

BOOK REVIEWS

Briones, Leah (2009) *Empowering Migrant Women. Why Agency and Rights are not enough.* Farnham: Ashgate. 228 pp.

Over the past decades, hundreds of thousands Filipina women have emigrated to affluent parts of the world in order to work as domestic workers. Leah Briones, a researcher based at the University of Queensland in Australia, refers to them as Filipina overseas workers or *FODWs*. The prior debate and research on the FODW phenomenon is highly polarised: either FODWs are categorised as victims of global inequality or – by those emphasising FODWs' agency – as free-standing individuals. Briones challenges this simplified slave versus worker distinction in her research on FODWs' experiences in Hong Kong and Paris.

The empirical data of the study consists of discussions, interviews, and email exchanges with 24 FODWs in the abovementioned cities, which are both major destinations for FODWs. NGOs and associations dealing with migrant work issues have also been interviewed. The theoretical discussion elaborates the agency versus structure debate in the feminist migration studies.

Briones's aim has been to write a book that is important not only academically but also of relevance to policymakers in the field of migration and human rights. The FODW phenomenon has a transnational character: prosperous families in wealthy countries demand cheap and flexible labour while the Philippine economy is highly dependent on the remittances that FODWs send back. The main motivation behind FODWs' emigration is securing a better livelihood for themselves and for their families and relatives in the Philippines since the Philippine labour market fails to provide all the citizens opportunities to make a decent living. All except one of the respondents in the study said they would not have left the Philippines had they been earning enough to support themselves and their families. According to Briones, the economic situation in

the Philippines has worsened due to neoliberal structural changes and corruption.

The author distances herself from the feminist structural studies that "describe migrant domestic workers as export-import traded commodities whose labor is reduced and confined to slave-like servitude within the precarious employment sector of domestic work in the host countries" (p. 5). However, Briones does not underestimate the problems and oppression related to the phenomenon – problems that are exemplified by the following interview quote from a FODW in Hong Kong:

"My first employer would feed me just one boiled egg and noodles a day for a week ... Of course I have my limits for when I think there is an unacceptable form of abuse. That's when I will fight back and take them to court and leave them. But if it's just the long hours and the unreasonable verbal scolding, well that's just part and parcel of the job" (p. 124).

The interview quote highlights the ambiguity of the position of the FODW. On one hand, there are some possibilities for exerting agency (such as suing or leaving the employer); on the other hand, the scope for negotiating working conditions is often very limited.

The study has an emancipatory aim to protect the rights and livelihoods of Filipina overseas domestic workers. The argument is that the most viable way is to shift approaches from the paradigm of protection to that of empowerment. The inclusion of domestic work as vulnerable, for instance in the United Nations Trafficking Protocol in November 2000, has led to a victim based approach to the FODW phenomenon. This modern slavery discourse has led to many human rights NGOs lobbying for the "protection" of victims under anti-trafficking laws. Briones argues that policymakers' ideas of protection and focus on border controls are in many ways counterproductive as they fail to respond to migrants' needs for empowerment.

Residence permits, for example, are often conditional on having employment, which undermines the bargaining position of the migrant worker vis-à-vis the employer. Briones shows that FODWs are capable agents “because they exert agency even when abused/ oppressed/enslaved”. Nevertheless, external constraints such as migration policies – including a threat of deportation back to the Philippines – where the opportunity of gainful employment is absent, weakens the FODW agency.

The author admits that she had previously been “thoroughly convinced by feminist-structuralist explanations that FODWs, as ‘poor Third World women’, were clearly victims” (p. 5). Briones now criticises this common one-sided approach to the phenomenon. Lately there has been much focus on agency in the feminist works dealing with the positive aspects of migration in contrast to the structural-based studies. These studies centred around agency to highlight individual migrants’ abilities to make a better living in the global labour market and represented the “victorious” side of migrant domestic work. Briones, however, claims that looking at the agency of the FODWs is not enough. In practical terms, this means “that while protecting rights doesn’t guarantee livelihoods, protecting livelihoods creates the opportunity or capability for securing rights” (p. 4).

Briones argues that the most viable way to empower FODWs is to identify and remove the constraints that prevent FODWs from earning a livelihood. The *internal* constraints inside the FODW institution are accounts of oppression, abuse, and enslavement at the workplace or by FODW recruitment agencies. Therefore host country domestic work needs to be regulated more effectively. So far improvements in this area have focused mainly on the visibility of workers and societal respect for their work. This is important but not enough. Policy discussions should also address “the need to develop and increase access to resources such as accommodation for interim periods of unemployment, counseling, health cover, as well as social security access” (p. 173).

The *external* constraints are the limited possibilities for FODWs to reach a decent living standard in their country of origin. In this regard Briones criticises the “under-valorization of poverty in current agency-based analyses of FODWs” (p. 135). The weakness of the agency-based accounts lies in their “failing to incorporate the role of broader structural contexts that push and facilitate the movements of migrant workers through multiple borders, on multiple occasions” (p. 8).

As the name of the book implies, a human rights based approach is limited for empowering FODWs whose existence is tied to their access to resources. Consequently, rights must be paired with capabilities (both theoretically and practically) for migrant women to realise empowerment, that is, getting access to resources in their host country. Here Briones follows philosopher Martha Nussbaum, who asserts that all human rights have an economic and material aspect.

Briones’s study addresses an important and topical phenomenon that entails much human suffering but also potential for improving one’s life by utilising opportunities provided by the globalised economy. The strength of the book lies in reaching beyond the conventional “black and white” approach to the FODW-phenomenon. The author also discusses the strengths and weaknesses of different policy approaches to the issue. The ethnographical part is illuminating and reminds us of how migration is related to gender, racialisation, and class.

The book is well grounded in the previous sociological and feminist debates on the agency/structure dilemma. However, it would have benefited from a more compact introduction of existing theories, especially as it is also aimed at a non-academic audience of policymakers and activists. The theoretical discussion seems at times excessive and partly overlapping. Nevertheless, it is highly recommended for academic and non-academic audiences interested in migration, migration policy, gender, feminism, and the rights of migrant workers in general. What is not addressed is what kind of issues lie behind the increasing need of foreign domestic workers in the receiving countries. But that is perhaps an issue for a future study.

Rolle Alho^{1,2}

¹PhD candidate, Department of Social Research, University of Turku

²Swedish School of Social Science, University of Helsinki

Eide, Elisabeth & Nikunen, Kaarina (eds) (2011) *Media in Motion. Cultural Complexities and Migration in the Nordic Region*. Farnham: Ashgate. 296 pp.

Media in Motion is the latest take on assessing the role played by various migrant groups both as the subject and the object of the mediated negotiation of symbolic national boundaries. The volume is a timely response to the rapidly evolving Nordic context of such negotiation, especially considering how differently the Nordic countries are situated along their immigration trajectories. Despite significant variation among the countries considered (Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden), the editors Elisabeth Eide and Kaarina Nikunen point out that there are also some common developments they refer to as a “change of climate”. In particular, the editors point to a proliferation of roles given to migrants in the media that all include some kind of Othering, whether the role is the “victim” or the “villain”, or whether migrants are objectified and silenced or accepted into a dialogue (pp. 9–11).

In order to illustrate the developments responsible for the Othering practices, the book introduces chapters that analyse the internal routines through which mediated content is produced, as well as chapters assessing responses to such mediated contents by migrants and society at large. This variety in approaches is decidedly a great strength of the book, allowing the reader to link

* E-mail: rolle.alho@helsinki.fi

and triangulate between several coexisting narratives to gain a better understanding of the environment in which various cultural complexities arise. Still, it would have been helpful to divide the fifteen chapters into two or three sections based on similarities in the research setting, thus helping the reader compare and contrast the findings in a more systematic way. Likewise, an addition of a concluding chapter would have allowed the authors to underscore at least some of the major findings and their implications relative to each other, thereby also making their contribution more readily accessible to a larger audience.

1 Confrontation by choice

One of the most interesting ideas in the book is that the confrontational relationship towards migrant minorities is a combination of a consciously chosen media strategy by political actors and the conflict-emphasising journalistic criteria. Eide and Nikunen discuss the rise of immigration on the political agendas of populist parties as communicated by leading news media. Particularly with the recent electoral success of the True Finns and Sweden Democrats, it seems that confrontational approaches are clearly made use of in political mobilisation. However, the extent to which the media have facilitated this kind of confrontational political mobilisation in the Nordic countries varies greatly. While the Finnish media treats the True Finns' party leader Timo Soini in a docile way, in Sweden the confrontational approach has resulted in a *cordon sanitaire* impeding the Sweden Democrats from transforming their popular support into daily political influence (Mulinari & Neergaard 2010). It would have been interesting to read more about how the contextual factors in the media climate determine how successful the strategy of framing migration in terms of conflict can be from the point of view of political actors.

Often, though, the conflict-emphasising approach vis-à-vis minorities is due to choices taken by news journalists rather than their sources. As Gunn Bjørnsen notes in her assessment of Norwegian broadcasting practices, the journalistic criteria produce an overrepresentation of conflict and drama, rather than lengthy descriptions of phenomena deemed unfamiliar to an "average listener" (p. 60). On the basis of her interview material Bjørnsen also identifies the lack of personal relationships with members of migrant minorities by both journalists and Norwegians in general as a source of difficulty for a less biased sourcing of immigrant-themed news (p. 53), which then further facilitates confrontational framing.

While Bjørnsen's informants expressed their belief that many of these problems will be solved through increased presence of journalists with immigrant backgrounds, Elisabeth Eide's findings on Norwegian journalists with minority backgrounds furnish this assertion with more critical remarks concerning newsroom conventions and the experience of being straitjacketed by subtle but ubiquitous "ethnified" categorisations (p. 85).

Anne Hege Simonsen and Suvi Keskinen both further contribute to the understanding of mediated confrontation with the minorities. Simonsen notes the great reliance by media on local authorities, particularly the police, as a crucial journalistic source on Roma beggars in Norway, leading to extensive contextualisation of the Roma presence through human trafficking and other criminal activity. Keskinen focuses on the media discussion on three rape cases in Oulu, Finland, pointing out the racialised othering of the unknown perpetrators and the subsequent proliferation of the masculine-defender discourse.

2 Dealing With the Responsibility for Diverse Journalistic Output

Leonor Camauër's chapter on the diversity work policies in Swedish newsrooms suggests that the enforcement of measures "aiming at increase of diversity in the journalistic output" (p. 39) require a constant drumming as to produce even "an awfully slow change". As one of her informants puts it, this is because such diversity work "is not something which solves itself automatically but you have to think of it in each and every [case]" (p. 44). Camauër also identified a sentiment that since the economy of a private enterprise calls for short-term gains, there is a lack of continuity in diversity work programmes. Reporters put a significant amount of accountability for the success of these programmes in the hands of managers at different levels who are considered responsible for the constraints under which the reporters are required to work, effectively proliferating the drama-dimension of journalism also on migration topics (pp. 42–43).

Gunilla Hultén and Karina Horsti discuss the complex questions of responsibility for audience responses and the societal impact of migrant minority content within public service broadcasting (PSB) by presenting the case of *Halal-TV* in Swedish public service television (SVT). Hultén and Horsti take particular interest in the implementation of "good practice" as established by the European Broadcasting Union (EBU). Since EBU statutes require PSBs to both support the national culture and to reflect increasingly multi-ethnic and multicultural societies, PSBs face the challenge of how to provide unbiased content that presents both minority and majority practices while still remaining impartial in the treatment of contested topics. SVT sought to implement these standards by allowing three young Muslim women to present their experiences of problematic encounters with the Swedish society.

The program, aired in 2008, consisted of six episodes dealing with themes such as sex, alcohol, and beauty ideals. According to the authors, the public outcry that ensued testifies to the failure by the SVT "in reconciling and mediating between different types of identities and authorities." While *Halal-TV* succeeded in giving a voice to a migrant minority within the PSB context, the attempt to move towards reporting individual migrant experiences had

several unintended consequences. Hultén and Horsti conclude that by presenting a homogenous and non-contextualised view of Islam, the programme lacked proper dialogue between religious and secular values. As such, *Halal-TV* resulted in compromising not only the “objective ideals of journalism”, but also contributed to “Muslim ideals” being perceived in Sweden as “a threat to secular society” (p. 32).

3 Approaching Migrant Audiences in Theory and Practice

Tobias Hübinette and Carina Tigervall assess the persistence of practices in which a caricatured version of an East Asian man is continued to be portrayed in the Swedish marketing and entertainment industry. According to their analysis, the ridiculing treatment of East Asians, less commonly acceptable towards other minorities, is tied to the Swedish tradition of rebellious humour directed against a growing superpower. These fantasies of power, however, “tend to ‘taint’ and spill over onto the individuals whose bodies connote the imagined superior group [...] even if they feel, and also are, inferior in relation to majority population” (p. 138).

Other depictions of migrants change quite rapidly, as indicated by Eva Bakøy’s historical survey of Norwegian migrant cinema. She draws a trajectory from themes of lonely guest workers of 1980s to the diasporic complexities in 2000s, to indicate how “migrant cinema functions as a space to tell [ethnic Norwegians] about the migrant experience” (p. 160), but also as means of inclusion into Norwegian society. Mari Maasilta shows in her chapter, that while the Finnish prime-time television viewers were satisfied with the content of the serials *Salatut elämät* and *Mogadishu Avenue*, migrants did not find themselves properly represented (p. 197). Among the reasons were given the overloading of the ethnic minority characters with “non-Finnish characteristics” and making them “even more Finnish than the native Finns themselves.”

Rikke Andreassen argues that while migrant audiences have been sought within the entertainment media through a diversified, more inclusive representation, migrants in Denmark continue to experience difficulties in gaining a voice within more “serious” media genres, news in particular. Andreassen discusses the hurdles migrants regularly have to tackle in order to be represented in the “high media” and the awkward contexts they are commonly portrayed in even when they manage to gain a voice. She notes that Muslims entering entertainment formats like “The X Factor” typically get to be presented through a frame of heightened familiarity – as ordinary Joes like “Mohamed from Nørresundby” (p. 172). This approach is contrasted with the news coverage of the candidate Asmaa Abdol-Hamid in the parliamentary elections of 2007. Abdol-Hamid, as well as the few other Muslim candidates, “very often had to answer questions about Islam, arranged marriages, headscarves, death penalty and so on, before they were able to talk about their politics”

and thus were subject to marginalising practices as a result of being marked by difference and controversy (p. 168).

While the divergence in cases discussed by Andreassen gives a lot of food for thought, it would have been helpful to read a more thorough contextualisation of the differences between the genre-specific practices to better assess the specific role that the migrant status has in creating biases in media representation. The members of the majority group commonly, too, find it much easier to gain publicity and media coverage through “an entertaining appeal” than with actual political issues. Much of the news coverage is clearly geared towards the construction of controversies even when dealing with candidates who are considered to belong to the ethnic majority (Kivioja 2008).

Ulrika Sjöberg and Ingegerd Rydin describe the concrete practices through which migrants develop a sense of citizenship through the consumption of national media. The authors note that the informants’ endeavours to follow national print media in spite of the linguistic challenges can actually result in highly communal news-reading practices via informal personal networks. Migrants, some of whom have advanced further in their language studies, gather regularly to discuss recent developments, to share opinions, and to “learn the special laws we have in Sweden” (p. 249). Sjöberg and Rydin conclude that while many do not feel emotionally committed to Sweden, on the rational level they were highly interested in using the national media to gain some levels of cultural proximity, effectively “doing citizenship” (p. 250). Henry Mainsah points out that among Norwegian ethnic minority youth there are high levels of ambivalence concerning the prospect of becoming “an active part of the diasporic community”, and that their transnational connections greatly extend the diasporic community (p. 216). Similarly, Karina Nikunen observes that “life experience in Finnish society” strongly shape interpretations and meanings given to satellite television programmes, facilitating “pluralisation of the public sphere” and promoting “multiple forms of citizenship” (p. 232).

In the last chapter, Sharam Alghasi outlines the importance of transcending both methodological nationalism and methodological multiculturalism in order to better appreciate the diasporic, hybrid identity-work. According to Alghazi, an example of the complexities hard to grasp within the older “migrant study 1.0 and 2.0” frameworks can be found in the Iranian-Norwegians’ keen interest in monitoring how their identity markers are represented in the national media, individually constructing “an Iran of their own.” By cherishing their transnational bonds through the use of national media, these migrants have become both “more Iranian” and more integrated through familiarising themselves with national media and creating solid individual ties to the civic fora (p. 263). The theoretical weight of the chapter leaves the exploration of actual mechanisms sidelined and the empirical data to exemplify these processes is scantily discussed.

Some pertinent questions are left hanging and a concluding chapter devoted to theoretical conclusions within media studies

could have elaborated the implications of the findings in *Media in Motion*. Even so, the book remains an important contribution towards understanding the complexities of the mediated boundary work revolving around the contemporary migratory phenomena.

Niko Pyrhönen

PhD Candidate in Political Science, The Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations and Nationalism, University of Helsinki

References

Kivioja, Pasi 2008, *Iltapäivälehdet mediakentän ja yhteiskunnan muutoksessa*, Tampere: Journalismien tutkimusyksikkö, tiedotusopin laitos, Tampereen yliopisto.

Mulinari, Diana & Neergaard, Anders 2010, 'Sverigedemokraterna och det teoretiska fältet', in *Det vita fältet. Samtida forskning om högerextremism*, eds. M Deland, F Hertzberg & T Hvitfeldt, Uppsala: Opuscula Historica Upsaliensia.

Prato, Giuliana B. (ed) (2009) *Beyond Multiculturalism: Views from Anthropology*. Farnham: Ashgate. 224 pp.

Multiculturalism is a hotly debated subject both in the academia and outside of it. In many European societies at the moment, there is an on-going, often heated debate over the best practices of arranging relationships between migrant populations and the "natives" – a debate that is in many cases highly politicised and engages actors from various walks of life. At the same time, researchers from various disciplinary backgrounds are trying to develop conceptual, theoretical, and methodological tools for grasping issues around multiculturalism and migration. *Beyond Multiculturalism: Views from Anthropology* is a collection of essays that take a critical look at the concept of multiculturalism, and at the various societal practices associated with the term. The aim is thus to discuss "multiculturalism" both as a theoretical concept and as a political practice.

The title of the book promises to look at the issue of multiculturalism from a specifically anthropological point of view. Anthropologists have not figured prominently in academic work on multiculturalism; the area has rather been dominated by sociologists and political scientists. This situation has many causes, tied for example to the ways in which anthropologists traditionally have understood their object of research, but one could say that the long silence of anthropologists on this area is regrettable. One could expect that anthropologists, claiming to be experts on cultural difference, would have something to offer to debates over multiculturalism. Their long silence is also somehow surprising, as "culture" is one of the key concepts in anthropological tradition, and anthropologists have engaged in very sophisticated debates over the concept of culture – debates that would be very useful also when considering social relations in multicultural societies. Of course there are some significant exceptions to this silence: some anthropologists, such as Ulf Hannerz, have commented on

questions of multiculturalism, and many anthropologists working with transnationalism have engaged also in such debates. Nowadays, there is a growing amount of anthropologists doing research on topics related to multiculturalism and migration. Thus, the title of the book is promising and it made me expect important contributions.

What were my expectations concerning a specifically *anthropological* contribution to debates over multiculturalism? I think I expected at least two points: I expected careful theoretical discussion about the concept of culture as well as a review of the radical rethinking over the concept that is currently taking place within the discipline. Secondly, I expected carefully contextualised ethnographic examples of various multicultural settings. Careful ethnographies, at their best, can provide understanding of the ways in which people's everyday life with unexpected nuances articulates with larger economic and political structures. This would enable us to see what is actually taking place, at an everyday level, in various multicultural settings.

My expectations were met to some extent, but not fully. The book consists of an introduction and eleven articles based on empirical research. The scope of the book is rather ambitious: it sets out to criticise the conceptual base of multiculturalism as a contemporary western ideology and practice, and to show how relations between culturally diverse groups are organised in different societies. The array of empirical cases presented in the book is huge: the empirical examples cover Italy, Austria, China, India, Brazil, Argentina, Canada, the United States, Germany, and England. Some cases discuss transnational migration patterns, while others deal with migration from rural to urban areas and with culturally or ethnically articulated encounters resulting from such inter-country mobility. I found it rather refreshing that both international and rural–urban–migration are brought together, to be analysed within the same framework. The empirical examples from Latin America, China, and India are also welcome in this context: they remind us that "multiculturalism" is not something that concerns only western metropolitan societies, but that diversity and migration in different forms shape social relations everywhere in the world. The book thus seeks to bring together different examples in order to produce wide understanding of migration and cultural difference as factors arranging human relations in our time. Such a huge geographical coverage makes at least one point clear: there are vastly differing ways of organising social relations between different culturally defined groups, and in order to understand the variety of social formations, we need to carefully contextualise our object of study.

The introduction of the book, written by the editor of the collection, Giuliana Prato, contextualises the articles in the on-going political debates over multiculturalism as a political model, and in debates over migration and citizenship. The writer is especially critical towards an understanding of multiculturalism that has sometime been called a "culture mosaic" – view of cultural difference (although not named so in this collection) – that is, an

* E-mail: niko.pyrhonen@helsinki.fi

understanding according to which multicultural societies are, and should be, constituted of diverse, bounded cultural communities living side by side and reproducing themselves within their boundaries. She summarises rather economically many large fields of scholarship and debate, such as debates over individual versus collective rights, in relation to the state under various forms of multiculturalism. Prato also summarises debates over the concept of culture within anthropology, paying special attention to tensions arising from the tradition of cultural relativism. She points out that cultural relativism should not be equated with moral relativism, a point that is highly significant in debates over multiculturalism. However, a more profound review of recent debates around the concept of culture within anthropology would have been fruitful ground for elaborating further a critical project for analysing multiculturalism. Prato emphasises the importance of concentrating on cultural practices rather than in culture as an abstract “thing”; she could have developed this line of thought much further by introducing anthropological debates and developments in this field. Debates over hybridity and creolisation, as well as contemporary emphasis on understanding culture as a process, would have been enlightening in this context.

Jerome Kruse’s article “Visual Approach to Multiculturalism” introduces an interesting methodological approach. He analyses visually landscapes in different places (USA, China, Germany, Italy, England) in relation to different paradigms of social relation between culturally diverse groups, in his case “assimilationism”, “cultural pluralism,” and “multiculturalism”. He claims that “vernacular landscapes” may be read as texts that visualise dominant ideologies of ethnic diversity in various places. The article, with photographic illustrations, is thought provoking, but careful ethnographic contextualisation of the presented cases would have made the text much more interesting and the argument stronger. Silvia Surrenti’s article, which closes the book, relies similarly on symbolic interpretation of the urban surroundings. She looks at the ways in which “ethnicity” and cultural difference become consumer goods in the contemporary western world.

Eric Fong gives a rather macro-perspective sociological overview on the ways in which recent migration has changed Canadian cities, whereas Paula Rubel and Abraham Rosman look at transnationalism through the institution of family – they compare various groups (Dominicans, Sikhs, Tongans, Pakistanis, and Chinese) that engage in transnational practices and show how transnational social organisations are formed in the dynamic interplay between the countries of origin and new countries of settlement. Their article is an important reminder of the significance of transnational social formations, and also of the ways in which such formations challenge traditional views on multiculturalism. They remind us of the importance of looking beyond the borders of the receiving state in order to grasp the realities of migrant populations.

Giuliana Prato’s article on Albanian-speaking minorities in Italy, and Italo Pardo’s article on the encounters between natives and

migrants in both formal and informal sectors of the economy in the Naples area in Italy are based on ethnographic fieldwork, and as such they provide interesting glimpses of the articulation between people’s everyday life and macro-structures. Prato’s case of the Albanians in Italy is also framed within a historical framework: she looks at the long history of migration between Albania and Italy and shows how migrants from different time periods are differently positioned in relation to both the country of settlement as well as to the country of origin and diasporic connections. Her article is an important reminder of the fact that ethnically demarcated or linguistic minorities are not homogeneous, but rather internally divided by various factors.

Italo Pardo contextualises his analysis of encounters between migrants and natives to the overall economic and political situation of the Italian south. He argues that in order to analyse and understand these encounters, we need to look also at the circumstances in which the native populations live. He points to the relationships between citizens and the political elite, to modes of governance, and the legitimacy of the rule among citizens. His argument is that the integration or rejection of various segments of migrant population takes place in such complex contexts.

Danila Mayer’s article on young people with migrant backgrounds in Vienna is also based on ethnographic material. She looks at the ways in which youngsters with migrant background negotiate their position in relation to their cultural background at home and to the dominant Austrian culture. She is able to show some of the on-going dynamic in such encounters.

Ethnographic cases from Latin America – Hector Vazquez and Graciela Rodrigue’s article about an indigenous Argentinean group that has migrated to an urban centre, and Suzana Burnier’s article on rural–urban migration in Brazilian context – remind us of the fact that “multiculturalism” takes very different forms in different parts of the world. These articles discuss the ways in which these rural populations negotiate their place in urban settings in economic, political, and cultural terms.

Zhang Jijiao looks at rural–urban migration in China and its impacts on social relations in multi-ethnic cities. He relies both on statistical material and in qualitative interview material. His article provides interesting material on the developments in China, but his conceptual framework is rather sociological than anthropological. He analyses his material with concepts such as stereotyping, and through Ralph Dahrendorf’s theories of inequality and rank.

Sumita Chaudhuri’s article on rural–urban migration in India, especially migration to “mega-cities” such as Kokata, Delhi, Mumbai, and Chennai relies heavily on statistical material. The huge ethnic and cultural variety of India is played out in such mega-cities. The writer puts forward an argument that these rural migrants bring with them their cultural traditions to the big cities, and the cultural heterogeneity is reproduced in urban areas. The article provides an interesting overview of the situation in India, but

I expected more ethnographically grounded understanding of the actual encounters between the various groups.

All in all, the array of articles in this book raise several interesting themes in relation to multiculturalism, and the case studies presented are interestingly varied. However, to my disappointment, many of the empirical articles in the book are not based on an ethnographic approach. Most of them are informative and put forward interesting points, but they do not bring any specifically anthropological viewpoint to the discussions over multiculturalism. The nuances of cultural encounters on the ground are largely missing in these contributions. Thus, there is still ample room for ethnographic and anthropological contributions to the study of migration and multiculturalism.

Laura Huttunen

Acting professor, School of social sciences and humanities, University of Tampere

Encarnación Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Manuela Boatcă & Sergio Costa (eds) (2010) *Decolonizing European Sociology. Transdisciplinary Approaches*. Farnham: Ashgate, 269 pp.

The aim of the anthology on decolonising European sociology is to “read sociology against its grain – exposing and disposing of its conventional European genealogy of thought and revealing its national boundaries as limitations to knowledge on global interconnections” (p. 1). This aim is an ambitious one: there is a clear theoretical focus on the very foundations of sociological thought and scholarship. To “decolonise” sociological knowledge refers particularly to challenging the ideas of modernity that the whole discipline is based on. How to alter the conviction that modernity started in Europe and from there has been (and is) spreading to the rest of the world?

I share the authors’ view that sociology, as well as studies on ethnicity and migration, needs to “provincialise Europe” (term spread to wider use by [Chakrabarty 2000](#)) and learn from the “South” (e.g. [Connell 2007](#)). The book focuses on European sociology, with prominent scholars working in different European locations – mainly the UK, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Italy, and France. From a Nordic perspective it is interesting to note that there are some differences in debates regarding colonialism in different parts of Europe (see e.g. [Keskinen et al. 2009](#)).

The anthology is about *decolonising* sociology. In the Nordic discussions, the more commonly used concept has been postcolonial. Some of the writers (e.g. Boatcă & Costa p.16) emphasise the commonalities between the post- and decolonial: to consider colonial power relations and their present-day consequences. Many of the writers indeed use the term postcolonial in their texts. If postcolonial research has mainly analysed the British colonial rule (particularly in India), decolonial studies focus particularly on luso-hispanic colonialism and Latin American theorising on colonialism. Several of the chapters also discuss the relation between different post-epistemologies: postcolonialism, poststructuralism,

postmodernism, and postsecularism. For instance Boaventura de Sousa Santos (p. 233–237) makes an interesting critique of what he calls dominant forms of postcolonial studies, through making clearer links for instance between capitalism and colonialism than is usually done in postcolonial studies.

The volume consists of fifteen chapters divided in five parts. The first two parts focus most concretely (and theoretically) on an analysis of the foundations of sociological thought and rethinking modernity. The first part analyses the discipline of sociology itself and its dependence on European modernity. As for instance Boatcă & Costa (p. 14), Bhabra (p. 35) and Nederveen Pieterse (p. 86) point out, the whole research aim of sociology is “modernity”. Thus, to make a truly decolonial critique of modernity with Europe as its original locus, is a challenge, and an extremely important one. According to Boatcă & Costa (p. 14) the question is to “trace back the colonial turn that preceded the institutionalization of sociology” rather than advocate for a “postcolonial turn” in current sociology.

The second part focuses explicitly on approaches on modernities and makes a critical discussion of theorising on multiple modernities and globalisation. The third and fourth parts focus on critical readings of “politics of difference” and “border thinking”. These parts include chapters with theoretically motivated empirical analyses, for example on constructions of migrant homophobia, postcolonial analysis of integration practices, and decolonial approaches to beauty studies. If the aim of the book is to make a critical reading of the taken-for-granted alliance of Europe and modernity, one of the answers is to “look South”, to engage with such theorising and experiences that have been largely in the margins of social theory. This perspective is present throughout the book, and the last part of the book is explicitly about Southern perspectives.

The volume is at once coherent and diverse: the approaches to modernity, legacies of colonialism, and European sociological thought are not the same in all chapters, while there is a common drive and ambition to carefully examine these questions. This makes the anthology a rich and dense piece of work. In this review, I will discuss two themes more thoroughly: 1) how the anthology discusses modernity and 2) what does it mean to learn from the South.

1 Rethinking modernity

The basic argument in the anthology is that “modernity” simply cannot be uttered without “coloniality”. In sociological narratives, modernity is often told through political and economic revolutions in Europe, which are further seen as an endogenous European development. For instance, British-led industrial revolution is usually mentioned without the accumulation of capital through colonial economy and even the development of cotton industry in Britain is told without reference to colonial practices that enabled it (Boatcă & Costa p. 16, Bhabra p. 34–35, Encarnación Gutiérrez p. 53–54). As Boatcă and Costa put it (p. 16, Bhabra makes a similar

* E-mail: Laura.Huttunen@uta.fi

argument on p. 34) “Although the establishment of sociology as discipline in Britain, Germany, France and Italy ran parallel to their race for African territories and their creation of colonial empires in Asia and Africa, sociological categories, basic concepts and key explanatory models only reflected developments and experiences internal to western Europe.”

Several authors (Boatcă & Costa pp. 17–20; Bhabra pp. 37–38, Nederveen Piederse pp. 85–91) discuss globalisation theories and theories on multiple modernities, both of which have addressed the Eurocentrism of social theories. However, according to the authors, there is a tendency in both strands of theories to view the West as the starting point of development with other places following the track. Thus, the original and normative modernity is still found in the West, and other places are easily seen as incomplete. There is also a lack of addressing the dependencies and power relations that are legacies of colonial relations (Boatcă & Costa p. 18). Jan Nederveen Piederse offers a critical and historical look at understandings of modernity. We need to reorient in our thinking: for instance, early world economy was centred on East and South Asia and not Europe, which has profound implications for conceptualising the relation between capitalism and modernity. At the moment there is also an “Easternisation of the world” going on, which has not been acknowledged in sociology.

The idea of modernity as European or western takes shape in studies of migration and ethnic relations for instance in “tradition–modernity paradigm”, where some migrants are seen to belong to the “premodern”, or “in need of integration” (see Gutiérrez Rodríguez p. 53). Kien Nghi Ha analyses how colonial civilising missions are revived in integration policies and particularly in policies that differentiate between immigrants from different places. Modernity is often attached to attributes such as equality (e.g. in Göran Therborn’s contribution in the volume). Critical readings on practices and policies regarding migrants and ethnic minorities challenge these kinds of automatic links. Nülifer Göle’s (pp. 109–110) chapter on how Islamic studies can challenge European notions of modernity shows how visibility of Islam in the public sphere questions the alliance of secularism and modernity. He also shows how the European debate on veiling has been unable to address the complex ways in which agency, gender, sexuality, class, public space, and religion intermingle in practices and debates on veiling. Jin Haritaworn looks at how gay and lesbian politics are normatively, even violently, white and construct a figure of the “homophobic migrant”. Shirley Ann Tate analyses how black women’s beauty practices are often interpreted merely as conforming to white beauty norms, rather than understood as performatively produced diverse black beauties. She affirms that there is potential in reconceptualising black beauties that challenge clear racial boundaries of beauty. Franco Cassano (pp. 214–217) names the kind of inability to see and hear other kinds of conceptualisations and knowledge as western fundamentalism attached to colonialism.

2 Engaging with knowledge from the South

What is meant by engaging with knowledge from the “South” is a complex issue. On one hand, it can be a question of epistemological location – what is the location of theoretical knowledge and how is it produced? For Boaventura de Sousa Santos (p. 227) “South” is a “metaphor for human suffering caused by capitalism” and an epistemological location within North–South imperial relations. On the other hand, it can be a question of academic structures and geographical locations – who reads whom and how do the channels of publication and distribution work, who is appointed to positions within the academia (Gutiérrez Rodríguez, pp. 51–52, 58–59).

It is typical that more marginal voices are heard in certain kinds of questions, but not others. Gurinder K. Bhabra for instance (pp. 38–39) criticises Ulrich Beck’s proposal to listen to non-western voices in issues such as coexistence in multi-ethnic, multireligious and multicultural societies, with the implication that the West can set the agenda of listening and dialogue. Instead of these kinds of conditional openings, Bhabra (pp. 42–45) proposes “provincialised cosmopolitanism” that is sensitive to the voices of non-western others. It would mean dialogues among a series of local perspectives on cosmopolitanism, that is, different kinds of practices and aims to think beyond the local, which do not involve the West.

How does learning from the South change the knowledge that is produced? De Sousa Santos (p.226) emphasises knowledge from the South in reinventing social emancipation and answering to the incomplete fulfilment of modern ideals such as equality, liberty, and solidarity. For Franco Cassano decolonising knowledge means first and foremost to deconstruct universalism. Learning from South means also learning from margins within the West. Encarnación Gutiérrez Rodríguez (p. 49, 55) emphasises the importance of bringing such decolonial voices as Chicana, Black, and Third world feminist voices and queer theorising to the core of sociology. These are strikingly absent in the curricula of western sociology.

In the anthology global South refers geographically most often to Latin America and sometimes to East Asia. The focus on Latin American theorising and Latin American colonial experiences is important and interesting and brings nuances to postcolonial thinking. However, there is also plenty of critical African scholarship that would be interesting to read alongside of Latin American theorising.

3 In conclusion

The anthology is a careful piece of work, where scholars with different approaches communicate with each other. I found most inspiring the chapters that question and discuss the basic assumptions of social theories and indicate possible ways forward. The chapters

that focus more on empirical analysis were more predictable, even if they are of high quality and make important contributions to map and explore the racialised and gendered formations in Europe today. Perhaps this shows the work that is to be done: it is easier to sketch visions with a big brush, while it is more challenging when doing the actual sociological work and going into the details of social formations.

Rather expectedly, it is a challenge in this kind of anthology that works with the concept of “Europe” to be faithful to the differences within Europe. There are some chapters in which constructions of “West” and “Europe” are addressed. For example de Sousa Santos calls for a “reprovincializing Europe” in which the differences within Europe are also addressed. What is particularly valuable in the book is that it addresses mainstream sociology and challenges those scholars who are not working at the margins or with questions of difference. Coloniality and its legacies cannot, as the volume powerfully shows, be regarded as the “bad things in the shadow of modernity” (to paraphrase Walter Mignolo 2007) but are at the core of modernity. The insights, as the authors claim, are relevant for social sciences more broadly. Migration research has been also complicit in ways of thinking where some are seen to embody modernity and others are seen to be in need of learning modernity or on their way to modernity. Migration is sometimes seen, in more or less subtle ways, at the same time as a leap in time, not only space – even in the context of research. Thus, the volume builds upon and makes an inspiring contribution to debates on the legacies of colonialism in European scholarship.

Salla Tuori

Postdoctoral researcher, University of Helsinki

References

- Chakrabarty, Dipesh 2000, *Provincializing Europe: postcolonial thought & historical difference*, Princeton University Press.
- Connell, Raewyn 2007, *Southern theory*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Keskinen, Suvi, Tuori, Salla, Irni, Sari & Mulinari, Diana (eds) 2009, *Complying with Colonialism. Gender, Race and Ethnicity in the Nordic Region*, Ashgate, Farnham.
- Mignolo, Walter 2007, ‘Delinking. The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality’, *Cultural Studies*, vol. 21(2–3), pp. 449–514.

Roy, Anjali Gera (2010) *Bhangra Moves. From Ludhiana to London and Beyond*. Farnham & Burlington, VT: Ashgate. 289 pp.

Even if people did not have any musical education, many of them, or at least those exposed to transnational media flows, would probably acknowledge the importance of music originating from India. Those familiar with the vicissitudes of Anglophone popular music would

undoubtedly refer to select songs by the Beatles, while on the classical side people might mention the world-famous sitar-player Ravi Shankar. In addition, the music of India holds a specific place in the disciplinary history of ethnomusicology (or the study of music in and as culture), through the “discovery” of classical northern Hindustani and southern Karnatic musics with their theoretically and acoustically elaborate *ragas* (scales or modes) and *talas* (rhythm patterns). As implied, these constitute some of the core topics of ethnomusicology also in Finland.

At the beginning of the second decade of the 21st century, the Beatles are certainly still well known, and the classical musical traditions of India are thriving – also in the Anglophone ethnomusicological institutions. Yet the Indian music currently heard and experienced outside academic ivory towers is to a considerable degree something else. While departments and disciplines of higher music education foster ideas of core traditions, the music of the streets, of now, of everyday life, is critically and objectively overlooked in the academia. To this end, Anjali Gera Roy’s study on Bhangra is a timely addition to the scholarly literature on the musics of the world and of course particularly that associated with the Indian subcontinent.

I must admit, I am – or at least used to be – one of the ivory tower (ethno)musicologists struggling with “core” topics, comforting myself in the moments of crisis that to familiarise oneself with all the musics in the world would take more than eight billion lifetimes. In this respect, I readily confess that before reading *Bhangra Moves* I was rather ignorant about the music in question. Thus, the intellectual journey that took place between the covers of the book was first and foremost a lesson for me; a lesson predicated on questions about why I know so little about this music and what can I learn from the ideas and interpretations made about it. This inevitably entails acknowledging also the geopolitical positions involved; what might be the significance and applicability of the ideas expressed about a particular type of South Asian music for people living in the north-eastern corner of Europe?

The explicit objectives of *Bhangra Moves* would seem to support my stance, as Roy begins by stating that her general aim is “to investigate the meaning of globalization from the non-West”. More specifically, she intends to combine “a global frame with local and grounded perspectives to examine the various Bhangra mutants that have emerged on the Indian popular musical scene in the wake of globalization”, and hopes “to revise the relation between culture, space and identity and problematize boundaries.” Ultimately, her goal is to address if “cultural practices can alter hierarchies and power structures in the real world” (pp. 2–4). On the basis of these guiding principles, it is clear from the very beginning that Roy treats Bhangra as an inherently political phenomenon, one in which musical sounds, lyrics, and movements are irrevocably intertwined with social, ideological, and economic peculiarities. This is well in line with the basic premises of ethnomusicology, but as the analytical comments on musical sounds *per se* are quite rare and rather

* E-mail: salla.tuori@helsinki.fi

impressionistic, readers who are more musicologically oriented may be disappointed. Readers with a more interdisciplinary mindset in turn will be impressed by the breadth of Roy's treatment as in her "analysis of Bhangra's intervention in the cultural and political field" she indeed "marries the tools of ethnomusicology, sociology and cultural anthropology to performance theory and folklore", in order to conceptualise Bhangra as "an integrated performance that employs various permutations and combinations of sounds, words, movement in varied contexts and produces varied effects on different spectators and performers, which are invariably mediated by circuits of capital and technology" (pp. 26–27).

Indeed, in the ten chapters of *Bhangra Moves* Roy addresses such multifaceted and complex issues as hybridity, authenticity, mimicry, global and local markets, media technologies and formats, subcultures, bodily performances, global communities, and the debates over "global monoculture" (p. 223). The methodological range of Roy's treatment is imposing and highlights superbly the intersections of aesthetics, economy, traditions, generations, media and so on. This comes however at the expense of theoretical insightfulness, as much of the discussion is framed in terms of continental cultural and sociological theorisations with a recurrent twist towards postmodernity; I for one was expecting to learn more about Indian cultural theory, and to that end I was disappointed by the oh-so-familiar conceptual assault by Adorno, Appadurai, Bakhtin, Bourdieu, Foucault, Hall, Jameson, and the lot. There appears to be a kind of methodological contradiction in Roy's points of departure, as she wishes to "explore if it is possible to speak about globalization in an idiom other than the dominant Euro-American" (p. 5) but ultimately does not ground her analysis on any alternative conceptual framework. Certainly, her examples and interpretations complement and contest Euro-American ideas, but the idiom remains the same.

Despite this methodological incongruity, *Bhangra Moves* highlights brilliantly the indisputable constructedness and fluidity of one of the major popular musical genres of the moment. To begin with, Roy acknowledges the difficulties in defining Bhangra, as while it may most often refer to "the hybrid music produced by second generation British Asian youth by mixing Panjabi melodies with western and black beats", it is at the same time "derived from the Panjabi folk genre of the same name, which has spawned other Bhangra mutants such as Bhangrapop and Panjabipop" (p. 1). Or, in more precise terms and distinguishable on the basis of the phonetic rather than typographic qualities of the generic labels, "pung'raa" refers to the Panjabi harvest traditions, "bhaang ra" to a tributary form associated strongly with Indian national identity, and "baeng'raa" to "a made-in-Britain musical genre that hybridizes Panjabi folk rhythms with western melodies and the beats of reggae, hip-hop and rap" (p. 19). The "purity" of various Bhangra-inflected performances is further obfuscated by the ubiquitous presence of "Bollywood impersonations" of the genre where the elaborate performance rules of traditional Panjabi Bhangra are decontextualised,

bowdlerised, and reduced into "a free-for-all dance in which one is legally permitted to make wild noises". As "resplendent in exotic ethnicity [—] against the backdrop of spectacular ethnic or modern settings", this particular form of Bhangra signifies, according to Roy, nothing more than "a wild shaking of torso or limbs best performed in an inebriated state" (pp. 96–97).

Given Roy's critical take on hybridity and culture, as well as her demystifying touch in general, the strong moralistic attack on Bollywood Bhangra comes somewhat as a surprise. The impossibility of escaping one's own value-laden presuppositions becomes evident also in the way in which she celebrates the talent and uniqueness of select performers, whereby her style occasionally is closer to journalism than academic argumentation. Here, of course, Roy's own interpretative position is of primary importance, and while she confesses her "Panjabi roots" in the acknowledgements of the book, and that "Bhangra has been a part of [her] life for a long time" (p. xi), a more detailed self-reflexive account on the nature of the roots and ways of participation would have been of aid in grasping the valorisation of certain artists and the dismissal of Bollywood. Thus, while she contends that "[t]he authenticity question in music is really subservient to the production of Panjabi modernity in the present, which is, by nature, a narrative of fluidity rather than fixity" (p. 50), she ends up assigning different types of Bhangra in an hierarchical order where traditionalist folk discourses top the chart.

Nonetheless, I find her discussion on Bhangrapop in terms of orientalism very useful in its emphasis on the reversing or occidentalising tendencies due to a reliance on "repeat[ing] 'western' sounds that have no recognizable referent in order to modernize traditional music". Thus, Euro-American popular music is for Bhangrapop "an other through which it constitutes itself" (p. 84). Also Roy's dissection of ethnomusicology in relation to the category of World Music is insightful in its warnings against "privileging place over form" whereby ethnomusicology may very well be nothing more than the beginning of "the process of the exocitization of others' music, which the industry converts into a unique selling proposition." Furthermore, she aptly reminds the reader of the tensions between the "pleasure in listening or buying music" and "ethical qualms about the violence in intervening in others' cultural development", as well as of "the typically Adornoesque nightmare" of dichotomising art, folk, and popular musics from each other. In the final analysis, Roy maintains, "Bhangra producers, artists of various dispositions, generic preferences, classes, castes, religious affiliations and geographical location tour non-stop between the folk and the popular, at times ill at ease with, but at others happy, to play along with the 'girls' and other (un)dressings of the popular cultural industry" (pp. 104–105).

From a North-European stance, equally appropriate and exploitable are Roy's remarks on spatially and culturally divergent conceptualisations of youth, meaning that the "western concept of youth as a preparation for adulthood, in particular, differs from the Indian *varnashram* philosophy that regards youth as a preparatory

stage [—] in the four-fold division of individual life” (p. 155). Here, I was immediately struck by concerns about the differences between “youth” in urban and rural areas at different times in Finland, for example, not to mention more recent questions pertaining to so-called multicultural Finland. With respect to the latter aspect, the recurrent references in *Bhangra Moves* to various Muslim musicians and particularly the *mirasi* “who had historically been the mainstay of music production in Panjab” (p. 111) are surely of aid in questioning the prevalent monolithic and Islamophobic assumptions about a total ban on music regardless of the denomination, community, or society in question. In addition, Roy’s considerations over “Bhangra as an embodied practice in which sounds and movements become pivotal to the performance and contestation of ethnocultural identity” (p. 26) and “the overlap between the biological and the social in the production of the body” (p. 177) especially through Bhangra dancing hold a more general validity.

Bhangra Moves proves to be highly useful too for those who wish to elaborate on hybridisation. By critiquing “the polarized idiom of tradition and modernity, indigenous and non-indigenous, purity and contamination” through a notion of “the boundary fetish” as well as “cultural invasion theory” (rather than cultural imperialism), Roy historicises and questions hybridity “by embedding it in a multi-layered history of homegrown hybridity to show that hybridity means different things to different people at different times.” In other words, she “tease[s] out a demotic notion of hybridity in the local practices of everyday life” and “problematize[s] boundaries to deconstruct culture and nation as concepts” (pp. 30–31). This judicious attitude towards hybridity is epitomised in *Bhangra Moves* in the omnipresent notion of “Bhangra mutants”, which – though, alas, nowhere in the book explained or theorised in detail – refers to the constant and inevitable mutation, in a neutral scientific rather than a pejorative sci-fi sense, of musical styles and genres. Thus it moves the discussion beyond the implications of pure lineages (and ultimate infertility) in hybridity, and towards more intricate problematising of rigid categories of music in general.

Bhangra Moves moved me, as promised by its subtitle, to Ludhiana and London, and to some extent beyond those elemental locations too. It may have moved me also to participate now in “Bhangra’s reification in the Euro-American academy” (p. 103), but if nothing else, it urged me to look up and listen to Bhangra from various archives, whether public libraries or YouTube, and even to move my body a little bit to the sounds of it. But the final words of Roy stopped me too, as against a reference to a murder of a five-year-old by ten-year-old drug addicts in Panjab for less than a quarter, all analyses of Bhangra’s empowering potential appear rather inane. On the basis of this, the answer to Roy’s initial question about the capacity of cultural practices to transform real-world power structures would be “no” – but then again, maybe one should remind oneself once again of the complexity of the issues involved, and in this task the eventual movement beyond the gruesome scenes of

Punjabi marginal lives may be facilitated by such multidirectional and intersectional analyses as *Bhangra Moves*.

Antti-Ville Kärjä

Academy of Finland Postdoctoral Researcher, Musicology, University of Turku, Finland/
Film, Television and Media Studies, University of Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand

Maasilta, Mari (2010) *Suomen televisio ja monikulttuuriset yleisöt*. Tampere: Tampere University Press. 219 pp.

Kulttuurien välinen vuorovaikutus on osa postmodernia Suomea ja kansainväliset kontaktit ovat lisääntyneet yhteiskuntaelämän kaikilla osa-alueilla. Suomalaisessa kontekstissa kulttuurien välistä vuorovaikutusta ja monikulttuurisuutta on myös tutkittu melko runsaasti ja näkökulmat sekä tutkimusmenetelmät ovat monipuolistuneet (esim. Koskinen 2003; Sainola-Rodriuez 2009; Sotkasiira; Harinen & Ronkainen 2010). Merkittävää kuitenkin on, että television merkitystä osana maahanmuuttajien kotoutumista ja identifioitumista suomalaiseen yhteiskuntaan on tutkittu vain niukasti. Tampereen yliopiston journalismin tutkimusyksikön tutkijan Mari Maasilan teos *Suomen televisio ja monikulttuuriset yleisöt* onkin tervetullut herättämään keskustelua journalistiikan, media-tutkimuksen ja monikulttuurisuuden merkityksistä suomalaisessa yhteiskunnassa. Teos perustuu Maasilan tutkimushankkeeseen *Maahanmuutto ja media*. Kirja soveltuu sekä oppimateriaaliksi että monikulttuurista mediatutkimusta ja sen metodeja käsitteleväksi syventäväksi oppaaksi.

Tutkimus sisältää kolme osaa, joista ensimmäisessä luodaan katsaus aiempiin maahanmuuttajia televisioyleisönä koskeviin tutkimuksiin ja maahanmuuttajia television katselijoina käsittelevään tilastotietoon. Toisessa kokonaisuudessa esitellään fokusryhmäkeskustelu tutkimusmenetelmänä ja kolmen televisionkatselukokemuksen pohjalle perustuvat haastatteluaineistot. Kolmannesta osasta löytyvät tutkimuksen johtopäätökset ja seikkaperäiset liitteet, esimerkiksi fokusryhmäkeskustelujen haastattelurungot.

1 Maahanmuuttajat ja media

Tutkimuksessa pyrittiin selvittämään, miten maahanmuuttajat merkityksellistävät ja tulkitsevat suomalaisia televisio-ohjelmia. Lisäksi haluttiin saada tietoa siitä miten maahanmuuttajasuomalaisten ja kantasuomalaisten tulkinnat televisio-ohjelmista mahdollisesti eroavat toisistaan. Tutkimus perustuu brittiläisen kulttuurintutkimuksen käsitykselle, jonka mukaan yleisöt tulkitsevat mediasisältöjä omista lähtökohdistaan käsin. Maasilta on tutkimusryhmänsä kanssa onnistunut erinomaisesti sisällyttämään tämän lähtökohdan tutkimusasetelmaansa ja tulosten esittelyyn. Tutkijat halusivat selvittää niitä merkityksenantoja, joita maahanmuuttajat antoivat

* E-mail: avkarj@utu.fi

suomalaiselle televisiolle. Lisäksi tarkasteltiin miten sukupuoli, ikä, koulutustausta tai etninen alkuperä vaikuttivat televisio-ohjelmista tehtyihin tulkintoihin. Tarkoituksena oli myös analysoida television roolia maahanmuuttajien identiteetin muodostumiselle suhteessa Suomeen ja suomalaisiin.

Teoksessa esitellään suomalaisten maahanmuuttajataustaisten televisionkatsojien profiileja tilastollisen tiedon pohjalta. Tilastotiedot tuovat mielenkiintoisen näkökulman televisionkatsetun perhekeskeisyyteen maahanmuuttajien keskuudessa. Perhekeskeisellä televisionkatsetulla voi Maasilan mukaan olla merkittävä sukupolvien välisen kulttuuritiedon siirtämisen funktio. Se tarjoaa maahanmuuttajaperheiden vanhemmille ja lapsille mahdollisuuden samanaikaisesti ylläpitää omaa alkuperäistä kulttuuria ja yhteisen mahdollisuuden oppia asioita suomalaisesta kulttuurista.

2 Metodina fokusryhmäkeskustelu

Fokusryhmähaastattelussa käsiteltiin kolmea katselukokemusta: televisio-ohjelma Mogadishu Avenueta, katkelmaa Poliisi-tv:stä ja Teleoperaattori Elisan mainosta "olen suomalainen". Näitä ohjelmia koskevia tulkintoja kerättiin maahanmuuttajilta, kantasuomalaisilta ja keskusteluryhmiltä, joihin osallistui sekä maahanmuuttajia että kantasuomalaisia. Ryhmille esitettiin näytteitä edellä mainituista televisio-ohjelmista, minkä jälkeen keskusteltiin ohjelmien herättämistä ajatuksista ja tulkinnoista. Ryhmäkeskustelut toteutettiin Tampereella ja pääkaupunkiseudulla vuonna 2008. Ryhmiä oli yhteensä 15. Ryhmien kokoonpano vaihteli kolmen ja yhdentoista henkilön välillä. Osa ryhmistä oli varsin heterogeenisia, toisissa taas osallistujia yhdisti samankaltainen tausta. Esimerkiksi yhteen ryhmään osallistui viisi kotoutuskurssille osallistunutta naista. Ryhmien kokoonpano on esitetty tarkoin liitteissä. Maasilta pohtii teoksessaan ansiokkaasti ryhmien koostumuksen merkitystä, ryhmänvetäjien roolia ja keskustelutilanteita tehden näin fokusryhmäkeskusteluista läpinäkyviä ja helposti lähestyttäviä.

Teoksen keskeiset tulokset liittyvät maahanmuuttajien katselutottumuksiin ja identiteetin muotoutumiseen. Maasilan mukaan maahanmuuttajat katselevat sekä suomalaisia että kansainvälisiä kanavia keskittyen suosikkiohjelmiinsa. Valintoja ei tehdä niinkään ohjelman alkuperämaan mukaisesti. Entisen kotimaan kanavilta maahanmuuttajat etsivät erityisesti tietoa ajankohtaisista tapahtumista. Lisäksi he seuraavat aiemmin tärkeiksi muodostuneita tuttuja ohjelmia. Maahanmuuttajien transnationaalit katselukokemukset näyttivät sekä edistävän kotoutumista että torjuvan entisen kotimaan ikävää. Toisaalta maahanmuuttajien kotoutumisvaihetta ei Maasilan mukaan huomioitu riittävästi television ohjelmatuotannossa. Maahanmuuttajien kiinnostus televisio-ohjelmia kohtaan syntyy henkilökohtaisen elämänvaiheen linkittymisestä ohjelman sisältöön. Suomen paikallinen mediasisältö ei kiinnosta, jollei sillä ole tarttumapintaa maahanmuuttajan omassa elämässä.

Maasilan tutkimusprojektin osallistajat arvioivat esitetyt televisio-ohjelmat kiinnostaviksi ja ajankohtaisiksi, mutta kritiikkiä esitettiin esimerkiksi ohjelmissa esiintyviä stereotyyppioita kohtaan. Fiktiivistä Mogadishu Avenue-sarjaa kritisoitiin epäaidoksi, koska sarjan maahanmuuttajia esittävät näyttelijät olivat suomalaisia. Omaa etnistä ryhmää käsittelevät ohjelmat koettiin usein loukkaviksi. Toisaalta tutkimukseen osallistuneet pitivät hyvänä sitä, että myös maahanmuuttoon liittyviä haasteita esiteltiin televisiossa. Osallistujien mukaan asioiden käsittely kuitenkin vaatii erityistä sensitiivisyyttä, jotta esimerkiksi kokonainen etninen ryhmä ei leimautuisi uutisoinnista.

3 Toiveita suomalaiselle televisiolle

Teoksen lopussa Maasilta tuo esille tutkimuksen tuloksia ja esittää toivomuksia suomalaiselle televisiolle. Ensimmäinen havainto liittyy maahanmuuttajien kokemukseen siitä, että televisio esittää maahanmuuttajat yhtenäisenä ryhmänä, vaikka esimerkiksi Euroopan maista tulleet eivät ensisijaisesti identifioitu maahanmuuttajiksi. Tällöin maahanmuuttajien runsaskaan käsittely televisiossa ei vähennä kokemusta siitä, ettei oman ryhmän etnisyyttä ja sen erityistarpeita huomioida. Tätä pitävät ongelmana erityisesti paluumuuttajat ja Euroopan maista muuttaneet. He toivovat yksilöidämpää televisiosisältöä eri kulttuureista.

Fokusryhmäkeskusteluissa suomalaisen television toivottiin kehittyvän monikulttuuriseksi mediaksi, jossa olisivat esillä erilaiset ja useista etnisistä ryhmistä tulevat juontajat ja näyttelijät. Toisaalta television toivottiin myös näyttävän esimerkkiä siitä, ettei huono suomenkielentaitokaan estä oman viestin esittämistä mediassa. Haastatellut pitivät toivottavana sitä, että heidän entistä kotimaataan ja kulttuuriaan esiteltäisiin positiivisissa asiayhteyksissä sen sijaan, että nyt näitä käsitellään usein vain kielteisten tapahtumien, kuten sotien yhteydessä. He kokivat myös tärkeäksi, että suomalainen televisio edistäisi maahanmuuttajien hyvinvointia tarttumalla vaikeisiin ja vaiettuihin kysymyksiin, kuten seksuaaliseen häiritäntään ja rasismiin.

Suomen televisio ja monikulttuuriset yleisöt –teos on perusteellinen kuvaus tutkimusprojektista, jossa pyrittiin löytämään Suomessa asuvien maahanmuuttajien televisio-ohjelmille antamia tulkintoja sekä tarkastelemaan eroavatko maahanmuuttajien tulkinnat kantasuomalaisien tulkinnosta. Tutkimuksessa käytetty fokusryhmämenetelmää käsitellään ja arvioidaan teoksessa mielestäni riittävästi. Paikoin lukija ei kuitenkaan tiedä, oliko tarkoituksena kirjoittaa tutkimusraportti vai populaarimpi laajemmalle yleisölle tarkoitettu teos. Kaiken kaikkiaan teos on kuitenkin mediatutkimuksen ja journalistiikan ulkopuolisellekin tarkastelijalle riittävän helppolukuinen, sillä turhaa tieteenalakohtaista terminologiaa on vältetty. Erityisen kiitoksen teos saa selkeästä terminologian määrittelystä. Teoksen myötä lukijalle syntyy kuva suomalaisen

televisionkatsomisen monikulttuuristumisen prosessista. Se tuo myös selkeästi esille maahanmuuttajien oman näkemyksen ja toiveet televisio-ohjelmien kehittämiseksi. Tässä suhteessa tutkimus toimii mainiosti myös muita yhteiskunnan osa-alueita koskevan monikulttuurisuuskeskustelun suunnannäyttäjänä.

Ikali Karvinen, Terveystieteiden tohtori, Sh AMK

Post doc-tutkija, Itä-Suomen yliopisto, Terveysalan yliopettaja,
Diakonia-ammattikorkeakoulu

Lähteet:

Koskinen, Liisa 2003, To survive, you have to adjust. Study abroad as a process of learning intercultural competence in nursing, Kuopion yliopisto, Kuopion yliopiston julkaisuja E Yhteiskuntatieteet. Kuopio.

Sainola-Rodriuez, Kirsti 2009, Transnationaalinen osaaminen – uusi terveydenhuoltohenkilöstön osaamisvaatimus, Kuopion yliopisto, Kuopion yliopiston julkaisuja E Yhteiskuntatieteet 172. Kuopio.

Sotkasiira, Tiina, Harinen, Päivi & Ronkainen, Jussi (toim) 2010, Meille saa tulla, Itä-Suomen yliopisto, Joensuu.

* E-mail: ikali.karvinen@luukku.com