

**This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.**

**Author(s):** Ennser-Kananen, Johanna; Karimi, Zeinab; Petäjäniemi, Maria; Sadatizarrini (Rahaa), Sepideh; Masoud, Ameera; Khalimzoda, Ilkhom

**Title:** Introduction : Thinking Integration Otherwise

**Year:** 2023

**Version:** Published version

**Copyright:** © 2023 kirjoittajat

**Rights:** CC BY 4.0

**Rights url:** <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

**Please cite the original version:**

Ennser-Kananen, J., Karimi, Z., Petäjäniemi, M., Sadatizarrini (Rahaa), S., Masoud, A., & Khalimzoda, I. (2023). Introduction : Thinking Integration Otherwise. In Z. Karimi, J. Ennser-Kananen, S. Sadatizarrini (Rahaa), M. Petäjäniemi, I. Khalimzoda, & A. Masoud (Eds.), *Rethinking Integration : Challenging Oppressive Practices and Pointing to Ways Forward* (pp. 15-32). Siirtolaisuusinstituutti. Tutkimus / Siirtolaisuusinstituutti, 9. <https://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-7399-38-5>

Johanna Ennser-Kananen, Zeinab Karimi,  
Maria Petäjaniemi, Sepideh Sadatizarrini (Rahaa),  
Ameera Masoud & Ilkhom Khalimzoda

# 1. Introduction: Thinking Integration Otherwise

## 1.1. Why This Book?

How do we celebrate the twentieth birthday of the ETMU, the Society for the Study of Ethnic Relations and International Migration (Etnisten suhteiden ja kansainvälisen muuttoliikkeen tutkimuksen seura)? When ETMU board members first started thinking about this in 2020, the answer “with a book” was almost immediate. While the idea seemed conventional at times, we agreed that a book was an appropriate format: It was something with the potential to last, something stable and material, something concrete and tangible. Maybe a book would give us pause. Maybe something stable and solid would carve out the time and space to stop, look around, and reorient ourselves and our work in an ever-changing, fast-paced (academic) life.

A book about what? An ETMU member survey was designed, brains were stormed, ideas were discussed, and finally, we decided that “integration” was a topic contested and complicated enough for us to get our fingers burned. We heard from the board and ETMU members who had

experienced and witnessed the effects of so-called “integration” policies and discourses, either firsthand, in their families’ or friends’ circles, or in their research or other working life, or in all of these. In other words, “integration” practices (including discourses and policies) were hurting many of us. The experiences that came to the fore in conversations were not outliers but rather evidence of systemic injustices. When we delved into the literature on integration, it quickly became clear that scholars had been expressing their sentiments using academic frameworks and language.

In this introduction, we discuss the concept of “integration” at a general level and outline the meanings and functions integration discourses have assumed in both Nordic and Finnish contexts.

## 1.2. Critical Review of Integration as Conceptual Tool and Discourse

The concept of integration gained attention at the beginning of the twenty-first century, when assimilation theory (the idea that immigrants should adapt their values, culture, and behaviors to those of mainstream society) became contested (Kivisto 2001). Bucken-Knapp, Omanovic and Spehar (2020, 5) offer insights into the concept and its use in Sweden and beyond. They define integration as “a process intended to enable the migrant to achieve an equal footing with the ‘native’ population in terms of functioning in the society”. To counter dominant discourses that expect migrants to assimilate to the (perceived) host society’s culture, researchers have argued for a more nuanced, bidirectional, and multidimensional understanding of integration (e.g., as a two-way process: Favell 2001). While Bucken-Knapp, Omanovic and Spehar (2020, 6) stick with the term despite its ambiguity, they ask the important question “Integration into what?”. Although they do not engage in a profound deconstruction of the notion of a “target/host society,” they point out that integration can have different goals and directions. For instance, participating in the labor market does not necessarily lead to political or social integration, although these facets interact and need to be considered in integration assessments. The authors advocate for an understanding of integration that does justice to the complex, dynamic, and longitudinal nature of the process.

Moving away from assimilation discourses, integration was found to be a better approach to understanding the social processes involved in migration and resettlement. However, integration remained a rather vague concept with a variety of definitions (Garcés-Mascareñas & Penninx 2016). For instance, Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas and Rinus Penninx (2016, 14) understand integration as “the process of becoming an accepted part of society.” Heckmann (2006, 18) offers specific ideas of what this might entail in their understanding of integration as “a generations lasting process of inclusion and acceptance of migrants in the core institutions, relations and statuses of the receiving society.” The EU, in one of its earliest definitions, introduced integration as “a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of the Member States” (Council of the European Union 2004, 19). This definition (i.e., a two-way process), which continues to be presented in policy documents and discourses at both EU and national levels (Schneider & Crul 2010), is a step forward from assimilation discourses and policies; however, several aspects of “integration” remain problematic.

Following his work in Denmark, Rytter (2018) portrays integration as a particularly unclear concept widely used across academic disciplines and in non-academic contexts with a variety of meanings and implications:

*Integration* may refer to anything from *social integration* in certain neighbourhoods or educational institutions to *economic integration* understood as participation in the labour market; *political integration* seen as participation in general elections and local associations; and *cultural integration* measured by the extent to which immigrants and refugees have maintained traditions, identity or notions of belonging connected with their first homeland. (681)

Despite “well-intended” definitions of integration built on two-way inclusivity, processes, and discourses by and large maintain a regime that stratifies and segregates. Instead of analyzing the structural contexts in which integration is supposed to happen, integration remains a one-way process (Klarenbeek 2021). A major shift is needed in how “integration” is conceived of and how it is entangled with other systems of oppression (see Klarenbeek 2019). In other words, a critical focus, which has begun

to gain traction in Finland, needs to be developed. As scholars of integration and migration, we resound the calls of others (e.g., Klarenbeek 2021; Schinkel 2013; Schinkel 2017) to problematize and challenge the concept and create a space for rethinking integration (see Masoud forthcoming), which is the core objective of this book.

As we rethink integration, we, in line with Lentin (2014), point to the particular urgency to address racism, white supremacy, and the historical silence associated with them. One of the main limitations of integration as an analytical tool is its failure to address intersectional inequalities (Anthias 2013; Korteweg 2017). This limitation shifts the focus from discrimination to cultural differences. By homogenizing migrant groups, it fosters a distinction between “migrants” and “non-migrants”. The language of integration defines “migrants” outside the discourse of belonging to society, while in fact they are part of society at the given time and space and are affected by its overlapping hierarchies (Korteweg 2017). The concept fosters an endless process of becoming part of society, a never-ending labor (Karimi 2023; Schinkel 2018). It misses the point that individuals are engaged in various and overlapping social structures such as those of gender and class. Traditional understandings of integration tend to overlook the intersectionality of inequalities and bypass the source of struggles and its temporal and local context (Anthias 2013).

As another shortcoming, integration is deeply affected by a methodological nationalism that serves neo-colonial, nationalist processes (Favell 2019, 2022; Garcés-Mascreñas & Penninx 2016; Schinkel 2018; Dahinden 2016). In integration frameworks, cultural boundaries are defined along national boundaries that problematically reproduce the discourse of “us” against “them.” The problematic view on “cultural differences” expects the existence of a homogenous, static national culture and the idea that certain qualities can be attributed to certain national groups (e.g., Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov 2005; Hall 1989). The language of racism uses such culturalized labels and categorizes people as though they inherently belong to different “cultures.” The culturalization of integration discourse frames some bodies as inherently unfit and incompatible with western nation values (Müller-Uri & Opratko 2016; Karimi & Ghazi Tabatabaei 2023). When claiming a distinct national identity, a cultural picture is drawn that will support the particularity of that culture (e.g., Sadatizarrini 2016; Henriksson & Boynik 2007; Bright et al. 1995). Cultural nationaliza-

tion and using art as a tool to generate and strengthen a national identity are common practices, so that generally accepted symbols and cultural customs are defined as creating a distinct national identity (Shin & Hutzler 2022). For instance, Finnish literature and visual arts have played a significant role in representing a unifying image of a nation and concealing the differences and diversity within it. It seems that Finnishness is a particular cultural position that, according to Muukkonen (2007), is increasingly threatened by the transitional environment caused by immigration, and cultural diversity. Indeed, such rhetoric relies on a curious combination of both cultural vulnerability and self-sufficiency and on a dystopian projection of fear of the foreign.

Recent scholarship concludes that integration discourses produce hierarchy and boundaries in a society by fostering the culturalization of social relations (Anthias 2013; Korteweg 2017): culture is viewed as a static property and not as a process practiced and understood non-coherently in a given population (Anthias 2013). Thus, the socio-historical pattern of group-making and its inherent power dynamics are left unproblematic. As Korteweg (2017) notes, “immigrant integration” as a discursive practice creates a racialized order through presenting “migrants” as Others who impose economic and socio-political problem on society. In this discourse, two-way integration is either forgotten or used merely rhetorically (Anthias 2013).

A traditional understanding of integration is the notion of the host society as cohesive, homogeneous, and overall positive (i.e., worthy of “integrating into”). In their edited volume *Undoing Homogeneity in the Nordic Region*, Keskinen, Unnur and Toivanen (2019) deconstruct the notion. They do so by foregrounding the histories and presentations of minoritized populations in Nordic regions, discussing how constructions of cultural and national homogeneity have interacted with the racialization of “others” as non-white, and, relatedly, by critically investigating the participation of Nordic countries in colonial activities and discourses. Importantly, constructions of homogeneity have been deliberate and violent, including land theft, restriction of movement, and cultural/linguistic erasure and assimilation policies. In Nordic regions, the welfare state imaginary plays a particularly important role in the construction of unity and deservingness, in which migration studies has participated by adopting a nation-state paradigm that identifies migration as a problem and

integration as a requirement for migrant “others.” To combat continued colonial thinking and othering, Keskinen et al. (2019, 1) call for “politics of solidarity” to “replace ideas around homogeneity/sameness and reformulate notions of social justice to include migrants and racialized minorities that are today increasingly portrayed as the ‘undeserving Others’”.

While integration is supposed to be a two-way process, scholarly and public attention typically focus on the level of integration among “migrants” (Klarenbeek 2021). As an example, contact with members of other ethnic groups is a main criterion for measuring the level of integration among so-called “migrants.” A lack or low level of intra-co-ethnic contact is assumed to be related to a lack of willingness to integrate into mainstream society (Schinkel 2018). Another area for measuring integration is minorities’ participation in the labor market. Instead of addressing the right to work and the right to skills recognition, dominant thinking around integration erases existing expertise (e.g., Ennsner-Kananen & Ruohotie-Lyhty 2023) and represents minorities as taking advantage of the welfare state and rejecting Finland’s civic society and labor market (Menke & Rumpel 2022). Previous studies in Finland and in other European countries have shown that integration programs function as engines to either limit the employability of racialized minorities, especially women, or direct them into the least attractive sectors (which are deeply gendered) (Farris 2017; Masoud, Holm & Brunila 2021). Through this mechanism, gender inequality becomes the property of non-western *cultures* and un(der)employment among racialized groups is justified through the failure of racialized individuals in integrating into the “imagined society,” and these groups are othered and depicted as destabilizing social cohesion (Schinkel 2018).

Schinkel (2018) defines integration as a social hygiene device presenting a “purified” image of “society” with clear cultural boundaries. It defines “migrants” as racialized Others who cannot fit into epistemic understandings of Us as members of an imagined society. Thus, the white population’s integration is not relevant, as the population is considered to make up a fixed “society” tied to the nation state. As a result of neoliberal processes, integration becomes the responsibility of individuals (Schinkel & Van Houdt 2010; Schinkel 2011).

Perceiving a society as a homogenic unity puts “migrants” in a position of being in need of integration. As a result, society is viewed through

binaries, including liberal/illiberal and integrated/in need of integration. The resulting boundary separates Us, the “good citizens,” from Them, who need to prove their ability and willingness to “integrate” (Korteweg 2017; Petäjaniemi, Lanas & Kaukko 2021). This categorization is complicated with different axes of social identities, such as “origin” or national identity, gender, religion, and class and sustains a racial social hierarchy (Karimi 2023). The discursive practices of integration function as a tool for further marginalization and labeling racialized groups. While the successful passing of integration and gaining permanent residency is understood as a sign of “successful integration,” the *bodies* remain as unfit to ontological understanding of Us. This not only excludes the first generation of migrants but also labels their children and grandchildren as “migrants” who are not “real” citizens of the nation state (Karimi 2023; Korteweg 2017). Thus, even the next generations are not viewed as part of the imagined society but as *in the process of arriving* (Boersma & Schinkel 2018, 309).

Ultimately, the “technology of order and governance” is based on racist constructs that ignore the deep entanglement of racial structures in western modernity (Lentin 2016, 384). The connection between here and there, western and non-western is entangled with a colonial lens that has been constructed and reshaped in recent centuries. This lens reinforces the idea that non-western cultures are inherently “uncivilized” and contain non-gender-equal ideologies (Karimi & Ghazi Tabatabaei 2023). As Joppke (2007, 16) points out, in “[c]ontemporary civic integration [...] illiberal means are put to the service of liberal goals.”

### 1.3. Integration Studies in Nordic and Finnish Contexts

As elsewhere, research on integration in the Nordic context has been shaped by larger societal dynamics and developments, for instance by discourses around protection of the welfare state and societal cohesion. Despite recent critiques of this notion (Keskinen 2016), Nordic countries still tend to be perceived as model welfare states. The concept of “Nordic exceptionalism” positions Nordics as pioneers of inclusive policies, social cohesion, quality education, and gender equality, to name a few qualities. For instance, Bucken-Knapp, Omanovic and Spehar (2020) describe changes in integration policies in Sweden since the 1990s, which



moved toward more restrictive and assimilative measures. These include “stricter requirements for obtaining a resident permit and/or citizenship, the introduction of more stringent rules for family reunification, bans on veils and hijabs at schools”, as well as mandatory integration plans or programs. Overall, they note a “shift from rights-based to obligation-based” integration, one that includes policies of migration control (i.e., the exclusion of unwanted migrants) (Omanovic & Spehar 2020, 7.). They point out that this shift in integration policies is driven by a nationalistic ideology of serving and “protecting” the host society, though the implementation of such policies may vary locally and deviate from the larger ideological discourse. Such integration policies are also evident in other Nordic countries (e.g., Hiitola, Karimi & Leinonen 2023; Widfeldt 2018).

An ample body of research has evaluated the interaction between migration movements, migrants’ employment situations, and other so-called integration indicators (e.g., Heikkilä & Peltonen 2002; Kempainen et al. 2020; Kunwar 2020; Sarvimäki 2017) and national or international policies (e.g., Jakobsen, Korpi & Lorenzen 2019; Saukkonen 2017; Valenta & Bunar 2010). While these studies certainly contribute to improving policymaking for the benefit of migrants and refugees, the large part of this work uncritically uses the concept of integration without consideration of its socio-historical implications (see Leinonen 2015). One step toward rethinking integration could be a refocus on integration experiences through the voices of those at the center of the processes and discourses: refugees and other migrants. An example of such work is Bucken-Knapp, Omanovic and Spehar’s (2020) study with 90 refugees from Syria and Bosnia-Herzegovina in Sweden, which documents their narratives and experiences in a large time span (1990–2020). Bucken-Knapp, Omanović and Spehar (2020) paint a relatively nuanced picture of refugee integration, documenting its “successes” (such as integration into work life) as well as its obstacles (e.g., racism, stigmatization, and isolation, lack of language support, and ineffective educational evaluation). The authors also highlight the agency of refugees, for instance their “sticktoitiveness” (resourcefulness, stamina) (91; see also Ingvars 2021). A similar study (Bucken-Knapp, Omanovic & Spehar 2018) based on interviews with 60 Syrian refugees in Sweden found that even if measures intended to promote “integration,” such as language pro-

grams, are put in place, the effects are not always as desired and may even be detrimental to inclusion, for instance when existing knowledges are erased or dismissed (see also Masoud et al. 2020; Kärkkäinen 2017).

Research that centers refugees' and other migrants' experiences has also been conducted in Finland. In their study on integration and language courses for stay-at-home migrant mothers and their young children, Intke-Hernandez and Holm (2015) found that the course instructors acted as "cultural instructors." They instructed the mothers on Finnish values and child-rearing habits and on Finnish concepts about what is good for children. According to the authors, the ethnocentric deficit model, where mothers stay only in the knowledge-receiver position, does not lead to real communication. At times, however, the mothers did not accept being the objects of the Finnish, middle-class model offered by the instructors and instead actively brought forth their own cultural perspectives and practices. Studies like this reveal that discourses of "culture" can fall short of recognizing complexities and epistemic resources in both local and migrant groups and provide fodder for deficit views on cultural difference (Kärkkäinen 2017). Related work has uncovered the epistemic resources, particularly dark and resistant knowledges, of migrants and/or refugees in educational contexts (e.g., Ennsner-Kananen 2021; under review).

Another strand of scholarly work has examined integration training contexts and found that immigrants become trapped in the process of "exclusionary inclusion and inclusionary exclusion" (Masoud, Holm & Brunila 2019). As long as immigrants are in integration training, they are considered included despite the exclusion, for instance when they participate in educational programs that do not suit their previous experiences (Masoud et al. 2019). Employment is considered a key indicator of successful integration, which encourages behaviors that identify immigrants as "integrateable subjects" (Masoud et al. 2019). Therefore, integration training traps individuals in a constant need to become employable, regardless of whether the respective field matches their abilities, education, and preferences (Masoud, Kurki & Brunila 2020). Ultimately, the dynamics of neoliberal, racialized economy require individual immigrants to develop resilience to survive; the system is not altered to, for example, address systemic racism.

Kurki, Masoud, Niemi, and Brunila (2018, 242) discuss how integration training for immigrants is affected by marketization and the demands of the global economy:

market-oriented discursive practices hide the realities of integration behind the figures, economic efficiency, and the market-oriented terminology where teachers become transformed into teaching consultants as pedagogy becomes re-made as the delivery of correct knowledge, and immigrants become transformed into consumers and clients responsible for their own success or failure.

The authors conclude that the idea of “integration as business” is paradoxical; when integration is adjusted with predetermined objectives, it may no longer benefit immigrants. Kurki, Brunila and Lahelma (2019) suggest that as a result of labor market policy and economic needs, as well as through gendering and racializing practices in education, migrants are considered ideal care workers. Guiding migrants toward the care sector is justified by the idea of how it serves both Finland and migrants (as they get employed) and by gendered and racialized stereotypes of caring cultures (Kurki et al. 2019; Jokinen & Jakonen 2011). Kurki (2018) termed this process “immigrantization” – the making of immigrant subjectivity through integration policies and education practices. It is the constitution of people with various backgrounds as one, as migrants. Pushing migrants into care work is a way in which systemic racism and sexism manifest in integration policy (Kurki et al. 2019).

Rytter (2018) points to the flexible and fleeting nature of integration as a problem because it facilitates the possibility of remaining a carrot on the stick: a moving target that migrants are expected to work toward and will be evaluated by but that remains unattainable. In addition, they understand integration as invoking imaginaries of unitary, (to-be) bounded nation states that migrant “others” need to become part of, as well as dystopian ideas of disintegration and chaos. Integration is, Rytter notes, also a racialized concept that serves the othering of individuals and groups such as “Muslim immigrants and refugees from Africa, the Middle East and South Asia” (Rytter 2018, 685). Specific to the Danish context, but certainly applicable to Finland, Rytter outlines three nationalist imaginaries

that popular integration discourses promote: (a) negative welfare reciprocity (i.e., the idea that migrants receive unearned welfare benefits because they did not pay their share of taxes), (b) a host–guest relationship with an adaptable and grateful migrant in the guest role, and (c) Danes as indigenous people united by kinship and the only rightful owners of Danishness. Rytter closes with a call to critically explore the concept of “integration” and its usage as well as its ideological underpinnings and to, instead of using integration, “develop a new language in order to enable a more inclusive analysis” (Rytter 2018, 690).

In Finland, racism and how it impacts integration policies, practices, and lived experiences is not recognized as a main barrier to equal opportunities and “successful” integration as described in policies (Masoud et al. 2023; Petäjaniemi 2022). Researchers have also pointed out the need to address integration and migration from viewpoints and approaches of racialization and postcolonialism (Keskinen & Andreasen 2017; Kurki 2019). An essential element remains drastically missing in the Finnish context, namely an effective anti-racist approach that shifts the responsibility away from the racialized refugee and immigrant (Masoud et al. 2023).

#### 1.4. ETMU’s Invitation to Rethink Integration

As outlined above, important work has critiqued problematic understandings of “integration” and its underpinnings, such as: the myth of society as a static whole, the implication of integration being an individual responsibility, the notion of integration as a status that can be accomplished to different degrees (i.e., one can be “more” or “less” integrated), the fact that racialization serves as the basis for identifying and categorizing those in need of integration, and the tacit understanding that whiteness releases people from the duty of integrating (Schinkel 2018). These underpinnings hark back to colonial discourses that serve to uphold a Eurocentric world order.

As a scientific organization that hopes to contribute to social change, the ETMU has a role in challenging such colonial imaginaries and their manifestations. Part of unsettling these discourses and practices is rejecting their claim to universality and creating a space for rethinking them and imagining alternatives: What if, as Schinkel (2018) suggests, social

sciences – and indeed all science – refused to cater to the colonial archive and instead started dismantling the technologies that identify, pathologize, and control those who “don’t fit?” What if we understood our social environment as regulating access to a variety of capitals? What if, as an academic community, we critically and routinely interrogated discourses of “society,” “community,” or “culture” in light of how they produce or maintain difference? What if we acknowledged the harm “integration” has caused, not as an “accident” but as an ideology doing the work it was designed to do? What if we had a space to grapple with these questions, and what if the ETMU book was providing such a space?

With the goal of honoring experiences, activism, art, and scholarly work that stand against “integration,” we assembled a team and put out an invitation. In our call, we argued:

[I]nstead of focusing on migrant “integration” as a process that perceives a particular group as “other” and lays out the requirements for fitting in, “integration” should be about critically examining societal structures that exacerbate racism, inequality, and exclusion. (Call for abstract submissions, February 2022)

Looking at the chapters we have gathered, we think that our book does that. We hope that you, dear reader, can sense our sincere intention to make a positive contribution to rethinking integration. We invite you to pause with us and to reconsider some of the ideas, concepts, and discourses related to integration that we sometimes use so nonchalantly. As our title suggests, we invite you to challenge oppressive “integration” practices with us, and think about ways forward that create and sustain more just and safer ways of living together. We hope that this way of celebrating and honoring the ETMU and its historical and contemporary community will be meaningful to you. Happy birthday, ETMU!

## 1.5. Content of the Book

As we grapple with complex questions around discourses and policies of “integration” that shape our professional and personal lives, we are grateful for the contributions to this book that have helped us learn and think

about these complexities in new ways. Artists and cultural workers also contributed to this book by examining “integration” in Finnish society with a critical lens, suggesting different modes of coexistence and steps forward.

Diana Soria Hernández’s compelling performances completed in the span of eight years (2014–2022) challenge Finnish national symbolism and ideas of the homogeneity of the nation by bringing up her own position as a de-indigenized artist relocated in Finland. Her outsider position as an immigrant artist enables her to investigate and observe behaviors in society. In public performances, she addresses this issue. She challenges the sense of otherness and not belonging by reusing objects of nationalist identity and by responding to them. Her provocative performances address as well as question the violent and often invisibilized process of assimilation and integration in Finland. The artist goes beyond by reuniting with her own roots and customs as an act of everyday resistance offering a way forward. Her art contribution is distributed throughout the book.

The chapter by Anastasia Asikainen draws on fieldwork and observations of elderly Russian-speaking migrants in the Helsinki area. Her findings resonate with the multiplicity and complexity of the process of sociocultural integration and call for rethinking integration beyond fixed indicators and letting elderly migrants (in this case) discover what it means for themselves.

The chapter by Zeinab Karimi navigates the life trajectories of two women in relation to social connection and trust. Her analysis shows the limitations of the integration approach in addressing structural struggles, such as racism, faced by these women. The empirical analysis reveals the importance of de-migrantizing integration discourses and shifting the focus to structural inequalities.

Zahra Edalati and Majid Imani’s chapter shows how exclusion and othering are dominant features in the everyday integration experiences of non-white women in Finland. The authors conceptualize the experiences around ordinary whiteness and everyday racism, question taken-for-granted assumptions of “equality” in Finnish society, and criticize the homogenized picture of women from Muslim countries.

Ceyda Berk-Söderblom’s chapter critically highlights what art can do. Based on her extensive experience and knowledge in the field, she inves-

tigates the obstacles that prevent artists and cultural workers with foreign backgrounds from being included in the Finnish art scene. She goes beyond by offering solutions for how to tackle these obstacles. Berk-Söderblom, too, claims that “to resist” is an act against any kind of forced integration and assimilation as such.

Alyssa Marie Kvalvaag’s chapter focuses on how public discourses on integration are shaped by the media. Her analysis reveals that the normalization of migration-related differences is used in integration discourses, which consequently contributes to racialization and the production of a white national imaginary.

Ioana Țișteea’s chapter makes a compelling argument for moving toward creolizing research with Roma on the basis of subaltern counter-histories. The author brings together her own positionality and complicity as a non-Roma Romanian migrant woman with historical and present colonial imaginaries that undergird processes of Finnish nation- and identity-building. In showing Roma women’s resistance to processes of erasure and assimilation, she problematizes a concept of “integration” that requires compliance with Finnish mainstream ways of being and offers the notion of creolization as a fruitful way forward.

Ali Akbar Mehta explores how the governance of human mobility might be one of the most important political problems confronting us in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and the role of art and cultural institutions that exacerbate it. He argues that state-led art and cultural institutions actively support and work toward a political desire for cultural homogeneity maintaining and normalizing the otherness not only of asylum seekers and immigrants but also of citizens. His argument is backed up by a thorough investigation of several cases in Finnish art and cultural museums as well as the Finnish National Pavilion at the Venice Biennale.

## Bibliography

- Anthias, Floya (2013). Moving Beyond the Janus Face of Integration and Diversity Discourses: Towards an Intersectional Framing. *The Sociological Review*, 61 (2), 323–343. doi: 10.1111/1467-954X.12001
- Boersma, Sanne & Willem Schinkel (2018). Imaginaries of Postponed Arrival: On Seeing ‘Society’ and its ‘Immigrants’. *Cultural Studies*, 32 (2), 720–737. doi: 10.1080/09502386.2017.1354047
- Bright, Brenda Jo & Liza Bakewell (1995). *Looking High and Low: Art and Cultural Identity*. Arizona: The University of Arizona Press.

- Bucken-Knapp, Gregg Vedran Omanović & Andrea Spehar (2020). *Institutions and Organizations of Refugee Integration. Bosnian-Herzegovinian and Syrian Refugees in Sweden*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Buonfino, Alessandra (2004). Between Unity and Plurality: The Politicization and Securitization of the Discourse of Immigration in Europe. *New Political Science*, 26 (1), 23–49. doi: 0.1080/0739314042000185111
- Council of the European Union (2004). Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the EU, 19 November, 14615/04 (Presse 321). Available: [https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/sites/default/files/2008-08/docl\\_1274\\_415560448.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/sites/default/files/2008-08/docl_1274_415560448.pdf). Accessed 20.10.2023.
- Dahinden, Janine (2016). A Plea for the 'De-migrantization' of Research on Migration and Integration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39 (13), 2207–2225. doi: 10.1080/01419870.2015.1124129
- Ennsner-Kananen, Johanna (2021). "My Skin is Hard": Adult Learners' Resistance to Racialization and Racism. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 7 (3), 179–189. doi: 10.1080/20020317.2021.2008113
- Ennsner-Kananen, Johanna (under review). "I Almost Died": The Role of Knowledges of Pain in Educating Adult Learners with Refugee Experience. *Nordisk tidsskrift for pedagogikk og kritikk*.
- Ennsner-Kananen, Johanna & Maria Ruohotie-Lyhty (2023). 'I'm a Foreign Teacher': Legitimate Positionings in the Stories of a Migrant Teacher. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 49 (3), 491–506. doi: 10.1080/02607476.2022.2105138
- Farris, Sara (2017). *In the Name of Women's Rights: The Rise of Femonationalism*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.
- Favell, Adrian (2001). Integration Policy and Integration Research in Europe: A Review and Critique. T. Alexander Aleinikoff & Doug Klusmeyer (eds.), *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution/Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 349–400.
- Favell, Adrian (2019). Integration: Twelve Propositions after Schinkel. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 7 (21), 1–10. doi: 10.1186/s40878-019-0125-7
- Favell, Adrian (2022). Immigration, Integration and Citizenship: Elements of a New Political Demography. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 48 (1), 3–32. doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2022.2020955
- Garcés-Mascareñas, Blanca & Rinus Penninx (2016). *The Concept of Integration as an Analytical Tool and as a Policy Concept*. Cham: SpringerLink.
- Hall, Stuart (1989). Cultural Identity and Cinematic Representation. *Framework: The Journal of Cinema and Media*, 36, 68–81.
- Heckmann, Friedrich (2006). Integration and Integration Policies. IMISCOE Network Feasibility Study. Available: <http://www.efms.uni-bamberg.de/pdf/INTPOL%20Final%20Paper.pdf>. Accessed 16.10.2023.
- Heikkilä, Elli & Selene Peltonen (2002). Immigrants and Integration in Finland. Available: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1075.9539&rep=rep1&type=pdf>. Accessed 20.2.2021.
- Henriksson, Minna & Sezgin Boynik (eds.) (2007). *Contemporary Art and Nationalism – Critical Reader*. Pristina: Institute of Contemporary Art "EXIT".
- Hiitola, Johanna, Zeinab Karimi & Johanna Leinonen (2023). Navigating Affective (In)securities: Forced Migration and Transnational Family Relationships. Marja Tiilikainen, Johanna Hiitola, Abdirashid A. Ismail & Jaana Palander



- (eds.), *Forced Migration and Separated Families: Everyday Insecurities and Transnational Strategies*. Cham: Springer, 183–200.
- Hofstede, Geert, Gert Jan Hofstede & Michael Minkov (2005). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (Rev. 2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hutzel, Karen & Ryan Shin (2022). *Borderless: Global Narratives in Art Education*. INSEA publications, 184–203.
- Intke-Hernández, Minna & Gunilla Holm (2015). Migrant Stay-at-Home Mothers Learning to Eat and Live the Finnish Way. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 5 (2), 75–82. doi: 10.1515/njmr-2015-0012
- Jakobsen, Vibeke, Tomas Korpi & Thomas Lorentzen (2019). Immigration and Integration Policy and Labour Market Attainment among Immigrants to Scandinavia. *European Journal of Population*, 35, 305–328. doi: 10.1007/s10680-018-9483-3
- Jensen, Tina Gudrun, Kristina Weibel & Kathrine Vitus (2017). 'There is No Racism Here': Public Discourses on Racism, Immigrants and Integration in Denmark. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 51 (1), 51–68. doi: 10.1080/0031322X.2016.1270844
- Jokinen, Eeva, & Mikko Jakonen (2011). Rajaton hoiva ['Unbounded care']. E. Jokinen, J. Könönen, J. Venäläinen & J. Vähämäki (eds.), *Yrittäkää edes! Prekarisaatio Pohjois-Karjalassa* ['At least try! Precarisation in the North Karelia']. Helsinki: Tutkijaliitto, 118–138.
- Joppke, Christian (2007). Beyond National Models: Civic Integration Policies for Immigrants in Western Europe. *West European Politics*, 30 (1), 1–22. doi: 10.1080/01402380601019613
- Karimi, Zeinab (2023). I am Not the Info Desk for Islam and Arabs: The Racialization of Islam and Boundaries of Citizenship. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. doi: 10.1080/01419870.2023.2210659
- Karimi, Zeinab & Mahmoud Ghazi Tabatabaei (2023). Locating Iranian Diasporas in 50 years of Academic Discourse: Critical Review of Acculturation Theory. *Middle East Critique*. doi: 10.1080/19436149.2023.2256143
- Kemppainen, Teemu, Laura Kemppainen, Hannamaria Kuusio, Shadia Rask & Pasi Saukkonen (2020). Multifocal Integration and Marginalisation: A Theoretical Model and an Empirical Study on Three Immigrant Groups. *Sociology*, 54 (4), 782–805. doi: 10.1177/0038038520904715
- Keskinen, Suvi (2016). From Welfare Nationalism to Welfare Chauvinism: Economic Rhetoric, the Welfare State and Changing Asylum Policies in Finland. *Critical Social Policy*, 36 (3), 352–370. doi: 10.1177/0261018315624170
- Keskinen, Suvi & Rikke Andreassen (2017). Developing Theoretical Perspectives on Racialisation and Migration. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 7 (2), 64–69. doi: 10.1515/NJMR-2017-0018
- Keskinen, Suvi, Unnur Skaptadottir & Mari Toivanen (2019). *Undoing Homogeneity in the Nordic Region: Migration, Difference, and the Politics of Solidarity*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Kivisto, Peter (2001). Theorizing Transnational Immigration: A Critical Review of Current Efforts. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24 (4), 549–577. doi: 10.1080/01419870120049789
- Klarenbeek, Lea M. (2019). Relational Integration: A Response to Willem Schinkel. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 7 (20). doi: 10.1186/s40878-019-0126-6
- Klarenbeek, Lea M. (2021). Reconceptualising 'Integration as a Two-way Process'. *Migration Studies*, 9 (3), 902–921. doi: 10.1093/migration/mnz033

- Korteweg, Anna (2017). *The Failures of 'Immigrant Integration': The Gendered Racialized Production of Non-belonging*. *Migration Studies* 5 (3), 428–444. doi: 10.1093/migration/mnx025
- Kunwar, Jagat (2020). Assessing the Level of Immigrant Integration in Finland. Sylwia Przytuła & Łukasz Sułkowski (eds.), *Integration of Migrants into the Labour Market in Europe: National, Organizational and Individual Perspectives*. Emerald Publishing Limited, 171–186.
- Kurki, Tuuli (2018). *Immigrant-ness as (Mis)fortune? Immigrantisation through Integration Policies and Practices in Education* (PhD diss.). Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Kurki, Tuuli, Ameera Masoud, Anna-Maija Niemi & Kristiina Brunila (2018). Integration Becoming Business: Marketisation of Integration Training for Immigrants. *European Educational Research Journal*, 17 (2), 233–247. doi: 10.1177/1474904117721430
- Kurki, Tuuli, Kristiina Brunila & Elina Lahelma (2019). Constituting Immigrant Care Workers through Gendering and Racialising Practices in Education. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 9 (3), 329–345. doi: 10.2478/njmr-2019-0009
- Kärkkäinen, Katarzyna (2017). *Learning, Teaching and Integration of Adult Migrants in Finland*. University of Jyväskylä. (PhD diss.). Available: [https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/55745/978-951-39-7212-7\\_v%C3%A4it%C3%B6s10112017.pdf?sequence=1](https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/55745/978-951-39-7212-7_v%C3%A4it%C3%B6s10112017.pdf?sequence=1). Accessed 10.10.2023.
- Lentin, Alana (2016). Eliminating Race Obscures its Trace. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39 (3), 383–391. doi: 10.1080/01419870.2016.1109685
- Lentin, Alana (2014). Postracial Silences: The Othering of Race in Europe. Wolf Hund & Alana Lentin (eds.), *Racism and Sociology*. Berlin: Lit Verlag, 69–104.
- Masoud, Ameera (forthcoming). *Constructing the Integrateable Refugee and Immigrant Through Integration Policies and Practices in Finland*. PhD dissertation. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Masoud, Ameera, Gunilla Holm & Kristiina Brunila (2021). Becoming Integrateable: Hidden Realities of Integration Policies and Training in Finland. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 25 (1), 52–65. doi: 10.1080/13603116.2019.1678725
- Masoud, Ameera, Tuuli Kurki & Kristiina Brunila (2020). Learn Skills and Get Employed. Constituting the Employable Refugee Subjectivity through Integration Policies and Training Practices. Kristiina Brunila & Lisbeth Lundahl (eds.), *Youth on the Move: Tendencies and Tensions in Youth Policies and Practices*. Helsinki University Press, 101–123.
- Masoud, Ameera, Tuuli Kurki, Kristiina Brunila & Gunilla Holm (2023). Racialised Integration: Arabic-Speaking Refugees and Immigrants' Experiences on the Paradoxes of Integration. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 13 (1), 1–18. doi: 10.33134/njmr.543
- Menke, Katrin & Andrea Rumpel (2022). Who Belongs, and How Far? Refugees and Bureaucrats within the German Active Welfare State. *Social Inclusion*, 10 (1), 217–226. doi: 10.17645/si.v10i1.4646
- Muukkonen, Marita (2007). Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Art Institutions and Creative Industries. M. Henriksson & S. Boynik (eds.), *Contemporary Art and Nationalism: Critical Reader*. Pristina: Institute of Contemporary Art "EXIT", 71–89.

- Müller-Uri, Fanny & Benjamin Opratko (2016). Islamophobia as Anti-Muslim Racism: Racism without "Races", Racism without Racists. *Islamophobia Studies Journal*, 3 (2), 1–16.
- Petäjaniemi, Maria (2022). *(Un)becoming an Asylum Seeker. Nomadic Research with Men Awaiting an Asylum Decision* (doctoral diss.). University of Oulu.
- Petäjaniemi, Maria, Maija Lanas & Mervi Kaukko (2021). How to Be a 'Good Asylum Seeker'? The Subjectification of Young Men Seeking Asylum. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 11 (3), 284–300. doi: 10.33134/njmr.389
- Rytter, Mikkel (2019). Writing against Integration: Danish Imaginaries of Culture, Race and Belonging. *Ethnos*, 84 (4), 678–697. doi: 10.1080/00141844.2018.1458745
- Sadatizzarini, Sepideh (2016). Nationalism, Exile and Agony in Contemporary Art. Aalto University, School of Arts and Design and Architecture. Available: <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:aalto-201606162355>. Accessed 16.10.2023.
- Sarvimäki, Matti (2017). Labor Market Integration of Refugees in Finland. *VATT Research Reports*, 185. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2921095
- Saukkonen, Pasi (2017). Interplay and Co-operation between National and Local Levels in Integration Policy. Case Helsinki, Finland. Helsinki: Helsinki city. Available: [https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/sites/default/files/2017-09/17\\_09\\_18\\_Tyopapereita\\_4\\_Saukkonen.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/sites/default/files/2017-09/17_09_18_Tyopapereita_4_Saukkonen.pdf). Accessed 4.9.2023.
- Schinkel, Willem (2013). The Imagination of 'Society' in Measurements of Immigrant Integration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36 (7), 1142–1161. doi: 10.1080/01419870.2013.783709
- Schinkel, Willem (2017). *Imagined societies. A Critique of Immigrant Integration in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schinkel, Willem (2018). Against 'Immigrant Integration': For an End to Neocolonial Knowledge Production. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6 (1), 1–17. doi: 10.1186/s40878-018-0095-1
- Schinkel, Willem, & Friso Van Houdt (2010). The Double Helix of Cultural Assimilationism and Neo-liberalism: Citizenship in Contemporary Governmentality. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 61 (4), 696–715. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-4446.2010.01337.x
- Schneider, Jens & Maurice Crul (2010). New Insights into Assimilation and Integration Theory: Introduction to the Special Issue. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33 (7), 1143–1148. doi: 10.1080/01419871003777809
- Valenta, Marko & Nihad Bunar (2010). State Assisted Integration: Refugee Integration Policies in Scandinavian Welfare States: The Swedish and Norwegian Experience. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 23 (4), 463–483. doi: 10.1093/jrs/feq028
- Widfeldt, Anders (2018). *The Growth of the Radical Right in Nordic Countries: Observations from Past 20 Years*. Washington DC: Migration Policy Institute.