

FINDING ONE'S WAY IN SOCIETY:
Identity, positioning and discourses in immigrant
narratives

Master's thesis
Osku Haapasaari

University of Jyväskylä
Department of Language and Communication Studies
English
Department of Education
Education
January 2018

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta - Faculty Humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellinen ja Kasvatustieteiden tiedekunnat	Laitos - Department Kieli- ja viestintätieteiden ja kasvatustieteiden laitokset
Tekijä - Author Haapasaari, Osku	
Työn nimi - Title Finding one's way in society - Identity, positioning and discourses in immigrant narratives	
Oppiaine - Subject Englannin kieli Kasvatustiede	Työn laji - Level Pro Gradu
Aika - Month and year Tammikuu 2018	Sivumäärä - Number of pages 124
Tiivistelmä - Abstract <p>Tutkin pro gradussani maahanmuuttajien identiteettejä kielen käyttäjinä ja kielen oppijoina sellaisina kuin ne esiintyvät heidän maahanmuuttoaan ja työelämäänsä koskevissa haastatteluisissa, jotka on tehty vuosina 2012-2013. Käsittelen työssäni identiteettejä alati muuttuvina, moninaisina, kontekstisidonnaisina, vuorovaikutuksessa esiin tulevina ja kamppailun tapahtumapaikkoina.</p> <p>Haastatteludatan alkuperä on Integroituminen ammattiyhteisöihin Suomessa-hanke (Suomen Akatemia 2011-2014). Haastatteludata analysoitiin narratiivianalyysin ja diskurssianalyysin keinoin. Erityistä huomiota kiinnitettiin siihen, miten maahanmuuttajat positioivat itseään suhteessa toisiinsa heidän kertomuksissaan esiintyviin henkilöihin, yleisöön ja vallitseviin diskursseihin.</p> <p>Tutkimuksessani käy ilmi, että korkeasti koulutetut, naispuoliset Itä-Euroopasta Suomeen muuttaneet maahanmuuttajat luovat kertomuksissaan johdonmukaisesti kuvaa itsestään ahkerina ja kyvykkäinä suomen kielen käyttäjinä ja oppijoina haastattelujensa alusta loppuun.</p> <p>Toinen tutkimukseni keskeinen tulos on, että maahanmuuttajat vastustavat ja uudelleenneuvottelevat ei-haluttuja identiteettidiskursseja, joille heidät alistetaan. Maahanmuuttajat näyttäytyvät haastatteluisissa aktiivisina yhteiskunnallisina toimijoina, jotka osallistuvat yhteiskunnalliseen keskusteluun saadakseen äänensä kuuluville.</p>	
Asiasanat - Keywords: Identiteetti, narratiivi, diskurssi, positiointi, maahanmuuttaja	
Säilytyspaikka - Depository: Jyväskylän yliopistokirjasto	
Muita tietoja - Additional information:	

Contents

1.	Introduction	4
1.1.	Why immigrant identities as the object of study?	4
1.2.	Why narrative as the method?	5
1.3.	Why an inductive, data-centred approach?	6
1.4.	Research questions.....	7
2.	Theoretical considerations	8
2.1.	Social constructionism as a paradigm and a philosophy of science	9
2.2.	Foucault, discourse and identity.....	9
2.3.	Discourse	11
2.4.	Identity	12
2.4.1.	Hybrid identities	12
2.4.2.	Language identities.....	14
2.5.	Agency and reported speech.....	15
2.6.	Immigration critic discourse.....	16
2.7.	Previous studies and their findings.....	19
3.	Methodology and data	22
3.1.	The field of narrative study	22
3.1.1.	Fundamentals of narrative positioning.....	24
3.1.2.	Positioning narrative identity in autobiographical research interviews.....	26
3.1.3.	Reintroducing discourse into positioning	30
3.2.	Data collection methods.....	31
3.3.	Interview structure and participants.....	32
3.3.1.	Participant profile: Maria.....	34
3.3.2.	Participant profile: Lena.....	34
3.3.3.	Participant profile: Anastasia	35
3.4.	Ethical considerations.....	36
3.5.	Transcription, coding and translation.....	37
4.	Analysis	37
4.1.	Maria	38
4.1.1.	Identity as a learner of Finnish.....	38
4.1.2.	Identity as a user of Finnish and a professional	43
4.1.3.	Identity as a user/learner of other languages.....	50
4.1.4.	Identity as an immigrant.....	51
4.2.	Lena.....	62

4.2.1.	Identity as a learner of Finnish.....	62
4.2.2.	Identity as a user of Finnish.....	67
4.2.3.	Identity as a user/learner of other languages.....	73
4.2.4.	Identity as an immigrant.....	74
4.3.	Anastasia	83
4.3.1.	Identity as a learner of Finnish.....	83
4.3.2.	Identity as a user of Finnish.....	84
4.3.3.	Identity as a user/learner of other languages.....	91
4.3.4.	Identity as an immigrant.....	93
5.	Discussion and conclusion.....	102
5.1.	Responses to the research questions	102
5.1.1.	Language user and language learner identities of the participants.....	103
5.1.2.	Participants' reactions to ascribed identities	109
5.2.	Significance of the results.....	117
5.3.	Evaluation of the study	118
5.4.	Conclusion	119
	References	120
	Appendix 1.....	124

1. Introduction

“For there is nothing to lay hold of. I am made and remade continually. Different people draw different words from me.” (Woolf 2014)

This thesis looks at the way immigrants in Finland perceive themselves as users and learners of language, and how they position themselves in relation to the identities ascribed to them by their peers, other members of society and different institutional actors and how they perform active identity work in order to orient themselves to their new frame of reference. The research stance aims to be inductive and data-centered, keeping the individual narrative data as the focal point throughout the study.

1.1. Why immigrant identities as the object of study?

Immigrants are a significant and sizeable component of the Finnish society, and their social and economic importance grows as the size of the demographic increases. Both the absolute number of foreign citizens in Finland and their percentage share of the whole population has been increasing annually since 1990 (Väestöliitto 2014). In 2012, 4.9 percent of the Finnish population spoke a language other than Finnish as their first language, and 5.2 percent were born abroad.

Immigrants are chosen as the object of research partly also because they have historically been underrepresented in mainstream media (Laihiala-Kankainen, Pietikäinen & Dufva 2002: 242). In the academic realm, there have been relatively few studies that have looked at immigrants' identity negotiation in the Finnish context (Iskanius 2006: 15), especially within the realm of sociolinguistics (for examples of the Finnish research tradition, see Ch. 2.7). My research hopes to shed more light onto how, and through what processes, immigrant identities change and new ones are formed and adopted.

Immigrants have a special position as individuals who have undergone a situation in life where they have had to traverse the boundary between countries and thus needed to mold their identities in order to orient to their new surroundings. It is clear, that individuals who are uprooted from their earlier national and cultural

context and arrive in a new frame of reference experience instances, when they will have to re-evaluate their previous identity strategies and adopt new ones. This can have a profound impact on the social, cultural and linguistic aspects of their identity as well.

One characteristic of a pluralistic society that most modern nation states have in common is the existence of two or more distinct languages and cultures within the nation. One way to achieve this is by securing the position of minority languages in society through language planning and legislation (Iskanian 2006: 64). If supporting the cultural identities and securing linguistic rights of distinct groups in society are considered goals worth pursuing, then my study provides evidence to support these objectives by investigating whether distinct immigrant identities exist in the Finnish context, and by providing insights into how these identities function. Looking at immigrant identities, special attention will be paid to the role of language: to how different languages and linguistic phenomena are used as symbols and instruments through which immigrant identities are reinforced and/or played down (see e.g. Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004, Baynham & De Fina 2005).

This study and its results will have their uses in the planning process of language education for students whose first language is not Finnish. The analysis of in-depth data on how individual language learners' identities have developed over time in relation to and under the influence multiple languages is a task that requires well thought-out methodology. It is to this methodology that I now turn.

1.2. Why narrative as the method?

My research will combine the approaches of applied linguistics and social sciences to build a theoretical foundation on which an in-depth examination of identity can be built. Special attention will be paid to the language identities of the individuals, their identities as language users and language learners. Identities are examined through a social constructionist lens, which sees identity as ever-changing instead of constant, multiple instead of singular and conflicted instead of easily defined.

The data analyzed had been gathered in first person, by encouraging narration through interview questions, reminiscing past events related to employment. I look at how language identities, in particular, have influenced the process of identity negotiation and reformation in the data.

There is much research on the advantages of using narrative research to investigate identities. Miyahara (2010), for example, quotes multiple scholars (e.g. Schiffrin 2006; Bastos & Oliveira 2006; Ricoeur 1988) to support his argument, states that

poststructuralist discourse no longer regards identity as 'given or innate', individuals must now construct who they are and how they want to be known in a particular discourse. Identity is seen as something that emerges out of what is said and done: people attempt to create a link to explain events and experiences in their lives. The process of narrating experience is not merely a communication tool, but also one that allows to negotiate and/or make meaning out of it.

Dyer & Keller-Cohen (2000: 285) argue that narrative and the act of narration help us make sense of our internal and even conflicting identities and draws out something that is a "(re)construction of identity, an outward manifestation of the 'reflexive project of the self'". This way investigating identity through narratives produces somewhat coherent data, which has already been subjected to conscious or subconscious processing.

1.3. Why an inductive, data-centred approach?

As a researcher, issues such as the politics of knowledge production, avoiding stereotypical representation and promotion of intercultural awareness are close to my heart. This is the position I start my thesis from as well, taking care to assess how my study will represent the interviewees, minimizing the need to impose categories and theoretical constructs upon my interview data and striving towards a representation of immigrant identities that is authentic and recognizes the variance between experiences and every single interviewee's individual stories. I strive to achieve this in two ways.

Firstly, I will avoid positioning myself as a hegemonic producer of knowledge about immigrants and someone who as a member of the academic community has the preordained right to draw conclusions from people's experiences. I strive to adopt a data-centered, inductive approach to the study at hand, which lets the immigrants' own voices be heard. I hope to explore, not to impose an interpretation.

Secondly, a way in which an unequal relation of power related to power over knowledge will be avoided, is by utilizing theories created to recognize and destabilize such power relations by definition. While not employing the methodologies of these theoretical traditions as such, this study draws inspiration from the disciplines of critical discourse analysis, feminist theories and postcolonial theory.

1.4. Research questions

The questions that prompted me towards the topic of my thesis were the ones Dufva (Laihiala-Kankainen, Pietikäinen & Dufva 2002: 23) posed in a paragraph dealing with current trends of change in the Finnish society, and the lack of research data regarding such questions their book:

“In Finland, new cultural milieus are being formed, new languages spoken at homes and new linguistic needs born. What kinds of linguistic identities have been born and are being born – what, for example, is the linguistic identity of a Finnish youth growing up in a family of Somalian origin like? How will this change affect the identity of those who traditionally identify themselves as ethnic Finns?”

My goal is to investigate answers to questions like this from the point of view of the immigrants themselves. I will focus on their identities in general, and language identities in particular, and leave the analysis of the ever-changing and malleable identity category 'ethnic Finn' to other researchers.

My research questions are:

1. What kinds of language learner and language user identities do immigrants construct and what kinds of strategies do they employ in doing so; and

2. How do the participants react to the ascribed identity discourses they are subjected to by their peers, other members of Finnish society and different institutional actors?

I focus on language learner and language user identities because I believe that language plays a central role in the immigration experience, and the consequent reformulation of identity after migration from one country to the other. I aim to explore these questions by looking at narrative data and analyzing it through some of the most eminent identity theories in the poststructuralist tradition. The following chapter will focus on this theoretical aspect.

2. Theoretical considerations

This chapter outlines the process of thought which leads to developing a methodology for the analysis of immigrant identities. It begins by briefly summarizing the intellectual history leading up to the perspective that will be adopted. Working through tenets of Foucault and classics in the social constructionist tradition of scientific philosophy, I hope to build a sound foundation on which to begin the investigation of identities in general and immigrant and linguistic identities in particular.

I will start by discussing views of language, knowledge and meaning-making. Before I can move on to handle identities as such, the notion of discourse needs to be established, as it is widely employed over a broad range of scientific disciplines and serves our analysis well. Having established this groundwork, I can start to delve into the multiple dimensions of the word 'identity' and the various research stances that have been adopted in identity research. To conclude the discussion, the aim is to arrive at a coherent view of identity as something that is socially constructed, multiple, a site of struggle and subject to change (Norton Peirce, 1995).

From there onwards the realm of narrative analysis is explored (see Ch. 3). The study will be situated in a concrete way in the tradition of narrative research, adopting the perspective of de Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012: 51), who argue for a

discourse analytic view into narratives, which is a more “flexible approach to narrative structure that is amenable to synthesizing work”.

2.1. Social constructionism as a paradigm and a philosophy of science

Social constructionism is a philosophy of science, which dictates how knowledge is formed and what is considered ‘true’. In *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory* (2009: 892) social construction of reality is defined as a view in which “people make sense of experience by constructing a model of the social world and how it works” and one which places “language as the most important system through which reality is constructed”.

It is worth pointing out the distinction between two terms which were born from different disciplines, but which aim to communicate a similar idea with differences in what aspect of the social construction is stressed. These two terms are *constructivism* and *social constructionism* (Young & Collin 2004).

On the one hand, constructivism has its roots within the tradition of psychology where it has been used to describe the perspective which stresses the processes within the individual that leads to the construction of a world of experience through cognitive processes. It implies an epistemological perspective which states that “the world cannot be known directly, but rather by the construction imposed on it by the mind” (Young & Collin 2004: 375).

Social constructionism, on the other hand, stresses interpersonal social constructions over inner workings of an individual’s mind. It dictates that “knowledge is sustained by social processes and that knowledge and social action go together” (Young & Collin 2004: 376). The root of this approach lies in the writings of such theorists as Mead (1934), Derrida (1982) and Foucault (1970), and the tradition has continued in the realms of sociology, literary studies and postmodern approaches.

2.2. Foucault, discourse and identity

Identity can generally be considered to work on two levels: on the level of the individual and on the level of a sense of belonging to a group. In his work, Michel Foucault is hesitant to use the word identity as he considers it a label through which

an individual is tied to in the process of subjectification, being subjected to power (Foucault 1982). The concern with power which is evident in his work thus explains this preference of 'subjectivity' over 'identity'. He speaks of subjects being tied to their identity by different forms of power.

Foucault's analyses are mainly concerned within the triangle of power, knowledge and the body, the body representing the individual. He rarely refers to identity as such, preferring words such as 'subject' and 'body' to refer to the individual. An excerpt from *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977* (1986) illustrates this point and the reasons why:

It's my hypothesis that the individual is not a pre-given entity which is seized on by the exercise of power. The individual, with his identity and characteristics, is the product of a relation of power exercised over bodies, multiplicities, movements, desires, forces. There is much that could be said as well on the problems of regional identity and conflicts with national identity.

According to Mills (2003: 104), Foucault is "concerned with the radical questioning of the stability of the individual subject or self in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and *The Order of Things*." She continues (2003: 83) "rather than seeing individuals as stable entities, he analyses the discursive processes through which bodies are constituted." As will be shown later, similar sentiments are echoed in the tenets of the schools of identity research that I utilize in this thesis. Mills (2003: 95) agrees, stating that that while Foucault's vocabulary was different from the identity research that followed him, his work nevertheless "has also been influential in rethinking identity itself and has led to a concern with performative rather than essentialist views of identity."

For Foucault discourses are practices which systematically mold their objects (Husa: 1995). If this view is applied to the discourse about the self, the process of identity construction through narrative, an image of identity as something fluid and malleable emerges. Foucault's notions of truth and knowledge as power also pertain

to the idea of identity in the sense that such power both enables and delimits identity formation.

As has been shown here, during the latter part of his career, Foucault focused his attention towards topics related to subjects and subjectivity relevant to our concerns, although he mainly examined them through isolated historical examples, which leads to Kelly (2013: 512) criticizing him for not forming a unified theory of the subject as such. As the notion of discourse was central to Foucault's analysis, I will move on to other theorists who refined perspectives into discourse and their role in shaping people's understanding of the world.

2.3. Discourse

The etymology of the word *discourse* is derived from the Latin word *discursa*, which literally translates as 'running to and fro' (Scollon & Scollon 2003: 25). Discourse is a multifaceted and even contested term which is widely used, but seldom agreed upon. Brown and Yule (1983: viii) formulate discourse in the realm of sociolinguistics as "the structure as social interaction, as manifested in conversation." Conversation, in their usage, refers to all communication that has a social dimension. Thusly, traffic signs, newspapers, hand gestures and speech acts all constitute discourse.

Norman Fairclough, who is widely recognized as one of the pioneers of what has come to be called *Critical Discourse Analysis*, combines the tenets of sociolinguistics, critical linguistics and Michel Foucault into a theory which is mainly concerned with power as manifested in language use. He speaks of discursive practices and the order of discourse, just as Foucault (1981) did, which represent the established ways of talking about something.

Discursive practices add up to what Fairclough (2001) calls the order of discourse. He defines the order of discourse as the "discourse/semiotic aspect of a social order". The order of discourse "is the way in which diverse genres and discourses and styles are networked together" (ibid.). Order of discourse, as a concept, is not a static and eternal monolith, but rather a malleable entity that is continuously shaped

by the instances of discourse that it consists of. Fairclough is, as Foucault was, concerned with power, and he highlights that some ways of meaning-making are dominant in a particular order of discourse, while others are marginal. These concepts will be applied to the analysis of the narrative data where appropriate.

2.4. Identity

Where identity research began in social sciences is in the examination of cultural identities. While this remains an important tradition of research, my thesis will go beyond cultural identities to focus on the identities of individuals who have crossed cultural and linguistic borders to arrive at their current situation in life. Thus, essentialist notions of shared cultural identities as something that are relatively static and easily defined will be less useful, and ones which stress the multiple and changing nature of identities more useful.

According to de Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012: 157), social constructionism has become the dominant paradigm in sociolinguistic theorization about identity. Social constructionism is especially well suited to the investigation of immigrant identities as they manifest in interaction. Bucholtz and Hall (2010: 18) refer to identity “as a relational and socio-cultural phenomenon that emerges and circulates in local discourse contexts of interaction rather than as a stable structure located primarily in the individual psyche or in fixed social categories”, which resonates well with the viewpoint I have adopted.

2.4.1. Hybrid identities

Hall (1999: 70) summarizes the effects of globalization on cultural identities as being twofold: both a pluralizing and a unifying tendency. On the one hand, being considered ‘Finnish’ today can be considered to be vastly different from what it meant to be ‘Finnish’ a hundred years ago. In the global world, a wider variety of people from different backgrounds with different histories can claim ‘Finnishness’. On the other hand, in this age of globalization small groups, such as language minorities (the Sami, for example), can find a new unity and distinct sense of identity

on which to build their politics of resistance towards processes that aim to subdue them and undermine their indigenous culture.

Hall goes on to discuss immigrants, to point out that for people who have been uprooted from their homeland who have no inclination to return to the past state of affairs inhabit a new kind of identity space, into which they arrive through a process of “translation of the self” (Hall 1999: 71). He says that on the global scale, new identities keep on appearing, identities which are in a transitional space, neither here nor there (Hall, *ibid.*). This translation of the self includes founding one’s identity on particular, now (geographically) distant, histories and experiences, but giving up the wish for a unified cultural identity in the new context. These translated people carry with them the cultures, traditions, languages and histories from their homeland.

As Hall states in his work, as national identities are undergoing a process of erosion, new, *hybrid* identities are taking their place (1999: 58). Laihiala-Kankainen, Pietikäinen and Dufva agree, (2002: 12) quoting Grossberg (1996) in identifying four factors and processes that contribute to the multiplicity and overlap of identities. These factors and processes are fragmentation, hybridity, the drawing of borders and diaspora.

One of the main theorists of hybridity is the postcolonial theorist Homi Bhabha (1994), who used the term to discuss the process where the colonial masters aim to translate the identity of the colonized, but then end up producing something that can only be characterized as hybrid and that “challenges the validity and authenticity of any essentialist cultural identity” (Meredith 1998: 2). It is with this same wariness that I approach essentialist notions of identity within the context of this thesis.

Bhabha (1994) claims there is a space “in-between the designations of identity” and that “this interstitial passage between fixed identifications opens up the possibility of a cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy.” Even though analyses of such colonial power relations might seem far removed from the Finnish context, immigrant identities fit well into this framework of theorization about in-between identities. It is to be expected that linguistic, social

and cultural identities undergo a major overhaul in the process where an individual moves from one country to another. In some cases, these identities can remain in a state of “in-betweenness”, a state of hybridity.

2.4.2. Language identities

How can the relationship between language and identity be characterized? Dufva (Laihiala-Kankainen, Pietikäinen & Dufva 2002: 24) identifies *language identity* on the interpersonal level as the feeling in a group which makes people say “we understand each other”. It is not as simple as might at first seem, though. Shared language does not necessarily mean shared language identity. In a group, where one language is used in different ways which represent different dialects and social positions, for example, a sense of shared language identity might be lacking.

Iskanius (2006: 64) shares this conviction. She writes that a sense of shared linguistic identity goes beyond sharing a language: understanding and being able to construct linguistic utterances and structures is a part of shared linguistic identity, but so are meanings, ways of thought and worldviews shared through language within a group. As language use varies from instance to instance based on the context and participants of the interaction, it can be argued that individuals carry multiple language identities that are utilized in different situations.

Rampton (1995) criticizes a traditional view of all individuals having a simply definable mother tongue and a corresponding identity as a speaker of that language. In his view, perspectives which highlight the mother tongue as the main characteristic of people’s language that defines their language identity often neglect new and mixed language identities that are more and more common in our time. He highlights a discrepancy between native-like language use and language identity by introducing two different aspects of language identity: expertise and allegiance. Expertise means the skills to use a language, while allegiance refers to the degree of identification with the language and the meanings and identities it carries with it.

It is also worth mentioning Iskanius’s (2006: 65) separation of two further dimensions of language as something that shapes identity. She draws the distinction

between the symbolic meaning that a language has to a group or an individual, and the importance of language as a means through which “identity and meanings are produced and told to others” (ibid.). It is expected that both kinds of instances arise from my data.

To conclude our examination of various theorizations of identity, it is worth reiterating the perspective into identity that perhaps best summarizes in one phrase the socially constructivist view into identity which has been adopted. In this view, identity is multiple, a site of struggle and subject to change (Norton Peirce, 1995).

2.5. Agency and reported speech

In de Fina’s *Identity in Narrative. A study of immigrant discourse* (2003: 93), agency in narrative research is defined as “the degree of activity and initiative that narrators attribute to themselves as characters in particular story worlds”. By exploring agency through reported speech, she is able to draw conclusions on some aspects of her informants’ identities.

De Fina (2003) analyzes the accounts of migrants who have crossed the border from Mexico to the United States, which she calls chronicles. These chronicles have similarities with my data, as they are autobiographical, focus on past events and deal with a border crossing from one country to another. She analyses the plentiful reported speech in their accounts, concluding that most of the immigrants’ reported speech in their chronicles is evaluative and/or internal in nature (2003: 122), with the migrants merely reacting to the situation they find themselves in. A large portion of the reported speech acts she analyzes are by policemen or “coyotes”, the gatekeepers of the immigration process who have institutional or non-institutional power. She does go on, however, to point out that in the story world, the migrants manage some positioning maneuvers that helps them establish agentive selves.

De Fina (ibid.) stresses the initiation of an instance of reported speech as an indicator of who holds power in the interactional situation in question. She also pays attention to whether the instances of reported speech are evaluative, inquisitive, requests or proposals, which helps her build an overall view of the agency, or lack thereof, of the

migrants. Her conclusion (2003: 134) is that as individuals, the migrants lack agency, but that when they appear in the narrative as a member of a group their voice is externalized and grows more agentive.

2.6. Immigration critic discourse

Many authors have examined the way media and public figures talk about immigrants, and many have been able to identify some established ways of talking about immigrants that can be considered systematic discourses (see Ch. 2.3.). I will cover some such studies which focus especially on the Finnish context in order to establish a discourse and related analysis categories which will be utilized in the analysis.

In 2011, Finnish political discourse went into upheaval when the right wing populist Finns Party (Perussuomalaiset r.p., henceforth: FP) had a major victory in the parliamentary elections. Rastas (2009) says that the popularity of FP, which was on the rise already even before the elections, inspired politicians from other parties, officials, and various anonymous citizens online to participate in discourse which represents immigrants as a threat to the Finnish society and Finnish culture. As the interview data for my study was gathered in 2012 and 2013, it is likely that the participants also position themselves in relation to these discursive practices.

Pälli (1999) has analyzed the interview transcripts of 24 16- to 17-year-old ethnic Finns, who were asked questions about immigrants and attitudes towards immigrants alongside other questions related to education, hobbies, home and family life, society and politics. Some of Pälli's conclusions are that the participants think of immigrants, especially refugees, as a socioeconomic threat to the Finnish society. Another prevalent discourse about foreigners and refugees identified by Pälli (1999: 216) in the data relates to the cultural differences between the in-group (Finns) and the out-group (foreigners and refugees). This discourse which emphasizes cultural differences between groups who have immigrated to Finland and ethnic Finns aims to maintain the unification Finnishness and to combat outside influence, says Pälli (1999: 216).

Hujanen & Pietikäinen (2000) have studied a dataset of news articles and editorials from a large Finnish newspaper, *Helsingin Sanomat*, gathered between 1985 and 1993. Hujanen and Pietikäinen, concerned with otherness as they are, identify a discourse prevalent in media which represents some people moving to Finland as non-genuine and dishonest and other people as real and genuine. In the same context, Finns are positioned as the objects of dishonest activities, payers of the bill and victims of scams. They (Hujanen & Pietikäinen 2000: 13-14) go on to quote articles which speak of “welfare tourists” (transl. elintasopakolainen), “social security abusers” and the “funding of this abuse with taxpayer money”.

Horsti (2002) examines the way immigrants are represented in the Finnish newspaper *Aamulehti*. She reports (2002:112) that immigrants are often represented in the newspaper in relation to employment. Still, notably, not many immigrants are shown at work in the newspaper, and those that are portrayed at work, are shown as trainees or interns. Being unemployed or working as a trainee are thus normalized as circumstances for immigrants, and regular salary work is omitted altogether.

Tuomisto (2017) delved into content published in *Helsingin Sanomat* during the refugee crisis in 2015. One of the discourses Tuomisto (2017: 61) identified in her thesis was the discourse of prejudice, which focuses on a better standard of living as the main motivation of immigrants who come to Finland. She too references the notion of welfare tourism as being central to this way of talking about immigrants.

Herneaho (2016) has analyzed immigration discourse as it manifests in the election materials of Finnish political parties from 2015. Especially in the materials of Finns Party she finds evidence for a similar discourse about socioeconomic threats to the Finnish society caused by immigrants, such as welfare tourism and abuse of social services. She argues that the Finns Party material, especially, represents immigrants as an expense which puts the welfare of Finns at risk (Herneaho 2016: 52). She also identifies a passage in FP material which identifies three metrics for successful integration into Finnish society: language skill, the ability to ensure one’s own livelihood, and the willingness to live according to society’s rules (Herneaho 2016: 116).

Kolehmainen (2016) analyzes the blog posts of six Finns Party MPs, who are self-proclaimed “immigration critics”. She (2016: 95) divides the threat of immigration discourse, as it emerges in these blog posts, into three aspects: a cultural threat, a security threat and an economic threat. The cultural threat is based on the idea of backward cultures which will invade Finland alongside new immigrants, and which are not compatible with the Finnish way of life. This cultural threat discourse gives the right to define Finnish culture only to native Finns and excludes immigrants, especially racialized immigrants who are low on the hierarchy ladder (Kolehmainen 2016: 96).

The security threat discourse, as it is presented by Kolehmainen (2016: 100) creates an image of immigrants as criminals, violent and homicidal individuals who are prone to committing more crimes than native Finns. Imagery of rape, robbery, assault, murder, mutilation of children or subjugation of women is evoked to show it as natural or innate to people from certain backgrounds. Finns are positioned in this discourse as the victims of these crimes, in a similar way as in Hujanen and Pietikäinen’s article (2000).

Economic threat discourse related to immigrants in Kolehmainen’s treatment (2016: 107) echoes sentiments from Pälli (1999) and Herneaho (2016). This discourse focuses on the costs and economical effects of immigration, and the idea of immigration being too expensive for Finland is communicated. Ideas of immigrants as “freeloaders”, people with expensive “special needs” and as abusers of the Finnish welfare state are identified in the data (Kolehmainen 2016: 107-116).

Consequently, for the purposes of effective analysis, I establish the analysis categories of ideal and non-ideal immigrants, based on these identified threat discourses propagated by immigration critics. It is to be noted that I do aim to reproduce this discourse to give it more prevalence, but rather it is reproduced here because in the course of the analysis, participants are shown to position themselves in relation to such discourse.

Negative stereotypes associated with immigrants in the above discourses, such as social security abuse, welfare tourism, being unemployed, living on the expense of

Finns, crime, being culturally backward and not being able to speak Finnish, will be associated with the category of non-ideal immigrants. The polar opposite qualities, being an employed, law-abiding citizen who has taken Finnish culture and language as their own, are associated with contributing to the essence of being an ideal immigrant.

2.7. Previous studies and their findings

Frances Giampapa (2004) examines the identities of three Italian Canadian youths and the way they relate to the representations and positions relating to being Canadian and Italian Canadian in Toronto. Through a model employing the notions of “center” and “periphery”, Giampapa arrives at a conclusion that “in different spaces and at different times, they challenge the undesirable imposed identities, and attempt to reconfigure what is valued and what is legitimate” (Giampapa 2004: 215). This has implications for the answer to my second research question, the way in which the immigrant participants react to identity discourses that they are subjected to.

In the Finnish context, sociolinguistic studies of immigrant identities have centred in the University of Jyväskylä, especially in the Centre for Applied Language Studies. The study which cleared the way for future investigations into immigrant identities such as mine was Laihiala-Kankainen, Dufva, & Pietikäinen (Eds.) 2002, which looked at the interplay of language, culture and identity in relation to different distinct linguistic and cultural groups in the Finnish society.

Virtanen (2016) looks at the development of international nursing students’ professional language and agency during practical training. Virtanen employs positioning theory as one methodological tool through which she probes these aspects. Virtanen considers agency as both “subjectively experienced and collectively emergent”. Referring to Dufva and Aro (2015:38), she further conceptualizes agency as negotiated in dialogue and as continuous by nature. In addition to having agency as a central concept, immigrant language skills as a focus, and positioning theory, the author also employs narrative analysis to investigate the participants’ professional language skills and agency.

Virtanen (2016) finds that international nursing students are expected to have sufficient Finnish language skills before entering the labor market. She says that these international students may be positioned differently in relation to their Finnish peers due to their insufficient language skills, and thus as a result they have fewer opportunities to perform work tasks independently. Virtanen (ibid.) adds that international students seem to be set in unequal positions when it comes to accessing the labor market. Furthermore, she finds that agency and professional Finnish skills do in fact develop during the practical training, and she argues that there is a reinforcing relationship between professional Finnish skills and agency. Throughout their practical training, as the participants' agency and professional language skills accumulate, they utilize more affordances at the work place.

Pöyhönen et al. (2013) examine how Russian IT professionals experience their integration to Finnish working life, with special focus on identities, experiences of participation and the role of languages. The data for their study comes from the same research project as my thesis, but the three participants chosen were different from mine. Similarly to my study, Pöyhönen et al. chose participants who had taken the opportunity to narrate their life at length in their interviews. The three participants they chose have very different trajectories in their life in Finland, and thus interesting comparisons emerge.

Pöyhönen et al.'s (2013) conclusions are that the integration of adult Russian-speaking immigrants to Finnish working life is a complicated and multidimensional process and that the characteristics the participants had in common, their expertise in IT and Russian language, were not the defining factors in shaping their career paths or navigating integration environments. Moreover, the extent of their Finnish skills was not a factor in their integration to work communities.

Tarnanen, Rynkänen and Pöyhönen's study (2015), likewise, uses data from the same research project as my study, but the participants they chose were different from mine. Their article investigates the narratives of two Russian-speaking women who migrated to Finland in the 2000s and the role languages and language learning play the construction of identities and integration. They divide the immigrants'

narratives related to language into three separate contexts: working life, education and social life. They do not separate these contexts from one another, but examine how the language skills of the participants develop alongside events that take place in their lives in these three contexts.

Both participants in Tarnanen, Rynkänen and Pöyhönen's study (2015) report having had problems during the early stages of their Finnish learning. To both of them, success has come eventually, but it has demanded the development of contexts of Finnish use in the daily life, outside of formalized language courses. While both of the participants have the motivation and need to study Finnish, the ease of access to language courses varies between the two participants, as one of them entered Finland on a student visa, and the other through marriage.

Tarnanen, Rynkänen and Pöyhönen (2015) also highlight that the two participants they examine are able to assess their own strengths and weaknesses when it comes to language skills well, and to articulate these assessments in the interview. They also argue that it is noticeable in the interviews that when the immigrants' language skills develop, simultaneously develops their sense of how much room they have for improvement when it comes to their language skills. This development of language skills reflects other ongoing processes of identity and integration as well, showcasing how they are continuous processes whose final destination is not as important as the construction of the experience itself.

It is evident that my study has a lot in common with the two previous studies, Pöyhönen et al. (2013) and Tarnanen, Rynkänen and Pöyhönen (2015) due to the shared o. It is especially these two studies that I hope to relate my findings in the discussion section of this thesis (see Ch. 5). This concludes our examination of theoretical considerations and leads us to the chapter where I characterize the research project from which I acquired the data and the profiles of the participants, as well as discuss principles of narrative study.

3. Methodology and data

In this methodology chapter, I aim to bring together the lines of thought begun in the theory chapter, to combine the previous ideas; discourses and identities with the notion of narratives; into a concrete methodology through which I can analyze the interactional made available to me. The data is then scrutinized in detail, and its different characteristics and their implications to the research setting considered.

What is narrative? Narratives, which provide the data for this study, are handled as instances of discourse, drawing from the theory of discourse analysis. I follow Bamberg's (2011) logic, who sees narrative as a discourse mode. Under this heading I will not discuss in length any trends of narrative research that are irrelevant to the study in question. I do intend, however, to provide a concise summary of narrative study that situates the current study within the paradigm in relation to other traditions of narrative research.

3.1. The field of narrative study

There are many ways to categorize the field of narrative study from which I draw my methodological tools. Some researchers divide the field into "form-focused" and "content-focused" schools, others into "naturalist" and "constructivist approaches" (de Fina & Georgakopoulou 2012: 1-25). After exploring the different approaches within the realm of narrative study, I will briefly summarize where the current study is situated, and attempt to provide reasoning as to why these methodological choices have been made.

De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012: 24), quoting Mishler (1995), separate the field of narrative study into

- studies focused on temporal ordering and reference,
- studies based on the analysis of coherence and structural makeup, and
- studies centered on the investigation of narrative functions in social contexts.

De Fina and Gergakopoulou (2012: 26) also introduce three approaches to narrative structure: Labov's model, ethnopoetics and conversation analysis. For a discourse

analytic view into narratives, which combines analyses of the micro and macro levels, the authors are not happy with any of these structural models, but call for a more “flexible approach to narrative structure that is amenable to synthesizing work” (de Fina and Georgakopoulou, 2012: 51).

Bamberg (2011) separates the analytic work done with narratives into two categories:

1. Approaches in which discourse is underdetermined and narratives are analyzed as monologues in terms of what they are about and as units of structural form; and
2. Approaches in which narratives are overdetermined and equated with experience and life, whereby discourse becomes the mere expression of *narrative thinking* or *narrative being*. (emphasis in original)

He (ibid.) summarizes concisely that by combining the two trends of narrative research (Labovian/structuralist and narrative discourse as the expression of narrative thinking or narrative being) researchers can “highlight particular positions that are taken as more personal or individual stances vis-à-vis commonly shared and circulating positions that are floating within communal discourse practices”. He uses the word discourse practices here to relate to the larger orders of discourses that operate on a wider level than the singular instance of interaction in question (see Ch. 2.3).

A combination of these two ways of working with narrative analytically would provide an alternative that makes use of the resources and analytic procedures that both approaches have to offer. Bamberg reasons (2011) that “narratives don’t just empower or constrain their users with identity-generating potential, just as narrative discourse does not take place in disembodied minds”. My approach echoes Bamberg’s, aiming to combine insights both from the levels discourse practices and the level of daily interaction.

De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012: 24) conclude in their categorization of narrative approaches that hard-and-fast divisions are difficult to make, and that many, if not most researchers adopt eclectic methodology when it comes to narrative research.

This is true of my study as well. Simply put, my approach is a discourse analytic approach that looks at identities in narratives. I aim to look at narratives in a discourse analytic manner, which combines structural analysis with analysis of the sociocultural context and prevailing discursive practices.

3.1.1. Fundamentals of narrative positioning

One of the main analytical tools that I will be employing my analysis of identities is positioning. This is a concept with which various applied linguists, including Fairclough, have been concerned with. As Fairclough (1992: 43) puts it, referring to Foucault,

the social subject that produces a statement is not an entity which exists outside of and independently of discourse, as the source of the statement (its 'author'), but is on the contrary a function of the statement itself. That is, statements position subjects – those who produce them, but also those they are addressed to – in particular ways

It is clear how, in an analysis of immigrants' narratives regarding their fluid and multiple identities, a perspective into this aspect of interaction could be fruitful.

Bamberg (1997) identifies three levels of positioning within narratives. He demonstrates these three levels by posing the following questions (paraphrased from original):

1. How are the characters positioned in relation to one another within the reported events?
2. How does the speaker position him- or herself to the audience?
3. How do narrators position themselves to themselves?

The first question's implications are quite straightforward: what kinds of encounters do characters in the story world have with one another. Bamberg also places importance on the depiction of characters in the narrative under this question (Bamberg 2004: 336).

The second question refers to the linguistic means by which the narrator addresses the audience, e.g. whether they make excuses for their actions or whether they blame

others for their circumstances. Later, Bamberg reframes this question by stating that the focus of it is on “the interactive work that is being accomplished between participants in the interactive setting” (2004: 336), in other words between the narrator and the researcher.

The third point is the one which most requires further elucidation. In Bamberg’s (1997) own words, it relates to “how is language employed to make claims that the narrator holds to be true and relevant above and beyond the local conversational situation”. Even though Bamberg himself does not explicitly discuss discourses in this instance, later Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) reframe this third level of narrative positioning as dealing with “how the speaker/narrator positions a sense of self/identity with regard to dominant discourses or master narratives”. In my analysis, I strive to remain sensitive to these three questions, which demonstrate three levels of narrative positioning and their implications.

Wortham (2000: 12) quotes authors such as Schiffrin (1996) and Bamberg (1997) in reasoning that “autobiographical narratives might have power to construct the self because of their interactional effects, not just because they represent certain characteristics of the narrator.” He says that the predominant academic account of narratives about identity focuses on this representational function of the autobiographical narrative and calls for an approach that pays special attention to the business of interactional positioning in narratives, and its capability to highlight “certain versions of a self – because of their power to *position* the narrator interactionally” (emphasis in original). Wortham (ibid.) continues:

“Autobiographical narratives might partly construct the self because, in telling the story, the narrator adopts a certain interactional position – and in acting like that kind of person *becomes* more like that kind of person, at least in certain contexts.”

However, Wortham (2001: 14) does not give positioning complete reign over construction of the self in autobiographical narratives. Rather, he argues that researchers “*need not choose* between the predominant representational explanation and the interactional explanation of autobiographical narratives’ power” (emphasis

in original). He stresses that the analysis interrelations between representations of self and interactional positioning is what researchers should strive for, if the data warrants usage of both methodologies.

Some methodological tools that Wortham (2001: 6) proposes for the investigation of autobiographical narratives in the representative vein are representational foregrounding and emplotment. Representational foregrounding refers to the way narrators give certain scenes, people and events central stage in their narrative. Emplotment is one example of representative foregrounding; the process where the narrator chooses what will be included in their narrative and sets them in order that leads to a resolution or a conclusion.

3.1.2. Positioning narrative identity in autobiographical research interviews

Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2000) have built a methodological model for analyzing autobiographical research interviews with narrative identity as the focal point. Their methodology builds upon Bamberg's groundbreaking work, although they disagree with him on one crucial point: according to Deppermann (2015: 383) Bamberg's level 3 positioning (see Ch. 3.1.1.), the relevancy of the level of positioning in relation to larger discourses, does not apply universally across all data.

Deppermann (2015) says, quoting Heritage and Clayman (2010: 20-33), that while investigating narratives, "the macro context 'D-discourse' has to be shown to be oriented to by the participants, that is, that it is 'talked into being' by local action". They further argue, quoting Benwell and Stokoe (2006: Ch. 2) that "the tendency of critical discourse analysts to assume that societal power relations and power-sensitive identity categories such as gender, race, class and ethnicity invariably and ubiquitously matter in discourse" is a problem.

From the perspective adopted in this thesis, it is impossible to detach a text, no matter how autobiographical or specific, from the larger orders of discourse in which individuals operate. As has been shown (see Ch. 2 Theoretical considerations), every

text is constructed by an individual who is connected to the world in which s/he lives in and whose perspective is constructed by their experiences as an individual situated on the gender spectrum and member of a certain ethnic group, just to give a few examples. All of these and more facets of their identity, reflecting the discourses around them inevitably influence the way perceive and orient to the world. I will argue that especially in analyzing autobiographical accounts of female migrants maintaining connection to this third level of interactional positioning in the data is essential (see also Ch. 3.1.3. for De Fina's justification for the inclusion of level 3 positioning in analysis).

To Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann's (2000) credit, though, they offer a concrete methodological toolkit and a rigorous analysis scheme to use while investigating narrative identity in autobiographical research interviews. They pay special attention to communicative frames, which represent sets of discursive rules and epistemological levels that influence the research interview situation. Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann's Frame 1 refers to the situation between the interviewer and the participant, before any interaction has taken place. Frame 2 refers to the situation when the researcher contacts the participant, and Frame 3 refers to the interview situation itself, including greetings, warm-up etc. Using these frames and considering their significance helps to keep in mind all the presence of presuppositions and previous interaction that is absent from the transcripts themselves.

Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2000: 216) maintain the position of the interviewer as central to the identities portrayed by the narrator. They argue that "the key to the interactional constitution of narrative identity is the analysis of the rhetoric strategies of positioning on every frame". They claim that the interviewer's activities require equal focus to the narrator's utterances, as the interviewer is most often in charge of designing the context to which the narrator's replies are tailored.

Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2000: 212) situate their positioning analysis in the aforementioned three frames. Means of positioning that they reference include standard stories, using others as mirrors, contrast structures and the multiplicity of

temporal selves. Multiplicity of temporal selves means e.g. that a participant refers to something they did not know before, but learned during the narrated experience. Thus there are three layers of temporality: past self in narrative, current self in narrative and current narrating self. In our data, there are also quite rich examples of the participants speculating their future prospects, so a fourth temporal dimension is added to our methodology: future narrating self. This is also an aspect to which Bamberg and Georgakopoulou pay attention to in their “small stories” analysis, the underrepresented narrative activities which include “future or hypothetical events” (2008: 381).

Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2000: 211) expand the theory of narrative emplotment (see Ch 3.1.1.), stating that through the narrator’s self-presentation, narrative emplotment offers the invaluable advantage to display identities by recounting actions which are indicative of the claimed identities. Aspects that counteract these identities can be played down or omitted altogether. Thus, the very choosing of what to narrate and what to leave out is a major building block of a narrator’s projected identity.

Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2000: 217) list a number of positioning activities which help interpreters gain access to facets of the narrator’s identity. They discuss the following activities (paraphrased from original):

- explicit categorizations, attributions, addresses, etc. in the interaction between narrator and interviewer,
- implicit positionings by which imagined aspects of the interviewer and corresponding identity claims of the narrator are expressed,
- characterization of narrated self as character by means of narrative devices, such as emplotment,
- positioning activities between narrated self and in-narrative interlocutors, realized by recounted action sequences and by reanimating dialogues, and
- hidden opponents or addressees for whom argumentation or account is designed.

These positioning activities will be employed in my analysis, where appropriate. As Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2000: 217) themselves argue, though, it is impossible to use these frames to deductively yield interpretations. Rather, “they function as sensitizing, potentially relevant knowledge”, which should be employed where appropriate and relevant.

In addition to the various positioning layers, Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2000: 218) highlight other narrative phenomena that can provide a perspective into the identities projected in narratives. They discuss so-called “key stories” which account for dominant or critical biographical experiences, the skillful and efficient use of anecdotes, metaphors and figures of speech which show they have been employed frequently and presentational crises in narration where the problematic character of the content is indicated by “an increased effort to explain and argue, or by contradictions and incoherences”. I will strive to identify such key stories and presentational crises by paying close attention to linguistic cues.

As for the essence of narrative identity in the context of research interviews, Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2000: 215) argue that it is a situated identity, which is formed as the interview progresses, and which is shaped by the developing interactional frames. They conceptualize this narrative identity through the “processual development of the relations between the dialectics of narrating self and narrated self on the one hand and the manifold addressees’ roles on the other hand”. Such an approach fits in well with the social constructionist philosophy of science and the theories discussed earlier (see Ch. 2).

Deppermann (2015), quoting Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2004), highlights the fact that the nature of the narrative data shapes the methodology being used. He argues that “in biographic interviews, opportunities for overt reciprocal interactional positioning are scarce, while rich opportunities for multifaceted self-positioning of the teller are offered”. This is true of data handled in this thesis as well, which is why I will utilize a synthesizing approach to shape the operationalization of these varied methodological perspectives that I discuss in this chapter, focusing on self-positioning by the narrator.

3.1.3. Reintroducing discourse into positioning

De Fina (2013) seems to disagree with Deppermann (2015: 383), arguing for the continued inclusion of Bamberg's level 3 positioning as an analytical tool in narrative identity research. She argues (2013: 41) that positioning analysis, particularly level 3 analysis, can be an important tool for perspectives into identity that lie somewhere in the middle along the continuum of approaches that range from identity mostly defined by wider social processes (e.g. critical discourse analysis) to identity mostly emerging from the data (e.g. conversation analysis). She does acknowledge that "current approaches to positioning underline that the relations between local processes and more global processes are very complex and cannot be seen as a matter of straightforward determination of macro to micro social structures of action and cognition" (2013: 42).

She goes on to provide an elegant analysis employing Bamberg's three levels, some aspects of which I aim to emulate in this thesis. On the first two levels (2013: 53), she pays special attention to the types of actions, motives and characteristics attributed to protagonists and story characters (Level 1) as well as the amount of agency that the narrator attributes to herself (Level 2). Similar examples of narrator agency are also found in my data, which is why I will maintain agency as one of the instruments in my methodological toolbox throughout the analysis.

For her level 3 positioning analysis, De Fina (2013: 54) builds upon a foundation of ethnographic knowledge and wide array of interview data to establish connections to prevailing orders of discourse. Her logic is that by analyzing various immigrant narratives from the same project she can establish what wider discourses are repeated and related to by most participants and thus make sense of what ways of speaking the immigrants evoke implicitly.

To summarize, Bamberg's positioning theory (Bamberg 1997, 2004, Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008) will remain at the focus of my analytical work throughout Chapter 4. Insights from Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2000) will be included whenever pertinent. The goal is to investigate the participants' identities and identity strategies through the utilization of these tools, which include three levels of

positioning analysis, key stories and presentational crises, emplotment and narrative foregrounding, among other, more specific linguistic cues.

The purpose of examples regarding interactional positioning and the emergence of identities in narratives in this chapter is not to constitute a comprehensive list, but to act as examples of the kinds of linguistic phenomena through which researchers can gain insights into the participants' projected identities.

3.2.Data collection methods

My data comes from a research project titled "Transforming Professional Integration" at the University of Jyväskylä, which was funded by the Academy of Finland and ran from 2011 to 2014. The project gathered narrative interview data from 60 immigrants, who have or are looking for a job in Finland. The interviewees' experiences were examined in three focal settings: aspiration settings, achievement settings and abandonment settings. While immigrants in aspiration settings were preparing for working in a professional community, something which immigrants in achievement settings had already achieved, immigrants in abandonment settings had been marginalized from work and professional communities, giving up their aspirations to integrate into these communities (Tarnanen, Pöyhönen and Rynkänen 2015). The data was gathered between February 2012 and June 2013.

The ages of the interviewed immigrants ranged from 22 to 64 and the length of their residence in Finland from less than a year to twenty-seven years. Most of the interviewees were Russian-speaking, with the largest represented professional fields being IT and education.

Most interviews were conducted at the Centre for Applied Language Studies at the University of Jyväskylä. The interviews I chose for my study were conducted by a researcher, Tatjana Rynkänen, in Russian, and translated into English by an expert in translation studies. The interviewer is a researcher who has moved to Finland from Russia as the spouse of a returnee immigrant approximately 20 years before the interview was conducted. Therefore, there may be overlapping shared identities between the interviewer and the participants. However, identities related to

immigration are diverse, and inter-generational, educational and cultural identity framings might still differ, even if the interviewer and participants share an immigration experience.

Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2000: 216) point out that the analyst should possess knowledge about the circumstances of the interview as this kind of information is often essential for an accurate interpretation. To construct this understanding, it would be important to know what happened before the interview started, what are the interviewer and participant's interests, and what the shared understanding of the participant's identities is. In the case of this study, it has to be taken into account that this kind of first-hand information was not available, as the instances of data gathering and analysis were temporally distant from one another.

3.3. Interview structure and participants

In choosing the interviews to be analyzed from the range of interviews made available to me within the context of the "Transforming Professional Integration" project I firstly decided to pay special attention to immigrants whose experience of immigration was fairly recent (length of residence in Finland 10 years or less) as picking immigrants whose immigrant experience was fairly recent promoted the telling of stories that were fairly fresh on their minds, and with which the immigrants still engaged on a daily basis.

I also chose to focus on recent immigrants to Finland whose interviews contained long, uninterrupted passages of narration with relatively little input from the interviewer. As such, the interviews chosen provide fruitful ground for narrative analysis.

As my methodology makes it possible to delve deep into the underlying stories in each passage of interview data, the number of interviews that needed to be chosen was small. This decision was also supported by the fact the interviews transcripts were fairly lengthy, 22 to 26 pages each. Due to the relatively small amount of interviews that were chosen for closer analysis, I decided that striving to achieve a representative sample was not needed.

After these decisions had been made, I began acquainting myself with the interviews that suited my criteria. I quickly noticed that there were a number of interviewees that shared similar characteristics: they were female, belonged to the aspiration setting (see Ch. 3.2.), and their country of origin was an Eastern European country. Furthermore, many of them had an educational history of having studied at an institute of higher education. I decided to choose three interview transcripts to be analyzed from the interviewees who shared these characteristics.

All chosen participants had a higher education degree either from Finland or their country of origin, and/or were working towards achieving one. The fact that all of the participants had an educational background that had to do with the study of languages enabled the participants to analyze their experiences in relation to language in an in-depth, detailed way, which in turn contributed towards detailed analysis.

The interview followed a semi-structured approach to research interviewing, covering similar themes and questions in every interview, nevertheless allowing the interviewer to pursue interesting narratives emerging during the interview. In all interviews the participants were asked to introduce themselves, to describe their Finnish skills in detail, to assess whether their Finnish skills are sufficient to work or study in Finland, to consider whether Finland is a multicultural society, to evaluate whether the move to Finland has had an effect on their identity and to describe what languages they speak besides Finnish and their mother tongue. All participants were also given an opportunity at the end of the interview to add anything they wanted to the themes covered in the interview.

Besides the above questions which were worded in a similar fashion in all three interviews, there were a number of themes that were covered in all interviews. These included questions related to the contexts of working life, studies, hobbies and free time. The participants were also asked questions investigating their perception of their own future, difficulties they experienced as immigrants in Finland, their perception of what makes an immigrant successful in society and their conceptualization of the membership of Finnish society.

3.3.1. Participant profile: Maria

Interviewee Maria has studied philology and journalism in higher education. When the interview was conducted in 2012, she had lived in Finland for 3.5 years, having immigrated to Finland from Russia in 2008. Before immigrating, Maria had studied Finnish with a tutor and on her own. Originally she had wanted to go on a cultural exchange, as an au pair, to Finland, but in the end these plans did not manifest. It does show, however, that she did not start her language learning from a completely blank slate when she came to Finland.

Maria belongs to the 'aspiration' setting of the Transforming Professional Integration project, even though she was employed as an intern at the time of the interview. The employment position of an intern was considered relatively insecure, which is why they were included in the 'aspiration' frame instead of the 'achievement' frame.

In the transcript of her interview, Maria discusses a wide spectrum of issues, including her own language skills and the context in which she uses them, the effect of her (lack of) language skills on her career advancement, the relation between language and culture, and the change in perspective that she has had to go through since coming to Finland. Such rich narration is excellent grounds for investigation of language identities.

When Maria discusses her arrival in Finland and her initial plans, she says that she decided that she would try to become a teacher of Russian language, culture and literature at the university. She subsequently comments that this did not really work out for her and that when she moved, she was looking for work for a very long time without anyone being willing to employ her "neither *as a waitress nor as a *cleaner, nowhere at all", saying that she had no vocational education suitable for such work. Likewise, she has been unable to find work where she could use what she has learned during her studies in Russia.

3.3.2. Participant profile: Lena

Interviewee Lena's educational history includes a master's degree in Polish philology. She had immigrated to Finland from Poland in 2010, two years before the

interview, which was conducted in 2012. Her mother tongue is Polish, and the interview was conducted in Russian.

At the time of the interview, Lena was in her late thirties. She, too, belongs to the 'aspiration' setting of the Transforming Professional Integration research project, because at the time of the interview she was a student at a university of applied sciences. She had a history of working many jobs 'dealing with languages, sometimes indirectly'. During her stay in Finland, she had worked as an intern at a university and with a project at a non-governmental organization. This was not her first emigration, as she had lived and worked in Eastern Europe before.

The reason for her emigration was her husband, who had secured a job in Finland two years before the interview was conducted. His initial contract was temporary, after which he was offered an extension for two more years, by which point, in Lena's words, they had already "decided that they wanted to stay here".

In many instances, Lena takes quite an analytic view into her own and others' immigrant experience, offering comments such as "in order to participate in social life, you need to be able to communicate". Her replies are marked by pauses in the interview, when she formulates her next argument or thought. The fact that even these long pauses have no input from the interviewer show that she is in control of this interaction and largely takes it in the direction she wants. She also discusses multiculturalism at length, and the degree to which it manifests in daily life in Finland (see chapter 4.2.4.).

Exactly one year before the interview, she had begun the first Finnish course organized by the employment office, completing the third course, Suomi 3, in the spring of 2012. After finishing Suomi 3, she applied to study a 3.5-year program at a University of Applied Sciences, to which she was admitted.

3.3.3. Participant profile: Anastasia

Interviewee Anastasia had moved to Finland in 2011 from Russia, having lived in Finland for two years when the interview was conducted (2013). She had graduated from a university in Russia, and was studying at a Finnish institution at the Master's

level. During her studies in Russia, she studied to become a teacher of Finnish and English.

Anastasia belongs to the 'aspiration' setting of the Transforming Professional Integration project. At the time of the interview, she was a full-time student who worked various part-time jobs. The fact that Anastasia was, at the time of the interview, a full-time student of language affects the way she perceives linguistic phenomena in her daily life. In the interview transcript, she shows quite an analytical perspective into daily language use, both her own and others'.

In the interview, Anastasia discusses how "culture shapes up a person", the effect of the spoken language on the identity of the speaker and the attitudes of native Finnish people towards people of immigrant origin. These topics add to the usefulness of the interview as data for this study.

At the time of the interview, Anastasia was married to a Finnish man, whom she met during a language course that was organized in Finland, before her immigration to Finland. The fact that she has a non-immigrant spouse has an effect on the way she experiences and the kinds of identities she performs, which enables fruitful comparisons between her and the other two participants, who have immigrant spouses.

3.4. Ethical considerations

The parts of the interview that appear in this thesis have been anonymized in two steps. Firstly, the Transforming Professional Integration project transcriber and/or translator has removed people's actual names from the documents and designated codes to them. Secondly, I have substituted these interview codes for popular Russian and Polish names. Furthermore, all references to geographical location on a more specific, regional level have been removed, as well as references to any detail, such as field of study or employer, which could enable identification of the individual(s) in question. The text has then been submitted to Professor Sari Pöyhönen, who worked with the Transforming Professional Intergration project for approval which was received.

3.5. Transcription, coding and translation

The transcription scheme that was used by the Transforming Professional Integration project was fairly fine-grained, with pauses and hesitations marked into the interview transcripts. In addition to this, asterisks were used to denote words that were stressed by the speaker. Parentheses were used to mark non-verbal communication and square brackets for additional edits by the transcriber, translator or me. Hyphens and slashes were used when the speaker interrupted themselves and paused mid-sentence to reformulate what they were saying. A complete list of transcription symbols included in this thesis can be found in Appendix 1.

After choosing the interviews to be analyzed from the 60 available, I proceeded to identify intact narratives from them, in addition to highlighting instances where the participants implicitly or explicitly handled languages, identities, or both. This enabled me to narrow down the amount of data to a manageable level for the scope of a Master's thesis.

All of the chosen interviews were translated from Russian into English. Translation is a process during which inevitably something is lost and subtle changes in the meanings of phrases and words occur. As it was a pre-given characteristic of the data as it was handed to me, and I myself do not possess any skills in Russian, this limitation was inevitable.

The foundation of methodology, data and theoretical considerations has now been built, and it is time to apply them to the data, forming the analysis.

4. Analysis

The analysis chapter proceeds by first handling the participants' identity strategies that relate to learning and using Finnish. Then, language learner and language user identities that relate to other languages are scrutinized. Finally, the participant's identity as an immigrant is explored, including positioning in relation to macro level discourses and identity discourses they are subjected to by external actors. By this logic, I hope to arrive at a comprehensive overview of the performed identity

strategies and reactions to wider discourses. Results and their significance will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter (see Ch. 5).

The order in which the interviews are handled is based on the participants' current educational status. Maria's interview is analyzed first as she currently has no right to study at a Finnish educational institution. Lena's interview follows, as she has the study right to a Bachelor's degree at a University of Applied Sciences. Finally, Anastasia's interview is handled last, as she was a university student when the interview was conducted.

4.1. Maria

One of Maria's main concerns is her employment situation, a fact that becomes quite evident throughout her interview transcript. Due to this, and the implications that these employment-related utterances have to her identity construction, I have renamed the second analysis category 4.1.2. *Identity as a user of Finnish and a professional.*

Maria has been looking for a job in which she could apply what she has learned during her university studies. The problems that she has encountered are that her degree in philology and journalism was recognized as a degree in journalism in Finland, and it does not give her eligibility to work as a teacher, which is something she would like to do. She has had little success in entering the world of Finnish journalism, as well, because her Finnish proficiency is not at the native level.

4.1.1. Identity as a learner of Finnish

As a learner of Finnish, Maria presents herself as a good student who is making "good progress" and who "learns everything fast". Initially, she was unaware of the opportunities for language learning that were available for her, which led to her not having access to language training at the very beginning of her stay in Finland.

Maria's utterances when she speaks of the way she was treated by the employment office and people dealing with her language training at the beginning of her stay in Finland are characterized by the passive voice and use of the impersonal pronoun 'they':

- (1) I was told that I did not need Suomi One, I needed Suomi Two.
- (2) They told me that I should not stop, I should *go further since I was making good progress

The agency that she attributes to her narrated self suffers as a result of these kinds of lexical choices. She continues, describing the two penalties she received from the unemployment office:

- (3) I got the *second penalty for I was not able to attend the course, as we lived very far away from Jyväskylä, and there was no transportation.

In this excerpt she positions herself as the passive recipient of a penalty, and her own reaction is not taken into account, not shown in the narrative. In these passages it is already shown that Maria is making progress in her language learning, but her voice nevertheless remains lacking in agency, exemplified by her narrated self being the object of the action in this sentence, and the two instances where she refers to circumstances outside her own control: "I was not able to attend" and "there was no transportation". The following relates to the YKI test which is a general test for immigrants' language skills, and a prerequisite for citizenship:

- (4) I was told 'come on, get ready to take next summer'.

Utterances like these make her narrative sound somewhat resigned, as if she was the victim of circumstances, instead of a capable agent in the narrative (see Ch 2.5.) she is telling. As the interview progresses, and she no longer is discussing the beginning of her time in Finland, the narrative shifts in a more agentive and capable direction, exemplified by this utterance:

- (5) And now we are planning to take a language test and he is getting his citizenship this year and I [will get mine] next year

Passages like this, where Maria discusses her own and/or her husband's plans for the future, especially, display an agentive and capable voice, and an optimistic outlook on the future through placing the narrator as the subject of a sentence. The projection into the future that she utilizes in this excerpt is an instance of multiplicity

of temporal selves (Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann 2000: 212), where the narrator makes predictions regarding her future.

Maria had studied Finnish already while at university, before arriving in Finland, with the help of a tutor and by herself. When asked whether she was satisfied with the content of studies she was offered when she had arrived in Finland, she says that yes, she was satisfied with her own abilities, because she “learns everything fast and that is why these courses were not enough for me.” These claims are good examples of level 2 positioning in Bamberg’s (1997) terms, direct positioning by the narrator in relation to the audience. Here, Maria utilizes this positioning maneuver to claim the identity of a good student, and a fast learner.

- (6) Despite the fact that I speak -- Russian at home, we speak, my Finnish, in comparison to others!, if one may say so, is a *lot better, although I have studied for a very, very short time.

Maria says that despite the fact that she speaks Russian at home, she speaks Finnish a lot better than others, although she has studied for a “very, very short time”. She brings this vague “others” into her narrative as a way to position herself in relation to Bamberg’s (1997) first level, positioning between characters within narrative, to have a reflection against which she can judge her own language skills. These “others”, which Maria refers to in this passage are most likely other students she has encountered on her courses or other immigrants she has met in other contexts. She has confidence in herself, saying that her Finnish is a lot better than some of her peers, even though some of them have lived in Finland for much longer than her.

Maria reports that in the beginning she was offered professional retraining as a part of her integration plan, while all she personally wanted to do was to continue her studies, to get a higher degree. This is why she largely had to work on her own, try to find out how to achieve her goals. This is how she reports this experience in her interview:

- (7) But because I was not going to be retrained, I wanted to get a higher degree, so I tried to find everything on my own. And the woman, who was supervising

me, was always surprised at the fact that I was *active, *resourceful, I was *doing many things on my own and she would say: Try harder, harder!

In the excerpt above, which is a part of a section where she describes the language training courses she took part in, she portrays herself as an ambitious and capable individual, saying that she needs more than just the courses and that she studied by herself as well which surprised her supervisor. Here, through a level 1 positioning move, which happens between characters in the story world (Bamberg 1997), Maria reinforces her identity as an active and resourceful student by referring to an external authority, “the woman, who was supervising me”, whose reported speech, too, is included in the narrative in the phrase “Try harder, harder!”

Maria goes on to explain the manner by which she was pursuing a higher degree:

- (8) When I tried to get into teachers training college at ammattikorkeakoulu myself, I had been getting ready for this for two years but, unfortunately, I was not accepted. I do not know, maybe they did not like my experience as a journalist, I do not know. I have not found this out, I am going to make an appeal.

The fact that Maria is willing to make an appeal to the decision of the University of Applied Sciences not admitting her as a student showcases the confidence she has in herself and her abilities. Note that there is no uncertainty as to whether she will make an appeal, her voice is agentive and strong when she states that she “is going to” do it. The decision-making body that rejected her application is referred to simply as “they”, and she uses the passive voice in reporting “I was not accepted”, moving back in the direction of a loss of agency. She repeats the phrase “I do not know” twice in the excerpt, reinforcing the sense that she is very baffled by this decision.

Maria responds to the interviewer’s question “what helped to learn the language so well?” in the following way:

- (9) What helped me, of course, well the *language helps, no doubt, when I came I knew only sinä, minä!, and I spoke English. But at Suomi Two, at the Suomi Two course I began to speak, and I continued at Suomi Three! And that is why

I can express my *thoughts more or less well, I understand a *lot, I can *say, that is, only colloquialisms put me into stupor, but except for this I am more or less fine. That is why I am planning, *I think that *I hope I will manage to pass the state language test.

She attributes her own success during the courses to her previous knowledge of Finnish before entering Finland, and the fact that she found her confidence in speaking the language relatively early in her language training. The rest of her reply is confident as well when she lists the things that she can do with the language in the active voice: “I can express”, “I understand”, “I can *say”, “I am” and “I am planning”. As a result, she seems confident in her abilities to pass the state language test. All of the verbs in this reply are in the active voice, reinforcing her agency and lending credibility to her confidence.

The previous excerpt from her reply is also a clear instance when the multiplicity of temporal selves (Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann 2000: 212) of the narrator comes through clearly. In the beginning she reminisces her past, the time when she had just arrived in Finland. From there on, she moves on to the narrative present to assess her current language skills. After narrating a history of progress in her language skills she speculates about her future self, and her ability to pass the state language test.

In her response to the interviewer’s question on what skills in Finnish she has best developed, Maria says that during the courses the course staff did not pay that much attention to speaking. She portrays herself as an active student, saying “if I speak in the classroom, many just keep silent.” Thus she thinks that practicing speaking was not facilitated well enough on the courses, but on the other hand it also depends a lot on the students, whether they would like to speak or not. Her positioning maneuver makes her stand out from the crowd of students, on the level 1 positioning level (Bamberg 1997), by showing her as an active student eager to learn, and the unnamed mass of others keeping silent.

She says, continuing on the topic of speaking in another reply:

- (10) Actually, I realized that the more you *talk, the more you understand. That is, [language] courses are not enough, one needs one's own *initiative and desire to learn, to listen, to speak. Not to be afraid of speaking, but speaking, maybe with mistakes, but still speaking, just the same.

In this excerpt, Maria seems to have found a method for studying Finnish that suits her, and instances and contexts where to use Finnish and practice using the language. She discusses motivation, and thus not only portrays herself as a motivated language learner, but also claims knowledge over this topic in her reply with an epistemic positioning move and thus by using her background as a philologist to lend credibility to her utterance. As the positioning here happens between the narrator and the interviewer rather than characters in the story world, we can consider it an instance of level 2 positioning in Bamberg's (1997) terms. Furthermore, her perception that a good way of learning to speak a language is by using it and not being afraid of any mistakes shows just how much insight she has to how successful language learning works.

4.1.2. Identity as a user of Finnish and a professional

Maria's high level of motivation for studying Finnish and completion of three courses in beginner Finnish imply that her language skills are already at a level where she can confidently use the language independently. She discusses the contexts in which she uses Finnish:

- (11) In everyday life, *outside (laughing). That is, now in the classroom, at the course, first, all the immigrants speak *Finnish, they try hard, they make us speak Finnish but some do not, although at the course we nevertheless speak *Finnish. I speak Finnish in shops, pharmacies, buses, with some friends and acquaintances. That is, we try to speak only Finnish.

The fact that she is able and willing to use Finnish out in the public shows the level of confidence in her own abilities she projects in her narrative and displays the lack of fear of being ashamed by making any mistakes with the language. By saying that "some do not" speak Finnish on the courses and that "all the immigrants... they try hard" she creates a positioning maneuver which distances her from the other

immigrant students and their use of Finnish on Bamberg's (1997) level one of positioning hierarchy. It seems that she does not include herself in this instance when she refers to 'all the immigrants'. The contrast structure (Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann 2000: 212) created is clear, when in the following sentence, she says that she "speaks Finnish in shops, pharmacies, buses, with friends and some acquaintances". Thus she seems to go above and beyond the teacher's wishes when compared with other immigrants who do not speak Finnish on the courses even when they are urged, and she and her friends who keep using it outside courses even though they do not have to. Thus, it can be seen that the identities she performed in relation to language learning, such as fast learner, diligent student, are reinforced by these positioning maneuvers.

When asked about the specific language skills that she has best developed since moving to Finland Maria comments that she has most developed writing since the integration language courses mostly focus on grammar, but in her own assessment her listening comprehension is also "ok". In her view, the aspect of her own language skills that she has the most room for improvement in is speaking. She finds that she has developed her writing better than her speaking, and thinks that speaking is the hardest skill to master and feel comfortable at.

Maria responds to the interviewer's question whether her language skills are sufficient for living and working in Finland in the following way:

- (12) I think *not, because (3) although Suomi Three is considered sufficient for passing YKI *test, I think that it is not so. I think there should be courses Suomi *Four and Suomi *Five. not *only evening courses at lukio twice a week, but full-fledged courses like Suomi One, Suomi Two, Suomi Three, toimienalinen? [toiminnallinen] Suomi

Here, Maria argues that the Finnish integration policy needs to be amended so that more full-time courses are added after the current three. She thinks that although the third course namely gives the student good enough capabilities to pass the state language test, it does not give sufficient language skills for living and working in Finland. By wanting more courses, she portrays herself as an eager student willing to

learn more than is strictly required of her. On the other hand, this eagerness is caused by a lack of faith in her own abilities, as she does not think that with her current knowledge acquired during the courses her language skills are up to par for living and working in Finland.

It should also be noticed that she holds a three-second pause first before responding, which can signal a small presentational crisis, an instance where the participant needs to reorganize their thoughts (Lucius Hoene & Deppermann 2000: 218). She goes on to explain that even if she would pass the state language test, this would not be enough to live and work comfortably:

- (13) Because with this baggage of *knowledge I have now I cannot do everything I would like to, for example. I cannot express all the things I can express in English and in Russian, my native tongue. I would like to know some *peculiarities of the Finnish language, which, in any case, makes the language *nicer and more *advanced. If I can say simple sentences or complex sentences with, say, *subordinating conjunctions, or with *coordinating conjunctions. I would like my speech to be *rich.

In the case of excerpts like this, it is not always simple to classify them under either language learner identities or language user identities. The two categories intersect and overlap often. Consequently, although Maria discusses and evaluates the language skills she has and as a result her identity as a language user, she keeps on hoping for progression in her language learning, arguing that she wants to achieve a level of language skills similar to the level of skills she has in English and Russian, a level where she can use “rich” language.

For Maria, knowing a language is not only a question of being able to survive using it and having basic communicative competence. This positions her as an ambitious language learner who keeps on reaching for a new level of language proficiency and not simply being content with the large amount she has learned in a short time. By talking about “complex sentences”, “subordinating conjunctions” and “coordinating conjunctions”, Maria positions herself in relation to the audience as a linguistically aware and educated individual, whose skills in Finnish are limited due to a lack of

education instead of a lack of cognitive capabilities. Thus, this is an explicit level 2 positioning maneuver (Bamberg 1997). She continues on the same topic:

- (14) I am a philologist and it makes me unhappy because I cannot speak *beautifully, the way I would do it in Russian. I cannot, for example, to keep up some *important conversation, though I would gladly *talk about politics or economy, and sometimes it works, but nevertheless I cannot express everything quickly. Ideas disappear because I do not have such a large vocabulary. I am still trying, trying.

Maria puts her unhappiness with her current level of language skills down to her educational background that she is being demanding on herself because she has gotten used to “speaking beautifully”. She keeps being persistent with her learning, highlighted by the repetition in the phrase “I am still trying, trying.” As an example of a level of language proficiency she would like to reach she mentions discussing politics and the state of the economy.

Responding to the interviewer’s question about her hobbies in Finland, Maria humorously reports that it is “problematic to go the *movies” with her husband as Finnish theatres do not show Russian movies. Problems arise because her husband’s stronger language is Finnish instead of English, and hers is English instead of Finnish. In her opinion, “it is a lot easier to watch online in *Russian.” This shows that in a non-formal context where she and her husband are free to choose the medium of entertainment, they opt for Russian-speaking content. Thus, her identity as a Finnish language speaker is reflected in her husband, in a level 1 positioning move (Bamberg 1997), and her skills are shown as inferior when it comes to Finnish, which is unsurprising in that her husband’s mother tongue is Karelian, which is a cognate language to Finnish.

Maria goes on to explain how persistent she has been in looking for a job. A portion of her exasperation seems to stem from the fact that she thinks her rejection by employers has been caused by her relatively low level of Finnish skills. She says:

- (15) Then again, the employer thinks the language level is *not high, the person will not be able to speak Finnish, so there is a problem. How to learn it, I do not

know, *one cannot guess, for example, you could be a *professional, with a *PhD, you would not get this job. Or, for example, you do not know Finnish, but you will be working at a *construction site and you will *earn very good money. It all depends on the willingness of the employer and on your *luck

The characters in this excerpt are the employer, an immigrant professional with a PhD and an immigrant who does not speak Finnish and works at a construction site. As a positioning maneuver between these characters in the narrative (Bamberg's level 1, see 1997) she presents a situation of apparent injustice, where less educated people with just as few language skills would be employed and "earn very good money" while a more highly educated individual would not get a job. She puts most of this down to "luck" but also on employer preferences when it comes to workers. The employer is the character in this snippet of narrative on whom everything hinges, the character who has the power to decide who gets employed and who doesn't. Maria represents this decision-making process as a seemingly arbitrary process, channeling her frustration in not finding a job into pondering the motives of employers.

Her frustration caused by her unemployment is reinforced by the fact that she takes the topic up again, later in the interview when the interviewer asks what skills, in her opinion, make an immigrant successful in a new country of residence:

- (16) It is impossible to say how people get jobs, for example, some get to work as car mechanics! without knowing the Finnish language. And, for example, I, no matter how hard, I *cannot, they do not hire me. Well, I *cannot be a cleaner, I have *no qualification to be a cleaner! That is, I cannot say, it is luck. Not everything depends on the language skills and on inventiveness. As I say, what cards you get (3).

By comparing the process of search for employment to a card game she makes it seem like the nature of both is completely random. The "I *cannot be a cleaner, I have *no qualification to be a cleaner!" passage is most likely quoted speech from a potential employer, but their identity and the context seem to have been omitted from her reply. She introduces a vague "others", possibly referring to other

immigrants she has discussed with, and performs a level 1 positioning maneuver (Bamberg 1997), comparing her own success in looking for employment to theirs in the excerpt. She, a highly educated individual, is shown as unemployable, and other people go on to secure jobs that require lower levels of qualifications.

Maria seems to also have a concept of occupational prestige, as she says that “simple work, like construction, one can *probably get a job without experience” and “for example, a more prestigious job, it is more *problematic, I think”. As an example of a more prestigious job she gives the position of an intern at a newspaper, a position that she has applied for herself but been rejected on the basis of her language skills. She ends her comment with the phrase “so I do not know” which adds to the exasperated, frustrated nature of her replies.

Maria gives a lengthy answer to the interviewer’s question about her educational background, describing her university studies and saying that the degree she completed while in Russia, which was a degree in Philology, Department of Journalism, was recognized as a degree of journalism, not philology, by Finnish authorities. She heavily criticizes this bureaucratic decision, as her degree gave her the right to teach in Russia, but not in Finland. She says:

- (17) And this, *as I now understood, or maybe, I have not fully understood it, how many hours of Russian I need to get in addition, I do not understand this, because some people say, I need to be a full-fledged at the Russian Language Department, to study for five years, and some people say one should write a Master’s thesis, some say that it is only study hours I need to get. But besides that I need to get either a *separate qualification in *pedagogy or study in the Russian-, a the Russian department, where they will teach pedagogy, so I would not have to do anything extra in this field.

Here, she quotes unnamed authorities (“some people”), who have given her conflicting information on what she needs to study in order to gain the eligibility to work as a teacher. Her voice as the narrator appears confused and powerless, once again a victim of the circumstances. This is reinforced by the repetition “I have not fully understood” and “I do not understand”. It seems that she herself lacks

knowledge on this topic, and external authorities, in-narrative others, are incapable of offering her what she is looking for.

Maria sees two avenues for her own advancement when it comes to employment: working as a teacher or as a journalist. While her path to a qualified teacher's position is blocked by the lack of a suitable degree in the eyes of the law, her path to becoming a journalist is blocked by the fact that she is not a fluent Finnish speaker or writer. When the interviewer asks her whether she follows what is happening in the field of journalism, she replies:

- (18) Journalism? Well, I was interested in Russian-language *mass media because I believe that there are very (4) * few of them [in Finland]. And they do not provide people with sufficient information -- that is, well, they * do not provide all the information needed for Russian-speaking immigrants here, though they are * trying. It's wonderful.

Here Maria evaluates the performance of Finnish Russian language mass media. She uses epistemic positioning, utilizing her educational background, to position herself as an expert on the subject of people's needs and evaluates that the mass media does not provide Russian immigrants with the information they need. She does not specify the nature of this information and its specifics, in this instance though. The fact that she has a degree in journalism lends credibility to her words.

She goes on to evaluate her own consumption of Finnish media:

- (19) Of course, I watch, I listen to the Finnish news, read newspapers, I did it * before I moved to Finland, because I wrote a diploma paper on that, and course papers, I wrote it on *Finland, the topic was "The Russian Finnish relations in Mass Media." That is, there was *myth-makings, creation of various *images and *analysis of the publications of several years. That is, *international relations, and many other things. So I am really interested. Now I started looking into the field of the Russian language and literature, how things are there, and in this area I am trying to find a job all the time but have not found anything yet."

Here, Maria positions herself as a very interested individual who consumes Finnish media. Her interest is not merely a person's who wants to keep up with current events, she makes it quite clear that she also has academic interest in the topic, continuing with the epistemic positioning strategy from the previous excerpt. Her interest comes through in various ways, firstly through the fact that she claims authority by referring to her own research on the topic by saying "I wrote a diploma paper on that" during her studies in Russia. Furthermore, she states she has analyzed "publications of several years."

Maria adds, in another reply, that her future plans are uncertain:

- (20) But the problem is that now, in April, my adaptation plan ends, it has been extended thanks to this course, until June, and then I do not know what I am going to do! I have no job, but I will try to do something. But I do not *need more language courses. I have had a round of everything I could, already.

This excerpt showcases aspects Maria's identity through employing the multiplicity of temporal selves (Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann 2000:212) when the narrating self directly speculating about their future. Here, the only thing she seems to be sure of is that she does not need more language courses. In her own words, she "does not know", she "will try to do something". The uncertainty is most clearly reflected in the lexical choices "I will try to do something", which is uncertain on two levels, both the success of doing, "try to", and the direction of the action, "something". The exclamation mark at the end of "I do not know what I am going to do!" adds to the urgency and the sense of frustration that is conveyed.

4.1.3. Identity as a user/learner of other languages

As a language learner, Maria's ambition is also marked by her willingness to keep learning new languages including Swedish, French and Karelian. She says that currently she is able to speak Russian, English and Finnish, and to understand Slavic languages such as Ukrainian and Polish. She plans on learning Karelian, which is her husband's first language, and will be the first language of their future children, according to her.

Maria had some courses in English during her studies, and she had attained a proficiency in English before coming to Finland. She thinks very many people in Finland speak English, which made surviving easier. She says that her skills in English were very useful at the beginning of her stay in Finland:

- (21) Well, to doctors I speak English (laughing). By all means, it is important for me to understand what is happening at the doctor's, that is why I speak English to the doctor, but it happens quite rarely anyway.

In this excerpt, Maria details how she chooses to place higher importance to maintaining her health and understanding healthcare personnel's language precisely than for using Finnish whenever an opportunity presents itself, and thus codeswitches into English when discussing her health. Elsewhere in the interview, Maria has already established a representation of herself as a strong English speaker, so here she merely evokes an image of her discussing her health fluently in English at a doctor's office in a level 2 positioning move (Bamberg 1997). Other interviewees, too, recount their visits to the doctor's office in their interviews, which warrants comparison between their experiences (see p. 68, 90).

Maria says she has proficiency in a variety of languages, which makes it possible for her to choose which language to use in certain contexts. These languages are concrete resources that she carries with herself wherever she goes. Speaking three different languages during a day in different contexts is certainly not common, and it gives her an unusual amount of maneuvering room in which to use her linguistic strategies. In addition to the various language skills she says she possesses, she also describes how she is willing to learn new languages, upholding a presentation of herself as an eager and motivated language learner.

4.1.4. Identity as an immigrant

One of the questions in the interview investigated how the move to Finland has changed Maria's identity. Her response to the question is thoughtful, she dwells in length on the change of perspective that the move has brought with it. I have picked only some parts of the reply here for analysis:

- (22) Yes, some impact (laughing). I've never thought that I * belong to the Russian culture, and then I realized that after all our Russian culture is *rich, it * is special, and I wanted to teach Russian culture, because in my opinion it is being taught in the *wrong way, they do not *make it understandable, and they do not *show all its delights. Because mostly in Finnish mass media one can hear words of criticism towards Russia, and I think Finns, when I was doing my research, have a *totally biased vision of Russia and Russians.

Maria reports that the change of perspective that she underwent during her immigration made her realize that the culture she left behind has had a lasting imprint on her and that it is "rich". She goes on to state that she would like to teach Russian culture to Finns, as "they" are teaching it the wrong way. In this instance, she positions herself in relation to Finns who are teaching about Russia, and claims expertise over the topic based on her own ethnic background and education. This happens concretely through her reference to "our Russian culture" as opposed to "they" who teach Russian culture in Finland. Later on in the response she refers to "our Russian returnees, which further reinforces the dichotomy between "us" and "them", Russians and Finns. Furthermore, she claims credibility by referring to "her research", indicating that she has based her views on impartial scientific information and thus utilizing an epistemic positioning move. These are positioning maneuvers on Bamberg's level 1, positioning between characters in the story world, Russians and Finns (see Bamberg 1997).

Maria proceeds to analyze her own identity explicitly:

- (23) That, and I realized that I am * - Russian. Although in Russia I have not thought about it, *ever. When I was in Russia I was always interested in everything that was happening in the *West, and now I am still interested. Also, I realized that I was thus at all, I have the *European mentality, I do not limit myself to Russia only or just * Finland, * I am open to everything, I do wonder, all that is happening in the world (3). And so I am kind of, I have *just grown up, a lot of things [in me] got *overlapped, I grew up, I realized that I was independent.

Many aspects of this reply are very interesting. Firstly, it took Maria's immigration to actually make her realize she is Russian. This is an instance of a multiplicity of temporal selves in Deppermann and Lucius-Hoene's words (2000: 212), and instance where the narrator is looking into the past and comparing and evaluating what she thought then with what she knows now.

It is characteristic of Maria's interview, and in fact of the other interviews chosen as data for my thesis as well, that she shifts positions between a narrator and describer of past events to a speculator of current events and her own position. It is a common feature in my data that the narrating self comments on actions of the narrated self and evaluates them, creating interaction between temporal selves (Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann 2000: 212). Thus, in the interview transcript, the focus is continuously moving on an axis from self in narrative and current narrating self and back.

Interestingly, Maria thinks of her pre-emigration identity as a "Western", "European" mentality. It seems that this part of her identity did not disappear, but a new identity layer was added when she realized she is indeed Russian after her immigration. She goes on to state that she "does not limit herself to Russia or only just * Finland, she is open to everything". She describes this experience as "growing up" and "things getting overlapped". It is striking how clearly she describes the experience of coming to grips with multiple and/or hybrid identities (see Ch. 2.4.1.) that she has overlapped within herself. This utterance is also marked by a three-second pause, which could be a minor presentational crisis in Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann's terms (2000: 218), indicating brand new words and theorizations which she has not uttered before.

Her newly found cosmopolitan and international identity construction is further reinforced by another reply much later in the course of the interview:

- (24) I do not separate, there is no such * thing: and *Finns and *Russians! No! Finns are not different from Russians, the same people as well as * Americans or like the French. The same values: family, children, love, self-realization. But this is

all some kind of inter-ethnic problems, they are still cultivated by media and *politicians. Because I researched it, I know what is what.

Here Maria dismantles the idea of nationality as the basis for people's identities. By removing nationality from the basis of identity construction, we all remain the same, in her eyes, with the same values that guide a good life. She places the blame for upholding these kinds of constructions, which feed into the problems of immigrants not having rights, prejudice and discrimination, with media and politicians. By discussing these conceptual issues, she creates an image of herself as a thoughtful and insightful individual, who is also aware of the state of things and the disseminators of harmful beliefs. Again, she refers to having researched it, drawing on her university studies, claiming knowledge over the issue and positioning herself on Bamberg's level 2 (1997) as a knowledgeable individual, claiming a higher epistemic position.

It can also be argued that in the previous excerpt Maria positions herself in relation to a larger discourse about national identities by stating that "I do not separate, there is no such * thing; and *Finns and *Russians". Thus, she is simultaneously making a level 3 (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008) positioning move in relation to a discourse about nationalities, and about what it means to be a Finn or a Russian. Furthermore, she seems to be aware of the fact that she is contesting a dominant discourse, evidenced by her statement that "they are still cultivated by media and *politicians". By these positioning maneuvers she portrays herself as someone who is willing to challenge the prevailing order of discourse, an activist who sees something wrong in the world and takes action in order to set things right. The previous excerpt was from a passage where Maria was given the opportunity to add anything she wanted at the end of the interview. The fact that moving beyond discrimination and separation between ethnicities are things that she brings up on her own accord testify how close these issues truly are to her heart.

When the interviewer asks Maria whether she thinks it is easy for immigrants in Finland to preserve their language and culture, she replies as follows:

- (25) If a person *wants to keep it, one *will do it. If, for example, parents do not give the Russian language to a child completely they say the child does not need it, so it looks like they do *not want to support this culture, so it would be a part of their child's culture. And I do *not understand, for example, why these families send their children, I have never asked, maybe they have to, to *mother tongue lessons, their native language classes, and the children do not speak Russian at all. You either *maintain your Russian culture, or you *don't.

She does not handle this response as relating to herself directly, as she picks Russian as the exemplifying language instead of Karelian, which, according to her own words, will be the first language of her children. In her perception, then, it is easy to maintain one's own culture and language. She continues:

- (26) It is not difficult to keep it because there are very many Russian-speaking immigrants, there is always something organized, true, I am not affiliated with *these organizations because I do not feel any need. Right, and if I have, for example, no such *problem, I speak Russian at home, so they, probably have difficulties, with , so called *nostalgia, missing *Russia and something else, I feel nothing of it. That is why, I think, there are opportunities to preserve [national cultures], opportunities to join these excellent *courses or *organizations, the other question: if the person wants to do it or not. (3).

Maria reports that she is not affiliated with a Russian-speaking organization, as she does not consider she needs it. She refers to people affiliated with such organizations as "they" in this passage, distancing herself from them through positioning. While these people "have difficulties with nostalgia", she "feels nothing of it". In the previous two quoted passages, an increasing disconnect to Russian immigrants is communicated. The identity that emerges is a person's who does not hold sentiments related to national cultures or cultural heritage in a very high regard. This fits in well with the cosmopolitan identity construction discussed above.

Maria reports that in the beginning of her stay in Finland she encountered more prejudice from Finns, and that the visibility of such attitudes in her daily life has decreased since then. She describes the times she has been conscious of Finns' prejudices:

- (27) at first, when I used to visit my future husband, I could not understand why they stared at us, when we spoke Russian. He said: 'do not pay attention'. And there were incidents when we were standing in line to the checkout counter and some people would *walk away, but now I do not see it anymore,. And now there are very many Russian *tourists and it seems that it is no longer an issue. *It happens that some *older women look back at us, this I do not understand. Maybe they remember something, there.

The interviewer then asks Maria what she means by this "remembering", to which she replies with a long comment where she explains that "they still *cultivate the image of the Winter War very much, I do not understand why this is * necessary". In her opinion, this strategy generates ethnic friction between Russians and Finns. She speculates that the war is important to Finns as it shaped "their ethnicity":

- (28) But I think that the world has changed - now it is the time of globalization, yet contemporary, the Cold War ended, the Second World War ended, and people are different now, and one has to forget things. *One cannot build on this policy, one *cannot build their own national interests and national ideas on that.

In these passages Maria uses a level 3 positioning maneuver (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008) to relate to a dominant discourse that circulates in Finland about the Winter War as a national symbol. The position that she adopts in relation this discourse is resistance, and she wishes that such romanticization of the war would cease altogether, as it has adverse effects when it comes to relationships between immigrants from Russia and Finns.

It is worth returning to the continuation of Maria's response to the question about the change in her identity that happened after emigration, which is interesting for two different reasons related to the relationship between Russians and Finns. In this instance, Maria begins to make opaque the attitudes she has about other Russian immigrants:

- (29) Because mostly, in Finnish mass media one can hear words of criticism toward Russia, and I think Finns, when I was doing my research, have a *totally biased

vision of Russia and Russians. In addition, our Russian returnees do not characterize the *entire Russian people in the good light *either, when they do not want to work.

Here, Maria identifies two problems that could be the root cause of the faulty representation of Russia and Russians in Finland. Firstly, she refers to biases that Finns have, and secondly, she refers to non-ideal immigrants (See Ch. 2.6) who have moved from Russia to Finland who “do not want to work”. The positioning moves happening here are between her, an (allegedly) ideal immigrant, Finns and non-ideal immigrants on Bamberg’s level 1 (1997). She at least partially places the blame for the criticism that Finns’ biases with Russian returnees, a group of immigrants who she does not identify with.

Furthermore, Maria claims credibility by saying “when I was doing my research”, which establishes her as a voice of authority on the issue of Finns’ biases based on her university studies in Russia. In a maneuver of resistance against a larger order of discourse, through this epistemic positioning she states her willingness to change the dominant representation of Russia and Russians that she has encountered in Finland.

Even though, unlike the Anastasia and Lena, Maria was not explicitly asked whether she feels like a member of the Finnish society, she approaches the topic on her own accord. While responding to the researcher’s question about whether she feels like the Finnish society is multicultural, she says the following:

- (30) Here and now Finns, I think, they are becoming more open to immigrants, to refugees. The immigration policies are changing. That is, there is more and more talking about rights of immigrants. And *immigrants are being told about it, you have rights and you have to fight for them. Even if you do not succeed, you have a lot of problems, it is necessary to go through because you are a full member of society.

In addition to proclaiming hope for the future and describing how Finland is becoming more multicultural as time goes on, almost as a side note Maria adds that immigrants are being told that they are full members of society, just like everyone

else who lives in Finland. Here, she contests official definitions of integration and citizenship, and argues that everyone who resides in Finland has to fight for their rights in order for the immigration policies to change for the better. In this sense, she reinforces her activist identity and positioning herself in relation to the discourse about membership of society and citizenship on Bamberg's level 3 (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008).

In this instance I will reiterate the two conceptual categories that emerge from the data, related to the way the participants position themselves in relation to discourse about immigrants "who do not want to work" and live on welfare (see Ch. 2.6.). These identity categories are labeled as "ideal immigrants" and "non-ideal immigrants". When participants perform identity maneuvers related to these categories, they are at the same time level 3 positioning maneuvers (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008) which take place in relation to the discourse outlined in Chapter 2.6.

In her identity work, Maria places herself in a completely separate category from returnees who have immigrated to Finland from Russia. She says that these returnees have the right to receive permanent residence and do, according to her, receive support from the Finnish government. Even though her husband is originally from Karelia and could be categorized as a returnee, in her narrative she consciously separates him from other immigrants from that area. In this passage, she discusses her access to services of the employment office:

- (31) I did not know that one could, because I'm not a wife of a citizen of *Finland, I am not a *returnee's wife, I am * not a returnee. Well, we are Russian citizens, so I do not know what was allowed for me //

She has the following to say on her husband's ethnic and legal status:

- (32) He is *Karelian but he did not move to Finland as a returnee, he said he considered it to be *unfair when one comes and gets *money for nothing, lives in an apartment paid by the state, though all his relatives moved [here], he did not follow. He said he would earn it all himself, and he came here on a working visa.

When asked about her move to Finland's impact on her identity, she says the following:

- (33) I can cope with all the problems that, for example, the * problems there were, the problem, such as ones of immigrant workers are very different from the problems of repatriates. Repatriates have * no problems, to be honest. Everything is paid for them, but immigrant workers need to make their *lives normal with a small salary.

She also discusses, at length, the way she perceives the inequality between immigrant workers and other immigrant groups:

- (34) I do not understand those people that have been here for ten years and for ten years they attend Suomi One and Suomi Two.
- (35) People can be expelled out of the country if one cannot find a job in the next for three months to find a job and to find a job is *very difficult. Therefore, in such cases, people experience a catastrophe, their whole life is here, they have here their children going to school. Their children are already Finnish and they have to drop everything and go back. That, I think, is a mistake. And the repatriates and the spouses of Finns are doing well.

These are examples of level 1 positioning within her narrative (Bamberg 1997), where she draws a clear distinction between herself and this group that she does not identify with and has reservations towards. These passages also evoke Rampton's (1995) concepts of expertise and allegiance. As a native speaker of Russian, Maria shares expertise in Russian with other immigrants from Russia, but is unwilling to claim allegiance with speakers of the language in Finland. She tries to distance herself from the meanings and identities that being a returnee immigrant in Finland carries with it.

Throughout the interview, Maria associates qualities such as being hardworking and ambitious with herself, which can be seen as a resistance maneuver towards discourse about immigrants as unemployed and lacking proficiency in Finnish (see Ch 2.6.). It is an example of a positioning move on Bamberg's level 3 in relation to this discourse (Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008). However, she does not actively

deny the existence and truthfulness of the stereotyping discourse, as she uses similar strategies while talking about other immigrants.

Maria presents a concern with the rights of immigrant workers, a category which she herself identifies with, and which is opposed to repatriate immigrants. She says, referring to the position of immigrant workers in society:

- (36) This is the problem, and you have to fight for your rights, which no one wants to defend. And besides this, like, well, I just grew up and everything. I am an *adult, I have*become a woman (3), so perhaps this is now, probably, more like that.

This passage is from a reply to a question about the move to Finland's effect on her identity. So in addition to the Western and cosmopolitan identity constructions mentioned above, while giving an overview of her identity construction Maria quickly skims over identity categories which include a membership of an oppressed minority, immigrant workers, adulthood and womanhood. These are all explicit identity categorizations that Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2000: 217) referred to in their listing of positioning activities.

Her concern for the rights of immigrants is even more evident in a passage where she describes discrimination that she encountered:

- (37) That is, immigrants have one problem, those without permanent residence permit, if something happens, they go back home. If they lose their jobs they go back home. That is why, (sighing) voicing your demands and saying 'I have *rights' will not work, there will be no *grounds for it. That is, when you have the permanent residence permit, then you can say: 'Well, you know, I have rights too.' Until that, then yes. That is, your life begins, when you have the permanent residence permit, and before you are just earning this.

There characters in this excerpt of narrative include immigrants, "they", and "I", the narrated self. In "I have rights too", the narrator positions themselves, the immigrant, with another group that presumably already has rights. Maria thinks that you have to somehow "earn" your permanent residence permit, and that until you get it you will not have rights, as you will have no grounds for your claims. In

her perspective, then, the handing out of permanent residence permit happens based on merit in Finland. The decision-making body, however, is not referenced and only the object of action, residence permit, is mentioned. Again, through voicing her concerns she strengthens an image of herself as someone concerned with the rights of immigrants, an activist hoping to make the world better.

Thus, I present an overview of Maria's identity as a language user, language learner and an immigrant. As a learner of Finnish, Maria's narration of the beginning of her time in Finland gave only limited agency to her narrated self. However, she attributes more agency to her narrated self when describing later events, demonstrating a more confident attitude towards language learning. As soon as Maria has reached the stage in her narrative where she describes the small victories she reached in her language learning journey, an image of her as a motivated, confident, ambitious, resourceful and quick-witted language learner starts to emerge. She demonstrates good knowledge of her own language skills and puzzles over the fact that she was denied a study placement at a University of Applied Sciences. There is a clear development narrative embedded in her account of her language learning, which shows her continuously improving her skills as time goes on.

As a user of Finnish and a professional, Maria is not entirely happy with her language skills at the time of the interview, and is shown as someone who is still eager to improve and learn more. Unfortunately, she is frustrated with her own unemployment, which feeds into her opinion that her Finnish skills are "poor". Maria despairs over the fact that searching for work seems to be entirely dependent on luck, and she is positioned as a confused and powerless individual in the face of these odds. When considering the future during the interview, she has a hard time seeing a way forward which she could pursue.

As an immigrant, Maria separates herself from Finns through the use of pronouns, she discusses "them" in many cases, referring to Finns, and in a couple of instances refers to "our Russian culture". Maria articulates the experience of forming a hybrid, overlapped identity explicitly, and speculates that she has only recently found the

richness of the Russian culture and realized that she is “in fact Russian”. She also professes to a European, Western identity construction and argues against national culture as the foundation of personal identities.

Maria also establishes an activist identity construction in her narrative, criticizing media and politicians for cultivating imagery that leads to the renewal of stereotypes and prejudices against Russians. She shows concern for the rights of migrant workers, reinforcing the identity construction of a person who is willing to voice their concerns and to fight for what is right.

Maria separates herself and her husband strictly from returnee immigrants from Russia through positioning maneuvers embedded within her narrative. She contests the economic threat discourse of immigrant critics (see Ch. 2.6.) through identity claims in her narrative, but falls back on a similar prejudiced representation when it comes to returnee immigrants from Russia.

4.2. Lena

Lena’s interview has two characteristics that separate it from the other two analyzed in this study. Firstly, her native tongue is not Russian, although the interview was conducted in Russian. Secondly, she spends less time narrating events and looking back on her life as an immigrant and more time speculating the state of the Finnish society as it currently is and its future developments. This is reflected to an extent in the fact that Bamberg’s (1997) level one positioning is more scarce in her interview when compared with Maria’s and Anastasia’s interviews.

4.2.1. Identity as a learner of Finnish

At the time of the interview, Lena studied primary education at a University of Applied Sciences. The medium of instruction at the UAS was Finnish, which attests to her level of proficiency in the language. She characterizes her experience of studying in Finnish at the UAS as “like a long language course” and that it makes her happy that during her studies, she had the opportunity to be immersed in a Finnish-speaking environment.

She says that the feeling of Finnish being more difficult to learn than other languages has been dispelled for her long ago. Jokingly, she adds that perhaps this is due to the fact that Slavic languages, which she has grown up with, are so complicated. This is an instance where her higher education as a Polish philology major shows through by enabling her to make informed comparisons between languages and the perceived difficulties associated with language learning.

In her interview, Lena tells the story of how she came to take part in the language courses offered by the Finnish government. As was the case with Maria, she too had to overcome some administrative hurdles in order to secure the right to participate in language training. This shows the amount of agency and capability that she attributes to her past self in her narrative. The difficulties were caused by a company she had established in Poland, which she had to close down in order to get unemployed status in Finland and to get access to language training.

When asked whether the language courses she attended were a part of her integration training, Lena's reply begins as follows:

- (38) Yes, that is, --- it seems that in most cases it works the way that a person, who comes to Finland, and for whom the integration plan is designed, begins with language learning. In my case, it was a bit unusual because I still had a *company in Poland, I had to close it down to get an unemployed status, and then got registered at TE-toimisto, and that is why it took a bit longer.

She uses a distancing maneuver here, referring generally to "a person, who comes to Finland" instead of "an immigrant" or herself. Her explanation of what happens "in most cases" is used to create a direct contrast with her own situation, which she explains in the following sentence. In Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann's (2000) terminology, she uses this contrast structure as a positioning maneuver to separate herself from other immigrants. Simultaneously it is a level 1 positioning maneuver between her narrated self and other characters in the narrative in Bamberg's terms (1997).

Lena recounts how she was told that the authorities had no place for her in integration training language courses as she could already understand some Finnish after having lived in Finland for half a year and would not need to start from the basics. She uses the phrases “I was told that they had no place for me” and “I had to wait”, which give the narrated character a limited amount of agency in this context. The “I was told” passage positions her as a recipient of orders who has no option but to obey. The narrator does not represent her own reply in this conversation, which makes it seem like she was a passive recipient of the message. “I had to”-structure in the following sentence further reinforces Lena’s position as someone who has no real choice in what to do in the situation. Lena’s way of narrating the events early in her life in Finland using passive constructions echoes Maria’s (see p. 39) manner of narration of the beginning of her life in Finland.

Even though the interviewer’s question in this passage is rather neutral, asking Lena to tell about her language courses and whether they were a part of her integration training, Lena seems compelled to explain why it took her so long to attend Finnish language courses. This is a positioning move on Bamberg’s level 2 (1997), the narrator positioning herself and her temporal selves in relation to the audience. Even though the real present audience in this instance was most likely just the interviewer, a member of the academic community, possibly representing the whole educational institution, it is possible that Lena directs her words also at hidden addressees, whoever might be reading or analyzing her interview afterwards, and modifies her projected identity accordingly.

When Lena has progressed in the narrative past the point detailing the beginning of her language training, the use of verbs in her narrative shifts away from the passive voice and in a direction that attributes more agency to the narrated self. Now she, as the narrator, “waited”, “attended”, “had”, “wanted to go”, “was accepted” and “studied” etc., which shows a clear contrast with the verbs earlier in the same passage: “it turned out”, “I needed to”, “it was”, “there was”, “I was offered”, “there was”, “I was told”, “they had no place”, “I had to wait”, “would start” and “it happened”. The shift is well exemplified when, after some utterances that

undermined the agency of the narrated self, she goes on to explain the first successes she had in studying Finnish:

- (39) And then I started this course // that is, I wanted to go to “Finnish 1” because I was afraid that it would be difficult to start at some higher level, and I was accepted at *aikuisopinto here, in [location]. I studied in this course for a week, after which, after some test, the teacher said that, well, actually, unless, of course, I want to stick with this group, she could not object to that, but she suggested I should (chuckling) go to “Suomi 2”.

Here, Lena is no longer shown as a passive observer or the recipient of orders, but rather as an individual with aspirations, skills and knowledge, and control over her language-learning path. She “started the course”, she “wanted to go” she “was afraid” and she “was accepted”. Her own decision is also brought to the fore, influencing how she would proceed further quicker in her studies, evidenced by the passage “unless, of course, I want to stick with the group”. She also includes in her narration the voice of authority in the shape of her teacher, who is portrayed as a gatekeeper, and whose approval is foregrounded as the needed permission for her to proceed faster in her language studies. On Bamberg’s level 1 (1997) her narrated self is positioned in relation to this teacher character, whose favor she has managed to earn based on her merits.

In addition to positioning Lena in relation to the teacher, the previous passage also positions her in relation to the rest of the students in her class and shows that her Finnish skills were already that much better than theirs that she was permitted to jump onto the next, more advanced class. This is an example of Bamberg’s level 1 positioning (Bamberg 1997), positioning between characters in the narrative. Even though other students in her class are not explicitly mentioned, her own proficiency in the language is contrasted with the expected level of proficiency immigrants have while studying the very first introductory course in Finnish. The passage establishes an image of Lena as a student capable of performing at a high level and presents the first real triumph in her narrative about her language training, gaining access to a language course. The length of her study on that course, one week, is sharply

contrasted with the length of the period, over a year, she had to wait for access to a course.

Lena moves on to analyze the courses she took part in, explaining her opinion of the teaching methods, curriculum, and definition of the target group. She praises the fact that the students were able to use the language for a few hours every day they studied. She liked the fact that they did not need to memorize anything during the courses, and that the methods were “rational” in her own words. She states that, in her opinion, the program of the courses was quite reasonable, but they were “absolutely not for everyone”, “designed more for people, --- who have a desire to deepen their knowledge but they are not conversational”. Such remarks also showcase her educational background as a linguistics expert and claim power for her to speak as a voice of authority on the issues of language learning and course design. The excerpt also already gives an inkling of her position towards her fellow students, but it becomes even clearer in the following passage.

(40) I've always wondered why we had a group of people who were having a hard time learning anything at all, but they were actually planning to become, for example, drivers (laughing), and so on. I realize, of course, that the problem is related to the number of places and a limited --- diversification of these courses. Of course, it is impossible to provide everyone with what *one needs.

In this passage, Lena positions herself apart from the group of students who had difficulties with learning. This positioning is a clear example of Bamberg’s level 1 (1997) positioning that happens between characters in narrative. She almost seems amused by the fact that such individuals would take part in language courses. However, she quickly moves on to a more analytical perspective and comments that having learners of such different levels on language courses is an issue of limited differentiation in teaching and lack of resources. This more impartial, analytic perspective that she adopts is showcased in the verb “realize”, which points finding out the factual state of the things, and the two instances where she repeats the phrase “of course”.

By positioning herself in relation to a group of poorly performing students and finding their lack of learning results amusing, Lena draws a clear distinction between herself and them. By offering an analytical explanation of their difficulties through an epistemic positioning move she furthermore assumes a position of power over them while adapting a voice of authority on the issue. The immediate effect of this positioning move seems to be to reinforce her expertise in the field of language learning and further cement her representation of herself as a well performing student.

This claim to expertise in the field of language learning is explicitly communicated in the following sentence, which she begins with “I am looking at it from the linguistic point of view, like someone who has worked a lot with groups.” This is an instance of direct epistemic positioning from the narrator to the audience, invoking Bamberg’s level 2 (1997). In her opinion, the courses are well designed, if students are more or less at the same level it does not matter that the group size is large, “when we already know how to communicate, we talk to each other, then it gets really interesting”. Thus, it can be said that she uses her background in linguistics to claim expertise over language pedagogy, and while doing so reinforces the image of herself as a well-performing and capable student of Finnish.

4.2.2. Identity as a user of Finnish

Lena states, jokingly, that she is “slightly dependent on news” echoing Anastasia’s sentiment (see p. 84). The fact that both of them willingly and independently consume media in Finnish is an indication of the level of language proficiency they have reached and the motivation that has led them to this point. Willingness to consume media can also be seen as willingness to keep up to date what is happening in the Finnish society and willingness to participate, both qualities that can be associated with a discourse about ideal immigrants (see Ch. 2.6.).

Lena uses a highly technical language to respond to the question “to what extent do you now know the Finnish language?” It seems unlikely that an immigrant without a background of university studies, linguistics in particular, would respond to the question by saying “in April, was at B2.2 level, but I think it is a little higher now but

it is difficult to estimate”, referencing the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. This highlights her awareness of her own language skills and their limitations. This is a good example of Bamberg’s level 2 positioning (Bamberg 1997), where the narrator directly positions themselves in relation to the audience. In this case the positioning is a continuation of her expertise in language issues, which was established previously when Lena was discussing her background and Finnish studies. Furthermore, Lena offers no explanation as to what “B2.2” means, assuming that the audience; interviewer and members of the higher education institution; knows already.

Lena states that her language skills are “sufficient for an independent life in any area”, continuing that at the doctor’s office and at the UAS there are no lapses in communication, that she understands them and they understand her. Later in the interview, though, when she is asked whether her knowledge of the Finnish language is enough for studying, she replies that she just started, and “it is enough, one just needs to work [hard], that is, I understand I need to spend more time than my colleagues.” This utterance is preceded by a long 3-second pause. Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2000: 218) discuss presentational crises in narration, instances when increased effort to explain and argue, contradictions and incoherencies turn up in the narrative accounts. This pause could signal such a presentational crisis. Consequently, she began the interview representing her established identity as a proficient and capable language user, but something happened during the interview that lead her into a presentational crisis during which she had to reassess her positioning strategy and the identity she was projecting.

Even though in the previous instance Lena reported that her language skills are sufficient for “no problem with communication” if she goes to the doctor’s office, later she says the following:

- (41) The same was about doctors. Here, for example, you know, there is a system that refugees get an interpreter every time they need to do something in the city, that is, to go to a doctor or to some public office. I did not have such an opportunity, and when I started going to doctors,

even to the dentists, --- I do *not have any serious problems with my health but I did some tests. It turned out they do not speak English very well and I had to speak Finnish and there was no other --- way out.

In this instance she is discussing the practicalities related to moving to Finland that the beginning of her and her husband's stay in Finland. This is an instance where multiplicity of temporal selves (Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann 2000: 212) is evident, and exemplifies an instance where Lena, during her narration, is evaluating her past experiences in the light of her current telling situation. When combined with the previous reference to language use at the doctor's office (no problem), a comparison between current narrating self emerges and past self in narrative, which creates a contrast and shows that while at the beginning of her stay in Finland she hoped for the assistance of an interpreter, she no longer requires it and is capable of visiting the doctor's office and interacting in Finnish throughout the visit.

So far, we have established that Lena feels her language skills are enough for daily life in Finland. However, she feels the need to turn to external authorities to validate her level of language skills in the context of her studies:

- (42) there was a language *test for foreigners, and as long as I managed it well enough for them to accept, although the competition was tense, so that means that *they decided that it was enough. And I think it is enough because I understand --- what is happening, I understand what they want from me, and what information I get and somehow digest. The only thing is it could turn out that there will be a heavy workload if // there will be a lot of *independent studies

While not strictly contradictory to what Lena said earlier interview, it is not difficult to notice the increased amount of uncertainty in her statements, "I managed it well enough" and "I think it is enough" as the most prominent examples. Despite increased uncertainty, she still seems optimistic that her language skills are good enough and that if she works hard, she is able to study in Finnish. The fact that instead of continuing to confidently claim that her skills in Finnish are "sufficient for an independent life in any area" she instead relies on external validation by saying

“that means that *they decided that it was enough” is a symptom of this increased uncertainty. “Them” in this case refers to the people who evaluated her entrance examination to the UAS studies.

When discussing her language use in the context of UAS studies, Lena presents the following very interesting utterance:

- (43) (3) Of course, --- maybe, one may think ---that if my knowledge was better I could have done *better --- in obtaining --- knowledge, and make a better *use of it but I think it will get better. That is, the first year, it may be more complicated but it seems that I learn something every day, even I do not notice that, and this is not in the way of new words, which I could count that like today // It seems that --- this is a little bit, like a long language course, and this makes me happy, I was afraid that what if I go to work to some place like a university, for example, where there will be a lot of foreigners, so that it will be like I will not use Finnish that often. And not that I will *forget, I will *not forget, but there will be some line that would be difficult for me // to cross. That is why, it seems that it is a good option for me so I could (3) --- *strengthen my knowledge. I seems that it is not that strong (chuckling), so if I left the country for two or three months and stopped using Finnish so it is likely that it would do a lot of damage (chuckling) because of it //

It is quite clear that this passage has an increased number of pauses and presentational crises when compared to rest of Lena’s replies during the interview. It almost seems that Lena is admitting, reluctantly, that her language skills could limit her success during her UAS studies. She then steers the conversation to another topic, saying that studying in Finnish helps her retain the language skills she has in Finnish and to develop, if compared to a situation where she would be in an environment where the lingua franca is not Finnish.

Lena uses similar pauses when she has to reply to the interviewer’s question of what skills in Finnish she has developed best. She begins her reply by sighing, holding a six-second pause, saying “This is, perhaps, hard to say” followed by a three-second

pause. The fact that the interviewer does not offer any specific cues for her (e.g. reading comprehension, writing comprehension) testifies to their shared understanding that the interview situation has two educated linguists talking to one another.

This presentational crisis, in which Lena has to pause to consider her next move is not necessarily a presentational crisis relating to her identity, but rather a sign that she was not expecting this question or that she had not considered this issue before. When she finally does reply, her reply is long and well-formulated:

- (44) I have a feeling that I write better than I speak, because there I make fewer mistakes and more things come to mind, and I can remember more. But, on the other hand, it is a very slow process, that is, I write slowly (laughing) and I read very slowly. But I speak fast (laughing) and I understand when people talk fast

In this excerpt, Lena separates two aspects of language skills in addition to breaking her skills down into four dimensions. The aspects she uses are the level of proficiency and speed, while discussing the four essential language skills: speaking, comprehension of spoken language, writing and reading. She says she “writes better than she speaks” but “writes slowly” and “speaks fast”. The same distinction applies to reading and listening comprehension as well as she says she “reads very slowly” but “understands when people talk fast”. The fact that she is instinctively, without an explicit prompt from the interviewer, able to break down her knowledge of Finnish into four skills and evaluate each of the skills on two separate criteria shows how well aware she is of her own language skills and of the way language skills are evaluated.

She says that one of her main problems in learning Finnish is learning vocabulary, that she is too “lazy” to look up many words. In her account, this is partly due to the fact that she understands a lot based on the context of the words, and thus does not necessarily need to check the meanings of individual words. At a first glance, this laziness would seem at odds with the representation of herself she gives in the earlier in the interview which was identified as a motivated learner identity. It is to

be noted, though, that even though she acknowledges a problem with her language learning, Lena manages to maintain a representation of herself as a gifted, if occasionally lazy, language learner and user.

When discussing everyday language use and learning Lena considers herself “lazy”, which implies a lack of motivation to exert oneself in order to learn. When discussing language learning in the context of her studies, in contrast, she says that she is a little bit afraid but “will have the highest level of motivation”. It appears that the level of motivation and dedication she has depends on the context of language use. She is not as motivated to learn Finnish by checking words from a dictionary in the context of everyday interaction, but seems much more eager to do whatever she can to improve the learning of the kind of language skills she needs while studying at the UAS. She even acknowledges this by stating “just for the sake of curiosity and *necessity it never works somehow”.

Lena describes her coping mechanisms that relate to Finnish that emerged after living in Finland for two years by explaining how it is easy to find other words if they could not “explain something directly with one word”. As a result, she says that she could easily spend five or six hours speaking only Finnish with friends. She states that while interacting in Finnish, the amount of information which she is able to ingest “subconsciously” is not as large as with her mother tongue, for example. This “subconscious” reception of information by the brain happens “between the lines”. This is the level of language proficiency that she has not, in her own words, achieved yet. This in-depth theorization about how language works in relation to the brain shows Lena as a linguist with a keen interest in psycholinguistic processes, even though there have been many years since she has studied at a university.

The only problem with such intensive Finnish use, in her account, is the feeling of tiredness that she sometimes feels afterwards. She also reports problems with her memory, that she understands everything someone says but in a couple of days’ time does not remember anything, for example based on notes that she made during the interaction. She also refers to a friend who has lived in Finland for twelve years who reported similar problems, “not remembering things in Finnish”.

Besides using Finnish during her studies, Lena has also used the language during an internship period with a project dealing with the integration of immigrants. As people working from the project were from diverse backgrounds, the only practical option for working language was Finnish.

4.2.3. Identity as a user/learner of other languages

As with Maria and Anastasia, Lena's interview was conducted in Russian, although the two other participants were Russian nationals and she was not. This demonstrates the level of proficiency she has in Russian. Lena's language arsenal includes Polish (her native tongue), English, Russian, Belarussian and Finnish. She indicates that her skills in Belarussian might have decreased to a level where she might no longer be able to speak it fluently.

Lena's major during her studies in Poland was Polish philology, although she has not had the degree recognized in Finland. Many of the jobs she held in her life before immigration to Finland were related to languages in one way or another, for example by doing translations through a company that she established herself.

Lena says that she does not have many opportunities for using her mother tongue in her daily life, as she rarely meets Poles by themselves. When she meets with the local Poles she knows, usually their spouses are present, which restricts the use of the Polish language and leads them to converse either in Finnish or in English.

Lena's husband is Belarussian, and their primary home language is Russian. The fact that the interview was conducted in Russian speaks volumes about her capabilities with the language, although in her own assessment she "cannot type fast in Russian". According to her, her husband does know some Polish, but they "*always speak Russian nevertheless". She also states that she and her husband have friends whom they converse in Russian with. Her husband studies Finnish, but in Lena's words, "he has only got to the point when he can say 'en puhu suomea', so always when some guests come, they usually speak English, if they are English-speaking people".

As for English, Lena says that an English course is a part of the compulsory studies in her UAS degree, but that she will most likely “take it as an external exam because I know English, I do not think I need to attend it.” This shows just how much confidence she has in her English skills, once again claiming the identity of the confident student who knows languages. This is an explicit level 2 positioning move (Bamberg 1997). She also says that she has at least one friend with whom she speaks English and that time to time, her work language has been English.

4.2.4. Identity as an immigrant

When discussing her non-Finnish friends, Lena says that the people she knows are from different countries, one half being from Europe and the other half being non-European. She says she enjoys the variety of people she has met during language courses, their thoughts about Finland and ways of speaking about their own countries. She also states that such an opportunity to meet an extensive variety of people is very interesting for her, an opportunity to watch and learn.

Considering integration into society, Lena says “at least, *I got integrated quickly, I began to feel at home right away”. In her language use, thus, integration does not as much relate to the requirements that a society has for incoming immigrants but the mindset of the immigrant themselves. Also, in the light of her statement, she also perceives that in her case the process of integration was fast and has already been completed, and thus has already become a part of her identity.

Lena seems disappointed that many people on the language courses she attended used languages other than Finnish in their extracurricular communication. She says she did not herself want to disclose that she knew Russian and English in order not to be drawn into one of these groups. When recounting this experience she had, she portrays herself as someone who has the option of joining a group but chooses not to, keeping the decision-making power to herself. It is also clearly a level 1 positioning maneuver (Bamberg 1997) which takes her further from other immigrants in her class and maintains an image of someone on the outside, looking in. Later in her language learning career though, especially during internships, she

has had no gripes about using English and Russian where appropriate and necessary.

Lena reports that in the beginning, during the first six months of her stay in Finland, she “felt like a bystander”. This implies that she did not feel like an active nor a capable participant in social life in Finland. Later, though, she says that she “found her own place, her own people”. In her view, then, the amount of agency and capability that she experiences is largely influenced by the environment and people that she surrounds herself with.

While describing her language courses, Lena tells the story of an instance where she encountered prejudice in the classroom during one of the language courses, and laments the passivity of the teaching staff when it comes to intercultural encounters during the courses. She says:

- (45) there was one situation when one person of this type [with prejudices] was in our classroom, the second person --- just like from a completely different environment, too, he was an immigrant himself.

She adds, discussing the tensions that arise in multicultural groups during immigrant language training:

- (46) teachers do not do anything in this respect, that is, something you asked about human interaction between people of different ethnic groups, different cultures and countries.

It is to be noted that Lena does not in portray in any way what she did in this situation. She only foregrounds the teacher’s passivity in a situation where a conflict took place in the classroom. In a positioning move between characters in the story world (Bamberg 1997), she paints a picture where the teacher passively looks on while a conflict takes place between students. This passivity is mirrored by her own passivity as an observer, she does not in fact appear as a character at all in this scene of the narrative apart from the very beginning of the paragraph where she says “I saw...”

Lena hopes that the pedagogic material that is used in integration training would have room “for sharing ideas about modern society”, and that the texts that are included in the material would include a greater amount of texts focusing on immigration, immigrants and different cultures. It seems that she is advocating an approach where the integration training would incorporate perspectives into multiculturalism and cross-cultural encounters as well as language training. She says that she has witnessed instances when people have not been ready to socialize with people from other cultural backgrounds because they have thought the others have “no right to be here”. She states that these kinds of prejudices and worldviews need to be changed and modified, which reinforces her activist identity.

In the discussion that ensues afterwards, Lena is asked how she interacted with other people in integration training, she discusses people who are not ready to socialize with people from other cultures because the others have no right to be in Finland. Here, she mirrors the discussions about Finnish immigrant policy in the public eye, where the major questions are and have been how large the refugee quota is, and which countries will be eligible to be included in the quota. Essentially, the core question in the immigrant policy debate has been for years who does and who does not have the right to be in Finland. As such, even though she is discussing instances that take place between two individuals her utterances also position her in relation to this larger order of discourse in a level 3 positioning move (Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008).

She continues that the integration training is “designed for adults, it is quite natural that they do not deal with what is evident. That is, it is clear that modern society is as follows...”, indicating that the way people from different cultural backgrounds should interact in a modern society should be evident to anyone. Her remark also seems to indicate that she thinks that prejudice is a childish notion. As this immediately follows the passage where she presented the conflict between two immigrants in her classroom, the positioning move becomes clear, having prejudices and being racist that prevent you from talking to your fellow student are childish things, and that she is opposed to such attitudes. Again, this is an example of a level

1 positioning move (Bamberg 1997) that happens between characters in the story world, as she uses her judgement of another character's actions to claim power over them.

When asked whether she thinks Finland is multicultural, Lena says that it is "a different world" to Poland, where the immigrant demographic is much smaller than in Finland. She elucidates on the position of immigrants in Finnish society, stating that they are a part of daily life, but hardly participate in public life; administration and politics for example. She says:

(47) in this public discourse --- many of the participating voices are missing and if they are involved only in issues concerning immigration.

She goes on to suggest a possible solution to this problem: a quota system that would ensure that the percentage of immigrants in state employees and in the public sphere would be the same as the share of immigrants is in that locality's populace. This would mean that "there should be around - two percent of *positions reserved specifically for foreigners. And it's an interesting idea - theoretically" she says. She backs up her argument for such a model by saying that this would help develop Finland into a more multicultural society, and help provide immigrants with employment. She adds that for many foreigners their social life is directly related to their employment, that they only have two options: to either stay at home and do nothing or to go to work and get connected with people, talk and meet people. By showing concern for immigrants and their representation in government and public life, she once again reinforces her activist identity.

Lena states that she has felt in the past that she has a European identity, which has "diminished" since she moved to Finland. During her working life in Poland, she often travelled to Brussels and Vienna to meetings, and those places were very close, she could easily travel there. However, it was not only an issue of physical distance and convenience:

(48) *the place where I lived was not necessarily somewhere in Europe
*physically, but somehow in some way, I felt more associated with this

European context. My job was too --- // *very closely connected to the *European Union because I was working in a network of *Polish organizations but we were both a member of the European Union and of non-governmental organizations

This statement shows that Lena thinks that the social distance from Finland to the rest of the European Union is greater than from Poland. She goes on to state that the day when Poland joined the European Union was a day of celebration for her. One way that this increased social distance manifests itself, in her opinion, is that the European context does not receive much attention in mass media and that when foreign news is handled in the Finnish media, attention is “equally divided between what is happening in the world without any emphasis on Europe.” In this statement, she clearly implies that Europe and the European Union deserve their share of emphasis. She says that she still feels European after moving to Finland, although that part of her identity is somehow diminished and that from her current perspective in Finland she still “can see Europe on the horizon but it is very far away.”

She even inquired from her employers at the civil society organization during her internship why they did not include European aspect in the language courses they organized. She questioned why, if the people taking part on the courses were to be new Finns, they would not be informed that they were a “part of a different circle, a different community”, meaning a part of the European Union. However, in her own opinion, she never received satisfactory replies to her questions, stating that perhaps they were after all “too abstract”.

While Lena explicitly identifies and claims a European identity, all she says about Poland is:

- (49) there are no alternative plans, then I have no hardwired connections with Poland somehow because I have no family there, almost, and my friends also are scattered around the world, there is nothing really to tie me to it.

There is a clear difference in her attitude towards her country of origin when compared to Maria and Anastasia, who either recognized the richness of their culture after emigration, in the case of Maria, or respect the traditions that represent their origin country in their mind while remaining liberal, in the case of Anastasia. Besides this excerpt, Lena barely touches upon Polish culture and traditions, for example.

To reinforce her concern for immigrant representation in the public sphere, Lena says the following while pondering multiculturalism in the Finnish society:

- (50) multiculturalism is sometimes seen more in the fact that --- if you come out on Kauppakatu and Pepe and Ahmed play drums there or you can drop in into a Thai restaurant but it is not particularly applicable to --- for example, *working life participation, to elections turnout and so on.

Lena seems to think that multiculturalism in Finland has not yet reached the stage where immigrants and refugees can participate in the social and governmental spheres in full capacity, as full-fledged participants. She does, however, have hope for positive societal change, that when the generation that includes the children of the recent refugees and immigrants grows up, the matter will be “naturally resolved”.

In the previous passage, she introduces two hypothetical immigrant characters: Pepe and Ahmed, who engage in playing drums. The names she chooses for these characters are stereotypical, and by name alone the audience will have an idea of their home countries. It is notable that these characters are not explicitly referred to as “immigrants”, however through their naming and the context the narrator gives a strong implication in that direction. The fragment of narrative also draws on another stereotype, the fact that the activity Pepe and Ahmed are engaged in is playing drums on the street. This image draws on the preconception that immigrants are in a worse socioeconomic situation than the native population, and thus more likely to resort to busking for their livelihoods. These two stereotyping features, naming and drum-playing, are examples of Bamberg’s level 3 positioning in relation to discourse about immigrants (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008).

Lena's response to the interviewer's question regarding whether she considers herself a member of Finnish society is long, and in it she speculates her past, her current situation and ends with a speculation of what the essence of being a member of a society actually means. She says:

- (51) (6) I think *yes, although I have actually have a feeling that I'm a bit like *an observer so far (laughing) or a researcher. With this thought, by the way, I also went to college, I just wanted to see what it looks like, what it looks like when young people, when they work, how they work --- and what education they get because it is interesting for me.

Here Lena, who is older than the average Finnish UAS student, states that her main motivation for studying was not to prepare herself for a career or to accrue certain professional skills but to observe the process of others learning and working. In this passage she is explicitly positioned on Bamberg's level 1 (1997) in relation to these "young people", who are portrayed working and studying, while she is portrayed observing. Her passivity is reflected in the activity of the other students, and a strong contrast is created.

- (52) So it feels like I am going through a crash course, *getting to know the society, it is a bit like looking through a magnifying glass. But I think that *yes, I think that maybe without counting those first six months, when I did not know if we were going to stay here or leave, I did not actually want to learn Finnish, and I felt like a bystander, then later I somehow found myself here ---

In this passage, Lena shifts her narrative perspective to the past, assessing the beginning of her time in Finland. Here she refers to her narrated self explicitly as a "bystander" which evokes different kinds of connotations than the "observer" and "researcher" she referred to in the previous passage. Here, she is left out of the interaction because of the circumstances, not out of her free will. A researcher, especially, takes interest in what they are looking at and can purposefully remain as far removed from the events as possible. A bystander, on the other hand, cannot

help but look on. In this sense, although the same passivity and being outside looking in is reflected in both positions, being a bystander is not a matter of choice.

Again, Lena utilizes the multiplicity of temporal selves (Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann 2000: 212) to draw the distinction between these two states: in the beginning she was a bystander by necessity, but during the narrative now, she positions herself as a researcher and an observer by choice. She continues:

(53) Of course, one might wonder --- what --- if at all, that is how to * become a member of the community. That is, I think that, *yes, that is, I have a plan to become a *Finnish citizen, I want to take part in *elections here, and for me it is *important somehow, that is, it seems to me that this is a natural part of my life.

Prior to this passage, Lena reports that she has "somehow found myself here --- my own place, my own people, and I think that --- I --- here it is not worse than other places I have lived". She moves right on to speculate whether this "finding yourself, your own place and own people" actually is how to become a member of society. She does not explicitly refer to feeling at home in Finland, but the fact that she speaks of "finding her own place" and "this being a natural part of her life" communicates similar sentiments.

As evidenced by the previous excerpts, compared to the other two interviews (Maria and Anastasia), Lena spends less time narrating events, and dedicates a large part of her interview to speculating societal change in direct dialogue with the interviewer. She spends even more time speculating about her current situation and the state of the Finnish society than the other interviewees, which means that there are fewer passages of pure narration of events in her interview transcript.

To conclude with, an overview of Lena's identity as projected in this interview. As a language learner, the beginning of Lena's journey includes similar positioning maneuvers as Maria's (see p. 39), which cause a momentary lack of agency. When Lena moves forward in her narrative, her voice as the narrator grows more confident and her narrated self gains more agency. As a result, she portrays herself as an

educated, proficient, analytical student who is shown to perform better than other students in her class. Ultimately, in her narrative she is shown as an expert linguist who is capable of studying full-time in Finnish. When she is positioned in relation to other students, be it on integration language courses or at the University of Applied Sciences, she is shown apart from other students, which creates an image of her as a outsider.

As a language user, she begins the interview by portraying a Finnish user who has no problems in communicating in any context. However, as she moves on to discuss her language skills in the context of her UAS studies, some of this confidence is shed, and she grows slightly more uncertain in her own skills. One reason why this shift in positioning takes place is because new others, native Finns, enter the narrative as peers during her time in the UAS, and she is no longer able to position herself as more proficient and skilled when positioned in relation to them, as was her positioning tactic when she described her experiences during the integration language training.

Lena claims to be highly motivated when it comes to language use during her studies, but in the context of everyday language use she portrays herself as somewhat lazy, if proficient, language user. Throughout the interview she maintains the identity construction of an educated, analytical individual with expertise in linguistics.

Lena, like Maria (see p. 53) also explicitly admits to a European identity construction, which has somewhat diminished since she moved to Finland from Poland. Numerous times throughout her interview, she uses words such as bystander, observer and researcher to refer to her narrated self, and also positions her narrated self in a way that reinforces these kinds of representations. The agency attributed to the narrated self, however, increases throughout the course of the interview transcript as she moves from being a bystander to being a researcher or an observer out of her free will.

In Lena's own opinion, she has already completed the process of integration and has begun to feel right at home in Finland, having found her own place and her own

people. She, much like Maria (see p. 56), discusses prejudices, and the extent to which immigrants participate in the Finnish society, and is willing to argue for positive social change during her interview.

4.3. Anastasia

In Anastasia's interview, experiences of learning Finnish are fewer than in Maria and Lena's interviews, because the interview is mostly about her immigration experience and her life in Finland, and most of her language training took place before the immigration. A second reason why Anastasia's Finnish learning experiences are not foregrounded in her interview transcript is due to the fact that she is a student visa holder, she has no integration plan, and thus no integration training which would require her to assess her language skills and possibly participate in training.

4.3.1. Identity as a learner of Finnish

Even before immigrating to Finland, Anastasia had visited Finland several times and had some skills in Finnish, thanks to her studies. After graduating from a Russian university, she had worked as a teacher of Finnish language and country studies. She also had experience in teaching English. In terms of developing her language skills, she also has the added benefit of having a Finnish husband, when both Maria and Lena have partners that have been born outside Finland.

Anastasia describes how, if she has the basics of pronunciation of a language and the basics of grammar, she "would have no problems learning languages". This shows her aptitude for learning languages as well as establishes a representation of herself as a highly independent language learner that is able to keep learning without the help of a teacher or a tutor. This representation is further strengthened by what she says when asked about what languages she speaks:

- (54) And it seems to me, then, on the basis of what I have, I think, I would have no problems learning languages. That is, I learn Spanish myself, I do it sometimes at home by doing something, because I already know something about the *logic of the language and I know how it sounds, and, in principle, so I can read and translate something.

This quotation is preceded by a sentence in which Anastasia explains that what she means when she says she has sufficient “linguistic foundation” to study languages independently, which includes the basics of grammar and pronunciation of a language. She thus shows the ability to extrapolate from basics of the language, and presents an identity construction of a capable and independent language learner who is able to effectively use what she has learned previously to proceed further in her language studies.

Due to Anastasia’s status as a visiting student in Finland, she lacks access to an integration plan, and thus to the Finnish language studies that often accompany it. Later in the interview she laments this explicitly and presents the wish that visiting students’ rights would be taken more seriously (see Ch. 4.3.4.).

4.3.2. Identity as a user of Finnish

According to Anastasia’s own assessment, her Finnish proficiency is at the level of “good”. Something that she highlights repeatedly in her narrative is that she enjoys reading newspapers in Finnish and watching Finnish television. This shows that her language skills are at a level where she is capable of consuming media and understanding Finnish independently. In her interview, she describes her morning ritual that includes beginning the day with a careful reading of the newspaper.

When Anastasia discusses her Finnish skills and the contexts in which she uses Finnish, a sense of pride is quite clear:

- (55) I begin with a careful reading of the newspaper. That is, I like it, I am
*generally trying to learn what is happening in Finnish culture. And
sometimes I surprise my husband by knowing Finnish culture better
than him, even some names. I watch enough of Finnish TV, that is,
documentaries, movies, when I can.

This is a good example of a positioning move on Bamberg’s first level (1997), the level of positioning between characters in a narrative. By relating the narrated self’s knowledge of current affairs to the knowledge of her husband, who supposedly, as a Finn, is already an expert in the issues, and indicating that she knows more she is

portraying her narrated self as a surprisingly knowledgeable individual who is eager to keep up to date with what is happening in society. The expected reaction from the interviewer and other (hidden) audience is surprise.

A similar sentiment is communicated in the passage where Anastasia narrates the instance when she watched the Finnish Independence Day celebration on television together with her husband and his relatives. In this context, she was able to name more celebrities and politicians that visited the televised celebration than the Finns she was watching the celebration with. In this instance, she seems to receive the surprised reaction she was looking for from the interviewer, when after stating that “if Finns talk about some person, for example, or about something that is *important in Finnish society now, I can participate in this talk”.

(56) I: That is, you think you know what is happening in Finnish society?

A: Yes.

I: And people acknowledge that.

A: Yes, [continues to Independence Day celebration narrative]

Bamberg (1997) uses the second level of narrative positioning to describe the way the narrator positions themselves towards the audience. In this instance, the positioning move and identity claim by Anastasia is quite explicit, and is followed by a reinforcing move that falls back on level 1 interactional positioning in comparing the level of knowledge Anastasia had when it came to following the Independence Day celebration on television with the level of knowledge that Finns she watched the broadcast with had.

When the interviewer asks Anastasia what areas of Finnish social life she participates in, she replies with the following:

(57) cultural or academic areas of life? I am trying [to be active] in *all areas, that is, it seems to me that if I am here so that I must be *informed somehow in all aspects of life here.

It is interesting how she states that by residing in Finland she “must” be informed in all aspects of life. This leaves no room for arguments by the audience; she has no choice, in her own perspective. It seems to be a condition she has placed on herself, though, which speaks more of her own motivation to get to know Finland rather than of a requirement by an external authority. Later in the same reply she states:

(58) I do not distinguish between those for Russians or foreigners, or for Finns. If it is something interesting, we can always go, watch and listen.

In this passage, she is discussing cultural events, saying that she and her Finnish husband always “try” to participate in something. In her view, it does not matter whether the target audience of a cultural event is Finns or not, she is eager to attend. Her choice of verbs in saying that they “can always go, watch and listen” portrays her and her husband as passive observers in this instance. The pride over her Finnish skills mentioned earlier also relates to this remark, urging the audience to imagine Anastasia, an immigrant, sitting in the audience of a play or a lecture in Finnish, able to appreciate the content due to her proficiency in Finnish.

In the following passage, Anastasia responds to the interviewer’s question “What Finnish language skills have you developed most: speaking, writing, listening comprehension, reading comprehension?”:

(59) It seems to me that it is writing and comprehension. Although even ---- it surprised me, when I visited Finland for the first few times, it seemed to me that I did not understand anything what people were talking about, because, first of all, written and spoken languages are so different. Even if it is not *slang but just some ordinary speech, everyday communication. That is why I even included it into my final paper how the textbooks usually deal with this problem.

Here, Anastasia seems to be aware of two separate variants of Finnish when she says “written and spoken languages are so different.” To simplify the setting for the purpose of an argument, I will consider spoken and written Finnish two distinct language variants, although in reality the situation is much more nuanced and less

dichotomous. Hakulinen (2003) explores the differences between these variants, displaying how the differences between the language variants are morpho-syntactic, grammatical and relate to the level of contextual knowledge required from the recipient. Hakulinen (ibid.) also notes how features traditionally peculiar to written Finnish have been introduced to spoken language and vice versa throughout the development of the Finnish language. In this passage Anastasia says that she studies the “funnies” section of the newspaper carefully as it contains more “modern” language use, possibly referring to a linguistic variety that has a closer relation to the spoken variant of Finnish. The fact that she refers to her final paper, in which the differences between language variants was handled, is an epistemic positioning move on Bamberg’s level 2 (1997).

Anastasia showcases her awareness of her own language skills by providing a detailed response to the question investigating her speaking, writing, listening comprehension and reading comprehension skills. She says that she is happy with her skills when it comes to reading and writing, as she is capable of reading the newspaper every day and because she has practiced writing a lot at the university and already she is internalizing some sentence structures that come naturally. She enjoys writing because rather than with speech, she has time to think in advance of what she is going to say.

As for comprehension, Anastasia says that she understands 95 percent of spoken language if the speaker has no noticeable dialect or slang. As an example of something that she would not understand, she gives highly specific technical words, such as “a word for a tool or something”. Similarly, she is aware that poetry, novels and academic texts are still difficult for her, and that she has to take an increased amount of time in order to understand these text types. She says that speaking about such complicated topics “is probably her weakest point yet”.

In this overview of her language skills she shows a strong understanding of her own strengths and shortcomings, saying that she has made most progress with writing and comprehension. Her voice as the narrator remains strong and agentive throughout the reply, showcased by phrases such as “I have a good command of”, “I

cannot complain”, “I thoroughly studied”, “I read some novels” and “I noticed”. This strengthens the image of her as a confident language user and an accomplished language learner.

Interestingly, Anastasia says that she has noticed that

- (60) if *I have this stream of thoughts and I want to desperately *express them, then I might even * intentionally forget grammar. That is, I * intentionally stop paying attention to grammar, that is, I just want to express my idea. Or vice versa, that is, if I start thinking very carefully about *how and *what I am saying, I already do it slower and more likely I would say less.

Here she describes a concrete survival strategy when it comes to speaking Finnish. Her strategy varies whether the context makes her value more the communication of the message or linguistic correctness. To be able to bend the rules of a language and recognize that she is making a so-called mistake while still getting the message across speaks for her innovativeness and willingness to use Finnish instead of switching over to a language where she would be more fluent and thus possibly able to deliver the message more accurately.

After noting these difficulties, Anastasia declares her wish to be able to participate in “some Finnish course for immigrants for some grammar basics” so that she would not need to think about structures, about grammar during interaction. She says that acquiring this kind of education would help her make language-related cognitive processes, such as creating structures, automated.

Another instance where Anastasia’s pride over her Finnish skills comes through is when she discusses instances where she takes part in hobbies where everyone else present is Finnish and the activity itself takes place in Finnish. These hobby groups were something that her husband introduced her to, in the beginning of her stay in Finland. This is a passage where Anastasia lists the different people that she speaks Finnish with, which include her husband’s father’s family, her husband’s mother’s family, the couple that her and her husband socialize with, and indeed the people in

the hobby groups she takes part in. These various characters in the narrative she refers to act as positioning devices, which she aligns herself with on Bamberg's level 1 (1997). She, as a character in the narrative, is seen in the company of Finns, interacting with Finns and undertaking activities with Finns. All are activities which are considered to be beneficial to good integration into society, marking an ideal immigrant.

When asked whether her language skills are sufficient for living and working in Finland, Anastasia says that most likely they are, and that she has in fact already had a job where her working language was Finnish. She even says that she encounters no problems during her lectures when asking questions about the academic content in Finnish.

In two instances, Anastasia discusses her own accent while speaking Finnish. The first one is initiated by the question investigating whether her skills are sufficient for living and working in Finland. The second instance comes about when Anastasia discusses how multicultural Finland is, which leads to a discussion of encountered prejudice. In this instance, I will only discuss aspects related to her Finnish use (see Ch. 4.3.4. for discussion of Anastasia's identity as an immigrant).

- (61) it is this kind of profession, that people on the phone, they can still hear my accent, and it happens that they ask me about it, and it happens they react in a some way [to that], but it seems to me that it is enough for now. But in the future, of course, I would like to put more efforts into speaking, and try to develop it somehow. Because if I really get down to that, and I get to be like an entrepreneur and I organize some Russian language courses for some representatives of some Finnish businesses, then I would like to have a higher level of speaking. So that it would create a respectable image of me for my clients, for business.

As is evident from this reply, Anastasia feels that there is still room for improvement with her language skills, specifically with spoken language. She thinks that her speaking is something she should work on, in order to appear more "respectable", as is shown by the previous quote. In it, it is implied, although not explicitly stated, that

having a strong Russian accent in working life undermines the respectability of a person's professional image. Here one sees language ideology at work; the reader gets a small glimpse into Anastasia's conceptualization of good language use. The myth of an "accent-less" language variant as the preferred option in society has nothing to do with communicative competence, but seems to be a goal towards which many language learners gravitate towards (see. e.g. Lippi-Green 2012).

Later in the interview she recounts an instance where she was called pejorative names by a person she called during her working hours. When the interviewer inquires how the person knew she was Russian, she replies that it was by her accent, "obviously". She adds that her accent was stronger when she started working than it was at the time of the interview. This is an example of an assessment of past experience embedded within narrative, evoking Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann's multiplicity of temporal selves (2000: 212). She uses this device to strengthen an image of herself as someone who is constantly improving, constantly moving forward in her journey of language learning.

A narrative fragment that relates to Anastasia's Finnish skills and the identities related to them is the recollection of her visit to the doctor's office. Unlike Maria, who codeswitched to English when visiting the doctor, Anastasia used Finnish throughout the experience by "conscious choice". She argues she wants "everything to be in Finnish" although English, for her, was the stronger language.

She continues her narrative regarding the doctor's visit:

- (62) And that moment, I remember, some questions, they asked me one question I could not understand. I said: I do not understand, I do not know. They asked me again, probably, they rephrased it somehow, I said: I do not know, I do not understand. And then the third question, in the *very simplified way, I say: - Yes, yes, that is right, I said. And after it was over, I had an operation, I went home, I realized that I had then enriched my vocabulary with such words as "appendicitis", that is, I will never [forget] the word, this Finnish phrase I will not forget (laughing). That is, maybe, this *comes along, when you already have such

experience, you cannot help using the knowledge. And *all the words you have in your head, you need them to explain what is happening to you, where it hurts. This is a situation of survival (smiling).

Anastasia considers the visit to the doctor's office a learning experience and also recounts the difficulties she had by reanimating the dialogue between her and the healthcare professional. She also humorously highlights that this event led to a learning experience, her learning the word for "appendicitis" in Finnish. She recounts how she had to use the whole breadth of her Finnish skills in order to survive the situation and achieve successful communication and shared understanding. This is an instance of emplotment (Wortham (2001: 6), where the participant chooses what events to include in the narrative in order to construct a certain type of identity.

The fact that even when faced with the possibility of mistreatment by healthcare professionals Anastasia did not codeswitch into English shows the resolution she has to do whatever anything in her power to use Finnish. It also portrays her as an innovative language user who is capable of navigating an interactional situation in a language with which she is still somewhat inexperienced in a "situation of survival" context. The overall picture of Anastasia that emerges is a motivated and resourceful language user who is not discouraged by small lapses in communication.

4.3.3. Identity as a user/learner of other languages

When evaluating her own language skills, Anastasia says that Russian is her native tongue and that according to tests made during her studies her English is as good as a native speaker's, she has proficiency in English. Furthermore, she has taken basic courses in Spanish, Swedish and Norwegian during her studies. Having some skills in such a wide variety of languages shows how Anastasia is an individual who is both a motivated and a proficient language learner.

Anastasia's response to the interviewer's question "are you interested in passing the Russian language down to your children?" is thoughtful and long. She says that they have discussed the issue with her husband, whose first language is Finnish, and

come to the conclusion that she will always speak Russian to the child, and her husband will always speak Finnish. She bases this decision on benefits in life the child gains from language skills, the need to enable communication between the child and Anastasia's Russian relatives, and an understanding of Russian culture that the child would receive by knowing the language. Anastasia says:

- (63) And again, as I believe the language - it still creates culture, that is, the child, he would still be able *to understand Russian culture by knowing the Russian language, the same [is true] about literature and so on.

It seems to be quite important to Anastasia that the child would be able to appreciate Russian cultural products, literature and cartoons, for example. However, Anastasia goes on to point out that she would not be strict about the child following Russian traditions:

- (64) Maybe not so *fanatically, so they should follow traditions that, there, the child must celebrate the Orthodox Easter or something else. That is the way I *treat these traditions, I am very liberal about them. That is why, no, why not celebrate Easter with Finns when they observe it, i.e. it does not matter. The language - yes, to know the language is an imperative.

These passages showcase interesting facets of Anastasia's identity construction in the context of this narrative. Her appreciation of Russia, Russian language and Russian cultural products comes through clearly, as does the appreciation she has for her own ties to Russia, including family relations. By introducing a hypothetical child as a character in her narrative, she makes salient her own attitudes towards Russia, Russian language and Russian culture.

She also seems to position herself in relation to Finnish and Russian traditions through an explicit level 2 positioning move aimed at the (presumably Finnish) audience (Bamberg 1997). The example that she uses is the celebration of the Easter, and she aligns her own, and her hypothetical child's, preferences with the way Finns observe Easter, rather than the way Orthodox Russians do. Thus hers, and in

conflation the hypothetical child's, identity is portrayed as a hybrid identity (see Ch. 2.4.1.), incorporating aspects of both Russian and Finnish spheres of influence. By being liberal about traditions, she claims the identity of a secular, modern parent.

Anastasia speaks English at home with her husband. In her own words "it just happened" because when she met her husband, her own Finnish was not at a high enough level. She also appreciates the fact that when they communicate in a language that is neither of their mother tongue, she feels at an equal standing with her husband. Interestingly, Anastasia describes difficulties that take place when she has spent a weekend for example at home speaking English and has to go back to the university on Monday. She says "then sometimes, of course, it gets difficult, if on Monday I have classes and lectures in Finnish, I have to switch back. That is, I almost feel as I am tuning my brain back."

Anastasia goes on to point out that besides spending time with her husband and her single Russian-speaking friend, she spends all her free time with Finnish-speaking people, for example when she spends time with her husband's relatives. She provides the reply that an ideal immigrant would, that she spends a considerable share of her free time alongside Finns, using Finnish, getting integrated into society. Her sense of pride is again quite clear in this instance. It can be argued that by claiming to spend most of her time with Finns using Finnish, she claims a shared Finnish language identity, by claiming allegiance in Rampton's terms (1995) with Finns, even if she does not consider her expertise in Finnish to be perfect.

Anastasia says she "loves teaching" and thinks that teaching would be the most suitable job for her. In her own words, she would love to teach Finnish, Russian or English at an adult education center (*kansalaisopisto*), but she does not know how to look for a teaching job. The fact that she is eager to teach any of these three languages speaks of her confidence in her own skills in them.

4.3.4. Identity as an immigrant

It appears that Anastasia has no direct contact to other immigrants besides the people she has met during studies, hobbies and work. Since she does not participate

in government-organized language courses and does not belong to the Russian-speaking society, and taking into account the fact that her husband is a Finn, her social networks seems to include more on Finns than immigrants. It does not seem to bother her, though, as she takes pride in participating in activities where everyone else is Finnish (see 4.3.2.).

- (65) And if you take immigrants, I practically do not know where in [Finnish city] *Russians are [located], and *if there are any Russians because, so far, I could not access them at all. That is, in principle, I know about the Russian-speaking society, [name], and I am now planning to join it because I wanted to participate in their theater, in their theater group.

Anastasia seems compelled in this instance to justify the reason she wants to join the local Russian-speaking society, namely because she wants to join their theater group. Perhaps she feels as if the interviewer or another hidden audience is judging her for this decision, even though there is no interjection visible on the interview transcript from the side of the interviewer. This response to a potential reaction from the interviewer is a level 2 positioning move in Bamberg's terms (1997), of positioning that happens between the narrator and the interviewer in the interview situation.

When asked about her work experience, Anastasia delivers the narrative of how she was able to secure her first job in Finland, only just having moved to Finland. She recounts how it was a place her husband recommended to her, where students usually work doing telephone polls. In the interview she was upfront about her recent immigration to Finland as a student and that Russian was her native tongue. She describes how in the job interview, she read excerpts from an interview, without understanding the content. Nevertheless, she was offered the job, because the employer "liked her attitude", in her words. She attributes the main reason for successful employment being the way she said she wanted "any job related to the Finnish language". In the narrative, and possibly in the eyes of the employer, this reinforces the image of her as a motivated language learner and an ideal employee.

Later, in replying to the researcher's question about her strengths in the Finnish labor market, she describes her work at the company in more detail:

- (66) Plus, I like when we worked in this research center, we were there, and our chairwoman said: You are such good workers. That is, it was after my friend got a job there, too, I had advised her to fill in the application. She said: You are such good employees, you are always friendly on the phone with clients (with those who we interview) and you are always very hard-working, that is, you come --- you work through your four o'clock shift and work so hard, you interview and dial numbers. Because I noticed other Finnish students are hooked on their social networks, they sit, shirk the work a little, they do not appreciate this job very much. That is, I think I have my motivation in that/ / this position motivates me because I really want to work and I love to work. And I love it when I can be responsible for many things, and even sometimes the work is such that you need to remember a lot, to do a lot but I just like it.

A narrative positioning tactic that Anastasia uses quite frequently throughout the interview is comparing her own actions and/or skills and knowledge with Finns. Here she is seen employing this tactic in relation to Finnish students at her first job in Finland. The 'we' she refers to relates to her and another Russian woman that she was working with during the time. She recounts the experience of receiving praise from her superior, giving external validation from an authority figure to her claim that she and her friend were good workers. She goes on to contrast her and her friend's working attitude with Finnish students' who "are hooked on social networks" and "do not appreciate this job", while Anastasia herself is dutiful and resourceful. This is a clear instance of level 1 positioning (Bamberg 1997), showcasing the kinds of qualities and actions that the narrator attributes to other characters and herself.

Anastasia's position is different from the other participants whose interviews I analyze in that she does not have official immigrant status and has entered the country on a student visa. She finds this problematic and, unlike Lena, thinks that she cannot be considered "a member of this society" yet. This is an explicit

positioning move that happens in relation to wider discourses about social membership, on Bamberg's level 3 (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008). She also finds that her student status also delimits her participation in the activities of immigrant societies and communities, that she does not have the "rights" to it.

In response to the interviewer's question whether Anastasia has anything that she needs to work on to match the requirements of the labor market in Finland, she turns the question on its head and reports that she has a different kind of problem imposed by the system, that she has "surprisingly very few rights" when it comes to employment. She goes on to explain that as a student visa holder, she only has a limited right to work in Finland, that her working hours are limited. This shows how the identity categories that relate to this statement are imposed on her, not a result of a conscious choice to identify with certain groups. She is thus shown as a victim of circumstances who would like to work but is incapable of doing so.

She also describes another aspect of the same problem, that employers see a person with a student visa and think "she has a residence permit, that she is a student, who will probably finish her studies and will *return to her home country". She reports that these issues slowed her down, when she "did not have rights to *go to some center, to learn about Finland, as our immigrants do who come here". The way she positions herself in relation to these immigrants happens on Bamberg's level 1 (1997). Interestingly, she uses the phrase "our immigrants", possibly to indicate people arriving from Russia but at the same time distancing herself from them and drawing a clear distinction between immigrants and people on student visas.

Anastasia hopes that in the future she is able to get a different kind of permit, which lets her attend these courses and to visit and use the services of the local labor exchange. Throughout her reply to this question she maintains a representation of herself as someone who is eager to work, but is experiencing difficulties imposed on her. She says:

- (67) That is, I may, however, lack some *knowledge and such *skills, how to search and how to navigate on the labor market. Although, it seems to me, as an employee, I'm the same person. Maybe I may have some

moments that sometimes it will be *hard to do the job, probably, or something else, something I cannot cope with initially, there will be some computer program or something else. But, in principle, there will be no serious problems

From this passage, the reader somehow gets an impression from this passage that Anastasia is on the defensive, that she somehow needs to justify her position, even though she is a full-time student and has worked part-time during her studies. This is possibly to resist a discourse in Finland about immigrants living of welfare and not being employed at all (see Ch. 2.6.). There is no evidence that she is replying in anything the interviewer has said, as the only questions preceding these comments investigate whether she knows how to look for a employment in Finland, and what her strengths and her weaknesses are in the labor market. This defensiveness can thus be interpreted as a level 3 positioning move (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008) positioning in relation to social conventions and discourses.

Anastasia argues that because people on student visas already have a Finnish education and that they want to work they are valuable to the Finnish society and should be viewed as such. Her level of investment in Finnish society is showcased by this statement, as she is invested in the politics and policies of the society as well. Later in the interview she echoes a similar sentiment, saying that the general populace in Finland should be informed that “there are really very many immigrants who came here because they love this country and they want to work and live here just for the good of Finland and the Finnish society”. Her conception of immigrants and visiting students when it comes to employment is thus much more positive than the one circulating in political discourse (see Ch 2.6), and she challenges the these discursive practices by attributing the opposite qualities, such as being hard-working and loving Finland, to immigrants.

Another topic that Anastasia explores during her interview is whether she feels like a member of the Finnish society. It seems that she approaches this topic herself, without an explicit prompt by the interviewer. The interviewer’s previous question before the subject is taken up relates to what Anastasia thinks makes an immigrant

to Finland successful in society. She ends her lengthy reply by stating that if she can participate in talk about something current that is important in the Finnish society with Finns, "it somehow brings me closer to the point where I can be a member of this society".

The interviewer shows interest in this topic and approaches it after the following question, asking whether Anastasia considers herself a member of Finnish society. Her response is interesting in many ways:

(68) You can say that, probably, almost (smiling). Because I was // because I lived here as a student, I was somehow discriminated in many things. That is, as a member of Finnish society, I still want to have more *rights, perhaps more involvement in public life.

The first point Anastasia makes is that some discrimination she has encountered is caused by her student status, and it is her student status that is causing her to lack rights. When she speaks of discrimination in this instance she does not mean prejudices that manifest in interpersonal communication, but a systematic pressure that is imposed on her. She positions herself as the victim of bureaucracy, a victim of Finnish policies.

The way forward which Anastasia identifies is by receiving official immigrant status. Twice in her reply, she refers to this, firstly hopefully remarking that "this summer already, I will receive an official immigrant status" and secondly commenting that "now I would like to have some official status, and I could try to develop my life in this society." These utterances show that despite being discriminated against, she strives to feel optimistic about the future. This implies an instance where the narrator uses the multiplicity of temporal selves in Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann's terms (2000: 212) to speculate about the future.

Anastasia also reports that even though she is a person that usually takes part in civil society and organizations, she "felt out of place" when she went to visit a civil society organization that acts as a meeting place for local immigrants. She recounts

this experience, being not a participant in integration training and not a member of the Russian-speaking society:

- (69) But I did not have the rights to it, so to speak, because students are still, they are *strange folks here. They are somewhere in between foreigners and immigrants in the local society. That is not clear who they are. And now I would like to have some official status, and I could try to develop my life in this society.

She performs an interesting positioning maneuver in this snippet of the interview transcript by creating a division between foreigners, immigrants and visiting students. This is an explicit level 1 positioning maneuver (Bamberg 1997). Her own position is in the visiting student category, hoping for a move to the immigrant category where she could enjoy the rights immigrants do to “develop her life in this society”. It is also rather interesting that in the sentence “that is not clear who they are”, referring to students, she nevertheless leaves herself outside the group, and instead of using “we” she refers to “they”. Perhaps she uses this positioning device to strengthen that she is talking from the perspective of the “local society”, apparently adopting an impartial position.

The interviewer’s questions run out at this point but they prompt Anastasia to add anything that they consider important about studying, living and working in Finland. Anastasia pauses, but then decides to approach the topic of prejudice once more, saying that it is hard to find a job and difficult to get inducted into society. It seems thus, that admission into society is more in the hands of Finns than people who have moved to Finland.

She goes on to explain that Finns should reconsider the way they relate to and treat foreigners and to advocate increased multicultural education. She says:

- (70) The fact is that people should not judge all people by [their experience with] one person, and really see that they are all different people, and all came here for completely different reasons

Anastasia says that she too has experienced negative stereotypes, not directly or aggressively, but nevertheless in a way that has made her aware of them.

Stereotypes held by native Finns are one concrete example of a discourse relating to immigrants, which leads to Anastasia effectively positioning herself explicitly in relation to them, on Bamberg's level 3 (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008). She goes on to point out how it is peculiar how Finnish society puts so many resources into preparing and educating immigrants for life in society and working life, but so little is done to inform the general population about immigrants. In her opinion, the prejudices in the native population come from the way people are raised, and the only way the children who are raised by people with prejudices can be rid of these "extremist views" is through education. In this utterance, she places the responsibility for the existence of such attitudes with the older generation and national political movements, despairing over the fact that the children who grow up in these kinds of families grow up having a hard time reacting and responding to immigrants. It is a clear sign of an activist identity construction.

Anastasia goes on to describe the prejudice she has encountered:

- (71) And I do not like why people are *surprised when they meet me for the first time and I do not criticize Finns or Finland or something else. But why should this be surprising, on the other hand? That is, there is something that the local population, the already *expect something negative from immigrants.

It is exactly these negative expectations that constitute prejudice against a certain demographic. She reports having encountered them first hand, as well as having heard them from Finns she has interacted with. She goes into even more detail to outline specific beliefs:

- (72) Recently I had a talk with some Finns, they said Russians usually do not work, do not do anything. Then Somalis live only on social benefits. I'm sure *some do. And with them, maybe, if you come across such people, you do not talk to them, just leave them alone, it's their life, let them figure it out for themselves. And there, maybe, some social services will

help them or they will be able to assist them in getting a job or finding their way in society. But it is necessary to inform the Finns somehow (smiling) that there are really very many immigrants who came here because they love this country and they want to work and live here just for the good of Finland and the Finnish society.

Here Anastasia “talks into being” (Deppermann 2015: 382) a discourse, which economic threat discourse of immigrant critics, which portrays immigrants as unemployed people who abuse the Finnish welfare state (see Ch. 2.6.). These passages, and indeed her whole final comment in this interview, the topic of which she chose herself, is about positioning in relation to a discourse on Bamberg’s level 3 (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008). She contests a higher level discourse, and turns it on its head, saying that it is the Finns who are at fault, not the immigrants. Clearly she has grown confident enough throughout the interview to claim power over this topic and contest the dominant representation. Again, it is a clear indication of her activist identity.

To conclude with, I will present an overview of the identities Anastasia claims and performs in this interview. When it comes to language learner and language user identities, Anastasia consistently portrays herself as someone who is resourceful, motivated and skilled when it comes to learning and speaking Finnish. She describes how she is able to learn languages independently, and to be able to extrapolate from a basic understanding of grammar and linguistic knowledge. As a user of Finnish on the other hand, the identity that is portrayed is confident, motivated and proud of their abilities. She shows pride in the activities she performs in Finnish, with Finns. She shows even greater pride in moments where she is able to beat Finns at their own game, for example by knowing more about current issues than her husband.

Anastasia believes that she is making progress with her language skills and is able to utilize an analytic perspective when assessing her own language skills. The fact that one of her main concerns is her accent shows that her communicative competence in Finnish is already at a very high level.

As an immigrant, Anastasia shows appreciation for her own heritage, but simultaneously does not wish to impose Russian customs on her hypothetical child. This strengthens her projected identity as a secular and modern person who does not cling to traditions. This is consistent with the identity construction of an immigrant whose integration to Finnish society should be quite easy.

Anastasia shows throughout the interview that she resists prevalent discourses about immigrants as lazy newcomers who do not work. Throughout her replies to the interviewer's questions, she positions herself in a way that associates the opposite qualities to these with herself, being hardworking and motivated to success in society. When the interview nears its end, Anastasia grows more confident and speaks up against both structural discrimination caused by bureaucracy and prejudices about immigrants that some Finns have, reinforcing her activist identity.

In the following chapter, I will weave together the findings presented in this analysis chapter and relate them to previous research and my research questions.

5. Discussion and conclusion

In this chapter, I aim to bring together the trails of thought from the previous chapters, to discuss the results outlined in the analysis chapter and to draw conclusions. The objective is to respond to the research questions posed in the introductory chapter, and to relate the results to previous research. The limitations of the study, as well as avenues for further study, will also be examined.

It has not been and is not my goal to extrapolate from such a small sample any universal characteristics of the immigrant experience. Rather, the goal of this study is to explore and interpret the experiences of these three participants, with the hope of uncovering some of their identity constructions and strategies. It can be seen even from such a small sampling of highly educated, female immigrants to Finland from Eastern Europe, that their identities and identity strategies they perform in their narratives are very different.

5.1. Responses to the research questions

To reiterate, my first research question looked at what kinds of language learner and language user identities immigrants perform, and what kind kinds of strategies do they employ in doing so. As has been demonstrated, immigrant narratives gathered relatively shortly after their move to Finland are rife with positioning cues as well as explicit and implicit identity claims that act as perspectives to the kinds of identities they perform.

The second research question investigated immigrants' reactions to identity discourses that they were subjected to by their peers, other members of Finnish society and different institutional actors. In other words, this research questions brings to the fore the negotiation of identities (Blackledge & Pavlenko 2004: 20) and level 3 positioning (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008).

5.1.1. Language user and language learner identities of the participants

Maria, Lena and Anastasia use Finnish in a variety of contexts, from hobbies to work and from university courses to the doctor's office. They all show willingness to follow what is happening in Finnish society through media outlets that broadcast in Finnish. Furthermore, all also had contexts where they used Finnish out of their free will, not out of necessity. This motivation to use the language when it is not compulsory can be considered one of the reasons for their successful Finnish learning journeys.

In their narratives, all three participants constructed language user and language learner identities which associated positive qualities, such as being hard-working, ambitious, motivated, active, resourceful, capable, confident, proficient, interested, skilled, eager to learn, adaptable and gifted, with their narrated and narrating selves. In the cases of both Maria and Lena, though, at some point during their interview they ran into a presentational crisis in which they had to reassess the language-related identities they were claiming in their narratives. In the following section, I will first handle identities and positioning strategies that the participants had in common, and then move on to handle specific characteristics of each participant's narrative.

The list of strategies through which the participants positioned themselves to claim positive language user and learner identities is long, and includes explicit identity claims, level 1 positioning, level 2 positioning (Bamberg 1997), emplotment, contrast structures, multiplicity of temporal selves (Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann 2000: 212) and claiming a higher epistemologic position. I will proceed to give an example of each strategy from the data.

An example of level 1 positioning (Bamberg 1997) through which the participants reinforce their identity as accomplished language learners is when Lena reports in her interview that the teacher told her that ‘unless, of course, I want to stick with this group, she could not object to that, but she suggested I should (chuckling) go to “Suomi 2”.’ This reinforces Lena’s identity as someone who performs better than other students in her class, which enables her to proceed further in her studies quicker than the other students. Simultaneously it is an example of narrative foregrounding through emplotment (Wortham 2001: 6), as Lena decides consciously to reanimate this scene where she receives the praise of the teacher as one of the scenes in her narrative.

Level 2 positioning (Bamberg 1997) happens in the narrating situation between the narrator and the audience. As an example, the instance where Maria discusses how she is not happy with her skills in Finnish, and that she wants her speech to be “rich”, to be able to use “complex sentences, with, say, *subordinating conjunctions, or with *coordinating conjunctions” reinforces her identity as both an ambitious language learner and someone who understands linguistic terminology. Through the use of specialized vocabulary, she positions herself as a certain type of individual towards the audience, and aims to associate these qualities with herself.

Contrast structures are one of the positioning strategies that Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2000: 212) list in their paper, saying they takes place when “specific features of the protagonist are implied by contrasting his actions with those performed by other people.” One example of the use of this strategy in my data is when Maria discusses her language training, saying that “some do not” speak Finnish during the courses even when prompted to and, later in the same response,

that she “speaks Finnish in shops, pharmacies, buses, with some friends and acquaintances.” Through a positioning strategy that contrasts her actions with other immigrants in her class, she strengthens the image of herself as a more dutiful student and a more proficient language learner.

In many instances, participants invoke a positioning strategy akin to something Wortham (2000: 23) calls epistemic modalization. In Wortham’s conceptualization, epistemic modalization happens when the narrating self claims a higher epistemic position than a narrated character. What I witnessed on many occasions is not quite the same phenomenon, as the claim for a higher epistemic position happens in the narrating situation, in other words on Bamberg’s level 2 (1997), between the participant and the researcher. I use the term *epistemic positioning* to refer to these kinds of instances in the data. An example would be when Anastasia discusses the differences between spoken and written variants of Finnish and remarks that this is an aspect of Finnish linguistics that she included in her final paper. These kinds of instances are quite typical of the data and all participants make similar epistemic positioning moves, drawing on their educational background.

When Anastasia reports in her interview that “when I visited Finland for the first times, it seemed to me that I did not understand anything what people were talking about” and later describes how she studies full-time in Finnish without a problem, she is utilizing what Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2000: 212) call the multiplicity of temporal selves, the developmental process of the narrator that is enabled by the narrative setting and the available temporalities. In this instance this positioning strategy is used to create a contrast between the narrative past and the narrative now in order to showcase the level of language skills that Anastasia has attained.

Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann (2000: 211) list explicit characterizations as one positioning strategy through which the narrator can demonstrate their past identity. One instance of this is when Maria states “I learn everything fast and that is why these courses were not enough for me.”

All three respondents use multiplicity of temporal selves (Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann: 212) to construct a development narrative in their interviews. This

creates a sense of increasing proficiency of Finnish when they move from the past to the present (and to the future in some cases). In all three's accounts, the narrating self is shown as more proficient in Finnish than the past narrated self. In addition to using the multiplicity of temporal selves to highlight the development narrative in their interviews emplotment is a strategy through which this aspect of the development narrative was highlighted.

The strength of agency in all three interviews is interesting to scrutinize and compare. Where the amount of agency in Maria and Lena's narratives increases once they leave behind the narration of the very beginning of their time in Finland, in the case of Anastasia her voice remains strong and agentive throughout her narrative. Her maintained confidence and no apparent difference in the level of agency might be partly due to the fact that she was already more proficient in Finnish than the other two participants when she moved to Finland. My results considering agency in immigrant narratives are thus consistent with Virtanen's (2016), who found that there is a reinforcing relationship between the development of language skills and the strength of agency.

Changes in agency and consequently in the projected identity of the participants happens mostly through the lexical choices the narrator makes, which include the choice of passive or active voice in a sentence, the choice of subject and object of verbs and the connotations of the verbs used. Other strategies through which agency is either reinforced or played down are level 1 positioning, emplotment and claims to higher epistemic positions.

All three participants use their higher education to lend credibility to the statements they are making in their narration. To claim this higher epistemic position, they refer to their diploma paper (in the case of Maria), to their experience in working with groups (in the case of Lena) or to the knowledge of difference between spoken and written variants of Finnish, which was handled in their thesis (in the case of Anastasia). These are claims to knowledge, and as such claims to power over a certain topic. Lena goes the furthest with her knowledge claims, claiming power over fellow students too by analyzing their language learning aspirations (also a

level 1 positioning move, Bamberg: 1997). She is also the only participant out of the three who in the interview situation itself seems to establish an uncontested interpersonal understanding of herself as an academian (level 2 positioning, Bamberg: 1997), when the researcher offers no concrete cues for her when she is asked to break down her proficiencies in Finnish.

In addition to the above language-related identities and strategies that the three share, there are some which are peculiar to specific participants. In the case of Maria, late in her interview when she moves on to discuss employment, she suddenly shifts to a narration strategy which stresses her confusion and frustration, which mostly comes through via lexical choices, in not finding a job in Finland, which she partly puts down to lack of Finnish skills. One example of these kinds of lexical choices is the thrice-repeated "I do not know" phrase when she discusses her future plans.

Lena begins the narrative about her language learning by utilizing level 1 positioning (Bamberg 1997) to show how she was an outstanding student in her integration language classes. However, when she moves on in her narrative to discuss her studies in the University of Applied Sciences and new fellow students enter the positioning arena, suddenly her confidence in her own abilities seems to falter somewhat and she needs to reassess the identity she is projecting.

In Anastasia's interview, the development narrative she constructs about her language skills specifically focuses on her accent. She utilizes multiplicity of temporal selves (Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann 2000: 212) to report that her accent was stronger when she started working than it is now, and she would like to develop her speaking somehow "so that it would create a respectable image of me for my clients, for my business". Even though she does not have any problems in understanding anything in Finnish or being understood in Finnish, she is not completely happy as a user of Finnish until she has gotten rid of the accent. As far as language identities go, these remarks highlight her ambition as a language learner and the high level of proficiency she has already attained as a language user, but reveal her language ideology, what she considers to be good Finnish, namely accent-less speech.

Similarly to the participants Katja and Nina in Tarnanen, Rynkänen and Pöyhönen (2015), the situations of Maria, Lena and Anastasia varied at the beginning of their stay in Finland, which affected their access to formal Finnish language training. Nina's case (Tarnanen, Rynkänen & Pöyhönen 2015: 68) was similar to Anastasia's, as both entered Finland on a student visa and both had difficulties accessing courses they consider suitable for them.

Tarnanen, Rynkänen and Pöyhönen (2015: 68) show how the early periods in Katja and Nina's Finnish learning journeys were marked by feelings of stress and inadequacy. It can be argued that the diminished agency, which can indicate a lowered confidence, which is evident when Maria and Lena discuss their early experiences of trying to gain access to language training, reflects a similar phenomenon. It can be concluded that the beginning of immigrants' stay in Finland seems to be the most stressful time in their language learning journeys and many encounter feelings of lesser confidence during this time.

In Tarnanen, Rynkänen and Pöyhönen (2015: 68) participant Nina considers her language skills to be good and sufficient for everyday use but she encounters problems when she needs to use the language during her internship at an IT company. The authors argue that this implies that the perception of whether one's language skills are adequate can be context-dependent. The same phenomenon can be found in Lena's interview when she has no problems with language use in daily life and has grown too "lazy" to check everyday words in dictionaries while she simultaneously has high motivation to do extra work for her studies and worries that her language skills might not be sufficient in the context of UAS studies.

After initial obstacles had been overcome, all three participants appeared in their narratives as confident and proficient students and users of the language. All three consistently claimed language learner and language user identities associated with positive qualities, such as being hard workers and fast learners. All three used similar positioning strategies, especially epistemic positioning claims, likely due to the educational backgrounds they shared. Similarly to Katja and Nina in Tarnanen, Rynkänen and Pöyhönen (2015: 69), all three are conscious of their own strengths

and weaknesses when it comes to Finnish and able to articulate these strengths and weaknesses and discuss them in detail. Furthermore, all three employ a development narrative in their own description of their language skills – as time passes their proficiency increases.

5.1.2. Participants' reactions to ascribed identities

In responding to this research question, I will focus on unwanted identity discourses and the participants' reactions to them, as they are the most interesting from the point of view of the objectives of the study.

As was seen in the previous section, all three participants associate positive language user and language learner identities with themselves. This also acts as a resistance maneuver against a discourse which represents non-ideal immigrants as unwilling to learn Finnish, unwilling to participate in society and unwilling to adapt to aspects of the Finnish culture. By narrating instances of their own use of Finnish and by claiming identities that portray them as accomplished language users and learners the participants distance themselves from the negative qualities associated with non-ideal immigrants in the immigrant critic discourse (see ch. 2.6.).

All three participants whose narratives are handled in my study reported in their interviews that they have encountered negative stereotypes and/or prejudice during their stay in Finland. Below I will go through these, and other identity discourses which the participants had been subjected to, and how they react to these processes of subjectification. In this section, I will handle the participants' experiences in the order they were handled in the analysis chapter, with the exception of connecting similar experiences from multiple participants together.

When Maria discusses the way Russians are portrayed in Finnish media, she claims a higher epistemic position as a student of media and backs up her claim that Finns "have a *totally biased vision of Russia and Russians" by referring to the research that she has done. In this way, she positions herself on Bamberg's level 3 (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008) in relation to this public discourse, and challenges its

truthfulness. The alternate representation of Russian culture that she advocates is characterized as “rich”, “special” and having many “delights”.

Simultaneously while Maria resists public discourse about Russia in Finland, she utilizes the very same discursive practices that immigrant critics use (see Ch. 2.6) to position herself in relation to returnee immigrants from Russia who “do not characterize the *entire Russian people in the good light *either, when they do not want to work.” She goes on to state that “repatriates have * no problems, to be honest. Everything is paid for them” Here two aspects of the immigrant critic discourse about immigrants as an economic threat to Finnish society are reproduced in her talk: immigrants being unemployed and unwilling to work and immigrants living on welfare. Through this effect, Maria creates a dichotomy between ideal Russian immigrants, whom she associates herself with, and non-ideal Russian immigrants, namely returnees.

Maria reports that she has noticed older people staring at her when she speaks Russian in a public place. She puts this down to the fact that Finns and Russians were at war with one another in the past, and that some people might have memories of this time, the time of the Winter War. Maria argues against the usage of Winter War as a symbol in discourse about Finnish national identity and thus positions herself in relation to nationalist discourse (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008), saying that she is aware that such imagery is still cultivated by media and politicians. She resists the usage of such symbols and thinks the use of such imagery creates needless tensions between Finns and Russians.

At one stage of her interview, Maria also debunks the idea of nationality as a basis for individual identity, saying that there are really no such things as Finns and Russians, that all human beings are the same. Here, she first claims knowledge over the topic of how historical events are used as symbols in work towards forming a collective national identity, and then consequently dismantles the whole concept of national identity. Through reasoning and counter-arguments, she thus responds to an established discourse and positions herself in opposition to it on Bamberg’s positioning level 3 (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008).

The debunking of national identity as a basis of identity also interestingly contests and deconstructs immigrant critic discourse as well (see Ch. 2.6.), which is based on strong notions of “us” and “them”, the in-group and the out-group. By removing national identities from the equation, Maria denies the legitimacy of this discourse and proposes a counter-discourse in which “Finns are not different from Russians, the same people as well as * Americans, or like the French.” This argument is further reinforced by Maria when she claims a higher epistemic position by adding “I researched it, I know what is what.”

In her interview, Maria constructs an image of herself as someone who values employment greatly. The frustration caused by her unemployment is evident from remarks in her interview (see p. 46). By showing concern for the rights of immigrant workers who “need to make their *lives normal with a small salary” and whose rights “no one wants to defend” she positions herself in relation to the discourse of the Finnish governmental system, which dictates who has the right to live and work in Finland, and who has the right to receive support in looking for a job. In the end of her interview, where she has the opportunity to discuss a topic of her choosing, she returns to the rights of immigrant workers and demonstrates the apparent injustice in the fact that “the employer has all the power, because your stay here depends on the employer. If an employer calls the police and says you know, he quit, and he will *not work for me anymore! People can be expelled out of the country”. Once again, she juxtaposes the position of the immigrant workers to the position of the returnee immigrants in the Finnish society by adding “and the repatriates and the spouses of Finns are doing well.” The willingness to point out apparent injustice in society, such as the misrepresentation of Russians in media and the lack of immigrant worker rights, reinforces her identity as an activist, someone who is willing to take action and speak out for societal change.

Lena contests the discourse of integration by claiming that she “got integrated quickly” and “began to feel at home right away.” It is likely that she is aware that integration is a part of political terminology and is being used in discourse about immigrants, and wants to resist such discourse and reclaim power over her own

integration. Through this positioning move, which happens on Bamberg's level 3 (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008) positioning in relation to discourse about integration, she discredits the formal criteria of integration (see p. 17-18) and argues for a concept of integration which centralizes the immigrant's own identity and experience.

Instead of claiming Polish national identity, Lena barely handles Poland and Polish culture in her narrative. Whereas Maria denied the importance of nationality in identity construction altogether, Lena uses a different strategy to contest what it is like to be a Polish immigrant in Finland: she renounces Polish identity and claims a European identity, placing herself under the same umbrella native Finns are under. By utilizing this maneuver in her narrative, she is able to erase some of the difference between Finns and herself.

Lena recounts in her interview the instance when she was at a language training course and a confrontation took place between students because of an individual with prejudiced views. She describes what happened and tells how the teacher of the course did nothing to stop the confrontation from happening, but only foregrounds the teacher's actions in the narrative and does not attribute agency to her own narrated self at all in this scene. She positions herself apart from all the people and events in the classroom through a level 1 positioning move (Bamberg 1997) and only appears as a passive observer.

Prompted by narrating this event to discuss prejudice, Lena describes how it is a childish notion, and how it should be evident to anyone that you cannot hold on to prejudiced views in a modern society. She proposes that immigration training would incorporate texts which handled different cultures and cultural encounters so that instances such as the one she witnessed could be avoided. She positions herself in relation to the discourse about the right to be in Finland on Bamberg's level 3 (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008), and states that thinking others have no right to be in Finland is a worldview which needs to "be gradually modified".

Lena performs similar positioning maneuvers as in the classroom confrontation scene throughout her interview, in addition to explicitly referring to her narrated self

as a bystander, a researcher and an observer. This shows how she positions herself outside events most of the time, which diminishes her agency somewhat. When the interview progresses, she moves from the bystander identity construction towards the researcher identity construction, which increases her agency and adds the sense that she is positioned on the outside out of her free will. This is especially evident when she discusses her UAS studies and the reason she wanted to pursue these studies, which was “to see what it looks like when young people, when they work, how they work --- and what education they get because it is interesting for me.” Lena performs this outsider identity through level 1 and level 2 positioning maneuvers (Bamberg 1997) as well as implicit and explicit identity claims.

To a greater extent than the other two participants, Anastasia uses emplotment (Wortham 2001: 6) to highlight time she spends with Finns. Out of the three participants, she reports having the least contact with other immigrants, partly due to her lack of integration plan. These strategies could be interpreted as an attempt from her side to position herself as an ideal immigrant, a claim to integration in good progress.

While discussing her experiences of working in Finland , together with her Russian friend, Anastasia positions herself and her friend in relation to Finnish students who work at the same office, saying that they “are hooked on their social networks, they sit, shirk the work a little, they do not appreciate this job very much” while she and her friend, in their boss’ words, “are always friendly on the phone with clients” and “work through their four o’clock shift and work so hard, interview and dial numbers.” This is level 1 positioning in Bamberg’s terms (1997) and highlights the work ethic of her and her friend, claiming superiority over Finns in this aspect. Simultaneously, this statement turns the economic threat discourse favored by immigration critics (see Ch. 2.6.) on its head by demonstrating how immigrants are not unwilling to work, but rather work harder than native Finns do, given the opportunity.

Another way in which Anastasia positions herself in relation to the economic threat discourse favored by immigrant critics (see Ch. 2.6.) is by showing how she, as a

visiting student, “had a student visa, which, first, provides a limited *right to work in Finland”. She goes on to explain how for her and other people with her it is difficult to find work due to the concerns employers have concerns for the temporality of visiting students’ residence in Finland, and the lack of structural support from the government in the form of access to the services of the employment office. Thus, she contests the discourse about immigrants as being unwilling to work and shows that for many working is not an option due to factors that do not depend on themselves.

Being a visiting student is an ascribed identity to Anastasia, as she has no control over it. She reacts to this ascribed identity by resisting it, by looking for ways out of it through citizenship or other immigrant statuses, and by showcasing how other immigrants have rights that she lacks, highlighting the apparent injustice of the situation. The fact that she takes the position of visiting students as her main concern, and argues for their rights contesting unwanted discourses, echoes Maria’s remarks when she defends the rights of immigrant workers in Finnish society. In Anastasia’s case, too, she appears as an activist in her narrative, pointing out apparent injustices and hoping for their resolution.

When Anastasia is asked for anything she would like to add at the end of her interview, she takes up the topic of how Finns treat foreigners. In her response, she repeats comments she has heard from Finns, and talks demonstrates a prejudiced discourse about Russians who “do not work, do not do anything” and Somalis who “live only on social benefits”. Here, she echoes two aspects related to non-ideal immigrants in the immigrant critic discourse outlined in Chapter 2.6 and “talks it into being” (Deppermann 2015: 382). She goes on to argue that even if there are some immigrants that fulfil these characteristics, Finns should be informed that there are numerous immigrants who just want to work and live here “for the good of Finland and the Finnish society”. Here Anastasia performs a level 3 positioning move (Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008) in relation to these prejudiced discourses and refutes their truthfulness.

For Anastasia, Russian culture and cultural products remain valuable, and she is perhaps the most attached to the identity related to her origin country out of the three participants. However, she considers it essential to clarify to the interviewer and audience that she is not attached to customs by saying “that is the way I *treat these traditions, I am very liberal about them.” when discussing Orthodox Easter. Through these maneuvers, she participates in discourse about what it is like to be a Russian immigrant in Finland and while simultaneously stressing the importance of language and family heritage plays down aspects which would not fit as easily into a (stereo)typical mold of Finnishness, such as celebrating Orthodox holidays.

During the research interviews, two of my participants, Lena and Anastasia, were explicitly asked the question whether they feel like members of the Finnish society. In their responses, the participants position themselves in relation to a discourse about the statuses of immigrants in Finland, which includes visa policies, residence and work permits, voting rights and citizenship. Lena replies to this question that she does feel like a member of society, has integrated quickly and considers to be at home in Finland, having found her own people and her own place. Anastasia, on the other hand, feels as if her student status is holding her back from attaining full membership of society, and that she is only “almost” a member. Maria, who is not explicitly asked whether she personally feels like a member of society, nevertheless approaches the topic on her own accord and argues that all immigrants who reside in Finland are, to an extent, members of the society, and have rights.

Maria positions herself in relation to the discourse about society membership by describing how the society in general and immigrant policies in particular are changing under increasing immigration. She reports that immigrants are being told that they have rights, which they should fight for, and that they are full members of society. In this sense, even though she is not discussing the issue on a personal level, she does consider herself a member of society, too, since she currently is an immigrant residing in Finland. Moreover, when discussing Finnish citizenship, Maria remarks: “this is * my country, especially when I become its citizen, I would never say that it is not my country”.

For Lena, this membership of the Finnish society does not consist of external markers such as Finnish citizenship or residence permit, but of how she personally experiences her life in Finland. For her, being a member of the society is more about finding yourself in Finland, finding your place and your people. Nevertheless, she also looks forward to receiving citizenship.

For Anastasia, the essential markers of being a member of society are having rights, and being involved in public life, things that are lacking in her life currently. She places the power over society membership to Finns, to the authorities that consider her a student, not an official immigrant. When discussing membership of society, she puts more emphasis on what rights the society can and should give her, rather than what criteria she herself has to fulfil in order to become a member of society. In discussing her current situation in life, she feels trapped in her visiting student status and his hoping for official immigration status in order to participate more fully.

In many instances, some of which were outlined above, my participants discussed the state of the Finnish society, identified social problems and argued for measures that could be used to tackle these problems. Often this happens through a level 3 positioning (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008) move against a discourse that undermines the rights of immigrants or reinforces/reproduces an unequal power relationship between immigrants and native Finns. I have identified these maneuvers as performances of the activist identity category, of a willingness to identify problems in society and take action to combat these problems. Such instances are visible in all three interviews I have examined.

I argue that by systematically performing identity work throughout their interviews Maria, Lena and Anastasia construct identities for themselves that are in direct opposition to unwanted discourses about immigrants that they have been subjected to. By performing the identities of good students, quick learners and proficient users of Finnish, they contest the presupposition that immigrants do not want to learn Finnish or become accustomed to the Finnish culture, that they are unemployed and abuse social support (see Ch. 2.6.). This echoes Giampapa's findings, whose participants challenge unwanted identities in different contexts and renegotiate

“what is valued and what is legitimate” (Giampapa 2004: 215). I have shown how Maria and Anastasia directly argue against such unwanted identities, while Lena maneuvers out of the way and is shown outside the events, outside the reach of prejudice.

Even though the Finns party rhetoric about immigrants cannot be considered to constitute the whole order of discourse (Fairclough 2001) or all the ways of talking about immigrants, it is nevertheless a robust and established set of discursive practices as was seen in Chapter 2.6. By contesting this discourse and renegotiating the identities and meanings related to being an immigrant in Finland, the participants in my study hope to change these discursive practices by making their voice heard. Nevertheless, the voices of immigrants themselves remain marginal in discussion about refugees or immigration policies in the Finnish society, a problem which was made explicit by Lena in her interview when she says “there are representatives, that is, *candidates who are immigrants themselves but they do not quite understand what this implies” and “who they represent, how they can defend our interests, that is, it is somehow no quite clear”. She continues that “there is a feeling that in this public discourse --- (4) many of the participating voices are missing”. It can be hoped that my study contributes somehow to making these missing voices heard.

It can be concluded that while similar trajectories and identity strategies could be found when it comes to the participants’ experiences of language learning and language use, the participants’ reaction to prevailing discourses varied greatly. While Maria, Lena and Anastasia all opposed stereotypes and prejudices, the way they responded to them was different.

5.2. Significance of the results

It can be argued that the findings in my study, especially to my first research question, besides increasing understanding of highly educated immigrants’ identity work, have the potential to support the planning process of integration training of immigrants by showcasing what kinds of linguistic identities highly educated immigrants perform and how they relate to the interplay of multiple languages in

their lives. Tarnanen, Rynkänen and Pöyhönen (2015) agree, arguing that data gathered from immigrant themselves is needed when integration training and degree programmes are being developed.

Responses to my second research question demonstrate how immigrants respond to identity categories that come to them from the outside, including being part of a certain demographic from a certain country, being an immigrant, being a visiting student et cetera. Making immigrants' own voice heard and documenting their strategies of resistance towards those identities that are unwanted helps immigrants claim more maneuvering room for their identity work in Finnish society and hopefully contributes towards the development of a more equal society where immigrants are not required to continuously contest and renegotiate the types of frames in which they are placed by others.

5.3.Evaluation of the study

The most evident limitation of my research stems from the fact that many of the results and conclusions in my study are founded on close linguistic perusal of the texts. Unfortunately, some of the legitimacy of these findings is undermined by the fact that the interview transcripts were not in their original language, but rather translated into English from Russian. A more authentic and fruitful analysis could have been conducted analyzing data that was produced in the same language as it was analyzed in.

As a researcher, I worked only with the textual interview transcripts which I received from the Transforming Professional Integration project. This limited the methodological and other research design choices I made while conceptualizing my study. Different kinds of methodological choices could have been made if either videotaped or recorded audio interviews had been made available to me. In the hypothetical case where the medium of delivered data was different, it would have been possible for me, as the researcher, to settle on a transcription scheme that would support my study's goals, and to fully utilize a richer dataset to investigate the research problem.

It seems that narrative analysis, and positioning analysis in particular, serves the objectives of this study well. By utilizing positioning analysis to process the narratives, the sensitivity of the analysis increased and identity claims, which otherwise could have been missed, surfaced from the narration of events. Narrative analysis combined with aspects discourse analysis has helped me, as the researcher, make implicit identity claims explicit and to probe the data deeper for insights about the participants' projected identities.

The topic of immigrants' language identities could be further investigated through quantitative means, by obtaining a larger sample of immigrants and utilizing statistical tools to analyze their language skills and the extent to which they meet the needs of society and employers. A comparative study could also be conducted, to draw some conclusions on what kind of an impact the origin country of the immigrants has on their experience in Finland and the identities they perform.

One central aspect which I have consciously delegated a side role in my thesis is the role of gender. Through a gendered analysis of both male and female immigrants some insight to gender differences could be found, and consequently conclusions could be drawn on the gendered aspects of the immigration and language learning experience. Another framework which could prove fruitful would be intersectional analysis, which stems from the field of feminist studies.

5.4. Conclusion

This study has illustrated the kinds of identity work immigrants perform in the context of a research interview that investigates their experiences related to immigration to Finland and employment in Finland. The study has generated new knowledge about immigrant identities through narrative and positioning analysis of interview transcripts on which no previous study had yet been published.

References

- Bamberg, M. (1997) Positioning Between Structure and Performance. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7(1-4), 335-342.
- Bamberg, M. (2004) Form and Functions of "Slut-bashing" in Male Identity Construction in 15-Year-Olds: "I Know It May Sound Mean to Say This, but We Couldn't Really Care Less about Her Anyway". *Human Development* 47(6), 331-353.
- Bamberg, M. (2011) *Narrative Discourse*. In C. A. Chapelle (ed.), *The encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bamberg, M. and Georgakopoulou, A. (2008) Small stories as a new perspective in narrative and identity analysis. *Text & talk* 28(3), 377-396.
- Bastos, L.C. & Oliveira, M. (2006). Identity and personal /institutional relations: people and tragedy in a health insurance customer service. In A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin, and M. Bamberg (Eds.). *Discourse and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baynham, M. & De Fina, A. (2005) *Dislocations/relocations: narratives of displacement*. Manchester and Northampton: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Benwell, B. and Stokoe, E. (2006) *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983) *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. (2010) Locating identity in Language. In C. Llamas and D. Watt (Eds.) *Language and Identities*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- De Fina, A. (2003). *Identity in narrative : a study of immigrant discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- De Fina, A. and Georgakopoulou, A. (2012) *Analyzing Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Fina, A. (2013) Positioning level 3: Connecting local identity displays to macro social processes. *Narrative Inquiry* 23(1). 40-61.
- Deppermann, A. (2015) Positioning. In A. De Fina and A. Georgakopoulou (eds.), *Handbook of Narrative Analysis*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Derrida, J. (1982) *Margins of philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dufva, H., & Aro, M. (2015). Dialogical view on language learners' agency: Connecting intrapersonal with interpersonal. In P. Deters, X. Gao, E. R. Miller & G. Vitanova, (Eds.), *Theorizing and analyzing agency in second language learning*. Bristol:

Multilingual Matters.

Dyer, J. and Keller-Cohen, D. (2000) The discursive construction of professional self through narratives of personal experience. *Discourse Studies*, 2(3). 283-304.

Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity.

Fairclough, N. (2001) *Language and power*. New York: Longman.

Foucault, M. (1970) *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1981) The Order of Discourse. In R. Young (ed.), *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Boston, London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Foucault, M. (1982) Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry* 8(4), 777-795.

Foucault, M. and Gordon, C. (Ed.) (1986) *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. Brighton: Harvester Press 1986.

Giampapa, F. (2004) The Politics of Identity, Representation, and the Discourses of Self-identification: Negotiating the Periphery and the Center. In A. Pavlenko and A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Grossberg, L. (1996) Identity and cultural studies - is that all there is? In S. Hall & P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity*. London: Sage.

Hakulinen, A. (2003) Vielä nykysuomesta ja sen huollosta. Ovatko puhuttu ja kirjoitettu kieli erkaantuneet toisistaan? *Kielikello* [online] 1.

<http://www.kielikello.fi/index.php?mid=2&pid=11&aid=1401>

Hall, S. (1999) *Identiteetti*. (M. Lehtonen and J. Herkman Eds. and Transl.). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Heritage, J. and Clayman, S. (2010) *Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities and Institutions*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Herneaho, I. (2016) *Maahanmuuttodiskurssit eduskuntapuolueiden vuoden 2015 aalimateriaaleissa*. Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä.

Horsti, K. (2002) Maahanmuuttojournalismi - välivaihe monikulttuuriseen journalismiin. In Raittila, P. (ed.) *Etnisyys ja rasismi journalismissa*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Hujanen, J. and Pietikäinen, S. (2000) Syrjäinen ja aito, vallan pitäjä ja ulkopuolinen. Paikka ja etnisyys "meidän" ja "toisten" rakentumispintana journalismissa. *Tiedotustutkimus* 23(4). 4-21.

Husa, S. (1995) Foucault'lainen metodi. *Niin & Näin* 2:3, 42-48.

Iskanius, S. (2006) *Venäjänkielisten maahanmuuttajaopiskelijoiden kieli-identiteetti*. Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 51. University of Jyväskylä.

- Kelly, M. (2013) Foucault on critical agency in painting and the aesthetics of existence. In Falzon, C., O'Leary, T. and Sawicki, J. (eds.) *A companion to Foucault*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kolehmainen, S. (2016) *Barbaarit, onnenonkijat, kävelevät säkit ja muut epätoivotut ainekset. "Maahanmuuttokritiikki" stigmaviestintänä*. Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Helsinki.
- Laihiala-Kankainen, S. Pietikäinen, S. and Dufva, H. (2002) *Moniääninen Suomi: kieli, kulttuuri ja identiteetti*. Jyväskylä: Sovetavan kielentutkimuksen keskus.
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent : language, ideology and discrimination in the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- Littlejohn, S. W. and Foss, K. A. (Eds.) (2009). *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Lucius-Hoene, G. and Deppermann, A. (2000) Narrative Identity Empiricized: a Dialogical and Positioning Approach to Autobiographical Research Interviews. *Narrative Inquiry* 10(1), 199-222.
- Lucius-Hoene, G. and Deppermann, A. (2004) Narrative Identität und Positionierung. *Gesprächsforschung* 5. 166-183.
- Mead, G. H. (1934) *Mind, self and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meredith, P. (1998). Hybridity in the Third Space: Rethinking Bi-cultural Politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Te Matahauariki Research Institute [online]. <http://lianz.waikato.ac.nz/PAPERS/paul/hybridity.pdf>. (21 November 2017).
- Mills, S. (2003) *Michel Foucault*. New York: Routledge.
- Mishler, E. (1995) Models of narrative analysis: A typology. *Journal of Narrative and life history* 5(2). 87-123.
- Miyahara, M. (2010) Researching Identity and Language Learning: Taking a Narrative Approach. *Language Research Bulletin* 25.
- Norton Peirce, B. (1995) Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning. *TESOL Quarterly* 29(1), 9-31.
- Pavlenko, A. & Blackledge A. (Eds.) (2004). *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pälli, P. (1999) "Kyllä niilläkin joku paikka pitää olla missä asua mutta...": Rasismi suomalaisnuorten ulkomaalais- ja pakolaispuheissa. *Sosiologia* 36 (3), 205-218.
- Pöyhönen S., Rynkänen T., Tarnanen M. and Hoffmann D. (2013) Venäjänkieliset IT-alan asiantuntijat työyhteisöissä - monikieliset käytänteet, identiteetit ja osallisuuden kokemukset integroitumisessa. In T. Keisanen, E. Kärkkäinen, M. Rauniomaa, P. Siitonen and M. Siromaa (eds.) *Osallistumisen multimodaaliset diskurssit*. AFinLA yearbook 71, 77-102.

- Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rastas, A. (2009). Rasismin kiistäminen suomalaisessa maahanmuuttokeskustelussa. In S. Keskinen, A. Rastas, and S. Tuori (eds.) *En ole rasisti, mutta... Maahanmuutosta, monikulttuurisuudesta ja kritiikistä*. Tampere: Vastapaino and Nuorisotutkimusverkosto, 47-64.
- Ricoeur, P. (1988). *Time and Narrative: Volume 3*. (K. Blamey and D. Pellauer, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Schiffrin, D. (1996) Narrative as self-portrait. *Language in Society* 25, 167-203.
- Schiffrin, D. (2006). *In Other Words: Variation in reference and narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scollon, R. and Scollon, S. W. (2003). *Discourse in Place: Language in the material world*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tarnanen, M., Rynkänen, T. and Pöyhönen S. (2015) Kielten käyttö ja oppiminen aikuisten maahanmuuttajien integroitumisen ja identiteettien rakennusaineina. In T. Jakonen, J. Jalkanen, T. Paakkinen and M. Suni (eds.) *Kielenoppimisen virtauksia - Flows of language learning in Jyväskylä*. AFinLA yearbook 73, 56-72.
- Tuomisto, S. (2017) *Pakolaiskriisi sanomalehden sivuilla. Diskurssianalyttinen tutkimus pakolaiskriisikeskustelusta Helsingin Sanomissa*. Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Vaasa.
- Virtanen, A. (2016) Insights into the agency, positioning and development of professional Finnish language skills of international nursing students. *Apples: Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 10(2). 63-81.
- Väestöliitto 2014: Maahanmuuttajien määrä.
http://www.vaestoliitto.fi/tieto_ja_tutkimus/vaestontutkimuslaitos/tilastoja/maahanmuuttajat/maahanmuuttajien-maara/. (21 November 2017).
- Wortham, S. (2000) Interactional Positioning and Narrative Self-construction. *Narrative Inquiry* 10(1), 157-184.
- Wortham, S. (2001) *Narratives in Action: a strategy for research and analysis*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wolf, V. (2015) *The Waves*. Adelaide: University of Adelaide.
- Young, R. and Collin, A. (2004) Introduction: Constructivism and Social Constructionism in the Career Field. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 64(3), 373-388.

Appendix 1

Transcription symbols

//	Interruption of own utterance
-	Interruption of own utterance
(1)	Pause, in seconds
.	Pause, shorter than a second
[street]	Either information that has been redacted to preserve anonymity, or information that has been added by the transcriber or translator to make the transcript easier to understand.
*	Word that receives particular stress