adopted a national class views, where the interest of all is considered in their exercise of power. What he considers consensual domination and applies to every society including the capitalist West. Within such framework, Gramsci knew he had added the social and cultural interest to the more economic and political nature hegemony was understood (Coutinho 2012.). However, Gramsci argued within this new mixtures, that for the ruling class as a way of maintaining a stable power over a certain group while exploiting the subordinate's classes; it does not require simply the coercive backing of the state (that is power of law and ultimately threat of violence). But through "*intellectual and moral leadership*", they can ensure their superiority (Gramsci 1971, 57). However, these intellectual and moral leadership are depended on a strong ideological hegemony in a particular society. These ideologies involves a matrix of ideas, attitudes and principles produced by the states and institutions of civil societies with the ultimate purpose of maintaining both the position of the ruling class, as well as the consent of the wider masses to such an arrangement (Gramsci 1971).

The internalisation of such hegemonic ideologies by the subordinate class means certain feeling of belonging, which might result to support for the standing. In line with this strong perceptions of belonging from the subordinate, Gramsci argue it is only when another class of people present a counter hegemony ideologies contrary to what the ruling class has presented and gain consensus from the subalterns, can powers relation shift (Coutinho 2012). Within such notion of hegemony and counter hegemony, comes the exercise of powers and the increasing role of subordinates and civil societies as an instrument of representation and evaluations. However, according to Gramsci, organic intellectuals in contrast to traditional intellectuals were needed to push for more changes. The organic intellectuals comes from the subaltern groups and developed into leaders of their class. Nevertheless, though powers will remain in the hands of the bourgeoisie, transformism was inevitable in the West as the bourgeoisie class will make adaptable changes or improvements in the society for the masses including the subalterns (Coutinho 2012).

Concluding therefore, for Gramsci the East and West dichotomy was a means to distinguish the various forms of power and how it manifest itself. While his notion of North and South depicted the hierarchal nature in which power exist. Within such a framework, the working

class would become the prominent class by recognising the issue (difficulties) of the South (subalterns). This would then create a sense of hegemony amongst the working class and as they proceed to think nationally and not limited to local thought through, the ruling class are able to unite with other subaltern groups and as such creating consensus which might be able to fight the governing hegemony (Coutinho 2012). Within such notions of complains, the state achieves what can be term ethical authority. This is so, because perceptions of force (state repressiveness) and class struggle will be eliminated and power perceived as moral, universal and natural. Coupled with the fact that, the subaltern's class will now feel belonging, involved and their interest considered and aligned with those of the ruling class.

Hence, in Gramsci hegemony, power goes beyond state force to include legitimate consent and through persuasion, coercion is attained (Hobden and Wyn Jones 2008, 149-150). Though, Burroughs (2012) argues that just like other theories of power, Gramsci's theory of hegemony, overtime, and influenced by the impact of cultural turns was considered by many academicians as inadequate. However, this did not imply hegemony was not valuable, it goes a long way to contribute significantly to understanding power in relationships; coupled to the fact that it strengthened Marxist theory of class struggles.

2.2. Hegemony and the Analysis of Cultural Issues: Multiculturalism and Migrants Privilege (Labour Market Inclusion)

Today, we can understand ethnic relations in the way Gramsci approached class relations in his understanding of hegemony and social class. Embedded with Gramsci concept of hegemony, hegemony to represent all conscious attempt at policies/ideologies towards co-habitation and attitudes to multicultural values and privilege (recognitions, inclusions, exemption, redistributions and equality). Such understanding is because, for Gramsci hegemony is perceive as an effective attainment of power to function through discourses and ideologies (Jackson Lears 1985). Moreover, Gramsci been a post-Marxist, saw politics as a form of struggle between diverse groups of individuals with the objectives of influencing, appropriating or controlling the exercise of authority (Dean 1990, 199). The central tenet employing hegemony in this study is to produce a platform where pressures between acceptances of policies aimed at constructing a multicultural society and concerned about loss of majority privileged, could be implemented to explain why immigrant's minorities in

Jyvaskyla-Finland are consciously experiencing labour market inequality in their attempt to be included within labour market institutions of the host nation. What we conceptualise as, integration and hegemonic relationship of labour market inequality. This is so because according to Gramsci, culture and economy are inseparable, as hegemony means culturalized class relationship and or struggle (Nielsen 2010).

2.2.1. Dominant Culture Hegemony and Multiculturalism

As earlier mentioned at the introductory section of this study, migration is not just a discourse in recent times but dates back to history with a genealogy. However, from a cultural discuss point of view and couple with the 1945 migration, modern migration has led to an increase in ethnic compositions of Finland in particular and Europe in general. Such flow has equally manifest itself and impact changes within the social, political and economic order of the host nations (Dancygier and Laitin 2014). The debate of whether these emerging minorities groups poses a threat to the national culture and economy of the receiving nation as the majority group continue to resonates within migration discourses (Lubbers and Güveli, 2007; Lucassen and Lubber 2012; Lindsköld 2015).

Nevertheless, such an ideological discourse of threat is still spreading, despite the fact that the rhetoric of cultural diversification is becoming popular, coupled with the awareness within some states that human civilisation was embedded in different cultures (Berry 1992); there are still attitudinal thinking within members of the dominant society that multiculturalism and privileges are separate and independent dimensions (Forrest and Dunn 2006, 203). Yet, amide such dichotomy, prior to the second half of 20th Century, there was a strong ideology that a state was strongly united when it was culturally and ethnically related (Saukkonen 2014). This strong ideological rhetoric, correlate with a basic assumption in social theory and western political thought which perceive a society as a community united with primary characteristics such as culture, ethnic decent and language. Such trends represent the bourgeoisie class cultures and way of life which Gramsci argue was been thought as a standard of practices for other class (migrants) to incorporate.

However, the aftermath of the World War (just like what Gramsci studies in Russia and Italy) discredited this single class political ideologies; as such human, social, political and cultural rights started to develop (Saukkonen 2014). Within this new ideological

development and coupled with international migration which turned many European countries into heterogeneous societies (migrants ethnic groups), the 1960s onward saw a thriving pressure demanding new impetus/policies for cultural minorities (subalterns). Not just did tensions echo from the dominant class on actual or perceived loss of hegemony of previous dominant (Forrest and Dunn 2006, 203-204), there were also differences amongst Western societies on how to address issues of diversity, ethnic conflicts, privileges and the place of immigrants within these newly emerge space known as multiculturalism (Cordell and Stefan 2004).

Those models towards relationships that is, ideologies and rationalities, Lloyed and Thomas (2014, 4) refer to them as “*a certain idea of the State*”, represents those thinking which are design within government institutions, civil, social, economic and political institutions with the gaol of producing appropriate subject of the states. In line with the fact that Gramsci did not argue for a right or wrong path hegemony should follow, the idea was to ensure reciprocal recognition is maintain. Moreover, just as Gramsci argument that social privileges and differences are product of the society and not even nature can overcome it; the concern in recent migration discourses surround complex interrelationships questions such as what societal privilege could be assign mainly to the majority population, share privileges, concern about national identity, citizenship and the politics surrounding diversity (Forrest and Dunn 2006).

The first amongst policy model in the 1960 was assimilation (conformity to the dominant ethno culture). This was a one side hegemonic ideology for adaptation and labour market accessibility, as migrants where expected to discard their distinctive traditions, cultural and linguistic values, social characteristics and adopt those of the majority society as such becoming indistinguishable (Vertovec and Wessendorf 2005; Saukkonen 2014). Assimilation ideology, an immigrant hegemonic acculturation mechanism has been perceived and uncritically seen as a framework to achieve linear progress leading to labour market inclusions of immigrant. A hegemonic persuasion ideology of becoming like the dominant group as a result of relinquishing one previous identity (Rumbaut 1997). Here, neither is there any formal recognition for ethno-cultural minorities, nor are there individual rights over group rights. The implication is that, consensually, minorities are given less stricken routs towards attaining citizenship (become bourgeoisies) and employments

opportunities. With a rhetoric of socio-cultural similarity and socio-economic success attached to assimilation, assimilation is considered by certain states as an important hegemonic instrument to cultural relationship, as immigrant problems are considered national issues (Rumbaut 1997). France still apply it as a conscious power instrument when dealing with immigrant's question of equality (Féron and Beauzamy 2012).

Nevertheless, over time and coupled with increase movement of people, there were growing demand for minorities civil rights. In the USA for example, there was a call for a change from full assimilation following the demand for Black Powers (Glick et al. 1997, 5). A trend which has continue and discourses turn towards opinions for migrant acquiring societal characteristics (collective approach) like: representation; participation (also in the political economy); cultural and minority rights (Skrentny 2002). These discourses has gain persuasive strength within policy, public (including the immigrant groups) and governance leading to the growing call for "*politics of identity*" subsumed within a rubric of immigrant integration incorporated under the broader scope of multiculturalism (Vertovec and Wessendorf 2005; Sassatelli 2009).

In particularity, what Gramsci advocated for when he called for a society where diversity (class differences in Gramsci words) was encouraged while avenues for inclusions made available. Consensual arrangement are vital in such societies, and for Gramsci *Hegemony is at its root, a conceptualization about the process by which a relationship is maintained between those who dominate and those who are dominated*" (Gramsci 1971). Within such prevailing demands for functional relationship in the 1960s, persuasive ideologies which could offer both cultural diversity and civil privileges were called for. Such ideologies could also be grounded on those modern state notion that membership of the political community entails a minimal obligation to observe the state's laws (coercive hegemony), but not a responsibility to participate in the sustenance of a specific way of life or the common good (Martin 2013, 36). The result was the concept integration subsumed within the broader concept of multiculturalism.

According to Berry (1992), integration at individual level (policy likewise) represents those intention to maintain one's own culture (immigrants), while at the same time the need to carry on with inter-cultural contact with the dominant culture. In their studies "*debating*

multiculturalism in the Nordic Welfare States”, Kivisto and Wahlbeck (2013, 2) argue that, in contrast to previous policy model (conscious encounters), multiculturalism is foretold on the idea that if dissimilarities are respected, permitted and or assisted over time, then simultaneously societal integration and expansion can be fostered. In this regard, we see the valuable policy similarity between integration and multiculturalism (regard for cultural pluralism), explaining why we argue integration is subsumed within the concept of multiculturalism.

The implication employing this policy model within many immigrant-receiving states, is increase contestations in views on what hold the visions of the notion of nationalism and national identity within this new conscious model of culturalize interactions. Hegemonic categorisation of nationalism and national identity, we have: firstly, the civil relationship, whether immigrants should be integrated into a nation of equal citizens or difference-blindness. Secondly, ethno-cultural encounter, whether to assimilate immigrants into the majority culture or allow ethno-culture. Thirdly, multicultural, whether to recognise cultural diversity and or minority right (Brown 2000, 126-7). However, such normative view (assigning privileges) about multiculturalism had often been confronted with debates if really multiculturalism is a fair and reasonable choice (conscious attitudes) for constructing a consensual societal relationship between host nationals and immigrant population at all levels of the society, including the economic (Kivisto and Wahlbeck 2013).

In their study on core culture hegemony and multiculturalism, a cross-tabulation and component analysis of perception of the privileged of Australian with British background, Forrest and Dunn (2006, 204) argued amide the two dichotomy of assimilation and multiculturalism, is the prevailing issue of “white privilege or supremacy”. The point of contestation is that, as societies increasingly becomes multicultural, those occupying the dominant class (host populations) are facing the dilemma on how to maintain the supremacy of their own identity, as they persistently perceive threats towards certain enjoy privileges (Johnson 2002, 164). Moreover, aligned to this perceived privilege threat from the minority within multicultural hegemonic relationships, are tensions which often are imminent. For example, Forrest and Dunn (2006, 204-5) maintain that, when both civic and ethno-cultural nation fail to converge in practice, the notion of social justice is reduce, resulting not just to

the maintenance of dominant cultural supremacy over the minority group, but also the emergence of new ideologies towards minority rights.

An argument which Nathan Glazer (1988) within the context of African-Americans in America encounter, argued was evidence following years of prejudice and discrimination caused by perceived failure of assimilation. He maintained over the course of time, high level of consensual inequality by the majority white class towards the black minorities led to more consensual demands for both social integration and upwards mobility for certain segregated class of Americans. Far from the revolutionary struggle in Gramsci writing, for Glazer civil right movements were viewed as a counter-hegemonic ideologies/struggle of removing barriers to inclusion before accepting assimilation. However, when these barriers could not be eliminated, Glazer (1997, 147) went further to argue in his study we are all multiculturalists now, that *“multiculturalism was the price America is paying for its inability or unwillingness to incorporate into its society African-American, in the same way and to the same degree it has incorporated so many groups.”* The feeling of “apartness” by the black minorities for Glazer resulted to a multicultural America (Glazer 1997, 120). Here, different segments of ethnic groups were offered different privileges because multiculturalism offered potential to fragment the nation.

Brown (2002, 126) argues *“the emergence of multiculturalism raises major issues for the sense of national community, in that it challenges both the civic idea that the nation is a community of equal individual citizens and the ethnocultural (dominant society) idea that the nation is a community whose members ought to be culturally assimilating”*. Moreover, Brown (2002, 126) emphasised that, within the broader rubric of multiculturalism, the resultant politics vary significantly amongst states, as a result of differences in their ethnic composition of minorities groups and in the character and responses of their governments. Such stand aligned with what this study previously argued in its discussion of “Hegemony” when we said, hegemony is a form of politics which at best always presume an unstable equilibrium between the imaginary and the management of social positivity. On this light, Laclau and Mouffe (2001, 109-111) reasoned that the best way to break from the dichotomy of whether a society is “communist enumeration” (relationship of equivalent between different class within societies) or a “discursively construction” (social relations of contradiction) *“is a rethinking of the thought/reality dichotomy with a rethinking and*

interpenetration of the categories which have until now been considered exclusive of one or the other”

The results of such rethinking and interpenetration has been the different nature in which the relationship between dominant culture and multiculturalism had been employed within migrant-receiving countries. For example, In the United States, we have a scenario where there is a decline of the dominant ethnicity while an emergence of a process of segmented assimilation. In his study on the rise and fall of Anglo-America and the decline of dominant ethnicity in the United State, Kaufman (2004, 6-9) maintained the pre-1960's in America was a period where relationships of privileges were marked by white Anglo-protestant hegemony, what he referred to as “the dominant ethnic phase of Americanism”. This stage was then phased out by a liberal-egalitarian phase, which could approximately be referred to the notion of a civic, but is multicultural. Critically, during this time, it was possible to make distinction between ethnic groups and racial groups. Quoting (Kaufman 2004, 7)

“During this second phase... previously marginalised ethnic groups’ attained rough institutional parity with Anglo-Protestants, a development that has been accompanied by a relaxation of all ethnic group boundaries...”

Kivisto (2002, 83) argued that such perception towards changes in United States were only prominent because it was part of a socio-political process where federal government active role especially in defining or pressing forward the cause of inclusion and multiculturalism were very minimal. In contrast to the inactive role of government in America, in Canada, despite having a cultural pluralism and assimilation theme as a hegemonic encounter in the pre-1960s. Multiculturalism in the 1960s was a state-sponsored initiative aimed at preserving national unity through a shared Canadian identity regardless of ethnicity. This trend later on developed to gain political supports which lead to demand for equal rights. The result has not just seen multiculturalism legally and constitutionally enshrined, but also Canada becoming a home to all its minorities ethnic population: indigenous and immigrants imperatives, Anglophone and Francophone (Hiebert et al. 2003, 6-7).

2.2.2. Dominant Culture and Multicultural Privilege Claim-making (Counter-Hegemony).

The question we will be addressing in this section is guided by the premises that, the above liberal democratic nature of dominant culture and multicultural relationship could not be employed as our theoretical framework alone, if we do not align it to its sociological dimension. In his sociological analysis of multiculturalism, Kivisto (2012) argued multiculturalism as an ideology is the outcome of interaction most often contestation for privileges. What Forrest and Dunn (2006, 204) argued are often imminent especially when perceived assigned privileges fail to converge in practice reducing the feeling of social justice. The implication is that, either the dominant group tries to maintain its supremacy over the minority group or the demands for new conscious ideas towards minority rights from either minorities or certain moral leadership from the dominant culture. In this regard, aligning multiculturalism to the concept of hegemony is: firstly, a form of claim-making by the minority groups and secondly, a way in which the dominant (host) society and its political system accommodate and manage diversities (Kivisto 2012).

Claim-making Attitudes

In his writing, *we really are all multiculturalists now*, Kivisto (2012) argued that within public space of society (multiculturalism), there exist the act of claim-making, from claim-makers who often are more or less legitimate speakers for a particular social group or what he termed “*community of fate*” (those who represent the well-being of not just members of that category but the community itself). Such community of fate, Taylor (1994) and Will Kymlicka (1995, 2001) the two most prominent multicultural theorists, argued in a broader context constitutes the indigenes and or immigrants as well. Aligned to what Gramsci advocated when he raised up the plight of the poor South of Italy in his “Southern Question”, its application in today’s contemporary multicultural society represent those claims made in pursuits for redistribution, recognition and or a combination of redistribution and recognition.

Such change from Glazer liberal democratic views to Kivisto sociological understanding, in the context of this study represents what Gramsci encouraged in Western societies when he questioned for structures that will create organic intellectuals, which are needed to push for

more changes within societal relations rather than just traditional intellectuals. Within this new space, added to certain civic and ethno-cultural privileges already apportioned to these new class of citizens; migrants (subaltern) groups develops into leaders and can voice demands towards further perceptions of inequality. However, even though powers will still remain in the hands of the dominant group (Johnson 2002), demands for privileges are not limited to those of the dominant cultures. As such, in contemporary multicultural encounters claims have been made by members of a marginalised community bonded together to demand or advocate for programs and or policies aim at improving not just educational opportunities but also employments possibilities.

The objectives is to ensure upward social mobility and integration of its members into the public mainstream (Kivisto 2012, 7) which often are characterised by discrimination and inequality. Here, we see a claim for both redistribution of opportunity and recognition into the mainstream society. Moreover, Barry (2001, 8) argued that multiculturalism as an ideology “*undermines a politics of redistribution*”. A relational scenario which, Laclau and Mouffe (2001, 110) considered a transition in multiculturalism which is never fulfilled. However, Kivisto (2012) disagreed. He claims redistribution and recognition claims should not be undermined in multicultural claims, while upholding they always work in tandem. The argument is that, it should not just be made an immigrant question, but be treated as a national question by the ruling class.

Furthermore, similar to the prevailing difficulties Gramsci identified in his Southern question, Kivisto (2012, 8-11) distinguished five broad scope of “cultural rights” claim-making by the marginalised immigrant subjects, and which have implications towards labour market accessibility: exemption; accommodation; preservation; redress and inclusion arising as a result of dominant culture supremacy and multiculturalism challenges. Firstly, “exemption” for a group from a practice which they deem vital for their cultural identity (Kivisto and Wahlbeck 2013, 6-7). Example, putting on hijab at work or public institutions. Here, we see a conscious relationship build on power differential treatment, which might demand an appeal for certain laws, regulations and rules to be ignored in societal encounters. Comparable to exemption is “accommodation”.

Even though claims-making towards accommodation does not necessitate a claim for certain issues to be ignored, it is a claim for a relationship constructed on mutual agreeable

adjustments for individuals in that group to be integrated into societal mainstreams. Examples, accommodation in schools and workplaces over time without first choice to certain preferences. The third claim “preservation” are claims made for the protection of minority language by immigrants and at times policy actors (Kivisto and Wahlbeck 2013, 6). Though, such claim for preservation (language question) has often been made by the host nationals to ensure they keep their official status, something I will argue later is a power mechanism when I examine the vulnerability question of immigrants within the host labour market.

The fourth claim “redress” call for certain issues to be made right (injustice of the past) such as racism. Just like what Gramsci claimed when he argued, the poor political and socio-economic conditions of Southern Italy was the root cause of the revolutions, and which can be avoided when the ruling class becomes conscious of these difficulties. Kivisto (2012, 11) argued that the politics of redress also undergirds call for affirmative action on certain groups within multiculturalism. Having it grips within economic, educational and political institutions, Kivisto (2012) disputed that simply removing barriers that has prevented those members of a groups which has experiences long history of exclusion and discrimination to schools and jobs is not sufficient. It warrants more conscious claims for what he termed “preferential” treatment towards this group until the marginalised group is fairly ably to compete at equal basis. A situation we will further look into in chapter three when we study Finnish Minority Policy Development and the Acculturation Framework (the politics and the political).

The fifth claim, Inclusion explicitly reveals the incorporative nature of contemporary multiculturalism societies (Kivisto and Wahlbeck 2013, 6). What Gramsci supported when he argued that the ruling class been conscious of the need of the subalterns through “intellectual and moral leadership” (Gramsci 1971, 57). However, these intellectual and moral leadership are depended on a strong ideological (ideas, attitudes and principles) hegemony in a particular society with the ultimate purpose of maintaining both the position of the ruling class, as well as the consent of the wider masses to such an arrangement (Gramsci 1971). Here, we see how firstly, language supporting multiculturalism are put forward by members of the mainstream society, not just at state level but to the broader public at large. The aim here is to reach out and increase public support for minority’s

communities while celebrating their particularities (Kivisto 2012, 12). What Bauböck (2008, 3) termed “celebrating multiculturalism”. Still, academicians have question in reality such conscious advocacies for diversity consumption by the mainstream dominant culture, as they argue it is a little more than “happy talk” (Hartmann and Bell 2007) and “superficial” (Kivisto 2012).

Even so, amide such public languages of support towards multiculturalism, is a “*type of a claim for inclusion which constitutes a call to expand the boundaries of solidarity, not by transforming those on the outside into clones of insiders but by valorising the diversity that they bring with them*” (Kivisto (2012, 13). The implication is greater mindfulness for inclusion with deepen civil mutuality to advocate for more equal cultural rights within multicultural encounters, which will then foster full integration and participation. The assumption according to Alexander (2006, 451) is that “*insofar as outsider qualities are seen not as stigmatizing but as variations on civil and utopian themes, they will be valued in themselves.*”

Accommodation and Management Attitudes

The second reciprocal sociological analysis of multiculturalism which could be align to hegemony is “accommodation and management”. Although partially identical to the liberal democratic dimensions, it focuses on how to achieve a form of continuum between the host audiences (bourgeoisie) who are for multiculturalism and those who are against. In the context of accommodation and management in multicultural hegemonic encounters, the gaol at policy level is how to redefined identities through the “*language of relationships, not attributes*” (Goffman 1963, 3-4, cited in Kivisto 2012, 16). Surrounded by this discourse of language of relationship, are governmental policies designed to remedy marginalisation and inequalities experiences of minorities group. The policy goals behind this awareness has often been the allocation of certain privileges. However, within the rubric of multiculturalism are diver’s variations from majority groups which often can be categorized under the following:

- Negative attitudes towards minorities and opposition to policies
- Negative attitudes towards minorities but support for policies
- Positive attitudes towards minorities but opposition to policies, and

- Positive attitudes towards minorities and support for policies (Kivisto and Wahlbeck 2013, 7.).

The central tenet at this level, is how amidst these divers' public attitudes towards multiculturalism, can a win-win attitude be achieved and sustained over time. This is because, the application of hegemony within multiculturalism implies, not just a state where minorities are positively acknowledged by the majority culture with conscious policies and support towards these policies framework, but also an implicitly and expressly valued judgement state of mind by the minority population in their daily encounters.

CHAPTER THREE

DESCRIPTIVE HISTORY OF FINNISH MULTICULTURALISM

Having defined the theoretical framework of this study power relation through ideological management models, assigning privileges and resultant tensions resulting to claim-making attitudes; this section will address certain issues of the conceptual framework of this study. As such, this chapter covers the definitions of the history and state of art in Finland multiculturalism and how within the rubric of immigrant labour, integration has been employed at a hegemonic ideology for multicultural encounter. However, before plunging into the state of arts in Finland, it is important we understand both the political economy case for immigrant labour as advocated rhetorically within the broader European Union in general in which Finland is a member and Finland in particular.

3.1. The Rhetoric of migration as an essential human resources strategy in Europe in General and Finland.

One might be tempted to question why the renaissance of labour migration all over Europe which started in the early 2000s. What makes this renaissance different from the guest and temporal migrant workers systems of the 1945-1970s. Is it not just the same post-war quest worker program as it makes use of wordings like skills and temporary workers programs? However, answering these questions might look like a dilemma because the reawakening itself is a puzzle, as its context is unpropitious (Menz 2015, 4). With relatively low rates of employment in Europe especially in Western Europe and a negative public opinion towards immigration and political restrictiveness towards immigrations (asylum and family reunions), one might be tempted to argue the case for a liberal labour migration policy would have been impossible.

Still, amidst these inconsistencies, not just have studies portrayed migrant labour as vital to the big economy of Europe and measured in terms of population shares, foreign nationals were of comparable importance for many of the smaller economies in Northern Europe (Sari and William 2011) and Finland (Bucken-Knapp et al, 2014). What this means is that, amidst the socio-cultural relationship perceptions identified within multiculturalism, there is an

economic dimension (Saukkonen 2014). In Gramsci's concept of Hegemony, culture and economy are inseparable, as his understanding of hegemony means culturalized class relationship and or struggle (Nielsen 2010).

Yet, from a labour stand point and a cultural discourses, there is still that perceptions of fear and hope on the role of immigration in Europe and Northern Europe in particular. Fear resulting from the scale and social strains of integrating or in some cases assimilating these diverse labour. And also, culturally in terms of social cohesion of these ethnic groups (Sari and William 2011.). Moreover, some argue a shift from economic resources, to economic burden and now socio-cultural threat (Féron and Beauzamy 2012). However, surrounded by these threats and calls for more restrictive migrant's policies, recent studies depict how demographic and competitiveness discourses (positive economic multiplier of migrants) are rhetorically frame as a base to push for a more consensual liberalise labour migration schemes in Europe (Menz 2015).

Rhetoric within this chapter, represent those arguments and rational put forward by both policy makers and business professionals for policy towards immigrant labour. What, Gramsci considered those persuasive ideologies of the state. In his comparative study of Europe nations, Menz (2015) maintained that through discourse formation, regardless of its veracity or validity, policy actors are able to influence and shape policy debates towards a more liberal migration policy both at the European level and national and local levels. This views coincides with Gramsci cultural hegemonic arguments that ideologies are a significant power tool in legitimizing policy changes. As such, when these cultures (ideologies) becomes hegemonic, it becomes "a common sense" for the majority of the population (Duncombe 2002).

Demographic Sustainability

A hegemonic political economic rhetoric framing within EU neo-liberal labour migration policies had been "*sustainability*". The demographics characteristics (its nature and cognitive contents) of migration is important underlining principle under which a hegemonic rhetoric of migration as a strategic human resources for Europe has been formed. As of 2012, the demographic trend within Europe population shows while it is increasing, it's ageing. And couple with a declining young ageing population, the increasing slow level of fertility

rate, projections doubt if the population size will be stable in the absence of immigration by 2060 (Eurostat 2013). In Finland, statistic on the demographic dependency ration by municipalities show 57 out of 59 of its municipalities register a dependency ration of more than 51% with exceptions of Helsinki 45% and Jyvaskyla 50% (Official Statistics of Finland, 2017). This explain why despite recent challenges of huge outflows of refugees to Europe from Middle East and Africa, the EU Commission reports “Agenda on Migration” to the European Parliaments; the Council; The European Economic and Social Committee; and the Committee of the Regions rhetorically framed economic and demographic challenges. The reports claims:

“Its population is ageing, while its economic is increasingly dependent on high-skilled jobs. Without migration the EU’s working age population will declined by 17.5 million in the next decades. Migration will increasingly be an important way to enhance the sustainability of our welfares systems and to ensure sustainable growth of the EU economy”

(EU Commission: EU Agenda on Migration 2015, 14)

Here, we see a statement which does not just adopt a parliamentary format, supporting existing migration policy amid the increase inflow of refugees; but also a judicial format employing certain scaremongering language style, using logical statistical figures to deductively support their claims. As such, a counter-hegemonic persuasion towards those who (far rights parties) argue against existing liberal policies towards immigrants, when they made use of the phrase “without migration the EU’s working age population will decline”.

Economic Competitiveness

Affiliated to the rhetoric of sustainability is competitiveness with other economies of the world. In his ideational framing of policy discourses research, Menze (2015) argue despite the challenging political climate, unconvinced public perceptions and persistent unemployment; politically and economically it has been possible for EU and its member’s states to attempt and link liberal labour migration policies rhetorically to the prerogative of economic competitiveness. Citing, Descy Pascaline (2015) in EU Commission Report 2015 “changes in the skills required by the EU between 2012 and 2025 are expected to show a sharp increase in the share of jobs employing higher-educated labour by 23 per cent”. These shortages the commission argue it has already been observed in some sectors within EU economy (Science, technology, engineering and healthcare). As such, the commission

rhetorically claim “Europe need to build its own skill base and equip people for inclusion in today’s market labour” (EU Commission Report 2015, 14).

These rhetorical framing of competitiveness for a liberalized labour migration, empirically has not just ended within the governing body of EU. Nationally amongst member states, it has also resonates and been exploited by governments, business think tanks and organized business of members states. The rationale behind these framing by these actors has been to create an elite consensus and influence the public opinions and lobby policy makers with a discourse that rhetorically links liberalized economic migration policies with the policy goals of improving economic competitiveness (Menz 2015.). As such, through hegemony, the EU argue even if the case for legal migration will always be difficult in times of high unemployment and social changes, it is important to have in place a clear and rigorous common system, which reflects the EU interest, maintaining Europe as an attractive destination for migrant. However, these rhetoric framing have often be confronted with negative rational against migration coupled with currents trends in migration (refugees inflow in EU and it borders).

Such trends in the demographics of Europe and coupled with theories and studies that have aligned labour (Skills and Knowledge) to the economic development of a nations have strengthen hegemonic ideologies within the European Union’s. Advocating for greater national policies to integrates non-EU migrants labour into the host labour force. (Chen and Dahlman 2004; Mohamed 2008; Lonnqvist et al. 2014). Those rhetoric within nations acculturation policies toward immigrant’s integration are often geared towards social, political and economic inclusions of migrants into the host society. From an employment point of view, it says acculturation (education and language) will improve migrant’s access to the labour market of the host nation (Féron and Beauzamy 2012).

This economic inclusion “harnessing migrant’s capabilities through integration” constitute an important directive commonly shared by EU member states when managing immigrants (Basin et al. 2011), and are often guided by the values and purposes at national level towards migrant’s integration and its processes. Many state-framed acculturation policies (integration and or assimilation) are often geared towards social, political and economic inclusions of migrants into the host society. It is difficult to explain why this change in thinking but as stated in the introduction of this study, the evolution can be attributed to

political liberation, as state began to perceive people's ways of life as a value, as a responsibility, as a right and as an opportunity (Whitehead 2014; Mandaville and Williams 2015).

Notwithstanding, despite population projection forecast and necessity of migrant labour, there still remain within Europe a mixed feeling on the economic important of international migration (International Organisation for Migration 2015). Coupled with the recent out flow of asylum seekers and economic migrants portraying to be refugees, public discourses towards immigration has been surrounded with divers opinions but mostly negative. However, as plan of the European Agenda on Migration, a long-term EU-wide political hegemonic ideology has been to manage through proper integration scheme, these asylum migrants just like any other immigrants into the labour market (Carrera et al. 2015). However, even though one can argue much of Menz (2015) research findings were based on Europe's bigger states. Yet, not just have these rhetoric of sustainability and competitiveness gained popularity within the big dogs of Europe such as Germany, Britain and France (Menz 2015), studies shows sustainability and competitiveness rhetoric have also submerged within the smaller nations in Northern Europe and the Scandinavians (Sari and William 2011, 8) and Finland (Sarvimaki 2010; Bucken-Knapp et al. 2014).

In Finland, on the ministry of interior web site, addressing labour migration establish: *"it views migration as an opportunity... Migration will help to answer to Finland's dependency ratio problem, but at the same time, competition for workers between countries will increase. To succeed in this competition, Finland must be able to effectively attract skilled workers who will stay in the country for the longer term. It argues Labour migration will be promoted with due regard to the need for labour and demographic trends in Finland and the situation in origin countries for labour migration* (Ministry of the Interior Finland). Despite such strong arguments for immigration, and as compared to Sweden who in 2008 left its previously strict non-EU labour migration policies and took up a Europe most relaxed regime, the Finnish case is different. It allows for transitional movements within EU citizens but a strict non-EU citizen's immigration policies. Notwithstanding, in terms of policy line divide, both mainstreams parties in Finland and Sweden demonstrated a degree of consensus (Bucken-Knapp et al. 2014, 586-588).

Liberalization and Far Right Parties: Is Immigration a Cultural or Economic Threats

What this study also draws from Menz (2015) and Bucken-Knapp et al (2014) studies is that, not just have there been hegemonic rhetoric backed by framed discourse in favour of labour migration policies within EU and its member states, these liberal migration policies coupled with recent outflow of immigrants have also seen the emergence and supports for “Far Right Parties” in Europe and anti-immigration sentiments in Europe leading to segregation and marginalisation of the immigrant class. This rise and popularity one might be tempted to question within these current global climate and the liberal labour migration policy of EU, if whether supports for these parties are based on perceptions of cultural or economic threats posed by immigrants labour? One is tempted to argue within the current climate of global immigration discourses that as compared to the 1980s, recent trends depict an increase support for far-rights parties in Europe and especially Western Europe (Lucassen and Lubbers 2012, 548). One important policy instruments that distinguished and act as a unique selling rhetoric and discourses backing these rhetoric for these parties is their anti-immigration standpoints (Hatton 2015).

In their comparative study of Finland and Swedish labour migration policy research, Bucken-Knapp et al (2014, 586-588) argue despite the Nordics having no hegemonic models towards migration, there was to an extent some ideological similarities between mainstreams political parties in both countries. In Finland and Sweden, the Centre-Left parties where against and opposed less restrictive policies while the Center-Rights parties and the Green advocated less restrictive measures. One might be tempted to argue accounted for why the ruling Center-left party of Finland was willing to form a coalition with the Fins People party, paving the way for Finland to become the third country with populist Eurosceptic government along with Belgium and Greece (Jean-Baptiste 2015). These anti-immigration attitudes of these far rights, one might be tempted to argue, constitute the main reasons why these parties have gained popularity. To effectively cover this debates which have submerged within the rubric of globalization and liberalization of migrant labour policies, I will examined the research work of Lucassen and Lubbers (2012). This is because this research did not just apply multiple exclusionary threat theories of immigration in its finding, it findings outlined how perceptions of threats resonates amongst different class in a society.

Many studies have argued in order to understand the existing exclusionary reaction towards immigrants, it is important to look at it from an ethnic threat point of view. Example, the realistic group conflict theory argues that in every society scarcity exist, as such there are bound to be social group conflict over these limited resources. Here, we see how conflict does not just resonates over economic benefits, but also these group interest can also submerged over many valued goods such as cultural identities and values. However, a more substantive ethnic theory, known as the integrated theory purported that realistic threats encompasses any threat to the welfare of a group or its members. Moreover, on contextual measures, realistic threats argues economic measures (unemployment levels) did not significantly influences far-rights wing inclinations.

Nevertheless, weather interpreted either as economic ethnic threats or indicators of cultural ethnic threats, immigrant's/asylum seekers proportions show relatively strong indicator for far-rights parties' preference. Yet, from an attitudinal point of view in explaining exclusionary reactions, despite resulting showing distinct effects of perceived economic (well-being) and cultural (identity) ethnic threats to immigrants in the Netherland; adopting a factor analysis on the same data revealed both the economic and cultural ethnic threats are not distinct (citing Sniderman and Hagendoorn 2007 in Lucassen and Lubbers 2012). What this means is that, no matter which threat theory is studies, applying the same data on a factor analysis show distinction on economic ethnic threat from cultural ethnic threat are often not supported (Lucassen and Lubber 2012, 566).

In terms of measurements and in relation to far-rights preferences, cultural ethnic threats (cultural identity) are more likely to encourage exclusion and consequentially far-rights voting. The question now is why within the globalization processes and the expansion of the European Union, cultural threats are stronger than economic threats. Within this argument, Norris (2005) claims not just has feelings of loss of national identity been threatened in the globalization processes, despite the economic benefits of immigration to individual countries, individual strong affiliation to cultural identity (European Identity) has never subsides. This explain why perceived cultural threats rather than economic ethnic threats would lead to stronger far-right-wing vote surrounded by discourses depicting them as protectors of national identity against foreign influences (Lucassen and Lubbers 2012, 551).

Using data from the European Social Survey (2002-2003), not just did the results show how perceptions of economic ethnic threat and cultural ethnic threats varies amongst EU countries. In terms of social class division, preferences for far-rights parties based on perceptions of cultural ethnic threats were stronger among sociocultural specialists compared to technocrats and manual workers. However, it is vital to draw from this findings that, based on these social class scheme, there are cross-national variables in explaining far-right preferences (Lucassen and Lubbers 2012, 555). Drawing on the fact that data for these study were 13 years ago, one might be tempted to argue these perceptions might have change. Nevertheless, Dancygier and Laitin (2014) research on this economic and cultural ethnic threats dichotomy, reaffirmed the centrality of cultural ethnic threat over economic threats.

3.2. The Concept of Finnish Multiculturalism

In the last thirty years, one can say subjectively that they has been an ideological shift towards multiculturalism within European states with countries like Sweden, Finland and Britain showing strong index. The history of the Finnish nation-state was until the end of the 1980s comparatively closed as compared to other Western states. Such a closed policy of isolationism within the cold war periods meant Finland maintained and kept its borders closed to immigration. However, the Republic of the late 1980s met a broader national consensus to preserve amid a rhetoric of a homogeneous country. Nevertheless, the homogeneous characteristics of Finland continued, following the collapse of the Soviet Union and coupled with the fact that Finland became a member of the European Union in the early 1990s (Rinne et al. 2002, 646.). With this historical path, Finland became a multicultural nation and just as the term states, in Finland it entails the mutual recognition of diversity and includes *“a positive or at least neutral government attitudes towards this cultural diversity, public support for the maintenance and development of cultural practices and identity; and public efforts to overcome social inequalities based on cultural backgrounds”* (Saukkonen 2014, 179).

Yet, despite opening itself to the world, Finland has by no means been a significant destination of migration movement; rather many Finns emigrated more to the America and Sweden in the 19th and early 20th century. Nonetheless, the era of the Grand Duchy nevertheless saw a great deal of international movements especially in the coastal cities and

those closer to Russia. The legacy of such times are groups which today are considered historically minorities namely; the Old Russians, Jews, Tatars, and Sami (Saukkonen 2013, 270.). As international mobility continue to grow, coupled with the fact that Finland became a member of the European Union, the second half of the 20thC saw modest migration to Finland, a trend which has continue resulting to significant changes on the ethnic and cultural landscape of Finland especially Helsinki despite the modest scope(Statistic Finland 2015). Nevertheless, in his multiculturalism and nationalism study in Finland, Saukkonen (2013, 271) argue, Finland is a country where a rather exclusive form of nationalism has played a predominant role in the nation-building process and where national identity has traditionally emphasized cultural homogeneity, rather than diversity of the state. Still, the diversity composition of its demographic continue to grow. The figures below outline the foreign population in Finland, as well as the percentage changes in their population from 2015 to 2016.

Figure 1: Foreigners in Finland

Country of citizenship	2015	%	Annual change, %	2016	%	Annual change, %
Estonia	50 367	21,9	4,2	51 499	21,1	2,2
Russia	30 813	13,4	0,6	30 970	12,7	0,5
Iraq	7 073	3,1	4,1	9 813	4,0	38,7
China	8 042	3,5	6,4	8 480	3,5	5,4
Thailand	7 229	3,1	5,3	7 487	3,1	3,6
Somalia	7 261	3,2	-1,6	7 018	2,9	-3,3
Afghanistan	3 741	1,6	6,1	5 294	2,2	41,5
Viet Nam	4 552	2,0	14,0	5 253	2,2	15,4
Turkey	4 595	2,0	1,9	4 654	1,9	1,3
United Kingdom	4 427	1,9	3,4	4 562	1,9	3,0
Poland	3 959	1,7	7,5	4 192	1,7	5,9
Ukraine	3 392	1,5	12,1	3 761	1,5	10,9
Others	77 036	33,5	7,0	83 451	34,3	8,3
Total	229 765	100	4,6	243 639	100	6,0

Source: Official Statistics of Finland ([Statistics Finland, Population structure](#))
Updated: 3.4.2017

From the above statistics, we notice not just are there significant positive annual changes from ethnic groups population outside Europe (as those numbers in red shows), figures outline a drop in annual changes for ethnic immigrants from Europe. Also, the percentage changes for “Others” ethnic groups which probable include ethnic African’s immigrants

shows an increase over time (fig. 1). Moreover, not just is Finland geographical location in the European Northern periphery, aligned to its historical development with Sweden could further explain its ethnic diversity; it also meant Finland inherit the Swedish language as the national language along its traditional Finnish language. Moreover, the Separate language Act (148/1922; 423/2003) further reaffirmed the dual constitutional right towards Finnish or Swedish language to be used before court and other authorities on equal basis. However, the section likewise approves the rights of the Sami, the Roma and other groups to maintain and develop not just their own cultures, but likewise their own language (Saukkonen 2013.). Saukkonen (2013, 273) argued, such positive provision in principle “*only affirms the will of the Finnish authorities to respect the international treaties regarding the protection of ethnic, linguistic and cultural minorities from discrimination and non-voluntary assimilation. The purpose here is to show tolerance and support*” (ibid 273).

Figure 2: Population by language

	2013	2014	2015	2016
Finnish	4 869 362	4 868 751	4 865 628	4 857 795
Swedish	290 910	290 747	290 161	289 540
Sami	1 930	1 949	1 957	1 969
Other languages:				
Russian	66 379	69 614	72 436	75 444
Estonian	42 936	46 195	48 087	49 241
Arabic	13 170	14 825	16 713	21 783
Somali	15 789	16 721	17 871	19 059
English	15 570	16 732	17 784	18 758
Kurdish	10 075	10 731	11 271	12 226
Chinese	9 496	10 110	10 722	11 334
Persian	7 281	8 103	8 745	10 882
Vietnamese	6 991	7 532	8 273	9 248
Thai	7 513	8 038	8 582	9 047
Others	63 229	69 084	74 776	80 991
Total	5 451 270	5 471 753	5 487 308	5 503 297

Source: Official Statistics of Finland ([Statistics Finland, Population structure](#))

Updated: 3.4.2017

As figure 2 outline, we notice while there seems to be an insignificant drop in the total population speaking both Finnish and Swedish over the years, on the other hand, there is a significant increase in the total population speaking English, Arabic and others. It is worth

mentioning here that, despite explicitly granting language rights to other minorities groups, the Finnish legislation does not legitimately acknowledged minorities' language. Yet, as immigration to Finland continued to grow coupled with the fact that it was evident majority of these newcomers would settle permanently; the Finnish answer to this enlargement were ideologies which mutually combines individual inclusion into society with collective rights and privileges that is cultural and language (Saukkonen 2013, 274.). As Governments continues to adopt new mechanism and policy models to gain consensus of hegemony means and ensure compliances, in Finland a welfare state, integration has been adopted within its multicultural encounters. Valtonen (2001, 251) argue integration signify "*the ability to take part fully in society, implying unimpeded participation in society and the access or openness of institutions to all members of society.*"

In Finland there has been legislative and policy documents produced by the state having in mind the necessity for migrant's integration within the society in general and the national economy in particular. The objectives in this regard was that assigning rights and privileges to immigrants was not just to be beneficial to them, but also to the Finnish society in general (Saukkonen 2013, 275).

3.3. Finnish Minority Policy Development and the Acculturation Framework (the politics and the political).

It is worth stating that the approach to immigrant integration in Finland took its legal form following the Act on the integration of Immigrants and Reception of Asylum Seekers (493/1999). Integration as a policy document and a framework was adopted by Finland as a multicultural encounter instruments following the growing homogenous nature of the state. Within this period (1999) integration according to the Act was defined explicitly as "*the personal development of immigrants, aimed at participation in work life and the functioning of society while preserving their language and culture*". Here, we see a two-dimensional process, where development is seen as a privilege towards participation in work life and society on the one hand, and cultural preservation as a right on the other hand. Also, within this period, the Finnish term "*Kotoutuminen*" was adopted to represent integration. The objective here was to avoid using the concept "integration" and its assimilatory suggestions (Citing Panananen 2005 in Saukkonen 2013, 275). As Finland continue to develop as a

multicultural nation and its multicultural index continue to grow high, Finnish government in their quest to interact with migrants adopted a more integrated model, the 2010 Act on the Promotion of Migrant Integration. Integration in this new Act is define as:

“integration means interactive development involving immigrants and society at large, the aim of which is to provide immigrants with the knowledge and skills required in society and working life and to provide them with support, so that they can maintain their culture and language; integration also means the multi-sectorial promotion and support of integration using the measures and services provided by the authorities and other parties; ... immigrant means a person who has moved to Finland, who resides in the country with a permit issued for purposes other than tourism or similar residence of short duration, whose right of residence has been registered or who has been issued with a residence card”

(Finlex Data Bank)

Thoughtfulness should be made here, on the dichotomy surrounding the definition of the concept “immigrant” in this policy document. Even though all efforts were taken to explicitly broaden who an immigrant should be when it excluded tourist from this scope; still, the assertion “*short duration*” one can argue is a conscious language style to implicitly limit the scope providing the play field to further operationalise who an immigrant should be at implementation level. Nevertheless, as compared with the 1999 Act, one can argue the tones within these two documents show a slight changes in definition and terminology. Yet a critical review on both act shows the basic principles continued unchanged (Saukkonen 2013, 275). Example, from an employment point of view, both Act where formulated with the general vision of improving migrant’s access to the labour market of the host nation. The ministry of Labour primary involvement in migration affairs in relation to integration includes the receptions of asylum seekers and refugees, placement within municipalities, work permit issues, employment promotion (Heikkilä and Peltonen 2002,7).

Within the framework of laws and politico-administrative principles in Finland, immigrant integrations principles have develop not just at legal forms level, but also within institutional values. Example, align to this study focus (labour integration), the underlying values of basic education in Finland, as explicitly stated in the National Core Curriculum for Basic Education (2004) are certain multiculturalist tenets. Page 12 states “*despite the basic of instruction is Finnish culture, it must take into account the diversification of Finnish culture through the arrival of people from other cultures. The instruction should help support the formation of the pupil’s own cultural identity, and his or her part in Finnish society and a*

globalising world. The instruction also helps to promote tolerance and intercultural understanding”

Furthermore, the Ministry of Education strategy for Cultural Policy outlined *“Finland as a multicultural country with a strong cultural identity. The Cultural diversity spring from a wealth of diverse regions, languages, indigenous cultures and cultural heritage. The plurality finds its expression in a wealth of cultural products and services and gains strength from growing interaction and mobility cultures... Immigrants are a new creativity and talent resources, and the positive effects of multiculturalism add to the vitality of Finnish cultures”* (Ministry of Education 2009, 16). With such strong value judgements at both legal and institutional levels, in a broader scope of economic inclusion *“harnessing migrant’s capabilities through integration”* now constitute an important directive commonly shared by Finland and other EU member states when managing immigrants (Basin et al. 2011).

Integration an Acculturation Framework

The development of Finnish minority right under the canopy of integration can be best understood under the broader context of acculturation. What this mean is that, it is worthy to explicitly state that integration is part of the acculturation framework. As such, what then is acculturation?

Acculturation is a concept within the social sciences disciplines with genealogy and within anthropology it was first studied in the 1930s (Berry 1992). Its classic meaning understands acculturation as *“those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups ... acculturation is to be distinguished from culture change, of which it is but one aspect”* (Redfield et al. 1936, 149-52). In their recent studies, HakimLarson and Menna (2015) argue acculturation encompasses *“the variety of different ways that a person can adapt to culture that is different from that of their family’s culture of origin”*. These two distinct historical studies (1936 and 2015) outline how the concept acculturation dates back to history and has increasingly become an area of scholar and academic research focuses, as well as its contribution to the understanding of immigration and cultural diversity (Arends-Toth and Van de Vijver 2003; Berry 2001).

However, despite these time gaps in the two definitions above, we see a define framework where there is an introduction of a new cultural elements from outside to an individual, groups or a society. Moreover, Berry (1992) argue that within acculturation there are two levels of phenomena; firstly the population level which involves the ecological, cultural, social, and institutional. Secondly, the individual level which includes a person characters and behaviours. Important to note here that acculturation differs from psychological acculturation, the changes that those who come in contact experiences (individually/groups) as a result of cultural contacts and also as a results of taking part in the acculturation process involving his ethnic group or culture.

Understanding those changes within these two levels, Berry (1992) argued that this is very important for two reasons. Firstly, the way those changes manifest itself at these two levels differs. Example, frequent changes are witness within social structures, political organisations and economic bases at the population level, whereas at the individual levels changes are perceived in behaviours, values, attitudes and identity. Secondly, within these two levels it is important to note that not all acculturated person share in collective changes in that group at equal magnitude or in an identical way. This situation will further be explain and will underpinned this thesis.

Having defined and outlined in a broader sense what acculturation is and what it entails, it is equally vital to point out some significant fundamentals in acculturation as studied in cross-cultural studies. Firstly, acculturation begins when there is a contact or an interaction amongst cultures usually between a dominant culture and a receptor or acculturating group made up of either one of or a combination of the following; ethnic groups, native people, immigrants and refugee (which can be grouped between voluntary or involuntary). Moreover this contact should often be first hand and continues ruling out short-term accidental contacts (Berry 1992).

The effects or results of these interaction are approximately change in the cultural or mental phenomena amongst people in contact which often continue to the generation down the line (Berry 1992). This views had been supported in research finding, arguing that ethnic loyalty to the culture of origin remain steadily high from the first to the fourth generation. But also important was that, perceived perceptions of stigmatisation and discrimination from the host often result to a closer identification with their original ethnic cultures (Padilla and Perez

2003, 37-38). Summing up these two aspect together (contact and change), is a scenario were two cultures are in contact (A and B) and which in principle could influenced one another through symbiosis equally.

However, contrary to this individualistic and or collective nature of cultural contact outline by Berry, HakimLarson and Menna (2015) in their study on Arabs acculturation and enculturation in USA argues that in reality acculturation occurs in a multiplicity dimensions. They argue psychological variable such as self-constructs are contextual factors that influences acculturation, and often individuals from the acculturated group often come in contact with other influential cultures other than the host cultures. In this study, the Arab ethnic identity young people came in closed contact with not just the American culture but other cultures and values like Christain, Protestantism and Western values. Though, Berry (1992) argue in practice the case is not always so as one culture often the dominant group culture prevail, and insert more influences on the other, yet, this is not to say that changes do not occur too within the dominant culture no neither are these changes not important or interesting.

At this stage, it is important to outline the four varieties of acculturation which are; assimilation, separation, marginalisation and “integration. Integration for Berry (1992, 47) exist when those actors in cultural encounters (host and immigrants) are positive because they intent to maintain their own cultures while at the same time felt the need to carry on with inter-cultural relationship with each other cultures. Within such broader scope, Valtonen (2001, 251) defined integration to signify “*the ability to take part fully in society, implying unimpeded participation in society and the access or openness of institutions to all members of society.*” Berry et al (1989) claim at individual level or generally from an acculturated group point of views, it represent what has been termed “acculturated attitudes”; that is the way the acculturated group or individual chose to relates with the dominant group culture. And from the dominant group perspectives, it often manifest itself through conscious gaols expressed in their policy statements and which outline their attitudes or how they would want these relationships to follow. In other words, hegemonic relational encounters.

Immigrant Integration in Finland: The City of Jyväskylä

An important development from the 2010 Act aligned to acculturation, is the role of individual municipalities as an agent of immigrant integration in Finland. Under this provision, what is needed is for some degree of state coordination towards local integration programmes or strategies at municipality's level. Moreover, the 1999 Act in its creation also did not allow for a state compulsory instructions on what integration should content and or what/how it should be for all its municipalities. This explains why we have variation within municipalities on how hegemonic acculturation should proceed. The city of Jyväskylä which was incorporated as a town on March 22nd 1837, and on January 1st 2009 became one city, Jyväskylä (after the city of Jyväskylä, the rural municipality of Jyväskylä and the municipality of Korpilahti merged), is the seventh largest city in Finland, with 138 850 resident in 2016, a 1.1% change as of 2015 and a demographic dependency ratio of 51% (Official Statistics of Finland, 2017).

With such a population demographics, it is important to remark that, 4200 residents are foreigners from over 100 different countries. Also, Jyväskylä is a city hosting 47 000 students, home to 48 comprehensive schools, 8 high schools, 3 universities and 15 libraries. The city also is home to 61 000 number of jobs with a total number of 7 000 employers, the biggest employer in the area (statistics on Jyväskylä). Statistics from the data protection team of the University of Jyväskylä, establish that in the spring semester, 232 EU and 537 Non EU degree and doctoral students registered for attendance in 2017, not forgetting 178 EU and 119 Non-EU exchange students (Hanne Allonen: Data production team). Even though the city of Jyväskylä was the fastest growing city region in Finland, but, it still lags behind the national on critical performance measures (unemployment high and low productivity with predominantly SMEs business. Nevertheless, the enlargement of higher educational institutions has been the key tools fostering regional economy growth in the municipality of Jyväskylä (Marmolejo and Puukka 2006, 6-8.). In this regard, it is of fact that the city of Jyväskylä is a city of education, where every fourth bystander is a school goer or student (statistics on Jyväskylä: Facts about Jyväskylä, 2017). This may be possible explanation why Jyväskylä registered the second municipality with the lowest dependency ratio of 50%, after Helsinki with 45%.

In Jyvaskyla, integration as a conscious acculturation services are managed by the migration service of the city of Jyvaskyla in cooperation with different agencies organizing immigrant services like the employment office, Kela (social security) and immigrants organisations like Gloria (a multicultural center in Jyvaskyla). In general, the services provided include: organisation of refugee and re-migrant reception; guidance and advice for immigrants, guidance about family reunification for refugee; and education, consultation and information about alien affaires. The Immigrant Services in Jyväskylä supplies social welfare work for refugees for a period of 3 years from immigration and for re-migrants for the period of one year. Social welfare service for other foreigners are made according to the demands of each situation (Immigrant Services Jyvaskyla.). The ideological vision behind such acculturation efforts is not just to help immigrant adjust to Finnish society while preserving their personal cultural identity; it is also an effort to expose the development of the city of Jyvaskyla as a multicultural community which supports diversity.

Such above vision is been grounded by the 2010 Act, which lays the responsibility on local integration programme for the implementation of individual integration plan for immigrant, financial support for participants in these activities and labour market inclusion (Saukkonen 2013, 277). Immigrant acculturation in Finland begins with an integration plan, a blueprint personal plan for individual immigrants focusing on learning the national languages, training and education, and also opportunities for improving employability. Section 17(3) of the 2010 Act quote *“the immigrant shall adhere to an integration plan and regularly attend a Finnish or Swedish language course provided as part of the immigration plan and participate in other measures and services agreed as part of the plan on a regular basis”*. Here, the focus is on Finnish culture with no measures of maintaining the individuals own language and culture, and even when it exist, it is secondary. Far from the 1999 Act, which gave rights to integration plan to the unemployed, dependent, income support and or under the age of 18 year old immigrant living in Finland; the 2010 Act stretched the right (initial assessment) to a plan to all newcomers willing to complete the assessment. The goal here was to extend the focus group, ensuring more immigrants are able to benefit from such conscious system, and also shortlisting who need a plan (Saukkonen 2013).

Within the broader scope of the Finnish Act and specifying the necessity for a political economic consensus in Finland; in accordance with the Act on Public Employment and

Business Services and the Act on Social Assistance, section 35 of the 2010 Act does not just place the Ministry of Employment and the Economy, responsible for immigrant's labour integration at city level, it also ensure the promotion of good ethnic relations at national level and the needs of the immigrants. Section 3 calls for an *“interactive development involving immigrants and society at large, the aim of which is to provide immigrants with the knowledge and skills required in the society working life and provide them with support, so that they can maintain their culture and language”* (Finlex Data Bank: Act on the Promotion of Immigrant Integration. Translation of Finnish Acts and Degree. 2010-1386/2010).

Also, multiculturalism in schools equally represent an effective method in which integration programmes are design not just at institutional level but also how municipalities get involved. Schooling inhabits a salient place in the integration of immigrants and their children in Jyväskylä-Finland. Not just is language instructions key to delivery, education is also designed to take into consideration cultural diversities of immigrants/pupils. The central tenet here is to consciously understand immigrants/pupils challenges by designing frameworks with the goal of preserving their original identities. Within such framework, the National Board of Education in Finland continue to strive in such basis objective towards immigrants especially newcomers to Finland with an opportunity to participate on equal basis in Jyväskylä-Finland.

3.4. Rhetoric/Reality of Immigrant Representation within Finnish Labour Integration

Drawing from the ideological underpinnings of hegemony so far in this study, representation in this context epitomises those explicit and implicit ideologies and rhetoric laying provisions for immigrants/ethnic minorities to be more involved not just at decision making level within personal integration framework, but also the general labour market institutional of the host society. Reality in this section does not follow the traditional pattern that integration is a perfect solution to diversity and equality, rather it entails what Bowskill et al (2007) argued when they ascertain, integration ideologies and rhetoric are conceal with implicitly structures design to reproduce or produce hidden agenda. In her research result which analysis multicultural project in Finland, involving series of interviews with practitioner aiding migrants in finding jobs and or education, shows while it seems migrants lack the necessary abilities for labour market accessibility, there was a consensual desire for

a task that will help immigrants participate more and overpower immigrants. This is because, the Finnish multicultural projects have been criticised at structural level for its failure and lack of interest especially dealing with cultures and cultural differences at group or individual level.

In dealing with migrant's labour integration, it has focused its attention on social structural questions forgetting the valuable role of immigrants' features and participation (Wrede and Nordberg 2010, cited in Touri 2013). In the words of Touri (2013, 38) she recommended a "*formulated somehow differently, what might be individuals' potential to act as subjects within the structures of society, institutional practices and current ideologies*". With a weak tradition of anti-discriminatory and anti-racism in Finland (Valtonen 2001), labour market integration projects were understood instrumentally when immigrants were more involved. Furthermore, amid a highly individualistic work environment, working structural questions and as well as culturally racist structures; "*emphasizes on empowerment of participants and activation of migrants easily cast individual migrants as the agents of change*" (Touri 2013, 38). The result has been strong emphasis on immigrant's participation and representation ideologies within policy framework.

Immigrant's participation and representation (labour market)

In her assessment of Finnish multiculturalism, Saukkonen (2013, 285) claimed Finnish integration is deliberately defined as a holistic process which does not just expect the Finns to adapt to these changing circumstances, but it also ensures immigrant participation in societal affairs (labour market institution), while maintaining their own language and cultures. The motivation, is to cultivate an awareness amongst the immigrant's population that the ruling class is conscious of their needs and values. Example, The Finnish Act 2010 insists for an increasing involvement of immigrants in decisions concerning their welfare. For Gramsci, such involvement is required for societal transformation. Such avenue for representation and participation, according to Gramsci lays the grounds for the subaltern's voices to be heard and if their voices are heard, the ruling class will become more conscious of the needs of these class of citizens and through consensus the subalterns can gain economic power.

Section 3(4) does not just call for immigrant's social empowerment aimed at improving their life skills and preventing social exclusions, Section 11(1) "*the integration plan*" gives the immigrants personal control in determining how he/she wishes to interact with societal

institutions. Gramsci, maintained the subalterns need to get involved in the political and cultural sphere, produce social forces that opposed capitalism, since capitalism in the West had developed superstructures. In Finland, such superstructures outlined in the 2010 Act, that deals with immigrant's economic integration are Municipalities Councils, Employment and Economic Development Office and National Board of Education. Moreover, within such class participation, Gramsci knew he had added the social and cultural interest to the more existing economic (labour integration) nature hegemony was understood.

Under the 2010 Act, the "*Participative Integration Finland*" pilot scheme which was designed to be implemented in 2011-2013 laid the grounds for immigrants including students with rights and obligation during the integration training. It also provide immigrants participant with a certificates of completion, which then allow him to attest of his/her capabilities in the job market. Within such framework, participation becomes a ground for an integration policy surrounded by consensus. Such practically comes the ideology that successful integration of immigrants into the labour market requires a broader cooperation. The 2012-2016 Multicultural programme of the city of Jyvaskyla was a policy document containing 45 gaols and was drafted not just by the host municipal state, but with the participation of individuals with immigrant intellectuals and representatives of immigrants association (Multicultural Programme of Jyvaskyla 2013).

However, even though Finnish multiculturalism allows for such structures and procedures for immigrant's representation and participations, Touri (2013) argues that such structures and procedures are complex making it difficult for individual voice or a community voices to be heard. Complex and difficult because, immigrants are inadequately represented and even when they are represented, participations is limited. She maintained this is because opinions of immigrants and even experts with migrant's backgrounds (having knowledge on how societies construct immigrants within host labour markets) are not valued in decision redressing immigrant inclusion into the host labour market. Moreover, these integration policy frameworks, provides for a more subtle or unconscious form of non-listening between the host and the migrants, as migrants are not involved or their interest sought after in policy formulation for immigrant.

Moreover, those involved in these power functions most often are not migrants (subalterns), but classes of people who do not represent the views of the migrant's class (Touri 2013.).

Against such inadequate level of participation, Touri (2013, 37) maintained “*some kind of politics of representation are however necessary*”. Nevertheless, Valtonen (2001, 253) argued that in order for the expertise of immigrant’s organisation to be effectively represented and their clear voices heard, third sectors actors need to play an integral part in the decision-making process in their municipalities. These sectors are more conscious and are aware of those difficulties, challenges and power domination mechanism migrants’ encounter in their quest to access the host labour market. As such, conscious multicultural encounters allows for these varieties of competences, expertise and experiences to come together in services provision (Valtonen 2001).

However, despite the above genealogy quest for representation and participation, the oppressive fit taken by integration policies discloses a shift from its ideology (Brigitte and Elise 2012) and to an extent a non-hegemonic viewpoints. Not just are there few employees representation in the public social services with migrants’ background in many welfare states, institutionalisation is unclear with little initiatives done to include these immigrants’ experts (Valtonen 2001, 259). Within such stand, one is force to question how immigrant’s labour market interest can be represented in general when immigrants themselves are not substantially represented in the process. In their studies aligning migration to world capitalism, Glick et al (1992, 14) argues that migrants, if not classed by their class of origins, they are primarily proletarians when placed within the host labour force.

Such representations are further differentiated along class origins with different stratification of power elements. Moreover, in her research finding in Finland, Tuori (2013, 37) reveal experts of migrant background are marginalised from both service provision and in designing economic integration programmes. In their study, Christie and Sidhu (2006) argues that these stratification stand at the core of governmentality practices which then give room for differentiation that is whether to exclude or integrate migrants within institutional settings (labour market). Such stratification and misconceptions of migrant knowledge/expertise as a results of their origins denote what is termed as racism or racialization in Finland, and which does not just resonate at individual level but to the larger political scales including NGOs representing migrant’s economic interest (Tuori 2013).

Further, in her study of multiculturalism in Finland, Saukkonen (2013, 290) argues that such misconceptions and non-consensual relation at a broader and general level represent what

she stylistically brand “*lip-service multiculturalism*.” Lip-service, because despite a strong ideological stand, Finnish multicultural policies remains unimplemented or non-concretized at the practical levels of decision-making and service provision (Saukkonen 2013, 290). Within the context of immigrant participation, Touri (2013) claimed that policy unimplemented also means migrant’s initiatives towards integrations are accredited, appreciated but perceived as not accurately engaging. Such research claim by Touri aligned with what Pyykkonen (2007) argued when he maintained in a broader context most nation states government rationality behind migrant’s integration strategies and policies incorporated within numerous set of techniques are aimed at controlling the multicultural development of migrants in their society, shaped by political economic democracy.

Within such developments, public policies and integration frameworks are designed not just to encourage consensual migrant participation and representation but to also ensure a power position in favour of the ruling class which in this case is the host nation (Brigitte and Elise 2012). In the case of Finland, Saukkonen (2013, 285) claimed the Finnish integration has an undecided character. Not just are immigrant participation in societal affairs designed to encourage them maintain their own language and cultures, it also demands the Finn to adapt to this changing circumstances. In this regard, Saukkonen argues that policy practice in reality exclusively focuses on the personal development these immigrant makes in finding their places in the Finnish economic, social, cultural and political systems particularly the labour market. She again argues conversationally that in practice, most nation states multicultural policy framework demands more adaptation attitudes from immigrants rather than from the native population and some Finnish institutions.

However, it is vital to note here that, the degree of an immigrant participation/success in integration is measured by immigrant’s level of employment within the labour market and societal interaction in the host country. Amide the above arguments for and reality of immigrant participations in a host nation labour market, Kymlicka (2012, 14–15) argues that effective integration occurs when all barriers to full participation in a society (labour market inclusion) have been dismantled, allowing cultural distinctiveness. Bowskill et al (2007) contended that far from the micro focus attached to particular acculturation policy or attitudes, acculturative matters have to be perceived from a broader (macro) social

constructionist perspectives providing avenues for equal participation and representation rather than inequality.

To conclude, and in line with such above reasoning, what has been professed is for a deconstruction against those alienating and dominating constructions within policies and market realities, towards a more sensitive conditions and structures relating to participative integration (economically) of immigrants within multicultural societies (Touri 2013). Yet, within Finnish Multiculturalism, dismantling these barriers could be a challenge because its creation dates back to history and has a genealogy. In the next chapter, we are going to identify how within the focus of power, knowledge towards Finnish identity domination is been created and how such knowledge has transformed resulting to issues of racism, discrimination and stereotyping which we argue resonates as an instrument of power by the host towards immigrants within the labour market. What in lined with Gramsci Southern Question, we termed the “vulnerability question” immigrants encounter in their pursuit for labour equality.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE CENTRALITY OF KNOWLEDGE IN IDENTITY CREATION, PRESERVATION AND DOMINATION

4.1. Hegemonic Construction of Finnish Supremacy within Multiculturalism

As earlier mentioned, the path to multiculturalism dates back to history, and within individual nations or states, these path varies and often carry with its certain knowledge transfer to subsequent generations. The nature of this discourse determine the mode of immigrant-host relationship in this new space. In their research on boundaries of national belonging in Ingrain Finnish return migration, Mähönen et al (2015) maintained that within Finland, through discussions, there is what is call the construction of Finnishness, which outline the characteristics of what a Finns is and should be, especially taking into account ancestry and language variables. Such knowledge of what constitutes Finnishness, when constructed are then employed within communities, interpersonal levels of text and talk, and as well as within institutions. Such Knowledge are then used as an essentialist notions of ethno national belonging, strategies by both authorities and individuals to claim their Finnishness, rights and privileges. Such attitudinal knowledge, demonstrated how through allocations of social and political rights, a power structure is created limiting the rights of others (Bowskill et al. 2007).

Moreover, amidst many multicultural labour policy frameworks, Glick et al (1992, 13) within the context of migrant and host relationship, argue that despite final domination retained by force, through the daily practices, common sense and habits under which the dominated (migrants) live their life's, dream their dreams and understand their society, the socio-economic dominations of the host are also maintained. Within such practices and standards, quoting Raymond Williams (1977, 110) "Hegemony within these frameworks will be the lived system of meaning and values, constitutive and constituting, which as they are experienced as practices appear as reciprocally confirming. It is a culture which also has to be seen as the lived dominance and subordination of particular class". Here, we see how individuals engages and performs certain activities of their daily living based on pre-existing societal constructed standards.

A scenario, Tuori (2013) in her multicultural studies project in Finland, argue multicultural economic relationships are sometimes guided by informed and in other scenario misinformed diver's kinds of assumptions. Her study revealed such assumptions often originates and or results to knowledge which can either be false and or biased, but are used by the host nationals to determine and define the nature of labour relationship with the immigrant class. Such understanding aligned with Gramsci's conceptualisation of Hegemony, when he argue hegemony at the center of policies/processes denotes how the relationships between those who dominate (states and citizens of the host nation) and those who are dominated (migrants) are created and maintained. As such, we see the centrality of knowledge in this process generation and or used. The question now is, how are these knowledge for domination constructed within present day's host-immigrants relationship?

The Class Dichotomy:

Far from the class distinction and consensual ideologies for domination Gramsci spoke of in his study of hegemony, recent trends in Western nations shows the construction of hegemony knowledge say little of class. Direct to the class dichotomy is race, ethnicity, or nationalism which serves to discipline a classless migrant public into capitalist subject through practices of consumption, leisure, and work (Glick et al. 1992). Nevertheless, these consensual constructions and practices are persistently created, restructured and reconstructed by states over time. Overtime, these knowledge are internalised by both the dominant and the dominated, which then generate a logic for loyalty and legitimacy for the dominant classes within institutional contacts (Lloyd and Thomas 2014) including labour markets. This does not means these systems are not fair and or these legitimacy are acquired through consensus. Surrounded by such circumstances, Glick et al (1992) in their study of trans-migrants in the USA, and Ndukwe (2016) trans-migrants in Finland; confirms that in order for these immigrant to survive divers societal constructed knowledge, trans-migrants adopts and maintained different racial, national and ethnic identities to be able to resist such global political economic situations that engulf them as they try to put up to the different living conditions marked by vulnerability and insecurity.

Contextualising these knowledge constructions, the Finnish multicultural economic politics is surrounded by a paternalist and a nice side of colonialism, the trend is to "tolerate and include, which gives a hand to assists but which does not revolt nor rise in rebellion against

the power structures that reinforces whiteness and its privileges”(Molinas 2010, cited in Tuori 2013, 37). Moreover, aligning such hegemonic knowledge to rights within immigrants-natives economic relationship, Heikkila (2005) observed that within new multicultural societies, studies have suggested that rights have both a structural and a cultural dimension, and that the vulnerability of immigrants within the Finnish labour market, is not just a physical condition but it is socially constructed by the nationals of the country in which migrants are living. The structural nature of migrant vulnerability derives from the existence of a power structure which in any given society allocates more power to some than others.

As such, in their attempt to integrate within the host labour market, “the cultural nature of vulnerability derives from a set of cultural elements (stereo-types, prejudices, racism, xenophobia, ignorance and institutional discrimination) are used to justify the power differentials between nationals and immigrants” (Heikkila 2005). Yet, Rex (1997) argue “in a multicultural society, we should distinguish between the public domain in which there is a single culture based upon the notion of equality between individuals, and the private domain, which permits diversity between groups” He maintained that, despite such an idea of diversity, the basic principle of pluralist societies is the hegemony of the dominant cultures within societal institutions (labour market institution). Such domination does not help the minorities to grow (employ), because most often it is the public dimension which is used. Such public dimensions, Mähönen et al (2015) research finding argued is created within a discourse of equality based on characteristic of Finnishness.

As such, drawing from Glick et al (1992) and Ndukwe (2016) trans-migrant findings, we can say the attainment of a European citizenship makes it easy for immigrants to resist diver’s migrant’s hegemonic inequality discursive constructions within the national market of European states. They are able to move and settle within other member states that provides a suitable hegemonic environment (favourable constructions) more suitable for their inclusion into the labour market. Such environments have constructed knowledge which allows for its nationals and institutional structures not to govern based on ethno grounds. Hence, in societies that are characterised by numerous informed and misinformed knowledge about immigrants labour, Tuori (2013) advocated for a good multicultural politics which come upon listening in such a society, not the non-listening, cold interrogation and anti-listening common in societies.

Amidst the non-listening nature of the Welfare states of Europe and Finnish multicultural society included, in his research finding on the provision of social workers in Welfare states, Valtonen (2001) amidst the low level of immigrants representation within this labour segment, advocated not just for avenues for participation, but also for strategies that will fight those barriers of migrant inclusions and participation in social works. To redress these deficiencies, there need to be willingness and readiness at institutional (Macro level) and policy level to adopt anti-oppressive and anti-discriminative tactics to fight these barriers. A tradition which Touri (2013, 37) observed that it is very weak in the social work sector in Finland, partly as a result of socially constructed misinformed migrants knowledge's and non-listening type of immigrants-host relationship. Knowledge and listening for Touri refers to the sensitivity to conditions and structures relating to the integration (economically) of immigrants within multicultural societies, what Gramsci referred to as the ruling class portraying societal consciousness. Within such premises (construction of knowledge and listening to immigrants) comes the prerequisite for migrant's participation in most multicultural relationship and in the case of Finland migrant's participation in the labour markets processes (Tuori 2013). Moreover, even though these migrants could still express their resistance through small everyday ways, Glick et al (1992), maintained these means of resistance do not challenge or even recognise the basic premises of the systems which dictate the terms of existence within the host labour markets.

4.2. Labour Markets Realities: Ethnicity and Linguistics as Domination

What we have just examined above is how through knowledge creation and re-creation, a hegemonic discourses of what and who a Finn is (Finnishness vs Otherness) continue to develop and now pose a genuine question about social acceptability and a tool to demonstrate power with multicultural encounter. Within such notions, and drawing from Gramsci's Southern Question, the debate about class/ethnic representation often brake down exactly on the question, too what extent the minorities have direct access to the real? In this regard, Shohat and Stam (2014) argue this powerlessness of historically marginalised groups resulting from: stereotypes, discrimination, racism and misrepresentation, negatively influences their abilities to control their own representation in a hegemonic setting. Such scenario, then has implication on an individual/group economic power compared to the dominant culture. Below, I am going to examine some case vulnerabilities of migrants as a

minority group within market realities and how within the play of power it influences their ability to effectively form a subaltern group.

This section examines how labour market attitudes towards migrants influences the nature of migrant's labour inclusion within economic institutions. In discussing these market realities, this study examines how ethnicity and language represents an avenue for domination, not based on consensus and as well as the inability for minorities to form an effective subordinate class within the political economy hegemony despite efforts to ascertain these class with rights and privileges.

A. Ethnicity as Domination

When an individual or groups are normatively category for example "Whiteness" or "immigrants needing help", it makes it visible and possible to stay comfortable within a position of privilege or sense of pity respectively (Touri 2013, 37). Within such an understanding and aligned to market inclusions, Heikkilä (2005) states that "*within most cultural theories, an immigrant's success in the labour market is described in terms of whether his or her ethnic background is evaluated in a positive or a negative way*".

In their study using the European Social Survey to examine the relationship between ethnic identity and labour market outcomes of non-EU immigrants in Europe, Bisin et al (2011) argue that despite adopting a common Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) and having a shared goal for integrating migrants; generally, there is a 17% penalty to be paid for being a first generational migrant as compared to second generation migrants whose likelihood were statistically comparable to native. Vital to their research finding was the relationship between ethnic identity especially those with strong identity (identity having strong ties with religion and tradition, example Muslim ethnicity) and degree of unemployment. Being a first or second generational migrant of a perceived strong ethnic identity regardless of the nature of acculturation (whether assimilated and or integrated), their level of economic unemployment's are statistically different compared to other ethnic identity. The argument they raised to redress such claim were that, such ethnic directed alienation within labour market encounters could be remedied within a more regulated markets (Besin et al. 2011).

Moreover, across Europe, statistical analyses of employment patterns time and again show that even when controlling for education, work experience and language, immigrants (including second and third generation) in Western countries do not have the same labour market opportunities as ethnic native majority (Health et al. 2007; Midtbøen 2015). Example, In Norway, Hermanansen (2013) research finding shows even when controlling for human capital and social backgrounds of migrant children of non-European countries, they still do not have access to Norwegian labour market on equal terms with ethnic natives majority. Result show, these children still suffer additional ethnic penalties which put them on a weak position in accessing opportunities.

To contextualised these above research findings to Finland, in her study on the vulnerability of immigrants ethnic origins and Finnish labour market, Heikkila (2005) argue that within Finnish integration policy, ethnicity influences labour participation with the most successful immigrants participants in this hegemonic relationship being the Westerners and by contrast those from the developing world. She conceptualised these ethnic penalties under a broader context of “Otherism”, something which integration policy inadequacy has failed to address in its effort to construct hegemonic relations. This is because cultural misrepresentation elements such as; scapegoating, stereotyping, prejudices, xenophobia, racism, ignorance and institutional discrimination are socially constructed by the host majority within the political economy and often manifest itself through power distribution given more consensus (labour representations) to migrants from Western nations against non-western subalterns groups (Heikkila 2005, 486). What Heikkila depicted was that, despite both classes of migrants going through similar integration frameworks, the host reinforces their Western domination by discriminating against other non-western migrants while maintaining their cultural supremacy within labour institutions.

Moreover, common outside integration practices in many host nations are observes preferences discrimination and as the segmentation theory argues, we see dualism in the labour market which often takes the form of ethno-stratification of jobs based of class status. What Shohat and Stam (2014, 189) called “the racial politics of casting” in cinema production, when Europeans and white-Americans play a dominant roles while non-Europeans downgraded to supportive roles and the status of extras. He further argues that such practices has implications on the literal self-representation of the minority, something

which is viable for an individual ability to work. Aligning such ethnic inequality, to immigrant group size notion within labour market realities produced what can be term discrimination based on taste (distaste based on culture). What Dancygier and Latin (2014) called “statistical discrimination” a market scenario where a whole group is been discriminated based on a particular distaste attitude from the host. They claimed such distaste still remain a powerful account of labour-market failure of certain groups of ethnic minorities.

These distaste of immigrant groups are not just noticeable within labour market realities (exclusion), but also within native-immigrants relationship which have implications for immigrant’s labour integration processes. Not just are immigrants reluctant to report cases of ethnic discriminations in areas where far right is strong, they are equally force to proliferation of ethnic enclaves communities; promoting segregation which might hinders an immigrant abilities to learn skills through limited contact with natives. It also has implications on networking which is an important variables for labour market accessibility and consensual relationship (Cutler et al. 2008; Dancygier and Latin 2014, 39.). The result has been the segmentation of immigrants with certain low skill jobs.

In his discourse-analytical approach study, reconstructing problematic identity-positions in migrant care workers in Finland, Olakivi (2013, 92) from an organisational discourse stand, argues that identity politics does not just work as a form of control legitimising division of labour, it also enable actions. Identity-categories of migrant of a foreign-born care worker in Finland, was understood as a discursive means to shape and justify existing power divisions of labour. Example, despite the fact that studies have revealed especially in eldercare that migrant workers are motivated, highly skilful and capable (Gavanas 2013; Näre 2013); in Finland, we often see migrants commonly being employed within low sector employment despite their high level educational qualification. Nevertheless, operating from a dominant position, the host population often argue immigrants skills does not actually transcend in real life working situation and coupled with lack of experiences migrants are unable to compete with other Western migrants or natives (Heikkila 2005), justifying why they have been segmented to those labour market sectors.

Surrounded by this argument, Van Oorschot (2000) maintained “Identity” (whether people can be regarded as one of us) represent one of the five criteria’s in which natives evaluate

who deserves welfare benefits, and from an employer stand point who is to be employed (Eva and Didier 2016). In his investigative field experimental study why Canadian immigrants struggle in the labour market, Oreopoulos (2009) finding revealed not just were Canadian educational qualifications and experiences vital, interview request for resumes with English-names were three times higher than those with Chinese, Indian and Pakistani names. Moreover, based on a Meta analyses study from 1990-2015, identity was a fundamental variable under which hiring decisions were made and show how taste-based and statistical discrimination interplay and still remain dominant within immigrant integration and labour market reality (Eva and Didier 2016, 14). Nevertheless, some interviewees (immigrant employees) in his study in Finnish social care service, demonstrated the absence of discrimination based on their ethnicity within their employment or job search, but instead portraying possibility that their ethnical background might be a positive resources for being employed and not experiencing discrimination in health care delivery (Olakivi 2013).

B. Language as Domination

Not just has ethnicity been a hegemonic discriminative power variable towards distribution of rights and privileges resulting to inequalities (Shohat and Stam 2014, 191-92), the questions of self-representation and power, equally stand up in relation to national language (Olakivi 2013; Toivanen, 2013). Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004, 4) argue, national language bring about a rooted power relations, and besides being deliberated as a settings to construct identities, it is perceived as an instrument of exclusion, resistance, solidarity and empowerment. Despite the Finnish policy general commitment to linguistic plurality, Finnish language has positioned itself in a 'hierarchical order' within immigrant integration hegemonic discourses. The implication of such provision is that, not just has there been an end in public funding for instructions in immigrant's national language, it has develop and stand at the center in service delivery in Finland (Saukkonen 2013, 287). Wahlbeck (2013, 313) retained the bilingual politics in Finland constitute a vulnerable variable for Finnish minority. The challenge here, has been how to make right the legal requirements concerning indigenous and tribal people in implementation of specific economic rights.

In his discourse-analytical approach to interviews conducted in Helsinki, Olakivi (2013) research finding shows far from ethnicity, more emphasis was given to Finnish language

skills. Olakivi (2013, 95) argue this was partly because unlike race and ethnicity, proficiency in language skills in Finland is an official legitimate base which determine recruitment attitudes in care work. One can argue, such perceptions explain why a substantial part of the host population still find it difficult to internalised and accept the present of diversity. In practice, not just at administrative level and Financial level, the general state and society do not have the will to ensure new languages (English) and cultures which has immigrated to Finland to form a lasting element in Finland in general (Saukkonen 2013).

In her ethnographic study (including interview and observation) which examine how young Kurds in Finland negotiate their identity, Toivanen (2013, 28) employing and combining a post-structuralist and social constructivist approaches with emphasis on the role of power relations, claim *“the discourses of integration conceals a dimension of language in the process of “being/becoming one of us”*. Her argument was that belonging to a community of Finnish-language speakers can provide an additional space for being classified as “one of us”. However, one is tempted to question if an immigrant ability to speak a host language correlates with feeling of belonging not just at societal level, but labour market inclusion?

In his research finding in Canada, Oreopoulos (2009) argued that, not just was English language skills a variable for differences in interview request rates for Canadian citizens and migrants in CV examinations, there were also differences when the study examined response to calls. Those with Canadian accents were told jobs were available 85%, Slavic accents were told jobs were available 52% and Indo-Pakistani accents were told jobs were available 47% of times. Such dichotomy was also revealed in her study findings when she concluded *“belonging to Finland is constructed through mastering the Finnish language, whereas identification with “Finnishness” seems to be out of reach due to racialized notions of physical difference”* (Toivanen 2013).

What we noticed here, is the discriminative power aligned to physical appearances, as interviewees could not identify themselves as “Finn” despite haven grown up in Finland and speaking Finnish as mother language (Toivanen 2013, 31). As such, the fascinating powers of language and ethnicity/race in determining who belong to Finland particularly labour market institutions. The assumption in her research finding was that, Finnish language was merely considered by Kurds a functional necessity for surviving in the Finnish society. Her analysis shows membership criteria for belonging are not purely constructed on birth rights

justification, rather feeling of belonging is also fabricated through personal experiences and social networking in a locality and memories.

What we have examined so far in this chapter, depict a trends in migration studies which outlined not just how knowledge for host supremacy is been constructed against immigrants class, but also how these knowledge has resulted to discriminative and racial attitudes from the host towards immigrants within labour markets in particular and the society at large. Yet, without over emphasising on this dominant culture quest for control, some longitudinal studies have equally shown that the lack of immigrant adoption desires to the host cultures but rather a strong retention attitudes has subsequent effects on labour market hegemonic inequality (Hohne and Koopmans 2010; Ode and Veenman 2003). In their research, Evelyn and Ruud (2011, 229) suggested that combating socio-economic disadvantages of immigrants is a more promising avenue to stimulate immigrant integration than policies that focus on formal legal equality and cultural accommodation or assimilation. Wahlbeck (2013, 321) maintained that social science theories can be of help in providing insights on what in practice can constitute positive multicultural encounters.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study recognises the importance of employing a theory-data driven qualitative research. The reasons for this research method choice was to pave the pathway for the study to recruit research participant; get their subjective perceptions on Finnish integration policies/framework and labour market reality through conducting interviews. However, even though primary data constitute the fundamental of our research corpus, secondary data (reviewed immigrant integration and labour market literatures) is equally part of the corpuses for analysis. Their function is mainly to ensure the research accomplish its methodological framework (which in this case is a theory-driven data analysis). Such assertions explain why the integration Act 2010 was rhetorically analysed at the beginning of our data analysis chapter.

Also, this method choice allows us to perform a rhetorical analysis on research corpus, providing an avenue for investigating perceptions of immigrants and policy makers on economic inclusion of migrants, with emphasis on how power relations are constructed within the labour markets of Jyväskylä-Finland. Combining these two research methods choice, a forum was made to explore how immigrant/policy makers' experiences of immigrant labour integration are framed, bringing these two voices to the fore front in this study. What Silverman (2001, 12) maintained that in qualitative research, "*the aim is to understand how participants' categories trend and to see how these categories are used in concrete activities*". The focus behind employing a theory-data driven qualitative research (interviews and rhetorical analysis) was not to trace the true representation of meaning, but rather to allow the study with a means and tools to be able to question how/why certain categories of meaning resonate in participants' mind in particular situations. This is because the way "*we speak about different identities, may be instrumental, manipulative and sometimes unconsidered, they are never random*" (Nordberg 2006, 527).

5.1. Method of Data Collection.

For the fact that the surrounding theme of this study is to discern how research participants using language, understand, experience and interpret the Finnish integration policy instrument with particular emphasis to labour relationship, the research adopted the following;

To ensure a diversify mixture of credible research participant groups, a purposive sample technique was adopted. Firstly, a formal request for interview letter was send to the Multicultural Center Gloria Jyvaskyla, the African Association of Central Finland, Migration Service of the City of Jyvaskyla and the Employment and Economic Development Offices Jyvaskyla. Participants were provided with participant information sheets and consent forms. The purpose of these documents was to ensure participants were aware of the research scope in general, as well as issues of confidentiality and anonymity. A purposive technique ensured a selection of key demographic variables in research participants paying particular attention to non-EU migrants with resident of at least one and a half year in Jyvaskyla and on the other hand, selected policy administrator dealing with immigrant integration in Jyvaskyla. A total of 16 participants were identified but one was rejected because he/she was employed to work on a project and was not at policy level as was initially thought. Average interview time was 45minuits and a total of 15 participants were interviewed.

Classified within territorial demographic, participant representation ranges from Latin America, Africa, Asia and Finland (policy administrator). Immigrant's statuses included six (6) first generation students' immigrants with student resident permits and four (3) first generation immigrants with permanent status (who either came to Finland as refugees, Family reunion or student but has changed to work visa). Also, three (3) immigrants working as experts within institutions integrating immigrants into Jyvaskyla were also interviewed. Lastly, at policy level, two (2) key informant administrators were interviews, from the Migration Service at the City of Jyvaskyla and the Employment Office Jyvaskyla respectively were also interviewed. Note should be made, there exist a broad differences in statuses between the two classes of immigrant's participants that is Student and others (Refugees, family reunion and work visa).

These differences in status goes beyond the title of statues as stated in the classification above, but also in terms of legal rights entitlements, service provisions, delivery and access. The significant of such differences has implication in data analysis and result finding. Moreover, this dual nature of our research participant (immigrants and policy maker) was a conscious research strategy to ensure we were able to explicitly illuminate the principal main actor in issues of immigrant integration in reality, operationalization the research finding. Also, it will be our style to employ different referencing style when doing the actual analysis of data, using different categories and ethos position (nationality, statues, gender, job title, and degree program) of our research participants. The aim of such references style, is to further substantiate the power position while ascertaining certain arguments.

The study adopted thematic interview method (semi-structured interview) with both closed and open-ended question conducted at individual basis with research participant. Camilla (2006, 527) maintained that interview is s a digressive field, where language use does not just merely reflect some form of objective reality, rather reality is simultaneously being produced through the use of language. As such, the questions that were asked ranges from closed questions which covers biographical informations (*level of education, number of years in Finland, career level and level of Finnish language*). Some closed questions where followed with open questions like “*in your opinion, what will you make a claim for (recognitions, resource redistribution, language exemption and inclusion) if you are given an opportunity and why.*”

Examples of open questions include “*do u think integrative policy instruments or processes seek to improve immigrant labour market opportunities or does it subject them to particular policy instrument or processes.*” Moreover, through probing, it was a deliberate choice of mine to allow myself to actively engage with interviewees through comment and claims with the purpose of providing in-depth discussion. “*Do you think your own ethnicity has given you (or will be) any advantage or disadvantage in your work or job search in Jyvaskyla*” and “*Based on your experiences or knowledge, do you think immigrant (student/refugees) are treated fairly by the Finnish labour system*”.

5.2. Method of Analysis: Rhetorical Analysis

Why Rhetorical Analysis

Guided by Nordberg (2006, 527) observes that way we speak about different issues may be instrumented, manipulative and unconsidered, it was this study's interest to employ rhetorical analysis on research data, because rhetoric itself is an integral part of human communication and politics. As such, it will prove effective in understanding the persuasive powers behind participant's perceptions when questions were asked. Moreover, far from previous integration studies argued that most argument behind immigration and integrations policies/frameworks are just rhetoric (Hatton 2015; Féron and Beauzamy 2012; Bowskill et al. 2007), it was this study position to support this position but add the power argument of reality brought to migration arguments through voices of experiences. Also, in distinction to those identical studies that have either employed discourse analysis on text/policy and talk (Mähönen et al. 2015; Féron and Beauzamy 2012), discourse analysis on Survey (Heikkilä and Peltonen 2002), discourse analysis on narrative interview (Nordberg 2006) and a cross-tabulation and component analysis on perception (Forrest and Dunn 2006), rhetorical analysis turn our attention to individual speakers and their experiences through their voices.

Also, for the fact that most policy documents (integration) or individual perceptions are surrounded with specificity and or lack of specificity, performing rhetorical analysis in practices uncover those wishes and schemes hidden in public discourse within a given phenomenon (hegemony and immigrant labour inclusion). It also shows how important answers can be gotten if the right questions are asked of a data, thereby enabling us better appreciate why certain statements or text are important than others (Hart 1997). Moreover, in an attempt to effect the choices of others, is a matter of persuasion not generally of knowledge. As such, employing this analysis provide this study with an opportunity to discover *those* means of persuasion (Rapp 2010) in majority-minority labour relationships. Moreover, in our analysis, it will also provide room to build an argument about social conditions (labour relationship) by observing what research participant think and say about certain themes (Hirschman 1991) for example ethnicity. Surrounded by these valuable inside role of rhetorical analysis, Hart (1997) argued those employing this method listen to the contrasting arguments, examine the evidence each offers and then render judgment.

This method allow for general understanding via the case-study methods. By adopting this method on data gotten specifically from non-EU immigrants, this research is able to restrict the scope or range of available insights to peculiar message rooted in these audiences' perceptions. Within this framework, what this method give up in scope is balance by the power of insight made available through analysis (Hart 1997.). It produces meta-knowledge that is explicit understanding of implicit realisation. Applying this methods on interview data and secondary data remind us of what we already know about this space of multiculturalism. It forces or entices us to do detail comparison of each new message to our already existing bulk of long accumulated life time reading and listening. Hence, this method enables us or asked us to make our implicit knowledge explicitly, because only our explicit knowledge can be used in a practical way (Hart 1997.).

The ability of rhetorical analysis to invite radical confrontation with Otherness which is an important variable in this study necessitate its application as a method of analysis in this study. Hart (1997) argued that, employing his method is a wonderful way to get outside of oneself. It enables us to confront the space which we perceived as not ours. As such, it allows a kind of vacationing away by visiting the not-us, examining what research participants had to say. Within such framework of Otherness, rhetoric analysis allows for the voice of the ordinary not just focusing on those persuasions made by politicians or those at policy level within institutions. Hence, it allow for the valuable subjective voice of the ordinary too (immigrant) to be represented, as they too represent how persuasion functions in general (Finlayson 2007). This explains why, interview data represent a central focus of this study.

Hence, being bounded by the above valuable functions of rhetorical analysis to our study, what then are the philosophical/epistemological definition of rhetoric, its content and the qualitative meta-theoretical presumptions behind rhetorical analysis? Also, how does it function as an analytical perspective to our research corpuses?

5.3. Rhetoric and its Contents: The Qualitative Meta-theoretical Presumptions behind Rhetoric Analysis

Even though it is objectively difficult to ascertain the increase popularity of rhetoric both in the past and in modern academia as a field of study, nevertheless much of the focus of its application has not just been on rhetoric as a productive art, an art of composing and

delivering speeches or written discourse (Souders and Dillard 2014.); it has also develop as a linguistic construct within social sciences, example, political communication (Martin 2013). However, such artistic assumptions on what Rhetoric is was disputed by Aristotle the very founder of rhetoric theory in his early dialogue on rhetoric titled “Grullos”, when he argued that rhetoric cannot be an art (Rapp 2010, 2). Nevertheless, despite this inconsistency of whether rhetoric is an “art” or not, Covino and Jolliffe (1995, 36) claim, “*Rhetoric is not a content area that contains a definite body of knowledge, like physics; instead, rhetoric might be understood as the study and practice of shaping content*”. Surrounded by these discrepancies, Hart (1997, 4-5) argues that the theory of rhetoric in an intuitive attraction and not in a sophisticated form is “*the art of using language to help people narrow their choices among specifiable, if not specified policy option*”. Here, we see the persuasive power of language designed to influence/narrow the choices of others.

Such non argumentative tools of persuasion aligned to what Aristotle the founder of rhetorical analysis classified as the two tripartite divisions of rhetoric (Rapp 2010). The first of this tripartite division consists of the three means a speech can be persuasive. In his writing “The Rhetoric”, lies the doctrine that persuasion within rhetoric can either emerged through the character of the speaker (resulting from his practical intelligence, virtuous character and good will of the persuader), the emotional states of the listener (was the listener or reader in the state of grieve, hostile or rejoice or friendly), as emotions have the power to modify judgements, and lastly the argument (logos) of the situation (Rapp 2010).

Within this last means of persuasion (logos), Aristotle maintain persuasion can take either the inductions or deductions form, what he term “*posterior analytics*”. He argues that “*induction*” proceed from the particular up to a universal and “*deduction*” is an argument in which certain things having been supposed, different from the supposition results of necessity through them or because of their being true. Within rhetoric, inductive argument is the “*examples*” which often does not proceed from many particular cases to one universal case but from one particular to a similar particular. Also deductive argument in rhetoric is the “*enthymeme*” what has the function of a proof or demonstration (explicit or implicit) in speech. In order words, addressing the issue of “*honest truth speaking*” in rhetoric (Rapp 2010.).

Employing deductive analysis therefore, means we examine how bone of contention was established through argument in data. Finlayson (2007, 554-555) within the “*Roman rhetoric theory*” maintained can be understood through the “*stasis theory*”. This theory outlined the four points of argument: if the argument is “*conjecture*” (concern facts); if the argument is “*definition*” (centre on the naming of things); if the argument is “*quality*” (concern the nature of an act) and lastly if an argument is “*place*” (suggesting that the question is relevant or no longer important now). However, we employed Hart (1997) argument, that rhetoric (data) never produces complete truth. It produces partial truth, truth for particular times and people.

Johnstone (1969, 408) claims it is only truth when we contemplate its evocative power, that is power to secure the agreement of others. Within such understanding, it is the focus of our analysis to examine how arguments are framed to ensure they are: scientifically demonstrable, artistically creative, socially concerned and philosophically reasonable (Hart 1997), with the goal of securing agreements. However, Aristotle calls this enthymeme (deductive argument) “the body of persuasion” suggesting everything else in rhetorical data are only an accident or addition to the core of the persuasive process. Within these presumption, lays the Aristotelian basic idea of a rhetorical demonstration “*In order to make a target group believe q, the orator must first select a sentence p or some sentences $p_1 \dots p_n$ that are already accepted by the target group; secondly he has to show that q can be derived from p or $p_1 \dots p_n$, using p or $p_1 \dots p_n$ as premises. Given that the target persons form their beliefs in accordance with rational standards, they will accept q as soon as they understand that q can be demonstrated on the basis of their own opinions*” (Rapp 2010.).

Hence, it is this study’s assumption that in the mind of research participants, perceptions of labour integration frameworks and labour market inclusion had been constructed and reconstructed rhetorically. As such, it is important to employ the above rhetorical demonstration in explaining how such arguments are presented explicitly. In Hart (1997, 61) wording, argumentative actions generated out of particular field, shaped by the contingencies to which they are responses and the audiences to which they are addressed. Such methodological power of enthymemes thus offers my thesis, a formal or qualitative difference needed to provide rhetorical analytical argument a qualitative nature; even though it does not have to be precise as a scientific demonstration. A situation Finlayson (2007, 549) confirms when he argues that Aristotle was well informed that in politics, “*we have to come*

to certain decisions on the basis of claims that are at best probable rather than certain, to act when the grounds for acting are not as solid as we might like”

5.4. Rhetorical Analysis: An Analytical Techniques

In this sub-chapter, we outline how the study employed rhetorical analysis as an analytical tool for analysing the study research data. The emphasis here was to make sure all necessary techniques were taken to ensure the epistemological backgrounds guides our data analysis. Our analysis begin by identifying the research corpuses. In the case of this study the main corpus of arguments were transcript interviews with immigrant’s and policy officials. On these corpuses, our analysis was structure thematically around commonplaces. As martin (2013, 61-62) argue it is a formal logic of enthymeme rather than the strict logic of syllogism. The ideas is that, we can see certain power relationship within data, if we analysis truth in interviewee based on certain collection of commonplace understandings in this topic. As such, certain matters in data were consider to be true by using certain off-the-cuff remarks and figures of speech, what Gramsci referred “common-sense thinking” (Gramsci 1971, 432). Martin (2013, 62) maintain that common sense is an acceptable way of reasoning that does not lay itself to question but relies on our implicit acceptance or deference (counter-arguments). In this light, the following three broader thematic divide was employed in our analysis:

Firstly, to analyse how arguments (appeals) were made using language when participants were questioned on immigrant’s participation and empowerments within integration and labour policies in Jyvaskyla-Finland? Example, those expressions within data which outline how integration policies and framework exclude and or include immigrants towards labour integration. Second, how issues of hegemonic inequality were explicated when certain notion of belonging (Finnish language) and identity (ethnicity) where raised up in labour market inclusions and real life experiences. Lastly, how persuasion towards claims-making were presented, with focus on individual present and future decision to stay or move away from Jyvaskyla-Finland. Departure from these questions but never the less based on research material, are analyses in relation to theoretical arguments on immigrant labour integration, identity and inequality.

In this regard, the application of our analysis was not to examine what interviewees actually said, but who has said something, how has it been said, why and when it was said. As such,

we commence by analysing for rhetorical “motives” in data structure according to participant rational thinking and reasoning. This means, interviews (rhetorical situation) were located within the circumstance of relations in which they occurred (Finlayson 2007, 554). We question under what capacity were interviewees at the time of interview? Is the interviewee a Non-EU first generation student migrants, refugees, other first generational migrant or policy official? Is he/she a student, employed or unemployed? Such ethos awareness in corpuses (participant character/experiences) help us identify certain roles and particular positions of relationships vis-à-vis the broader scope of our study (hegemony).

As such, specifying the circumstances behind data enable the study to reduce intrinsic ambiguity from analysis and uncertainty in relationship between variables, ensuring we rely on the honesty of participants as individuals voicing their experiences/ arguing from migrant and expert positions. Through this methodological process, this study was aware of the varieties of communication options open in data in a given phenomenon (How and what did the interview say, how he/she structured his/her speech in constructing meaning/arguments). However, aware of the complexity involved in analysing arguments, the study adopted Hart (1997) advised and ensure we employed a multi-level rhetorical analysis of perspectives on research data. Below are some multi-level rhetorical analysis perspectives that the study employ as rhetorical tools:

Efforts were made to identify the bond of contention in data. As such, procedures were taken to isolate and list all the main ideas (arguments) within data’s. Some rhetorical analysis writers have argued that understanding bond of contention or ideas within rhetorical data could be understood by either employing the “stasis theory” categorising data under the four points of argument (conjecture, definition, quality, and place), or placing attentions to analysing “tone (Finlayson 2007, 554; Hart 1997, 62 respectively). Analysing for ideas necessitated we performed a descriptive (topic and judgemental) study on research corpus, reducing them to their basic ideal unit. Hence, data were catalogued and examine for those phrases in data that could appear in quotation marks, phrases referring to feeling and emotional, words demonstrating resilience of certain status quo and or arguments against changes.

Nevertheless, value judgements were also placed in juicing the substantive content within data, asking questions like what is the overall point of view of participants with regard to

integration policies, language and ethnicity in labour market trends in Jyvaskyla-Finland. Finlayson (2007, 554) argued that locating the subject in data, in relation to the two axes of particular and universal domain help analyse for substantive content. On this note, our analysis question if interviewee's subjective opinions could be generalist or specific to certain groups of immigrants our case study? Furthermore, efforts were taken to analyse how in their efforts to express their perceptions towards phenomena, what things were emphasised and which de-emphasised when participants addresses issues of integration frameworks, immigrant labour inclusion and market realities.

In a broader scope of argument, another technique was to analyse for "form" and "genre" (differing objects, orientation and role) within research corpus. For Hart (1997, 108-128) "Forms" in data represents the pattern of meaning generated when exposed to certain phenomenon and how these ideas are linked together. In this regard, the study deem it vital to analyse for "Forms" as it tells the speaker reaction to certain phenomena (integration frameworks and Finns attitudes towards immigrants). Analysing for "genres examine meant we identify how data were objectify, position to time and their role in ascribing feelings (Finlayson 2007, 556.). As such we questioned if participants were demonstrating sceptics towards future, either to praise or blame certain groups of people or being defensive. It is also our strategy to examine the appropriateness and sequences of data elements in relation to power. How facts and ideas about language and ethnicity are put forward, what amount of information is given and how those ideas were arrange to ensure maximum persuasion.

Creating probing questions to valuable contextual function of research data also entail this study analyse for hierarchy and transcendences in research data. Hart (1997, 257) argued that *"If hierarchy gives rhetoric analysis a quantitative dimension (how much, how often, how high) arguing how people (immigrants) can get more and suggest how people (immigrants) can improve; on the other hand, transcendences gives it a qualitative dimension (how good) arguing how things can become better"*. Identifying and understanding hierarchy and transcendences in research data, means the study is be able to build consensus. Questions like how valuable is Finnish integration framework and Finnish language in having a job in Finland, will help guide the present of hierarchy and transcendences within data.

Within such examination, we investigate and revise for real life human experiences within data. Even though as earlier stated above, the methodological trajectory and ontology presupposition aligned to rhetorical analysis allows it to connect the relationship between theories and practice, how if we understand one it help our understanding of the other. In this light, determinations were taken to ensure we incorporate Gramsci hegemony in our analysis. What Hart (1986) argued we must do (studying both data and theory) regardless of the research intention. A situational analysis on every data, not just analysing for variable setting (language and power, identity and power), but also for broad-based perspective within data ensuring we were able to line theory and data (Hart 1997, 57). Searching instances when perceptions of dominion, inequality, equality and consensus were presented in research data. As such, we employed the following rhetorical techniques;

Analysing for metaphors was also a central aspect of this research aligned to its theoretical paradigm (hegemony). Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 3) argued that in everyday life relationships, action and thought permeate. The use of metaphors when speaking are often to suppress others, emphasises certain features of “Them” while distinguishing “Us from them”. Identifying and understanding metaphors in our study data is thus theoretically imaginative, enabling us to perceive things in new and different ways, forging new conceptual connections (Finlayson 2007, 559). Data were coded to identify how metaphors which re-enforces hegemonic labour inequality, were constructed by immigrants/policy administrators. Also, how languages were used to address the question of immigrants vulnerability in the labour market, compared to Finns and other classes of immigrants (Western immigrants).

Furthermore, analysing for ideas denoting inequality also means we examine the word choice of research participants (purpose behind each word choice and how certain phenomenon’s are named) and the stylistic patterns in language employed (formal and or informal). For example, we would investigate for those words in data that are unique to certain groups or individual, having special rhetorical power, What Hart (1997, 156) argued set people apart in data. Such cords wording often results to segregation ideas when there become common and discriminatory as they set the users apart from the larger society (Hart 1997, 161). In this regards, we examine what kind of socio-economic segregate, domination, and marginalise ideas are made possible when certain words were available or unavailable in research data. Words like class, ethnicity, race, language, immigrants and Finns represent

an important lexicons in examining the hegemonic constructions between the host nationals and immigrants.

Analysing for cultural trends in data also mean we further investigate how in the mind immigrants perceptions of either segregation and or inclusion lays, especially when questions on Finns attitudes towards immigrants in general, as well as issues of segmentations (those jobs immigrants are highly represented) were raise. Analysis for cultural trends within data embodies what, Hart (1997, 234) termed the “*study of cultural features of rhetoric*” when he underlined culture step into all messages. Such valuable cultural features means we study for statements in data expressing “*values*” (deep seated persistent belief), “*Myth*” which are that statements in data expressing stories describing exceptional people doing exceptional things and serving a moral guide to proper action, and “*fantasy themes*” (myths which manifest current values, linguistic preferences with idealised vision of the future) in data.

Cultural analysis as such in data entails the categorisation of “Myth and imaginary” in corpus, referring to sediment meaning and shared themes and horizons (Laclau 1990). Within such framework, the study probe on how societal myth, identity myth and eschatological myth is being construct and deconstruct within societal institutions like labour markets. The importance of probing for myth when performing rhetorical analysis is that, it provide a heighten sense of authority, continuity, coherences, community choice and sense of agreement (Hart 1997, 242). As such, we observe for interpretive position in research data, in such a way that we were able to explain actions orient from immigrant’s beliefs and preferences, not on beliefs and preferences from objective facts about immigrants such as race, social class and institutional preferences. This provides the research with an opportunity to use “time” and examine how practices have evolved.

Rhetorical Evaluation

Here, we refer to how our evaluation on research data. Hart (1997) claimed that faulty evaluation in rhetorical analysis occurs when analysis fail to explicate the standard used in the evaluation. Essential to classical rhetoric standard (employed in this study) are the three primary modes of persuasive appeal (to ethos, to pathos and to logos (logical justification)). However, the study shied away from claiming logical justification on data, but employed enthymemes; a quasi-logical argument that employ only some parts of a syllogistic form of

reasoning while relying on our data to construct or validate premises from which further deduction can logically follow.

As such, evaluation based on appeal to ethos (participant character) and individuals voicing their experiences was also an important tool for ascertaining evaluation. However, effectively applying these standards and in some cases a variety of them is what, Hart (1997, 35) argue distinguishes the quality of our analysis. The vital quality of employing rhetorical analysis is that it allows for multiplicity of choice in drawing evaluation. What it calls for is the ability to be able to defend the choices of evaluation and its appropriateness (Finlayson 2007). Besides, we had in mind an awareness that, data which allow for certain evaluation might fail in other. Our strategy allow us to develop and use analytical probes, something Hart (1997, 36) perceived as nothing more than intelligent and special questions to be asked of a given data.

Concluding therefore, this study's methodological design does not just allow for data analysis to foreground the intersubjective, dynamic, formation and reformation of arguments on the elements of which they are compose; it also allow for ideas, concepts and words to be disseminate in our analysis of research phenomenon. The method allows us to understand how 'genealogies' of 'common sense' are established and transformed, resulting to patterns of societal hegemonic or non-hegemonic relationships. Hence, when we analyse for multiple variables (words, metaphors, figurative, styles, and the argument), we are guided and our horizon broadens on those 'rationalities' on which hegemonic inequality is based.

CHAPTER SIX

RESULT ANALYSIS

6.1. Integration frameworks, Participation and Empowerment

The adage that “A nation that forgets its defenders will itself be forgotten”, by default underlines how the notion of immigration, immigrant economic value, integration and immigrant’s participation/empowerment appear within public dialogues. Such discourses, often provoke both explicit and implicit sentiments amongst both actors (Finns and Immigrant) in this space of multiculturalism. Accordingly, recent trend shows the politics and the political surrounding the value position of immigrants in this new space appear purely problematic. Yet, from a subordinate position, immigrants are certain of their economic value they bring into this Jyväskylä multicultural space. Quoting one immigrant refugee *“Yes I am one, I am number one, I pay my tax. I am really against those who live by benefits, they should be able to go to work by themselves”*. Not just was her response designed to entice a judicial genre allowing her to be able to praise herself and blame others; her continued repetition of the phrases *“I am one”* was a conscious persuasive style to reaffirm her particularistic contributing role as a working refugee to the economy of Jyväskylä, and also an attempt to appeal to both authority and emotion, evoking moral duty sentiments from certain groups of immigrants who do not contribute but rather live on benefit.

Though occupying a dominant position, the value judgement question of the role of immigrant labour to the contribution of the economy of Jyväskylä/Finland still remains doubtful at policy level in Jyväskylä, amidst the high inflow of refugees.

“Somehow I have heard discussions, the discussions have gone that direction that we should see the new comers more as resource point of view not so much as a target of services”

(Policy maker: Expert Integration Service (TET))

As a policy maker in Jyväskylä, stylistically, her response is filled with dramatic contrast and oppositions views towards such notion of economic value of immigrant; as well as powerful imagery of conflict of ideas but yet certain level of reconciliation when she ascertains *“the discussion have gone that direction”*. The indication is that, such economic potential immigrant *“resource point”* is just getting more value attention now, but at the moment

those arguments are still uncertain. Even though she did not employ logical reasoning in supporting such change in perception, however, her position as someone in authority and her role as witness “*Somehow I have heard discussions*” ensure her argument towards such change in ideological position is persuasive. However, this economic potentials of immigrants has not come void of both explicit and implicit notions that certain immigrant’s privileges are burden to service delivery in Jyvaskyla-Finland by the dominant population. Employing imagery like “*new comers*” to metaphorically refer to immigrant, and words choice “*target of service*” to symbolise those negative resource Finns perceptions that immigrant are a burden to the social service of Jyvaskyla was her attempt to align her arguments towards those populist hegemonic discourse which see multiculturalism as evil, immigrants as strangers and threat to the society.

The idea that we always admire what we do not understand, in retrospect could be a reason for such misconception towards immigrants and service provision. Those dominant notion that at the onset, immigrants are a burden/target to service was equally disputed at policy level. One policy maker in responding to the same question, of immigrants contribute? Argue;

“Always when people move to Finland the first question they ask is when I can have work, when can I start studying and when can I start taking care of my family, it’s usually the first question quite soon. So our task is to of course take care and give help”

(Policy Maker: Migration Service city of Jyvaskyla)

Not just did she reiterate the constant willingness and desire of immigrants to be engage with the labour market of Jyvaskyla, when she employ words like “*Always*” and “*soon*”, her continue repetition throughout her respond of words like “*when*” also bring in the question of time to the discourse and space of immigrant integration to the labour market. In her capacity as someone who head immigrant integration at the city of Jyvaskyla, her persuasive force in her response were to ensure her ideas were shaped to question those negative perceptions of immigrant unwillingness to be involve within the labour market or burden to the social service. As such, she was trying to re-iterate that even if at a certain point, immigrants are place on social care services, their initial vision was not to be a burden but to work and take care of themselves. More so, her respond also outline the nature of response they at policy level must engage to in order to match those willing immigrant attitudes. In

this light, an epideictic notion of praise *“take care and give help”* were her policy goal persuasion. Here, she was concourse of the need to ensure they advocate for more politics in the society surrounded with those perceptions that immigrants are willing to contribute to the economic potential of Jyvaskyla.

The Politics of Consciousness:

The implication so far from the above analysis, make certain a claim that the politics and the political of immigration and immigrant integration is increasingly been question at policy level. Yet, the vision was that an ounce of action is worth a ton of theory. To explicate such assertion, and aligned to our theory-data driven analysis, it was our interest to introduce a secondary data corpus at this stage. The integration Act 2010 is a policy documents (hegemony) which outline immigrant integration frameworks/visions, not just within the municipality of Jyvaskyla but also Finland in general. Its underlining strategy is not just to constraints immigrant to integrate but to show them those opportunities supplied by submitting to the life circle of Jyvaskyla integration. As a parliamentary documents, it persuasion embellish a ritual function of confirming immigrants as equal participant in this relationship resulting to labour market empowerment.

“Interactive development involving immigrants and society at large, the aim of which is to provide immigrants with the knowledge and skills required in the society working life....”
(Integration Act 2010)

Its pronouncement of such morals standings like *“interactive developments involving immigrants”* is a persuasion on its own towards the immigrant population, enhancing the position of this document ethos as a conscious documents formulated by elected Finnish politician, invoking ideologies like immigrant equality within the broader society of Jyvaskyla-Finland. The value judgements of the entire document is to persuasively re-instate it position as a dominant immigrant integration document, not just to the immigrant’s population alone, but also to those in charge of immigrant integration in Jyvaskyla when it expressly outline to *“provide immigrants with knowledge and skills required in the society working life”*, Its inducing style of logical sequences of pattern, is a persuasive vision to maintain a consensual power relationship, supporting good ethical standing between both parties in this interaction, create a state of mind of belonging within the immigrant’s populations. As such, employing deductive reasoning that, if immigrant interact and participate not just within integration activities, but in the broader context of the new space

of multiculturalism especially with the Finns population, the more they are empowered to compete with the Finns in the labour market of Jyvaskyla-Finland. Hence, offering them a power position to make a choice.

There is an old maxim that, “when you have eliminated the impossibility, whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth”. Hence, it will be wrong, however, to over emphasis this hegemonic position of this documents as been entirely outside the domestic immigrants labour integration politics and the political of Jyvaskyla. Moreover, despite the fact that integration was identified and built to close down possible area of contestation (Augoustinos et al. 2005), the question of whether such a policy document appeal in general to the entire immigrant population or to a particular segment of the immigrant groups depending on their legal statues, goes a long way to determine the scope of its rhetorical effect. Such contestation amongst these divers’ statues aligned to the operationalization of integration policies and framework in Jyvaskyla is visible through its provision of more privileges and rights to certain immigrant statues than others. One *refugee* interviewee responding to a question on her awareness and value judgment of integration policies and framework in Jyvaskyla, make certain;

“I made use of it, I went through the integration process and I kept everything straight to make myself educated as a single mother to be able to stand my feet, volunteered and work to sustain my children. Through that, today am a better woman”

(Refugee Immigrant from Liberia)

Her mindfulness, in her delivery to ensure she portray her knowledge in this field, when she adopted the phrase “*I made us of it*”, as well as her affirmative celebration of her effort in this relationship, were her persuasive style in her language to demonstrate her mutually inclusive power position of her statues as a refugee. Labelling herself as a “*single mother*” (whose actual existence remain uncertain) function as a metaphor for her additional vulnerability far from been a refugee prior to her integration. Her ceremonial manner of persuasion and style of personifying her individual efforts through repetition of “*I*” and “*my*” allow her to demonstrate not just her level of participation, but also her level of authority and control in the process of her integration, and interaction with Finnish authorities. In this regard, her employment of the phrase “*I kept everything straight*” was an ethos and pathos logic of persuasion to appeal to other immigrants to engage in an effective fashion towards immigrant integration frameworks if they aim at success. Moreover, in her further attempt

to appeal while hailing the empowering and participative nature of Jyvaskyla integration framework, efforts were taken by her to expressly made known in her respond her present career achievement as an immigrant refugee in Jyvaskyla.

Notwithstanding, such deep seated esteemed beliefs and appealing statement expressing exceptional moral actions as a result of the effectiveness of integration policies/frameworks, could not be generalised amongst other immigrant population in research participants. Example, when similar question was ask on students, if they identify or rely on the character of integration policies/frameworks, its deductive reasoning, its honesty and or its inclusive power abilities, one student argue:

“I don’t have any official knowledge or experiences on these policies/framework. It is like they have an integration plan that they normally put on immigrants like those immigrants not all immigrants the marginalized ones. But with my category as a student there is no internal plan for us, we fall outside the integration. So we are being perceived to struggle on our own and look for our survival if any....”

(Immigrant student, Ghana)

As the twig is bent, so grow the tree. As an immigrant student, employing exaggerating diction like *“I don’t have any”* to transgressive deny any awareness of policies initiatives in his statement were all effort to depict certain societal dichotomy amongst the student immigrant population segment dealing with issues of integration in Jyvaskyla. More so, to appeal for more equality and conscious awareness towards immigrant student, emphasis was made in his respond, to explicitly spell out his statues *“with my category as a student”*, comparing it with other statues *“the marginalized ones”* to metaphorically refer to refugees whom according to integration policies ideologies are meant for. This notion of civic rights persuasion, was his respond to segregationist and social privilege division in statues within immigrant groups within multicultural encounters.

Moreover, such a high tone nature of his voice was an effort to reiterate his voice as a state’s man for immigrant student. Nevertheless, relying on his ethos, sequentially arranging his arguments and using particular phrase like *“fall outside the integration”* and *“perceived to struggle”*; were persuasive efforts to support his claim of negligence at policy level towards student, which could not only arose perception of alienation from student immigrants, but resulting to frustration. As such, using ethos and appealing to emotion, he was able to petition certain gushes of moral indignations amongst student immigrants in Jyvaskyla, and that

without a proper redress to this situation, immigrant student are force to struggle and fight for a place in this space

Important to note that, such evocative appeal of power exclusion, resonating from integration policies/framework by student immigrant, were equally shared by policy makers in Jyvaskyla. One policy maker from the City of Jyvaskyla, I quote: *“Our office is for people who have come for humanitarian reasons to Finland. Usually students are not our clients so that is one service that is missing somehow in Jyvaskyla. There are points and places where the students can get help, counselling and advice services but our office doesn’t serve students”* Though not overtly racist or discriminative in her language, her speech nonetheless depict favouritism to a statues there consider vulnerable, giving legitimacy towards a political opinion of exclusion and segmentation.

On the other hand, her judicial language of acknowledgment when she said *“one service that is missing somehow”*, were her persuasive ability to control her language, her thoughtful and well-prepared sequences of claim. Such abilities, reflect a more intellectual style depicting not just her ethos as a Finns policy administrator with specialist skills in integration, but also a broader awareness at policy level of certain default in service delivery to students within integration policies and frameworks. Her continues recitation of *“students”* while appealing to certain action when she emphasis *“there are points and places”* were conscious sign of persuasive appeal towards student not just to actively engaged, but also intention to demonstrate that at policy level, there is this feeling towards more recognition and more resource distributions to empower immigrant student within Jyvaskyla multiculturalism.

Nevertheless, guided by the above three (different ethos within data representation in Jyvaskyla) liberal persuasive languages on the inclusive/empowering nature of Finnish integration policies and frameworks from; when further probe were made in line with previous empirical research finding of Féron and Beauzamy (2012) which claim within welfare state systems, immigrant inclusion programs are design with the purpose of maintaining dominant cultural supremacy rather than hegemonic equality for all. In this regard, one Finnish administrator argued:

“Well I think at the moment integration is still at the side of getting the information and the information point of view more than being able to have equal opportunities. I think

integration laws give some type of possibilities that will discriminate positively but we are developing....”

(Policy maker: Expert Integration Service (TET))

Even though the Integration Act 2010 has been seven years ever since its enactment, she did not shy away from her systematic manner of deductively using metaphor when she took on the phrase “*at the moment*”, to stylistically designed her argument, emphasising the value of time in judging and asserting the effectiveness of immigrant integration frameworks at this stage of its implementation. Besides, her reiteration of the role of time were vital argument advance towards those odds of discrimination, as she aim at arousing sentiments that as compare to other municipalities in Finland, Jyvaskyla is comparatively new to the discourses of multiculturalism and much credit need to be given to the already existing initiatives. Also, her ability to enhance her position within the range of policy makers when she used the figure of speech “we” in connection to “*developing*” were not just persuasive efforts to appeal to authority, but also appeal to emotion invoking sentiments of moral outrage, of hope and seriousness at policy level.

6.2. Hegemonic Labour Market inequality

In line with the old Marxism commonplace that, when you have eliminated the impossibility, whatever remains, however questionable must be the truth. The ideology of equality and eliminating inequality within immigrant integration and labour market multicultural encounter, however is that question of truth which remains. Just like the precarious living experiences in South Italy that prompted Gramsci to write the famous essay title “*the southern question*”, the experiences of immigrants in Jyvaskyla-Finland within the labour market, (the question of immigrant vulnerability) constitute an important baseline for analysing how power resonates within interviews. Our focus was, how through voices of experiences in the labour market, certain notions of inequality rhetorically play in the minds of immigrants (an intellectual substance of experiences expressed through language). Here, we investigate how issues of hegemonic inequality were explicated when certain notion of belonging (Finnish language) and identity (ethnicity) were raised up in labour market inclusions and real life experiences.

A conscious Language of Belonging (Finnish Language).

Analysing power in the labour market in relation to those persuasive experiences towards notion of belonging particularly Finnish Language, quoting one immigrant student:

“Most Finns speaks English but they really appreciate if you speak Finnish. Their first option go to a Finnish speaker even if you are qualified than the Finnish speaker It’s very challenging as they normally use Finnish language as a prerequisite requirement to exclude like a silent racist especially when it comes to visible minorities.. I was force to go back to my savings despite having a visa that allow me to work”

(Immigrant student from Mexico)

The logic of persuasion in such statement above in his respond to the question of language as a power construct, rest on the immigrant student ability to use explicitly certain choices of words, while ensuring his overall design and delivery of his arguments were deductively logical. Beginning with certain ceremonial notion of praise and character appreciation *“Most Finns speaks English but they really appreciate if you speak Finnish”*, his strategy was to appeal by employing evident of some kind to demonstrate the veracity of his arguments. In this regard, by praising and rhetorically demonstrating the value of Finnish language to the Finns, his efforts was to create an awareness that, immigrants are unequally treated natural due to those desires by certain groups of Finns to hold on to certain core hegemonic culture in which language is one. His ability to operationalised in reality how language function in his persuasion, combination of words choices such as *“Finnish language and prerequisite requirements”*, *“exclude and silent racist”* and word imagery like *“visible minorities”* as a metaphor referring to immigrants groups, give his argument about racism and discrimination a form of lecture ascertaining how language could be a power tools employed against another class of people in the labour market.

Nevertheless, what sign show that such above evocative reasoning is true? In this light, addressing similar question to a policy maker in research data, provided not just our analysis with appeal based on authority, but also an inductive logical fact. Citing one policy maker at the migration service at the city of Jyväskylä: *“off course the discrimination cannot be really open but because there are so many unemployed immigrants in Jyvaskyla and in Finland, there has to be some kind of discrimination. Education is one thing that employers cannot say immigrants are not suitable for the task or don’t have the education, language is one and it is a large question because I think that the labour market cannot really be open”*

Inductive appeal because, in her attempt to address the issue at stake, her position as a policy maker in Jyvaskyla gave her the authority to support the seriousness of language as a power construct, by making certain inductive statistical comparative comments when she said

“because there are so many unemployed immigrants in Jyvaskyla”. Also, by adopting certain societal phenomenon, she was able to established enthymeme to support her arguments when she adopted the phrase in the middle of her respond *“education is one thing that employers cannot say immigrants are not suitable for the task or don’t have the education”*. All these appeal, styled in a careful logical sequences were all attempt to outline her vocal and articulated awareness of language as a contingences with an evocative alienated power nature within labour market inclusion of immigrants in Jyvaskyla. More so, her style of repeating the phrase *“cannot really be open”* at the beginning and the end of her statement were all persuasive attempt not just to present herself as a critic to such market phenomenon, but appeal to authority pointing the inappropriateness of such power myth (linguistic preferences with idealised visions of the future of Finnish culture) against immigrants.

In general, the structure of persuasion brought forward by immigrants on the evocative power of language in the Finnish labour market resonate within two dichotomy: the channel of low skilled verse the channel of high skill jobs. In this light, analysis shows more suggestive defences were advanced in support for striker language conditions in favour of professional jobs like nursing and doctors; on the other hand, persuasion against language skills were de-emphasised for low skills jobs (cleaning and posting) and certain skilled jobs like Information technology, were Interviewee 4, an immigrant with family reunion statues, having information technology educational qualification argued *“English is the language that is used in the IT world”*. Such ethos position as an IT experts, provided him with the power position to appeal to authority and reasoning carefully framing such a short performances of his speech with a degree of certainty and assurances addressing this situation not just citing Jyvaskyla-Finland, but the global IT world as a case study. Hence, a proof based persuasion due to his reputation as an IT specialist.

Language and its Political:

Nevertheless, when questions were coined to specifically address immigrant employment within respective field of studies, that is, those pattern of meaning generated when this issue of Finnish language was raised in line to their respective field of study (speciality after completing their degrees and professional studies); the political in participant statements and language tones differs, ranging not just from what these immigrants perceive as the real, but also those issues that has been antagonise as legitimate in this question of representation in labour market base on Finnish language skills. As such, not just were statement made to

question the likely promises of actually getting a job in one field of study in Jyväskylä, quoting one immigrant student studying social and public policy *“That would have been a miracle”* employing the word *“miracle”* as a metonymy for possible likelihood; the evocative power of Finnish language was aligned with three persuasive argument of uncertainties in data: the circumstances and nature of the field of study; individual efforts and attitudes towards integration aligned to availability of jobs in the labour market of Jyväskylä; and the supremacy position of the employers in this relationship, which constitute a vital subjective content in research data.

Those persuasion which appeal to circumstances and nature of an individual field of study, employed deductive reasons based on situations, time and space of their field of study in the society and the demands for their skills to support their language of experiences. Quoting one immigrant student;

“I am like if in terms of percentages, if am rating myself, it is likely out of a hundred am having 80% chances that I will have a job after graduating from my nursing program.”
(Nursing student, 4 years in Finland, intermediate level in Finnish language)

His style of continue repetition of certain evocative language *“if I”* was a well-prepared design to show the level of consideration and he placed on his Finnish language intermediary skills as such. Moreover, aligned to such above reflection, is his affirmation when he stated *“A profession which is very demanding”* was a well careful and consciousness plan strategy to support his intellectual style when he hyperbolically ascertain his confidence to a certain percentage level, that is 80% certainty in his present career choice. Also, his style of questioning himself *“if am rating myself”* and answering *“it is likely out of a hundred”*, were all persuasive means of shaping his argument to established a relationship between his field of study and labour market demands in Jyväskylä.

Furthermore, the hegemonic position of the employers in this relationship, constitute an over-all subjective persuasive assessment that employers are a determinant factor in this relationship regardless of immigrants language skills, field of studies and or experiences. As one immigrant student argued: *“It all depend on the employer and you. If you proof you are good in Finnish language and your skills in the job is efficient, you can be employed. However the employer has the final say...”* His persuasive strategy in this case, was not just to design a statement which will explicate the valuable role of both employer and individual

immigrant in this relationship when he made to create the awareness through the phrase “*it all depend on the employer and you*”; his style of logically presenting and personally validating certain case scenario to stress the power of an employer in this relationship when he employed the phrase “*employer has final say*” were conscious attempt to supports his assumption that immigrants are forced to struggle in a hostile work environment created down along memory lane that has re-establish itself firmly not just in the attitudes and beliefs of the host population, but within institutional setting control by employers as well. The question one might ask is whether such assumptions are fake claims.

Identity and Inequality:

The notion how power corrupt and absolute power corrupt absolutely, can be well employ to elucidate not just the alienating power of language, but also the question of ethnicity as an absolute power mechanism employed by the dominant culture (employers) to absolutely discriminate against immigrant within labour market encounter. Based on research data, regardless of immigrant’s statues and Finnish language proficiency; ethnicity sentiments were raised by immigrant’s participants, and shared by policy makers interviewees as a variable defence for certain injustice against immigrant’s access to the labour market in Jyvaskyla. The sequences of it assertion in research data supports its appropriateness, raising sceptic of the future of integration policies and frameworks.

The success of this power nature has often relies on the ability of employers to creatively style themselves according to taste and feeling towards immigrants ethno qualities. The operationalization of power has been through reflecting on those interest and need of their constituents. The result is therefor, power or more representation decision made based on simple identity shared between them and the other. Such persuasive views were generally shared by immigrants within research data regardless of statues and ethnicity. Quoting two immigrant with different ethnical background:

“I think being African and trying to participate in the labour market in Finland has its own sets of challenges. I applied a lot to many open job positions but I basically didn’t get a response and being an African and there was this feeling I perceived coming from employers against my type”.

(Immigrant from Nigeria)

The power rhetoric in his respond could not just be limited and trace to the rhetorical context which one can argue depict certain perception of blame as illuminated in his statement,

when certain evocative power phrases were used *“feeling I perceived coming from employers”*. Moreover, the underlining nature of the speaker argument were stylistically structured to rely on his rhetorical experiences as an African immigrant, when certain figurative word choices were combined in his argument “I applied a lot”, “being an African” and “against my type” to support his claim that black African are most likely been estranged within labour market in Jyvaskyla. Nevertheless, a similar rhetorical experience was equally shared by another class of immigrant identity far from the black African. Citing one immigrant respondent with Mexican identity *“I am a white Mexican that looks like an Arab which is perfectly explainable. It has been a mixed blessing and a double edge sword. They may invite me and they may not invite me. Mafia and drug dealings are some of the identities I am identified with”*

Even though his appeal shared similar rhetorical context and argument with the respondent from Africa research participant when he employed phrase like *“they may invite me and they may not; nonetheless, his stylistically approach of equivocally comparing his identity to “double edge sword”, were conscious attempt to echo certain character intimidation of his identity in his word “Arab”, “mafia” and “drug”, which are likely going to prevent him been equally perceive as comparative peer to Finnish whiteness. Hence, consciously appealing to the sensitivity of his audiences, inviting them to inductively rely on his physical appearance as a white to support his claim that just being a white does not make you a comparative peer.*

The improbable truth resulting from such societal allocation, has development into a power of naming and categorizing immigrants based on certain values of “Finnishness” (names, attitudes and whiteness), which redefined how power resonates within labour inclusion of immigrants in Jyvaskyla. From a policy stand point, such efforts towards categorizing represent what Saukkonen (2013, 290-291) identified as “formal multiculturalism”. When she argued that even though there is an official recognition of diversity and cultural rights in Finnish integration policies and legal frameworks, perception of national identity is till often gear towards the old-fashioned idea of homogeneity based on traditional values; what Gramsci considered the culture of the bourgeoisie’s rich working class. Such views, was expressly voiced out by one immigrant from the Philippines, working with an association that ensure immigrants integration in Jyvaskyla; she make certain in her respond to the

question of the power influence of her identity as compared to other immigrant identity in the labour market:

One thing is when your Finnish language is good, the only thing that can hinder is stereotype or racialization especially people with Muslim threats who are already on the minority side, you will be silently abused without knowing. Russian people or other parts of Europe experiences little or no difficulty in getting the internship position. I just think it's probably as a result of my name, it's easy to tell that am not of American or European background so...."

(Family-reunion Immigrant from Philippines)

Stylistically, all effort were employed by her, aware not just of her own identity as an immigrant, but also the position of authority she hold as someone working to integrate immigrant in Jyvaskyla; to filled her argument with dramatic contrast of different identity types as well as powerful imagery of conflict arising from the different identity type. Such persuasive lexicon, when she began by establishing authority in her statement with repeated expressions such as *"one thing"* and *"only thing"*, followed by the many named levels of identity types *"Muslim"*, *"Russian"* and *"Europeans"*, and then reduced to one hostile focus *"my name"*, were conscious attempt in her respond to articulates feeling of segmentation amongst immigrant groups, another form of hegemonic inequality far from the standard notion of Finns verse immigrants. Here, we see the power of style in language in representing how hegemonic privileges are assigned based on certain preferences within labour institutions in Jyvaskyla, when she used the slogan *"you will be silently abused without knowing"*. Her hypothesis when as she appeal to authority and reasons was that, mentality there is a huge difference between Anglo-American background and other immigrants (Africa and Asia) with more power to influence allocated to Anglo-American immigrants.

Vital to note that, data analysis also depict rhetorical experiences of statistical discrimination on taste founded on immigrants resident permit statuses. As compared to other visa statuses, there were robust rhetorical opinions employing persuasive words codes which depict strong perceptions of marginalisation and inequality of access in labour market in Jyvaskyla from immigrant's student. Example, one student immigrant retained *"students especially are the most vulnerable and limited immigrants groups"* (interviewee 6, student immigrant). Appealing to ethos (student) and pathos (student job seeker), he was able to deductively argue that as compared to other classes of first generational immigrants (immigrant Finnish passport holders, long term resident permit holders and refugee statuses), having a student

permit does mean you are in his own word “*limited*” to metaphorically mean employers always prefer those that can work full time without dedications to other commitments (studies).

Nevertheless, regardless of ethnicity type and status, the manner in which such hegemonic inequality manifest itself within labour institutions are most often implicitly rather than explicitly constructed. General terminologies in research data stresses such inequalities are often implicitly done at decision level in the recruitment process when employers are choosing or categorising applicants for a certain position, as one immigrant student from Ghana argued; “*the conceal decisions*”. Although, as compared to Canada (Kivisto 2002), the government of Finland too has explicitly express its concern towards equality in its multicultural encounter.

Ethnicity and its Political:

In line with what we have examined so far with regard to the question of identity and inequality, one can be tempted to question if an invitation for reconciliation in the form of a truce, be reconstructed in line with the notion of hegemonic inequality in the labour market multicultural encounter? Those norms and framing in the public view on who should be made equal to whom or given specific dominant privileges by implication, called upon immigrant to acquaint themselves with such realities in the labour market in Jyväskylä-Finland. There were, certain persuasive appeals resonating from policy makers, inviting immigrant to imagine themselves behind the veil of reasoning, accepting it should be but normal that immigrants should face such situations in the labour market in Jyväskylä multicultural encounter characterized by power inequality. Citing one policy maker in Jyväskylä:

“Well the integration act was created because of that to seek the same opportunities and smoothing the way for immigrants. Because in Finland everybody is supposed to be treated with equality but I don’t think that there are those kind of society because even though women are equal to men in Finland, we are getting less money so I think there will always be inequality.....”

(Policy maker: Expert Integration Service (TET))

What is significant about this response, is the speaker character. The recognizable circumstance that the speaker is a woman (a female policy maker within Jyväskylä integration) in a world dominated by men and masculine competitiveness in the political-

economy, inquisitively gave her a power position of strength and experiences from which to address this idea of immigrant labour inequality in Jyväskylä. In this regard, she was quick to engage her ethos and role as a witness to gender pay inequality in Finland, to consciously adopt a deductive metaphorical style of persuasion, when she cited the pay gender gap between Finnish Men and Women as a justifiable appeal for inequality based not just on gender, but also identity. Her aim was to consensually affirm, normalise and validate the notion that, the politics of integration and acculturation may contest patriarchal relations of power, where the Finns occupy the position of male-control. The political therefore in her speech does not just express concern that not just are women unequally treated, immigrant voices are likely comparable pair; when she used the catchphrase "*I think there will always be inequality*".

Likewise, her attempt to overtly voice her awareness of inequality, was also her style to consciously draw support towards why the integration act and other policies initiatives came in force in the first place. It seek the same opportunities and smoothing the way for immigrant's inclusions in Finland. So far, despite those positive valued judgements towards integration policies and immigrant experiences of labour accessibility; the civic and ethno cultural nation entitlements of Finnish multicultural encounter could be question based on these perception of hegemonic labour inequalities in Jyväskylä. Yet, probing if at policy level, there are populist ideologies/measures to redress these issues far from the current integration frameworks appear to produce limited results. Not just were there persuasive opinions that, there are no such measures in the public arena in Jyväskylä, one immigrant student in his attempt to persuade, question rather its effectiveness rather than existence:

"I would say if there are such measures, in my opinion I think those measures are cosmetically, I don't think they go deeply enough"

(Immigrant student from Nigeria)

The logic behind his assertion were to shy away from arguments which questioned the existence of such measures in the first place, but rather to question the hierarchy and transcendences of those policies measures in Jyväskylä by appealing to pathos. In this regards, he was able to used words choices like "*cosmetically*" as a deductive metaphor to support his claims that these measures improves only the outside appearance of immigrant integration, not its basic characteristics of inequality. Hence, his respond was to convince that even if there should be any measures, the society still has a strong value judgement

towards immigrants and as an immigrant you have to go through several filters of value judgements in order to be perceived as an equal person or appropriate person or worker for that position compared to the Finns. Surrounded by such attitudinal perceptions of the labour market, far from any policy measure to redress it, what was purported by interviewees in research data were for immigrants to accept certain societal phenomenon, which is, Finns in Jyväskylä as compared to Finns in Tampere or Helsinki are relatively new in issues of immigration. Multiculturalism in this light, is a marriage of conveniences between the Finns and immigrant's population. Quoting a refugee immigrant who has been in Jyväskylä for 10 years:

“In the world Finnish people are one of the best people compared to any other country. I have seen racism, I have been beaten, people have done so many things to me, these are negative things and I let it go because they didn't know me. Finnish people if they don't know you they get afraid. It has changed already, from the time I came to Jyväskylä, Finns used to run away when they see blacks and now we are sitting together. So things are improving”

(Interviewee 5, Refugee)

Her appeal to sensitivity based on her character as a refugee immigrant in Jyväskylä for more than 10 years, exhibits example of rational reasoning from immigrant community and a logic of agreements, interpreting oriented Finns actions towards immigrants far from issues of immigrant social class dichotomy. Her style of praising “*best people*”, blaming “*I have been beaten*” (whose actual existence remain uncertain) function as a metaphor for discrimination and then justifying “*Finnish people if they don't know you they get afraid*” where persuasive rhetoric giving legitimacy towards certain discriminating and exclusion Finns attitudes, while depicting ideological quandaries within a broader liberal discourse of tolerance from the immigrant population. What she increasingly outlined in her respond, was the significance of time when she concluded the phrase “*so things are improving*”, in justifying certain trends and evolution of Finns attitudes in Jyväskylä. In this regards, the question of who should be held accountable for this hegemonic labour inequality (blame game) was considered baseless in persuasion.

In this regard, not just were there persuasive appeals to immigrants, inviting them to developed deep seated and persistent belief toward themselves, but also a positive mind set in this encounter focusing on their motives in this relationship. Citing one immigrant: “*All you have to do is run for something, not waiting something will come to you. You need to go*

and ask for help and it will be given to you but if you want to sit down you would not get anything. I was running for it all the time (Family-reunion immigrant). Here, we see a carefully plan and delivered statement, calling on immigrant to be active, engaging and proactive. His continue use of figurative languages aligned to action verbs such as “run”, “waiting”, “go” “given” and “sit” as well as repeated pronoun “something” and “anything” to metaphorical refer to job types, were cognizant arrangement to forcefully appeal to feeling and forcefully advanced his ideas that immigrant need to be proactive regardless of those rhetorical experiences of hegemonic labour inequality.

In view of the above power affluence derived from immigrant’s proactiveness, were equally rhetorical substances given to the role of networking at all level involving multiple actors (family, friends and Finns), in breaking certain issues of immigrant vulnerability in job search and employment in Jyvaskyla. When words choice like “*favour charms*” was used in the quotation below to echoes the power value of networking in immigrants persuasive experience.

“In Jyvaskyla, getting a job is a huge challenge and I think anyone who has a job especially African immigrants you have to be probably be at the right place at the right time, or you know someone who has to go in as your favour charms”.

(Immigrant student from Ghana)

What the above data unveiled, is research backing to finding by Saukkonen (2013, 285) when she argues that policy practice in reality in Finland exclusively focuses on the personal development these immigrant makes in finding their places in the Finnish economic, social, cultural and political systems particularly the labour market. A trend or process this thesis refer to as self-directed immigrant integrations, to denote a self-directed initiative by immigrants hemmed by institutional supports.

6.3. Claim-Making and Attitudinal/Behavioural Commitment

Unlike the revolutionary nature Gramsci predicted was inevitable as a result of perceptions of inequality emerging from socio-economic and political marginalisation of the subaltern’s; its application in today multiculturalism rhetoric criticise ideology of uprising from the immigrant population (Tuori 2013). The implication is that, perceived perception of inequality (labour) by the immigrant’s class (subalterns) has resulted to diver’s attitudinal change depending on the severity of perceived inequality. What research data depict so far

can be compare to the economic term “optimum”, as integration policies in its best ensures an environment most conducive to a favourable integration outcome for immigrant (labour inclusion). Yet, though powers will continue in the hands of the dominant culture, the question is whether these optimum environments has achieve consensual acceptance of fairness from the immigrants populations in Jyvaskyla-Finland. In this regards, conscious attempt were made during interviews to probe for issue of attitudinal changes.

The Pledge

An analysis of research data depicts certain rhetorical persuasions towards a linear pattern of change amongst immigrants: firstly, pledge to stay either in Jyvaskyla in particular or Finland in general, and secondly, intention to move away from Jyvaskyla to other cities like Helsinki and Tampere or away from Finland in general. Quoting one immigrant student:

“These decimations have just made me strong and then has changed my perception that in life it is not a straight line there are a lot of pot holes and is a curve that you need to really struggle before you get what you want. The perception is things do not come the way you want, it comes the way the society wants it. So we just have to adjust. For now I don’t have any plans of moving”.

The underlining structure, design and delivery of his responds, were sequentially formulated to depict certain defensive or cautious attitudes following the situation at stake, which according to the interview were those challenges of immigrant integration. To sustain his persuasion, efforts were made to deductively incorporate certain broader life experiences, when trope such as “*lot of potholes*” and word choice like “*a curve*” were similes to normalized immigrant integration challenges experiences. Such logical style are generalization, were mindful attempt not just to justify his intention to stay in Jyvaskyla, but appeal to the broader immigrants groups to accept such life experiences, when he said “*we*”

Those rhetorical persuasion to stay in research data, in most cases were affiliated to moment of success notion measured by immigrants through career achievement in once speciality or any other professional job that can enable them meet their needs. The result, were petition for immigrants to seek those career options with greater employment possibility in Jyvaskyla. As one immigrant student make certain “*I had to switch to this nursing program for reason being that it’s likely that after graduating I will get a job*” (Immigrant Nursing Student). Even though, there was still this feeling of job uncertainty in his statement when he said “*likely*”, such appeal to thoughtfulness, in general depict the value choices in an

immigrant's outcome of labour inclusion in Jyvaskyla-Finland. Hence, a counter-hegemonic variable towards hegemonic labour inequality.

Secondly, intention to move away from Jyvaskyla in particular and or Finland in general, was also an attitudinal change resulting from those mental states of hegemonic labour inequality as evident in rhetorical experiences of immigrants in research data. Note should be made here that, intention to leave Jyvaskyla to other cities in Finland, were linked to rhetoric that, re-counting one immigrant student: *“Jyvaskyla as it is, is an educational oriented city, so getting a job is quite challenging as compared to other cities like Helsinki and Tampere where you find a lot of companies. It is really quite challenging to get a job here in Jyvaskyla”* (Student interviewee from Cameroon). Even though, no logical arguments were advanced to support such a bold claim that the city of Jyvaskyla is an educational hub; his comparative style of arguments, comparing the numbers of companies Jyvaskyla to other specified cities, were sensible effort to support his claim and be more persuasive in this regards.

On the broader context, those who argued pledge to leave Finland in general, laid emphasis on the discriminatory power instrument of language (Fluency in Finnish language). As one immigrant student articulate:

“I came here at first because I thought this was a very open and acceptable society. But spending time here, you noticed there are growing unrest about immigrants and any one non-European. Seeing yourself in this kind of situation where you do not know what the future hold is a kind of difficult and hopes crumbles. A Free for all cannibal markets where language will not hinder me is an option”

(Immigrant student from Mexico)

The quasi-logical argument from these statements is for the fact that an individual speaks English language, the opportunity set of getting a job in an English speaking country what he metaphorically referred to as a *“cannibal market”* is greater than in a non-English speaking country. However, one thing which did not resonate as a motive to stay or move factor, was the hegemony discriminatory power instrument of individual ethnicity. Perhaps, maybe because there were general perception of its operationalization at global level. Nevertheless, one can till metaphorically establish the word choice *“cannibal market”* to mean those nations of the world which as compared to Jyvaskyla-Finland, are more

advanced when it comes to issues of multiculturalism and immigrant integration into the labour market (Canada, USA and UK).

A More Conscious Change:

Aligned to the above attitudinal intention to stay in Jyvaskyla-Finland in research data, were also probing questions inspired by research finding of Kivisto (2012). Firstly, When question were raised to probe into how persuasion were made by the dominant culture and its political system (policy makers) to accommodate and manage diversities, from management standpoint, quoting one policy maker: *“the whole labour system I think it should change. If people don’t enter labour market, if they don’t have the possibility to build life here, get work, get a good services and get further in their lives, it will bring problems in the future. So in that way it is an important question that we can make it easier”*. Addressing the issue of immigrant increase level of unemployment, her position as a policy maker in immigrant integration provided her with a power position to make forward such parliamentary genre of respond for change.

Also, her ability to control her language, with stylistically well-prepared chronological imagery, when she twice made phrases beginning with “if.”, and thrice phrases beginning with “get”; were energetic efforts to carefully sustain her argument that present situation need a change. Her idea was to evoke sentiments of moral outrage when she said *“it will bring problem in the future”*, building a perfect playground for her overall policy agenda which is to make immigrant integration into the labour market easier, and a walkable path to labour market. Guided by such substantive rhetorical persuasion for structural changes, comes a broader rhetorical appeal for more support and positive value judgement awareness (knowledge). Citing a policy maker at the city:

“There should be more good experiences, good example stories to get employers to be more courage and also get immigrants to work”

(Policy maker: Migration Service city of Jyvaskyla)

Such leadership call, employing evident of some kind when she continually repeated the expression “good” to validate the reliability of her arguments, were persuasive vocabulary in her language style to advocate for assenting actions which in line with the present situations (immigrant high level unemployment) could deconstruct certain pre-existing negative labour perception about immigrants in Jyvaskyla. Such ceremonial appeal genre of her statements with powerful imagery “good experiences” and “good stories” to trigger

certain action from employers, were essential, exerting valuable economic potential capabilities of immigrants visible outside the notion of their ethnicity. In this regard, she was conscious of the valuable role of those at policy level in triggering certain behavioural action of employers; aware of the power position of employers in multicultural labour encounter.

Secondly, when question were raised to probe into how persuasion were made not just by the immigrant research participant towards claim-making, but also at policy level (intellectual leaders in Gramsci terminology). Guided by an old real estate maxim that says, the most important things when looking for a property are location, location, and location, which is the same thing. In research data, while there was general emotion appeal from immigrant's participants towards claims for language exemptions, resource redistribution and inclusion; persuasion claim for recognition were put forward as an umbrella claim (location) that has within it all the other three claims (inclusion, language exemption and resources redistribution). As one immigrant student weigh up:

“If I am not recognised as a peer and equal, I cannot decide, claim for redistribution, or included. I will just be kept in an exclusive role. Recognition free me from all checks....”
(Interviewee 7, Immigrant student)

Such a well thoughtful judiciously style of persuasion, mobilising convincing particularistic notion of belonging through reinforcing white dominance over immigrants, when he employed the catchphrase *“free me from all checks”* as a Metonymy for immigrant discrimination and racism, were mindful techniques to re-enforced his ideas for more valuable initiatives towards immigrant recognition.

Also, data also revealed while there were affirmative celebrative rhetorical appeal, culturally esteeming the power notion of belonging in the Finnish language, by policy administrators interviewees *“in Finland we have been quite proud of our language because it is the basic of our independence and culture”* (Policy Maker: *Expert Integration Service (TET)*). There were still inducement appeal for Finnish language not to be considered a necessary criteria for employment in jobs were higher understanding of the language was not a requirement. Quoting one social and public policy immigrant student: *“Even the ministry of culture and Education in Finland had raised this argument in their policy and I agree with them”*. Aware of his ethos, a figure he sought to keep, his respond was design to raise up an optimistic persuasive voice while appealing to authority. In this light, efforts were made in his respond

to underscore the political appropriateness of the topic of discussion, citing relevant state actors in this regards, while announcing his experiences in the field when he said *“I agree with them”*. Such argument, open up areas for future research, investigating the nature or characteristics of these job in the context of Finland were languages could be waived.

Such above political reasoning within research data, was also persuasively aligned to certain moral reasoning from both immigrants/policy interviewee’s, which is that language should come second after qualification in employment decision. A rhetoric which is emerging in Finland at policy level, under the rubric of *“integration through the work-place”*. However, surprising from research data, were reiterating inducement from immigrants on the value of learning the Finnish language. Quoting one immigrant student from Nigeria: *“I think it is fairness in demanding that people learn the language...”* The idea in his persuasion was simply to evoke a form of behavioural conduct from immigrants, that regardless of the employment potential it offers, it will be culturally insensitive if they are not required to understand Finnish and speak Finnish. Moreover, the question of contestation, bond to labour inequality and claim-making within research data, also saw arguments towards the introduction of tuition fee for international student in Finland. Opinions from data were divided into two, those who argue against, rhetorically compared Finland with other countries:

“English is a language of research now if you want to attract people... you want to give them some sought of incentive to come. That incentive was free education in Finland and immigrants only needed to take care of themselves. Now if you take that away the incentive question for a prospective student will be why I would want to go to that country; it is cold and I have to pay the same amount of fees and study in English compared to going to England, the States, Australia or Canada to study”.

(Family reunion Immigrant: expert in immigrant integration in Jyvaskyla)

The preparation and conveyance of the above response, follow a regular parliamentary format, praising previous government tuition free initiatives. Nevertheless, efforts were also taken to assure his appeal never fall short of a judicial format proper to defend the attractive forces of immigrant to Finland, while also pinpointing the risk towards greater antagonism in tuition fee introduction, advocating for policy rethink, more policy consciousness. In this regard, his argument were a combination of both logical comparative claims supported by his reference to both his curiosity and personal attachment with which he approach this topic

(personal experiences as an immigrant experts, with immigrant identity who came to Finland through family-reunion from England).

Conclusively, all what we have done in this chapter, entails the overall rhetorical experiences of the politic and the political of the Jyvaskyla-Finnish integration policy and framework, subsumed under the broader rubric of multicultural labour market hegemonic encounter. I sum up this section with an appeal from one policy maker responding to a question of her moment of success; subsuming the overall central tenets of Jyvaskyla integration:

“Moment of success is like here is a client from Afghanistan without any educational background. We put him in the language course. He get the language and get the school and get the profession and then he comes back and says that I got the job...”

(Policy Maker: Expert Integration Service (TET))

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1. Conclusion:

Guided by a well-researched design methodological trajectory and ontology presupposition of rhetorical experiences (how if we understand the language of persuasion within immigrants experiences, we are able to understand hegemonic power within multicultural encounters in Finnish integration and labour market encounter); the purpose in context through this study has been to connect the relationship between theory and practice, how if we understand Gramsci theory of hegemony (power gotten by conscious awareness) it help our understanding of immigrant labour market unconscious inequality. It was this research interest that Gramsci hegemony can through vital insight as it provided guidance for complex questioning which should be taken into consideration in the dialogue about minority struggle for economic equality. In this light, the rhetorical manner in which the economic and labour market importance of migration, immigrants and integration as a framework to achieve these importance, has develop and now constitute a hegemonic discourse not just in Jyvaskyla-Finland, but the broader European Union. Even though, the current mass flow of refugee from Syria and North Africa to Europe has witness the emergence and supports for “Far Right Parties” in Europe and anti-immigration sentiments in Europe; there still has been conscious persuasive rhetoric employing ideologies of sustainability and economic competitiveness has been a frame discourse in favour of labour migration policies within EU and its member states.

The nature of which such hegemonic economic definitions resonates in Jyvaskyla, the politics and the political surrounding the value position of immigrants in this new space appear purely problematic. From a subordinate position, immigrant are certain of their economic value they bring into this Jyvaskyla multicultural space. General rhetorical experience amongst the immigrant population within research data, regardless of statues, were that immigrants constitute a valuable economic conscious resource to Jyvaskyla. Nevertheless, the above value role persuasions, were never short of conscious appeal to emotion and sensitiveness, to those immigrants who personally has made a choice to live on benefits. Such persuasions, were designed to trigger certain moral duty sentiments to engage

in certain job search attitudes. Though occupying a dominant position, such above value judgement question, still remain doubtful at policy level in Jyvaskyla, subsumed under the discourse of high inflow of refugee.

Hitherto, amid certain powerful imagery of conflict of ideas at policy level on the economic resource potential of immigrants in Jyvaskyla (immigrants perceived also as burden to service provision), such rhetoric were never short of reconciliatory rhetoric, with valuable hegemonic persuasion ascertaining its appearance within policy makers in Jyvaskyla of certain value judgement perceptions of immigrants. The development and change of perceptions, one can argue could be aligned to certain rhetorical appeals from policy makers when one policy maker reiterate the constant willingness and desire of immigrants to be engage with the labour market of Jyvaskyla. In this light, we see a rhetorical hegemonic definition, subsumed with judicial genre of praise and blame, and never short of parliamentary format appealing for policy goals, example "*help and care*" as a metaphor for immigrant integration and acculturation. Hence, a paternalistic relations of power.

Nonetheless, amidst those consensual politics of integration policies/framework as a general labour market inclusion mechanism, the operationalization of such politics within research participant in research data, did not come without certain notion of the political. The political therefore incorporated within rhetorical voices of immigrants in this light, surfaced under the broader rubrics of empowerment and issues of privileges. This is because, trends does not just indicate the historical national minority group within the dominant societies is shifting to consist of new classes of minorities (refugees, family-reunion migrants, student and economic migrants), the prerequisites, goals, politics and economic desires of these minorities groups are likewise changing. As such, hemmed with the rhetoric of sustainable and economic competitive resources for Jyvaskyla-Finland and affirmative and celebrative rhetoric of the empowering nature of Jyväskylä integration from refugees and family reunion statuses migrants, are also struggle for class power not just between the dominant culture and the subordinate culture, but amongst the subordinate groups, subsumed under the rubrics of immigrant empowerment..

The democratic style ethos of Finnish integration policy, inspired with certain language image that depict argument in favor of essentialist dimensions of immigrant participation and empowerments as a persuasive logic of fairness; constitute a hegemonic attempt by the

Finnish government to demonstrate its awareness of its role as a dominant culture in this new space of multiculturalism. However, its formation as a public policy towards immigrant acculturation and labour integration (through assigning privileges) has also been an instrument where power manifest itself. Here we see a power position of Finnish integration policy as a national quality, illusory in the form of a labour entrepreneur instrument allowing immigrant to contest with Finns in the labour market of Jyvaskyla. A multicultural democratic idea of the Finnish state as an enabler to immigrant integration, where an individual may have certain normalities like his/her ethnicity, but is not bias in the relationship of accessing the society through work and position. In other words, there is no divide between the rich North and the poor South in service delivery.

Until now, the vision is more or less divisive, rather than simple inclusive. Though not overtly racist or discriminative in her language, the operationalization of the integration policies/framework in Jyvaskyla nonetheless depict certain feeling of favoritism (empowerment) to a statues there consider vulnerable, giving legitimacy towards a political opinion of exclusion and segmentation. Not just does its selective process nature of integration policy ascribing more representation or focus towards refugees and family-reunion migrants statues, as compared to immigrant student, constitute an aesthetic form of power; as it create friction not just between the states and immigrants as a whole, but friction in opinion between immigrants statues (student Vs others). The implication from rhetorical experiences has been that, the existing policies measures in Jyvaskyla-Finland have attracted both negatives and positives feedbacks, not Just from the immigrant's population in research data, but also those at policy level.

In Jyvaskyla, immigrants student are on the offensive, as they question the level of consciousness these policies show towards immigrants student. In Jyvaskyla-Finland, findings from research participants, depict student still feel unrepresented at policy level and the bond of contestation is that students rather are the most marginalized groups in this hegemonic encounter; because their privileges are not sufficiently addressed within integration initiatives at policy levels and frameworks in Jyvaskyla. However, there were positive perceptions from refugees and family-reunion immigrant groups towards policies initiatives, as integration were perceived as a conscious hegemonic mechanism towards co-habiting.

Moreover, the fact that the many named levels of support and participation are now reduced to one hostile focus “language”, depict a struggle for supremacy as a means of control, hemmed with the purpose of maintaining the supremacy of core hegemony (bourgeois culture) over migrants cultures in this new space known as multicultural Jyvaskyla. As such, its appeal for an immigrant to learn Finnish language is not just to endeavor more immigrant inclusion, the influential position of Finnish language as a multiplier effect to immigrant labour market representation in Jyvaskyla, is a conscious attempt to achieve a sense of Finnishness, in which one can argued that it is not just morally inspire, but also a fundamental tool for serving a moral guide to proper action. The implication is that, not just does it create a conscious perception of assist and empowerment, but also a perception that those who do not engaged will be punished in the long run when they try to adjust to the economy.

Hemmed by these different voices, results show that despite the central tenets of Finnish integration policies and frameworks continue to be tailored with rhetoric of providing immigrant with privileges, which will enable this immigrant (subalterns) classes access to the labour markets; such consensual vision of providing immigrants a means of inclusion is been hindered as a result of societal preconceptions. Experiences shows immigrants continue to encounter a power struggle in their efforts to be integrated within the labour market of Jyvaskyla-Finland. In this regards, the idea that a modern state (multiculturalism) is a political association promoting a distinct understanding of freedom (notion of belonging), exercise outside the formal public domain without regard to the concern of the public life is increasingly becoming an issue of debates with multicultural labour encounter. Amide those different rhetorical voices (depending on an immigrant statues) of empowerment and or segmentation towards policies framework, are unified rhetorical experiences of hegemonic labour market inequality, substantially embodied with certain notion of power. That is, a conscious drive to create a dominant identity by the Finns within this space of multiculturalism especially within the labour market interaction.

The tension between the principle of universality and particularity dimension within multicultural relationships possess a legitimate avenue for excising power with the labour market encounter of Jyvaskyla. The issue is that, modern societies employing multiculturalism have widely expanded those possibilities for legitimate differences in society, yet are simultaneously losing the hold on those principles and values that purportedly transcend these diversities and joining immigrants and Fins as equivalent parts

in this space of multiculturalism (labour market). The implication is that, such universality notion within multiculturalism (example liberties, equalities and fairness) within the economic is increasingly in tension with power attitudes (racism and discrimination) questioning what makes us equal. The result has been that those particularities of immigrants (language skills and ethnicity) have certainly not been erased, but immigrants are being subordinated to their collective identity as subject to this new space and labour relationship.

The controversy in these circumstances is that, despite arguments towards mobilizing or redefining universal ideas that promote inclusion, metaphorically, these universals are often particular elements of the society writ. What this means is that, the universal is never without some grounding in the particular, for example, Finnish language. In this regard, ideologies towards demands for efficiency in Finnish language skills has been the creative arts and preconceived rules in this process. Even though, Kymlicka (2012, 14–15) maintained that integration allows for cultural distinctiveness but demands fluency in at least one of the host national languages which in our case is either Finnish or Swedish; such demand has been a hegemonic instrument employed by the dominant culture to unequally discriminate against non-Finnish immigrants in Jyväskylä. Finnish language in Jyväskylä is considered a valuable tool under which Finnish national identity is constructed in the labour market. Its place within Finnish integration does not just create a forum where immigrants can interact with Finns, it is also an empowering instrument towards which immigrants can have access to the labour market.

Nevertheless, Finnish language has been systematically used as a power instrument by labour market institutions in Jyväskylä to discriminate against immigrants who cannot speak Finnish. Its application in the labour market in Jyväskylä has taken a central stage to an extent that those who cannot communicate in Finnish, now consider speaking Finnish as an acquired privilege. Language ability has been systematically constructed and now it resides in the mind of immigrants as the first discriminatory instrument in the labour market of Jyväskylä before their ethnicity. In this regard, the official language of the country of destination (which in most cases is New Zealand, United Kingdom and Canada) was the first criteria, amongst all those who mentioned relocating out of Finland. General beliefs were that, even though some countries might have and others might not have integration policies like Finland, they won't experience those inequalities brought on them through those discriminatory power constructs of Finnish language.

Despite strong opinion that Finnish Language is power language for discrimination, there are still value consciousness of fairness from the immigrant's population towards these discrimination; encouraging themselves to ensure they are proficient in Finnish language. The purpose is not because, been proficient in Finnish is a way of fighting discrimination but an expression of respect towards the dominant culture. However, general persuasive arguments with research data, were that, language should not be used statistically as a discriminating power instrument against immigrants in the labour market. Globalization has made labour mobility unstoppable and employing language to decimate in a broader context has psychological implication on job search, immigrant ability (trust and recognition) and intention to stay or move.

In addition to the power of language, are also popular persuasion in research data, appealing not just to authority but also feelings that certain immigrants are set apart within labour market encounter through statistical discrimination attitudes based on societal taste (Finnishness) and ethno-stratification preferences (whiteness). A state of affairs where the dominant culture (employers) in this space of multiculturalism, has the power to decide who gets what privileges, when do they acquires it, how do they get it and why are they entitled to it. A notion Kaufman (2004, 6-9) identified as segmented assimilation to refer to distinction between ethnic groups and racial groups in multicultural encounters. Just as Brown (2002, 126) argued that within states the power relationships varies depending on the ethnic composition; in Jyvaskyla multicultural labour relationship, ethnic identity variable (immigrant ethnicity) is a power instrument. Hence rather than a hegemonic power relationship of equality, experiences has depict a sense of rather a hegemonic labour inequality.

Although emphasis are on the hegemony of Finnish Language towards labour market inequality, the manipulative role of ethnicity as a power instrument towards immigrants' vulnerability in the labour market in Jyvaskyla-Finland comes secondary after language skills. The prevailing sense amongst immigrants at least is that not just are Finns on the offensive, been favour and offered more employment privileges, but also, Anglo-Saxon immigrants could not be considered similar peers. General feeling amongst non-EU immigrants is that, immigrants from Europe, Russia and Anglo-Americans, are offered preferential privileges second to Finns in employment decisions and were often perceived as expatriate. Confined to the power of ethno-stratification, is also power of relegation and

denigration, when Immigrant are relegation to certain position in the labour market realm of Jyvaskyla and the denigration of their quality within employment The question of immigrant identity, how and what are the societal knowledge about that class of immigrant are closely bound with the allocation of social roles and capacity, which in Jyvaskyla often result to immigrant occupying certain low skill jobs regardless of their high level of education.

In the broader context of our analysis, and guided by Finlayson (2007, 556) argues that, when using rhetorical analysis as an analytical tool, it is possible for certain phenomenon to be problematized. In this light, for the fact that perceptions from data were mixed, it was difficult to problematized integration policies and framework as a phenomenon resulting to hegemonic labour inequality between Finns and immigrants groups. However, this study was able to ascertained that, the Finnish integration policies/framework make available certain privileges towards certain immigrants groups (refugees and family-reunion migrants) with exceptions of student immigrants, unconsciously laying a framework under which immigrants groups are unequally integrated into the Jyvaskyla-Finnish labour market. Nevertheless, on the broader scope of multicultural hegemonic encounter, this study was able to problematize that, the desire to maintain their cultural hegemony, certain dominant values (Finnish language and Finnishness (whiteness)) were power phenomenon which were also unconsciously employed by the dominant group (labour market institutions) to influence immigrant labour market inclusion (hegemonic labour market inequality).

Concluding therefore, the Finnish integration aligned to Gramsci theory of hegemony entails a set of conscious activities (identifying, planning, educating, training and participation) with numerous actors (immigrant included) resulting to immigrant's inclusion in the labour market as well as the society of Finland at large. Aligning Finnish integration to the broader acculturation process, shows how immigrant labour market affiliation are made possible through greater cultural (language) integration with the majority culture. Yet, no matter how good the existing laws are, the society and the labour market is prejudices towards immigrants especially those who do not meet the criteria of whiteness. These immigrants have to face racism no matter how hard the laws try to prepare these immigrants towards labour market inclusion or prevent discrimination based on taste. A situation, we conceptualised as hegemonic relationship of labour market inequality.

Immigrants are made to struggle with racist institutional setting, a situations that has long genealogy spanning from the era of slave trade. In this light, being part of the Finnish society and labour market is neither a matter of what resident permit statues one came to Finland with, or had stayed in Finland to have (citizenship or permanent statues); nor is it about what position one occupy in the integration policies/frameworks. It is a matter of submitting to the greater vision of Finnish integration ideologies (labour equality) through personal determination in faith amide challenges and obstacles. As such, integration policies/framework are one end of this relationship, Finnish language another and immigrant ethnicity occupying the third end to this linear relation. As such, we are faced with trends in hegemonic multicultural encounter, where multiplicity power dichotomy need to be considered in policy formulation and implementations.

7.2. Recommendations

Nevertheless, all what we have discussed in this section reveals the nature of power and a sense of non-consensual hegemonic control embedded in the notion of knowledge (truth which emphasis on a single public domain host culture) existing within labour market institutions and the society at large. It allows for designed ideologies to pursuit undisclosed policy objectives which in most cases results to latent hegemony of the mainstream/dominant cultures. The moulding of immigrants as a class of people needing help from the host nation has surrounding multicultural relationship dating back to colonialism. Coupled with recent trends in refugee's flows from Middle East and Africa, such normative constructions of immigrants is enough to make hegemonic positions visible. Such realities, contradict the centrality of politics which Gramsci sought, when he argues hegemony or leadership is always even, only implicitly or unstated form politically. He called for states or institutions to take a clear political economic position that are aware of the responsibilities that are involved in providing leadership for a much broader layers of the society (including immigrants).

Such leadership responsibilities one might argue should center on deconstructing pre-existing labour knowledge which in most cases, have normative construct the immigrant's class negatively, with knowledge exerting valuable economic potential capabilities visible outside their ethnicity. Such new naming should be explicitly and implicitly visible within

labour market institutions and the society at large. Hence, we are forced to question if really, such consensual labour relationship and immigrants favourable deconstructions can be achieved depending on the present policy initiatives in place?

In this regards, all efforts were taken to ensure result of this study were not short of certain ideas which could be employed as recommendations. Not just were important areas for improvement identified by interviewees, qualities recommendations were suggested towards policy framework, labour market institution, the broader Finnish community and the immigrant's population themselves. The following recommendations were made:

An honest job applications procedure: job application shouldn't bear any name because if you submit blind applications it's easy to be fair. What was suggested, were for all applications to probably be affixed with numbers uniquely known only to the applicant and the recruiter. Even though it will not eliminate taste discrimination, concealing applicants name is a step against institutional labour inequality.

Career training: Enough professional, high skills practicing and volunteer placements should be made and immigrants encourages to participates. The appeal is that, immigrants will be exposed to the Finnish working professional, Finnish employer and might be able to sell their skills and talents while breaking the natural stereotype of "must speak Finnish" from an employer point of view. Moreover, these initiatives might go a long way to rebut those rhetoric depicting Jyvaskyla as an educational hubs rather than both education and labour market hubs.

Good stories examples: important thinking should also be given towards perceptions of second generational immigrants. Particularly, when one thinks about the future and surrounded by those assumptions that children generally learn by examples and from experience. Imagine an immigrant family/communities with just few or none immigrant figures to look up to as good case examples. Without such stories, most immigrant children and new first generation immigrants, might probably lack those aspirations to move forward. The present of these stories and more of it is a motivational factor which might go a long way to neutralise those immigrant perceptions of existing hegemonic inequality in the Finnish labour market.

An awareness campaign: General perceptions were that current Integration policy in are very good, yet if you look at it from the point of view of what it is supposed to achieve which is to get people to work; popular perceptions were more towards failure, as even interviewees at policy level ascertain the increase number of unemployed immigrants as compared to Finns. I think the reason why there has been a failure on the integration policy is because it has not accepted or it has not involved the dominant culture (population) in the integration process. Integration process do requires both parties in this encounter. When the two parties want to integrate, integration will happen, in this case the immigrants and then the local population. Now, in Jyvaskyla-Finland almost all provisions of the law are directed at immigrants with little or no initiatives directed at the local population.

This makes the integration process a bit more difficult. In this light, if information can pay, there should be policy inventiveness, some positive sensitization could be directed to the local population. Educating them more on those positive value judgements on immigration, especially what immigrants bring to the city of Jyvaskyla in particular and Finland in general. Such knowledge reconstruction and dissemination might go a long way in removing those threats perceptions within the broader communities in Jyvaskyla-Finland. This initiatives should not just end at communities' level, but more follow up should be directed towards employers with good stories examples of immigrants doing great at their job roles.

Inclusion of other stakeholders: Aligned to those rhetoric within integration policies and framework, were inducement for the government to collaborate with the employers. Within the welfare systems of equality, there need to be an awareness that groups differs and effective solutions can be made through quality participation from all actors. Far from immigrant participation, employers should be included at policy formation level rather than just the implementation level. Effective representation of all stakeholders might go a long way to eliminate perceptions of blue print aligned to existing integration initiatives especially from those parties who were not stakeholders when these policies were drafted. Such creativities through cooperation, might go a long way to subdue those divisions between policy makers and employers whether immigrant qualification should come first or Finnish language skills in employment decisions.

Resources Distribution: Not just were there recommendations from students that they should be more consideration towards students in future integration policies formulation.

With the current commitment placed on schools to ensure student learn Finnish language before graduation, this study suggest Finnish language course should be made compulsory to all international degree courses. Education bodies should also consider the time spent in teaching. This is because, international students find the time too small and aligned to other studies pressure and commitments, learning Finnish language during study time is equally very exhorting. Surrounded by these arguments, it was this study recommendation that, a policy should be made where those immigrants student who succeed in completing their studies on time, should be given a six months period after graduation to effectively learn Finnish language on a shared funded bases. This initiative will go a long way to supplements employer's initiatives (employee development) as these measures will come with it other work related pressures which learning Finnish does not require.

Commitment and determination: All the above six recommendations so far will not achieve their purpose if those whom these resourcefulness are designed for are not committed and motivated. On this ground, immigrants through their associations and other settings should be inspired to be more than ever be positive not just limited towards integration initiatives, but also towards job search efforts amid these numerous language and ethnicity challenges.

Future research:

This study opens up opportunities for further research study:

1. If perceived immigrants perception towards integration policies and immigrant vulnerability, have an effect on attitudes towards integration activities and labour market interaction.
2. How within the rubric of Finnish multiculturalism, perceptions towards privileges resonates amongst the core culture Hegemony.

CHAPTER EIGHT

REFERENCE LIST

- Alexander, J. C. (2006). *The Civil Sphere*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Alexander, J.C. (2007). "Keeping Faith with Civil Sphere and My Critics." *Perspectives* 30:1, 10–15.
- Arends-Toth, J., and van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2003) "Multiculturalism and acculturation: Views of Dutch and Turkish-Dutch". *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 249–266.
- Back, L. (2007). *The art of listening*. Berg: Oxford.
- Banting, K., and Kymlicka, W. (Eds.). (2006). *Multiculturalism and the welfare state: recognition and redistribution in contemporary democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bisin, A., Patacchini, E., Verdier, T., and Zenou, Y. (2011) "Ethnic identity and labour market outcomes of immigrants in Europe". *Economic Policy*, 26(65), 57-92.
- Bauböck, R. (2008). *Beyond culturalism and statism. Liberal responses to diversity*. Euro spheres Working Paper Series, Online Working Paper No. 06. Retrieved on the 06 November 2016. Available on:
http://eurospheres.org/files/2010/08/plugin-Eurosphere_Working_Paper_6_Baubock.pdf
- Berry, J. W. (2001) "A psychology of immigration". *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 615–631.
- Berry, J. W. (1992). Cultural transformation and psychological acculturation. *Teoksessa: Burnet, Jean ym. (toim.) Migration and the Transformation of Cultures. Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario*, 23-54.
- Berry, J.W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M. and Bujaki, M. (1989) "Acculturation Attitudes in Plural Societies." *Applied Psychology* 38: 185-206
- Bengtsson, B., Strömblad, P., and Bay, A. H. (Eds.). (2010). *Diversity, inclusion and citizenship in Scandinavia*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Bowskill, M., Lyons, E., and Coyle, A. (2007). "The rhetoric of acculturation: When integration means assimilation". *British Journal of Social Psychology* 46:4, 793-813.

- Brochmann, G., and Hagelund, A. (2012). *Immigration policy and the Scandinavian welfare state 1945-2010*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brown, D. (2000). *Contemporary Nationalism: Civic, Ethnocultural and Multicultural Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Brummett, B. (2014). *Rhetoric in popular culture*. Sage Publications.
- Bucken-Knapp, G., Hinnfors, J., Spehar, A., and Levin, P. (2014) “No Nordic model: Understanding differences in the labour migration policy preferences of mainstream Finnish and Swedish political parties. *Comparative European Politics*, 12(6), 584-602.
- Burroughs, E. (2012) *Irish Institutional Discourses of Illegal Immigration: A Critical Discourse Analysis Approach* (Doctoral dissertation, National University of Ireland Maynooth).
- Carrera, S., Gros, D., Blockmans, S., and Guild, E. (2015) The EU’s Response to the Refugee Crisis: Taking Stock and Setting Policy Priorities. CEPS Essay No. 20, 16 December 2015.
- Castles, S. (2006). “Guest workers in Europe: A resurrection?” *International migration review* 40:4, 741-766.
- Castles, S and Mark, J. M. (2009). *The Age of Migration. International Population Movements in the Modern World*. Fourth Edition. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chen, D. H. C., and Dahlman, C. J. (2004). *Knowledge and development: a cross-section approach* (Vol. 3366). World Bank Publications.
- Christie, P., and Sidhu, R. (2006) “Governmentality and ‘fearless speech’: framing the education of asylum seeker and refugee children in Australia”. *Oxford Review of Education*, 32(4), 449-465.
- Cordell, K., and Stefan, W (2004) *the Ethnopolitical Encyclopaedia of Europe*. Hound mills: Palgrave Macmillan
- Coutinho, Carlos (2012) *Gramsci's Political Thought*. Boston: Brill
- Covino, A. W. and Jolliffe, D. A. (1995). *Rhetoric: Concepts, Definitions, Boundaries*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Cutler, D. M., Glaeser, E. L. and Vigdor, J. L. (2008) “When are ghettos bad? Lessons from immigrant segregation in the United States”. *Journal of Urban Econ.* 63:759-74.

Dancygier, R. M., and Laitin, D. D. (2014). “Immigration into Europe: Economic discrimination, violence, and public policy”. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 17, 43-64.

Dean, M. (1999) *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. Sage: London.

Duncombe, S. (2002). *Cultural resistance reader*. Verso.

Edward, P. J. C. (1991) [Review of *Modern Rhetorical Criticism*]. *Rhetoric Review*, 9:2, 353–355. Retrieved on 07th November 2016. Available on: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/465919>

Ekechukwu, R.O., Ateke, B.W. and Ekenedo, G.O. (2014). “Leadership Education through Extracurricular Activities in Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria”. *Academic Research International*, 5:3, 273-279.

Ellsberg, M., and Heise, L (2005). *Researching Violence Against Women - A Practical Guide for researchers and activists*, Washington DC, United States, World Health Organisation and PATH, 2005.

Eurostat news release (2016). Asylum in the EU Member States - Record number of over 1.2 million first time asylum seekers registered in 2015 Syrians, Afghans and Iraqis: top citizenships. Retrieved on 07 March 2016. Available On: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/en/web/products-press-releases/-/3-04032016-AP>

Eurostat (2013) European Social Statistics. Retrieved on 03rd May 2016. Available Online: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3930297/5968986/KS-FP-13-001-EN.PDF>

Eva Zschirnt and Didier Ruedin (2016) Ethnic discrimination in hiring decisions: a meta-analysis of correspondence tests 1990–2015, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2015.1133279

Evelyn Ersanilli and Ruud Koopmans (2011). “Do Immigrant Integration Policies Matter? A Three-Country Comparison among Turkish Immigrants”. *West European Politics*, 34:2, 208-234,

Féron, E., and Beauzamy, B. (2012). "Otherism in discourses, integration in policies? Comparing French and Danish educational policies for migrants". *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 2:1, 066–077.

Fine, G. A. (2012). *Tiny publics: A theory of group action and culture*. Russell Sage Foundation: New York

Finlex Data Bank: Act on the Promotion of Immigrant Integration. Translation of Finnish Acts and Degree. 2010-1386/2010. Retrieved On 03 March 2016. Available on: <http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/2010/en20101386>

Finlayson, A. (2007). "From beliefs to arguments: interpretive methodology and rhetorical political analysis". *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, 9:4, 545-563.

Fontana, B. (2008) *6 Hegemony and Power in Gramsci*. Routledge Studies in Social and Political Thought, 80.

Forrest, J., and Dunn, K. (2006). "Core 'culture hegemony and multiculturalism: perceptions of the privileged position of Australians with British backgrounds". *Ethnicities*, 6:2, 203-230.

Foss, S. K. (1996). *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice*. 2nd ed. Prospect Heights: Waveland.

Gavanas, A. (2013). "Elderly care puzzles in Stockholm; strategies on formal and informal markets." *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 3:2, 63-71.

Glazer, N. (1997) *We are All Multiculturalists Now*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glazer, N. (1988). *The new immigration: a challenge to American society*

Glick, S. N., Basch, L., and Blanc-Szanton, C. (1992). Transnationalism: A new analytic framework for understanding migration. *Annals of the New York academy of sciences*, 645(1), 1-24.

Gramsci Antonio (1978). *Selections from Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Edited by Q. Hoare and G. N. Smith.

HakimLarson, J., and Menna, R. (2015). ACCULTURATION AND ENCULTURATION. *Handbook of Arab American Psychology*.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Clarendon Press.

Hanne, Allonen: Urgent Information? Email message. Recipient: Njikang Kennedy Ebang. Send: 06 June 2017, read 06 June 2017. Private email message.

Hart, R. P. (1997). *Modern rhetorical criticism*. A Simon and Schuster Company: Maaaschusetts

Hart, R. P. (1986). "Contemporary Scholarship in Public Address: A Research Editorial." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50: 282-89.

Hartmann, Douglas and Joyce, Bell (2007). "Diversity in Everyday Discourse: The Cultural Ambiguities and Consequences of 'Happy Talk.'" *American Sociological Review* 72:6, 895–914

Hatton, T. J. (2015). "Asylum Policy in the EU: the case for deeper integration". *CESifo Economic Studies*, 61:3-4, 605-637.

Heath, A. F., and Cheung, S. Y. (2007) *Unequal chances: Ethnic minorities in Western labour markets* (Vol. 137). Oxford University Press.

Heikkilä, E. (2005). "Mobile vulnerabilities: perspectives on the vulnerabilities of immigrants in the Finnish labour market". *Population, Space and Place*, 11:6, 485-497.

Heikkilä, E., and Peltonen, S. (2002). Immigrants and integration in Finland. *Survey: About the Situation of Immigrants and Refugees in Six Baltic Sea States. Developed within the framework of the European Community Action, SOCRATES*.

Hermansen, A. S. (2013) "Occupational Attainment among Children of Immigrants in Norway: Bottlenecks into Employment - Equal Access to Advantaged Positions?" *European Sociological Review*, 29(3) 517-534.

Heywood Andrew (2014). *Global Politics*. Palgrave MacMillan: New York

Hiebert, D., Collins, J., and Spoonley, P. (2003). *Uneven Globalization: Neoliberal Regimes, Immigration and Multiculturalism in Australia, Canada and New Zealand*. Vancouver

Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis (RIIM), Working Paper No. 03–05. Hobson, J. (2012) *Body as evidence: mediating race, globalizing gender*. SUNY Press.

Hirschman, A. O. (1991). *The rhetoric of reaction*. Harvard University Press: London, England.

Hobden, S. and Wyn Jones, R. (2008) Marxist Theories of International Relations, In: Baylis, J., Smith, S. and Owens, P., eds. (2008) “*The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations*”. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 144-158.

Hohne Jutta and Koopmans Ruud (2010) Host-Country Cultural Capital and Labour Market Trajectories of Migrants in Germany. The Impact of Host-Country Orientation and Migrant-Specific Human and Social Capital on Labour Market Transitions. WZB Discussion Paper No. 2683.

Ingrid Robeyns (2003). “*The Capability Approach: An Interdisciplinary Introduction*”. Training Course preceding the 3rd International Conference on the Capability Approach, Pavia, Italy, on 6 September 2003.

International Organisation for Migration (2015) How the World Views Migration: Results from a New IOM/Gallup Report. Retrieved on 3rd March 2016. Available Online: <http://www.iom.int/news/how-world-views-migration-results-new-iomgallup-report>

Jackson Lears, T.J. (1985) “The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities”. *The American Historical Review*, 90(3), 567-593.

Jean-Baptiste, C. (2015) far right set to enter government coalition in Finland. Published online in The Guardian on the 19 May 2015. Retrieved on 11 March 2016. Available Online at: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/may/19/timo-soini-far-right-finns-party-finland-government>

Johnson, C. (2002). “The Dilemmas of Ethnic Privilege: A Comparison of Constructions of “British”, “English” and “Anglo-Celtic” Identity in Contemporary British and Australian Political Discourse”. *Ethnicities* 2:2, 163–88.

Johnstone, H. W. (1969). Truth, Communication, and Rhetoric in Philosophy. *Revue Internationale de Philosophie*, 404-409.

- Kaufman, E. (2004). *The Rise and Fall of Anglo-America: The Decline of Dominant Ethnicity in the US*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kivisto, P., and Wahlbeck, Ö. (2013). *Debating multiculturalism in the Nordic welfare states. In debating multiculturalism in the Nordic welfare states*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Kivisto, P. (2012). “We really are all multiculturalists now”. *The sociological quarterly*, 53:1, 1-24.
- Kivisto, P. (2002). *Multiculturalism in a Global Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kurekova, L. (2011). *Theories of migration: Conceptual review and empirical testing in the context of the EU East–West flows*. Presented at the Interdisciplinary conference on Migration. Economic Change, Social Challenge.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Clarendon Press.
- Laclau, E. (1990). *New Reflections on the Revolution our Time*.
- Laclau, E., and Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. Verso.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Lindsköld Linnea (2015). “Contradicting Cultural Policy: A Comparative Study of the Cultural Policy of the Scandinavians Radical Right Parties”. *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidsskrift* 18:1, 8-27
- Lloyd, D., and Thomas, P. (2014). *Culture and the State*. Routledge.
- Lonnqvist, A., Kapyła, J., Salonius, H., and Yigitcanlar, T. (2014). “Knowledge that matters: identifying regional knowledge assets of Tampere Region”. *European Planning Studies* 22:10, 2011-2029.
- Lubbers, M., and Güveli, A (2007) “Voting LPF: Stratification and the varying importance of attitudes”. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 17: 21-48.

- Lucassen, G., and Lubbers, M (2012). "Who Fears What? Explaining Far-Right-Wing Preference in Europe by Distinguishing Perceived Cultural and Economic Ethnic Threats". *Journal of Comparative Political Studies* 45:5, 547–574.
- Mähönen, T. A., Varjonen, S., Prindiville, N., Arnold, L., and Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2015). "Boundaries of National Belonging in Ingrian Finnish Return Migration". *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 5:3, 126-134.
- Mandaville, P., and Williams, A. (2015). *Meaning and international relations*. Routledge.
- Marmolejo, F., and Puukka, J. (2006). Supporting the Contribution of Higher Education to Regional Development: Lessons Learned from an OECD Review of 14 Regions throughout 12 Countries. Available online: <https://www.oecd.org/finland/36809119.pdf>
- Martin, J. (2013). *Politics and rhetoric: A critical introduction*. Routledge.
- Menz, G. (2015). "The promise of the principal-agent approach for studying EU migration policy: The case of external migration control". *Comparative European Politics* 13:3, 307-324.
- Midtbøen, A. H. (2015). "Ethnic Penalties in Western Labour Markets". *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 5:4, 185-193.
- Mohamed, S. (2008). *Economic policy, globalization and the labour movement: Changes in the global economy from the Golden Age to the Neoliberal Era* (No. 1). Global Labour University Working Paper.
- Näre, L (2013). "Ideal workers and suspects: Employers' politics of recognition and the migrant division of care labour in Finland." *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 3:2, 72-81.
- Ndukwe, T. C. (2015). "Between multiculturalism and conservatism in Finland: Experiences of African immigrants in the Helsinki region". *Omnes. The Journal of Multicultural Society* 5, 146-193.
- Ndukwe, T. C. (2016). "African Immigrants in Finland in Onward Translocal and Transnational Mobility and Migration, and the Political Implications". *Journal of Black Studies*, 0021934716680323.

Nielsen, H. K. (2010). "Identity and Politics in Late Modernity". *Nordisk kulturpolitisk tidsskrift* 13:2, 251-265.

Nordberg Camilla (2006). "Claiming Citizenship: Marginalised Voices on Identity and Belonging, *Citizenship Studies*, 10:5, 523-539.

Norman, K. D. and Yvonna, S. L. (1994) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage: London

Official Statistics of Finland (OSF): Population structure [e-publication]. ISSN=1797-5395. Helsinki: Statistics Finland [referred: 5.6.2017].

Available online: http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/index_en.html

Norris, P. (2005). *Radical right: Voters and parties in the electoral market*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Ode, Arend, and Justus Veenman (2003). 'The Ethno-cultural and Socio-economic Position of Ethnic Minority Groups in the Netherlands', in L. Hagendoorn, J. Veenman, and W. Vollebergh (eds.), *Integrating Immigrants in the Netherlands. Cultural versus Socio-economic Integration*. Ashgate: Aldershot, 173–241.

Olakivi, A. (2013). "In Case You Can Speak Finnish, There's No Problem. Reconstructing problematic identity-position in migrant care workers' organisational discourse". *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 3:2, 91-99

Oreopoulos, P. (2009). *Why do skilled immigrants struggle in the labour market? A field experiment with six thousand resumes* (No. w15036). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Ortner, S. B. (2006) *Anthropology and social theory: Culture, power, and the acting subject*. Duke University Press.

Pavlenko, A and Blackledge, A (2004). Introduction', in *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*, eds A Pavlenko and A Blackledge, Cromwell Press Ltd., Great Britain, 1–33.

Pekkala, S. (2003). "Migration flows in Finland: regional differences in migration determinants and migrant types". *International regional science review*, 26:4, 466-482.

- Pirkkalainen, P., Wass, H., and Weide, M. (2016). The political potential of migrants is often overlooked in discussions around integration.
- Pyykkönen, M. (2007). "Integrating governmentality: administrative expectations for immigrant associations in Finland". *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 32(2), 197-224.
- Rapp, Christof, (2010). "Aristotle's Rhetoric", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (spring 2010 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), Retrieved on April 27, 2016. Available online: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2010/entries/aristotle-rhetoric>.
- Rastas, A. (2009). "Racism in the everyday life of Finnish children with transnational roots". *Barn 19:1*, 29-43.
- Rebecca Davies (2007) Reconceptualising the migration – development nexus: diasporas, globalisation and the politics of exclusion, *Third World Quarterly*, 28:1, 59-76,
- Redfield, R., Linton, R., and Herskovits, M. J. (1936). Memorandum for the study of acculturation. *American anthropologist*, 38(1), 149-152.
- Rinne, R., Kivirauma, J., and Simola, H. (2002). "Shoots of revisionist 1 education policy or just slow readjustment? The Finnish case of educational reconstruction" *Journal of Education Policy* 17:6, 643-658.
- Robinson, W. I. (1996). *Promoting polyarchy: globalization, US intervention, and hegemony* (Vol. 48). Cambridge University Press
- Rowse, T. (1985). "The trouble with hegemony: Popular culture and multiculturalism". *Politics* 20:2, 70-76.
- Rumbaut, R. G. (1997). Assimilation and its discontents: Between rhetoric and reality. *International migration review*, 923-960.
- Sari, P. K. and William, R. K. (2011) *Economic impacts of immigration: A survey* (No. w16736). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Sarvimaki M. (2010) Assimilation to a welfare state: Labor market performance and use of social benefits by immigrants to Finland, *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 1113(3), 665-588.

Sassatelli, Monica (2009) *Becoming Europeans. Cultural Identity and Cultural Policies*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan

Saukkonen, P. (2014). "Multiculturalism and cultural policy in northern Europe". *Nordisk kulturpolitisk tidsskrift* 16:2, 178-200.

Saukkonen, P. (2013). *Multiculturalism and Nationalism: The politics of Diversity in Finland*. In *Debating Multiculturalism in the Nordic Welfare States* (pp. 270-294). UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Shohat, E., and Stam, R. (2014). *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the media*. Routledge.

Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Text, Talk and Interaction*. London: Sage.

Sniderman, P. and Hagendoorn, A. (2009). *When Way of Life Collide: Multiculturalism and Its Discontent in the Netherlands*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press

Souders, M. C., and Dillard, K. N. (2014). "Framing Connections: An Essay on Improving the Relationship between Rhetorical and Social Scientific Frame Studies, Including a Study of GW Bush's framing of Immigration". *International Journal of Communication*.

Statistics on Jyvaskyla: Immigrants in Jyvaskyla. Retrieved on the 06th May 2017. Available online: <http://www.jyvaskyla.fi/international/facts/statistics>

The Multiculturalism Programme of the City of Jyvaskyla 2013-2016. Retrieved on the 05 March 2016. Available on:

http://www.jyvaskyla.fi/instancedata/prime_product_julkaisu/jyvaskyla/embeds/jyvaskyla_wwwstructure/69390_monikulttuurisuusohjelma_tiivistelma_englanti.pdf

Taylor Charles (1994). 'The Politics of Recognition.' pp. 25–73 in Amy Gutmann (ed.). *Multiculturalism and the 'Politics of Recognition.'* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Toivanen, M. (2013). "Language and negotiation of identities among young Kurds in Finland". *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 3:1, 27-35.

Tuori, S. (2013). “Enabling and disabling spaces within multicultural projects”. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 3:1, 36-39.

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, Trends in International Migrant Stock: The 2013 Revision. Available Online:

<http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/publications/wallchart/index.shtml>

UNDP (1990-2003). *Human Development Report*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wennerås, Christine, and Agnes Wold (1997) Neopotism and sexism in peer-review. *Nature* 387, 341-343.

Valtonen, K. (2001). “Immigrant integration in the welfare state: Social work’s growing arena”. *European Journal of Social Work*, 4:3, 247–262.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001) Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis In: Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. and Yates, S. J. (2001) Discourse theory and practice. A reader. London: Sage Publications. 300-317.

Van Oorschot, W. (2000) “Who should get what, and why? On deserving criteria and the conditionality of solidarity among the public”. *Policy and Politics* 28(1): 33–48.

Vanhanen, S. (2016). “Emerging Joint Expertise? Multiagency Collaboration Described in Local Integration Programmes in Finland”. *Finnish Yearbook of Population Research* 50, 85-96.

Vertovec, S., and Wessendorf, S. (2005). *Migration and cultural, religious and linguistic diversity in Europe: An overview of issues and trends*. Centre on Migration, Policy & Society.

Wahlbeck, Ö. (2013). *Multicultural Finnish Society and Minority Rights*. In *Debating Multiculturalism in the Nordic Welfare States* (pp. 295-324). UK: Palgrave Macmillan

Whitehead, E. (2014). A Leap In The Dark: Identity, Culture And The Trauma Of War Mediated Thorough The Visual Arts Of North-East European Migrants And Émigrés To Australia After 1945.

Wichelns, H. (1972). “*The Literary Criticism of Oratory*”, in Brock, B. L., and Scott, R. L (1989) *Methods of rhetorical criticism: A twentieth-century perspective*. Wayne State: University Press

Williams Raymond (1977). *Marxism and literature* (Vol. 1). Oxford Paperbacks.

Wolf, E. R. (1982). *Europe and the People without History*. University of California Press.

World Migration in Figures 2013 – OECD. Retrieved on 7th March 2016. Available online on:

<http://www.oecd.org/els/mig/World-Migration-in-Figures.pdf>

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix I

Informed Consent Form

THE AIM OF THIS RESEARCH IS TO “INVESTIGATE THE PERCEPTIONS OF IMMIGRANTS AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS ON FINNISH ECONOMIC INTEGRATION POLICIES AND FRAMEWORKS ON THE ONE HAND, AND LABOUR MARKET REALITY ON THE OTHER” BY FEELING AND SIGNING THIS FORM, YOU AKNOWLEDGES TO HAVE READ THE PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET AND GIVE YOUR CONSENT.

Please tick

- 1. I confirm that I have read and understood the participant information sheet for the above study and have the opportunity to ask questions.
- 2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.
- 3. I understand that all the information I provide will be treated in confidence
- 4. I understand that I also have the right to change my mind about participating in the study for a short period after the study has concluded the interview (01/02/2017)
- 5. I agree to be recorded as part of the research project
- 6. I agree to take part in the research project
- 7. I understand that I can request further information from project supervisor at University Jyvaskyla any time during the research. Supervisor – Professor Pyykkönen Miikka and email address is miikka.pyykkonen@jyu.fi

Name of participant:

Signature of participant:

Date:

Witnessed by (if appropriate):

Name of witness:

Signature of witness:

Name of Researcher:

Signature of researcher:

Date:

Appendix II

Participant Information Sheet

Study Title:

INTEGRATION AND HEGEMONIC RELATIONSHIP OF LABOUR MARKET INEQUALITY: AN INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRANT'S/POLICY OFFICIAL'S PERCEPTIONS ON LABOUR INCLUSION IN JYVASKYLA-FINLAND

What is the purpose of the study?

The aim of the research was to investigate the perceptions of immigrant (students, refugees and others) and public officials, on the value of Finnish economic integration within the broader context of immigrant-host labour relationship. Employing Gramsci theory of Hegemony, this study examined those discursive hegemony in defining the economic and labour market importance of migration and integration, and how do such "hegemonic definitions" resonate within the views of Non-EU foreign students and other migrants. How does hegemonic labour inequality explicate when certain notions of belonging and identity resonates within labour market inclusions of Immigrants.

Why have I been approached?

As an immigrant/public official in Jyvaskyla your views of integration policies and frameworks and real life labour experiences is invaluable with regards to obtaining true-to-life feedback on the given subject.

Do I have to take part?

No. it is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. You can withdraw any time during the research and you do not need to give a reason. All you need to do is to contact me through my address and sending me your participant information number and all your data will be destroyed and will not be used. They will not be any consequences if you decide to withdraw.

What will happen to me if I take part?

If you decide to take part in the research, you will be required to answer some questions, it will take 40 Minutes.

What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?

The only issue is that it will take a little of your time. Information you provide will be confidential and anonymous.

What are the possible benefits of taking part?

You will have the knowledge that you are taking part in a study to improve immigrant labour integration and host relationship in Jyvaskyla and Finland in general. In the future, we hope the findings from this research will be used by immigrant integration departments to improve on its policies and frameworks for positive immigrant-host labour relationship. Such

conscious relationship will ensure Jyvaskyla in particular, Finland in general and the immigrants themselves rip all the full benefits of immigrant integration.

What if something goes wrong?

If you change your mind in participating, you can withdraw at any time during completing the interview. All you need to do is to contact me and my supervisor using the email address below prior to the interview or during the interview. If you decide to withdraw all your data will be destroyed and will not be used in the study.

Will my taking part in this study be kept confidential?

Yes, any information collected about you during this study will be kept strictly confidential. Only I and my supervisor will have access to the raw data. All the consent forms will be stored in a separate, secure location from the raw data itself. You will only be identified on the score sheet by your participant code number. I will only retain the raw data from the project until my final report is submitted. They will then be destroyed. When the data has been entered into a computer file, your scores will only be associated with your code number and access to the file will be password protected.

What will happen to the results of the research study?

The results will be written up and presented as my final year postgraduate dissertation. At the request of you or your organisation a copy can be sent to you, as research findings can be used to improve current policies and or immigrant attitudes towards integration. If you would like a general summary of the results of the study, please contact me on the address below by June 30th, 2017.

Who is organizing and funding the research?

The research is organized by Njikang Kennedy Ebang. I am a final year postgraduate student in the faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Jyvaskyla. This project is not externally funded, but a requirement for a master degree certificate.

Contact for Further Information

Head of Department

Ojakangas Mika, Prof.

mika.m.a.ojakangas@jyu.fi

Supervisor

Pyykkönen Miikka, prof

miikka.pyykkonen@jyu.fi

Researcher

NJIKANG KENNEDY EBANG

[njkenne@student.jyu.fi](mailto:njkenned@student.jyu.fi)

Appendix III

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR POLICY OFFICIALS

Dear participant, by answering these questions you are giving your consent for information it contains to be used in the research project. This information will be stored anonymously and securely. When the information is used in any publication project during the research project, no individual or organisations in the project will be identified.

1. In practical terms, which task of your job responsibility covers immigrant labour integration?
2. How does these responsibilities relate to existing immigrant labour integration policy programs and legislation goals?
3. In your opinion, will you say immigrants in Finland want to be more involve in the Finnish labour market relationship?
4. Within the scope of your job, will you say the motivation of integration laws and framework is to ensure immigrants understand Finnish norms and values, or to ensure they are provide with equal labour opportunities?
 - a. How does Finnish language skills fit into immigrant labour market integration?
 - b. How does Immigrant ethnicity fit into immigrant labour market integration?
5. Do you think Finnish “language skills” and Immigrant “ethnicity” are challenges which hinders immigrant’s greater involvement in Finnish labour market relationships?
 - a. How/Why?
6. Are these challenges (Finnish language and ethnicity), consciously/unconsciously used within labour market institutions and or the society at large to decide who is to be included in this labour relationship? Why/ how?
7. In your capacity, do you think labour market institutions (employers) and or the society at-large created these challenges?
8. What measures have your organisation put in place to ensure employers do not capitalised on language/ethnicity to alienate immigrant?
9. In your assessment, do you think that the policies on migrant labour market integration, such as the “Integration Act 2010”, work well in addressing these challenges? If yes/not, why?

10. In your daily interactions with immigrants, what are the moments of success in your work and what are moments of failure? Why?
11. In your opinion as part of management, which areas of your job duties do you think need more policy and structural changes if immigrant's labour relationship was to be improved upon? Why? (choose one)
 - a. Immigrant recognition
 - b. Resource redistribution
 - c. Language exemption
 - d. Ethnical Inclusion

Thank you for your time.

Appendix IV

SEMI-STRUCTURAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR IMMIGRANT STUDENT AND OTHERS CLASS OF IMMIGRANTS

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

1.1. Nationality

--

1.2. Age

18 - 30	31 - 40	41 - 50	51 +
---------	---------	---------	------

1.3. Sex

Male	Female
------	--------

1.4. Level of Education

Grade 1 – 7	Grade 8 - 12	Diploma	Degree	Degree +
-------------	--------------	---------	--------	----------

1.5. Number of years in Finland

Less than one year	One – two years	Three – four years	More than Five years
--------------------	-----------------	--------------------	----------------------

1.6. Present Career status Are you employed at the moment studying full time, working full time and or studying and working

Studying(what)	Working (occupation)	Studying and working	Neither studying nor employed
----------------	----------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

1.7. What is you level of Finnish Language

Poor	Basic	Intermediate level	Advanced Level
------	-------	--------------------	----------------

2. PERCEPTION TOWARDS LABOUR MARKET INTEGRATION POLICIES, FRAMEWORKS AND INSTITUTIONS.

- 2.1. Why did you choose to migrate to Finland in general and Jyvaskyla in particular?
- 2.2. Generally, what is your knowledge on immigrant labour integration policies, frameworks and institution in Finland and Jyvaskyla in particular? (was it part of your orientation at the university or refugee induction seminars)
- 2.3. Have you attended or have accessed to any labour integration training or seminar ever since you arrived Finland? (More follow up question. If an integration plan exist for him/her)
 - a. If no, Why?
 - b. If yes, what was the nature of the training and what was your motives/expectations for taking part?
 - c. What efforts did you take or plan to take to rip the best out of these programs?
 - d. How will you judge your level of participation or involvement in these training or seminars? (was it open to individual choice or rather an institutionally designed path to be followed by you)
- 2.4. In your opinion, do u think integrative policy instruments or processes seek to improve immigrant labour market opportunities or does it subject them to particular policy instrument or processes?
 - a. Why
 - b. What should be done more?
- 2.5. Are you aware of or part of any non-governmental migrant organisations that help immigrant get access to labour market in Jyvaskyla?
 - a. In your opinions, is or are these institutions helpful in addressing some of your employment needs?
- 2.6. Does the general labour integration process offers an empowering voice or does it rein scribe certain traditional host images (values and practices)
In a statement, how do u value these integration policies, frameworks with regards to helping you get a job?

3. PERCEPTION ON DIALY LABOUR MARKET REALITIES

- 3.1. Are you of the opinion that immigrants are contributing to the economy of Jyvaskyla in particular and Finland in general?
- 3.2. Are you of the understanding that finding a job in Jyvaskyla labour market is a challenge for immigrant?
 - a. Why?
 - b. Can you share some of your experiences?
 - Segregation
 - Stereotypes
 - Religion
- 3.3. Are you aware of any measure in place by the governing institutions to address such experiences in the labour market?
 - a. How effectives are these measures if in place?
- 3.4. Do you think language is a crucial factors employers consider before granting you employment?
 - a. How. Examples?
- 3.5. In your view, is it possible in Jyvaskyla/Finland to have a job within your education degree when your Finnish language skill is poor/perfect? (Examples).
 - a. What can possible hinders you from having such a job even when you Finnish language skill is good?
 - b. How will you react to the arguments that immigrants are unemployed because they lack the required skills to meet job needs?
- 3.6. In your belief, do you think immigrants should be allowed access to the labour market without a comprehensive knowledge of Finnish language? Why
- 3.7. Do you think your own ethnicity has given you (or will be) any advantage or disadvantage in your work or job search in Jyvaskyla? (Probe on other Western identities like British, USA, and Russian).
- 3.8. Based on your experiences or knowledge, do you think immigrant (student/refugees) are treated fairly by the Finnish labour system, and what changes would you recommend, if any?
 - a. Has such treatment enticed you to take life changing decisions? (What are your plans after studying).

- Career change,
 - Stay or relocate away either from Jyvaskyla or Finland.
- b. How do you evaluate if your labour market inclusion is a success?
- 3.9. What are your perceptions on Finns attitudes in general towards immigrant in the labour market?
- a. What makes Jyvaskyla/Finland a good place to stay and work?
 - b. Do you envisage their attitudes (Fins) will change in the nearest future? Why and in which direction?
- 3.10. What is the meaning of family and friends in getting a jobs?
- 3.11. In one statement, how will you evaluate you experiences with employers and employment agencies with regards to your efforts in getting a job.
- 3.12. Concluding, in your opinion, what will you make a claim for if you are given an opportunity and why?
- a. Recognition
 - b. Redistribution
 - c. Language exemption
 - d. Inclusion
- 3.13. In terms of immigrant labour inclusions and policies, if you were not in Finland, where (country) would you have love to be?

Taking into consideration the introduction of tuition fee, -----

Thank you for your time.