One Nation, One Language?

National minority and Indigenous recognition in the politics of immigrant integration

Nina Carlsson

SÖDERTÖRN DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

One Nation, One Language?

National minority and Indigenous recognition
in the politics of immigrant integration

Nina Carlsson

Södertörns högskola

Subject: Political Science
Research Area: Politics, Economy and the Organisation of Society
School of Social Sciences & the Baltic and East
European Graduate School

Södertörns högskola
(Södertörn University)
The Library
SE-141 89 Huddinge

www.sh.se/publications

Cover image: Yulia Drozdova, incomible © 23RF.com
Cover layout: Jonathan Robson
Graphic form: Per Lindblom & Jonathan Robson

Printed by Elanders, Stockholm 2021

Södertörn Doctoral Dissertations 182
ISSN 1652–7399
ISBN 978-91-89109-40-7 (print)
ISBN 978-91-89109-41-4 (digital)

Abstract

Policies regulating immigrant integration constitute a core element of nation-building through the compliance they prescribe with cultural and linguistic norms. The recognition of multiple national belongings in states with national minorities and Indigenous peoples nevertheless challenges majority-centred notions of what integration should entail. Research on connections between integration and recognition, however, has mainly focused on minority substates such as Quebec and Catalonia, where local integration policies align with the respective minority nationalist project, leaving other contexts of recognition largely unexplored.

By employing critical and interpretive approaches to the study of politics, this study aims to explore connections, separations, and synergies between policies of national minority recognition and immigrant integration in Europe. Using a combination of document analysis, interviews, and ethnographic observation, it asks how integration policy produces or counters expressions of majority nationhood in states with recognized minorities, how colonial or imperial legacies shape such policies, and what normative tensions can be identified between the promotion of majority and minority identities. Theoretically, it draws on scholarship on liberal multiculturalism, settler colonial studies, and theories on belonging and boundary-making.

The four articles of this compilation dissertation combine empirical findings with normative questions. States with recognized minorities in EU27 are shown to reproduce majority nationhood through integration, which clashes with minority protection and with some migrants' aspirations. In Finland, where the Swedish-speaking minority enjoys equal linguistic recognition with the majority, the minority and migrants are shown to mobilize to ensure the implementation of minority elements in the predominantly majority-centred integration. In Indigenous Swedish Sápmi, state-led integration is found to largely reproduce colonial practices, which are nevertheless also occasionally challenged. In Bulgaria, Turkish-speaking, Muslim minorities are othered in society and marginal within integration, even though post-Ottoman Muslim institutions have come to function as spaces of belonging for recent refugees.

Integration policies are shown to misrecognize minorities and thereby fail to represent the actual heterogeneity faced by migrants. Past and present linguistic, religious, racial, and societal contestations are shown to intersect in complex, layered ways that contemporary monolingual, territory-based models of minority recognition and integration fail to capture. The study's findings have normative implications for research on minority recognition and integration and call for contextually sensitive perspectives to rethink present policies that serve the goals of majority nation-building rather than mirror actual societal belongings.

Keywords: Immigrant integration, nation-building, national minorities, Indigenous peoples, recognition, language policy, Bulgaria, Sápmi, Finland, Sweden, liberal multiculturalism, settler colonialism, belonging, boundary-making.

Sammanfattning (summary in Swedish)

Integrationspolitik har en viktig nationsbyggande funktion då den ställer krav på kulturell och språklig kunskap som vanligtvis reproducerar majoritetsnationalism. Integrationskravens utformning utmanas emellertid i stater med erkända nationella minoriteter och urfolk där flera tillhörigheter officiellt erkänts och därmed kan förväntas ta plats i nationsbyggande narrativ. Tidigare forskning om kopplingar mellan integrationspolitik och minoritetserkännande har i huvudsak fokuserat på federala autonoma minoritetsterritorier såsom Quebec och Katalonien, där de lokala integrationspolicyerna stödjer det minoritetsnationalistiska projektet. Hur övriga former av minoritetserkännande förhåller sig till integration är i stort sett outforskat i litteraturen.

Denna avhandling har som syfte att utforska kopplingar, skiljelinjer, spänningar och synergier mellan minoritetserkännande och integrationspolitik i Europa. Avhandlingen tillämpar kritiska och tolkande perspektiv på material bestående av dokument, intervjuer och etnografisk observation. Den kretsar kring tre forskningsfrågor: Hur producerar eller motverkar integrationspolitik uttryck av majoritetsnationalism i stater med erkända minoriteter? Hur formar koloniala arv och stormaktsarv denna politik? Vilka normativa spänningar kan utläsas mellan minoritetserkännande och integration? Avhandlingens teoretiska ramverk bygger på forskning om liberal mångkulturalism, bosättarkolonialism, samt teorier om tillhörighet och gränsdragande.

De fyra artiklarna i denna sammanläggningsavhandling kombinerar empiriska resultat med normativa frågor. I en policygenomgång visas att EU:s 27 medlemsländer i hög grad reproducerar majoritetsnationalism i sin integrationspolitik, vilket kan anses krocka med målet att skydda minoriteter från majoritetens dominans samt vissa invandrares minoritetsspråkliga omgivning. I Finland, där den finlandssvenska minoriteten enligt lag har lika stark språklig ställning som den finskspråkiga majoriteten, visas hur minoriteten och invandrare mobiliserar sig för att säkerställa att även minoritetsspråket inkluderas i den majoritetscentrerade implementeringen av integrationspolitiken. I den svenska delen av Sápmi visas att den statliga integrationspolitiken till stor del reproducerar koloniala praktiker, vilka dock till viss del utmanas framförallt i implementeringen. I Bulgarien visas hur språkliga, religiösa och geografiska gränsdragningar bidrar till att få kontakter uppstår mellan den turkiskspråkiga, muslimska nationella minoriteten och nyanlända flyktingar, även om post-osmanska muslimska institutioner har kommit att skapa tillhörighet för nyanlända flyktingar i ett land där staten är frånvarande vad gäller integrationsstöd.

Avhandlingen visar att integrationspolitiken i de undersökta länderna endast ger marginellt utrymme för minoritetstillhörigheter och därmed misslyckas med att representera den faktiska samhälleliga heterogenitet som invandrare möter. Historiska och samtida spänningar kopplade till språk, religion, etnicitet och ras interagerar på komplexa vis, som nutida enspråkiga, monokulturella och territoriella modeller av minoritetserkännande och integration inte lyckas fånga. Avhandlingens resultat har normativa implikationer för forskningen om minoritetserkännande och integrationspolitik och efterlyser kontextbundna perspektiv för att ompröva den nuvarande

politiken som tjänar majoritetsnationsbygge snarare än speglar samhällets faktiska mångfald.

Nyckelord: Integration, nationsbyggande, nationella minoriteter, urfolk, erkännande, språkpolitik, Bulgarien, Sápmi, Finland, Sverige, liberal mångkulturalism, bosättarkolonialism, tillhörighet, gränsdragande.

Acknowledgements

Without all the inspiring meetings, exchanges, generosity and support over the past few years, this research would not have existed. I am deeply indebted to all interviewees for generously sharing their time and experiences with me. I am also grateful to each person who has engaged with this work by asking curious questions, sharing advice, discussing texts, ideas, or in any way has guided the paths taken in it.

I cannot thank my supervisors Karin Borevi and Emil Edenborg enough. I always left our meetings with advice and encouragement that made it not only possible but much easier to carry out this research. Karin, since our first encounter you have shown endless interest and support for my work and have continuously contributed with fantastic advice and guidance at all stages of this research. Emil, besides always providing insightful and pertinent advice on texts and ideas, you have also helped me find the right paths, courses, and opportunities during my doctoral studies. I was beyond lucky to be guided by the both of you during these years.

My warmest thanks go to Suruchi Thapar-Björkert, Christian Fernandez, Reetta Toivanen and Simon Birnbaum for perceptive, helpful and constructive comments on my manuscript that helped me to choose between crucial paths and finalize this dissertation. Thank you also to Fredrika Björklund and Simon Birnbaum for kindly reading my final manuscript and giving highly helpful final recommendations.

I was fortunate to write this work embedded in the institutional and collegial environment of the School of Social Sciences and the Centre for Baltic and East European Studies (CBEES) at Södertörn University. Special thanks to all past and present colleagues in political science for forming my immediate research environment and for engaging with my work in a number of seminars. I am especially grateful for Joakim Ekman's engaged supervision in the initial stages of my PhD, for Inga Brandell's insightful comments on my half-time manuscript, for Johan Eriksson's helpful comments on previous drafts, and for Ann-Cathrine Jungar's support for future steps. I also wish to thank my office neighbour Linda Ekström for constant encouragement, and my former office neighbour Jaakko Turunen for always being up for debating theory, politics, or life.

Olena Vinogradova, Ignė Stalmokaitė, Erik Gråd, Raili Uibo, Johan Sandén, and Sara Persson, thank you for sharing the first year of doctoral studies with me at CBEES. Special thanks to my PESO course mates Sara and Johan for also making settling in in Stockholm so fun, and housing-related matters easier. Vasileios Petrogiannis, Çağla Demirel, Anders Backlund, Roman Privalov, Ellinor Hamrén, and Hugo Faber, thank you for sharing the perks of PhD studies in political science. Thank you Anders for being such a good office mate. Thank you Vasilis for the best travels. Thank you Çağla, for being there.

For all the greatness and brilliance that has taken place within *Nätverket*, I am truly grateful to Eva Karlberg, Joanna Mellquist, Ann-Sofie Lönnqvist, Hanna Bertilsdotter-Rosquist, and many others.

Thank you Lina Lorentz and Ulrica Lindbäck for always being helpful and supportive with administrative matters, and Lisa Kings for being an excellent Director of Studies. Thank you Matilda Lindgren for the help navigating Erasmus+. Thank you Edmond Bacchus, and *hvala* Hasan Šehić, for solving every technical emergency with patience and professionalism.

This project was possible only thanks to generous funding from the Foundation for Baltic and East European Studies. I am also grateful to the funders of the travel that profoundly enriched this research: Siamon Foundation, Helge Ax:son Johnson Foundation, Swedish Network for European Studies in Political Science, Karl Staaff Foundation, Erasmus+, and the Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul. Thank you REMESO graduate school for accommodation during your excellent PhD courses.

I am deeply grateful to Ayhan Kaya at Istanbul Bilgi University and Anna Krasteva at New Bulgarian University for sharing their precious time and expertise in Istanbul and Sofia. I also wish to thank the staff of the Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, as well as my fellow scholarship holders Mina Ghassaban Kjellén and Anna Ehrhart for our shared time in Istanbul. Thank you Cangül Aydın and Arjin Taş for excellent help with my data. Nadia Staneva, *благодаря* for teaching me Bulgarian in Sofia, I still miss our lessons.

My warmest thanks go to Colin Rowe and Camille Pascal for great workshop co-organization that introduced me to linguistic justice research at RIPPLE at KU Leuven and beyond. I am grateful to all workshop participants for excellent discussions, in particular Helder De Schutter for helpful paper comments, Seunghyun Song for sharing inspiration, and Matteo Bonotti and Colin for great co-editorship.

Moltes gràcies to Linguapax International for the invitation to Faber Residency in Olot, Catalonia. Charo Reyes Izquierdo, Irene García Losquiño, Kasimma Okani, and Maddie Kurchik, thank you for sisterhood, inspiration and laughter that still goes on.

Out of the many exchanges that have shaped my thoughts, I wish to extend my particular gratitude to Leena Huss, without whom I would not have thought of one day doing a PhD in the first place, and Lava Selo, for their important input at the initial stages of this work. Thank you Dieter Halwachs for occasionally bringing a piece of Steiermark to Flemingsberg. Thank you Sabira Ståhlberg for being beyond helpful and sharing your rich and impressive knowledge.

Among the friends I made during academic events, I wish to especially thank Jenni Helakorpi for many wise discussions, and Tuire Liimatainen for teaching me so much on the academic side of what has become "my own" minority.

I am lucky to have friends who also ended up doing a PhD. Thank you Elina, Karin, Zohreh, Sofia, Artan, and Vishal for making academia lighter.

I wish to thank my parents Kauko and Britt-Marie for planting the seeds for ideas that over the years grew into an academic interest and this dissertation, my older

brother Daniel for eternal optimism, and my little brother Anton for teaching me what really matters in life.

Finally, to those outside of these public acknowledgements: your being there during these years means a lot. Thank you for sticking around even when deadlines distracted me from life.

Nina

Stockholm, 30th of November 2020

Table of contents

List of papers

Paper I
Connections, separations, and tensions between policies of national minority recognition and immigrant integration in the European Union. Under review

Paper II
Navigating Two Languages – Immigrant Integration Policies in Bilingual Finland. Originally published in *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 16.2 (2017): 41-66. URL: https://www.ecmi.de/fileadmin/downloads/publications/JEMIE/2017/Carlsson.pdf.

Paper III
Revitalizing the Indigenous, integrating into the colonized? The banal colonialism of immigrant integration in Swedish Sápmi. Originally published in *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 43.16 (2020): 268-286. DOI:10.1080/01419870.2020.1776360.

Paper IV
"The communities, they support each other a lot." Boundaries and belonging among settled minorities and refugees in Bulgaria. Submitted for initial review.

The author of the thesis is the sole author of all papers.
Papers II and III are reproduced here with the permission of the publishers.

List of abbreviations

BKP	Bulgarian Communist Party
CEE	Central and Eastern Europe
CoE	Council of Europe
ECRML	European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages
ELY-centre	Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment
EU	European Union
EU27	The 27 member countries of the EU as of January 31st, 2020
FCNML	Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities
ILO 169	The Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989
INGO	International non-governmental organization
IO	International organization
MP	Member of Parliament
NGO	Non-governmental organization
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
SAR	State Agency for Refugees with the Council of Ministers
SFI	Swedish for Foreigners
UN	United Nations

1. Introduction
National minority and Indigenous recognition in the politics of immigrant integration

This dissertation investigates tensions, connections, synergies and separations between politics of recognition for historically present "old" minorities, and politics of immigrant integration targeting "new" minorities. Together, they form a distinct part of the governance of 'others' taking place within the borders of nation-states, units of governance where cultural and linguistic boundaries are expected to correspond with territorial boundaries. In processes of nation-building, where national boundaries are to become congruent with state borders, the policies have different and even contradictory aims. Whereas policies that target "old" minorities are guided by a quest to protect minority identities from the homogenizing pressures of nation-building, policies of immigrant integration are instead guided by an aim of making newcomers approach the cultural "core" of the nation-state.

Two categories of minorities are in this study investigated as old minorities: national minorities, who are culturally, ethnically or linguistically distinguished from the majority, with a presence that usually predates the foundation of the nation-state, and Indigenous peoples, who in addition have a connection to ancestral homelands targeted by colonialism. Many states award limited linguistic, cultural, or religious recognition in public space to minorities recognized as national or Indigenous, from which new minorities are excluded. As new minorities, this study investigates the category of immigrants, here understood as non-citizens who have moved to the country from another state either permanently or on a long-term basis. Under the label of integration, immigrants are targeted with policies in which linguistic and cultural knowledge is linked to various rights, such as residency, welfare, or family reunification. A core interest of this dissertation lies in what version of nationhood these requirements put forward, in particular what position national minorities and Indigenous peoples are awarded in processes of nation-building that take place through the politics of immigrant integration.

Previous research on the position of "old" minorities in immigrant integration has mainly focused on minorities whose recognition extends to territorial autonomy. This autonomy enables minority-dominated substate nations to be formed in federal, multinational states, where the minorities also rule over local politics. Studies have shown how in substates such as Catalonia, Quebec, and Flanders[1] the minority language has become the language of immigrant integration, which thereby supports

—

[1] Flanders is commonly conceptualized as minoritized despite its de facto majority position.

the goals of minority nation-building. A minority recognition strong enough to enable control over integration policies is nevertheless an exception. Most national minorities or Indigenous peoples are either demographically weak, lack nation-building ambitions, or simply do not hold legislative power over a territory. Whereas almost all countries in Europe have recognized national minorities,[2] those with substates are only a handful. Even though most national minorities do not live under substate arrangements, the scholarship that investigates immigrant integration has barely engaged with questions of national minority or Indigenous recognition but rather tends to take the majority identity markers in linguistic or cultural integration for granted. Since linguistic and civic competencies have become increasingly important aspects of integration policy, by disregarding recognized minorities policies may falsely reflect a homogenous version of the nation-state, while simultaneously perpetuating a homogenizing nation-building that further marginalizes old minorities within nation-building narratives and practices. This dissertation not only seeks to initiate a dialogue between research on national minority recognition and immigrant integration, but also takes as a starting point the idea that joint interrogations of differently aimed nation-building policies are crucial for understanding nationalisms in an era with increased mobility, nationalist mobilizations, and identity-based politics of integration.

This study carries out critical, empirical and minority-centred investigations into the politics of immigrant integration in Europe. Given the gatekeeping functions of language for access to social rights in integration policy, but also its significance in policies of minority recognition, the inquiry places a special focus on language. In doing so, it continuously connects linguistic matters to other political identities and to larger societal processes. The dissertation is based on interviews, documents, and ethnographic observations, following critical and interpretive approaches to the study of politics (Yanow 2007; Yanow and Schwartz-Shea 2006; Bevir and Rhodes 2016). Both existing connections between minority recognition and integration and those that were absent could thereby be explored. By relating the findings from empirical inquiries to normative discussions, this study contributes to ongoing efforts to generate a dialogue between normative theories of citizenship and their empirical conditions (cf. Bloemraad, Korteweg and Yurdakul 2008, 155).

This dissertation is a compilation of an introductory chapter and four individual papers. The first paper develops ideal types of minority-integrationist regimes, shows how most countries in the European Union (EU) do not acknowledge recognized national minorities in integration policy, and discusses normative tensions between

—

[2] Out of the 47 Council of Europe member states, 25 have ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML) and 39 have ratified the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM), entailing some forms of minority recognition on state level. Indigenous peoples are in some cases covered by both national minority and Indigenous recognition and have in other cases chosen to remain outside of the weaker national minority recognition. When referring to the category of national minorities in this work, however, Indigenous peoples are also included.

policies of minority recognition and immigrant integration. The second paper carries out an in-depth case study in Swedish-speaking Finland, where the minority has mobilized to facilitate integration policy implementation in the minority language even in areas with clear majority domination. The third paper shows how integration policy reproduces colonial narratives and Swedish nation-building in a location in Indigenous Sápmi, but also shows instances where majority-centred narratives are occasionally challenged. The fourth paper shows how boundaries are drawn between "new" Muslim refugees and "old" Turkish/Muslim national minorities in processes of settlement, integration, and belonging in post-Ottoman Bulgaria. The four studies make (dis)connections between immigrant integration and national minority policies visible, identify how imperial and colonial legacies and dynamics shape the recognition-integration nexus, and explore normative tensions that emerge when these policies are connected, by employing theoretical perspectives from within liberal multiculturalism, settler colonial studies, and beyond.

By constantly centring minority perspectives in a joint interrogation of national minority recognition and immigrant integration, this dissertation continues the emerging scholarly endeavours to combine two literatures commonly treated as separate, while bringing inquiries to novel, theoretically critical empirical contexts. It thereby enables us to reconceptualise, expand, connect, and bridge theories of migration and minority governance in an era where the rights of migrants are increasingly connected to knowledge of majority identity markers, minorities mobilize to ensure their rights, and nationalist mobilization is on the rise globally.

1.1. Dissertation outline

This introductory chapter presents the overarching aims and research questions of the dissertation, summarizes its main contributions, clarifies the logics behind the case selection, and presents reflections on chronology and order in the process of writing, as well as limitations of the research undertaken. Thereafter, significant literature is reviewed, gaps are made visible, and the contributions of this dissertation are highlighted in relation to previous literature. After the theoretical elaboration, the interpretive methodology is presented, together with a discussion on how interviews, documents, and ethnographic observations were carried out, collected, and analysed. Finally, the findings of the four papers are brought into dialogue in a discussion that answers the research questions in a synthesized manner and provides ideas for future research. At the end of the introductory chapter, the four papers are summarized, after which the introduction is followed by the four full individual papers.

1.2. Aim, research questions, and summary of main contributions

This dissertation aims to explore connections, separations, and synergies between policies and practices of national minority recognition and immigrant integration in

Europe. It is concerned with three questions that are discussed in each of its four constituent papers, with varying emphases:

1. How are expressions of majority nationhood produced and/or countered through immigrant integration policy in states with recognized national minorities and/or Indigenous peoples?
2. How do colonial or imperial legacies shape formulations of immigrant integration in states with recognized national minorities and/or Indigenous peoples?
3. What normative tensions can be identified in the politics of immigrant integration with regard to the promotion of minority and majority identities?

In addition to answering the three overarching questions, each paper also focuses on one or more narrowed-down, paper-specific questions. Paper I asks how national minority recognition is acknowledged in integration policies in EU27, and what normative tensions are revealed between the policy aims of promoting national minority recognition on the one hand, and immigrant integration on the other. Paper II asks how and whether integration governance in Finland, where the linguistic minority enjoys identical legal rights to the majority, may pave a way for multilingual integration. Paper III asks how immigrant integration policies and their implementation in Swedish Sápmi reproduce colonial practices on Indigenous territory. Finally, paper IV asks how boundaries are drawn between settled minority communities and new refugees in processes of refugee reception, integration, and belonging in Bulgaria.

The contribution of this dissertation is threefold. Empirically, it shows the richness, layers, complexities and tensions between the politics of national minority recognition and immigrant integration as investigated in EU27, one Indigenous context, and two post-imperial contexts of which one has included, and one excluded, the national minority from its nation-building. Through all the contexts studied, the dissertation shows how minority identities are given a marginal position in integration policies and practices, but also what the consequences of an inclusion of minoritized identities in integration may be for immigrants' belonging. Methodologically, it shows how immigrant integration provides a fruitful lens to studying national minority recognition. Since immigrant integration policies are not subject to monitoring by international organizations (IOs) who aim to safeguard compliance with international minority rights' conventions, they may reflect the position of minorities within national narratives more accurately than explicit minority policies, which are regularly monitored by IOs. Theoretically, it shows how integration in weak or non-territorial contexts of minority recognition is a complex process that challenges current territory-based models of minority recognition and majority-centred policies of integration. The dissertation argues that integration in minority

contexts can be understood and analysed through a layered perspective on integration, which both captures intersections between recognition and integration and has normative implications for theories on integration and recognition.

1.3. Case selection

The dissertation revolves around empirical cases selected among the member states of the European Union.[3] I will now elaborate on the value of choosing a European focus, why the specific cases were selected for this research, and briefly describe how each case study contributes to the overarching aims and questions of this dissertation both theoretically and empirically.

The focus of the dissertation, cultural and linguistic integration requirements in contexts of minority recognition, is a phenomenon that can be characterized as Western. It can be found especially within European "old" democracies and welfare states, as well as Anglo-Saxon settler states, namely states that were founded by European migrant settlers whose descendants still dominate over the Indigenous populations. This dissertation therefore contributes to debates on the governance of minorities and integration formulated primarily within Western knowledge production. Hence, it does not in the first instance produce knowledge for the large number of mostly post-colonial nation-states where multilingualism and the governance of difference is the norm. Rather, given the policy impact of present theories on minority governance formulated not only in the West but, more specifically, within the paradigm of liberal multiculturalism in North America, the goal of this dissertation is to develop the scholarship within a European context. This includes investigating cases that are European but not clearly captured by dominant theorization within Western scholarship – one Indigenous context and one Eastern European context. Even though the findings may be applicable outside of Europe or the West, such connections should nevertheless be made with caution and contextual sensitivity.

Influential parts of the scholarship on liberal multiculturalism draw from the Anglo-Saxon settler states Canada, the US, and New Zealand that form predominantly English-speaking jurisdictions following principles of civic nationalism. Research on the French minority in Canada has been particularly important in shaping our understanding of national minority governance. The minority in question was, however, a competing European settler group that also displaced Indigenous peoples, and today holds subnational power over a Canadian province with nearly nine million inhabitants. With regard to migration, these settler regimes have been seen as comparably inclusive to migrants. As Janoski describes, it can historically be connected to the need to replace Indigenous peoples displaced through settler colonialism

—

[3] The EU is in this work not equated with Europe, nor are non-EU member state per definition considered less European than EU member states. Rather, the EU has guided the case selection since it forms a main institutional framework for nation-states that are considered European, with shared frameworks of mobility.

and genocide with naturalised, assimilated immigrants (Janoski 2010, 12-13). Theories stemming from Anglo-Saxon settler contexts are therefore not directly comparable with the processes of nation-building, immigration or national minority recognition in Europe.

This dissertation addresses a phenomenon that has attracted scarce attention within the otherwise vast literature on nationalism, minorities, and migration in Europe. Within European minority research, empirical foci have been on autonomous minority contexts such as Catalonia and Scotland, which in a European context "fit the description of 'nations without a state' better than that of a national minority" (Sasse and Thielemann 2005, 660). Research on integration and migration in Europe has furthermore been deemed to require context-specific frameworks rather than merely applying conceptual tools developed elsewhere (Modood, Triandafyllidou, and Zapata-Barrero 2006, 6-7). As the authors further note in relation to scholarship on multiculturalism, European multiculturalism has dimensions that are not covered in the largely North American literature (Ibid.). Hence, translating concepts and frameworks from Anglo-Saxon settler states to a European context requires contextual sensibility when it comes to different nation-building projects, different trajectories of post-imperial minority formation, as well as legacies of civilizing, racist, and assimilatory ideas practiced within and beyond the territories of present-day Europe. The migratory histories and the colonial legacies targeting migrants as well as Indigenous peoples in Europe differ from those in Anglo-Saxon settler states that were built on settler migration. Furthermore, Islam is commonly presented in contemporary discourses on migration and integration in the West not only as a barrier to integration (Foner and Alba 2008, 368), but also as a threat to cultural unity in liberal societies (Parekh 2006). At the same time, unlike in North America, Islam is a religion with long historical roots in a number of European states, in some of which it is in majority and in others in minority position.

The empirical, in-depth studies of this dissertation are carried out with the aim of gathering context-dependent knowledge (Flyvbjerg 2006, 4) in settings where the national minorities, as is common in Europe, do not have territorial[4] autonomy. What unites the cases is that, despite the lack of minority political power over linguistic and cultural matters, each case leads us to expect minority influence in integration, due to either a strong recognition (Swedish-speaking Finland/Paper II), a normative justification for strong minority recognition (Swedish Sápmi/Paper III), or minority institutions filling the role of an absent state (Turkish-speaking, Muslim

—

[4] Many of the national minorities that in this work are referred to as non-territorial (or rather, non-substate minorities) are de facto recognized territorially, e.g. on municipal or regional level. However, their recognition is weaker than those of substate minorities, where the minority language is dominant or in a strong position in local linguistic policies, including in immigrant integration. By drawing a line between substate and non-substate (i.e. non-territorial) minorities, this study furthermore acknowledges the many persons who belong to or are connected to national minorities but reside outside of minority territories/substates due to increasing mobility and urbanization, a position that a territorial focus fails to describe.

Bulgaria/Paper IV). At the same time, the cases differ with regard to some key attributes of interest for this dissertation, not least when it comes to language requirements for naturalization, the languages of orientation courses, the societal status of minorities, their political representation, migration patterns, and colonial or imperial pasts. Table 1 provides a more thorough overview of the various differences between the cases, which enable rich explorations of the research questions. Through the in-depth case studies, tensions, layers, connections, and complexities in policies targeting "old" and "new" minorities are unravelled, thereby advancing our understanding of the politics of integration in contexts where minorities do not hold territorial autonomy, are weakly recognized, or clearly minoritized.

Table 1. Differences between selected cases

	Finland (Swedish language)	**Sweden (Sámi languages)**	**Bulgaria (Turkish language)**
Minority-linguistic integration regime*	Co-constitutional	Majoritarian	Exclusionary
Proportion of minority members within state	5,3%	0,2%	8%
Language / civic requirement for citizenship	Certificate of Finnish or Swedish knowledge	None	Passing language test and interview in Bulgarian language
State-funded orientation courses	In Finnish or in Swedish	In Swedish only	None/in Bulgarian only
Imperial/colonial past	Minority formerly privileged in Swedish Empire	Colonized by present state	Minority formerly privileged in Ottoman Empire
Current status	High status minority	Revitalization	Post-assimilation, stigmatized minority
Recognition (constitutional or other)	Co-national	Indigenous people / national minority	None / ethnic group
Form of domination	Majority nation-building under equal legal recognition	Majority nation-building through (settler)colonialism	Majority nation-building with assimilatory tendencies
Minority identity	Linguistic	Indigenous	Religious/linguistic
Migration pattern since WWII	From country of emigration to country of immigration	Country of immigration	Country of emigration
Minority language vitality	Slightly declining sociolinguistic status. Bordering state where minority language is dominant (Sweden)	Lule Sámi and South Sámi: severely endangered. Pite and Ume Sámi: critically endangered. North Sámi: Definitely endangered**	Weakened by assimilation, emigration. Bordering state where minority language is dominant (Turkey)
Minority representation in national level politics	Party in government (Swedish People's Party)	None	Party in parliament (Movement for Rights and Freedoms)
Main body of minority representation	The Swedish Assembly of Finland	Sámi Parliament	Grand Mufti's Office

* See paper I in the dissertation where four ideal types of minority-linguistic integration regimes are developed – the co-constitutional, territorial, majoritarian, and exclusionary types. The territorial ideal type, assigned with substate nations already prevalent in research, is not investigated through an in-depth case study.
** The degrees of language endangerment are taken from the UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger (ed. Moseley 2010). Definitely endangered means that "children no longer learn the language as mother tongue in the home". Severely endangered means that the "language is spoken by grandparents and older generations; while the parent generation may understand it, they do not speak it to children or among themselves". Critically endangered means that "the youngest speakers are grandparents and older, and they speak the language partially and infrequently". (See: UNESCO Interactive Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger, available on: http://www.unesco.org/languages-atlas/). Out of the languages studied in this dissertation (Swedish in Finland, Turkish in Bulgaria, and Sámi in Sweden), only Sámi languages figure as endangered in the Atlas.

In order to present how each case contributes to the overall research aim, I now briefly elaborate on how each of them relates to questions central for this dissertation.

In paper I, the aim is to explore and identify (dis)connections and value conflicts between policies of national minority recognition and linguistic-cultural immigrant integration in the European Union. It brings attention to different contexts of recognition and shows empirically that the scarcely researched contexts of weak minority recognition are the most prevalent in Europe yet do not extend their minority recognition to policies of immigrant integration. In addition, the study initiates a discussion on the multiple tensions between the preservationist aims of present, territorially based minority recognition frameworks and the politics of integration with regard to its homogenizing aims.

In paper II and paper IV, in-depth case studies are carried out in Finland and Bulgaria, which exemplify states with post-imperial minorities who used to belong to the imperial "core" group. Paper II aims to investigate the applicability of scholarship developed in substate nations to Finland,[5] a co-constitutional minority regime with strong national rather than subnational recognition. Its main contribution is to show how, unlike substate nations that strive to make integration policy on local level inclusive of the minority identity through coercion, migrants can by law select their language of integration in Finland. Since the implementation of Swedish-language integration possibilities nevertheless is largely lacking, Finland Swedes have mobilized to implement the far-reaching constitutional right of integration in Swedish even in locations where the language is in minority position. It thereby shows how the strong recognition could be mobilized beyond subnational or territorial limits, making the minority identity an option for immigrants even in places where the language is spoken by few. The formerly dominant Swedish-speaking minority was co-founder of the Finnish nation-state and has not been targeted by assimilation, forced settlement, or other repressive state policies aiming to weaken it but is weakened by linguistic developments resulting from majority Finnish nation-building. The case then enables an investigation of a context where past injustices do not

—

[5] For the Finnish case, the Swedish monolingual, autonomous Åland islands are excluded from the analysis, which instead focuses on continental Finland.

play into concerns for the future survival of the minority. The significance of historical domination and the conditions of present minoritization can thereby be studied from the perspective of a high-status, formerly dominant minority that enjoys possibly the strongest minority language legal rights in Europe.

In contrast to Finland, the post-imperial nation-building of Bulgaria has aimed at excluding the Turkish minority (Todorova 1997; Eminov 1997). Paper IV aims to investigate how settled minorities, including Turkish-speaking, Muslim national minorities and Arabic-speaking diasporas, are part of shaping the belonging of recently arrived refugees in Bulgaria. Both settled minorities and recent refugees are found to be targeted by othering discourses and practices. On the one hand, settled minorities are kept separate from refugees through linguistic, geographical and religious boundaries that can be connected to past and present practices of nation-building. On the other hand, settled minorities are shown to perform significant actions for refugee reception, integration, and belonging under conditions where the state is absent in providing integration support. Conducting research on an exclusionary case in Eastern Europe thus brings our focus to the multiple consequences of policy absences, of weak recognition, and the intersecting exclusions of minorities and migrants.

Unlike Swedish-speaking Finns and Bulgarian Turks who historically were part of imperial core groups, the Swedish domination over Sápmi has colonial attributes of an ongoing nature. Even though settler colonial injustices play an important role in the normative justification for minority-led integration policies as set out by Kymlicka (2001), little or no attention has been directed to connections between colonialism, Indigenous recognition, and immigration policy. Whereas scholarship on settler colonialism has traditionally been applied to contexts such as the United States, New Zealand, and Australia, such frameworks have recently also increasingly been applied to colonial processes in Sápmi (Kuokkanen 2020; Hennessey and Fur 2020; Össbo 2020). The investigation of the dynamics in Sápmi through a settler-colonial lens undertaken in paper III offers an exploration of theoretical connections between Indigenous recognition and integration in a context of ongoing colonialism. The aim of paper III is to understand connections between integration and Indigenous recognition in a European context by asking how immigrant integration policies and their implementation in Swedish Sápmi reproduce colonial practices. The study found that settler colonial attributes are identifiable in the Swedish context, that integration policy generally reproduces colonialism but also that integration policies and practices occasionally challenge the premises of settler colonialism.

All four papers and all three in-depth case studies show how majority domination and majority nation-building characterize integration in the contexts of weak or non-territorial minority recognition here investigated. They show how the phenomenon explored takes different forms depending on context and unravel complexities and tensions that challenge present theories and their normative starting points. In the

following, I describe how the work proceeded chronologically and raise some of its limitations.

1.4. Reflections on chronology and limitations

Writing a dissertation compiled of separate papers allows for concentrated, case-specific theoretical explorations, while simultaneously addressing overarching questions that join the pieces to a whole. The order of the papers as they are presented in this dissertation does not reflect the writing process chronologically, and thereby also not fully the theoretical journey embarked on. The chronological order of the writing is here presented together with theoretical choices made during the writing process, after which some limitations are raised in the scope of this work.

The writing process began with an exploration of the applicability of scholarship on immigrant integration in minority substate nations such as Quebec, Catalonia, the Basque Country and Flanders, to locations in mainland Finland where the Swedish minority is not territorially dominant. Applying the scholarship on substate nations to a case conceptualized as a non-territorial minority resulted in paper II, with contributions to theories on minority nationalism and immigrant integration. Sparked by discussions within liberal multiculturalism on how past settler injustices justify national minorities having control over immigration, the dissertation proceeded to explore and develop connections between contemporary migration and colonialism in an Indigenous context in paper III. Instead of applying theories of internal colonialism or other frameworks suitable for the partly ambiguous settler context investigated, it turned to a framework based on scholarship on settler colonialism. The importance Kymlicka (2001, 67) assigns to settler domination in normative justifications for why minorities should have control over integration opened for a need to explore the structural aspects of settler colonialism in relation to integration, which is adapted here for the specific case of immigrant integration in an Indigenous territory located in Europe.

The tensions identified between the different perspectives of nation-building, language policy, and integration guiding minorities, majorities, and immigrants in papers II and III, and the identified absence of synthetizing overviews of the research field, sparked the explorations undertaken in paper I. By investigating connections and tensions between policies of immigrant integration and national minority recognition, it combines novel empirical material from 27 EU countries with findings from prior research, conceptualizes different minority-linguistic regimes into ideal types, and pushes normative debates toward acknowledging weakly recognized minorities and questions of migrant belonging. Since it is conducted on policy level, however, it does not address conditions of actual implementation or empirical realities, which is particularly a limitation in contexts characterized by an *absence* of policy, or by minority exclusion. Paper IV therefore expands the research to a context where the large, territorially concentrated Turkish-speaking, Muslim minority is weakly recog-

nized and where the state offers marginal support for refugee integration. Furthermore, since not only language but also religion is a major identity marker for the historical minority, the mostly Muslim refugees enter a state with historically charged discourses on Islam. Thereby, the study does not only increase our understanding of contexts of weak recognition but brings religion too to the forefront of investigation in this dissertation.

As a final step, this introductory chapter formulates what, in chronological terms, are the final words of the theoretical journey undertaken in this dissertation, where the individual contributions are brought together into a collected discussion that ends with suggesting a layered perspective on analysing integration in minority contexts.

Like all research, this dissertation has its limitations in scope and approach. The conscious choice to focus on state officials, NGO representatives and official policy omits the voices of persons targeted by these policies. While we find both migrants and minority members among the interviewed representatives, the lack of personal testimonies raising minority and migrant perspectives limits this study and its knowledge claims to one on policies and perceptions by implementers. On a related note, an immersed participant observation during classroom activities, or when shadowing integration workers or migrants, could have contributed with knowledge on what is actually done in practice, rather than collecting perceptions. Notwithstanding the limitations, the focus of this dissertation enables us to investigate state ideas and actions through policy and testimonies, while future research could bring persons targeted by policies to the centre of inquiry.

Having introduced the questions and considerations guiding this dissertation, I now proceed to one of its core components, namely a theoretical discussion in which this work is positioned in relation to previous research, and where its theoretical contributions are outlined.

2. Situating the study in relation to previous research

In the following four sections, key scholarship is presented, gaps in the previous research are identified, and the contributions of this dissertation are highlighted in relation to the prior literature. The first section positions the study in relation to nationalism scholarship, defines key concepts, and reviews significant literature on minority recognition and immigrant integration. The second section goes through empirical and normative research where immigration is discussed in relation to minority nationalism and recognition, identifies gaps in the literature and outlines how this study will contribute to present scholarship in relation to the gaps and unexplored dimensions identified. The third section introduces theoretical perspectives useful for addressing gaps identified in the literature relating to contextual and historical specificities of nation-building, othering, and mobility. The fourth and final section proceeds to discussing how a layered perspective makes it possible to capture the complexities of jointly analysing integration and recognition, through examples from this dissertation's three in-depth case studies.

2.1. Internal 'others' as a challenge for majority nation-building

The phenomena of minority recognition and immigrant integration in their contemporary forms can be seen as reactions to, forms of, or consequences of nation-building that have emerged within the modern nation-state. In this section, I review significant literature on nation-building, immigrant integration, and minority recognition. I also clarify some key concepts and explain what the focus on language entails in this work.

The nation-state, which has become the predominant way of organizing modern societies, can be defined as a sovereign state where national and political boundaries coexist, whose population is presupposed to be bound together by a common culture and civic ideology (see: Smith 1991, 11). Nationalism has been connected by many scholars to modernity (Gellner 1983; Hobsbawm 1990), as has the phenomenon of having a national language (Calhoun 1997). Even though the idea of the modern nation has been connected to the state (Gellner 1983, 6), there are more nations in the world than states. Some nations instead hold subnational power through territorial accommodations in multination states (Keating 2001), which may have a common national identity and a shared lingua franca. Most minorities nevertheless form nations that do not hold significant political power or territorial control, but rather live under the dominance of majority nation-states.

Even though some forms of nationalism may be more inclusive than others to minorities, what nation-states have in common is that one core nation typically

dominates politically over groups that form smaller minorities without significant political or territorial power within the state. The national, or non-national, 'others', with cultures or languages that differ from the core nation(s), nevertheless challenge the aspirations of majority nation-building. Triandafyllidou highlights how the presence of minorities within national borders "disrupts the cultural and political order of the nation, and thus challenges its sense of unity and authenticity" (1998, 603). Many states have aimed to create such unity by political means through language policy, history and civic education, and by regulating who has the right to settle within it. At the centre of such governance we find politics targeting different minorities who are perceived to be deviant with regard to the national core.

As political categories, national minorities and migrants are the most common groups assigned as internal 'others'. National minorities are commonly understood as numerically inferior, historically established groups who are distinguished from the majority population through linguistic, ethnic, religious, or cultural characteristics which they wish to preserve (Preece 1998, 28; Sasse and Thielemann 2005, 657). Indigenous peoples are further distinguished from national minorities through the connection to an ancestral homeland, which may currently be politically threatened or from where Indigenous peoples may have been expelled in the past (Corntassel 2003, 91-92) due to colonialism. (Im)migrants are here understood as people moving from one country to reside in another on a long-term basis, who usually lack citizenship in the country of residence. Crepaz (2016) claims that national minorities, with exceptions such as the Roma, have over the years become part of national narratives, whereas migrants are viewed as othered outsiders. Hence, both "new" and "old" minorities are targets of nation-building policies within the majority state, but through forms that take different expressions.

The differences can be made clear using Mylonas' (2013) conceptualization of three forms of nation-building policies – assimilationist, accommodating, and exclusionary – that captures complex interplays between the national "core" and "non-core" groups. According to him, assimilationist policies target non-core groups with the ultimate aim of creating loyal, obedient co-nationals. They include policies aiming for changes of behaviour, language use, or dress, but also practices of colonialism and exclusion. The second form of policies identified by Mylonas consists of accommodating policies, which means that the state awards recognition as a national minority, but still demands loyalty and may discriminate the minority. The third strand of policies are called exclusionary, referring to policies aiming to remove non-core groups from the state through massacres, deportations, but also in some cases segregation (Mylonas 2013, 21-22). Relating his division to the categories of interest in this dissertation, assimilationist policies can be connected not only to the past or present of many national minorities, but to contemporary integration policy too. In a similar manner, exclusionary policies can be related to both national minorities and immigrants. In contemporary policies, migrants obtain relatively weak accommodations compared to many national minorities. The accommodating nation-buil-

ding policies that allow for cultural preservation within the state are then primarily directed at national minorities rather than immigrants.

The accommodating features of nation-building accept a certain degree of difference within the nation-state. As Calhoun notes, nationalists can be inclusionary in the sense of developing institutions and cultural practices that approve of difference (Calhoun 2007, 162). Smith, too, claims that education systems in liberal democracies, rather than homogenizing the population, have attempted to unify it, allowing minorities to keep their own symbols while also seeking to accommodate or incorporate them into broader national culture (Smith 1998, 40-41). These practices of approving difference generally take place within what commonly is referred to as "politics of recognition" (Taylor 1994; Fraser 2000; Fraser and Honneth 2003), connected above all to Western liberal democracies (Gutmann 1994, 2). As Taylor writes in his seminal essay, "with the politics of difference, what we are asked to recognize is the unique identity of this individual or group, their distinctness from everyone else" (Taylor 1994, 38). Fraser further defines the goals of recognition as "a difference-friendly world, where assimilation to majority or cultural norms is no longer the price of equal respect" (Fraser and Honneth 2003, 7). The absence of recognition may inflict harm, as Taylor notes, since our identities are partly shaped by recognition (Taylor 1994, 25). In this dissertation, recognition is used to describe the inclusion of non-core national groups in official policy. The recognition of multicultural difference has been widely researched within the normative literature that has been called liberal (multi)culturalism. Patten summarizes the research field as being sympathetic to majority nationalism yet allowing for multiple majorities within the state through substate arrangements (Patten 2016, 5-6). Thus, scholars in the field do not reject nationalism but are open to accommodating multiple nations within a state.

The large body of scholarship on liberal multiculturalism maintains that multiculturalism and multilingualism accommodations are to be strived for in multinational contexts for reasons of justice (Kymlicka 1995; 2007; Patten 2016; May 2012; De Schutter 2007). Liberal multiculturalist researchers hold that practicing neutrality in matters of culture and language would lead to the promotion of the majority culture and language through state institutions and thereby indirectly cause an unjust assimilation that harms the dignity of national minorities. The normative starting points of liberal multiculturalism can be viewed in contrast to research within political philosophy where a neutrality towards, or assimilation of, minority identities is seen as a path towards a just or equal society (Barry 2001; Pogge 2003; Laitin and Reich 2003). Within research on liberal multiculturalism, possibly the most influential, widely used, and often contested, theory of minority rights has been written by Kymlicka. As he states in relation to the direct policy influence of his theories, "I have been struck by the way [the ideal of liberal multiculturalism] has come to inform the work of many international organizations". He further describes how the concepts, facilitated by IOs, have reached countries such as Syria and Moldova (Kymlicka 2007, 7). The ideas, which have been treated as near-universal theoretical tools (Modood,

Triandafyllidou, and Zapata-Barrero 2006, 4-7), have thereby shaped not only academic thoughts central for this dissertation, but also the minority and integration policies that are its subject of scrutiny.

At the core of Kymlicka's work is the division of minorities into three different tracks, where national minorities and Indigenous peoples are granted limited cultural autonomy in order to counter past injustice, and immigrants are granted weaker, 'polyethnic' rights. They are thereby expected to integrate into the host state's culture(s), learn its language(s), while maintaining their own language in the private sphere (Kymlicka 1995, 78). As justification for the weak accommodations made for immigrants, Kymlicka claims that they have "waived" their rights to their original culture by "deciding to uproot themselves" (1995, 96). Unlike "voluntary" migrants, refugees have not made the choice, but they can still expect to be treated as immigrants with merely polyethnic rights (Kymlicka 1995, 99) and are thereby expected to integrate into the host state. The rigid division that removes immigrants from substantial cultural and linguistic rights has received a number of criticisms by scholars (see e.g. Parekh 1997, 62; Carens 1997; Pinto 2007, 151-152; Choudhry 2002; Benhabib 2002; Patten 2016).

As a response to some of his critics questioning the exclusion of migrants from linguistic and cultural rights, Kymlicka has recently stated that:

> Enabling immigrants to assert self-governing rights over a particular chunk of the state's territory would in effect be allowing them to colonize a part of the territory of the state. This is exactly what colonizing settlers did throughout the Americas, and if we grant immigrants the right to establish self-governing societies we would be reproducing that injustice yet again. (Kymlicka 2018, 85)

This statement points to an inability to imagine non-territorial models of recognition in present minority policies. Sasse indeed points out the multiple linkages between migration and national minorities – both groups are usually geographically concentrated and many national minority groups have formed as a result of earlier migration (Sasse 2005, 674). Indeed, some scholars have argued that especially when a migrant language has many speakers, it should also get some recognition (May 2016, 47).

Many of the policy instruments used for national minorities are however founded on a clear separation between immigrants and minorities, and follow, as Palermo describes, "the 'original intent' argument: minority rights instruments were designed with a clear set of groups in mind, which in no way includes migrants" (Palermo 2019, 16). National minorities are subject to limited protective measures partly steered by a number of supranational legal instruments. The only legally binding minority treaties in the world (Weller 2008, 1), the Council of Europe's (CoE) European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML) and the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM) are among the main tools shaping policies protecting national minorities in Europe. EU accession mechanisms and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) also have measures in

place promoting minority protection alongside a nexus shifting between security and rights (Sasse 2005). The UN's Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (ILO 169) protects the Sámi, who are the only recognized Indigenous people in Europe, but only in Norway (Ravna 2015). Sweden, Finland, and Russia who have also colonized parts of Sápmi have not ratified the convention. The recognition of national 'others' is then shaped by international actors in cooperation with national and local politics, which in part may have contributed to the broad consensus of only recognizing historically present minorities, but also to the situation where many minorities across Europe do have official recognition.

When recognizing minorities, the identity markers that become politically central may vary from one group to another. Language has been identified as an important identity marker and carrier of culture for many minorities (Schmidt 2008; Tannenbaum 2009; Karoulla-Vrikki 2004; McCarty, Romero, and Zepeda 2006; Van Parijs 2011), and has been analysed as central to the spread of nationalism through the creation of "imagined communities" facilitated by the print press (Anderson 2006). Language is, however, not the only, nor the most important identity marker for many groups, and should therefore not be analysed in isolation, as a number of scholars have observed. May (2006, 255-56) states that it is important not to investigate language in an ahistorical, apolitical manner, separated from other social structures. He further calls for a reconceptualization of "language and identity as inextricably interlinked, and inevitably situated within a wider nexus of power relations" (May 2014, 388). An example of such power relations can be found in Perrino's (2019) study on Veneto where revitalization, a common practice among minorities whose language and culture have been weakened, has been used for the purpose of excluding migrants as part of separatist and right-wing political mobilization. Regarding the position of language in individuals' lives, Piller (2016) notes that "language intersects with race, socioeconomic status, legal status, and gender in complex ways". Hence, as these scholars note, language is closely connected, if not inseparable, from the surrounding society, and linguistic politics consequently also play out differently in individuals' lives.

The connections between language and social structures are exemplified when a lack of language skills functions as a proxy of exclusion that seems objective and neutral (Knutsen, Fangen and Žabko 2020; Blackledge 2005), in contrast to illegal religious or racial grounds. Language requirements for immigrants, which have been discussed in relation to concerns of justice and fairness (Kunnan 2013; McNamara and Ryan 2011), are also politically widely used and endorsed. In comparison, explicit requirements to follow the dominant state religion would in most Western states today be considered a repressive act. Acts aiming to restrict freedom of religion do nevertheless occur through measures framed as neutral, such as bans on religious dress for Muslim women in France and the Netherlands (see e.g. Heider 2012; Saharso and Lettinga 2008). However, unlike the more direct linguistic demands, they do not take the form of explicit requirements to practice the state religion.

Scholars within liberal multiculturalism have pointed out that a state can refrain from promoting a particular religion, but it cannot be linguistically neutral since its constitution, national anthem, passports, and education system operate in a chosen language (De Schutter and Robichaud 2015, 89; Kymlicka 1995, 111; Rubio-Marín 2003, 55). Hence, all states need to officially privilege one or more languages over others in policy. Van Parijs furthermore claims that the communicative function of language makes it stand out compared to religion – when speaking to an interlocutor, there is an imperative to find a common language, while religious practices can be disagreed on and lived distinctly (Van Parijs 2011; Patten 2016, 222). Hence, since we operate, communicate, and organize through a language, we have to pick at least one for our societies, but do not need to be restricted to it since we can switch between languages.

As part of wider political developments, linguistic and cultural requirements have become central in contemporary integration policies in Europe. Immigrant integration has come to characterize various state practices regulating immigrants' adaptation to the nation-state in relation to employment, financial sufficiency, linguistic and cultural practices, or housing (Givens 2007; Joppke and Morawska 2003). Favell points out that immigration has only become a salient political issue following political and economic instabilities, taken up by politicians framing it as a cause behind other grievances (1998, 23). As a consequence of the rise of immigration as a policy issue, immigrant integration has become a widely researched academic topic investigated from different starting points – comparing philosophies or models of integration in different countries (Favell 1998; Koopmans 2010; Ersanilli and Koopmans 2011; Wright and Bloemraad 2012), measuring integration successes and failures (Phalet and Swyngedouw 2003; Harder et al. 2018) or investigating the concept itself from a critical perspective (Korteweg 2017; Schinkel 2018; Collyer, Hinger, and Schweitzer 2020). The central role assigned to linguistic and cultural knowledge in recent integration policies in Europe has inspired a range of research characterizing it as civic integration (Joppke 2007; Goodman 2010; Mouritsen 2013).

Describing a 'civic turn' in integration policies (Borevi, Jensen, and Mouritsen 2017; Bonjour and Duyvendak 2018; Mouritsen, Jensen, and Larin 2019), research has shown how access to citizenship is increasingly restricted and conditioned through a range of requirements. In such policies, access to citizenship, residency, welfare support, entry permits, or family migration depend among other things on financial, behavioural and linguistic compliance. The state's active role in disciplinary actions, the expansion of good citizenship to personal conduct and values, as well as the connection to immigration control have been identified as key ideological underpinnings of the trend (Mouritsen, Jensen, and Larin 2019, 601). While the range and degree of civic integrationist policies differ between countries (see e.g. Goodman 2010), the most extreme example is perhaps how entry to a country is made conditional on demonstrating knowledge of the dominant language and civics through "integration from abroad" in the Netherlands, Austria, Denmark, France, Germany,

and the UK (de Leeuv and van Wichelen 2012, 203; Bonjour 2014). Persons aspiring to reunite with family members thereby need to fulfil criteria of integration before even arriving in the country. Triadafilopoulos (2011, 863) calls such practices "aggressive integrationism", stating that they stem from a strand within liberal thought concerned with a preservation of liberal core values in Western societies that, perhaps ironically, occurs through illiberal practices.

Nationalism has also been identified as a central factor behind civic integrationist policy (Jensen and Mouritsen 2019, 838). Indeed, Larin states that, rather than preparing for integration into the actual dynamics in society, civic integration can be seen as a mirror of the (imagined) majority society and is "likely to fail because it reflects the ideological self-representation of the majority instead of the social bases of integration" (Larin 2020, 135). Similarly, Hadj Abdou labels integration as "a phenomenon that reveals more about those who articulate ideas about integration and decide on integration measures than it does about those who are the target of integration (i.e. the migrant 'other')" (Hadj Abdou 2019, 1). The supposed two-wayness of integration has also been criticized by Kostakopoulou for having "the ideological function of presenting society as a united national community represented by the government and simultaneously placing it in opposition to another party, namely, the migrants" (Kostakopoulou 2010, 952). Indeed, when policies of immigrant integration are determined, the "national" target culture(s) and language(s) need to be explicitly formulated, determining which language requirements are to guide contents of civics courses, requirements for naturalization, or residency, and which belongings are to be excluded from such formulations. As noted by multiple scholars, the official policy serves the interests of majority identities and majority nation-building rather than reflecting the multitude of belongings in society.

In contrast to such clearly defined majority-led integration formulations, the complex processes of integration that take place in individuals' lives are characterized by plurality and multilingualism. Research on integration in Western urban, multicultural contexts of superdiversity (Vertovec 2007) has empirically shown how the idea of a single majority target culture of assimilation, as propagated in policies, is challenged (Grzymala-Kazlowska and Phillimore 2018). In contexts where the "minority" has a demographically dominant position, previous migrants may become significant for the settlement of new migrants (Crul 2016, 57; Castles 2002, 1148). For instance, in the UK, the role of migrants who are ahead in the settlement process has been deemed crucial for feelings of migrant cultural and linguistic integration, contrary to political discourses that link such processes to relations with white majority Britons (Wessendorf 2018, 11). Linkages to previously settled groups can nevertheless fuel exclusions, as it has been found that "[n]ew foreigners who bear a striking similarity to old foreigners are consequently ranked lower on a hierarchy of belonging" (Back and Sinha with Bryan 2012, 148) in the UK. Hence, not only are othered groups identified as valuable for belonging but being associated with them may also link individuals to exclusionary social processes fuelled by majority nation-building. Scholar-

ship thus shows that integration policy and the society it promotes and images not only mirror the imagined majority population, but also inaccurately reflect and fail to recognize the multitude of belongings in society.

To conclude, research has shown how minorities are perceived as challenges for fundamental premises of nation-states and nation-building, how the accommodations and requirements found in policies that target national minorities and immigrants differ, but also how integration policies are guided by ideas that do not reflect actual societal dynamics. In the following, I proceed to a more focused exploration of the nexus between minority recognition and immigrant integration, by reviewing literature specifically addressing connections between minority nationalism and immigrant integration.

2.2. Minority nation-building through immigrant integration

As previously noted, the preservationist aims of minority recognition may conflict with aims of nation-building. Characterizing them as two rival positions, Patten however finds an exception in substate nations where the goals of immigrant integration and minority nation-building align (Patten 2016, 195-96). In this section, I review literature that explicitly deals with normative and empirical connections between minority nationalism and immigrant integration, mostly in substate contexts. While Kymlicka remains the leading normative scholar in addressing the topic, a broad range of scholars has conducted empirical research that is presented here. Furthermore, I raise underexplored questions and identify significant gaps in the scholarship, after which I outline how this dissertation addresses and contributes to the gaps identified.

Research in which national minorities are part of the receiving citizenry *targeting* non-citizen immigrants with integration policy focuses on a number of substate cases. Based on observations from Quebec, Catalonia, the Basque Country, Scotland, Flanders, and French-speaking Switzerland, Kymlicka set some theoretical foundations for connections between minority nationalism and immigrant integration in 2001. He shows how minority nationalism is not inherently more exclusionary toward migrants than majority nationalism and how minority nations have largely come up with similar (linguistic) solutions for immigrant integration to majority nations (Kymlicka 2001). Speaking in civic integrationist terms, the language and civics requirements placed upon immigrants follow the territorially dominant minority languages and narratives of minority nationhood rather than those of the nationally dominant majority. Thus, a linguistic territoriality principle can be identified in such cases, where each language gets to be the "queen" of a certain territory, thereby determining its linguistic rules (Van Parijs 2011).

For immigrants, learning a minority language can however be a challenge. According to Kymlicka, the normative motivation for minorities having "some control over

the numbers of immigrants" and the terms of integration (2001, 75) is nevertheless rooted in past unjust, forcible, and massive state settlement policies:

> And if immigrants in a multi-nation state integrate into the majority group, the national minority will become increasingly outnumbered and so increasingly powerless in political life. Moreover, states have often deliberately encouraged immigrants (or migrants from other parts of the country) to settle in lands traditionally held by national minorities, as a way of swamping and disempowering them, reducing them to a minority even within their historical territory. (Consider the fate of Indian tribes and Chicanos in the American south-west.) (Kymlicka 2001, 67)

Past oppression, not least that of Indigenous peoples, combined with concern for future survival, is thus central to how Kymlicka justifies why national minorities have the right to impose demands on migrants. Even though the statement is shaped with a settler state in mind, asymmetric core-periphery dynamics that Hechter (1975) has characterized as internal colonialism can be found in most substates. The power exercised over migrants through integration is thereby normatively motivated based on past injustices.

Over the years, a number of studies have interrogated the empirical conditions of minority-nationalist integration, starting largely from the substate contexts brought up by Kymlicka, namely Catalonia (Barker 2015), the Basque Country, Flanders (Jeram and Adam 2015; Adam 2013), Quebec (Barker 2010; 2015), Scotland (Barker 2015; de Casanova 2014), but also South Tyrol (Carlà 2018; Wisthaler 2016), Galicia, and Wales (Bermingham and Higham 2018). In the scholarship we can identify how ideas and practices that can be connected to civic integration come to expression when substate parties and governments "counter the state-level 'citizenship agenda' by attempting to foster belongings to the substate national community among immigrants, either through force and sanction or with persuasion and argument" (Jeram, van der Zwet, and Wisthaler 2016, 1234). The research field further shows that substates have power over local linguistic affairs that also extend to integration, while migrants at the same time are also subject to national-level naturalization and immigration policies. Migrants thus generally face demands on both the local and national level, becoming subject to both minority nationalist and majority nationalist policies.

The ways in which substates politically react to immigration nevertheless differ. They are shaped by conceptions of who belongs to the minority, historical legacies of migration, and the relation of the minority to the majority state. The relatively inclusionary approach to migrants of Catalonia has been partly ascribed to positive experiences of past migration from other parts of Spain, while South Tyrol's restrictive approach to migrants can be linked to negative past experiences of Italian immigration (Carlà 2018, 1111). Drawing on Conversi (1997), Jeram states that migration to Catalonia from other parts of Spain was driven by economic reasons rather than conscious state settlement, and that migrants were welcomed by Catalans as long as they attempted to learn Catalan (Jeram 2014, 228). In South Tyrol, regional parties

have favoured an assimilatory approach to immigration, calling for migration from contexts of "cultural proximity". They also view immigration as a threat to the German and Ladin speakers who are separated by clear boundaries from the Italian national majority (Wisthaler 2016, 1285-1286). As a more inclusionary reaction, Jeram and Adam have shown that narratives of past oppression among Flemish and Basque substate elites have paved the ground for a multiculturalist rather than assimilatory approach to contemporary immigration (2015, 245). The divergent reactions are nevertheless bound by time, as Barker notes, drawing on evidence from Quebec where integration policies have been a result of the conceptions political elites have had of national identity and shift over time (Barker 2010, 12). Adam summarizes how "regional and substate responses to immigration are as diverse as those of states, but for different reasons" (Adam 2018, 264). Importantly, rather than necessarily being more inclusive, it seems that national minorities holding territorial power tend to target migrants as recipients of integration policy in a similar way to majority nations.

Whilst an asymmetry exists between the receiving minority that sets demands and the migrants who are to integrate in accordance with them, the politics of minority recognition and immigration may reciprocally influence one another. Expressions of solidarity and connectedness have been observed when Basque nationalists have made connections between the plight of refugees and Spanish policies forcing Basque persons to emigrate (Jeram and Adam 2015). After living in Catalonia where Catalan is valued, migrants whose languages, such as Tamazight or Wolof, were minoritized in their home countries have been found to begin fighting for their native languages (Cortès-Colomé, Barrieras, and Comellas 2016). Catalan politicians have also been active in supporting the Amazigh movement (Maddy-Weitzman 2011, 139). Conversely, migrant languages have also been found to strengthen national minority languages. The language rights Sweden granted to immigrants came to pave the path towards the recognition of national minorities (Borevi 2017). Even though there are many examples where internal 'others' within the nation state have found support and solidarity across struggles, the links between minorities and migrants may also take opposite paths. Minority revitalization has, as part of anti-immigrant and pro-separatist political dynamics, been used as a means to exclude migrants in Italian Veneto, which lacks territorial autonomy (Perrino 2019). In Britain, where "there is an understanding that national identity is multiple – English, Scottish and Welsh", immigrants with Commonwealth citizenship were excluded from civil and social rights until the 1960s (Fekete 2008, 11). Also, in Switzerland, the well-functioning federal multilingualism is paired with an exceptionally strict approach to immigration (Manatschal 2015) that draws a firm boundary between those deemed as belonging and not. Hence, even though solidarities exist, research shows no inherent support between "old" and "new" minorities, nor is it always clear how connections emerge between policies that target the two categories.

Returning from the empirical research to normative dimensions of the relation between old and new minorities, an exchange between Kymlicka and Miller has

addressed what kind of citizenship should be promoted for immigrants in multination states. Kymlicka (2011) suggests how multination states could foster a multinational citizenship through civic and linguistic education for immigrants by expanding the number of narratives put forward. Rather than promoting a single narrative across England, Wales, and Scotland, the goal would be to educate all citizens on both the multinational (substate) citizenship and the postnational (majority) citizenship (Kymlicka 2011, 299). In reply, Miller instead calls for a 'nested' model of citizenship where each substate nation agrees on how questions of nationhood are to be handled, jointly agreeing on what a 'nested' identity might look like. An immigrant in Glasgow would, for instance, identify as both Scottish and British rather than either-or (Miller 2011, 306). Both scholars, then, address the question of what policies of civic integration could strive for in states with national minorities.

Whereas their exchange is valuable for approaching many core questions in the relation between immigration and national minorities, the empirical contexts that ground their discussion are limited. Just like Kymlicka and Miller in their exchange, research has closely followed the Canadian-inspired research on Quebec, leading to a focus on autonomous minority contexts such as Scotland. As previously stated, such cases can nevertheless better be seen as "nations without a state" than national minorities (Sasse and Thielemann 2005, 660), entailing a territorial power that to some extent makes them closer to nation-states with regard to cultural or linguistic citizenship than to many national minorities. Patten, too, points out that "[c]ultural groups do not always have a nationalist agenda and are not always in position to pursue one" (2016, 6). Indeed, Benhabib has identified some challenges with Kymlicka's neat divide

> the assumption that ethnic groups form only through immigration, while national minorities are self-governing and territorially concentrated, is hard to sustain. […] Take the case of the large German-speaking minority in East European, Baltic, and Russian territories. Likewise, a "national minority" may become more and more like and ethnic group through historical developments. (Benhabib 2002, 62)

Multiple scholars have pointed out the difficulty of sustaining this divide in the face of empirical realities. Sasse, examining connections between the governance of national minorities and migrants, states that the distinction between "old" and "new" minorities "ironically points to the overlap rather than the distinction between the two categories" since there is no definition on when a migrant community becomes old, nor a consideration for when newly arrived migrants enter "old" communities and thereby blur the categories (Sasse 2005, 676). Other migrant groups have been recognized as "old", such as Vietnamese and Belarusians in the Czech Republic, (Kascian and Vasilevich 2015). Recently, an edited volume has been published aiming to investigate possibilities of extending the protection of national minorities to migrants (Medda-Windischer, Boulter, and Malloy 2019). The work points to

limitations in Kymlicka's divide and attempts to overcome the rigid divide between minority studies and migration studies.

In a study of French speakers in Canada who reside outside of Quebec, Poirier shows how Kymlicka's typology has a blind spot that overlooks the minority (Poirier 2019). She compares French speakers outside of Quebec with minorities such as Roma and guest workers, groups that Kymlicka (2001) himself has acknowledged are not covered by his framework (Poirier 2019, 38). Toivanen (2019) shows how current minority typologies that require a connection to a homeland both misrecognize and overlook the needs of Roma, who do not know where their ancestors came from. She claims that they should be awarded Indigenous recognition, given that territorial frameworks exclude and misrecognize the largest (national) minority in Europe (Toivanen 2019).

As multiple scholars have shown, empirical realities do not fit the strict division prevalent in research and policy, where national minorities are to have territorial autonomy, and immigrants modest linguistic and cultural accommodations. These categories are shown to overlap, to be expandable, and even to misrecognize minorities. I argue that these observations, widely made within minority and migration research, also need to be transferred to inquiries on connections between minority recognition and immigrant integration by redirecting attention from minority nations with territorial autonomy to a wider range of minority recognition while acknowledging migrant belongings.

The tendency to focus primarily on minority substates may be explained by the clear empirical connections in locations where, according to policy, migrants are to learn minority languages that are also widely used. However, substates too are under transformation with regard to their clear territorial attachments. O'Rourke (2018) notes that modernization, globalization, and urbanization have eroded traditional minority communities, resulting in deterritorialization and a wide range of new speakers of minority languages, in all kinds of minority contexts. Observing the marginal position of migrants within such processes, Ó Murchadha et al. illustrate how many national minorities live under conditions that marginalize them from discussions on migration:

> [N]ew speakers as a result of migration represent a relatively rare minority language new speaker profile, as the economic and social processes which contributed to the language's minorisation mean that minority language communities tend to be sites of out-migration rather than in-migration. (Ó Murchadha et al. 2018, 14)

Even though virtually all minorities, including those forming substate majorities, have been affected by processes of urbanization, deterritorialization, and modernization, this observation can be interpreted in light of contrasts between different minority contexts. The conditions of comparably wealthy substate nations that hold some political power over cities such as Barcelona, Bilbao, Glasgow and Antwerp, can be contrasted with recognized national minorities in Europe such as Roma, Turks,

Kvens, Russians, Gagauzes, Sámi, Tatars, and Occitans whose languages are, from the dominant majority perspective, considered as having either low instrumental value for immigrants, low status, or a marginal or weakening position within the nation-state. Hence, if we wish to better understand connections between the heterogeneous category of national minorities and policies of immigrant integration in Europe, we need to go beyond the substate focus of current research that excludes a significant part of said minorities, investigate a wider range of minority recognition, acknowledge migrant identities too, and ask different questions.

Such an empirical shift has normative implications. By expanding the focus from substates to a wider range of minorities and minority belongings, the starting points and conclusions of the previously described normative debate between Kymlicka and Miller can be challenged. Firstly, the focus of the normative exchange is on multination federations with the institutional means to reproduce minority nationhood (Kymlicka 2011, 287). One may then question what remains for minorities that do not have such institutional means – who should promote their citizenship narratives? Furthermore, should the majority narrative not be reformulated in such a way that it does not clash with minority narratives? Also, the role assigned to migrants' histories within both majority and substate histories is not discussed in the debate. Rather than assuming that migrants are merely passive recipients of the messages that civic education classes are to convey, it should be recognized as far from self-evident that migrants from, for instance, former British colonies would want to identify with hegemonic, colonial Englishness. Should former colonies not occupy a central place in citizenship narratives that are explicitly communicated to migrants rather than expecting colonized people to unite behind the master's narrative? Finally, may not the citizenship narrative and history writing of the internally colonized, Welsh or Gaelic, be more plausible or relatable for some migrants than the majority narrative?

The above-mentioned considerations partly reflect the state of the research field investigating connections between national minorities and immigration. Even though a number of studies have been carried out on the observation Kymlicka made in 2001 regarding the low scholarly attention directed to the intersections between minority nationalism and immigration, almost 20 years later scholarship combining minority recognition and migration is still seeking its paths.

Building on the findings of previous research addressing questions of minority nationalism, integration, minority recognition, and nation-building, this dissertation identifies three areas of key interest for further developing the research on intersections between minority recognition and immigrant integration. The first one relates to the overall lack of research on national minorities outside of models of territorial recognition in integration policy. Apart from the scholarly gap already discussed, it also touches upon wider questions of minority recognition, the possibilities of maintaining minoritized identities in a nation-state, and which national narratives are to be conveyed to newcomers.

The second area relates to Indigenous contexts and inconsistencies between the normative weight of past settlement and the little attention directed towards settlement of an ongoing nature. Kymlicka states that forced settlement both forms an important normative motivation for national minorities to control immigration, but also gives reasons to prevent cultural autonomy for immigrants since he claims it can be equated with past settler injustices (2001; 2018). However, a recognition of immigrant identities would not need to be territorial as Kymlicka states but could follow other principles such as the personality principle (Réaume 2003, 271) where rights are assigned to individuals no matter in what part of the state they live. Furthermore, the parallel Kymlicka makes between past settler injustices and present (territorial) rights for migrants is questionable from two perspectives. First, the Americas are still under colonization, which is continuously pointed out by scholars within the field of settler colonialism (Wolfe 2006; Tuck and Yang 2012; Veracini 2015). Secondly, using injustices targeting Indigenous peoples in order to deny rights to present-day migrants could in this context be seen as primarily defending the current models of recognition rather than the product of concerns about past or present settler colonization. For instance, Quebec and its integration policy focused on the French language forms an important point of comparison for contemporary scholarship, which nevertheless fails to acknowledge Quebec's role in Indigenous displacement. Being founded by a group of European settlers who became hegemonic only in a limited territory within what today forms Canada has led to conflicting quests for recognition between Indigenous peoples and French Quebecois (Salée 1995). Such tensions should be central in normative investigations of integration in Indigenous contexts.

Finally, expanding the research focus from substates that partly function as nation-states to investigations on contexts of weaker minority recognition, minorities weakened by assimilation, and minorities in exclusionary states, demands novel analytical angles. Such endeavours should be carried out with an eye for the intricacies of directly observable empirical data, but also silences and layered historical conditions that are not clearly noticeable due to legacies of domination and majority nation-building. Refined theoretical tools are needed to capture forms of recognition, nation-building, and minority/ness prevalent in such contexts.

In the next section, theoretical angles are presented that can be used to address the gaps and neglected foci identified in previous research on national minority recognition, immigrant integration, and the connections between the two.

2.3. Postcolonial and critical perspectives on integration in minority contexts

As concluded in the previous section, research on the intersections between minority nationalism and immigrant integration has been carried out on a limited number of cases in the West, which also has implications for the questions asked and the theoretical perspectives applied. In this section, I address how the research gaps, neglected

foci, and underexplored questions identified in the previous discussion can be addressed by considering scholarship applying postcolonial or critical perspectives. Also, I bring attention to some of the more repressive dimensions of European nation-building that have consequences for how different categories of people are targeted by different exclusions and inclusions.

The weight given to past injustices in normative justifications of how integration policy should be formed has in the previous section been identified as a key aspect to be further explored in scholarship. Regarding liberal theory and the difficulties of addressing languages weakened by historical injustice in a fair way, Patten states that "we do not yet have a fully satisfying account of how fairness in today's background conditions should be sensitive to unfairness in the past" (Patten 2016, 214). Indigenous, postcolonial, and settler colonial scholarship has nevertheless broadly addressed questions of past injustice. Using the example of Canadian institutions, Coulthard has shown how liberal discourses of recognition are materialized in ways that maintain the colonial status quo (Coulthard 2014, 39). Bell criticizes Taylor's idea of recognition for, while focusing on French Canadians in Quebec, ignoring Indigenous struggles. She states that the Western subject aiming for inclusion within existing liberal frameworks is left untouched from any fundamental challenges in the process of recognition, as the asymmetry in the system enables them to reject Indigenous demands for self-determination (Bell 2008, 854-855). The frameworks of recognition in place, influenced by notions from liberal multiculturalism, thus fall short on a fundamental level in Indigenous contexts since they do not question the structural foundation of the settler jurisdiction.

Scholars applying settler colonial perspectives on migration have furthermore discussed how contemporary migration also risks supporting settler colonialism since migrants enter, become part of, and operate within a settler system (Saranillio 2013; Snelgrove, Dhamoon, and Corntassel 2014). Despite the fact that the theories discussed here stem from Anglo-Saxon settler contexts, they describe a colonial condition that is inherently European, yet commonly externalized as non-European history whose effects in making Europe and European nation-states are portrayed as marginal (Goldberg 2006, 336). Even though the application of postcolonial and settler colonial theories to European colonial and Indigenous contexts, such as Sweden and Sápmi, is gaining popularity, their use on empirical conditions is still in its early stages (Hennessey and Fur 2020, 379-380). A number of scholars have recently made use of scholarship on settler colonialism when discussing Sápmi (see e.g. Kuokkanen 2020; Össbo 2020), a theoretical endeavour that we can expect to continue working towards its context-specific language.

Another context that constitutes a challenge to prevalent theories of recognition and integration mainly developed in and for Western civic nation-states, is Eastern Europe. Europe's East/West divide is expressed through an attribution of otherness to Eastern Europe that according to Kuus (2004) has an orientalist underpinning. The commonly used yet contested binary divide between ethnic (bad) and civic (good)

nationalism (Yack 1996) has been used to strengthen divides between East and West in Europe in relation also to migration and minority policy, portraying the East as exclusionary and the West as inclusionary. Rather than dividing European nationalisms into "good" or "bad" based on geography, they can according to Yuval-Davis be viewed "as different facets of specific historical constructions of nationalisms which are often contested" (Yuval-Davis 2011, 86), thereby also capturing exclusionary and inclusionary processes that may take different forms on both sides of the civic/ethnic binary. However, different questions may have to be asked when investigating integration in high-status substate nations, and when studying territorial minorities in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), where the existence of large, territorial minority groups in particular tends to be unrecognized due to historical and political concerns (Weller 2008, 1). In such cases, there is simply no recognition to investigate, which nevertheless does not mean an absence of politics or lived minority/ness.

Investigations into the recognition-integration nexus have had the minority as their main focus, perceiving migrants primarily as the targets of policy. Scholarship applying postcolonial perspectives to contemporary migration has shown how the way Europe views difference through racial lenses has colonial roots and targets migrants and ethnic minorities (Ponzanesi and Colpani 2015, 6; Marchetti 2015; Parvulescu 2015). Scholars have further highlighted how safe possibilities to migrate from (non-white) countries in Asia and Africa to Europe have largely been removed (De Genova 2018; van Houtum 2010), but also how integration has become a practice of border control (Lentin and Titley 2011, 204). The processes of othering and exclusion extend beyond national borders, specifically targeting certain categories in preference over others.

Among national minorities, too, some categories stand out with regard to violent exclusions, with implications for the politics of recognition. Jews, subject to the undeniably European Shoah, are today recognized as a national minority in many European countries. In Hungary, a significant part of Jewish public opinion nevertheless opted not to be recognized as a national minority, partly for fear of the stigma and burden that such a recognition may bring (Kovács 2000). Jewish collective memory made people wary of the risks of visibility in a society where the official recognition of Jews as a national minority was enthusiastically endorsed by nationalist groups with anti-Semitic agendas (Mars 2000). Roma, who still live with the legacies of slavery in Romania (Achim 2013), have been targeted by eugenic practices as recently as the past decade through forced sterilizations of Romani women (Tomasovic 2009; Albert and Szilvási 2017). Their victimhood in the Porajmos (Roma Holocaust) still balances between silence and recognition (van Baar 2011; Kelso 2013). According to Imre (2005), the treatment of Roma reflects ideas of whiteness connected to an idea of authentic nationalism that is deeply embedded in CEE. As previously noted, frameworks of minority recognition have misrecognized Roma (Toivanen 2019). Some categories of internal 'others' are subject to more forceful powers of domination or exclusion than others. Minority protective frameworks are

not designed with non-territorial minorities in mind, do not reflect the needs of all minorities, or struggle with acknowledging the past.

The asymmetries identified between certain categories of minorities and migrants, and between territorial and non-territorial minorities, lead to politics that target different minorities differently, also in terms of what is understood as "successful" or desirable accommodation, integration, or assimilation. Primarily writing on the situation of migrants, Kostakopoulou identifies similarities between integration and assimilation in their one-wayness and their linking of non-majority identities with inferiority:

> To a varying degree, both concepts presuppose the existence of deficit(s) on the part of migrants which must be overcome through learning to become a national (education to Anglicise or Americanise) or a national citizen (education to citizenship). Such deficits normally include speaking another language, lacking the cultural traditions and values of the nation in question, having a foreign name, a different religion and a different cuisine or not knowing the history of the host state and its constitutional evolution. There is the expectation that some of these deficits would be overcome through the gradual process of acculturation to middle-class patterns of life and through learning and embracing the nation's ideals and civic culture. (Kostakopoulou 2010, 946)

Not all groups are equally targeted by such policies, nor are all identities equally seen as deficient. Some will be seen as deficient despite fully assimilating to the core culture, whereas others will be perceived as belonging despite lacking knowledge of majority identity markers. For instance, white, wealthy work or lifestyle migrants are commonly viewed as expatriates rather than migrants (Lan 2011; Lundström 2017). Globally hegemonic identities, such as those dominant in white English-speaking states present in public spaces through popular culture are not among those primarily targeted by policy. Many other immigrant identities are "confined to the private space, removed from public spaces that would involve majorities, and […] from two-way integration" (Miera 2012). At the same time, the majority can go through life with little, if any, involvement with non-dominant cultural or linguistic expressions, while the 'others', migrants and minorities, are constantly immersed in majority nationhood.

As has been shown in the literature, different minorities face different challenges, migrants hold vastly different positions, and the two categories may overlap or be misrecognized. Giving space to contextual, historical, and power-based specificities allows layers to emerge that cannot be fully captured with the dominant perspectives used within research on national minorities, integration, or their connections. The following, final section of this part of the dissertation outlines how a layered perspective on integration in minority contexts can capture the richness and complexities that emerge when the policy strands here investigated meet.

2.4. Approaching the recognition-integration nexus through a layered perspective

As outlined in the previous sections, present research combining integration and minority recognition has yet to capture the broad empirical range of recognized or non-recognized national minorities, by giving space to contextual specificities and trajectories rooted in the past. In this section, I suggest and present how applying a layered perspective can capture intersections between the politics of integration and minority recognition, and examine the multifaceted implications the attention given to layeredness has for belonging and for how we view integration and recognition.

The three in-depth case studies of this dissertation, carried out in different contexts of minority recognition in Finland, Sweden, and Bulgaria, are all found to be permeated by a layeredness connected to the intersecting policy categories. By making visible through empirical examples how the layeredness may come into expression in policy, implementation, and in the lives of individuals, we can approach an understanding of how the layers are not only an empirical reality but can have normative and policy implications too.

Yuval-Davis has proposed a multi-layered perspective on citizenship, which she has raised as particularly important when investigating citizenship through a gaze that does not centre the West. According to such a perspective:

> [C]itizenship needs to be understood as a multi-layered construct, in which one's citizenship in collectivities in the different layers – local, ethnic, national, state, cross- or trans-state and supra-state – is affected and often at least partly constructed by the relationships and positionings of each layer in specific historical context. (Yuval-Davis 1999, 122)

Research applying the perspective of multi-layered citizenship has been able to describe ways in which different layers affect and interact with others. Rumelili and Keyman have for instance shown in their investigation on Armenian Turks how, by defending their minority identity, national minorities may risk second-class treatment as national citizens, while claiming rights as citizens may require downplaying their minority identities (Rumelili and Keyman 2016, 68-70). When it comes to integration, Erdal has shown how approaching it as multi-layered can capture the different functions of integration "as a normative programme, as process of migrant adaptation (which can be viewed in relation to measures of integration), or as individual experiences" (Erdal 2013, 984). Indeed, integration covers a range of practices, from linguistic support that may be needed and appreciated by individuals to more restrictive, gatekeeping functions, all of which may make themselves felt differently for each individual.

Applying a layered perspective on integration in minority contexts, with Yuval-Davis' multi-layered citizenship as a starting point, would capture how multiple belongings, transnational, national, and local processes interact with individual tra-

jectories of migration and minority/ness in a specific historical context. In line with this dissertation's combined focus on minority recognition and immigrant integration, this perspective brings attention to the specific functions of both fields of politics. At the same time, it makes it possible to practice contextual sensitivity while simultaneously identifying more general patterns in this inquiry's case studies, all identified as being permeated by layeredness.

In minority contexts characterized by weak recognition or weak minority presence, a layered perspective makes minority belongings visible even though they will not be dominant enough to form a single narrative that fits the norms of monolingualism and monoculturalism. Often, they rather form situations resembling what a vast scholarship drawing in particular from postcolonial contexts has characterized as hybridity (Bhabha 1994; 2015; Hall 1990). A layered perspective on integration makes visible intersections between the belongings of weak(ened) national minorities, the majority culture that penetrates most societal dynamics, and migrant belongings that may not be recognized or valued in public space. Furthermore, the perspective brings attention to specificities of integration policies that may take different expressions in each state and locality, placing them in local, national, and transnational context.

All of the three case studies in this dissertation, regardless of the strength of minority recognition, describe situations where past, present, local, national, and transnational matters are joined through layers, forming situations challenging to capture through dominant understandings of how integration should go about. In the Finnish case study, layers can be identified in the tensions between the strong legal position and weak implementation of minority language policy, the monolingual policy and the multilingual reality, and the pressure of mobility between Swedish-majority and Finnish-majority regions. With consideration to possible future movement to Finnish-majority regions, some Swedish-speaking municipalities discourage the provision of language courses in Swedish. The particular situation of migrants, who are viewed as less rooted and established than local populations in minority regions, thus contributes to a lack of opportunities to become part of the local societal culture lived in the minority language. Instead, they are encouraged to direct their integration efforts toward the hegemonic majority. Together with migrants, the Swedish-speaking minority has mobilized in order to ensure that possibilities for integration are implemented in the minority language, by requesting bilingual solutions adapted to the particular situation of immigration. While the need perceived by migrants and integration workers for providing support in acquiring both languages rather than one challenges the foundation of present monolingual state policies, it also exemplifies how current frameworks fail to acknowledge the layeredness inherent when migration encounters policies drafted for other aims. For instance, some migrants select Swedish rather than Finnish as the language of integration and naturalization in part due to prior knowledge in related languages, but also with the possibility of easier transnational mobility in Scandinavia in mind.

Thus local, national, and transnational processes are shown to interact with individual preferences and identities in ways that can be captured by applying a layered perspective.

Bringing attention to individual stories both challenges the view of asylum seekers as "flows" and avoids superficiality (Pöyhönen and Simpson 2020). In addition, the layeredness of integration itself can best be captured by following how layers are formed in the lives of individuals. We may for instance portray a refugee from a former British colony who resides in a reception facility in a Swedish-speaking municipality in Finland. They are confronted with the use of Swedish in local interactions, and with Finnish as part of national, hegemonic narratives portrayed as a belonging both rational and desirable to acquire. After being granted asylum, they nevertheless have to fight for the right to attend orientation courses in Swedish instead of in Finnish, a request that eventually is granted in a neighbouring municipality. Not only does learning Swedish help maintain the local relationships established, but it also speeds the fulfilment of the linguistic requirements of citizenship, since they are fully proficient in English, a related language. In addition, knowing Swedish makes it possible to obtain a job that requires knowledge of the minority language. Importantly, the high status associated with Swedish also means they are targeted by a different process of racialization than when speaking Finnish in public space, sometimes being perceived as an expat Swede rather than a migrant. The high status of Swedish connected with the "colonial" relation to Sweden softens some of the discriminatory expressions they would otherwise risk, even though it does not protect them from racism within the largely white minority community or society at large. Whereas skills in Swedish open many doors to minority communities, English proves to be a better-known and more widely used language in the society that predominantly operates in Finnish. As they struggle to master the majority language, a form of societal marginalization makes itself felt to an increasing extent. Over time, they become part of the continuous Finnish-Swedish emigration to Sweden, where they find a broader range of job opportunities, a larger diaspora from their country of origin – and a diverse group of persons with a Finnish heritage.

The strong legal position for Swedish speakers in Finland shaped and enabled the pathways integration took in the example above. In Swedish Sápmi, the legal recognition of the Sámi[6] language, recognized as a national minority language, is however weaker. As a consequence, the aim of the state-led integration policy is to integrate people into Sweden in the Swedish language, even on Indigenous territory. Indigenousness is nevertheless constantly present as a layer, through bi/multilingual signs, Indigenous institutions, reindeer, and other attributes that signal the multiplicity of belongings. When integration policy is implemented on Indigenous territory, such elements are also present in state practices of integration. Hence the

—

[6] The Sámi were by Sweden recognized as an Indigenous people in 1977, as a national minority in 2000, and as a people in 2011. The Sámi language (with its different varieties) was recognized as a national minority language in 2000.

recognition as national minority and Indigenous people, in addition to the strong Indigenous presence, contribute to the layeredness of integration in Sápmi.

The case study provides examples of how layers are manifested in the lives of individuals. A refugee boy who had worked with animals when living in his country of origin was given a Sámi reindeer herder mentor who let the boy work with animals once again in Sápmi. Furthermore, another person with experience of assimilation, linguistic repression, and conflict in their country of origin identified with the Indigenous situation in the location of integration in ways that increased their sense of belonging. Gaining awareness of the Indigenous presence became a layer that tied their own belonging more firmly to Sweden as the nation-state within which they reside, not as an endorsement for its repressive, colonial acts, but due to shared experiences with Indigenous citizens affected by them. At the same time, the official recognition of Indigenousness and its presence in public space made them reflect on how precarious the conditions under which their own minority lives are in their country of origin. Layers identified on the local level are thereby extended to transnational dimensions. Despite the sense of belonging developed by many migrants in the locality, the difficulty of finding employment made it a temporary place of residency for several. Most individuals therefore eventually leave to other towns, within or outside of Sápmi, with knowledge of Sweden and the Swedish language gained in an Indigenous locality.

In contrast to Finland and Sweden, where the state actively regulates integration and minority policy, Bulgaria has scarce integration measures and weak minority recognition in place. The absence of policy, as has previously been noted, nevertheless in no way means that national contestations are less significant, nor are they less political than in contexts where they are regulated by explicit policy. Indeed, a multitude of layers can be identified in the processes of integration that ensue when the mostly Muslim refugees enter a state where post-Ottoman discourses exclude Turkish-speakers and Muslims from the national core. The case study shows how the demographic fears of the majority target Muslim national minorities and refugees, who are portrayed as non-belonging and othered in societal discourses. Furthermore, it shows how linguistic, geographical, and religious boundaries largely keep national minorities separated from contemporary refugees, even though individual and institutional contacts do exist. Previously settled Arabic-speaking diasporas were nevertheless identified as important actors within processes of integration and belonging. Layers can then be identified in how narratives rooted in history are extended to contemporary othering that binds refugees and old minorities together but also to how previous migrations have come to shape possibilities of belonging for refugees who have arrived during the past decade.

As an example of how the layers may play out in the life of an individual, we can portray a person who years ago fled the Syrian civil war from Aleppo and was finger-

printed in line with the Dublin system[7] after entering Bulgaria from Turkey. Even though other members of their family have already been granted asylum in Germany, the individual is required to await a decision on their asylum application in Bulgaria under the Dublin rules. Bulgaria, intended merely as a country to cross on the way to Germany, has become more than a transit stop during the waiting period. They can visit a state-funded mosque built by Ottoman architects and visit a café in the Arab neighbourhood where memories can be shared with other individuals from their home city. In addition, these settled migrants, who arrived in Bulgaria decades ago, have been providing help navigating the new society. Despite its restrictive attitude to Muslims, it is perhaps not so different from what has been recounted by the relatives residing in Germany. Thanks to prior knowledge of Russian, a language closely related to Bulgarian, the lack of language and orientation courses provided by the state has not formed a significant barrier to employment, which unlike in many other European countries is allowed soon after arrival in Bulgaria. After they eventually gain asylum, they do proceed to Germany, leaving Bulgaria behind like an increasing number of minority and majority citizens, refugees, and migrants. Layers manifest in this individual's life through minority institutions, past migrations, present nation-buildings, and individual identities, all aspects that become significant for their belonging and integration not only in Bulgaria, but within the wider EU through the (im)mobilities its asylum governance fuels.

In all three examples, the presence of "old" minorities in the nation and their position in integration shape the belongings of migrants in different ways. Minority presences may make the belonging of migrants deeper, more complex, or not have a significant impact on it. "Old" minority/ness may enter the lives of migrants through their initial location of residence in the country, or through other ways, and may follow them in their lives or be left at the initial location of arrival. It may shape their future trajectories of mobility, or simply be yet another layer in the already complex paths their lives have taken. Whereas a layered perspective could be fruitfully applied to substate cases too, the comparably weaker nature of minority presence in the cases here investigated makes the national minority belonging in these instances marginal. It is not the identity promoted by local authorities, but rather something to be discovered or sought for under the majority domination in the nation-state.

The individual experiences described here show how integration ultimately can be understood as a question of migrant belonging. As the review of prior literature has shown, migrant identities, preferences, or aspirations are rarely centred in investigations of integration in minority contexts. Even though the scope of this dissertation too is in the main limited to investigating national minority recognition through the lens of immigrant integration, a layered perspective should capture not only power asymmetries and inequalities targeting national minorities but also asymmetries and

—

[7] The Dublin system is formed by the EURODAC Regulation establishing a centralized asylum fingerprint database, and Regulation (EU) No. 604/20133, determining that the first country of entry is primarily responsible for processing an asylum application.

commonalities between national minorities and migrants. As later will be elaborated in the concluding part of this introductory chapter, the layered perspective and the layeredness identified in the case studies have normative implications and call for a stronger position for migrants' voices and agency in future research.

In the following part, the research design, methodology, and methods of this dissertation are presented and reflected on, ethical challenges are raised, and questions of positionality are discussed.

3. Research design, methodology, and material

This part presents how the studies of the dissertation have been carried out. It clarifies how the interpretive approach is understood and applied in this work, presents the methods used for data collection, and explains how documents, interviews and observations complement each other. Matters of access, confidentiality, and consent are reflected upon in a discussion where ethical challenges and considerations taken during the course of the research are discussed. Finally, questions of positionality, a key component within the interpretive paradigm, are reflected upon.

3.1. Critical and interpretive approaches to the study of politics

This dissertation draws on critical and interpretive approaches to the study of politics. When investigating politics through a critical approach, attention is commonly directed to silent and silenced discourses (Yanow 2007, 116), with the aim of identifying power dimensions. For the present study, a critical approach entails a focus on taken-for-granted reproductions of majority nationhood while also striving to identify silences relating to non-dominant minorities and migrants. Interpretive research directs attention to meanings behind policy formulations, highlights their contextual nature, and assigns importance to the role of the researcher in the process of extracting meaning (Yanow 2007, 111). Studying political phenomena through an interpretive perspective acknowledges that governance consists of diverse (everyday) practices carried out by individuals with sometimes conflicting beliefs, while also bringing attention to new connections and aspects of governance (Bevir and Rhodes 2006). This dissertation connects seemingly separate processes of governing 'others' and makes visible mundane practices of nationhood, while acknowledging "that political life consists of actions laden with meanings", even if such actions are not always conscious (Bevir and Rhodes 2016, 3).

Critical interpretations require an act of identifying dominant narratives and considering alternative sets of interpretation (Lynch 2006, 294-95). Central analytical foci in this dissertation have been any instances of minority influence on immigrant integration, but also expressions of dominant nationhood, the ideological functions of immigrant integration, and perceptions of local and national integration practices and needs. The material has been analysed with the aim of continuously exploring connections and separations between integration and minority policy, firstly, by seeking visible or hidden connections, and secondly, by identifying how boundaries are made between different groups and policies.

3.2. Methods and techniques for data collection

In this work, a range of methods suitable for extracting silences, meanings, and power dynamics relating to immigrant integration in minority contexts are employed. Document analysis, interviews, and ethnographic observation are methods that are commonly used within interpretive research, but also methods that complement and support each other.

3.2.1. Documents

By collecting documents, a rich variety of text produced in different contexts and for different aims could be analysed. Policy documents and legislation were used to understand state actions, while newspaper articles were retrieved for "providing contemporaneous accounts of key actors and their views along with more general sentiment at the time, especially for periods when the researcher was not or could not be present" (Yanow 2007, 114). The set of documents analysed for this research consists of a variety of policy documents, legislative documents, media articles, press releases, blog posts, teaching material, and reports where issues related to integration policy, minority policy, language policy, or nation-building emerge. Written documents were found through organizations, via targeted internet searches, or with the help of informants.

In paper I, the constitutions of 27 EU member states were investigated. Formulations on official and recognized languages, "national groups" or, when applicable, separate laws regulating minority protection were at the centre of the analysis. In addition to constitutions, language requirements in naturalization legislation were also examined. To gather information about orientation courses, government websites concerning integration were analysed. These documents, collected between 2019 and 2020, consisted either of official English translations or material in the original language. Paper II is based on reports from Finnish-Swedish think tanks and organizations, legal documents, press releases, newspaper articles, and blog posts, written in Finnish or Swedish, gathered in 2016 and 2017. For paper III, Swedish-language documents on integration, teaching material, and media coverage were collected between 2018 and 2020. For paper IV, a selection of Bulgarian newspaper articles in Turkish and in English collected in 2019 were used, describing connections between refugee reception, settled minorities, and nation-building.

3.2.2. Interviews

In this study, the interviewees spoke as representatives of their organizations and the interviews can thereby be characterized as expert interviews (Bogner, Littig, and Menz 2006). Interviews added to the information extracted from documents, as "in-depth interviews can be used to pursue questions that are difficult to locate in documentary sources or everyday interactions and to explore such questions in intricate detail" (Soss 2006, 141). Interviews enabled clarifications of temporal aspects by

providing "a very convenient way of overcoming distances both in space and in time; past events or faraway experiences can be studied by interviewing people who took part in them" (Peräkylä 2005, 869). The temporal aspect was particularly helpful when building connections between documents from different points in time, and when contextualising observations that took place during a limited time frame.

Interviews of different kinds and with different aims were conducted for each in-depth case study (paper II, III and IV), guided by the availability of written material, and the specific questions emphasized in each study. Since documents constituted the principal material for paper II, the interviews provided an update on recent developments, helped contextualise the documents, and gave an opportunity to ask questions on topics not covered in detail in the documents. The function of the interviews was to connect written documents with present conditions rather than to generate interview data to be analysed through a critical or interpretive lens. One structured expert interview was conducted, during which it was assumed that the researcher and the informant share a system of meaning (Lune and Berg, 2017, 69), namely that integration policy and minority policy is closely connected and the focus of discussion. The interview was conducted with a key person working with Swedish-language integration coordination on the national level in Finland. The interview was not recorded; however, notes were taken. In addition to the expert interview, several informal, conversational interviews (Patton 2002, 342) were conducted in connection with the *Finlandssvenska integrationsdagarna* [Finnish-Swedish Integration Days], a two-day event in Helsinki at the end of November 2016. It was attended by persons working or having an interest in the integration industry, namely municipal workers, NGO representatives, politicians, immigrants and researchers. The informal interviews made it possible to discover questions that had been overlooked, moved the research in new directions, and facilitated further elaborations. They were mainly used for background information, contextual information, and for deepening understanding of the context and topic.

For Paper III, interviews were conducted with the aim of generating new data. Through in-depth interviews, the experiences and motivations of persons implementing national policy locally could be accessed, complex and contradictory matters could be explored, and social processes could be portrayed in detail (Rubin and Rubin 2011, 3-4). Seven semi-structured interviews were conducted in a municipality in Swedish Sápmi in February 2018. Interviews were conducted with four language teachers, one public servant working with immigrant integration, one public servant working with cultural issues, and one civic orientation teacher. The logic of purposive sampling was followed, with the aim of covering different roles within the implementation of integration policy (Lynn 2016, 248). The interviews, which were all recorded and fully transcribed, lasted between 20 minutes and 1 hour and were conducted in Swedish. The interviewees were recruited through email, phone calls, personal contact, and snowball sampling.

For Paper IV, the larger number of interviews conducted made it possible to capture first-hand testimonies in the absence of official policy and prior scholarship on the topic. Fifteen semi-structured interviews were conducted in Bulgaria, of which eight were with organizations working with refugee integration (including one group interview with four persons representing the State Agency for Refugees), seven with Turkish and/or Muslim organizations, of which three have a cultural-linguistic focus (in Northeastern and Southeastern Bulgaria) and four are religious organizations operating under the state, namely the Grand Mufti's Office in Sofia and three regional mufti's offices in Southeastern Bulgaria. The interviews, which were carried out in Turkish (with Turkish and Muslim authorities) or English (with integration workers), lasted between 30 minutes and 2 hours, the most common duration being 1 hour. They were fully transcribed, apart from two interviews during which notes were taken. Since I am not a native speaker of Turkish, a thorough interview guide was prepared to ensure that important follow-up questions would not be overlooked and parts of the interviews were transcribed by native speakers. Any unclarities during the research and analysis were clarified with native speakers, when needed.

3.2.3. Ethnographic observations

When interrogating complex and multifaceted phenomena such as nationhood and othering, analysing documents and interviews requires an understanding of the context in which the material was produced. Ethnographic observations made it possible to enhance understandings of the social phenomena investigated, by being "made aware of the range of meanings relevant to a particular phenomenon under study" (Wedeen 2010, 265), but also gave an increased understanding of the silences and implicit meanings that are important in interpretive research (Yanow 2007). In order to capture boundaries and power relations linked to nationhood in the contexts under study, observations were further used to facilitate the process whereby "the invisible and taken-for-granted can be made explicit and visible" (Pader 2006, 167).

Rather than conducting a stand-alone, long-term ethnography seeking to generate data for analysis, observations were utilized in this research with the aim of increasing knowledge on the context, guiding data collection to paths relevant for answering the research questions and identifying significant silences. The observations carried out have been inspired by research on focused ethnography (Knoblauch 2005), in which short-term observations can be conducted during events, and research within political ethnography that views everyday phenomena or objects as political (see Pachirat 2009, 146-47; Schatz 2009, 306). The ethnographic elements of the research made it possible to capture the contested and intersecting nature of the otherwise homogenizing categories of minority, migrant, and majority, which fail to describe the varieties of experience within each category (Pachirat 2009, 157).

At the core of these observations, subsequently documented in field diaries written at the end of each day, was the use of language in multilingual areas, both in spoken interactions and also in written form in public space. The physical locations of minor-

ity institutions were also observed, in addition to reproductions of majority nationhood in museums, in the media, and in majority and minority neighbourhoods. This ethnographic approach thereby made it possible "to analyse the gap between the idealized representation and actual apprehension of events, people, and political orders" (Wedeen 2009, 85), in this case the position of minorities within the nation-state when going beyond written policy or testimonies gathered through interviews. The observations also made it easier to see the research contexts as dynamic rather than static, and thus to give space to human agency in a study that focuses on policies formulated on a macro level (Schatz 2009, 11). Observations were used to shape interview questions and as a background layer informing data collection and complementing academic texts and policies, following the principle by which ethnographies, "[r]ather than taking flight from abstractions, […] can and should help ground them" (Wedeen 2010, 257).

The more focused observations were carried out in relation to events. For paper II, the observations took place in the same context as the informal, conversational interviews were conducted (Patton, 2002, 343), at the *Finlandssvenska integrationsdagarna* [the Finnish-Swedish Integration Days]. Attending the event enabled me to immerse myself in how integration in the Swedish language in Finland is discussed, which discourses were dominant, and what issues were and were not brought up, as well as to map the actors in the field. The interviews for paper III were preceded by attending the Jokkmokk Winter Market in February 2018. The market has been held without interruption since 1605 and is an important celebration and meeting place for Sámi in Sweden and across Sápmi. The cultural events, lectures, exhibitions and conversations conducted gave an updated idea of present conditions under which minority recognition is lived in the locality during and after the mass event. Finally, for paper IV, participant observation was carried out when teaching during one day in a Turkish-majority school in northern Bulgaria, and when spending time in villages with only Turkish-speaking inhabitants in Southeastern Bulgaria. The observations from the school gave insights into actual practices of nation-building as lived by pupils and teachers of different origins within the institution. Observations from everyday life in Southeastern Bulgaria gave an understanding of lived minority-majority relations in a location where the minority is demographically dominant. Furthermore, the minority and majority presences were actively observed when visiting different parts of the country, when discussing with people, and when visiting cultural monuments or institutions, which gave an idea of the marginality of minority identities in public space.

As Kubik states, "It is hard to imagine a method other than ethnography that would highlight and clearly demonstrate that national-level meaning formation and similar local-level processes are often incongruous, and if related, their relations are complex" (Kubik 2009, 39-40). The ethnographic observations in the three cases opened for reflections relating to gaps between political discourses and local practices, minority aspirations and majority actions, but also to the clear disconnections

between the two phenomena at the core of this dissertation, namely minority recognition and immigrant integration, which could take highly different expressions on the level of policy and in people's lived realities.

3.2.4. Access, confidentiality, and consent

Research that involves human contact and immersion comes with a number of challenges relating to access and ethics. Gaining access to interviews with representatives of organizations working with integration was rarely a problem, and most interviews could be booked by simply sending an email to an address found on the webpage of the respective institution. The clearest explicit denials of access (Burnham et al. 2008, 292-93) occurred in Bulgaria, where minority institutions were also part of the research. Any contact by telephone with minority organizations without a personal referral from common acquaintances were either declined due to time constraints or hesitantly accepted, which could be understood in relation to the societal tensions surrounding Turkish and Muslim organizations, but also in terms of hesitation when being approached by a foreigner. When institutions were approached physically, through the reception, or through persons informally gathering or waiting, there was nevertheless a high willingness to share insights and experiences, which can be attributed to the combination of being perceived as a white, Swedish student who formerly studied and worked in Turkey, but also to the difference between an in-person and a telephone interaction. At the same time, I exercised sensitivity when determining the reasons behind hesitance or reluctance on the part of minority or minority-led organizations, since providing access to their resources or insights is no obligation and any reluctance may be based on legitimate and ethical reasons (Burnham et al. 2008, 294). A possible reason for denials could have been the combination of scarce resources and "research fatigue" particularly prevalent among minorities who are often subject to research but observe little or no change in their lives (Glick et al. 2018; Craig and O'Neill 2013; Brunger and Wall 2016). Such positions have been observed not least regarding research on Indigenous groups. As Smith writes, "it has been taken for granted that indigenous peoples are the 'natural objects' of research. It is difficult to convey to the non-indigenous world how deeply this perception of research is held by indigenous peoples" (Smith 2012, 122).

In the social sciences, providing informants with confidentiality through pseudonyms is a common practice. Such a decision nevertheless holds meaning. As Guenther states, "the decision to name or not to name is rife with overlapping ethical, political, methodological, and personal dilemmas" (Guenther 2009, 412), whether it be in relation to an individual, an organization, or a place. In this dissertation, all informants are provided with confidentiality and are described by their professional positions rather than names. This decision is in line with the research focus being on testimonies by representatives of organizations rather than the experiences of private persons. While many were indifferent to the offer of confidentiality, and others explicitly wished to be named, confidentiality is applied to all informants as selective

naming may risk revealing the identity of others. At the same time, the organizations are, if not explicitly named, described, as are also the positions the interviewees held within them. In combination with the mentioning of some geographical markers, anonymity may be compromised. The level of confidentiality selected is nevertheless the result of a balancing act between the commitment to anonymity, being transparent about the positions from which interviewees speak as they are representatives of public (non)governmental institutions, and necessary disclosures of geographic locations. At the same time, confidentiality has potentially harmful dimensions: confidentiality poses ethical dilemmas in terms of it being something protecting secrecy and thereby hindering transformative political action (Baez 2002; Guenther 2009). In relation to some interviewees this was a concern, since they were closely connected to a political cause they wished to represent under their own name.

The interviewees spoke as representatives of their organizations and were with few exceptions interviewed in their offices. Informed consent is a central issue when conducting ethical research (Crow et al. 2006). Consent was asked for prior to recording, and interviewees were given the option of ending the interview or the recording at any time. Only once did an interviewee wish to say something "off record", and only two informants wished not to be taped. One interviewee wished to verify any quotes on their part that are included in this work. When conducting critical research aiming at challenging dominant ideologies, discrepancies may occur between the expectations of the interviewees and the researcher (Hammersley 2014, 531), which in the case of this study concern the researcher's interest in the production of majority nationhood and the experts' interest in topics central for their work. While all interviewees were asked questions on the connections between integration and minority politics, the emphasis during interviews with integration organizations was put on integration, and on minority issues with minority organizations. Consequently, when approaching the interviewees, the research was presented to be on immigrant integration for integration organizations, and on minority issues for minority institutions. When the overarching aim of the study was initially mentioned prior to some of the interviews, reactions varied between confusion and curiosity. Sometimes, it led to interviewees imagining what I wanted to know and not (Crow et al. 2006, 90) which diverted the focus of conversation from the actual practices carried out by organizations to things that they did not do or know about. Indeed, interpretive research on topics framed around silences may come across as unclear and cause confusion for a policy implementer, possibly since the matter investigated is so peripheral, or even unthought of, in their everyday work. The study was therefore in several cases presented in line with the particular expertise of the respective organizations rather than emphasizing the interest in intersections between policy strands. The way the study was presented reflected the nature of questions asked to each organization, the kind of data that was aimed to be collected from each representative, and was the result of a reflexive process mindful of maintaining the integrity of the research while acknowledging potential vulnerabilities among the interviewed experts (Obelenė 2006).

With regard to the written documents collected for this dissertation, they were all publicly available, so access did not pose any challenges. Concerns related to confidentiality emerged only in relation to persons interviewed in media articles. Even though they publicly figure with their names and pictures in the media, the decision was made to not mention their names in this work.

When it comes to ethnographic work, the nature of informed consent as a process rather than a one-time event becomes an even more complex matter than when working with taped interviews in an official setting (Plankey-Videla 2012). No material from the ethnographic work directly figures in the dissertation but has instead informed interview questions and framings. Everyone I interacted with during ethnographic work was aware of my being a student and writing a dissertation, and during the one occasion where informal interviews were part of this ethnographic approach, I officially participated in the event as a researcher, presented myself as one, and disclosed the topic of my dissertation.

As always when conducting research on marginalized populations, the researcher has particular responsibilities. Even though this dissertation focuses on state policy and has gathered narratives from representatives of state and non-state organizations rather than involving marginalized persons in the data collection, any research contributing with knowledge claims regarding minorities needs to consider what consequences it may have. The present dissertation strives to continuously centre minority positions by bringing attention to majority domination, in an attempt to avoid contributing to injustices toward minorities that take place through knowledge production.

3.3. Reflections on positionality

Following the interpretive paradigm, rather than objective executors of research, researchers are actors in the meaning-making processes when conducting analyses (Yanow 2007, 111). Instead of attempting to avoid any impact on the material such as "interviewer effects", a central part of interpretive work is seeking for

> an awareness of how their own lived experiences shape and filter what they attend to in the research project, what they observe and to what they might be "blinded," what questions they ask (and don't), what they are told - and what might be being kept from them, who talks to them and who doesn't, and so forth. (Yanow 2007, 114)

Consequently, the researcher's positionality with regard to the topic of interrogation becomes an important element for assessing the plausibility of analyses conducted, not least regarding the ability to identify how power is expressed through silences and the ability to see beyond dominant debates (Yanow 2007, 116).

In the present study, the most important attributes for a researcher include sensibilities to capture power dynamics in regard to minority positions, majority positions, silences and taken-for-granted expressions of nationhood. Being a researcher with

experience of living within two differently positioned national minorities while simultaneously being a migrant has influenced the perspectives taken in this research. Following migration from Sweden to Finland at an early age, I have experiences of being immersed in majority Finnish and minority Finland-Swedish institutions, while living in a neighbourhood inhabited by majority Finns, different national minorities, and migrants. The experiences developed understandings on how status, privilege and othering come into expression between different groups in society and within specific majority and minority institutions. Following migration to Sweden in early adulthood, I have participated in a number of Sweden-Finnish contexts where status negotiations between the past as a stigmatized migrant group and the present emancipatory recognition as a national minority shapes the Sweden-Finnish political identity project and mobilization (Liimatainen and Carlsson 2020).

The lived experiences within and between the minority contexts have cultivated a sensitivity for identifying minority perspectives, majority domination, and boundaries constructed between groups. As also discussed in this dissertation, these experiences have also given an understanding of how political categories may be fluid, overlapping, homogenizing, and misrecognizing. Having, in line with many persons categorized as national minorities in Europe, the privilege of whiteness and external "invisibility" in relation to the majority, and thereby holding experiences of both being perceived as majority and minority in two countries, has cultivated a sensibility for codeswitching that has been useful for perceiving layers behind the surface when conducting this research. Such experiences give perspectives that persons positioned as majority may not be able to fully capture. In respect of the fluid category of migration and citizenship, going through the process of denied naturalization in my home country has provided some insights on how exclusions take place through formal citizenship policies, and how low and rigid the bar of exclusion may be.

When it comes to barriers to identifying phenomena relevant for the study, a number of factors may have impacted the course of the research. Coming from the wealthy Nordic countries, from a culturally Lutheran environment with language as the main identity marker, being embedded within the protections of a welfare state, holding a Nordic passport that is among the most privileged on a global scale, and being white and non-Indigenous, may have contributed to important silences, borderings, and exclusions built into policy being overlooked. Such a position becomes a limitation when identifying meanings and silences in policies targeting mostly non-citizen migrants racialized as non-white. Yanow states that "As a reader, I want to know that the researcher has thought about whether there might be silent, and silenced, voices, and, if so, what efforts have been made to identify them" (Yanow 2009, 287). The most important effort can be found within the ethnographic approaches described above, where complexities, novel angles, and everyday experiences were consciously sought out. Among the most important insights gathered through observations would be the complexity of identities, their layers, and ultimately, how

questions of nationhood are only one, albeit often important, aspect in the complexities of life.

While the case studies conducted in Finland and Sweden were part of minority-political frameworks in large part familiar to me, the clearest instance of being in an outsider position for me came in Bulgaria, which may have had a number of consequences for data collection and analysis. Being perceived as an "outsider" may have led to both additional disclosures of information, and information having been withheld. Having skills in Turkish enabled gathering data in Turkish-speaking contexts in Bulgaria. Not being Muslim may have resulted in more thorough explanations regarding religion, nationhood and how boundaries are drawn in conversations with religious authorities, but also in silences on topics not disclosed to outsiders. Despite having experience of living in Turkey and in a majority Muslim country in the Western Balkans, interpretations may be limited by the lack of lived experience as a Muslim. Interviewees, however, found varyingly creative commonalities as part of attempts to bond, e.g. between protestant culture and Sunni Islam as opposed to Christian Orthodoxy. Othering and bonding based on perceptions of the researcher's identity in fieldwork (Shehata 2006, 257) is indeed relational. Many persons asked whether I am Muslim, and women attempted to bond in relation to gender by discussing masculinity and patriarchal norms, or shared experiences of living in a certain country or city. Experiences of Turkey and the Turkish language, which many Turkish-speakers in Bulgaria struggle with, were also used to find common ground. Coming from a Swedish university, many discussions were held on Sweden, as several had family or friends who reside in Sweden.

Having outlined the methodological considerations guiding this work, the introductory chapter now proceeds to its fourth part, where the research questions are answered, the contributions are developed, and ideas for future research are presented.

4. Discussion, contributions, and future pathways

The aim of this dissertation has been to explore connections, separations, and synergies between policies and practices of national minority recognition and immigrant integration in Europe. It has done so in four papers that each take different angles on connections between recognition and integration. In this section of the introductory chapter, the three research questions are answered, the contributions of the dissertation are elaborated on, and pathways for future research are discussed.

4.1. Revisiting the questions and contributions of the dissertation

This dissertation has been concerned with three main questions, of which the first one asks: *How are expressions of majority nationhood produced and/or countered through state integration policy in immigrant-receiving states with national minorities and/or Indigenous peoples?* The starting point of the research question, namely that integration to a large extent is a political practice that reproduces majority nationhood, is constantly confirmed in the findings. Indeed, the three cases investigated in this dissertation all focus on minority contexts where majority nationalism is reproduced in integration, in contrast to much of the previous research that has focused on integration in substate nations where integration reproduces minority nationhood.

A clear majority dominance in integration was not only found in the three case studies but also on policy level in the EU. In the analysis of integration and minority policies of 27 EU member states, only seven out of 27 states showed accommodations for minority identities in integration policies. The few instances of minority accommodation identified consisted of either substate recognition or the recognition of minoritized core national group extending to integration policy. In most cases, namely fifteen EU countries with recognized national minorities, and five with no or weak recognition, existing minority recognition did not extend to integration policy. Hence, whereas instances where majority nationalism is challenged do exist on policy level, most forms of minority recognition were found to lead to a reproduction of majority nationhood, and thereby a misrecognition of minorities, in integration policy.

In different ways, the three empirical case studies all show how majority nationhood is reproduced in integration, regardless of the grade and kind of minority recognition. In Finland, where the minority and the majority have the same legal position in integration, the minority language is legally assigned a central place in integration policy even in municipalities where Swedish is spoken only by small minorities. However, the implementation is majority-centred in practice, which undermines the possibilities of migrants to choosing Swedish as their language of integration. Despite the co-national status of the Swedish language, then, integration

policies support the aspirations of the majority state, even though they are occasionally countered due to the bilingual legislation.

Exemplifying a case of Indigenous and national minority recognition, integration policy in Swedish Sápmi reproduces colonial majority Swedishness. It is mainly the societal presence of the Sámi language(s), culture(s), and institutions that makes Indigenous recognition occasionally come through in integration practices, rather than a strong policy inclusion of national minorities or Indigenous peoples. These practices, that challenge the colonial majority Swedishness otherwise promoted, are driven by teachers' own agency, migrants' participation in the local institutional environment, or the participation of Indigenous persons in immigrant reception. Thereby, they manifest that Sweden is not a homogeneous country to which majority Swedes alone belong.

In Bulgaria, both the integration support offered for refugees and the recognition of national minorities can be characterized as weak. The belonging promoted in the scarce orientation courses is majority Bulgarianness, in line with official policy and naturalization that demands both civic and linguistic knowledge in Bulgarian. Even though majority nationhood is promoted through such measures, the actual presence of minority institutions, headed by national minorities or settled diasporas, expands the notion of what it entails to belong in Bulgaria. State mosques were found to function as spaces of belonging, and institutions such as schools where Arabic is the main language form alternative pathways of integration alongside majority Bulgarianness. Whereas such possibilities can be stated to counter majority nationhood as reproduced through integration, they were described as paths of integration that, facilitated by Arabic-speaking diasporas, support integration and belonging in Bulgaria rather than contradict inclusion to the majority nation-state.

In all four papers, majority nationhood is shown to be firmly established in policies of immigration, integration, and naturalization. This finding does not, however, mean that alternative, minority belongings take no space or do not challenge the mononational ideas promoted through policy or its implementation. The existing measures for minority recognition have indeed resulted in policies, practices, and institutional functions that directly or indirectly extend into integration, whether this be intended by the state or not. In contrast to substate nations, where a clearer *countering* of majority nationhood could be claimed to occur, the elements of minority nationhood present in integration in the contexts studied here often take modest forms. As such, they do not as clearly counter the stronger majority nationhood promoted in policy, even though occasions where they do so more distinctly do exist. Instead, the expressions of minority/ness can be viewed as a layer, or what Miller (2011) has characterized as a 'nested' identity.

The second question of this dissertation asks: *How do colonial or imperial legacies shape formulations of immigrant integration in states with national minorities and/or Indigenous peoples?* As established in the literature review, national minorities often have a presence which precedes the foundation of the nation-state and have in many

cases become minorities due to dynamics provoked by the nationalizing of former empires. Since integration policies in the contexts here studied are shown to generally be formed without consideration for minority linguistic or cultural preservation, existing minority recognitions are found to hold a key significance for the position awarded to minorities within integration. Such forms of recognition have historical roots and are linked to wider contestations around nationhood.

The strong position of the Swedish language in Finnish integration policies is a direct consequence of the independent Finnish nation-state's initial language legislation, which promotes bilingualism rather than making Finnish the main national language. Even though Finland has shifted from being part of an administratively Swedish-speaking empire to an independent nation where Swedish is spoken by merely 5.3 per cent of the population, the post-imperial language legislation has made integration fully bilingual at least on official policy level. Hence, integration is deeply shaped by the imperial legacy, yet in a way that does not fully extend to implementation.

In Sápmi, not only a colonial past but also its ongoing present thoroughly shape what integration policy is implemented. As a result of colonization and connected nation-building, Swedish is the language of integration throughout the Swedish nation-state, which includes a part of Sápmi. The present politics of integration is a Swedish state practice, in which Sámi elements are manifested in the form of extra information during teaching, some mentions in the teaching material, as well as the societal and institutional presence of Sámi when integration policy is implemented in Indigenous locations. As such, integration and its present practices are profoundly shaped by the colonial relation that is today firmly established on Indigenous territory.

In Bulgaria, the Ottoman past and its role in national discourses portraying the era negatively target Muslim minorities and migrants in ways that also shape the conditions of integration. Apart from restrictive reactions toward Muslims that can be attributed to post-imperial nation-building, Ottoman-era Muslim institutions also form the core of the modest minority elements involved in integration. Intended for the shrinking post-imperial Muslim minorities, these institutions have become part of life for many of the Muslims who have arrived in Bulgaria over the past years. Not an imperial legacy as such, communist international cooperation too has left its traces in the form of Arabic-speaking schools and a variety of diasporic communities who have settled in Bulgaria not as refugees or migrants, but as fraternal people. The historical legacies, then, have mixed consequences for minorities and integration, in which they on the one hand contribute to exclusionary discourses, and on the other hand facilitate institutional and societal belonging.

As such, all three cases show how imperial and colonial legacies take different forms but are of importance for understanding present policy. In the Finnish and Bulgarian cases, the post-imperial minorities belonged to the "core" in the past. Finland includes the minority in integration policy on near-equal terms, and Bulgaria employs exclusionary measures in relation to the Turkish-speaking, Muslim minority. Religious accommodations made to the national minority are, however, to a

limited degree extended to Muslim migrants. In Sápmi, where both the past and the present are characterized by colonialism, formulations of integration hardly include the Indigenous people beyond the minor mentions associated with national minority recognition in teaching material, and the incorporation of local, Indigenous presences in practices of integration, partly shaped by Indigenous recognition. In all three case studies, the forms that present policies of integration take, the formulations of nationhood migrants are faced with, and the position national minorities and Indigenous peoples are given within them, are rooted in the past; in order to fully understand present-day conditions, this past needs to be revisited.

The final question of this dissertation investigates tensions between the promotion of minority and majority identities by asking: *What normative tensions can be identified in the politics of immigrant integration with regard to the promotion of minority and majority identities?* A starting point of this dissertation was the tension between the preservationist dimension of minority recognition, and the integrationist, even homogenizing, ambitions of immigrant integration, a tension which has been present throughout the study. As noted in the answer to the first two questions, integration policies largely reproduce majority nationhood and thereby promote majority identities. Hence, integration counters the preservationist aims of minorities by serving the aims of majority nation-building. Whereas the goals of minority nation-building can align with the goals of integration policy in substate nations, where the minority language is also widely used, such a situation forms an exception.

In contexts of recognition weaker than in substates, integration policy ends up serving majority identities and nationhood rather than those of minorities. From the perspective of minority protection, requiring migrants to learn minority languages would support these languages' preservation and vitality. However, the dissertation notes that such a requirement disregards the burdens that are placed on migrants with regard to majority language acquisition and other requirements that citizens do not face. At the same time, migrants who live within a national minority community may not get their linguistic or civic skills recognized for naturalization, residency, or the access to social rights. Indeed, present models of minority recognition, which in this study have been established to closely inform integration policy, fail to capture non-territorial recognition, mobility, multilingualism, and weakened minorities in ways that could otherwise bridge the tensions identified between the policy goals of minority recognition and immigrant integration.

By exploring and bringing clarity to questions on the intersections between minority recognition and immigrant integration, the main contributions of this dissertation are made to scholarship on immigrant integration, on liberal multiculturalism, and more specifically to scholarship investigating connections between minority recognition and immigrant integration. More broadly, it contributes to questions on minority and majority nationhood, the relation between new and established minority/ness, and how minority recognition and integration policy could be rethought beyond binary categories. The dissertation shows how institutions of historically

present minorities may function as important spaces for belonging for migrants, how the presence of national minorities may contribute to the belonging of migrants, and how adopting minority identities may open up a faster pathway to formal rights. It shows how the politics of integration, with few exceptions, is majority-centred, how minority belongings are missing or marginal in formulations on what the nation entails as communicated to migrants, and how policies of recognition and immigrant integration are governed separately, with few overlaps. The dissertation thereby shows not only how integration policy functions as a misrepresenting mirror of an imagined majority society, but also how narrow a space is given to minorities within narratives and policies on nationhood faced by migrants. The dissertation provides empirical insights, from contexts ranging from states with minoritized former elites, to Indigenous peoples, and minorities subject to othering discourses, on how integration as a policy of nation-building relates to minoritized identities. It thereby identifies and calls attention to tensions, conflicts, incongruences, contradictions and gaps that have implications for normative theories on integration and minority recognition.

4.2. Implications and pathways for future studies

In the theoretical discussion of this introductory chapter, a layered perspective on integration was suggested as a way to capture how multiple belongings, transnational, national, and local processes interact with individual trajectories of migration and minority/ness in a specific historical context. Apart from providing an analytical perspective on the intersecting policies, a layered perspective also has normative implications. Rather than simply applying it to existing policy, or merely using it as a way to understand empirical complexities, it could provide a first step toward solving some of the incompatibilities and tensions identified in this dissertation with regard to present minority recognition and integration.

In terms of outlining what a layered perspective in policy could mean normatively, a first endeavour would be the inclusion of minorities alongside majority identities in the politics of integration. In most European countries, we find that the most explicit formulations of state nationhood that target migrants are found in courses on civics and language, as well as in requirements for residency or naturalization. The implications for an inclusion of minorities in such policies can be illustrated by returning to the empirical case studies of this dissertation. In the Finnish case, this could entail a possibility to attend both Finnish and Swedish orientation courses or integrating elements from both languages in each course rather than selecting only one language of integration. Instead of conveying a majority Finnish history, the treatment of Roma, the history of the Tatar minority, as well as colonial practices in relation to Sámi could be included, as could histories of migration. Furthermore, the preferences and identities of individual migrants could be acknowledged. As an example, for those for whom it is easier, namely speakers of related languages such as English, or other Indo-European languages, Swedish could be explicitly encouraged

as a language of integration that may enable a faster pathway to citizenship and full legal rights.

Unlike in Finland, language is not a requirement for naturalization in Sweden. However, since orientation course attendance conditions access to social rights, they do perform a gatekeeping function, which accentuates the significance of the course contents. Applying a layered perspective, Sweden's cultural and linguistic pluralism could be placed at the forefront in the curricula. Were language requirements to be imposed, knowledge of national minority languages would be recognized when granting rights that require language knowledge. In Bulgaria, an approach to the Ottoman past that does not simply see it as something negative, but rather provides some support for Muslim identities would pave the way for Muslim belonging, as too would acknowledging Turkish as a domestic language while continuing to provide space for Arabic institutions within processes of integration.

A potential objection to the suggestions outlined above could be that they only seem to make the politics of integration more complex and constitute a combination of both unrealistic and largely symbolic actions. Indeed, any normative application of the layered perspective would need to dig deeper into the institutional side of integration, minority recognition, and the politics of immigration. A telling example of what a mere inclusion of minority identities in curricula would entail can be found in the Dutch civic integration test where knowledge of Anne Frank is included, meaning that residency and citizenship partly depends on demonstrating knowledge about her. While it confronts migrants with past atrocities, holds up a person who today would be a member of a national minority, and thereby challenges the idea of the Netherlands as homogeneous, such an inclusion is not merely symbolic but could even be characterized as misrecognition. Dutch civic integration policy is formulated in ways that would have kept Anne Frank herself excluded from citizenship, residency, and possibly also entry to the country. A layered perspective on integration applied in policy, in which importance is given to transnational, historical, and intersecting processes of inclusion and exclusion, would need to be guided by a fundamental scrutiny of the consequences and built-in exclusions of integration policies for minoritized people who are differently positioned in relation to majority nationhood.

Whereas this dissertation has introduced and outlined in part how such processes are expressed in today's policy, the normative possibilities for a layered perspective applied to integration could be explored in future scholarship. Such an endeavour cannot be conducted in separation from dominant discourses in society and narratives on minorities within mainstream education. Challenging such narratives has been shown to be a continuous, demanding and disputed task filled with affective contestations. Integration policy could nevertheless be a suitable arena in which to conduct such reformulations. If integration is to actually foster inclusion, belonging, and democratic citizenship, would it not be important to be familiar with the multiplicity of national belongings that are present? Furthermore, migrants, depending on their specific circumstances, are likely to be subject to racist and othering practices,

to confusing history descriptions, and to barriers to belonging that majorities do not face. Should not the targets of such policy be prepared for a more truthful version of what is awaiting within their new nation-state of residency and its agendas of nationhood? These questions could be explored in future scholarship outlining the normative basis of an integration policy attentive to layers.

A further important focus for future studies could be giving a bigger role to agency. This could be done by investigating how differently positioned national minorities perceive migration, including continued explorations of how solidarities and exclusions are formed between minorities of different categories, differently situated with regard to citizenship, belonging, or whiteness. Connected to this, collecting first-hand experiences from migrants living within minority contexts, which may be sheltered from important discourses on racism and exclusion taking place in wider society, would be vital to understanding such processes of inclusion and exclusion. Taking a perspective from within policy-making, future research could explore how policy makers are confronted on the one hand with calls to reproduce majority hegemony in relation to newcomers through state integration, yet on the other hand with the need to acknowledge minority policies formed for different aims.

Besides research on agency, future scholarship could also explore normative and empirical potentials for drawing in and engaging majority society, too, through minority-centred civics. Such inquiries could also investigate potentials for recognition of migrant languages and belongings. Future research could push for not only acknowledging minority identities alongside dominant ones within existing institutions but imagining a politics of recognition that goes beyond symbolic and performative actions. Adding minorities to the list of recognized and acceptable belongings available to migrants, we may further inspire discussions about when and how civic formulations of integration are desirable and when not, moving towards a society more inclusive and supportive of minority belongings than those possible to imagine within the frameworks of present-day nation-states in Europe.

5. Summaries of papers

Paper I aims to identify and explore (dis)connections and value conflicts between policies of national minority recognition and immigrant integration, a topic hitherto underexplored outside of minority substates. In contrast to substates, where integration policies align with minority nation-building, most states exclude recognized minorities from integration policy. Addressing the position of national minorities without substate recognition in integration policies in Europe, the study first asks: How is national minority recognition acknowledged in integration policies in EU27? Secondly, with the aim of identifying normative tensions between recognition and integration, it further asks: What normative tensions are revealed between the policy aims of promoting national minority recognition on the one hand, and immigrant integration on the other? The paper develops four ideal types of minority-linguistic integration regimes, which are applied to a mapping of policies of minority recognition and immigrant integration in EU27. Most states with recognized minorities are shown to exclude national minorities from immigrant integration policies. The finding is discussed by identifying normative tensions between identity-based goals of minority language preservation, and instrumental goals of the majority-centred immigrant integration. Finally, commonalities are identified between the values guiding minority recognition and integration, suggesting that identity values connected to the majority shape the formulations of integration policy in significant ways. The study holds that investigations of contemporary language policy should jointly consider national minorities, Indigenous peoples, and immigrants, while acknowledging the significance of majority identity interests in policy formulations.

Paper II addresses the dilemma that emerges when states with strongly recognized linguistic minorities are to determine which language newly arrived immigrants should learn in the state-provided integration programmes. It explores how constitutionally bilingual Finland, which has a Swedish-speaking non-territorial minority with the same linguistic rights as the majority, governs linguistic aspects of immigrant integration. It investigates the implications of the strong legal and the weak societal status of Swedish for immigrant integration by connecting scholarship on minority nationalism and immigrant integration to laws, reports and interviews on integration in Swedish-speaking Finland. It shows tensions between Finland-Swedish integration aspirations favouring Swedish as the language of integration, and state-level policies promoting a Finnish-majority monolingual integration. Unlike substate minorities that have a political mandate to coerce migrants to learn the territorially dominant minority language, the non-territorial Swedish-speaking minority relies largely on the voluntary choice of immigrants to choose Swedish as their language of

integration. Structural obstacles, however, hinder this choice in bilingual regions, which has sparked political debates and actions. The paper bridges research on Finnish multiculturalism and research on integration policy in contexts where historical minorities are present by introducing a non-territorial, formerly dominant minority to the research field.

Paper III aims to understand connections between immigration policy and contemporary colonialism on Indigenous territory by asking how state-led immigrant integration policies and practices reproduce colonialism in Swedish Sápmi. It explores the applicability of scholarship on settler colonialism to Sweden and develops the notion of banal colonialism by combining scholarship on settler and everyday colonialism with banal nationalism. Drawing on state documents regulating immigrant integration and semi-structured interviews conducted with integration workers in Swedish Sápmi, the study shows that immigrant integration policy largely silences Sweden's colonial past and present. While the implementation of national level policies on Indigenous land reproduces majority-centred narratives, practices challenging the colonial order are also identified. The study shows how the notion of banal colonialism captures mundane colonial practices in relation to integration, but also brings attention to instances where immigrant integration policy has the potential to challenge settler colonialism.

Paper IV investigates the role of settled minorities for refugee belonging in Bulgaria, a state with the largest historically present Muslim minority in the EU, where the state has minimal involvement in the reception of the mainly Muslim refugees arriving via Turkey. It asks how boundaries are drawn between settled minorities and new refugees in processes of reception, integration, and belonging in Bulgaria. Based on interviews conducted with state, NGO and Muslim representatives working with issues related to refugee integration or Bulgarian Turkish communities, it analytically connects settled minority communities with new, mainly Muslim, refugee migration. It identifies how spatial, linguistic, and religious boundaries are perceived to separate settled minorities from newly arrived refugees. Previously settled diasporas are nevertheless witnessed to overcome these boundaries through geographical proximity, a shared language, and a shared country of origin, and have thus functioned as key facilitators of refugee belonging and inclusion. Furthermore, Muslim institutions led by Bulgarian Turks have functioned as spaces of belonging and charity for refugees. The study finds that settled minority communities contributed to refugee reception in ways that compensated for the state absence, calling for further research on the role of settled minorities for inclusionary processes in society.

References

Achim, Viorel. 2013. *The Roma in Romanian History*. Budapest: Central European University Press.

Adam, Ilke. 2013. "Immigrant Integration Policies of the Belgian Regions: Sub-State Nationalism and Policy Divergence after Devolution." *Regional & Federal Studies* 23 (5): 547–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/13597566.2013.789024.

———. 2018. "Immigration and Sub-State Nations: Researching the Nexus." In *Handbook of Territorial Politics*, edited by Klaus Detterbeck and Eve Hepburn, 261–77. Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Albert, Gwendolyn, and Marek Szilvasi. 2017. "Intersectional Discrimination of Romani Women Forcibly Sterilized in the Former Czechoslovakia and Czech Republic." *Health and Human Rights* 19 (2): 23–34.

Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London: Verso books.

Back, Les, and Shamser Sinha with Charlynne Bryan. 2012. "New Hierarchies of Belonging." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 15 (2): 139–54. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549411432030.

Baez, Benjamin. 2002. "Confidentiality in Qualitative Research: Reflections on Secrets, Power and Agency." *Qualitative Research* 2 (1): 35–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794102002001638.

Barker, Fiona. 2010. "Learning to Be a Majority: Negotiating Immigration, Integration and National Membership in Quebec." *Political Science* 62 (1): 11–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032318710370585.

———. 2015. *Nationalism, Identity and the Governance of Diversity: Old Politics, New Arrivals*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Barry, Brian. 2002. *Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bell, Avril. 2008. "Recognition or Ethics? De/Centering and the Legacy of Settler Colonialism." *Cultural Studies* 22 (6): 850–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380701702474.

Benhabib, Seyla. 2002. *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bermingham, Nicola, and Gwennan Higham. 2018. "Immigrants as New Speakers in Galicia and Wales: Issues of Integration, Belonging and Legitimacy." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 39 (5): 394–406. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1429454.

Bevir, Mark, and R.A.W. Rhodes. 2006. "Interpretive Approaches to British Government and Politics." *British Politics* 1 (1): 84–112. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.bp.4200001.

———. 2016. "Interpretive Political Science: Mapping the Field." In *Routledge Handbook of Interpretive Political Science*, edited by Mark Bevir and R.A.W. Rhodes, 3–27. Abingdon, GB: Routledge.

Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

———. 2015. "Foreword to Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multicultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism." In *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multicultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*, edited by Pnina Werbner and Tariq Modood. London: Zed Books.

Blackledge, Adrian. 2005. *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*. Amsterdam: Benjamin.

Bloemraad, Irene, Anna Korteweg, and Gökçe Yurdakul. 2008. "Citizenship and Immigration: Multiculturalism, Assimilation, and Challenges to the Nation-State." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34 (1): 153–79.

Bogner, Alexander, Beate Littig, and Wolfgang Menz, eds. 2009. *Interviewing Experts*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bonjour, Saskia. 2014. "The Transfer of Pre-Departure Integration Requirements for Family Migrants among Member States of the European Union." *Comparative Migration Studies* 2 (2): 203–26. https://doi.org/10.5117/CMS2014.2.BONJ.

Bonjour, Saskia, and Jan Willem Duyvendak. 2018. "The 'Migrant with Poor Prospects': Racialized Intersections of Class and Culture in Dutch Civic Integration Debates." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 41 (5): 882–900. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1339897.

Borevi, Karin. 2017. "Diversity and Solidarity in Denmark and Sweden." In *The Strains of Commitment. The Political Sources of Solidarity in Diverse Societies*, edited by Keith Banting and Will Kymlicka, 364–88. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Borevi, Karin, Kristian Kriegbaum Jensen, and Per Mouritsen. 2017. "The Civic Turn of Immigrant Integration Policies in the Scandinavian Welfare States." *Comparative Migration Studies* 5 (9): 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-017-0052-4.

Brunger, Fern, and Darlene Wall. 2016. "'What Do They Really Mean by Partnerships?' Questioning the Unquestionable Good in Ethics Guidelines Promoting Community Engagement in Indigenous Health Research." *Qualitative Health Research* 26 (13): 1862–77. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316649158.

Burnham, Peter, Karin Gilland Lutz, Wyn Grant, and Zig Layton-Henry. 2008. *Research Methods in Politics*. 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Calhoun, Craig. 2007. *Nations Matter: Culture, History and the Cosmopolitan Dream*. London: Routledge.

———. 1997. *Nationalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Carens, Joseph H. 1997. "Liberalism and Culture." *Constellations* 4 (1): 35–47. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.00034.

Carlà, Andrea. 2018. "Land of Welcome, Land of Fear: Explaining Approaches to 'New' Diversity in Catalonia and South Tyrol." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44 (7): 1098–1116. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1352465.

Casanova, Jean-Thomas Arrighi de. 2014. "Managing Immigration in a Multinational Context. Border Struggles and Nation-Building in Contemporary Scotland and Catalonia." In *The Politics of Immigration in Multi-Level States*, edited by Eve Hepburn and Ricard Zapata-Barrero, 108–29. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Castles, Stephen. 2002. "Migration and Community Formation under Conditions of Globalization." *International Migration Review* 36 (4): 1143–68.

Choudhry, Sujit. 2002. "National Minorities and Ethnic Immigrants: Liberalism's Political Sociology." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 10 (1): 54–78.

Collyer, Michael, Sophie Hinger, and Reinhard Schweitzer. 2020. "Politics of (Dis) Integration–An Introduction." In *Politics of (Dis) Integration*, edited by Sophie Hinger and Reinhard Schweitzer, 1–18. IMISCOE Research Series. Cham, Switzerland: Springer Open.

Conversi, Daniele. 1997. *Basque Nationalism and the Spanish State: Alternative Routes To Nationalist Mobilisation*. Reno, NV: University of Nevada Press.

Corntassel, Jeff. 2003. "Who Is Indigenous? 'Peoplehood' and Ethnonationalist Approaches to Rearticulating Indigenous Identity." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 9 (1): 75–100. https://doi.org/10.1080/13537110412331301365.

Cortès-Colomé, Montserrat, Mònica Barrieras, and Pere Comellas. 2016. "Changes in Immigrant Individuals' Language Attitudes through Contact with Catalan: The Mirror Effect." *Language Awareness* 25 (4): 272–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2016.1212868.

Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Craig, Gary, and Maggie O'Neill. 2013. "It's Time to Move on from 'Race'? The Official 'Invisibilisation' of Minority Ethnic Disadvantage." In *Social Policy Review 25: Analysis and Debate in Social Policy, 2013*, edited by Gaby Ramia, Kevin Farnsworth, and Zoe Irving, 93–112. Bristol: Policy Press.

Crepaz, Katharina. 2016. "'Old' vs. 'New' Minorities – an Identity-Based Approach to the Distinction between Autochthonous and Immigrant Minorities." *Migration Letters* 13 (2): 203–13.

Crow, Graham, Rose Wiles, Sue Heath, and Vikki Charles. 2006. "Research Ethics and Data Quality: The Implications of Informed Consent." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 9 (2): 83–95.

Crul, Maurice. 2016. "Super-Diversity vs. Assimilation: How Complex Diversity in Majority–Minority Cities Challenges the Assumptions of Assimilation." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42 (1): 54–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1061425.

De Genova, Nicholas. 2018. "The 'Migrant Crisis' as Racial Crisis: Do Black Lives Matter in Europe?" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 41 (10): 1765–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1361543.

De Leeuw, Marc, and Sonja Van Wichelen. 2012. "Civilizing Migrants: Integration, Culture and Citizenship." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 15 (2): 195–210. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549411432029.

De Schutter, Helder. 2007. "Language Policy and Political Philosophy: On the Emerging Linguistic Justice Debate." *Language Problems and Language Planning* 31 (1): 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.31.1.02des.

De Schutter, Helder, and David Robichaud. 2015. "Van Parijsian Linguistic Justice – Context, Analysis and Critiques." *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 18 (2): 87–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230.2015.1023627.

Eminov, Ali. 1997. *Turkish and Other Muslim Minorities in Bulgaria*. London: Hurst.

Erdal, Marta Bivand. 2013. "Migrant Transnationalism and Multi-Layered Integration: Norwegian-Pakistani Migrants' Own Reflections." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 39 (6): 983–99. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.765665.

Ersanilli, Evelyn, and Ruud Koopmans. 2011. "Do Immigrant Integration Policies Matter? A Three-Country Comparison among Turkish Immigrants." *West European Politics* 34 (2): 208–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2011.546568.

Favell, Adrian. 1998. *Philosophies of Integration: Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain*. Basingstoke: Macmillan in association with Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations, University of Warwick.

Fekete, Liz. 2008. *Integration, Islamophobia and Civil Rights in Europe*. London: Institute of Race Relations.

Flyvbjerg, Bent. 2006. "Five Misunderstandings about Case-Study Research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 12 (2): 219–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800405284363.

Foner, Nancy, and Richard Alba. 2008. "Immigrant Religion in the US and Western Europe: Bridge or Barrier to Inclusion?" *International Migration Review* 42 (2): 360–92.

Fraser, Nancy. 2000. "Rethinking Recognition." *New Left Review* 3 (May-June): 107–20.

Fraser, Nancy, and Axel Honneth. 2003. *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange*. London: Verso.

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Givens, Terri E. 2007. "Immigrant Integration in Europe: Empirical Research." *Annual Review of Political Science* 10: 67–83. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.9.062404.162347.

Glick, Jennifer L, Katherine Theall, Katherine Andrinopoulos, and Carl Kendall. 2018. "For Data's Sake: Dilemmas in the Measurement of Gender Minorities." *Culture, Health & Sexuality* 20 (12): 1362–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2018.1437220.

Goldberg, David Theo. 2006. "Racial Europeanization." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29 (2): 331–64. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870500465611.

Goodman, Sara Wallace. 2010. "Integration Requirements for Integration's Sake? Identifying, Categorising and Comparing Civic Integration Policies." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36 (5): 753–72. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691831003764300.

Grzymala-Kazlowska, Aleksandra, and Jenny Phillimore. 2018. "Introduction: Rethinking Integration. New Perspectives on Adaptation and Settlement in the Era of Super-Diversity." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44 (2): 179–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1341706.

Guenther, Katja M. 2009. "The Politics of Names: Rethinking the Methodological and Ethical Significance of Naming People, Organizations, and Places." *Qualitative Research* 9 (4): 411–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794109337872.

Gutmann, Amy. 1994. "Introduction." In *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, edited by Charles Taylor, 3–24. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hadj Abdou, Leila. 2019. "Immigrant Integration: The Governance of Ethno-Cultural Differences." *Comparative Migration Studies* 7 (1): 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-019-0124-8.

Hall, Stuart. 1990. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." In *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, edited by Jonathan Rutherford, 222–37. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Hammersley, Martyn. 2014. "On the Ethics of Interviewing for Discourse Analysis." *Qualitative Research* 14 (5): 529–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794113495039.

Harder, Niklas, Lucila Figueroa, Rachel M Gillum, Dominik Hangartner, David D Laitin, and Jens Hainmueller. 2018. "Multidimensional Measure of Immigrant Integration." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115 (45): 11483–88. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1808793115.

Hechter, Michael. 1975. *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Heider, Jennifer. 2012. "Unveiling the Truth behind the French Burqa Ban: The Unwarranted Restriction of the Right to Freedom of Religion and the European Court of Human Rights." *Indiana International and Comparative Law Review* 22 (1): 93. https://doi.org/10.18060/17670.

Hennessey, John, and Gunlög Fur. 2020. "Svensk Kolonialism, Sverige Och Kolonialism Eller Svenskar Och Kolonialism?" *Historisk Tidskrift* 140 (3): 375–84.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holmes, Seth M, and Heide Castañeda. 2016. "Representing the 'European Refugee Crisis' in Germany and beyond: Deservingness and Difference, Life and Death." *American Ethnologist* 43 (1): 12–24. https://doi.org/10.1111/amet.12259.

Imre, Anikó. 2005. "Whiteness in Post-Socialist Eastern Europe: The Time of the Gypsies, the End of Race." In *Postcolonial Whiteness: A Critical Reader on Race and Empire*, edited by Alfred J. López, 79–102. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Janoski, Thomas. 2010. *The Ironies of Citizenship: Naturalization and Integration in Industrialized Countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jensen, Kristian Kriegbaum, and Per Mouritsen. 2019. "Nationalism in a Liberal Register: Beyond the 'Paradox of Universalism' in Immigrant Integration Politics." *British Journal of Political Science* 49 (3): 837–56. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123416000806.

Jeram, Sanjay. 2014. "Sub-State Nationalism and Immigration in Spain: Diversity and Identity in Catalonia and the Basque Country." *Ethnopolitics* 13 (3): 225–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449057.2013.853998.

Jeram, Sanjay, and Ilke Adam. 2015. "Diversity and Nationalism in the Basque Country and Flanders: Understanding Immigrants as Fellow Minorities." *National Identities* 17 (3): 241–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/14608944.2014.951611.

Jeram, Sanjay, Arno Van Der Zwet, and Verena Wisthaler. 2016. "Friends or Foes? Migrants and Sub-State Nationalists in Europe." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42 (8): 1229–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1082286.

Joppke, Christian. 2007. "Beyond National Models: Civic Integration Policies for Immigrants in Western Europe." *West European Politics* 30 (1): 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/01402380601019613.

Joppke, Christian, and Ewa Morawska, eds. 2003. *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Karoulla-Vrikki, Dimitra. 2004. "Language and Ethnicity in Cyprus under the British: A Linkage of Heightened Salience." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2004 (168): 19–36. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2004.030.

Kascian, Kiryl, and Hanna Vasilevich. 2015. "Czech Republic Acknowledgement of Belarusian and Vietnamese as New Minorities." In *European Yearbook of Minority Issues Online*, edited by European Centre for Minority Issues, The European Academy Bozen/Bolzano, Åbo Akademi University, Babes-Bolyai University, Hungarian Academy of Science, and University of Glasgow, 353–71. Leiden: Brill/Nijhoff.

Keating, Michael. 2001. "So Many Nations, so Few States: Territory and Nationalism in the Global Era." In *Multinational Democracies*, edited by Alain-G. Gagnon and James Tully, 39–64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kelso, Michelle. 2013. "'And Roma Were Victims, Too.' The Romani Genocide and Holocaust Education in Romania." *Intercultural Education* 24 (1–2): 61–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2013.768060.

Knoblauch, Hubert. 2005. "Focused Ethnography." *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 6 (3). https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/20/43.

Knutsen, Hege Merete, Katrine Fangen, and Oksana Žabko. 2020. "Integration and Exclusion at Work: Latvian and Swedish Agency Nurses in Norway." *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 21 (2): 413–29. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-019-00660-5.

Koopmans, Ruud. 2010. "Trade-Offs between Equality and Difference: Immigrant Integration, Multiculturalism and the Welfare State in Cross-National Perspective." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36 (1): 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830903250881.

Korteweg, Anna C. 2017. "The Failures of 'Immigrant Integration': The Gendered Racialized Production of Non-Belonging." *Migration Studies* 5 (3): 428–44. https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnx025.

Kostakopoulou, Dora. 2010. "The Anatomy of Civic Integration." *The Modern Law Review* 73 (6): 933–58.

Kovács, András. 2000. "Jewish Assimilation and Jewish Politics in Modern Hungary." In *Jewish Studies at the Central European University: Public Lectures 1996-1999*, edited by András Kovács and Eszter Andor, 109–33. CEU Jewish Studies Yearbook. Budapest: Central European University.

Kubik, Jan. 2009. "Ethnography of Politics: Foundations, Applications, Prospects." In *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*, edited by Edward Schatz, 25–52. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kunnan, Antony John. 2013. "Fairness and Justice in Language Assessment." In *The Companion to Language Assessment*, edited by Antony John Kunnan, 3:1098–1114. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kuokkanen, Rauna. 2020. "The Deatnu Agreement: A Contemporary Wall of Settler Colonialism." *Settler Colonial Studies*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2020.1794211.

Kuus, Merje. 2004. "Europe's Eastern Expansion and the Reinscription of Otherness in East-Central Europe." *Progress in Human Geography* 28 (4): 472–89. https://doi.org/10.1191/0309132504ph498oa.

Kymlicka, Will. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2001. "Immigrant Integration and Minority Nationalism." In *Minority Nationalism and the Changing International Order*, edited by Michael Keating and John McGarry, 1:61–84. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2007. *Multicultural Odysseys: Navigating the New International Politics of Diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2011. "Multicultural Citizenship within Multination States." *Ethnicities* 11 (3): 281–302. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796811407813.

———. 2018. "Liberal Multiculturalism as a Political Theory of State–Minority Relations." *Political Theory* 46 (1): 81–91. https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591717696021.

Laitin, David D, and Rob Reich. 2003. "A Liberal Democratic Approach to Language Justice." In *Language Rights and Political Theory*, edited by Will Kymlicka and Alan Patten, 80–104. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lan, Pei-Chia. 2011. "White Privilege, Language Capital and Cultural Ghettoisation: Western High-Skilled Migrants in Taiwan." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 37 (10): 1669–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2011.613337.

Larin, Stephen J. 2020. "Is It Really about Values? Civic Nationalism and Migrant Integration." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 46 (1): 127–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2019.1591943.

Lentin, Alana, and Gavan Titley. 2011. *The Crises of Multiculturalism: Racism in a Neoliberal Age*. London: Zed Books.

Liimatainen, Tuire, and Nina Carlsson. 2020. "'Kyss mig, jag är en sverigefinne!' Gränsdragningar mellan invandrarskap och minoritetsskap i den sverigefinska etnopolitiska mobiliseringen 1980-2020 ['Kiss me, I am a Sweden-Finn!' Boundaries between migranthood and minority-ness in the Sweden-Finnish ethnopolitical mobilization 1980-2020]." *Unpublished Manuscript*.

Lundström, Catrin. 2017. "The White Side of Migration: Reflections on Race, Citizenship and Belonging in Sweden." *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 7 (2): 79–87. https://doi.org/10.1515/njmr-2017-0014.

Lune, Howard, and Bruce L Berg. 2017. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. 9th ed. Harlow: Pearson.

Lynch, Cecelia. 2006. "Critical Interpretation and Interwar Peace Movements Challenging Dominant Narratives." In *Interpretation and Method. Empirical Reseach Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, edited by Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, 291–99. New York: Sharp.

Lynn, Peter. 2016. "Principles of Sampling." In *Research Methods for Postgraduates*, edited by Tony Greenfield and Sue Greener, 3rd ed., 185–94. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Maddy-Weitzman, Bruce. 2011. *The Berber Identity Movement and the Challenge to North African States*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Manatschal, Anita. 2015. "Switzerland–Really Europe's Heart of Darkness?" *Swiss Political Science Review* 21 (1): 23–35. https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12148.

Marchetti, Sabrina. 2015. "Resentment at the Heart of Europe." In *Postcolonial Transitions in Europe: Contexts, Practices and Politics*, edited by Sandra Ponzanesi and Gianmaria Colpani, 133–47. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Mars, Leonard. 2000. "Anthropological Reflections on Jewish Identity in Contemporary Hungary." In *Jewish Studies at the Central European University: Public Lectures 1996-1999*, edited by András Kovács and Eszter Andor, 280–305. CEU Jewish Studies Yearbook 1. Budapest: Central European University.

May, Stephen. 2006. "Language Policy and Minority Rights." In *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*, edited by Thomas Ricento, 255–72. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

———. 2012. *Language and Minority Rights: Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Politics of Language*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

———. 2014. "Contesting Public Monolingualism and Diglossia: Rethinking Political Theory and Language Policy for a Multilingual World." *Language Policy* 13 (4): 371–93. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-014-9327-x.

———. 2016. "Language, Imperialism, and the Modern Nation-State System: Implications for Language Rights." In *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Society*, edited by Ofelia Garcia, Nelson Flores, and Massimiliano Spotti, 35–54. New York: Oxford University Press.

McCarty, Teresa L, Mary Eunice Romero, and Ofelia Zepeda. 2006. "Reclaiming the Gift: Indigenous Youth Counter-Narratives on Native Language Loss and Revitalization." *American Indian Quarterly* 30 (1/2): 28–48. https://doi.org/10.1353/aiq.2006.0005.

McNamara, Tim, and Kerry Ryan. 2011. "Fairness versus Justice in Language Testing: The Place of English Literacy in the Australian Citizenship Test." *Language Assessment Quarterly* 8 (2): 161–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2011.565438.

Medda-Windischer, Roberta, Caitlin Boulter, and Tove H Malloy, eds. 2019. *Extending Protection to Migrant Populations in Europe: Old and New Minorities*. London and New York: Routledge.

Miera, Frauke. 2012. "Not a One-Way Road? Integration as a Concept and as a Policy." In *European Multiculturalisms: Cultural, Religious and Ethnic Challenges*, edited by Anna Triandafyllidou, Tariq Modood, and Nasar Meer, 192–212. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Miller, David. 2011. "Will Kymlicka 'Multicultural Citizenship within Multination States': A Response." *Ethnicities* 11 (3): 303–7. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796811407814.

Modood, Tariq, Anna Triandafyllidou, and Ricard Zapata-Barrero, eds. 2006. *Multiculturalism, Muslims and Citizenship: A European Approach*. London: Routledge.

Moseley, Christopher, ed. 2010. *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*. 3rd ed. Paris: UNESCO Publishing. http://www.unesco.org/languages-atlas/.

Mouritsen, Per. 2013. "The Resilience of Citizenship Traditions: Civic Integration in Germany, Great Britain and Denmark." *Ethnicities* 13 (1): 86–109. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796812451220.

Mouritsen, Per, K Kriegbaum Jensen, and Stephen J Larin. 2019. "Introduction: Theorizing the Civic Turn in European Integration Policies." *Ethnicities* 19 (4): 595–613. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796819843532.

Murchadha, Noel P Ó, Michael Hornsby, Cassie Smith-Christmas, and Máiréad Moriarty. 2018. "New Speakers, Familiar Concepts?" In *New Speakers of Minority Languages: Linguistic*

Ideologies and Practices., edited by Noel P Ó Murchadha, Michael Hornsby, Cassie Smith-Christmas, and Máiréad Moriarty, 1–22. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Mylonas, Harris. 2013. *The Politics of Nation-Building: Making Co-Nationals, Refugees, and Minorities*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Obelenė, Vaida. 2009. "Expert versus Researcher: Ethical Considerations in the Process of Bargaining a Study." In *Interviewing Experts*, edited by Alexander Bogner, Beate Littig, and Wolfgang Menz, 184–200. New York: Springer.

O'Rourke, Bernadette. 2018. "New Speakers of Minority Languages." In *The Routledge Handbook of Language Revitalization*, edited by Leanne Hinton, Leena Huss, and Gerald Roche, 265–74. London: Routledge.

Össbo, Åsa. 2020. "Från Lappmarksplakat till Anläggarsamhällen: Svensk Bosättarkolonialism Gentemot Sápmi." *Historisk Tidskrift* 140 (3): 420–43.

Pachirat, Timothy. 2009. "The Political in Political Ethnography: Dispatches from the Kill Floor." In *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*, edited by Edward Schatz, 143–62. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pader, Ellen. 2006. "Seeing with an Ethnographic Sensibility Explorations Beneath the Surface of Public Policies." In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, edited by Dwora Yanow and Schwartz-Shea, 161–75. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Palermo, Francesco. 2019. "Deconstructing Myths: What's in the Debate on Extending the Scope of Minority Rights and Policies to Immigrants?" In *Extending Protection to Migrant Populations in Europe: Old and New Minorities*, edited by Roberta Medda-Windischer, Caitlin Boulter, and Tove H Malloy, 16–36. London and New York: Routledge.

Parekh, Bhikhu. 1997. "Dilemmas of a Multicultural Theory of Citizenship." *Constellations* 4 (1): 54–62. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.00036.

———. 2006. "Europe, Liberalism and the 'Muslim Question.'" In *Multiculturalism, Muslims and Citizenship: A European Approach*, edited by Tariq Modood, Anna Triandafyllidou, and Ricard Zapata-Barrero, 179–203. London: Routledge.

Parvulescu, Anca. 2015. "European Racial Triangulation." In *Postcolonial Transitions in Europe*, edited by Sandra Ponzanesi and Gianmaria Colpani, 25–46. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Patten, Alan. 2016. *Equal Recognition: The Moral Foundations of Minority Rights*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Patton, Michael Quinn. 2002. *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. 3rd ed. London: Sage.

Peräkylä, Anssi. 2005. "Analyzing Talk and Text." In *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K Denzin and Yvonna S Lincoln, 3rd ed., 869–86. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.

Perrino, Sabina. 2019. "Intimate Identities and Language Revitalization in Veneto, Northern Italy." *Multilingua* 38 (1): 29–50. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2017-0128.

Phalet, Karen, and Marc Swyngedouw. 2003. "Measuring Immigrant Integration: The Case of Belgium." *Studi Emigrazione* 152: 773–804.

Piller, Ingrid. 2016. *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice: An Introduction to Applied Sociolinguistics*. 1st ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Pinto, Meital. 2007. "On the Intrinsic Value of Arabic in Israel — Challenging Kymlicka on Language Rights." *Canadian Journal of Law & Jurisprudence* 20 (1): 143–72. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0841820900005737.

Plankey-Videla, Nancy. 2012. "Informed Consent as Process: Problematizing Informed Consent in Organizational Ethnographies." *Qualitative Sociology* 35 (1): 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-011-9212-2.

Pogge, Thomas W. 2003. "Accommodation Rights for Hispanics in the United States." In *Language Rights and Political Theory*, edited by Will Kymlicka and Alan Patten, 105–22. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Poirier, Johanne. 2019. "Francophone Minorities in Canada: Trapped between the New/Old Minority Categories." In *Extending Protection to Migrant Populations in Europe*, edited by Roberta Medda-Windischer, Caitlin Boulter, and Tove H Malloy, 37–64. London and New York: Routledge.

Ponzanesi, Sandra, and Gianmaria Colpani, eds. 2015. *Postcolonial Transitions in Europe: Contexts, Practices and Politics*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Pöyhönen, Sari, and James Simpson. 2020. "Contesting Language Policy for Asylum Seekers in the Northern Periphery: The Story of Tailor F." *Language Policy*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-020-09554-0.

Preece, Jennifer Jackson. 1998. *National Minorities and the European Nation-States System*. New York: Clarendon Press.

Ravna, Øyvind. 2015. "Sami Rights to Natural Resources and Lands in Norway." In *Polar Law and Resources. Nordic Council of Ministers, Copenhagen, Denmark*, edited by Natalia Loukacheva, 63–77. Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers.

Réaume, Denise G. 2003. "Beyond Personality: The Territorial and Personal Principles of Language Policy Reconsidered." In *Language Rights and Political Theory*, edited by Will Kymlicka and Alan Patten, 271–95. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rubin, Herbert J, and Irene S Rubin. 2011. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.

Rubio-Marín, Ruth. 2003. "Language Rights: Exploring the Competing Rationales." In *Language Rights and Political Theory*, edited by Will Kymlicka and Alan Patten, 73–76. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rumelili, Bahar, and Fuat Keyman. 2016. "Enacting Multi-Layered Citizenship: Turkey's Armenians' Struggle for Justice and Equality." *Citizenship Studies* 20 (1): 67–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2015.1107027.

Saharso, Sawitri, and Doutje Lettinga. 2008. "Contentious Citizenship: Policies and Debates on the Veil in the Netherlands." *Social Politics* 15 (4): 455–80. https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxn020.

Salée, Daniel. 1995. "Identities in Conflict: The Aboriginal Question and the Politics of Recognition in Quebec." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 18 (2): 277–314. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.1995.9993864.

Saranillio, Dean Itsuji. 2013. "Why Asian Settler Colonialism Matters: A Thought Piece on Critiques, Debates, and Indigenous Difference." *Settler Colonial Studies* 3 (3–4): 280–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2013.810697.

Sasse, Gwendolyn. 2005. "Securitization or Securing Rights? Exploring the Conceptual Foundations of Policies towards Minorities and Migrants in Europe." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 43 (4): 673–93. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2005.00591.x.

Sasse, Gwendolyn, and Eiko Thielemann. 2005. "A Research Agenda for the Study of Migrants and Minorities in Europe." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 43 (4): 655–71. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2005.00590.x.

Schatz, Edward. 2009. "Ethnographic Immersion and the Study of Politics." In *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*, edited by Edward Schatz, 1–22. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schinkel, Willem. 2018. "Against 'Immigrant Integration': For an End to Neocolonial Knowledge Production." *Comparative Migration Studies* 6 (31): 31. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0095-1.

Schmidt, Ulrike. 2008. "Language Loss and the Ethnic Identity of Minorities." 18. ECMI Issue Brief. European Centre for Minority Issues.

Shehata, Samer. 2006. "Ethnography, Identity, and the Production of Knowledge." In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, edited by Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, 244–63. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.

Smith, Anthony D. 1991. *National Identity*. Vol. 11. London: Penguin.

———. 1998. *Nationalism and Modernism. A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism*. London: Routledge.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies*. 2nd ed. London: Zed Books.

Snelgrove, Corey, Rita Kaur Dhamoon, and Jeff Corntassel. 2014. "Unsettling Settler Colonialism: The Discourse and Politics of Settlers, and Solidarity with Indigenous Nations." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 3 (2): 1–32.

Soss, Joe. 2006. "Talking Our Way to Meaningful Explanations: A Practice-Centered View of Interviewing for Interpretive Research." In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, edited by Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, 127–49. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Tannenbaum, Michal. 2009. "What's in a Language? Language as a Core Value of Minorities in Israel." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (6): 977–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830902957742.

Taylor, Charles, ed. 1994. *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Todorova, Maria˜Nikolaeva. 1997. *Imagining the Balkans*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Toivanen, Reetta. 2019. "Beyond Legal Categories of Indigeneity and Minority-Ness: The Case of Roma and Falling in-Between." In *Extending the Protection to Migrant Populations in Europe Old and New Minorities*, edited by Roberta Medda-Windischer, Caitlin Boulter, and Tove H Malloy, 65–88. London and New York: Routledge.

Tomasovic, Elizabeth K. 2009. "Robbed of Reproductive Justice: The Necessity of a Global Initiative to Provide Redress to Roma Women Coercively Sterilized in Eastern Europe." *Columbia Human Rights Law Review* 41 (3): 765–824.

Triadafilopoulos, Triadafilos. 2011. "Illiberal Means to Liberal Ends? Understanding Recent Immigrant Integration Policies in Europe." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 37 (6): 861–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2011.576189.

Triandafyllidou, Anna. 1998. "National Identity and the 'other'." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21 (4): 593–612. https://doi.org/10.1080/014198798329784.

Tuck, Eve, and K Wayne Yang. 2012. "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1 (1): 1–40.

Van Baar, Huub. 2011. "Cultural Policy and the Governmentalization of Holocaust Remembrance in Europe: Romani Memory between Denial and Recognition." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 17 (1): 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286631003695539.

Van Houtum, Henk. 2010. "Human Blacklisting: The Global Apartheid of the EU's External Border Regime." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28 (6): 957–76. https://doi.org/10.1068/d1909.

Van Parijs, Philippe. 2011. *Linguistic Justice for Europe and for the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2015. *The Settler Colonial Present*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Vertovec, Steven. 2007. "Super-Diversity and Its Implications." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30 (6): 1024–54. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465.

Wedeen, Lisa. 2009. "Ethnography as Interpretive Enterprise." In *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*, edited by Edward Schatz, 75–94. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2010. "Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science* 13: 255–72. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.052706.123951.

Weller, Marc. 2008. "Introduction: The Outlook for the Protection of Minorities in the Wider Europe." In *The Protection of Minorities in the Wider Europe*, edited by Marc Weller, Denika Blacklock, and Katherine Nobbs, 1–7. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wessendorf, Susanne. 2018. "Pathways of Settlement among Pioneer Migrants in Super-Diverse London." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44 (2): 270–86. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1341719.

Wisthaler, Verena. 2016. "South Tyrol: The Importance of Boundaries for Immigrant Integration." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42 (8): 1271–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1082290.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (4): 387–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240.

Wright, Matthew, and Irene Bloemraad. 2012. "Is There a Trade-off between Multiculturalism and Socio-Political Integration? Policy Regimes and Immigrant Incorporation in Comparative Perspective." *Perspectives on Politics* 10 (1): 77–95.

Yack, Bernard. 1996. "The Myth of the Civic Nation." *Critical Review* 10 (2): 193–211. https://doi.org/10.1080/08913819608443417.

Yanow, Dvora. 2000. *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

———. 2007. "Interpretation in Policy Analysis: On Methods and Practice." *Critical Policy Analysis* 1 (1): 110–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2007.9518511.

———. 2009. "Dear Author, Dear Reader." In *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*, edited by Edward Schatz, 275–302. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.

Yanow, Dvora, and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea. 2006. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. 1999. "The 'Multi-Layered Citizen.'" *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 1 (1): 119–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/146167499360068.

———. 2011. *The Politics of Belonging: Intersectional Contestations*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Södertörn Doctoral Dissertations

1. Jolanta Aidukaite, *The Emergence of the Post-Socialist Welfare State: The case of the Baltic States: Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania*, 2004
2. Xavier Fraudet, *Politique étrangère française en mer Baltique (1871–1914): De l'exclusion à l'affirmation*, 2005
3. Piotr Wawrzeniuk, *Confessional Civilising in Ukraine: The Bishop Iosyf Shumliansky and the Introduction of Reforms in the Diocese of Lviv 1668–1708*, 2005
4. Andrej Kotljarchuk, *In the Shadows of Poland and Russia: The Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Sweden in the European Crisis of the mid-17th Century*, 2006
5. Håkan Blomqvist, *Nation, ras och civilisation i svensk arbetarrörelse före nazismen*, 2006
6. Karin S Lindelöf, *Om vi nu ska bli som Europa: Könsskapande och normalitet bland unga kvinnor i transitionens Polen*, 2006
7. Andrew Stickley. *On Interpersonal Violence in Russia in the Present and the Past: A Sociological Study*, 2006
8. Arne Ek, *Att konstruera en uppslutning kring den enda vägen: Om folkrörelsers modernisering i skuggan av det Österuropeiska systemskiftet*, 2006
9. Agnes Ers, *I mänsklighetens namn: En etnologisk studie av ett svenskt biståndsprojekt i Rumänien*, 2006
10. Johnny Rodin, *Rethinking Russian Federalism: The Politics of Intergovernmental Relations and Federal Reforms at the Turn of the Millennium*, 2006
11. Kristian Petrov, *Tillbaka till framtiden: Modernitet, postmodernitet och generationsidentitet i Gorbačevs glasnost' och perestrojka*, 2006
12. Sophie Söderholm Werkö, *Patient patients? Achieving Patient Empowerment through Active Participation, Increased Knowledge and Organisation*, 2008
13. Peter Bötker, *Leviatan i arkipelagen: Staten, förvaltningen och samhället. Fallet Estland*, 2007
14. Matilda Dahl, *States under scrutiny*: *International organizations, transformation and the construction of progress*, 2007
15. Margrethe B. Søvik, *Support, resistance and pragmatism: An examination of motivation in language policy in Kharkiv*, Ukraine, 2007
16. Yulia Gradskova, *Soviet People with female Bodies: Performing beauty and maternity in Soviet Russia in the mid 1930–1960s*, 2007
17. Renata Ingbrant, *From Her Point of View: Woman's Anti-World in the Poetry of Anna Świrszczyńska*, 2007
18. Johan Eellend, *Cultivating the Rural Citizen: Modernity, Agrarianism and Citizenship in Late Tsarist Estonia*, 2007
19. Petra Garberding, *Musik och politik i skuggan av nazismen: Kurt Atterberg och de svensk-tyska musikrelationerna*, 2007

20. Aleksei Semenenko, *Hamlet the Sign: Russian Translations of Hamlet and Literary Canon Formation*, 2007
21. Vytautas Petronis, *Constructing Lithuania: Ethnic Mapping in the Tsarist Russia, ca. 1800–1914*, 2007
22. Akvile Motiejunaite, *Female employment, gender roles, and attitudes: The Baltic countries in a broader context*, 2008
23. Tove Lindén, *Explaining Civil Society Core Activism in Post-Soviet Latvia*, 2008
24. Pelle Åberg, *Translating Popular Education: Civil Society Cooperation between Sweden and Estonia*, 2008
25. Anders Nordström, *The Interactive Dynamics of Regulation: Exploring the Council of Europe's monitoring of Ukraine*, 2008
26. Fredrik Doeser, *In Search of Security After the Collapse of the Soviet Union: Foreign Policy Change in Denmark, Finland and Sweden, 1988–1993*, 2008
27. Zhanna Kravchenko. *Family (versus) Policy: Combining Work and Care in Russia and Sweden*, 2008
28. Rein Jüriado, *Learning within and between public-private partnerships*, 2008
29. Elin Boalt, *Ecology and evolution of tolerance in two cruciferous species*, 2008
30. Lars Forsberg, *Genetic Aspects of Sexual Selection and Mate Choice in Salmonids*, 2008
31. Eglė Rindzevičiūtė, *Constructing Soviet Cultural Policy: Cybernetics and Governance in Lithuania after World War II*, 2008
32. Joakim Philipson, *The Purpose of Evolution: 'Struggle for existence' in the Russian-Jewish press 1860–1900*, 2008
33. Sofie Bedford, *Islamic activism in Azerbaijan: Repression and mobilization in a post-Soviet context*, 2009
34. Tommy Larsson Segerlind, *Team Entrepreneurship: A process analysis of the venture team and the venture team roles in relation to the innovation process*, 2009
35. Jenny Svensson, *The Regulation of Rule-Following: Imitation and Soft Regulation in the European Union*, 2009
36. Stefan Hallgren, *Brain Aromatase in the guppy, Poecilia reticulate: Distribution, control and role in behavior*, 2009
37. Karin Ellencrona, *Functional characterization of interactions between the flavivirus NS5 protein and PDZ proteins of the mammalian host,* 2009
38. Makiko Kanematsu, *Saga och verklighet: Barnboksproduktion i det postsovjetiska Lettland,* 2009
39. Daniel Lindvall, *The Limits of the European Vision in Bosnia and Herzegovina: An Analysis of the Police Reform Negotiations,* 2009
40. Charlotta Hillerdal, *People in Between – Ethnicity and Material Identity: A New Approach to Deconstructed Concepts*, 2009
41. Jonna Bornemark, *Kunskapens gräns – gränsens vetande,* 2009
42. Adolphine G. Kateka, *Co-Management Challenges in the Lake Victoria Fisheries: A Context Approach*, 2010

43. René León Rosales, *Vid framtidens hitersta gräns: Om pojkar och elevpositioner i en multietnisk skola*, 2010
44. Simon Larsson, *Intelligensaristokrater och arkivmartyrer: Normerna för vetenskaplig skicklighet i svensk historieforskning 1900–1945*, 2010
45. Håkan Lättman, *Studies on spatial and temporal distributions of epiphytic lichens*, 2010
46. Alia Jaensson, *Pheromonal mediated behaviour and endocrine response in salmonids: The impact of cypermethrin, copper, and glyphosate*, 2010
47. Michael Wigerius, *Roles of mammalian Scribble in polarity signaling, virus offense and cell-fate determination,* 2010
48. Anna Hedtjärn Wester, *Män i kostym: Prinsar, konstnärer och tegelbärare vid sekelskiftet 1900*, 2010
49. Magnus Linnarsson, *Postgång på växlande villkor: Det svenska postväsendets organisation under stormaktstiden*, 2010
50. Barbara Kunz, *Kind words, cruise missiles and everything in between: A neoclassical realist study of the use of power resources in U.S. policies towards Poland, Ukraine and Belarus 1989–2008*, 2010
51. Anders Bartonek, *Philosophie im Konjunktiv: Nichtidentität als Ort der Möglichkeit des Utopischen in der negativen Dialektik Theodor W. Adornos,* 2010
52. Carl Cederberg, *Resaying the Human: Levinas Beyond Humanism and Antihumanism*, 2010
53. Johanna Ringarp, *Professionens problematik: Lärarkårens kommunalisering och välfärdsstatens förvandling*, 2011
54. Sofi Gerber, *Öst är Väst men Väst är bäst: Östtysk identitetsformering i det förenade Tyskland*, 2011
55. Susanna Sjödin Lindenskoug, *Manlighetens bortre gräns: Tidelagsrättegångar i Livland åren 1685–1709*, 2011
56. Dominika Polanska, *The emergence of enclaves of wealth and poverty: A sociological study of residential differentiation in post-communist Poland*, 2011
57. Christina Douglas, *Kärlek per korrespondens: Två förlovade par under andra hälften av 1800-talet*, 2011
58. Fred Saunders, *The Politics of People – Not just Mangroves and Monkeys: A study of the theory and practice of community-based management of natural resources in Zanzibar*, 2011
59. Anna Rosengren, *Åldrandet och språket: En språkhistorisk analys av hög ålder och åldrande i Sverige cirka 1875–1975*, 2011
60. Emelie Lilliefeldt, *European Party Politics and Gender: Configuring Gender-Balanced Parliamentary Presence*, 2011
61. Ola Svenonius, *Sensitising Urban Transport Security: Surveillance and Policing in Berlin, Stockholm, and Warsaw*, 2011
62. Andreas Johansson, *Dissenting Democrats: Nation and Democracy in the Republic of Moldova*, 2011
63. Wessam Melik, *Molecular characterization of the Tick-borne encephalitis virus: Environments and replication*, 2012

64. Steffen Werther, *SS-Vision und Grenzland-Realität: Vom Umgang dänischer und „volks-deutscher" Nationalsozialisten in Sønderjylland mit der „großgermanischen" Ideologie der SS*, 2012
65. Peter Jakobsson, *Öppenhetsindustrin*, 2012
66. Kristin Ilves, *Seaward Landward: Investigations on the archaeological source value of the landing site category in the Baltic Sea region*, 2012
67. Anne Kaun, *Civic Experiences and Public Connection: Media and Young People in Estonia*, 2012
68. Anna Tessmann, *On the Good Faith: A Fourfold Discursive Construction of Zoroastripanism in Contemporary Russia*, 2012
69. Jonas Lindström, *Drömmen om den nya staden: Stadsförnyelse i det postsovjetisk Riga,* 2012
70. Maria Wolrath Söderberg, *Topos som meningsskapare: Retorikens topiska perspektiv på tänkande och lärande genom argumentation*, 2012
71. Linus Andersson, *Alternativ television: Former av kritik i konstnärlig TV-produktion,* 2012
72. Håkan Lättman, *Studies on spatial and temporal distributions of epiphytic lichens*, 2012
73. Fredrik Stiernstedt, Mediearbete i mediehuset: Produktion i förändring på MTG-radio, 2013
74. Jessica Moberg, *Piety, Intimacy and Mobility: A Case Study of Charismatic Christianity in Present-day Stockholm*, 2013
75. Elisabeth Hemby, *Historiemåleri och bilder av vardag: Tatjana Nazarenkos konstnärskap i 1970-talets Sovjet*, 2013
76. Tanya Jukkala, *Suicide in Russia: A macro-sociological study*, 2013
77. Maria Nyman, *Resandets gränser: Svenska resenärers skildringar av Ryssland under 1700-talet*, 2013
78. Beate Feldmann Eellend, *Visionära planer och vardagliga praktiker: Postmilitära landskap i Östersjöområdet,* 2013
79. Emma Lind, *Genetic response to pollution in sticklebacks: natural selection in the wild*, 2013
80. Anne Ross Solberg, *The Mahdi wears Armani: An analysis of the Harun Yahya enterprise,* 2013
81. Nikolay Zakharov, *Attaining Whiteness: A Sociological Study of Race and Racialization in Russia,* 2013
82. Anna Kharkina, *From Kinship to Global Brand: The Discourse on Culture in Nordic Cooperation after World War II*, 2013
83. Florence Fröhlig, *A painful legacy of World War II: Nazi forced enlistment: Alsatian/Mosellan Prisoners of war and the Soviet Prison Camp of Tambov*, 2013
84. Oskar Henriksson, *Genetic connectivity of fish in the Western Indian Ocean*, 2013
85. Hans Geir Aasmundsen, *Pentecostalism, Globalisation and Society in Contemporary Argentina*, 2013
86. Anna McWilliams, *An Archaeology of the Iron Curtain: Material and Metaphor*, 2013
87. Anna Danielsson, *On the power of informal economies and the informal economies of power: Rethinking informality, resilience and violence in Kosovo*, 2014
88. Carina Guyard, *Kommunikationsarbete på distans*, 2014
89. Sofia Norling, *Mot "väst": Om vetenskap, politik och transformation i Polen 1989–2011*, 2014
90. Markus Huss, *Motståndets akustik: Språk och (o)ljud hos Peter Weiss 1946–1960,* 2014

91. Ann-Christin Randahl, *Strategiska skribenter: Skrivprocesser i fysik och svenska*, 2014
92. Péter Balogh, *Perpetual borders: German-Polish cross-border contacts in the Szczecin area*, 2014
93. Erika Lundell, *Förkroppsligad fiktion och fiktionaliserade kroppar: Levande rollspel i Östersjöregionen*, 2014
94. Henriette Cederlöf, *Alien Places in Late Soviet Science Fiction: The "Unexpected Encounters" of Arkady and Boris Strugatsky as Novels and Films*, 2014
95. Niklas Eriksson, *Urbanism Under Sail: An archaeology of fluit ships in early modern everyday life*, 2014
96. Signe Opermann, *Generational Use of News Media in Estonia: Media Access, Spatial Orientations and Discursive Characteristics of the News Media*, 2014
97. Liudmila Voronova, *Gendering in political journalism: A comparative study of Russia and Sweden,* 2014
98. Ekaterina Kalinina, *Mediated Post-Soviet Nostalgia*, 2014
99. Anders E. B. Blomqvist, *Economic Natonalizing in the Ethnic Borderlands of Hungary and Romania: Inclusion, Exclusion and Annihilation in Szatmár/Satu-Mare, 1867–1944,* 2014
100. Ann-Judith Rabenschlag, *Völkerfreundschaft nach Bedarf: Ausländische Arbeitskräfte in der Wahrnehmung von Staat und Bevölkerung der DDR*, 2014
101. Yuliya Yurchuck, *Ukrainian Nationalists and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army in Post-Soviet Ukraine*, 2014
102. Hanna Sofia Rehnberg, *Organisationer berättar: Narrativitet som resurs i strategisk kommunikation*, 2014
103. Jaakko Turunen, *Semiotics of Politics: Dialogicality of Parliamentary Talk*, 2015
104. Iveta Jurkane-Hobein, *I Imagine You Here Now: Relationship Maintenance Strategies in Long-Distance Intimate Relationships*, 2015
105. Katharina Wesolowski, *Maybe baby? Reproductive behaviour, fertility intentions, and family policies in post-communist countries, with a special focus on Ukraine*, 2015
106. Ann af Burén, *Living Simultaneity: On religion among semi-secular Swedes*, 2015
107. Larissa Mickwitz, *En reformerad lärare: Konstruktionen av en professionell och betygssättande lärare i skolpolitik och skolpraktik,* 2015
108. Daniel Wojahn, *Språkaktivism: Diskussioner om feministiska språkförändringar i Sverige från 1960-talet till 2015*, 2015
109. Hélène Edberg, *Kreativt skrivande för kritiskt tänkande: En fallstudie av studenters arbete med kritisk metareflektion*, 2015
110. Kristina Volkova, *Fishy Behavior: Persistent effects of early-life exposure to 17α-ethinylestradiol*, 2015
111. Björn Sjöstrand, *Att tänka det tekniska: En studie i Derridas teknikfilosofi,* 2015
112. Håkan Forsberg, *Kampen om eleverna: Gymnasiefältet och skolmarknadens framväxt i Stockholm, 1987–2011*, 2015
113. Johan Stake, *Essays on quality evaluation and bidding behavior in public procurement auctions*, 2015

114. Martin Gunnarson, *Please Be Patient: A Cultural Phenomenological Study of Haemodialysis and Kidney Transplantation Care*, 2016
115. Nasim Reyhanian Caspillo, *Studies of alterations in behavior and fertility in ethinyl estradiol-exposed zebrafish and search for related biomarkers,* 2016
116. Pernilla Andersson, *The Responsible Business Person: Studies of Business Education for Sustainability,* 2016
117. Kim Silow Kallenberg, *Gränsland: Svensk ungdomsvård mellan vård och straff,* 2016
118. Sari Vuorenpää, *Literacitet genom interaction*, 2016
119. Francesco Zavatti, *Writing History in a Propaganda Institute: Political Power and Network Dynamics in Communist Romania*, 2016
120. Cecilia Annell, *Begärets politiska potential: Feministiska motståndsstrategier i Elin Wägners 'Pennskaftet', Gabriele Reuters 'Aus guter Familie', Hilma Angered-Strandbergs 'Lydia Vik' och Grete Meisel-Hess 'Die Intellektuellen',* 2016
121. Marco Nase, *Academics and Politics: Northern European Area Studies at Greifswald University, 1917–1992,* 2016
122. Jenni Rinne, *Searching for Authentic Living Through Native Faith – The Maausk movement in Estonia*, 2016
123. Petra Werner, *Ett medialt museum: Lärandets estetik i svensk television 1956–1969*, 2016
124. Ramona Rat, *Un-common Sociality: Thinking sociality with Levinas*, 2016
125. Petter Thureborn, *Microbial ecosystem functions along the steep oxygen gradient of the Landsort Deep, Baltic Sea*, 2016
126. Kajsa-Stina Benulic, *A Beef with Meat Media and audience framings of environmentally unsustainable production and consumption*, 2016
127. Naveed Asghar, *Ticks and Tick-borne Encephalitis Virus – From nature to infection*, 2016
128. Linn Rabe, *Participation and legitimacy: Actor involvement for nature conservation*, 2017
129. Maryam Adjam, *Minnesspår: Hågkomstens rum och rörelse i skuggan av en flykt*, 2017
130. Kim West, *The Exhibitionary Complex: Exhibition, Apparatus and Media from Kulturhuset to the Centre Pompidou, 1963–1977*, 2017
131. Ekaterina Tarasova, *Anti-nuclear Movements in Discursive and Political Contexts: Between expert voices and local protests, 2017*
132. Sanja Obrenović Johansson, *Från kombifeminism till rörelse: Kvinnlig serbisk organisering i förändring, 2017*
133. Michał Salamonik, *In Their Majesties' Service: The Career of Francesco De Gratta (1613–1676) as a Royal Servant and Trader in Gdańsk,* 2017
134. Jenny Ingridsdotter, *The Promises of the Free World: Postsocialist Experience in Argentina and the Making of Migrants, Race, and Coloniality*, 2017
135. Julia Malitska, *Negotiating Imperial Rule: Colonists and Marriage in the Nineteenth century Black Sea Steppe,* 2017
136. Natalya Yakusheva, *Parks, Policies and People: Nature Conservation Governance in Post-Socialist EU Countries,* 2017

137. Martin Kellner, *Selective Serotonin Re-uptake Inhibitors in the Environment: Effects of Citalopram on Fish Behaviour,* 2017
138. Krystof Kasprzak, *Vara – Framträdande – Värld: Fenomenets negativitet hos Martin Heidegger, Jan Patočka och Eugen Fink*, 2017
139. Alberto Frigo, *Life-stowing from a Digital Media Perspective: Past, Present and Future*, 2017
140. Maarja Saar, *The Answers You Seek Will Never Be Found at Home: Reflexivity, biographical narratives and lifestyle migration among highly-skilled Estonians*, 2017
141. Anh Mai, *Organizing for Efficiency: Essay on merger policies, independence of authorities, and technology diffusion*, 2017
142. Gustav Strandberg, *Politikens omskakning: Negativitet, samexistens och frihet i Jan Patočkas tänkande*, 2017
143. Lovisa Andén, *Litteratur och erfarenhet i Merleau-Pontys läsning av Proust, Valéry och Stendhal*, 2017
144. Fredrik Bertilsson, *Frihetstida policyskapande: Uppfostringskommissionen och de akademiska konstitutionerna 1738–1766*, 2017
145. Börjeson, Natasja, *Toxic Textiles – Towards responsibility in complex supply chains*, 2017
146. Julia Velkova, *Media Technologies in the Making – User-Driven Software and Infrastructures for computer Graphics Production*, 2017
147. Karin Jonsson, *Fångna i begreppen? Revolution, tid och politik i svensk socialistisk press 1917–1924*, 2017
148. Josefine Larsson, *Genetic Aspects of Environmental Disturbances in Marine Ecosystems – Studies of the Blue Mussel in the Baltic Sea*, 2017
149. Roman Horbyk, *Mediated Europes – Discourse and Power in Ukraine, Russia and Poland during Euromaidan*, 2017
150. Nadezda Petrusenko, *Creating the Revolutionary Heroines: The Case of Female Terrorists of the PSR (Russia, Beginning of the 20th Century)*, 2017
151. Rahel Kuflu, *Bröder emellan: Identitetsformering i det koloniserade Eritrea*, 2018
152. Karin Edberg, *Energilandskap i förändring: Inramningar av kontroversiella lokaliseringar på norra Gotland*, 2018
153. Rebecka Thor, *Beyond the Witness: Holocaust Representation and the Testimony of Images – Three films by Yael Hersonski, Harun Farocki, and Eyal Sivan*, 2018
154. Maria Lönn, *Bruten vithet: Om den ryska femininitetens sinnliga och temporala villkor*, 2018
155. Tove Porseryd, *Endocrine Disruption in Fish: Effects of 17α-ethinylestradiol exposure on non-reproductive behavior, fertility and brain and testis transcriptome*, 2018
156. Marcel Mangold, *Securing the working democracy: Inventive arrangements to guarantee circulation and the emergence of democracy policy*, 2018
157. Matilda Tudor, *Desire Lines: Towards a Queer Digital Media Phenomenology*, 2018
158. Martin Andersson, *Migration i 1600-talets Sverige: Älvsborgs lösen 1613–1618*, 2018
159. Johanna Pettersson, *What's in a Line? Making Sovereignty through Border Policy*, 2018
160. Irina Seits, *Architectures of Life-Building in the Twentieth Century: Russia, Germany, Sweden*, 2018
161. Alexander Stagnell, *The Ambassador's Letter: On the Less Than Nothing of Diplomacy*, 2019
162. Mari Zetterqvist Blokhuis, *Interaction Between Rider, Horse and Equestrian Trainer – A Challenging Puzzle*, 2019

163. Robin Samuelsson, *Play, Culture and Learning: Studies of Second-Language and Conceptual Development in Swedish Preschools*, 2019
164. Ralph Tafon, *Analyzing the "Dark Side" of Marine Spatial Planning – A study of domination, empowerment and freedom (or power* in*,* of *and* on *planning) through theories of discourse and power*, 2019
165. Ingela Visuri, *Varieties of Supernatural Experience: The case of high-functioning autism*, 2019
166. Mathilde Rehnlund, *Getting the transport right – for what? What transport policy can tell us about the construction of sustainability*, 2019
167. Oscar Törnqvist, *Röster från ingenmansland: En identitetsarkeologi i ett maritimt mellanrum*, 2019
168. Elise Remling, *Adaptation, now? Exploring the Politics of Climate Adaptation through Post-structuralist Discourse Theory*, 2019
169. Eva Karlberg, *Organizing the Voice of Women: A study of the Polish and Swedish women's movements' adaptation to international structures*, 2019
170. Maria Pröckl, *Tyngd, sväng och empatisk timing – Förskollärares kroppsliga kunskaper*, 2020
171. Adrià Alcoverro, *The University and the Demand for Knowledge-based Growth: The hegemonic struggle for the future of Higher Education Institutions in Finland and Estonia*, 2020
172. Ingrid Forsler, *Enabling media: Infrastructures, imaginaries and cultural techniques in Swedish and Estonian visual arts education,* 2020
173. Johan Sehlberg, *Of Affliction – The Experience of Thought in Gilles Deleuze by way of Marcel Proust*, 2020
174. Renat Bekkin, *People of reliable loyalty…: Muftiates and the State in Modern Russia*, 2020
175. Olena Podolian, *The Challenge of 'Stateness' in Estonia and Ukraine: The international dimension a quarter of a century into independence*, 2020
176. Patrick Seniuk, *Encountering Depression In-Depth: An existential-phenomenological approach to selfhood, depression, and psychiatric practice*, 2020
177. Vasileios Petrogiannis, *European Mobility and Spatial Belongings: Greek and Latvian migrants in Sweden*, 2020
178. Lena Norbäck Ivarsson, *Tracing environmental change and human impact as recorded in sediments from coastal areas of the northwestern Baltic Proper*, 2020
179. Sara Persson, *Corporate Hegemony through Sustainability: A Study of Sustainability Standards and CSR Practices as Tools to Demobilise Community Resistance in the Albanian Oil Industry, 2020.*
180. Juliana Porsani, *Livelihood Implications of Large-Scale Land Concessions in Mozambique: A case of family farmers' endurance*, 2020
181. Anders Backlund, *Isolating the Radical Right: Coalition Formation and Policy Adaptation in Sweden*, 2020
182. Nina Carlsson, *One Nation, One Language? National minority and Indigenous recognition in the politics of immigrant integration*, 2021

Integration policies typically require immigrants to demonstrate knowledge of the majority language and culture. Official recognition of national minorities or Indigenous peoples nevertheless challenges the idea of one national belonging to be exclusively promoted through nation-building practices such as integration.

This study investigates previously unexplored tensions, connections, synergies and separations between the politics of immigrant integration and minority recognition in Europe. Drawing on material ranging from documents and interviews to participant observation, it carries out an overview of policies of integration and recognition in 27 EU member states, as well as in-depth case studies on integration in Swedish-speaking Finland, Swedish Sápmi, and Turkish-speaking, Muslim Bulgaria.

Immigrant integration policies are shown, with few exceptions, to reproduce majority nationalism. Integration and recognition are found to intersect in complex, layered ways that contemporary monolingual, territory-based models of minority recognition and integration fail to capture. The study's findings have normative implications that call for context-bound inquiries to help rethink present policies in ways that acknowledge the multitude of belongings in society instead of primarily supporting the goals of majority nation-building.

Nina Carlsson is a political scientist at Södertörn University. This study is her doctoral dissertation, written at the Department of Political Science, within the research area of Politics, Economy and the Organisation of Society (PESO), and the Baltic and East European Graduate School (BEEGS), Södertörn University.

Political Science, Politics, Economy and the Organisation of Society, School of Social Sciences, Baltic and East European Studies, Södertörn University

ISBN 978-91-89109-40-7 (print) / 978-91-89109-41-4 (digital) | **Södertörn University** | **publications@sh.se**

SÖDERTÖRN UNIVERSITY | STOCKHOLM
sh.se